HERODOTOS



Hugh Bowden

Abstract

Hugh Bowden
Trinity College

D. Phil.
Trinity Term 1990

This thesis argues that sanctuaries of the gods played a significant role in the political life of the Greek polis in the archaic and classical periods, and that the politics of the period cannot be understood fully without consideration of religion. It uses the text of Herodotos as a source of evidence about the history and perceptions of the period, but also makes use of other literary and archaeological evidence, so that the resulting models may be considered generally useful for the study of the period. Ch. 1 lays out the background to the subject; ch. 2 is an analysis of the activities related to sanctuaries described by Herodotos; ch. 3 examines sanctuaries as the meeting places of federations of Greek states, as well as investigating the nature of sanctuaries as areas of bounded space, showing that political meetings were frequently, if not always, held in sanctuaries, and that this was perceived as allowing some divine influence on decisions; ch. 4 investigates the dedications made at sanctuaries by foreigners, as part of a diplomatic process, showing that they provided a means of access to the polis as well as the god; ch. 5 compares the dedication of booty at sanctuaries with the construction of the battlefield trophy; ch. 6 argues that Herodotos portrays divine intervention as always happening through sanctuaries; ch. 7 argues that Herodotos's frequent mentions of Delphi are a sign of its importance in Greek history, not his own interest; ch. 8 draws some of these ideas together and suggests some general explanations for the importance of sanctuaries, as providing symbolic control of access to the polis, and bestowing authority on decisions taken by assemblies. Finally it suggests that Herodotos's inclusion of religious matters in his histories increases his importance as a source and an historian.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements Page 5

Chapter One: Introduction Page 6
What is a sanctuary p.7 - Greek sanctuaries and the birth of the polis p.9 - Religion and politics in the archaic and classical polis p.13 - Sanctuaries in archaic and classical Greece p.16 - Herodotos p.18 - Theology and causation p.20 - Herodotos and Greek sanctuaries p.22

Chapter Two: What do sanctuaries mean to Herodotos? Page 25
References to sanctuaries in Herodotos p.26 - Descriptions of sanctuaries for their own sake p.28 - Temple building in Athens and Samos p.30 - Religious authority for founding sanctuaries p.34 - ἀρχιτέκτων p.36 - Temples as ἔργα p.38 - Sacrilege and festivals p.39 - Dedications in sanctuaries p.43 - The Spartan bowl (i. 70) p.44 - Amasis's portraits (ii. 182) and corslet (iii. 47.1-3) p.45 - Polykrates's furniture (iii. 123.1) p.46 - Mandrokles's painting (iv. 88.1-2) p.46 - The Samian tripod (iv. 152.4) p.47 - The value of gifts p.49 - Conclusion p.52 - Endnote: the dating of the Samian Heraion and the Ephesian Artemision p.54

Chapter Three: Sanctuaries and federations Page 56
The Panionion p.57 - The administration of joint sanctuaries p.60 - Sanctuaries and federations p.62 - How to become king (i): in Egypt p.64 - How to become king (ii): in Persia p.65 - Sanctuaries and space p.67 - 'Sacred' and 'secular' p.68 - Religion and colonisation p.69 - Perceptions of urban space p.73 - Alternative approaches to sacred space p.74 - Sacred space and political activity p.76 - Naukratis p.77 - Conclusion p.81

Chapter Four: The diplomatic role of sanctuaries Page 84
The problem illustrated: Kroisos and Delphi (Hdt. i. 46-92) p.84 - Foreign dedications at Greek sanctuaries p.86 - The archaeological evidence p.87 - Sanctuaries and suppliants p.89 - Diplomacy through sanctuaries p.93 - Sacrifices by foreigners p.96 - Rome and Greece p.98 - The problem restated: Kroisos and the Greeks p.101 - Conclusion p.104 - Endnote: reading through sanctuaries p.105

Chapter Five: Dedications of booty in sanctuaries Page 107
τροπαῖον p.107 - The trophies of the Persian Wars p.108 - τροπαῖον in dramatic poetry p.110 - τροπαῖον in historians p.112 - The battlefield trophy p.114 - The classical period: τροπαῖον and Zeus Tropaios p.117 - Offerings in sanctuaries p.120 - Dedications of booty in Herodotos p.122 - Relations between Greek states p.126 - The polis and the gods p.127 - Conclusion p.129

Chapter Six: Sanctuaries and divine intervention Page 131
Divine intervention in Homer p.132 - Divine Intervention in Herodotos p.134 - The difference between Homer and Herodotos p.138 - Herakles and Pan at Marathon p.139 - Guardian-heroes p.140 - Gods and their territory outside the Greek world p.144 - Conclusion p.145

Chapter Seven: Herodotos and Delphi Page 146
The role of Delphi in the archaic period p.147 - Delphi in the fifth century: the modern view p.152 - Delphi in the fifth century: the ancient view p.155 - Delphi and Herodotos's 'sources' p.160 - The 'Delphic tradition' p.163 - Conclusion p.167

Chapter Eight: Conclusion Page 169
Protecting the polis p.169 - Sanctuaries, ritual and power p.172 - A community of men and gods p.174 - Herodotos p.175

Tables Page 179
Table 1: References to Greek sanctuaries in Herodotos p.179 - Table 2: References to non-Greek sanctuaries in Herodotos p.184- Table 3: References to sanctuaries in Thucydides p.187 - Table 4: References to sanctuaries in Xenophon p.191 - Table 5: Dedications in Greek sanctuaries in Herodotos (excluding booty) p.193- Table 6: Dedications of booty in Herodotos p.195

Bibliography Page 196

Acknowledgements

This thesis has been written over a period of six years while I have been researching and teaching at three English Universities, Oxford, Leicester and London. I owe thanks in particular to my supervisors, Professor George Forrest and Professor Anthony Snodgrass. Many other people have given me advice and read drafts of chapters. They include (in alphabetical order) Anthony Andrewes, David Gill, Robin Lane Fox, Robin Osborne, Graham Shipley, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, Michael Vickers, and many others. I was able to travel around and pursue work in Greece thanks to generous grants from the Craven Committee of Oxford University, and the Research Board of the University of Leicester. I have benefited from the encouragement of colleagues at Trinity College and New College, Oxford; the Department of Classics, University of Leicester; and the Departments of Classics and History, King's College London. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the support of my family, and of my wife, Jill Bayley, without whom this thesis might have been finished somewhat sooner.

Abbreviations of ancient works are as in Liddell-Scott-Jones, Greek Lexicon; of modern works as in L'année philologique. Where no other author is indicated, references are to Herodotos.

Chapter One: Introduction

οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ἀνδραποδισάμενοι τοὺς κατέλαβον αὐτῶν, ἐνέπρησαν καὶ τὰ ἱρὰ καὶ τὴν πόλιν.

The Persians enslaved those of them that they captured, and then burned the sanctuaries and the *polis*. (Hdt. vi. 96)

τὸ δὴ μετὰ τοῦτο πρῶτον μὲν τὴν πόλιν ἱδρῦσθαι δεῖ τῆς χώρας ὅτι μάλιστα ἐν μέσῳ, καὶ τἆλλα ὅσα πρόσφορα πόλει τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἔχοντα τόπον ἐκλεξάμενον, ἃ νοῆσαί τε καὶ εἰπεῖν οὐδὲν χαλεπόν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα μέρη δώδεκα διελέσθαι, θέμενον Ἑστίας πρῶτον καὶ Διὸς καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν, ἀκρόπολιν ὀνομάζοντα, κύκλον περιβάλλοντα, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δώδεκα μέρη τέμνειν τήν τε πόλιν αὐτὴν καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν χώρην.

After this, he must establish the *polis* as near as possible to the centre of the territory, choosing a place which is as advantageous as possible for the *polis* in other respects: this is not something difficult to ascertain and explain. After that he should divide the territory into twelve parts, first setting up a sanctuary of Hestia and Zeus and Athena, and calling it the akropolis, and surrounding it with a circuit-wall; from this centre he should make the lines dividing the *polis* itself and the whole territory into the twelve parts. (Pl. Lg. 745b2-c2)

Sanctuaries of the gods were a crucial part of the Greek perception of the polis. This is a fact acknowledged by modern scholars who write about the Greek city, but the implications of it are seldom followed through.[1] The modern distinction between 'politics' and 'religion' has led scholars to examine the political structures of the Greek world as purely secular; above all, the idolisation of 'democracy' as the highest achievement of the rational mind has encouraged historians to see the Greek polis as an entirely man-oriented society.[2] In this thesis I want to show that the most important political activities of Greek communities were carried out in religious settings, and in particular in the religious space that is the sanctuary. Furthermore, I shall argue, these settings were not an empty, 'secularised', set of rituals, but

---

1 Thus, for example, V. Ehrenberg's The Greek state has a useful analysis of the Greek city, taking four pages (Ehrenberg 1960, 74-77), and then virtually ignores religion in the rest of the work.

2 The analysis of the polis as the fountainhead of Western democracy is of course politically highly charged. In particular, perhaps, the wish to establish 'democracy' as by its nature opposed to 'fundamentalism' (whether political as in Marxism, or religious as in Islam), has discouraged historians from looking for anything remotely irrational or 'religious' in the political institutions of the polis. In her book on The origins of democratic thinking (1988), C. Farrar writes about Athens in the fifth century BC: her only explicit reference to religion is the suggestion that 'In the 460s and 450s religious claims were explicitly absorbed into the sphere of secular authority' (p. 23). As we shall see, this kind of approach is inadequate.

provided a framework within which Greek citizens could relate themselves to each other and to the gods.

In the last decade a number of works have been written about the importance of sanctuaries for the development of the Greek polis at the end of the dark age. These studies have made particular use of the large amount of archaeological evidence from sanctuaries now being published. I shall investigate the importance of sanctuaries in the archaic and classical periods; instead of working primarily from the reports of archaeologists, I shall use the text of Herodotos's histories as a basis. In the thesis I shall show that the sanctuary continued to be a central element of Greek society, in political, diplomatic and military activities, as well as providing a structure through which human relations with the divine could be articulated.

In this introductory chapter I shall first outline ideas about the role of the sanctuary in the early polis, and about the place of religion in the classical polis; I shall then indicate why Herodotos provides a suitable basis for the exploration of sanctuaries in the archaic and classical periods, and explain how I shall approach the text in subsequent chapters. The next six chapters will consider aspects of the role of sanctuaries in Herodotos, and in conclusion I shall suggest some implications for the understanding of Greek politics and society.

What is a sanctuary?

I must first attempt to define what I mean by 'sanctuary'. The most useful definition is that of R. Tomlinson:

> A sanctuary was an area set aside for the uses of religion, and the cult of a particular god, or, perhaps, an associated group of gods. It had no fixed form or size, and the particular places selected as suitable localities for sanctuaries varied considerably in character. (Tomlinson 1976, 17)

The expression 'the uses of religion' needs to be carefully considered. The various uses made of sanctuaries are our subject, and one of the questions that will be raised several times is to what extent these uses are 'religious'. The term

'sanctuary' must cover some sites whose function would not necessarily be thought of as primarily religious. At Athens for example, the Pnyx was marked off by horoi and contained an altar, where religious ritual was a regular part of the proceedings (e.g. Aeschin. i.23), and the same applies to the Agora; they were, therefore, sanctuaries. However, I shall concentrate on more easily identifiable sanctuaries, and the tables listing references in historians are limited to those identified with specific gods, or where the cultic importance of the place is emphasised.

Archaeologically a sanctuary can usually be identified by the presence of certain features. Most commonly these include votive offerings, an altar or a temple building, or a boundary marker of some sort.[3]

In literary works there are a number of words that may be used to refer to a sanctuary. The basic word used by Herodotos is ἱρόν, which has a general sense of 'holy place'. It includes sanctuaries to gods and heroes, and natural features like the grove sacred to Argos (vi. 75.3). The ἱρόν includes various elements, and Herodotos uses specific words to describe them. Thus we may find altar (βωμός), temple (νηός), enclosure (τέμενος), oracle (μαντήιον, χρηστήριον) and, in the case of a heroon, tomb (τάφος). Herodotos can be very specific when detail is needed. Thus the ἱρόν of Protesilaos (vii. 35) is later described in more detail as τάφος τε καὶ τέμενος περὶ αὐτόν (ix.116.2); the sanctuary of Athena Krathia at Sybaris is described as τέμενός τε καὶ νηὸν (v. 45.1); at the sack of Miletus, the completeness of the destruction of the oracle of Branchidai is brought out by the detail: ἱρὸν δὲ τὸ ἐν Διδύμοισι, ὁ νηός τε καὶ τὸ χρηστήριον, συνηθέντα ἐνεπίμπρατο (vi. 19.3). Table 1 at the end of the thesis details the words used in the references to each sanctuary.

The word τέμενος requires some further explanation. It is sometimes used to refer to the sanctuary as a whole (e.g. Bergquist 1967), but its meaning in Herodotos is different. It can mean the enclosure around a temple or tomb (see above), but it can also refer to a separate piece of land sacred to a god or gods. Thus the τέμενος

---

[3] Although occasionally it may be difficult to distinguish between sanctuary, house or grave, but this is usually the result of poverty of material.

τῶν θεῶν at Eleusis, which Kleomenes devastated (vi. 75.3), was not the sanctuary itself, but ploughland sacred to Demeter and Kore, possibly the same land that the Megarians were later accused of cultivating, which Thucydides calls τῆς γῆς τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ τῆς ἀορίστου (Th. i. 139.2). The same is true of the τέμενος of the temple of Demeter Eleusinia at Plataia: Herodotos draws a distinction between the ἄλσος and τέμενος on the one hand, where no Persians were found killed, and the area περὶ τὸ ἱρὸν on the other, where the corpses were thickest. The τέμενος must have been quite large for the absence of corpses in it to be a θῶμα, and it cannot have been simply the temple precinct. The third temple of Demeter Eleusinia that Herodotos mentions, at Mykale, is also said by him to have a τέμενος, and we may assume that also to be a piece of land.

In this thesis I use the word 'sanctuary' to refer to any sacred site, and I take it to be equivalent to ἱρόν or ἱερόν.

Greek sanctuaries and the birth of the polis

The most important work on sanctuaries in the eighth century BC has been F. de Polignac's La naissance de la cité grecque (1984). In its wake have come other studies, including I. Malkin's Religion and colonisation in ancient Greece (1987) and C. Morgan's Athletes and oracles (1990). These works, all of which owe much to the work of A.M. Snodgrass, need to be examined in some detail.

De Polignac starts by noting that the development of the polis is closely paralleled by a movement of cult activity from naturally marked features such as groves, lakes and mountain-peaks to bounded temenea with temples and altars. He suggests that the attitude to space has changed:

> Or l'apparition du sanctuaire signifie une modification sensible de la perception de l'espace, en mettant fin d'abord à son état de relative indétermination: cet espace est désormais organisé, réparti, et la frontière nettement tracée entre sacré et profane. (de Polignac 1984, 30)

The bounded sanctuary, and the cults associated with it, provide the means for the integration of the elements of the polis. The argument is illustrated by archaeological evidence and structuralist readings of a large number of rituals and myths.

The most important element in de Polignac's account is the major extra-urban sanctuary, established on the edge of the territory of the polis; this, together with the central urban sanctuary creates a bipolar system which brings out the indisoluble link between astu and chora. This link is particularly important in agriculture and warfare, and it is made visible in processions from centre to periphery. Such processions cross the plough-land of the polis, and involve the transportation of sacrificial animals, most importantly the bull, which is the animal used in agricultural labour. It is just such a procession that is at the heart of the story of Kleobis and Biton (Hdt. i. 31): in Herodotos's story, the two men pull the priestess's cart in place of the bull, and after the feast they die, as the bull does (de Polignac 1984, 49-54). De Polignac suggests that Athens functioned differently from other poleis in not being bipolar (pp. 85-92), but it is possible to argue that the annual procession to Eleusis, which was connected with several cults concerned with agriculture, fitted this pattern.[4] The frequent dedication of military objects, and military activity in the centrifugal processions, indicate that sanctuaries were also connected with warfare. De Polignac argues that the development of hoplite warfare was closely connected with the need to defend the fertile plains in the territory of the polis. The earliest wars we know of are frontier disputes on the plains between neighbouring poleis, and in each case we find an extra-urban sanctuary at the point of conflict (p. 58).

Sanctuaries did not only provide points between which the nature of the polis was defined; they also affected social organisation by providing space within which groups met. This is crucial for understanding the development of political institutions. Sanctuaries were the places where humans could come in contact with the divine,

---

[4] This is the suggestion of C. Sourvinou-Inwood.

but also with each other; they were places of communication and a means of controlling that communication - the defined space 'mediated' relations between worshippers and worshipped and between individuals. Also, however, within the bounded space of a sanctuary, people could define themselves in relation to the cult; thus joint participation in ritual activity involved the acknowledgement of equality before the god or gods. Different groups were defined by different cults, and thus cult could exclude as well as include. Most obviously women were excluded from much ritual activity, and limited to their own cults and festivals, for example the Thesmophoria (p. 78). The organisation of the polis in terms of cult are significantly different from those that de Polignac envisages in pre-polis society, based on kinship or 'aristocratic' domination. He suggests:

> Or le développement singulier du fait religieux dans la société grecque du haut archaïsme montre que la polis est la mise en forme d'une cohésion cultuelle. Il s'est, en effet, focalisé sur des cultes non seulement protecteurs de l'intégrité et de la croissance, mais capables de réunir en une seule communauté tous les groupes ayant jusque-là vécu dans une situation de proximité géographique ou sociale sans avoir été pour autant liés par une cohésion contraignante, mais désormais englobés dans une structure stable. C'est autour de ces cultes que s'est progressivement constituée, sous la pression des circonstances, la solidarité territoriale qui appelait l'atténuation d'anciens clivages, une redéfinition des rapports entre élites locales, entre conquérants et conquis, de façon générale entre dominants et dominés. (de Polignac 1984, 83)

His conclusion is that political unification and geographic definition on the one hand, and cultic organisation on the other, are two mutually dependent developments which together led to the creation of the polis (pp. 155-156).

The study of the organisation of colonies will provide information about the place of sanctuaries in the polis. Since colonial foundations are new beginnings, their form will reveal the approaches to the division of space, and the understanding of the sacred at the time they were established. The major wave of colonisation started in the late eighth century, and is thus roughly contemporary with the development of the polis on the mainland. The subject of religion and colonisation has been investigated by I. Malkin, who devotes a chapter to the question of where sanctuaries were sited. Malkin concentrates on urban and suburban sanctuaries, because that is where the archaeological evidence is most useful. He

demonstrates that the choice of sites for sanctuaries was not controlled by what he calls 'external religious criteria' (Malkin 1987, 185) such as the pre-existence of native cult sites, or the inherent or natural 'holiness' of locations. Rather, the urban and suburban sanctuary sites are planned as part of the astu as a whole, and cannot be isolated from it. The authority to establish sanctuary sites is given to the oikist when he is appointed by Pythian Apollo, as part of his authority to set up the colony as a whole. Malkin concludes: 'the initial division of the territory, the organisation by the oikist of the private, political and religious space, was a single rationally planned act' (p. 186).[5] It is clear from this that colonists did not acknowledge separate source of political and religious authority.

A separate category of sanctuaries, the major international sites of Olympia and Delphi are the concern of Morgan. She argues that, as the idea of the polis developed, and with it political participation by a greater part of each community, inter-state sanctuaries provided places where members of the elite could continue to display their wealth and status, and compete with other individuals, in both dedications and games. These sanctuaries also made possible the communication of ideas between states, as the leading members of each polis would meet there. Morgan concludes her study like this:

> From the eighth century onwards, elite participation began to draw sanctuaries such as Olympia and Delphi into the process of state formation, and thus ensured that they became targets for later state investment. As Anthony Snodgrass has emphasised, religious pilgrimage in the early Greek world was more usually a concern for the individual than an affair of state. From the eighth century onwards, the history of inter-state sanctuaries, including the most prestigious, Olympia and Delphi, was the history of the establishment of a state framework for that pilgrimage, a fundamental part of the process of defining the role of individuals within the emerging state. (Morgan 1990, 233-234)

There are, I believe, problems in Morgan's analysis. She assumes that individual religious activity by the elite pre-dates the emergence of the polis and was constrained by it; she assumes that elite activity was to some degree opposed to

---

[5] Malkin's use of the word 'rationally' is problematic here, and I shall discuss his ideas again in chapter three.

state activity. This is not necessarily true, and it is clear from the behaviour of Miltiades (Hdt. vi. 36.1) or Alkibiades (Th. vi. 16.2) that chariot-racing at Olympia, for example, was used as a means of advancing an individual within the archaic and classical polis. It could be argued that the state provided a structure within which elite display could be put to greater use, not less. This criticism, however, does not affect the importance of Morgan's conclusion that, as poleis developed, inter-state sanctuaries were coopted as part of the political arena: they are, from the eighth century, an integral part of the political-religious organisation of Greek states.

Two important ideas emerge from this survey of work on the role of the sanctuary in the early development of the polis. First, the organisation of civic space, which is the basis of the polis, was paralleled by the organisation of religious space in the form of sanctuaries. Second, Greek political institutions did not grow up in opposition to religious pressures, but in conjunction with them.

Religion and politics in the archaic and classical polis

Having examined the role of sanctuaries in the eighth century, we can outline possible approaches to their importance in later periods. It is certainly the case that many of the ritual practices discussed by de Polignac and others continued into the classical period and beyond, and it is clear that religious activity was still a fundamental feature of the classical polis, (e.g. Osborne 1985, 154-182; Osborne 1987a, 165-192). Does this mean that religion maintained the same position as before, still inextricably bound up with political and social organisation, or was there a separation, as 'secular' forms of organisation became more important?

The idea that political changes led to the marginalisation or adaptation of Greek religion is widely held. For example, the authority of oracles may be seen to clash with democratic power:

> Perhaps public divination gave way because its function had been absorbed by other institutions... Under a radical democracy, of course, every vote is a

> referendum. The guarantee for the propriety of a decision is that it has been passed in the sovereign assembly. (Parker 1985, 323)[6]

It has been assumed, too, that 'religious' and 'political' interests may clash. This kind of interpretation is given to explain why the East halls of the Propylaia at Athens were never built:

> These halls were never erected; that towards the south was opposed by the priesthood of Artemis Brauronia, on whose precinct it would have encroached, and was therefore abandoned at an early stage. (Dinsmoor 1950, 204)

Here we are presented with opposition between the political and new in the form of Perikles's building programme, and the religious and traditional in the form of a priesthood.[7]

The clearest argument for the idea of 'secularization' is made by J.K. Davies in the Cambridge Ancient History iv[2] (1988). Like de Polignac, Davies identifies two conceptions of society, the religious and the socio-political; he talks of 'a society conceived of as embedded in cult and ritual and the same society conceived of as an autonomous political actor' (p. 370). He accepts that religious and political authority lay with the same people:

> The relationship was not one between separate entities such as "church" or "state" or whatever. Rather it turned on the different social purposes that might be served by the same group, custom or institution (p. 370).

Having said this, Davies treats religion and politics as opposing forces acting on the individual and on communities. Religious activity is driven by 'the rhythms and institutions of cult' (p. 371), and relates back to an 'original theocentric framework' (p. 388). Davies does not explain what these phrases mean; they are taken to be opposed to political autonomy. He appears to suggest that religious forces are external to human ideas and irrational, and necessarily in conflict with, or not

---

6 The role of oracles in the classical period is discussed in detail in chapter seven.

7 Whatever the merits of the general theory, Dinsmoor's explanation can be refuted convincingly on two grounds. First of all there is not a scrap of evidence to support it, and indeed it is clear that there was nothing connected to the cult of Artemis Brauronia on the site until the very end of the fifth century, well after work had ceased on the Propylaia (Osborne 1985, 155-156). Secondly, the priests of Artemis Brauronia were appointed by the Athenian demos, who were also responsible for voting for the building of the Propylaia: any possible conflict would be easily resolved by the assembly before it became a problem (Garland 1989).

'convenient' for civic organisation. Here he clearly differs from de Polignac. For Davies, sanctuaries are not places within which social organisation is constructed, but the sites of struggle between men and gods:

> Very largely, the resources needed to build sixth-century temples came from outside, from cities themselves or from the rich and powerful. Such patronage was not just piety but also an investment in civic or personal prestige and charis: to honour the god so elaborately was also to subordinate him, to dynast or to city. (Davies 1988, 388)

It can be said straightaway that Davies's explanation is a limited one. He is concerned only with religion as it affects the internal organisation of Greek poleis in the archaic period. He ignores the question of how religious practice mediated relations between citizens and what lay outside the polis - other poleis, foreigners, natural forces, etc. Any full account of Greek religion must include these.

It is important, however, to consider an alternative approach, exploring the idea that there might be harmony between religious and political authority in the polis. The most convincing account of the unity of the religious and political in an ancient city-state is that of M. Beard in 'Priesthood in the Roman republic' (1989). She concentrates on the idea of 'mediation', that is, the task of controlling communication between gods and men. This is, as we have seen, a crucial part of the way sanctuaries are perceived by de Polignac to function. Beard argues that 'the principal focus of mediation in Republican Rome was the Senate' (p. 31). Thus the major political body within the state is at the same time the major religious body. Technical tasks were carried out by pontifices, augurs and other 'priestly' groups, but authority in religious affairs lay primarily with the Senate, which took decisions based on the advice of these other groups. One striking fact confirms this view:

> The sittings of the republican Senate were never, as far as we know, subject to hindrance or interruption on religious grounds, by the declaration of ill omens or the like... The Senate, as the body which formed the focus of communication between gods and men, could not be seen as in an improper relationship with the gods; it could not logically be interrupted by an ill omen. (Beard 1989, 32-33)

Beard is concerned here with the religious authority of men and women, and not with sanctuaries. However it is important to note that the senate always deliberated within a sacred building: in republican Rome the Curia can be seen as providing a

defined space within which senators could function with each other and with the gods.

Beard's description of Roman practice can be compared with R. Garland's analysis of religious authority in classical Athens (Garland 1989). In Athens the supreme political body is the demos; if the Roman model holds for other city-states, we would expect it to be the source of religious authority too. This is the conclusion of Garland: 'it would be valid to think of the Athenian dêmos, sitting in ekklêsia (assembly) as a focus of communication between men and gods' (p. 86-87).

I have outlined two ways of explaining the relationship between the 'religious' and the 'political' in archiac and classical Greece: put simply, either they are in conflict or they are identical. For Davies, there is a change in the position of religion as it becomes subordinate to political concerns. Indeed, Davies probably would not accept the formative role that de Polignac attributes to it in the eighth century. The approach of Garland and Beard can be seen to fit with de Polignac's view, as political and religious organisation develop together.

Sanctuaries in archaic and classical Greece

The study of religion in the social and political life of the archaic and classical polis, whatever approach is taken, has tended to neglect the sanctuary. Emphasis tends to be on festivals above all,[8] that is to say, on the religious organisation of time rather than of space. Certainly studies of the Brauronia or Dionysia at Athens involve investigation of the location of sanctuaries, and the meaning of the processions to and from them, but they do this only within the context of a certain series of events within a fixed amount of time. What do sanctuaries mean in the rest of the year?

8 See for example Osborne 1985 and 1987, Goldhill 1987, Connor 1987.

Those works which do concentrate on sanctuaries tend to be interested mainly in architecture and function.[9] They may consider the question of what kind of rituals were performed, but there is little attempt to relate the sanctuary to questions of social and political organisation. A notable exception to this is R. Martin's 'L'espace dans les cités grecques' (1983). Martin argues that the organisation of space within a city, both religious and profane, was continually affected by political and philosophical pressures. He treats the astu as a whole; the limits of sacred and profane space are determined by each other, so the forces that act upon the polis must act upon both together. Thus, describing Athens after the reforms of Kleisthenes, he says:

> Les solutions mises en place dans le domaine politique trouvent leur expression concrète et matérielle dans les formes architecturales; elles s'inscrivent sur le terrain et dans le cadre urbain par l'aménagement topographique et architectural de l'espace civique que constituent tout à fois l'acropole, centre religieux, et l'agora, centre politico-religieux. (Martin 1983, 26)

The next step, which Martin does not take, is to investigate what distinguishes sacred and profane space, or why some activities take place in one sort and not the other. However, the conclusion drawn from the examination of urban planning and architecture, that sacred and profane space are bound together and controlled by the same forces, is important.

Martin is an exception. The general concentration on temple-architecture and festivals in the archaic and classical periods is in marked contrast to the concerns of those studying sanctuaries in the eighth century. This is largely because of the nature of the evidence. It is impossible to recover the temporal organisation of early sanctuaries; examination of votive offerings can reveal changes over long periods of time, but cannot distinguish festival offerings from others, for example. The existence of plentiful literary and epigraphic evidence enables scholars to investigate the division of time in the classical period, and monumental architecture remains a large area of study. This has perhaps led to the neglect of other aspects

---

9 See for example Bergquist 1967, Tomlinson 1976, Coldstream 1985.

of the sanctuary in the archaic and classical periods which literary evidence can reveal. By examining the activities of individuals and communities around sanctuaries, we may gain a greater understanding of their importance, and the importance of 'religious' matters in the polis. It is on this subject that historians, and Herodotos in particular, become important.

Herodotos

Herodotos's histories provide a particularly fertile ground for the study of sanctuaries, because he mentions so many.[10] Herodotos makes 294 references to a total of 102 different Greek sanctuaries. In addition there are 67 references to 32 non-Greek sanctuaries. Virtually all of these non-Greek sanctuaries are given the names of Greek gods, and some feature in the text as if they were Greek. Herodotos's stories involving non-Greek sanctuaries can sometimes cast light on the function of Greek ones.[11] This thesis concentrates on the Greek sanctuaries. If we compare Herodotos with Thucydides, whose work is approximately the same length, we find that he has 134 references to 57 sanctuaries, less than half as many. Xenophon's Hellenica is approximately half as long as Thucydides and Herodotos, and contains 57 references to 33 sanctuaries; length for length, these figures are comparable to those for Thucydides.

There are several possible explanations for the discrepancy between Herodotos and later historians. One obvious difference is the length of time their histories cover. Although Herodotos's avowed theme is the conflict between Greece and Persia, and in particular Xerxes's invasion, which takes up the last three books, he does cover earlier Greek history in some detail. It is not possible to state

---

10 The references are laid out in tables at the end of the thesis, along with comparative information for his 'successors', Thucydides and Xenophon's Hellenica.

11 See for example the stories involving the temple of Hephaistos at Memphis (II. 147-152) discussed in chapter three.

exactly how far back he goes, since his Greek chronology is not clearly set out, but he covers a period of at least 150-200 years. In contrast Thucydides covers little more than 20 years in detail, and Xenophon 50: a shorter span of time may imply fewer noteworthy events connected with sanctuaries. This is not an adequate explanation by itself, since it could be argued that the greater detail that Thucydides provides might have included more references to events involving sanctuaries. A second suggestion is that sanctuaries were more important in the archaic period than later; this would perhaps fit with Davies's explanations of religious development in the archaic period.[12] This is a suggestion that cannot be easily confirmed or rejected; however, one of the points that I hope will emerge from subsequent chapters is that the functions of the sanctuary were closely linked to the organisation of the polis as a whole, and that they remained important throughout the classical period and even later.

If we turn from external factors to internal ones, we may be able to explain the differences in terms of the different 'philosophies of history' of Herodotos and Thucydides. In discussing the differences between the two, S. Hornblower provides some useful ideas. He notes three distinctions:

> The first main difference between Herodotus and Thucydides is in their theology and view of causation. Herodotus is much readier than Thucydides to give a place in his causal scheme to oracles, and to see human fate in terms of tisis, divine requittal, although this does not exclude causation at a human level... In Thucydides by contrast, the religious aspect even of apparently 'religious' episodes is absolutely minimised. (Hornblower 1987, 29-30)

As we shall see, it is wrong to raise Herodotos's comments about tisis to the status of a 'theology and view of causation', but it is possible to argue that Thucydides plays down the importance of religious activity, while Herodotos draws attention to it.[13]

> Second, Thucydides' historical method... It was Thucydides who by his influential practice ordained that history should henceforth be a matter of war and politics... The difference in scope between Herodotos and Thucydides can be illustrated by their differing uses of the word erga, 'works', which both writers

---

12 See above.

13 See especially chapter five, on the difference in the presentation of religious aspects of rituals after battles, and chapter six on Herodotos's acknowledgement of divine presence.

> describe as an important part of the subject matter of their writings. For Herodotus, erga means concrete artefacts as well as political actions... This sense of ergon as monument is rejected by Thucydides... By erga Thucydides regularly means political or military actions. (pp.30-31)

Here there are two separate explanations for why sanctuaries feature more rarely in Thucydides. It is worth noting that Thucydides's concern with 'war and politics' is particularly narrow, because, as I shall show in this thesis, both have a religious dimension which he ignores almost entirely. The second explanation, Herodotos's interest in concrete erga, is the subject of chapter 2. In this case, Hornblower's comments on Thucydides also apply to Xenophon's Hellenica. His third distinction is in the 'manner of presentation' (p. 33); this has no bearing on the question of sanctuaries.

Theology and causation

Hornblower's reference to Herodotos's 'theology' needs to be considered carefully. If his history has a personal theology, and is in fact an apologia for a certain view of the gods, this might limit his usefulness as a source of information about 'typical' Greek religious practice. It is clear, however, that Herodotos's remarks about τὸ θεῖον, and his quoting of oracles, do not add up a religious view of causation. J. Gould argues that

> we are not dealing with the sort of unified and structured set of ideas that we are entitled to call a theory, but rather with a set of metaphors of very different implications. (Gould 1989, 79)

He suggests that Herodotos's apparent theological explanations, such as τὸ θεῖον ἐὸν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες (i. 32.1) or, in contrast, πᾶν ἐστι ἄνθρωπος συμφορή (i. 32.4), are gnomai, remarks that cast the events with which they are associated in a certain philosophical light, without providing a general explanation, or a rule of life.[14] B. Shimron, who believes that Herodotos did have a personal 'faith', also argues at

---

[14] It can be pointed out too that these gnomai are not related to named gods, and are not connected with the description of events involving sanctuaries, or religious ritual. Indeed, Herodotos can describe crimes committed in temples without a hint of censure.: for example Periandros forcing the women of Corinth to strip naked in the Heraion (v. 92η).

length that his religious views were kept separate from his historical analysis. He concludes:

> We may therefore confidently state that notwithstanding his undoubted beliefs and his deep religious feelings Herodotus knew very well how to discern between the divine and the human and that he was singularly free from superstition or blind belief when he approached what we, from the whole of his work, have singled out as political history, that is, practically the whole of the story and the history of the collision between Persia and Greece. (Shimron 1989, 57)

Gould suggests an alternative view of historical causation in Herodotos. He argues that this is based on the concept of 'reciprocal action' (Gould 1989, 82), or perhaps 'give and take'. The important questions, such as how a series of events started, are explained by reading back through actions and reactions, which frequently includes the giving and receiving of objects or obligations. This is clearly not a 'religious' way of structuring history, although it may have implications for religious activity: an individual may, of course, enter into a reciprocal relationship with a god. Gould's interpretation implies that Herodotos does not accept any overarching explanatory theory, such as an inevitable destiny.

If we accept that Herodotos's history is structured in a non-religious way, then the references to sanctuaries are not going to be exaggerated out of a desire for a 'theological' explanation; they may, however, be stressed if sanctuaries play a significant part in reciprocal activity. Reciprocal action involving sanctuaries includes dedications to gods in response to favours given, or sanctuaries used as points for communication between individuals: we do find sanctuaries fulfilling these roles in Herodotos, and this is discussed in chapters four and five.

We can go further and say that Herodotos's interest in reciprocity makes him particularly useful. Gould remarks: 'for us, "he started it; no, I didn't, he did" is essentially a childish exchange (except in the context of international relations)' (Gould 1989, 84-85). The parenthetical aside is actually quite important, in this thesis, because it is precisely the level of political and inter-state activity with which we will be concerned here, rather than individual behaviour.

Herodotos and Greek sanctuaries

The following chapters will concentrate on the role of sanctuaries in relations between states, or between kings and states. I do not intend to ignore the actions of private individuals when they may cast light on wider issues,[15] but in general it is difficult to use the work of an historian to ascertain the intentions of private individuals. What Herodotos does provide is examples of action by Greek poleis or powerful individuals that can be paralleled either elsewhere in his histories or in other sources. It is in these areas, which include political meetings, diplomacy, the dedication of booty and the consultation of oracles, all of which take place in sanctuaries, that we can hope to find a pattern of use that will explain both why Herodotos mentions so many sanctuaries, and how important sanctuaries were in the world he wrote about.

In using Herodotos as a source I shall not give precedence to his 'explanations' over the rest of the narrative. Instead, I shall be using the text as a whole as a source of material out of which models can be constructed to explain the way sanctuaries were used. This kind of approach has been attacked recently by Shimron, who says:

> It is a little disturbing to observe scholars (even of the first rank) on the one hand looking for deeper meanings, thereby according to Herodotus the status of a profound thinker, but on the other hand neglecting what he himself declares to be the aim of his research and its presentation. Many of the attempts to interpret his work by modern theories stem from fields of enquiry outside the philological-historical disciplines, especially from sociology and anthropology, and sometimes they are influenced by those ultra-modern epistemological theories which destroy rational thinking in their attempt to relativise it. One has sometimes the feeling that at least some of these authors see in Herodotus not a person, but an inanimate or abstract object of research like a 'social force'or 'Myth' with a capital M, or a work of poetry which is the fruit of the writer's imagination. Before applying to Herodotus' work any theory, one has to ascertain as closely as possible his intentions, primarily by examining his own words; one may not explain away or disregard what he himself presents as his aims and least of all his main goal, namely to solve a problem which had never been posed before. (Shimron 1989, 108-109)

---

15 For example the dedication of a tripod by Kolaios the Samian (iv. 152.4), discussed in chapter two.

Shimron is mainly concerned here with the general question of Herodotos's overall purpose, but this attitude to the text raises difficulties at several levels. It assumes that Herodotos is telling an objective truth, rather than creating a literary persona, and can therefore be trusted; a view which has been challenged by Fehling and others. It assumes that the forces that act upon his creation of the text are all under his control, whereas social and literary requirements may affect the shaping of the text without the writer's awareness. For our purposes, the stories which he adapts and retells about sanctuaries may include information that he does not think important but passes on nonetheless. Shimron sees Herodotos's approach to religion as entirely a question of 'rational explanation':

> Because he dealt with reality, however 'naive' his empiricism may have been, and because the popular religion was part of that reality, Herodotos had to come to grips with the problem of the supernatural which then included much more than it does for a believer today. However, as he obviously did not accept that religion uncritically, he had to combine his own convictions of the divine with his obvious striving for as rational an explanation and presentation as possible. (p. 113)

This picture of Herodotos is certainly not the only one that can be drawn from the text[16] and, as we have seen, the understanding of Greek religion it suggests is limited. We should not assume that rationality and religion must be in conflict, or that Herodotos had a complete understanding of religious matters. His explanations may provide important evidence for a fifth-century interpretation of events, but they are not necessarily useful for the purposes of this thesis, and so should not be prioritised.

The explanatory models constructed from material in Herodotos can be used to examine other ancient evidence, and if they produce useful results, we may hope that they can be applied to the study of Greek sanctuaries in general. Thus I am seeking to produce interpretations of the role of sanctuaries that are more than simply maps of Herodotos's personal thought world. It is because the explanations of the role of sanctuaries in the following chapters fit evidence drawn from a wide

16 See chapter six.

range of sources, literary, archaeological and epigraphic, that I believe they can be used in the wider study of archaic and classical Greece.

Chapter Two: What do sanctuaries mean to Herodotos?

In order to be able to explain the role of sanctuaries in the world Herodotos describes, we must first examine how they appear in his narrative. In this chapter we will examine the various contexts in which sanctuaries are mentioned by Herodotos, and consider in detail his references to one place, Samos. We will see that Herodotos refers to sanctuaries for a number of reasons, and that they are particularly important in the narrative because of the stories associated with them: sanctuaries are embedded in the history which he is telling. After looking at the way in which Herodotos describes sanctuaries, we will compare his approach to that of Pausanias, and see that this casts light on the changing importance of sanctuaries in Greece in different periods.

In the previous chapter we saw that Herodotos should not be regarded as having a particularly 'religious' theory of historical causation. We should also note that he does not express an attitude of religious reverence when discussing sanctuary sites. There is a great deal of difference between the attitude expressed by the Psalmist on the one hand, for whom the Temple at Jerusalem has to be entered with appropriate respect, and definite purpose:

> I rejoiced when they said to me,
> 'Let us go to the house of YHWH.'
> Now we stand within your gates
> O Jerusalem:
> Jerusalem that is built to be a city
> where people come together in unity;
> to which the tribes resort, the tribes of YHWH,
> to give thanks to YHWH himself,
> the bounden duty of Israel. (Ps. 122. 1-4)

and Herodotos on the other, who also describes visits to temples:

> καὶ θέλων δὲ τούτων πέρι σαφές τι εἰδέναι ἐξ ὧν οἷον τε ἦν, ἔπλευσα καὶ ἐς Τύρον τῆς Φοινίκης, πυνθανόμενος αὐτόθι εἶναι ἱρὸν Ἡρακλέος ἅγιον... εἶδον δὲ ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ καὶ ἄλλο ἱρὸν Ἡρακλέος ἐπωνυμίην ἔχοντος Θασίου εἶναι. ἀπικόμην δὲ καὶ ἐς Θάσον, ἐν τῇ εὗρον ἱρὸν Ἡρακλέος ὑπὸ Φοινίκων ἱδρυμένον ...
>
> Wishing to know quite clearly about these things as far as I could, I sailed to Phoinikian Tyre, as I understood that there was there a sanctuary dedicated to

> Herakles... In Tyre I saw too another sanctuary of Herakles, with the title 'Thasian'. I also came to Thasos, where I discovered a sanctuary of Herakles founded by the Phoinikians. (ii. 44)

Obviously the two passages belong to different genres, and we would not expect a similar approach. Greece produced religious poetry as well as history, and the Bible contains more straightforward descriptions of the Temple (e.g. in I Kings 6/ II Chron. 3-4). However, it is clear that for Herodotos, sanctuaries were sometimes treated as opportunities for tourism. As we shall see, even when describing tyrannical behaviour within a sanctuary, for example Periandros's treatment of the women of Corinth (v. 92η), he is not usually concerned with issues of sacrilege.

References to sanctuaries in Herodotos

I shall divide Herodotos's references to sanctuaries into five categories. These will inevitably over-lap, but they provide a rough guide to the role of sanctuaries in the text. They are (a) descriptions of sanctuaries for their own sake; (b) historical events involving sanctuaries; (c) descriptions of objects dedicated in sanctuaries; (d) references to sanctuaries as landmarks; and (e) consultation of oracles at a sanctuary. One set of references which does not fit into any of these categories is Herodotos's account of his visits to Tyre and Thasos in search of the truth about Herakles, quoted above (ii. 44); otherwise these categories are adequate.

(a) In general, Herodotos does not discuss Greek sanctuaries as sites of interest in themselves. Non-Greek sanctuaries are more often described in this way, and the cases where Greek sanctuaries are singled out are significant. We will examine Herodotos's interest in one Greek sanctuary, the Samian Heraion, later in this chapter.

(b) Within the category of historical events, I include activity that takes place in or around a sanctuary, where the sanctuary itself is more than simply a landmark. The word 'historical' is meant to include not only actions narrated by Herodotos, but also

those put into the mouths of his speakers.[1] Of particular interest are several stories closely related to festivals and rituals that took place regularly at various sanctuaries, and we shall consider these later in the chapter. Others involve political activities and they are the subject of chapter three.

(c) Stories involving dedications might sometimes also be considered as historical events. The activities of Kroisos, and in particular his gifts to Delphi, discussed in chapter four, are an example. There are, however, a number of cases where the description of a dedication is introduced as a pendant to a story which does not otherwise involve the sanctuary. We will consider examples of this later in this chapter.

(d) When Herodotos uses sanctuaries as landmarks, he may simply be providing geographical information, but there may be more to it. Some cases are obviously straightforward, suggesting only that the major sanctuaries were well known to his audience:

> ἔστι δὲ ὁδὸς ἐς Ἡλίου πόλιν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἄνω ἰόντι παραπλησίη τὸ μῆκος τῇ ἐξ Ἀθηνέων ὁδῷ τῇ ἀπὸ τῶν δυώδεκα θεῶν τοῦ βωμοῦ φερούσῃ ἔς τε Πῖσαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν νηὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου.
>
> The journey up from the sea to Heliopolis is about the same length as the journey from the altar of the twelve gods at Athens to the temple of Olympian Zeus at Pisa. (ii. 7.1)

At other times, however, the presence of a sanctuary can be seen to indicate the involvement of a god or goddess. Thus Herodotos draws attention to the fact that the Athenians at Marathon twice took up their position in sanctuaries of Herakles (vi. 116), and that the battles of Plataia and Mykale both took place near temenea of Demeter Eleusinia (ix. 101.1). This is discussed in chapter six.

(e) References to oracles in Herodotos are usually concerned with the content of the reply more than with the sanctuary itself. We will consider an exception, Kroisos's supposed consultation of a number of Greek oracles (i. 46.2), in chapter four. In chapter

---

[1] For example, the actions of Periandros referred to above, which are described in a speech by a Corinthian (v. 92η).

seven we will examine Herodotos's attitude to the most important oracular sanctuary, Delphi.

References to the sanctuaries of Samos appear in all these categories except (e).[2] In particular the size of the Heraion and a number of dedications within it are discussed by Herodotos. In what follows, therefore, I shall refer to examples from Samos in particular.

Descriptions of sanctuaries for their own sake

The opening words of the text of Herodotos suggest that he includes objects as well as events in his field of enquiry:

> Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε, ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δι' ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι.
>
> Here are set forth the researches of Herodotos of Halikarnassos, so that the deeds of men should not be erased by the passage of time, nor the great and wonderful works both of Greeks and foreigners lose their glory, particularly those through which they came into conflict. (proem)

The word ἔργα covers a multitude of possibilities, and includes buildings such as the tomb of Alyattes in Lydia:

> ἓν δὲ ἔργον πολλὸν μέγιστον παρέχεται χωρὶς τῶν τε Αἰγυπτίων ἔργων καὶ τῶν Βαβυλωνίων· ἔστι αὐτόθι Ἀλυάττεω τοῦ Κροίσου πατρὸς σῆμα τοῦ ἡ κρηπὶς μέν ἐστι λίθων μεγάλων, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο σῆμα χῶμα γῆς.
>
> There is one work which is by far the greatest of any except for those of the Egyptians and the Babylonians: there stands the tomb of Alyattes, Kroisos's father, which has a base of huge stones, and the rest of which is a mound of earth. (i. 93.2)

It also includes building projects on Samos:

> ἐμήκυνα δὲ περὶ Σαμίων μᾶλλον, ὅτι σφι τρία ἐστὶ μέγιστα ἁπάντων Ἑλλήνων ἐξεργασμένα.

---

2 (a) II.148.2, III.60.4; (b) III.48, III.142; (c) I.70.3, II.182.1 (, III.47 - the Heraion is not specifically mentioned, but it is assumed that the Egyptian corslet was dedicated there; see below), III.123.1, IV.88.1, IV.152.4; (d) IX.96.1.

> I have spoken at length about the Samians in particular, since to them belong three of the greatest works of all Greeks. (iii. 60.1)

included in such erga are a number of temple buildings and many dedications made within them.[3] Is there any reason why Herodotos should draw attention to some physical erga in particular, and why in the case of Greece they should include sanctuary buildings?

One important fact is that temple buildings were as a rule commissioned by Greek communities rather than individuals (Coulton 1977). As we shall see, this suggests that they may be taken to represent the community as a whole. Such an idea raises questions about the supposed 'building programmes' of Greek tyrants. Archaeologists have sometimes tried to identify large-scale building programmes of the archaic period with known tyrants, basing their view on a statement of Aristotle:

> καὶ τὸ πένητας ποιεῖν τοὺς ἀρχομένους τυραννικόν, ὅπως ἥ τε φυλακὴ τρέφηται καὶ πρὸς τῷ καθ' ἡμέραν ὄντες ἄσχολοι ὦσιν ἐπιβουλεύειν. παράδειγμα δὲ τούτου αἵ τε πυραμίδες αἱ περὶ Αἴγυπτον καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα τῶν Κυψελιδῶν καὶ τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου ἡ οἰκοδόμησις ὑπὸ τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν, καὶ τῶν περὶ Σάμον, ἔργα Πολυκράτεια· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα δύναται ταὐτόν, ἀσχολίον καὶ πενίαν τῶν ἀρχομένων.
>
> It is a principle of tyrants to make their subjects poor, so that their bodyguard will be fed and the people, being kept busy every day, will be unable to plot. Examples of this are the Pyramids in Egypt, the dedications of the Kypselids, the temple of Olympian Zeus under the Peisistratids, and of the things in Samos, the Polykratean works: for these all make possible the same thing, the poverty and lack of leisure of the subjects. (Arist. Pol. 1313b18-25)

As we will see, Aristotle's explanation cannot necessarily be trusted, and the example of the Pyramids is certainly anomalous. Nonetheless, if Aristotle is correct, it can possibly be argued that there is no real conflict between the idea that temple-building

---

3 Herodotos uses the word ἔργον 148 times in his histories. Of these 17 refer to physical objects:
Buildings and engineering works: Alyattes's tomb (i. 93.3 twice) ; Nitocris's bridge (i.186.1); Egyptian buildings (ii.35.1); Pheron's obelisks (ii. 111.4); Cheops's road (ii. 124.2); the Great Pyramid (ii. 125.7); Greek buildings (ii. 148.1, ii. 148.3); the upper rooms of the Labyrinth (ii. 148.6); the buildings of Amasis (ii.176.1); the Phoinikian section of the Athos canal (vii.23.3).
Works of craftsmanship: Kroisos's craters (i. 51.3); peploi (quoting Homer at ii. 116.3); Polykrates's ring (iii. 41.1).
'Acts of god': the Peneus gorge (vii. 129.4 twice).
In other cases the word refers to activity rather than objects. (This analysis is a revision of Powell's, since some of the references in his category of buildings fit better as activity.)

was carried out by the state, and the theory of tyrants' building programmes, since the tyrant was the state, and therefore commisioned buildings on its behalf. If he did this in the name of the polis rather than his own, and the resulting work was not associated with him personally, however, we cannot reasonably call it a personal programme. In any case, Herodotos gives no support for the idea that tyrants were responsible for building works. We may see this in the cases of Athens and Samos.

Temple building in Athens and Samos

A number of sources, including Thucydides, mention the Peisistratids in connection with religious buildings in Athens, and archaeological evidence appears to support this (Lewis 1988). Thucydides mentions that Peisistratos, son of Hippias, dedicated the Altar of the Twelve Gods and the Pythion when Archon (Th. vi. 54.6-7). Excavations in the Agora give support to what Thucydides says about the Altar of the Twelve Gods (Crosby 1949; Camp 1986, 40-41). The dates of both the original foundation and the later alteration fit with Thucydides's account. The inscription on the Pythion altar has been found and dated to c. 521 (ML 11); the dating is based as much on historical grounds as stylistic ones, and the script could be dated later. The other major sanctuary building attributed to the Peisistratids is more problematic: Aristotle (Pol. 1313b) mentions the building of the Temple of Olympian Zeus as a way the Peisistratids kept their subjects perpetually at work. The temple foundations are dated by Welter to c. 515 BC at the earliest (Welter 1923); if that is the case, there will have been little time to keep the people in work before the tyranny was overthrown.[4] Finally, building activity on the

[4] Wycherly argues that the pottery, the latest of which is dated to c. 530, allows the Olympieion to have been started by Peisistratos just before his death, and to have been well under way by the time the tyranny was overthrown. Thus he is able to accept Aristotle's idea that the building provided plenty of work. He suggests that Aristotle is reliable because 'the days of Peisistratos were not so very distant' (Wycherley 1964, 165): the days of Peisistratos were actually some 150 years distant, and to judge from Thucydides's comments about the general knowledge of

acropolis, in particular concerning the temple of Athena Polias, has been dated on archaeological grounds to the time of the Peisistratids (Boersma 1970). None of these connections is mentioned by Herodotos. He refers to the Altar of the Twelve Gods (ii. 7.2; vi. 108.4), and to the Temple of Athena (v. 72.3, 77.3; viii. 41.2, 51.2) but in neither case does he mention the tyranny. He does not even mention the Olympieion at all.

In any case, it is important to note that the dedications of the altar of the twelve gods and the Pythion do not in any case prove that the Peisistratids were particularly interested in religious building: Peisistratos the younger dedicated them in memory of his Archonship, and it may be better to associate the action with the religious obligations of the Archon, rather than a 'religious policy' of the tyrants.[5]

In Samos, excavation has revealed two colossal Archaic temples at the Heraion site; the first, usually dated to c. 570 BC, is known as the 'Rhoikos Temple', and the second, of c. 540 BC, is called the 'Polykrates Temple'. The dating of these buildings is by no means secure[6], and the names given to them are entirely unhelpful. The question of who was responsible for which temple has been convincingly answered by Andreas Furtwängler (Furtwängler 1984). The most recent major work on Samos (Shipley 1987) shows no knowledge of this article and draws on an older view. Furtwängler argues that Herodotos should be taken at face value, that at iii. 60 he is referring to the temple existent in his day, and that it was built by Rhoikos son of Phileus. His description as ἀρχιτέκτων πρῶτος may mean 'chief architect', but it cannot be stretched to mean 'architect of the previous (now invisible) temple on this site.' (cf. Tölle-Kastenbein 1976, 56); indeed we do not know whether Herodotos was aware that there had been an earlier temple. Furtwängler dismisses the late and confused references in Pliny,

---

Athenians about the tyranny (i. 20.2; vi. 54.1), that is quite long enough to render Aristotle's testimony quite untrustworthy (cf. Thomas 1989, 123-131).

5 The Archon had several religious duties ((Aris.) Ath.) and the post may have given the holder a particularly significant religious position (Connor 1988, 171-173)

6 See end note.

Diodoros, Diogenes Laertius and Vitruvius which were used to give the penultimate building the title 'Rhoikos Temple'. So far as Herodotos is concerned, there was only one temple building, the so-called 'Polykrates Temple'.

Herodotos did not give it that name, however; for him the temple was simply Samian. Herodotos accounts for his interest in Samian affairs by describing the τρία μέγιστα ἁπάντων Ἑλλήνων ἐξεργασμένα (iii. 60.1), for which the Samians were responsible; he describes his digression here as περὶ Σαμίων, and does not mention Polykrates[7]. This is important: Herodotos's Samian story starts before the time of Polykrates, and it does not end at iii. 59, where the temple is mentioned, or at iii. 125, where Polykrates dies; the real end is iii. 149: τὴν δὲ Σάμον σαγηνεύσαντες οἱ Πέρσαι παρέδοσαν Συλοσῶντι ἔρημον ἐοῦσαν ἀνδρῶν, 'having "dragnetted" Samos, the Persians handed Samos over to Syloson empty of inhabitants'.

It has been suggested that Herodotos deliberately suppressed references to Polykrates's involvement in building the second temple (Mitchell 1975), but this is an unnecessary hypothesis. We may be similarly sceptical of such statements as:

> The Rhoecus Temple is the earliest of the great Ionian temples, and can be assumed to be a grand gesture on the part of Syloson I or his successor. (Shipley 1987, 73).

There is no need to assume that a tyrant had to be responsible for a colossal temple. The archaeological record bears out the idea that size appealed to Samians well before the sixth century. The series of altars (Rupp 1983) and of temple buildings (Walter 1976) show that things happened earlier and on a larger scale in Samos than elsewhere. There is no cause to invent an eighth or ninth century tyranny to account for 'the oldest Greek built altars so far known' (Rupp 1983, 102) or 'der älteste bekannte griechische Tempel' (Walter 1976, 41). Samos was renowned as a place of innovation, with the

---

7 Aristotle's supposed reference to these works as ἔργα Πολυκρατέα (Pol. 1313b) need not necessarily refer to the temple, and therefore cannot be used in the argument. Aristotle's information might also be wrong (see n. 4).

introduction of bronze casting attributed to the Samian Theodoros, and Kolaios as an earlier successful trader; both names are connected with Egypt in the literary sources[8], and Samos's geographical position makes it likely that there would be contact between the two places from early on. The influence of Egypt would explain not only the fact that Samos was ahead of the rest of Greece, but also Samian interest in the colossal. Of course the magnificence of a sanctuary is likely to be affected by the wealth and success of the polis, so it is to be expected that great temple buildings might have been erected in Samos during the period of Polykrates's power: nevertheless this does not prove that Polykrates was responsible for the temple that now bears his name.

There are two occasions where Herodotos does apparently attribute responsibility for temple-building to named figures, at Delphi and Ephesos. The Alkmaionidai were responsible for the construction of the late Sixth-Century temple at Delphi, but they were not patrons but contractors following an already existent plan (v. 62.3; cf. Forrest 1969; Lewis 1988, 301). Kroisos is supposed to have had a hand in building the Ephesian Artemision, since he was responsible for some columns there (i. 92.1); it has been argued that Herodotos does not mean part of the building, but gold dedications within it (Vickers 1985b, 8-17: cf. contra Cook 1989a, 166). Even if the building itself is meant, Herodotos's words τῶν κιόνων αἱ πολλαί, 'most of the columns', imply that the rest of the temple was someone else's responsibility. We may therefore conclude that, for Herodotos at least, buildings in sanctuaries were associated, not with individual rulers, but with the polis or community to which the sanctuary belonged.

8 Theodoros: D.S. I. 98; Kolaios: Hdt. iv. 152.

Religious authority for founding sanctuaries

We can find support for the idea that a new sanctuary or temple building was always perceived to be the responsibility of the whole community, by considering the authority required to establish one. We will see that in Greece the establishment of a new sanctuary usually involved the consultation of an oracle, but we will start by looking at a non-Greek example, Herodotos's description of Egypt.

Herodotos mentions temple-building, or adding to existing temples as part of the reigns of several Pharaohs. Lloyd, in his commentary on Book ii, suggests two major reasons for the frequency of these references, in particular concerning the temple of Hephaistos (in fact Ptah) at Memphis. One reason concerns Greek interest, the other Egyptian practice:

> Building at the Temple of Ptah at Memphis was initiated by Menes (ii. 99.4) and becomes a leitmotif of H.'s history of Egypt (cf. ii. 108, 110, 121, 136, 153; cf. 112, 176). The prominence of this topos reflects the particular interest which long and close familiarity and the spectacular nature of its main architectural complex had engendered in the Greek world. (Lloyd 1988, 16)

> Temple-building was one of Pharaoh's traditional functions. He alone was empowered to carry out the foundation ritual of 'the stretching of the cord.' (p. 30)

As we will see, Herodotos had particular reasons for drawing attention to the temples of Egypt. Here we must look at the question of the authority by which they were built. Pharaoh's position was more or less that of a god, and he was also absolute ruler of Egypt, and thus was the state in a way that no Greek tyrant ever was. It is this position of being in contact simultaneously with the earth and the heaven that enabled him alone to create sacred space on earth: the extent of a Pharaoh's building programme was therefore a firm indication of his importance. We may compare the case of Egypt with that found in the Greek polis, and we will find that, although the political and religious organisation is different, the same elements are present in the creation of sanctuaries.

In Greece, contact with the gods is provided by oracles, and above all Delphi. Herodotos records six examples of a new sanctuary being established,[9] and in five cases this happens after the receipt of an oracle. In the other case, the sanctuary of Pan on the akropolis at Athens, the instruction to establish the sanctuary comes from the god 'in person'. In the cases where Delphi is consulted, it is always the polis as a whole which sends the enquiry, except in the case of Assesos, where the enquiry comes from Alyattes; but he, as king of Lydia, may be taken to represent the whole kingdom. Clearly then, in these cases the community as a whole is involved, and divine approval is required.

The examples from Herodotos are all responses to crisis, but there is reason to believe that divine authority was usual when sanctuaries were established. The obvious example of new sanctuaries being created when there is no crisis is the foundation of a colony.

I. Malkin has investigated the siting of religious sanctuaries in colonies in some detail. He is particularly interested in the question of authority, and concludes:

> It seems that the religious authority to make decisions about the siting of sacred areas was implicitly given to the oikist when he was designated by Apollo. (Malkin 1987, 146)

This statement is supported by quotations from ancient sources, including the description of Nausithoos's foundation of Scheria in the Odyssey (Od. vi. 7-10), and the assumption that Thoukles himself was responsible for the altar of Apollo Archegetes in Sicilian Naxos (Th. vi. 3). The 'designation' by Apollo was considerably more than simply being named:

> The most important aspect of the oikist's consultation at Delphoi was his personal designation by Apollo and the implied religious authority with which he was invested.

---

[9] Temple of Athena at Assesos (i. 19.3); statues to Damia and Auxesia in Epidauros (v. 82.1); temenos of Alakos in Athens (v. 89.3); sanctuary of Pan in Athens (vi. 105.3); altar to the winds at Thyia (vii. 178.2); temple of Boreas in Athens (vii. 178.2).

> Miltiades will serve as a good example; Herodotus[10] relates that it was not merely sufficient for Apollo to have indirectly indicated to the Thracians that Miltiades was to be their oikist; in fact, he had to go to Delphoi himself to receive the oracle's confirmation and designation. By 'religious authority' we do not mean only the religious aspect of his authority as a leader but also the authority to act and make religious decisions, such as instituting cults and designating precincts to the gods. In this respect the religious authority with which the oikist was invested resembled that of Apollo himself. (Malkin 1987, 27)

The oikist had a special position, as the link between the mother-city and the colony, and the representative of the colony before and during the actual foundation (pp. 88-89). Thus he was in a similar position to the Egyptian Pharaoh.

We cannot prove that the rebuilding of a temple-building required the same authority as the original establishment, but there are indications that this was the case. The privilege of Pharaoh as sole builder in Egypt covered additions to temples as well as the creation of new ones, and one of the cases referred to above, the temple of Athena at Assesos, concerned rebuilding the temple rather than the creation of a new sanctuary. We may get further by considering the role of the person who is sometimes named in connection with temple-building, 'the architect'.

ἀρχιτέκτων

The title ἀρχιτέκτων is usually translated as 'architect', but the word does not have quite the same meaning (cf. Coulton 1977). A definition of the position is given by Plato:

> τούτῳ δέ γε, οἶμαι, προσήκει κρίναντι μὴ τέλος ἔχειν μηδ' ἀπηλλάχθαι καθάπερ ὁ λογιστὴς ἀπήλλακτο, προστάττειν δὲ ἑκάστοις τῶν ἐργατῶν τό γε πρόσφορον, ἕως ἂν ἀπεργάσωνται τὸ προσταχθέν.
>
> It is required for him, I think, not to stop after making his judgements, nor to go away, as the calculator could go away, but to set out for each of the workmen what is to be done, until what has been set out has been achieved. (Pl. Plt. 260a)

It is clear that in this case, the post is taken to involve supervision rather than simply designing the building in advance. One can also note two Hellenistic inscriptions from

---

10 vi. 35.3-36.1.

Athens which refer to the post of ἀρχιτέκτων ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά (IG ii^2 839, 840): the holder of the office in 221 BC is included, along with the relevant ἱερεύς, as one of a committee responsible for dedicating an oinochoe to the "Ηρως Ἰατρικός; the post here is a regular appointment, and is concerned with matters that do not have anything to do with buildings. These examples are later than Herodotos, and there is no suggestion that the post of ἀρχιτέκτων ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά existed in his time. What they demonstrate is that the word came to have a meaning that emphasised the idea of supervision rather than building design.

Herodotos mentions the ἀρχιτέκτων of two of the three great Samian works, the tunnel, built by Eupalinos of Megara, and the temple built by Rhoikos son of Theodoros (iii. 60.3). Although the tunnel was a great feat of engineering, it might not be described as architecture, and the job of Eupalinos was probably supervisory as well as concerned with design, as would have been that of Mandrokles, ἀρχιτέκτων of the bridge over the Bosphoros (iv. 87.1). We are not concerned, therefore, with the idea of architect as artist, but as the man in charge of a project, in which design skill was only incidental.

On this view, Rhoikos would have supervised the whole construction of the temple. Indeed, Herodotos cannot have drawn attention to his role because of the quality of the building, since it was unfinished: 'only one row of columns was completed and no roof or entablature' (Shipley 1987, 78). Rhoikos would have been appointed by the Samians, just as the Alkmaionidai were appointed by the people of Delphi. In this position he would have had also to supervise the disposal of damaged votives and other things: his position, unlike that of Mandrokles and Eupalinos, would therefore have had a religious side to it and would have resembled on a small scale that of the oikist of a colony. Possibly, he too was authorised by Apollo. In any case, he would have done the work on behalf of the whole polis, not as a personal achievement. One might also suggest

that Rhoikos's position was comparable to that of Peisistratos son of Hippias when he dedicated an altar and a sanctuary in connection with his Archonship.

Temples as ἔργα

This investigation suggests that sanctuaries and temple-buildings were in general associated with poleis rather than individuals. What is it about them that interests Herodotos? First, it is clear that architectural beauty is not the issue. At the Samian Heraion he would have seen an unfinished building, no doubt with a temporary roof.[11] We must not try to compare its effect with that of ruined buildings in England: what impresses us about the ruined abbeys of Tintern, Fountains or Glastonbury is at least partly their history, and the feeling of former glory now destroyed: in other words, the fact that they once were ergo. The building-site facing Herodotos would be less than a hundred years old[12], and, as we have seen, would not have the romance of Polykrates's name associated with it. Only one aspect of the temple can have struck Herodotos, and that is precisely what he says: it was very big. That size rather than beauty is the point at issue is also suggested by the fact that he equates the temple building with a harbour mole and a tunnel (iii. 60.3).

Herodotos is not interested in the size of buildings only for their own sake, but because they are an indication of the power of Greek states (Hornblower 1987, 31). In the non-Greek world, the architectural wonders of the various states, Babylon and Egypt in particular, but also Lydia (i. 93.1), are described at some length before Herodotos tells how these kingdoms were conquered by Persia:[13] the immensity of the buildings

11 There must have been something to protect the wooden statues given by Amasis for example (ii. 182).

12 Shipley suggests that work continued on it until 480, and it may have carried on even later (Shipley 1987, 78).

13 The temple and ziggurat in Babylon are described as part of the story of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus (i. 181.2), and it is referred to again when Darius reconquers the city (iii. 158.2).

indicate the resources of the kingdom, and make the Persian victory that much more impressive (Drews 1973).

It is therefore significant that the Greek poleis whose buildings Herodotos finds impressive, Ephesos and, above all, Samos, were both conquered by the Persians, and that Herodotos has little to say about the architecture of those Greek poleis, like Athens and Sparta, which defeated the Persians. When Herodotos claims that he has devoted extra space to the history of the Samians because of the greatness of their ἐξεργασμένα (iii.60.1), we may suspect that he is actually mentioning the building works not to justify what he has already said, but to increase the pathos of the part of the Samian story he has still to tell, as the people who built them are, temporarily at least, utterly wiped out (iii. 149).

Sanctuaries themselves are therefore symbolic of their polis. Herodotos can use the Heraion as one of the indications of Samian greatness because it belonged to the Samians as a whole. At the end of the chapter we will consider the implications of this, but first we will look at Herodotos's approach to events within sanctuaries.

Sacrilege and festivals

We may now consider historical events. In Herodotos's narrative, sanctuaries are sometimes the sites of battles and conferences, the usual material of history. The effect that the setting has on the events is discussed in chapters three and six. There are two other kinds of event that are described as happening in sanctuaries, more or less straightforward acts of sacrilege, and rather more complicated stories which are presented as explanations for the subsequent ritual behaviour of the citizens of the polis involved.

The Egyptian buildings are discussed in the second half of book II, the whole of which is presented as an introduction to Cambyses's conquest.

There are ten stories where an individual or group has either tried to enter a sanctuary improperly, or has been forced out of one to be killed; usually, but not always, retribution is seen to fall on those responsible.[14] This kind of story occurs frequently in history, and it is the stuff of propaganda; there are three examples in Thucydides, for example.[15] It is noteworthy that three of the cases involve Kleomenes, and clearly Herodotos's presentation of him is to a large extent a construct of a wicked ruler (Griffiths 1988). Kambyses, a similar figure in Herodotos, is also responsible for attacking sanctuaries, in Egypt (iii. 29.3).

We will see in chapter six that Kleomenes's encounter with the priestess of Athena, when he tries to enter her temple in Athens, forms part of a larger pattern of divine intervention in his affairs, and in chapter eight we will examine Herodotos's presentation of Kleomenes in more detail; on the whole, however, incidents such as these do not play a major role in Herodotos's history. Although the Chians, who handed Paktyes over to the Persians, avoided the territory they were given in return, and the people of Kyme were threatened with retribution for asking about handing him over, Herodotos does not suggest that these acts led to serious disaster in the long term. They cannot easily be fitted into a large-scale framework of tisis as a theory of causation in Herodotos. Instead, they should be seen as incidents that colour our perception of the characters involved, especially Kleomenes and Miltiades.

Rather more interesting is a group of stories that may be linked to rituals and festivals of various poleis. Herodotos does not often describe religious festivals as such.

---

14 Agisikles of Halikarnassos at the sanctuary of Triopian Apollo (i. 144); Aristodikos of Kyme at Branchidai (i. 159); Paktyes at the temple of Athena Poliouchos on Chios (i. 160.3); Kylon on the akropolis at Athens (v. 71); Kleomenes at the temple of Athena in Athens (v. 72); Kleomenes at Delphi (vi. 66.2-3, 75.3); Kleomenes at Argos (vi. 76-82); a prisoner at the temple of Demeter Thesmophoros on Aigina (vi. 91.2); Miltiades at the temple of Demeter Thesmophoros on Paros (vi. 134); Artayktes at the sanctuary of Protesilaus at Elaious (ix. 116-120).

15 Kylon (Th. i. 126.10-11); Pausanias in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos in Sparta (Th. i. 134.2-3); numerous incidents on Corcyra (Th. iii. 81). Accusations of desecrating churches were inevitably made against Iraq invading Kuwait in August 1990.

However, we are given eight stories which can be seen to be built up around the rituals of a festival.[16] We will consider some of these in more detail.

Religious events provide the opportunity for two tyrants to outwit their people. Peisistratos manages to restore himself to Athens by using a religious procession and a girl dressed as Athena (i. 60. 3-5). In a speech later the Corinthians describe the behaviour of Periandros:

> κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον ἐξιέναι πάσας τὰς Κορινθίων γυναῖκας. αἱ μὲν δὴ ὡς ἐς ὀρτὴν ἦισαν κόσμῳ τῷ καλλίστῳ χρεώμεναι, ὁ δ' ὑποστήσας τοὺς δορυφόρους ἀπέδυσέ σφεας πάσας ὁμοίως, τάς τε ἐλευθέρας καὶ τὰς ἀμφιπόλους, συμφορήσας δὲ ἐς ὄρυγμα Μελίσσῃ ἐπευχομένας κατέκαιε.
>
> A proclamation was made that all the women of the Corinthians should go out to the Heraion. They went as if to a festival, wearing their most beautiful adornments; but he, stationing his spear-bearers around, stripped them all alike, both free women and slave-girls, and collecting everything in a pit, burned it with a prayer to Melissa.(v. 92η. 3)

This is clearly a shocking story, and it is told to illustrate Periandros's cruelty. What is interesting is that it is the treatment of the women that is dwelt on as wrong, not the misuse of the temple. Herodotos introduces the story by saying μιῇ δὲ ἡμέρῃ ἀπέδυσε πάσας τὰς Κορινθίων γυναῖκας διὰ τὴν ἑωυτοῦ γυναῖκα Μέλισσαν, 'one day he stripped all the women of the Corinthians, on account of his own wife, Melissa' (v. 92η. 1), and the worst feature appears to be that freeborn women are treated the same as slavegirls. The fact this happens in a temple is not remarked upon. The women are tricked into thinking that they are going to a festival in order that they will be wearing their finest clothes; there does not seem to be any greater significance than this. Periandros suffers no divine punishment for what he does; on the contrary, having satisfied his dead wife, he recovers the object he had lost.

---

[16] At the Argive Heraion (i. 31); the Athenian akropolis (i. 59); the sanctuary of Artemis at Samos (iii. 48); the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron (iv. 145, vi. 138); the Heroon of Melanippos in Sikyon (v. 67); the sanctuary of Damia and Auxesia on Aigina (v. 82-88); the Heraion at Corinth (v. 92η); the temple of Demeter at Eleusis (viii. 65.2).

Explaining why the Corinthians supported the Spartan attack on Samos in 525, Herodotos tells how the Samians rescued some Corcyrean boys being sent by Periandros to Alyattes to be made into eunuchs. The boys took sanctuary in the temple of Artemis on Samos, where they were besieged by their guards. To save them the Samians invented a festival which involved children dancing outside the temple and throwing millet-seed honey-cakes to the captives. The festival continued for ever after, according to Herodotos (iii. 48.3).

Each of these stories is presented as a single incident, but they can be related to regular occurences. The story of Peisistratos's procession has been used as evidence for a theory that the tyrant identified himself with Herakles (Boardman 1972; cf. contra Cook 1989b); it has also been compared to the common practice of religious processions in other poleis in which someone dresses up to represent the goddess or god (Connor 1987, 42-47). It is possible that Athens did have a regular procession in which either images, or people dressed up, represented Athena leading Herakles to Olympos; this would explain the frequency with which the image appeared on Attic pottery, well after the end of the Peisistratid tyranny. If this were the case, then Herodotos is describing an historical incident as if it were the origin of a religious ritual.

Periandros's action can also be related to matters of Athenian ritual. Periandros is reminded by Melissa that he had intercourse with her corpse, an act of sexual deviance. A law of Solon decreed that women guilty of adultery could not wear jewellery or attend public festivals (Aeschin. i. 183); the women of Corinth are therefore presented, for an Athenian audience at least, as obviously innocent of sexual impropriety, in contrast to Periandros himself. The story, put into the mouth of a Corinthian as a warning against tyranny, thus uses religious symbolism to make a political point.

The Samian story is another case where an historical incident is described by Herodotos as the origin of a festival, but again it can hardly be true, since children's

dances and honey-cakes are common in festivals of Artemis (Burkert 1985, 151). The story of the expulsion of the Pelasgians from Attica, and their subsequant raid on Brauron from Lemnos, which led ultimately to the capture of Lemnos by Miltiades (vi. 137-140), is related to the concerns of the festival of the Brauronia: the story concerns the sexual status of the daughters of the Athenians, and the distancing of women from Athenian society (Osborne 1985, 157-172). It is presented in the narrative as the background to a story about Miltiades. Similar fragments of explanation feature in the story of the statues of Damia and Auxesia on Aigina (v. 82-88), where dedications of brooch-pins by women are related to the violent death of men trying to move cult statues.

What ties these stories together is the way that Herodotos weaves the elements of religious festivals into the fabric of his narrative. He provides apparent explanations for ritual activity by relating it to the main subject of his narrative, the great deeds of individuals and nations. Just as sanctuaries symbolise their poleis, religious festivals are presented as monuments to past historical events or characters. This integration of festivals into the story is in marked contrast to Thucydides, who has, for example, a detailed and reverent description of the refounding of the Delian festival (Th. iii. 104).

Dedications in sanctuaries

We can now turn to dedications in sanctuaries. The importance of gift-giving in Herodotos has been stressed by Gould in his recent book on Herodotos (Gould 1989, esp. 82-85). He examines the part that ideas of reciprocity play in stories that Herodotos tells. Gould is therefore mainly interested in the act of giving rather than the object given. I intend to concentrate on the objects given, because it is these that have ended up in

sanctuaries.[17] Two categories of gifts I shall deal with in later chapters: objects given by foreign rulers as part of a 'diplomatic' process (chapter four) and objects dedicated by Greeks after a military victory (chapter five). In this chapter we shall consider the more miscellaneous selection of objects dedicated at the Samian Heraion.

The Heraion was the major sanctuary of Samos, but was not an 'international' centre in the way that Branchidai or Ephesos were. It therefore gives an idea of what might be placed in the sanctuary of a reasonably important polis. Herodotos provides us with descriptions of several of the dedications at the Heraion, and these allow us to make comparisons with offerings elsewhere. With the exception of Amasis, the dedicators are Greek, and of particular interest are the materials they use: absent are the gold and silver that characterise the gifts of Lydian kings, and instead we have a variety of materials, including large bronze vessels from Kolaios's Samians and from Sparta. These are considered worthy of description by Herodotos, and from his detailed accounts we can gain a fairly good idea of what they looked like. We may then compare the kind of information that classical archaeologists might be interested in with the information about the dedications that Herodotos chooses to give us. We will find that straightforward monetary value is not the most important element of interest: it is the history of the objects, or at least stories attached to them, that contribute to their true value for Herodotos.

The Spartan bowl (i. 70)

> ποιησάμενοι κρητῆρα χάλκεον ζῳδίων τε ἔξωθεν πλήσαντες περὶ τὸ χεῖλος καὶ μέγαθεϊ τριηκοσίους ἀμφορέας χωρέοντα ἦγον ...
>
> They made a bronze crater, covering the outside around the rim with figures: it held three hundred amphoras.

17 Table 5 lists all the references to dedications in sanctuaries mentioned by Herodotos, with the exception of dedications of booty (for which see table 6).

Herodotos's description of this crater is interesting because it suggests an object very similar to the Vix Crater in both shape and size (Joffroy 1954). The Spartan bowl can be closely dated from Herodotos's account to the very end of Kroisos's reign, that is c. 545 BC; dates for the Vix Crater vary from the second quarter of the sixth century (Gjødsen 1963) to the end of that century (Joffroy 1954), and this further suggests that the two craters are similar. Nor does the comparison end there: both were intended for rulers. We do not know whether the Vix crater was kept long above ground before it was buried with its princess, and we do not know how it came into her possession, but it may have been a gift, as Kroisos's bowl was a gift. What is important is that the objects were considered valuable - worthy objects for powerful rulers - and yet their manufacture cannot have been expensive. The scrap value of the Vix Crater (and presumably Kroisos's bowl) has been calculated as about 465 dr. (Vickers 1985a, 120), which is not very much when compared with the offerings made by Kroisos at the same time. Certainly the object was large, but if it was valuable we must accept a different idea of value from simply a monetary value.

Amasis's portraits (ii. 182) and corslet (iii. 47.1-3)

> εἰκόνας ἑωυτοῦ διφασίας ξυλίνας
>
> two wooden likenesses of himself
>
> καὶ γὰρ θώρηκα ἐλήισαντο τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτεϊ ἢ τὸν κρητῆρα οἱ Σάμιοι, ἐόντα μὲν λίνεον καὶ ζώων ἐνυφασμένων συχνῶν, κεκοσμημένον δὲ χρυσῷ καὶ εἰρίοισι ἀπὸ ξύλου· τῶν δὲ εἵνεκα θωμάσαι ἄξιον ἀρπεδόνη ἑκάστη τοῦ θώρηκος ποιέει· ἐοῦσα γὰρ λεπτὴ ἔχει ἀρπεδόνας ἐν ἑωυτῇ τριηκοσίας καὶ ἑξήκοντα, πάσας φανεράς.
>
> The year before the crater they stole a corslet of linen, with many animals woven in, and decorated with gold and cotton; what makes it worth marvelling at is that each of the threads, which are fine themselves, contains three hundred and sixty strands, each one visible. (iii. 47.2-3)

Amasis's gifts illustrate the fact that major dedications need not be made from precious metals. The choice of wood should not be particularly surprising, since Egypt had a long

tradition of sculpture in wood (Meiggs 1982, 300-301),[18] nor is it unique for Samos, where a number of dedications in wood have been found in excavation (Ohly 1953; Kopcke 1967). In fact it is probable that wooden dedications were common elsewhere, and have not been preserved. Conditions in Samos and in Egypt have made preservation possible, and it is a happy coincidence that one of the two references to wooden sculpture in Herodotos should link those two places. Linen too was a common Egyptian product, and in chapter four we will see why Amasis might choose these materials for his gifts.

As to what the portraits actually looked like, we cannot be certain, as little survives in Samos from the late sixth century. One would expect a kouros type, not only because this was the most common form of dedicatory statue, but also because that shape is imposed upon the sculptor by the shape of trees. An example of a standing male figure from the seventh century does survive from Samos (Ohly 1953, no. 5), and this may be the closest we have.

Polykrates's furniture (iii. 123.1)

τὸν κόσμον τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρεῶνος τοῦ Πολυκράτεος ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητον

The furniture from Polykrates's hall which is worth seeing

There is little that can be said about what this would have looked like, given Herodotos's rather brief description.

Mandrokles's painting (iv. 88.1-2)

ζῷα γραψάμενος πᾶσαν τὴν ζεῦξιν τοῦ Βοσπόρου καὶ βασιλέα τε Δαρεῖον ἐν προεδρίῃ κατήμενον καὶ τὸν στρατὸν αὐτοῦ διαβαίνοντα, ταῦτα γραψάμενος ἀνέθηκε ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον, ἐπιγράψας τάδε·

18 There may also have been particular circumstances which made the choice of material significant: see chapter four.

Βόσπορον ἰχθυόεντα γεφυρώσας ἀνέθηκε
Μανδροκλέης Ἥρῃ μνημόσυνον σχεδίης,
αὐτῷ μὲν στέφανον περιθείς, Σαμίοισι δὲ κῦδος
Δαρείου βασιλέος ἐκτελέσας κατὰ νοῦν.

He had a picture painted showing the whole bridging of the Bosphoros, and king Dareios sitting on his throne, and his army crossing; having had these things drawn, he set it up in the Heraion, writing these words on it: 'Mandrokles, who bridged the fishy Bosphoros, dedicated this memorial to Hera; having achieved this in accordance with the intention of king Dareios, he received a crown for himself, and honour for the Samians.'

Little can be said for certain about large-scale archaic Greek painting, since none survives. It is perhaps ironic that when Strabo visited the Heraion, the temple itself had become a πινακοθήκη, 'picture-gallery' (Strab. xiv. 1.14).

The Samian tripod (iv. 152.4)

οἱ δὲ Σάμιοι τὴν δεκάτην τῶν ἐπικερδίων ἐξελόντες ἓξ τάλαντα ἐποιήσαντο χαλκήιον κρητῆρος Ἀργολικοῦ τρόπον· πέριξ δὲ αὐτο γρυπῶν κεφαλαὶ πρόκροσσοί εἰσι· καὶ ἀνέθηκαν ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον ὑποστήσαντο αὐτῷ τρεῖς χαλκέους κολοσσοὺς ἑπταπήχεας τοῖσι γούνασι ἐρηρεισμένους.

The Samians, putting aside six talents as a tenth of their profits, had a bronze vessel made in the style of an Argolic crater; around it were griffins' heads in rows. They set it up in the Heraion and stood it on three colossal kneeling figures of bronze seven cubits high.

Herodotos's description is very useful because it is apparently one of the very few examples in literature of a monetary value being ascribed to an object of the archaic period. Kolaios's voyage is connected with the foundation of Kyrene, and must belong to c. 630 BC, so we start with a reasonable amount of useful information, having both date and value. However, there is a serious problem in the high value given: it is possible to establish a price for the raw materials of bronze-making for the late fifth century in Athens, and this would suggest a scrap value for the tripod of nearer 1% of sixty talents than 10%.[19] The main question to consider is the origin of the tripod: was it of

[19] I.G. I^3. 472 gives costs for tin as 230 dr. a talent, and for copper as 35 dr. a talent. The proportion of tin in bronze vessels imported from the East in the seventh century is about 10% (as it is in the later, Greek, Vix Crater), and in Greek vessels 5% at most (Rolley 1986, 22). This gives a value of 45-55 dr. for a talent of bronze. If we estimate the weight of the dedication to be about ten talents (the Vix

Samian origin or imported? The word ἐποιήσαντο might suggest that the vessel was made in Samos, and there is certainly evidence of the manufacture of griffin protomes in Samos at this time (Jantzen 1955); on the other hand, the high value of the tripod might better be accounted for if the tripod was imported, and the cost of transport was responsible for the greater value. There is plenty of imported bronze-work in the Heraion, especially from Egypt (Jantzen 1972), and it has been explained as dedications made by traders returning from Naukratis (Snodgrass 1983, 24). Kolaios's ship is supposed to have been πλέουσα ἐπ' Αἰγύπτου, 'sailing from Egypt', when he was blown to Tartessos (iv. 152.1), and perhaps he had bought it on his journey. Griffin craters are not, however, an Egyptian product, although the stand of Kolaios's tripod may have had Egyptian features.[20] Griffin protomes have been found in Greece and also in Cyprus and Etruria - but not in the East at all - and this has led to an assumption that they are exclusively a Greek creation (Jantzen 1955). However, protomes are found on cauldrons with distinct Eastern elements in several places, and one would have to postulate the addition of griffins to Eastern cauldrons happening independently all over the Greek world. Furthermore the griffin, in an anthropomorphic form, is known from Syrian wall-reliefs. It is therefore likely that some griffin-cauldrons were made outside the Greek world and imported (cf. Rolley 1986, 82). The find-spots suggest that the importers may have been Phoinikian, and indeed Phoinikian cauldrons, in this case silver, are mentioned in a source from the seventh or eighth century, Homer (Il. xxiii. 740-745). This would of course fit very well with the idea of Tartessos itself being the source not only of Kolaios's wealth, but also his tripod:

Crater weighs eight), then its scrap value, at fifth century prices, would be around 500 dr. Of course metals might have been more valuable in the seventh century, but even if bronze was sixty times as expensive (i.e. more than half the value of silver), the scrap value of the tripod would be at least a talent less than Herodotos suggests.

20 See below.

> There is much more evidence now in the south of Spain for a substantial Phoenician presence in the eighth century... There were dedications, said to be of 'Tartessian bronze', at an even earlier date (than Kolaios) (648). (Boardman 1980, 213)

Postulating a Phoinikian origin for Kolaios's cauldron might perhaps explain its eventual value, although, as we shall see, Herodotos's interest in the object was not that of an antiquarian, and we should probably read δεκάτη very loosely.

A foreign origin may help to account for the design of the stand. The description of the stand does not correspond to any surviving tripod-stand, but a model can perhaps be found in ivory. There is a statuette of a kneeling figure found in the Samian Heraion, dating from the end of the seventh century (Barnett 1982, 59 and pl. 62 a-c). The piece is of Greek workmanship, but Barnett comments: 'the kneeling pose is oriental and could have been copied from many Egyptian works of art.' The stand of the Samian tripod might have been such a model.[21]

The value of gifts

In order to understand Herodotos's interest in these gifts we must look at the context in which they are found. Herodotos does not describe them when he discusses the Heraion, but at widely spaced intervals through the work. The Spartan bowl is part of the story of Kroisos's attempts to win Greek support against Cyrus; the portraits of Amasis are in a list of gifts made to Greek states by the Pharaoh, and foreshadow the story of Amasis and Polykrates (iii. 40-43); Kolaios's tripod comes into the story of the foundation of Kyrene.

---

[21] In connection with this dedication we should consider another of the same period not mentioned by Herodotos. Under the foundations of the sixth century temples are the remains of what must have been the stand for an entire ship (Walter and Vierneisel 1959). The ship will have disappeared in the sixth century reorganisation, by which time it may well have been crumbling anyway. Several people have been tempted to associate this with Kolaios also (cf. Shipley 1987, 57 and n. 45), although it cannot be proved. Certainly it would be an appropriate dedication for so successful a trader - it might even account for the rest of the six talents not spent on the cauldron - but it is also possible that Samos produced other great traders, and that because the dedication was made in wood rather than portable, durable bronze, its dedicator's name was lost.

It would be inadequate to say that the objects are simply pegs upon which to hang a good story, or that they are mentioned because Herodotos learned the stories he tells while being shown the objects by the temple attendants at the Heraion. This is most easily shown to be the case with the tripod. Kolaios has a 'cameo' role in the story of Kyrene: he provided food for Korobios, the purple-fisher left on the island of Platea by the Theran settlers. This happened while Kolaios was on his accidental journey to Tartessos, and it was there that he gained the wealth to which his dedication refers. Herodotos claims that his source for the story of Kolaios's intervention was μοῦνοι Θηραῖοι (iv. 150.1; cf. iv. 154.1), so the story is not presented as coming from Samos and the description of the tripod is peripheral to the narrative of the colonisation of Kyrene. It could have been left out without affecting the narrative. Since the object is not central to the story, then rather than the object providing validation for the story, we should see the story providing value to the object. In the context the tripod is worthy of attention for two reasons. First it is associated with Kolaios, the second-most successful trader Herodotos knows of (iv. 152.3), and secondly it is part of the story that explains the friendship between Samos and Thera and Kyrene (iv. 152.5).[22]

The Spartan bowl too has it its own story. Within the wider story of Kroisos's attempts to win over the Spartans, there is the conflict over how the bowl ended up in the Heraion. This is later given as an explanation for the Spartans joining the attack on Polykrates (iii. 47.1). The bowl is described because of the problem it caused, as is clear from the fact that Herodotos continues his narrative κατὰ μέν νυν τὸν κρητῆρα οὕτως ἔσχε, Κροῖσος δὲ ... 'that is enough about the crater, but Kroisos...' (i. 71.1).

22 It is, perhaps, because Herodotos's real interest is in the story rather than the actual monetary value of the tripod that we have such difficulty reconciling the apparent value of the tripod with Herodotos's mention of a δεκάτη of sixty talents.

One way to explore the idea that objects gain their value through the stories that involve them is to look at myths. Gernet, in an article on '"Value" in Greek myth', says this:

> We can see that precious objects occur in legends - even that they play, so to speak, a central rôle - because in them they are always endowed with a peculiar power. (Gernet 1981, 116)

He goes on to look at a number of myths and folk tales where an object seems to exert an influence over the people who come in contact with it: the tripod of the seven sages, the necklace of Eriphyle, Polykrates's ring and the Golden Fleece. From the various versions of these stories he draws out some common threads. The objects are often gifts, changing hands several times in the story; sometimes they end up dedicated in a temple; frequently there is conflict associated with them. Gernet's exploration is wide-ranging, and there are differences between the objects he discusses and the ones we have found in Herodotos. Most obviously, Gernet's objects are made of precious metal. This is not a crucial difference, reflecting perhaps a difference of genre: legendary objects are usually made of precious materials, while large objects made by Greeks of the archaic period would seldom be.

The similarities between the elements Gernet discusses and those found in Herodotos are more significant than the differences. The bowl the Spartans try to give to Kroisos coincides with his downfall, and it then becomes the cause of an ongoing conflict between Sparta and Samos, as is Amasis's corslet; Amasis's gift to Polykrates is followed by a breach in their friendship and Polykrates's downfall; Polykrates's furniture is dedicated after his violent death; Kolaios's tripod is set in a story of endurance both for himself, blown off course, and Korobios and the Therans suffering famine; Mandrokles's picture depicts a particularly impressive piece of engineering. Herodotos is interested

in these particular objects, therefore, because of the kind of story associated with them, which have a definitely 'epic' or 'mythical' tone.[23]

Finally, one of the important features of valuable objects in myth was the link with religion, the fact that the object was finally dedicated in a temple (Gernet 1981, 117). Herodotos would therefore be interested in these dedications because they were in sanctuaries. It should be stressed, however, that this is not the only reason for his interest: the 'value' that these objects had was acquired before they reached the sanctuary where Herodotos saw them.

Conclusion

We are now in a position to assess the role of sanctuaries in the story Herodotos tells. We have seen that the sites themselves are identified with the polis to which they belong, and that, in the case of Samos, the size of the temple-building is symbolic of the former glory of the island. In a similar way, some of the religious rituals and restrictions which Herodotos has found at sanctuaries are tied by him to the stories of leading individuals. The same is true of the offerings dedicated in sanctuaries. This means that by talking about sanctuaries, Herodotos can tell stories about the characters of his history. It is important to see that the kind of stories he tells are not usually particularly 'religious'; they are most often military or political.[24] This should give us confidence that there is no 'theological' programme in Herodotos's history.

---

[23] Another example that supports this reading is the Dolphin dedicated by Arion in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Tainaron (i. 24.8). The object is not mentioned to show where Herodotos learned the story of Arion's miraculous dolphin ride; he says that he heard the story from the people of Lesbos and Corinth. It is because this story is associated with the dedication that the dedication becomes worthy of mention.

[24] Military: e.g. Miltiades's capture of Lemnos, Mandrokles's bridge, Kleomenes at Argos; political: e.g. Peisistratos at Athens, Kleisthenes at Sikyon, Maiandrios in Samos (iii. 142.2-3).

It also suggests that sanctuaries were really central to the lives of the Greek poleis at the time when Herodotos was writing, and this can be brought out by a brief comparison with Pausanias. Pausanias too describes both objects and stories:

> His aim was to record the most memorable features on two levels: λόγοι and θεωρήματα. The first term means 'words', whether spoken or written; the second refers to what you can see. The logoi are not subordinate to the theoremata, not digressions but an integral part of the descriptions of what can be seen. (Habicht 1985, 21)

However, whereas Herodotos's work is an integrated whole, Pausanias provides a series of independent descriptions of places and pieces of history or myth. The difference can be explained by the fact that the two works belong to different genres, but this is not the most important point. We must consider why descriptions of buildings and objects connected with sanctuaries are found, in the fifth century BC, in what we call a history, while in the second century AD similar descriptions appear in a 'guide book'.

In Pausanias's time, Greece had virtually no political importance; it was a part of the Roman empire, and could be seen, at best, as a source of culture and artistic beauty:

> νῦν ἅπασαι μὲν αἱ Ἑλληνικαὶ πόλεις ἐφ' ὑμῶν ἀνέχουσι καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς ἀναθήματα καὶ τέχναι καὶ κόσμαι πάντες ὑμῖν ἔχουσι φιλοτιμίαν, ὥσπερ ἐν προαστιῷ κόσμος
>
> Now all the Greek cities rise up under your leadership, and the monuments which are dedicated in them and their embellishments and comforts redound to your honour like beautiful suburbs. (Aristid. Panegyric 94)

Greece is like a museum, a collection of interesting objects and stories. For Pausanias it is buildings or objects or stories themselves that are τὰ ἀξιολογώτατα or τὰ μάλιστα λόγου ἄξια (Paus. ii. 13.3 etc.): having described one he moves on to the next. In contrast, Herodotos's Greece was a world of autonomous states coming into frequent conflict or alliance with each other. Thus the erga of Herodotos are part of a larger story. We have examined the dedications at one sanctuary, the Samian Heraion, and found that the dedications and festivals connected with it involve, amongst others, Alyattes, Amasis, Dareios, Kroisos, Periandros and Polykrates, and the peoples of Corcyra, Kyrene, Samos, Sparta and Thera. These individuals and peoples occur elsewhere in the

histories, and to a great extent it is this that makes the objects dedicated interesting to Herodotos.

In the next three chapters we will use Herodotos's narrative as the starting point for a wider investigation of the ways in which sanctuaries were central to the lives of the Greek poleis.

Endnote: the Dating of the Samian Heraion and the Ephesian Artemision

Those who want to associate the destruction of the penultimate building on the Heraion site with an historical event choose either the unsuccessful Spartan siege of 525 (White 1954) or the massacre by Otanes in 517 (Wiegand 1911, 23); the latter receives doubtful support from Pausanias (vii. 5.4), who says that the Heraion was burnt by the Persians, but seems to think that the temple standing in his day was the one the Persians destroyed. The alternative and more plausible explanation, given the silence of our sources, is accidental fire (Buschor 1930, 95-96); here the problem is that this makes it impossible to give a close date, and Buschor seems to favour the early 530s specifically in order to associate the later temple with Polykrates, thus leading to the danger of circularity.

The conventional date for the foundation of the penultimate building can also be called into question. It is dated by its stylistic relation to the Archaic Artemision at Ephesos, which it is thought to predate by about twenty years. That building is dated from the statement in Herodotos that Κροίσῳ δὲ ἐστὶ ... ἐν δὲ Ἐφέσῳ αἵ τε βοὲς αἱ χρύσεαι καὶ τῶν κίονων αἱ πολλαί, 'in Ephesos the gold bulls and most of the columns are from Kroisos' (i. 92.2). The reference is taken to prove that the Artemision was built c. 560 BC, but it does not. The reference to the columns should not be taken to refer to the structure itself, since, as we have seen, Herodotos shows little interest in buildings as such. It is more likely to refer to dedications of gold columns within the temple, since all

the other gifts of Kroisos mentioned in the chapter are made of gold (Vickers 1985b, 9-11). The Artemision can no longer be firmly dated, nor therefore can the penultimate Samian temple.

Indeed, if one was mischievous, and accepted a low chronology for the temple buildings (cf. Francis and Vickers 1983), one could argue not only that the so-called 'Polykrates Temple' should be called the 'Rhoikos Temple' (Boardman 1959, 201; Furtwängler 1984), but also that the earlier, so-called 'Rhoikos Temple' should be dated to the 530s, when its magnificence would coincide with the growth of Samian power under Polykrates, and hence that it should be called the 'Polykrates Temple'.

Chapter Three: Sanctuaries and federations

The close bond between the religious and the political in archaic and classical Greece is particularly suggested by the use of religious sites for political meetings of all kinds. This chapter investigates the role of sanctuaries as centres for joint political action by Greek states. Mainly this means the discussion of sanctuaries as meeting places for what we call 'leagues', for example the groups of states which met at the Panionion at various points in the sixth century. When discussing the Ionians, Herodotos draws attention to the meetings at the common sanctuary, the Panionion, and this has led historians to assume that there was an ancient Ionian league, which was originally a religious institution, that developed into a political-military organisation in the sixth century. This is not a view that finds support from the archaeological evidence, and is based on an evolutionary view of the role of international organisations that does not fit the historical evidence very well. I want to show that the clear distinction between 'political' and 'religious' activity is misleading: all Greek leagues met at sanctuaries, and their actions were understood to be under the influence of the gods, but at the same time their activities can often be seen to be political, determined by the decisions of the human participants.

In this chapter I will examine first the accounts of activities associated with the Panionion, to establish what kind of groups met there. The use of the Panionion will be compared with the activities at other inter-state sanctuaries to show that Greek poleis used them for a range of different purposes, both 'religious' and 'political'. I shall show how two stories in Herodotos provide a model for divine involvement in political decision-making in sanctuaries, and relate this to a more general idea, that all defined space was sacred, and hence that political organisation was necessarily also religious. I shall then apply this analysis to the religious organisation of Naukratis, as described by

Herodotos, to suggest a new interpretation of the building of the Hellenion there. Finally, I will demonstrate how this analysis of political activity between states can be related to the workings of politics within individual states.

The Panionion

Herodotos's description of the Panionion and its origins do not give a clear indication of how old it was. He makes it clear that it was a joint sanctuary, founded as a place for common cult activity, and in particular a joint festival. He describes how it was founded:

> οἱ μέν νυν ἄλλοι Ἴωνες καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔφυγον τὸ οὔνομα, οὐ βουλόμενοι Ἴωνες κεκλῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν φαίνονταί μοι οἱ πολλοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τῷ οὐνόματι· αἱ δὲ δυώδεκα πόλιες αὗται τῷ τε οὐνόματι ἠγάλλοντο καὶ ἱρὸν ἱδρύσαντο ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτέων, τῷ οὔνομα ἔθεντο Πανιώνιον, ἐβουλεύσαντο δὲ αὐτοῦ μεταδοῦναι μηδαμοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἰώνων.
>
> The other Ionians and the Athenians avoided the name, not wanting to be called Ionians, and most of them seem to me even now to be ashamed of the name. But these twelve cities were proud of the name, and set up a sanctuary for their own use, which they called the Panionion, and they decided not to share it with any other Ionians. (i. 143.3)

He goes on to describe the sanctuary itself:

> τὸ δὲ Πανιώνιόν ἐστι τῆς Μυκάλης χῶρος ἱρός, πρὸς ἄρκτον τετραμμένος, κοινῇ ἐξαραιρημένος ὑπὸ Ἰώνων Ποσειδέωνι Ἑλικωνίῳ· ἡ δὲ Μυκάλη ἐστὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ἄκρη πρὸς ζέφυρον ἄνεμον κατήκουσα Σάμῳ, ἐς τὴν συλλεγόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν πολίων Ἴωνες ἄγεσκον ὁρτήν, τῇ ἔθεντο οὔνομα Πανιώνια.
>
> The Panionion is a sacred site at Mykale, facing North, dedicated to Poseidon Helikonios jointly by the Ionians; Mykale is a promontory of the mainland, running westwards towards Samos, to which the Ionians came together to hold a festival which they called the Panionia. (i. 148.1)

Herodotos introduces the Panionion when he discusses meetings of the East Greek poleis to plan resistance to Kroisos (i. 141.4), and it is clear that the Panionion already existed at that point. It has been suggested that the sanctuary was the centre of an ancient religious league, founded at the time of the great Migration (cf. Shipley 1987, 30), and we will examine the evidence for an Ionian league later. However, the archaeological evidence does not support so early a date: there is nothing earlier than

the sixth century (Kleiner, Hommel and Müller-Wiener 1967; Shipley 1987, 30, 267). Herodotos's description of the formation of the sanctuary and festival suggests that it was caused by a need for some form of self-definition as Ionians by those poleis. This would make sense in the first half of the sixth-century, when the Greeks of Asia Minor were first threatened seriously by the kings of Lydia, Alyattes and Kroisos (i. 17ff.; cf. i. 6).[1]

Herodotos's account, as we have seen, emphasises the common festival, but it has been argued that the sanctuary was the centre of a more formal religious organisation. The story that is cited to demonstrate this idea is the so-called 'Meliac War'. This is an event which has been put together from various pieces of ancient evidence. The fully developed account says that the Ionian Dodecapolis originally had a thirteenth member, Melia. At some point, by decision of the common council of the Ionians, Melia (or Melite if that is the same place) was utterly destroyed by the other twelve cities for a religious offence (cf. most recently Shipley 1987, 29-30).

If this story were true, it would suggest that a form of Ionian league existed from the dark ages, meeting either at the Panionion or some earlier common sanctuary. The league's responsibilities appear to be essentially religious, like those of the Delphic Amphiktyony, but to extend to beyond simply the sanctuary itself. The religious function of the league would explain why it met at a sanctuary. If such a league was the origin of the group of Greek states which met to plan resistance to Kroisos (i. 141) and Darius (vi. 6), we would not need any new explanation for the choice of a sanctuary as a meeting place: the mid-sixth century meetings could be explained as the transformation of an ancient sacred league into a more modern, military organisation in a rationalist late archaic Ionia, which perhaps simply retained its traditional centre. There are, however, serious problems with this explanation, as we shall see.

---

[1] Introducing his account of the Ionian revolt, O. Murray comments: 'like the Jews, the Greeks learned to define themselves as a nation in the course of their contact with the Persians' (Murray 1988, 461). Herodotos's narrative, on my argument, would suggest that for the Ionians, the process started a little earlier.

The story of the Meliac War is open to serious doubt. First, there is no parallel for this kind of action in Greek history. Second, the site of Melia has been excavated, and although the abandonment of the place might be interpreted as the result of an Ionian destruction (Kleiner, Hommel and Müller-Wiener 1967), there could be any number of other reasons for the abandonment of the site. Third, the literary 'evidence' for the Meliac War consists only of remarks in some late authors, and the idea that Melia/Melite was once a member of an Ionian league contradicts the statement of Herodotos that there only ever were twelve Ionian poleis (i. 145).

Herodotos also makes it clear that meetings at the Panionion were a new idea at the time of Kroisos's expansion. He describes the news of Kroisos's advances and says:

> Ἴωνες δὲ ὡς ἤκουσαν τούτων ἀνενειχθέντων ἐς τὰς πόλιας, τείχεά τε περιεβάλοντο ἕκαστοι καὶ συνελέγοντο ἐς Πανιώνιον οἱ ἄλλοι πλὴν Μιλησίων.
>
> The Ionians, when they had heard these things reported to the cities, each began to build walls and to gather at the Panionion, with the exception of the Milesians. (i. 141.4)

The implication is that the idea of meeting at the Panionion is a new one for the states involved. The absence of the Milesians shows too that the states which met at the Panionion on this occasion were not all the states associated with the sanctuary, and it is possible that on this occasion there were non-Ionians there, as there must have been at the time of the Ionian revolt, as we shall see. That the meetings at the Panionion were originally related to Kroisos's attacks is suggested also by Herodotos when he describes the meetings that happened afterwards: κεκακωμένων δὲ Ἰώνων καὶ συλλεγομένων οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἐς τὸ Πανιώνιον, 'after things had gone wrong for the Ionians, they gathered no less often at the Panionion' (i. 170.1). The states that met at the Panionion during the 'Ionian Revolt' were not exclusively Ionian. The fleet which assembled after the meeting included a significant number of Aiolean Lesbians (vi. 8.2), and they must therefore have been present at the meeting. It is also clear that the states which met there were not members of a formal Ionian federation, since Thales is

supposed to have proposed the creation of a federation at one such meeting, putting forward Teos, not Mykale, as its centre (i. 170). It follows therefore that the group of states which met together to defend themselves from Kroisos and Darius is not the same as the group which is said to have founded the Panionion, and the formation of a defensive alliance against Kroisos, or the holding of meetings to plan the Ionian revolt, cannot be related to events that are supposed to have taken place hundreds of years earlier (Murray 1988, 481).[2]

If the choice of the Panionion as a site for meeting is not based on an ancient tradition, we must look for immediate rather than historical reasons for why a group of Greek poleis should choose to meet at a sanctuary to plan resistance to a military threat. We must start by establishing the relationship between the sanctuary itself and the poleis which meet there, and then show that meeting in sanctuaries was not limited to Ionian or East Greek poleis.

The administration of joint sanctuaries

We must be careful when we look at the relationship between Greek states and inter-state sanctuaries, in order that we may compare like with like. A group of states frequently would meet at a sanctuary without being responsible for the religious organisation of activities at it. The Panionia was a festival attended only by the twelve Ionian poleis that set up the sanctuary: they were an exclusive group. But who organised the Panionia? The major Greek international sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi were also exclusive, in that they excluded non-Greeks from participation,

---

[2] It has been suggested that the 'Ionian revolt' is a misleading title referring to a series of disjointed actions carried on for different reasons by different East Greek poleis (Neville 1979). It seems to me that this view is strengthened by the argument that Panionian unity is itself a mirage: a common cult was established only in the sixth century, and meetings for common action do not begin until the states are forced into it.

although all Greeks were included. In both these cases there was a distinction between those who took part in activities at the sanctuary, and those who organised the festivals.

At Olympia, the distinction is clear between those who participate in the Olympic festival and those who organise it. Herodotos talks about οἱ τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέποντες ἀγῶνα, 'those organising the games at Olympia' (v. 22.1) in contrast to οἱ ἀντιθευσόμενοι, 'the competitors'; and although there is reference in Thucydides to τῷ Ὀλυμπιακῷ νόμῳ, 'the Olympic law' (Th. v. 49.1), it is clear from his work and Xenophon (HG iii. 21.2) that the people who run the games are the Eleians.

Delphi was a sanctuary used by all the Greek states, but it was administered by the people of Delphi, from whom the Pythia and other officials were drawn, and, for certain matters, a small group of states, the Amphiktyony (Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 298-299). Herodotos mentions the ἕδραι of the Amphiktyons at Anthela (vii. 200.2), and there are occasional references to the Amphiktyons throughout the book, from which it is possible to get an idea of what their role was in the archaic period. They are concerned with the fabric of the temple at Delphi (ii. 178; v. 62.2), and later with avenging the betrayal at Thermopylai (vii. 213) and commemorating the defeat (vii. 228.4). They are responsible therefore for looking after the two sanctuary areas, Delphi itself, and under the name of Πυλαγόραι, Anthela/Thermopylai. The Amphiktyony is presented as the guardian of sanctuaries, and not as a league for joint military action: when, in the fourth century, Philip of Macedon uses his position as head of the Delphic Amphiktyony to justify his military activities in central Greece, it is because he can claim that Delphi itself is under threat. In contrast to this small group of states, we can point to a much larger number who would have attended the Pythian Games regularly, and who put their names to the spoils from the Persians dedicated at Delphi (viii. 121; ix. 81).

The distinction I am trying to establish is between a group of states who use a sanctuary as a place of common activity, whether it be a festival or whatever, and a state or group of states that has special responsibility for the maintenance of the

sanctuary itself. The Ionians, as described by Herodotos, fall into the first category: it does not follow that because access to the sanctuary is limited to them, the Ionians object in meeting is only to look after the sanctuary. The suggestion of Sourvinou-Inwood (1990, 298) that even 'Panhellenic' sanctuaries were in reality polis sanctuaries would imply that the Panionion was probably looked after by the people of Mykale or Priene.

Sanctuaries and federations

For Greek writers in the fifth century and later, the idea that a group of states should hold their joint meetings at a sanctuary is both universal and unremarkable. Thucydides does not feel it necessary to explain why Athens and her allies should meet at the sanctuary at Delos (Th. i. 96.2), leaving it to commentators to postulate reasons (e.g. Gomme 1945, 280; Meiggs 1972, 43). Polybios too, when describing a Sicilian federation (Plb. ii. 39.6), mentions as part of a very brief outline that they had a κοινὸν ἱερόν.

The case of the 'Delian League' provides a useful parallel for the meetings at the Panionion. We know something about a Delian festival that dates back to the archaic period. The festival, which was reinstated by the Athenians in 426/5, is discussed in some detail by Thucydides, who relies in part on the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. He describes it as μεγάλη ξύνοδος ἐς τὴν Δῆλον τῶν Ἰώνων τε καὶ περικτιόνων νησιωτῶν, 'a great gathering at Delos of the Ionians and the nearby islanders' (iii. 104.3). I shall argue later that it was because the sanctuary of Apollo at Delos was an important cult-centre for the islanders that Datis showed respect to the sanctuary on his way to Marathon, and was therefore able to win support from Ionians and Aioleans (vi. 97-98).[3]

[3] See chapter four

The festival existed in archaic times, but in 478 a new form of meeting began at Delos; the 'Delian league'. Athens and her allies chose to meet on Delos to plan common action against Persia, and kept their treasury there (Th. i. 96). The 'members' of the league came from a wider area than just 'Ionians and nearby islanders'; they met annually rather than every four years. Like the Panionion, the sanctuary on Delos was a convenient central location, and was already known to many of the league members, but there is no direct connection between the ancient Delian festival and the newer 'Delian league', except that they shared the same sanctuary.[4]

There was apparently nothing particularly 'sacred' about the activities of the Delian League, as described by Thucydides (i. 96-117), nor those of the Greeks fighting Kroisos and then taking part in the Ionian revolt. Nevertheless, we will see that the Greeks did place these actions in some kind of religious context. In chapter five I will demonstrate that Greek poleis understood their military victories to be directly attributable to their gods, and made dedications to acknowlege this; in chapter six I shall show how this divine intervention is pictured by Herodotos. Here I want to show how, by holding meetings in sanctuaries, Greeks saw themselves as able to work in accordance with the will of the gods.

Two stories in Herodotos illustrate how sanctuaries work to permit the intervention of gods into human decision-making. Both stories concern non-Greek individuals, but, as we shall see, both clearly cast light on what happens when representatives of Greek states meet in sanctuaries.

---

[4] It is clear that Athens was in charge of both the league and the festival: she appointed the 'Ελληνοταμίαι (Th. i. 96.2), and organised the games (Th. iii. 104.6). This suggests that Delos was to some extent under Athenian influence, possibly since Peisistratos's purification of the sanctuary (Hdt. i. 64; Th. iii. 104.1). Nonetheless, it remained an international sanctuary, not part of the Athenian state.

How to become king (i): in Egypt

The story of Psammetichos I (ii. 147-152) is simple: Egypt has been divided into twelve parts, each with a ruler, and these rulers met regularly in temples. An oracle foretold that whoever poured a libation from a bronze cup in the temple of Hephaistos would rule all Egypt; when once, by accident, only eleven cups were brought to the kings, Psammetichos poured his libation from his helmet, thus fulfilling the oracle. He was immediately exiled by the other rulers, and his dominion divided between them. Psammetichos vowed revenge, and received an oracle telling him to look for bronze men from the sea; when Greek and Carian mercenaries appeared in Egypt, he hired them and gained control of all Egypt.

The whole story is very Greek in tone. This is perhaps signalled by Herodotos when he introduces this section of Egyptian history by saying that from now on he is not relying only on what the Egyptians say. Greek elements include, for example, the attempt to avoid the outcome of an oracle, which leads directly to its fulfilment (cf. Sophokles, Oedipus Tyrannus). Herodotos does not remark on the fact that the rulers met in temples, saying merely ἐς γὰρ δὴ τὰ πάντα ἱρὰ συνελέγοντο, 'for they met in all the sanctuaries' (ii. 147.4). Herodotos sees no difference between Greek and Egyptian religion (cf. ii. 50-64, esp 58), and Egyptian temples are described as though they were Greek temples dedicated to Greek gods, so the rituals may be taken to be standard Greek practice. Libations are made, but at no point does Herodotos suggest that the gods are asked to act. Nor is there any special piety attributed to Psammetichos, or impiety attributed to his co-rulers. We see merely regular political meetings of rulers related by marriage (ii. 147.3)

Herodotos makes the temple important to his story, implicitly, and the role of Hephaistos is very visible. The crucial event that starts the action happens in the temple of Hephaistos, when the ἀρχιερεύς brings out too few phialai (ii. 151.1). The helmet out of

which Psammetichos pours his libation indicates how the oracle will be fulfilled, through armed force, and is bronze, Hephaistos's metal[5]. And indeed it is through bronze that Psammetichos succeeds, Greek mercenaries ὁπλισθέντας χαλκῷ, 'armoured in bronze' (ii. 152.4). If there is any doubt that here Hephaistos is at work, it will be dispelled by the fact that the very next act that Herodotos attributes to Psammetichos is building a προπύλαια for the Hephaistion at Memphis (ii. 153).

For Herodotos the sanctuary has a special role when used as a meeting place. The meeting takes place with straightforward ritual activity, with participants meeting as equals. Should the god wish to intervene, he is in a position to do so; this would appear to give authority to the meeting.

How to become king (ii): in Persia

We may compare the story of Psammetichos with that of Darius's accession (iii. 68-87), which provides a distinctly non-Greek setting for a similar story. Once again one of a number of equals rises to become sole ruler, but other features are different.

The story is as follows. After Cambyses's death, seven conspirators gather together, overthrow the pretender Smerdis, and then decide that one of their number shall become king. The method of choosing is to meet outside the city, and the man whose horse first neighs is chosen as king. Darius wins by a trick, but there is thunder from heaven and the others recognise him as king immediately.

The most important aspect of the story for our purposes is the way that it is presented as non-Greek. The story does include the important debate on forms of constitution (iii. 80-83), superficially very Greek. In fact, however, the outcome, with overwhelming support for monarchy, shows how unGreek the Persians were, since in Greece at the

[5] cf. his δόμον χάλκεον (Il. xviii. 369-371)

time of Herodotos this was the one form of government that was practically nonexistent. The story contrasts with that of Psammetichos in a number of less important ways. The meetings in Egypt are to prevent anyone becoming sole ruler, here the meeting is to determine it; the significant incident in Egypt appears accidental, in Persia it comes about through cheating; the Egyptian co-rulers immediately reject Psammetichos, Darius's co-conspirators accept him.

The most striking difference between this story and that of Psammetichos is the place where the conspirators meet. While the Egyptians meet in temples, the Persians meet ἐν τῷ προαστίῳ (iii. 84.3). The προαστίον is specifically outside the fortification walls, the boundary of the ἄστυ (cf. Th. v. 2.4), so the meeting place chosen is the opposite of a bounded sanctuary.

The explanation of this lies in Herodotos's attitude to Persian religion, which he introduces like this: ἀγάλματα μὲν καὶ νηοὺς καὶ βωμοὺς οὐκ ἐν νόμῳ ποιευμένους ἱδρύεσθαι, 'they do not consider it in accordance with custom to set up statues and temples and altars' (i. 131.1). Sacrifice too is very different from Greek practice, with no altar, fire, libations, music, garlands or sprinkling meal (i. 132.1). Persian religion is presented as fundamentally different from Greek religion, and Herodotos emphasises this difference by making Persian religion into the exact opposite of Greek religion.[6] The most important consequence of this approach for our purposes is the way in which religious space is defined: while the boundaries are the same as in Greek society, for Persians sacred space lies on the outside. Whether this is an accurate idea of Persian religion is open to doubt (Cook 1984, 150-154), but it is Herodotos's idea. Herodotos believed that the 'Zeus' of the Persians was τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, 'the whole circle of the sky'

[6] This idea of the Persians as opposite is noted by Hartog when he considers warfare: 'There can therefore be no doubt that, in Greece, the Persians are regarded as barbarians, that is to say, as anti-hoplites.' (Hartog 1988, 46; cf. Hall 1989, 56-100; Lissarrague 1990, 29-34).

(i. 131.2), so the thunder and lightning that occured when Darius's horse neighed (iii. 86.2) can be seen as the sign of Zeus's approval of Darius.

The conclusion must be that the apparent opposition between the actions in the two stories reveals the actual identity of the divine role. Persian religion is non anthropomorphic, sanctuary-less, altar-less: it could be seen as Greek religion inside-out. This may explain why, when Psammetichos is pictured as almost completely passive, Darius is extremely active, to the point of having his groom cheat on his behalf (iii. 85-87). It certainly explains why Darius and the conspirators meet outside in unbounded space: being the opposite of Greek/Egyptian religion, Persian religion considers the unbounded areas sacred. In each case the main event happens where the God can intervene, and give approval, and in each case he does. The fact that the Persian conspirators meet outside a boundary indicates how important it was for Greeks to meet within one.

Sanctuaries and space

These stories provide a possible model for the way in which, for Herodotos, the gods intervene in human decision making. The element which links them together is the idea of bounded space as sacred. This is not explicitly stated by Herodotos, but it is the concept that makes the two stories fit together. It is the fact that Greeks meet together in space marked off and dedicated to a particular deity that allows that deity to be involved in decision making.

Examples of this understanding of sacred space can be found in other societies. It is particularly visible in cases where different groups share the same territory, but not the same spatial organisation. H. Kuper (Kuper 1972) describes behaviour in Swaziland, where the organisation of space for the Swazi was different from that of the colonial British authorities. The effect of this was that when the Swazi king and his 'court' met with

colonial officials, the appropriate place was the colonial 'office', but when discussing their own affairs they would move to their own traditional meeting place, the sibaya. All the meetings described by Kuper were concerned with matters of political organisation; nevertheless, the Swazi explained why meetings were held in different places in religious terms:

> 'When we meet in the sibaya to discuss, we must sit down. We are close to the labaphansi (those who are down below), that is the ancestors. We remember them in the sibaya. In the office we sit on chairs like Europeans who do not connect with our ancestors.' (Kuper 1972, 418)

Here, as in Herodotos's stories, a certain defined space, the sibaya, is appropriate for meetings because it allows access to the meeting for non-human advisers. Also, as with Herodotos, the subject of the meetings is not primarily 'religious' but 'political'.

The case of the Swazi suggests that it was possible sometimes for them to meet in a 'secular' area, the 'office': might Greeks sometimes have met in 'secular' areas, to discuss certain matters? In Kuper's example this was the case because it was not the Swazi themselves, but the colonial authorities, who had created the 'office'. We will now see that in Greece, all defined space was somehow considered sacred space, and that therefore all meetings were under the influence of the gods. The effect of this is to challenge the distinction between 'sacred' and 'secular'.

'Sacred' and 'secular'

Many ancient historians now accept that a traditional distinction between 'secular' and 'sacred', which puts political activity firmly onto the 'secular' side, is no longer tenable (e.g. Connor 1988, Garland 1989, Sourvinou-Inwood 1990). Describing classical Athens it is possible to say:

> Almost all civic activities which we might term 'secular' or 'profane' are carefully linked to a sacred realm, especially by entrance and exit rites - the assembly begins with religious ritual, wars involve special sacrifices and offerings, places primarily devoted to civic business often also have some sacral identity. (Connor 1988, 171)

This is not a situation that developed through the 'secularisation' of religious rituals, their adaptation for a non-religious occasion, but goes back to the origins of the polis. As far as the organisation of space is concerned, we can see this if we examine the original creation of civic space in Greek states. As we saw in chapter one, according to de Polignac it was an increasing interest in defining space, both the sacred space of the temenos of a sanctuary and territorial space, that was crucial for the formation of the polis. We must therefore look at the way in which these bounded spaces were established.

Religion and colonisation

The most useful place to look at the establishment of bounded space in Greek poleis is in colonies, where the initial division of space is part of a single act (Malkin 1987, 186).

Every stage of the creation of a Greek colony was carried out with appropriate religious rituals. The initial decision to found a colony was ratified by an oracle, usually Delphi; it was Delphi which was responsible for authorising the oikist, and showing him where to go:

> The geographical directions given to the oikist in those oracles with claims to authenticity provided a divine authority in topographical terms. The colonists would thus know the exact area which was granted to them. (Malkin 1987, 91)

On arrival, expert religious advice was taken by the oikist, to confirm that he had found the right place, and various rituals were carried out to establish how the city should be laid out, which we will consider in more detail. Herodotos mentions a number of cases where failure to perform the right religious action led to the colony not succeeding. The Theran colonisation of Kyrene had a poor start because the colonists did not follow the advice of the oracle, to go to Libya, but settled on an off-shore island (iv. 155-157). Even more clearly, Dorieus had trouble for neglecting the correct forms:

ὁ Δωριεὺς δεινόν τε ποιεύμενος καὶ οὐκ ἀξιῶν ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος βασιλεύεσθαι, αἰτήσας λεὼν Σπαρτιήτας ἦγε ἐς ἀποικίην, οὔτε τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι χρηστηρίῳ χρησάμενος ἐς ἥντινα γῆν κτίσων ἴῃ, οὔτε ποιήσας οὐδὲν τῶν νομιζομένων. οἷα δὲ βαρέως φέρων, ἀπίει ἐς τὴν Λιβύην τὰ πλοῖα· κατηγέοντο δέ οἱ ἄνδρες Θηραῖοι. ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐς Κίνυπα οἴκισε χῶρον κάλλιστον τῶν Λιβύων παρὰ ποταμόν. ἐξελασθεὶς δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ ὑπὸ Μακέων τε Λιβύων καὶ Καρχηδονίων ἀπίκετο ἐς Πελοπόννησον. ἐνθαῦτα δέ οἱ Ἀντιχάρης ἀνὴρ Ἐλεώνιος συνεβούλευσε ἐκ τῶν Λαΐου χρησμῶν Ἡρακλείην τὴν ἐν Σικελίῃ κτίζειν, φὰς τὴν Ἔρυκος χώρην πᾶσαν εἶναι Ἡρακλειδέων αὐτοῦ Ἡρακλέος κτησαμένου. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα ἐς Δελφοὺς οἴχετο χρησόμενος τῷ χρηστηρίῳ, εἰ αἱρέει ἐπ' ἣν στέλλεται χώρην· ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾷ αἱρήσειν. παραλαβὼν δὲ Δωριεὺς τὸν στόλον τὸν καὶ ἐς Λιβύην ἦγε ἐκομίζετο παρὰ τὴν Ἰταλίην.

Dorieus took things badly, and, not wishing to be ruled by Kleomenes, invited a group of Spartiates to go with him, and led them off to found a colony, neither asking the oracle at Delphi which country he should go to to found it, nor doing any of the required acts. Acting thus in anger, the expedition went off to Libya; some Therans guided them. Arriving at Kinyps they settled on a very beautiful piece of land, by a river, belonging to the Libyans. After two years he was driven out by the Lybian Makei and the Carthaginians, and returned to the Peloponnese. Then a man from Eleon called Antichares advised him to found Herakleia in Sicily, because of some oracles of Laios: he said all the territory of Eryx belonged to the descendants of Herakles, as it was founded by Herakles himself. Dorieus, when he heard this, went to Delphi to ask the oracle whether he would gain the territory he was after. The Pythia told him that he would. Taking with him the party which he had taken to Libya, Dorieus set off for Italy. (v. 42.2-43)

The story makes it clear that ignoring Delphi led to failure, but taking advice from Delphi would lead to success. In fact Dorieus has more trouble, connected with his attempt at colonising, and Herodotos goes on to say that Dorieus died, according to the Sybarites, παρὰ τὰ μεμαντευμένα ποιέων, 'going beyond what the oracle had said' (v. 45.1).

We must now look in more detail at the religious rituals performed when the site was reached. In what follows, all the examples are from the fourth century or later. We do not have detailed accounts of the foundation of colonies in the archaic period. It is possible that in earlier periods, the details of rituals were different; however, it seems unlikely that there would have been no religious ritual associated with archaic colonisation, if it was such a major feature of classical activity.

Sacrifice was certainly carried out in the fifth and fourth centuries, to establish whether a site was suitable by reading the entrails (e.g. X. An. v. 6.15), and this practice probably dated back to the archaic period (Malkin 1987, 112). There is some evidence too that the establishment of the alignment of the polis was also thought of as a

process involving the gods, as it was in Roman colonies. In a poem of Kallimachos we are told:

> Φοίβῳ δ' ἐσπόμενοι πόλιας διεμετρήσαντο
> ἄνθρωποι. Φοῖβος γὰρ ἀεὶ πολίεσσι φιληδεῖ
> κτιζομένησ' αὐτὸς δὲ θεμείλια Φοῖβος ὑφαίνει.
>
> Following Phoibos men measure out *poleis*. For Phoibos always takes delight in *poleis* being founded, and Phoibos himself lays out the foundations. (Ap. ii. 55-57)

This clearly refers to the laying out of the site, and implies that the ground-plan of the colony is divinely determined. Malkin, who is keen to argue that 'rational' considerations determined the planning of a colony, tries to minimise the significance of these lines (p. 143). However, Apollo's association with the sun makes it fit neatly with the Roman practice of using the sun to establish the orientation of the grid of a town plan (Rykwert 1979, 50). There are certain major differences between Greek and Roman colonisation practices; for example there is no Greek equivalent to the Roman ritual furrow around the proposed line of the walls (Salmon 1969, 24); there is no evidence that the division of the chora of a Greek colony was aligned with the urban plan, as in Roman colonies (Salmon 1969, 20-22). These processes created a symbolic bond between urban centre and territory (Malkin 1987, 93), which in Greek colonies was in part created by the extra-urban sanctuary (de Polignac 1984, 101-108). These difference do not mean, however, that Greek colonies were not perceived to be designed in accordance with a divine plan.

A further indication that the division of urban space was perceived to be divinely ordained comes from Alexander's foundation of Alexandria in Egypt. There are two different stories, but each implies that the ground-plan received divine approval after it had been laid out. Arrian's story is straightforward:

> καὶ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ὁ χῶρος κάλλιστος κτίσαι ἐν αὐτῷ πόλις καὶ γενέσθαι ἂν εὐδαίμονα τὴν πόλιν. πόθος οὖν λαμβάνει αὐτὸν τοῦ ἔργου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ σημεῖα τῇ πόλει ἔθηκεν, ἵνα τε ἀγορὰν ἐν αὐτῇ δείμασθαι ἔδει καὶ ἱερὰ ὅσα καὶ θεῶν ὄντινων, τῶν μὲν Ἑλληνικῶν, Ἴσιδος δὲ Αἰγυπτίας, καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ᾗ περιβεβλῆσθαι. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐθύετο, καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ καλὰ ἐφαίνετο.

> And it seemed to him that the site was excellent for founding a *polis* on, and that the *polis* would become prosperous. Therefore a longing for the work took hold of him, and he himself marked out the *polis*: where the agora should be built; the number of temples and the gods to which they were to belong, Greek gods and Egyptian Isis; and where the wall was to be built around. And he made a sacrifice about these things, and the omens came out good. (Arr. An. iii. 1.5)

Plutarch's story is a little different:

> καὶ γῆ μὲν οὐ παρῆν λευκή τῶν δε ἀλφίτων λαμβάνοντες ἐν πεδίῳ μελαγγείῳ κυκλοτερῆ κόλπον ἦγον, οὗ τὴν ἐντὸς περιφέρειαν εὐθεῖαι βάσεις ὥσπερ ἀπὸ κρασπέδων εἰς σχῆμα χλαμύδος ὑπελάμβανον, ἐξ ἴσου συνάγουσαι τὸ μέγεθος. ἡσθέντος δὲ τῇ διαθέσει τοῦ βασιλέως αἰφνίδιον ὄρνιθες ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ τῆς λίμνης, πλήθει τε ἄπειροι καὶ κατὰ γένος παντοδαποὶ καὶ μέγεθος, ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον καταίροντες νέφεσιν ἐοικότες οὐδὲ μικρὸν ὑπέλιπον τῶν ἀλφίτων, ὥστε καὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον διαταραχθῆναι πρὸς τὸν οἰωνόν. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τῶν μάντεων θαρρεῖν παραινούντων, πολυαρκεστάτην γὰρ οἰκίζεσθαι πόλιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ παντοδαπῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐσομένην τροφόν.
>
> As there was no chalk, they took barley meal and sprinkled it on the dark earth in a semicircle, and marked out straight lines from the inner arc, as if from the skirt of a *chlamys* , dividing it into areas of equal size. While the king was admiring the symmetry, suddenly countless numbers of birds of every species and size, coming from the river and the lake, landed on the area like clouds, and took every grain of barley. Alexander was upset by the birds, but the diviners encouraged him to take heart, saying that the *polis* would be rich in resources itself, and would be nurse to men of all races. (Plu. Alex. 26.5-6)

In both stories it is clear that the omens refer to the actual plan of the town, not just the decision to found the colony. How far it is possible to read these stories back into earlier periods is open to question, but the stories suggest that the spatial organisation of Alexandria at least was understood as being divinely authorised.

Malkin discusses all these foundation stories, but he is anxious to demonstrate that human considerations lay behind the organisation of space. Thus he says of the siting of sanctuaries in the urban centre:

> The initial divisions of the territory, the organisation by the oikist of the private, political, and religious space, was a single rationally planned act. The Greek colonists of the 8th and 7th centuries B.C. therefore appear before us, long before the rise of speculative and critical philosophy, as the first Greeks whom we know applied rational criteria to decisions concerning some of the most fundamental aspects of their religion. (Malkin 1987, 186)

He sees a potential conflict between what is rational and what is divinely ordained, and hence wants to minimise the importance of religious activity at the point of planning. I believe that this is not a real problem. Divination is usually used as a way of providing

authority for a decision already taken; it is not an irrational means of making a decision (Parker 1985, Price 1985). There is no difficulty in the idea that colonists might find a town plan functional and at the same time in accordance with divine will. This is certainly the implication of the stories about Alexandria.

Perceptions of urban space

If we turn from how space was defined to how it was perceived, we will find that the organisation of space was frequently understood in religious terms. This is particularly noticeable in non-colonial poleis, where various myths and stories may be told about the various boundaries of organised space.

The sanctuary and the temple are the central elements of this organisation of space, which is presented as a series of concentric boundaries. The central sanctuary is at the heart of the city, meaning in this case the area surrounded by a defensive wall, the astu. Commonly the main urban sanctuary is at the highest point within the astu, on the acropolis (as in Athens and Sparta) or dominating the agora (as at Corinth). This is in turn the centre of the territory, whose boundary is itself marked, most obviously by the major extra-urban sanctuary.

Different elements of this organisation have been emphasised in different ancient stories, and different modern studies. For de Polignac it is the development of the sanctuary at the edge of the territory, and hence the emphasis of that boundary, that marks the birth of the polis (de Polignac 1984). The sanctuary on the edge is also the point of contact between foreigners and friendly Greek states.[7]

The wall around the astu is the subject of other stories, most famously the death of Remus at Rome (Livy i. 7.2), but also, for example, Meles who carried a lion cub around

7 See chapter four.

the walls of Sardis (Hdt. i. 85) or Nitokris, who had herself entombed in the wall of Babylon (i. 188). These are all examples of non-Greek cities, but Herodotos, as we have seen with Psammetichos, sometimes treats non-Greek societies as if they were Greek. To give a Greek example from another writer, Aischylos draws attention to the walls of the astu in the Seven against Thebes.

The central sanctuary and temple are the subject of the story of Kleomenes at Athens (v. 72). It is when he tries to enter the temple of Athena on the akropolis that he is stopped by the priestess, and driven out of Athens altogether. As I shall show in chapter six, this can be seen to be the turning point of Kleomenes's career in Herodotos.
In all these cases, we may see the combination of the 'religious' and the 'political'. The stories are similar, whether they concern the central temple of a polis, or the 'secular' city walls. These are all boundaries approached or crossed, and the implications affect the sacred as well as the secular powers of the cities. For the Greeks, therefore, the whole territory, as much as the temple areas, was considered holy.

Alternative approaches to sacred space

A rather different idea of the sacredness of the land is that put forward by V. Scully in The earth, the temple and the gods (1979). Scully suggests that the Greeks started with an idea of a 'specifically sacred landscape' (p. 2), and that it was the inherent nature of the land that determined the development of cult. For him therefore, the sacredness of sites is predetermined, rather than being imposed on the landscape by human actions. Scully accepts the idea of some kind of continuity in religious thought extending back to Neolithic times, and starting with the cult of the Earth Mother. There are problems with this approach, quite apart from the questionable assumptions of religious continuity. It does not explain the organisation of urban sites in colonial foundations (Malkin 1987, 185),

and it underestimates the evidence for polis involvement in religious organisation (Sourvinou-Inwood 1990).

Another analysis of the importance of religion in the social organisation of space is P. Wheatley's The pivot of the four quarters (1971), which is concerned with Chinese urbanisation in particular, but analyses Near Eastern and Mediterranean societies as well. For Wheatley religious ritual is important as a possible source of social control in early urban organisation. He identifies the development of a 'ceremonial centre' as a crucial stage in the appearance of urban society, and suggests that religion is a means by which the spatial organisation can be translated into social organisation:

> At the same time the rituals and ceremonies celebrated in the great cult centres would appear to have acted as mirrors to society at large, as reflections of a sacrally sanctioned social order; inculcators of the attitudes and values appropriate to that order, and, not least, as symbolic statements about the nature of society, which could serve as guides to action for its constituent individuals and groups. In other words they may be regarded as idealized structural models which, while giving ritual expression to the moral framework of social organisation, defined the approved status relationships between 'social persons' within those groups. (Wheatley 1971, 305)

Wheatley is particularly interested in the growth of a powerful priestly class, something that did not happen in Archaic Greece, but his explanation can be applied to the power of sanctuaries more generally. Wheatley takes an evolutionary approach: ceremonies at the centre encourage the participants to acknowledge the power of the priests who organise them, and allow a gradual shift in the role of the priestly class from ritual authority on certain occasions to secular power on all occasions. Such an explanation underestimates the continuing importance of the sacred to those who participate in religious activity, since, as we have seen, in the world of Herodotos, 'rituals and ceremonies' include political meetings as well as festivals, and the presence of the gods remains crucial.

Sacred space and political activity

What emerges from this investigation of relligious aspects of spatial organisation is that in general, in the classical period as well as in the archaic, the actual physical structure of the polis could be interpreted as organised in accordance with the will of the gods. This meant that everything which happened within the polis happened with the possibility of divine influence. Within the polis, certain boundaries were understood as particularly important, and hence had myths and stories associated with them. As well as the cases discussed earlier, we can see other cases of areas particularly important to civic or political and religious life, areas of public space, being marked off. An example is in classical Athens. There the akropolis was the site of the major urban sanctuary, that of Athena; the agora was the centre of 'political' life. However:

> The Agora was not a truly 'secular' area, as various hints and indications show. A major portion of it was, for example, marked off by boundary stones, in a way reminiscent of sacred temene. The presence of basins holding water for ritual purification, perirrhanteria, is a further indication of its quasi-sacral character. Religious sanctions and regulations governed its use. Important shrines, including the altar to the Twelve Gods, were located within its boundaries. However sharply set off from the Acropolis it may have been, it possessed a sanctity of its own, closely linked, we may conjecture, to its centrality in ensuring justice and order in civic relationships. (Connor 1988, 173)

It appears that, in order to emphasise the distinct identity of a particular area of space, that space was hedged about with specifically religious markers. In other words, the importance of the agora was indicated by turning it into a sanctuary. In a system where spatial organisation is all divinely authorised, the sites of particular importance were marked out by symbols of 'sacredness'.

This interpretation explains why leagues of Greek states met in sanctuaries. It was not that delegates were consciously seeking 'divine inspiration'; rather, a meeting place for the planning of important joint activity had to be a place of some significance itself. Sanctuaries were sites which were marked off as being particularly important within a system of spatial organisation established by men in accordance with the will of

the gods, and were therefore significant for human activity as well as divine. In the case of the Panionion, we can see this in two separate processes, both of which point in the same direction. There is the initial creation of the Panionion as a joint sanctuary: Ionian identity is marked by the establishment of a site for a Panionian festival, clearly marked out by its dedication to Poseidon Helikonios. Later, a group of Greek states needs common ground on which to meet to discuss joint action: the already existing Panionion provides an appropriate place, known to most of the states involved.

An alternative, 'religious' interpretation to this 'political' approach can be provided. That would suggest that sacrifices to Poseidon must have been an important aspect of the Panionia, and meetings at the sanctuary would have been considered to be under the authority of the god. The important point is that these are not conflicting explanations of what is going on, but different ways of explaining political activity in a religiously ordered world.

Naukratis

Before considering the implications of this explanation of the use of sanctuaries, we may look at a further example of a joint sanctuary, the Hellenion at Naukratis in Egypt. Herodotos's description of Amasis's activities with regard to Naukratis is very detailed, and it is worth examining, even if it is argued that the archaeological material points towards a settlement at Naukratis before the time of Amasis. Herodotos's account is as follows:

> φιλέλλην δὲ γενόμενος ὁ Ἄμασις ἄλλα τε ἐς Ἑλλήνων μετεξετέρους ἀπεδέξατο καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῖσι ἀπικνευμένοισι ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἔδωκε Ναύκρατιν πόλιν ἐνοικῆσαι, τοῖσι δὲ μὴ βουλομένοισι αὐτῶν ἐνοικέειν αὐτοῦ δε ναυτιλλομένοισι ἔδωκε χώρους ἐνιδρύσασθαι βωμοὺς καὶ τεμένεα θεοῖσι. τὸ μέν νυν μέγιστον αὐτῶν τέμενος καὶ ὀνομαστότατον ἐὸν καὶ χρησιμώτατον, καλεύμενον δὲ Ἑλλήνιον, αἵδε πόλιές εἰσι αἱ ἱδρύμεναι κοινῇ, Ἰώνων μὲν Χίος καὶ Τέως καὶ Φώκαια καὶ Κλαζομεναί, Δωριέων δὲ Ῥόδος καὶ Κνίδος καὶ Ἁλικαρνησσὸς καὶ Φάσηλις, Αἰολέων δὲ ἡ Μυτιληναίων μούνη. τούτων μέν ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ τέμενος καὶ προστάτας τοῦ ἐμπορίου αὗται αἱ πόλιές εἰσι αἱ παρέχουσαι· ὅσαι δὲ ἄλλαι πόλιες μεταποιεῦνται, οὐδέν σφι

μετεὸν μεταποιεῦνται. χωρὶς δὲ Αἰγινῆται ἐπὶ ἑωυτῶν ἱδρύσαντο τέμενος Δίος, καὶ ἄλλο Σάμιοι Ἥρης καὶ Μιλήσιοι Ἀπόλλωνος.

> Having become friendly to the Greeks, Amasis showed favour to some of the Greeks, and in particular gave the *polis* of Naukratis to those who came to live in. To those of them sailing there who did not wish to live there he gave land to set up altars and *temenea* to the gods. The biggest and most famous and richest of these *temenea*, called the Hellenion, was set up jointly by the following *poleis*: of the Ionians, Chios, Teos, Phokaia and Klazomenai; of the Dorians, Rhodes, Knidos, Halikarnassos and Phaselis; of the Aioleans only Mytilene. The *temenos* belongs to these *poleis*, and these *poleis* are the ones which provide the officials of the *emporion*: Any other *poleis* which claim a part in it do so improperly. In addition the Aiginetans established a *temenos* of Zeus, the Samians one of Hera, and the Milesians one of Apollo. (ii. 178)

Details about the settlement do not concern us here, but information about the sanctuaries, and in particular the Hellenion.

The usual approach to Herodotos's account has been to ignore the temples and concentrate on the προστάται τοῦ ἐμπορίου. It is usual also to interpret πόλιες as 'traders from these states' (Austin 1970, 31-32; Boardman 1980, 131). Austin dismisses the literal sense of Herodotos's words:

> How could a whole series of Greek states, from Mytilene down to Phaselis, which were often quarreling with each other and, even in the face of a major threat such as Persia, were incapable of any coherent plan of action, actually agree year after year on the appointment of officials from their midst who were to take charge of affairs in a distant port in Egypt? There is no parallel to such a complicated procedure in Greek history. (Austin 1970, 32)

Yet neither Austin nor Boardman face the question of how itinerant traders could organise themselves to build or manage a temple, even if they could afford the cost. Nor is it true to say that the procedure is unparalleled. The 'Delian league' had far more members than the Hellenion had founders; it had officials appointed annually, the Hellenotamiai, although they were always Athenian; quarreling occurred between member states (e.g. Th. i. 115). The various decisions about providing ships, collecting tribute, planning campaigns etc. that had to be made at Delos each year make the administration of Naukratis appear simple by comparison. In any case, if contact with Egypt was important to the East Greek poleis and frequent, then Naukratis, which was the only point of contact for the Greeks, would not have been that distant.

It is the existence of the joint sanctuary which helps us understand what is happening. Austin and Boardman fail to grasp its significance. If the Hellenion is like other joint sanctuaries, it will have been set up as part of a common plan by the nine Greek poleis. It would not have been set up as an end in itself, however, but as a centre for some kind of joint activity, and it is easy to establish what that joint activity was. Herodotos mentions the fact that the states to which the Hellenion belonged appointed the προστάται τοῦ ἐμπορίου. Control of the port of Naukratis (which was separate from the polis there, according to Herodotos), would no doubt have produced wealth through tolls for the states which appointed the controllers.

We can also find a pattern of events which might be related to the establishment of a temple belonging to these East Greek states. The Pharaoh Necho is said by Herodotos to have dedicated a set of clothes at the sanctuary at Branchidai (ii. 160). In chapter four we will examine the diplomatic function of foreign gifts to sanctuaries in detail; here we may note that Branchidai was one of the most important 'international' sanctuaries in the Eastern Aegean, and would have been frequented by those poleis Herodotos mentions as sharing in the Hellenion at Naukratis. Geographically, it is roughly in the centre of the nine poleis. Necho's offering may have been the start of a diplomatic process which lead to the establishment of Greeks at Naukratis. It is significant that Amasis's gifts to the Eastern Greeks were made to Samos and Rhodes (ii. 187, 189): Rhodes was one of the states involved in the Hellenion, and the Samians built an Heraion at Naukratis. This 'diplomatic' activity cannot have been only commercial, since it is unlikely that traders would have been able to influence Greek poleis, let alone Egyptian Pharaohs.

This interpretation stresses the primacy of the Hellenion among the sanctuaries at Naukratis, as Herodotos does. He implies that a share in the temple was a jealously guarded privilege; since Herodotos's native Halikarnassos was one of the poleis which did have a share, this would have been a matter of personal pride. It is likely of course

that by Herodotos's own time the nature of Naukratis had changed. The archaeological evidence suggests that at some point after Amasis's reign the site diminished, and then recovered in the mid fifth century: it is highly likely that the invasion of Cambyses, which led to an influx of Greeks to Naukratis, according to Herodotos (iii. 139.1), led to a change in the organisation of the port. Herodotos's emphasis on the fact that only nine states shared in the Hellenion may reflect contemporary claims to a share from other poleis.

The archaeological evidence might be taken to show that the Hellenion is later than the rest of the settlement, and therefore represents an afterthought, but this is far from certain. The original excavation (Petrie 1886; Gardner 1888) was conducted long ago, and is not easy to interpret. There have been recent attempts to create coherence from the reports (Gjerstad 1959), and more recent examinations of the pottery (Coulson and Leonard 1979; Davis 1979 and 1980; Venit 1984). None of these can securely recover the stratigraphic evidence that might allow the site to be better understood. The evidence suggests that all the sanctuaries date from the earliest time of the settlement, except the Hellenion, where the earliest material is some thirty years later. This does not prove that the Hellenion is later, since a number of factors might have caused the material not to survive.[8] If Herodotos is right to connect the Hellenion with the προστάται τοῦ ἐμπορίου, then it can hardly be much later than the organisation of the port.

This investigation suggests that we should not see the establishment of Naukratis as a purely commercial venture. The establishment of sanctuaries for the port that are separate from the polis is not simply providing a service for traders (like English churches in foreign cities, which are built more or less for the sole use of British people), but part of a process of interaction between the Greek states which administer the sanctuaries, and between the Greeks and Egyptians. The Hellenion would have been an

[8] Accident of excavation, or a change in the site of the Hellenion for example.

appropriate place for delegates from the nine poleis to meet and administer affairs; it would also be a means of contact between these nine poleis and Pharaoh, and this idea will be developed in the next chapter.

Conclusion

We have seen that sanctuaries were used as meeting places for groups whose aims were not primarily 'religious'. We have also seen that these meetings might be considered to be under divine influence because they were held in sanctuaries. We cannot therefore assume either that groups which met in sanctuaries were, even in origin, religious leagues, or that the religious nature of the place was simply ignored when political meetings were held there.

We can go further and compare the meetings of Greek states with the meetings of citizens within the state. Two examples will suggest that the political assemblies of Greek states met in religious space. The Spartan Great Rhetra starts with the clause Διὸς Συλλανίου καὶ Ἀθανᾶς Συλλανίας ἱερὸν ἱδρυσάμενον, 'After dedicating a temple to Zeus Syllanios and Athena Syllania' (Plu. Lyc. 6.1). Commentaries on this clause have tended to concentrate on the epithets of the divinities, and not on how the founding of a sanctuary fits into the rest of the document. The actual founding, rather than the subsequent use of the place is seen as what matters (e.g. Hammond 1982, 740). It is arguable, however, that the sanctuary was to be created where the meetings were to be held, μεταξὺ βαβύκας τε καὶ Κνακιῶνος, 'between Babyka and Knakion' (Plu. Lyc. 6.2), and that meetings were to be held in it. The sanctuary has not been identified archaeologically, but Pausanias refers to sanctuaries of Zeus Agoraios and Athena Agoraia in the agora at Sparta (Paus. iii. 11.9-10), which might be related to it (Lévy 1977, 90).

The second case is much more certain. The Athenian assembly in the classical period always met in sanctuaries. The Pnyx itself, like the agora, was marked by horoi and contained the altar of Zeus Agoraios (Travlos 1971, 466-476). The assembly also met in the theatre of Dionysos ((Aris.) Ath. 42.4; D. xxi. 8-9), in the theatre at the Piraeus (D. xix. 60; Lys. xiii. 32-3), at least once in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Kolonos (Th. viii. 67.2) and possibly at the Lykaion (Gomme, Andrewes and Dover 1981, 166). Meetings were set in a further religious context by means of ritual activity which opened the meeting (Garland 1989, 87); we may compare this with the libations that began the meetings of Psammetichos and his fellow rulers (ii. 151).

Political meetings were therefore always religious occasions. We have seen that this was the consequence of organising space through religious procedures, as part of the process by which the polis was formed, but the religious nature of the space was acknowledged, as is shown both by the rituals that accompanied meetings in sanctuaries, and the stories that are attatched to them.

At the same time, we should not deny that meetiings in sanctuaries had purposes that we would not call religious, whether it be planning joint defence against conquest, at the Panionion, or organising the port, at Naukratis. There is no reason to doubt that the decisions taken at meetings were the result of practical reasoning and 'rational' argument, as decisions taken by the Athenian assembly were.[9]

These two conceptions of meetings in sanctuaries are essentially separate: neither is dependent on the other. However, there is a way of understanding the sanctuary that does combine these two ideas. That is to see the sanctuary as a place of interaction with the 'other'. I want to keep a very broad idea of the 'other': in this case sanctuaries provide a means of communication with other Greeks, that is, delegates from the

---

9 It is significant that many Athenian decrees start θεοί, acknowledging the divine presence, before continuing ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

various poleis which use a sanctuary, and also with the gods. As we shall see, there are other ways in which a sanctuary can be seen as a way of communicating with the 'other', and I shall return to this theme in the final chapter.

Chapter Four: The diplomatic role of sanctuaries

An awareness of the close bond between the gods and the polis is visible in the operations of diplomacy between Greeks and nonGreeks. This chapter examines the role of Greek sanctuaries in the relations between Greek states and non-Greek rulers. In particular it is concerned with the gifts and dedications made by foreigners at Greek sanctuaries. It starts with the story of Kroisos's involvement with Delphi, and places that in the more general context of dedications by non-Greeks at various sanctuaries from Archaic to Roman times. It examines foreign interest in Greek religious activity by comparison with suppliants seeking aid, and explains gifts as methods of introduction. It then relates dedications to the foreign policy of non-Greeks towards Greece in the second century BC, and suggests that this model fits the activity of Kroisos in the sixth century, and adds another dimension to Herodotos's own explanation.

The problem illustrated: Kroisos and Delphi (Hdt. i. 46-92)

The most detailed account of gift-giving is of Kroisos's gifts to the oracle at Delphi. According to Herodotos, Kroisos gave gifts to Delphi in order to curry favour with Apollo. No gifts are given until after the oracle has passed a test, but, having passed, Delphi is rewarded for every apparently favourable answer:

> Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδῶν τε καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βασιλεύς, νομίσας τάδε μαντήια εἶναι μοῦνα ἐν ἀνθρώποισι, ὑμῖν τε ἄξια δῶρα ἔδωκε τῶν ἐξευρημάτων, καὶ νῦν ὑμέας ἐπειρωτᾷ εἰ στρατεύηται ἐπὶ Πέρσας καὶ εἴ τινα στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν προσθέοιτο σύμμαχον.
>
> Kroisos, King of the Lydians and other peoples, believing these to be the only oracles among men, has given you gifts worthy of your powers of discovery, and now asks you if he should march against the Persians, and if he should make an alliance with any army of men. (i. 53.2)

Herodotos is able to develop a story that makes much of the relationship between Kroisos and Pythian Apollo, and concludes with faith in Apollo renewed: ὁ δὲ [Κροῖσος]

ἀκούσας συνέγνω ἑωυτοῦ εἶναι τὴν ἁμαρτάδα καὶ οὐ τοῦ θεοῦ, '(Kroisos), having heard this, acknowledged that the error had been his, not the god's' (i. 91.6). Other information in the text, however, suggests that this story is inadequate to explain Kroisos's actions. If Kroisos courted Delphi only because the oracle could be trusted, we should expect discredited oracles to receive no gifts, yet Branchidai received gifts ἴσα τε σταθμὸν καὶ ὅμοια τοῖσι ἐν Δελφοῖσι, 'equal in weight and kind to those in Delphi' (i. 92.2). Thus Branchidai was rewarded even more richly than Amphiaraos, even though that oracle was credited with telling the truth (i. 52). The explanation Herodotos gives clearly needs to be modified.

A detailed discussion of our passage is given by Parke (Parke 1984). He demonstrates the impossibility of reconciling the evidence of Herodotos, but his alternative explanation is at least as problematic. He argues:

> The fact that Croesus' recorded dedications, apart from those to Ephesian Artemis, were all made to oracular sanctuaries suggests that his underlying intention was to obtain responses of an approving kind from Hellenic deities. (Parke 1984, 230)

Already he has to find an alternative explanation for the Ephesian dedications. He goes on to argue that Kroisos's large-scale dedications were to counteract libellous prophecy:

> On this hypothesis Croesus through a great part of his reign may have been the object of attack from a popular literature in the form of Sibylline prophecies... Against this attack Croesus prudently replied by a similar weapon. (Parke 1984, 230)

It must be said that Parke has very little evidence with which to build his case. Also it is based on two false assumptions: first that Kroisos was solely concerned with gaining oracular responses, and second that his relationship with Delphi, and his motive for approaching the sanctuary, were unique amongst foreign rulers.

The first approach can be shown to be wrong from Herodotos. He states that, having found Delphi trustworthy, Kroisos asked εἴ τινα στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν προσθέοιτο σύμμαχον (i. 53.2), and this was clearly Kroisos's real desire, troops against Persia, not words against a sibyl. The second assumption ignores the fact that Kroisos's gifts are part of a

long series of dedications to Delphi, from at least the early sixth century to the second century, including not only those mentioned by Herodotos (see table 5) but also, for example, Romans from the fourth century (Camillus: Livy v. 28.1-5) and possibly the sixth (Tarquinius Superbus: Cicero de Republica ii. 44).

A better explanation is needed, and it can be found by considering a much more general area: we need to investigate the role of sanctuaries, and of dedications in them, in international relations.

Foreign dedications at Greek sanctuaries

Outside Herodotos, our main information about dedications by non-Greeks comes from Roman sources. These are exclusively concerned with offerings to Delphi, but not necessarily related to oracles.

The first Roman supposed to have sent offerings to Delphi is Tarquinius Superbus, about whom Cicero says 'dona magnifica ... Delphos ad Apollinem misit' (de Rep. ii. 44). The truth of the statement is impossible to establish. Cicero does not connect these gifts with any inquiry to the oracle. Livy (i. 56) on the other hand describes how ambassadors were sent by Tarquin to the oracle at Delphi after the appearance of a snake in the royal palace, but does not mention any offering of gifts to the oracle. There are a great many problems with this story, and it has been suggested that:

> from the known connexion of the Tarquins with Delphi the story which we find developed in L. was evolved... for that story is certainly no more than an assemblage of folk tales. (Ogilvie 1965, 216)

Livy does record a dedication by the Roman general M. Furius Camillus to Delphi in 394 BC (v. 28.1-5). The truth of this account is confirmed by Appian (Ital. xviii), who saw the bronze base of the bowl at Delphi himself. Livy connects the dedication with an earlier consultation of Delphi (v. 15.3), but once again this is problematic. The story in Livy involves both a local seer and the Delphic oracle, and Ogilvie comments:

> It has been argued that the consultation of Delphi is a doublet of the seer and, since Cicero alludes only to the latter, is unlikely to be the original story. (Ogilvie 1965, 660)

Parke and Wormell also hesitate to accept the story of the consultation and conclude:

> The one certain event is that the Romans commemorated the siege of Veii by an important dedication of a gold mixing bowl. (Parke and Wormell 1956, 270)

Ogilvie goes on to say:

> Furthermore Roman religious law officially forbade the consultation of foreign oracles, permitting reference only to the Haruspices or the Libri Sibyllini. (Ogilvie 1965, 660-661)

Assuming he is right we can confidently assert that the Roman dedications at Delphi had nothing to do with the oracle itself, and require alternative explanation. Certainly we need an alternative explanation for the dedications made to Delphi in the second century BC when the oracle had lost much of its importance. Parke refers to dedications by T. Quinctius Flamininus, Antiochos IV, Eumenes and Perseus[1], and it is his explanation of these dedications which, it seems to me, can be extended to cover all dedications by important foreigners to Greek sanctuaries:

> Delphi retained some importance as a great centre, at which powers from outside Greece could make contact with the city-states. (Parke and Wormell 1956, 261)

It is contact with Greek city-states that Delphi provided, and other sanctuaries, both international and local, did the same.

The archaeological evidence

There is some archaeological material that, I believe, illustrates the argument that I am outlining. Two problems arise when trying to relate archaeological evidence to theories concerned with literary evidence. First there is the difference of scale: Herodotos is concerned with the gifts of the very rich, while archaeology can find usually only the

---

[1] Flamininus: Plu. Flam. xii; Antiochos: Livy xxxvi. 11.5; Eumenes: Plb. xxi. 18.4; Perseus: Plb. xxv. 3.2, Plu. Aem. xxviii, xxxvi, App. Mac. xix.

least valuable objects, dedicated by the very poor. We cannot be certain that the motivation was the same for all.

> With regard to votive offerings ... we have a store of epigraphical information: the votive inscriptions which bring us far more closely into contact with the 'average' Greek. (Van Straten 1981, 69)

How close was Kroisos to the average Greek?

The second major problem is one of interest. So far as I am aware, the major interest of archaeologists who look at sanctuary material is in the light it casts on the 'religious mentality' of the Greeks[2], the relationship between (Greek) men and God, and little attention has been paid to other aspects of religious activity. Tullia Linders draws attention to the fact that dedications could act as advertisements:

> Similar to other rulers, a city also had to demonstrate its power by displaying its riches. (Linders 1987, 121)

However, she never considers the purpose of such advertisements, stressing rather the fact that such objects were genuinely sacred, and could not be used for cash. In the next chapter I shall consider in more detail some of the attitudes of the Greeks to their gods; here, however, I want to concentrate on the gifts of foreigners to Greek gods.

Some work has been done by Kilian-Dirlmeier on archaeological evidence for foreign dedications in Greek sanctuaries (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1985). She is concerned with the Late Geometric - Early Archaic period, which is obviously earlier than the gifts referred to by Herodotos, but nevertheless is revealing. She has established the proportion of dedicated objects from different places at several sanctuaries. For my purposes, two sanctuaries are worth examining, Olympia and the Samian Heraion.

At Olympia 76·9% of dedications are Greek, and the largest proportion of non-Greek objects, 8·9% of the whole, are Italian. This contrasts with Samos, where only 15·1% of dedications are Greek, and the largest proportion of non-Greek goods come from

---

[2] e.g. the subtitle of Versnel's Faith hope and worship (1981): 'aspects of the religious mentality in the ancient world.'

Cyprus (16·3%) and Egypt (12·6%). We cannot tell whether dedications were made by Greeks or foreigners, and it is probable that at least some of the non-Greek objects were dedicated by Greeks (I suggested in Chapter Two that the cauldron dedicated at the Heraion by the Samian Kolaios was in fact Phoinikian). It is highly likely, however, that the different proportion of Greek:non-Greek dedications does imply that some sanctuaries were more approached by foreigners than others. The overwhelmingly Greek origin of dedications at Olympia parallels the exclusivity of the sanctuary's games, where non-Greeks were firmly excluded (e.g. Hdt. v. 22.2). The foreign objects at Samos continue into the sixth century (Shipley 1987, 55-56): Shipley claims that they

> are most likely to have been brought back from abroad by Samians, rather than finding their way to Samos as trade items. Their dedication in the temple supports this. (Shipley 1987, 56)

He does not consider the possibility that, like the wooden portraits of Amasis (ii. 182), they were actually dedicated by foreigners (cf. Simon 1988; Morgan 1990, 229). If the objects examined by Kilian-Dirlmeier are dedications made by foreigners at Greek sanctuaries, we are witnessing actions similar to those of Kroisos and the Romans.

Sanctuaries and suppliants

I intend to argue that states wanting to make political contact with Greeks approached sanctuaries, 'international' or 'local'. The sanctuary was the natural means of contact between foreigner, whether Greek or barbarian, and Greek.

The question of how a foreigner approached the polis is discussed in some detail by M.F. Baslez (Baslez 1984). She is concerned with tragedy, and in particular with Aischylos's Supplices. In the play Danaos wants to claim protection for himself and his daughters from the Argives. They make their request by laying branches on the altar of a sanctuary (Sup. 241-242). Baslez comments:

> Aussi deux gestes sont-ils conseillés à l'étranger qui veut recevoir une protection efficace dans la cité où il arrive et où il ne connaît personne: entrer en contact avec un sanctuaire et y rester comme suppliant. (Baslez 1984, 35)

The passage is worth investigating further. The subsequent decision of the Argives to help him is taken not there and then but in a meeting of the Argive assembly (Supp. 600-608). Because of this the play has been used several times recently to illustrate ideas about the relationship between religion and politics. For example, M. Ostwald uses it to support his theory that the fifth century saw a growth in secular control of religion:

> One of the central themes of Aeschylus's Supplices is the clash between the right of sanctuary (asylia), based on a religious appeal to kinship, and the secular interest of the state, which is likely to be involved in war if it grants asylum. (Ostwald 1986, 141)

Ultimately, according to Ostwald, the secular prevails:

> The secular authority thus resolves the conflict by adopting the demands of religion as its own policy, ratified in the form of a decree. The democratic state has become the protector of religion. (p. 145)

C. Farrar, following this approach, argues that the play 'suggests that only democratic politics can reconcile (freedom and order).' (Farrar 1988, 30). She emphasises the political at the expense of the religious and sees the relationship between them as problematic:

> The claim which conflicts with the political one is in some sense a religious claim. (Farrar 1988, 30)

For R.K. Sinclair too the play has a political purpose:

> The underlying tenor of the play is supportive of these democratic procedures and of the propriety of involving all the citizens. (Sinclair 1988, 16)

The apparent conflict between state and cult is explored in some detail by J.K. Davies in CAH iv^2, although he does not refer to Aischylos. I think it is worth quoting his view of the development of Archaic religion here because it clarifies the approach of Farrar and Sinclair:

> We can detect a double movement: first a gradual and partial emancipation of 'the state' from the rhythms and institutions of cult, and second, an equally gradual and partial reorientation and redefinition of cult activities and institutions in ways more convenient for civic organisation. (Davies 1988, 371)

All these interpretations contrast old 'religious' ideas with new 'democratic' practice. The conflict, however, does not exist. It seems to me that the play makes clear the bond between the religious and the political: the appeal to the gods is an appeal to the polis, and the decision of the assembly clearly gives the suppliants the protection of the gods of the polis (A. Supp. 921-927). Furthermore, as I shall point out at the end of this section, Danaos's behaviour and Pelasgos's response are in fact the standard diplomatic procedures of fifth century Greece.

Baslez also takes examples from Herodotos, and discusses the case of Aristagoras's visit to Kleomenes (v. 51) in terms similar to those she uses about the passage from Aischylos. Aristagoras comes to Sparta in search of troops: ἔδεε γὰρ δὴ συμμαχίης τινός οἱ μεγάλης ἐξευρεθῆναι, 'for he needed to find some major alliance' (v. 38.2). When he cannot at first persuade Kleomenes he takes an olive branch and acts ἅτε ἱκετεύων, 'like a suppliant' (v. 51.1), which forces Kleomenes to listen to him again. Baslez concludes:

> C'est aussi un moyen de forcer une porte, si forte est la constrainte religieuse liée au rite. (Baslez 1984, 36)

We may see Aristagoras as seeking the protection of Sparta, using the same kind of ritual as Danaos used, seeking the protection of Argos. This is how Baslez interprets the action. At the same time Aristagoras can be seen to be seeking military aid: the way to seek asylum is the same as the way to seek an alliance, and both involve religious ritual. The same situation, suppliant behaviour as a means of seeking military aid, is also found when the Plataians go to Athens and gather at the altar of the twelve gods to ask for help against Thebes (vi. 108.4)

The most comprehensive examination of the place of this kind of behaviour in Greek society and history is J. Gould's study of 'Hiketia' (Gould 1973). He concentrates on the supplication of individuals on their own behalf, and comments 'ἱκετεία in the sense which I have been describing is a religious and social institution characteristically of

archaic and early classical Greece' (p. 101). I believe that as a ritual part of interstate communication it retained its function longer. An example from Thucydides, an author who does not normally stress religious matters, suggests that sanctuaries were still the normal means of access to poleis in the late fifth century. In 435 BC the 'democrats' at Epidamnos sent ambassadors to Corcyra asking for protection from exiles and barbarians. They made their request from the sanctuary of Hera in Corcyra:ταῦτα δε ἱκέται καθεζόμενοι ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον ἐδέοντο, 'the ambassadors made their requests sitting in the Heraion' (Th. i. 24.7). Thucydides does not describe other embassies as acting in this way, but that does not mean that it is unusual. Rather I think that Thucydides is emphasising that the people of Epidamnos acted entirely correctly. They went first to their metropolis with the correct ritual, and only then to Delphi, which they obeyed[3]. Thucydides emphasises the rituals that are used at the start of the war, not only here but also at i. 118.3 (Sparta consults Delphi) and i. 139 (embassies about religious complaints). Here too he chooses deliberately to focus on protocol, which must have been traditional in these cases, rather than the underlying motives. This passage fits closely with the two I have already discussed to demonstrate the role of sanctuaries in diplomacy.

In the cases of Aristagoras and the Epidamnians and Platalans, these examples have been of Greeks approaching Greeks, and although Danaos is supposed to be an Egyptian, Aischylos is writing for a fifth century Athenian audience, and is portrayed in some ways as a Greek. However, I believe that the model can be extended to non-Greeks seeking the support of Greek poleis. The aim of the ritual is to place an obligation on the people whose sanctuary is approached: it would therefore be natural for a non-

[3] This emphasis on religion continues. In their response the Corinthians stress religious obligation (Th. i. 25), and Gomme remarks: 'It is to be noted that Thucydides, who in his introduction is careful to stress political and economic motives, should here mention only sentimental ones.' (Gomme 1945, 159).

Greek wishing to gain support from Greeks to adopt their diplomatic language in order to do so.

Diplomacy through sanctuaries

I am arguing that large-scale dedications by foreign rulers at Greek sanctuaries can often be explained as part of a diplomatic process whereby foreigners seek to gain material benefit from the Greeks, meaning normally military aid.

There may appear to be a vast difference between Danaos and his daughters appearing in Argos with nothing at all, and Kroisos sending enormous quantities of gold and silver to Delphi, but I believe that this is not the case. The nature of the gifts is significant: they should not be seen as bribes or down-payments for services to be rendered, but as forms of introduction. The gifts cannot be seen as material incentives because they cannot be used, except within the sanctuary. The Greek poleis could not melt down the gifts of Lydian gold and silver, except in emergencies as loans, because the objects were the property of the sanctuary, and hence sacred (Linders 1987, 116). That is why the gifts were still there to be seen by Herodotos. Of course the presence of the gifts was valuable for the prestige of sanctuary and polis, but prestige did not feed soldiers. The case of Aristagoras at Sparta (v. 51) makes clear the difference between supplication and bribery: when Aristagoras acts as suppliant, Kleomenes is required to listen, but when he offers money, it has the opposite effect.

In order to understand the gifts we should look at what they are, and where they come from. We can usefully compare the gifts of Egyptians (Necho, Amasis) with those of Lydians (Gyges, Alyattes and Kroisos). As table 5 shows, almost all the gifts of Lydian kings are of gold and silver; those of the Pharaohs never are. The explanation is, I think, very simple. The gifts display the strength of the countries from which they come.

In his description of the natural features of Lydia, Herodotos is very brief, and chooses to mention only the gold that runs in the rivers:

> θώματα δὲ γῆ Λυδία ἐς συγγραφὴν οὐ μάλα ἔχει οἷά γε καὶ ἄλλη χώρη, πάρεξ τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Τμώλου καταφερομένου ψήγματος.
>
> The land of Lydia does not have wonders worth writing of such as other lands do, except for the gold-dust that is carried down from the Tmolos. (i. 93.1)

This supply had apparently dried up by the time of Strabo (xiii. 4.5), but certainly in the Archaic period Archilochos could call Gyges πολυχρῦσου (West fr. 19). Down to Herodotos's time, therefore, Lydia was notable specifically for its precious metal, rather than wealth in general; this is important, because it should warn us against overrating the value, and underrating the significance, of Kroisos's gifts. The gifts show the God and the Greeks who they are dealing with: a king with a great deal of gold.

In contrast, precious metals are rare in Egypt; wood and linen, however, are associated with Egypt in antiquity. Herodotos specifically mentions the unusual nature of Egyptian linen when describing the Kolchians:

> λίνον μοῦνοι οὗτοι τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι ἐργάζονται κατὰ ταὐτά ... λίνον δὲ τὸ μὲν Κολχικὸν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων Σαρδονικὸν κέκληται, τὸ μέντοι ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἀπικνεύμενον καλέεται Αἰγύπτιον.
>
> Only they and the Egyptians make linen in this way... Kolchian linen is called 'Sardinian' by the Greeks, while that which comes from Egypt is called Egyptian. (ii. 105)

Elsewhere Herodotos describes the linen corslet that Amasis sent to the Spartans, which was stolen by the Samians:

> ἐόντα μὲν λίνεον καὶ ζώων ἐνυφασμένων συχνῶν, κεκοσμημένον δὲ χρυσῷ καὶ εἰρίοισι ἀπὸ ξύλου· τῶν δὲ εἵνεκα θωμάσαι ἄξιον ἀρπεδόνη ἑκάστη τοῦ θώρηκος ποιέει· ἐοῦσα γὰρ λεπτὴ ἔχει ἀρπεδόνας ἐν ἑωυτῇ τριηκοσίας καὶ ἑξήκοντα, πάσας φανεράς.
>
> It is of linen, with many animals woven in, and decorated with gold and cotton; what makes it worth marvelling at is that each of the threads, which are fine themselves, contains three hundred and sixty strands, each one visible. (iii. 47.2-3)

The corslet given to the sanctuary of Athena on Lindos was similar, and the unusual nature of the work must have been clear to the Greeks at the time. We may assume that Necho's gift of clothes to the sanctuary at Branchidai (ii. 159.3) would also have

been of linen. The Egyptians in Xerxes's fleet are described as mostly θωρηκοφόροι 'corsletted' (vii. 89.3), and this must mean linen sinces they are immediately preceded by Phoinikians whose corslets are specifically described as λινέους (vii. 89.1). Alkaios, Necho's contemporary, had linen corslets amongst his armour (L-P fr. 357)[4].

Amasis's other gifts are also fairly easily associated with Egypt. The statue sent to Lindos was 'apparently carved from some native Egyptian stone, for example, green basalt, granite or serpentine.' (Francis and Vickers 1984, 121). The wooden sculptures sent to Polykrates may also have been of native wood: Egypt is one of the places Theophrastos is particularly interested in when describing trees (HP iv. 2). On the other hand Amasis might have had another motive for making gifts of wood. Just as linen garments are the clothes of warriors, wood is the material of fleets; Egypt's major sources of wood were Cyprus and Phoinikia, and timber must have been one of the reasons for Egyptian attempts to control these places from the New Kingdom to Hellenistic times (Meiggs 1982, 62-68, 133). Alliance with Samos was part of Amasis's strategy according to Herodotos (iii. 39.2) and carved wood might be a particularly appropriate means of diplomatic discourse from a Pharaoh who had just captured Cyprus, and made it pay tribute (ii. 182.2).

This interpretation of the gifts of foreigners suggests that dedications are the means by which an absent ruler may introduce himself. Danaos in Aischylos's Supplices by contrast is himself present in Argos, and his daughters can tell the Argives who they are and what they want.

---

4 Egyptian use of linen for armour is discussed more fully in Francis and Vickers 1984, 125.

Sacrifices by foreigners

The argument is strengthened if we consider the actions of two Persian commanders. Datis sacrificed at Delos on his way to Marathon (vi. 97), and Tissaphernes did the same at Ephesos in 411 BC (Th. viii. 107). In both cases the Persians were seeking, and found, military support.

Herodotos's description of Datis's activity in the central Aegean is not entirely straightforward. Datis attacks and sacks Naxos καὶ τὰ ἱρὰ καὶ τὴν πόλιν, 'sanctuaries and *polis*'(vi. 96), but then sends messengers offering friendship to the Delians:

> ταῦτα μὲν ἐπεκηρυκεύσατο τοῖσι Δηλίοισι, μετὰ δὲ λιβανωτοῦ τριηκόσια τάλαντα κατανήσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐθυμίησε.
>
> He made this announcement to the Delians, and then piled three hundred talents of incense on the altar and burned it.(vi. 97.2)

As a result he sails on with Ionians and Aiolians, and then goes around the islands collecting more Greeks, by force if necessary.

For some commentators, Datis's personal piety is the point at issue; taking the words attributed by Herodotos to Datis seriously, they argue that Datis respects Delos because he identifies Apollo and Artemis with Mithras and Mitra (Blakesley 1854, ii. 142) or Mithra and Mah (How and Wells 1912, ii. 103)[5]. There are two problems with this explanation: first, it is difficult to see how a Persian could identify his non-anthropomorphic gods with Greek ones, and second, it is strange that Datis should show great reverence to some Greek gods, and yet completely destroy the temples of others (Naxos and Eretria[6] vi. 101.3), if it is his relationship with gods that is relevant.

If Datis's intention was basically diplomatic the issue becomes clear. Naxos and Eretria had to be punished, but Datis sacrificed at the sanctuary at Delos, like Danaos at

---

5 Blakesley goes further in his ingenuity: 'The Phoenicians, who doubtless formed a part of the fleet, would have had no respect for this combination of deities; and hence Datis sailed on by himself and kept them at Rhenea.' (Blakesley 1854, ii. 142-143).

6 Including of course the temple of Apollo Daphnephoros.

Argos, in order to get help from those islanders who used to visit Delos. Thucydides 's description of the old Delian festival as a ξύνοδος τῶν Ἰώνων τε καὶ περικτίονων νησιωτῶν (Th. iii. 104.3) points to the very people from whom Datis raises troops:

> οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι ὡς ἀπῆραν ἐκ τῆς Δήλου, προσῖσχον πρὸς τὰς νήσους, ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ στρατιήν τε παρελάμβανον καὶ ὁμήρους τῶν νησιωτέων παῖδας ἐλάμβανον.
>
> When the foreigners left Delos, they put in at the islands, where they raised troops and took the children of the islanders as hostages. (Hdt. vi. 99)

Tissaphernes's sacrifice at the Ephesian Artemision (Th. viii. 107.1) is remarkably similar to Datis's action, and can perhaps be explained in a similar way. It ties in closely with an incident soon afterwards described by Xenophon where Tissaphernes calls upon the local people to βοηθεῖν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, 'aid Artemis'(HG i. 2.6). According to Andrewes:

> The form of the proclamation may suggest that the satrap of Sardis claimed some special relationship, inherited from Kroisos. (Gomme, Andrewes and Dover 1981, 358)

Such a supposition is not necessary. It is probable that in both cases Tissaphernes was trying to raise troops from the area around Ephesos, and naturally went to the major sanctuary. It is important to bear in mind that the Artemision was not only the chief sanctuary of Ephesos itself, but also a cult centre for the poleis round about. According to Thucydides, those people who used to go to Delos for the Ionian festival go νῦν ἐς τὰ Ἐφέσια (Th. iii. 104.3)[7]. It is certainly impossible to be sure what Thucydides was going to say about Tissaphernes, but his sacrifices can be read as a diplomatic act aimed at the Ionian states, and indeed to all intents and purposes as an identical act to that of Datis.

---

7 See below.

Rome and Greece

We are now in a position to answer the problems raised earlier in the chapter, and to produce a new explanation for the gift-giving of Kroisos with which the exploration began. If gift-giving and sacrificing is part of a normal diplomatic process, then Roman contact with Delphi and other sanctuaries should be explicable as part of Rome's Eastern policy, and should, so far as we can follow it, correspond to her military activity. This thesis is not the place for a detailed analysis of Roman relations with the East, but the topic is worth looking at, because it provides a model against which an explanation of Kroisos's actions, as described by Herodotos, can be tested.

Rome's first recorded contacts with Delphi are mentioned by Livy, and discussed by Derow (Derow 1970). These are the embassies connected with Tarquin and Camillus (Livy i. 56.4-13; v. 28.1-5). The first is part of the story of Brutus, first consul of Rome, and Derow comments: 'the story as it stands would raise the eyebrows of the most gentle sceptic.' (Derow 1970, 9-10). He follows Ogilvie in making clear the connection between the Tarquins and Caere (formerly Agylla), and between Agylla and Delphi (Hdt. i. 167) (Ogilvie 1965, 216)[8]. Caere appears to have had a treasury at Delphi, so the sanctuary was part of the diplomatic activity of Agylla/Caere in the late sixth century. We should not be suprised then to find Rome following their example.

The embassy of Camillus in 394 brought a dedication that was placed in the Massilian treasury (App. Ital. xviii). Commenting on this Derow says 'Massilia was an early link between Rome and Delphi' (Derow 1970, 16), and suggests that Rome was introduced to the East through contact with Massilia. The opposite may be true: Delphi may have been an early link between Rome and Massilia. Delphi would have been a

[8] The story in Herodotos is not necessarily reliable. It is part of the confused account of Phokaian activity around the Tyrrhenian Sea after the coming of Harpagos. Delphi is mentioned because the Agyllaioi, who are Etruscans, paid honours to the Phokaians, having been instructed to do so by the oracle: it is one of Herodotos's explanatory myths.

point of contact for the various Greek cities of the West, all of which will probably have been founded with the help of the oracle (Malkin 1987, 17-29). We do not know of any joint sanctuary for the Greeks in the West other than Delphi, so it would have been the obvious point of contact between Western non-Greek cities and the Greeks. In this case Massilian friendship to Rome (Derow 1970, 14-16) may be the result rather than the cause of Camillus's dedication.

There is a spate of dedications at Delphi and other Panhellenic sanctuaries in the early second century: T. Quinctius Flamininus (196 BC), Antiochos IV (191 BC), Perseus (179 BC), Eumenes (172 BC) and L. Aemilius Paulus (168 BC). Some of these dedications have been discussed by Gruen, but he treats them piecemeal, and for a book on 'the nature of Roman expansion in the East against the background of Greek society and institutions' (Gruen 1984, 1) there is surprisingly little on the role of sanctuaries. For Gruen, Rome's enemies used sanctuaries as advertising hoardings, so Antiochos's sacrifice at Delphi (Livy xxxvi. 11.6) is 'a deliberate advertisement of his role as patron and protector of Greeks' (Gruen 1984, 637), while Perseus (Plb. xxv. 3) is 'generating publicity' (Gruen 1984, 191). Flamininus's dedications on the other hand are explained as 'standard Greek practice of conquerors and benefactors' (Gruen 1984, 167), while Aemilius Paulus's sacrifice at Delphi, made before he conquered Perseus, is not mentioned. There is more to it than that.

Aemilius Paulus is the person with whom to start. In a speech that is quoted by Appian and Plutarch, he described his campaign against Perseus:

> ἐς μὲν Κέρκυραν ἐκ Βρεντεσίου διαπλεῦσαι μιᾶς ἡμέρας, ἐκ δὲ Κερκύρας πέντε μὲν ἐς Δελφοὺς ὁδεῦσαι καὶ θῦσαι τῷ θεῷ, πέντε δὲ ἄλλαις ἐς Θεσσαλίαν παραγενέσθαι καὶ παραλαβεῖν τὸν στρατόν, ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης πεντεκαίδεκα ἄλλαις ἐλεῖν Περσέα καὶ Μακεδόνας παραλαβεῖν.
>
> (He said that) he sailed to Corcyra from Brindidium in one day; from Corcyra he journeyed for five days to Delphi and sacrificed to the god; in another five days he reached Thessaly and took up command of the army; after that in fifteen more days he captured Perseus, and gained control of the Macedonians. (App. Mac. xix cf. Plu. Aem. xxxvi. 3)

The sacrifice at Delphi was clearly a major part of the expedition, and it fits as part of the process of bringing Greeks over to Rome when the Greeks were divided over support for Rome or Macedon (Gruen 1984, 505-514).

Antiochos and Perseus were clearly engaged in gathering troops too. Antiochos's sacrifice at Delphi is presented by Livy as part of his preparations for war with Rome, and Perseus according to Polybios ἑλληνοκοπεῖν ἐπεβάλετο, 'he tried to win over the Greeks' (Plb. xxv. 3), when he set up notices at Delos, Delphi and the sanctuary of Itonian Athena. They do not make these moves while seeking military aid, as Gruen implies, they do it in order to get military aid. It was presumably at the time he set up the notices that Perseus arranged for a golden statue of himself to be put up at Delphi (Plu. Aem. xxxvi. 2). This may be seen, like Kroisos's golden gifts, as a reminder to the Greeks of Perseus's wealth, and hence an incentive for them to help him. The practice could work against people: lack of respect for Delphi is a charge levelled against Perseus by the Romans in a letter of 171/0 BC which was displayed at Delphi (Sherk 1969, no. 40). The aim of the letter was to discourage anyone from joining Perseus and to encourage them to join Rome:

> No efforts were spared to secure friends in Greece in the period 172-170 BC. Therefore, a general proclamation by the Delphic Amphictyons to their members concerning the crimes allegedly committed by Perseus might be an effective means to help achieve that end. (Sherk 1969, 239)

Flamininus's proclamations were clearly not aimed at raising troops, but they were certainly part of a diplomatic process. He was at Isthmia in 196 BC and at Nemea in 195 BC, and, because he was present, he could communicate directly with the Greeks at the games. His dedications at Delphi (Plu. Flam. xii) inscribed with references to Greek freedom, are the exact equivalent to the speeches, but presented when he was absent.

After 168 BC, Roman intervention in Greece was concerned to enforce control against a hostile Achaian League. This is clear from the destruction of Corinth and the

sanctuary at Isthmia. Before then, however, we may see the major Greek sanctuaries as crucial to the conduct of the Romans and their opponents, fighting wars with the sword in one hand and the sacrificial knife in the other.

The problem restated: Kroisos and the Greeks

We now return to Kroisos. Having dismissed the story of the testing of the oracles, we should consider all his gifts to Greek sanctuaries together. According to Herodotos, Κροίσῳ δὲ ἔστι καὶ ἄλλα ἀναθήματα ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι πολλὰ καὶ οὐ τὰ εἰρημένα μοῦνα, 'there are many other dedications of Kroisos in Greece, not only the ones mentioned' (i. 92.1); the places he goes on to mention are not the full list, but offer some help. He names Ephesos, Didyma, the Amphiareion at Oropos, Thebes and Delphi; I shall show that each of these sanctuaries is an appropriate place for summoning troops.

The Ephesian Artemision was one of the major sanctuaries of Ionia in the Archaic period. That much is clear from the remains of the sanctuary buildings. It was certainly a sanctuary where foreign dedications were made (e.g. Bammer 1985). Kroisos's approach to Ephesos has been misunderstood, because it has been assumed that he was involved in the construction of the monumental late Archaic temple[9]. It has been argued, however, that when Herodotos describes Kroisos's dedications of αἵ τε βοές αἱ χρύσεαι καὶ τῶν κίονων αἱ πολλαί, 'the gold bulls and most of the columns' (i. 92.2), he is referring not to parts of the building but to golden columns, to be set up within the sanctuary (Vickers 1985b, 10). This would mean that the changes in the sanctuary need

[9] The present excavator has built much on this assumption. He has detected a seventh century temple building in front of the so-called 'Kroisos Temple', and has suggested that this hekatompedon was associated with a different goddess, for example Cybele; the cult of Artemis was introduced by Kroisos to replace this earlier cult when he captured the town (Bammer 1982). For Bammer, Kroisos's dedications are hostile, being part of the Lydianisation of Ephesos. There is little evidence to support his view.

not be associated with Kroisos.[10] Quite possibly the seventh century hekatompedon detected by Bammer would have been the Artemision of Kroisos's time. The point is that if Kroisos was not responsible for reorganising the cult, his dedications are more easily explained as seeking favour, as Tissaphernes was to do. The 'international' status of the Artemision is made clear from Thucydides iii. 104.3. It has been suggested that Ephesos was the temporary home of the Delian festival after 440/39 BC (Hornblower 1982), but it is better to see the Ephesia as one of several Ionian ceremonies (Stylianou 1983, 249). In that case dedications at the sanctuary would be seen by many Ionian poleis, and can be understood as part of a diplomatic offensive aimed at them by Kroisos.

The sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma would have been of similar value. The excavators distinguish between the local sanctuary of Artemis, and the international one of Apollo:

> Die überregionale Anziehungskraft erhielt Didyma jedoch erst durch den Apollonkult, literarisch durch Necho-Weihung Ende des 7. Jhs. v. Chr. bezeugt (Herodot II 159); um die Mitte des Königsstiftung des Kroisos erweist (Herodot I 92). Der spätgeometrische Sekos des Apollon wurde von einem größeren abgelöst und mit einer Ringhalle ausgestattet, während das Heiligtum auf der Felsbarre seine altertümliche Gestalt bewahrt hat, aber auch seine lokale Bedeutung. (Tuchelt 1984, 234)

I have already suggested that Necho's dedication there may be associated with the Greek states of the Hellenion at Naukratis[11]; Kroisos's dedications will have given him access to several East Greek states, not solely Ionians.

The same is true of the Amphiareion. Like Kroisos, Mardonios had someone consult the oracle after Salamis (viii. 134.2), and he appears to have been seeking allies (cf. viii. 36). This role for the sanctuary is clear from later inscriptions recording missions there:

> The record of known foreign visitors throughout the sanctuary's history is impressive, quite apart from the sheer volume of proxeny decrees. Dedications and proxeny

---

10 see chapter three.

11 see chapter three.

> decrees reveal a considerable degree of interest on the part of states and important individuals, which can only be explained by assuming that the Amphiareion was regarded as an important meeting place... the Amphiareion was an international centre, the only real one in Boiotia. (Schachter 1981, 24 n.2)

The dedication of a tripod at the temple of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes has also been seen as an action with strong political overtones (Schachter 1981, 83).

The gifts to Delphi can more clearly be related to the gathering of troops from the Greek states. Herodotos describes how the result of Kroisos's activity at Delphi was an alliance with Sparta (i. 69). Sparta's close connection with Delphi is emphasised by the role of the oracle in the early history of Sparta (i. 65-68). It turns out though that Kroisos had already had dealings with the Spartans (i. 69.3-4), so the gifts to Delphi make little sense as a means of gaining information. This is why it makes more sense, I believe, to see Kroisos's dedications as part of a request for help addressed to the Spartans and other Greek states.

This interpretation of Kroisos's behaviour draws on the common features of the sanctuaries at which he made dedications; they were all to some extent 'international', that is, they were attended by more than the local citizens; and they were sanctuaries which non-Greeks would visit. It does not give undue emphasis to some oracular sanctuaries (Delphi, Amphiareion) over others that might have had an oracle at the time that Herodotos does not mention (Thebes) or never had an oracle (Ephesos). It provides an explanation of Kroisos's actions that can be paralleled elsewhere. Whatever Kroisos's attitude to the Greek poleis of Asia Minor at the start of his reign (i. 26-28), the growing threat of Persia made him seek allies in the West. A series of dedications in major Greek sanctuaries was the means of beginning a dialogue with potential allies. The result was the presence of Ionians in his army, who remained loyal (i. 76.3), but the unfortunate absence of the Spartans (i. 83).

Conclusion

I have concentrated on the model of the suppliant in explaining the way in which foreigners used sanctuaries to approach Greek states, because I wanted to emphasise that when non-Greeks perform ritual acts, they are doing more than merely satisfying a personal religious need. However, it is important not to neglect the gods entirely. As I have said, an appeal to the gods of a polis, such as that of Danaos, is an appeal to the polis: Kroisos may be seen to be winning the support of Greek gods, most obviously Apollo, as well as of Greek troops. This is how it is presented by Herodotos.

We may even see on some occasions attempts to win over the gods in the teeth of opposition from the citizens, as in two stories about Kleomenes. At Athens, when he has captured the Akropolis, he attempts to enter the temple of Athena (v. 72.3); Herodotos does not explain why, but since the episode is similar to one that happens in Argos, it may be that the same thing is happening as there. Having burned down the grove of Argos, Kleomenes went to the Heraion to sacrifice, but was told by the priest that he could not, because he was not an Argive:

> βουλόμενον δὲ αὐτὸν θύειν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ὁ ἱρεὺς ἀπηγόρευε, φὰς οὐκ ὅσιον εἶναι ξείνῳ αὐτόθι θύειν.
>
> He wished to sacrifice at the altar himself, but the priest forbade him, saying that it was not acceptable for a foreigner to sacrifice there. (vi. 81)

This is virtually the same objection as that made by the priestess in Athens: οὐ γὰρ θεμιτὸν Δωριεῦσι παριέναι ἐνθαῦτα, 'it is not proper for a Dorian to go in there' (v. 72.3). In this case Kleomenes ignored the priest and made the sacrifice. On his return to Sparta, Kleomenes explains that he was looking for a favourable sign from Hera, but received an unfavourable one (vi. 82.2), and that this is why he gave up his attempt to capture

Argos. It appears that, both in Athens and in Argos, Kleomenes was attempting to win over the gods as a part of an attempt to win capture the polis.[12]

Kleomenes's actions were unsuccessful, but they may be compared to those of Kroisos or Datis. In all these cases, the process of diplomacy is a question of communication with the gods and people of the states approached, and gods and people are inseparable: as Kleomenes found, one could not be won over without the other. In this way, the use of sanctuaries in the diplomatic process is very similar to the role of sanctuaries in Greek leagues: the political and the religious are part of a single process. In the next chapter we will see that this was understood by the Greek poleis in their behaviour after victories in war.

Endnote: reading through sanctuaries

This chapter started with the Kroisos testing the oracles. Why is that story given such prominence in the histories? The traditional explanation of the oracle competition is that it was told to Herodotos as 'a Delphic legend, concocted to glorify the Pythian Apollo over his prophetic rivals' (Parke 1985, 15)[13]. All Herodotos has done is to repeat propaganda: Herodotos the artless reporter. I believe that there is more to it: the answer to the question itself demonstrates the mediating role of sanctuaries between Greeks and outsiders in Herodotos's work.

Herodotos's work, after a brief prologue, starts in Lydia, on the edge of, but outside the Greek world. Herodotos manipulates the details so that Kroisos the Lydian is introduced to the heart of the Greek world by way of Delphi. The story of the competition set by Kroisos serves to introduce the reader to oracles, and moves the reader's

12 We will return to Kleomenes in chapter eight.
13 cf. How and Wells 1912, i. 31.

attention firmly towards Delphi in particular, and through Delphi into the world of early Athens and Sparta. That the reader is being brought into the text is indicated by Herodotos's description of what Kroisos found out:

> μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐφρόντιζε ἱστορέων τοὺς ἂν Ἑλλήνων δυνατωτάτους ἐόντας προσκτήσαιτο φίλους. ἱστορέων δὲ εὕρισκε Λακεδαιμονίους τε καὶ Ἀθηναίους προέχοντας, τοὺς μὲν τοὺ Δωριοῦ γένεος, τοὺς δὲ τοῦ Ἰωνικοῦ.
>
> After this he turned his mind to researching which of the Greeks he should make friends with, being the strongest. By research he found that the Spartans and the Athenians were preeminent, the former being of the Dorian race, the latter of the Ionian. (I. 56.1-2)

The word ἱστορέων, repeated in quick succession, takes the reader back to the opening words of the work: Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε[14]. Kroisos is in the role of Herodotos, and the reader who is following the researches of Herodotos follows the researches of Kroisos through the sanctuary of Delphi and into Athens and Sparta; by means of research at a sanctuary the outsider introduces himself to the Greek world for the first time. It has been pointed out that the apparent chaos of the first six books of Herodotos carefully prepare the reader with the information needed to appreciate the 'Great Event' of Xerxes's invasion and defeat (Drews 1973, 45-96); the story of Kroisos is the start of that process, and it is significant that a sanctuary is central to the narrative.

---

[14] ἱστορέω (16 times)and ἱστορίη (5 times)are not common in Herodotos, and ἱστορέω occurs only once between the proem and this passage: there it is within the story of Arion (I. 24.7), which is attributed by Herodotos to the Corinthians and Lesbians, rather than being claimed as Herodotos's own account.

Chapter Five: Dedications of booty in sanctuaries

This chapter is concerned with dedications by Greeks in their sanctuaries, and in particular with the dedications of spoils of war. There are two important forms of religious activity after battles in Greece, the erection of a trophy on the field of combat, and the dedication of spoils, including armour, in sanctuaries. It has been a commonplace to note that Herodotos never mentions the erection of battlefield trophies, although they are common in Thucydides (e.g. Pritchett 1974, 263). What has not been noted is that Herodotos frequently mentions dedications in temples after battles, whereas Thucydides hardly ever does. In this context it is illuminating to note that Pritchett's three chapters on dedications after battles, 'The dekate from booty', 'The battlefield trophy', and 'Captured armour' come in three different volumes of his The Greek state at war (Pritchett 1971, 93-100; 1974, 246-275; 1979, 277-295). I believe that by taking these customs together we may discover something about the relationship between warfare and religion in Greece, and something about the attitude of Herodotos. We will start with the idea of the τροπαῖον.

τροπαῖον

The word τροπαῖον does not appear in extant literature before the fifth century[1]. When it does appear, in dramatic poetry and history, it seems to be used of three different kinds of object: the trophy erected on the battlefield immediately after the battle, dedications of armour in temples and, in rare instances, permanent constructions of stone, built on the field of battle some time after the event. Discussions of τροπαῖα tend to have two

[1] Unless the Batrachomyomachia is earlier. Various dates have been suggested for this work, where the word tropaion occurs once (Batr. 159); it has no effect on my argument, so I accept here the judgement of Howatson (Howatson 1988, 86).

faults: they treat one kind in isolation from the others, and they tend to ignore the distinction between the forms, in searching for a single simple explanation for the term. We must look first at the way the term is used.

The trophies of the Persian Wars

Permanent trophies of stone are very rare, but there were monuments erected after the battles of Marathon, Salamis and Plataia. These are discussed by West (West 1969) who concludes that:

> they were really victory monuments, not trophies in the traditional sense, although they continued to be called tropaia. (West 1969, 18)

West argues that marble monuments, in the form of a trophy mounted on a column, were set up by the Athenians at Marathon and Salamis, probably in the 460s. The dating of the Marathon monument is based on the style of the column capital, and references to the column in Aristophanes.[2] The difference between this and a 'normal' battlefield trophy is clear:

> It was not, of course, erected immediately after the battle; the Greek force under Miltiades undoubtedly set up a trophy of the ordinary type, after customary practice. A few decades later this was replaced by the commemorative monument. (West 1969, 8)

There is evidence for a similar monument at Salamis. Its location is discussed by Wallace (Wallace 1969), and a fifth century date is argued for this too; no pieces of the monument now survive, and we have no references to it from the fifth century, so it cannot be firmly dated, but it is probable that it was roughly contemporary with the Marathon trophy (West 1969, 16-17). In addition the Spartans may later have erected a similar monument at Plataia (West 1969, 17-18).

---

[2] Eq. 1334; Ve. 711; Fr. 413 K; Lys. 285. Meiggs and Lewis suggest that an epigram about Marathon was added to an inscription commemorating Salamis, perhaps in the 460s at the instigation of Kimon (ML 26). The political mood that led to the inscription might also have produced the Marathon trophy.

The monuments at Marathon and Salamis reappear in the second century B.C. According to inscriptions, sacrifices were made to Zeus Tropaios at both places[3]. And also:

> Trophy symbols appear in the New Style coinage of Athens. When the trophy was selected by a mint magistrate of the name of Themistokles, it has been suggested that this was done out of 'family pride', in other words, as a symbol of prestige. (Pritchett 1974, 274)

Pritchett does not discuss what the trophy symbol represented, but if it was indeed associated with a man called Themistokles, it is hard to doubt that this was a reference to the permanent Salamis monument, and not the representation of a traditional, temporary τροπαῖον.

It is not clear whether the interest in trophies shown by coins and inscriptions is something that appears anew in the second half of the second century, or whether it reveals attitudes that have been carried through from the fifth century. The representations of Nikes sacrificing in front of trophies on the balustrade of the temple of Athena Nike on the Athenian akropolis (Carpenter 1929) may suggest that sacrifices at the trophies of Marathon and Salamis do date back to the fifth century. However that may be, we are dealing here with exceptional monuments, not typical τροπαῖα.

It follows that we should not generalise from the evidence of these Persian War trophies when we try to explain the meaning of τροπαῖα in other contexts, nor assume that Athenian practice in those instances corresponds to normal Greek activity. I therefore take issue with Rouse's suggestion:

> Sacrifice was done before a trophy periodically by the Athenians both at Marathon and Salamis, and doubtless elsewhere. (Rouse 1902, 99)

We shall return to these monuments, but first we must look at other uses of the word τροπαῖον.

---

[3] Marathon: I.G. ii^2 1028 (101 B.C.); Salamis I.G. ii^2 1006 (122 B.C.).

τροπαῖον in dramatic poetry

The word occurs twice in Aiskhylos, in the Seven against Thebes. The first time explicitly refers to dedications in temples, as Eteokles promises:

> θήσειν τροπαῖα, καὶ λάφυρα δαΐων
> στέψω πρὸ ναῶν δουρίπληχθ' ἀγνοῖς δόμοις.
>
> I shall set up trophies, and set before the holy chambers of the temples the spear-fixed spoils of the enemy. (Th. 277-278)

The second equally clearly refers to a trophy erected where the battle was:

> ἕστακε δ' Ἄτας τροπαῖον ἐν πύλαις,
> ἐν αἷς ἐθείνοντο, καὶ δυοῖν κρατή-
> σας ἔληξε δαίμων.
>
> The trophy of *Ate* stands in the gates where they died and, having overcome the two of them, the god ceased his work.(Th. 956-960)

I shall return to this passage.

Sophokles also uses the word twice, in the Trachiniae. The first time it clearly refers to spoils to be erected in a temple, as the verb ἄγων indicates:

> ὅθ' εἶρπε κλεινὴν Εὐρύτου πέρσας πόλιν,
> νίκης ἄγων τροπαῖα κἀκροθίνια,
>
> When he came, having destroyed the famed city of Erytos, bringing trophies and spoils of victory (Tr. 750-751)

Commentators have noted the distinction between τροπαῖα and ἀκροθίνια, which refers to the nature, not the position of the objects. Easterling for example comments:

> **τροπαῖα κἀκροθίνια:** the two regular types of spoil: the captured weapons of the enemy, to be dedicated to the gods, and a select portion of the booty (lit. 'top of the pile', i.e. the best) for sacrifice, notably cattle. (Easterling 1982, 166)

In the other case the meaning is metaphorical, and the word is used with ἵστημι to mean 'be victorious':

> κοὐδεὶς τροπαῖ' ἔστησε τῶν ἐμῶν χερῶν.
>
> And no-one erected a trophy over me. (Tr. 1102)

Since ἵστημι can be used of dedications in temples as well as battlefield trophies, we cannot assume that Sophokles had in mind one rather than the other.

Euripides uses τροπαῖον eight times[4]; most commonly it is used with ἵστημι in the same metaphorical sense as in Sophokles, and in one case when it is not necessarily a metaphor we cannot tell whether it is referring to a battlefield trophy or a dedication in a temple:

> τρόπαια πῶς ἀναστήσεις Διί;
>
> How will you set up trophies to Zeus? (Ph. 572)

In the Heraclidae we might assume that the battlefield is referred to:

> νικῶμεν ἐχθροὺς καὶ τροπαῖ' ἱδρύεται
> παντευχίαν ἔχοντα πολεμίων σέθεν.
>
> We defeat the foe, and trophies are erected with the full armour of the enemy. (Heracl. 786-787)

However, we cannot be certain. Earlier in the play (Heracl. 402) the word is used figuratively, and again could imply either kind of trophy, but since the reference is to a girl who is to be sacrificed in a temple[5], the connection with a battlefield trophy is weakened.

Apart from the references to the trophy at Marathon, the word τροπαῖον occurs three times in Aristophanes, always with ἵστημι or τίθημι in the same metaphorical sense as above, and it appears in the same sense and construction in the Batrachomyomachia:

> στησόμεν εὐθύμως τὸ μυοκτόνον ὧδε τρόπαιον
>
> Gladly we will set up this trophy of our mouse-killing (Batr. 159)

It is clear, then, that for the dramatic poets the word τροπαῖον could refer to a dedication of armour either on a battlefield, or in a temple, and that most often the word is used in a context that does not specify one or the other. The feature that unites the

---

4 And. 694, 763; Heracl. 402, 786; Or. 713; Ph. 572; Supp. 647; Tr. 1222.
5 Following Diggle's ordering of the lines in the OCT of 1984.

uses of the word is the connection with battle. Where the trophy is actually erected is not relevant.

τροπαῖον in historians

Mentions of τροπαῖα are frequent in Thucydides and Xenophon: the word occurs 58 times in Thucydides, and 30 times in Xenophon's Hellenica (Pritchett 1974, 270-271). The references are always to battlefield trophies, and most of the time they appear to be almost formulaic. Thucydides usually ends his account of a battle with the erection of a trophy and the stripping of corpses or handing them back to the losers under a truce: e.g.

> καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τροπαῖόν τε στήσαντες καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ὑποσπόνδους ἀποδόντες τοῖς Συρακοσίοις...
>
> Afterwards the Athenians set up a trophy and gave back the corpses to the Syracusans under a truce... (Th. vi. 97.5)
>
> στήσαντες δὲ τροπαῖον ἐπὶ τῇ ἄκρᾳ οὗ τὸ Κυνὸς σῆμα καὶ τὰ ναυάγια προσαγαγόμενοι καὶ νεκροὺς τοῖς ἐναντίοις ὑποσπόνδους ἀποδόντες...
>
> They set up a trophy on the headland of Kynossema, and gathered up the wrecked ships, and they gave the corpses back to the enemy under a truce... (Th. viii. 106.4)

It is for Thucydides merely part of the process of battle. The only occasion on which Thucydides shows any interest in a trophy is after the sea battle of Panormos (Th. viii. 24.1): the Athenians erected a trophy two days after the battle, and the Milesians came out and tore it down, according to Thucydides, ὡς οὐ μετὰ κράτους τῆς γῆς σταθὲν, 'since it had been set up when they did not have control of the territory'. Andrewes comments:

> the conventions about tropaia tend to be sentimentalized, and this unemotional statement of a fifth century view is valuable... Trophies were not objects of cult worship but symbols of prestige. (Gomme, Andrewes and Dover 1981, 54)

As we shall see, there is more to trophies than Andrewes will admit, but his 'unsentimentalized' attitude reflects that of Thucydides.

Xenophon's references to τροπαῖα are also only to battlefield trophies, and only occur in descriptions of the aftermath of the battle. This is particularly noticeable at the end of the Hellenica: the outcome of the battle is put down to divine will, but the building of trophies is seen as part of human activity, like the returning of corpses:

> ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὕτως ἐποίησεν ὥστε ἀμφότεροι μὲν τροπαῖον ὡς νενικηκότες ἐστήσαντο, τοὺς δὲ ἱσταμένους οὐδέτεροι ἐκώλυον, νεκροὺς δὲ ἀμφότεροι μὲν ὡς νενικηκότες ὑποσπόνδους ἀπέδοσαν, ἀμφότεροι δὲ ὡς ἡττημένοι ὑποσπόνδους ἀπελάμβανον κτλ.
>
> The god so arranged it that both sides set up a trophy as if they had won, but neither side prevented the other from setting theirs up; both sides gave back the corpses under a truce, as if they had won, and both received back their corpses under a truce, as if they had been defeated, etc. (HG vii. 5.26)

If Xenophon thought that trophies were built in recognition of god-given victory, neither side should have built one. That Xenophon, who frequently mentions religious activity like sacrificing and augury (cf. Pritchett 1979, 47-90), should not consider τροπαῖα as part of man's relationship with the divine is important for our understanding of the meaning of the τροπαῖον.

The frequent references to the erection of trophies in Thucydides and Xenophon makes the silence of Herodotos on the subject interesting. In one instance, the Battle of the Champions between Sparta and Argos at Thyrea in the mid-sixth century (i. 82), the absence of a trophy is more noticeable than its presence would have been. The battle, between three hundred men from each side, ended with two Argives and one Spartan left alive;

> οἱ μὲν δὴ δύο τῶν Ἀργείων ὡς νενικηκότες ἔθεον ἐς τὸ Ἄργος, ὁ δὲ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων Ὀθρυάδης σκυλεύσας τοὺς Ἀργείων νεκροὺς καὶ προσφορήσας τὰ ὅπλα πρὸς τὸ ἑωυτοῦ στρατόπεδον ἐν τῇ τάξι εἶχε ἑωυτόν.
>
> The two Argives ran off to Argos, as if they had won, but Othryades, for the Lakedaimonians, stripping the Argive corpses and carrying the weapons to his own camp, kept himself under arms. (i. 82.5)

The Spartan, by staying on the field and stripping the corpses, did everything that usually accompanied the erection of a trophy, but Herodotos does not mention one. The battle became a popular topic with later epigrammatists (Gow and Page 1965, ii. 220),

and some of the poems imply the existence of a trophy, although the word τροπαῖον is not used[6]. The epigrams are probably dependent on Herodotos[7], and the fact that later writers would assume the existence of a trophy, even when none was mentioned, suggests that their understanding of the erection of a trophy is the same as that of Thucydides and Xenophon: it is a natural part of post-battle activity. I believe that Herodotos's failure to mention one is significant, because it indicates a different understanding of how battles were decided.

We must now look at the meaning of the battlefield trophy.

The battlefield trophy

The battlefield trophy has been discussed in detail in two recent works, W.K. Pritchett's The Greek state at war ii (Pritchett 1974, 246-275) and R. Lonis's Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique (Lonis 1979, 129-146); Lonis's work shows no knowledge of Pritchett's, and the two cover much of the same material, but with different conclusions.

For Pritchett:

> Primarily, of course, trophies set up in the field of battle were war dedications, presumably to the god to whom the victory was ascribed. They were protected by a religious sanction, for they were respected even when set up in enemy territory. But one reason for the great general interest in the trophy must have been that it was a symbol of prestige, with a powerful psychological value. (Pritchett 1974, 273)

For Lonis, the trophy is a representation of Zeus Tropaios:

> L'érection de sa statue, sur le lieu même de l'action... est la matérialisation de l'issue du combat par une borne-témoin dont nul ne pourra contester la validité car son édification résulte d'un arbitrage de Zeus. (Lonis 1979, 137)

---

6 Nikandros refers to σκύλα (Gow-Page 2726 = A.P. vii. 526.4); cf. Dioskorides (Gow-Page 1664) and (Simonides) (Gow-Page 3338).

7 Despite Gow and Page's strange claim about Nikandros (Gow-Page 2723-2726) that 'the suicide of Othryades seems to be an embellishment, perhaps N(ikandros)'s own... Herodotos says nothing about his death.' (Gow and Page 1965, ii. 424). The death is in fact described at I. 82.8.

My own view is closer to that of Lonis, but there are problems with his idea of the trophy as simultaneously ἀγάλμα and ὅρος ('statue' and 'borne-témoin').

It is important to remember that the word τροπαῖον only appears in the fifth century. There are a number of possible explanations for this: either (a) the word was used, but happens not to appear in extant literature, or (b) trophies were not created before the fifth century, or (c) trophies were erected, but were not called τροπαῖα before the fifth century. (a) is very unlikely, given the extent to which warfare is a subject for archaic literature; (b) is the view of Lonis, who argues that the trophy belonged only to hoplite warfare. He suggests that it was only gradually, after the introduction of the phalanx, that rules of engagement were sorted out, and with them the conventions about the trophy (Lonis 1979, 137). Against this there are two strong objections. The first is that, as we have seen, the earliest uses of the word τροπαῖον are not limited to battlefield trophies, but include references to dedications in temples: the rules for that kind of dedication would not have needed such time to develop. The second objection is that there are examples in earlier literature of what would be called τροπαῖα in the fifth century. In the Iliad Hektor says of Aias:

> εἰ δὲ κ' ἐγὼ τὸν ἕλω, δώῃ δὲ μοι εὖχος Ἀπόλλων
> τεύχεα συλήσας οἴσω προτὶ Ἴλιον ἰρήν,
> καὶ κρεμόω ποτὶ νηὸν Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκατοίο.
>
> If I defeat him - may Apollo grant my prayer - I shall strip his weapons and bring them to sacred Ilion, and hang them in the temple of far-shooting Apollo. (Il. vii. 81-83)

This would not be a battlefield trophy, but it would be a τροπαῖον in the sense of Sophokles Tr. 751. Another example is Odysseus fixing Dolon's armour to a tree at Il. x. 465-466, which Pritchett sees as a real trophy (Pritchett 1974,). Lonis cannot claim that the Iliad, not being about hoplites, is hors de combat, since he invokes Homer's picture of Zeus holding the balance (Il. viii. 66-72) to support his own explanation. We are left with (c): the word τροπαῖον was applied, in the fifth century, to several kinds of thing that had been erected after battles as far back as Homer's time. We are left with two tasks: to trace

the origin of the battlefield trophy in the early archaic period, and to explain how it came to be called a τροπαῖον in the fifth century.

I believe that, in origin, the trophy should be understood as a marker, indicating that territory has been won by the victor. The relationship between early archaic warfare and territory is stressed by de Polignac, who argues that the development of the hoplite phalanx was a means of protecting cultivated ground from invasion. But hoplite tactics also made possible the gaining of territory:

> Car, réciproquement, s'emparer d'un territoire suppose un effort militaire commun et continu capable d'assurer une appropriation permanente et non un pillage temporaire. Ainsi se mettent en place les éléments de la guerre archaïque et classique où l'on voit deux armées en rangs serrés s'affronter dans un champ clos, une plaine, d'où chacune cherche à chasser l'autre pour occuper le terrain. (de Polignac 1984, 57)

Something is needed to indicate possession, and for de Polignac that is a function of an extra-urban sanctuary; he sees the building of temples like the Argive Heraion as the means of territorial definition in the early archaic period:

> L'ancienne indétermination spatiale d'une plaine faiblement habitée n'est plus: chaque groupe délimite ses frontières, défend et cherche à étendre ses terres, et la mise en place d'un sanctuaire extra-urbain symbolise cette possession en même temps qu'elle la sauvegarde face à l'ennemi. (de Polignac 1984, 59)

This is also the function of the battlefield trophy: it marked the field of battle as territory gained. Such an explanation fits well the case of Panormos referred to above, where possession of the field was considered necessary when the trophy was erected[8]. The idea of the trophy as a marker of conquered territory is visible in a speech in Thucydides. Before the battle of Delion Pagondas warns:

> ἡμῖν δὲ ἐς πᾶσαν, ἢν νικηθῶμεν, εἷς ὅρος οὐκ ἀντίλεκτος παγήσεται;
>
> For us, if we are defeated, one *horos* will be fixed immoveably for all. (Th. iv. 92.4)

A trophy erected by victorious Athenians would be a ὅρος, a marker to show that Boiotian territory was now controlled by Athens.

---

[8] The erection of trophies after a sea-battle, as in this case, should be seen as a simple extension of the idea.

The Classical period: τροπαῖα and Zeus Tropaios

The explanation of the origin of the trophy that I have given does not explain the word τροπαῖον which comes to be used of the trophy in the fifth century. That word would appear to be closely connected with the title 'Tropaios', first applied to Zeus also in fifth century literature. The earliest appearances of the title are in the tragedies of Sophokles and Euripides[9], where the god is appealed to in matters relating to warfare[10]. Pausanias claims that the sanctuary of Zeus Tropaios at Sparta dated back to the Dorian invasion:

> τοῦ δὲ Τροπαίου Διὸς τὸ ἱερὸν ἐποίησαν οἱ Δώριεις πολέμῳ τούς τε ἄλλους Ἀχαιούς, οἳ γῆν τὴν Λακωνικὴν τηνικαῦτα εἶχον, καὶ τοὺς Ἀμυκλαεῖς κρατήσαντες.
>
> The Dorians built the sanctuary of Zeus Tropaios after defeating in battle the Amyklaians and the other Achaians who then held the Lakonian plain. (Paus. iii. 12.9)

It is presumably to be associated with the trophy mentioned at Paus. iii. 2.6. Nothing of this temple or trophy have been discovered, and there is no reference to it in any earlier sources; it has been suggested that Pausanias's sources were Hellenistic (Pritchett 1974, 250 n. 18). It would be surprising, had the temple existed in Archaic or Classical times, that neither Herodotos nor Tyrtaios nor anyone else mentioned it. I am inclined to doubt the existence of the temple in the Archaic period. The earliest documentary evidence for a cult of Zeus Tropaios comes from the inscriptions from Marathon and Salamis (I.G. ii^2 1028, 1006) discussed above. The existence of this cult at sites created soon after the Persian Wars, and the appearance of the title in Athenian literature at the same period, suggest that the cult of Zeus Tropaios started in Attika as a result of the experience of the Persian Wars.

---

9 S. Ant. 143; Tr. 303; E. El. 671; Heracl. 867, 937.

10 e.g. on S. Tr. 303: '**τροπαῖε:** because Zeus who turns the tide of battle is responsible for the plight of these women.' (Easterling 1982, 116)

Now by this period battles between Greek states were no longer usually concerned with the gaining of territory for long-term exploitation, although battles to absorb other poleis in to the territory of a dominant polis still happened in some areas, and thus the battlefield trophy had largely lost its original meaning. The cult of Zeus Tropaios provided a new explanation for the trophy: it came to be seen as a dedication to Zeus, in recognition of his intervention on the battlefield, and hence trophies might be called τροπαῖα Ζηνὸς (E. Supp. 647). The involvement of Zeus in the outcome of a battle is described by Homer:

> καὶ τότε δὴ χρύσεια πατὴρ ἐτίταινε τάλαντα,
> ἐν δὲ τίθει δύο κῆρε ταηλεγέος θανάτοιο
> Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαίων χαλκοχιτώνων,
> ἕλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβών· ῥέπε δ' αἴσιμον ἦμαρ Ἀχαιῶν.
>
> And then the Father stretched out the golden scales, and placed on them two portions of miserable death, for the horse-taming Trojans and the bronze-clad Achaians, and he raised them, holding them in the middle: the day fateful for the Achaians sank. (Il. viii. 69-72)

It was also acknowleged by states which made dedications to Zeus Olympios at his sanctuary of Olympia. Dedications of arms and armour are found at Olympia from the eighth century onwards, and from the sixth century we have inscriptions indicating that armour was booty won in conflict with other Greeks (Pritchett 1979, 290-291). As we shall see, in the Persian Wars, dedications to Zeus can be explained as thank offerings to a Panhellenic deity: in the archaic period it seems likely that it was the role of Olympian Zeus as the decider of battles that led Greeks to dedicate spoils at Olympia. There does not appear to be a similar number of dedications of booty won from Greeks from this period at Delphi for example.[11]

In Homer, Zeus is pictured as being some distance from the events, sitting on Ida;[12] in the fifth century for the first time Zeus is seen as intervening actually in the place of

---

11 I shall return to this topic below.

12 And perhaps dedications by Greeks from Athens and Boeotia at relatively distant Olympia might also suggest a god who acts at a distance.

conflict. This is not always the case in tragedy where, as we have seen, τροπαῖον may refer to a dedication in a temple as well as a battlefield trophy, but it is implicit in Thucydides, where the trophy is set up to mark the point at which the enemy turned and ran:

> ἔστησαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι τροπαῖον ὡς νενικηκότες τῆς τροπῆς,
>
> The Peloponnesians set up a trophy, as the victors at the turning. (Th. ii. 92.5)

Pritchett refers to this passage when he discusses the convention that appears in later literature that 'the place of erection was the turning point of the battle.' (Pritchett 1974, 252-253).

It must be born in mind that no explanation of the word τροπαῖον will necessarily work in every case, and in particular tragedy may provide exceptions. A unique idea of the nature of the trophy comes in Aiskhylos's Seven against Thebes referred to above:

> ἔστακε δ' Ἄτας τροπαῖον ἐν πύλαις,
> ἐν αἷς ἐθείνοντο, καὶ δυοῖν κρατή-
> σας ἔληξε δαίμων.
>
> The trophy of *Ate* stands in the gates where they died and, having overcome the two of them, the god ceased his work.(Th. 956-960)

This is one of the earliest occurances of the word and on this passage a whole theory is built by Picard. He sees the trophy as a magical means to control Ἄτη, as a stake through the heart is supposed to give rest to a vampire: 'L'érection du trophie a eu pour effet de le fixer, de lui donner la repos' (Picard 1957, 28). Pritchett in contrast dismisses the passage altogether:

> There is nothing more in the passage than a poetical metaphor. Ate had no place in cult, but is one of the semi-allegorical divine beings created by the poets. (Pritchett 1974, 247)

However, to call it a metaphor is not to explain the meaning of the passage. The passage is interesting: the trophy, standing in the gates, breaches the boundary between the city and the space outside, just as the conflict between Eteokles and Polyneikes breaches the rules of the family (Zeitlin 1982, 155). In this case the trophy is

nothing to do with territory won or enemies turned, since neither happened; it is a visible sign of Ἄτη, the real victor. The audience might perhaps have thought of the trophy now standing in the middle of the plain of Marathon, or the one at Salamis, and remembered how destruction came to Athens, and was driven away. The word in this case may be used to contrast the τροπαῖον Ἄτας of Thebes with the τροπαῖα Ζηνὸς of Athens.

This discussion has been rather long, considering that the objects do not occur in Herodotos. It is relevant, however, because it demonstrates the existence of a concept of divine intervention on the battlefield that can be contrasted with that of Herodotos. The identification of the trophy as a representation of, or dedication to Zeus Tropaios is clear acknowledgement of divine aid, but it is a limited acknowledgement, not extending beyond the centre of the battlefield. I want to go on to show that for Herodotos and other Greeks, divine involvement went further, and was recognised not in human space on the battlefield, but in religious space. As West puts it:

> Proper commemoration of the battle was ordinarily by votive offerings made to a deity in his sanctuary since the battle was thereby placed in the religious framework from which the victory had arisen. (West 1969, 11)

Offerings in sanctuaries

It is clear that numerous dedications of booty were made during the Peloponnesian War, even though Thucydides mentions only three dedications, including that of 300 panoplies dedicated by Demosthenes after his victory over the Ambraciots (Th. iii. 114.1); these are discussed because Thucydides wants to explain that what can be seen in his day is <u>not</u> the principal booty from the battle. The other two dedications are of ships, one by the Athenians at Antirrion (ii. 84.4) and one by the Peloponnesians at Rion (ii. 92.5). The first was dedicated to Poseidon; Thucydides does not name the divinity in the second case, but that was almost certainly Poseidon also. Both were set

up close to trophies, and, although they are dedications in sanctuaries, they act almost as if they were trophies themselves, bearing witness to naval victories in the immediate area. That there were more dedications from the war is made clear from a variety of sources. Gomme suggests that a dedication was made by the Athenians at Dodona after the battle at Th. ii. 92.5, and he mentions Pausanias's description of other booty at Delphi (Paus. x. 11.5) (Gomme 1956, 232). Pausanias refers also to the Syrakusan treasury at Delphi, built with the spoils of the Sicilian expedition (x. 11.4).

These dedications suggest that Zeus Tropaios was not the only deity held responsible for victory, and suggest that the Greeks acknowledged a more complex idea of divine involvement in battle. The rest of this chapter will examine how this involvement is recognised by dedications in sanctuaries.

Dedications of armour and booty can be misunderstood if we see them as determined by a personal relationship between dedicator and deity. Pritchett explains the fact that Demosthenes was given 300 suits of armour as a personal reward, and then dedicated them in temples, like this:

> By Greek convention all of the panoplies were destined for sacred shrines; but it was Demosthenes, and not the Athenian demos, who had the voice about where the three hundred were to go. (Pritchett 1979, 285)

The idea of the general or warrior deciding freely where to make a dedication is assumed even more strongly earlier:

> Just as religious practice required the woman to dedicate her used garments and other articles to Artemis, so in the same spirit of piety the warrior offered his arms, but in this case to any shrine of his choosing. (Pritchett 1979, 275)

At the bottom of this view I believe there lies a very modern idea of the relationship between men and gods or God. If it were correct, we could learn very little from dedications, since they would reflect nothing more than the thought of individual dedicators.

Dedications of booty in Herodotos

A more useful approach to Greek religious practice is offered by Gould:

> What Greek religion offered to those brought up within its field of efficacy was both a framework of explanation for human experience and a system of responses to all that is wayward, uncanny and a threat to the perception of order in that experience - a language for dealing with the world. (Gould 1985, 5)

This framework of explanation extends to the outcome of battles. Very simply, in Herodotos's account victory in a battle between two Greek states appears to be attributed to the power of the local deities, that is, the deities of the victorious polis, and victory of Greeks over non-Greeks is attributed to the power of the deities of various Panhellenic sanctuaries, although individual states in these victories may also acknowledge the aid of their own gods.

Herodotos describes in detail the dedications made by the Greeks after their victories at Salamis (viii. 121-122) and Plataia (ix. 81.1). In each case the main dedication was made at Delphi, and this suggests that Delphi, or Apollo Pythios, is recognised by all the Greeks as the main source for their victory. This is emphasised by references to additional dedications made at Delphi later by individual states: the Aiginetans after Salamis (viii. 122) and the Tenians after Plataia (ix. 82.1). The importance of Delphi is the subject of chapter seven.

Herodotos mentions only some of the other dedications made after Salamis, the three ships set up to Poseidon at Sounion and Isthmia, and to Aias on Salamis. Dedications of ships to Poseidon seems to have been usual (cf. Th. ii. 84.4), although other deities sometimes received them (for example Hera on Samos (Walter 1976, 58) and Aias here). We may interpret the choice of these sanctuaries in several ways: the Poseidon sanctuaries are two of the main sanctuaries to the god on the Saronic gulf, one at each end, and may have been chosen for their location. Alternatively they may have been chosen as sanctuaries in the territory of the two leading Greek contributors,

Athens and Corinth (cf. viii. 94.4). The dedications of ships then, represent either local or Panhellenic responses to the victory. It is certain that individual states did make dedications in their own territory after Salamis which Herodotos does not mention: the marble trophy erected by the Athenians which I have discussed above is one such.

The dedications made after Plataia which Herodotos picks out are more obviously Panhellenic. Apart from Delphi, statues are dedicated at Olympia and Isthmia, and, since Plataia was a land battle, and no earthquake was involved, we may assume that Isthmia was chosen for its importance as an international sanctuary, rather than because Poseidon was an appropriate deity. Here once again there were dedications also in individual state sanctuaries: Herodotos mentions the bronze manger dedicated by the Tegeans at the sanctuary of Athena Alea at Tegea (ix. 70. 3).

What does seem clear is that in the archaic period it was uncommon for Greeks to celebrate their victory over other Greeks at Delphi or other Panhellenic sanctuaries, with the exception of Olympia noted above. This changed in the fifth and fourth centuries, as the nature of the fighting changed. 'From that time on, Greece was divided into two enemy camps and engaged in a struggle whose aim, scope and form were quite different.' (Vernant 1982, 32-33). Domination over the whole of Greece became an issue, and Delphi was no longer external to the fighting, but had to be seen to be on one side or the other. During the course of the fifth century, both at Delphi and Olympia, Greeks begin to erect monuments or make dedications to mark victories over other Greek poleis.[13] It is significant then that the one dedication made at Delphi after a battle between Greeks should be the result of a dispute concerning Delphi itself. Herodotos mentions shields and statues dedicated by the Phokians after a defeat of the Thessalians. Herodotos does not explain the origins of the war, but accounts for it by saying ἅτε σφι ἐνέχοντες αἰεὶ χόλον, 'since they always had a hatred of them' (viii. 27.1). It

[13] Delphi: Paus. x. 9.3-4, 10.2; Olympia: ML 36; Hill 1951, B110 Siewert, 1981.

is clear, however, from later history that control of Delphi was the fundamental issue in Phokian conflict with its neighbours (cf. Th. i. 111.1, 112.5 with Gomme 1945, 337). Dedications at Delphi by Phokians would indicate that Delphi belonged to Phokis. These dedications are an exception which proves the rule that victories by Greeks over Greeks would be celebrated as achievements by local deities, and dedications would be made in local, polis sanctuaries.

We can see several examples in Herodotos of commemorations of victories in the sanctuaries of individual states. The dedications tend to be of shields or fetters. Fetters hung on the akropolis marked the victory of Athens over Chalkideans at the end of the sixth century (v. 77.3-4) and the victory of the Tegeans over the Spartans (i. 66.4), when they were hung in the temple of Athena Alea. Shields, including that of Alkaios, were hung in the temple of Athena at Sigeon after the defeat of the Mytileneans by the Athenians there (v. 95.1). Ships' prows were dedicated at the temple of Athena on Aigina after an Aiginetan victory over Samian settlers at Kydonia (iii. 59.3).

It is important to note that we are dealing in each case with the victories of autonomous Greek states. The dedications are thus made in the major sanctuary of each state. In fact, all the examples above refer to sanctuaries of Athena, and it might be argued that, as a warrior goddess, she would be a natural recipient of the dedication of spoils; the fact that the major spoils after Salamis and Plataia were not offered to Athena suggests that this argument is wrong. Burkert suggests:

> Certainly in Greek times, Athena is everywhere the preeminent citadel and city goddess; often this is expressed by her epithets, Polias, Polioúchos. Her temple is therefore very frequently the central temple of the city on the fortress hill, not only in Athens, but also in Argos, Sparta, Gortyn, Lindos, Larisa in Thessaly, and Ilion. (Burkert 1985, 144)

Athena Alea is clearly also the major sanctuary at Tegea (Paus. viii. 45.4), and, we may assume, at Sigeon, which is an Athenian foundation. The same may be true for Aigina. It would therefore appear from Herodotos's account that the standard practice was for dedications to be made by the successful side in their own major sanctuary.

Thucydides's mention of Demosthenes dedicating his 300 panoplies suggests that dedications might sometimes be more complicated. This passage has, I believe, been misunderstood, and is worth commenting on in detail:

> μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τρίτον μέρος νείμαντες τῶν σκύλων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὰ ἄλλα κατὰ τὰς πόλεις διείλοντο. καὶ τὰ μὲν τῶν Ἀθηναίων πλέοντα ἑάλω, τὰ δὲ νῦν ἀνακείμενα ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς ἱεροῖς Δημοσθένει ἐξηρέθησαν τριακόσιαι πανοπλίαι, καὶ ἄγων αὐτὰς κατέπλευσεν·
>
> Afterwards, setting aside a third of the spoils for the Athenians, they divided the rest between the *poleis*. The Athenians' share was captured on the journey, and what is now lying in the Attic sanctuaries are three hundred panoplies given as an honour to Demosthenes, who brought them when he sailed back. (Th. iii. 114.1)

Gomme says that the panoplies were

> a personal gift to Demosthenes by the Akarnanians and Amphilochians because he was their leader and, clearly, popular as well as successful... Demosthenes did not receive this booty as Athenian strategos. (Gomme 1956, 428)

He offers no support for this claim. It seems to me that the distinction drawn by Thucydides with the τὰ μὲν...τὰ δὲ... construction is not between public and private booty, but between what was lost and what survived. I would suggest that Demosthenes was given the booty precisely in order that he should dedicate it in the Attic sanctuaries, and that he had the say in which sanctuaries were chosen because that was part of the religious role of the strategos. The religious function of Greek magistrates is usually neglected, but it is clear that the strategos was required to perform certain actions. Pritchett has very little to say about these religious actions; however it is clear from his account that sacrifices before battles were the job of the strategos himself (Pritchett 1971, 109-115), and it was not uncommon for the strategos to make vows to the gods on behalf of the polis (Pritchett 1979, 232); the strategoi also carried out religious rituals before the Dionysia and other dramatic festivals (Goldhill 1987, 60). The position of strategos appears to give the holder contact with the gods, or some kind of access to divine activity; this suggests that the strategos would be in a position to know which sanctuaries were entitled to share in the fruits of a victory won with divine aid.

However, it is true that we know virtually nothing about the details of dedicating spoils (Pritchett 1979, 276).

Dedications after battles are of a fairly limited kind, being usually captured armour and weapons. The choice of fetters as an object dedicated is worth commenting on. In the case of Tegea, Herodotos tells an ironical story: the chains were brought by the Spartans to bind the Tegeans, and in the end were used on the Spartans themselves. This story is set in the distant past, and connected with an oracle which ends:

> δώσω τοι Τεγέην ποσσίκροτον ὀρχήσασθαι
> καὶ καλὸν πεδιόν σχοίνῳ διαμετρήσασθαι.
>
> I will give you Tegea to dance on, striking it with your feet, and its beautiful plain to measure out with the line. (i. 66.2)

A more mundane explanation for the dedication of fetters is suggested by the Athenian example (v. 77.3-4). They seem there to indicate that prisoners have been ransomed. This view is supported by the fact that Kroisos, when rescued from the pyre, sends his fetters to Delphi (i. 90.4), and Demokedes is given golden fetters when released from prison by Darius (iii. 130.4).

Relations between Greek states

Having described the practice of dedication of spoils in Herodotos, I want to suggest an explanation for the practice. In chapter four I argued that dedications made by foreigners in Greek sanctuaries could be understood as a type of diplomatic communication. That is no doubt part of the idea of dedications of booty in local sanctuaries: it impresses visitors. However, these dedications are primarily for 'internal' purposes - they will be seen most frequently by citizens, and by the deity. They are part, I shall argue, of a nationalist religious attitude found in every Greek polis.

The conventions which appear to govern battles between Greek poleis, and which are particularly visible in the setting up of trophies, underestimate the reality of hostility

that existed between states, particularly in the archaic period. This view reaches an extreme perhaps with Vernant when he suggests:

> It was (the common body of customs, values and beliefs) that constituted the unity of the Greek world in so far as it comprises a single whole, composed of different city-states which were always more or less in a state of rivalry and confrontation in peace-time, but which in war remained always more or less united or associated with one another. (Vernant 1982, 32)

In this sentence, war is taken to mean only conflict between Greeks and non-Greeks, and the examples described above are reduced to being 'rivalry and confrontation'! With this approach goes a concentration on τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων νόμιμα, and an assumption that common religious practice implied a common acceptance of 'the rules of the game'. Vernant is in fact aware of the reality of interstate warfare:

> Since each city was a sovereign state, the arche acquired through victory gave it the quasi-absolute power of kratein over the enemy - the power to treat it as a master, doing as one would with it, if necessary reducing it to slavery. (Vernant 1982, 33)

It is the difference between Greek states, and their awareness of their autonomy, not their common heritage, that I believe is indicated by their dedications in sanctuaries.

The polis and the gods

The relationship between states and the gods of their own sanctuaries, their 'local' deities, has received little attention in works on Greek religion. These books always treat 'Greek religion' as a homogeneous whole, an approach that is the result of concentration on literature rather than ritual practice. Thus Burkert can start a chapter encouragingly entitled 'polis and polytheism' like this:

> To give an account of Greek religion means listing numerous gods one after another; the task of the history of religion seems to dissolve into the history of individual gods. The fact that the Greek gods manifest themselves as individuals makes this seem quite natural, and the clarity of the resulting organisation of the evidence confirms the procedure. (Burkert 1985, 216)

This gives no help to anyone wanting to know why, when the Tegeans defeat the Spartans, they make dedications to Athena Alea at Tegea, whereas if the Spartans defeat the Tegeans, we may assume they make dedications to Athena Chalkioikos on the Spartan akropolis (cf. Paus. iv. 15.5). A study of 'Athena' will not explain the mentality behind these acts, but a study of the role of individual sanctuaries might. In the next chapter I shall examine the way in which deities and heroes were perceived to operate from their sanctuaries. Here I wish to show how this relates to conflict between Greek states.

Quite simply, every polis was protected by its own gods and heroes, and in times of battle these gods do not seem to have been identified with anything outside the interests of the place. Thus, for example, Pagondas can talk before Delion of the Thebans πιστεύσαντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς ἡμῶν ἔσεσθαι, οὗ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀνόμως τειχίσαντες νέμονται, 'trusting that the god will be on our side, whose sanctuary they occupy and improperly fortify' (Th. iv. 92.7). Thus too the ownership of the bones of the hero Orestes gives Sparta the strength to defeat the Tegeans (i. 67-68).

This idea of state gods fighting for the state is visible in other Near Eastern societies, most obviously in the Hebrew Bible. An example comes in the Song of Deborah:

> Hark, the sound of players striking up
> in the places where the women draw water!
> It is the victories of YHWH that they commemorate there,
> his triumphs as the champion of Israel.
> (Judges 5.11)

The Song of Deborah probably dates from the late second millenium BC, but it is a notoriously difficult passage to interpret (Soggin 1987, 92-101). What is clear, however it is understood, is that YHWH is here perceived as fighting on one side: he is the god of the Israelites, and not the Kenites. This is the kind of role we should understand for Athena Alea when the Tegeans went to war, or Orestes (and Athena Chalkioikos) when the Spartans did. It is not so easy now to argue that Near Eastern practice would have been radically different from Greek practice, in the light of current work (e.g. Kuhrt 1989).

Conclusion

The dedication of spoils after a battle can therefore be explained as two practices. From the fifth century, for Athenians at least, the battlefield trophy was understood as a dedication to Zeus Tropaios in recognition of his help on the field of battle. More generally, dedications by victors in their own sanctuaries were an acknowledgement of aid given by that particular divinity. Clearly too, dedications made by the Greeks as a whole at Panhellenic sanctuaries after the defeat of the Persians acknowledged the aid received from those gods, Zeus Olympios, Poseidon Isthmios and Apollo Pythios.[14]

It is significant that the Persian Wars were responsible for changes in both practices. The practice of leaving a marker on the field of battle was reinterpreted as the acknowledgement of help from a god who was not the major city god, while the practice of making dedications in temples now included celebrating the victories of Greeks over Greeks in panhellenic sanctuaries. The changes can be linked, I believe. The effect of the Persian Wars was to emphasise the power and importance of those gods who defended the Greeks as a whole, the gods of the panhellenic sanctuaries. Although the various polis gods continued to receive dedications, the splendour of the dedications made at Delphi above all, but also at Olympia and Isthmia, must indicate the increased prestige of their deities. The new cult of Zeus Tropaios also acknowledges a god who defended the Greeks in general, both at Marathon and at Salamis (and presumably at Plataia); although the cult appears to be Athenian in origin, the god himself is understood to have aided Greece as a whole. It is also possible that the breakdown of relations between Athens and the Peloponnesians after the Persian Wars, and hence an unwillingness on Athens part to go on honouring Zeus at Olympia,

[14] This argument clearly does not support the modern theory that the Delphic Oracle was considered to have medised (see chapter seven).

might have been a spur to the development of a new cult, of Zeus Tropaios, nearer home.

Thus in the area of cult, the Persian Wars can be seen to move the balance a little way towards greater awareness of common Greekness, and away from the insularity of the cults of the archaic polis. In this situation, the relationship between the poleis and the international sanctuaries becomes more important: in battles between Greeks, it becomes necessary to show that the powerful Panhellenic gods support one side rather than the other. This would account for the start of dedications from battles between Greeks, as each polis claims to have Olympian Zeus or Pythian Apollo on its side, and to advertise that fact outside the confines of its own territory.

Chapter Six: Sanctuaries and divine intervention

In this chapter I shall argue that the involvement of the gods in human affairs is frequently visible in the text of Herodotos, and that it is through the sanctuary that this involvement is realised. I shall concentrate mainly on warfare, because it is here that we can most clearly see the gods at work.

The interpretation of the role of the gods in Herodotos's work that I shall present is different from most conclusions about his 'religious attitude', since it is based not on isolated statements drawn from the text, but on a reading of the text as a whole.

The traditional approach to Herodotos's religious ideas is to try to establish 'what Herodotos believed': it is assumed that his account was written from a particular religious viewpoint, and, perhaps, that if this viewpoint is discovered, the reader can take it into account, and get at the truth behind the religious interpretation. There are a number of problems with this approach. For a start, 'what Herodotos believed' turns out not to be obvious:

> Herodotos seldom affirms his own beliefs. Often he makes general statements either 'in character' - as Solon or Croesus - or in the course of his own story, with the risk that they may be accepted as his own; and the probability that he intends them so is increased by what he affirms expressly and personally. (Myres 1953, 46)

There is a more fundamental problem of the nature of Greek religion. Modern commentators have sometimes concentrated on 'belief' as the most important aspect, with the result that they mischaracterise its nature:

> The religious ambience of Greece in Herodotos' formative years was one of rather superstitious belief in divine influence in, or control of, human affairs.' (Waters 1985, 96)

This approach can produce a more or less determinist Herodotos, for whom the gods are almost incidental:

> For a believer, as he demonstrably is, his own interest in the roles of gods is really quite slight, and except where he refers to shrines or quotes oracles, he far more often than not simply speaks of 'God' or 'The Gods' as being responsible for whatever phenomenon is under discussion. 'Fate' and 'Zeus' will' and 'The will of the Gods' are identical. Neither Zeus nor, a fortiori, any other divinity has any

> real room for manoeuvre once the broad decisions have been taken. (Hart 1982, 28)

All these quotations, from general books on Herodotos, assume that the 'religious attitude' of an ancient author is comparable to that of a modern writer. That is to say that it provides a universal explanation for how the world works, and in particular forms the basis of moral judgements on individual characters. In a polytheistic religious system this is inappropriate. If we follow Gould in seeing Greek religion as 'a system of explanation and response and as constituting a complex statement about what the world of experience is like' (Gould 1985, 14), then we cannot separate 'religious explanation' from other forms of explanation. We must consider specific cases rather than general statements. To gather together all the explicit statements about the gods in the text will not tell us how Herodotos saw them working in individual events. In what follows we shall see that 'religious explanations' operate at a much more specific level than Hart or Myres imply, and that 'where he refers to shrines' Herodotos is dealing with important cases of divine involvement.

Divine intervention in Homer

The idea that the outcome of a battle is determined by the gods is visible in the Iliad. Most obviously, there is the image of Zeus holding the balance that determines which way the struggle will go:

> ἦμος δ' Ἠέλιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,
> καὶ τότε δὴ χρύσεια πατὴρ ἐτίταινε τάλαντα·
> ἐν δὲ τίθει δύο κῆρε ταληγέος θανάτοιο
> Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
> ἕλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβών· ῥέπε δ' αἴσιμον ἦμαρ Ἀχαιῶν.
>
> When the sun had reached the centre of the heavens, then the Father stretched out the golden scales, and placed on them two portions of miserable death, for the horse-taming Trojans and the bronze-clad Achaians, and he raised them, holding them in the middle: the day fateful for the Achaians sank. (Il. viii. 69-72)

There are several other occasions where individual gods help individual heroes, but in Book Twenty they all join the fray:

> ὣς τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους μάκαρες θεοὶ ὀτρύνοντες
> σύμβαλον, ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς ἔριδα ῥήγνυντο βαρεῖαν·

δεινὸν δὲ βρόντησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
ὑψόθεν· αὐτὰρ νέρθε Ποσειδάων ἐτίναξε
γαῖαν ἀπειρεσίην ὀρέων τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα.
πάντες δ' ἐσσείοντο πόδες πολυπίδακος Ἴδης
καὶ κορυφαί, Τρώων τε πόλις καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν.

So the blessed gods, stirring up both sides, came together, and let loose amongst them their heavy wrath; the Father of gods and men thundered terribly from above, and below Posidon shook the boundless earth and the lofty peaks of the mountains. All the feet of Ida, rich in springs, and all the peaks, were shaken, and the city of the Trojans, and the ships of the Achaians. (Il. xx. 54-60)

I shall argue that the activity of the gods in Herodotos can be seen to be very similar to this, and that the differences between them, in particular the role of the sanctuary, reveal an important aspect of classical Greek thought.

In the Iliad, the power of the gods is limited. Their intervention will never tip the balance the wrong way[1]. Thus it is because Achilleus is the greater hero, the better fighter, that he has Athena helping him against Hektor. Priam points out Achilleus's advantage in terms of pure physical strength: ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερός ἐστι, 'since he is much stronger' (Il. xxii. 40). Because of this we do not consider it 'cheating' when Athena persuades Hektor to stop, and then retrieves Achilleus's spear (Il. xxii. 247, 276-277). Hektor was similarly helped against Patroklos (Il. xvi. 787-800), and Patroklos was weaker, and reckless. In both episodes the victim recognises the role of the gods, but nevertheless credit is given to the mortal: in Books xvii and xviii the death of Patroklos is blamed on the Trojans, not Apollo. The poem never loses the human scale. As Jasper Griffin argues:

> When the gods intervene, they do so in fully human fashion. At the moment of highest exaltation the hero performs feats beyond the normal strength of a man, but not wildly in excess of it. (Griffin 1980, 166)

Furthermore, in Homer, although there is plenty of divine activity, appearances of gods to men are rare and limited. In Iliad Book One Athena appears to Achilleus alone (Il. i. 197); it is clear also from Athena's words to Diomedes (Il. v. 127-128) that mortals cannot normally see the gods, because of a mist that blinds them. Such

---

1 K.H. Waters is surely wrong (as well as ungrammatical) when he talks of "the Homeric poems where direct interventions of deities ... was the controlling influence upon single events." (Waters 1985, 96)

revelations as there are come only to the heroes - the ordinary people never see the gods.

Divine intervention in Herodotos

In Herodotos, the nature of divine intervention is similar. The turning point of the battle of Plataia comes when Pausanias calls on Hera:

> ἀποβλέψαντα τὸν Παυσανίην πρὸς τὸ Ἥραιον τὸ Πλαταιέων ἐπικαλέσασθαι τὴν θεόν.
>
> Pausanias, turning his gaze towards the Heraion of the Platalans, called on the goddess. (ix. 61.3)

Immediately the Tegeans leap forward and the tide of the battle turns. Herodotos makes no explicit connection between the prayer and the Tegean charge, but the reader is left in no doubt that they are connected.

A similar turning point in history is Kleomenes's visit to the temple of Athena Polias on the Athenian akropolis (v. 72.3). Superficially this is presented as an incident where the king's behaviour breaks a religious sanction: he is a Dorian trespassing in an Ionian sanctuary. In addition Forrest has taken it to illustrate Kleomenes's political aspirations: he suggests that Kleomenes response to the priestess, Ὦ γύναι, ἀλλ' οὐ Δωριεύς εἰμι ἀλλ' Ἀχαιός, 'O lady, I am not Dorian but Achaian', is a manifesto for Spartan foreign policy (Forrest 1968, 92). A close reading of the passage reveals that there is more to it. The episode comes slightly out of chronological order. Herodotos has already all Kleomenes's activities: the expulsion of the 700, the abolition of the boule, the occupation of the akropolis, and even Kleomenes's final departure (v. 72.2). It is at this point in the narrative that Herodotos describes the encounter with the priestess of Athena (which had actually happened two days earlier), after which he says of Kleomenes τότε πάλιν ἐξέπιπτε μετὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, 'then he was thrown out again with the Lakedaimonians' (v. 72.3). Thus we are told for a second time that Kleomenes left Athens, and the verb ἐκπίπτω

is stronger than the ἐξέρχοντο of the previous section[2]. In v. 72.2, Herodotos says that all Athens banded together against the Spartans, and that they therefore retreated under a truce, but the impression left by the juxtaposition of the priestess's prohibition with the second, more abrupt, account of Kleomenes's departure, is that it was Athena, from her temple, who was responsible for throwing him out. And indeed, all Kleomenes's subsequent efforts against Athens are entirely futile. Thus Herodotos's text, I believe, places the goddess, in her sanctuary, in the heart of human affairs.[3]

In neither of the two incidents does the goddess actually appear, but both stories focus on the sanctuary, and in particular on the temple. It seems that these are events in which the goddesses play a part. If we look at the other battles between Greeks and Persians we shall find similar examples.

In Herodotos's account of the battle of Marathon, the Greeks start and finish the battle in sanctuaries of Herakles (vi. 108.1, 116), and he draws attention to the coincidence. Now Herakles was a figure of particular interest to Herodotos (ii. 43-45); whatever he may say in his discussion about the Egyptian Herakles, Herodotos is aware of the traditional idea of the labouring Herakles struggling, almost alone, against great odds (iv. 8; vii.193.2, 198.2). There is therefore an appropriateness for Herakles's τεμένη to have guarded the Athenians against the much greater Persian forces. Herodotos's account of the fighting in the battle is far from clear (cf. Whatley 1964), but the two sanctuaries provide it with a firm framework.

Herakles is present too at the other battle against hopeless odds, Thermopylai. In describing the site Herodotos mentions a βωμός of Herakles (vii. 176.3). This apparently irrelevant detail appears more relevant when he describes Leonidas, here only, as ἐών γένος Ἡρακλείδης, 'being a descendant of Herakles' (vii. 208.1). It might be argued that this is merely to prepare us for the oracle at vii. 220.4 foretelling

2 cf. i. 150.1; vi. 121.2; iii. 14.10.

3 We will return to Kleomenes in chapter eight.

or requiring the death of a Heraklid king, but surrounded by other references it has added significance. Just before he reaches Thermopylai Xerxes passes the river Dyras, which, according to Herodotos, sprang up originally to help τῷ Ἡρακλέϊ καιομένῳ (vii. 198.2); meanwhile fifteen Persian ships put in at Pagasai, where Herakles had been left by the Argonauts (vii. 193.2), and are immediately caught by the Greek fleet at Artemision. Nowhere does Herodotos say that Herakles was present at the battle, and he makes it clear that the stories about Herakles he recounts are only tales (λέγεται 193.2, ἐστὶ λόγος 198.2) but we cannot read the account of Thermopylai without being aware of his presence.

Other battles, other divinities; but the pattern is still there. If we return to Plataia we will see that Hera is not the only goddess involved. Just before the battle, Pausanias moves his troops, and when Amompharetos refuses to follow, he halts at the temple of Demeter Eleusinia at Argopion (ix. 57.2); it is here that the fighting is fiercest, and here that Mardonios dies (ix. 62.2). On the same day, according to Herodotos, the Persians drew up in front of the Eleusinion at Mykale (ix. 97), and they were defeated there too. Herodotos mentions this coincidence as he did in the case of Herakles at Marathon:

> καὶ τόδε ἕτερον συνέπεσε γενόμενον, Δήμητρος τεμένεα Ἐλευσινίης παρὰ ἀμφοτέρας τὰς συμβολὰς εἶναι.
>
> And then there was another point: there were *temenea* of Demeter Eleusinia near the site of both encounters. (ix. 101.1)

Demeter Eleusinia might appear to be an unusual divinity to affect the outcome of a battle, but this is connected to other events. Before the battle of Salamis, Herodotos describes how two Greeks in the Persian camp, Dikaios and Demeratos, see smoke and hear noise coming from the temple of Demeter at Eleusis (viii. 65) and realise that the King's army is in danger. He later explains that Demeter was angry because the Persians had burned the ἀνάκτορον at Eleusis (ix. 65.2). Demeter's revenge for an event that happened at Eleusis is thus carried out at two places where she also has sanctuaries.

The battle of Salamis has its divine element too. Herodotos describes the φάσμα γυναικός that urges the Greeks on, once again as saying that this is only a story (λέγεται viii. 84.2). He does not say who this woman is. A little later in the narrative he tells another story about how Adeimantos the Corinthian fled, and was stopped by a boat from the temple of Athena Skiras (viii. 94). It might be possible to associate the φάσμα with the same deity, and to see Athena presented as one of the forces involved in the Greek victory.

The limits to the role of the gods are also similar in Homer and Herodotos. We should not think of divine intervention as preventing the deserved outcome of events. I have already discussed how a completely human explanation is given of Kleomenes's ejection from Athens, before the description of the episode at the temple of Athena (v. 72). There are other examples. The Athenians' chances at Marathon, although against enormous odds, are considered reasonable by Miltiades, without divine favour: θεῶν τὰ ἴσα νεμόντων οἷοί τε εἶμεν περιγενέσθαι τῇ συμβολῇ, 'if the gods grant favours equally, we will be able to overcome them in battle' (vi. 109.5). At Plataia, too, the Persians were never bound to win, and Herodotos describes Artabazus as not keen to fight (ix. 41.3); the implication of the auspices also was that the Greeks had a strong defensive position (ix. 36). The Greek victory at Salamis was foretold by Artemisia, who explained why the Persians would lose in purely human terms:

> οἱ γὰρ ἄνδρες τῶν σῶν ἀνδρῶν κρέσσονες τοσοῦτον εἰσι κατὰ θάλασσαν ὅσον ἄνδρες γυναικῶν.
>
> Their men are as much stronger than your men at sea as man are than women. (viii. 68α.1)

In Herodotos as in Homer, it is the deserving whom the gods support. Furthermore, such divine involvement is taken not to belittle human achievements, but rather to emphasise them. About Homer it has been said that the presence of gods glorifies the heroes (Griffin 1980, 85-88); similarly with Herodotos it is still the erga of men, not gods, that is his subject.

One further similarity between Homer and Herodotos should be noted, and that is in the relationship between the gods and fate. Kroisos, after he is rescued from the funeral pyre, complains to Apollo about his ingratitude. Apollo says in reply:

> τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἀδύνατά ἐστι ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῷ.
>
> It is impossible even for a god to escape ordained fate. (i. 91.1)

In sentiment and in vocabulary, this is close to the problem faced by Zeus about Sarpedon:

> ἄνδρα θνητὸν ἐόντα, πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἴσῃ,
> ἄψ ἐθέλεις θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ἐξαναλῦσαι;
>
> He is a mortal man, ordained since long ago to meet his destiny: do you wish instead to release him from painful death? (Il. xvi. 441-442)

In both cases the god cannot go against μοῖρα, but in both cases the doom is made somewhat less bad.

The difference between Homer and Herodotos

The influence of Homer on Herodotos is profound, and not limited to the presentation of the gods (Hornblower 1987, 28-29). What is important for this discussion is the extent to which Herodotos's approach differs from that of Homer. I shall argue that the fact that, in Herodotos, gods work from their sanctuaries, reveals a significantly different attitude to divine space, and that this difference is not simply an aspect of Herodotos's own thought, but reflects the post-dark age view of the gods in Greece, and indeed in other polytheistic systems.

There are virtually no temples mentioned in the Iliad or Odyssey. This has led de Polignac to say:

> L'univers rituel des 'siècles obscurs', tel qu'il transparaît dans certains passages de L'Iliade et de L'Odyssée, semble en effect caractérisé par une relative indétermination spatiale, sans différenciation bien marquée entre espace sacré et espace profane. (de Polignac 1984, 27)

As a statement about dark age Greece this may not be true, but as a comment on 'The Homeric World' it is important. The gods appear all over the plain of Troy, and

they are presented as bound, not to any one place, but sometimes to certain individual heroes. Athena is particularly associated with Achilleus, Diomedes and Odysseus (in both Iliad and Odyssey); Aphrodite with Paris (Il. iii. 373-446) and Aineas (Il. v. 311-317).

This spatial indeterminacy, and concentration on individuals, is different from the world of the archaic and classical polis, Herodotos's world, where, as I suggested in chapter three, spatial organisation is very important. In all the examples I have given above, and in other examples in Herodotos, it is the presence of a sanctuary that makes clear the intervention of a deity. This clearly contrasts with the Homeric examples, where temples are not mentioned. It does fit closely with the attitude to the gods we saw in chapter five, where each polis acknowledged aid from its own gods. Herodotos's text reflects the spacial definition of the classical world: the large number of different sanctuaries he mentions, belonging to so many different poleis, reveals the divisions of sacred and secular space. Also in contrast to Homer, he tends to concentrate on groups and communities as much as on individuals: he shows interest in foreign peoples, and many of the stories he tells about individuals are told as part of the 'social memory' of Greek poleis (cf. Gould 1989, 19-41). The Herodotean world is divided in a way in which the Homeric world (in the Iliad at least) is not.

Herakles and Pan at Marathon

The idea that gods helped the Greeks at their sanctuaries is not simply a literary device. The Athenians recognised officially that Herakles assisted them at Marathon: Herakles appeared in the painting of the battle in the Stoa Poikile (Paus. i. 15.3). Two inscriptions from Marathon, both dating to the early fifth century, seem to refer to games in honour of Herakles Empylios.[4] It has been suggested that these

[4] IG I^3. 3; Koumanoudes 1976, 237-238.

games took on a new importance after Marathon, when the Athenians organised them centrally:

> After their brilliant victory it would be only natural that they should want to do more to honour Herakles, their protector. (Vanderpool 1942, 336; cf. Davis 1984, 111; Lewis 1963, 31)

The involvement of Pan also suggests that Herodotos's presentation of divine intervention is part of a wider Greek idea. In Herodotos's story, Pheidippides claimed to have met Pan on his way back from Sparta. On his instruction the Athenians, after their victory, instituted a cult of Pan on the akropolis, with an athletic festival. Such archaeological and iconographic evidence as we have supports Herodotos's story, since worship of Pan appears to have been introduced into Attika in the early fifth century, both at Athens and at Marathon, with athletics (Boardman 1975, 226; Ergon 1958 15-22; Simon 1976). It is difficult to find an alternative explanation for the introduction of the cult of Pan in Attica at precisely this period. What is interesting is the circumstances in which Pan came into contact with the Athenians. Herodotos does not mention him at the battle itself: 'le dieu Pan, à Marathon, ne participe pas au combat proprement dit' (Borgeaud 1979, 200). Nor does Herodotos mention Pheidippes passing a sanctuary of Pan, but says he met the god περὶ τὸ Παρθένιον ὄρος τὸ ὑπὲρ Τεγέης, 'by Mount Parthenion above Tegea' (vi. 105.1). There was nonetheless, according to Pausanias (Paus. viii. 53.11), an altar of Pan near Tegea, on the road to Lakonia, which Pheidippides would have passed. This suggests that other Greeks than Herodotos associated the appearence of deities with their holy places.

Guardian-heroes

We can now look at another way in which superhuman beings were perceived to guard a particular territory. We can compare Herodotos's accounts with Greek practice as revealed in other literature, to see if Herodotean 'stories' reflect a wider perception. We will examine how heroes and, in colonies, oikists, were offered cult

as guardians of the polis. There are two examples from Herodotos, the bones of Orestes and the phantasmal warriors at Delphi.

The story of the bones of Orestes has, like other stories about Sparta, been scoured for deeper meanings. Herodotos describes how the Spartans cannot defeat the Tegeans, and then learn from the Delphic Oracle that, if they get hold of the bones of Orestes and bring them to Sparta, he will assist them against Tegea: τὸν σὺ κομισσάμενος Τεγέης ἐπιτάρροθος ἔσσῃ, 'if you bring him back, you will be helped against Tegea' (i. 67.4).[5] The Spartans get hold of the bones, and from then on they defeat the Tegeans at every conflict.

Taken at face value, the story is about how a hero helps the Spartans. Modern commentators want to make it more complicated, however. Forrest is cautious, but he sees the explanation as propagandist rather than religious:

> Whether the seizure of Orestes' bones was intended as an announcement to the world at large that a new Sparta had been born, we do not know. Herodotos saw it as a strengthening of Spartan arms not of Spartan diplomacy, and it need not have been more than a propaganda blow in a local quarrel between Sparta and Tegea for Orestes' plain. (Forrest 1968, 75-76)

Others go much further:

> As for the recovery of Orestes' bones from Tegea, and perhaps also those of Teisamenos from Achaia (Paus. 7.1.3), this symbolized and emphasized the shift in Spartan foreign policy from aggression to peaceful coexistence, from 'Helotization' to diplomatic subordination. The Spartans could now give preponderant emphasis in their propaganda to their claim to be the legitimate successors to the 'Achaean' rulers of the Peloponnese and even represent themselves as champions of all Hellas. (Cartledge 1979, 139; cf. Leahy 1955, 34)

There is insufficient evidence to build this kind of fantasy. The Spartan claim to be 'Achaian' is a modern theory based on an interpretation of a few words attributed to Kleomenes by Herodotos, discussed earlier.[6] As for 'the shift from aggression to

---

5 This sentence is problematic because in Homer the word ἐπιτάρροθος is used to describe gods when they help men. In this context it ought to refer to Orestes helping the Spartans, but grammatically it agrees with σύ, the Spartan questioner. The context makes it clear, however, that Orestes would help the Spartans.

6 Dedications to the 'Achaian' Menelaus and Helen at the Menelaion in any case predate the translation of Orestes's bones, so there is no archaeological evidence for a shift in cult practice.

peaceful coexistence', the story suggests that the aim is continued aggression. Cartledge sums up:

> Tegea, then, had been "subjugated" through a quintessentially Spartan combination of magic, military might and diplomacy.

This is wrong. Military might was crucial certainly, but there is no diplomacy, and no magic; the Spartans attributed their success to a semi-divine helper, and that might be called a religious explanation. As we shall see, it was not quintessentially Spartan, but part of a common Greek view.

This view is most dramatically revealed in the story of Autonoos and Phylarchos at Delphi. Herodotos says that some of the Persians involved in Xerxes's attack on Delphi had an amazing vision:

> ἔλεγον δὲ οἱ ἀπονοστήσαντες οὗτοι τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, ὡς πρὸς τούτοισι καὶ ἄλλα ὥρων θεῖα· δύο γὰρ ὁπλίτας μέζονας ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων φύσιν ἐόντας ἕπεσθαί σφι κτείνοντας καὶ διώκοντας. τούτους δὲ τοὺς δύο Δελφοὶ λέγουσι εἶναι ἐπιχωρίους ἥρωας, Φυλακόν τε καὶ Αὐτόνοον, τῶν τὰ τεμένεά ἐστι περὶ τὸ ἱρόν, Φυλάκου μὲν παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὁδὸν κατύπερθε τοῦ ἱροῦ τῆς Προνηίης, Αὐτονόου δὲ πέλας τῆς Κασταλίης ὑπὸ τῇ Ὑαμπείῃ κορυφῇ.
>
> Those of the foreigners who got back home, as I understand it, say that they saw other divine activity as well. Two armed men, larger than human size, followed them, killing and pursuing them. Delphians say that these two were guardian heroes, Phylakos and Autonoos, whose *temenea* are near the sanctuary: that of Phylakos is along the road above the sanctuary of Pronaia, that of Autonoos near the Kastalian spring beneath the peak of Hyampeia. (viii. 38-39)

This is all in reported speech, and we need not assume that Herodotos believed the story. What matters is how the Delphians are presented as interpreting the event. Accepting that two supernatural warriors did appear, the Delphians associate them with two heroes buried in the vicinity. Although it is presented in a more fantastic way, the process is the same as with Orestes: a hero actually intervenes to help those in whose territory he is buried.

The idea is also the theme of Sophokles's Oedipus Coloneus, where Oidipous promises to protect Athens from Thebes if he is buried in Attika, and it may also be present in Kimon's removal of the bones of Theseus from Skyros to Athens (Plu. Cim. 8.5-7).

The cult of the oikist in Greek colonies is connected to his role as a guardian-hero. Malkin talks about the cult providing 'a common heros as the focus of their worship (and, thus, as their own protector)' (Malkin 1987, 203). We can see how this might have worked by considering the case of Amphipolis, where the citizens decided to replace the cult of Hagnon, their oikist, with that of Brasidas:

> νομίσαντες τὸν μὲν Βρασίδαν σωτῆρά τε σφῶν γεγενῆσθαι καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἅμα τὴν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ξυμμαχίαν φόβῳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων θεραπεύοντες, τὸν δὲ Ἅγνωνα κατὰ τὸ πολέμιον τῶν Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως σφίσι ξυμφόρως οὐδ' ἂν ἡδέως τὰς τιμὰς ἔχειν.
>
> They considered that on the one hand Brasidas had become their saviour (and for the present also they were encouraging the alliance with Sparta out of fear of the Athenians), while on the other hand, because of the hostility of the Athenians, for Hagnon to receive honours would no longer be advantageous or pleasant for them.[7] (Th. v. 11.1)

Interpreting this passage I follow Malkin in assuming that Hagnon was still alive, and receiving cult as oikist because he had by then left Amphipolis. The interesting word is ξυμφόρως in the last line: the people of Amphipolis had benefited from the continuing cult of Hagnon while they were allied with Athens. It is not stated how, and this may have been in the form of having their interests specially represented by him at Athens, although this would normally be carried out by a proxenos anyway; it may have been something less tangible. What is clear is that oikist-cult was seen to be an activity which was done with the expectation of benefit to the colony.

This model can be extended to include hero-cults in many Greek poleis. There is clearly a close relationship between hero-cult and oikist-cult, and Malkin suggests that 'the public cult the polis accorded its founder and guardian-hero' (Malkin 1987, 265) became the model taken up by those cities which had only mythical founders.

---

7 There are alternative translations possible: the word ἡδέως might be applied to Hagnon's feelings, but the overall sense is clear.

Gods and their territory outside the Greek world

It seems that the stories of divine intervention in Herodotos fit well with the notion of guardian-heroes protecting their own locality that is widespread in Greece. This idea is found outside the Greek world as well, and an example from Nepal will serve to illustrate how it is conceived elsewhere.

Richard Burghart discusses early nineteenth century AD royal activity in the Nepalese kingdoms. He says of the kings:

> They saw their territorial possessions to be the abodes of one or more gods. For example, the Nepal valley was an abode of 5,600 Bhairavas and Bhairavis (the terrible forms of Siva and his consort); the goddess Kali dwelled at Vijayapur; and Jvala Mai at Dailekh. Other deities were linked to a place by virtue of their being a tutelary deity of the king; as was the case of Taleju who was brought from Ayodhya and worshipped by the Malla kings of the Nepal valley. As an abode of a deity, the territory over which the king ruled was also an enduring field of that deity's grace. Everything which happened upon that territory, happened by the grace of god. The focal point of that field was the deity's temple which was likened to a celestial palace. (Burghart 1987, 261).

This is very similar to the Greek model: the gods guard their own territory, and may sometimes be moved from one place to another. The obvious difference is the role of the king in Nepal, which has no parallel in Greece where there were no absolute kings; however, the relationship between the god and the king is close to the relationship between the god and the polis as a whole that we saw in chapter five. The attitude to the gods in war is similar too:

> In conquering a rival kingdom the Shah rulers confiscated the land grants of the defeated nobles and military officers but they confirmed the tenurial rights which the deposed king had gifted to the gods. The reason for this was not simply the legalistic one that the king ought not to confiscate that which has been gifted by others; rather it would appear that the main reason was the belief that by the grace of these gods the Shah rulers had gained victory. (Burghart 1987, 265-266)

Conclusion

The idea that the gods operate from their temple to protect the territory around it can be found in other cultures as well as Greece and Nepal.[8] The picture of the world that this idea produces ties in closely with that put forward in chapter five. There we saw that Greek cities were concerned to pay respect to their own deities for the help they gave. Here we have found examples of gods or heroes protecting more immediate areas around their sanctuary, and being moved occasionally to guard a new area (Orestes, Oidipous, Taleju). In these two chapters we have come up with an explanatory model for how the gods were understood to have worked. It is important to note that this model is never made explicit in Herodotos.

Herodotos does make general statements about divine activity, for example: δῆλα δὴ πολλοῖσι τεκμηρίοισί ἐστι τὰ θεῖα τῶν πρηγμάτων, 'that the divine hand operates in our affairs is clear from many proofs' (ix. 100.1). He notes the coincidences with the sanctuaries of Herakles at the battle of Marathon (vi. 116) and of Demeter Eleusinia at Plataia and Mykale (ix. 101.1). He does not investigate further, but he nonetheless provides enough information for us to be able to draw a more coherent conclusion, and provides the basis for a model that can be applied outside his text. It is this view of Herodotos, reflecting the thoughts of his time, rather than imposing a strong personal view, that we may consider as we examine his presentation of Delphi.

8 For the Near East see Ahlström 1982.

Chapter Seven: Herodotos and Delphi

In this chapter I shall examine Herodotos's treatment of one particular sanctuary, Delphi. The very large number of references to Delphi and the Delphic oracle has led to a number of theories about Herodotos's attitude towards that sanctuary and towards the gods in general. It has been suggested that Delphi was the source of much of Herodotos's information, and that as a result much of the history is Delphic propaganda. It has been suggested that the moral tone of Herodotos's history is related to the views of Delphi and its priests. It has been suggested that some of Herodotos's sources were particularly close to Delphi, and that this helped in the prominence of the sanctuary and oracle in the work.

This is an important issue for the argument of this thesis. If it could be shown that Herodotos was heavily influenced by ideas associated with Delphi and the oracle, it would be difficult to maintain the view that Herodotos can provide a useful picture of the role of sanctuaries in Greek society in general: he could obviously be accused of giving more credit to the gods in his account than most Greeks might. To show that this is not a fair criticism, I shall argue that the frequency with which Delphi appears in the narrative reflects its importance in the political life of archaic Greece and its continuing importance in Herodotos's own time. I shall then argue that there is no visible 'Delphic tradition' in Herodotos, and that whatever moralizing there is is not part of a religious framework.

The role of Delphi in the archaic period

In earlier chapters we have seen that Delphi provided a point of contact for foreigners wishing to approach Greek states from the archaic period onwards[1]. We have also seen that it was one of the sanctuaries where the Greek states made combined dedications after the defeat of Xerxes's invasion, and that this could be explained as the acknowledgement of the help given by Pythian Apollo.[2] These two factors alone go some way to explain the frequent presence of Delphi in the narrative, since Herodotos's stated theme is precisely Greek-barbarian relations and the conflict of the Greeks and Persians. In the course of his narrative, however, Herodotos covers many other areas of Greek history, and Delphi plays its part in these too. We must therefore examine Delphi's role in Greek history more generally.

There have been two recent analyses of the role of Delphi in archaic Greece, by Forrest in the Cambridge Ancient History (Forrest 1982), and by Morgan in Athletes and Oracles (Morgan 1990). Both accounts concentrate on areas where the oracle itself is involved: the political development of Greek poleis, and colonisation. Both writers make uses of archaeological evidence as well as a range of literary sources, which means that their accounts can be used to provide a comparison with the importance of Delphi in Herodotos.

For Forrest, Delphi was an active agent, deliberately influencing the development of Greek states, until it lost influence by backing the wrong side in the Persian Wars. He sees its early associations for example with Corinth and Chalchis as indicating a partisan policy:

---

1 see chapter four.
2 see chapter five.

> Willingness to give advice on political matters must lead to commitment, to partiality; no state would consult unless it had some hope of a friendly answer or would send a thank-offering to a god who had helped its enemies. (Forrest 1982, 307)

On this view Delphic association with tyrants and law-codes is seen as support for 'progress' or 'revolution' in the seventh century, and various sixth-century oracles are read as indicating a pro-Persian stance from the time of the conquest of Lydia.

Morgan in contrast sees the oracle as 'a non-interventionist mechanism for the sanctioning of predetermined answers to difficult questions of state' (Morgan 1990, 176). This approach follows other recent work (Parker 1985, Price 1985) in making use of comparative evidence from anthropological studies of other, mainly African, oracles. In Morgan's view, the oracle did not give advice at all: the true decision was taken by the consultor state either before or after receiving the oracle. In most cases the oracle would be confirming and authorising an action which the questioner had already decided to take, such as sending a colony or declaring war; occasionally, perhaps, the oracle would give an answer which would force the questioner to think again, for example when Themistokles was told about the 'wooden wall' (vii. 141).

This approach provides convincing reasons why the oracle should remain important throughout the archaic and classical periods: there was a continuing need for an external source of authority to legitimise the major decisions of the poleis, in particular when they involved social change. For example, Solonic legislation apparently included fines payable to Delphi for thesmothetai who broke the laws (Plu. Sol. 25), thus making Pythian Apollo guardian of the law-code.[3] The widespread need for such a source of authority would have helped the oracle survive any occasional 'failures'. This explanation also provides one reason for Delphi's loss of importance as an oracle in the Hellenistic period: it was no longer a sanctuary external to Greek poleis,

[3] There is also the story that Solon gained his original encouragement from Delphi (Plu. Sol. 14), but this could easily be a later addition.

but, like them, part of a larger kingdom, where authority now lay with the various Hellenistic monarchs.

In the rest of this chapter I shall be following the approach taken by Morgan, although, as we shall see, in the area of colonisation she may not have taken all the possibilities into account. It is necessary first to suggest why I find Forrest's argument unsatisfactory. To support an argument that Delphi was pursuing a consistent policy during the archaic period it is necessary to demonstrate both that the oracle was regularly giving advice, and that the advice followed a clear pattern. I intend to show that the evidence does not allow us to be certain that Delphi was giving clear advice or backing certain states and individuals and no others, and that in any case the organisation of Delphi would make it difficult for any consistent 'policy' to be advocated.

The greatest single problem is the reliability of the evidence. In their analysis of attested responses, Parke and Wormell (1956) and Fontenrose (1978) have dismissed as not genuine almost all the early oracles. Some may date back to the archaic period, but even these, especially when they are concerned with tyrants, may well be forgeries created as propaganda: 'fictitious oracles were created to reinforce a variety of political points' (Morgan 1990, 182).

The idea that Delphi backed certain states against others, or certain individuals, is also open to doubt. It is clear from the dedication of artefacts at the sanctuary, as well as the literary evidence, that some states, for example Corinth, Chalchis and Sparta, had greater contact with Delphi than others in the earlier period. However, this can be explained as a result of the early development or special circumstances of these states - Corinth in particular is near Delphi, and both Corinth and Chalchis were engaged in contact overseas by the mid-eighth century. It is likely too that their early development would mean that they would be the first to face problems that could not be solved within

the polis, and therefore seek a resolution from outside (Morgan 1990, 181). In other words, these states, and the law givers or would-be tyrants within them were the active seekers of Delphic support, rather than the passive recipients.

Even if it is accepted that Delphi did give advice to states, it is difficult to see how or why the sanctuary would pursue a consistent policy over several centuries. The idea of a Delphic 'policy' raises the question of who would have formulated the policy, and how they would have carried it out. The sanctuary was staffed by local Delphians, from whom both Pythia and prophetes were drawn, and it is difficult to conceive of that small community manipulating the history of Greece by itself. After the First Sacred War the sanctuary was looked after by the Delphic Amphictyony, but their role did not include involvement in the operation of the oracle; it is in any case difficult to accept that a group of states would be able to influence the pronouncements of the oracle without the oracle losing all credibility, and without anyone apparently realising. When we do have an example of the oracle being influenced, this is done by bribing one man, Kobon, to get the Pythia to give a favourable answer (vi. 66.2-3). What is clear from this, and from what we know of the consultation procedure (Parke and Wormell 1956, i. 30-34), is that the Pythia herself was the person who produced the response, and that therefore any 'Delphic policy' would have to be carried out through her; it is difficult to see how this would work since 'the Pythia was not selected from any special family nor was she the product of particular training' (Parke and Wormell 1956, i. 35). Would Delphi have benefited from being partisan anyway? As we have seen, Delphi's wealth did not come entirely from those seeking oracular responses. The active intervention of Apollo, and Delphi's diplomatic role were also valuable. A consideration of the wealth of dedications made in the fifth century and later suggests that if the oracle did lose prestige after the Persian Wars (which I shall argue it did not), the sanctuary as a whole did not. Clearly Delphi's wealth did not rely on the oracle giving sound advice.

There is one area where it has been more fully argued that Delphi did provide advice as well as authorisation, and that is colonisation. In his detailed study, Malkin suggests that 'Delphoi was involved in colonisation as early as the late 8th century' (Malkin 1987, 22). Whereas most writers doubt the authenticity of early foundation oracles, he concludes:

> We are inclined to accept as authentic an oracular response about the foundation of a colony when it answers the criteria of straightforwardness (i.e., a direct 'command' to found a particular place), sometimes with the addition of geographical directions, unless there are additional reasons in an individual case which tell strongly against it. (Malkin 1987, 27)

The important element here is the geographical information, since it suggests that Delphi was able to direct colonists to suitable sites. Morgan is highly sceptical about this possibility, at least in the early period, since she doubts that Delphi could have acquired enough information, although she accepts that the Pythia or prophetes may have interrogated questioners while giving responses, and thus may gradually have gained knowledge. Malkin does not discuss the means by which the oracle gained the knowledge that it passed on, but there are other possibilities. Delphi was more than an oracle, and it may be the case that dedications were made at the sanctuary by traders after successful voyages. It is likely, for example, that the Cretan dedications were made by Corinthian traders (Morgan 1990, 142). It is possible that contact with these traders, informal as well as formal, will have given the Delphians, including those involved in the oracle, a great deal of evidence about the land on their trade routes, from an early stage. The fact that the early colonies are built on trade-routes, even when their purpose was primarily agrarian, might suggest that the oikists learned about the land indirectly from traders. It is of course possible that the colonists learned this information directly from the traders who visited the mother-city, but support for the role of Delphi comes from Plutarch (de Pythiae oraculis 407f-408a), and cannot be ruled out.

It is therefore clear that the Delphic oracle did play a significant part in the development of archaic Greece. When Herodotos recounts stories such as the rise of Kypselos at Corinth (v. 92) or the colonisation of Kyrenaica (iv. 150-159), which involve several oracles, we cannot claim that he is emphasising the role of Apollo: he is simply acknowledging it. We must now consider whether he was unusual in choosing to do so, by examining attitudes to Delphi in Herodotos's own time.

I do not intend to discuss exactly when and under what circumstances Herodotos came in contact with Athens. It is certain that at some point in the mid-fifth century, Herodotos did learn a great deal from Athenian sources (Gould 1989, 14-15). I shall argue that Delphi was important to Athens and all of Greece throughout the fifth century.

Delphi in the fifth century: the modern view

It is commonly held that Delphi lost its importance after the Persian Wars, and it has been argued that this was because the oracle supported the Persians; for example, 'the simple fact is that Apollo... medized. It is no accident that thereafter Delphi ceased to be an active power in Greek politics' (Forrest 1982, 319). I shall argue here that there is no evidence for Delphic medism, and also that there is no reason to suppose that the sanctuary and oracle did decline in any way in the fifth century.

We have already seen that it is difficult to support the idea that the Delphic oracle could have advocated a consistent policy such as support for Persia. Furthermore there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that anyone at the time thought that the oracle had medized. The oracular responses that support such a view are open to doubt or reinterpretation: the oracle which told the Knidians to surrender to Persia (i. 174.5) is probably a post eventum creation; the highly pessimistic oracle given to the Athenians:

ὦ μέλεοι, τί κάθησθε; λιπὼν φεῦγ' ἔσχατα γαιής
δώματα καὶ πόλιος τροχοειδέος ἄκρα κάρηνα. κ.τ.λ.

O unhappy men, why do you sit there? Flee to the ends of the earth, leaving your houses and the high peaks of your wheel-like city etc. (vii. 140.2-3)

if genuine , is not a suggestion that they should surrender, but an accurate prediction of what would happen to Athens, and advice which the Athenians took.[4] The oracular responses alone are not enough to prove that Delphi did medize, and there is little other evidence. Parker has examined the case for Delphic bias in general, and concludes that it cannot be demonstrated (Parker 1985, 324-326). On the question of Persia he is more forthright:

> It is a common modern belief that Delphi 'medized' in 481/0. Indeed, scholars often assert, in bold defiance of the evidence, that it was this humiliating misjudgement that brought the oracle's political influence to an end. But Delphi's prestige was perhaps never higher than in the aftermath of the Persian Wars. (Parker 1985, 318)

The dedications at Delphi, as I have argued,[5] suggest that Pythian Apollo was regarded as a saviour, not a traitor.

The idea that Delphi was less important after the Persian Wars is assumed, but not argued for, by Parker, following Parke who suggests that 'the practical influence of the Pythia in Greek politics had begun to wane' (Parke and Wormell 1956, i. 180). Parker suggests that 'it is hard to prove that the Athenians consulted an oracle on any important issue of public policy after the Persian Wars' (Parker 1985, 320). His explanation is that the authority an oracle gave was not required in Athens, because the popular assembly gave any decision all the legitimacy it required: 'as a procedural guarantor of decisions, therefore, an oracle is redundant in a democracy' (Parker 1985, 323). This is unconvincing. For a start, there is no reason to suppose that non-democratic forms of government would have felt the need of external guarantors any more than democracies; under a democracy there might still be major questions where

---

[4] In fact, the fact that it gives the answer Themistokles wanted, to make the evacuation of Athens possible, suggests either that the oracle is a forgery or that it was given to assist the Athenians.
[5] see chapter five.

external authority might be requested, such as how to respond to the plague (cf. Paus. i. 3.4); in any case it is highly likely, if not certain, that the Athenians did consult Delphi, not only about the plague, but also, for example, when sending colonies to Thourioi[6] and Amphipolis.[7] It is certain too that they consulted Delphi in 352 about whether or not to leave uncultivated the hiera orgas at Eleusis (IG ii^2 204); it might be argued that this was a purely religious affair, and not an 'important issue of public policy', but this would be to beg the question. The decree itself makes it clear that the responsibility for the hiera orgas lies with the whole range of democratic bodies of Athens (cf. ll. 16-23), and that the polis is presenting the problem to Delphi for a resolution. To talk about 'the gradual decline in influence, especially over the fifth and fouth centuries' as Parker does, is mistaken. As I shall show, Delphi was very important to Greeks, including Athenians, in the fifth century. Our evidence does not allow us to say whether the oracle was consulted more or less than earlier, although the fact that Sparta and Athens acquired promanteia suggests that it was possibly busier in the fifth century. As for influencing decisions, we have already seen that it is better to regard Delphi as non-interventionist in the archaic period:

> It would be erroneous to characterise the Delphic oracle (or indeed most others) as prescriptive/proscriptive, directing action or providing information. (Morgan 1990, 154)

If this is the case in the seventh and sixth centuries, it would be perverse to expect an interventionist Delphi in the fifth.

---

6 'About the panhellenic settlement of Thurii, Apollo probably was consulted' (Parker 1985, 307).

7 'We can be sure that a consultation did take place' (Malkin 1987, 81).

Delphi in the fifth century: the ancient view

Delphi received major dedications in the aftermath of Xerxes's invasion, and later. A trophy was erected there by the Athenians after Eurymedon (Paus. x. 15.4) and by the Argives in 456 (Paus. x. 10.4). This practice continued into the Peloponnesian War, with dedications by the Syracusans (Paus. x. 11.4), and by the Spartans after Aigospotamoi (Paus. x. 9.4). This supports the assessment of Parke that 'one can regard the fifty years after the Pentacontaetia as in some ways a Golden Age for Delphi' (Parke and Wormell 1956, I. 180). The archaeological evidence from the sanctuary cannot provide a great deal of detail for building activity in the fifth century because of difficulties in dating some foundations, and the effects of later activity (Amandry 1981, 722); it is, however, clear that the sanctuary remained important into the fourth century, since a new stadium (Aupert 1973, 526-527), theatre (Lerat 1951, 136-137) and temple were built then. It is possible that several of the unidentified buildings in the sanctuary date from the fifth century.

It is clear from Thucydides's account that consultation of the oracle remained part of the political practice of Greek states in the fifth century. Consultation of Delphi, or oracular responses, are mentioned in connection with the decision of the Epidamnians to turn to Corinth for help (i. 25.1), the resolution of the helot revolt by the Spartans (i. 103.2), the sending of a colony to Herakleia in Trachis (iii. 92.5), and the repopulation of Delos by the Athenians (v. 32.2). These are all major decisions, and there is no reason to suppose that the intention behind consultation is any different from those mentioned in Herodotos as occuring in the previous century.

Delphi was also still the object of military and diplomatic activity. The most obvious case is the 'Second Sacred War' of 449-448:

> Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν ἱερὸν καλούμενον πόλεμον ἐστράτευσαν, καὶ κρατήσαντες τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ παρέδοσαν Δελφοῖς· καὶ αὖθις ὕστερον Ἀθηναῖοι ἀποχωρησάντων αὐτῶν στρατεύσαντες καὶ κρατήσαντες παρέδοσαν Φωκεῦσιν.

> Afterwards the Lakedaimonians marched out to the so-called Sacred War: taking control of the sanctuary at Delphi they handed it over to the Delphians; immediately afterwards, when they had gone away, the Athenians marched out, and, taking control of the sanctuary, they handed it over to the Phokians. (Th. i. 112.5)

Thucydides does not explain the reasons behind these actions; indeed, the language of the account, with the verbatim repetition of the actions of the two sides, together with the word καλούμενον, might seem dismissive of the whole episode. Plutarch says that Sparta and then Athens gained promanteia, the right of immediate access to the Pythia (Plu. Per. 21): this would suggest that both sides considered access to the oracle to be important. This is brought out again in the terms of the peace treaties at the end of the Archidamian War that Thucydides includes. In the truce of 423 the first term is:

> περὶ μὲν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τοῦ μαντείου τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου δοκεῖ ἡμῖν χρήσθαι τὸν βουλόμενον ἀδόλως καὶ ἀδεῶς κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους.
>
> Concerning the sanctuary and the oracle of Pythian Apollo, we accept that any person who wishes to may use it without fraud or fear according to ancestral custom. (Th. iv. 118.1)

The first clause of the Peace of Nikias concerns international sanctuaries in general, and includes the right of access to oracles for τὸν βουλόμενον. It is followed by a clause specifically about Delphi:

> το δ'ἱερὸν καὶ τὸν νεὼν τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Δελφοὺς αὐτονόμους εἶναι καὶ αὐτοτελεῖς καὶ αὐτοδίκους καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἑαυτῶν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.
>
> The sanctuary and the temple of Pythian Apollo in Delphi, and the Delphians are to control their own laws, taxes and courts, for themselves and for their territory, according to ancestral tradition. (Th. v. 18.2)

Gomme suggests that the clauses in the two treaties are very different in intent, the first benefiting the Athenians, while the second is aimed against them (Gomme 1956, 596, 667). This does not affect the argument: the fact that the clauses come at the beginning of the treaties suggests that access to Delphi and Delphic independence were important issues in Greece in the second half of the fifth century. In this respect at least, Delphi had political influence.

The importance of Delphi may be seen in literature. The sanctuary is central to two Athenian tragedies, Aischylos's Eumenides and Euripides's Ion. These were written for public performance, and we should expect to find topical concerns explored within them. The Eumenides was performed in 458 and the Ion some forty years later (Owen 1939, xxxvi-xli), and both address the relationship between Delphi and Athens.

In the Eumenides the link between Delphi and Athens is established early on, when the Pythia says Παλλὰς Προναία δ' ἐν λόγοις πρεσβεύεται, 'Pallas Pronaia holds first place in my prayers' (A. Eu. 21). Athena is the first divinity acknowledged after those directly connected with the oracle, and this foreshadows her appearance in the play. The whole story brings out the close relationship between Athens and Delphi, as Apollo sends Orestes to Athens for the council of the Areopagos to resolve the question of his blood-guilt. In Athens Apollo announces:

> ἐγὼ δέ, Παλλάς, τἄλλα θ' ὡς ἐπίσταμαι
> τὸ σὸν πόλισμα καὶ στρατὸν τεύξω μέγαν·
>
> Pallas, in other matters, as I understand well, I shall make great your city and people. (A. Eu. 667-668)

He goes on to talk about how he has sent Orestes as an ally for Athens, and this must be part of the theme of the Athenian-Argive alliance that runs through the Oresteia, but it is clear that Aischylos is here suggesting Delphic approval for Athens's actions. The Oresteia was performed ten years before the Second Sacred War, and four years before the Spartan conflict with Phokis (Th. i. 107.2), but Delphi is clearly a major issue.

The Ion is equally clearly a play about the close relationship between Delphi and Athens, with its story of how Apollo, having had his own son by the daughter of Erechtheus brought up as a temple-servant at Delphi, arranges for him to be returned to his mother and become king of Athens. Once again the close link between the two places is established early, as Hermes sets the scene:

> ἥκω δὲ Δελφῶν τήνδε γῆν, ἵν' ὀμφαλὸν
> μέσον καθίζων Φοῖβος ὑμνῳδεῖ βροτοῖς

τά τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα θεσπίζων ἀεί.
ἔστιν γὰρ οὐκ ἄσημος Ἑλληνὼν πόλις,
τῆς χρυσολόγχου Παλλάδος κεκλημένη,
οὗ παῖδ' Ἐρεχθέως Φοῖβος ἔζευξεν γάμοις
βίᾳ Κρέουσαν, ἔνθα προσβόρρους πέτρας
Παλλάδος ὑπ' ὄχθῳ· τῆς Ἀθηναίων χθονὸς
Μακρὰς καλοῦσι γῆς ἄνακτες Ἀτθίδος.

I have come to this land of Delphi, where Phoibos, sitting on the navel-stone, sings to mortals, prophesying what is and is to come. For there is a city of the Greeks, not without renown, named after golden-speared Pallas, where by force Phoibos raped the daughter of Erechtheus, Kreousa, by the north-facing rocks beneath the hill of Pallas in the land of the Athenians, which the kings of Attica call the Long Rocks. (E. Ion 5-13)

The opening words of the first chorus, sung by Kreousa's Athenian attendants, express the bond of common cult practice:

οὐκ ἐν ταῖς ζαθέαις Ἀθά-
ναις εὐκίονες ἦσαν αὐ-
λαὶ θεῶν μόνον οὐδ' ἀγυι-
άτιδες θεραπεῖαι·
ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ Λοξίᾳ
τῷ Λατοῦς διδύμων προσώ-
πων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς.

Not only in holy Athens are there halls of the gods with beautiful colonnades, and the worship of the guardian of the streets; but here also, at the home of Loxias, Leto's son, is the bright-eyed gleam of twin temple-faces. (E. Ion 184-189)

At the end of the play, Athena appears on behalf of Apollo, thus identifying herself with his prophecies (ll. 1553-1605), and Kreousa, who must be taken to speak for Athens in the play, says:

τἀμὰ νῦν ἄκουσον· αἰνῶ Φοῖβον οὐκ αἰνοῦσα πρίν,
οὕνεχ' οὗ ποτ' ἠμέλησε παιδὸς ἀποδίδωσί μοι.
αἵδε δ' εὐωποὶ πύλαι μοι καὶ θεοῦ χρηστήρια,
δυσμενῆ πάροιθεν ὄντα. νῦν δὲ καὶ ῥόπτρων χέρας
ἡδέως ἐκκριμνάμεσθα καὶ προσεννέπω πύλας.

Now hear this: I honour Pholbos whom before I did not honour, because of this child which he gives back to me, having once neglected it. I love these beautiful doors and the oracles of the god, which before I hated. Now gladly I cling to the door-handle with my hands and hail the doors. (E. Ion 1609-1613)

This speech, at the climax of the play, must have struck the audience as significant, and it is inconceivable that an audience would not draw conclusions about contemporary relations between Delphi and Athens.

It is possible to analyse these plays without reference to the political content (e.g. Burnett 1971, 101-129). However, the fact that Athenian-Delphic relations are explored fits well with the Athenian military and diplomatic activities that we have already examined. Herodotos would not be unusual in Athens when he acknowledges the importance of Delphi in Greek affairs.

One reason for suspecting that Herodotos overemphasised the position of Delphi is that Thucydides hardly mentions the sanctuary. Indeed, this is taken as evidence for Delphi's decline. The sanctuary and oracle appear eighty-one times in Herodotos's story; in Thucydides's work of about the same length it is mentioned eighteen times. I believe that this difference does not reflect the general attitude to Delphi and shall show that Thucydides's choice of subject matter, and his choice of approach, adequately explain why Delphi appears less frequently.

The most obvious differences between Herodotos and Thucydides are that Herodotos covers over two hundred years of Greek history (if we start with Gyges and Kypselos, both of whom have dealings with Delphi) while Thucydides covers nearer seventy; Herodotos writes about Greeks and barbarians from India to the central Mediterranean, while Thucydides concentrates on Greece itself and Sicily.[8] Since, as we have seen, Delphi was particularly important in the interaction between Greeks and non-Greeks, these points alone ought to explain why Herodotos mentions it so much more. Indeed, the eighteen references in Thucydides seem to be rather a lot.

It is, however, also possible that Thucydides deliberately tried to exclude oracles from his narrative. He only quotes one, which need not have been from Delphi: ἥξει Δωριακὸς πόλεμος καὶ λοιμὸς ἅμ' αὐτῳ, 'a Dorian war will come and a plague with it' (Th. ii.

[8] His claim that κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐγένετο καὶ μέρει τινὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς δὲ εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων, 'This was the greatest upheaval ever for the Greeks, and for part of the non-Greek world - one could say for the greatest part of humankind' (Th. I. 1.2) is hardly borne out by the narrative.

54.2), and he goes on to criticise the Athenian attitude to oracles in general. This of course contrasts with Herodotos's attitude: ἀντιλογίης χρησμῶν πέρι οὔτε αὐτὸς λέγειν τολμέω οὔτε παρ' ἄλλων ἐνδέκομαι, 'I do not dare say anything against oracles, nor listen to such words from others' (viii. 77.2).[9] It may be that oracles are included in what he calls τὸ μυθῶδες (Th. I. 22.4), which he intends not to discuss. Gomme translates the expression as 'the story-telling element' and suggests that it means 'historical romance', in which he includes prophetic dreams (Gomme 1945, 149). It is reasonable to suspect that stories involving oracles might fit in this category. If this is the case, it is certainly not reasonable to argue from the example of Thucydides that scepticism about oracles in general or Delphi in particular was widespread in Athens. His narrative points the opposite way (e.g. Th. ii. 8.2, 54.1; viii. 1.1). As Hornblower points out, Thucydides was intellectually independent: 'Thucydides - a lonely man, I think - ultimately went his own way' (Hornblower 1987, 135).

Delphi and Herodotos's 'sources'

It is clear then that the frequency with which Delphi appears in Herodotos's narrative can be explained by the importance of Delphi both in the development of Archaic Greece, his subject, and in the world of his contemporaries, including Athenians. We must now consider whether 'Delphic ideas' influenced his narrative. There are a number of ways in which this might happen. It is possible that Herodotos learned some or all of the stories he tells which involve Delphi from the priests of the sanctuary; it is also possible that sources in Athens, for example the Alkmeonidai, might have told stories involving

[9] Although it may not be appropriate to put to much weight on this particular remark (cf. Shimron 1989, 39-40)

Delphi. If either of these possibilities were correct, it would be necessary to investigate whether this resulted in 'biassed' accounts.

The whole question of Herodotos's historical method has been raised by Detlev Fehling's Herodotus and his 'sources' (Fehling 1989).[10] Fehling's book is important in giving Herodotos credit for creativity, but his conclusion that Herodotos's work can be reduced to 'a hard core of facts equivalent to maybe thirty printed pages' (Fehling 1989, 247), drawn from memory and bulked out with false source-citations and adaptations of poetry, suggests that he misunderstands Herodotos's originality. This is not the place for a thorough analysis of the book as a whole,[11] but it is important to consider one major error. Fehling believes that

> the customary Herodotean formula, λέγουσι οἱ ..., 'the X say', basically denotes not just any information Herodotus happens to have obtained but the authoritative tradition of that community. (Fehling 1989, 7-8)

We have already seen that Herodotos tends to attribute to sources information from which he wishes to distance himself, for example references to divine interventions and miraculous events.[12] In consequence Fehling focuses in on precisely the wrong parts of Herodotos: he concentrates on those episodes in Herodotos's narrative where we would most expect to find fantasy, and naturally discovers it. Fehling misunderstands Herodotos's use of λέγουσι οἱ ... because he assumes that source-citation must be, or pretend to be, a sign of a scientific approach. Since he is not a scientific historian, Herodotos must be a sort of H.G. Wells figure: 'Herodotus' methods of critical research ... belong not so much to the realm of science as to science fiction', 'In some of the methods ostensibly employed, (Herodotos's historie) is really a vision of avenues only later opened to science' (Fehling 1989, 252, 259). But Herodotos does not use source

---

10 This is a translation and revision of his German original (Fehling 1971).

11 See my forthcoming review in JHS for 1991 or 1992.

12 See chapter six.

citations to strengthen his argument. Thucydides, who claims to have learned his facts from people he talked to, presents an authoritative account by not using source-citations. It is only much more recently that source-citation has become a means of supporting an argument. It is notable that Fehling never discusses what any possible sources might be, so he does not discuss Delphi, or its possible influence on Herodotos at all. His theory stands or falls as a whole. We must therefore reject it as a whole, and return to the idea of identifiable sources - which need not be formally cited in the text.

Before we consider Delphi itself as a source, we should consider the commonly held idea that Herodotos picked up much of his information from the family of the Alkmeonidai in Athens. This is relevant because Herodotos tells several stories that link the family to Delphi. He mentions that the family rebuilt the temple there (v. 62.2) and bribed the priestess (v. 63.1, 90.1; vi. 123.2) and that Alkmeon assisted Kroisos's envoys at Delphi (vi. 125.2). These stories combine to suggest a close relationship between the family and the temple, which might be seen to continue in Perikles's prosecution of the 'Second Sacred War'. These references, and especially the last, which links the stories about Lydia to the Alkmeonidai, might suggest that the Alkmeonidai were Herodotos's source for many of his stories involving Delphi, and that those stories would present an over-favourable view of Pythian Apollo. Could the Alkmeonidai have been Herodotos's source?

The theory that Herodotos provided a mouthpiece for the 'Alkmeonid tradition' goes back to Jacoby in RE (Jacoby 1913). It has been followed by a number of scholars since (e.g. Forrest 1969, Evans 1982, Murray 1987). There have been arguments against the view, including those of Fehling, and of Develin, who cautions:

> We know so little of Herodotos' time in Athens that we are hard put to it to make a definite statement as to what his sources of information in that state were. We should at least be cautious in assuming that he had access to the company of the leading families. (Develin 1985, 134)

The most comprehensive rebuttal of the theory is that of Rosalind Thomas in Oral tradition and written record in Classical Athens (Thomas 1989). She argues that much of the information about the Alkmeonidai in Herodotos is not the kind of material that family traditions would contain. Some of it is unfavourable to the family, and much of it has the character of folk tales: these would belong to popular, not family traditions. The episodes relating to Delphi are relevant here. For example the story of Alkmeon and Kroisos:

> Even taken at its face value, the story is amusing, and amusing at the expense of Alcmaeon, a boorish Greek displaying his greed before the wise and generous king of Lydia. At a deeper level, it hardly glorifies the Alcmaeonid house to be introduced to its eponymous ancestor in Croesus' treasury. (Thomas 1989, 266-267)

The repeated references to the bribing of the Pythia would also be unfavourable to the Alkmeonidai in the eyes of Greeks. This is indicated by Herodotos's comments on the painful death of Kleomenes: ἀπέθανε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ, ὡς μὲν οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσι Ἑλλήνων, ὅτι τὴν Πυθίην ἀνεγνωσε τὰ περὶ Δημαρήτου λέγειν, 'he died in this way, so most Greeks say, because he bribed the Pythia to say what she did about Demaratos' (vi. 75.3 cf. Thomas 1989, 249 and n. 29). If these unfavourable stories did not come from the Alkmeonidai, it is possible that others, even favourable ones, did not either: the information about their rebuilding the temple could have come from Delphi itself. It is to Delphi that we must now turn.

The 'Delphic tradition'

It is highly likely that Herodotos did gather information from Delphi. He claims to have learned something from the people of Delphi when he says about a consultation made by Alyattes Δελφῶν οἶδα ἐγὼ οὕτω ἀκούσας γενέσθαι, 'I know that it happened like this, having heard it from Delphi' (i. 20). The detailed description of gifts, and especially

references to their location or the fact that they have been moved, suggest that he knew the sanctuary.[13] Even here we must be careful; one commentator has remarked:

> It will be observed, in the narrative of the Lydian dynasty, that no detailed account of any transaction occurs which is not connected with some offering to the Apollo temples of Delphi or Apollo. (Blakesley 1854, 9)

This may be true, but Branchidai was destroyed by the Persians in 494 BC, and cannot therefore have been Herodotos's direct source for details about the dedications there or stories attatched to them. Although Delphi does seem to be a likely source for several stories, we cannot prove that, and we should not assume that it is the only source.

The most positive view of the importance of the 'Delphic tradition' comes from Murray:

> At Delphi a different type of tradition was available, a series of stories told by the priests and related to the monuments and offerings at the shrine. These stories contain many folk tale motifs and have a strong moral tone: the hero moves from prosperity to misfortune as a victim of divine envy - the ethical teaching is not aristocratic, but belongs to the shrine of a god whose temple carried the mottoes, 'know yourself' and 'nothing too much'. (Murray 1986, 190; cf. Murray 1987)

The difficulty with this theory is that it doesn't work very well. There are relatively few stories with a 'strong moral tone' that are connected with Delphi, and it is not clear in the cases where stories are connected with Delphi that Delphi provided the moral emphasis. The obvious episode that might fit the theory is the story of Kroisos, and we shall return to that. The few other stories fit the pattern. One that might concerns the Siphnians, who built a treasury at Delphi shortly before they were attacked by the Samians (iii. 57-58). Like Kroisos they asked how long their prosperity would last and received a response that they misunderstood; there is, however, no suggestion of divine envy involved, and Siphnos survived the attack, albeit rather poorer. Another story is that of Kleomenes, who was believed 'by most of the Greeks' to have gone

---

[13] e.g. I. 50-51; II. 135.4 etc.

mad because he corrupted the Pythia (vi. 75.3). However, there is no reason to believe that Herodotos learned this version from Delphi. While it is difficult to find moral tales that involve Delphi, it is not hard to find ones that do not. The accounts of the career of Polykrates is most obviously one of prosperity ending in misfortune (iii. 39-60, 120-125). In this case wise advice about avoiding excess comes from an Egyptian king, not Delphi. The death of Cyrus sees the hero moving from prosperity to misfortune (i. 214.3) but Delphi is not involved. While it is true that the Greeks attributed their success against Xerxes to Pythian Apollo, as we have seen,[14] it would be difficult to argue that Delphi's role is obvious in Herodotos's account.

When we consider the Kroisos story, we find that the role of Delphi here is hardly moral. We have already seen that Kroisos's actions can be interpreted in a way rather different from that taken by Herodotos;[15] here we can consider what kind of a story Herodotos was trying to tell. His presentation of Kroisos falls into two parts: the first contains the stories of Solon's visit and Atys's death (i. 26-45), the second Kroisos's encounter with Cyrus (i. 46-92).

In the first part Delphi is only mentioned in a story told by Solon, when he refers to the dedication of statues of Kleobis and Biton there (i. 31.5).[16] The main subject is first of all Solon the Athenian warning Kroisos not to count himself fortunate, and then the death of his son, which Herodotos attributes to divine envy:

> μετὰ δὲ Σόλωνα οἰχομένον ἔλαβε ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον, ὡς εἰκάσαι, ὅτι ἐνόμισε ἑωυτὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἁπάντων ὀλβιώτατον.
>
> After Solon had gone away, great retribution from god seized Kroisos, as it seems, since he had thought himself to be the most fortunate of all men. (i. 34.1)

There is nothing in the story to lead one to read it as a Delphic morality tale.

---

[14] see chapter six.

[15] see chapter three.

[16] Parke suggests that the whole Kleobis and Biton story came from Delphi. This is quite likely, but it should be noted that, taken by itself, the story does not have a strong moral message.

The second part is different. According to Parke:

> Herodotus' account[17] is primarily derived from Delphian sources and he tells the story as recast after the event. All the incidents are made to connect with the fall of Croesus, and that supreme disaster has coloured all the narrative, which is arranged with a naive skill to heighten the tragedy and at the same time to save the credit of Delphi as far as may be. (Parke and Wormell 1956, i. 129)

Herodotos's account does not help Delphi much. Initially the oracle accepts his gifts and advises him to seek allies: τοὺς δὲ Ἑλλήνων δυνατωτάτους συνεβούλευόν οἱ ἐξευρόντα φίλους προσθέσθαι, 'they advised him to find the most powerful of the Greeks and to make an alliance with them' (i.53.3). The apologia for Delphi after the event is contained in chapter 91: the oracle's response is that even a god cannot avoid fate, and that Kroisos was paying for the crime of Gyges (i. 91.1); that Apollo rescued Kroisos from the pyre and that he tried to postpone the sack of Sardis until after Kroisos's death, so that his (equally innocent) son would suffer it. In other words, the 'Delphic version' is that Kroisos was a victim of pre-ordained fate, and Apollo was entirely on his side. The lesson that Kroisos learns from this is nothing to do with the dangers of prosperity but is about the problem of not checking ambiguous answers (i. 91.4-6). Kroisos does learn about the danger of assuming oneself to be fortunate too soon, but he recalls Solon, not Delphi, when he does this (i. 86.3). It may be that Herodotos's presentation of Kroisos as καὶ θεοφιλὴς καὶ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, 'a good man loved by god' (i. 87.2: attributed to Cyrus) is the result of Delphi's influence, but it is clear that the story as a whole cannot be seen as ethical teaching that puts forward a Delphic view. It is therefore difficult to find any evidence to support Murray's theory that in Herodotos 'the Delphic tradition imparts a moral dimension to the past' (Murray 1987, 105).[18]

---

[17] I.46.2ff. (Parke's note)

[18] It should be added that the earliest references to the maxims to which Murray refers (X. Mem. iv. 2.24 and in Plato) postdate Herodotos, and the possibility cannot be ruled out that they were carved on the temple as late as late as the early fourth century. The earliest reference to any maxim at Delphi comes from Euripides Fr. 923 (Nauck^2) quoted by Diodorus (D.S. ix. 10.4) which

Murray does suggest that Delphi was not the only source of moralising stories, and he suggests that Herodotos drew on 'a tradition of story-telling in Ionia, absent from mainland Greece except Delphi' (Murray 1987, 107). If we eliminate Delphi it is perhaps a more useful suggestion. It would provide an origin for the first half of the Kroisos story, as well as for the story of Polykrates, and, since Herodotos came from Ionia, it would fit with the theme of prosperity leading to misfortune that is a repeated motif in his narrative. It is important to note that this is in no way a 'religious' tradition. There is no need to associate it with any particular sanctuary as a source. It is rather a 'philosophical' view that can exist in Herodotos alongside accounts of 'religious' activities that we have already discussed.[19]

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated two things about Herodotos. He does not show particular favouritism to Delphi, and his history is not visibly influenced by a Delphic moral or religious viewpoint, if there was such a thing. I have not argued that Herodotos did not gather any information from Delphi: it is clear that he did. We should, however, consider stories from Delphi in the same way that we did those related to objects in the Samian Heraion.[20] Noone has suggested that the Heraion emphasised a certain moral outlook, and there is no reason to believe Delphi to be different. While stories of various kinds no doubt were associated with the objects in the sanctuary, we should be aware, as Thomas points out, that 'there was no priestly caste to make (preserving tales) easy and

---

refers to the rather less 'moralising' maxim ἐγγύα, πάρα δ' ἄτα, 'make a pledge, and disaster is at hand.'

19 see especially chapters five and six.

20 see chapter two.

one should not envisage a massive propaganda machine' (Thomas 1989, 275 n. 110). For Herodotos, Delphi was a sanctuary like any other.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

πολλαὶ μορφαὶ τῶν δαιμονίων,
πολλὰ δ' ἀέλπτως κραίνουσι θεοί·
καὶ τὰ δοκηθέντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθη
τῶν δ' ἀδοκήτων πόρον ηὗρε θεός.
τοιόνδ' ἀπέβη τόδε πρᾶγμα.

Many are the forms of the heavenly ones, and the gods fulfill many things unexpectedly; and what was intended did not come to pass, while god found a way of doing the unexpected. This matter has turned out in that way. (E. Alc. 1159-1163)[1]

The world of the Greeks in the archaic and classical period was one in which the gods were continuously involved. The permanent visible signs of their presence were the sanctuaries established wherever the polis existed. Sanctuaries were not merely places visited at festivals, or where individuals could make vows and sacrifices and dedications. They were an integral part of the functioning of the polis in all its aspects.

It is possible to suggest a number of general ways in which we may understand the relationship between sanctuary and polis. Although in what follows, Herodotos provides the illustrations, the ideas may be understood to have a wider application.

Protecting the polis

The sanctuary may act as a means of guarding the polis as a whole against the force that would otherwise destroy it. In chapter three we saw that the space of the polis was defined in a series of ritual activities that made it in some ways sacred: the polis becomes an area of organised space within a universe that was perceived to be unorganised and chaotic. Taking this approach, F. de Poliginac emphasises the idea of the sanctuary as the boundary point between the civilised and the uncivilised worlds, and argues that this is the case not only in geographical terms, but also in social ones:

---

[1] cf. Andr. 1284-1288; Bac. 1388-1392; Hel. 1688-1692; Med. 1415-1419.

> Le sanctuaire extra-urbain paraît donc dressé comme un rempart symbolique contre le domaine de l'indifférencié, du désordonné et de l'éphémère, où dominent les conjonctions anormales, placées sou le signe de la ruse et de la violence non institutionalisée: entre hommes et dieux, sans intermédiaire (visions interdites, phénomènes de possession), entre les êtres humains eux-mêmes (misanthropie, misandrie et misogynie, ou formes d'agression incontrôlée, anthropophagie, violence sexuelle) entre hommes et animaux (chasse). (de Polignac 1984, 44-45)

If this suggestion can be extended beyond extra-urban sanctuaries to sanctuaries in general, we may see that it can be seen to operate in Herodotos's history. In Herodotos, the unorganised world is present usually on the geographical edges of the world, in places like Ethiopia (iii. 23-24), and above all Skythia (iv. 59-117; cf. Hartog 1988). Occasionally, however, there are examples of uncontrolledness within the Greek world, and the case of Kleomenes's self-destruction is a clear one.

I have already commented on several incidents where Kleomenes came into contact with sanctuaries. His attempt to sacrifice at the Heraion in Argos was a case of approaching a community by way of its sanctuaries, which was discussed in chapter four; his encounter with the priestess at Athens was considered in chapter six as a clear example of a city's goddess intervening through her sanctuary to protect the polis. Stories of his sacrilege were also referred to in chapter two as a way of characterising him as a bad king. This concentration of sanctuary stories on one individual deserves further analysis.

Herodotos presents Kleomenes as a destructive force: he is responsible for the deposition of two Spartan kings; he tries to invade his own country; he bribes the Pythia and devastates land at Eleusis; and in the end he mutilates himself until he dies.[2] Herodotos also links Kleomenes with the most unGreek of races, the Skythians, saying that the Spartans claimed that his madness was due to drinking unmixed wine:

> Κλεομένεα δὲ λέγουσι ἠκόντων τῶν Σκυθέων ἐπὶ ταῦτα ὁμιλέειν σφι μεζόνως, ὁμιλέοντα δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ἱκνεομένου μαθεῖν τὴν ἀκρητοποσίην παρ' αὐτῶν· ἐκ τούτου δὲ μανῆναί μιν νομίζουσι Σπαρτιῆται.

---

2 Dorieus goes into exile (v. 42.2); Demeratos deposed (vi. 64-70); planned invasion from Arkadia (vi. 74); crimes at Delphi and Eleusis, and death (vi. 75.3).

> They say that when the Skythians came about these things, Kleomenes spent a lot of time with them, and from spending time with them he learned from them to drink unmixed wine: the Spartans believe that he went mad because of this. (vi. 84.3)

Taken together, this is more than simply a hostile portrait of Kleomenes: it identifies him as opposite to Greek social norms. He sets himself against his brother, then his fellow king, then his polis, and finally himself; he chooses for companions instead a people who have no poleis (iv. 46.2), and no temples (iv. 59.2), and hate all things Greek (iv. 76.1). It is in this light that his expulsion from the temples at Athens and Argos becomes particularly significant. The temples are in each case the major sanctuaries of the polis: the temple of Athena on the akropolis at Athens (v. 72.3), and the Heraion at Argos (vi. 81). Although the actual reason given for forbidding him access to the temples was that he was a Dorian or a foreigner, it seems clear that the real reason is that he is opposed to the society of which the sanctuaries are a major element. They are the representatives of the orderly, divinely organised world of the polis, while he is the perpetual outsider.

Herodotos's portrait of Kleomenes is to some extent a literary creation, containing many standard elements of the portrayal of unpopular rulers (Griffiths 1988). The story nonetheless indicates that one aspect of Herodotos's presentation of sanctuaries is as protectors of their polis, and resistant to the disordered, 'uncivilised' world. The disordered world is of course also represented by the Persians. As we have seen, they, like the Skythians, are presented as opposite to the Greeks (i. 131-132), and their destruction of temples on the Marathon campaign adds to the image of them as opposed to Greek social order. The fact that they are repulsed from Delphi by an earthquake (viii. 35-39), and that a ghostly force marches out from Eleusis against them (viii. 65) are the most visible examples of the sanctuaries themselves resisting Persian disorder.

Sanctuaries, ritual and power

Another way of looking at the function of sanctuaries within the political life of a polis or a group of poleis is to focus on the 'symbolics of power'. Recent studies of kingship have emphasised the importance of ritual and religious symbolism in maintaining the power of the ruler (Geertz 1977, Cannadine and Price 1987). These studies explore the ways in which royal authority is supported and enhanced by rituals that raise the person of the king above the ranks of ordinary mortals, creating a sort of 'divine kingship'. Quite often the king may be taken to have supernatural powers; he is usually understood to be the main point of contact between men and God or gods. It is possible to argue that equivalent rituals can be seen to operate even, paradoxically, in a radical democracy like classical Athens.

In the archaic and classical periods, Greek poleis were not ruled by kings: almost all poleis were governed by popular assemblies of some kind, whether narrow and oligarchic, or broad and democratic. Tyrannies are not a true exception: the tyrant appears to have held his position by the ad hoc operation of non-autocratic political structures, rather than by formally establishing his personal power. In Sparta, after the Great Rhetra, the kings were part of a system which gave ultimate authority to the popular assembly. In the case of federations too, member states appear usually to have been ἰσοψήφος, 'having equal voting rights': decisions were taken by an assembly of equals.

It is sometimes suggested that after the end of the dark age, the traditional functions of the king were taken over by the leading magistrates, for example the archon basileus at Athens, or by the magistrates as a whole (Connor 1988, 172). Alternatively, it can be argued that the mediating role of the king is taken over by various priests, who are appointed for this purpose by the polis or groups within it (Sourvinou-Inwood 1988, 261). I want to suggest, however, that in the polis, the sovereign assembly as a whole took on all the symbolic pomp that is associated with 'divine kingship'. The meetings of governing assemblies were surrounded by

the same kind of religious ritual that surround kings in other societies. Whereas usually the ritual was focussed on the body of the king, in the polis it was focussed on the equally clearly defined space where the meeting happened. Meeting in a sanctuary was a way in which the assembly could reveal and maintain its authority.

It might be argued that pomp and circumstance serve to distance the sovereign from his subjects, something impossible if the sovereign is simply the subjects themselves met in a certain place.[3] What is the point of surrounding the assembly with religious symbolism, if most people are included within the religious setting? This is not in fact a problem. Each individual citizen can recognise the authority of the assembly as something external to himself. By crossing the boundary to enter the agora or Pnyx, and by witnessing the libations, sacrifice and curse at the start of a meeting,[4] the individual places himself within the sovereign body. At the end of the assembly meeting, he returns to the world outside, and is now bound by the decisions taken at the assembly. Binding decisions cannot be taken, even by a majority of the citizens, except within the ritually bounded time and space of a meeting of the assembly. The rituals that surround the meeting therefore serve to distance and 'sanctify' the power of the assembly in the same way that rituals sanctify the power of the king. This is perhaps most important of all in meetings of federations, where the ritual and setting of the sanctuary give the meeting the authority to take decisions binding on the autonomous poleis within it.

It is certainly the case that rituals of various kinds surround the operation of the democratic process in most societies.[5] It is nonetheless significant that in a society where power supposedly lies most clearly in the hands of the people, access to that power is regulated by religion.

---

[3] I leave aside for the sake of simplicity the relationship of the assembly to those groups, such as women, children, slaves etc., who were not part of the citizen body.

[4] To use the case of Athens as an example.

[5] Down to the battered black box, stubby pencil tied to a string, and rickety booths that make every British polling station look the same.

A community of men and gods

One might also suggest a different approach to the role of sanctuaries, based on the models we have considered in earlier chapters. We can treat the language of Greek religion as comprehensible as it is (cf. Gould 1985), and attempt to explain the role of sanctuaries in terms of men and gods. We can see that the polis was generally perceived to be made up of its citizens and gods together, and that both were involved in all aspects of polis life.

By approaching a polis through its sanctuary, the ambassador or suppliant can be seen to be making his request to the gods of the polis as well as the mortal inhabitants. We saw that this is explicitly shown in Aischylos's Supplices where the Danaids pray to the gods of Argos before Pelasgos arrives (ll. 211-233), and then are protected in their name when the Egyptian herald tries to seize them (ll. 921-927). In chapter four we saw that the actions of the Danaids could be fitted into a general framework of diplomatic activity within a religious context.

The citizens themselves will have seen the gods as part of the polis. This is clear from the dedication of booty discussed in chapter five: the gods received a share of the spoils in the same way that mortal individuals did, because they were recognised as being involved in the actual battles. If the gods took part in battles, we have seen that they also took part in peace-time political activity as well. We have seen in chapter three that Herodotos's story about Psammetichos becoming Pharaoh[6] illustrates how the gods may be seen to influence human affairs. By placing their political meetings within a religious setting, Greek federations and poleis could make divine intervention possible in their affairs. This intervention could be implicit, as in the story of Psammetichos, or it could be deliberately sought through divination, either by sacrifice, or by consulting an oracular sanctuary such

6 ll. 147-152.

as Delphi. In either case, we may take it that the citizens of the polis understood themselves to be in a close relationship with the gods.

It is also clear that it was always the sanctuary that provided the means of access to the gods. This brings us back to the idea of the sanctuary as a means of communication: it is when the citizens are within a sanctuary that they are able to communicate with the gods. The defined areas of space, marked out and dedicated to the gods, are what holds the divine and mortal parts of the polis together.

One place outside Herodotos where the link between the citizens and the gods is most clearly illustrated is in the sculptures of the Parthenon in Athens. The pediments depict scenes from the (mythical) history of Athens, and the frieze shows a Panathenaic procession with, at its climax, the gods present, sitting on the Athenian akropolis, taking part in the ritual. The sculptures at the East end of the temple

> create a frame which poses fundamental questions about the position of the Athenians vis-à-vis the gods. The east pediment showed the birth of Athena, whose genesis, fully armed from the head of Zeus, is observed by a seated company of gods and framed by the horses of Helios and Selene. The base of the cult statue of Athena Parthenos showed the creation of Pandora, with, in all likelihood, a central frontal figure of Pandora staring at the incoming viewer, her genesis observed by an assembly of some twenty gods, again framed by Helios and Selene. The east frieze also assembles the gods, but the focus of their assembly is no god or figure from myth, it is the autochthonous Athenian. In the face of scenes of the creation of Athena and Pandora the Athenians are made to confront their own construction of themselves, their own place in the world order. (Osborne 1987b, 101-102)

The perception of themselves as inhabiting a world of gods and men is not limited to Athenians. It is comparable to the interpretation of Herodotos that I argued for in chapter six, and is explicit in the works of Homer that were so important for the articulation of religious ideas in the archaic and classical periods (ii. 53.2).

Herodotos

Throughout this thesis, Herodotos has provided the material from which theories about sanctuaries have been drawn. The resulting explanations are not necessarily

ones which would make sense to Herodotos, or any fifth century reader, although they are not incompatible with Herodotos's stated views on the occasions where these are put forward. The explanations do fit with evidence drawn from a wide variety of sources beyond Herodotos, and it is this fact that allows us to accept that they are valid for the archaic and classical Greek world in general.

It should be pointed out that this project could not have been carried out using any other historical source as a basis. It is true that the narrative of Thucydides contains more references to sanctuaries than one might expect,[7] and that most of the uses of them that I have discussed in detail in this thesis can be found in Thucydides.[8] Nonetheless, a thesis on 'Thucydides and Greek sanctuaries' would be very limited, because his work provides no information that we could use to explain why sanctuaries were used in these ways. In particular his deliberate exclusion of τὸ μυθῶδες (Th. i. 22.4) denies us the kind of stories that illustrate the mentality behind the use of sanctuaries. What is true for Thucydides is true for all his successors who concentrate on military and political action; those who are concerned only with what people do, and not the stories they tell about what they are doing, or have done.

It is Herodotos's role as a story-teller that makes him so valuable. Greek religion is articulated not through theology but through myth (Gould 1985), and that should be taken to include the kind of quasi-historical stories that Herodotos includes in his work. These stories need not be historically 'true'; they may even be propaganda invented to blacken the reputation of individuals like Kleomenes. What is important is that the structures that articulate the stories are the structures of Greek society: they reveal how Greeks understood their own relationship to the gods, even as they attempt to show how others fell foul of them. Similarly, Herodotos's frequent

---

7 see table 3.

8 Sanctuaries and federations: Th. i. 96.2, iii. 8.1; the diplomatic role of sanctuaries: Th. i. 24.7, viii. 107.1; dedications of booty in sanctuaries: Th. iii. 114.1; sanctuaries and divine intervention: (?) Th. ii. 8.3; Thucydides and Delphi: Th. i. 25.1 etc.

discussions of the religious practices of other peoples[9] help us to interpret those of the Greeks. Herodotos tends to point out where he believes other peoples' practices differ from Greeks', and thus these accounts, whether or not they are accurate or 'true', provide a sort of mirror image of Greek religion; from them we may judge what is important in Greek religion, and why.

From these accounts and stories, and from the more straightforward 'historical' narrative, we are able to build up a picture of several aspects of what we may call Greek polis religion, which is in reality inseparable from other areas of polis life. That polis life is held together and controlled by the bounded space of the sanctuaries of the gods.

---

9 Persians: i. 131-132; Chaldaians: i. 181-183; Egyptians: ii. 38-67; Skyhtians: iv. 59-63; Libyans: iv. 188.

Vollendet das ewige Werke:
auf Berges Gipfel
die Götterburg,
prächtig prahlt
der prangende Bau!
Wie im Traum ich ihn trug,
wie mein Wille ihn wies,
stark und schön
steht er zur Schau:
hehrer, herrlicher Bau!

(R. Wagner, Das Rheingold)

Table 1: References to Greek sanctuaries in Herodotos

The following table lists all specific references to Greek sanctuaries in the text of Herodotos. It includes colonies in Italy and North Africa, and places in Cyprus. As well as references to named sanctuaries I have included those to unnamed temples in Athens, Eretria, Kydonia and Naxos. In the fourth column I list all the words used to describe the sanctuary in the various references. In some cases, for example if the text describes the institution of a cult (e.g. Damia and Auxesia on Aigina), no specific word is used, and the column is left blank.

PLACE	DIVINITY	REFERENCE	WORD USED (where relevant)
Abai	Apollo	i.46.2, viii.27.4, viii.27.5, viii.33, viii.134.1	ἱρόν, μαντηίον, χρηστήριον
Aigina	Athena	iii.59.3	ἱρόν
	Damia and Auxesia	v.83.3	
	Demeter Thesmophoros	vi.91.2	πρόθυρα
Amathous	Onesilos	v.114.2	
Anthela	Amphyktion	vii.200.2	ἱρόν
	Demeter Amphyktionis	vii.200.2	ἱρόν
Aphetai	Herakles	vii.193.2	
Argos	Argos	vi.75.3, vi.78.2, vi.80, vi.82.1	ἄλσος, ἱρόν
	Hera	i.31.2, i.31.5, vi.81, vi.82.2	Ἥραιον, ἱρόν
Artemision	Artemis	vii.176.1	ἱρόν
Athens	Aiakos	v.89.3	τέμενος
	Ares (Areopagos)	viii.52.1	ὄχθος
	Artemis Mounichia	viii.77.1	ἱερόν
	Athena (Akropolis)	i.59.6, v.71.1, v.72.2, v.72.3, v.77.3, v.77.4, v.82.1, v.90.2, vi.137.2, vii.142.1, viii.41.2, viii.41.3, viii.51.2, viii.53.1, viii.53.2, viii.54, viii.56	ἀκρόπολις, ἱρόν
	Boreas	vii.189.3	ἱρόν
	Demeter Achaia	v.61.2	ἱρόν
	Dodeka Theoi	ii.7.1, vi.108.4	βωμός
	Erechtheus	v.82.1, viii.55	νηός
	Herakles (Kynosarges)	v.63.4, vi.116	Ἡράκλειον
	Pan	vi.105.3	ἱρόν
Athens (cont.)	Pelasgian land	vi.137.2	ἱρὰ, οἴκοι καὶ ἀγάλματα [τῶν θεῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἡρωῶν]
	'sanctuaries'	viii.140α.2, viii.143.2, ix.121	

Branchidai	Apollo	i.46.2, i.92.2, i.157.3, i.158.1, i.159.1, v.36.3, vi.19.2, vi.19.3	ἱρόν, μαντήιον, νηός τε καὶ χρηστήριον
Brauron	Artemis	iv.145.2, vi.138.1	
Byzantion	Artemis Orthosia	iv.87.2	βωμός
	Dionysos	iv.87.2	νηός
Chersonesos	Helle	vii.58.2	τάφος
Chios	Athena Polioυchos	i.160.3	ἱρόν
Corinth	Hera	v.92η.3	Ἥραιον
Cyprus	Aphrodite Ouranios	i.105.2	ἱρόν
Delion	Apollo Delios	vi.118.2	
Delos	Apollo	i.64.2, ii.170.2, iv.33.2, iv.33.3, vi.97.1, vi.97.2, vi.98.1, vi.98.3, vi.99.1, vi.118.1, viii.132.3, ix.90.1, ix.96.1	βωμός, ἱρόν
	Artemis	iv.34.2, iv.35.4	Ἀρτεμίσιον
	Hyperoche and Laodike	iv.34.2	σῆμα
	Opis and Arge	iv.35.4	θήκη
Delphi	Apollo Pythios	i.13.1, i.14.1, i.14.2, i.19.2, i.19.3, i.25.2, i.31.5, i.46.2, i.47.2, i.48.1, i.50.1, i.50.3, i.51.1, i.52, i.54.1, i.65.2, i.66.1, i.67.2, i.85.1, i.90.4, i.92.2, i.167.2, i.174.4, ii.135.3, ii.135.4, ii.180.1, iii.57.2, iv.15.3, iv.150.2, iv.155.3, iv.156.1, iv.157.1, iv.161.1, iv.162.3, iv.163.1, iv.179.1, v.42.2, v.62.2, v.63.1, v.67.2, v.82.1, v.89.2, v.92β.2, v.92ε.1, vi.19.1, vi.27.2, vi.34.1, vi.35.3, vi.52.4, vi.57.2, vi.66.1, vi.66.2, vi.70.1, vi.76.1, vi.86γ.1, vi.125.2, vi.135.2, vi.139.1, vii.111.2, vii.132.2, vii.139.6, vii.140.1, vii.163.2, vii.165, vii.169.1, vii.178.1, vii.239.1, viii.27.4, viii.27.5, viii.35.1, viii.35.2, viii.37.1, viii.82.1, viii.114.1, viii.121.2, viii.122, ix.33.2, ix.42.3, ix.81.1, ix.93.4	βωμός, θήσαυρος, θυμιητήριον, ἱρόν, μαντήιον, νηός, οὐδός, χρηστήριον
	Athena Pronaia	i.92.1, viii.37.2, viii.37.3, viii.39.1, viii.39.2	ἱρόν, τέμενος
	Autonoos	viii.39.1	τέμενος
	Phylakos	viii.39.1	τέμενος
Dodona	Zeus	i.46.2, ii.52.1, ii.55.3, ix.93.4	ἱρόν, μαντήιον
Egesta	Philippos	v.47.2	ἡρώιον

Elaious	Protesilaus	vii.33, ix.116.2, ix.116.3	ἀδύτον, ἱρόν, τάφος τε καὶ τέμενος περὶ αὐτόν
Eleusis	Demeter and Kore	vi.75.3, viii.65.2, ix.19.2, ix.65.2	ἀνάκτορον, τέμενος
Epidauros	Damia and Auxesia	v.82.1	
Ephesos	Artemis	i.26.2, i.92.1, ii.148.2	νηός
Eretria	'sanctuaries'	vi.101.3	ἱρά
Halos	Zeus Laphystios	vii.197.1	ἱρόν
Isthmia	Poseidon	viii.121.1, viii.123.2, ix.81.1	βωμός
Knidos	Apollo Triopios	i.144.1, i.144.2	ἱρόν
Kydonia	Diktyna	iii.59.2	νηός
	'sanctuaries'	iii.59.2	ἱρά
Kyrene	Aphrodite	ii.181.4	
	Athena	ii.182.1	
	Zeus Lykaios	iv.203.2	ὄχθος
Kythera	Aphrodite Ouranios	i.105.3	ἱρόν
Lebadeia	Trophonios	i.46.2, viii.134.1	μαντήιον
Lindos	Athena	ii.182.1, ii.182.2, iii.47.3	ἱρόν
Marathon	Athena Pallenis	i.62.3	ἱρόν
	Herakles	vi.108.1, vi.116	Ἡράκλειον, τέμενος
Metapontion	Apollo	iv.15.2, iv.15.4	βωμός, ἀγάλμα
Miletos	Athena Assessia	i.19.1, i.19.3, i.22.4	νηός
Mykale	Demeter Eleusinia	ix.97, ix.101.1	ἱρόν, τέμενος
	Poseidon Helikonios	i.141.4, i.142.1, i.143.3, i.148.1, i.170.1, vi.7	ἱρόν, Πανιώνιον, χῶρος ἱρός
	(Panionion)	ix.97	ἱρόν
	Potniai		

Naukratis	Apollo	ii.178.3	τέμενος
	Hellenion	ii.178.2	τέμενος
	Hera Samia	ii.178.3	τέμενος
	Zeus	ii.178.3	τέμενος
Naxos	'sanctuaries'	vi.96	ἱρά
Olympia	Zeus	i.59.1, ii.7.1, ii.160.1, v.22.1, vi.36.1, vi.122.1, vi.127.3, vii.170.4, viii.134.1, ix.81.1	νηός
Oropos	Amphiaraos	i.46.2, i.49, i.52, i.92.2, viii.134.1, viii.134.2	μαντήιον
Paros	Demeter Thesmophoros	vi.134.2	ἔρκος, μέγαρον
Plataia	Demeter Eleusinia	ix.57.2, ix.62.2, ix.65.2, ix.69.1, ix.101.1	ἄλσος, Δημήτριον, ἱρόν, τέμενος
	Hera	ix.52, ix.61.3, ix.69.1	Ἥραιον
Salamis	Aias	viii.121.1	
	Athena Skiras	viii.94.2	ἱρόν
Samos	Artemis	iii.48.2, iii.48.3	ἱρόν
	Hera	i.70.3, ii.148.2, ii.182.1, iii.60.4, iii.123.1, iv.88.1, iv.152.4, ix.96.1	Ἥραιον, νηός
	Zeus Eleutherios	iii.142.2, iii.142.4	βωμός, ἱρόν
Selinous	Zeus Agoraios	v.46.2	βωμός
Sepias	Thetis and the Nereidai	vii.191.2	
Sigeion	Athena	v.95.1	Ἀθηναίον
Sikyon	Adrastos	v.67.1	ἡρώιον
	Melanippos	v.67.3	τέμενος
Sounion	Poseidon or Athena	vi.87, viii.121.1	
Sparta	Apollo (Thornax)	i.69.4, vi.61.3	ἀγάλμα, ἱρόν
	Astrobakos	vi.69.3	ἡρώιον
	Erinyes of Laios and Oidipous	iv.149.2	ἱρόν
	Helen	vi.61.3	ἱρόν
	Lykourgos	i.66.1	ἱρόν
	Talthybios	vii.134.1	ἱρόν
Sybaris	Athena Krathias	v.45.1	τέμενός τε καὶ νηός

Tainaron	Poseidon	I.24.8	
Tegea	Athena Alea	i.66.4, ix.70.3	νηός
Thasos	Herakles	ii.44.4	ἱρόν
Thebes	Apollo Ismenios	I.52, I.92.1, v.59, viii.134.1	ἱρόν, νηός
	Apollo Ptoos	viii.135.1	τέμενος
Thermopylai	Herakles	vii.176.3	βωμός
Thesprotis	Nekyomanteion	v.92η.2	νεκυομαντήιον
Thrace	Dionysos	vii.111.2	μαντήιον
Thyia	Anemoi	vii.178.2	βωμός
	Thyia	vii.178.2	τέμενος

Table 2: References to non-Greek sanctuaries in Herodotos

In this table I have followed Herodotos's names for gods, so that at Babylon, for example I have listed temples of Aphrodite and Zeus Belos rather than Ishtar and Baal. This seems more useful in an examination of Herodotos's depiction of Greek religion. Once again, references are to clearly identified sanctuaries, as outlined in table 1.

PLACE	DIVINITY	REFERENCE
Ammoniol	Ammon (Zeus)	i.46.1, ii.18.1, ii.18.2, iv.181.2
Askalon	Aphrodite Ouranios	i.105.2
Atarbechis	Aphrodite	ii.41.5
Babylon	Aphrodite Zeus Belos	i.199.1 i.181.2, iii.158.2
Boubastis	Artemis Hermes	ii.137.5, ii.138.2 ii.138.4
Bousiris	Isis	ii.59.1
Bouto	Apollo and Artemis Leto	ii.155.2 ii.83, ii.111.2, ii.133.1, ii.152.3, ii.155.1, ii.155.2, ii.156.2
Chemmis	Apollo Perseus	ii.156.3 ii.91.1
Gelonos	'sanctuaries'	iv.108.1
Heliopolis	Helios	ii.73.3
Labraunda	Zeus Stratios	v.119.2

Memphis	Aphrodite Xeine	ii.112.2
	Apis	ii.153, iii.29.3
	Helios	ii.111.4
	Hephaistos	ii.99.4, ii.101.2, ii.108.2, ii.110.1, ii.112.1, ii.121.1, ii.136.1, ii.141.6, ii.151.1, ii.153, ii.176.1, iii.37.2
	Isis	ii.176.2
	Kabeirioi	ii.37.3
	Proteus	ii.112.1
Mende	Mendes	ii.42.2
Meroe	Zeus	ii.29.7
Mylasa	Zeus Karios	i.171.6
Papremis	Ares	ii.63.1
Patara	Apollo	i.182.2
Pedasos	Athena	i.175
Saïs	Athena	ii.169.4, ii.170.1, ii.175.1, iii.10.2
Sardis	Kybebe	v.102.1
Taricheia	Herakles	ii.113.2
Tauris	Iphigeneia	iv.103.2
Thebes	Zeus	i.182.2, ii.42.1, ii.54.1, ii.74, iv.181.2
Telmessos	'oracle'	i.78.1, i.84.3
Lake Tritonis	Triton	iv.179.3

Tyre	Herakles	ii.44.1
	Herakles Thasios	ii.44.3

Table 3: References to sanctuaries in Thucydides

The table contains all the references to sanctuaries in Thucydides. The principle on which the references are counted is as for Table 1.

PLACE	DIVINITY	REFERENCE
Amphipolis	Athena	v.10.2
	Brasidas	v.11.1
	Hagnon	v.11.1
Argos	Apollo	v.47.11
	Hera	iv.133.2
Asine	Apollo Pythaeus	v.53
Athens	Akropolis	i.126.4, i.126.10, ii.13, ii.15, v.18.10, v.23.5, v.47.11
	Apollo Pythios	ii.15, vi.54.6
	Dionysos in Limnais	ii.15
	Dodeka Theoi	vi.54.6
	Demeter Eleusinia	ii.17.1
	Ge	ii.15
	Leokorios	i.20.2, vi.54.6
	Pelasgians	ii.17.1
	Poseidon (Kolonos)	viii.67.2
	Semnai Theai	i.126.11
	Theseus	vi.61.2
	Zeus Olympios	ii.15
	'sanctuaries'	ii.52.3, iii.114.1, iv.98, vi.27.1
Chios	Zeus	viii.19.2

Corcyra	Dionysos	iii.81.5
	Dioskouroi	iii.75.3
	Hera	i.24.7, iii.75.5, iii.79.1, iii.81.2
	Zeus and Alkinous	iii.70.4
	'sanctuaries'	iii.81.5
Delion	Apollo Delios	iv.76.4, iv.76.5, iv.89.1, iv.90.1, iv.90.4, iv.92.7, iv.93.2, iv.96.7, iv.96.9, iv.97.3, iv.100.1, iv.101.1, v.15.2
Delos	Apollo	i.8.1, i.96.2, ii.8.3, iii.104.1, v.1, v.32.1, viii.77, viii.80.3, viii.86.1, viii.108.4
Delphi	Apollo Pythios	i.25.1, i.28.2, i.112.5, i.118.3, i.121.3, i.126.4, i.132.2, i.134.4, i.143.1, iii.57.2, iii.92.5, iii.101.1, iv.118.1, iv.134.1, v.16.2, v.18.2, v.18.10, v.32.1
Egesta	'sanctuaries'	vi.6.3, vi.8.2
Elaios	Protesilaos	viii.102.3
Ephesos	Artemis	iii.104.3, viii.109.1
Eryx	Aphrodite	vi.46.3
Isthmia	Poseidon	v.18.10, viii.10.1
Ithome	Zeus	i.103.2
Knidos	Apollo	viii.35.2
Laconia (opposite Kythera)	Apollo	vii.26.1

Lekythos	Athena	iv.116.2
Leukas	Apollo	iii.94.2
Mantineia	Herakles	v.64.5, v.66.1
	Zeus	v.47.11
Mende	Poseidon	iv.129.3
Minoa (Megara)	Enyalios	iv.67.2
Mykalessos	Hermes	vii.29.3
Mytilene	Apollo Maloeis	iii.3.3, iii.3.5
Naxos (Sicily)	Apollo Archegetes	vi.3.1
Oineon	Zeus Nemeos	iii.96.1
Olympia	Zeus	i.121.3, i.126.5, i.143.1, iii.8, iii.14.1, v.18.10, v.47.11, v.49.1, v.50.1
Plataia	Androkrates	iii.24.1
	Hera	iii.68.3
	Zeus Eleutherios	ii.71.2
Selinous	'sanctuaries'	vi.20.4
Sparta	Athena Chalkioikos	i.128.2, i.134.1
	Amyklaion	v.18.10, v.23.5
	'sanctuaries'	iv.80.4
Syracuse	Temenites	vi.75.1, vi.100.2
	Zeus Olympios	vi.64.1, vi.65.3, vi.70.4, vi.71.1, vi.75.1, vii.4.7, vii.37.2, vii.37.3, vii.42.6

Tainaron	Poseidon	i.128.1, i.133

Table 4: References to sanctuaries in Xenophon

The table contains all the references to sanctuaries in Xenophon's Hellenika. The principle on which the references are counted is as for Table 1.

PLACE	DIVINITY	REFERENCE
Aigina	Herakles	v.1.10
Aphytis	Dionysos	v.3.19
Argos	Hera	iv.5.5, iv.59
Astyra	Artemis	iv.1.41
Athens	Akropolis	ii.3.20, ii.4.39
	Akademeia	vi.5.49
	Apollo Lykaios	i.1.33
	Artemis Mounichia	ii.4.11
	Athena	i.6.1
	Bendis	ii.4.11
Aulis	Artemis	iii.4.3, iii.5.5, vii.1.34
Chalkedon	Herakles	i.3.7
Corinth	Poseidon (Pireion)	iv.5.4
	'statues and altars'	iv.4.3
Delphi	Apollo Pythios	iii.3.1, iv.3.21, iv.7.2, vi.4.2, vi.4.30, vii.1.27
Ephesos	Artemis	i.2.6, iii.4.18

Gergis	Athena	iii.1.22
Isthmia	Poseidon	iv.5.1, iv.5.2
Leukophryn	Artemis	iii.2.19
Melea	Herakles	vii.1.31
Olympia	Zeus	iii.2.22, iii.2.26, iii.2.31, iv.7.2, vii.4.14, vii.4.28, vii.4.31, vii.4.32, vii.4.35
Phleious	Hera	vii.2.6, vii.2.11, vii.2.13
Phokaia	Athena	i.3.1
Sellasia	Apollo	vi.5.27
Skepsis	Athena	iii.1.21
Sparta	Athena Alea	vi.5.27
	Gaiochos	vi.5.30
	Tyndaridai	vi.5.31
Tegea	Artemis	vi.5.9
Thebes	Amphion	v.4.8
	Kadmos	v.2.29, v.2.31, vi.3.9, vi.3.11
	Herakles	vi.4.7
	'sanctuaries'	vi.4.7

Table 5: Dedications in Greek sanctuaries in Herodotos (excluding booty)

This table lists all dedications in Greek sanctuaries mentioned by Herodotos. As with Table 1, non-Greek sanctuaries have been excluded. In Herodotos's description of Egypt, which includes most of the references to non-Greek sanctuaries, it is often not possible to distinguish between dedications in temples and additions to them. Since Egyptian sanctuaries are not the subject of the thesis, I have found it clearer to leave them out entirely. Dedications of booty are listed on table 6.1.

Place	Dedicator	Dedication	Reference
Aigina (Oia)	Aiginetans	olive wood statues of Damia and Auxesia	v.83.2
Amphiareus	Kroisos	gold shield and spear	i.52
Branchidai	Kroisos	gifts equal in weight and kind to those at Delphi	i.92.2, v.36.3
	Nekos	clothing	ii.159.3
Cyrene	Amasis	gold plated statue of Athena, painting of himself.	ii.182.1
	Ladike	statue (to Aphrodite)	ii.181.5
Delos	Datis	gold statue of Apollo (from Delion)	vi.118.2
	Hyperboreans	sacred things wrapped in straw	iv.33.1
Delphi	Alyattes	Silver crater with iron stand	i.25.2
	Amasis	alum	ii.180.2
	Argives	Statues of Kleobis and Biton	i.31.5
	Euelthon	Censer	iv.162.3
	Gyges	Most of the silver at Delphi, many gold vessels, six gold mixing bowls weighing 30 talents.	i.14.1-2
	Kroisos	117 gold bricks (4 refined weighing 2.5 talents, 113 white gold weighing 2 talents), gold lion (10 talents), gold crater (8.5 talents, 12 minas), silver crater (holds 600 amphorea), 4 silver pithoi, 2 perirranteria (1 gold, 1 silver), 'many other dedications not noteworthy', round silver bowls, gold statue of a women (3 cubits high), necklaces and girdles of his wife.	i.50.2-51.5
		fetters	i.90.4

		gold shield (in the Pronaia)	
Delphi (cont.)	Midas	Throne	i.14.3
	Rhodopis	iron spits	ii.135.4
	Siphnians	silver (in a treasury)	iii.57.2
	Spartans	statue of a boy	i.51.4
Ephesos	Kroisos	gold cow and many of the columns	i.92.1
Epidauros	Epidaurians	olive-wood statues of Damia and Auxesia	v.82.1-3
Lindos	Amasis	2 stone statues, linen breastplate	ii.182.1
Samos	Amasis	2 wooden statues of himself	ii.182.1, cf. iii.47.3
		linen breastplate (meant for Spartans)	ii.47.1-3
	Kolaios's crew	tripod	iv.152.4
	Maiandrios	τὸν κόσμον τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρεῶνος τοῦ Πολυκράτεος	iii.123.1
	Mandrokles	painting	iv.88.1
	Spartans	bronze crater (holding 300 amphorea; meant for Kroisos)	i.70.1-2, ii.47.1
Tainaron	Arion	Bronze statuette of a man on a dolphin	i.24.8
Thebes	Kroisos	gold tripod (for Apollo Ismenios)	i.92.1
	Laodamas	tripod	v.61.1
	Skaios	tripod	v.60

Table 6: Dedications of booty in Herodotos

This table lists all examples of the dedication of booty in Greek sanctuaries in Herodotos. In the sixth column I have included technical words used to describe the part of the booty dedicated. As well as these cases, one further reference can be added: at vii. 132.2, the Greeks take a decision to δεκατεῦειν medising states, that is, to send a tenth of their property to Delphi.

Ref.	Dedicator	Defeated	Place dedicated	Object dedicated	Word used
i.66.4	Tegeans	Lakedaimonians	Tegea (Athena Alea)	fetters	
iii.59.3	Aiginetans and Cretans	Kydonians	Aigina	ships prows	
iv.81.3	Pausanias	Persians	Black Sea mouth	bronze crater	
v.59	Amphitryon	Teleboans	Thebes (Apollo Ismenios)	tripod	
v.77.3-4	Athenians	Chalcideans	Athens (akropolis)	fetters and chariot	δεκάτη
v.95.1	Athenians	Mytileneans	Sigeon	shield of Alkaios	
viii.27.4-5	Phokians	Thessalians	Abai, Delphi	shields and statues	δεκάτη
viii.82.1	Tenians	Persians (Salamis)	Delphi	name added to tripod (set up after Plataia)	
viii.121	Greeks	Persians (Salamis)	Isthmia Sounion Salamis (Aias) Delphi	Phoinician trireme Phoinician trireme Phoinician trireme Statue holding ship's prow (12 cubits high)	}ἀκροθίνια ἀκροθίνια
viii.122	Aiginetans	Persians (Salamis)	Delphi	3 gold stars on a bronze mast	
ix.70.3	Tegeans	Persians (Plataia)	Tegea (Athena Alea)	Mardonius's bronze manger	
ix.81.1	Greeks	Persians (Plataia)	Delphi Olympia Isthmia	gold tripod on a bronze three-headed snake bronze statue of Zeus bronze statue of Poseidon	δεκάτη

Bibliography

Ahlström, G.W. (1982) Royal administration and national religion in ancient Palestine (Leiden)

Amandry, P. (1981) 'Chronique delphique (1970 - 1981)' BCH cv 673-769

Aupert, P. (1973) 'Delphes iii: stade' BCH xcvii 526-527

Austin, M.M. (1970) Greece and Egypt in the archaic age: PCPS supp. 2 (Cambridge)

Bammer, A. (1982) 'Forschungen im Artemision von Ephesos von 1976 bis 1981' AS xxxii 61-87

Bammer, A. (1985) 'Spuren der Phöniker im Artemision von Ephesos' AS xxxv 103-108

Barnett, R.A. (1982) Ancient ivories from the Middle East: Qedem xiv (Jerusalem)

Baslez, M.-F. (1984) L'étranger dans la Grèce antique (Paris)

Beard, M. (1989) 'Priesthood in the Roman republic' in M. Beard and J. North eds. Pagan priests: religion and power in the ancient world (London) 17-48

Berquist, B. (1967) The archaic Greek temenos: a study of structure and function (1967)

Blakesley, J.W. (1854) Herodotus 2 vols. (London)

Boardman, J. (1959) 'Chian and early Ionic architecture' AJ xxxix 170-217

Boardman, J. (1972) 'Herakles, Peisistratos and sons' RA 1972 57-72

Boardman, J. (1975) Athenian red-figure vases: the archaic period (London)

Boardman, J. (1980) The Greeks overseas[3] (London)

Boersma, J.S. (1970) Athenian building policy from 561/0 to 404/5 BC (Groningen)

Burghardt, P. (1987) 'Gifts to the gods: power, property and ceremonial in Nepal' in Cannadine and Price 1987, 237-270

Burkert, W. (1985) Greek religion (Oxford)

Burnett, A.P. (1971) Catastrophe survived: Euripides' plays of mixed reversal (Oxford)

Buschor, E. (1930) 'Heraion von Samos' AM lv 1-100

Camp, J.M. (1986) The Athenian agora (London)

Cannadine, D. and Price, S.R.F. eds. (1987) Rituals of royalty (Cambridge)

Carpenter, R. (1929) The sculpture of the Nike temple parapet (Cambridge, Mass.)

Cartledge, P.A. (1979) Sparta and Laconia: a regional history 1300-362 BC (London)

Coldstream, J.N. (1985) 'Greek temples. Why and where?' in P.E. Easterling and J.V. Muir eds. Greek religion and society (Cambridge) 67-97

Connor, W.R. (1987) 'Tribes, festivals and processions: civic ceremonial and political manipulation in archaic Greece' JHS cvii 40-50

Connor, W.R. (1988) '"Sacred" and "secular": ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια and the Athenian concept of the state' AncSoc xix 161-188

Cook, J.M. (1984) The Persian Empire (London)

Cook, R.M. (1987) 'Pots and Pisistratan propaganda' JHS cvii 167-169

Cook, R.M. (1989) 'The Francis-Vickers chronology' JHS cix 164-170

Coulson, W.D.E. and Leonard, A. (1979) 'A preliminary survey of the Naukratis region in the Western Nile Delta' JFA vi 151-168

Coulton, J.J. (1977) Greek architects at work: problems of structure and design (London)

Crosby, M. (1949) 'The altar of the twelve gods at Athens' Hesperia supp. viii 82-103

Davies, J.K. (1984) Wealth and the power of wealth in classical Athens (Salem)

Davies, J.K. (1988) 'Religion and the state' CAH iv^2 368-388

Davis, W.M. (1979) 'Ancient Naukratis and the Cypriotes in Egypt' Gött. Misz. xxxv 13-23

Davis, W.M. (1980) 'The Cypriotes at Naukratis' Gött. Misz. xli 7-19

de Polignac, F. (1984) La naissance de la cité grecque (Paris)

Derow, P.S. (1970) Rome and the Greek world PhD Thesis (Princeton)

Develin, P. (1985) 'Herodotus and the Alkmaeonids' in J.W Eadie and J. Ober eds., The craft of the ancient historian: essays in honour of Chester G. Starr (Lanham)

Dinsmoor, W.B. (1950) The architecture of ancient Greece: an account of its historic development^3 (London)

Drews, R. (1973) Greek accounts of Eastern history (Cambridge, Mass.)

Easterling, P.E. (1982) Sophocles Trachiniae (Cambridge)

Ehrenberg, V. (1960) The Greek state (Oxford)

Evans, J.A.S. (1982) Herodotus (Boston)

Farrar, C. (1988) The origins of democratic thinking (Cambridge)

Fehling, D. (1971) Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot (Berlin)

Fehling, D. (1989) Herodotus and his 'sources' (Leeds)

Fontenrose, J. (1978) The Delphic oracle (Berkeley)

Forrest, W.G. (1968) A history of Sparta 950-192 BC (London)

Forrest, W.G. (1969) 'The tradition of Hippias' expulsion from Athens' GRBS x 277-286

Forrest, W.G. (1982) 'Delphi 750-500 BC' CAH iii^2.3 305-320

Francis, E.D. and Vickers, M. (1984) 'Amasis and Lindos' BICS xxxi 119-130

Furtwängler, A.E. (1984) 'Wer entwarf den größten Tempel Griechenlands?' AM xcix 97-103

Gardner, E.A. (1888) Naucratis ii (London)

Garland, R. (1989) 'Priests and power in classical Athens' in M. Beard and J. North eds. Pagan priests: religion and power in the ancient world (London) 73-91

Geertz, C. (1977) 'Centres, kings and charisma: reflections on the symbolics of power' in J. Ben-David and T.N. Clark eds. Culture and its creators: essays in honour of Edward Shils (Chicago) 150-171

Gernet, L. (1981) '"Value" in Greek myth' in R.L. Gordon ed. Myth, religion and society: structuralist essays (Cambridge) 111-146

Gjerstad, E. (1959) 'Naukratis again' Acta Archaeologica xxx 147-166

Gjødsen, M. (1963) 'Greek bronzes: a review article' AJA lxvii 333-350

Goldhill, S. (1987) 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology' JHS cvii 58-76

Gomme, A.W. (1945) A historical commentary on Thucydides i (Oxford)

Gomme, A.W. (1956) A historical commentary on Thucydides ii-iii 2 vols (Oxford)

Gomme, A.W., Andrewes, A. and Dover, K.J. (1981) A historical commentary on Thucydides v (Oxford)

Gould, J. (1973) 'Hiketeia' JHS xciii 74-103

Gould, J. (1985) 'On making sense of Greek religion' in P.E. Easterling and J.V. Muir eds. Greek religion and society (Cambridge) 1-33

Gould, J. (1989) Herodotus (London)

Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L. (1965) The Greek anthology 2 vols (Oxford)

Griffin, J. (1980) Homer on life and death (Oxford)

Griffiths, A. (1989) 'Was Kleomenes mad?' in A. Powell ed. Classical Sparta (London) 51-78

Gruen, E.S. (1984) The hellenistic world and the coming of Rome (Berkeley)

Habicht, C. (1985) Pausanias' Guide to ancient Greece (Berkeley)

Hall, E. (1989) Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy (Oxford)

Hammond, N.G.L. (1982) 'The Peloponnese' CAH iii^2.3 321-259

Hart, J. (1982) Herodotus and Greek history (Beckenham)

Hartog, F. (1988) The mirror of Herodotus (Berkeley)

Hill, G.F. (1951) Sources for Greek history BC 478-431^2 (Oxford)

Hornblower, S. (1982) 'Thucydides, the Panionian festival and the Ephesia (III 104)' Historia xxxi 241-245

Hornblower, S. (1987) Thucydides (London)

How, W.W. and Wells, J. (1912) A commentary on Herodotus 2 vols. (Oxford)

Howatson, M.C. (1988) The Oxford companion to classical literature^2(Oxford)

Jacoby, F. (1913) 'Herodotus' RE supp. ii 205-520

Jantzen, U. (1955) Griechische Griefenkessel (Berlin)

Jantzen, U. (1972) Ägyptische und Orientalische Bronzen aus dem Heraion: Samos viii (Bonn)

Joffroy, R. (1954) Le trésor de Vix (Paris)

Kilian-Dirlmeier, I. (1985) 'Fremde Weihungen in grieschischen Heiligtümern vom 8. bis zum Beginn des 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.' JRGZ xxxii 215-254

Kleiner, G., Hommel, P. and Müller-Wiener, W. (1967) Panionion und Melie (Berlin)

Kopcke, G. (1967) 'Neue Holzfunde aus dem Heraion von Samos' AM lxxxii 100-148

Koumanoudes, S. (1978) 'Μαραθωνι' AAA xi 232-244

Kuhrt, A. (1989) 'Nabonidus and the Babyonian priesthood' in M. Beard and J. North eds. Pagan priests: religion and power in the ancient world (London) 117-156

Kuper, H. (1972) 'The language of sites in the politics of space' American Anthropologist lxxiv 411-425

Leahy, D.M. (1955) 'The bones of Tisamenus' Historia iv 26-38

Lerat, L. (1951) 'Delphes' BCH lxxv 134-140

Lévy, E. (1977) 'La Grande Rhètra' Ktema ii 85-103

Lewis, D.M. (1963) 'Cleisthenes and Athens' Historia xii, 22-40

Lewis, D.M. (1988) 'The tyranny of the Pisistratidae' CAH iv^2 287-302

Linders, T. (1987) 'Gods, gifts and society' in T. Linders and G. Nordquist eds. (1987) Gifts to the gods (Uppsala)

Lissarague, F. (1990) L'autre guerrier: archers, peltastes, cavaliers dans l'imagerie attique (Paris)

Lloyd, A.B. (1988) Herodotus book ii vol. iii: commentary 99-182 (Leiden)

Lonis, R. (1979) Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique: recherches sur les rites, les dieux, l'idéologie de la victoire (Paris)

Malkin, I. (1987) Religion and colonisation in ancient Greece (Leiden)

Martin, R. (1983) 'L'éspace civique, religieux et profane dans les cités grecques de l'archaïsme à l'époque hellénistique' in Architecture et société de l'archaïsme grec à la fin de la république romaine (Rome)

Meiggs, R. (1972) The Athenian empire (Oxford)

Meiggs, R. (1982) Trees and timber in the ancient Mediterranean world (Oxford)

Mitchell, B.M. (1975) 'Herodotus and Samos' JHS xcv 75-91

Morgan, C. (1990) Athletes and oracles: the transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the eighth century BC (Cambridge)

Murray, O. (1986) 'Greek historians' in J. Boardman, J. Griffin and O. Murray eds. The Oxford history of the Classical world (Oxford) 186-203

Murray, O. (1987) 'Herodotus and oral history' in H.W.Am. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt eds. Achaemenid history vol. ii: the Greek sources (Leiden)

Murray, O. (1988) 'The Ionian revolt' CAH iv^2 461-490

Myres, J.L. (1953) Herodotus, father of history (Oxford)

Neville, J. (1979) 'Was there an Ionian revolt?' CQ xxix 268-275

Ogilvie, R.M. (1965) A commentary on Livy books i-v (Oxford)

Ohly, D. (1953) 'Holz' AM lxviii 77-126

Osborne, R.G. (1985) Demos: the discovery of classical Attica (Cambridge)

Osborne, R.G. (1987a) Classical landscape with figures: the ancient Greek city and its countryside (London)

Osborne, R.G. (1987b) 'The viewing and obscuring of the Parthenon frieze' JHS cvii 98-105

Ostwald, M. (1986) From popular sovereignty to the sovereignty of the law: law, society and politics in fifth-century Athens (Berkeley)

Owen, A.S. (1939) Euripides Ion (Oxford)

Parke, H.W. (1984) 'Croesus and Delphi' GRBS xxv 209-232

Parke,H.W. (1985) The oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor (London)

Parke, H.W. and Wormell, D.E.W. (1956) The Delphic oracle 2 vols (Oxford)

Parker, R.C.T. (1985) 'Greek states and Greek oracles' in P.A. Cartledge and F.D. Harvey eds. Crux: essays presented to G.E.M. de Ste Croix on his 75th birthday (Exeter) 298-326

Petrie, W.M.F. (1886) Naucratis i (London)

Picard, G.C. (1957) Les trophées romains (Paris)

Price, S.R.F. (1985) 'Delphi and divination' in P.E. Easterling and J.V. Muir eds. Greek religion and society (Cambridge) 128-154

Pritchett, W.K. (1971) The Greek art of war i (Berkeley)

Pritchett, W.K. (1974) The Greek art of war ii (Berkeley)

Pritchett, W.K. (1979) The Greek art of war iii: religion (Berkeley)

Rolley, C. (1986) Greek bronzes (London)

Rouse, W.H.D. (1902) Greek votive offerings (London)

Rupp, D.W. (1983) 'Reflections on the development of Greek altars in the eighth century BC' in R. Hägg ed. The Greek renaissance of the eighth century BC: tradition and innovation (Stockholm) 101-107

Rykwert, J. (1976) The idea of a town (London)

Salmon, J.T. (1969) Roman colonization under the republic (London)

Schachter, A. (1981) Cults of Boiotia i (London)

Scully, V. (1979) The earth, the temple and the gods: Greek sacred architecture^2 (New Haven)

Sherk, R.K. (1969) Roman documents from the Greek East (Baltimore)

Shimron, B. (1989) Politics and belief in Herodotus: Historia Einzelschriften lviii (Stuttgart)

Shipley, G. (1987) A history of Samos 800-188 BC (Oxford)

Siewert, P. (1981) 'Eine Bronze-Urkunde mit Elischen Urteiler über Böoter, Thessaler, Athen und Thespial' Olympia Bericht x 228-248

Simon, C.G. (1988) 'Foreigners, Greek women and the use of archaic Ionian shrines: AIA abstract of paper' AJA xcii 279

Simon, E. (1976) 'Ein nordattischer Pan' AK xix 19-23

Sinclair, R.K. (1988) Democracy and participation in Athens (Cambridge)

Snodgrass, A.M. (1983) 'Heavy freight in archaic Greece' in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins and C.R. Whittaker eds. Trade in the ancient economy (London) 16-26

Soggin, J.A. (1987) A history of Israel (London)

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1988) 'Further aspects of polis religion' AION x 259-274

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1990) 'What is polis religion' in O. Murray and S.R.F. Price eds. The Greek city from Homer to Alexander (Oxford) 295-322

Stylianou, P.J. (1983) 'Thucydides, the Panionian festival and the Ephesia (III 104), again' Historia xxxii 245-249

Thomas, R. (1989) Oral tradition and written record in classical Athens (Cambridge)

Tölle-Kastenbein, R. (1976) Herodot und Samos (Bochum)

Tomlinson, R.A. (1976) Greek sanctuaries (London)

Travlos, J. (1971) A pictorial dictionary of ancient Athens (London)

Tuchelt, K. (1984) 'Didyma' Ist. Mitt. xxxiv 193-240

Vanderpool, E. (1942) 'Inscribed stele from Marathon' Hesperia xi 329-337

Van Straten, F.T. (1981) 'Gifts for the gods' in Versnel 1981, 65-151

Venit, M. (1984) Greek pottery from the mainland found in Egypt unpublished PhD thesis (Michigan)

Vernant, J.-P. (1982) Myth and society in ancient Greece (London)

Versnel, H.S. (1981) Faith, hope and worship: aspects of the religious mentality in the ancient world (Leiden)

Vickers, M. (1985a) 'Artful crafts: metalwork and Athenian painted pottery' JHS cv 108-128

Vickers, M. (1985b) 'Early Greek coinage: a reassassment' NC cxlv 1-44

Vidal-Naquet, P. (1981) 'Land and sacrifice in the Odyssey: a study of religious and mythical meanings' in R.L. Gordon ed. Myth, religion and society: structuralist essays (Cambridge) 80-94

Walter, H. (1976) Das Heraion von Samos (Munich)

Walter, H. and Vierneisel, K. (1959) 'Heraion von Samos: die Funde der Kampagnen 1958 und 1959' AM lxxiv 10-34

Waters, K.H. (1985) Herodotos the historian (Beckenham)

Welter, G. (1923) 'Das Olympieion in Athen ii' AM xlviii 182-189

West, W.C. (1969) 'The trophies of the Persian wars' CP lxiv 7-19

Whatley, N. (1964) 'On the possibility of reconstructing Marathon and other ancient battles' JHS lxxxiv 119-139

Wheatley, P. (1971) The pivot of the four quarters: a preliminary enquiry into the origins and character of the ancient Chinese city (Edinburgh)

White, M. (1954) 'The duration of the Samian tyranny' JHS lxxiv 36-43

Wiegand, T. (1911) Erster vorläufiger Bericht über die von der Königlichen Museen unternommenen Ausgrabungen in Samos (Berlin)

Wycherley, R.E. (1963) 'The Pythion at Athens' AJA lxvii 75-79

Wycherley, R.E. (1964) 'The Olympieion at Athens' GRBS v 161-179

Zeitlin, F.I. (1982) Under the sign of the shield: semiotics and Aeschylus' Seven against Thebes (Rome)