5

Trade and the consumption of travel

I have mapped a route through the contexts and references of Korinthian pottery, through production and consumption, art and style (Figure 1.4) - a cultural assemblage of uses, meanings, lines of dispersal away from what may be conceived as the artifact in itself. I have yet to fully consider the movement of pots and other goods away from Korinth, the question of the mode of distribution. Such is the purpose of this chapter: the matter of 'trade'.

The general trend in archaeological considerations of the movement of goods, a most visible aspect of the archaeological record, has been more sophisticated anthropological models of forms of exchange and distribution (from the seminal work of Renfrew 1969,1972,1975; through Ericson and Earle 1982), in the context of those anthropologies of regional links (world systems and prestige goods) mentioned in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, simple descriptive accounts of 'trade' allied with a common-sense understanding of its economic working (traders taking goods from point of surplus to point of demand) is still evident in many conventional archaeologies and ancient histories of archaic Greece. Salmon's monograph on Korinth takes such a line (Salmon 1984: Chapters 7-10).

The rich associations and textures of the cultural assemblage that is Korinthian design can be interpreted as relating to social and personal identity, building new experiences into the city state, providing a stylistic repertoire and visual ideology which goes far beyond the conventional boundaries of the economic, hence my references to Bataille's concept of general economy. The term 'trade' already seems too narrow. I will build on this point, arguing that a narrow and economic definition of trade (as simply the mechanism whereby goods reach their destinations) is inadequate in accounting for the distribution of Korinthian wares. With respect to anthropological modelling through archaeological sources, my work on archaic Korinth suggests that forms of (archaeological) narrative which contrast with those of cultural and social anthropology may be needed.

Homo economicus and *homo politicus:* minimalist models of archaic trade

> νῆες ἐν πόντωι θοαί
> πολλὸν δ' ἱστίων ὑψώμεθα
> λύσαντες ὅπλα νηός
>
> fast ships at sea
> let's untie the sheets and slacken the ship's tackle.
> Archilochos *West 106.1–2*

A trend in approaches to the archaic Greek economy which has developed in the discipline of ancient history has been a more anthropologically sophisticated understanding which questions the easy application to early Greece of concepts and models of economy and trade drawn from study of more modern economic systems of medieval Europe and after. Theoretical impetus has come from Marxian analysis and social history, as in the work of Finley (for example 1973) , and from the anthropologically derived work of Polanyi (1957), Hasebroek (1933) and others. Many issues crystallised in the long-runningdebate *between formalist or modernising accounts* of the ancient economy and those which are described as *substantivist* or *primitivist.* Formalist models use general and formal concepts which are not necessarily related to the substantive field of reference, to the particular society studied. Primitivist models use concepts which take account of the character of the particular society studied, that is pre-modern or 'primitive'; the basic point is that there is no general category of the 'economic', but that it is embedded in wider society and varies according to society type. I trust that it is clear that my work immediately questions a common-sense or modernising conception of the economic context of Korinthian pottery. Therefore a short sketch of a substantivist or primitivist model of the archaic economy (and particularly with respect to trade) is in order here (I draw on Austin and Vidal-Naquet 1977; Finley 1973; Garnsey *et al.* 1983; Humphreys 1978).

The picture of the ancient economy presented in a substantivist model is of the self-sufficiency of relatively small and cellular social and economic units (from farms to towns), based on agriculture and depending little on inter-regional trade. High overland transport costs meant that no region could undercut another in the production of cheap essentials, and export was dominated by prestige or special items. With a low status accorded to traders and craftsmen, wealth and status lying in land, and with little investment in productive techniques or in large-scale production, the economy was consumption- rather than production-led. Towns were therefore centres of consumption rather than production, and with wealth and status lying in the ownership of land, consumption followed the stylistic tastes of landed wealth and the landed aristocracy.

The production of Korinthian pottery was almost certainly undertaken on a small and household basis, and I have given estimates of the scale of production and export. That design works with the tastes and ideologies of what may be termed an 'aristocratic' interest in male sovereignty, though subject to experiment and negotiation, is also clear from my interpretation. I have also shown in Chapter Four the close link between production and consumption: the notion that there is little intervening between design and consumption in cemeteries and sanctuaries, because mode of production and the visual ideology and significances of deposition correlate so closely. This is to play down the independence of mediating distribution and exchange.

Snodgrass (1983) has presented a powerful argument that the scale of archaic trade was small and cannot be characterised as commerce. He cites the following evidence which indicates that there was no class of Greek trading ship before the late sixth century, and that oared warships were the means of distributing goods.

Figure 5.1 From archaic ceramic plaques found at Penteskouphia, near Korinth.

Pictures of archaic ships carrying goods for trading are all penteconters indistinguishable from war galleys (for example upon the Penteskouphia plaques from the Korinthia: *(Antike Denkmaler* 1887: Pl. 8.3a 1898, PI. 29.12), and ships which are clearly merchant vessels are not found depicted until 525 BC at the earliest (Morrison and Williams 1968).

Herodotos *(1.163)* has archaic Phokaians using pentekonters and not a form *of* merchant ship for trading.

Miniature ships dedicated at archaic Samos were all war galleys (Kyrieleis 1980: 89-94).

Related arguments for his minimalist model of archaic trade include the following.

Trade would seem not to involve an independent class of traders. The Berezan letter (of about 500 BC) would seem to indicate trade operated by wealthy land-owning shipholders and their dependants or agents. Bravo, in discussion of the implications of the letter (1975, 1977), has drawn attention to the fact that the two most common early terms for trader, *emporos* and *phortegos*, both imply collaboration between traders and others. It can also be added that Millett (1991) traces early Greek credit, which could have been central to the logistics of early trading ventures, to a devolved form of reciprocal gift-giving between aristocratic patrons and their clients.

When Herodotos (4.152) has the whole crew of the trading ship of Kolaios of Samos making a tithe dedication, cooperative enterprise and shared profits are indicated, not management and control by a merchant.

Hesiod (*Works and Days* 618-94) generally has trade as a complement to agriculture: a landowner setting off to make some profit from his surplus.

Snodgrass gives quantitative estimates of the scale of archaic trade in stone and metals, the two heavy materials shipped in any quantity. It was relatively slight. Metalworking sites (such as at Pithekoussai, Motya and Bassai) were consistent with industries dedicated to local needs; the operation of commerce in the field of metals would seem to have been cut to the minimum by the location of a network of foundries serving local needs. 'As in so many aspects of the archaic economy, the practice . . . was to support oneself as far as was feasible from internal resources, of labour if not of materials' (Snodgrass 1983: 25). He argues that most artifacts would have travelled with their owners; for example, many exotic imports appear as dedications in sanctuaries - brought with visitors. As regards marble (which, given the sources and quarries, must have travelled) and statuary, Snodgrass reckons that the stone would have been purchased at the quarry by the sculptor, and would have travelled as their property;'there is no , . . marble trade' *(ibid.;* 25). He summarises:

> If 'trade' is defined in the narrow sense of the purchase and movement of goods without the knowledge or the identification of a further purchaser, then it seems that a substantial component of archaic Greek maritime shipments could not be classified as trade.
> *(ibid.:* 26)

Snodgrass draws substantially on the model of the ancient Greek economy of Humphreys (1978) to which I refer in the heading for this section (followed also by Rihll 1993). In Marxian and Weberian tradition she has the economic institutions and functions of the city state dependent upon the political realm: hence we might look as much to a *homo politicus* as well as a *homo economicus* in understanding the early polis. The importance of war and the war-band is proposed as Humphreys traces a complicated interaction between travel and guest-friendships of nobles, war, raiding, piracy and the development of trade. On analogy with the medieval war-machine (Duby 1973) trade is to be studied in the context of other forms of the transfer of goods such as war, raiding, hospitality to strangers and gift-exchange. These are matters of lifestyle (of aristocracy) within which particular demands and desires are generated. Lifestyle and wealth depended upon ownership of land, establishment of the *oikos.* And war and exchange involved more than the transfer of goods; they were concerned with the mobility of manpower, soldiers and others travelling abroad, and slaves acquired and imported. Humphreys (1978: 161-2) places great emphasis upon slavery, an institution assumed by both Homer and Hesiod. With land owned inalienably and transmitted by inheritance, there were inevitably imbalances in the relationship between land and manpower, with some *oikoi* having too little land for its members, some *oikoi* too little manpower to work their land. Inheritance is important here also as a source of friction and threat to the *oikos:* fathers might well quarrel with sons over the division of land and the time this took place. The interest of inheriting sons was to persuade the old man to give up and hand over land which could become the basis of their own *oikos,* after marriage too. Hesiod *{Works and Days* 331-2) has quarrels between fathers and sons as wicked

crime against the family, and he advises men not to marry before the age of thirty *(ibid.:* 695-6). So the availability of labour becomes crucial;

> Wherever imported slaves, bought or captured, are used to supply the extra labour needed on land which the owning family cannot work with its own manpower, a potential outlet for the surplus labour produced by other families is blocked. Given the scarcity of agricultural land in Greece, the use of slaves in farming meant, at least potentially, the need to drain surplus free labour off the land into emigration or alternative types of occupation. (Humphreys 1978: 162)

These other occupations were war, seafaring, raiding, colonisation, attendance perhaps at the sanctuary games - opportunities to establish personal alliances, display prowess, dispose of and acquire goods. Fighting, travel and seafaring were the main political outlet for young men who had not yet received their inheritance or who may have had little or no land to inherit. Travelling and joining a colony was also a means of acquiring land which had become unavailable at home. Illegitimate and therefore landless Archilochos led the life of seafarer and mercenary before settling as hoplite and landowner in the colony of Thasos.

Their separation from the *oikos* and from marriage, and their association with younger men and others who were not full land-owners and heads of households, makes war and travel *marginal* and ambiguous. They are also complements to agriculture, rather than alternatives. They fit into the slack agricultural seasons, would belong to a space in the life-cycle of the male member of a city state between adolescence and land-ownership. Travel and war were means of acquiring mobile wealth and slaves to provide status when a land-owner, perhaps even wealth to purchase land for an *oikos*. These activities are thus also a means of *social* mobility - providing opportunities for the enrichment of lifestyle, for acquiring the expensive equipment of a hoplite, for acquiring the trappings of a landed aristocracy in the absence of their inheritance.

It is appropriate here to mention the grave (No. 79), admittedly pre-archaic (sub Protogeometric II), found *in* the 1*994* excavation *season* of the Toumba *cemetery at* Lefkandi, Euboea (Popham and Lemos 1995). Given the discussion of mobility, war and exchange, a list of the contents of what the excavators call a 'warrior-trader' will suffice.

cremation in a bronze cauldron
stone balance weights
a bronze weighing balance (?)
Syrian cylinder seal (an antique of 1800 BC)
three vases from Cyprus
two bichrome jugs from Phoenicia
earrings
bronze krater
remains of monumental standed craters

Any household might own a small boat, and use it for local trading, *cabotage*, as perhaps envisages Hesiod. But both Snodgrass and Humphreys stress the point that the only ships depicted in archaic times (and therefore used for trade) are those sea-going war galleys which would have belonged with the wealth and lifestyle of the aristocracy:

> In an age when political success depended upon personal resources and prestige, noblemen travelled abroad to make influential friends, to contract marriage alliances with leading families in other states, and to gain fame by winning at the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean or Isthmian games; some voyaged further afield to visit the wonders of the East (Solon) or to serve eastern monarchs as mercenary soldiers.
> (Humphreys 1978: 166)

So shipping is not so much an 'occupational role' as an aspect of lifestyle, embedded in reciprocal obligations (rowing for the experience of travel and opportunity of acquisition; discharging perhaps the obligation to return a gift, to repay a visit).

> πολλὰ μὲν δὴ προυκπονέαι Τηλέμβροτε,
> ἐνταῦθα μέν τοι τυρὸς ἐξ Ἀχαΐης
> Τρομίλιος θαυμαστός, ὃν κατήγαγον
>
> you've made quite some preparations Telembrotos,
> now here's a fabulous Tromilian cheese
> which I brought back from Achaia.
> Semonides West 22-3

Travel and *mobility*

Humphreys stresses *a priori* the need to integrate an understanding of archaic trade into a holistic view of the circulation of men, women and goods. She considers archaic Greek trade as part of a much wider context of exchanges between the Aegean and the world beyond. This regional approach has been followed by Purcell (1990) whose ideas may be profitably associated with those of Andrew and Susan Sherratt (Sherratt and Sherratt 1991, 1993). Challenging easy conceptions of trade and colonisation, Purcell relates the redistribution of local resources, mercenaries, slaves, demography and the movement of luxury goods by means of a general concept of *mobility*. In contrast to the self-sufficient cellular household, Purcell stresses the extensive regional systems to which communities in the eastern Mediterranean belonged, systems which extended to include key relationships with imperial powers of the Near East. For Purcell mobility is a function of a varied and broken ecology and its necessity of interdependence: 'instead of autonomous enterprises and isolated producers, the object of attention is now whole ecological systems which exploit varied resources in highly complex and flexible ways, and which maintain large and ramified social groups' (Purcell 1990: 42). Colonisation, mercenaries and slavery are operations performed by and upon the resource of manpower; the relocation of surplus. This is not necessarily a result of population increase and too many people: 'we do not have to assume significant demographic growth in any

individual community; the *effect* is the better deployment of available resources, intensification ... as a general response to new political demands' *(ibid.:* 47-8). Imperial powers of the Levant were a 'source of movement', requisitioning systems creating social and economic demand for all sorts of goods and people from abroad, the central part of centre and periphery relationships. From the Levantine coastal margin in the first half of the first millennium developed the Phoenician *koine,* a network of routes and communities over the Mediterranean, many already long-established. Into this network moved the Greek aristocracy in the eighth century, intensifying links and a mobility which served their interests and demands.

Purcell provides an easy prime-mover, ecological diversity, for the social changes he considers. But this ecological determinism may be discarded without seriously damaging the observations on the connections between economy, war and travel. Although the independence of a household economic unit is opened to question, trade is subordinated to wider concepts of movement and mobility, and the economic evaporates into a cultural field of travel, social links, obligations and dependencies.

This is an historical field too: the inter-regional links of the eastern Mediterranean were long established, as emphasised by Purcell (also Kochavi 1992; Morris 1992; for summary comment Sherratt and Sherratt 1991); I have already made reference to the case of Lefkandi: (Popham 1982, 1994; Popham *et al.* 1980). The Aegean in the second millennium was linked with many communities abroad. The Aegean states were in an international milieu from the start. Those Greeks setting out in the eighth century from Korinth were accessing *again* links, experiences and meanings (of the external, the exotic and the East). They may not have been Korinthian of course. This does not substantially affect my sketch. Indeed carriers who came from outside Korinth would add to the 'international' character of this 'trading assemblage'.

Experience and the constitution of geographical space

Malinowski's classic ethnography of the Trobriand islanders, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific (1922),* gives account of the Kula ring, the great cycle of Melanesian gift-exchange. Travelling in their canoes on long journeys, the Kula voyagers enact the adventures of mythical culture heroes (Helms *1988:46)* endeavouring in the Kula to affirm their individuality, freedom and fame through travel, esoteric knowledge and the exchange of extraordinary goods - shell armbands and necklaces. Authority *too,* displayed in the exchange deals pulled off, the artifacts owned, the knowledge and know-how acquired (Scodiiti and Leach 1*983:* 272).

In Trobriand cosmology the geometric form of the circle (necklaces, armbands, the Kula 'ring') stands for complete knowledge of the cosmos, realisable, but *never* actually attained, by journeying men, given that only they have the capability of knowing the world through travel, diving under the sea, exploring the terrestrial world of caves, climbing mountains. In their travel, which is as much ritual as opportunity for entrepreneurial gain (Uberoi 1971: 141-7), men's names become associated with shells, so the Kula hero may hope to achieve ultimate prestige through immortality, the circulation in space of Kula goods transformed by naming

and association into personal preservation in time unending (Scoditti and Leach 1983:271-2).

Trobriand earth and distant lands of Kula contacts, bridged by the ocean, correspond to inner and outer experience (Montague 1980: 74-8, 83-6). The outer world of experience is like stone, solid, substantial, directly visible, and includes the living people of the Trobriands. Inner experience is amorphous, like the wind, only indirectly perceptible (noises and scents), full of movement, and ghostly. Foreign lands, being out of sight, are associated with inner experience, and foreigners, though they appear solid, are conceived as amorphous beings, just as the ocean appears solid but dissolves into movement in the Kula voyage.

Mary Helms has provided an invaluable comparative ethnography of the experiences of trade, exchange and travel in her book *Ulysses' Sail* (1988). As well as an economic activity, the travel in trade is variously experienced as fun and enjoyment opportunity for companionship and establishing self-identity. Its ritual defines an ideological field as much as an economic function, involving goods often conceived sacred, because invested with so much social significance. Travellers, delvers into the unknown, frequently engage in competitive rivalry through their Kula goods and through displays of knowledge which negotiate social standing and authority. A major argument in relation to the mobility of people and goods is that geographical displacement needs to be associated with other forms of distance, including cosmologies, mentalites and what may be termed the conceptual space of lifeworld.

The conceptual space of archaic Korinthian design

Here then I trace a continuity between geographical space and mental maps, but involving also secular cosmologies and ideologies of social distance. Beginning with Figure 1.1, the ruined fragments of archaic Korinthian lifeworlds have helped me construct images of the new scales of building, personal and public spaces redefined, the old space of the *oikos* augmented and transformed. Sanctuary sitings, the Perachora headland, the narrowing of isthmus with Akrokorinthos and Korinthia as backdrop, are highlighted by new building projects and public activities - designed vistas. With continued haptic experiences of the touch of smooth fine ceramic comes surface treatment and scale which brings the aryballos or cup close, just as the lack of graphical accent of geometric pattern repelled close attention. These may be termed new vectors or scales of phenomenological reach: spaces of personal and cultural definition, encounters with alterity.

The conceptual space of Korinthian ceramic imagery is one which works upon alterity and in relation to the fields of the domestic and gender. The presentation of masculine sovereignty is one of ambivalence and mediation between different states such as animal, human and divine (summarised perhaps in the figures of bird and fighting soldier); referenced are distinctions to do with particular conceptions of masculine and feminine identity.

The stylised wild animals and figures representing bodily control, the scenes of violence and references to soldiery, the absence of the everyday and of agriculture, the connections with the east and with travel can be interpreted as delineating a

world which belongs with that of the mercenary who moves away from home, inhabits spaces removed from the household and polis. I related this sort of masculine sovereignty to a war-machine - concepts, meanings, powers to do with permanent war and the identities by which it is sustained. Standardised hoplite weaponry *can* be related *to* techniques of the. body: postures, disciplines, articulated *in arts*, practices and lifestyles.

The glory of praise achieved through travel, a form of *kleos,* might well be accompanied by the acquisition of *keintelia,* treasure (Morris 1986: 8, 9; Finley 1978: 60-1). Kurke (1991: esp. Chapters I and 2) has outlined the relationship of the general economy of the archaic *oikos* to its moral geography. The hero, representative of his *oikos,* was bound to its space, marked by the house itself, its land and the presence of ancestors. The symbolic capital of the *oikos* was its treasury of *kleos* (renown), crystallised in its *keimelia* and *agalmata.* But the renewal of the ancient and ancestral *kleos* of the *oikos* took the hero away to acquire deeds and exchange *agalmata.* The result was what Kurke terms the 'loop of *nostos* (homecoming)'. This is typified by Odysseus, his travels and (inevitable) homecoming. It is exemplified in a new genre and idiom by Pindar's odes, celebrating the victory and homecoming of aristocratic athletes; here though, Pindar's art is its mediation of individual *kleos and* a new civic pride and duty,

The ships for long-distance travel, supplied ultimately by landed wealth, belong with lifestyles of display, war, raiding and movement into spaces beyond the local and everyday. Its material culture and world of experiences constitute a repertoire of style. The colonies, cemeteries and sanctuaries mark out the space of the polis, conceptually and in terms of territory and geography. Colonies are at the edge of the Greek, or at least (by definition) beyond the limits of the mother city. Their independence is ambiguous: dependent upon mother city in origin, but a pristine design of polis in new lands. This is related to the ambiguity of the colonial founder, social outcast, but later colonial hero, found in ancient accounts and dealt with below, Cemeteries mark the boundary of living community and the dead; they may also be found at the edges of the community. Sanctuaries may have identified the limits of the polis; they mark the boundary between human and divine. Korinthian pottery, in its design, travel and consumption significantly as gift (to dead and divinity) is an *actualisation of ambivalence.* The gift mediates giver and receiver, establishes a **link** between them, *and* their equivalence, but *also* the subordination of receiver to giver. An object inalienable from the social relationships by which it is constituted, it objectifies the link between giver and receiver, representing the giver to the receiver. The gift is both the person of the giver and object. Hence the gift marks ambivalence (Mauss 1954; Richman 1982). Korinthian ceramics in their design, exchange and consumption, their conceptual space, mark the boundaries.

The Phoenicians, east and west

δὴ τότε Φοῖνιξ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ἀπατήλια εἰδώς,
τρώκτης, ὃς δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐώργει·

ὃς μ' ἄγε παρπεπιθὼν ἦσι φρεσίν, ὄφρ' ἱκόμεσθα
Φοινίκην, ὅθι τοῦ γε δόμοι καὶ κτήματ' ἔκειτο.

Then there came a Phoenician, knowledgeable and wily,
a greedy rodent who had done a lot of bad things to men.
He won me round with his clever reasoning so we went to
Phoenicia, where he had his houses and goods.
Odyssey 14.288-91

Tyre, the crowning city, whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the great and honourable of the earth.
Isaiah 23.8

Analysis of the places where scarabs and similar traded objects have been found, reveals discrete and separate distributions: for example the Perachora material (Greece) is stylistically separable from Campanian imported orientalia (Italy) (Markoe 1992: 81 based on Holbl 1979 I: 214-15, 220-1). Markoe (1992) and Ridgway (1992a) both consider that this pattern of distribution of imported goods and of mineral sources reveals an important role for Phoenicians in Italy, shared spheres of commercial interest with Italians and Greeks. Sherratt and Sherratt (1991, 1993) give much importance, in their social system for the first millennium, to enterprising, entrepreneurial Phoenicians, a professional mercantile cadre. What is to be made of these Phoenicians?

Aubet (1993) has developed a systemic model of the Phoenician city states and their trade. As Purcell emphasised the motivation for Phoenician activities clearly had a great deal to do with Assyria. Tiglath-Pileser III (745-727 BC) and his successors Shalmaneser V and Sargon II built a military ring around an independent Tyre, one of whose kings, Mattan II, was forced to pay tribute amounting to 150 talents of gold (some 4,300 kg) (Aubet 1993: 73). For Aubet, tribute, rather than outright domination, was a way of exerting control and directing Phoenician interest while respecting autonomy *(ibid.:* 74). Assyrian demand was for raw materials, particularly metals. Phoenicia was no mere vassal of Assyria. Accordingly Aubet looks to the internal dynamics of Phoenician society for understanding their trading interests and activities.

Aubet (1993: Chapter 4) closely examines the historical sources for the mechanisms of Phoenician trade in the first half of the first millennium BC in the light of historical and anthropological models of the ancient economy, such as were outlined above (see pp. 200-1). The sources are surprisingly meagre:

- an account given by an Egyptian Wen-Amon of a journey from Egypt to Phoenicia and dated to about 1070 BC (text translated in Aubet 1993: Appendix *2);*
- biblical sources - the Hebrew prophets, particularly the oracles against Tyre in the books of Isaiah and Ezekiel (sources gathered in Aubet 1993: Appendix 3);
- a diplomatic document (a treaty between Baal of Tyre and Asarhaddon of Assyria and dated to 675-671 BC);
- the Homeric epics.

Aubet finds no evidence for any clear evolution of trading systems, for example the development of private mercantile enterprise from state controlled exchange and distribution. Nor is there any opposition between reciprocity or gift exchange in a ceremonial economy in which rank and status prevailed, and mercantile trade concerned with profit and market. So the formalist-substantivist distinction is not a *formal* opposition. Instead Aubet finds there was a mixture of exchange relationships involving eastern imperial monarchies, the Phoenician monarchy, oligarchic elites organised into trading partnerships, and private independent ventures, often as much piracy as trade.

> The essential question is *not* whether Phoenician trade in the ninth *to* seventh centuries was basically a private or a state undertaking . . . public trade and private initiative, almost always associated with the search for profits and the desire for gain, were perfectly complementary. It was a synchronous process in which both the private sector and the palace were looking for profits and in which the palace needed the private merchant as much as the trader needed the protection of the palace.
> (Aubet 1993:95-6)

Other notable features of Phoenician activity include a pronounced family orientation - the guilds or mercantile consortia behaved like family brotherhoods. Epigraphic evidence indicates that there were price/market fluctuations and operations. The temple acted as a financial body, lending on interest, and was fully involved in trade: religious institutions were fully embedded in the economy.

Archaic trade in Homer, much associated with 'Sidonians', Phoenicians and other foreigners, is clearly individual enterprise, not organised, but casual, nevertheless also associated with management by Phoenician monarchs, their gift-exchange and hospitality (Aubet 1993: 102-7). Homer's attitude to trade is the characteristic Greek and aristocratic one of disapproval of mercantile activity *(emporie)* in contrast to *prexis or ergon* trade (as in Hesiod), more akin to piracy. Such *(prexislergon)* trade was mentioned above (in discussion of Humphreys pp. 197-8) as complementary to the agricultural cycle. *Emporie* was left to the *emporos,* a specialised professional, often seen as untrustworthy and foreign. These professionals were not sailing in sleek war galleys: large Phoenician merchant vessels, the ships of Byblos, are known from the middle of the third millennium BC *(ibid.:* 146-8).

To illustrate the heterogeneity of trading activities consider the silver krater of Achilles and its life-cycle recounted in the *Iliad* (23.740f). It appears offered as a prize in the funeral games of Patroklos. Of Sidonian manufacture it was carried by Phoenician traders, set up in various harbours *(stesan en limenessi Iliad* 23.745), presumably for sale, but was given as gift to king Thoas of Lemnos. It later served as ransom for one of Priam's sons held by Patroklos. Odysseus won it in the *games and* took it back to Ithaka. Such items are called *keimelia* - things to be stored and treasured, not used, and there to be given as a gift, but they may be bought or stolen too.

The issue of the Phoenicians is intimately involved in questions of orientalising

contact between Greece and the east. To some, the archaeological links seem so close that resident or itinerant 'foreign' craftsmen have been proposed, making their goods of eastern style in Greece (Boardman 1980: 57f; Burkert 1992: 21-5; Dunbabin 1957: 40-1; Filippakis 1983; Markoe 1992: 68-9; 77-9,84; Muscarella 1992: 44-5; Ridgway 1992: 111-18, 1992a; Treister 1995). For Coldstream this involved direct foreign investment with Phoenician perfume manufacturing or bottling facilities on Rhodes (1969), Kos *{ibid.:* 2), and Krete (1979: 261-2, 1986: 324; discussion by Jones 1993; see also Frankenstein 1979). Phoenicians have been proposed to be living at Kommos on Krete because of what looks to the excavator like Phoenician cult (Shaw 1989).

The basis of these suppositions is almost entirely stylistic interpretation - that some sort of prolonged contact or presence was necessary for Greek style or goods to be so influenced, for certain orientalia to be present in the quantities observed. I will question the validity of this link between style and ethnicity in the next section. I conclude this section with the general picture to emerge from Kopcke and Tokumaru's.synoptic edited book (1992) on Greek Mediterranean links from the tenth to eighth centuries BC: there was mediation and heterogeneity rather than a bifurcation of Greek and 'barbarian', gift-exchange and mercantile activity.

The orientalising cauldron

I suggest that the question of whether Greek or Phoenician traders/carriers were responsible for the movement of goods is inappropriate. Cutting instead through to stronger *archaeological* inferences, concepts of mobility and movement, heterogeneity and mixture (whether of goods or people or ideas) are enough. The Mediterranean thus becomes in these times a cauldron of cultures (Morel 1984; Morris 1992; Purcell 1990: 33; Snodgrass 1994: 2).

Colonies were mixtures of Greek and non-Greek, and the Greek itself was not homogeneous:

> The description of, say, Syracuse, as 'a Corinthian colony' need mean little more than that the *oikist* and his immediate entourage came from Corinth. Does not Archilochos, with his cry that 'the ills of all Greece have come together in Thasos' (West 102), imply such a picture?
> (Snodgrass 1994: 2)

Ethnicity and identity are concepts which apply to a dynamic condition of contestation and negotiation in the face of 'otherness'; this is shown in a startling way by Clifford's portrayal of contemporary identity in Mashpee (1988) and Hebdige's classic work on sub-cultural style in the 1970s (1979), The relationships between ethnicity and material culture style are neither simple nor direct. This has been one of the main findings of archaeological theory and ethnoarchaeology of the last twenty years (consider the papers in Conkey and Hastorf, 1990, and, for classical archaeology, the work of Hall (1993, 1995)). Hence orientalising Korinthian design is not well understood as an interaction between east and Greek. This is the root of many

false lines of questioning which assume clear ethnic and national distinctions in material culture; Greek or Phoenician originality, movement of people or goods?

Colonisation and its discourse

A major dimension, indeed evidence, of mobility is colonisation. It is not my intention here to review the discussion about Greek colonisation in the eighth and seventh centuries. It is not necessary. After Carol Dougherty's presentation (1993) of ancient accounts of colonial foundations, consider rather the extant historical sources on colonisation, its discourse, and analogies with the cultural assemblage formed by Korinthian design.

Plutarch on the founding of Syracuse:

> Melissos had a son named Aktaion, the most handsome and modest young man of his age. Aktaion had many suitors, chief among them Archias, a descendant of the Herakleidai and the most conspicuous man in Korinth, both in wealth and general power. Archias couldn't persuade Aktaion to be his lover, so he decided to carry him off by force. He gathered together a crowd of friends and servants who went to Melissos's house in a drunken state and tried to take the boy away. Aktaion's father and friends resisted; the neighbours ran out and helped fight the assailants, but, in the end, Aktaion was pulled to pieces and killed. The friends then ran away, and Melissos carried the corpse of his son into the marketplace of Korinth where he set it on display, asking reparations from those who had done this. But the Korinthians did nothing more than pity the man. Unsuccessful, Melissos went away and waited for the Isthmian festival when he went up to the temple of Poseidon, decried the Bakchiadai and reminded the god of his father Habron's good deeds. Calling upon the gods he then threw himself from the rocks. Not long after this plague and drought came down on the city. When the Korinthians consulted the god about relief, they were told that the anger of Poseidon would not subside until they sought punishment for Aktaion's death. Archias heard this because he was one of the delegation consulting the oracle of Apollo, and he decided, of his own free will, not to return to Korinth. Instead he sailed to Sicily and founded the colony of Syracuse. *Moralia* 772e-773b

A frequently found narrative form in the founding of colonies is that of an act of murder, followed by expulsion of the murderer as act of purification (in consultation with Delphic Apollo), then the creative act of foundation of a colony by the exile. With features of radical break with mother city, mediation through the otherness of divinity, and sanction of creative sovereignty, the threat of disorder is withheld by expulsion of the threatening element which in turn, after contact with divinity, becomes a source of vital sovereignty - the new colonial city state. I have commented above on similarities with the narrative form of tyranny and reconstructions of ideologies of sovereignty. The sovereignty of the *oikist* (transferred to the state in

McGlew's account (1993)) is reflected also in the planned layout of colonial settlement:

> Politically, this planned element is one of the reflections of the power of the *oikist;* but culturally it is even more significant, in that it shows the Greek mind grappling with entirely fresh problems.
> (Snodgrass 1994: 8; see also Malkin 1987: 135-86)

Colonies play upon their separateness from mother city in design and material culture. Another archaeological dimension of this discourse is the competition and emulation to be seen in mortuary practices between the colonies, and less between mother cities and colonies (Shepherd 1993) (though there are links, for example at Syracuse, mentioned in the previous chapter). Awareness also of indigenous practices complements this negotiation of sovereignty.

The consumption of travel

According to Alkaios, his brother Antimenidas fought as mercenary for the Babylonians and killed a giant:

> ἦλθες ἐκ περάτων γᾶς ἐλεφαντίναν
> λάβαν τώ ξίφεος χρυσοδέταν ἔχων
>
> you have come from the ends of the earth
> with the hilt of your sword ivory bound with gold.
> Alkaios Lobel and Page 350.1–2
>
> καὶ δὴ' πίκουρος ὥστε Κὰρ κεκλήσομαι
>
> Now I'll be called an auxiliary, like a Karian.
> Archilochos West 216

Morgan (1988; 336) reminds us that there is no evidence for us to associate aristocracy with early trade, a position supported for Korinth by Snodgrass: 'the legendary wealth and power of the Bakchiad aristocracy seems to have begun improbably early for it to have been founded in commerce' (1980a: 147).

For the eighth century Morgan comments:

> Korinthian involvement in the Gulf was probably limited to small scale activity by private, non-aristocratic, individuals for personal motives; even if aristocrats were the group who needed, and eventually acquired, metal, it seems unlikely that they went out to get it themselves. Trading was unlikely to have enhanced the status of participants.
> (Morgan 1988: 336-7}

In the interpretation of Korinthian design I have developed there is no need to depend upon aristocratic traders. Design has been treated as a nexus of interest and ideology, as well as social practices, intimately involved with definitions of self and class. But aristocracy is not simply a social *rank;* as a *class* it is a set of relationships

and modes of translation of interest, and I have attempted to elucidate some of these. Accordingly it is a mistake to use archaeological sources to construct historical