BETWEEN EAST AND WEST:
THE GREEK *POLEIS* AS PART OF A WORLD-SYSTEM

Kostas VLASSOPOULOS

Abstract

Standard accounts of Greek history have been overwhelmingly *polis*-centred, Athenocentric and Hellenocentric; they have thus often marginalised the wider Greek world and separated Greek history from the wider Mediterranean and Near Eastern world. This article aims to situate Greek history within a wider world-system. It looks at how we can construct a new subject of Greek history by focusing on the networks moving goods, peoples and ideas and the various centres that organise this world-system.

Many years ago, A. Momigliano pointed out a peculiarity of Greek history, which has not attracted much discussion:

> There is a very elementary difference between Roman and Greek history to which perhaps not enough attention has been paid. Roman history, to the ordinary educated man, has definite limits in space and time: it has a beginning, it has an end; and it is obvious, if you speak of Roman history, that you mean the history of a well-defined territory… With the Greeks it was the opposite. There were no obvious limits of time and space, no proper beginning, no agreed end and no geographical boundaries.[1]

The Greeks had no centre or institution, around which one could organise their history; Greek-speaking communities were scattered all over the Mediterranean, and they never achieved political, economic or social unity; while their cultural unity was not centred on a dominant institution, such as a Church, or a Temple. In the face of these problems, what exactly is the subject of Greek history? And how is one to write it?[2]

In an important way, if there is any point talking about the unity of the Greek world, fragmented in a huge number of different polities, scattered all over the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, it must be emphasised that this unity was created and maintained by the huge numbers of people in movement: sailors, traders, soldiers, artists, physicians, poets, intellectuals. As F. Cassola has put it:

---

[1] Momigliano 1984, 133-34.

[2] It would take a long story to explain how different generations of historians of antiquity gave different answers to the problem. This is treated in detail in Vlassopoulos 2007.

… these 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 places.[3]

But if we accept that this is the case, it is important to recognise that the networks of mobilising and moving these people were not controlled only by Greeks and did not involve only Greeks.

Athenian monumental funerary art of the Classical period provides a good illustration.[4] One of the most impressive monuments of 4th-century Athenian art is the funerary monument of Nikeratos, a metic from the city of Istria in the Black Sea; the monument is clearly inspired and imitates the famous mausoleum of Halicarnasus. But the creation of this new form of funerary art, which fuses together Greek temple architecture and Greek sculpture with Near Eastern decoration themes and funerary monuments, is neither simply an imitation, nor another illustration of Athenian creativity; it was based on long experimentation between Greek and non-Greek artistic practices that took place in the wider Mediterranean Greek world.

Greek artists in Sinope (the Black Sea), Cyrene (North Africa) and the Greek cities of Asia Minor, working for both Greek and non-Greek customers, 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 4th century this experimentation found its way to Athens, creating one of the most impressive artistic achievements of the Greek world. We see here clearly 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 the role of metics in Athenian culture.

We can, I think, reach three conclusions, based on this example. The first is that talking about Athenian art, the art of the Athenian *polis*, is somewhat of a misnomer. We need a larger framework. The second is that the unity, the reciprocal comprehension of the Greek world, is not based on the *polis* or a mysterious common Greek spirit or character; what brings together Athens and Sinope are the networks that move artists, poets, philosophers, but also merchants, sailors, soldiers and craftsmen. But if put like this, a third conclusion seems inescapable: these networks do not move only Greeks and do not stop at the borders of Greek communities. We need therefore a larger framework, and an alternative subject of Greek history.

---

[3] Cassola 1996, 10.
[4] For the following, see Hagemajer Allen 2003.

In a similar way, I. Malkin has presented a case for the centrality of networks in the formation of Greek identities.[5] He has shown how networks between colonies and mother cities have created and transformed local, regional and ethnic identities in both the colony and the mother city. The altar of Apollo Archegetes in Naxos, on which the *theoriai* from Sicily sacrificed before sailing for the Panhellenic sanctuaries, was the starting point of a cultic network that helped define the local (Naxos), the ethnic-regional (Sikeliote), and the Hellenic facets of Greek identity. At the same time, he argues that it was the encounter with various communities and cultures in the wider Mediterranean world and the various networks that communicated this knowledge and experience to the various Greek communities that shaped the creation of a distinct Greek identity, as opposed to what the Greeks came to call the barbarians. The wider Greek world was an essential part of the Greek world-system; not simply in matters of economics (one could think how different the 5th-century Aegean would have been without the vital exchange networks with the Black Sea), but in all possible respects. To give just one example, 'a map designed to note the birthplaces of important pre-Socratic philosophers and fifth-century BC sophists would leave the entire mainland of Greece south of Thrace entirely empty'[6] (with the single exception of Hippias of Elis).

What all the above examples suggest, is that we need an approach that will eschew the distinction between mainland Greece and the colonial world, in order to reach the links and processes that bring them together, creating both the unity and diversity of the Greek world; we have to think of a model that allows us to study these networks and relationships systematically. My proposal is that we should look at the Greek world as a system of communities (Malkin's 'Greek World Web'), maintained by various networks and organised around a variety of different centres. I will argue that Greek history needs to be seen within a world-system approach, which can allow us to uncover a novel Greek history, taking into account the totality of Greek communities and to insert Greek history within the history of the wider Mediterranean and the Black Sea.

What is a World-System?

To answer this question, it is important to clear up some important misconceptions that gather round this notion.[7] The first is that a world-system implies by necessity a distinction between a dominant core and an exploited periphery (and semi-periphery).[8]

---

[5] Malkin 2003.
[6] Tarrant 1990, 621.
[7] See Stein 1999.
[8] For a criticism of this assumption, see De Angelis 2006, 43-45.

Therefore, if it is impossible to find a clear distinction between a centre and an exploited periphery, then there existed no world-system. A dominant centre and an exploited periphery is only one possible form of a world-system. The modern world-system is undoubtedly structured in a centre-periphery form,[9] but this does not mean that every world-system in the past had the same characteristics, or that there were no world-systems, before the emergence of the modern one. One can envisage a variety of different forms: J. Abu-Lughod has convincingly argued that the medieval world-system of the 13th and 14th centuries AD had a form of concentric circles, instead of a single centre and periphery.[10]

The other misconception is that one needs direct contacts in order to talk about a world-system. A sceptic might ask: what exactly do we gain in comprehension, if we say that Paestum, Thebes and Olbia belong to the same world-system?[11] But although direct contacts might as well develop within a world-system, they are by no means necessary. What makes Croton, Aegina, Athens, Samos and Persia parts of the same world-system, is not their direct contacts; it is rather the networks that already in the 6th century move the famous doctor Democedes to traverse the whole Mediterranean from his native Croton to Persia and that link these places together (Herodotus 3. 125-138).

In fact, we can accept I. 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'.[12] If so, the crucial issue is that a single community or polity (a Greek *polis*) cannot be a self-sufficient unit of analysis.[13] By using the term world-system, I am trying to portray and analyse a larger frame of historical reference. I will argue that 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. And 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.

---

[9] See Wallerstein 1974; Braudel 1984.
[10] Abu-Lughod 1989.
[11] An example of this attitude can be seen in Finley 1985, 177-78.
[12] Wallerstein 1974, 15.
[13] Wallerstein 1991.

A world-system exists because there appear processes, exchanges and interactions that link many groups, communities and polities; and these processes, exchanges and interactions, moving people, goods and ideas, range beyond the boundaries of a single group, community or polity. We can roughly distinguish between three different world processes: processes moving people; processes moving goods; and processes moving ideas/technologies.[14] We barely need to add that the three processes are not necessarily to be distinguished; it can often be the case that the same agents might move people, goods and ideas/technologies at the same time. Therefore, the relationship between the three processes cannot be established *a priori*, and needs to be contextually studied. Finally, a world-system is organised around multiple political, economic and cultural centres.

What I propose in this paper is that we can move from a *polis*-centred, Athenocentric and Hellenocentric perspective of Greek history into an account that puts at the centre the networks moving goods, people and ideas and the various centres that organise and direct these networks.[15]

Movement of Goods

The movement of goods in long-distance exchanges is well attested for antiquity. One of the most illuminating images is Polybius' description (4. 38) of the Black Sea:

> The Pontus therefore being rich in what the rest of the world requires for the support of life, the Byzantines are absolute masters of all such things. For those commodities which are the first necessaries of existence, cattle and slaves, are confessedly supplied by the districts round the Pontus in greater profusion, and of better quality, than by any others: and for luxuries, they supply us with honey, wax, and salt-fish in great abundance; while they take our superfluous stock of olive oil and every kind of wine. In the matter of corn there is a mutual interchange, supplying or taking it as it happens to be convenient.

We see here two important issues. The one is interdependence: the Aegean is dependent on the importation of cattle and slaves from the Black Sea; while the Black Sea is dependent on the importation of wine and oil from the Aegean. The archaeological record gives abundant evidence to verify this picture: the huge amount of amphorae from various Aegean communities found in the Black Sea region testifies to the intensity of these links.[16] The second issue is the distinction between luxuries and necessities. This distinction is important, but needs to be contextualised. The distinction between what constitutes a luxury and what a necessity

---

[14] See Charpin and Joannès 1992 for a similar perspective on the Near East.
[15] For a related perspective, see Gras 1995.
[16] See Garlan 1999.

cannot be established *a priori*; there are few goods that belong certainly to the one category or the other; for the vast majority, there is a spectrum of positions that they can occupy. Given sufficient demand, a luxury can become a necessity;[17] the modern history of sugar is a good example in this respect.[18] But it is also the cultural patterns of consumption, which determine what kinds of goods are deemed necessary for a certain mode of life.[19]

A history of the mobility of goods in the Mediterranean world-system would have to address a number of interrelated issues. The first one is the relationship between production, demand and consumption, which we underlined above. The second is the degree of interdependence. R. Osborne has argued that already in the Archaic period the distribution of different products of different Athenian pottery workshops over the Mediterranean shows marked and consistent patterns, which can be explained as production targeting specific markets; in this respect he thinks it possible to speak of a conglomeration of interdependent markets.[20] The question is to what extent this model can be extended to other goods. It is certainly the case that many goods circulated primarily within local networks and their production and prices reflect local needs.[21] We need models that will take into account the various levels of mobility, how different levels will shape the circulation of goods, and in which circumstances and conjunctures certain goods would move from one level to another.[22] To give an example, grain could be produced for local consumption, but in certain circumstances it could move to a regional or even international level; alternatively, grain could be produced directly for regional or international networks of exchange.[23] Production is not tantamount to capacity to produce: when a scholar asks 'Chian wine was once the island's main source of wealth and reputation. Why is it then that now Chian wine is not so famous?',[24] he points to the constant changes in the production and movement of goods that come a long way towards undermining the model of static pre-modern agriculture that until recently was the scholarly orthodoxy.[25] The relationship with consumption patterns and network connections is equally important in this respect.

---

[17] See the insightful comments of Vallet and Villard 1963, 263-65.

[18] Mintz 1985.

[19] Foxhall 1998.

[20] Osborne 1996a.

[21] See the study of Reger 1994 on goods and prices in Hellenistic Delos.

[22] Davies 1998. See the fundamental insights of Braudel 1982. Wallerstein has introduced the notion of commodity chains, in order to describe and study these interrelated phenomena; see the articles in *Review* (a Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center, Binghampton, NY) XXIII.1 (2000).

[23] Bresson 2000.

[24] Sarikakis 1986: 127.

[25] See Horden and Purcell 2000, 175-230; De Angelis 2006.

This introduces the issue of long-term changes in the mobility of goods. Unfortunately, from the time M. Rostovtzeff wrote his magnificent chapter on the economic development of the Mediterranean world in the 4th century,[26] there have been few attempts to trace the developments in the movement of goods.[27] Partly, this is the result of the influence of Finley-ism; an approach that denied economic development in antiquity, describing a static ancient economy for more than a thousand years.[28] Yet, there is clear evidence of changes in the movement of commodities: to give one example, the development of the wine production of southern Italy and Sicily in the Late Classical and Hellenistic period created a reorientation of patterns of exchange: the importation of wines from the Aegean took a very different form.[29]

Finally, of utmost importance are the networks through which goods circulate. Diaspora trade constitutes one such network: it is often the case in world history that trade between two communities is conducted by a diaspora community of merchants, often coming from a third community, which physically relocates and controls the movement of goods through its agents.[30] Diaspora communities are diverse; sometimes they have a single common origin, often they have mixed and ever-changing backgrounds; often they are stateless communities, in a few cases they have the active back of their community of origin. In other circumstances the movement of goods is based on itinerant communities.

At the same time one encounters the *emporion*, a form of regulated settlement housing the communities of exchange common to many different Mediterranean communities; the *emporion* is a settlement usually organised and maintained by the host community.[31] We see therefore on the one hand various diaspora communities (e.g. Phoenician traders) scattered over wide areas and creating and maintaining links of solidarity and support; on the other hand, *emporia*, where the various diaspora communities are brought together in relationships of collaboration, conflict or exploitation both between themselves and with the host community.[32] There have been some recent and very fascinating attempts to study the *emporia*, but much yet remains to be done.[33]

---

[26] Rostovtzeff 1941, 74-125.

[27] A recent one in Archibald *et al.* 2005.

[28] Notably, in Finley 1985 there is no discussion of factors of change.

[29] Vandermersch 1994.

[30] Curtin 1984; Kuhrt 1998.

[31] Bresson and Rouillard 1993.

[32] On the Phoenician diaspora communities and their place within the *emporia*, see Baslez 1986, 1987, 1996.

[33] Bresson 1993; Gras 1993; also Möller 2000.

Movement of People

At the level of moving of people, things are more complicated. Some of these movements are forced and without the will of the people moved; slavery is perhaps the best example of this category of movement.[34] Beyond slavery, mobility of people ranges across a wide spectrum of options from the more to the less voluntary.[35] Migration in the face of danger is the option closest to the forced movement of slavery. The migration of thousands of Ionians to the West during the latter half of the 6th century due to the Persian conquest is one of the most important developments in archaic history that still waits to be taken seriously into account.[36] The migration and the catastrophes that surrounded it changed decisively Ionia; one wonders what would have become of Miletus, this great colonising power of the Archaic period, if she did not have to suffer the haemorrhage of destruction and forced migration brought by 50 years of Persian rule.[37] At the same time it changed the West in important ways, bringing new architectural styles,[38] new philosophical schools and political ideas,[39] to new forms of colonial enterprises, like that of the Phoceans.[40]

But we have also migrations of people that seem more voluntary than forced. The migration of Athenian potters to southern Italy in the late 5th-century BC and their role in creating an innovative new style of pottery is well known to archaeologists.[41] On the contrary, it is absent as a fact from discussions of Classical history. What prompted these potters to migrate? How common was this kind of activity? What else did they bring with them, apart from their contribution to Late Classical southern Italian pottery?

Unfortunately, the study of mobility in the Mediterranean of the 1st millennium is marred by approaches focused on colonisation as an official act. According to this approach, mobility is only important in the Archaic period, when it is organised by the *poleis* in the form of colonies, and again in the Hellenistic period, this time organised by the Hellenistic monarchs; consequently, mobility disappears from historical accounts dealing with the Classical period, which was purportedly not a period of crisis, at least in the 5th century.[42] Fortunately, this view is now contested by a growing number of scholars. Concerning the archaic colonisation movement,

---

[34] Horden and Purcell 2000, 388-91.

[35] Horden and Purcell 2000, 377-89.

[36] It is largely absent from, for example, Osborne 1996b; but see Gras 1991; Lombardo 2000.

[37] Davies 1997, 139; see Ehrhardt 1983.

[38] Barletta 1983.

[39] von Fritz 1940; Mele 1982.

[40] Morel 1966, 1975, 1982.

[41] MacDonald 1981; see also Papadopoulos 1997b.

[42] A rare attempt to see mobility in its larger dimensions is McKechnie 1989, although he is still not completely outside the view that sees mobility as a crisis phenomenon.

they view it more as a result of individual mobility and private opportunistic enterprises.[43]

I think there is no need to restrict this perspective to the Archaic period, which is not to deny that from the 5th century onwards we have clear cases of colonising ventures that are centrally directed by the political authorities of the metropolis. But it is highly suggestive, that even in these centrally administered cases, the colonisers still come from various directions; the Athenian colony in Amphipolis and the re-colonisation of Sybaris are ample testimony to widespread personal mobility in the ancient Mediterranean.[44]

The time has come to see colonisation as simply one form of mobility:[45] we need to study the colonist along with the mercenary,[46] the sailor, the trader,[47] the craftsman,[48] the doctor, the sophist[49] and the exile;[50] the story of mobility in these larger terms remains still to be written.[51]

It is also important to abandon the Hellenocentric accounts of Greek mobility.[52] It is indeed the case that in the Dark Age and the Archaic period the Phoenicians have an accepted role in accounts of Greek mobility and colonisation,[53] though ethnocentric approaches are strong even here. What is truly remarkable is the complete disappearance of Phoenicians and other Mediterranean peoples in accounts of Greek history of the Classical period; in this period Mediterranean peoples feature only to the extent that they come into political conflict with the Greeks or fall under their control.[54] Xenophon's Socrates and his contemporary Athenians were impressed by the arrival of a huge Phoenician ship in the port of Piraeus, which must have been the event of the year; he discussed extensively with the crew the organisation of activities and the arrangement of material aboard the ship (*Oeconomicus* 8. 11-14); what else did they discuss and what else did Xenophon learn?

A fascinating example, showing how misleading is this orthodox approach, is Athenogenes, an Egyptian metic, involved in selling perfumes in late 4th-century

---

[43] For example Osborne 1998; but the reply in Malkin 2002 to Osborne's claims is highly stimulating.

[44] On Amphipolis, for example, see Thucydides 4. 100-106.

[45] Despite the arguments of Purcell 1990, few have heeded this direction in Classical history.

[46] I have argued in favour of this approach in Vlassopoulos 2003; Tagliamonte 1994.

[47] On Greek maritime traders, see Velissaropoulos 1980; Reed 2003.

[48] Burford 1969, 191-206; McKechnie 1989, 143-47.

[49] For the mobility of doctors and sophists, see Thomas 2000, 9-16. The issue of mobile intellectuals is unfortunately little explored until very recently; but see now Montiglio 2005.

[50] Seibert 1979.

[51] But see Giangiulio 1996, characteristically for the Archaic period.

[52] See Papadopoulos 1997a.

[53] Docter and Niemeier 1995; Shaw 1989; Hoffman 1997.

Athens. The cunning Athenogenes arranges in collaboration with Antigone, a prostitute, to sell to a wealthy young Athenian citizen two male slaves along with their perfume workshop, which is though heavily indebted (Hypereides *Against Athenogenes*). The details of the story are not of direct concern here, but 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 Chaeronea. 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… 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.

An Egyptian perfume seller has the obligation to fight for Athens, along with thousands other foreigners living in Athens; instead he escapes, goes to a tiny obscure place like Troezen, is enrolled as a citizen, even becomes a magistrate.[55] How common was such an event? If we judge from the tone of the passage, it does not seem very extraordinary; the moral outrage is against his disenfranchising citizens, not in his becoming one. What did Athenogenes carry from his Egyptian cultural baggage, when he became a citizen and a magistrate? We need a larger horizon.[56]

Movement of Ideas/Technologies

Finally, there comes the movement of ideas and technologies. And to some extent it has been better studied than the previous issues. We have excellent studies of the spread of Orphism from the Western to Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea;[57] of the idea, the practices and the accoutrements of the symposium in its spread from the Near East to Greece and the Western Mediterranean;[58] of the spread of the technology of constructing and employing triremes, instead of the much smaller pentekonters, from the Eastern to the Western Mediterranean during the Late Archaic period;[59] of the spread of religious techniques of healing and divination from the Near East all the way to the Western Mediterranean;[60] of the spread of new

---

[54] For the usual approach, see Hornblower 2002. For a welcome new perspective, see the articles in Settis 2001.

[55] See Whitehead 2000, 287-88, 339-41.

[56] Our colleagues studying the Bronze Age Aegean have been more open-minded in this respect: see Knapp 1993; Cline 1995.

[57] See the articles in Tortorelli-Ghidini *et al.* 2000.

[58] Dentzer 1982.

[59] Wallinga 1993.

[60] Burkert 1992, 41-87.

techniques of siege and fortification from the experiments of Greek tyrants in Sicily and Magna Graecia to the exploits of Philip and Alexander in mainland Greece and Asia Minor.[61]

The real problem here is that although individual issues are rather well studied, we are missing the larger picture. We lack studies of the interconnections between the different processes of moving ideas/technologies. To what extent is the transfer of an idea predicated or accompanied by the transfer of a technology? And what are the networks and the agents through which ideas/technologies spread? Does the spread of Orphism pass through the same networks and the same agents that spread perfume vases?

The case of Zopyrus of Heracleia/Tarentum is a fascinating illustration of these issues.[62] Zopyrus, a figure of the late 5th-early 4th century BC, is credited with authorship of the Pythagorean work *Krater*; but he is also credited with designs and innovations in the field of war engines. This is not very surprising, given the connection between Pythagoreans and science;[63] but what is more fascinating are the network connections. For in the 4th century Dionysius of Syracuse was distinguished for his successful attraction of specialist craftsmen, which led to important break-throughs in the art of siege warfare (Diodorus 14. 41-43), and Zopyrus of Tarentum could be plausibly linked to him; but Zopyrus is also credited with devising a catapult for the Milesians. The only plausible context for this service is the Syracusan expedition to help the Spartans during the latter stage of the Peloponnesian War (Thucydides 8. 26-39). And thus we see one man spreading the art of siege warfare from Syracuse to Miletus; but this same man is connected to the spread of Pythagorean religious and philosophic ideas. If the networks that move religious and military ideas and technologies seem to go together in this case, how far can we extend this example?

Many times, the most difficult problem is the identification of the agents of this process. The elite chamber tombs of Scythia and Thrace provide an interesting illustration of this issue:[64] they show many strong similarities, despite the huge distance between the two areas; they also seem to transfer the idea of the symposium to the context of the grave, given their iconography, spatial arrangement, reclining couches, etc. G.R. Tsetskhladze has argued that it was Ionian craftsmen from the Ionian colonies in the Black Sea and Thrace respectively who built these graves for the local elites; given that chamber tombs of a very similar construction were very popular

---

[61] Garlan 1974, 155-278.
[62] For what follows, see Kingsley 1995, 143-58.
[63] See, for example, Huffman 2005.
[64] For what follows, Tsetskhladze 1998.

in various regions of Asia Minor adjacent to Ionia (Phrygia, Lydia), it is plausible to argue that we have here a good case in which we can identify a group of people spreading an idea and a technology and linking together Asia Minor, Thrace and the Black Sea.

World Centres: Centres, Peripheries and Networks

Mediterranean history knows many centres. There are sanctuaries, religious centres which bring together communities, forge links of common identity, disseminate practices and ideologies; the role of Delphi and Olympia in this respect is too well known to require much discussion here.[65] There are the already mentioned *emporia*: those centres that organise, attract, and direct the mobility of goods, people and ideas/technologies. There are centres of cultural, scientific and academic practices: they range widely, from the courts of Sicilian tyrants[66] or an Anatolian dynast,[67] to the philosophical schools of 4th-century Athens,[68] or the Cnidian and Coan centres of medicine.[69] And there are of course political centres.[70] What should be clear from this discussion is that the creation of centres of processes defies the *polis*-centred approach, which sees the *poleis* as autonomous entities, and necessitates a world-system approach.

Athens in the Classical period is a good example. Athens managed to take control of the international commerce in cereals and based its subsistence and reproduction on the successful maintenance of this control.[71] No wonder of course that every time this control came under pressure, or was destroyed, Athenians found themselves in a very difficult situation. Moreover, Athens exploited to a large extent, as we already described above, the international movement in manpower, goods and ideas. From artistic production and intellectual exchange, to servile labour and the rowers of Athenian fleets, Athens depended overwhelmingly and attracted successfully huge numbers of foreigners, both Greek and non-Greek. Isocrates (*Panegyrikos* 41-43) has put it nicely:

> Moreover, she (Athens) has established her polity in general in such a spirit of welcome to strangers and friendliness to all men, that it adapts itself both to those who lack means, and to those who wish to enjoy the means, which they possess, and that it fails to be of service neither to those who are prosperous, nor to those who are unfortunate in their

---

[65] On their emergence, see Morgan 1990. See also Rougemont 1992; Sanchez 2001.
[66] Dunbabin 1948, 298-99.
[67] Hornblower 1982.
[68] Ostwald and Lynch 1994.
[69] Sherwin-White 1978, 256-89.
[70] Davies 1997.
[71] Garnsey 1988; Whitby 1998.

own cities; nay, both classes find with us what they desire, the former the most delightful pastimes, the latter the securest refuge. Again, since the different populations did not in any case possess a country that was self-sufficing, each lacking in some things and producing others in excess of their needs, and since they were greatly at a loss, where they would dispose of their surplus, and whence they would import what they lacked, in these difficulties also our *polis* came to the rescue; for she established the Piraeus as a market in the centre of Hellas – a market of such abundance that the articles which it is difficult to get, one here, one there, from the rest of the world, all these it is easy to procure from Athens.

Byzantium offers some good illustrations of what a centre could look like (Polybius 4. 38):

> As far as the sea is concerned, Byzantium occupies a position the most secure and in every way the most advantageous of any town in our quarter of the world: while in regard to the land, its situation is in both respects the most unfavourable. By sea it so completely commands the entrance to the Pontus, that no merchant can sail in or out against its will. The Pontus therefore being rich in what the rest of the world requires for the support of life, the Byzantines are absolute masters of all such things… The Byzantines themselves probably feel the advantages of the situation, in the supplies of the necessaries of life, more than any one else; for their superfluity finds a ready means of export, and what they lack is readily imported, with profit to themselves, and without difficulty or danger: but other people too, as I have said, get a great many commodities by their means.

Byzantium gained from its favourable condition in two ways: it was able to control the traffic to the Black Sea and thus to profit from taxes, dues and the invisible profits of a commercial port. The Rhodian war with Byzantium (220-219 BC) over the Byzantine imposition of taxes on trade through the Straits illustrates this capacity; it also shows the inevitable conflict when another emerging centre had to protect its own interests: the huge numbers of Rhodian amphorae in the Black Sea give ample testimony of what was at stake.[72]

On the other hand, as Polybius shows, Byzantium profited from being able to exploit its position in order to import commodities easily and export its surpluses with assurance; one could see that given the guaranteed customers due to the passing ships, there was gain in intensifying agricultural production. The Byzantines had to pay a high price for this, as Polybius narrates (4. 45), being in continual warfare with the Thracians and later on with the Gauls, in order to protect their precious and fertile territory. Finally, it would be wrong to assume that the Byzantines had a passive role, simply exploiting their ideal geographical position and profiting

---

[72] Ten thousand Rhodian stamps have been catalogued from the Black Sea (Badal'janc 1999).

from networks maintained by others. The war between Byzantium and Callatis in the Black Sea around 260 BC shows their active policies: the war erupted when Callatis decided to restrict the *emporium* of Tomis to her own traders; obviously that threatened the interests of Byzantine traders.[73] We can see here warfare caused by the attempts to enforce 'mercantilist' policies.

Byzantium raises another important issue; this is the role of location within the world-system. P. Horden and N. Purcell have recently stress connectivity as one of the essential features of Mediterranean history.[74] But an essential aspect of the maintenance of connectivity is the nodal points that control the passage of resources, people and ideas/technologies. Hellespont is of course one of these nodal points, whose importance is well illustrated in the Polybian passages discussed above. The Straits of Messina provide another such point in Western Mediterranean and there has been an excellent recent study of them.[75] The straits of Messina emerge as a node interlinking a variety of material cultures, ethnic groups and power strategies that stretch through the whole Mediterranean. It is particularly interesting to note the direct links between the Straits and Asia Minor.[76] The family of Scythes, tyrant of Zancle is a fascinating example. Losing Zancle from the wave of Samian migration in the aftermath of the defeat of the Ionian Revolt, Scythes moves to the Persian court, returns to Sicily and finally dies among the Persians. His son Cadmus becomes (through the Persians?) tyrant of Cos, renounces the tyranny, returns to Zancle and is sent by Gelon as his diplomatic emissary in Delphi (Herodotus 6. 22-24; 7. 163-164) The larger implication is that we need to study these various nodal points together, in terms of their function within the overall system.

It is also relevant to mention here the creation of zones of influence. Many communities found themselves in a position to impose their control over wider areas and create zones of influence, within which they exercised forms of control that varied widely in intensity. The case of Carthage and her creation of a commercial zone within which trade was restricted to Carthaginian merchants is well-known;[77] but many Greek communities had similar practices: Thasos created her own zone in the North Aegean; Olynthus in Chalcidice; Sinope in the Black Sea; Massalia in the Western Mediterranean.[78] We see here purposive attempts to forge a region around a dominant centre; it is an interesting question to what extent the creation of these commercial zones had a wider effect on other aspects.

---

[73] Vinogradov 1987, 41-44, with a different interpretation.
[74] Horden and Purcell 2000, 123-72.
[75] See Gras *et al.* 2000.
[76] For the following, see Ampolo 2000.
[77] See the treaties with Rome mentioned by Polybius (1. 82; 3. 23; 31. 21).
[78] Bresson 1993, 201-14.

The examples I am using here are all well known to ancient historians; but what we are missing is a combined study of the variety of social, economic, political and cultural centres of the wider Greek world. Such a study will have to raise a number of important issues.

The first issue is the relationship between all these different forms of centres. The Archaic period is a period in which these various centres tend to be distinct and separate; but during the 5th century Athens emerged as a political, economic and cultural centre at the same time. Unfortunately, this has led to the standard Atheno-centric image of Classical Greek history by obscuring the existence of other centres during the same period.[79] At the same time there has been little study of the wider phenomenon at hand: what are the connections between different forms of centres?[80] How does a centre of one kind transform itself into a multiple centre? It applies equally well to Classical Athens and to Hellenistic Delos, a religious centre becoming the chief commercial centre of the Eastern Mediterranean.[81]

The second issue is scale. The Mediterranean had thousands of *emporia* in the various periods of its history; although we still lack studies of the development of many of these *emporia* through time, their distribution and functions etc, what is even more important is to recognise the development in the scale and power of these centres. We can distinguish between local *emporia*, pooling the goods of the local areas; regional *emporia*, based on interregional exchange; and international *emporia*, which function as places of international exchange.[82] The creation of the last order of centres is one of the most important developments in Mediterranean history.[83] It is well reflected in the difference between the diverse cargoes found in Archaic and Classical shipwrecks and the homogeneous cargoes that characterise many Roman shipwrecks; evidence, among other things, of the emergence of international centres of exchange, which make it feasible for many traders to bypass the *cabotage* of local and regional *emporia*, and have direct access to the large international centres.[84]

A recent study shows clearly the differences between these centres of different order.[85] M. Lawall has compared the amphora finds in three Hellenistic centres: Athens, a centre of international transhipping of amphorae, but also due to its own

---

[79] See the protests of Thomas 2000, 9-16.

[80] But see Engberg-Petersen 1993.

[81] See Rauh 1993. For Hellenistic Rhodes becoming both a commercial and cultural centre, see Gabrielsen 1997; Rossetti and Furiani 1993.

[82] See the points of Bresson 1993, 199.

[83] For a survey of Late Hellenistic maritime centres, see Rauh 2003, 33-92.

[84] For these different models, see the comments of Parker (1992, 21-22; 2001).

[85] Lawall 2005.

lack of local amphorae a centre heavily reliant on importation of amphorae; Ephesus, a centre of both exportation and importation of amphorae; and Ilion, a local centre with a local production of amphorae which were though not exported and a significant reliance on imported amphorae. The analysis of the finds gives some illustrative results. In the Classical period Athens, as a centre of transhipping shows a wide diversity of amphora types from various regions of the Mediterranean, with no single type being dominant. Ephesus on the other hand, along with its own local production, seems to rely heavily on importation of amphorae from the adjacent southern Aegean. The wide connections of Athens are clearly missing in this case. Finally, Ilion relies overwhelmingly on local and regional production and a limited importation from other areas.

The change in scale already during the Late Archaic period with the emergence of Gravisca in the Western Mediterranean and Naucratis in the Eastern Mediterranean shows that we have to study this issue in its *longue durée*.[86] But there is not yet an overall study that tries to look at diachronic changes in the creation of these international commercial centres, from Athens to Rhodes, Alexandria and Delos. The emergence for example of the *mégapoles* in the Hellenistic period is of the utmost importance for this kind of analysis.[87]

A third issue is control and competition. A centre can attempt not only to attract, but actually to control the activities and processes on which it is based; moreover, it might try to transform its controlling power in one field into power in other fields; or, alternatively, its role as a centre in one field might necessitate the creation of centres in other fields too. There is an obvious difference between attracting and controlling; between the Athenian control on the movement of cereals and the Athenian attraction of manpower. The reason they are treated together here is not because I want to minimise the difference. Rather, it is because I want to draw attention to a spectrum of reactions and forms of control that an emerging centre might use in order to exploit for its own benefit these international networks.

A recent discovery of a lead weight from the western Black Sea, dating to the late 5th century, is a good illustration of the issues involved;[88] the weight bears the owl, emblem of Athenian coinage, on the one side, and the tunny, emblem of the coinage of Cyzicus, on the other. Its weight seems to aim at a synchronisation of the Attic with the Cyzicene standard, two of the most important standards in this period, and can even be synchronised with the Aeginetan one; was it a result of the needs created by the intensification of links within the world-system that brought together

---

[86] Giangulio 1996, 519-21.
[87] See the approaches in Nicolet 2000.
[88] For the following, see Meyer and Moreno 2003.

the Aegean world and the Black Sea, or of Athenian imperial imposition, as seen in the notorious Standards Decree (*IG* I³, 1453)? The former seems more probable, but the variety of possible answers shows well the complexity of the issue at hand here.

Conclusion

This article has tried to show that we need to study Greek history as the history of a world-system of networks and centres and, at the same time, to insert Greek history within the history of the larger Mediterranean and Near Eastern world. There are many issues which I have deliberately omitted (in particular the temporal and spatial extent of such a world-system). But these can form the subject of future debate, which this article hopes to initiate. We live in a globalised world; we live in multicultural societies. The ancient Greek world provides an excellent opportunity to study how one can write a non-ethnocentric and Eurocentric history. We should grasp it.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

ASNP   *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa.*
JMA   *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology.*
MHR   *Mediterranean Historical Review.*
WA   *World Archaeology.*

Abulafia, D. 2005: 'Mediterraneans'. In Harris, W.V. (ed.), *Rethinking the Mediterranean* (Oxford), 64-93.

Abu-Lughod, J.L. 1989: *Before European Hegemony. The World System AD 1250-1350* (New York/Oxford).

Ampolo, C. 2000: 'La funzione dello Stretto nella vicenda politica fino al termine della guerra del Peloponneso'. In Gras, Greco and Guzzo 2000, 49-70.

Archibald, Z.H., Davies, J.K. and Gabrielsen, V. (eds.) 2005: *Making, Moving and Managing. The New World of the Ancient Economies, 323-31 BC* (Oxford).

Badal'janc, J.S. 1999: 'La Rhodes hellénistique et le Nord de la Mer Noire'. In Garlan 1999, 247-53.

Barletta, B.A. 1983: *Ionic influence in archaic Sicily: the monumental art* (Gothenburg).

Baslez, M.-F. 1986: 'Cultes et dévotions des Phéniciens en Grèce. Les divinités marines'. In Bonnet, C., Lipinski, E. and Marchetti, P. (eds.), *Religio Phoenicia* (Namur), 289-305.

—. 1987: 'Le rôle et la place des Phéniciens dans la vie économique des ports de l'Egée'. In Lipinski, E. (ed.), *Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C.* (Leuven), 267-85.

—. 1996: 'Les immigres orientaux en Grèce'. *Cahiers du Centre Glotz* 7, 39-50.

Bilde, P., Engberg-Pedersen, T., Hannestad, L., Zahle, J. and Randsborg, K. (eds.) 1993: *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World* (Aarhus).

Braudel, F. 1982: *Civilization and Capitalism. Vol. II: The Wheels of Commerce* (London).

—. 1984: *Civilization and Capitalism. Vol. III: The Perspective of the World* (London).

Bresson, A. 1993: 'Les cités grecques et leurs emporia'. In Bresson and Rouillard 1993, 163-226.

—. 2000: 'Les cités grecques, la marché et les prix'. In *La cité marchande* (Bordeaux), 263-307.

Bresson, A. and Rouillard, P. (eds.) 1993: *L'Emporion* (Paris).

Burford, A. 1969: *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros: A Social and Economic Study of Building in the Asklepian Sanctuary, during the Fourth and Early Third Centuries B.C.* (Liverpool).

Burkert, W. 1992: *The Orientalising Revolution. Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, MA).

Cassola, F. 1996: 'Chi erano i Greci?'. In Settis 1996, 5-23.

Charpin, D. and Joannès, F. (eds.) 1992: *La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le proche orient ancien: actes de la XXXVIIIe rencontre Assyriologique internationale (Paris, 8-10 juillet, 1991)* (Paris).

Cline, E.H. 1995: 'Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor: Minoans and Mycenaeans abroad'. In Laffineur, R. and Niemeier, W.D. (eds.), *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Liège/Austin, TX), 265-87.

Curtin, P.D. 1984: *Cross-Cultural Trade in World History* (Cambridge).

Davies, J.K. 1997: 'Sparta e l'area peloponnesiaca. Atene e il dominio di mare'. In Settis 1997, 109-61.

—. 1998: 'Ancient economies: models and muddles'. In Parkins and Smith 1998, 225-56.

De Angelis, F. 2006: 'Going against the grain in Sicilian Greek economics'. *GrRom* 53, 29-47.

Dentzer, J.M. 1982: *Le motif du banquet couche dans le Proche-Orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.* (Rome).

Docter, R.F. and Niemeyer, H.G. 1995: 'Pithekoussai: The Carthaginian connection. On the archaeological evidence of Euboeo-Phoenician partnership in the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.'. *ASNP* n.s. 1, 101-15.

Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (eds.) 2003: *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration* (Cambridge).

Dunbabin, T.J. 1948: *The Western Greeks* (Oxford).

Ehrhardt, N. 1983: *Milet und seinen Kolonien. Vergleichende Untersuchungen der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen* (Frankfurt/Bern/New York).

Engberg-Pedersen, T. 1993: 'The relationship between cultural and political centres in the Hellenistic world'. In Bilde *et al.* 1993, 285-315.

Finley, M.I. 1985: *The Ancient Economy* (Berkeley/Los Angeles).

Fisher, N. and van Wees, H. (eds.) 1998: *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* (London).

Foxhall, L. 1998: 'Cargoes of the heart's desire: the character of trade in the archaic Mediterranean world'. In Fisher and van Wees 1998, 295-309.

von Fritz, K. 1940: *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy: an Analysis of the Sources* (New York).

Gabrielsen, V. 1997: *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes* (Aarhus).

Garlan, Y. 1974: *Recherches de poliorcétique grecque* (Athens).

—. (ed.) 1999: *Production et commerce des amphores anciennes en Mer Noire* (Aix-en-Provence).

Garnsey, P. 1988: *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis* (Cambridge).

Giangiulio, M. 1996: 'Avventurieri, mercanti, coloni, merecenari. Mobilità umana e circolazione di risorse nel Mediterraneo arcaico'. In Settis 1996, 497-525.

Gras, M. 1991: 'Occidentalia. Le concept d'émigration ionienne'. *ArchCl* 43, 269-78.

—. 1993: 'Pour une Méditerranée des emporia'. In Bresson and Rouillard 1993, 103-11.

—. 1995: *La Méditerranée archaïque* (Paris).

Gras, M., Greco, E. and Guzzo, P.G. (eds.) 2000: *Nel cuore del Mediterraneo antico. Reggio, Messina e le colonie calcidesi dell'area dello Stretto* (Rome).

Hagemajer Allen, K. 2003: 'Becoming the "Other": attitudes and practices at the Attic cemeteries'. In Dougherty and Kurke 2003, 207-36.

Hoffman, G.L. 1997: *Imports and Immigrants: Near Eastern Contacts with Iron Age Crete* (Ann Arbor).

Horden, P. and Purcell, N. 2000: *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford).

Hornblower, S. 1982: *Mausolus* (Oxford).

—. 2002: *The Greek World, 479-323 BC* (London).

Huffman, C.A. 2005: *Archytas of Tarentum: Pythagorean, Philosopher, and Mathematician King* (Cambridge).

Kingsley, P. 1995: *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery and Magic. Empedocles and the Pythagorean Tradition* (Oxford).

Knapp, A.B. 1993: 'Thalassocracies in Bronze Age eastern Mediterranean trade: making and breaking a myth'. *WA* 24, 332-47.

Kuhrt, A. 1998: 'The Old Assyrian merchants'. In Parkins and Smith 1998, 16-30.

Lawall, M.L. 2005: 'Amphoras and Hellenistic economies: addressing the (over)-emphasis on stamped amphora handles'. In Archibald *et al.* 2005, 188-232.

Lombardo, M. 2000: 'Profughi e coloni dall'Asia Minore in Magna Grecia (VII-V sec A.C.)'. In *Magna Grecia e Oriente mediterraneo prima dell'età ellenistica. Atti del XXXIX Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Taranto), 189-224.

MacDonald, B.R. 1981: 'The emigration of potters from Athens in the late fifth century B.C. and its effect on the Attic pottery industry'. *AJA* 85, 159-68.

McKechnie, P. 1989: *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC* (London/New York).

Malkin, I. 2002: 'Exploring the concept of "foundation": a visit to Megara Hyblaia'. In Gorman, V.B. and Robinson, E.W. (eds.), *Oikistes. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies and Military Power in the Ancient World Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham* (Leiden/Boston/Cologne), 195-225.

—. 2003: 'Networks and the emergence of Greek identity'. *MHR* 18, 56-74.

Mele A. 1982: 'La Megale Hellas pitagorica; aspetti politici, economici e sociali'. In *Megale Hellas: nomme e imagine. Atti del XXI Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Taranto), 33-80.

Meyer, H.-C. and Moreno, A. 2004: 'A Greek metrological *koine*: a lead weight from the Western Black Sea region in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford'. *OJA* 23, 209-16.

Mintz, S.W. 1985: *Sweetness and Power. The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York).

Möller, A. 2000: *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece* (Oxford/New York).

Momigliano, A. 1984: 'The rediscovery of Greek history in the eighteenth century: the case of Sicily'. In *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome), 133-53.

Montiglio, S. 2005: *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture* (Chicago).

Morel, J.-P. 1966: 'Les Phocéens en Occident: certitudes et hypothèses'. *PP* 21, 378-420.

—. 1975: 'L'expansion phocéenne en Occident: dix années de recherches (1966-1975)'. *BCH* 99, 853-96.

—. 1982: 'Les Phocéens d'Occident. Nouvelles données, nouvelles approches'. *PP* 38, 479-96.

Morgan, C. 1990: *Athletes and Oracles: the Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century B.C.* (Cambridge).

Nicolet, C. (ed.) 2000: *Mégapoles méditerranéennes. Géographie urbaine rétrospective* (Rome).

Osborne, R. 1996a: 'Pots, trade and the archaic Greek economy'. *Antiquity* 70, 31-44.

—. 1996b: *Greece in the Making, 1200-479 BC* (London).

—. 1998: 'Early Greek colonisation? The nature of Greek settlement in the West'. In Fisher and van Wees 1998, 251-70.

Ostwald, M and Lynch, J.P. 1994: 'The growth of schools and the advance of knowledge'. *CAH VI*[2], 592-633.

Papadopoulos, J.K. 1997a: 'Phantom Euboians'. *JMA* 10, 191-219.

—. 1997b: 'Innovations, imitations and ceramic style: Modes of production and modes of dissemination'. In Laffineur, R. and Betancourt, P.P. (eds.), *Techne: Craftsmen, craftswomen and craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Liège/Austin, TX), 449-62.

Parker, A.J. 1992: *Ancient Shipwrecks of the Mediterranean and the Roman Provinces* (Oxford).

—. 2001: 'Shipwrecks and Hellenistic trade'. In Archibald, Z.H., Davies, J., Gabrielsen, V. and Oliver, G.J. (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies* (London/New York), 273-312.

Parkins, H. and Smith, C. (eds.) 1998: *Trade, Traders and the Ancient City* (London/New York).

Purcell, N. 1990: 'Mobility and the polis'. In Murray, O. and Price, S. (eds.), *The Greek City-State from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford), 29-58.

Rauh, N.K. 1993: *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce: Religion, Economy, and Trade Society at Hellenistic Roman Delos, 166-87 B.C.* (Amsterdam).

—. 2003: *Merchants, Sailors and Pirates in the Roman World* (Brimscombe Port/Charleston/Stroud).

Reed, C.M. 2003: *Maritime Traders in the Ancient Greek World* (Cambridge).

Reger, G. 1994: *Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos, 314 –167 B.C.* (Berkeley/Los Angeles).

Rostovtzeff, M.I. 1941: *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford).

Rossetti, L. and Furiani, P.L. 1993: 'Rodi'. In Cambiano, G., Canfora, L. and Lanza, D. (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica. Volume I: La produzione e la circolazione del testo, Tomo II: L'ellenismo* (Rome), 657-715.

Rougemont, G. 1992: 'Delphes et les cités grecques d'Italie du sud et de Sicile'. In *La Magna Grecia e i grandi santuari della madrepatria. Atti del XXXI Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Taranto), 157-91.

Sanchez, P. 2001: *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes: recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au IIe siècle de notre ère* (Stuttgart).

Sarikakis T.C. 1986: 'Commercial relations between Chios and other Greek cities in antiquity'. In Boardman, J. and Vaphopoulou-Richardson, C.E. (eds.), *Chios. A conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984* (Oxford), 121-31.

Seibert, J. 1979: *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der griechischen Geschichte: von den Anfängen bis zur Unterwerfung durch die Römer* (Darmstadt).

Settis, S. (ed.) 1996: *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, società. Vol. II.1: Una storia greca. I. Formazione* (Turin).

—. (ed.) 1997: *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, società. Vol. II.2: Una storia greca. I. Definizione,* (Turin).

—. (ed.) 2001: *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, società. Vol. III: I Greci oltre la Grecia* (Turin).

Shaw, J.W. 1989: 'Phoenicians in Southern Crete'. *AJA* 93, 165-83.

Sherwin-White, S.M. 1978: *Ancient Cos. An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period* (Göttingen).

Stein, G.J. 1999: *Rethinking World-systems. Diasporas, Colonies and Interaction in Uruk Mesopotamia* (Tucson).

Tagliamonte, G. 1994: *I figli di Marte: mobilità, mercenari e mercenariato italici in Magna Grecia e Sicilia* (Rome).

Tarrant, H. 1990: 'The distribution of early Greek thinkers and the question of "alien influences"'. In Descoeudres, J.-P. (ed.), *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology* (Canberra/Oxford), 621-28.

Thomas, R. 2000: *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge/New York).

Tortorelli-Ghidini, M., Storchi-Marino, A. and Visconti, A. (eds.) 2000: *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora. Origini e incontri di culture nell' antichità* (Naples).

Tsetskhladze, G.R. 1998: 'Who built the Scythian and Thracian royal and elite tombs?'. *OJA* 17, 55-92.

Vallet, G. 1996: *Le monde grec colonial d'Italie du Sud et de Sicile* (Rome).

Vallet, G. and Villard, F. 1963: 'Céramique grecque et histoire économique'. In Courbin, P. (ed.), *Études archéologiques* (Paris), 205-17 (republished in Vallet 1996, 253-69).

Vandermersch, C. 1994: *Vins et amphores de Grande Grèce et de Sicile IVe-IIIe s. avant J.C.* (Naples).

Velissaropoulos, J. 1980: *Les naucleres grecs: recherches sur les institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénise* (Geneva/Paris).

Vinogradov, J.G. 1987: 'Der Pontos Euxeinos als politische, ökonomische und kulturelle Einheit und die Epigraphik'. In *Pontische Studien: kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes* (Mainz), 1-73.

Vlassopoulos, K. 2003: '*Persikon de karta dôron o stratos*: Ê diaplokê Ellênôn misthophorôn kai Persikou kosmou me basê tên Kyrou Anabasê tou Xenophônta'. *Ariadnê* 9, 31-58.

—. 2007: *Unthinking the Greek Polis. Ancient Greek History beyond Eurocentrism* (Cambridge).

Wallerstein, I. 1974: *The Modern World System. Vol. I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York).

—. 1991: *Unthinking Social Science: the Limits of Nineteenth-Century Paradigms* (Oxford).

Wallinga, H.T. 1993: *Ships and Sea-Power before the Great Persian War: the Ancestry of the Ancient Trireme* (Leiden).

Whitby, M. 1998: 'The grain trade of Athens in the fourth century BC'. In Parkins and Smith 1998, 102-28.

Whitehead, D. 2000: *Hypereides: the Forensic Speeches* (Oxford).

Department of Classics
University of Nottingham
Nottingham NG7 2RD
UK
konstantinos.vlassopoulos@nottingham.ac.uk