

1. Political change - Mait Kõiv (Tartu)

The paper explores the development of political organisation and vexation of forms of government in the Aegean polities from the Early Iron Age to the Classical period. It will discuss, on the one hand, how our views of this development are shaped by the inevitably selective and partly biased evidence, and on the other hand, how the political processes were influenced, perhaps shaped, by the development of the economic systems, the forms of dependency and the social and power relations within the communities. Attention will be paid to the demographic evidence and the evidence concerning warfare shedding light upon the political change. It will be suggested that the evidence does not indicate a decrease of elite power. The political change can be described not as a stepwise democratisation, but as an increase of the complexity of decision-making procedures developing in a permanent competition within the communities, and as a variable vexation of political order caused by shaky power balance between the relatively weak and competitive elites and the economically independent smallholders defending the right of political participation inherited from the Early Iron Age.

2. Military change - Hans van Wees (UCL)

One widely accepted grand narrative of changes in Greek warfare is – or was until recently – the story of the rise and decline of the hoplite. This begins with the introduction of new types of armour in the eighth century and the development of a distinctive ‘agonal’ culture of warfare by c. 650 BC, and ends with a gradual loss of dominance to other types of soldier, different military ethics, and new goals of war from the Peloponnesian War onwards. One problem with this narrative is that it is based in large part on classical ideals of warfare, which are projected back on the assumption that these ideals are a legacy of earlier military practice. A second, complementary problem is that much of the contemporary evidence for warfare in pre-classical poetry and art is dismissed as ‘heroizing’ and thus a fiction rather than a reflection of contemporary practice. This combination of approaches is surely unique, and obviously doubly problematic. If we adopt the normal rules of evidence and treat archaic sources as evidence for the archaic period, while treating classical ideals as evidence for the classical period only, a very different story emerges. The rise of the hoplite does not actually change much in the broader nature of warfare, whereas classical hoplite ideals reflect new ways of thinking about war rather than nostalgia for a kind of warfare that no longer exists.

In *Greek Warfare: myths and realities* (2004), I argued that the goals of war broadly remained the same throughout Greek history, and that what changed was only the capacity of Greek states to pursue these goals. As the process of state-formation advanced, cities acquired larger financial resources and organisational control that enabled them to conduct naval and siege warfare on a scale and by means not previously viable, and increased their ability to conduct infantry and cavalry warfare. I would now suggest that there may have been two significant shifts in the goals of warfare: first from raids for slaves and livestock to wars of territorial conquest from c. 750-700 onwards, then from wars of conquest to wars of hegemony from c. 550 to 350 BC. A clear

example of this is the history of Sparta, which is usually regarded as exceptional in this respect, but may have been exceptional only in the scale and longevity of its conquests. For instance, the Lelantine War (whenever it was fought) must have been an attempted war of conquest by Eretria rather than the near-ritualised duel for honour between neighbours that it is often imagined to have been. I will suggest that wars of conquest were part of a broader early archaic pattern that also included overseas settlement and 'mercenary' service, and amounted to an attempt to resolve social and political conflict in a period when elite expansionism placed a great strain on local resources. The development of the Greek economy, and of trade in particular, in the course of the sixth century not only relieved the strain on territorial resources, but also made control over, or at any rate access to, trade an important objective for most city-states. This objective was often better served by establishing hegemonic networks, through war or diplomacy, than by direct conquest.

3. Institutional change - Gunnar Seelentag (Hannover)

My paper will argue in favour of describing and analysing socio-political development of the Archaic and Early Classical period with the model of 'cartelization', which is based on building blocks inspired by organizational sociology, new institutional economics and game theory. This model specifically focuses on the processual nature of communization in early Greece, the gradual establishment of institutions and their often-precarious acceptance. 'Cartelization' endeavours to describe and analyse the motivation and scope of action of contemporary model actors who drove or inhibited these developments; and it also makes it possible to examine institutions beyond the political field.

A working hypothesis might be: Full political agents, in the face of external and internal pressure on the community, were eager to stabilize their own position and to do so consciously renounced certain competitive practices in order to cooperate in selected socio-political spaces and sought to secure this cooperation through an institutional framework. This served the purpose of enabling the exercise of power as a collective and under controlled conditions over those excluded from this group. In short, 'cartelization' might help us better understand the human factor behind investing in institutions in early *poleis* – but also in socio-political contexts beyond Greece and the ancient world.

4. Legal change - Edward Harris (Durham)

In 2015 an inscription of 139 lines discovered in the gymnasium of Amphipolis during the 1970s was published. The inscription contains a law dated to 24/3 BCE, which contains detailed regulations about the youth of the city and those officials who supervise their training. The rules go into remarkable detail about their personal conduct and behaviour. The aim of this talk is to study how the nature of laws and decrees changed from the Archaic period to the Roman conquest. In the earliest laws, the emphasis is always on the importance of punishment as a deterrent, not only for citizens but also for officials. This trend certainly continues in Athens during the fifth century. By contrast, there were few rewards for good conduct in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE. The Athenian state did not provide training and education for the youth.

Education was in the hands of private teachers such as *grammatistai* and for more advanced subjects the Sophists who received payment for teaching. In fact, Pericles in his Funeral Oration boasts that Athenians are courageous by nature and do not need training imposed by the laws. In law-court speeches, accusers often state that the punishment of criminals is what makes the citizens good. They do not claim that virtue is inculcated by the state's training. A change seems to have started by the 350s BCE. In *Against Timarchus* Aeschines argues that Solon was very concerned about the training of the youth. Yet the speech reveals that education was still private at the time. In the *Areopagiticus* Isocrates claims that in the past the Areopagus took a leading role in training the citizens, not just in punishing them. The interest in the state training the youth is also seen in Plato's Republic (just for the leaders) and in the Laws in which the state has a minister of education and public instruction. This is picked up in Aristotle *Politics* Book 8 and grows out of the concern that punishments in the laws are not sufficient to make the citizens good. At the same time, there was a new attitude about honours.

We start to see honorary decrees for citizens aft 400 BCE. Demosthenes' speech *Against Leptines* reflects a contemporary debate about rewards for public service. Demosthenes argues eloquently for the importance of rewards for citizens and foreigners as a way of stimulating patriotism and cites a whole list of honours going back several decades. There is also some evidence for the practice of honorary decrees in other *poleis* in this period. This is also reflected in the epigraphic record, which has honours such as crowns not found in the fifth century. There was also a backlash against these honours as in Demosthenes' *Against Aristocrates* and Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon*. The two topics go hand in hand - training for the youth and rewards for public service. The *polis* attempts to shape the conduct of citizens in a way it did not before in the fifth century. The culminating point of this is the reform of the *ephebeia* around 335 BCE. What was garrison duty was transformed into a system of training for the young. The most eloquent advocate of the new approach is Lycurgus in his *Against Leocrates*. But honours and training go hand and hand; the best way to promote civic peace is to create good citizens by training and incentives, not just by the threat of punishment. These two trends expand into the rest of Greece. As Chankowski shows, the *ephebeia* spreads from Athens to the rest of the Greek world in the third and second centuries BCE.

Another development is the state taking over gymnasia and instituting gymnasiarchs to supervise youth (see the Beroia law and several others). And the honorary habit spreads at the same time and in conjunction with the expansion of public education. And where are statues erected? In the gymnasium, showing the relationship between the two trends. Ma studies the development in statues but does not see its origins. What this shows is that the *polis* not only continued to exist after Chaeronea, but also continued to develop after Chaeronea. The *polis* of 200 BCE was similar to the *polis* of 450 BCE in some ways but not in others. This would help us to get beyond the pointless debate about democracy vs. oligarchy in the Hellenistic world, which ignores common features. Thus the ephebarchic law with its obsessive concern for training and regulating the youth has its roots in the fourth century in Athens, not in the Macedonia of Philip V.

5. Identities and change - Ioannis Xydopoulos (Thessaloniki)

The construction of an ethnic identity often presupposes a specific territory; yet pre-modern societies display features that transcend our mental horizons, which have been shaped by modern national states and identities. Regarding the ancient Greek city-states, for instance, an individual's identity could be defined in multiple and not necessarily compatible ways; cultural, political and social boundaries were as alive in people's minds as were geographical ones. But what was the case in the complex entities called *ethne*, such as the Macedonians? Identity is equally a cultural product, subject to complex historical processes. While modern identities presuppose a specific imaginary feeling of participation in a national entity, pre-modern identities were more often constructed on the basis of allegiance to a certain centre of power. Besides, they emerged as the result of a perceived differentiation between "us" and "others". Regarding identity, labelling material traits as 'ethnic' is tempting, but it is also dangerous. In this paper I will argue in favour of the opinion that members of a group conceive of themselves as a community by adopting common traits which distinguish them from the others, by using the expansion of the Macedonians in the 7th and 6th centuries as a case study.

6. Social change - Kostas Vlassopoulos (Crete)

The study of social change in ancient Greece has been dominated by three narratives. The first narrative concerns the rise, decline and fall of the archaic aristocracies and their gradual substitution by new classes in a process that is usually conceived as the democratization of the aristocratic values and modes of life. The second narrative concerns the growing role of slavery in archaic Greece and the substitution of societies with slaves, in which slaves are few and play limited economic roles, by slave societies, where slavery is the main source of elite revenue. The third narrative focuses on fourth-century and Hellenistic crisis and anomie.

The narrative of fourth-century crisis was already challenged during the 1980s; in the course of the last decade, the other two narratives have also been finally exploded as a result of the combined work of various scholars. We are in urgent need of creating a novel narrative of Greek social change that can take into account the development of the field and the emergence of new approaches. Social change is usually conceived as significant change in the various social structures (structural change). This is undoubtedly an element of Greek social change, and we need to debate the extent to which there were major changes in social structures in the course of Greek history. At the same time though, we need to consider an alternative phenomenon: the existence of major social changes in the life courses of tens of thousands of people even without changes in the major social structures (conjunctural change). In order to explore the relationship between structural and conjunctural change in Greek history, we shall explore the entanglements between various factors and their historical development: the various contexts of social action; resources; social groups and their identities; and patterns of sociality and lifeways.

7. Economic Change – David Lewis (Edinburgh)

What caused the economies of ancient Greek communities to change? In the last decade and a half, much has been written on the question of (positive) growth; that is, economic change in the direction of greater wealth and prosperity (e.g. Morris 2004; Bresson 2016). Explanations for this change typically emphasise factors close to the hearts of neoclassical and institutionalist economists: the division of labour and regional specialisation (Bresson 2016); republican state formation and the suppression of rent-seeking practices (Ober 2015); the enforcement of private property rights; the provision of third-party enforcement of contracts; institutions that record title to land (Harris 2016); institutions that foster the dissemination of accurate information on products and prices; various institutions that lower transaction costs for merchants (e.g. Bresson 2016; Manning 2019; Terpstra 2019; but cf. Osborne 2009 for cultural factors).

The aim of this paper is to map out the causal factors that historians have focused on for economic growth, and to supplement them by exploring the contribution of slavery to archaic growth (cf. Vlassopoulos 2016; Porter 2019). My argument comprises two prongs. First, I argue against [Aristotle]'s claim (*Athenaion Politeia* 2.1-3) that the Athenian elite in 594/3 owned all of the land in Attica, and that the *demos* were tenant sharecroppers. These details are unlikely to derive from archaic sources, but from normative Aristotelian ideas about the economic basis of extreme oligarchy (*Politics* 1292a-b). Disbelieving [Aristotle] on this point removes the only detailed episode of archaic elites using the *demos* as a mass source of forced labour. I follow the growing trend of seeing the *demos* in archaic societies not as weak and at the mercy of all-powerful elites, but as collectively powerful and liable to riot if trodden on too often (van Wees 2008). The second prong of my argument is that slavery had always been the go-to option of archaic elites looking for forced labour (Harris 2012), and that institutional aspects of slavery (*viz.* the fact that slaves are property) allowed the expansion of forms of production into which it would have proved difficult for elites to frog-march the *demos* in large numbers, esp. silver mining. The monetisation of Greece did not, *pace* Descat (2006), drive the emergence of 'slave society.' Rather, the availability of slavery enabled the spread of monetisation, a key facilitator of economic growth in the Aegean world. In so doing, I argue for a more complete picture of the range of causal factors driving change and growth in Aegean Greece.

8. Maritime change - Vincent Gabrielsen (Copenhagen)

Ancient Greek maritime history has been and continues to be a relatively thriving field of research. However, even a cursory look at the existing publications will reveal that 'maritime' is practically split in two different compartments which are kept separate: the one is the world of the warship, the other that of the merchantman. Studies in Classical Greek and Hellenistic navies (**Classical Greek** (= Athenian): Jordan 1975; Gabrielsen 1994; van Wees 2013; O'Halloran 2019. **Hellenistic**: Tarn 1930; Hauben 1975, 1990; Murray 2012; Kleu 2016), sea-power (Wallinga 1982; Starr 1989; Baltrusch et al. 2016; Kopp 2017), shipbuilding techniques (Morrison & Williams 1968; Morrison et al. 2000; L. Basch 1987), shipsheds (Blackman et al. 2013; Lovén et al. 2011) and the practicalities of seafaring (Casson 1971/1994 and 1959/1991; Meijer 1986) interact very

little with studies focusing on maritime (i.e. trade and religious) networks (Leidwanger & Knappett 2018, with Leitwanger et al. Manifesto, online; Brun 1996; Constantakopoulou 2007, 2017), connectivity or ‘small worlds’ (Malkin 2011)—in which harbours (Oleson & Hohlfelder 2011; Pison & Schmidts 2014; Ford 2011), shipwrecks (Parker 1992; Strauss 2013), distribution of goods (Chankowski, Lafon & Virlovet 2018), communication (Arnaud 2005; Leidwanger 2013) and mobility (Moatti 2004; Preisler-Kapeller & Daim 2015) are investigated with the purpose of discovering the scale and patterns of private economic activity. Thus, as well as being a ‘Corrupting Sea’ (Horden & Purcell 2000) and an ‘Open Sea’ (Manning 2018), our part of the Mediterranean—judging from the way it is studied, at least—is also a ‘Split Sea’.

The present paper proposes to integrate these two aspects into a single interpretative endeavor of maritime change in the Aegean, ca. 500-ca. 150 BC. Changes will be detected in two principal areas. **A.** The appearance (in the 5th cent.) and development of the Monopolistic State and the Tax State, demonstrated through the interactive processes of (i) state-formation and market-formation, and (ii) taxation and maritime protection. **B.** The incipient (and successful) experimentation from the 4th cent. onwards with firm-like modes of organisation in the pursuit of maritime profit. Most central here are two interconnected changes: (i) the traction which the habit of ‘syndication’ gained among private economic actors, and (ii) the creation, by this process, of the very circumstances out of which grew (and spread) the full-fledged trade network, in its formal as well as informal configurations (4th-2nd cent.).

9. The Archaic narrative - Marek Węcowski (Warsaw)

The goal of this paper is, first, to follow wider historical narratives comprehending historical change in the archaic period and then, hopefully, to suggest a new agenda for a conceivable ‘archaic narrative’ nowadays. For a historian, the archaic period is a much more theoretical, or model-oriented historical concept than other periods in ancient Greek history. Earlier models, or past ‘big narratives’, die hard, both as our semi-conscious sources of inspiration and as serious intellectual challenges even for those working in entirely different scholarly paradigms and using (partly) different historical methods. For my present purpose, I will briefly focus on the post-war scholarship, starting with the path-breaking article by Alfred Heuss, *Die archaische Zeit Griechenlands als geschichtliche Epoche* (1946).

The new agenda I will try to come up with to conclude my paper has two aspects, which I posit can be seen as complementary. On the one hand, despite recent attempts at problematization of such historical notions as ‘citizenship’ or ‘aristocracy’, too little attention has been given to the phenomena of social mobility within individual socio-political communities of the time. On the other hand, our present-day scholarship has long abandoned holistic approaches to the study of this period. What has progressively dominated the field is a sceptical vision of local particularisms so deep that they actually preclude any historical generalization regarding archaic Greek history. Still, I believe our current task is to strike a balance between the particular and the unifying in the archaic Greek history and to define the social phenomena responsible for maintaining its uniformity as a peculiar ‘cultural conglomerate’.

10. The Classical narrative - Christy Constantakopoulou (Birkbeck)

I would like to focus on three broad themes when exploring the narrative of the classical period: time, space (or locality), and agency. First of all, time: how useful indeed is to talk about the classical period? However we define it (in terms of centuries, i.e. 500 to 300, or in terms of grand political - military events, i.e. 478-323), was the Greek world of the fifth century so fundamentally different than the world of the late 6th, or indeed of the world of the late fourth? In some ways, it was. Athens is the primary example for this, as it went through a radical transformation over the course of the fifth century in terms of both internal politics (democracy) and external relations (empire). But here comes one of the problems I would like to highlight, which is that on the whole by default when we talk about the classical period, we talk about the history of Athens (and at most Sparta, or a handful other great cities). Rather than the 'classical' narrative, I would like to highlight the transformation of the Greek world during the 'short' fifth century, and the impact the Athenian empire had on the Greek world during that period. Indeed, one of my main arguments is that the Athenian empire should be understood as another configuration of the longer history of exploitation and imperialism that Athens promoted in the Aegean region.

Secondly, space and locality: what geographic focus for the classical period should we be talking about? A traditional 'classical narrative' is mainly concerned about the history of Athens and Sparta during the fifth century, and Athens, Sparta, Corinth and Thebes in the fourth century (until Macedonian enters the picture and that marks the traditional end of a 'classical' narrative). Considering, however, the point about time above, and the long-lasting impact of the Athenian empire onto the history of the Aegean world, is such a geographic focus a useful way to frame our narratives? I would argue that the long history of exploitation in the Aegean by Athens had a considerable impact on the economic and cultural integration of communities and states in the region. Indeed, if I would pick one defining feature of a 'classical narrative', that would be forceful economic integration of the Aegean communities into the larger networks of exchange and consumption through the presence of Athenian imperialism. At the same time, however, we should not disregard considerable local variation and regional networks that evade traditional classical narratives. This tension between local and regional variation and the impact of imperialism, as well as the events of grand narrative, should inform how we produce classical narratives. Finally, agency: how much agency is a defining feature of our narrative? What choices did smaller communities in the Aegean have when faced with the bigger political events of the fifth and fourth centuries? Do we even have the sources to write about these choices and include those voices in our narrative?

Inevitably, what I am putting forward is a narrative of greater complexity and no easy solutions. The lack of sources, especially for the fifth century, as well as the traditional emphasis on key cities and historical agents is a hindrance. But what we can gain is richness and diversity and a stronger sense of historical continuation. Rather than 'change', a longer historical focus, which emphasises geographic diversity and local variation, reveals the continuation of patterns between the sixth and third centuries, and highlights that away from the Braudelien 'history of events', a narrative approach that

adopts Braudel's 'middle duration' can tell us much about habits and everyday life of the Aegean Greeks.

11. The Roman narrative - Nikolaos Giannakopoulos (Athens)

The history of the Aegean World under Roman rule has quite early attracted the attention of modern scholars, although there were no great wars or major political upheavals to narrate. From the late 19th century to the mid-20th century a series of synthetic studies mutinously explored Greek municipal life, Roman provincial administration and economic conditions in Roman Greece and Asia Minor. From the 1970's onwards, the growing interest in the phenomenon of euergetism and later in public rituals, combined with an explosion of prosopographical studies, produced numerous thematic and regional studies which have examined in detail issues relating to the role of local notables and their interaction with the Roman authorities. In this respect, political and social institutions have been increasingly studied as dynamic adaptable structures and as elements of political culture. The literary 'high culture' has been also examined as an expression of anxieties corresponding to the particularities of its own age. Moreover, keeping pace with wider developments in historical studies, considerable progress has been made in areas such as the role of women in domestic and public life, the conditions in the countryside in terms of land-holding and patterns of settlement and the relation between town and country.

Clearly, a great number of historical developments in the Aegean World under Roman rule have been approached from an equally rich variety of angles. Thus, distinguishing comprehensive historical narratives is rather difficult, although general interpretative schemata in particular areas of studies are both discernible and influential. An interesting example concerns the nature and the character of the Greek *polis* under Roman rule as a complex socio-political entity. The prevailing 'orthodoxy' of an elite-dominated polis has been partly challenged by recent studies which, without rejecting the movement towards 'oligarchization' or 'aristocratization', have nonetheless highlighted both formal and informal ways in which 'ordinary' citizens could exercise their own political influence. The aim of this paper is to offer a brief critical assessment of both the 'elite-dominated *polis*' approach and of the nuances that the aforementioned studies are bringing to it.

12. Change in the literary sources - Paola Ceccarelli (UCL)

I will begin by asking where we should look for change in literary texts - a change that we might then possibly plot onto or, better, correlate with historical change, more broadly conceived. An important premise is that change is predicated on continuity - that is, in order to assess change, we need to look at series of texts as organised according to specific characteristics, so that an element of continuity may serve to highlight the change (I am expressly avoiding the term 'genres', even though that is the prevalent form of classifying literary material); otherwise, we'll have something simply different (something also worth looking into). And the criteria for the sorting and the selecting of data will inevitably influence the result. A (non exhaustive) list of loci of change in literary texts could start from formal changes, such as changes in versification, or in the form of prose (ring composition versus straight line, *lexis eioromene* and *lexis katestrammene*). Then,

there are choices – and changes – at the level of the terms used, both at the level of important concepts and at the level of ‘everyday’ vocabulary. Next, given the mutual implication of text and context, we might consider changes in media of communication and in performance settings. And at this point, we have to look at content and genre: what is told, when, how, by and to whom. For all of these changes, when taken separately, description is relatively easy. What is really difficult is to explain why the changes occurred, and to correlate all of these levels of change between themselves and to the historical situation, not least because literary sources, as well as being historical ‘documents’ at some level, also carry the idiosyncratic choices of their authors and the way in which authors position themselves and intervene into the discursive traditions and the socio-political settings within which they are working. A look at the lines along which histories of Greek literature have been written so far shows that the various levels of change tend to be treated separately – for understandable reasons – and that depending on the period of activity and the bent of the writer one factor or the other tends to be privileged, with communicative contexts being the most recent ‘fashion’. I shall close with a glance to recent discussions on whether it is possible to write a ‘history of Greek literature’.

13. Material culture change - Robin Osborne (Cambridge)

That the material culture with which people surround themselves does not stay static is the basis of the whole practice of archaeology. But for all the long study devoted to describing change, why change occurs remains in many cases mysterious. Scholars are no longer happy to conjecture an invasion every time the style or content of the material culture found at a particular place changes, and waves of influence have been replaced by frenzies of emulation, but why any particular group chooses to emulate a particular other group at a particular moment remains often obscure. This paper attempts to think through the various ways in which material culture varies, and how changes in material culture relate to other historical changes. I shall argue that the multiple characteristics of materials guarantee that change is always underdetermined, and that the excess of signification carried by the material is crucial to ensuring that the consequences of changes in material culture are unpredictable and the cycles of emulation irregular.

14. Monetary change - Katerina Panagopoulou (Crete)

Forming part of material culture, money is a category whose emergence and development through to the Roman period can be placed under the microscope in conjunction with at least some of Davies’ five predominant factors of change: the exceptional individual; population; the environment; the supernatural; convertible resources; and memory, imagination and identity. The present paper aims to show how and to what extent the nature of monetary transactions changed from the Archaic through to the Roman period. In order to achieve this, I will explore patterns of monetary change in time and space by focusing on the following case studies:

1. the introduction of coinage as a technological innovation (or a “monetary revolution”): the Lydian electrum coinage in the name of “Phanes” in its contemporary setting;

2. the Attic weight standard: formation, change and resilience through to the first century BC;
3. the emergence of credit in the Classical and Hellenistic periods within the realm employing the Attic weight standard;
4. the spread of Attic-weight coinage through space: interpreting the hoard evidence distribution for the Attic-weight coinages; markers of major changes in this pattern.

Within the above examples, by putting the emergence and development of coinage (and of its special features) together with that of credit, tokens, i.e. coin-shaped objects in Athens and elsewhere, forgeries, imitations of mainstream issues, institutions or laws regulating the employment and spread of money or imposing *prostima*, I shall explore the structural effects inflicted by diverse forms of change, political, economic, institutional, legal and other, upon the broadest monetary system, dominated by the Attic weight standard. I shall also examine the diffusion patterns of Attic-weight coinage through time, in order to understand the underlying mechanisms.

15. Religious change - Manuela Mari (Bari)

In Greek religion there is a natural tension, more than a contradiction, between conservatism and the upholding of tradition, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the elasticity and openness to change that characterize Greek religion, similarly to all other polytheistic religions. Every polytheistic pantheon is the result of successive additions and expansions and is therefore subject to constant change. At the same time, the introduction of a new cult, or of new sacrifices and ceremonies in a pre-existing cult, must be done appropriately for it to be accepted and not experienced as traumatic.

The aspects of ‘religious change’ that available documents allow us to grasp more clearly in ancient Greek history are the following:

1) the evolution of the *pantheon* of a colony (*apoikia*) as a symptom of its status as an autonomous city, and at the same time of its relations with the mother land; the evolution of the religious landscape of a *polis* resulting from the synoecism of pre-existing centers or (particularly in the Hellenistic age) from the transformation of a military settlement (*katoikia*) into an actual *polis*;

2) the evolution of the relations between a city and its ‘*poliad deity*’ in specific historical phases, and the emergence of new cults meant to assure protection to a city and its territory (including the cults offered to the Hellenistic rulers, their family members, and their *philoi*);

3) the introduction of new celebrations and festivals, or the expansion and re-organization of previous ones, marking specific moments in the history of a community; the transformation into regular occurrences of festivals originally conceived as one-time or exceptional events;

4) the importance of oracular interventions (especially Delphic ones) to ensure a ‘non-traumatic’ transition in the case of religious changes at a local level (introduction of new cults and/or priesthoods, re-organization of festivals, introduction of new rules for the celebration of a rite, and so on);

5) the often uncertain border between legitimate and socially accepted changes in religious customs (such as, for example, the ones sanctioned by the intervention of an oracle), and, on the other hand, modifications of traditional religious customs and introduction of new cults perceived as unacceptable, and open to the accusation of *asebeia* ('impiety').

6) the emergence in the course of time of certain festivals and sanctuaries over others as foci of regional, 'federal' or even pan-Hellenic cults, in response to the need (non solely religious) for a wide range of neighbouring communities.

While it will not be possible to deal in detail with all these questions, for each of them a few exemplary cases will be discussed, mostly from a strictly local perspective, the ideal one for the study of ancient Greek religion.