

Chapter 1 : Cult of Greek Gods & Goddesses | Theoi Greek Mythology

*Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium (Uppsala Studs in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civi) [Tullia Linders, Brita Alroth] on blog.quintoapp.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

Introduction 1 The ancient Greek economy is somewhat of an enigma. Given the remoteness of ancient Greek civilization, the evidence is minimal and difficulties of interpretation abound. Ancient Greek civilization flourished from around 3000 B.C. Throughout these periods of ancient Greek civilization, the level of technology was nothing like it is today and values developed that shaped the economy in unique ways. Thus, despite over a century of investigation, scholars are still debating the nature of the ancient Greek economy. Moreover, the evidence is insufficient to employ all but the most basic quantitative methods of modern economic analysis and has forced scholars to employ other more qualitative methods of investigation. This brief article, therefore, will not include any of the statistics, tables, charts, or graphs that normally accompany economic studies. Rather, it will attempt to set out the types of evidence available for studying the ancient Greek economy, to describe briefly the long-running debate about the ancient Greek economy and the most widely accepted model of it, and then to present a basic view of the various sectors of the ancient Greek economy during the three major phases of its history. In addition, reference will be made to some recent scholarly trends in the field.

Sources of Evidence Although the ancient Greeks achieved a high degree of sophistication in their political, philosophical, and literary analyses and have, therefore, left us with a significant amount of evidence concerning these matters, few Greeks attempted what we would call sophisticated economic analysis. Nonetheless, the ancient Greeks did engage in economic activity. They produced and exchanged goods both in local and long distance trade and had monetary systems to facilitate their exchanges. These activities have left behind material remains and are described in various contexts scattered throughout the extant writings of the ancient Greeks. Most of our evidence for the ancient Greek economy concerns Athens in the Classical period and includes literary works, such as legal speeches, philosophical dialogues and treatises, historical narratives, and dramas and other poetic writings. Demosthenes, Lysias, Isokrates, and other Attic Orators have left us with numerous speeches, several of which concern economic matters, usually within the context of a lawsuit. But although these speeches illuminate some aspects of ancient Greek contracts, loans, trade, and other economic activity, one must analyze them with care on account of the biases and distortions inherent in legal speeches. Philosophical works, especially those of Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle, provide us with an insight into how the ancient Greeks perceived and analyzed economic matters. We learn about the place of economic activities within the Greek city-state, value system, and social and political institutions. One drawback of such evidence, however, is that the authors of these works were without exception members of the elite, and their political perspective and disdain for day-to-day economic activity should not necessarily be taken to represent the views of all or even the majority of ancient Greeks. The ancient Greek historians concerned themselves primarily with politics and warfare. But within these contexts, one can find bits of information here and there about public finance and other economic matters. Thucydides, for example, does take care to describe the financial resources of Athens during the Peloponnesian War. Poems and dramas also contain evidence concerning the ancient Greek economy. One can find random references to trade, manufacturing, the status of businessmen, and other economic matters. Of course, one must be careful to account for genre and audience in addition to the personal perspective of the author when using such sources for information about the economy. The plays of Aristophanes, for example, make many references to economic activities, but such references are often characterized by stereotyping and exaggeration for comedic purposes. One of the most extensive collections of economic documents is the papyri from Greek-controlled Egypt during the Hellenistic period. The Ptolemaic dynasty that ruled Egypt developed an extensive bureaucracy to oversee numerous economic activities and like all bureaucracies, they kept detailed records of their administration. Thus, the papyri include information about such things as taxes, government-controlled lands and labor, and the unique numismatic policies of the Ptolemies. Epigraphic

evidence comes in the form of stone inscriptions from public and private institutions. Boundary markers placed on land used as security for loans, called *horoi*, were often inscribed with the terms of the loans. States such as Athens inscribed honorary decrees for those who had done outstanding services for the state, including economic ones. States also inscribed accounts for public building projects and leases of public lands or mines. In addition, religious sanctuaries frequently inscribed accounts of monies and other assets, such as produce, land, and buildings, under their control. Although accounts tend to be free of human biases, honorary decrees are much more complex and the historian must be careful to consider the perspective of their issuing institutions when interpreting them. Archaeological evidence is free of some of the representational complexities of the literary and epigraphic evidence. Pottery finds can tell us about pottery manufacture and trade. The vase types indicate the goods they contained, such as olive oil, wine, or grain. The distribution of finds of ancient pottery can, therefore, tell us the extent of trade in various goods. But such archaeological evidence is not without its drawbacks as well. Furthermore, it is always dangerous to attempt to extrapolate broad conclusions about the economy from a small number of finds, since we can never be sure if those finds are representative of larger phenomena or merely exceptional cases that archaeologists happened to stumble upon. Some of the most spectacular and informative finds in recent years have been made under the waters of the Mediterranean, Aegean, and Black Seas by what is known as marine or nautical archaeology. Ancient shipwrecks containing goods for trade have opened new doors to the study of ancient Greek merchant vessels, manufacturing, and trade. Although the field is relatively new, it has already yielded much new data and promises great things for the future. The Debate about the Ancient Greek Economy As stated above, the ancient Greek economy has been the subject of a long-running debate that continues to this day. In addition, confusion arose over whether the ancient Greek economy was like a modern economy in quantity scale or quality its organizing principles. Lastly, such terms clearly attempt to characterize the ancient Greek economy as a whole and do not distinguish differences among regions or city-states of Greece, time periods, or sectors of the economy agriculture, banking, long distance trade, etc. Seeing extensive trade and use of money in Greece from the fifth century B. On the other hand, seeing traditional Greek social and political values that disdained the productive, impersonal, and industrial nature of modern market economies, the primitivists downplayed the existence of extensive trade and the use of money in the economy. Neither primitivists nor modernists could conceive of the existence of extensive trade and the use of money unless the ancient Greek economy was organized according to market principles. Historical methods were also a factor in the debate. Traditional ancient historians who relied on philology and archaeology tended to side with the modernist interpretation, whereas historians who employed new methods drawn from sociology and anthropology tended to hold to the primitivist view. For example, Michael Rostovtzeff assembled a wealth of archaeological data to argue that the scale of the ancient Greek economy in the Hellenistic period was so great that it could not be considered primitive. A turning point in the debate came with the work of Karl Polanyi who drew on anthropological methods to argue that economies need not be organized according to the independent and self-regulating institutions of a market system. The latter, which is typical of economic analysis today, is appropriate only for market economies. Market economies operate independently of non-economic institutions and their most characteristic feature is that prices are set according to an aggregate derived from the impersonal forces of supply and demand among a group of interconnected markets. But material goods may be produced, exchanged, and valued by means other than market institutions. Such means may be tied to non-economic social and political institutions, including gift exchange or state-controlled redistribution and price-setting. Polanyi concluded that ancient Greece did not have a developed market system until the Hellenistic period. Thus, Polanyi opened the door through which scholars could begin to examine the ancient Greek economy free from the normative parameters originally imposed on the debate. Unfortunately, the grip of the old parameters has been very strong and the debate has never completely freed itself from their influence. The Finley Model and Its Aftermath At present the most widely accepted model of the ancient Greek economy is that which was first set forth by Moses Finley in This view owes much to the Weber-Hasebroek-Polanyi line of analysis and holds that the ancient Greek economy was fundamentally different from the market economy that predominates in most of the world today. Not only was the ancient

Greek economy much smaller in scale than economies today, it also differed greatly in quality. Economic activity was necessary in this system only in so far as the individual male citizen had to provide sustenance for himself and his family. This could be accomplished simply by farming a small plot of land. Beyond that, the male citizen was expected to devote himself to the wellbeing of the community by participating in the public religious, political, and military life of the polis. On the other hand, ancient Greek values held in low esteem economic activities that were not subordinated to the traditional activities of managing the family farm and obtaining goods for necessary consumption. A life on the land, farming to produce only so much as was needed for consumption and leaving enough leisure time for active participation in the public life of the polis, was the social ideal. Production and exchange were to be undertaken only for personal need, to help out friends, or to benefit the community as a whole. Such activities were not to be undertaken simply to make a profit and certainly not to obtain capital for future investment and economic growth. Given the limits put on economic activity by traditional values and the absence of a modern conception of the economy, agriculture comprised the bulk of production and exchange. Most production, therefore, was carried out in the countryside and cities were net consumers rather than producers, living off the surplus of the countryside. With limited technology and no understanding of economies of scale, cities were not hubs of industry, and manufacturing existed only on a small scale. Cities were mainly places for people to live as well as religious and governmental centers. Their contribution to the economy was only to demand the surplus produce of the countryside, manufacture limited amounts of goods, and provide market places and ports of trade for the exchange of goods. Since the bulk of economic wealth was produced from the land and banausic occupations were not esteemed, the elite of ancient Greek society were landowners who consequently dominated politics, even in democratic poleis like Athens. Such men had little interest in manufacturing, business, and trade and, like their society as a whole, did not consider the economy as a distinct sphere separate from social and political concerns. Thus, their official policies with regard to the economy were much different from that of modern states. Modern states undertake policies with specifically economic goals, desiring in particular to make their national economy more productive, to expand or grow, thereby increasing the per capita wealth of the state. Ancient Greek city-states, on the other hand, had an interest and involvement in what we would call economic activities trade, minting coins, production, etc. Thus, prices were set according to local conditions and personal relationships rather than in accordance with the impersonal forces of supply and demand. This was so in part because of the Greek socio-political emphasis on self-sufficiency *autarkeia*, but also because the physical environment and industry of the eastern Mediterranean tended to produce similar goods, so that there were few items that a city-state needed which could not be obtained from within its own boundaries. The former goal could be fulfilled by making laws that required or provided incentives for traders to bring grain into the city. Laws such as these were merely extensions of traditional political policies, like conquest and plunder, but in which a less violent form of acquisition would now be undertaken. But though the means had changed, the ends were still political; there was no interest in the economy *per se*. The same holds true for the traditional need of city-states for revenue to pay for public projects, such as temple building and road maintenance. Here again, old and often violent methods of obtaining revenue were augmented through such things as taxes on trade. But although the general picture it presents of the ancient Greek economy has not been superceded, the model is not without flaws. It was inevitable that Finley would overstate his model, since it attempted to encompass the general character of the ancient Greek economy as a whole. Thus, the model makes little distinction between different regions or city-states of Greece, even though it is clear that the economies of Athens and Sparta, for example, were quite different in many respects. Finley also treats the various sectors of the economy agriculture, labor, manufacturing, long-distance trade, banking, etc. But they have been matched by just as many studies that have revealed exceptions to the model. Thus, one recent trend in the scholarship has been to try to revise the Finley model in light of focused studies of particular sectors of the economy at specific times and places. Another trend has been simply to ignore the Finley model and bypass the old debate altogether by examining the ancient Greek economy in ways that make them irrelevant. Basically, given the quantity and the quality of the available evidence, our attempts to understand the ancient Greek economy are greatly affected by the perspective from which we approach it. We can choose to try to

characterize the entire ancient Greek economy in general, to see the forest as it were, and debate whether it was more or less similar to our own. Or we can focus in on the trees and undertake narrow studies of particular sectors of the ancient Greek economy at specific times and places. Both approaches are useful and not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Chapter 2 : Ancient Greece European History AP World History

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Guisepe The economic and social structure of classical Greece, including the colonies it sent out around the Mediterranean, had many features in common with other agricultural civilizations. It particularly resembled other civilizations in which an invading, warlike group settled down to agriculture. Thus, while 8th-century Greece depended clearly on farming, it had an aristocracy based on ownership of large estates and special claims to military service. At the same time many farmers were independent, owning their plots of land and claiming some political and social status just as tribal soldiers had once done. But - again in a common pattern - the Greek economy evolved, particularly as trade rose and cities grew. Social structure became accordingly more complex, and inequalities widened in many ways. There were also, however, distinctive features in the Greek pattern. Because mainland Greece was so rocky and mountainous, discouraging easy grain growing, many city-states came to depend unusually heavily on seagoing trade and colonies. Frequent wars and colonization produced abundant opportunities to seize slaves, and classical Mediterranean society maintained greater dependence on slavery than was true of Indian or Chinese civilizations in the same period. Correspondingly, while Greece developed many craft products, somewhat less attention was paid to the improvement of manufacturing technology than either China or India displayed. This reflected Greek concern for science as a philosophical system rather than a collection of useful empirical data. It also reflected widespread slavery, which reduced the need to think about better ways to produce because many of the hardest tasks were done by cheap, coerced labor. The pronounced aristocratic tone persisted in society as well as politics, based on the importance of the landed elite. Despite important differences among political forms, aristocratic assemblies and officials formed the most coherent single city-state theme in Greek politics. Aristocrats had the time to devote to political life as the Greeks defined it, and they argued that they brought special virtues, of education and disinterest, to the political process. Aristocratic cultural patronage also helped give shape to Mediterranean art, literature, and the education of aristocratic youth boys above all. The aristocratic tenor of Greek society showed in the ambiguous position of merchants. Greece progressively became involved with growing trade. Yet aristocratic suspicion of merchant values persisted, particularly among conservatives who blasted change in the name of traditional austerity. Sparta, which had unusually fertile land, tried to downplay trade altogether. The deliberately cumbersome coinage discouraged commerce, while aristocratic estate-owners concentrated on directing a semi-slave population of farm workers. Even in bustling Athens, most merchants were foreigners mainly from the Middle East. Overall, merchants held higher status in the classical Mediterranean than in Confucian China, but their standing was less firm than in India. The bulk of the population of the Greek and Hellenistic world was rural. The agricultural base of Mediterranean society must be kept in mind even though the leading political and cultural activities occurred in cities. Rural peoples preserved distinctive rituals and beliefs. Many Greek farmers, for example, annually gathered for a spring passion play to celebrate the recovery of the goddess of fertility from the lower world, an event that was seen as a vital preparation for planting and that also carried hints of the possibility of life after death - a prospect important to many people who endured a life of hard labor and poverty. A substantial population of free farmers played a vital role in the early politics of the Greek city-states. At the same time there was a constant tendency for large landlords to force these farmers to become tenants or laborers or to join the swelling crowds of the urban lower class. Waves of popular protest were not uncommon. Class tension was encouraged by special features of Greek agriculture. Farming was complicated by the fact that soil conditions were not ideal for grain growing, and yet grain was the staple of life. As Greek society advanced, there was a natural tendency to specialize in cash crops, which would allow importation of grain from areas more appropriate to its production - parts of the northern Middle East, Sicily, and North Africa. In mainland Greece, production of olives and grapes for cooking oil and wine making spread widely. The products were

well suited to soil conditions, but they required capital to install - a five-year wait was necessary before either vines or olive trees would begin to yield significant fruit. To convert to olives and grapes, farmers went into debt and often failed; aristocratic estate owners with more abundant resources converted more successfully, buying up the land of failed farmers in the process. Mediterranean agriculture thus became unusually market-oriented. Compared to other agricultural civilizations, relatively few farmers produced simply for their own needs, except in the early period before civilization fully developed. Imports of basic foods were more extensive here than in India or China. This was one obvious spur to empire: Greek expansion pushed out mainly toward sources of grain in Sicily and around the Black Sea. Large estate agriculture gained further momentum in the Hellenistic kingdoms. Vast estates spread in Egypt and the Middle East, requiring specialized banks and financial agents. Elements of this capitalistic agriculture affected Mediterranean history later under both the Roman Empire and Arab rule. The system also helped generate the surpluses needed for spreading Hellenistic culture and its urban monuments. For peasants themselves, the importance of commercial farming created an unusual tendency for farming families to cluster in small towns rather than the villages typical of other parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Towns of a few thousand people provided trading facilities for grain and other goods, while the peasants who lived there could still travel to the surrounding fields for work. These rural agglomerations would remain typical around the Mediterranean even after the classical period had ended and the region underwent new political and cultural divisions. The importance of trade in basic goods dictated extensive concern with commercial arrangements, despite the ambiguous status of merchants themselves. Private merchants operated most of the ships that carried foodstuffs and other goods. But Greek governments supervised the grain trade, providing not only transportation facilities but also storage depots to try to minimize the chance of famines. Other kinds of trade were vital also. Luxury products from the shops of urban artists and craftworkers played a vital role in the life-style of the upper classes, and some commodities, such as tools and pots, were sold more widely. There also was some trade beyond the borders of the Mediterranean civilization for goods from India and China. Slavery And Production Slavery was another key ingredient of the classical Mediterranean economy. Philosophers, such as Aristotle, produced elaborate justifications for the necessity of slavery to a proper society, for without slaves how would aristocrats learn what must be learned to maintain culture or have the time to cultivate political virtue? Slaves were acquired as a result of wars, unusually frequent in the Mediterranean world compared to China and India. Sparta used helots, or unfree labor, extensively for agricultural work. The Spartan system relied less on prisoners taken from war, for it was imposed by Indo-European conquerors over previous residents in the area. Of the approximately , people in 5th-century Athens 80, to , were slaves, while helots in Sparta outnumbered their masters by a ratio of nearly ten to one. In cities such as Athens some slaves enjoyed considerable independence and could earn money on their own. Manumission, or freeing, of valued slaves was also common. Yet slave systems also required extensive military controls. Slavery also helps explain why Greece was not especially interested in technological innovations applicable to agriculture or manufacturing. The Greeks made important advances in shipbuilding and navigation, which were vital for their trading economy. But technology designed to improve production of food or manufactured goods did not figure largely in this civilization. Abundant slave labor probably discouraged concern for more efficient production methods. So did a sense that the true goals of humankind were artistic and political. One Hellenistic scholar, for example, refused to write a handbook on engineering because "the work of an engineer and everything that ministers to the needs of life is ignoble and vulgar. Population growth, also, was less substantial. A host of features of Greek life, including aspects of politics, thus hinged on the slave system and its requirements. Greek Patriarchy Greek society emphasized the importance of a tight family structure, with husband and father firmly in control. Women had vital economic functions, particularly in farming and artisan families. But in law and culture, women were held inferior. The raping of a free woman, though a crime, was a lesser offense than seducing her, since seduction meant winning her affections away from her husband. Families burdened with too many children sometimes put female infants to death. Pericles stated common beliefs about women when he noted, "For a woman not to show more weakness than is natural to her sex is a great glory, and not to be talked about for good or for evil among men. Though Greek culture represented women abundantly as

goddesses, often with revered powers, and celebrated the female form as well as male form in art, the real cultural status of women was low. Aristotle even argued that women provided only an abode for a child developing before birth, as male seed alone continued the full germ of the child. Adultery was tolerated for men, but was grounds for divorce in the case of women. Even within the upper-class household, where women had vital functions including supervision of domestic slaves, men entertained in separate rooms. Relations between men and women in Greek society, at least in the aristocracy, help explain the Greek attitude toward homosexuality. Upper-class boys and girls were often brought up separately, which increased the likelihood of homosexual relationships. While some Athenians ridiculed homosexual love, most saw love affairs between two young people of the same sex as a normal stage of life. Homosexuality was not defined as an exclusive preference, and many people in later life emphasized heterosexuality. Older men sometimes took younger men as partners, a practice which the philosopher Plato and others praised as a means of training the young in practical wisdom. Spartans stressed same-sex love as a means of inspiring heroic deeds in battle. As with many aspects of Greek culture, homosexuality was almost certainly more pronounced in the aristocracy than in other social groups. Male and female peasants and urban workers worked together and generally mingled more freely, which may have promoted greater emphasis on heterosexuality, and these groups simply lacked the time for some of the more elaborate sexual arrangements. Other cultural divisions complicated Greek society. Peasants shared beliefs in the gods and goddesses about which the playwrights wrote, but their religious celebrations were largely separate from those of the upper classes. At times Greek peasants showed their interest in some of the more emotional religious practices imported from the Middle East, which provided more color than the official ceremonies of the Greek pantheon and spiced the demanding routines of work. Different beliefs reflected and furthered the real social tensions of Greek and Hellenistic societies, particularly as these societies became more commercial and large estates challenged the peasant desire for independent property ownership. Popular rebellions did not succeed in dislodging the landowning aristocracy, but they contributed to a number of political shifts in classical Greece and to the ultimate decline in the political stability of the city-states and later the Hellenistic kingdoms. Interestingly, conditions for women improved somewhat in the Hellenistic period, in an atypical trend. Artists and playwrights began to display more interest in women and their conditions. Women in Hellenistic cities appeared more freely in public, and some aristocratic women gained new functions, for example, in forming cultural clubs. A number of queens exercised great power, often ruling harshly. Cratesiclea, the mother of a Hellenistic king in Sparta, willingly served as a hostage to help form an alliance with a more powerful state; she reputedly said, "send me away, wherever you think this body of mine will be most useful to Sparta.

Chapter 3 : Economic Growth in Ancient Greece | pseudoerasmus

Eleanor Guralnick, "Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium Tullia Linders, Brita Alroth," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 56, no. 1 (Jan.,):

Research Interests My research ranges widely over ancient Greek history and archaeology, including epigraphy and the history of Greek art, and including issues of theory as well as substantive issues. Currently I am engaged in two particular major projects. Hill and were updated by M. Tod and then by David Lewis and Russell Meiggs. We expect to publish a volume covering the archaic period down to the Persian wars in the early s. Past dissertation topics supervised include: Iron in Greece to B. Other Professional Activities Editorial boards journals: Greece in the making â€”b. Routledge, ; 2nd edn. Archaic and Classical Greek Art Oxford, Athens and Athenian Democracy Cambridge, Performance-culture and Athenian democracy Cambridge, Rhodes Greek Historical Inscriptions â€” B. The Object of Dedication: Cunliffe, Mediterranean Urbanization â€” B. The Archaeology of Equality: Art, literature, philosophy and politics B. Cambridge University Press, The World of Athens 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, , Responsible for revision. Kindt, Theologies of Greek Religion. Cambridge University Press, ed. Rhodes, Greek Historical Inscriptions â€” B. El mundo rural en la Grecia antigua Ediciones Akal, Madrid, â€” Landscape archaeology as long-term history. Agriculture in ancient Greece. Tragedy, comedy and the polis Bari, Levante Editori 21â€”38 [reprinted in P. Does the sculpted girl speak to women too? Routledge History of Philosophy Vol. Not the Classical Ideal. Short Oxford History of Europe, Vol. Comments on David K. Side by Side Survey: Greek Vases, Images and Controversies. Chora und Polis Munich pp. Greek Art in View: Ritual Poetics Center for Hellenic Studies, 37â€” What is Urbanization and Why does it Matter? Mediterranean Urbanization â€” B. Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean. Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology, volume 10 Equinox, â€”8 with A. Irwin and E Greenwood ed. Recht und Religion in Europa. Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean Routledge 83â€” Greek History and Epigraphy: Essays in honour of P. G Bilde and J. Meetings of Cultures between Conflicts and Coexistence. Architectural Sculpture in the Greek World Oxford 2â€” Festschrift for Herbert Hoffmann. Vaiopoulos The New Ways of History: Developments in Historiography London, 35â€” Zirkulation und Rezeption griechischer Keramik im Mittelmeerraum Munich, â€” A Companion to Sophocles Blackwell, â€” J Paul Getty, â€” The Greek polis and the invention of democracy: The Secret Lives of Art Works: Past and Present Supplement 9 Oxford 34â€” Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses Philadelphia â€” Axel and Margaret Ax: Theologies of Ancient Greek Religion. The Frame in Classical Art: What if they jumped? Boiotia in the Fourth Century. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Published online April url: Survey at a complex urban site.

Chapter 4 : Slave-Wives, Single Women and "Bastards" in the Ancient Greek World

The economy of ancient Greece was defined largely by the region's dependence on imported goods. As a result of the poor quality of Greece's soil, agricultural trade was of particular importance.

The one-time motto of the US reminds us that, much like most of the larger nation states today, ancient Greece was a mosaic of very different components: That is, there were a thousand or so separate, often radically self-differentiated political entities, most of which went by the title of polis, or citizen-state. That was because the epics are set in a period before "Hellas" and "Hellenes" had become common currency – before, that is, the eighth century BC, when Greeks first started emigrating permanently from the Aegean basin and settling around the Mediterranean and Black Seas. Later, following the conquests of Alexander the Great, the pale of Hellenic settlement was extended even further eastwards, as far as Afghanistan and the Indus Valley of Pakistan. Everyone who was not a Hellene by birth, language or culture was labelled a barbaros. Originally an onomatopoeic description of anyone who spoke a non-Greek, unintelligible language, barbaros came to acquire the pejorative connotations of "barbarous" and "barbaric". The Romans took the same sort of view of all non-Romans – excepting only Hellenes – which is how those emotive terms entered our own language. The mighty Persian empire, the fastest growing and largest oriental empire yet, had threatened to swallow up mainland Greece as well as those Greeks who lived within the bounds of what the Persians considered their own sphere – Asia. Indeed, Alexander turned the tables by conquering the old Persian empire and starting to create a new Helleno-Persian successor: However, united though they were by religion and common social customs and by at least partly fictional self-images, these Greeks were very much not united by one of their major contributions to the sum of human achievement – politics. Much of our everyday political language is of ancient Greek derivation: Much of the rest is Latin-derived: That was partly because the fundamental ancient Greek political unit, the polis, was a strong community in a very exclusive sense: Even then, the ancient Greeks typically ruled themselves directly, in that they did not select rulers to rule over and for them. Theirs were direct, participatory self-governments, whereas ours are notionally "representative". But democracy, so far from being the ancient Greek norm, was at first a rare and rather fragile plant: And only in a few cases – in Athens, above all – was it both deeply rooted and conspicuously radical. At all times and in all places it remained more or less controversial. And there was a good linguistic reason for this. Demokratia was a compound of demos and kratos. By and large the Romans took the second view, which is why they went to great lengths to stamp it out within their empire – the eastern half of which was basically Greek – in the end with total success. It therefore took a great deal of effort and ingenuity in the 19th century to rehabilitate "democracy" as a viably positive term of political discourse – and even then only at the cost of draining it of the active, participatory, class-conscious dimension the Athenians had given it. Worship and sacrifice A popular proverb says that the ancient Greeks "had a word for it". A conspicuous example is that they had no word for our "religion", which is taken from Latin. Our manifold and multifarious legacy from the ancient Greeks does not include their polytheistic religion – which was superseded and suppressed by various forms of Judaeo-Christianity and then Islam. These latter faiths are all based on the presumption of a single deity, and on privileged hierarchies of vocational officials who interpret their sacred texts and dogmas. It is easy for us today to be over-impressed by the standing remains of monumental temples such as those on the Acropolis of Athens or of Greek Agrigento in Sicily, or by reports of now lost wonders such as the huge seated cult-statue of Zeus at Olympia, crafted by master sculptor Pheidias of Athens in the 5c BC. For most Greeks the object of their greatest devotion was an altar, whether domestic or public. The most characteristic act of religious worship was the performance of a sacrifice, such as a gift of olive oil, wine or grain, or the killing of a pig or chicken. These offerings symbolised both communion between the god or goddess and their mortal worshippers, as well as the unbridgeable gulf that separated the human from the super-human. In fact, they themselves were created only after a void state of chaos. But for the Greeks a myth was a traditional tale that could have a purely secular, mortal content. He not only fell down wells while contemplating the heavens as all proper intellectuals should, but also predicted a total solar eclipse here he was fortunate to be heir to the

discoveries and records of Babylonians and Egyptians before him, thus robbing it of potential divine mystique, and once made a substantial profit by successfully predicting a bumper olive harvest. Thales and his followers had a particular interest in the kosmos: The way to study it was through historia: Science The results they came up with were hardly what we would call scientific. That was left for the doctors of the school of medicine, founded by Hippocrates in the fifth century BC on the east Aegean island of Kos; and the astronomers attached to the museum and library of Alexandria in Egypt in the third century BC. Despite these giant steps, it is important to remember that most ordinary Greeks were not persuaded to adopt a rationalist, non-theistic world outlook, nor were they always tolerant of the eccentric intellectuals they harboured in their midst – especially not at times of great societal crisis such as the Peloponnesian War – BC. Both charges carried particular weight in the fraught circumstances of BC: That its oligarchic junta had done to death many hundreds of ordinary Athenians was still fresh in the memory. The trial of Socrates and its outcome should remind us that democratic Athens, despite being a relatively open society, was no liberal paradise of principled religious tolerance. Economics Socrates is the main participant in a fictional dialogue composed by the versatile Athenian historian Xenophon cBC, entitled in Latin transliteration *Oeconomicus*. Yet "economics" in our sense is not what the discourse is about, but rather the management of an *oikos* or "household". The Greeks "did" economics, practically speaking, but they did not theorise it as we do. This was partly because they did not develop a suitable macro-economic technical vocabulary but also because, like their politics and religion, their economic realities were very different from those of a capitalist, let alone a globalised, economy. This is not to deny that local, regional and international trading networks could be crucially important, not least when the commodity being traded was a life-giving staple such as grain. British Musuem Women, whose public valuation by men was often distressingly low, were economically crucial within the household, where they processed food, produced children and clothing, and managed the free or unfree workforce. The modern Greek term for housewife, *noikokyra* "lady of the household" had its ancient counterpart, especially in Sparta, where women vied not just to control but to own more than one household property. Ordinary Greeks, of course, might not have had the luxury of owning even a single slave, greatly desirable though that was thought to be. Most slaves were individually and privately owned, having been bought on the market as commodities. But some slaves – such as the gaolers of Socrates – were public servants. At Athens, there was an exceptional concentration of slave worker personnel in the state-owned silver mines, who were economically vital: In Sparta they managed their servile system very differently. Although there were some chattel-type privately owned slaves, the dominant form of servitude here was a kind of collective serfdom, known as *helotage*. And whereas most chattel slaves were dispossessed, non-Greek foreigners, the Helots were born into inherited bondage:

Chapter 5 : Classical Greek society (article) | Khan Academy

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW TULLIA LINDERS, BRITA ALROT (edd.)H Economics: of Cult in the Ancient Greek World. Proceeding of the Uppsala Symposiuma ,. (Boreas. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern.

The intellectual odyssey that laid the foundations for Western civilization began in classical Greece. Unfortunately, Greek thinkers failed in their attempt to grasp the essential principles of the spontaneous market order and of the dynamic process of social cooperation which surrounded them. While we must acknowledge the important Greek contributions in the areas of epistemology, logic, ethics, and even the conception of natural law, the Greeks failed miserably to see the need for the development of a discipline, economic science, devoted to the study of the spontaneous processes of social cooperation that comprise the market. What is even worse is that when the first intellectuals emerged, so did the symbiosis and complicity between thinkers and rulers. From the beginning, the great majority of intellectuals embraced statism and systematically undervalued and even criticized and denigrated the society of trade, commerce, and crafts that flourished around them. It may be too much to ask that, from the very dawn of philosophical and scientific knowledge, the Greeks would comprehend even the basics of political economy, a discipline that is still among the youngest of all the sciences and seeks to study a reality as abstract and difficult to understand as the spontaneous market order. History repeats itself over and over, and even today we have progressed very little in this sense. In fact, throughout much of the 20th century, the world and society in general were divided: In classical Greece we can also identify two such complete opposites. There was the relatively more liberal and democratic city of Athens, which was able to accommodate a thriving sphere of business and craft endeavors within a spontaneous order of social cooperation based on respect for and equality before the law. In contrast, there was the city of Sparta, which was profoundly militarist, and in which individual freedom was practically nonexistent, due to the belief that all resources must be subordinate to the state. It is remarkable that the most eminent and distinguished Athenian thinkers and philosophers invariably lambasted and undervalued the commercial order that surrounded and supported them while they took every opportunity to extol the statist totalitarianism Sparta represented. It is as if the intellectuals of that era, like those of today, could not bear the fact that, though considered wise, they were unable to reap in economic terms the fruits of what they saw as their own worth. Likewise, they were unable to resist the temptation to impose their own views of what was good and evil on their fellow citizens, and they continuously aspired to do so via the coercive power of the state. The recognition of this truth must not lead us to the mistaken belief that the relatively freer poleis were not also often victims of statism. For example, many politicians did not hesitate to justify imperialist Athenian policies, and even, as Pericles did in the 5th century BC, to misappropriate public funds in order to undertake mammoth works. Indeed, periods of greater civil liberty based on compliance with substantive laws were invariably followed by crises: Considerable social, economic, and political tension resulted and eventually led to severe civil disorder and conflict which, in turn, was used to justify increasing the power of the state, embodied in each set of historical circumstances by unscrupulous populist leaders who inevitably insisted upon being referred to as "saviors of the homeland. Nevertheless, there is evidence of some encouraging beginnings, which, had they been continued, might have cleared the way for an incipient formulation of the theory of the spontaneous market order. For example, as early as the 8th century BC, Hesiod indicates in his poems that scarcity is always present in human actions and is the reason we must allocate available resources efficiently. Furthermore, he mentions the sort of competition that emulation sparks, and which he calls "good conflict," and he regards it as a vital entrepreneurial force that often permits the surmounting of the big problems the shortage of resources poses. Moreover, Hesiod felt competition was only possible where there was respect for justice and the law, which foster order and harmony in society. In this sense, Hesiod and Democritus to a certain extent was much closer to the correct notion of the spontaneous market order than Socrates, Plato, and even Aristotle himself would later be. After Hesiod, we should give some thought to the Sophist philosophers. Despite the bad press they have received up to the present day, they were certainly much more libertarian, at least in relative terms, than the great philosophers who came later. In fact, the Sophists

sympathized with trade, the profit motive, and the entrepreneurial spirit, and they distrusted the centralized, absolute power of the governments of the city-states. Finally, we must note the manner in which the scientific conceit typically shown up to today in support of statism by most intellectuals has led to the systematic discrediting of the Sophists. Always considered politically "incorrect," they are branded as illogical, dishonest thinkers. It is no coincidence that Demosthenes understood the customary, evolutionary essence of law, and that hence he was able to overcome the reductionist dichotomy the Greeks had established between the physical natural world and the supposedly artificial world of laws and conventions. Indeed, in general the Greeks failed to comprehend that the natural cosmos must include the spontaneous market order and the social relationships which are the object of study in economics, for the Greeks believed that anything related to society was always artificially and deliberately caused by its organizers whom they hoped would be dictator-philosophers like those imagined by Plato. The subjectivist viewpoint, around which all modern economic science revolves, can be found, for example, in the definition of wealth that Xenophon offers in his *Oeconomicus*, when he defines property as "those things which the possessor should find advantageous for the purposes of his life. At any rate, despite these promising beginnings, and despite great contributions in other areas of philosophical and scientific thought and maybe precisely because of these contributions, Greek philosophers in general lapsed into the fatal conceit of the scientific intellectual. Thus they were blinded completely when it came to recognizing the market and the evolutionary social order, and they fell into the arms of statism; it became "politically correct" to scorn the commercial and mercantile activity of their contemporaries and to mercilessly criticize relatively more classical-liberal thinkers be they Sophists or not. The Particularly Alarming Examples of Socrates, Plato, and Even Aristotle From the standpoint of our topic, the principal characteristic shared by Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle – the three greatest philosophers of ancient Greece – was their inability to grasp the nature of the flourishing mercantile and commercial process taking place between the different Greek cities or poleis both in Greece itself and in Asia Minor and the rest of the Mediterranean. When they spoke of the economy, these philosophers relied on their instincts rather than on observation and reason. They scorned the work of craftsmen and merchants and underestimated the importance of their disciplined, daily efforts. Hence, it was through these philosophers that the traditional opposition of intellectuals to anything involving trade, industry, or entrepreneurial profit began. This "anticapitalistic mentality" would become a constant theme among "enlightened" thinkers all through the intellectual history of mankind from that point until our time. The philosopher Socrates serves as a paradigmatic illustration of this intellectual opposition to anything involving entrepreneurial profit, industry, or the market. We must note the arrogant tone and false modesty shown by Socrates in his defense speech before the jury which tried him, a speech Plato records. Socrates seized every opportunity to boast of his poverty and to idealize the supposed virtues of the totalitarian state of Sparta, which at that time represented ideals opposed to those of Athens. In fact, in his defense speech, he outrages the jury by proclaiming that his services to the state of Athens were so many that instead of being tried, he should receive a life pension paid for by everyone in the form of food financed by the city for the duration of his life! He believed people should obey all the positive laws derived from the state, even if they are *contra naturam*, and thus he laid the philosophical foundations for the legal positivism on which every tyranny to emerge after him in history would rest. In short, from the standpoint of the scientific theory of market processes, the influence of Socrates is definitely disastrous. He started and promoted the anticapitalist intellectual tradition. He showed a total lack of understanding about the spontaneous market order, itself precisely the source of the Athenian prosperity that permitted Socrates and the rest of the philosophers of his school the luxury of not working and of devoting themselves to thinking instead. And in payment for this environment of relative freedom and prosperity, Athens receives from Socrates only contempt and misunderstanding. He himself recognized that at his age and with his ailments, there is little he could have done in the few years he would have had left had he accepted the exile his judges and executioners offered him on a platter. Thus, he decided to go down in history by making himself the victim of a supposedly oppressive system, when his death was actually a timely and self-seeking suicide conceived by an arrogant, privileged mind. Indeed, he also sought to use this death to give legitimacy to the worship of oppressive statism while discrediting classical-liberal individualism. Plato

provides the highly dangerous philosophical justification for the most inhuman statism, which has been directly or indirectly imbibed by every tyrant to oppress humanity up to the present day. Plato was the purest embodiment of the gravest intellectual sin a scientist can commit: Typical of Plato are attacks on private property; praise for common ownership; contempt for the institution of the traditional family; a corrupt concept of justice; a statist and nominalist theory of money; and, in short, the extolling of the ideals of the totalitarian state of Sparta. These are all typical characteristics of the intellectual who believes himself wiser than and superior to everyone else and who, nevertheless, is ignorant of even the most essential principles of the spontaneous market order, which makes civilization possible. Furthermore, Plato champions the interest of the state against that of individuals, and he even goes to the extreme of attempting to put his utopian ideals of state tyranny into practice. Inevitably, he and his disciples failed in all of their attempts in Syracuse and in the rest of Greece. His supposed essentialism brought in, through the back door, the crudest positivist historicism: In short, with Plato, the intellectual ideal of the arrogant scientist who aims to become a "social engineer" to mold society at his whim gained currency. This approach was even further reinforced with the school of the mathematician Pythagoras, who believed virtue was found in the "equality" and "equilibrium" he continually observed in his mathematical formulas and principles, which he felt should be extrapolated to society. Though Aristotle did not go to the socialist extremes Plato did, he also failed to and dismally to comprehend in scientific terms the spontaneous market order. A philosopher in the service of the worst dictator of his time Philip of Macedonia, who put an end to the subtle network of independent city-states that comprised the ancient Greek world, Aristotle was the private teacher of the tyrannical, reckless despot, Alexander the Great. It comes as no surprise that Aristotle failed to escape the sin of intellectual conceit, which Socrates, and especially Plato, had committed: Aristotle also felt nostalgia for the statism of Sparta and for everything the totalitarianism of that city-state represented. However, he condemned usury and never understood the critical importance of interest as a market price that coordinates the behavior of consumers, savers, and investors. His theory of justice is extremely confusing, since it distinguishes between two forms, "distributive" and "commutative" justice, which have little or nothing to do with adapting human behavior to general legal and moral principles and which, as they rest on supposed equivalences, have confused human thought on such an important topic practically to the present day. Moreover, an almost perfect illustration of his failure to grasp the evolutionary, spontaneous market order lies in his conviction that a polis of over 100,000 inhabitants could never survive, because its government would be unable to organize it. Aristotle understood the polis solely as a self-sufficient body organized from above autarkia, and not as a historic manifestation of the spontaneous process of social cooperation led by flesh-and-blood human beings endowed with an innate entrepreneurial capacity. Finally, Aristotle followed the Socratic tradition of undervaluing work and entrepreneurial profit, which, in an anonymous and decentralized manner, supported the advanced stage of civilization that is precisely what allowed him and the rest of the philosophers to survive. Aristotle also failed to explain the reasons for exchanges. He mistakenly concluded that when they occur, there must be "proportional reciprocity" an erroneous idea Marx would ultimately use to form the basis of the false theory of labor value and its corollary, the Marxist theory of exploitation. Furthermore, his incapacity to comprehend the spontaneous emergence of institutions led him to state that money was a deliberate human invention and not, as it in fact is, the result of an evolutionary process, and he also failed to see why the demand for money is never unlimited. It is true that Aristotle shared the errors of Socrates and Plato, since he did not understand customary law, nor the market, nor the rest of the social institutions as spontaneous orders, nor was he able to distinguish between civil society and the state a distinction the Roman Stoics would grasp perfectly two centuries later. Still, in the field of epistemology, his contributions were momentous. His distinction between potentiality and actuality would even be applied centuries later to explain the evolution of human nature. His conception of formal essences and their specific material realization would serve as a basis for the epistemological distinction between theory and history and would permit their appropriate incorporation. Closer to the field of economics, we must recognize the Aristotelian approach to the subjective concept of value, and specifically the distinction between the concept of use value subjective and that of exchange value the market price in monetary units. This, to an extent, provides the foundation for the connection between the

subjective, inside world of valuations and the objective, outside world of numerical calculations, which makes economic calculation possible. Finally, in contrast with the socialist statism of Socrates, and particularly of Plato, Aristotle built a rational defense of private property, a defense which, though lukewarm and incomplete, for many centuries would constitute the best-known philosophical basis for private property. A Brief Note on Taoism. Lastly, it is very interesting to note that, during the same era when classical Greek thought was being forged from the 6th to the 4th century BC, ancient China saw the beginnings of three great currents of thought: Chuang Tzu (6th BC) goes as far as to say that "good order results spontaneously when things are let alone. In fact, Chuang Tzu wrote that the world "does simply not need governing; in fact it should not be governed at all. Taoism continued its development for centuries, and in the current era, we find Pao Ching-yen (early 4th century AD), for whom the history of the state is a history of violence and oppression of the weak. The state institutionalizes coercion and worsens and intensifies isolated instances of violence, expanding them on a scale unimaginable in the absence of the state. Pao Ching-yen concludes that the common notion that a strong government is necessary to fight disorder reflects the fallacy of mistaking the cause for the effect. It is the state that generates violence and corrupts the individual behavior of the human beings subjected to it; and all the while it stimulates theft and banditry among them. In stark contrast with the views of the Greek philosophers and with those of the rest of western intellectuals to the present day, Chinese Taoist thought always defended individual liberty and laissez-faire while attacking the systematic and coercive use of violence typical of government. These include the Parthenon, which was built using resources that had been accumulated at great effort by different poleis for other, defensive, ends. Here, "classical-liberal" means the philosophy of freedom as the classical liberals would understand it.

Chapter 6 : The Economy of Ancient Greece

This view owes much to the Weber-Hasebroek-Polanyi line of analysis and holds that the ancient Greek economy was fundamentally different from the market economy that predominates in most of the world today.

The largest, Sparta, controlled about square miles of territory; the smallest had just a few hundred people. However, by the dawn of the Archaic period in the seventh century B. They all had economies that were based on agriculture, not trade: Also, most had overthrown their hereditary kings, or basileus, and were ruled by a small number of wealthy aristocrats. Visit Website These people monopolized political power. For example, they refused to let ordinary people serve on councils or assemblies. They also monopolized the best farmland, and some even claimed to be descended from the gods. Land was the most important source of wealth in the city-states; it was also, obviously, in finite supply. The pressure of population growth pushed many men away from their home poleis and into sparsely populated areas around Greece and the Aegean. By the end of the seventh century B. Each of these poleis was an independent city-state. In this way, the colonies of the Archaic period were different from other colonies we are familiar with: The people who lived there were not ruled by or bound to the city-states from which they came. The new poleis were self-governing and self-sufficient. The Rise of the Tyrants As time passed and their populations grew, many of these agricultural city-states began to produce consumer goods such as pottery, cloth, wine and metalwork. Trade in these goods made some people—usually not members of the old aristocracy—very wealthy. These people resented the unchecked power of the oligarchs and banded together, sometimes with the aid of heavily-armed soldiers called hoplites, to put new leaders in charge. These leaders were known as tyrants. Some tyrants turned out to be just as autocratic as the oligarchs they replaced, while others proved to be enlightened leaders. Pheidon of Argos established an orderly system of weights and measures, for instance, while Theagenes of Megara brought running water to his city. However, their rule did not last: The colonial migrations of the Archaic period had an important effect on its art and literature: Sculptors created kouroi and korai, carefully proportioned human figures that served as memorials to the dead. Scientists and mathematicians made progress too: Anaximandros devised a theory of gravity; Xenophanes wrote about his discovery of fossils; and Pythagoras of Kroton discovered his famous theorem. The economic, political, technological and artistic developments of the Archaic period readied the Greek city-states for the monumental changes of the next few centuries.

Chapter 7 : The Ancient World | Greece | Culture | The Guardian

The economic and social structure of classical Greece, including the colonies it sent out around the Mediterranean, had many features in common with other agricultural civilizations.

She had shrines throughout Greece, the most famous of which were those of Cythera, Corinth and Cyprus. His chief shrines were the island of Delos and the Oracles of Delphi and Dindyma. ARES The god of war. Worshipped primarily in times of war, he also reputedly had important cults in Aetolia and Thesprotia in north-western Greece. Her main cult centre was perhaps Calydon in Aetolia, although she was honoured by huntsmen, girls and women throughout Greece. Artemis was also identified with the many-breasted Ephesian goddess of Asia Minor. Most of the ancient acropoli or city-fortresses possessed a shrine dedicated to the goddess as protector of the city. She was also worshipped by craftsmen of all sorts. Her most celebrated cult was at Athens. She was worshipped in Mysteries throughout the Greek world, the most famous of which were those of Eleusis. Harvest- and fertility-festivals were also celebrated in her honour. He had shrines throughout Greece and was celebrated with the grape-harvest and opening of the new wine. His orgiastic Mystery cult was also widely celebrated, and plays were written and performed in his honour. His most famous cult centres were Thebes and neighbouring Mount Cithaeron in Boeotia, and the island of Naxos. He was honoured by craftsmen throughout Greece and had many local festivals, but few large temples or shrines. His most important cult centre was the island of Lemnos, where he was represented as the national god. HERA The goddess of marriage and queen of the gods. Her main cult centres were those of Argos and the island of Samos. At Olympia she was honoured beside Zeus. He was widely worshipped in agora marketplaces throughout Greece, and in the Peloponnese by shepherds in the countryside. Fertility statues dedicated to the god called hermae were also erected along the roads. His main cult centre was on Mount Cyllene in Arcadia. She was a domestic goddess worshipped at the fireplace. Unlike the other Olympian gods she possessed no great temples, festivals or cult centres, and was rarely represented in Greek art. His most important cult centre was near Corinth on the Isthmus where the Isthmian games were celebrated in his honour. ZEUS The king of the gods, and the god of rain, rulership and civilisation in general. He was widely worshipped throughout Greece with numerous hill-top shrines where he was invoked as the rain-god. His main cult centres were Olympia and Nemea where Games were celebrated in his honour, and the Oracle of Dodona in the North. His main cult centre was at Epidaurus in the Peloponnese. Their were widely worshipped in the Boeotian town of Orchomenus and on the island of Cos. Their cult was centred in the region of Sparta. She was widely worshipped throughout Greece, with her chief cult centre at Amnisus in Crete. EROS The god of love. He had dedicated cults in the small towns of Thespieae and Parion on the Hellespont. He was usually only honoured at funerals, and indirectly in the Mystery cults. His most important dedicated shrine was the Oracle of the Dead in Thesprotia. She was one of the major goddesses of the Eleusinian mysteries, and also possessed small household shrines protecting the entranceways. His major cult centre was the island of Rhodes, famous for its colossal statue of the god. His cult was widespread in ancient Greece, one of the most important of which was the site of his apotheosis on Mount Oeta in northern Greece. LETO The goddess of motherhood. She was widely worshipped in conjunction with her children Apollo and Artemis. PAN The god of shepherds. He possessed numerous shrines in the Arcadian mountains, the most important of which was by Mount Lycaeus. Individual local rivers were worshipped throughout Greece and her colonies. The main cult of the Greek goddess Rhea was near the Cretan town of Gortyn. She was identified with the Phrygian goddess Cybele whose cult was introduced into Greece from the Near East. In art she was often depicted with the accoutrements of a city: However the scarce amount of information available on these is not sufficient to warrant a dedicated cult page. Even minor gods, which at first glance one might not expect to see in Greek religion, such as Iris the Rainbow, the hundred-handed Hecatoncheires, and the centaur Chiron, possessed small localised cults. Many others were worshipped only in conjunction with major deities, such as Peitho, the attendant of Aphrodite, and the various Eleusinian demi-gods in the retinue of Demeter.

Chapter 8 : The World Factbook – Central Intelligence Agency

The term Ancient, or Archaic, Greece refers to the time three centuries before the classical age, between B.C. and B.C. – a relatively sophisticated period in world history. Archaic Greece.

Agriculture in ancient Greece Greek soil has been likened to "stinginess" or "tightness" Ancient Greek: The olive tree and grapevine as well as orchards were complemented by the cultivation of herbs , vegetables , and oil-producing plants. Husbandry was badly developed due to a lack of available land. Sheep and goats were the most common types of livestock. Woods were heavily exploited, first for domestic use and eventually to build triremes. Bees were kept to produce honey , the only source of sugar known to the ancient Greeks. Agricultural work followed the rhythm of the seasons: In the ancient era, most land was held by the aristocracy. During the 7th century BC, demographic expansion and the distribution of successions created tensions between these landowners and the peasants. The Greeks would also have animals like cows, goats and chickens. Woman working with wool, BC, National Archaeological Museum of Athens Much of the craftsmanship of ancient Greece was part of the domestic sphere. However, the situation gradually changed between the 8th and 4th centuries BC, with the increased commercialization of the Greek economy. Thus, weaving and baking , activities so important to the Western late medieval economy, were done only by women before the 6th century BC. After the growth of commerce, slaves started to be used widely in workshops. Only fine dyed tissues, like those made with Tyrian purple , were created in workshops. On the other hand, working with metal , leather , wood , or clay was a specialized activity that was looked down upon by most Greeks. The basic workshop was often family-operated. After the death of Pericles in BC, a new class emerged: Examples include Cleon and Anytus , noted tannery owners, and Kleophon , whose factory produced lyres. Non-slave workers were paid by assignment, since the workshops could not guarantee regular work. In Athens, those who worked on state projects were paid one drachma per day, no matter what craft they practiced. The workday generally began at sunrise and ended in the afternoon. Part of the production went to domestic usage dishes, containers, oil lamps or for commercial purposes, and the rest served religious or artistic functions. The ancient Greeks did not add any innovations to these processes[citation needed]. The creation of artistically decorated vases in Greece had strong foreign influences. For instance, the famed black-figure style of Corinthian potters was most likely derived from the Syrian style of metalworking. The heights to which the Greeks brought the art of ceramics is therefore due entirely to their artistic sensibilities and not to technical ingenuity. Pottery in ancient Greece was most often the work of slaves. Many of the potters of Athens assembled between the agora and the Dipylon, in the Kerameikon. They most often operated as small workshops, consisting of a master, several paid artisans, and slaves. Metalworking[edit] Deposits of metal ore are common in Greece. Of these, the best known are the silver mines of Laurium. These mines contributed to the development of Athens in the 5th century BC, when the Athenians learned to prospect, treat, and refine the ore. Fortunately, the composition of the earth below the mines rendered drainage unnecessary, an important provision given that ancient mine drainage techniques did not allow for excavation below the level of subsoil waters. The passageways and steps of Greek mines were dug out with the same concern for proportion and harmony found in their temples. The miner, armed with his pick and iron hammer and hunched over in two, labored to extract lead ore. The Laurium mines were worked by a large slave population, originating for the most part from Black Sea regions such as Thrace and Paphlagonia. Weapons, armor tools, and a variety of other goods were created with these metals. Other Greek mines include:

Chapter 9 : Classical Greek culture (article) | Khan Academy

A philosopher in the service of the worst dictator of his time (Philip of Macedonia, who put an end to the subtle network of independent city-states that comprised the ancient Greek world), Aristotle was the private teacher of the tyrannical, reckless despot, Alexander the Great.