

**Ancient Greek History and Contemporary Social Science. A Conference.  
University of Edinburgh. November 12-15 2015**

**Organizers:**

Josiah Ober, Stanford University (Leventis Visiting Professor, U Edinburgh)  
Andrew Erskine. University of Edinburgh  
Mirko Canevaro. University of Edinburgh  
Benjamin Gray. University of Edinburgh

**Conference**

On November 12-15, 2015, the Leventis Conference at the University of Edinburgh, organized by Josiah Ober (Stanford University and Leventis Visiting Research Professor), Andrew Erskine, Mirko Canevaro, and Ben Gray (Edinburgh), will bring together Hellenists interested in the potential of contemporary social science methods with social scientists with a strong interest in ancient Greece. The conference papers will survey the current state of the field of “social science Greek history” and will seek to push the field forward to the next level.

There is a long history of successful engagement between social science and classical studies. Social science has been a source of new and productive approaches to understanding ancient Greece, while classical Greek history and culture has been a touchstone for social theorists since the 19th century. Substantial bodies of work that have contributed in fundamental ways to our understanding of classical Greece and its cultural legacy were produced in 20th century, by employing methods from anthropology, sociology, and psychology. More recently, the use of quantitative methods and formal theory, drawn from contemporary political science, economics, and sociology, has led to a new understanding of ancient Greek economic and political development. Meanwhile, normative considerations, drawn from contemporary political philosophy, have led to a richer understanding of Greek political thought and Greek institutional innovations – notably including democracy and the rule of law.

These advances were possible by cross-disciplinary work, as social scientists and political theorists have come to realize anew the potential importance of the classical Greek world and its legacy for testing social theories, and as Hellenists master the techniques of contemporary social science. Some of the most exciting new work in social science is now being done within interdisciplinary domains for which classical Greece provides an especially apt case study. These include: the role played by democratic political institutions in economic development; the potential for inter-state cooperation and international institutions within a decentralized ecology of states; the relationship between state government and the social networks arising from voluntary associations; the interplay between political culture, informal politics, formal institutions and political change; the relationship between empirical and formal methods of analysis and normative political theory.

Meanwhile, Hellenists have come to recognize the value of formal and quantitative methods as a complement to traditional qualitative approaches to Greek history and culture.

Presenters will include social scientists and Hellenists, ranging from postgraduates to senior scholars, from university departments and research centres in the UK, continental Europe, North America – and perhaps elsewhere. The conference proceedings will be published in the Leventis Conference series by the University of Edinburgh Press. The goal is to produce a volume that will demonstrate the potential of an exciting interdisciplinary field and the enduring value of academic studies aimed at a deeper understanding of the classical Greek world.

The Conference is sponsored by the A.G. Leventis Foundation, established in May 1979 as a result of provisions made by Anastasios G. Leventis, who died in October 1978.

### **Papers and abstracts.**

#### **Azoulay, Vincent & Paulin Ismard. Paris. Classics.**

“Athens in 403: An Attempt at Choral History”

The controversial watchword expressed twenty years ago by Actor-Network Theory is well known: “society” functions so little as a concept that it should be dismissed in order to be able to observe the various ways in which the social sphere is composed along with the individual strategies that they deploy. This proposition is certainly the backdrop for a number of recent examinations in the field of classical studies that favour a description of civic societies in terms of networks and circulation (most recently, Taylor and Vlassopoulos 2015). Such a perspective is situated as the opposite of the holistic Durkeimian approach that so greatly influenced Greek studies (especially in France), making the city—which is identified with civic bodies and likened to an organizing entity—the key actor in the changes affecting Greek societies.

Our paper will specifically aim to find a path that traverses—or a midway point between—both approaches by considering the model of the *choros* (as it was conceptualized by classical authors) as capable of offering a productive paradigm for understanding the mechanisms of belonging at work within Athenian civic society during the classical period. The choral reference also refers to a certain way of writing history—one inspired by the models of the novel and the choral film—that seems particularly fitting for describing the complex way in which the Athenian social sphere functioned. The article will dare to formulate the following hypothesis: a choral approach, at the crossroads between the specifically Greek conception of the chorus and the contemporary conceptualization of the chorus in the field of fiction, makes it possible to stay as close as possible to the ways in which the social sphere was composed, the formation of groups, and the identities at the various levels of community life. We will put our hypothesis to the test by examining a unique moment in Athenian history: the years between 404 and 400.

**Canevaro, Mirko. University of Edinburgh. Classics.**

“Majority rule vs. consensus: the practice of deliberation in the Greek *poleis*”

Scholars have often identified the Greek *polis*, and Athenian democracy in particular, as the first example of majority rule (e.g. Ruzé 1984, 1997, Pitsoulis 2011, Maffi 2012). This is in line with the common modern understanding of democracy as the rule of the majority, and those who subscribe to this understanding often use the Greek example as the beginning of a genealogy of democratic government (e.g. Flaig 2013; whatever the criticisms of this notion, cf. Downs 1957, Arrow 1963, Woodruff 2005, Ober 2008). This has had far-reaching effects, and has sometimes excluded the Athenian model from discussions of alternative models of deliberation, and of democracy: for instance, Graeber (2013), while trying to trace a genealogy of democratic forms based on consensus-deliberation such as those that were developed in the Occupy Wall Street movement, excludes the Greek *polis* (and Athens) from the analysis on the grounds that Greek democracy was based exclusively on majority rule, predicated on the overwhelming strength of whatever majority of armed men (hoplites) could form.

In this paper, I aim to review the evidence for Greek deliberative procedures and reassess how much they conformed to majority rule, and how much they made use of consensus-deliberation. I will discuss first the Homeric evidence, to counter the argument that we can see e.g. in Hom. *Od.* 24.463 ff. the first instances of binding majority decisions. Building e.g. on Elmer (2012), I shall argue that the deliberative model found in the Homeric poems can be better understood in terms of consensus-deliberation (cf. Hartnett 2011 and Graeber 2013 for discussions). Second, I will review the evidence of Hellenistic decrees from the Greek *poleis* for which we have voting figures, to show that what we find is for the most part unanimity or near-unanimity (cf. Todd 2013). Finally, I will discuss the Athenian evidence (e.g. the Assembly scenes in Thucydides and [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 2.7 about whether decisions are binding for those that are not present when they are made) to reassess whether the deliberative system in Athens practiced strict majority rule, or left space for considerable consensus seeking and even unanimity. I shall argue that consensus-based forms of deliberation were a key element of Greek decision making, which secured the cohesion of Greek communities as well as the synthesis of widely-spread knowledge highlighted by Ober (2008) as a key advantage of democracy.

**Carugati, Federica. University of Indiana & Barry R. Weingast. Stanford University. Classics and Political Science**

“Rethinking ‘Mass and Elite’: A New Model of Athenian Litigation”

In the Athenian law-courts, wealthy, educated, and powerful elites fought one another to prevail as leaders and advisors of the masses. Regulated by the masses’ ideals of a good society, elite competition pushed Athens toward stability, prosperity and cultural immortality. Or did it? This article puts pressure on the ‘mass and elite model’ (M&E) of Athenian litigation. According to the M&E framework, litigation is a game played by elite litigants and mass audiences; the

'masses' constitute a monolithic body with identical preferences; the 'elites' are thoroughly aware of, and willingly play by, the rules set by the masses; and policy/legal issues are subsumed under the overwhelming weight of ideological negotiations.

Moving from a different interpretation of Athenian political sociology, we build a new model of Athenian litigation that modifies the M&E model in three important respects: first, the jurors' preferences are not the product of a monolithic and static 'mass' ideology; second, litigants (not only elites) can reasonably (though not precisely) predict the location of the median juror (the central juror, one with an equal number of jurors on either side); and third, litigants' arguments are the product of a cost-benefit analysis that depends a) on the relative expected position of their opponent; b) on the expected position of the median juror; and c) on the policy/legal agenda they are pursuing. Our model suggests that repeated interactions in the law-courts allowed diverse interests to be advanced and negotiated, which helped the Athenians collectively define the boundaries of their social relations while responding to the new challenges that a post-imperial, highly fragmented Greek ecology posed to Athens' stability and prosperity.

**Cline, Diane Harris. George Washington University. Classics.**

"Actor Network Theory, Entanglement, and Social Network Analysis: The Periclean Building Program and the Transformation of Athenian Society and Politics in the Fifth Century BC."

In this paper, we will view the "Periclean Building Program" through the lens of Actor Network Theory (ANT), in order to explore the ways in which the construction of these buildings transformed Athenian society and politics in the fifth century BC. We begin by applying some ANT concepts to the process that was involved in getting approval for the building program as described by Thucydides and Plutarch in his *Life of Pericles*. ANT blends entanglement (human-material thing interdependence) with network thinking, so it allows us to reframe our views to include social networks when we think about the political debate and social tensions in Athens that arose from Pericles's proposal to construct the Parthenon and Propylaea on the Athenian Acropolis, the Telesterion at Eleusis, the Odeon at the base of the South slope of the Acropolis, and a long wall to Peiraeus. Social Network Analysis (SNA) can model the social networks, and the clusters within them, that existed in mid-fifth century Athens. By using SNA and entanglement to inform ANT, we can then show how the construction work itself transformed a fractious city into a harmonious one through sustained, collective efforts that engaged large numbers of lower class citizens, all responding to each other's needs in a *chaine operateire*. By looking at the ways in which teams of workmen in various trades coordinated for almost 15 years, we can visualize the building program as the workings of a human-thing machine or complex adaptive system that ultimately transformed Athenian society and had ripple effects that went far beyond the construction of mere buildings. It is clear that ANT, entanglement, and social networks were all integral to the political and social changes that we see in Athens in the fifth century BC.

**Fleck, Robert K. & F. Andrew Hanssen. Clemson University. Economics**

“What can Data drawn from the Hansen-Nielsen Inventory tell us about Political Transitions in Ancient Greece?”

Most of the democratic transitions that have occurred in human history took place in ancient Greece. Thanks to Mogens Hansen’s and Thomas Nielsen’s monumental Inventory of Archaic and Classical Period Poleis (augmented by Josiah Ober and his Stanford colleagues), a fascinating data set documenting ancient Greek political transitions now exists. But the data present an extraordinary challenge to empirical research, because so much remains unknown about so many poleis. Furthermore, and very importantly, one cannot treat missing information as if it were caused by chance destruction of records. Our objectives in this paper are threefold. First, we wish to illustrate the feasibility of useful statistical analysis, even when applied to data as uncertain in origin and/or interpretation as those from ancient Greece. Second, we wish to provide additional evidence of the value of a systematic database, such as that derived from Hansen and Nielsen’s work. Third, we wish to contribute to literature on political transition in ancient Greece.

**Forsdyke, Sara. University of Michigan. Classical Studies and History.**

“Ancient & Modern Conceptions of the Rule of Law”

The goal of this paper is to explore the ways that the ancient Greeks conceptualized the Rule of Law (RoL) and to determine in what ways it is similar or different from modern conceptions of the RoL. Although the meaning of the RoL is notoriously difficult to pin down, I will begin by identifying some key components of modern theories of the rule of law, including the concepts of Legal Supremacy, Legal Equality and Legal Certainty (see Dworkin 1986, Hutchinson and Monahan 1987, Tamanaha 2004, Maxeiner 2007, Bingham 2010 and Nardulli et al., 2013). I will then propose a three-stage development in Greek conceptions of the RoL. In the earliest phase, roughly between the seventh and sixth centuries BCE, the precise concept of the rule of law was lacking, but key elements of what we would recognize as the rule of law were developed. These elements were first and foremost the principle that society should be regulated through authoritative rules rather than violence (Legal Supremacy), along with the principle of the subordination of magistrates to the law and the equality of citizens before the law (Legal Equality). In the second phase, corresponding to the fifth century, these principles were strongly associated with democracy, though also present to lesser and greater degrees in other constitutions.

In the final period, roughly corresponding to the fourth century, a stronger conception of the rule of law emerged both among democrats and critics of popular rule. It is in this period, that the idea emerges that citizens should not only be obedient to the laws, but that they should be ruled by the laws and even become ‘slaves’ to the laws. In formulations of this period, the rule of law is opposed to the rule of the People or of any individual or group. The rationale for this development was the idea that the rule of a person or group was incompatible with the rule of the law, if that person or group was also the source of law. Modern liberal thought has found various solutions to this dilemma, but it is important to acknowledge that the problem was recognized already by the ancient Greeks. According to the terminology of the day, the ideal was that the “laws rule” or that the “laws are

sovereign” rather than any human individual or group. In these strong articulations, the human agency needed to formulate, interpret and enforce the laws was obscured in favour of the notion of the impersonal and inanimate laws ‘ruling’ the community. It will be suggested that this formulation captures at least in part the third element of modern conceptions of the RoL, namely the principle that the application of the laws should be consistent and predictable (Legal Certainty).

**Gray, Benjamin. University of Edinburgh. Classics.**

“Approaching the political thought of the Hellenistic polis through modern political theory”

This paper will discuss methods and problems in reconstructing an inclusive, dynamic picture of the political thought and debates of the Hellenistic cities (c. 323–31 BC), drawing on theories and models from modern political and social theory. It will examine the potential for applying to the Hellenistic cities some of the methods and approaches developed for the fully contextualised study of the political thought and debates of Classical Athens by J. Ober and others, especially in Ober’s trilogy on the Classical Athenian democracy (*Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens, Political Dissent in Democratic Athens, Democracy and Knowledge*). Recent scholarship has emphasised the vibrancy and dynamism of Hellenistic cities and their often democratic institutions, well attested through inscriptions: the rich debates about politics, power and justice of the Classical Greek world continued in the Hellenistic cities. Indeed, the Hellenistic cities preserved a vibrant public sphere of political deliberation, shared decision-making and philosophical and rhetorical education. This public sphere was still recognisable from its Classical predecessor, though it also reflected significant changes: the increased interconnectedness of more open cities; permeable boundaries of citizenship and status; the influence of kings and their courts; and Hellenistic philosophers’ new habits and priorities. Modern theoretical approaches to the connections between political rhetoric, political theory and political practice, such as those of Q. Skinner and P. Rosanvallon, offer very helpful means to reconstruct the form and content of complex, cosmopolitan Hellenistic debates about politics and citizenship: they reveal effective methods for integrating the evidence of literary and philosophical texts with that of more pragmatic and demotic texts, especially cities’ own inscribed laws and decrees.

The political thinking and rhetoric of Hellenistic philosophers, intellectuals and citizens shows evidence of the interlocking and mutual counterbalancing of the three types of political discourse studied in turn in Ober’s trilogy on Classical Athens: political lobbying and negotiation, including rival attempts to shape civic values; philosophical and critical reflection about the foundations of politics; and rationalistic consideration of efficiency, especially the devising and advertisement of incentives. Indeed, the main form of self-expression of Hellenistic cities, collective assembly debates about honours for benefactors, subsequently recorded in honorary decrees, usually simultaneously combined all three types of political discourse: political negotiation about resources and rewards between benefactors and beneficiaries, or between mass and elite; shared ethical reflection about civic virtue, justice and the good life, exemplified by benefactors; and assessment of the

most efficient means to provide clear, reliable incentives for future benefactors. Similarly, some Hellenistic philosophers, especially later Hellenistic Stoics and Peripatetics, sought simultaneously to promote certain political interests; to reflect about the foundations of politics; and to facilitate the efficient distribution of knowledge and incentives. As in the case of the Classical poleis, it was crucial for Hellenistic cities' stability and flourishing that citizens and thinkers simultaneously sustained all three types of political discourse, maintaining them in balance. If any of the three was neglected, or allowed to dominate the others, the public sphere and shared civic life could be severely damaged or undermined, including by sharpened inequality and conflict. This paper will explore these themes through the specific case-study of the ideas and debates about property, debt and benefit (individual and communal) attested in both Hellenistic inscriptions and philosophical texts.

**Kierstead, James and Roman Klapaukh. University of Wellington (NZ). Classics**  
"The Distribution of Wealth and Power in Classical Attica: Some Regressions and Visualizations"

An equitable distribution of wealth and of access to political power is often seen as a key condition for democracy. While some scholars of classical Attica (such as Lewis and Ismard) have taken the view that resources and influence were smoothly spread, others (Osborne and Jones, for example) have claimed that there existed significant clusters of privilege. In this paper, we draw on a dataset on demes compiled by Ober and Teegarden from a number of standard works (by Davies, Hansen, and Whitehead). After considering some methodological problems raised by the nature of the evidence, we focus on the question of whether wealth and power were distributed in a way that mirrors population density. Using a number of proxies for wealth and political power, we run regressions aimed at seeing whether these variables were correlated with population across demes. To anticipate our findings, our view is that most of the indicators for wealth and participation in classical Attica match up very closely with population. A citizen's origins in a particular deme are never a good predictor of his wealth or influence in the classical democratic state.

**Lewis, David. University of Edinburgh. Classics.**

"Behavioural Economics and Economic Activity in Classical Athens"  
This paper aims to build on recent work (esp. P. Christensen, *G&R* 50.1, 2003: 31-56) that analyses the motivations of economic actors in classical Athens. The (now) old orthodoxy of M.I. Finley, drawing on Bücher and Weber, stressed that the so-called *homo economicus* did not exist until recent times: in antiquity, an anti-productive mentality was essentially hard-wired into the minds of elite Greeks and Romans, preventing economic development. This approach has been widely rejected in recent years, and in particular the methods of New Institutional Economics (NIE) have provided a way around the moribund formalist-primitivist debate. Yet whilst NIE has provided a set of important analytical tools, it would be an exaggeration to claim that these tools can solve every problem relating to

economic activity in antiquity; here, the insights of behavioural economics can assist us in understanding economic activity in past societies.

Christensen's work shows a keen awareness of what Herbert Simon called 'bounded rationality,' in other words, the limitations on rational choice by which real economic actors are bound. Limits on rational choice may be universal (viz. general features of human cognition) or specific (for example, value systems of individual societies that curb purely self-seeking behaviour). However, when his article was published Christensen's most pressing concern was to illustrate that intelligent, profit-maximizing behaviour *did* exist in fourth-century Athens. (At this time, the Finleyan approach to the ancient economy retained a good degree of support.) He therefore left the insights of behavioural economics and the importance of value systems relatively unexplored. These are the issues that I wish to address in this paper. First, by drawing on recent work in behavioural economics I aim to sketch some of the general limits that inhibit the exercise of what Simon called 'Olympian rationality.' Since this work focuses on human cognition more broadly, its results are certainly applicable to historical societies. Second, I wish to revisit the evidence for values regarding money making among elite Athenians. Finley rightly placed a great deal of emphasis on this issue, but his ideological position led him to misread the sources, or better, to read a pervasive anti-commercial bias into elite behaviour that is not supported by the sources. A reappraisal of these values is necessary for a better understanding of Athenian attitudes to profit and wealth.

**Liddel, Peter. University of Manchester. Classics and Ancient History**

"The possibility of trans-community political activity in fourth-century Greece"

It might seem reasonable to take the view that the study of ancient Greek political behaviour could plausibly focus upon exchanges that went on inside the *polis*: after all, the word 'politics' derives from the Greek *politika* ('*polis* affairs'). However, the concerns of ancient Greek *polis*-communities were not merely introspective: communities (regardless of size or military clout) were obliged to face the consequences of the decisions and activity of other communities. Human representatives of city-states performed necessary interactions with outsiders: they fought as soldiers, and staked political or ideological claims as ambassadors and politicians. On their return to their home communities, these individuals proclaimed to their audiences the significance of their activity away from home. Furthermore, the overlaps in social and cultural structure of different Greek city-states (especially in the light of Greif's (1994) work on the relationship between cultural and institutional structure), as well as the existence of shared modes of decision-making, might lead us to anticipate the value of trans-community forms of political activity. At the heart of this question, therefore, is an overall debate about the degree of 'unity' of Greek political institutions and behaviour (a view recognised in some classical contexts: cf. e.g. Rhodes with Lewis 1997; Jones 1987; Herman 1987; Mitchell 1998; Low 2006; Vlassopoulos 2007; Hunt 2010, but perhaps better established for the Hellenistic period: cf., e.g., Crowther 1992; Ma 2003; Fröhlich 2004; Dmitriev 2005), a debate I intend to explore by particular reference to the

contested transferability of the decree (*psephisma*) in Greek inter-state politics of the fourth century.

In this paper I will assess the extent to which political activity possessed transferable value between Greek city states of fourth-century Greece: I will explore (a) Athenian perceptions of the shared characteristics of Greek political systems and morality, (b) the claims the Athenians made about the trans-community significance of their own political forms and institutions, (c) the dissemination of Athenian legislation among other communities, and (d) Athenian politicians' deployment of their political skills outside Athens. Some Athenians took the view that political values, institutions, and rhetoric possessed transferable trans-community moral and persuasive significance, and I will assess the evidence for the possibility that, in some circumstances, other Greek communities were interested in Athenian politics. How far, I will ask, was this perception of a cross-community transferability of politics distinct from (and indeed distinguishable from) wider hegemonic tendencies associated with the Athenians of the classical period? Was it challenged in the second half of the fourth century? Does awareness of such correspondence between globalistic and hegemonic views of the world (and its implications) underlie current implementations of International Political Economy and Institutional Logics theories, or can it inform them (cf. Friedland and Alford 1991; Djelic 2010; Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury 2012, 173-4)?

### **Low, Polly, University of Manchester. Classics**

"Hegemonic Legitimacy (and its Absence) in Classical Greece and Beyond"

A recurring concern of Greek writers on hegemony and empire (and of modern commentators on those writers) is the problem of securing the willing – or at least, not actively hostile – consent of those led: Thucydides might have made more than one of his speakers assure the Athenians that leadership could be secured only by power, not consent, but the fate of the fifth-century Athenian empire provided – for some later writers at least – evidence of the limitations of that approach. But ancient approaches to this question are often fragmented in their focus and limited in their perspective (Athens, of course, dominates the picture, even in those texts which purport to be particularly interested in the worries of non-Athenians); modern historical analyses have likewise tended to grapple more with specific instances (the Second Athenian Confederacy; the Boeotian League; etc) or themes (the role of democratic institutions; the rhetoric of panhellenism; etc), than the wider picture.

The aim of this paper, therefore, is to see if it is possible to develop a more systematic framework for assessing the legitimacy (or lack of legitimacy) of Greek hegemonic systems. In particular, I will explore the theoretical models for interstate and hegemonic legitimacy developed in recent work in International Theory, especially in reaction to the (alleged!) 'crisis of legitimacy' of the early years of this century, and assess their applicability (or lack of it) to a deliberately broadly-defined set of Classical Greek hegemonies (the fifth and fourth century Athenian leagues; the Spartan 'empire' of the early fourth century; the two varieties of Boeotian hegemony). In doing so, I aim to illuminate the various ways in which legitimacy was developed and defended by these hegemonies; the challenges to

legitimacy each faced; and – perhaps most importantly – the extent to which the successful cultivation of hegemonic legitimacy correlates with the success of hegemony more broadly (the answer to this last question, in particular, being one which is relevant not just to Greek historians but also to modern theorists of interstate politics).

**Lyttkens, Carl Hampus and Henrik Gerding, Lund University. Economics and Classical Archaeology and Ancient History**

"Understanding the politics of Perikles around 450 BC. The benefits of an economic perspective."

Perikles is usually seen as a great statesman and clever leader of the Athenians. In the mid fifth century BC, he seems however to have been in serious political trouble and may well have been in danger of losing the political struggle against his opponent Kimon. The fact that his incentives changed considerably at this point in time seems to have escaped attention in the literature. In contrast, we see the fierce competition as a motivation for several important policy measures introduced by Perikles at this particular time: the pay to jurors, the new law on citizenship (which has been a puzzle to many historians), and the building projects on the Acropolis and elsewhere. An economic rational-actor approach thus provides a diachronic analytical benefit by focusing on the way incentives change over time and it provides a synchronic benefit by dealing with various decisions in a common framework.

**Mackil, Emily. University of California, Berkeley. History**

"Property Security and its Limits in Ancient Greece"

Scholars working in the New Institutional Economics take it as axiomatic that economic growth cannot happen without secure property rights (*e.g.* North 1971). In his magisterial survey of the economy of the Greek cities, Alain Bresson (2007-2008: II.107-115) has followed suit in asserting that security of property was a precondition for the development of market exchange, fuelling the growth that the Greek world so evidently experienced over the course of the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. Yet careful consideration suggests that property in ancient Greece was comparatively insecure. This paper will explore the ways in which individuals could and did lose their property and will ask how we are to understand the phenomenon of widespread economic growth in this light.

Bresson, Alain. 2007-2008. *L'économies de la Grèce des cités*. Paris.

North, D. C. 1971. "Institutional Change and Economic Growth" *Journal of Economic History* 31: 118-125.

**Maehle, Ingvar. University of Bergen. History**

"Patronage in Ancient Sparta: A comparative perspective."

The ideology of the Spartan *homoioi*, the "equals", or rather the "similars" masked vast differences in wealth, prestige and power. In such circumstances, personal patronage thrive, decades of anthropological investigations has shown us. Yet patronage is most commonly associated with Rome, despite the demonstration by several scholars that patron-client relationships did indeed play a role even in

democratic Athens, a society before thought exempt from the universal laws of reciprocity.

In this paper I will discuss the role of personal patronage in classical Sparta, and the differences between unequal reciprocity in the society of the “similars” compared to democratic Athens and Republican Rome. I will build on the findings of Stephen Hodkinson (Sparta), Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz (Athens) and my own research into patronage in the Roman Republic (PhD dissertation) and the comparative structure of Athenian patronage (Hesperia, forthcoming), in order to demonstrate how patronage is a natural part of all ancient societies. Different systems allow patronage different scope and venues, forcing the phenomenon to adapt to various circumstances. This changes the rates of exchange between patron and client, but does not abolish the institution (as claimed by Paul Millet).

The aim is to construct a general theory of patronage in the ancient city-states of Greece and Rome.

**Mann, Christian. Mannheim University. History,**

“The nature and function of athletic prizes in ancient Greece.”

It is well known that Olympic victors received “only” an olive wreath – a fact that classified them as “amateurs” in the perspective of the modern Olympic movement. But the reality of ancient sports was far more complex: At many competitions, the victors’ awards were objects of value (amphorae filled with olive oil, weapons and other bronze objects, living animals) or cash. In some cases, victors were not allowed to do with the prize what they wanted to, but were obligated to dedicate it in a sanctuary, to sell it to the polis officials, to deliver it to a king etc. So what was the nature of athletic prizes? They have been analyzed as cult objects or in the context of gift exchange (according to Marcel Mauss). This paper offers a new approach taking into account network theory and theories about the convertibility of capital: Athletic prizes – wreaths as well as value prizes – are considered as objects with both an economic and symbolic dimension. Their function was to construct and strengthen networks in the Greek world, while the structure of those networks changed according to political developments.

**Teegarden, David. State University of New York at Buffalo. Classics.**

“The *Koinon Dogma* and the Consolidation of the Democratic Revolutions in mid 5<sup>th</sup> Century Sicily.”

This paper provides a partial explanation for the apparent success of the many democratic revolutions in mid 5<sup>th</sup> century Sicily. I make three primary points. First, the presence of mercenaries and displaced peoples constituted an existential threat to each of the new Sicilian democracies. For example, mercenaries – all of whom previously worked for the then recently deposed tyrants – might support an aspiring tyrant simply for pay. Second, no city could solve the problems posed by mercenaries and displaced peoples by itself. If City A, for example, does not welcome home its former residents currently living in City B, City B might not be able to welcome home its former residents currently living in City C, and so on. For the third point I draw upon the work of Michael Chwe and Barry Weingast and

argue that the promulgation of a *koinon dogma* (Diod. Sic. 11.76.5) helped the citizens of the relevant poleis solve their “inter-polis coordination problem” and thus helped consolidate the several democratic revolutions in Greek Sicily.

Chwe, M. 2001. *Rational Ritual*. Princeton.

Weingast, B. 1997. “The Political Foundations of Democracy and the Rule of Law” *The American Political Science Review* 91: 245-263.

**Taylor, Claire . University of Wisconsin-Madison. History**

“Economic (in)equality and democracy: the political economy of poverty in Athens”

This paper explores the relationship between participatory democracy and poverty in democratic Athens. Drawing on recent debates within Greek history and the social sciences, it will examine the relationship between the economic prosperity of Athenians and its democratic system, with particular emphasis on the role of direct democracy in the amelioration of poverty. Social scientists have frequently argued that democracy has a greater chance of success in wealthier polities, an idea which appears to have some application to the ancient world: Athens, for example, was undoubtedly affluent, had experienced long-term economic growth, had high wages and robust democratic institutions. However, much of this literature also betrays an anti-democratic/anti-poor rhetoric surprisingly familiar to historians of Athenian democracy (the poor are authoritarian, they lack intelligence, and are only interested in rule for their own redistributive self-interest etc). It also ignores those who are poor, plays down their participation in politics or fails to account for relative (in)equalities. This paper, therefore, uses the Athenian experience to explore how participatory democracy can be used as a tool for social flourishing to empower, enrich and improve the capabilities and well-being of the poor. It argues that direct democracy was the principle way that poverty was mediated (for citizens) and reproduced (for non-citizens) in Athens.

**van Alfen, Peter. American Numismatic Society. History & Archaeology**

“Muddle wrestling: grappling for conceptual clarity in archaic money”

In recent years, the global trends towards currency homogenization and monetary diversification have attracted the attention of sociologists Nigel Dodd, Geoffrey Ingham, and Viviana Zelizer, each of whom has explored at length not just contemporary monetary practices, but also the nature of money and its long history. In the course of their sometimes spirited debates over how to define money, to trace its origins, and to outline the theoretical approaches towards the production and consumption of money in various fields of study, including economics, sociology, and politics, they have worked towards achieving greater clarity where previously there has been what Ingham has called “category errors” and Dodd a “conceptual muddle.” Largely overlooked by those who work on ancient monetary problems, their efforts to disentangle money’s abstractions and materiality offers a path out of some of the thorniest pitfalls in discussions of the development of money in the ancient Mediterranean world, particularly in the archaic period.

In this paper I demonstrate how Ingham's and Dodd's clearly defined, hierarchical units of analysis--money idea, money of account, and currency—can be profitably employed to map and isolate problems in approaches to archaic money that hitherto have been plagued by their own conceptual confusions, not least of which is how to define “money” in an archaic context. Adopting these analytical units allows us to investigate with greater success the development of archaic money, particularly the currency form of coinage, and its relationships to critical social, political and economic developments taking place within various communities and regional systems at the same time.

**Van Liefferinge, Kim, Stanford. Archaeology.**

“Technology and Society in Classical Athens: A study of the social context of mining and metallurgy at Laurion.”

Technology is a ubiquitous aspect of the everyday world. Although hard to ignore in this day and age, Classical scholars have shown little awareness of this observation in their research. Technology has primarily been studied from a restricted angle, most notably a technical or economic one. The former perspective views technology as a purely technical force, concentrating principally on tools and techniques. The latter focuses on innovation, and its capability to increase production outputs and trigger economic growth. Both approaches, however, neglect the complex range of factors that actually contribute to technological change, inevitably leading to misconceptions about the role of technology in the ancient world.

In this paper, I wish to present a different way of approaching Classical technology. Using the sociological theory of SCOTS (*Social Construction of Technological Systems*), I argue that technological change always occurs against the backdrop of interdependent environmental, social, economic and political factors. I will apply this approach to the case study of the Athenian silver mines in the Laurion. The focus will be on the practice of silver production, with special attention to social groups and their interaction in a broader environmental, political and economic context. This framework will enable a more contextualized and thorough understanding of technological change in Athenian society.

**Commentators confirmed**

Alain Bresson, Chicago  
Paul Cartledge, Cambridge  
John K. Davies, Liverpool  
Stephen Haber, Stanford  
Jon Hesk, St. Andrews  
Ian Morris, Stanford.