Thomas Figueira

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

RECENT STUDIES ON THE STRUCTURE AND INSTITUTIONS

OF THE GREEK POLIS

This paper will consider several topics regarding recent work on Greek institutional and political history.[1]

One axis along which to proceed is first to consider the output between 1993 and 2005 of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, under the leadership of Mogens Herman Hansen. Ironically, the scale and intensity of publication have meant that this work has barely begun to be assimilated intellectually. Let me outline this dossier of work. First, two ventures in comparative studies deserve notice.[2] They appeared in sumptuously prepared offerings in the Historical/Philosophical proceedings of the Royal Danish Academy. These two volumes cast the net widely indeed for cultures that may have harbored polities resembling the *polis* or the Italic *civitas*. This approach is useful in that these studies amass a wealth of comparative material, with bibliography on socio-political structures and processes. Many instances are notable in deviation from or in congruence with the classical phenomena. I am basing my remarks on my review articles.[3] My chief concerns were several-fold. First, the design for these studies failed to distinguish the *polis* with sufficient clarity so that *comparanda* and *differentia* could be addressed in detail. Also, the developmental relationship or absence thereof between the *polis* and *civitas* and the other polities under study might have been specified. Note the appendix to this article. Finally, insufficient attention was sometimes paid to those areas of striking

convergence or divergence that would repay further study by ancient historians, as I tried to indicate in individual cases.

With a recent addition, there are now eight volumes of "papers" of the Centre that were published as *Einzelschriften* volumes of the journal *Historia*. These collections are more accessible to North American readers, as *Historia* is a widely subscribed publication.[4] The *CPCPapers* tend to concentrate on semantic studies on Greek political terminology, and on programmatic pieces, some of which respond to or dispute contributions in the *Acts* series.[5] As well as some reviewers of individual *CPC* volumes, I found this corrective intervention troubling. Several other offerings follow up, and not without some special pleading, on what were perceived as problems or inconsistencies in the evidence.

The seven volumes of the Polis Centre "acts" were published under the aegis of the Royal Danish Society of Arts and Sciences, appearing in its proceedings.[6] Unless purchased separately, these volumes are considerably harder to find than the *CPCPapers*. This is unfortunate because the bulk of the Centre's work appeared here. The volumes of the *CPCActs* embody a series of conferences held under the auspices of the Centre. While the earlier collections were synthetic and cover various aspects of institutions, historiography, and semantics, several volumes are more focused. Volume five brings together an array of programmatic studies by Hansen; volume six is devoted to Arkadia; and volume seven addresses utopias, philosophical constructs, and other so-called "imaginary *poleis*". The *CPCActs* assemble a more prestigious group of scholars, combined with in-depth treatment, especially in the early going. The participation of North American scholars throughout has been relatively limited, although our

compatriots have appeared here and there, including my respondent, Joshiah Ober. The

most active American collaborator has been Paula Perlman of Texas, who produced

several meaty pieces on Crete and on the institution of the *thearodokoi*.[7] I disagreed with

Dr. Perlman on some details, but also perceived scant impact from her chapters on the

overall project. The tangential place of American work *vis-à-vis* the *polis* as envisaged by

Hansen and collaborators is possibly the reason for their over-reaction to the appearance

of my first review article. Despite being put on friendly notice just as I started my reading

of their volumes, they initially interpreted my criticism, albeit in the midst of much

praise, as an attack. They have replied to me on their website and in *Ancient West & East*.

I shall take up an offer to respond once I am sure that they have nothing more to ventilate

after reading my later installments.

The final and perhaps most significant item for general usage is the

massive *Inventory of Greek Poleis*, published by Oxford.[8] Here we find summaries

recapitulating many of the programmatic presentations that are found in the other

publications of the Polis Centre. A somewhat wider complement of scholars has been

enlisted to produce the entries of the *Inventory* on the various *poleis*, which is organized

by regions. I and several other colleagues based here were invited to participate. Largely

by reason of that participation, I have forborne reviewing the *Inventory*. I note that the

Inventory takes an expansive perspective on identification of *poleis*. This is,

unsurprisingly, a feature of the entire enterprise, since the attestation of any community

as a *polis* in a single chronological niche by a reputable authority seems to trigger a sort

of constitutional essentialism that infiltrates all periods and aspects of that community's

existence. Another feature of the *Inventory* is alike notable: meaningful lists and

compilations that aggregate the city-states that manifest certain characteristics, for

example, all the colonies. We might have preferred to query the evidence on the *poleis*

with other questions based on our own vision of the city-state. I append my own to the

Handout. Such speculation does not vitiate the value of the *Inventory's* data on the

queries posed by Hansen and his colleagues. The usefulness of the *Inventory* may be

somewhat impaired by an over-schematization, of which I note some examples in my

review articles. Yet it will take more thorough utilization in order to assess the scale of

this phenomenon.

The areas of strength exhibited by the publications of the Polis Centre are the

following: semantic studies of terminology which encompass nomenclature[9]; overviews

of *polis* institutions[10]; area studies, with special reference to regions dominated by

ethnē[11]**;** and ekistics and urban studies[12] that include not only exploration of settlement

configuration and urban planning, but also surveys of characteristic structures or

complexes associated with *polis* life, such as theaters or *bouleutēria*. The picture of the

polis that emerges is traditionally comparative, institutionally and legally focused, and a

bit positivistic. As I noted, no public instrumentality or foundation in the US would have

subsidized such a project, one that is innocent of post-modern critical trends.[13] In much

of this scholarship, we are teleported back to a time before structuralists stalked the earth,

let alone scholars of post-colonial studies or nomadism. But before the *Weltanschauung*

of the Centre is received with wistful nostalgia, we must also regret under-appreciation of

mentalities, normative systems, and ideologies. The *polis* coevolves with the *politēs*. It

takes more than political procedures to build a classical civic order, as recent events in

Iraq and Afghanistan have underlined. The *poleis* of the mind are as real in their role as

historical actors as *poleis* rooted by stone and metal in the earth.[14] Nonetheless, for all my

reservations about some of this work, I am still moved to celebrate its accomplishments.[15]

Turning to some other recent European work for contrast, note two *comparanda*:

first, a collective volume edited by Silvio Cataldi,[16] and, the second, focusing on a single

polis, the publications of the International Sparta Seminar, led by Anton Powell and

Stephen Hodkinson. For Cataldi's work, the overlap in participants with the CPC is

notable, but not predominant. There is, however, a noteworthy displacement of emphasis

in this collection toward the internalization of the *polis* and toward ancient authorities not

as users of *polis* terminology but as deployers of particular concepts of the *polis* with

culture-general, context-sensitive, or individual facets.

Regarding the International Sparta Seminar, in disclosure, I point out my involvement

as contributor and editor of a volume of its proceedings.[17] [Time does not permit a

discussion of the parallel enterprises in Boiotian, Arkadian, and now Euboian studies.]

Nonetheless, I would argue that the Sparta Seminar has been strikingly inclusive of

different methodologies, while embodying an opening toward research in the social

sciences. Hansen struggled quite a bit in the Copenhagen publications over the typicality

or canonicity of Sparta. The Sparta Seminar has tried to negotiate the boundary of

dynamic tension between the competing visions of aberrant Sparta and normative Sparta.

As seen in its best practitioners, this exercise has redeemed the canonical archaic *polis* in

Sparta, which I stress differs fundamentally from the classical democratic *polis* with its

emergent monetary market economy. Sparta was a brilliant instantiation of the values and

social processes of the early archaic city-state; so successful it overstayed its day. The

Seminar has succeeded not only in incorporating at one time or another all the major

figures researching Sparta, but also in enlisting scholars whose focus of interest lies elsewhere. It has helped encourage parallel colloquia in France and Germany.[18]

I had hoped here to advert to other trends in Greek political history, but I am forced to forbear in the interests of time. Where I had hoped to linger to note the contributions of a number of scholars whose work on Greek political structure has been under-appreciated, I shall mention only the conspicuous case of Nicholas P. Jones.[19] [Jones's work on the units of the Greek *polis* reminds us that each polity had its own vision of social and political integration. These conceptualizations generally fell within panhellenic norms, although I observe that my research on the Aiginetans shows significant pressure at the margins of the envelopes of such norms, namely a pressure to integrate and rationalize unusual socio-economic adaptations. Yet, internal political structure affected patterns of decision-making, allocation of political energy, and the placement of points of cross linkage with other societal processes.]

[The scholarship on the internal political structure and institutions of Eretria by Denis Knoefler aptly appears in both the publications of the Copenhagen Centre and in the aforementioned volume of Silvio Cataldi.[20] At Eretria, we find an elaborate structure with analogies, to be sure, with both Attica and Ionia, but also a system in which there must have been an intense psychological investment by individual Eretrians. And I emphasize that it was the ability of the later archaic and classical *polis* to institutionalize autonomous social evolution that drove the engine of Greek progress, by turning the world of *poleis* into an array of cells adapting, incorporating, and rejecting cultural innovation.]

Now that we have explored for a bit work on the political history, one can observe trends in interdisciplinary research along three principal routes: scholarship utilizing anthropology, that drawing on post-modernist theory, and exploration undertaken in conjunction with political science. Our appraisal reveals the importance of the social and cultural framework for research in ancient history in the contemporary university. There are, unfortunately, some grounds for pessimism when prospects for ancient history are viewed in this light, despite the quality publications that continue to appear.

The interests of expeditiousness restrict my comments to a few. One, the lack of penetration by recent critical theory is both a weakness and a strength for ancient historians.[21] As a cause for weakness it has tended to create an appearance of backwardness to some literary interpreters in our field, who can afford to make unrealistic interpretative promises once works are deracinated from their cultural contexts. Even so I am often astounded by the readings of major fifth-century texts, where contextualization seems to be provided by some dimly recalled read-through of an old textbook, let's say, Bury as revised by Meiggs. The work by classicists along post-modernist lines has been only superficially reflective of the debates among comparativists and critical theorists. Eric Voegelin in his *Anamnesis* lamented the doggedness of his American colleagues in restricting their conceptual framework to the vestiges of nineteenth-century central European ideologies.[22] Now, we must conclude that the impulse toward ideologization will never run shorts of scripts so long as some new continental master can be touted.

Turning to anthropology, there have been many notable applications of anthropological theory and evidence in our field. Their influences have usually lain in

social, economic, and cultural history. Political history has been less well assisted. I note

the recent exception of the excellent monograph of Marcello Lupi that applied

anthropological work on maturation, the passage of time, and on the succession of

generation to marriage at Sparta.[23] The results for the politics of inheritance, sexuality,

and familial relations were important. Another productive scholar who has deployed

anthropological insights in many publications has been Hans van Wees of University

College, London.[24] Nonetheless, there have been some notable monstrous births in the

application of anthropology to Greek political history. I will not to single out any cases,

although such instances can be found among my book reviews. It is a general problem in

the utilization of any of the social sciences that one must attend first to the level

differentiation of social roles, of modes of work and economic productivity, of cultural

normative codes, and of ideologies. Moses Finley stressed the intermediate character of

the ancient economy when contrasted with peasant subsistence orders and early modern

market economies, but this point has tended to be elided. There has instead been a great

deal of fruitless posturing about substantivists and formalists that masks a failure to cope

with ancient economic phenomena by close analysis.[25]

Another topic inviting our attention is a surge of studies on ethnogenesis, amid a

veritable avalanche of works on ethnicity or ethnicities.[26] Moreover, Nino Luraghi's book

on the Messenians has just appeared and deals in large part with the evolution of an

ethnic identity. Luraghi and Peter Funke will soon publish a collection of studies on the

development of ethnicity in the classical Peloponnesus.[27] On one flank this research

focuses our attention on ancient polities other than the *polis*, and thus here it jostles

uneasily with the investigations of the Copenhagen Polis Centre. We must then

foreground a concern that the *polis* within the *ethnos* must operate in a fundamentally

different way, and not only in the division of political processes between different

political levels. Seeing ethnogenesis as mere political manipulation and propaganda in

support of foreign military policy is a tremendous pitfall.

As to dialogues between ancient historians and political scientists, in principle

these take place between equal partners. Yet, even here, we must be on our guard against

the self-censorship that prevails within a highly politicized discipline. The range of licit

opinion is now so narrow in many political science programs that some inhibition may

exist against anything that forthrightly contradicts current leftist orthodoxy. Here the

ancient historian must be careful against serving as the "beard" who lends authority to an

Aesopian dialogue.

Let me conclude by observing that all interdisciplinary studies are often driven by

gestures of appropriation and rejection of the central cultural status of Greco-Roman

civilization. We grapple with two modes of defamiliarization. One process of de-

familiarization plays an essential role in teaching Greek history in North America,

because students are so pervaded with images, clichés, and factoids garnered from

popular culture and childish secondary instruction. It is necessary to incise the contours

of the institutional distinctions before retrieving the analogues, homologies, and

inheritances from *polis* life. Adopting a vantage point at a distance brings into focus

significant points of correlation with non-western cultures that *polis* culture possesses.

Moreover, de-familiarization helps mount a guard against cultural and ethnic

cheerleading, in which classical accomplishments are vaunted as the unique legacy of

some self-proclaimed body of inheritors. De-familiarization complicates that legacy,

while insisting it belongs to all who understand and appreciate Greek civilization, and internalize its positive qualities. However, the rather more sinister de-familiarization practiced by ideologues serves to discard any vestige of classical heritage as the product of "dead white males", imperialists, chauvinists, colonialists, and racists. We must avoid even the milder manifestation of this syndrome where de-familiarizing is confined to rhetorical gestures meant to appeal to pseudo-multi-culturalist and present-minded colleagues in more powerful academic departments.

APPENDIX

I. The *polis* is an articulated political order with multiple loci of power and authority, which may be equivalent or hierarchical. The distinct placement of these loci is structural and not fundamentally geographical. The articulation of the *polis* is balanced by its "articulatable" character, in that its *politai* can render an account of its order in terms of relevant cultural values.

II. The *polis* co-evolves with the *politês*, a social personality who possesses not only a delineated political role, but also a characteristic psychology that is typified by a situational etiquette of socio-political assertion and deference.

A number of qualities of the *polis* reflect these most basic conditions.

A) The basic articulation of the *polis* encompasses the organization of space, in particular the integration of *asty* or (*acro*)*polis*, associated with the main power/authority locus/i, with the *khôra*, which itself will be necessarily organized into an array of units.

a1: The *politai* are embodied in this territorialisation through mythological or myth-historical justification, by the various means of autochthony, legitimate conquest, charismatic foundation, and synoecism.

a2: Hence the *politai* are embodied in units that are alternatively spatial and/or genetic in character, and which interact in nesting and cross-cutting modes. *Polis* and sub-units can develop autonomously, but can shape, or even transform, each other in that process.

B) The *politai* are able to account for and justify the features of their *polis* by appealing to basic cultural norms, such as *dikê*, *kosmos*, and *sôphrosynê* (see just below for the wider cultural frame). Such justifications not only contain the expected appeals to religiously sanctioned norms, such as the "justice of Zeus", but also reveal a strong aesthetic component (the *polis* should be *eukosmos*).

b1: Thus, the *polis* tends toward the codification of norms, systematic codes, written laws and codes, open display of laws, programs of law-giving, and public performance of adjudication.

b2: Because cultural norms understand human behaviour as agonistic in nature, activities within the institutions of the *polis* can be viewed as competitive gestures and performative acts. This agonistic process can subsume both the assimilation of behaviours and structures from other communities, and the mirroring of differential behaviours.

C) The *politai* are aware of their existence within the wider body of the Greeks, an awareness that requires the existence of other *poleis*. This common identity is sustained through shared poetic discourse(s), inter-communal ritual activity, and material exchange.

   c1: The panhellenic (or culture-general) tendency and the epichoric (or *polis*-local) tendency operate in dynamic tension against the backdrop of communal agonism.

   c2: The over-arching cultural affiliation and the sense of belonging to hierarchical or nested units sharpens the issue of individual identity, both as an experiential state and as a visualisation of others/outsiders.

D) The co-evolution of the *polis* and the *politês* is not only a direct arc of dynamic tension, but is also mediated through the *oikos* and other societal groupings.

   d1: This co-evolution directs social attention toward the rights and duties of individuals toward the community and the corresponding responsibilities of the whole toward its members. The community becomes a commonwealth that is assumed to have a major role in sustaining its members.

   d2: The equilibrium between *polis* and *politês* problematizes the question of the nature of an individual historical actor. Individualism emerges as a socio-economic disposition that gradually takes on emotional, spiritual, and intellectual dimensions.

   d3: The *politês* is alternatively the *idiotês* 'private person' and the *oikos*-member as well. Individuals and nested units interacting autonomously generate significant social structure from below which an open and overarching social matrix can accommodate. This process results in a complex social identity or identities in which a varied set of relations can radiate from each *politês*.

   d4: The complexity of individual identity and of group interaction renders possible and facilitates the coexistence and competition within the same societal order of different ideologies, of sectarian codes of behaviour, of distinct sub-cultures, and even of counter-cultures.

E. The intensity with which *polis* life is experienced renders it the most important cultural construction of its civilization. Yet the *polis* is equally the sum of its constituent units and is always orienting itself toward its panhellenic frame and the regional context to which it is bound by inter-communal exchange.

   e1: The *polis* exhibits a tendency towards autarky and autarchy, holding autonomy as its default state.

   e2: When and where the group life of a constituent element of the *polis* is intensely experienced, its members can be motivated to claim *polis* status for the constituent unit.

e3: Just as fission haunts the destiny of the *polis,* fusion through synoeism, confederation, or hegemony is a counterbalancing process.

---

[1] The endnotes of this paper had their original dissemination as items on a handout circulated at our session at the 2009 APA/AIA meetings, Phildelphia. The appendix was attached to that handout. There
are some comments in this text which are surrounded by brackets ([/]) that could not be included in my presentation that were shared with the respondent and other participants in the panel.

[2] M.H. Hansen, *A Comparative Study of Thirty City State Cultures. An Investigation* Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab/The Royal Danish Academy of Arts and Letters (RDA), Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 21, RDA, Copenhagen 2000; A Comparative Study of Six City State Cultures. An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre, Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 27, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab/The Royal Danish Academy of Arts and Letters (RDA), Copenhagen 2002.

[3] T.J. Figueira, "The Copenhagen Polis Centre: A Review-Article of Its Publications, Parts 1-2," *Ancient West & East* 5 (2006) 252–303; "… Part 3," *AWE* 6 (2007) 294-321; "… Part 4," *AWE* 7 (2008) 304–32; "… Part 5," forthcoming in *AWE* 8 (2009); "… Part 6," forthcoming in *AWE* 9 (2010).

[4] D. Whitehead *,* ed., *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius. Sources of the Ancient Greek* Polis, *CPCPapers* 1, *Historia, Einzelschr.* 87, Stuttgart 1994; M.H. Hansen & K. Raaflaub, eds., *Studies in the Ancient Greek* Polis, *CPCPapers* 2, *Historia. Einzelschr.* 95, Stuttgart 1995; Hansen & Raaflaub, *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, *CPCPapers* 3, *Historia. Einzelschr.* 108, Stuttgart 1996; T.H. Nielsen, ed., *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, *CPCPapers* 4, *Historia. Einzelschr*. 117, Stuttgart 1997; P. Flensted-Jensen, ed., *Further Studies in theAncient Greek* Polis, *CPCPapers* 5, *Historia. Einzelschr*. 138, Stuttgart 2000; Nielsen, *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek* Polis. CPCPapers 6. *Historia. Einzelschr*. 162, Stuttgart 2002; Nielsen, *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek* Polis. *CPCPapers* 7. *Historia. Einzelschr*. 180, Stuttgart 2004; Hansen (ed.), *The Return of the* Polis. *The Use and Meaning of the Word* Polis *in Archaic and Classical Sources*, *CPCPapers* 8, *Historia Einzelschr*. 198, Stuttgart 2007.

[5] S.E. Alcock, "Pausanias and the *Polis:* Use and Abuse," *CPCActs* 2, 326-44; countered by L. Rubenstein, "Pausanias as a Source for the Classical Greek *Polis*," *CPCPapers* 2, 211-17; S.G. Miller, "Old Metroon and Old Bouleuterion in the Classical Agora of Athens," *CPCPapers* 2, 133-56; countered by L. Shear, "Bouleuterion, Metroon, and the Archives at Athens," *CPCPapers* 2, 157-90.

[6] M.H. Hansen, ed., *The Ancient Greek City-State: Symposium on the Occasion of the*

250th Anniversary of The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters July, 1-4 1992. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 67, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Copenhagen 1993; Id., *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August, 24-27 1994*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. H-fM 72, RDA, Copenhagen 1995; Id., *Introduction to an Inventory of* Poleis. *Symposium August, 23-26 1995. CPCActs 3*. H-fM 74, RDA, Copenhagen 1996; Id., *The* Polis *as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community. Symposium August, 29-31 1996. CPCActs 4*. H-fM 75, RDA, Copenhagen 1997. Id., Polis *and City-State: An Ancient Concept and its Modern Equivalent: Symposium, January 9, 1998. CPCActs 5*, H-fM 76, RDA, Copenhagen 1998; Id. T.H. Nielsen & J. Roy, eds., *Defining Ancient Arkadia: Symposium, April 1-4 1998. CPCActs*. 6, H-fM 78, RDA, Copenhagen 1999; Hansen, *The Imaginary Polis: Symposium, January 7-10 2004. CPCActs 7*, H-fM 91, RDA, Copenhagen 2005.

[7] Paula Perlman, "   . Panhellenic *Epangelia* and Political Status," *CPCActs* 2, 113-64; "   . The Dependent *Polis* and Crete," *CPCActs* 3, 233-87; "Gortyn. The First Seven Hundred Years. Part II. The Laws from the Temple of Apollo Pythius," *CPCPapers* 6, 187-227 "Imagining Crete," *CPCActs 7*, 282-334.

[8] M.H. Hansen & T. H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical* Poleis (Oxford 2004).

[9] E.g., Peter M. Fraser, "Citizens, Demesmen and Metics in Athens and Elsewhere," *CPCActs* 2, 64-90; M.H. Hansen, "The *Polis* as an Urban Centre. The Literary and Epigraphical Evidence," *CPCActs* 4, 9-64; T.H. Nielsen, "Arkadia. City-Ethnics and Tribalism," *CPCActs* 3, 117-63.

[10] Kurt A. Raaflaub, "Homer to Solon: the Rise of the *Polis*. Written Sources," *CPCActs* 1, 41-105; W. Schuller, "Poleis im Ersten Attischen Seebund", *CPCActs* 2, 165-70.

[11] C. Morgan & J. Hall, "Achaean *Poleis* and Achaean Colonisation," *CPCActs* 3, 164-232; P. Funke, "*Polis*genese und Urbanisierung in Aitolien im 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr.," *CPCActs* 4, 145-88, G. Shipley, "'The Other Lacedaimonians': The Dependent Perioikic *Poleis* of Laconia and Messenia," *CPCActs* 4, 189-281. The many CPC publications on Arkadia, including *CPCActs* 6, would qualify as well.

[12] S.G. Miller, "Architecture as Evidence for the Identity of the Early *Polis*," *CPCActs* 2, 201-43; T. Fischer-Hansen, "The Earliest Town Planning of the Western Greek Colonies with special regard to Sicily," *CPCActs* 3, 317-73; C. Morgan & J.J. Coulton, "The *Polis* as a Physical Entity," *CPCActs* 4, 87-144; G. Shipley, "Little Boxes on the Hillside: Greek Town Planning, Hippodamos, and Polis Ideology," *CPCActs* 7, 335-403; Hansen& Fischer-Hansen, "Monumental Political Architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis. Evidence and Political Significance," *CPCPapers* 1, 23-90.

[13] Figueira, *AWE* (2006) 276: "I cannot imagine the production of these two volumes in the United States under federal funding. Sadly, an American version of this enterprise would have quickly miscarried. The editors would have been denounced for their *epistemic* bias, in that they are actually endeavouring to discover to the best of their ability objective truths about the cultures in question, and for their neo-colonialist, Eurocentric bias. Thereupon, the fog bank of ideologisation and jargon would have rolled in that is fed out of the vent pipes of critical theory and political correctness. There may well be a redolence of old-style positivism around these volumes – although there is nothing old-fashioned at all about the methodologies utilised – and I would not shun a judgment that *mentalités* are sometimes under-investigated, but the array of these bibliographies, factual descriptions, and social historical analyses strongly witnesses in its own favour."

[14] Figueira *AWE* (2006) 291: "We must surely admit that the situations where there

could be two *poleis* of the Aiginētai or of the Samioi in simultaneous existence lay bare the controversial heart of *polis*-identity." On the *polis* status of Naukratis, p. 293: "But then the plan of the features of the *polis* must encompass a psychological or behavioural map internalised in the *politai*. When external conditions are propitious, the outward structure of the *polis* can and perhaps will be erected."

[15] *AWE* forthcoming (2009): "Yet, amid a kaleidoscope of agreements and disagreements on particular points, the general verdict endorsing the work of the CPC is manifest. The Copenhagen vision of the *polis* is likely to remain the starting line for Greek constitutional studies for the foreseeable future. Our next generation of scholars, who are bound to be trained within contexts that mingle agreement or dissent with views expounded by the main authorities of the CPC, will likely experience an oscillation back toward specific *poleis*, *ethnē*, and regions. Some of these studies may well constitute direct attempts to interrogate and critique CPC findings in light of epichoric evidence on individual *poleis* – much of my criticism above was motivated by dissatisfaction over a perceived failure of the CPC hypotheses and schemata to confront places, institutions, and social dynamics that I had studied. … I would like to tender a final note of appreciation, speaking as an American classical historian who is actively engaged in training both undergraduate and graduate Greek historians. Our Danish colleagues have given us a remarkable gift in the publications of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, the vast majority of which are in English and thus accessible to non-specialist humanists and social scientists. They have also furnished our students in training with a veritable tool-chest of instruments of our profession, especially for the early stages of their disciplinary studies.

[16] S. Cataldi, ed., *Poleis e Politeiai: Esperienze politiche, tradizioni letterarie, progetti Costituzionali*, Alessandria 2004.

[17] A. Powell, ed., *Classical Sparta: The Techniques for her Success*, London 1989; S. Hodkinson & A. Powell, eds., *Sparta: New Perspectives,* Swansea 1999; *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage*, Swansea 2002; *Sparta and War*, Swansea 2006; cf. Figueira, *Spartan Society*, Swansea 2004.

[18] Andres Luther, Mischa Meier, & Lukas Thommen, *Das frühe Sparta*, Stuttgart 2006; and a substantial section, devoted to Sparta, *Xénophon et Sparte*, of *Ktema* 32, 2007, 294-456, that was edited by Nicolas Richer (under the general editorship of *Ktema* by Edmond Lévy). It reflects the French language papers of a conference held at l'École normale supérieure. Lettres et Sciences humaines of Lyon, July 2006.

[19] E.g, N.F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*, Philadelphia 1987; *Rural Athens under the Democracy*, Philadelphia, 2004.

[20] D. Knoepfler, "Le territoire d'Erétrie et l'organisation politique de la cité (*dēmoi, chōroi, phylai*)," *CPCActs* 4, 352-449; " 'Pauvres et malheureux Érétriens': Démosthene et la nouvelle loi d'Érétrie contre la tyrannie," in Cataldi, *Poleis*, 403-19.

[21] My articles written in collaboration with my sister, D.M. Figueira (University of Georgia), the noted Comparatist, contain much bibliography. Note D.M. Figueira & T.J. Figueira, "Imperialism: Heart over Minds?", *Interlitteraria* 11, 2006, 151-60; "Some Things are Best Left Un-*Said*: Exile in Ovid and Ransmayr," *Ovid and Modernity*, M. Schmitz-Emans, ed., Bochum 2008, 24-34; "The Colonial 'Subject' and the Ideology of Subjection in Lakōnikē. Tasting Laconian Wine behind Lacanian Labels," forthcoming in *Sparta in Comparative Perspective*, S. Hodkinson, ed., Swansea 2009.

[22] E. Voegelin, *Anamnesis*, trans. G. Niemeyer, South Bend 1978 (1st ed., *Anamnesis. Zur Theorie der Geschichte und Politik*, Munich 1966).

[23] M. Lupi, *L'ordine delle generazioni: classi di età e costumi matrimoniali nell'antica Sparta*, Bari 2000. See my review in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (2002).

[24] E.g., H. van Wees, *Status Warriors: War, Violence, and Society in Homer and History*, Amsterdam 1992; "A Brief History of Tears: Gender Differentiation In Archaic Greece*,*" in L. Foxhall & J. Salmon, eds., *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power And Identity in Classical Antiquity*, London 1998, 10-53; "The Mafia of Early Greece: Violent Exploitation in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries BC.," in K. Hopwood, ed., *Organised Crime in Antiquity*, Swansea 1999, 1-51.

[25] [The strange embrace of Karl Polanyi by ancient historians belongs to the same discourse of naivety over social structure. Yes, "embeddedness" is a nice prompt toward thinking away modern economic conditions; it is not a key to interpretation, however, and Polanyi's actual commentary on Greek economic life was filled with errors and absurdities. See Figueira, "Karl Polanyi and Greek Trade," *The Ancient World* 10 (1984) 15–30, for full references.]

[26] E.g., C. Dougherty & L. Kurke, eds., *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration,* Cambridge 2003; J.M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 1997; *Id.*, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago 2002; I. Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*, Berkeley 1998; *Id.*, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, Washington DC 2001; C. Morgan, "Ethne, Ethnicity, and Early Greek States, ca. 1200-480 B.C.: An Archaeological Perspective", in Malkin 2001, 75-112; R.Thomas, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*, Cambridge 2001. C. Ulf, "Griechische Ethnogenese versus Wanderungen von Stämmen und Stämmstaaten," in Ulf (ed.) *Wege zur Genese griechischer* Identität: die Bedeutung der früharcaischen Zeit, Berlin 1996, 240-80.

[27] N. Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians*, Cambridge, 2008; Luraghi & P. Funke, *The Politics of Ethnicity and the Crisis of the Peloponnesian League*, Cambridge MA, 2009.