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Abstract

The sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi has long been a popular subject for research among scholars, but the vast majority of studies have focused almost exclusively on the Delphic oracle. This thesis instead aims to explore in detail the use of the sanctuary as a space for elite interactions during the Archaic Period, an aspect of Delphi which has only briefly been mentioned by David Small (1994). More specifically, I analyse the nature of the Greek elite in order to determine how the characteristics of this social group led to their use of panhellenic sanctuaries such as Delphi as spaces of interaction and how those interactions were affected by the setting of the sanctuary.

The first chapter focuses on establishing the nature of the Greek elite during the Archaic Period, focusing on the effects of the economic, military, and religious changes which took place during the 8th century BCE as well as on elements of the elite lifestyle such as guest friendships, marriages, and competition which encouraged interpolital interactions. I then examine Delphi’s status as an interstate sanctuary and the advantages provided by such sanctuaries which led to their being used as spaces for elite interactions.

The second chapter examines a variety of different elite interactions which took place within the sanctuary at Delphi and explores how each interaction was shaped by the elite characteristics detailed in the first chapter. I show how the regular gatherings of a large number of elites made Delphi an advantageous site for interpolital interactions such as the making of guest friendships and marriage alliances as well as for competitive interactions such as displays of wealth through dedications and athletic competitions.
This study demonstrates that the developments of the 8th century BCE affected the nature of the Greek elite in such a way that it pushed their interactions and private affairs outside the territory of the *polis* and into interstate sanctuaries such as Delphi. The opportunity for regular gatherings at Delphi coupled with the elite inclination towards inter-political interactions and agonistic displays also encouraged a variety of Greek elite interactions within the Delphi sanctuary.
Preface

This dissertation is original, unpublished, independent work by the author, Maude Côté-Landry.
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Introduction

The oracle of Apollo at Delphi has been the subject of countless studies by modern scholars. The functioning of its oracle, the Pythia, and the political reach of the oracle have inspired numerous investigations, publications, and their fair share of speculation. However, little attention was paid to the many other aspects of the sanctuary until fairly recently. Catherine Morgan (1990) was one of the first to shift her focus away from the oracle and to investigate the sanctuary of Delphi during the 9th and 8th centuries BCE and its shift from a local sanctuary used primarily by the town of Delphi to a panhellenic site. Michael Scott (2010) chose to investigate the monumental dedications found within the Delphic sanctuary and to focus on their special arrangement. David Small (1994) briefly discussed the use of panhellenic sanctuaries such as Delphi as spaces for elite interactions. These more recent publications have shifted the focus of Delphic studies and broadened its scope.

Small’s brief exploration of elite interactions raised many questions, and I believe that the concept merits a more thorough examination. I therefore propose to conduct an analysis of the nature of the Greek elite in order to determine how the characteristics of this social group led to their use of panhellenic sanctuaries such as Delphi as spaces of interaction and how those interactions were affected by the setting of the sanctuary. For this thesis, I shall focus on the Archaic Period, as it was during this time period that the Delphic sanctuary grew in popularity and became one of the most renowned sanctuaries in Greece. In the first chapter, I shall begin by examining which parts of the Greek population were considered elites, what the necessary qualifications for membership in this group were, and which

---

1 See Scott, 2014, Fontenrose, 1978, and Dempsey, 1918, for detailed examinations of the oracle from its beginnings to its fall in the late Roman Empire.
aspects of the elite lifestyle might have influenced their interactions at Delphi. I shall then discuss the importance of Delphi’s status as an interstate sanctuary, meaning a sanctuary which was situated outside the territory of major city-states.

In the second chapter, I shall conduct a detailed analysis of the different types of elite interactions which were present within the Delphic sanctuary. I shall begin by looking at interactions such as trade, marriage alliances, and the creation and maintenance of guest friendships, all of which hinged on the interactions of elites from different parts of Greece. I shall then examine more competitive interactions, such as the many votive offerings which have been found within the sanctuary and the athletic competitions which took place during the Pythian games. Throughout this chapter, I shall examine how each interaction was affected by the nature of the Greek elite presented in the first chapter.

Ancient literary sources will be cited throughout this paper according to the conventions found in the *OCD* (2012). All translations of Greek passages are my own.
Chapter 1: Greek Elites and Interstate Sanctuaries

1.1 Who Were the Greek Elites?

In order to understand the variety of elite activities going on at Delphi during the Archaic Period, it is necessary to first explore two important aspects which deeply influenced these activities: the nature and identity of the Greek elites and the significance of Delphi’s position as an interstate sanctuary. I shall begin by examining which parts of the Greek population were considered elites, what the necessary qualifications for membership in this group were, and what kinds of social advantages and obligations accompanied this elite status.

First, it is necessary to define what I mean when I am speaking of the Greek elite. Which parts of the population were included in this group? Many attempts have been made to answer this question, either by attempting to identify the elite as a political group or a particular *genos*. However, none of these attempts have produced a satisfying, cohesive image of the Greek elite. Instead, throughout this thesis I shall be using Duplouy’s definition of the Greek elite, explained in his 2006 book “Le prestige des élites.” Duplouy argues that the Greek elite was performative in nature; the Greek elite were those who visibly engaged in elite activities and lived according to the elite lifestyle. These elite activities, including participation in symposia, paying liturgies, participating in guest-friendships, and competing in athletic competitions, were for the most part activities in which the heroes of the Homeric

---

2 For attempts to identify the Greek elite as a political group, see Carlier, 1984 and Arnheim, 1977. For elites as a particular *genos*, see Ménager, 1980 and Wathelet, 1998.
3 See Duplouy, 2006, 12-24 for a discussion of these attempts and of the various problems which arose from each one.
4 Duplouy, 2006, 24-30.
Considering the large influence of the Homeric epics of Greek society as a whole during the Archaic Period, it is not surprising that the elites would have sought to emulate Homeric heroes. According to this view of the Greek elite, money was only important in so far as it allowed individuals to engage in elite behaviours. Any individual who could afford to visibly engage in this lifestyle and chose to do so became a part of the elite. These characteristic of the Greek elite will be discussed in further detail below. First however, I wish to examine how this type of elite arose in the Archaic Period. In order to answer this question, it is necessary to look at the many changes which occurred during the 8th century BCE, how these changes led to a dramatic rise in population around the Aegean Sea, and how social structures in Greece were adapted to work with this growing population, as these changes directly influenced the nature of the Greek elite.

The 8th century BCE saw a rise in population throughout the Mediterranean basin, including in mainland Greece. There are many different estimates for the exact magnitude of the population growth. At the higher end of the estimates, Snodgrass has suggested a 3-4% yearly increase in Athens and Argos, which would result in the population doubling in these areas within 20 years. This estimate, however, is based on the number of graves found in Attica and in the Argolid, with the result that it is very likely too high. The higher number of graves may result from a higher population density, but it is also very likely to be influenced by changes in burial practices which appear at the same time. The graves studied by Snodgrass included between 5 and 10% infant or child graves during the 9th century, while

---

6 Duplouy, 2006, 30.  
this number rises to 50 to 60% for the graves from the late 8th century.\textsuperscript{8} The 8th century percentage falls into the numbers which are expected for child mortality rates in antiquity, which usually range from 35 to 55%. In addition, this percentage of children’s tombs remains stable through the 7th century.\textsuperscript{9} This indicates that the 8th century rise in infant and children’s graves was not caused by a catastrophe leading to more deaths, but instead reflects a change in burial practices where a large majority of infants and children were buried, as opposed to the selective burial practices reflected in the low child burial percentages of the 9th century. Adjusting for this change in burial practices however still results in a large population increase; Morris has calculated that the overall population of Greece doubled over the 8th century, with some of the larger settlements going from approximately 1500 people during the 10th century BCE to around 5000 by the end of the 8th century.\textsuperscript{10}

There are a variety of plausible causes for this occurrence. Morris suggests that the root cause was climate change. Between 850 and 750 BCE, Greece shifted from having a hot dry sub-Boreal climate to a cool wet sub-Atlantic system.\textsuperscript{11} While this climate change was not beneficial to all areas around Europe, the increase in reliable rainfall in Greece, and throughout most of the Mediterranean, resulted in population growth due to the fact that the main check on expansion previously seems to have been the annual variability of rainfall. Tandy attributes the increase to a change of diet and an increase in agriculture. Starting around 850 BCE, the diet of the average Greek started changing to include a growing amount of grains, which results in better health, more children, and longer life spans.\textsuperscript{12} Some also

\textsuperscript{8} Tandy, 1997, 24.
\textsuperscript{9} Tandy, 1997, 25.
\textsuperscript{10} Morris, 2009, 66-67; Tandy (1997) arrives to similar numbers, as does Hall (2007).
\textsuperscript{11} Morris, 2009, 67.
\textsuperscript{12} Ober, 2010; Morris, 2004; Tandy, 1997, 38-43.
argue that the population growth was encouraged by a higher overall standard of living because of the increased wealth that Greece created through trade. Many colonies were founded during the 8th century from Italy to the Black Sea, encouraging more interactions between Greece and the rest of the Mediterranean Sea and resulting in more widespread trade routes. These factors probably all contributed, as they would have precipitated one another; the change in climate would have facilitated the growing of grain, and the initial population boost created by better nutrition would have caused people to leave for colonising expeditions, which in turn would have increased trade with other areas around the Mediterranean Sea and resulted in a higher standard of living, thus promoting even greater population growth.

The large increase in population over the course of the 8th century BCE resulted in large changes in the social institutions of Greece, as the institutions in place during the 10th and 9th centuries could not accommodate such a large population, being better suited to small villages. Morris highlights three factors which greatly affected the shape of the social institutions which emerged from the 8th century: Greece’s economy, the nature of Greek warfare, and religion. Because these factors greatly affected the nature of the Greek elites throughout the Archaic Period, I shall now discuss each briefly.

Economically, there was a small amount of social stratification during the 9th and early 8th centuries. Housing sizes show little variation, with the average house size measuring approximately 50 m². Stratification increased throughout the 7th and 6th centuries to the point that social reforms had to be put in place in Athens to deal with the overwhelming

---

14 Morris, 2009, 74-75.
problem of debt. However even during the 5th century, elites did not achieve the same level of wealth as that which could be found in Lydia or Persia. During a naval battle at Artemisium, Herodotus thinks it worthy of mention that the Athenian Cleinias provided a whole ship and crew at his own expense. This does not represent substantial wealth when compared to the lavish dedications given by Croesus to several Greek temples, or to the gift of the Lydian Pythios to Xerxes of 2000 talents of silver and nearly 4,000,000 gold staters. Elite wealth came primarily from agriculture, which was often supplemented by livestock or workshops. Many elites also engaged in trade, though the Odyssey indicates that trade was considered by some elements of society as unsuitable for the elite. The wealth acquired by these means was great, but not large enough that it was unthinkable for a member of the non-elite to attain a similar fortune.

Concerning warfare, the late 8th century saw the development of a new type of fighting style, hoplite fighting. This style of fighting was widespread through Greece by 700 BCE, as evidenced by the finding of hoplite armour and weapons as well as the depiction of hoplite formations on pottery. As Morris points out, hoplite fighting offered very little opportunity to distinguish oneself on the battlefield. This is in direct contrast to the fighting style appearing in the Homeric epics, where the Greek elites regularly set themselves apart in

---

16 Stahl and Walter, 2009, 143-145.
17 Morris, 2009, 74. This statement applies primarily to mainland Greece. The economic situation varied in many Greek colonies, especially the city-states of Italy and Sicily, due in part to the different geographical landscape or to the absence of rivalry for territory. However, the discussion here will focus on the mainland due to a greater availability of sources of information.
18 Histories 8.17.
19 Histories 1.50-52 (Croesus’ gifts), 7.28 (Pythios’ gift).
20 Small, 1994, 292.
21 Hesiod (Works and Days 641-670) advises farmers to engage in trade during the slow agricultural months. However, Odysseus (8.162) is insulted by being told he looks less like an athlete than a captain of sailors who are traders.
23 Morris, 2009, 75.
battle and earn glory and status through their martial exploits. Hoplite fighting, while extremely effective, did not offer the same opportunities for individual glory.

Another effect which Morris does not mention is that this style of fighting makes it impossible for the Greek elite to maintain a physical distance between themselves and the non-elite. As is shown by the story of Deioces in Herodotus, keeping a physical separation between different social strata helps to maintain the myth that the elites are objectively superior and therefore inherently deserve to be of higher social standing.\(^{24}\) Deioces uses spatial separation after he is elected king to keep his previous social equals from realizing that he was similar to them in fortune and in background and that kingship was therefore something that they could aspire to. Hoplite fighting made it necessary for elites and non-elites to fight closely side by side and to practice together on a regular basis, thus preventing Greek elites from spatially setting themselves apart from the non-elites.

The last aspect discussed by Morris is religion. He argues that unlike Lydian and Persian kings who claimed to have special access to and favour of the gods, or Egyptian pharaohs who claimed to be gods themselves, Archaic Greece did not have divine kingships or sacred priestly classes.\(^ {25}\) According to Mazarakis Ainian in his detailed study of Dark Age Greek religion and of its transition to classical religion, Dark Age chiefs generally held religious ceremonies within their homes. As such, their homes essentially served as temples and religious centres for the community.\(^ {26}\) He then traces the emergence of a separation between social authority and religious authority between 750 and 700 BCE, a separation

\(^{24}\) *Histories* 1.98-99.

\(^{25}\) Morris, 2009, 75.

which is marked by the emergence of separate temples in Greek communities.\footnote{Mazarakis Ainian, 1997, 381-396.} As a result of this separation, Greek elites in the Archaic Period did not use ideas of divine kingship as support for their right to rule. And yet, it is worth noting that in many cases Greek elites did seek to increase their status by claiming heroic ancestors.\footnote{See Duplouy, 2006, 37-63 for an analysis of the factors leading Greek elites to claim heroic ancestry. While I believe that this phenomenon is different from eastern notions of divine kingship in degree only, not in kind, a proper exploration of heroic ancestors in Greece will have to wait for a later time.} Morris’ claim that Archaic Greeks did not have divine kingships also may not hold true for all Greek territories. As de Angelis and Garstad have shown, Sicily at least engaged in worship of \textit{oikistes} and worshiped some rulers as divinities at least by the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, and perhaps as early as the 8\textsuperscript{th} or 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE.\footnote{De Angelis and Garstad, 2006, 219-225.} Morris’ argument does seem to hold true for mainland Greece, and it can be said that most of Archaic Greece did not use divine kingship as support for the elite’s right to rule to the same extent as many Near Eastern cultures.

As a result of these three factors, individual Greek elites in the Archaic Period did not have sufficient economic resources, status and popularity acquired through martial prowess, or religious authority to establish a single economic and political centre above the other Greek elites. This lack of central authority resulted in the many independent city-states of Archaic and Classical Greece which were not unified until Greece was conquered by Philip of Macedon in the mid-4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE.\footnote{Littman, 1974, 10.} Individual elites not only did not have the resources to unite Greece, they also rarely achieved sole dominance of a single city-state, more often ruling as an oligarchic group. A few exceptions became tyrants, especially during the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, which is sometimes referred to as the “Age of Tyranny” in Greece.\footnote{Morris, 2009, 75-76.}
However, it must be noted that these tyrants did not achieve dominance of the *polis* through their own resources, but through popular support, usually making use of anti-oligarchic sentiments among the population.\textsuperscript{32}

Another effect of the economic, martial, and religious factors mentioned above was that elite status did not seem unachievable to non-elites. As has already been stated, most Greek elites did not have such a vast amount of wealth so as to make it impossible for a wealthy farm owner or merchant to work his way up. In addition, the lack of physical separation between elites and non-elites compounded with the lack of divine favour to justify the elites’ status resulted in the non-elites viewing elites as fellow citizens who were wealthier, but not necessarily innately better or different. This resulted in a high level of social mobility among the elites; wealthier non-elites could and did aspire to become part of the elites.\textsuperscript{33} This fact was not agreeable to everyone; the poetry attributed to Theognis of Megara in the mid-6\textsuperscript{th} century shows the attitude which some individuals from long-standing elite families had towards the newly wealthy.

\[\text{κριοὺς μὲν καὶ ὀνους διζῆμεθα, Κῦρνε, καὶ ἵππους εὐγενέας, καὶ τις βούλεται ἔξ ἀγαθῶν πάσασθαι: γῆμαι δὲ κακὴν κακοῦ οὗ μελεδαίνει ἐσθλὸς ἀνήρ, ἢν τις χρήματα πολλὰ διδόθη: οὐδὲ γυνὴ κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναίνεται εἶναι ἄκοιτος πλουσίος, ὀλλ᾽ ἄφνοιν βούλεται ἄντ᾽ ἀγαθοῦ. χρήματα γὰρ τιμῶσι: καὶ ἐκ κακοῦ ἐσθλὸς ἔγημεν καὶ κακὸς ἔξ ἀγαθοῦ: πλοῦτος ἔμειξες γένος.}\textsuperscript{34}

We seek well-born goats or asses or horses, Kyrnos, and a man wants to acquire them from good stock; but a good man does not hesitate to marry an ill-born woman from an ill-born father, if a man gives him a lot of money; nor

\textsuperscript{32} Again, this statement is truer for mainland Greece than for many of the Greek colonies. Tyrants were especially successful in the western city-states, and their regime also tended to be more stable, whereas many mainland tyrants did not last more than a generation or two. See McGlew, 1993, 14-52.

\textsuperscript{33} Duplouy, 2006, 12-22.

\textsuperscript{34} Theognis 183-190.
is a woman ashamed to be the wife of an ill-born man who is rich, but wishes to be wealthy rather than good. For they honour money, and good marries ill-born, and ill-born good: wealth has mixed the race.

This reaction against marriages between older elite families and newly enriched ones indicates that such marriages were occurring, and that former non-elites were joining the ranks of higher society through wealth and marriage alliances.

The poetry of Theognis also seems to indicate that the Greek elite was at some point formed of a distinct group of nobly born individuals, who referred to themselves as *aristoi*. As has been mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, many scholars have attempted to identify this group, often by looking at the *genos* as the social unit of distinction between the *aristoi* and the rest of the population.\(^35\) The picture which emerges from these studies however is that of a much more unstable, variable elite. Rather than belonging to specific noble families or holding particular political and social functions, it seems that being a part of the Greek elite depended on wealth and on adopting a certain lifestyle and set of behaviours.\(^36\) In addition, an individual’s elite status was rather unstable and had to be reaffirmed constantly throughout his life through displays of wealth or participation in elite activities such as symposia, athletic competitions, or rhetoric.\(^37\)

It is also apparent that wealth was not important in its own right, but rather because it allowed individuals to participate in elite activities, as has been mentioned above. Money was meant to be used to gain more glory, a better reputation, or to help friends, as is stated by Pindar in the first Isthmian and Nemean odes.

---

\(^35\) See Duplouy, 2006, 16-23 for a discussion of the various attempts to identify a specific elite class.


\(^37\) Duplouy, 2006, 24-35. For this reason, it is perhaps better to avoid referring to the Greek elite as an aristocracy, regardless of the Greek origin of the term; the nature of the Greek elite differs greatly from the rigid and well-defined style of social class which is evoked by this term.
εἰ δὲ τὶς ἐνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον,
ἄλλοις δ᾽ ἐμπίπτων γελᾶ, ψυχὰν Ἀδὰ τελέων οὐ φράζεται δόξας ἄνευθεν.\textsuperscript{38}

But if someone hoards hidden wealth at home, and attacks others with derision, he does not consider that he is giving up his soul to Hades without glory.

οὐκ ἔραμαι πολύν ἐν μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν,
ἄλλ᾽ ἔόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φίλους ἐξαρκέων.\textsuperscript{39}

I take no pleasure in keeping great wealth hidden away in my hall, but in using what I have to experience good things and a good reputation by helping my friends.

Both of these passages indicate that the accumulation of wealth for its own sake was considered a waste, as the purpose of wealth was to improve how others saw you. On the other hand, it is possible that our literary sources downplay the importance of wealth as a criterion for belonging to the elite. This is indicated in Solon’s division of the Athenian population according to wealth.\textsuperscript{40} His division of the people into Pentacosiomedimnoi, Hippeis, Zeugitai, and Thetes shows that the concept of social division according to wealth was no alien to the Greek mindset.

Greek society in general was very concerned with how one was seen by others; scholars often describe it as a shame culture rather than a guilt culture.\textsuperscript{41} What was important was how one seemed to others, and not how he actually was or considered himself to be. This attitude is reflected in Hesiod’s \textit{Works and Days}.

\begin{quote}
ῶδ᾽ ἔρδειν: δεινὴν δὲ βροτῶν ὑπαλεύει φήμην.
φήμη γὰρ τε κακὴ πέλεται, κοῦφη μὲν ἄειραι
ῥέα μάλ᾽, ἀργαλέη δὲ φέρειν, χαλέπη δ᾽ ἀποθέσθαι.
φήμη δ᾽ οὕτως πάμπαν ἀπολλυται, ἧν τινα πολλοῖ
λαοῖ φημίξωσι: θεός νὸ τίς ἐστι καὶ αὐτή.\textsuperscript{42}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{38} Isthmian 1.67-68.
\textsuperscript{39} Nemean 1.31-32.
\textsuperscript{40} Aristotle, Athenian constitution, 7.
\textsuperscript{41} Donlan, 1980, 4-5; Duplouy, 2006, 271.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Works and days} 760-764.
So act: and avoid the fearful talk of men. 
For talk is wicked, light, and very easy to raise, 
but painful to bear and difficult to set aside. 
Talk never wholly dies away when many people 
voice it: it is even in some ways divine.

The importance of appearances is also clearly visible throughout the Homeric epics, especially in the *Iliad.* The major conflicts are for the most part caused by a Homeric hero’s unwillingness to look weak in front of his peers, or by what is perceived as a public slight to that hero’s honour; Achilles’ conflict with Agamemnon falls under this category, as does Paris’ decision to fight Menelaus. In addition, many of the conversations between heroes reveal that it is the shame which would accompany retreat in front of their peers which keeps many heroes from fleeing from the battle.

Another aspect of the Greek elite lifestyle is competition, as has been briefly mentioned above. Because of the variable and unstable nature of elite membership, rank within the elite was not strictly defined, nor was it always clear. Competition against the other elites could determine rank, at least temporarily; an elite individual had to constantly prove his elite status through further competition in order to maintain it. In addition, while winning a contest increased the winner’s reputation and glory, a loss could conversely decrease these things; the concept of glory in Greece was seen as a zero-sum game, where

---

43 Throughout this thesis, I shall refer to the Homeric epics with the assumption that the social institutions and behaviours present in the epics reflect those in place in the 8th and early 7th centuries BCE. While many of the details such as armour and weapons reflect earlier time periods in order to create narrative distance for the audience, I believe that the overall social norms in the epics must have reflected those of their intended audience in order to be understandable. For a longer discussion on the subject, see Morris, 1986, or Murray, 2001, 35-39.
44 See *Iliad* 1 for the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon; See *Iliad* 3 for the duel between Paris and Agamemnon.
45 *Iliad* 14.82, 17.85, 22.90.
some had to lose glory in order for others to gain it.\textsuperscript{47} Because of this, elite individuals had to engage in competitions regularly, as the victories of others could eclipse and diminish their own.

There were a variety of competitive activities available to an elite individual wishing to distinguish himself. Generous liturgies, rhetoric, impressive dedications, musical contests, and athletic competitions were all aspects of elite life where one could compete against his peers and gain \textit{time} through victory. Athletic competitions in particular were associated with the elite; an athlete’s body was considered to be acquired through specific training in the gymnasia, for which a generous amount of leisure was necessary.\textsuperscript{48} This association of an athletic body with leisure rather than with hard work is apparent in the insult leveled at Odysseus by the Phaeacian Euryalus.

\begin{quote}
oὐ γάρ σ᾽ οὐδὲ, ξεῖνε, δαήμονι φωτὶ ἔσκο
ἀθλῶν, οἷα τε πολλὰ μετ᾽ ἀνθρώποις πέλονται,
ἀλλὰ τῷ, ὡς θ᾽ ἀμα νη πολυκλῆιδι θαμίζον,
ἄρχος ναυτάων οἳ τε πρηκτήρες ἔσαιν,
φόρτου τε μνήμων καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἵσιν ὑδαίων
κερδέων θ᾽ ἄρπαλέων: οὐδ᾽ ἀθλητήρι ἑοικας.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

No indeed, stranger, for I do not liken you to a man who is experienced in contests, such as there are many among men, but to one who, coming and going again with his well-benched ship, is a captain of sailors who are traders, mindful of his cargo, and is the overseer of his merchandise and of the gains of his greed. You do not look like an athlete.

In this passage, we see that being an athlete was strongly associated with the elite, while a ship’s captain was seen as having a lower social status. Euryalus denies Odysseus’ claim to belong to the elite by stating that he resembles a captain rather than an athlete. The

\begin{footnotes}
\item[48] See Miller, 2004, or Golden, 2008 for further explorations of Greek athletic competitions.
\item[49] \textit{Odyssey} 8.159-164
\end{footnotes}
connection between athletic competition and social status will be further explored in the second chapter.

The last aspect of the Greek elite lifestyle which I wish to discuss here is ritualized guest-friendship and gift exchange. Guest-friendship consisted of a ritualized agreement between two parties from different social units; there are records of guest-friendships between Greeks of different city-states, between members of Greek cities and of Greek territories, between Greeks and non-Greeks, and also between non-Greeks from different places. Guest-friendships were never formulated between two individuals of the same city-state or territory. The duties expected from guest-friends, referred to as xenoi, shared many similarities with those which would be expected from a kinsman. Xenoi were expected to help one another socially and economically. Like kinship, guest-friendship was expected to endure perpetually. Children inherited their parent’s xenoi, so that these ritualized friendships could span several generations. This is the case with Diomedes and Glaucus in book six of the Iliad; while Glaucus and Diomedes themselves have never met, they discover that their grandfathers had established a xenos-bond and straightaway stop fighting, and instead exchange armour and go off to fight other Greeks and Trojans respectively. Xenoi could also be expected to provide help for the friends or relatives of their guest-friends, as can be seen from Crito’s offer to Socrates to flee to Thessaly where he has guest friends that would gladly take in the philosopher. A similar institution, proxenia, involved relationships

50 For an in-depth exploration of guest-friendship in the Greek world see Herman, 1987. For more general information on gift exchange, see Tandy, 1997, or Donlan, 1989.
51 Herman, 1987, 12.
52 Herman, 1987, 16-29.
53 Iliad 6.119-236. For an examination of the status relationship involved in this passage, see Donlan, 1989.
54 Crito 45c.
formulated between communities and individuals.\textsuperscript{55} In cases of \textit{proxenia}, the alliance was always between a community, usually a city-state, and a stranger to this community, who could be Greek or non-Greek. The stranger, or \textit{proxenos}, was expected to look after the interests of the allied community in his own area, acting in much the same way as a xenos would for his guest-friend.\textsuperscript{56}

Another aspect of guest-friendships was that they were expected to receive each other in their homes if one were to travel abroad to his \textit{xenos}’ city. The visitor would then receive gifts from his host, and would be expected to return the favour should the host travel to his \textit{xenos}’ city.\textsuperscript{57} These gifts were usually luxury goods. According to Tandy, the gift-giving associated with guest-friendships, which he identifies as an economic model based on reciprocity, was responsible for the majority of the circulation of luxury goods in Dark Age Greece, before the introduction of a market economy.\textsuperscript{58} Because of the expectations that gifts would be exchanged and that the gifts would have relatively similar values, guest-friendships seemed to have been exclusively reserved for the Greek elite.\textsuperscript{59} Entering into a guest-friendship could be risky; the possibility existed that one would offer lavish gifts to their \textit{xenos}, only to have their \textit{xenos} die before they can return the favour, or decide to reciprocate with much less valuable gifts. Of course, the latter situation could result in the acquisition of a bad reputation, and an individual who behaved that way would be much less likely to be able to enter into further guest-friendship agreements.\textsuperscript{60}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} See Herman, 1987, 130-142 for a discussion on \textit{proxenia} and its similarities to \textit{xenia}.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Herman, 1987, 130-131.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Tandy, 1997, 97.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Tandy, 1997, 100-101.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Herman, 1987, 34-35.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Donlan, 1989, 8.
\end{itemize}
Guest-friendships appear to have worked in much the same way as marriage to create political alliances between elites of different city-states.\textsuperscript{61} The reputation and resources of one’s xenoi affected one’s reputation within his own community, just as the reputation and resources of one’s sons- and daughters-in-law would. Unlike marriage alliances however, guest-friendships were not limited to the number of offspring an individual might have. The network of alliances created by guest-friendships resulted in a Greek elite with many interstate connections. As has already been noted, Greek elites lacked a social or economic centre where they could have gathered to interact with their guest-friends or where they could meet to create new guest-friendships. Instead, elite interactions such as the formation of new xenoi centred on inter-state sanctuaries such as the one at Delphi, an aspect of the sanctuary to which I shall now turn.

1.2 Delphi as an Interstate Sanctuary

The second aspect which needs to be explored is Delphi’s status as an interstate sanctuary, meaning a sanctuary which was situated outside the territorial limits of the city-states which made use of it. The Delphic sanctuary was first administered by the small village of Delphi; after the early 6\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, control of the sanctuary passed to the Delphic Amphictyony.\textsuperscript{62} As a result, Delphi was located outside the territory and direct control of any single larger Greek city-state throughout the Archaic Period, a fact which had a large impact on the types of interactions present at the sanctuary as well as on the political implications of these interactions, as will be demonstrated below. I therefore want to explore

\textsuperscript{61} Herman, 1987, 36-37.
\textsuperscript{62} Morgan, 1990, 135-136; Scott 2010, 51-54.
the importance of Delphi’s location outside the territory of major Greek city-states in relation to the elite activities which occurred within the sanctuary.

Delphi was not unique or unusual in the fact that it was geographically and politically removed from larger Greek city-states during the Archaic Period. The majority of panhellenic sanctuaries followed this same trend; Delos, Olympia, Delphi, Nemea, and Isthmia were located either outside the territory of larger city-states or, in the case of Nemea and Isthmia, at the edges of Argive and Corinthian territory respectively. Politically, Delos remained independent until the mid-fifth century when Athens took over the sanctuary, while the administration of Olympia alternatively fell to Pisa and to Elis, two fairly small and politically weak city-states. Until the early 6th century, Delphi was administered by the small village of Delphi; the sanctuary started out as a local shrine which slowly grew in popularity throughout the Archaic Period. After the early 6th century, control of the sanctuary passed to the Delphic Amphictyon, possibly as a result of the First Sacred War. The Amphictyon was composed of various city-states and regions including Athens, Sikyon, and Thessaly. As a result, control of Delphi remained outside the hold of any one large city-state. Nemea was administered by Kleonai until the fifth century, when Argos formally took over the sanctuary. The case for Isthmia, the last sanctuary included in the periodos, differs from this pattern. Isthmia was controlled directly by Corinth from the sanctuary’s beginnings. It is worth noting that of the sanctuaries forming the periodos, Nemea and

---

64 For an examination of the historicity of the First Sacred War, see Morgan, 1990, 135-136, or Scott 2010, 51-54. While the details of the war and its historicity are in question, the changes which are thought to have come to be as results of the war, namely the seizure of Delphic administration by the Amphictyon, are readily apparent in the archaeological records around 580 BCE, as is examined in both of the above mentioned works.
65 Forrest, 1956, 33.
67 See de Polignac, 2009, 439.
Isthmia, which were more heavily under the control of a particular city-state, attracted interstate activities later than Delphi and Olympia and were never as popular as the older pair.\(^{68}\) It can be concluded that geographical and political marginality were popular traits of panhellenic sanctuaries, and therefore were probably advantageous to the activities taking place in these sanctuaries.

According to Parker, Delphi’s location far away from the borders of larger city-states was due to the presence of Apollo’s oracle within the sanctuary.\(^{69}\) He argues that in the Greek mindset, authoritative oracles came from afar, and that Delphi’s remote location gave it more weight when it came to oracular consultations. This would also explain the later popularity of the oracle of Ammon in the fourth century, as this Egyptian oracle was even more remote and therefore even more authoritative. This attitude towards oracles could indeed have influenced Delphi’s popularity. However, this fact does little to explain the pattern of marginal panhellenic sanctuaries, especially as many of them, such as Delos and Olympia, either did not have an oracle or had a smaller, less popular one. This explanation also does not account for the many other activities which took place at the Delphic sanctuary.

As Scott has pointed out, the oracle tends to be the focus of any Delphic study to the detriment of the rest of the sanctuary.\(^{70}\) His studies focus instead on the monumental dedications, and he shows that these dedications were often made independently of any oracular consultation, since at times the states which were most active with regard to the consultation of the Pythia do not correspond with the states which were most active in monumental dedications at the time. In addition, single states did not necessarily have their

---

\(^{68}\) Morgan, 1990, 213. Delphi and Olympia show signs of interstate activity from their beginning, while Isthmia and Nemea develop interstate functions during the early 6\(^{th}\) century.

\(^{69}\) Parker, 2000, 79.

\(^{70}\) Scott, 2010, 5-8.
busiest periods of dedication corresponding with a time of more active consultation. It is therefore necessary to look for explanations in addition to the presence of an oracle.

One clear advantage of having a sanctuary situated outside the bounds of major city-states is that it provided politically neutral ground. Delphi was used as a meeting place for elites from a large variety of city-states, as I shall examine in detail in the next chapter. The fact that it was located outside the territory of these city-states meant that no one could claim a ‘home-court’ advantage or feel slighted by the choice of location. Indeed Delphi took great pains to project an image of political neutrality throughout the Archaic and the Classical period. The marginal location of Delphi and of other interstate sanctuaries also allowed for more freedom when it came to putting up dedications. For example, a Corinthian citizen may have been unwilling to dedicate expensive offerings at an Athenian sanctuary, as the impressive nature of his offering would enhance and glorify the Athenian sanctuary and therefore the Athenian state. On the other hand, the Athenians may have been equally hesitant to allow a dedication from a Corinthian citizen in their polis sanctuary, because such a dedication could imply Corinthian political influence in the city. Interstate sanctuaries located outside of the major city-states were for the most part free of such complications. They even received dedications from eastern rulers at times; Delphi boasted several rich offerings from the Lydian king Gyges and the Phrygian King Midas, and the offerings made there by Lydian king Croesus are described in detail by Herodotus. Such dedications would not have been welcome within a polis sanctuary, since they were primarily political

---

74 For Gyges’ and Midas’ dedications, see Herodotus, Histories 1.14. For the dedications made by Croesus, see Histories 1.50-51.
statements about the eastern kings’ positions of power and therefore their presence in the middle of a city-state could have implied political submissiveness on the part of the city-state.\(^{75}\)

The political advantages provided by the use of a space outside the territory and control or major city-states as a nexus for elite interactions are clear. It must be noted however that this particular pattern of interaction is unusual for this time period and for civilisations at a similar organisational and technological level. As David B. Small points out, the most common model for economic and social interactions within early states such as those found in Greece in the Archaic Period is to have the interests of the elites coinciding with the interests of the state, while spaces outside the state itself usually align with the interests of the lower class.\(^{76}\) Unlike many other civilisations like the Roman or Persian Empires, the government of the Greek city-states did not offer economic advantages to the elites through extra land, lucrative political appointments such as governorships, or even through preferential taxation policies on trade goods.\(^{77}\) Indeed, Greek poleis had very loose economic policies; the states collected revenue through taxation, which was often only applied to metics and later in the Archaic Period as a harbour tax, and through state-owned resources, such as the Athenian silver mines, while expenditures were usually restricted to supporting the army, procuring enough grain to support the citizens, and in the case of Athens paying citizens for services to the polis such as holding public offices, sitting in a jury, or, after the early 5\(^{th}\) century, rowing in the Athenian navy.\(^{78}\)

\(^{75}\) Morgan, 1990, 226-227.
\(^{76}\) Small, 1994, 287-288.
\(^{77}\) Small, 1994, 293-294.
\(^{78}\) Salmon, 1999; Small, 1994, 297-298.
One of the main factors which influenced this atypical development was the lack of a central political power in Greece. The factors which influenced this development have already been explored above. As a result of this lack of central political and economic organisation, 8th century Greek elites needed to find alternative spaces for interpolital interactions. Interstate sanctuaries offered a suitable alternative because of the advantages discussed above which were provided by their politically neutral nature. In addition, festivals and competitive games held at the interstate sanctuaries provided the opportunity for interactions between a larger number of elites from a variety of states than could be achieved through such interaction opportunities as warfare or diplomatic visits.\(^7^9\) The various festivals also offered fairly regular occasions for these meetings; this feature was enhanced at the beginning of the 6th century by the creation of the *periodos*, a formalized game circuit which included the games at Olympia, Delphi, Nemea, and Isthmia. The games at Olympia and Delphi were held every four years and the games at Nemea and Isthmia were held every two years with the result that there was always at least one major competition every year.\(^8^0\)

Because of the marginal nature of interstate sanctuaries, Small believes that elite interests also became associated with marginality and therefore came to have no place within the *polis* itself in the Greek mindset.\(^8^1\) On the other hand, the state began to promote a more egalitarian mindset which was primarily concerned with the needs of the citizen body as a whole, rather than exclusively with the elites. This movement was influenced by the development of hoplite fighting around 700 BCE. As has been mentioned above, this style of fighting prevented individual elites from distinguishing themselves in the style of Homeric

---

\(^7^9\) Small, 1994, 305.
\(^8^0\) de Polignac, 2009, 439.
\(^8^1\) Small, 1994, 303.
heroes. Its tactics also encouraged a more egalitarian mindset among the soldiers, as all soldiers fought in the same formations on equal ground with one another, barring differences in the quality of their armour. Soldiers did not need great wealth to participate in this style of fighting; most small land owners could afford the necessary equipment, with the result that the hoplite army is usually thought to have included the top third of the adult males in the state.\textsuperscript{82} This percentage may be even higher, as Hall points out, since the back rows of the hoplite phalanx did not need to be fully equipped as they were mostly used to add power to the front ranks’ push forward.\textsuperscript{83} In most states, those qualifying for service in the hoplite army also qualified as citizens, since land ownership was usually the determining criterion for both of these groups. This group of soldier-citizens came to dominate politics and state interests in the majority of Greek states.\textsuperscript{84}

As a result of the fact that private elite affairs were regularly conducted outside the boundaries of the state in marginal sanctuaries, state interests were free to turn away from elite needs and instead focus on the interests of the larger class of warrior-citizens, many of whom were small landowners. This resulted in a clear divide between public and private affairs; private elite business looked outwards and was conducted in marginal spaces, while the state focused on public affairs and looked inwards to its citizens. This split between private and public interests is at the core of the unusual pattern of interaction found in Greek states.

There is another factor which may have pushed elite interactions to marginal spaces such as Delphi and other interstate sanctuaries. As I shall explore in further detail in the

\textsuperscript{82} Murray, 2001, 125.
\textsuperscript{83} Hall, 2007, 163-170.
\textsuperscript{84} Frost, 1987, 101-102.
second chapter, trade was an important part of the elite interactions taking place at interstate sanctuaries, and played a particularly important role in the rise of the Delphic sanctuary. I therefore wish to examine its place within the redistributive economic model present in early Archaic Greece.

David Tandy argues that the economy of early Archaic Greece functioned primarily thanks to reciprocity and redistribution.\(^{85}\) Reciprocity has already been discussed in the context of gift exchange and guest friendships among the elite and does not need to be discussed further here. Redistribution consists of an economic system where goods move from the periphery to a social and economic centre, and are then redistributed back out to the periphery. This system can take place in a unit as small as a household, where goods are pooled and then allocated to individual members according to their needs, or it can be applied to villages and larger territories. Within a redistributive system, the centre has a higher social status than the periphery, which justifies its receipt of communal goods. Those goods however are obligated back to the social unit; they must be used in a way that will benefit the unit. This can be accomplished by taking the goods to make a display of wealth which will increase the status of the centre, and therefore the unit as a whole, to finance ventures which will benefit the unit, such as public buildings or warfare in the case of a village, or the goods can be used to sustain the members of the unit. Essentially, the periphery gives its goods to the centre as a sign of deference and an acknowledgment of the centre’s status, and the centre uses it in some way to benefit the unit as a whole as a sign of the centre’s magnanimity, thus further increasing its status.

\(^{85}\) See Tandy, 1997, 84-111 for a more detailed examination of reciprocity and redistribution in the context of Dark Age Greek society.
Greece appears to have operated largely under a redistributive system during the early Archaic Period. The earliest evidence for such a system comes from the tomb of an Athenian woman, dating to approximately 850 BCE. Model granaries were found in the tomb indicating that the woman’s family engaged in some level of grain redistribution, though it is not possible to determine the scale of this enterprise. 86 There is then an increase of such granary models found from Lefkandi dating to the 8th century BCE, indicating an increase in centralized storage of grain which could be explained by the emergence of a redistributive system. A few foundations for actual granaries have also been found, including structure Theta at Lefkandi. 87

Several passages in the Iliad and the Odyssey also point to a redistributive economy within the epics, although we only get the centre’s point of view because of the epics’ focus on elite warriors. When Agamemnon is attempting to propitiate Achilles with gifts, he offers control of seven cities among other things. 88 In this context, Agamemnon is offering his role as the centre of the redistributive system of these cities to Achilles. The passage also shows that control of the centre was not hereditary or tied closely to one family, but that it could be transferred from person to person without the consultation of the peripheries. Similarly, in the Odyssey, Alcinous makes the following announcement to Odysseus among a council of the twelve other basiles ruling the people of Scheria:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἀλλ᾽ οἴς οἱ δῶμεν τρίποδα μέγαν ἢδὲ λέβητα} \\
\text{ἀνδρακάς: ἡμεῖς δ᾽ αὔτε ἀγειρόμενοι κατὰ δῆμον} \\
\text{τισόμεθ᾽: ἀργαλέον γὰρ ἐνα προικὸς χαρίσαισθαι.} \ 89
\end{align*}
\]

86 See Langdon, 2008, 142 for a discussion concerning the possible symbolism of these model granaries found in graves. See Tandy, 1997, 111-112 for a discussion concerning the connection between granaries and redistribution.
87 Tandy, 1997, 112.
88 Iliad 9.149-156.
89 Odyssey 13.1315.
But come now, let us give him a great tripod and a cauldron, each man of us; in turn we will repay ourselves by gathering it from throughout the people: it is hard to give freely at one’s own expense.

This passage shows that the group of thirteen basilees in Scheria have access to goods gathered from the people, and that they can use these goods to make a gift to an important visitor such as Odysseus. An impressive gift would generate gratitude from the visitor and increase the status of Scheria as a whole, and so it is appropriate for the centre, here the council of basilees, to use the goods gathered from the periphery for this purpose. The fact that the heroes of the Homeric epics do gather goods from the Greek populations and that these goods come with obligations is underscored by Menelaus, when he reminds his fellow leaders that they share drinks provided by the people’s labours in their assemblies, and that they must not be unworthy of this honour.\(^{90}\)

The clearest example of a redistributive system, albeit a small one, appears in the *Odyssey* on Odysseus’s boat. After Odysseus and some of his men escape the island of Polyphemus with a flock of sheep, the following division happens:

\[
\text{ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τὴν νῆσον ἀφικόμεθ᾽, ἔνθα περ ἄλλαι νῆς ἐσσελμοὶ μὲνον ἀθρόας, ἄμφι δ’ ἔταροι ἦτα’ ὅδυρόμενοι, ἡμέας ποτιδέγμενοι αἰει, νὴα μὲν ἐνθ’ ἐλθόντες ἐκέλασαμεν ἐν γημάθοισιν, ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτῶι βῆμεν ἑπὶ ῥημιᾶν θαλάσσης. μῆλα δὲ Κύκλωπος γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νησὶς ἐλόντες δασσάμεθ’, ὡς μὴ τίς μοι ἀπεμβόμενος κίον ἵσης. ἀρνείον δ’ ἐμοὶ οὐ ἐκενήθης ἐταῖροι μῆλων δαιμένων δόσαν ἐξοχα: τὸν δ’ ἐπὶ θινὶ Ζηνὶ κελαινεφὲ Κρονίδῃ. ὃς πᾶσιν ἀνάσσει, ῥέξας μηρὶ ἐκαίον.}\(^{91}\)

Now when we had come to the island, where our other well-benchèd ships lay gathered, and round about them our comrades sat weeping, always waiting for us,

---

\(^{90}\) *Iliad* 17. 248-255.

\(^{91}\) *Odyssey* 9.543-553.
after we had come to the ships, we beached our ship on the sands, and ourselves went forth by the edge of the sea. Then we took the sheep of the Cyclops out from out the hollow ship and divided them, that so no man may go cheated of his fair share by me. But the ram my well-greaved comrades gave to me alone. As a gift when the flocks were divided; and on the shore I sacrificed him to Zeus, son of Cronos, god of the dark clouds, who is lord of all, and burned the thigh-bones.

While only a portion of the sailors actually participate in the capture of the sheep, the plunder is gathered and distributed to all by Odysseus, the centre of this ship. He then receives the ram personally as an acknowledgment of his higher status, and sacrifices this status offering to Zeus in order to benefit the sailors by acquiring divine favour and by providing the meat from the sacrifice for a feast.

The archaeological evidence and the Homeric epics indicate that early Archaic Greece probably functioned under a redistributive system. According to Tandy, the centres of the redistributive model in Archaic Greece were elites of the individual communities possibly called basilees. For the most part, these elites engaged in gathering and redistribution of sustenance goods such as grain, olives, and flocks of sheep and goats as well as metal and marble if there was any to be found within the boundaries of their communities. Although the redistributive model was slowly disrupted through the late 8th and 7th centuries by the introduction of a market-based economy, several remnants of the redistributive model remaining in Classical Athens indicate that the government of the state remained the centre of the model whether the state was run by a handful of elites, a tyrant, or a democracy. The state-owned silver mines at Laurium, the liturgies expected of the

92 Tandy, 1997, 110-111

93 See Tandy, 1997, 112-138 for a detailed account of the beginnings of market economy in Greece and its effects on the current economic system. Tandy sees the redistributive system as ending entirely after the
wealthier citizens, and the institution of a ban on selling grain grown in Attica outside its territory all point to a remaining attitude that the resources originating within the borders of a community should be used for its benefit.\textsuperscript{94}

This economic model would also explain the trade route established during the early 8\textsuperscript{th} century through Euboean colonies. Euboean pottery has been found at several sites from Pithekoussai in Italy to Al Mina on the Orontes Delta, indicating the establishment of a trade route by 770 BCE, and perhaps as early as 800 BCE.\textsuperscript{95} Among other things, it appears that the Euboeans acquired iron in Pithekoussai and transported it east to Al Mina. It is strange that they went as far as Italy to acquire iron considering that there was an abundant supply of iron throughout the island. Iron was especially common in the territory of Chalcis, an active participant in the foundation of Pithekoussai and of Al Mina.\textsuperscript{96} One may wonder why they went so far to find a resource which they had in abundance at home. Under a redistributive system, the iron on Euboea would have been tied to the community; the resources such as metals which were found within a community’s territory had to be used in some way beneficial to the community. On the other hand, metal from abroad acquired through trade was free from such constraints. While resources acquired inside the boundaries of the community were obligated back to the community, trade goods were outside this redistributive arrangement and were therefore free from any obligation. Elites could use trade

\textsuperscript{94} While it is certainly true that the goal of the ban on selling Attic grain outside the borders of Attica stems from the ongoing struggle to keep Athens fed, the fact that this sort of law was considered and instituted indicates a remaining sense of obligation when it came to resources originating from the community.

\textsuperscript{95} See Tandy, 1997, 62-72 for further details concerning the many sites involved in this trade route and the variety of goods which may have been exchanged.

\textsuperscript{96} Tandy, 1997, 64
goods to pursue private goals that did not directly contribute back to the community in which they lived.

Considering that trade goods were situated outside the economic system which governed the Greek communities, and then the *poleis* which developed from these communities, it would have made sense to also place the activity of trade outside the physical boundaries of the *polis*. This separation of trade from the bounds of the *polis* along with the special division between private and public interests had as a result that elite activities took place outside the *polis* and instead took place primarily within interstate sanctuaries during the 8th century. As social and political circumstances changed throughout the Archaic Period, the advantages provided by the politically neutral grounds ensured that sanctuaries such as Delphi remained attractive as a nexus of Greek elite interaction.
Chapter 2: Elite Interaction at Delphi

2.1 Trade, Marriage, and Guest-Friendships

Now that we have examined the nature of the Greek elite in the Archaic Period as well as the importance of Delphi’s position as an interstate sanctuary, it is now possible to turn to the sanctuary itself and to examine in further detail the types of elite interactions which took place within the bounds of the sanctuary. Since, as has been shown, the sanctuary acted as a politically neutral space for elite gatherings, many elite activities were held there to take advantage of the regular congregation of a multitude of elite individuals. These activities included trade, contracting marriage alliances, and forming and maintaining guest-friendships.

Trade has already been mentioned in relation to interstate sanctuaries; Greek ideology during the early Archaic Period may have pushed trade outside the bounds of the polis and into marginal spaces such as interstate sanctuaries. Trade also had a large impact on the early history of the Delphic sanctuary and on its rise in popularity during the late 8th and early 7th centuries BCE. Corinth’s inclusion of Delphi within its extensive trade network brought Corinthian allies to the sanctuary and may have resulted in the Delphic oracle’s famous involvement with the colonisation movement of the 7th and 6th centuries BCE.

Although the site of Delphi was occupied during the Mycenaean Period, there is a break in the archaeological record after the fall of their civilization until approximately 875
BCE.97 While it is impossible to know whether or not there was a continuity of worship at this location, the remains at the site of Delphi show the emergence of a town with a local sanctuary with no clear connections to the Mycenaean remains underneath. The Delphic sanctuary does appear to have served primarily as a local sanctuary during the 9th and the early 8th century BCE, rather than as a panhellenic one.98 Ceramics found at Delphi are for the most part Thessalian in style until approximately 800 BCE, when Corinthian ware comes to dominate the archaeological record. It is unlikely that this early Corinthian pottery was associated with the temple of Apollo; the sanctuary was still fairly insignificant at the time, and every Corinthian vase with an identifiable archaeological context dating earlier than the mid-8th century BCE was found in a domestic context.99

It is much more likely that the Corinthian ceramics were a result of Corinth’s incorporation of Delphi into its trade network. Around the turn of the 8th century BCE, Corinth had been expanding its trade activities, with Corinthian pottery being found in Pithekoussai, North Africa, and Naukratis, among other places.100 The export of Corinthian pottery increased throughout the 8th century BCE; it came to dominate finds in most Western Greek city-states, also being found in Boeotian, Phocian, Attic, and Spartan sites.101 It may be because of this vigorous mercantile activity that the city is referred to as “wealthy Corinth” in the Iliad.102 The presence of Corinthian pottery at Delphi because of trade is also supported by the archaeological evidence from the site of Medeon, south-east of Delphi in

97 Morgan, 1990, 107-108. No archaeological evidence has been found in support of the succession of earlier temples described in mythological accounts of the sanctuary. For an examination of the mythology surrounding early Delphi, see Sourvinou-Inwood, 1979, or Fontenrose, 1959.
100 Salmon, 1984, 103-107.
102 Iliad 2.570.
the Phokis valley (Figure 2). Corinthian pottery has been found at Medeon throughout the 8th century BCE in large amounts; without the complication of a large sanctuary such as the one at Delphi, it is easier to see that this pottery was the result of trade with Corinth starting in the late 9th century BCE and intensifying throughout the 8th century BCE.103 Delphi and Medeon both provided access to the northern part of Greece, and Thessalian wares have been uncovered at both sites. Delphi’s geographical position within the Phokis valley made it very attractive to Corinth, which appear to have wanted to extend its trade activities north during the 8th century BCE.104 It is still unclear what exactly Corinth was trading for its pottery, but the most probable trade good would have been Thessalian metalwork.105 Regardless of what was being exchanged for it, it seems most likely that the Corinthian pottery found at Delphi was the result of trade prior to the mid-8th century BCE, while finds more clearly associated with a votive context become more common after 750 BCE.106

Delphi’s trade with Corinth during the 8th century BCE was probably responsible for a large portion of Delphi’s rise in popularity as a panhellenic sanctuary, most notably resulting in the Apolline sanctuary’s famous association with the Greek colonisation movement. During the late 8th century BCE, Corinth took part in the Lelantine war which opposed Chalkis and Eretria as well as their mutual allies; Corinth fought on the Chalcidian side along with Samos, Thessaly, Sparta and Erythrai, while the Eretrian alliance included Megara, Miletos, Messenia and Chios.107 W. G. Forrest brought to light a very interesting

103 For more information on Medeon and its political and economic position within 8th century Phokis, see Morgan, 1990, 118-126.
104 Morgan, 1990, 120.
105 Salmon, 1984, 112.
106 Morgan, 1990, 134.
107 See Forrest, 1957, and Hall, 2007, 1-8 for an overview of the Lelantine war. See Thucydides 1.15.3 and 6.4, Herodotus 1.18 and 5.99, and Plutarch’s Mor. 760 for the list of allies in the Lelantine war. See Aristotle Pol.
pattern concerning these sets of alliances. In his article “Colonisation and the rise of Delphi”,
he looked at allied states on each side and examined the colonies which each of these states
sent out during the late 8th century and the early 7th century BCE. Each side has an
abundance of colonies founded during this time period: Chalkis, Corinth, Eretria, Megara,
and Miletos were particularly active in this regard. Chalkis founded Kyme, Naxos, Zankle,
and Rhegion, while Corinth founded Corcyra and Syracuse. On the other side of the conflict,
Eretria founded Kyme in a joint venture with Chalkis, Methone, and other colonies in the
area of Chalkidike, while Megara founded Trotilon, Astakos, Selymbria, and Chalkedon, and
Miletus founded Kyzikos and a number of colonies in the area of the Hellespont.108

Forrest found that with the exception of Kyme, all of the Corinthian and Chalkidian
colonies had some sort of connection to Delphi, usually through a foundation oracle.109 In
addition, while Chalkis’ ally Thessaly was not an active participant in the colonisation
movement, it had been involved with the Delphic sanctuary since the 9th century BCE.110
This is not surprising; Delphi is present in a large number of Greek colonisation narratives,
with the result that Delphic foundation oracles are extremely common for Greek colonies
across the board. What is much more surprising is that when Forrest investigated the colonies
sent out by the Eretrian side of the war, he found no records of Delphic foundation oracles or
of other connections to Delphi. There is not a single oracle for any of the colonies sent out by
Eretria and its allies between the mid-8th and mid-7th century BCE.111 He concludes that
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4.3.2, Archilochus fr. 3, and Strabo 10.1.12 for information concerning the nature of the fighting. The exact
date of the conflict is unknown, with estimates ranging from 750 to 680 BCE. Forrest and Hall both agree that
a late 8th century is most likely.
109 Forrest, 1957, 165-166.
110 Morgan, 1990, 120.
111 Forrest, 1957, 167.
Corinth, which had been active at Delphi for at least 50 years when the Lelantine war broke out, promoted the Delphic sanctuary to its allies. These allies then made use of the oracle of Apollo when sending out colonies after the war.\textsuperscript{112} This would explain why Kyme alone among the Chalkidian colonies has no apparent connection to Delphi; it was founded around 750 BCE, before the Lelantine war and therefore before Corinth introduced Chalkis to the sanctuary. It also explains why none of the Eretrian allies appear to have consulted the oracle before sending out their colonies; the Delphic sanctuary was still for the most part a local sanctuary at the time of the war, only gaining more panhellenic fame after the Chalcidian allies started using it.

Of course, as Hall points out, most of the information found in literary sources from the 8\textsuperscript{th} and 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE cannot be accepted at face value; our earliest sources for the Lelantine war and for the foundation oracles of colonies date to the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BCE.\textsuperscript{113} It is entirely possible that the narratives were distorted and changed over the couple of centuries between the events discussed above and their inclusion in literary sources. However, because the pattern of colonisation oracles is so clear and is supported by the pattern of dedications at Delphi, I believe that Delphi’s trade connection with Corinth was responsible for its early association with the colonisation movement and subsequently for the rise of Delphi’s importance as a panhellenic sanctuary.

So far, we have examined how trade played a prominent part in Delphi’s transition from a local sanctuary to a panhellenic one, and we have already discussed how this status as a panhellenic interstate sanctuary may have resulted in Delphi being used as a good space for

\textsuperscript{112} Forrest, 1957, 171-173.
\textsuperscript{113} Hall, 2007, 5-8.
trade among elites because of Archaic Greek ideologies concerning public and private
affairs. It is therefore fair to say that trade played a very important role in the early history of
the Delphic sanctuary. It is also very likely the Delphi continued to be used as a good space
for trade throughout the Archaic Period, after Greece had turned from a redistributive
economy to a largely market-based economy. Although trade agreements often leave no trace
in the archaeological record and are not mentioned at interstate sanctuaries in our literary
evidence, the regular gathering of a large number of elites from throughout the Greek world
on a regular basis which occurred at Delphi would have made it extremely convenient for
trade. This would have been especially true after the institution of the Pythian games and
their incorporation into the periodos. In addition, as Small points out, the major panhellenic
festivals, including the Pythian games, were held shortly after the summer’s harvest, which
was done around the time of the summer solstice.\footnote{Small, 1994, 304-305.} This is exactly the time of year which
Hesiod recommended for overseas trade expeditions.\footnote{Works and Days 641-670.} Since the climate in Greece tends to
vary greatly by region, festivals held at such a time would have offered the perfect
opportunity for elites from areas with poorer harvests that year to buy whatever they lacked,
and for elites from luckier areas to sell off their surplus.\footnote{Horden and Purcell, 2000.}

There is another type of trade which took place within the space of the Delphic
sanctuary: the trade of news and information. According to Renfrew and his model of peer
polity interaction, panhellenic sanctuaries and particularly their festivals provided neutral
ground for the sharing of new information, cultural and artistic developments, and social
innovations. According to this theory, new developments in state formation, warfare, or architectural style seemed to develop at about the same time throughout most parts of Greece through panhellenic sanctuaries such as Delphi. The regular gatherings provided by the festivals held at these sanctuaries allowed elites to share innovations and news with their fellow elites, who then brought this information home and spread it even further. Delphi was particularly well located to serve such a purpose. Within the Phokis valley, it had access to a passage north into Thessaly and the rest of northern Greece, while also being very close to Boeotia and Attica by land. By sea, the sanctuary was near the Corinthian gulf, which made it easily accessible to the western city-states and to the northern part of the Peloponnese. It is probably for this easy access to most parts of the Greek world that Delphi was referred to as the navel of the world, and considered to be the center of the Earth.

Lewis brings up a counterpoint to this theory. While panhellenic festivals definitely provided a great opportunity for the exchange of news because of the large gatherings they created, these festivals only happened once a year at most, meaning that most elites could probably attend no more than three or four of these festivals each year. She argues that most news would be able to travel much faster through guest-friends and travelers, and would therefore not need to be exchanged for the first time at panhellenic sanctuaries. Rather, she argues that news and information displayed at panhellenic sanctuaries, especially written decrees, were displayed in order to provide religious backing or to glorify the decree through its large audience. While most of her argument is sound, I believe that she may be
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117 Renfrew, 1986, 16.
118 Renfrew, 1986, 12-16.
119 See Pindar, Pythian 4.74, and Strabo 9.3.6. Strabo tells the myth of how Zeus released two eagles from each end of the world, and that they met at Delphi, therefore designating it as the centre of the world.
120 See Lewis, 1992.
121 Lewis, 15-18.
overestimating the number of times one may visit one’s guest friends, at least during the early Archaic Period. While I agree that news must have travelled faster among geographically neighbouring areas of Greece, Panhellenic festivals were probably the easiest and fastest way for an individual from Sicily to hear of new developments in Ionia.

As has been examined above, the regular gatherings of a large number of elites made panhellenic sanctuaries such as Delphi excellent spaces for the exchange of goods and information. There were also other aspects of the elite lifestyle which were facilitated by large gatherings and which are therefore likely to have taken place within the Delphi sanctuary, such as the arrangement of marriage alliances and of guest friendships. Marriages among the Greek elites were primarily political and social alliances.122 The groom gained his bride’s family as allies as well as prestige for himself and his children if the bride came from a rich or well-known family, while the bride’s father gained an alliance with the groom and his family. There are several known instances of marriages between elites of different city-states; contact and alliances with individuals from outside their polis appear to have been a regular part of the elite lifestyle.123 For this reason, Pericles’ marriage law passed in 451 BCE stating that only children whose parents were both Athenians would be considered citizens is often thought to have been an anti-elite move targeting their usual practice of interstate marriage alliances.124 There is little evidence in our literary sources linking the makings of marriage alliances with interstate sanctuaries, except for the story of Cleisthenes of Sicyon and the competition he organized to find a suitable husband for his daughter.125 In this passage, Cleisthenes takes advantage of the crowd gathered for the Olympic games in

122 See Duplouy, 2006, 79-117 for a longer discussion of marriage among the Greek elite.
123 Duplouy, 2006, 80-90.
124 Stahl and Walter, 2009, 158.
order to have it announced to all the spectators that he was looking for a son-in-law, and that all who were interested should come to Sicyon to vie for his daughter. It is logical to assume from this passage that the crowds gathered for the Pythian games at Delphi offered the same advantages, and that men looking for brides and fathers looking to marry off their daughters could use these gatherings to contract interstate marriage alliances.

The gathering of elites created by festivals such as the Pythian games would have been beneficial to the creation of new guest friendships in much the same way as it aided marriage alliances. As has already been discussed in the first chapter, the alliances formed through guest friendships closely resembled those contracted through marriages, with the added bonus that the number of guest friendships one may have was not constrained by the number of children he had begotten, nor did it end after the death of the individuals involved in the original agreement. Small argues that interstate sanctuaries would have been the primary context for the contraction of new guest friendships and the maintenance of old ones.126 There is some literary evidence for this theory, although it dates to the mid-5th century. Isocrates states the following in reference to the games at Olympia:

\[ \text{σπεισαμένους πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ τὰς ἐχθρὰς τὰς ἐνστηκοῦσας διαλυσαμένους} \]
\[ \text{συνελθεῖν εἰς ταύτον, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ᾽ εὐχάς καὶ θυσίας κοινὰς ποιεῖσαμένους} \]
\[ \text{ἀναμνησθῆναι μὲν τῆς συγγενείας τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑπαρχοῦσης,} \]
\[ \text{εὐμενεστέρως δ᾽ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον διατεθῆναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦς, καὶ τὰς} \]
\[ \text{τε παλαιὰς ἐνεπίστησαν καὶ καινὰς ἑτέρας ποιήσασθαι.} \]

Having proclaimed a truce and resolved our pending quarrels, we come together in one place where, as we make our prayers and sacrifices in common, we are reminded of the kinship which exists among us and are made to feel more kindly towards each other for the future, reviving old guest friendships and establishing new ones.
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126 Small, 1994, 303-304.
127 Isocrates, Panegyricus 43.
Interstate sanctuaries offered one more advantage for the formation of new guest friendships over the manner found more often in literature, which is to visit a potential guest friend and to agree to the formalized bond while under his roof. As Donlan points out, when a guest friendship is formed while one of the members is being received by the other one, the guest is in a very advantageous position, while the host is somewhat at a disadvantage. In such a situation, the host would offer valuable gifts to his new guest friend, while he himself had to hope that he would soon have the chance to visit his xenos in order to receive gifts in turn. As has been mentioned in the first chapter, such arrangements could be risky, since the host at the time of the beginning of the friendship may never have the opportunity to visit his guest friend in turn and receive gifts in turn. Interstate sanctuaries such as Delphi offered a simple solution to this risk. Since it was essentially neutral ground, no gifts had to be exchanged at the time of the creation of the guest friendship, thus taking away the immediate risk. Of course whichever of the new xenoi visited the other first would still be coming out ahead, but the removal of the immediate disadvantage must have been agreeable to most elites.

2.2 Competitive Interaction: Dedications and Athletic Competitions

This chapter has so far focused on elite interactions and exchanges which were facilitated by the large number of Greek elites who gathered regularly within the Delphic sanctuary. These large gatherings also created the perfect opportunity for one of the most important components of the elite lifestyle, competition. As I have discussed in the first chapter, Greek elites and Greek society as a whole were very agonistic. It is therefore not

---
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surprising that places like Delphi which drew large crowds would also be home to numerous types of competitive displays. The first type of competitive display to which I wish to turn is the abundance of dedications to Apollo set up within the sanctuary.

The fact that many dedications within panhellenic sanctuaries were primarily competitive in nature has been discussed by Renfrew.\(^{130}\) According to him, elites from neighbouring *poleis* would have spurred each other on to larger and more extravagant displays of wealth through these dedications. As a result of this competition and emulation of particularly impressive pieces, similar styles and forms can be found in all panhellenic sanctuaries in dedications from different parts of the Greek world. To be sure, the rich nature of the dedications found at Delphi match this theory, as does the fact that the dedications get more elaborate and costly around the time where Delphi starts to have more panhellenic functions.\(^{131}\)

It may be tempting to claim that the dedications found at Delphi were primarily meant to thank the oracle for its services, with any competitive aspect being relegated to a secondary function. An analysis of the city states which consulted the oracle the most during the late 7\(^{th}\) and early 6\(^{th}\) century BCE compared to those which set up the majority of monumental dedications in the sanctuary show that there was no strong correlation between consulting the Pythia and making a dedication to Apollo. When one looks at the dedications put up within the sanctuary, the largest number of them comes from the edges of the Greek world.\(^{132}\) The first surviving treasuries were put up during the second half of the 7\(^{th}\) century, and they were built for the most part by the western city-states of Sicily and southern Italy.

\(^{130}\) Renfrew, 1986, 7-10.
\(^{131}\) Morgan, 1990, 137-146.
\(^{132}\) See Scott, 2010, 46-74 for an overview of the monumental dedications put up during this time period.
and by islands such as Naxos. In addition, a large number of smaller dedications were found originating from the eastern part of the Greek world, especially from Ionian city-states.\textsuperscript{133} Instead of the larger dedications preferred by the western city-states, dedications from the east for the most part took the shape of valuable metal objects such as craters, jars, lions, bulls, shields, and statues. The only exceptions to this pattern are city-states from the Isthmus area; as we have seen, Corinth had been active at the sanctuary since the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, and Megara and Sikyon also became involved at the end of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE.\textsuperscript{134}

On the other hand, the majority of oracular consultations which are mentioned in our literary sources and which are dated back to this time period concern central Greek city-states such as Athens, Argos, Thebes, or Sparta.\textsuperscript{135} The majority of the consultations are religious in nature, usually concerning the establishment of a temple, a festival, or a particular ritual. This is consistent with Morgan’s theory of state foundation and how it affected the use of interstate sanctuaries during the Archaic Period. She argues that city-states such as Athens, Argos, Thebes, and Sparta were still busy establishing the limits of their territory during the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE. As such, they often used religious institutions such as temples and festivals to help them in this task.\textsuperscript{136} For example, Argos built the Argive Heraion in order to claim an area of the Argive plain which was situated very close to Mycenae (Figure 3), while Athens established festivals at Brauron and at Eleusis in order to

\textsuperscript{133} Scott, 2010, 45.
\textsuperscript{134} Morgan, 1990, 16-17.
\textsuperscript{135} See Dempsey, 1918, 268-308 for a catalogue of the recorded oracular consultation which can be dated between the 7\textsuperscript{th} and the 6\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE. Our pool of oracles almost certainly includes a larger percentage of Athenian oracles than what would have been present in the total number of oracles because of the Athenocentric nature of many of our literary sources. Unfortunately, it is nearly impossible to correct such a bias, but it is still good to be aware of it.
\textsuperscript{136} Morgan, 1990, 7-16.
bring together its large territory and establish Athens as its centre. Morgan therefore argues that these city-states would have used the oracle at Delphi as a way to reinforce the foundation of these religious institutions, as well as other measures passed in order to support state formation.

In contrast, Morgan argues that the eastern and western poleis which were actively dedicating at Delphi had been founded as city-states from their beginning, usually with well-defined boundaries. They did not need to focus on establishing their territory as many of the mainland Greek city-states did. Similarly, city-states from the Isthmus area such as Corinth, Megara, and Sicyon had small territories which were well-defined early on by geographical features. These city-states, along with the poleis at the edges of the Greek world, did not need to use the oracle to consolidate their claims to territory and were instead free to start competing with one another through increasingly valuable and impressive dedications. While Morgan’s argument is sound with respect to city-states from the Isthmus area, it ignores the fact that many eastern and western poleis were founded on open-ended frontiers, and therefore their territories were not as firmly established as she claims. On a political level however, these frontier settlements were all established as poleis from their very beginning, and were often further along the state formation process than the Greek mainland. They would have therefore had fewer occasions than city-states such as Athens or Argos to consult the Delphic oracle in order to reinforce changes to their political organisation. In addition, Delphic backing may not have been as effective when used to
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claim territory against the non-Greek populations encountered by marginal Greek settlements, which may explain why these poleis do not appear to have consulted the Delphic oracle as often as central city-states. Finally, the large number of dedications from eastern and western poleis may be due to a desire of these new city-states to establish a panhellenic identity independent from their mother city.

During the 8th and 7th century BCE, the majority of the dedications found were set up by private individuals. The goal of such dedications was to gain honour by impressing one’s fellow elites, thereby also increasing one’s status within one’s own polis. The competitive nature of these dedications can be seen in the slowly increasing size, value, and elaborate nature of the offerings. The earliest such dedications took the form of metal tripods. While many tripod remains have been found, they are for the most part badly preserved, so that it is difficult to compare their style and decoration in order to identify competitive elements. From tripods and other small metal dedications, dedication trends grew to include numerous kouroi during the 6th century. The kouroi’s association with elites, especially with elite young men, is well known and has often been discussed. The most famous of the kouroi dedicated at Delphi would be the twin kouroi usually identified as Kleobis and Biton (Figure 4). These dedications, dated to approximately 580 BCE, were produced by an Argive workshop, and are therefore likely to have been dedicated by an

143 While Delphi’s fame and reputation was increasing in many areas of Greece throughout the 7th century BCE, there very little evidence to suggest that it had acquired fame outside Greece; there is more evidence to suggest that the oracle had gained international appeal during the 6th century BCE. See Forrest, 1957.
144 Morgan, 1990, 17.
147 Pedley, 2007, 176-180.
148 Jacquemin, 1999, 159. For the story of Kleobis and Biton, see Herodotus 1.31.
Argive, or by the city-state itself. Unfortunately, the accompanying inscription only partially survives, indicating the end of the sculptor’s name and his city of origin.

The tripods and *kouroi* mentioned above were primarily dedicated by private individuals, members of the elite wishing to increase their status. On the other hand, during the 6th and 5th centuries, there is a sharp rise in the number of city-states which make state dedications.149 The larger resources of city-states resulted in dedications which were much more monumental and elaborate than those which could be achieved by private individuals. The only exceptions to this rule were Greek tyrants. They were themselves elite individuals and often made dedications at Delphi in their own names with the same competitive aims as other elites, but they could draw on the resources of their city-states to increase the size and value of their dedications. The Delphi Charioteer is an example of this type of large dedication set up by a tyrant (Figure 5). This bronze statue, dating to approximately 478 BCE, has been identified as a part of a larger group of statues dedicated by Polyzalos, the tyrant of Gela.150 The statue group originally included a chariot and probably four horses, of which some fragments have been found. The inscription informs us that Polyzalos set up this dedication after his victory in a chariot race at the Pythian games.

A series of columns was also dedicated by Western tyrants during the early 5th century which shows well the competitive nature of such offerings (Figure 6). Gelon, the tyrant of Syracuse, and his successor Hieron both set up similar columns topped with tripods
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149 Scott, 2010, 75-110. This is another example of the ongoing efforts of city-states to appropriate the actions of the private elite throughout the Archaic Period. These attempts can be seen through the institution of public funerals in Athens, the establishment of the *syssition* in Sparta, the institution of public sacrifices and feasts, or the public undertaking of temple building. See Schmitt-Pantel, 1990.

150 Pedley, 2007, 233-234. However, Adornato (2008) argues that the charioteer and the base do not belong together. In that case, the unknown statue which would have stood atop Polyzalos’ base remains a good example of a tyrant dedication, although a rather less visually interesting one.
on the terrace in front of the temple of Apollo during the first half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BCE.\textsuperscript{151} These columns were meant to echo the two victory columns dedicated on the same terrace by the Greeks who had fought at the battles of Salamis and of Plataea. In their position as well as in their shape, the Syracusan columns associated the glory of the tyrants with the glory of the Greeks as a whole which was won through their victory during the Persian war; the aim was to show the Siracusan tyrants’ achievements as equal to those of the Greeks at Salamis and Plataea.\textsuperscript{152} In contrast to this, a third column topped by a tripod was built on the temple terrace by Croton around 475 BCE, shortly after the Syracusan ones.\textsuperscript{153} Unlike the Syracusan columns, the Croton column clearly intended to compete with the Greek victory columns and with the Syracusan ones by association. The Croton column was taller than the previous columns, raised upon a large base of Parian marble.\textsuperscript{154} It was also located next to the Salamis and Plataea dedications in such a way that it blocked the two other columns from the sight of visitors coming to the temple by the usual route. In its location and its size, the Croton column aimed to overshadow the Greek victory columns as well as the Syracusan columns which had sought to emulate the latter.

I now wish to turn my attention towards a particular aspect of the dedications found at Delphi: their inscriptions. As Neer has discussed, the choice of wording on dedication inscriptions varied greatly and indicated two very different ideologies among the Greek elite.\textsuperscript{155} These two ideologies have been identified by Morris as elitist and middling.
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ideologies.¹⁵⁶ The elitist ideology looked outside the polis; elites adhering to this ideology saw their power as coming from outside their polis, from their interactions with elites from other areas, and therefore sought to increase their reputation and honour outside the polis as well. They also sought to emphasize the distinction between elites and non-elites in their society. Because of this, interstate sanctuaries were particularly important to elitist individuals. On the other hand, elites inclined towards the middling ideology looked inwards; they saw their power as coming from the strength of their polis, and therefore tried to increase the reputation of their polis, thus increasing their own by association.

These ideologies are reflected in the dedication inscriptions found at Delphi. Some inscriptions, which were made by individuals who adhered to the elitist ideology, identify the provider of the dedication by mentioning his name, sometimes followed by his patronymic, but not his civic identity. The inscription accompanying the Delphi Charioteer is a very simple example of this type of inscription. It simply reads “Polyzalos dedicated me. Make this man prosper, O honored Apollo.”¹⁵⁷ This simple inscription emphasizes the name of the dedicator, but not his city of origin, since this was unimportant to the elitist mind. Neer provides an inscription from a kouros dedicated to Ptoian Apollo as a more elaborate example of this type of dedication. While this dedication does not come from Delphi, it is a good example of the types of inscription which could have been found there.¹⁵⁸

I am a beautiful delight for Phoebus, son of Leto.  
Alkmaion’s son, Alkmaionides,  
Dedicated me after the victory of his swift horses,  
Which Knopiadas the […] drove  
When in Athens there was a festive gathering for Pallas.¹⁵⁹

The man’s name and patronymic are emphasized, appearing shortly after the name of Apollo himself, but the man’s city of origin is never made clear in this rather lengthy dedicatory inscription.

At the other extreme, inscriptions inspired by the middling ideology tended to emphasize the identity of the dedicator’s *polis* more than his personal identity. Again, Neer provides an extreme example of this type of dedication; this inscription from Olympia is inscribed at the foot of a victor statue. \(^{160}\) As reported by Pausanias, the inscription states that the Samian boxer’s trainer Mykon dedicated the statue, and that the Samians were the best of the Ionians at athletic contests and in warfare. \(^{161}\) While this inscription emphasizes strongly the Samian origin of the boxer, it does not even give us the athlete’s name. Such middling-inspired inscriptions are rarer among the surviving dedications at Delphi, which is logical considering the interstate context which appealed more to the elitist mindset. \(^{162}\) However, it is important to remember that the small number of surviving inscriptions from the Archaic and early Classical Period may not accurately represent those which existed at the time.

Tyrants found themselves in an interesting situation when it came time to choose the wording for their inscriptions. They tended to lean more towards the elitist mentality, as is evidenced by their many interstate marriages and heavy involvement at interstate sanctuaries. \(^{163}\) However, their power often rested on support from the non-elite population of their *polis*, and it was in their interest to present more of a middling attitude in this regard.

\(^{161}\) Pausanias 2.2.9.
\(^{162}\) Neer, 2007, 231.
\(^{163}\) See McGlew, 1993, 14-52.
The result can be seen in the inscription on the base of Gelon’s column, which has been discussed above.

Gelon, son of Deinomenes, of Syracuse, dedicated [this] to Apollo. The tripod and the Nike were made by Bion son of Diodoros of Miletus.\footnote{Neer, 2007, 238; Jacquemin, 1999, 71.}

This inscription is very similar to the elitist inscriptions discussed above, with the exception that Gelon’s polis is mentioned after his patronymic, but the name of his polis is not emphasized by its position in the inscription, and rather seems to be mentioned in passing.

It is interesting to note that both extremes in inscription styles are present on the same monument within the sanctuary at Delphi. As has briefly been mentioned above, the Greeks who had fought at Plataea dedicated a column topped by a tripod as a victory offering to Apollo. When the column was first dedicated, Pausanias of Sparta, who had been the commander of the forces at Plataea, had the following inscription carved on the column.

\begin{quote}
Ἑλλήνων ἀρχηγὸς ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὅλησε Μῆδων, Παυσανίας Φοίβῳ μνήμ᾽ ἀνέθηκε τόδε.\footnote{Thucydides 1.132.}
\end{quote}

Pausanias, the leader of the Greeks, when he had destroyed the host of the Medes, dedicated to Phoebus this memorial.

This inscription, which did not mention Pausanias’ citizenship, seemed like a ploy to steal all the glory of the victory away from the many poleis which had participated in the battle and onto the commander himself. Of course, the Greek allies protested, and the tripod was inscribed with the following words:

\begin{quote}
Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχώρου σωτῆρες τὸνδ᾽ ἀνέθηκαν, δουλοσύνης στυγερᾶς ῥυσάμενοι πόλιας.\footnote{Diodorus 11.33.2.}
\end{quote}

This is the gift the saviors of far-flung Hellas dedicated here,
having delivered their poleis from the bonds of loathsome slavery.

The column, much of which can still be seen in Istanbul, was also inscribed with the names of all the poleis which participated in the battle. The second inscription therefore completely reversed Pausanias’ efforts, leaving out all references to individuals and focusing instead on the poleis involved.

So far, the discussion has focused on how elites used dedications as competitive displays in order to increase their reputation and their honour. Unfortunately, this increase in reputation could be dangerous for poleis; if individual elites obtained a great enough reputation, poleis with non-tyrannical governments could fear that these elites would use their popularity to set themselves up as tyrants, while tyrants already in place could fear to be supplanted. Because of this, efforts were made to control the competitive aspect of elite dedications; in many cases, these efforts took the form of treasuries. These were small buildings similar to temples in their architecture. Treasuries were built at several interstate sanctuaries by poleis in order to house the dedications made by their elite citizens. These treasuries were particularly numerous at Delphi, numbering close to 30 throughout the sanctuary. As Neer points out, storing dedications was not the prime reason for the existence of these monuments; many poleis whose citizens made many offerings at Delphi did not build treasuries. Instead, the primary role of treasuries was to provide context for the dedications. By placing elite offerings inside a treasury, these offerings became associated more strongly with the treasury’s polis, and not solely with the individual who set

\[167\] Neer, 2007, 239.
\[168\] See Neer, 2007, 239-251 for an overview of the use of treasuries at interstate sanctuaries. See Neer, 2004 and 2001 for more detailed analyses of individual treasuries and of their political context.
\[169\] Jacquemin, 1999, 141-149.
up the dedication. As a result, the glory gained from impressive dedications was applied to the *polis* as well as to the dedicants, converting elitist displays into civic pride.

The Athenian treasury is worth examining more closely because of the particular problem it faced (Figure 7). It not only had to recontextualize the dedications of elite Athenians, but also had to temper the glory which the Alkmaionids had acquired by taking on the construction of the temple of Apollo itself. After a fire had destroyed the previous temple in 548 BCE, the Alkmaionids, who were in exile from Athens at the time, obtained the contract to rebuild the temple, and exceeded the terms of the contract; while it had been agreed that the new temple would be built out of limestone, the Athenian elites built the east façade in Parian marble.\(^{171}\) The temple therefore became a source of glory for this elite family, glory which was reinforced whenever an individual beheld the Delphi temple of Apollo. Of course, Athens could not build a treasury around the temple to frame it as it did for other Athenian offerings. Instead, the Athenian treasury was positioned along the Sacred Way propped up on a high podium so that it was seen by visitors just before they turned the corner and caught sight of the temple itself.\(^{172}\) The treasury was also built of the same Parian marble as the east façade of the Alkmaionid temple. Finally, since remains of the sculptures adorning the treasury and the temple have been found, it can be observed that the overall composition of the treasury sculpture was very similar to that of the temple of Apollo.\(^{173}\) The result was that any visitor going up the Sacred Way would closely associate the two structures. While this did not make the temple an Athenian contribution, it did at least emphasize that it was the achievement of Athenian individuals.

\(^{171}\) Herodotus 5.62.

\(^{172}\) Neer, 2004, 84-87.

\(^{173}\) Neer, 2004, 84-85.
2.3 Competitive Interactions: Athletic Competitions

For the last part of this thesis, I want to turn to an aspect of elite interactions at Delphi which has already been mentioned several times: the Pythian games, and more specifically the athletic competitions held during the games. The first Pythian games were celebrated during the early 6th century BCE, either in 591, in 586, or in 582.174 There had been musical contests held at the sanctuary very early on during Delphi’s history, as is fitting for a sanctuary primarily dedicated to Apollo, but athletic competitions only started with the organisation of the Pythian games.175 As has been mentioned a few times already, the Pythian games were then incorporated into the *periodos*, a formalized game circuit. The games, less popular than those at Olympia, comprised of roughly the same athletic events as their more popular counterpart with the addition of musical competitions.176

As has already been stated in the first chapter, athletic contests in Greece were particularly associated with the elite. An athlete’s body was acquired through exercise in the *gymnasia*, for which the leisure available to the elite was necessary. The elite nature of athletic competitions is highlighted by the timing of the foundations of the Pythian games. Several literary sources mention a conflict during the first decade of the 6th century BCE which opposed Thessaly, Athens, Sicyon, and the Amphiktiony of Anthela to Kirrha in what is referred to as the First Sacred War.177 This war was waged over control of the Delphic sanctuary, and we are told that it ended in the destruction of Kirrha and the formation of the Delphic Amphiktiony, a council comprised of representatives from each city-state having

---

175 Neer, 2007, 227. Pausanias (10.7.2-5) tells us that the earliest contest was the singing of a hymn to Apollo.
taken part in the war, which took over the management of Apollo’s sanctuary. It has been argued fairly convincingly that this conflict was fictional, and that it was invented in order to establish a precedent for the later sacred wars waged over the control of the Delphic oracle. However, that which is claimed to be the result of the war, namely the creation of the Delphic Amphiktiony and its taking over the control of the sanctuary, is visible in the archaeological record. The removal of Delphic control from the village of Delphi marks the victory of the growing panhellenic function of the sanctuary over its original local function. As such, it also marks the moment when elite interests, which were closely tied to panhellenic sanctuaries, overtake the interests of the local population. The fact that this transition was marked by the institution of athletic competitions, which were themselves closely tied to the elite lifestyle, underscores this victory of elite interests at Delphi.

Athletic competitions such as those at the Pythian games offered an opportunity for elites to distinguish themselves and to earn honour and a better reputation. Victors at the Pythian games were rewarded with a laurel wreath; like all four games involved in the periodos, the reward for winning was symbolic. The real reward would have been the fame, honour, and perks in their home polis which accompanied such a victory. The amount of glory won in athletic competitions was not equal for all events. As has already been stated, the Pythian games were less popular than those at Olympia, and therefore a victory at Delphi appears to have been considered more impressive than an Olympic one. In addition, some athletic events appear to have been considered of higher status than others; events requiring

179 For a detailed analysis of the changes apparent in the use and administration of Delphi during the early 6th century BCE, see Scott, 2010, 41-75.
180 De Polignac, 2009, 439-441. Winners at Olympia, Nemea, and Isthmia won wreaths of olive, wild celery, and pine respectively.
more money in order to participate, such as horse races and chariot races, were held in higher esteem than cheaper sports like boxing or running.\textsuperscript{182}

There is no denying that events involving horses were much more expensive to enter, and were therefore particularly associated with the most powerful elites. The ownership of horses in Greece had been associated with the higher social ranks long before the Archaic period, and continued to be so long after.\textsuperscript{183} Indeed, there was very little practical use for a horse in Greece; the often rugged terrain and dry climate made it impossible for horses to be used much as modes of transportation, and mules were much better suited for such a purpose. Oxen were stronger and cheaper, thus better suited to working in the fields. Horses therefore were usually purchased solely for athletic competitions, serving no other practical purpose. When one adds to that the cost of transporting horses by sea to panhellenic competitions such as the Pythian games, as well as the financial risk of losing a prized horse at sea if the ship were to go down, it is easy to see why only the richest Greeks would participate in equestrian events.

As such, it is not surprising that equestrian events seemed to inspire the largest displays of wealth after a victory. As has already been mentioned, the Delphi charioteer was part of a larger statue group dedicated by Polyzalos, the tyrant of Gela, to commemorate his victory in a chariot race at the Pythian games. We also know that when Gelon, tyrant of Gela, won a chariot victory at Olympia in 488 BCE, he celebrated this victory with a bronze monument at Olympia as well as with a special series of coinage, adding a crowned Nike to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{182} Golden, 2008, 6.
\textsuperscript{183} Golden, 2008, 6.
\end{flushright}
the Syracusan currency.\footnote{Aristotle, \textit{Rhetoric} 3.1405b 24. See Golden, 2008, 7-8 for other examples of victory dedications.} When his successor Hieron, who happened to be his brother, won the horserace at Olympia in 476 BCE, he commissioned epinicean odes from both Pindar and Bacchylides.\footnote{Pindar, \textit{Olympian} 1; Bacchylides 5. Epinicean odes were often commissioned by victorious athletes in order to further enhance their fame. These odes tread a complex line between promoting the victor and associating him with heroes and gods, while avoiding hubris and making sure that the victor’s fame be integrated somehow within the context of his home \textit{polis}. The complicated interplay of elitist and middling values present in these odes is worthy of study on its own account. For a detailed analysis of these matters, see Kurke, 1991.} It is also worth noting that in our manuscripts of Pindar’s odes, the odes celebrating an equestrian victory are placed at the beginning of each section, although this is more likely to reflect the values of the later editors of the manuscripts rather than those of Pindar himself.

While equestrian events necessitated the largest economic investment, and therefore were entered by the richest members of Greek society, they did present a potential problem when it came to the glory of the victory. Unlike other events, the owner of the horse or chariot team did not need to compete himself; it was more customary to hire a jockey and a chariot driver. However, this meant that some of the glory of victory may have been passed on to this jockey or driver, rather than to the owner of the horses. Golden highlights this issue and discusses some of the measures taken by horse and chariot owners to diminish the glory attributed to their jockeys and drivers in order to maximize their own.\footnote{Golden, 2008, 6-16. Greek elites considered honour to be a zero-sum game; any honour attributed to a jockey or a driver would have been seen as stolen from the owner of the horses, and would diminish the owner’s achievement.} The jockeys presented less of a problem; because they needed to be as light as possible, young boys were usually chosen for these jobs, and individual jockeys could not occupy that job long enough to establish a reputation which would threaten the horse owner’s glory.\footnote{Golden, 2008, 12.}
Chariot drivers potentially presented a larger problem. Chariots had to be driven by grown men, and these races were fairly dangerous; crashes were common. Some, such as Hieron of Syracuse, chose to remedy this problem by driving the chariot themselves.\textsuperscript{188} Others chose to have a family member drive the chariot, with the result that any glory the driver may attain would at least remain in the same family. For example, Xenocrates’ victorious chariot at the Pythian games of 490 BCE was driven by his son Thrasybulus.\textsuperscript{189} Finally, some hired slaves as chariot drivers. While these were more problematic than family members, their status was low enough not to be threatening to the owners of the chariots.\textsuperscript{190} It is also worth noting that these slaves are never mentioned in epinicean odes, nor do they appear to have been a part of the athlete’s processions which preceded some athletic competitions.\textsuperscript{191} All efforts were taken to diminish these drivers’ contributions, and therefore any glory they might obtain if victorious.

So far, the discussion has focused on the equestrian events and their position as an exclusively elite event. It is worth noting that all athletic events at the Pythian games were primarily entered by elite individuals. In order to compete, an individual needed to have the leisure to train at the gymnasia, which was an activity which was particularly associated with the elite lifestyle, as has already been stated. In addition, the individual also needed the leisure and the funds to travel to Delphi in order to participate in the games.\textsuperscript{192} Aristotle relates the victory of an Argive fishmonger at the Olympic games, highlighting it as an

\textsuperscript{188} Pindar, \textit{Pythian} 2.1-9
\textsuperscript{189} Pindar, \textit{Pythian} 6
\textsuperscript{190} Golden, 2008, 13-14.
\textsuperscript{191} Golden, 2008, 14.
extraordinary event.\textsuperscript{193} It is apparent from this passage that this occupation was not the norm for victors, and that participation in the games was usually restrained to those of a higher social status.

It is also worth noting that the position of equestrian events as the most prestigious athletic disciplines may not have been universally accepted by all parts of Greek society. Because only the richest could afford to participate, it is logical that the winners of these events were able to make the most elaborate displays to celebrate their victories. However, it is worth noting that each Olympic game, the most prestigious athletic competitions at the time, are identified by the victors of the \textit{stadion} race rather than the four-horse chariot race or some other equestrian event.\textsuperscript{194} This could simply be because the \textit{stadion} was the oldest event at Olympia. Its antiquity may have given it a higher status, so that a number of Greeks may have considered a victory in this footrace as more impressive than an equestrian victory.

Regardless of the event, any individual who won an event at the Pythian games benefited from a large increase in his status and his honour. However, this increased status could be dangerous to that individual’s \textit{polis} in much the same way as impressive dedications. There is precedent in our literary sources for an athletic victor trying to use his increased fame and reputation to become a tyrant. Thucydides tells the tale of Kylon’s failed attempt to take over Athens after his victory at Olympia with the support of his father-in-law, who was tyrant of Megara.\textsuperscript{195} As was the case for dedications, \textit{poleis} strived to control the glory and reputation of their athletic victors in order to bring them back within the institution of the \textit{polis} and to maintain a political balance. Many \textit{poleis} instituted ceremonies during

\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{193} Rhetoric 1.1365a20 \\
\textsuperscript{194} Pausanias 5.7. The \textit{stadion} was a short distance race, approximately 190 meters. See de Polignac, 2009, 440. \\
\textsuperscript{195} Thucydides 1.126 \end{flushleft}
which the victor would transfer his crown to the *polis* as a whole, thereby symbolically sharing his glory with the *polis*. In some cases, the victors symbolically transferred some of their glory onto the *polis* in exchange for advantages within the *polis*, such as being fed at public expense, as was the case for Athenians who had won a horse or chariot race at Olympia.\(^\text{196}\) Whatever the method, it was important for *poleis* to seek to reintegrate victors of athletic competitions within the framework of the *polis* in order to preserve its stability and to prevent attempts to follow in Kylon’s footsteps.

\(^\text{196}\) Plato, *Apology* 36d.
Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that the developments of the 8th century BCE affected the nature of the Greek elite in such a way that it pushed their interactions and private affairs outside the territory of the *polis* and into interstate sanctuaries such as Delphi. In the first chapter, we saw how the economic, military, and religious changes during the 8th century BCE resulted in an unstable elite without a defined political centre. We also saw that elements of the Greek lifestyle such as guest friendships and marriage alliances strongly encouraged interpoltal interactions among the elite. The agonistic nature of Greek society as a whole was also highlighted. I then examined a variety of factors which led to interstate sanctuaries such as Delphi being chosen as adequate substitutes for elite interactions instead of a non-existent political and economic centre. The political neutrality of such sanctuaries was advantageous, and provided a good alternative to the *polis* as a space for interaction, especially since the *polis* was focused more on the needs of the common people, relegating elite interests to its margins.

The second chapter examined a variety of different types of elite interactions which occurred within the bounds of the Delphic sanctuary and examined how each was influenced by the elite values and characteristics discussed in the first chapter. We saw clearly that interactions such as trade, marriage alliances, and guest friendships, all of which were encouraged by the elites’ inclination for interpoltal interactions, could more easily be transacted at interstate sanctuaries such as Delphi because of its providing regular gatherings of elites from all over the Greek world. The important role which trade played in Delphi’s early history and rise to panhellenic fame was also highlighted. The agonistic nature of the
Greek elite was also reflected in the Delphic sanctuary. The votive offerings were early on competitive displays of wealth through which individual elites could and did win better reputations and honour. Athletic competitions such as those held during the Pythian games served a similar purpose; the competitive dedications and athletic competitions at Delphi allowed elites to establish their status and display it for other elites to see. However, it was noticed in both cases that the amount of influence gained through such competition could be dangerous to the stability of the elites’ poleis. As we saw, these poleis used measures such as treasuries or public feasts in order to take the honour resulting from competitive displays and integrate it into the framework of the polis.

One of the most interesting issues which arose during this investigation was the difficulty in establishing the characteristics of Greek elites as a whole. As has been mentioned, there were several regional differences among the various parts of Greece, and they were reflected in the ways in which their elite citizens made use of the Delphic sanctuary. The Western Greek city-states particularly seemed to have had very different economic circumstances during the 8th and 7th centuries BCE, and their relationship with tyrants was also markedly different from the rest of the Greek world. Scholars wishing to pursue further studies on this topic may want to focus on the regional differences found in various parts of Greece, and how these differences affected the behaviour of the Greek elite.
(This figure has been omitted due to copyright.)
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