Introduction

JONATHAN R. W. PRAG AND JOSEPHINE CRAWLEY QUINN

The Hellenistic West: provocation, posturing or, as we will argue, a useful paradox? We are not trying to create a new sub-discipline or regional history, and it will become clear that we would not be entirely happy to see the term embedded in academic discourse. Crucially, this is not a volume about the Hellenisation of the western Mediterranean. Instead, the overriding motivation for instituting the seminar, workshop and conference panels which underlie this set of papers was our disquiet at the persistence of the historiographical tradition of the 'Greek East and Roman West', and the negative effect this has had on attempts to write history both of and in the Mediterranean. It is this binary tradition which creates our paradoxical title for a volume concerned, loosely, with the western half of the Mediterranean in the last four centuries BC, in deliberate contrast to work on the western Mediterranean under Rome, or the eastern Mediterranean under the Hellenistic kingdoms. We wanted to decentralise Greek and Roman narratives in the study of the ancient Mediterranean – without deemphasising them. The absence of such a study seemed to us to call for redress; it also raised questions about the categories we think in, including 'Hellenistic' and 'West'. Before briefly advertising our collective response, we shall examine the problems of these particular categorisations in more depth.

East and West

In general terms, the gap between the Greek East and the Roman West that concerned us is easily illustrated in the latest companions and handbooks. Works on the Hellenistic world rarely extend westwards of the Adriatic or Cyrenaica.[1] Works on the Roman Republic are only concerned with a

[1] Examples of limited engagement: Shipley 2000: 51–2 on Agathocles, 368–99 on Rome and Greece; Erskine 2003a has one chapter (E. Dench 'Beyond Greeks and Barbarians: Italy and Sicily in the Hellenistic Age') and cf. Fig. 2.1 for a map that stops at the Adriatic and Fig. 4.1 for a map of 'Italy and the West' in which Italy is in fact 'the West'; Bugh 2006a has no map that extends beyond the Adriatic and no specific section on anything west of Greece.

region once it comes under Roman rule and, outside of specialised studies of a region such as the Iberian peninsula, the general narrative of Rome and the West is itself narrowly focused upon the clash with Carthage as precursor to the clash between Rome and the eastern Greek world (as indeed already in Polybius).[2] The second edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History* demonstrates the point perfectly: vol. VI, *The Fourth Century BC*, ranges extremely widely indeed; but with vol. VII a split occurs. VII.i, *The Hellenistic World*, has a chapter on 'Agathocles', but otherwise nothing west of mainland Greece or Ptolemaic Egypt; VII.ii, *The Rise of Rome to 220 BC*, is focused entirely upon Rome and Italy with the very limited exception of chapters on 'Pyrrhus' and 'Carthage and Rome'. The world outside of the Hellenistic kingdoms and the Roman Republic essentially ceases to exist in the course of the fourth century, until or unless it comes into contact with the Macedonian spear or Roman sword.

Of course, one should not criticise histories of *x* for not being histories of *y*. But it remains curious that in a post-colonial, post-modern world, in which the concepts of both Romanisation and Hellenisation have been challenged for several decades, a world in which the broader division between East and West – conveniently labelled 'Orientalism' – has been undermined and the prioritisation of Greco–Roman culture repeatedly called into question, this particular strait-jacket remains. Attempts to overcome it are not new, and our title consciously echoes the now-classic conference volume of 1976, *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*.[3] But even the increasingly sophisticated approaches to 'Hellenism' in Italy inspired by that work ultimately served to perpetuate the Greek East/Roman West dichotomy and to prioritise eastern Hellenism.[4] More recent work has extended that particular vision and placed greater emphasis upon local

[2] The chapters in Flower 2004 offer a typical sequence: expansion in Italy, the wars with Carthage, and 'Rome and Greek world'; the same narrative can be found also in Eckstein 2006 (esp. 118–80, Italy and Carthage) whose aims are in principle grander. J. Richardson 1986 is a fine example of a regional Romano-centric study. Van Dommelen and Gómez Bellard 2008 are almost unique in offering a non-Romano-centric study of the western Mediterranean basin in this period.

[3] Zanker 1976a. The same problem is implicit in the provocative observation of Pollitt 1993: 103: 'This symposium has provoked a number of interesting reflections on the role of frontiers in the Hellenistic world. The chief fountain of inspiration for the artists of the Hellenistic period was understandably old Greece, but to the extent that they were affected by frontiers, I think it can be asserted that the most influential one was not the Sudan or the Hindu Kush; it was the Tiber.'

[4] Bilde *et al.* 1993 is perhaps the closest in spirit to our enterprise: the editors note (p. 10), after the work of Champion, that 'there is no such thing as simple polarity and distinction between a centre and a periphery', and that there is a need 'to accommodate not only the dynamics of change, but also the differing views, past as well as present, on the presumed centres and peripheries'.

cultures in response to Hellenisation and/or Romanisation.[5] Indeed, the increased emphasis upon local and material culture studies has resulted in an increasing deconstruction of the pre- and post-Rome narratives at the local level.[6] The recent focus upon Carthage and the Punic world has likewise had a decentralising effect (below, n. 24). However, it is not obvious to us that the overarching model has altered, nor the dichotomy weakened, and one of our explicit aims has been to challenge the pervasive meta-narrative of ancient history which separates Mediterranean history into East and (then) West, and presents Rome as a successor to the eastern Hellenistic kingdoms.[7]

Hellenistics

Our other major aim was to use the western context to investigate the ambiguities and ultimately the value of the term 'Hellenistic', traditionally and variously used in a chronological, politico-institutional or socio-cultural sense. The adjective has its ultimate origins in the noun ἑλληνισμός (*hellenismos*), famously first deployed in 2 *Maccabees* 4.13 (of which the subsequently epitomised original is generally thought to be later second century BC), and already there carrying the sense of

[5] So, for example, Torelli 1995 prioritises the responses of local cultures in Italy in response to Rome, building explicitly on Zanker 1976a and others, but the papers collected in *Pallas* 70 (2006) mark in many respects a repeat of the model of Zanker's *Hellenismus* colloquium: the subject matter is narrowly 'Hellenisation', rather than the broader questions of interaction, regionalism and periodisation; the focus is chronologically very limited, and the principal extension is the increased reference to Carthage in tandem with Rome. Further recent work in the same general direction can be found in Osanna and Torelli 2006. Colivicchi 2011 shifts the focus slightly, albeit in an ultimately Romano-centric fashion and with a narrow concentration on Italy (plus two papers on Sicily). Curti *et al.* 1996: 181–8 (esp. the final paragraph of 188) still offers one of the most nuanced responses to the issues. For an up-to-date treatment of Italy in this period, both in terms of evidence and conceptual approaches, see now Wallace-Hadrill 2008.

[6] Although 'Romanisation' has undergone very extensive deconstruction in the last two decades, volumes such as Keay and Terrenato 2001 maintain the underlying model of the (post-conquest) 'Roman West'. Van Dommelen and Terrenato 2007 has more in common with our aims and approach, but it is still couched in terms of 'the differences between the ways in which both different regions became part of the Roman Republic and how different social and economic groups within these regional communities were incorporated in the new Republican setting' (introduction, p. 7). There is a convenient overview of historiographical issues associated with Italy in this period in Dench 2003: 295–8; cf. Campagna 2003c on Sicily.

[7] Firmly maintained and so reinforced, whether intentionally or not, by e.g. Scheidel *et al.* 2007: the only chapter specifically on the 'western Mediterranean' is 'The Iron Age in the western Mediterranean', thereafter sections examine 'Classical Greece', 'The Hellenistic States', 'Early Italy and the Roman Republic', etc. (cf. Archibald *et al.* 2011: 12).

'the Greek way of life', rather than the narrower language-based signification which was primary in the earlier use of ἑλληνίζειν (*hellénizein*, e.g. Thucydides 2.68).[8] 'Hellenism' thus in broad terms designates the Greek way of life, and that meaning, at least in English, has never been lost. However, famously, the nineteenth-century German scholar Johann Gustav Droysen gave the German equivalent *Hellenismus* a rather more particular focus, both in terms of content and chronology. Droysen developed an idea of *Hellenismus* as fusion between Greek and non-Greek, principally in the period between Alexander the Great and Jesus Christ, which led to the increasing formalisation of the 'Hellenistic' period as the period of *Hellenismus*.[9] But Droysen himself was unclear about the chronological and geographical limits of the concept, even if he was clear on the particular significance of the period between Alexander and Christ (for geographical reasons as much as anything else, of which more below). The terminology of Hellenism has the potential to extend forwards and backwards so far as elements of Greek-speaking civilisation are involved.[10] This is perhaps more obvious in English, where there is a real reluctance to treat 'Hellenism' as equivalent to (Droysen's) *Hellenismus* and so to limit its significance to the period traditionally known as Hellenistic.[11] By denying the potential equivalence, however, one also denies the ambiguity present in both the terms Hellenism and *Hellenismus*, in Droysen no less than elsewhere, and by extension in the term Hellenistic. After all, no claim about Hellenism or about Hellenising, whether linguistic or cultural, makes much sense except in relation to something which can be described by someone as more or less non-Greek.

In the face of such ambiguities, and the general trend for deconstruction of which this volume is but another example, historians of the Hellenistic period seem increasingly content to adopt 'an honest definition of the hellenistic world in plain language . . . [in terms of its primary constituant

[8] For the date of 2 Maccabees, e.g. Habicht 1976: 170–5.

[9] Trenchant summaries of the topic by Walter Eder, s.v. 'Hellenism', in *Brill's New Pauly, Antiquity*, Leiden, 2005, VI, cols. 85–6 and Simon Hornblower, s.v. 'Hellenism, Hellenization', in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd edn revised), Oxford, 2003, 677–9. See also Wallace-Hadrill and Bispham's Chapters 2 and 3 (this volume), on Droysen and Hellenism, as well as, classically, Momigliano 1970 and Bichler 1983.

[10] Noted already, e.g., by Préaux 1978: 5–6.

[11] Typical example of rejection, without further explanation, in Bugh 2006b: 1; contrast the earlier reverse approach in Tarn and Griffith 1952: 1, n. 1, claiming that 'Hellenism' is the mis-formed noun from 'Hellenistic' (rather than the unwieldy 'Hellenisticism'). There is an instructive parallel here in the absence from modern English usage of the noun 'Punics', from the adjective 'Punic', which has similarly led to considerable terminological confusion (cf. Aubet 2001: 12–13; Prag 2006: 4–7).

element] namely the highly distinctive group of inter-marrying and warring dynasts that presided over it, both directly and indirectly'.[12] Nothing wrong with that, but if so narrowly defined then Hellenistic history indeed runs in parallel to Roman Republican history (and Romanisation), and everything else is left out. However, Hellenistic historians tend to want to have their cake and to eat it, since the period is often presented as distinctive culturally, socially and economically as well as politically; here Droysen's *Hellenismus* – and Hellenism – resurface, and this is where the difference with Roman Republican history is most apparent. Tellingly, in the chapters which cover these other elements in works on the Hellenistic world, the geographical focus tends to be much broader than in the rest of the volume.[13]

Yet Droysen, who gets blamed for so much, did not intend a narrow geographical limitation to his Hellenistic world: the opening pages of volume three of his paradigm-shifting history make this abundantly clear.[14] For Droysen, the 'West' was the Mediterranean, all the way to the bounds of Ocean; the 'East' was the Iranian plateau, from the Syrian, Asia Minor and Caucasus mountains all the way to the Indus. The reason why the period from Alexander to Christ was so important, culturally, was because it was for Droysen the crucial period when the boundary between this East and West was broken down, only to be re-formed as the opposition between Rome and Parthia established itself.[15] This indeed resulted in a model where the important boundary between East and West shifted westwards into the Mediterranean: 'the old opposition between Asia and Europe' was overturned – in fact reversed – with the developing cultural

[12] Ogden 2002b: x–xi, echoed approvingly by Lane Fox 2011: 4; cf. Shipley 2000: 3, 'an investigation of the effects of Macedonian conquest upon Greece and the Near East'.

[13] So to take two of the more narrowly defined recent works: in Bugh 2006a, John Davies on economies summarises the '"main lines" of Mediterranean exchange' with a list of routes that goes from the Black Sea to the far western Mediterranean, including Carthage and Etruria, and looks wholly at odds with the volume as a whole (p. 78); Peter Stewart on art puts the houses of Sicilian Morgantina alongside those of Delos (p. 166, 178), although Sicily barely features in the volume otherwise; and in Ogden 2002a, Westgate on mosaics devotes considerable space to e.g. Morgantina, while ranging from Spain to Afghanistan. In similar vein, it is rather striking that the cover illustration of Flower 2004 (*Companion to the Roman Republic*) should be the famous Nilotic mosaic from Praeneste (baldly described in the cover note as 'Roman' and only picked up in any meaningful way in Ann Kuttner's chapter on art; Egypt otherwise warrants about two paragraphs).

[14] In the following reference is made to and quotations taken from the three-volume German second edition of 1877–8, which united Droysen's original history of Alexander (1833) with his two-volume history of the period 323–220 BC (1836 and 1843).

[15] See the concluding chapter in this volume by Purcell for a much more detailed reconsideration of history in the period in these geographical terms.

divide for Droysen being first that between Punic West and Greek/Hellenistic East, followed by a three-way division as Rome rises between Punic West and Hellenistic East.[16] Droysen nevertheless went on to devote more pages to the western Mediterranean than we have found in any later history of the so-called Hellenistic world, as part of a vision which was concerned to map the evolution of both East and West (in his broad definition) in relation to and under the influence of Hellenism. Pyrrhus' expedition into Italy and Sicily requires a chapter by itself, precisely because 'with the war against Pyrrhus, Rome entered the sphere of major political relationships, which, bound up with the Punic name and that of *Hellenismus*, extended from the Pillars of Hercules to the Ganges'.[17] Very strikingly, it is Polybius 1.3.3–4 that Droysen chooses to quote in full in the course of a set of remarks concluding the introductory chapter to volume III, which range from Rome and Carthage, through Lagid and Seleucid actions, and the formation of Parthian and Greek Bactrian empires, to the Pergamene and northern dynasties:

> Previously the doings of the world had been, so to say, dispersed, as they were held together by no unity of initiative, results, or locality; but ever since this date history has been an organic whole, and the affairs of Italy and Libya have been interlinked with those of Greece and Asia, all leading up to one end.

Droysen follows this up by noting again that '. . . a great coherence embraces political relations from the Pillars of Hercules to the Indus . . .'[18] Droysen, like Polybius, and in contrast to most subsequent Hellenistic history, had space for Rome, Carthage and further west still, in a vision of the *oikoumene* that was explicitly greater than that of the Macedonian conquests alone:

> . . . they [the Macedonians] still left the greater part of the inhabited world in the hands of others. For not once did they attempt to lay claim to Sicily, Sardinia or Libya, and as to Europe, if one is to be blunt about it, they did not even know of the most warlike peoples of the West.[19]

It would of course be wholly futile to deny that within this grand historical vision Hellenism still has pride of place: Droysen's view of Rome is more explicit than Polybius', with the ensuing narrative ultimately couched in

[16] Droysen 1877–8: III, 6: 'Rome drove itself like a wedge between Punic West and Hellenistic East'.
[17] Droysen 1877–8: III, 183.
[18] Droysen 1877–8: III, 114–15; note moreover that Droysen's *symploke* (to use the Polybian term) is on display a whole century earlier than Polybius'. See Erskine (Chapter 1 in this volume) and Quinn 2013 for a fuller discussion of the Polybian presentation.
[19] Polyb. 1.2.5–6 (trans. Erskine, and see further Erskine in Chapter 1).

terms of the struggle of Hellenism against, *inter alia*, the 'demonic force of the Roman people'.[20] Nevertheless, the broader vision is undeniable.

Why, then, has the history of the Mediterranean world in this period, since Droysen, become ever more compartmentalised and subordinated to these grand narratives of Greece and Rome rather than less?[21] This is hardly a question we can answer in full here, but we pick out several trends and themes.

Firstly, Droysen belonged to an age when one could write entirely positively of Carthage, on a par with Rome, for instance comparing Punic policy (favourably) with the model of English imperialism in the eighteenth century.[22] As is now well-documented, the shifting fortunes of Phoenicio-Punic studies, in particular from the later nineteenth century onwards, have had consequences for how we write the history of the western Mediterranean.[23] The recent flourishing of Punic studies has so far done little to alter the broader Greek East/Roman West dichotomy, since the Punic world is itself most often constructed as a discrete Western phenomenon, focused upon Carthage and viewed in opposition to both the Greek East and the developing Roman West (as indeed it was by Droysen), while also perceived as lacking in significance, other than as one part of the Roman West, by the second century BC.[24] The continued relative isolation of Punic studies is also symptomatic of the broader problem not simply of the prioritisation of Greco-Roman culture (and in particular Greco-Roman texts), but of the more general prioritisation of textual evidence over material culture, as well as the oft-bemoaned trend towards academic specialisation and in particular the historical divisions between classical ancient history and (non-classical) archaeology. 'When no . . . texts are available it can even be hard to acknowledge that a culture

[20] Droysen 1877–8: III, 185.

[21] The striking exception, although still couched firmly in terms of Hellenism and Rome, is Grimal *et al.* 1968.

[22] Droysen 1877–8: III, 292: In the period between Pyrrhus and the First Punic War, 'the prudent and cautiously calculating [Carthaginian] government demonstrated an energy, prudence, maintenance of material resources, and ruthless sacrifice of its immense treasury, such as would subsequently only be seen in English policy of the eighteenth century'. In this respect Hornblower (n. 9 above) is a little harsh on Droysen when he places him alongside all those later writers who were Bernal's target for undervaluing the Semitic Mediterranean.

[23] See e.g. Bernal 1987: cc. 8–9; Vella 1996; Liverani 1998; Bonnet 2005.

[24] This growth in Punic studies has been marked by the rise in manuals such as Lipiński 1992, Krings 1995 or Bondì 2009a; exhibition volumes such as *I Fenici* (1988), *Hannibal ad Portas* (2004), *La Méditerranée des Phéniciens* (2007); the major quinquennial *Congresso internazionale di studi fenici e punici* (begun in Rome in 1979); and research volumes such as Van Dommelen and Gómez Bellard 2008 or Quinn and Vella (forthcoming).

exists at all in any but the anthropological sense. Yet it hardly needs pointing out that such an intellectual framework is basically colonialist.'[25] If this is a problem for Punic studies, it is an even greater problem for the study of regions such as Numidia, Iberia, Gaul or Sardinia.

Secondly, we identify a more specific historiographic trend. Arthur Eckstein has recently taken up the banner of Maurice Holleaux's powerful and hugely influential attempt to demolish the evidence for Roman political engagement with the Greek East prior to the very end of the third century BC. This is a view which takes as one of its central tenets the idea of a 'sudden emergence of deep Roman involvement in the Greek Mediterranean' – 'Rome enters the Greek East'.[26] Although Holleaux himself did not deny the existence of contact between Rome and the Greek world in general, his powerful polemic levelled against any evidence for early Roman imperial engagement with the Greek East seems to have had this as its (unintended?) consequence. Holleaux's target was the idea that Rome had a preconceived intention to extend the conquest of Italy eastwards into the Greek world.[27] To achieve this end, he began by systematically rejecting each of the supposed instances of political contact between Rome and the Greek East in the period between Pyrrhus and the First Illyrian War, beginning with the accounts of an embassy between Rome and Apollonia (on the east coast of the Adriatic) in 266 BC. The scholarly genealogy presented by Holleaux for criticism as 'les historiens modernes', 'gens d'imagination' who had accepted that and other such incidents, begins with Droysen and continues through Mommsen and Hirschfeld to 'autres encores'.[28] Droysen, in line with his pan-Mediterranean approach, regularly accepted and discussed this and many other such episodes – but he is visibly alone in the list as a non-Roman historian and, after Holleaux, it seems, that door was firmly closed.[29] Ernst Badian subsequently made a serious plea for Sicily's importance in the development of Roman imperial practices, but the

[25] Davies 1984: 263; the general refrain is common in Hellenistic handbooks (e.g. Bugh 2006b: 3), but only with reference to how to treat the East.

[26] Eckstein 2008: 6 where he makes explicit that he offers 'a view similar to Holleaux'; cf. Holleaux 1921: esp. 1–24.

[27] This is not the place to discuss the merits of Holleaux's specific arguments (see 1921: i–iv for the statement of aims); but one might note that Pyrrhus and the 'Greek' world of southern Italy, Sicily and the Gallo-Iberian litoral are spectacularly ignored. Pyrrhus, defender of 'l'hellénisme contre la barbarie', is explicitly left out of consideration because he and his predecessors 'are not relevant to the history of the Republic's foreign policy' (1921: i).

[28] Holleaux 1921: 2 at nn. 4–7.

[29] Droysen 1877–8: III, 183–4 for Apollonia; cf. e.g. III, 183 for the Ptolemaic alliance in 273 BC; III, 303–6 on East–West political relations in the context of the First Punic War; III, 387 n.1 for the Seleucid alliance with Rome at the end of the First Punic War; and III, 439–40 on Roman

failure of that particular effort may have served merely to reinforce the East-West division in analysis of Roman imperialism.[30] What is so striking in Eckstein and other such formulations, is the apparent equation of the Mediterranean world east of the Adriatic with the 'Greek Mediterranean' or the 'Hellenic world', as well as the sweeping nature of the claim, not merely political in focus (as it was in Holleaux), but seemingly absolute.[31] This division, at least in relation to Roman political history, seems to have grown stronger with time and, as we have seen, it is the grand narratives of political history which tend to set the overall framework.

Thirdly, we emphasise geography. This theme is explored more fully by Nicholas Purcell later in this volume, but it is perhaps worth highlighting the contrast between Droysen's pan-Mediterranean 'West' and the much greater emphasis in more recent work upon a Mediterranean of two halves. In the geographical sketch with which his third volume opens, Droysen contrasted the Mediterranean North and South geographically, rather than East and West.[32] In discussion of both Asian East and Mediterranean West, these grand regions are also subdivided into multiple basins – in the case of the Mediterranean, the familiar East and West.[33] But given the shifting influence of Carthage, Rome and the Hellenistic states in Droysen's subsequent account, these basins are rarely if ever rigidly defined or to be found at the centre of the analysis. By contrast, Fernand Braudel, notwithstanding his assertion of the unity of the Mediterranean region, set out 'the narrow seas, home of history' early in his work, and in particular urged very strongly the idea of a sharp geographical East–West division, formed by the Ionian Sea and the Libyan desert, a 'double zone of emptiness, maritime and continental, separating East from West'. He goes on to assert that:

relations generally in 240 BC. Note that Holleaux was invited to contribute to the first edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*.

[30] Badian 1958: 33–43, arguing in particular for Sicily's role in the development of the concept of the *ciuitas libera*, rather than leaving all the emphasis upon T. Quinctius Flamininus and the Second Macedonian War; see especially the corrective of Ferrary 1988: 5–23.

[31] Cf. Gruen 1984: 1, examining 'The earliest stages of intercourse between Roman West and Hellenic East'. Gruen of course set out to decentralise the role of Rome in an analysis of Roman imperialism and e.g. Gruen 1990 and 1992 offer sophisticated discussions of the relationship between Hellenism and Roman cultural evolution that belong in the post-*Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* tradition noted above. But the Roman West/Greek East model is not challenged, and the rest of the West remains outside the discussion (cf. 1984: 8).

[32] See esp. Droysen 1877–8: III, 4; concluding p. 6 that 'These are the geographical conditions in general overview which form the foundation for the whole course of ancient history.'

[33] Droysen 1877–8: III, 1–6, with the two Mediterranean basins mentioned (but not explicitly defined) on p. 6.

To claim that the considerable obstacles between the two halves of the Mediterranean effectively separated them from each other would be to profess a form of geographical determinism, extreme, but not altogether mistaken . . . The two halves of the sea, in spite of trading links and cultural exchanges, maintained their autonomy and their own spheres of influence. Genuine intermingling of populations was to be found only inside each region, and within these limits it defied all barriers of race, culture, or religion. All human links between different ends of the Mediterranean, by contrast, remained an adventure or at least a gamble.[34]

The occasional exceptions noted, but described as 'either short-lived or followed by the severing of connections' are Phoenician Carthage, Greek Marseilles, the Byzantines and the Arabs (Rome is conspicuous by its absence from this list). At this point Braudel's rapid historical examples are offered as a proof of the principle: history repeats itself, and is additionally confirmed by the reverse example of the crusades. But this only holds true if the underlying historical narratives are true. Braudel may have opened a new door on Mediterranean studies and may have argued for the study of the Mediterranean as a unity, but he simultaneously reinforced the narrative of Mediterranean East and West. Here too, the direction of travel has been altering in recent years: Mediterranean studies are now flourishing, and in *The Corrupting Sea* we have a significant attempt to reappraise the place of the Mediterranean in history.[35] The influence of that work will be apparent in a number of the contributions below, to which we now turn.

Papers

The papers in this volume derive from a series of meetings in Oxford, Rome and Vancouver over 2006 and 2007, followed up by a lengthy period of

[34] Braudel 1972: I, 103 and 133–5 for the various quotations; cf. 103 'The Mediterranean is not a single sea but a succession of small seas that communicate by means of wider or narrower entrances. In the two great east and west basins of the Mediterranean there is a series of highly individual narrow seas . . .'; also Fig. 10 on p. 115. The first edition in French was published in 1949. Compare in general Horden and Purcell 2000: 9–25, and for a more recent micro-study, Quinn 2011a.

[35] Horden and Purcell 2000: esp. 123–72 (building on, e.g. the work of Shlomo Dov Goitein). For Mediterranean studies, see e.g: Harris 2005a; Malkin 2005; Van Dommelen and Knapp 2010; also the journal *Mediterranean Historical Review*, founded in 1986, which began with a survey of the work of Goitein.