Abstract

The extreme wealth of early Greek rulers, their lavish building programmes, and their enthusiasm for athletic competition have often been considered inseparable from accounts of their ‘tyranny’, self-seeking behaviour, greed, and in turn corruption and cruelty. These ‘tyrants’, though some were judged by ancient sources to have ruled well, ultimately, we are told, failed. More recent scholarship has tried to address this ‘discourse of tyranny’ in the sources, challenging accepted beliefs of what made a turannos or basileus, and where accounts are perhaps unduly influenced or biased, regenerating topoi which ultimately define a turannos, indeed all ‘tyrants’ perhaps unfairly. This thesis attempts to take things further, and examine the nature of the rule of these men through the lens of philia, in order to show that their use of wealth and religious activity, their temple-building and athletic competition, for example, were intrinsically linked to their pattern of ruling. In order to achieve this I have assessed five rulers, whose rules cover a period of over two centuries, and whose cities span a broad geographical aspect of the Greek world. Moreover I have chosen periods of rule which pre-existed coinage in their city, which oversaw its introduction, and which developed its minting, to examine how this phenomenon relates to the problem. As a result I have indeed found significant patterns of rule, in behavioural use of wealth, association with religious sanctuaries, personal portrayal, and that the introduction of coinage served as an additional medium for this activity. Philia was a fundamental conduit for such patterns of behaviour, a framework within which wealth was acceptably used in exchange with citizens, gods, and even other rulers, and through which, I have argued, a shared kudos benefitted all concerned parties, and ultimately sanctioned the ruler’s position of authority. With this initial research from an original viewpoint for the examination of these early Greek rulers, it is hoped that it paves the way for further and similar analysis.
For Nicola, φιλάτη
# Contents

Abbreviations .............................................................................................................. 7

1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 8
  1.1 Wealth and its Use .................................................................................................. 11
  1.2 Religious Practice and Rule .................................................................................... 14
  1.3 *Philia, Dōra, and Charites; Euergesia and Megaloprepeia* .............................. 16
  1.4 The Sources .......................................................................................................... 27

2 Cypselus' *Philia* and Rule ......................................................................................... 31
  2.1 How hostile was Cypselus to the Bacchiad regime, how revolutionary was his autocracy, and how did he secure his sole rule? ............................................................ 33
  2.2 What purpose was served by Cypselus' expenditure on dedications at Olympia and Delphi? ................................................................................................................. 48

3 Deinomenid *Philia* and Rule ....................................................................................... 56
  3.1 The Use and Display of Wealth .............................................................................. 57
    3.1.1 Acts of *charis* at Olympia and Delphi .......................................................... 57
    3.1.2 Monument and hymn, the gods as *phīloi*, the ruler as *euergetēs* .......... 60
    3.1.3 Victory in war and monument ....................................................................... 64
  3.2 Religious Activity and Good Rule ........................................................................... 76
    3.2.1 Ruler as Priest ................................................................................................... 76
    3.2.2 Ruler as Hero: Protector and Founder ......................................................... 78
    3.2.3 Ruler as Hero: *Sōter* and Bringer of Freedom .......................................... 86
  3.3 Coinage, Religious Activity and Good Rule ............................................................ 92
3.3.1 Coinage, *koinonia*, and *charis* ................................................................. 92

3.3.2 Control of the Mint ......................................................................................... 94

3.3.3 Iconography and Artistry of the coinage of foreign *philoi* ..................... 95

4 Pisistratid *Philia* and Rule .................................................................................. 101

4.1 Were the Pisistratids euergetai and philoi to the people of Athens and Attica? 102

4.1.1 Pisistratus the ‘Tyrant’ ................................................................................... 102

4.1.2 Pisistratus’ Final Rule and *Philia* .............................................................. 106

4.1.3 Pisistratus’ Wealth and Coinage ................................................................. 113

4.2 Was the rule of the Pisistratids dependent upon *philia* with overseas elite prior to their secure dynasty? ................................................................................. 116

4.2.1 Eretria and Thrace ........................................................................................ 116

4.2.2 The Chersonese ........................................................................................... 118

4.2.3 Naxos ............................................................................................................ 120

4.3 Was the rule of the Pisistratids dependent upon *philia* with the gods? ... 122

4.3.1 Delian Apollo ................................................................................................ 122

4.3.2 Ptōian Apollo ................................................................................................ 123

4.3.3 Athens and Attica ......................................................................................... 127

5 Polycrates’ *Philia* and Rule .............................................................................. 131

5.1 Polycrates and *Philia* ...................................................................................... 132

5.1.2 Polycrates’ Power and Piracy ...................................................................... 133

5.1.3 Reassessing Herodotus ............................................................................... 138
5.2 Wealth and *Philia* ................................................................. 144
5.2.2 *Xenia* and the Use of Wealth ........................................... 145
5.2.3 Samian *Megaloprepeia* .................................................... 149
5.3 Wealth, Coinage, and Religious *Philiai* ................................. 154
5.3.2 Introduction and use of Coinage ........................................ 154
5.3.3 Polycrates' Use of Wealth on Religion ................................ 158
6 Battiad *Philia* and Rule .......................................................... 165
6.1 Apollo and the Battiads .......................................................... 166
6.1.1 Apollo, Delphi, and Battus' Foundation of Cyrene ................. 167
6.1.2 The Enduring *Philia* of the Battiads, Delphian Apollo, and the
Cyreneans .................................................................................. 172
6.2 Battiad *Philia* and Apollo as Arbitrator .................................. 176
6.2.1 Arcesilas III and *Philia* .................................................... 176
6.2.2 Pheretime and *Philia* ....................................................... 179
6.3 Battiad *Xenia* and Trade ........................................................ 181
6.3.1 *Philia* and Opportunism with Non-Greeks .......................... 181
6.3.2 *Xenia* and Trade with Samos, and the Role of Coinage ........ 185
Conclusion ..................................................................................... 189
Bibliography .................................................................................. 191
Abbreviations

Periodicals are abbreviated as in *L’Année Philologique*. Abbreviated references to classical authors appear as in LSJ. Note also the following abbreviations for modern sources.

FGrHist Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*

IG *Inscriptiones Graecae* (14 vols)

IvO *Die Inschriften von Olympia*


Note on transliteration and translation

I have used the Latinised equivalents for most Greek names, and, in the interests of accessibility, have used a transliterated form (with the nearest English equivalents) of a few more specialised terms and individual Greek words (e.g. *philia, philos, kudos*). I have distinguished *xenia* (ritualised friendship) from *xeinia* (gifts of hospitality, with its singular *xeinion*). (All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.)
1 Introduction

This thesis argues that rulers across the Greek world created systems of networks to connect and communicate with their citizens and their gods, and that these networks took the form of philia. In their interaction with their philoi they employed their wealth in acts of charis, in the form of gifts, dedications, and benefactions, and through such activity their rule was sanctioned, enduring, and celebrated. It is hoped that for the first time it will be demonstrated here through the lens of philia that a ruler’s wealth and religions were intrinsically linked.

A religious responsibility and function is often associated with rule, giving the ruler authority as officiator and a lynchpin between god and the citizen-worshipper. Such an inherited right in the case of Gelon facilitated a claim to rule. In the example of the Pisistratids, their embellishment of the Panathenaea gave them roles as religious officiators, which enhanced their ruling authority. Battus I, as city founder, established the city’s shrines and cults and possessed rights over priesthoods and sanctuaries, which his sons and successors inherited. As ruler and priest the autocrat governed the temples’ and the city’s wealth, with which he renovated and built new monuments both to the gods and for secular use; Pindar, for example, frequently reminds us that this type of expenditure was expected of a ruler. Such expenditure by the ruler for

---

1 Philia is not easily defined, since it can encompass a mixture of emotions and activity, and can occur within a range of relationships. One important element emphasised in current scholarship is the behavioural aspect to philia, the exchange of gifts and thereby the use of wealth, which reciprocation leads to an obligation by each philos to the other. The functional nature to philia is generally considered dominant to any emotional nature, as we might expect from a modern definition of friendship, but Konstan has recently argued instead that affection was dominant (Konstan 1997, and for a criticism see Mitchell 1997b).

2 Herodotus (Hdt. 7.153) writes that his ancestor Telines had possession of the sacred objects of Demeter and Persephone, and through this authority he was able to stem an internal secession and restore peace to the city. His reward was the office of priest, which was handed down to his descendants, including Gelon and Hieron of Syracuse.

3 Even after Demonax’ reforms the Battiaids retained control of certain sanctuaries and priesthoods (Hdt. 4.161.3).

4 For example Pi. P. 2.88-100, where the poet calls Hieron a ‘steward of many things’, compares him to Croesus, famed for his wealth and his excellent use of it, and warns him against seeking selfish profit.
both his citizens and their gods established a contractual bond in the form of *philía*, I argue, and invited debt from citizens and gods to the ruler in return. This interconnection not only served the ruler well by the approval of others and therefore a continuation of his position, but benefitted those others, by means of embellished shrines which decorated the city and brought *kudos* to city and god alike, and by means of public facilities such as water supplies, fountains, processional roads, a merchant fleet, all of which enhanced the city aesthetically and economically. Through the activity of the ruler, he, citizens, and gods were *philoi* who all benefited from their continued investment in each other.

A very similar pattern of divine sanction and further investment in the divine can be seen in its extended form outside of the city, where the ruler embraced his relationship with, for example, Panhellenic sanctuaries. The Delphic Oracle is said to have prophesied a number of rulers’ reigns, including Cypselus and Battus, and in return the former built the first treasury at Delphi\(^5\) while the latter and his descendants repeatedly consulted with and, as we can tell from our sources, reinforced to others their strong association with Apollo at Delphi\(^6\). Dedications, especially in the form of treasuries and items which were housed in those treasuries at Delphi and Olympia were a collective investment by the ruler and his people, which connected them with the god of those sanctuaries. Just as the ruler invited bonds of *philía* between citizens, himself, and gods within his city by building temples and shrines, so too at Panhellenic sanctuaries he invited bonds of *philía* with those gods and himself and his citizens through dedications. Another way in which a ruler could invest in a Panhellenic shrine and its god and bring *kudos* to himself and his city was through

---

\(^5\) Hdt. 1.14.2; Scott 2010: 41-2.

\(^6\) For example, Hdt. 4.150-9; Pl. P. 4.4-8, 53-4, P. 5.20-3, 57-63, 87-93; Call. Ap. 77.
expenditure on and success in athletic contest. In his hymns Pindar commonly highlights the expense of such activity, which is in turn rewarded by the god.

Finally, within his own city, the ruler sought to emphasise his expenditure on both religious and secular activity and thereby reinforce his authority over these by presenting them as essentially inseparable. This could take the form of coinage, which would often feature iconography, or a ‘type’, which related to the city’s most important sanctuary as well as another type which stressed the city as a unit, or it could take a geospatial form, such as Battus I’s city plan which interconnected secular areas and monuments with those of cult. Where coinage related to activity outside of its city it was reflected in the ruler’s choice of standard or type, which again demonstrated his philia with other cities. Examples are the adoption by Aetna and other Sicilian cities of the Syracusan equine type, and Polycrates’ change of standard to align himself with potentially more favourable economic opportunities.

The rulers selected for study in this dissertation are from cities across the Greek world, from Sicily and North Africa to mainland Greece and Asia Minor, and date from across the Archaic Period and into the early Classical Period. In terms of examination of the use of wealth, the chosen rulers also span the period from pre-coinage Greece, through the introduction of coinage to their cities, and beyond. This selection will allow some measure of patterns in rule, geographically, chronologically, and will also measure those patterns with and without coinage.

Structurally, this thesis is straightforward. A comprehensive introduction of three parts will in the first place examine the key concepts related to the topics to be discussed, essentially the use of wealth, religious practice, and philia. This will provide a theoretical framework for the rest of the thesis. Secondly the variety of

---

7 Examples of the victor’s crown as kudos: Pi. O. 4.8-12, P. 12.4-6, i. 1.10-12; of the city receiving the crown: O. 5, P. 12. See Kurke 1991: 205-7, and ch. 8.
sources available will be assessed for their potential to provide evidence and any problems of reliability. This will include, as is necessary in an examination of the autocratic rulers of the period in question, an up to date analysis of the issue of ‘tyranny’, the use of the term in the sources, and the debate as to its constitutional nature.

The first chapter will focus on Cypselus of Corinth. He has been chosen firstly on the basis of chronology, as he is the earliest of the rulers discussed here, secondly because his rule pre-dates the introduction of coinage to his city, which will allow an assessment of the impact and use of coinage as a form of wealth, the ruler’s association with the production of his city’s coinage, and, potentially, the relationship of the city’s coinage to its religious practice, and thirdly because evidence is more limited on his rule, which will allow me to test some boundaries of my argument. In contrast, in the following chapter, a much greater abundance of evidence is available on Hieron’s reign, literary, archaeological, epigraphical, and numismatic. This will allow a more detailed analysis and a more comprehensive test of patterns of philia. Thereafter the rulers of each chapter are in chronological order, looking at Polycrates of Samos, the Pisistratids of Athens, and the Battiads of Cyrene.

1.1 Wealth and its Use

In order to discuss expenditure, it is important to distinguish the concepts of wealth, money, and coinage, and to highlight some terminology in the Greek. I shall examine the use of coinage in some depth, but it must be conceded that in our period the introduction of coinage to Greece was relatively new, even if as a phenomenon

---

8 I shall examine essentially the whole Battiad dynasty, but as its culmination post-dates that of the other rulers their rule will feature in the last chapter.

the spread of its use and the rate of that spread were impressive. Tracing the use of coinage, rather than another form of money, in transactions is problematic, not least because the terminology often used seems to have been used for money even prior to the introduction of coinage, and so distinguishing the two based on the use of these terms alone can be impossible. Evidence for the use of coinage is more prevalent and clearer from the mid-fifth century, and the use of coinage as evidence itself of expenditure is easier in and near to its original locale of production, the sphere in which the ruler and his city's coinage probably had the greatest influence. Wealth (in Greek πλούτος, ὀλβος or χρήματα) is the store of goods, which are not necessarily used in transactions. Each item in the store can take any form as long as it has value of itself for it to be considered as contributing towards the amount of wealth. Money (in Greek χρήματα), however, is 'a store of wealth, a medium of exchange, a measure of value, and a means for making payments'. When wealth is used in expenditure, it is money. Kim makes the important point that the form of that money can vary considerably, from cattle to spits to bullion or to coin, but the form taken and used in a community is 'culturally biased, acceptable to some but not to others'. From the sixth century coinage became the prevalent form of money in Greece. Coinage (in Greek χρήματα, ἀργύριον or νόμισμα) is 'a piece of metal which has been stamped by an issuing authority to be of a definite value or weight.'

---

13 On cattle performing at least one of the functions of money in the Homeric poems, see Seaford 2004: 27-30, on spits and coinage, and 'utensil money' see Schaps 2004: 82-8 and Seaford 2004: 102-12, and on bullion see Kim 2001: 13-20 and Kroll 2008: 12-37. On the proposition that what we might recognize as money used by the Greeks before the invention of coinage was not in fact conceptualised as money by the Greeks see Schaps 2004: 15-17.
Almost always of silver\textsuperscript{16}, the pieces of metal vary in size and weight, with a name for each designated weight. The names vary a little regionally or between cities, as does the exact weight of each type, the 'standard' on which the system of weights was produced for a particular region or city\textsuperscript{17}. The coinage of Syracuse, for example, is minted on the Attic standard where a drachm weighed 4.3 grams. Its largest denomination was commonly the tetradrachm, with other denominations the didrachm, drachm, the obol (sixth of a drachm) and litra (fifth of a drachm)\textsuperscript{18}. Only when I can be confident of examples of the use of coinage shall I refer to this in terms of coinage, otherwise examples of expenditure will be more carefully termed the use of money.

I shall argue that rulers managed their city's reserve of wealth, and that in fact it was difficult to distinguish between the private wealth of the ruler and the public funds. I shall also argue that these rulers managed the minting of the city's coinage, perhaps even choosing and manipulating its iconography. Some of these monarchs were distinguished in the historical record for their wealth, such as Polycrates, Hieron, or the Battiads, but they are marked out as extreme in wealth not as private individuals but as rulers of their cities. For example, Herodotus says that it was Polycrates, not Samos \textit{per se}, who had a considerable naval and military force\textsuperscript{19}, and that Gelon, Hieron's predecessor, possessed 'a great part of Greece'\textsuperscript{20}. Pisistratus meanwhile, we are told, taxed Athenians, though there is no suggestion that this revenue was destined for his private purse\textsuperscript{21}; indeed he also distributed loans to his

\textsuperscript{16} The first Greek (and Lydian) coins, minted in western Asia Minor, were of Lydian electrum, a gold-silver alloy, until the discovery of cementation, the process which separates the gold and silver from electrum. From this point Greek coins were essentially minted in gold and silver, though predominantly the latter (Kraay 1976: 28; Seaford 2004: 114-5, 125-8).
\textsuperscript{18} Holloway 1991: 124-5.
\textsuperscript{19} Hdt. 3.39.3-4.
\textsuperscript{20} Hdt. 7.157.2.
citizens. Moreover, as I shall argue, Athens’ earliest coinage, minted during Pisistratus’ reign, may have included silver which he had previously mined privately\(^\text{22}\). A powerful later example is that of Polydams of Pharsalus, whose people entrusted him with their acropolis, the collection of revenues, and the free choice of expenditure on administration and religious activity. In return Polydams used his own wealth to assist the Pharsalians when necessary\(^\text{23}\).

1.2 Religious Practice and Rule

The ancient Greek gods are most commonly associated with a locality, a sanctuary, which in turn is managed by a polis\(^\text{24}\). In the tradition about sanctuaries the god may choose the location or have a strong connection with it according to the mythology. There are examples of the less common interurban or even Panhellenic sanctuaries such as that of Apollo at Delphi\(^\text{25}\), whose sanctuary was governed by a confederacy of poleis\(^\text{26}\). However even a Panhellenic sanctuary such as Olympia was controlled by the single polis of Elis\(^\text{27}\). A particular sanctuary’s priests may stem from one or more family, and these could include the ruling family, as is most clear in the examples of Gelon, the Battiads, and the Pisistratids\(^\text{28}\). Mazarakis Ainian argues that

---

\(^{22}\) I argue later that the revenue raised by Pisistratus prior to Pallene in Thrace may have contributed to the first coinage of Athens, minted under Pisistratus, and which contained silver from a source apart from the local sources at Laurium ([Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 15.2; Hdt. 1.61.3-4; Dawson 1999: 74-5).

\(^{23}\) X. *HG* 6.1.1-3.

\(^{24}\) Recently Kindt has acknowledged the importance of the connection between polis and religion, but has attempted the examination of religious activity from alternative perspectives, such as the individual and personal experience (Kindt 2012). In contrast, Sourvinou-Inwood argues that all religion is polis-based, and on three levels, firstly the religious activity within the polis itself, secondly where defining practice and concepts are shared between poleis, and thirdly where interaction with Panhellenic sanctuaries are always made with reference to one’s polis (Sourvinou-Inwood 1990).

\(^{25}\) Apollo chose Delphi as the location for his oracle, as described in the *Homeric Hymns to Apollo* (*h. Ap.* 277-97).

\(^{26}\) Scott 2010: 35-6.

\(^{27}\) Scott 2010: 30-5. It would seem that cities could contest control of shrines, especially where they bordered the land of each. An example of this is perhaps Kalapodi, which only late in its existence became definitively, and also retrospectively, Phocian (Morgan 1997: 95-100).

\(^{28}\) The Battiads retained rights over certain religious *temenea* even after the reforms of Demonax diminished their political authority (Hdt. 4.161.3). The Pisistratids certainly enhanced the Great
it was this control of cult activity which in the Early Iron Age, at least, allowed leaders to retain their position of superiority. Gelon, ruler of Gela and Syracuse, appears to have asserted his authority as ruler in Gela by claiming that his ancestor had possession of cultic items of Demeter and Persephone. In this way, ruler and chief religious officiator were embodied as one, and the possession of one can lead to a claim of an entitlement to the other.

Rulers of this period were temple-builders, decorating their cities with such buildings which demonstrated the rulers’ beneficence to the people, accruing their gratitude and debt, and also their position of power and their wealth, divinely inspired, wisely used. Battus, founding ruler of Cyrene, for example, is praised for his city planning which included a temple to Apollo and a processional way to it from the heart of the city. Temples also stored wealth, which although dedicated to the god could be distributed for the good of the people, as long as it was repaid with the same value or more. An example of this was the use of the Parthenon wealth during the Peloponnesian War. The same is true of state treasuries at Panhellenic sanctuaries, such as those of Corinth at Olympia and Delphi. This association of a city’s wealth and the iconography on its coins, most commonly a representation of the city’s most important divinity, demonstrates the interlinking of the city, and therefore its ruler, with its wealth, and its gods. It is this triangular relationship,

Panathenaeai ([Pl.] Hipparch. 228b 4-8; Shapiro 1989: 41-7): Hipparchus was leading its procession when he was murdered (Hdt. 5.56.2; Th. 1.20, 6.56-7), and Hippias was to receive it ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 18.3). If the Pisistratids were not priests as such, they nonetheless controlled at least some aspects of the Panatheniac rites.

29 Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 393. He also shows that Early Iron Age rulers’ houses were in fact the religious centres of their city.

30 Hdt. 7.153. See Parker 2011: 48 and Mitchell 2013: 121 and n. 15. Parker disagrees, though he does quote the example of Gelon only to dismiss it as ‘enigmatic, and isolated’. On Gelon’s actual accession, Herodotus gives an account where Gelon crushed resistance from the populace to the autocratocracy and seized rule from the previous ruler’s rightful sons and heirs (Hdt. 7.155.1). However, Diodorus tells us that after the battle of Himera, Gelon submitted himself unarmed to the assembly and was duly ‘elected’ by the populace, hailed as ‘benefactor and saviour and king’ (D.S. 11.26.4).

31 Pl. P. 5.87-93. For other examples of rulers as temple builders see Mitchell 2013: 121.

32 Th. 2.13.

33 Th. 1.121.3.
wealth-religion-ruler that I shall examine in the rulers of a number of Greece’s cities. Moreover since the use of wealth for the good of others, be they friends, the citizen body, or gods, is exemplified in the transactional nature of philia, this methodology will be a vehicle for my examination.

1.3 Philia, Dōra, and Charites; Euergesia and Megaloprepeia

Philia is the Greek idea of ‘friendship’, though this translation is no easy equivalent and the nuance in the English does not fully reflect the concept in the Greek or the relationship between philoi. The same is true of the term philanthrópia, which Aristotle makes clearest to be associated with the concept of philia and its related concepts, charis and euergesia. Philia is a relationship of mutual advantage, a relationship which works and lasts as long as the advantage remains mutual, and need not be a relationship which displays affection, as we might expect from our term ‘friendship’\textsuperscript{34}. In fact it is in the interest of each philos to nurture the relationship which should prove useful in the future\textsuperscript{35}. The use of one’s wealth in a gift to a philos was called charis, a term whose meaning embodies both the gift itself and the pleasure it is intended to bring to the receiver, and it is this continued exchange of charites which allows the philia to endure. The precise balance of affection and utilitarianism in Greek philia is still debated. Millett places a greater emphasis on the instrumental nature of philia and the profitability for each party. He argues that philia was a form of insurance\textsuperscript{36}, created not only by the occasion of reciprocal beneficence, but also by the mutual advantage of the future expectation of further such acts of beneficence. So strong is this expectation of further acts of philia that if there is reason to doubt the

\textsuperscript{34} For the continuation of reciprocity in philia as embodying the democratic ideology of classical Athens, particularly where it suppresses hierarchical relations and emphasises relationships of equality, see Konstan 1998.

\textsuperscript{35} Adkins 1963: 36.

\textsuperscript{36} Millett 1991: 120.
ability of the other party to deliver, the *philia* could be abandoned on the basis that it is no longer useful\(^{37}\). As Goldhill says, and I agree, *philia* is 'overridingly a series of complex obligations, duties and claims'\(^{38}\) and affection can indeed be present, but Konstan argues that *philia* exists between ‘people who associate voluntarily on the basis of mutual affection’, and although *philoi* help *philoi* when required, it is out of kindly intentions\(^{39}\). For Konstan affection is above all the most important factor in *philia*, and obligations and duties are out of respect and an emotional tie, much less stemming from the opportunity of mutual gain. Foxhall too plays down the instrumentalist view of Millett and plays up the importance of affection in *philia*\(^{40}\).

The contractual nature of *philia* demands that debts are paid, and reciprocity endures. Aristotle makes the reciprocity between *philoi* very clear indeed when he says ‘a man becomes a *philos* whenever he is loved (*philoumenos*) and loves in return (*antiphilei*) and this is known to both’\(^{41}\) and examples in Xenophon highlight ‘the double obligation imposed by *philia*: the duty to help one’s friends is balanced by the clear expectation of help in return’\(^{42}\). The *philoi* assist each other by the giving of gifts, or whatever the other requires, as in *xenia*, on the understanding that each such act will be reciprocated and enhanced. The increase in return invites and ensures that a further gift will be given, and the relationship continues and endures. These acts are described as the giving of *dōra* or *charites*\(^{43}\). The relationship is then contractual, and intentionally long-standing. It can even span generations, with sons


\(^{38}\) Goldhill 1986: 79-83.


\(^{40}\) Foxhall 1998.

\(^{41}\) Arist. *EE* 7.1236a14-15.

\(^{42}\) Millett 1991: 117 discussing X. *Mem*. 2.4-6, 10.

\(^{43}\) Mitchell (Mitchell 1997a: 18-19) makes a distinction where *dōra* are tangible objects, representing the exchange within the relationship, while *charites*, indicated by their etymological meaning ‘things which delight’ produced gratitude at each turn, inviting the receiver to give again in one continuing and spiralling *philia*. 
replacing fathers as *philoi*\(^{44}\). An example might be the chariot monument of Hieron at Olympia, which was in fact erected by his son Deinomenes\(^{45}\), on his late father’s behalf. Hieron’s death was not enough to excuse him for the act of *charis* when his son should take on that inherited responsibility.

The debate as to the level of either instrumentalism or altruism in *philia* is not new, and we must analyse definitions of *philia* and usage of terms applicable to *philia* in the ancient authors. As we have seen, Aristotle explored the concept of *philia*, and he determined three types, based on virtue, pleasure and utility, but his discussion focuses on the element of reciprocity in *philia*, a feature emphasised by other writers too\(^{46}\). Mitchell, who shows that the affection-utility balance could be ambiguous to the Greeks too, and could be exploited by *philoi*, just as the meaning of ‘friendship’ can be exploited today, has examined the evidence, in philosophical and non-philosophical authors alike, and concludes that ‘some friendships were more affectionate and some less so, and that friendships worked on a sliding scale of affection and utility’\(^{47}\). Adkins has demonstrated that *philein*, ‘to love’ is not so much to show affection but to perform an action towards one’s *philos*, and it is what one does to benefit one’s *philos* which is more important than any affection towards them\(^{48}\). He also argues well that the same principles of *philia* between men are present in Aristotle’s discussion of the notion as are present in Homer’s poems, and that therefore there is continuity from the archaic to classical communities. It follows then that, in the examination of the importance of *philia* to the rulers of this thesis, we should not be too afraid to consider definitions and examples of *philia* in the work of

\(^{44}\) Lys. 18.26-7; Isoc. 2.19; [Dem] 50.56.
\(^{45}\) Paus. 6.12.1, 8.42.8-10.
\(^{46}\) For example Arist. *EN* 1155a1 and following, *EE* 1236a13 and following; *X. Mem.* 2.2.13-14; Pl. *Ly.* 212d.
\(^{47}\) Mitchell 1997a: 8.
\(^{48}\) Adkins 1963.
authors who came after them, such as Aristotle, authors who preceded them, such as Homer, as well as authors contemporary with them.

Xenia is a form of philia in similar respect, where the obligations to xenoi are inherited. Like the philiai our sources describe, xenia too is ‘often, although not always, at the utilitarian end of the scale’\textsuperscript{49}. A good example comes from Pindar’s words on his own relationship with Hieron. The poet says he shall receive charis, which he specifically implies is a payment (μισθός), from his hymns for other cities. He then advises the ruler that if he philein to hear good things about himself, he should spend his money without concern, and calls Hieron his philos in the same breath as warning him not to be tricked by thoughts of profit which could turn bad\textsuperscript{50}. Elsewhere Pindar calls Hieron his xenos, wishing to visit him in Syracuse, bringing charites\textsuperscript{51}. Philia then can occur between individuals in different cities (xenia), but it can also occur between individuals and whole states (proxenia). Similarly philia can occur between two whole states, where the citizens of each city act as a corporate body. Acts of charis can also be performed by a whole city, or in another formula ‘the ruler and the citizens’\textsuperscript{52}, to the gods. This is most in evidence at Panhellenic sanctuaries. Mitchell argues that many of these corporate acts of philia, despite this nature, operate very much as personal acts of philia did\textsuperscript{53}. Philia, then, acted as a glue which bonded entities of different types and of different scales, and functioned on a personal level as well as a political level, uniting individuals to each other, rulers to their citizens, cities to other cities, and cities to the gods.

\textsuperscript{49} Mitchell 1997a: 12.
\textsuperscript{50} Pi. P. 1.76-7, 90, 92.
\textsuperscript{51} Pi. P. 3.69-72.
\textsuperscript{52} An example is Hieron’s Etruscan helmets dedicated at Olympia, after his victory at the battle of Cumae: ‘Hieron and the Syracusans’, ἡιδάρων ὁ Δεινομένεος / καὶ τῷ Συρακόσιοι / τοῖ Δι Τυρ(ρ)ὰν ἀπὸ Κύμας (IvO 249 and ML 29).
\textsuperscript{53} Mitchell 1997a: 22-3, 51-5.
Though clearly philia did not need to be a contract between equals, Aristotle describes philia as equality\textsuperscript{54} nonetheless, since in examples of philia between unequals in status or ability, the equality or balance is addressed by each philos giving proportionately, where the inferior partner should not expect as great a return. He describes this as ‘equality in proportion, not equality in number’\textsuperscript{55}, where the ‘better’ or ‘more useful’ party should receive more philia than he displays\textsuperscript{56}. Each philos performs an act of charis in accordance with their station. Xenophon highlights an example of the necessary performance of charis and the importance placed upon this expectation, when he says that we should perform charis to our parents, lest the gods refuse us kindness or other men cast us out, thinking us ‘ungrateful’ (literally ‘without charis’, ἀχάριστος), and we become bereft of philoi (ἐν ἔρημίᾳ φίλων)\textsuperscript{57}. Aristotle gives as examples of unequal philia relationships like the father-son and ruler RULED relationships, and on the other hand like the husband-wife and benefactor-beneficiary (ἐὐεργέτης-ἐὐεργετηθέντα). As an overarching example of a superior-inferior relationship Aristotle gives god-man\textsuperscript{58}. The terms euergetēs (‘benefactor’) and euergesia (‘benefaction’) do not refer only to private acts of beneficence\textsuperscript{59}, between individuals such as husbands and their wives, but can commonly apply to acts of beneficence by an individual to a community or city. Herodotus describes the honourable burial of Histiaeus who had been a euergetēs to both the King of Persia

\textsuperscript{54} Arist. EN 1157b36 (φιλότης ἵσότης) and EN 1158b27-8.
\textsuperscript{55} Arist. EE 1238b20-1: κατ᾽ ἀναλογίαν γὰρ ἴσον, κατ᾽ ἀριθμὸν δ᾽ οὐκ ἴσον.
\textsuperscript{56} Arist. EN 1158b23-8. A comprehensive discussion of attitudes to philia in the literary record is Mitchell 2009.
\textsuperscript{57} X. Mem. 2.2.14. This example is compared to others where one fails to repay their benefactor with charis: χάριν οὐκ ἀποδόντας (X. Mem. 2.2.13).
\textsuperscript{58} Arist. EE 1238b.18-30.
\textsuperscript{59} Kurke 1991: 98 argues that Pindar, who only uses the terms in private contexts (Gundert 1935: 32, 121 n. 134), is conflating private and public acts of benefaction to appeal to an assumed aristocratic preference for private gift-exchange over public beneficence, and to obscure the poet’s service to both the individual and the community.
and the Persians\(^60\), and Mardonius’ choice to send Alexander on a mission to Athens as he was both a \textit{proxenos} and \textit{euergetēs}\(^61\). Gelon himself was hailed as \textit{εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα καὶ βασιλέα}, ‘benefactor and saviour and king’\(^62\), in a public assembly, for his beneficence to his citizens, for saving them from the Carthaginians at Himera, and for their desire that he continue his rule\(^63\). A ruler, then, could have an unequal \textit{philia} not only with his ruled \textit{per se}, but as \textit{euergetēs}, both on a parallel with the unequal \textit{philia} between god and man. Pindar offers an example of a god as \textit{euergetēs} to men, whose act of beneficence was to assist the victory of Herodotus from Thebes in the chariot race (\textit{εὐεργέταν ἀρμάτων ἱπποδρόμιον}). Poseidon was worshipped locally at Onchestus, and as such he is ‘neighbour’ to the Thebans, on all of whose behalf Pindar sings to give recompense to the god for his help in the victory\(^64\). Pindar, as a Theban himself, considers the god’s assistance a public beneficence\(^65\). The ruler, then, has the same sort of \textit{philia} with those he ruled, both as ruler and as \textit{euergetēs}, as a god has with men, and the ruler, like the god, deserves recompense for his beneficence.

There were different kinds of benefaction. The act of beneficence to a city known as \textit{megaloprepeia} was ‘the lavish public expenditure of wealth by those who can afford it’\(^66\), expenditure on, amongst other things, building, entertainment, hospitality, and

\(^{60}\) Hdt. 6.30: ως ἄνδρος μεγάλως ἐσωτῆτο τε καὶ Πέρσης εὐεργέτης. The Persian king also had his own private list of benefactors (Hdt. 3.140, 8.85), which means that the emphatic description of Histiaeus as a benefactor to both the Persians as a whole and to the king doubly reinforces his public relationship.

\(^{61}\) Hdt. 8.136: πρόξεινός τε εἰς καὶ εὐεργέτης.

\(^{62}\) D.S. 11.26.6. This expression is considered anachronistic by Hornblower (Hornblower 1983: 48), but Currie’s argument for these terms and their conveyed meaning to originate much earlier than the Hellenistic period is convincing (Currie 2005: 170, 287-8).

\(^{63}\) Pindar refers to another Sicilian ruler as \textit{euergetēs}, Theron (O. 2.94).

\(^{64}\) Pi. I. 1.52-4: ἀμμὸν δ’ ἐχει Κρόνου σεισίκοιν’ ύλον / γείτον’ ἀμειβόμενοις εὐεργέταν / ἀρμάτων ἱπποδρόμιον κελαδήσαι.

\(^{65}\) Kurke 1991: 150-1.

resources for war\textsuperscript{67}. Through \textit{megaloprepeia} the benefactor adorned the city, just as the athletic victor too crowned and adorned his city\textsuperscript{68}. The city benefitted from adornment and the expenditure of a private individual on public needs and wants, while both the city and the benefactor benefitted from \textit{kudos}\textsuperscript{69}. Expenditure on epinician poems, which in themselves were a form of monument, enhanced that \textit{kudos}, as did the adornment of Panhellenic shrines with monuments at the expense of the benefactor and the city, and the adornment of public spaces in the victor's city with statuary of the victor. In parallel with the city and its victor, the sanctuary and its god shared in this \textit{kudos}, and here we see the parallel relationships of \textit{philia} between victor-benefactor-ruler and their city and between god and victor-benefactor-ruler mutually benefitting all involved. It is well summarised by Xenophon: '[wealth] seems a sweet thing to me, Socrates, also to honour the gods greatly, to help friends in whatever they need, and that the city be in no way unadorned with wealth on my account.'\textsuperscript{70} Examples of all of these are further explored below. In each relationship acts of \textit{charis} are delivered reciprocally, both as thanks for assistance and to please the other, and to ensure continuation of the \textit{philia} for future mutual advantage.

Acts of beneficence, the use of wealth to help \textit{philoi}, not only benefited the receivers, but could also be seen as an opportunity for investment or for pleasure for the giver, an expectation of \textit{charis}, whatever its form, in return. Aristotle notes this benefit to the \textit{euergetēs} with the question: 'How would one benefit from such prosperity if one had no opportunity for beneficence (€ὔεργεσίας), which is most often

\textsuperscript{67} X. \textit{Oec.} 2.5-7.
\textsuperscript{68} Pl. \textit{N.} 2.6-8, P. 9.1-4. Kurke (Kurke 1993) argues that the dedication by the victor of his victory crown to his city shared his 'talismanic power' and thereby his \textit{kudos}. Epinician then functions within this 'economy of \textit{kudos}' in a shared language of action and diction.
\textsuperscript{70} Xen. \textit{Oec.} 11.9: ἥδυ γάρ μοι δοκεῖ, ὦ Σῶκρατες, καὶ θεοὺς μεγαλείως τιμᾶν καὶ φίλους, ἀν τινὸς δέωνται, ἐπιφελεῖν καὶ τὴν πόλιν μηδὲν <τὸ> κατ᾿ ἐμὲ χρήμασιν ἀκόσμητον εἶναι. Ischomachus is speaking here.
displayed, and most highly praised, in relation to friends (πρὸς φίλους)? An early example, in the *Odyssey*, of *charis* in return for beneficence of an *euergetēs* is the complaint of its absence in recompense for Odysseus' past deeds to his 'citizens', a sentiment given twice in the poem, once by Helen, who argues that this due recompense was owed to the benefactor, and a second time by one of the suitors, pleading for his life, affirming that he knew at least that he owed such recompense.

Though etymologically the term *charis* does not necessarily imply expenditure, its contexts often encourage us to see it as measurable in wealth in some way, and that its worth can be accounted. In the *Iliad* Achilles complains of the lack of *charis* from Agamemnon or the other Greeks in recompense for his warring, and, although Achilles refuses, a considerable array of wealth has been offered to him in recompense, and Nestor asserts that 'no one could find fault with the gifts.' Twice in Homer's poems, *charis* is linked both to *kudos* and to the income of wealth. In one instance Athene persuades Pandarus to attempt to kill Menelaus with the promise of χάριν καὶ κύδος and 'excellent and splendid gifts'. In another, Odysseus, in disguise, suggests to Euamaeus that he go into the service of the suitors, with the help of Hermes who brings χάριν καὶ κύδος. Eumaeus persuades him not to, but only because the suitors' servants wear fine clothes and with the promise that on his return Telemachus, as *philos*, will provide such things for him.

Our sources then associate *philia, charis* and *euergesia*, but they also associate *philanthrōpia, charis,* and *euergesia*. Plato lists *philanthrōpia* in his *Definitions* as 'The

74 Hom. *Il*. 9.121-56, 164: tripod, talents of gold, cauldrons, horses, women, a marriage to his daughter at no cost of dowry, and cities. The scale of the wealth offered on the one hand, and the offer to pay the wedding dowry on the other, emphasise the expenditure by one man and the need for no expenditure by the other.
characteristic of a propensity to *philia* towards a man. The state of performing *euergesia* for men. The quality of *charis*. Remembrance in combination with *euergesia*\(^{77}\). Study of the ancient idea of *philanthrōpia* has largely focused on individual passages rather than common perception, though Sulek\(^{78}\) has analysed a gradual change in meaning from its fifth-century origins in drama through its fourth-century philosophical and oratorical usage. Its first appearance is in *Prometheus Bound* to describe Prometheus’ beneficence to men and his stand against Zeus’ tyranny\(^{79}\), and its second in Aristophanes’ *Peace* where the mortal chorus appeals to Hermes by describing him as φιλανθρωπότατος. The Chorus also calls Hermes μεγαλοδωρότατος, ‘the greatest giver of gifts’, and asks that he give *charis*\(^{80}\). Most interesting is that both of these *philanthrōpoi* are gods, known mythologically for their beneficence to mortals, and, as Sulek observes, *philanthrōpia* would soon undergo a transition, where instead of describing a quality of a god beneficent to mortals, it would come to describe a quality of the ideal ruler\(^{81}\). This is most clear in the writing of Isocrates, who in his speech to Philip, for example, calls for his *euergesia* and *philanthrōpia*\(^{82}\). Elsewhere he expounds that those who wish to be successful in public life must behave with *philanthrōpia* and *charis* (ἐπιχαρίτως καὶ φιλανθρωπώς). The people love (φιλοῦσι) neither those who merely associate with others to gain their *charis* nor those who only feign their smiles and *philanthrōpia*, but love those who ‘do well’ (τοὺς εὖ ποιοῦντας) and are ‘beneficial, with substance and dignity’

\(^{77}\) [Pl.] *Def.* 413a11-13: Φιλανθρωπία ἔξις εὐάγωγος ἡθοὺς πρὸς ἀνθρώπου φιλίαν. ἔξις εὕεργητική ἀνθρώπων. χάριτος σχέσις. μνήμη μετ’ εὐεργεσίας.

\(^{78}\) Sulek 2010.

\(^{79}\) A. *Pr.* 7-11. The play’s authorship and date are contested, but a mid- to late-fifth-century date is still most likely (Griffith 1977; West 1990: 51-72).

\(^{80}\) Ar. *Pax* 390-9 (ἄλλα χάριες ὡς φιλανθρωπότατε καὶ μεγαλοδωρότατε δαιμόνων). Sulek omits the problematic Euripidean fragment (see Harder 1985: 5-7, n. 1 and Appendix 1A.41), which describes *charis* as ‘just and philanthrōpos’ (χάριν δικαίαν καὶ φιλανθρωπόν).

\(^{81}\) Sulek 2010: 393.

\(^{82}\) Isoc. *ad Phil.* 116 (ἔπι τε τάς εὐεργεσίας τάς τῶν Ἐλλήνων καὶ πραότητα καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν).
(τοὺς μετ’ ὄγκου καὶ σεμνότητος ὡφελοῦντας)\textsuperscript{83}. Demosthenes too collates *philanthrôpia* and *charis* via the act of giving and the due reciprocity when he describes the act of *charis* as *philanthrôpos* and *philodôros*, and when he says that those who have performed *euergesia* in the past deserve *charis* and *philanthrôpia*\textsuperscript{84}. The importance of the physical act of doing good for the benefit of others is clear, as opposed to mere well-meaning or kindness. *Euergesia*, ‘doing well’ (compare its synonym above εὖ ποιῶν) and the delivery of *charis* are crucial for successful rule in the eyes of one’s citizens, whose *philia* comes as the result of the ruler’s beneficence.

The economic and political advantage to a ruler and to his community of his benefaction was reinforced by its extension as a model to others in the city. Xenophon gives the example of Cyrus, who requests that on his death his body be buried in the earth as soon as possible and with no coverings to separate body from earth. The earth ‘brings forth and nourishes’, and since he has been *philanthrôpos* in life, it is fitting that he becomes one (κοινωνῆσαι) with the earth, which performs *euergesia* for men\textsuperscript{85}. By extension, to Aristotle *philia* is *koinonia*, and one is related to a *philos* as to oneself\textsuperscript{86}, reminiscent of his account of *philia* as equality\textsuperscript{87}. Political models which can unite a community in *koinonia* are explored by Aristotle, who focuses on material possession and the utility of the potential and product of these possessions\textsuperscript{88}. He concludes that the best political system is where the private possession of goods can be used to benefit the community. Excessive *philia* to oneself is unjust, while ‘giving *charis* and helping *philoi*, *xenoi*, and *hetairoi* is

\textsuperscript{83} Isoc. *Antidosis* 132-3.

\textsuperscript{84} D. *de Cor.* 316

\textsuperscript{85} X. *Cyr.* 8.7.25. Xenophon highlights Cyrus’ *philanthrôpia* at X. *Cyr.* 1.4.1, and at X. *Cyr.* 4.2.10, where some seek to repay him in *charis* for his *charis* (ἀντιχαρίζεσθαι).

\textsuperscript{86} Arist. *EN* 1171b3.

\textsuperscript{87} Arist. *EN* 1171b3, 1158b27-8.

\textsuperscript{88} Arist. *Pol.* 2.1263a-b.
sweetest’. This ability to give *charis* (χαρίσασθαι) is born of freedom. Put more bluntly, ‘the act of freedom is in the use of possessions’ (ἐν τῇ γὰρ χρήσει τῶν κτημάτων τὸ τῆς ἐλευθερίατος ἔργον ἐστίν)\(^90\), or, put another way, acts of *charis* and *euergesia*, in the name of *philia* and *philanthrōpia* are political and economic.

The economic nature of *charites* is described by Aristotle when he examines the scenario of money-lending and the relationship between creditor and debtor. He confesses that it is in human nature for the debtor to be forgetful of repaying, or less keen to repay than the creditor is keen to be repaid, but that it is in the interests of the creditor to sustain the relationship of *philia* to ensure that he receives τὰς χάριτας. The description of the return as τὰς χάριτας might imply more than a simple return of the equivalent money lent. Indeed elsewhere Aristotle implies that the debtor, even when he has repaid his creditor, remains in a debt of obligation\(^92\), and Theophrastus says explicitly that the debtor, aside from the repayment ‘owes *charis*, since he has been given benefaction (ἐὑεργετημένον)\(^93\). *Charis* can therefore be interest on the original sum borrowed. In this instance the act of *charis* to the creditor obligates the creditor to lend again to the debtor. This relationship may be one based on money, but *philia* it still is, where good credit and return invite further investment, and the mutually beneficial contract between *philoi* endures for the future shared advantage of each individual. The principle was not new to Aristotle, but

---

\(^{89}\) Arist. *Pol.* 1263b5-6.


\(^{91}\) Arist. *EN* 1167b16-24. Aristotle does consider the view that a relationship where the only concern is the return of payment is not one based in *philia*, but this is in the context of a debtor who is less than willing to repay his creditor and therefore the creditor’s concern is less with future mutually beneficial acts of *charis* than with the speedy return of his money. See Theognis 105 and 955-6 for the futility of being *euergētēs* to the wretched (Thgn. 105: δειλὸς δ’ εὖ ἔρδοντι).

\(^{92}\) Arist. *EN* 1165a7-12

\(^{93}\) Thphr. 17.9: δεῖ τάργυριον ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ καὶ χωρὶς τούτων χάριν ὀφείλειν ὡς εὐεργετημένον.
Hesiod offers such advice: 'give back the amount and something better, if possible, so that in times of need you might find a reliable source in the future'\textsuperscript{94}.

1.4 The Sources

This thesis benefits from a broad array of types of source; these are archaeological, epigraphical, numismatic, and literary. The nature of the various kinds of evidence however will mean that in different chapters different points will emerge as more or less significant. Archaeological detail will be employed wherever possible, in particular where it can provide evidence of building projects, monumental displays of \textit{euergesia}. Alongside this any epigraphical evidence will be potentially invaluable for the information it can supply. Unfortunately the latter in particular is relatively scarce, though there are some enlightening dedicatory inscriptions relating to the rules of the Deinomenids and Pisistratids, as well as many additional dedicatory inscriptions which show the language of \textit{philia} and \textit{charis} in use. The dating of temples in particular is not always straightforward, especially where there is not conclusive evidence at foundation level for at least a \textit{terminus post quem}. Dating is at times judged on stylistic grounds, and scholarship does not always agree. Nonetheless conclusions, however tentative, will be sought where possible. Examples of this are temples of Catana and Syracuse which may be associated with a temple to Aphrodite at Locri connected with Hieron’s benefaction to the city.

Numismatic evidence\textsuperscript{95} will be crucial where it can help to inform us of political and religious activity or indeed demonstrates that its production and form are examples themselves of political and religious activity. Scale of production, choice of standard, selection of denominations, and typography can all play a role in determining if and


\textsuperscript{95} For a discussion of the use of coinage as evidence see Howgego 1995.
how rulers were using wealth in the form of coinage for political reasons or as a religious medium, or indeed both. Relative dating of coins in sequence is reasonably secure, and more so with increasing finds, though precise dates are more problematic, as in the famous case of the Owls of Athens, which have been dated to both the period of the Pisistratids and later, both arguably with political motives.

The literary record is often our best and most detailed source of evidence, and for most of the following rulers the key authors are Herodotus and Pindar. However well informed the former was or attempted to be, and despite the contemporaneity of the latter, the work of both of these writers is not without problem. The rulers discussed here are almost all at some point in the sources referred to as *turannoi*, and most commonly in sources such as the Athenian Thucydides and later96. Herodotus uses the terms *turannos* and *basileus* interchangeably97. Nonetheless Herodotus and those later sources all wrote under the influence of a ‘discourse of tyranny’, largely developed and promulgated after Athens’ notable self-celebratory expulsion of its ‘tyrants’, or rule under the Pisistratids98, its aim to label Athens’ rule under the Pisistratids a ‘tyranny’ and in detailed definition a hateful constitution. Already in Herodotus’ accounts of the behaviour of these rulers we see characteristics, often seemingly fanciful, which are becoming accepted *topoi* of ‘tyrannical’ rulers. These are characteristics which our sources include and repeat, increasingly pigeon-holing and defining a ‘tyrant’, and conveniently so for the record of those cities which by Herodotus’ time wished to celebrate the removal of certain autocrats, often to be

96 The irony even then in Thucydides’ writing is that although the Pisistratids were *turannoi* he tells us that their rule benefited Athens (Th. 6.54.5).
97 Ferrill (Ferrill 1978) argues that Herodotus uses them distinctly, and, although I do not agree, this examination highlights some *topoi*.
98 For this blurred distinction, which troubled Greek thinkers and writers, between *basileus* and *turannos* see Lewis 2006: 4-6; Parker 2007: 13-17; and most recently Mitchell 2013: 23-55. On the Athenocentrism of study and scholarship, and Athens’ post-Pisistratid anti-tyranny laws giving a skewed emphasis on a definable concept of tyranny see Lewis 2006: 6-9. On the prejudice, in both the ancient sources and modern times, that absolute rule was unconstitutional, see Mitchell 2013: 127-32.
replaced with some form of democracy or oligarchy. Indeed authors from Herodotus onwards conflated descriptive ideology on fifth and fourth century ‘tyrants’ with earlier archaic rulers, and it is this which blurred any definition of ‘tyrant’ relating to the earlier period. Herodotus’ account of the Pisistratids, for example, is ultimately disapproving, although much of what he tells us of Pisistratus’ rule is complimentary and much of what he describes is so contradictory as to betray this confusion between his complementary account and topoi of ‘tyrannical’ rule. In order to get closer to an untainted version of events of these rulers we are required to strip away these layers of topoi, even if this leaves us with less detail and more questions.

The epinician poetry of Pindar, by its nature and by virtue of its purpose, presents the victor in a favourable light. Our first concern is then whether the picture we have of the victor, say one of the rulers in question, is somewhat biased, exaggerated in its praise, or lacking in detail of a different perspective. The genre is also tied to an extent by some of its own topoi and the way in which it portrays its victors. For example a poem might refer to a ruler as basileus, though we cannot be sure in the absence of further evidence, such as epigraphy, that the ruler presented himself in this way, to his citizens or to the rest of the Greek world. Related to this is the further problem that it is not always at all clear to which audience the poem was to be presented.

99 Topoi include trickery, sexual misconduct, luxurious living and a desire for personal wealth, extreme and often public cruelty. Examples are Periander of Corinth, who killed and banished those he saw as threats, humiliated all women of the city, and had intercourse with his late wife’s corpse (Hdt. 5.92η); Pisistratus, who tricked the Athenians with a 'fake Athena' and had unnatural intercourse with his wife (Hdt. 1.60.3-61.3); and Polycrates, whose ambition for power and wealth led him to his death (Hdt. 3.122-5). Xenophon’s Hieron explores a reconstructed and reflective view of a fifth-century ruler upon his own rule in the guise of such a fourth-century ‘tyrant’ construct. On Xenophon’s treatment of the topoi and earlier related literature, see Gray 2007: 214-6.

100 See, for example, Dewald 2003.

101 On this see in particular Anderson 2005.

102 I shall discuss this later in the chapter on Pisistratids.

103 And of Bacchylides, who writes of Hieron of Syracuse.

104 For a historical overview of epinician poetry and its place in society see Thomas 2007.

105 On such ambiguity and more generally on whether we can discern a political theory in Pindar’s works see Hornblower 2006.
performed, which we might expect to influence its tone and content. And finally, since each poem was likely commissioned by and funded by the victor, this adds further reason for a favourable depiction. Indeed Pindar highlights this relationship and hints at the payment, even if at the very least to emphasise his seemingly grateful bond of *philia* generated by this commission and payment between himself and the victor. However the fact that the victor-ruler commissioned and funded the poem may well have allowed him to urge upon the poet to an extent what should be included in the poem and how he was to be represented. This process then may hint at the ruler’s political aims and ambitions, feature moments of his career which he selected to be celebrated, and characteristics which he might want to be associated with his reputation.

As can be seen there will be required some considerable ‘picking apart’ of the sources to establish where *philia* is in action, though I hope to show that even in hostile sources influenced by *topoi* of tyranny and who do not specifically use the term *philia*, the activity can be described as such based on the definitions given to us by other ancient authors. The use of wealth in whatever form, including the minting of coinage, I shall argue, can often be seen as an act of *charis*, whether from a ruler to his citizens or to his gods, where such a gift enhances relationships which ultimately bring *kudos* to be shared by *philoi* alike.

---

106 On this debate see Carey 2007.
107 This is generally accepted, and represented in, for example, Hornblower and Morgan 2007.
108 The value to a city of its citizen’s victory and Pindar’s work as a medium for this recognition and exchange is examined in detail in Kurke 1991.
2 Cypselus’ Philia and Rule

As an initial test case, I shall examine the accession and rule of Cypselus of Corinth and argue that a framework of philia facilitated and sustained his sovereignty, through networks of philoi and acts of charis, both within Corinth and abroad at the Panhellenic sanctuaries at Delphi and Olympia. There is too little evidence of Cypselus’ religious activity in Corinth and the Corinthia to assist in this study, but on the contrary considerable evidence, literary, epigraphical, archaeological, concerning Delphi and Olympia to allow a detailed examination. Cypselus’ rule has been dated to c.655-c.625BC, with his son Periander succeeding him until a brief period of rule by his nephew Psammetichus and the fall of the Cypselid dynasty in c.585BC. This period pre-dates the production and use of coinage, which allows me to assess in subsequent chapters if and how the introduction of coinage changed the ways in which rulers used expenditure on acts of charis, how this expenditure was measured, and if, despite the use of coinage, there are in fact significant differences in practice. Most of our literary evidence on Cypselus comes from two sources, Herodotus and Nicolaus of Damascus, the latter of whose account is largely based upon that of Ephorus. While Nicolaus’ account has been criticised for inclusion of fourth-century anachronism and allusion to demagoguery, that of Herodotus has been criticised for inclusion of tyrannical topos.

1 The nature, scale and position of Cypselus’ dedications at Delphi demonstrate ‘his relationship with and power within,’ the city, while Periander made comparable assertions at Olympia (Scott 2010: 42-4).
2 The temple of Poseidon at Isthmia may have been built during Cypselus’ reign (Gebhard 1993: 128). However we have no evidence of his involvement, and one source says that he stopped the Panhellenic Isthmian festival (Sol. 7.14), which the Corinthians re-established after the fall of the Cypselids. Similarly the seventh-century predecessor to the sixth-century temple to ‘Apollo’ on Temple Hill in Corinth may date to Cypselus’ reign. However the date is insecure, pottery giving a terminus post quem as early as 680BC (Felsch 1990: 313-14 n. 40; Rhodes 2003 commits to nothing more exact than ‘seventh century’). See also Salmon 1984: 180.
3 On fixing the date of Cypselus’ accession see Salmon 1984: 186 n. 1. On Cypselid foundation and assertion of dominance abroad by relatives see Mitchell 2013: 93-4.
4 See FGrH 2 C 248 (commentary to 90 fr. 57-61) for this attribution to Ephorus.
6 See for example Gray 1996: 361-3 and esp. n. 3.
Both in fact focus on the background to and the means by which Cypselus secured power, though they treat this in very different ways, and give more detail on the nature and activity within the rule of his successor Periander.

Once I have argued that a framework of *philia* allowed Cypselus to secure his rule, and that in fact his accession was not as revolutionary or hostile to elements in Corinth as our sources might suggest, I shall examine Cypselus' expenditure on *charis* in religious dedication and monument at the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi. I shall argue that the private nature of this activity, in contrast, for example, to later state treasuries and dedications in the names of both ruler and people or the people alone, was related to Cypselus' very personal *philia* with the gods of those sanctuaries, whose acts of *charis* toward him secured his individual rule, and to whom in return the ruler gave *charis* duly and as a private individual. I shall argue that, after the fall of the Cypselids, the attempts by the Corinthians to have the monuments rededicated in their name, relates to the means by which Cypselus and the Cypselids secured the wealth necessary for the expenditure on these monuments. This will not only explain the growing importance of the unity of a state in its relationship of *philia* with the gods of the Panhellenic sanctuaries, but also the importance of expenditure in the acts of *charis* which establish and sustain those relationships.

The following questions will be addressed in turn:

How hostile was Cypselus to the Bacchiad regime, how revolutionary was his autocracy, and how did he secure his sole rule?

How did expenditure on dedications at Olympia and Delphi help to sustain his rule?
2.1 How hostile was Cypselus to the Bacchiad regime, how revolutionary was his autocracy, and how did he secure his sole rule?

Cypselus is the earliest sole ruler in the Greek world for whom we have any real detail at all in our sources, and the vast bulk of this detail comes from two writers, Herodotus, writing a century after the fall of the Cypselids, and Nicolaus of Damascus, writing a century after Herodotus. Critics are rightly sceptical about accepting everything which the authors have written. Herodotus’ account\(^7\) comes in the form of an appeal by a later Corinthian against the reinstallation of Hippias, as tyrant, in Athens, and describes at length the birth of Cypselus and his attempted murder by the ruling regime, his heroic folk-tale-like survival, then a brief comment on his rule, before describing Periander’s reign as bloody and savage. Therefore Herodotus’ description is essentially an argument against tyranny, despite its inclusion of the miraculous saving of the infant Cypselus. We should then expect some bias, which we find in particular in his lengthy account of Periander’s activity, which is filled with examples of tyrannical topoi\(^8\). We encounter less bias with what he writes about Cypselus’ early childhood, though we must be very sceptical of what seems to be folk-tale. Nicolaus’ account\(^9\) is much more positive in general as regards Cypselus and gives much greater detail about his political rise to power, though this has been dismissed as anachronistic, reflecting fourth-century practices and including related vocabulary\(^10\). Clearly and importantly, we must in the

---

\(^7\) Hdt. 5.92β-ε (Cypselus’ birth and accession), 5.92ζ (Cypselus’ rule), 5.92ζ-η.4 (Periander’s rule). Further information about Periander’s rule is given at Hdt. 1.23-4, 3.48.2-53 and 5.95.2.

\(^8\) ‘He committed every kind of crime towards his citizens’ (5.92η.1); he murdered anyone whom he considered a threat, on the advice of another ‘tyrant’ (Thrasybulus of Miletus); he maltreated all of women of his city, tricking them and stripping them naked for his own gain; he murdered his own wife and had sex with her corpse; he mutilated the sons of his enemies (the Corcyreans). For a summary of criticism see Gray 1996: 361-3 and esp. n. 3.

\(^9\) FGrH 90 58-60.

\(^10\) Salmon 1984: 189. He is described as a demagogue (ἐδημαγώγει), for example (FGrH 90 58.34).
first place assess these two sources in turn and gauge what we can successfully take away from them as most likely to be reliable and therefore informative.\textsuperscript{11}

Woven into Herodotus' folk-tale are three Delphic oracles, which together legitimise Cypselus' authority and position. Two of these oracles portray Cypselus positively, since they were delivered to Cypselus and his father, and the other less so, since it was delivered to the ruling regime, the family of Bacchiads.\textsuperscript{12} Interpretation has led to dating the former to Cypselus' own time\textsuperscript{13}, delivered by pro-Cypselid Delphi\textsuperscript{14} in support of the new regime. If we accept this, then we should be able to elicit suggestions of how Cypselus was depicted by others or sought himself to be depicted.

In the first place, the very presence of the oracles determines that Cypselus' rule was inevitable and sanctioned by the gods. It is possible that the first of the oracles, that delivered to Cypselus' father, could be seen in a way to excuse the Corinthians for accepting 'tyranny', in much the same way that Lavelle has argued on a very similar oracle given to Pisistratus' father\textsuperscript{15}, but the tone of both of the first two Cypselid oracles seems to invoke a fear not only of the inevitable but of a harsh deliverer (a rock hurtling at Corinth's rulers, and a ravenous lion). McGlew\textsuperscript{16} argues that all three oracles consistently show that tyranny is only necessary due to the injustice of the city's

\textsuperscript{11} To Lewis Herodotus' account is 'like a folk-tale', while that of Nicolaus is 'mundane' (Lewis 2009: 18-19); Stein-Hölkeskamp points out that Herodotus 'gives most space to the fairy-tale elements of the story', but makes no comment on the validity of Nicolaus's evidence (Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 102-3); to Andrewes Nicolaus fills the gap left by Herodotus, most of whose account is 'fairy-tale', with fiction (Andrewes 1966: 46).

\textsuperscript{12} Hdt. 5.92β.2, 5.92β.3, and 92ε.2.

\textsuperscript{13} Parker 2007: 18; Salmon 1984: 186. The final line of the third oracle, addressed to Cypselus, must post-date the Cypselids, since it refers to the fall of the dynasty (Hdt. 5.92ε.2), which suggests it is a later addition. On this revision of the oracle and whether the additional third line is at odds with the first two lines see McGlew 1993: 69-70. Amusingly, Dio Chrysostom, in an oration praising Periander, quotes this oracle but omits the second half of the final line, curtailing a hexameter line, in order to lose the reference to the fall of the dynasty subsequent to Periander's rule (D.Chr. 37.5.5-7).

\textsuperscript{14} For the suggestion of that initial Cypselid preference for the sanctuary of Delphi was transferred to Olympia, see Salmon 1984: 227-8 and also Scott 2010: 44 (an interest in both sanctuaries became a focus on one).

\textsuperscript{15} Lavelle 1993: 118-19 on Hdt. 1.59.2 and 1.62.4.

leaders. Cypselus' ambition is partly hidden behind and partly excused by the injustice of his predecessors. This lends weight to the suggestion that Cypselus had an influence on the form of these oracles, where he wanted himself to be pictured as divinely sanctioned, inescapable, an object of fear, in particular for the rulers (μουνάρχοι)\textsuperscript{17} preceding him.

Secondly, in contrast to the hated μουνάρχοι\textsuperscript{18}, Cypselus is titled βασιλεύς in the third oracle. Not only does this imply legitimacy as ruler, but the use of this particular term for his office is corroborated by Nicolaus' insistent statement that Cypselus deposed the Bacchiad basileus and became basileus himself, and by Diodorus' statement that the Bacchiads elected a magistrate who took on the role of basileus\textsuperscript{19}.

Thirdly, the legitimacy of Cypselus' rule is expressed in the first oracle's use of δικαιώ, that he will set Corinth straight, bring justice to the city. The verb is juxtaposed with μουνάρχοι and therefore placed in direct contrast with this arrogant injustice. Gray\textsuperscript{20} argues to the contrary that the term is used here to describe a violent act, 'an imperfect kind of justice' typical of tyrants, quoting Herodotus' description of Cypselus as bringing misery to Corinth\textsuperscript{21}, and two other occasions in Herodotus where the verb, used with a direct object, describes a harsh form of justice\textsuperscript{22}. In response the verb is overwhelmingly used by Herodotus where justice or the subject's reasoning and

\textsuperscript{17} Hdt. 5.92β.5.
\textsuperscript{18} See McGlew 1993: 65-7 on the hateful arrogance implied in this political term, and the comparison with Theognis' use of the term (on which also see Parker 2007: 18-19). Strabo calls the Bacchiads 'tyrants' (Str. 8.6.20).
\textsuperscript{19} FGrH 90 58.3, 58.42, 58.44, 58.54; D.S. 7.9.6. See also Parker 2007: 19-20 on the suggestion that these consistent references across authors and oracle might help to corroborate Nicolaus’ (Ephorus) account. We need not be concerned by Diodorus’ use of the rather more generic prytanis, since his point is to emphasise the title of the magistrate as basileus. Pausanias (Paus. 2.4.4) uses the term prytanis when describing only the annual nature of the role, so it is unsurprising that he does not stress that the office was in fact basileus. The emphasis in our sources on the title and role being that of a basileus is secure. On this debate see Salmon 1984: 190 and n. 16.
\textsuperscript{20} Gray 1996: 374-6.
\textsuperscript{21} Hdt. 5.926.1.
\textsuperscript{22} Compare Irwin’s analysis of the poetry of Solon, and comparison with Herodotus and Pindar, describing the use of force to bring justice (Irwin 2005: 207-20).
decision based on justice are clearly implied. Herodotus' description of Cypselus as κακά is hardly surprising given his intention for criticism, but it is not Herodotus who uses the verb δικαίω; it is the oracle, whom our author merely quotes. A comparable and well known example of δικαίω is in a Pindar fragment\textsuperscript{23}, where Nomos employs violence (not necessarily physical) to ensure justice, and where mythical examples are quoted to demonstrate. Here Nomos is basileus, championing common belief and its acceptance; 'it has absolute, unchallengeable, and legitimate power, both among men and among the gods'\textsuperscript{24}. Accepting the Herodotean oracles as likely pro-Cypselid propaganda and dating to the years of the dynasty itself, the oracles provide the image of an irrepressible force, bringing past injustices to account, in the form of a legitimate ruler, a basileus. Through the oracles, this image and Cypselus' rule were divinely ratified and indeed supported. His association with the gods began from the first.

Nicolaus' account has been treated nervously. Salmon divided it into two parts, Cypselus' rise and his rule, and warns us on a charge of anachronism to reject every detail of the former 'unless there is some special reason to accept it'\textsuperscript{25}. He does however accept Cypselus' title when he came to power may have been basileus\textsuperscript{26} and that Nicolaus' source preserves the tradition of this title, which is corroborated by Herodotus' oracle and by Diodorus. He also accepts that Nicolaus' description of Cypselus as polemarch, which one might expect to be a military office but which appears to have had chiefly civic duties, may again preserve a tradition based upon

\textsuperscript{23} Fragment 169.1-4: Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς / θνατῶν τε καὶ άθανάτων / ἄγει δικαιῶν τὸ βιαιότατον / ὑπερτάτα χειρί.
\textsuperscript{24} Caplan and Ostwald 1965: 126.
\textsuperscript{25} Salmon 1984: 188-9, 195 n. 28.
\textsuperscript{26} His concern here is more with accepting that Cypselus was appointed by the demos, since this would be an anachronism (Salmon 1984:190 and n.16).
fact. Nicolaus does stress the involvement of the *demos* in Cypselus’ appeal and approbation, which, it must be confessed, especially in his rise to power, does suggest fourth-century political ideological influence. Otherwise the manner in which he managed his duties as polemarch and in which he ruled mildly, without bodyguard, and always in favour, are in line with the Herodotean oracle’s description of him as bringing an otherwise absent justice to Corinth. He managed his affairs and his role as polemarch rightly (ὀρθῶς), obeying the law (νόμος), indeed benefitting others by his proscription to it. A hint at violence is there too, if we are to read it in his killing of the preceding *basileus* Patrocleides, who was by contrast ‘lawless’ (παράνομος). Despite his warning, Salmon then himself provides us with evidence why we should be more accepting of the first half of Nicolaus’ account; in political detail and in theme it shares important features with evidence contemporary to Cypselid rule, the oracles preserved in Herodotus.

It is in fact the second part of Nicolaus’ text which is more at odds with the oracles, specifically in the very distinct comparison made between Cypselus and other Bacchiads. He is during his polemarchate compared to ‘the other Bacchiads’, and when in power he exiles the Bacchiads, though I note that Nicolaus does not stress in any surer terms that all Bacchiads were exiled or treated altogether in one particular way.

The closest reference we have in the oracles to a Cypselid movement specifically against the Bacchiads is to μουνάρχοι, which, if our accounts of the political structure

---

27 Salmon 1984:189-90. He assumes that the office must have retained some of its military role at this time (Salmon 1977: 97 and n.51). On the importance of military success in ruling ideology see Mitchell 2013: 47.
28 Aristotle also says this (Arist. *Pol.* 1315b28).
29 FGrH 90 58.5-6. He is called Hippocleides at FGrH 90 58.1.
30 τοὺς ἄλλους Βακχιάδας (FGrH 90 58.5), τοὺς δὲ Βακχιάδας φυγαδεύσας (FGrH 90 58.7). Nicolaus does not use the definite article consistently here to suggest at all that ‘the Bacchiads’ can mean ‘all Bacchiads. Examples are: νόμος καθεστήκει Κορινθίοις, ‘the Corinthians had a law in place…’ (no definite article, though this must refer to all Corinthians, FGrH 90 58.5); τοὺς Κορινθίους εχθρωδῶς πρὸς Βακχιάδας διακειμένους, ‘the Corinthians were hatefully disposed towards Bacchiads’ (no definite article in contrast to the first two examples quoted above, FGrH 90 58.6).
can be trusted, must refer to Bacchiads, but need not refer to all of them en masse. Herodotus’ account does portray Cypselus’ rise as a particular concern for the Bacchiads, to whom one of the oracles is delivered and who, in the folk-tale, attempt to murder the infant. However, in the best and contemporary evidence we have for Cypselus’ motivation and strategy, a wholesale attack on all Bacchiads is far from clear. It is as if Nicolaus’ version of events has rationalised Cypselus’ treatment of those who opposed him into a general attack on Bacchiads, perhaps betraying in fact a simplification of matters.

We can explore this idea through a specific comparison in the texts. Herodotus’ only description of Cypselus’ manner of rule is summed up in a very brief statement, which details activity commonplace in accounts of ‘tyrannical’ practice influenced by fifth- and fourth-century political discourse. Nicolaus makes a remarkably similar summative statement, but it appears catered to his own account, in that it rationalises Cypselus’ activity specifically towards Bacchiads, a focus for the author. It also omits one of the actions, the killing of Bacchiads, which it could be argued would be at odds with his otherwise rather positive account and with his assertion that Cypselus exiled the family.

Πολλούς μὲν Κορινθίων ἐδίωξε, πολλούς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε, πολλῶ δὲ τι πλείστους τῆς ψυχῆς. (Hdt 5.92ε.2)

---

31 Diodorus tells us that they numbered two hundred (D.S. 7.9.5).
32 It would seem that because this is all that Herodotus has to say on Cypselus’ actual period of rule, and because Nicolaus elaborates on Cypselus’ policy of exiling those who oppose him (τοὺς μὴ φίλους, FGrH 90 58.6), Herodotus’ description has been too readily accepted. Herodotus’ statement should perhaps be seen as a rationalisation of Cypselus’ political activity on the basis of this common discourse of ‘tyranny’, and by way of introduction to his much more detailed account of Periander’s rule and specifically Thrasybulus’ advice to him (Mitchell 2013: 112 n. 14), who supposedly surpassed his father’s wickedness. This last motif, that a second generation of tyrannical rule turns bad, is common too in the discourse on ‘tyranny’. Other examples pertinent to this thesis are Hippias in Athens, and Hieron in Syracuse.
33 De Libero also limits the exiles to Bacchiads alone (de Libero 1996: 143).
34 Even Salmon (Salmon 1984: 195) doubts that more than a few could have been killed, not all Bacchiads or many Corinthians.
He 'pursued' many of the Corinthians, and robbed many of their money, and very many more of their lives.

τοὺς δὲ Βακχιάδας φυγαδεύσας ἐδήμευσε τὰς οὐσίας αὐτῶν. (FGrH 90 58.7)

Having exiled (the) Bacchiads he appropriated their property for the demos.

The style differs, from Herodotus' tricolon to Nicolaus less florid statement; Nicolaus omits any mention of killing; Nicolaus' choice of verb is more assertive about actual exile (more on what Herodotus actually meant by ἔδιωξε below); Nicolaus perhaps anachronistically specifies that the wealth gained from acquired property was given to the demos\(^{35}\). However, Nicolaus' statement is arguably a reworking of Herodotus', highlighted to an extent by their relative positions and summative intentions at the close of their accounts of Cypselus' rule. At the same time this is ironically reinforced by Nicolaus' additional summation, that the Bacchiads went to Corcyra and Cypselus ruled without bodyguard\(^{36}\) and was always in favour, which only complements the former Herodotean summation if the reference to killing is omitted and if reference to the removal of all Bacchiads is accepted. It is as if Nicolaus, or his source, appropriated Herodotus' statement to summarise his rationalisation that Cypselus acted specifically against the Bacchiads and that he exiled the Bacchiads. This raises suspicion of the simplification that Cypselus behaved in a specifically anti-Bacchiad manner. It begs two questions which shall be dealt with in turn: firstly, why does Nicolaus' account (and Herodotus' to some extent) rationalise what is not at all clear from our only contemporary evidence, the oracles, that Cypselus acted specifically against the Bacchiads; and secondly, did Cypselus in that case exile all Bacchiads?

---

\(^{35}\) FGrH 90 58.7.
\(^{36}\) Also Aristotle (Arist. Pol. 1315b28).
Cypselus was a Bacchiad himself, but the evidence suggests that he rebranded his new ruling dynasty Cypselid, distancing himself from his related Bacchiads. Nicolaus emphasises his Bacchiad status\(^{37}\), before describing his supposed campaign against other Bacchiads. Herodotus highlights Cypselus’ Bacchiad mother, but positions him as an outsider, with a non-Bacchiad father and living away from Corinth. The oracles make no claim that Cypselus was Bacchiad or otherwise, but they need not have done if, as our other sources tell us, Cypselus was known to be Bacchiad, worked within the Bacchiad political framework as polemarch, and would have legitimacy, as a Bacchiad at least, in his role as *basileus*. I maintain that Cypselus was Bacchiad, as we are told, and that this allowed his political advancement, working within the system to which he was born. His accession, however it was achieved, was legitimate on the basis that he was Bacchiad, and neither detail nor emphasis on this aspect of his legitimacy was required within the Delphic oracles. The purpose of the oracles was to demonstrate his legitimacy in other ways, that he would bring justice where it was absent, and that his rule was fated and sanctioned by the gods.

Despite Cypselus’ Bacchiad status and the legitimacy it held for his accession, thereafter the ruling dynasty became Cypselids, and references to Bacchiads remain essentially in our accounts of the accession and rule in Herodotus and Nicolaus and in mentions of a few in scattered exile. I suggest that in fact in the first place a rebranding of the ruling family, from Bacchiad to Cypselid, was engineered, and Cypselus-Cypselid became then a regnal name, much like the Battus-Battiads of Cyrene\(^{38}\). This would

---

\(^{37}\) Κύψελος Βακχιάδης καὶ αὐτὸς (FGrH 90 58 intro). See also Mitchell 2013: 93, 112 n. 14. As McGlew points out (McGlew 1993: 62) Oost (Oost 1972) and Drews (Drews 1972) have used the same evidence to argue for and against Bacchiad genealogy. Nonetheless Herodotus has his mother a Bacchiad, as does Nicolaus who calls him Bacchiad, despite his stark differences to other Bacchiads. The oracles make no distinction at all between Cypselus’ genealogy and Bacchiad. Pausanias (Paus. 5.18.7-8, cf. 2.4.4) offers an alternative genealogy, but I see no reason for accepting this over our more detailed and contemporary evidence. Salmon see the two genealogies as at least compatible (Salmon 1984: 189).

\(^{38}\) See chapter six on this dynasty.
explain why the oracles make no specific mention of anti-Bacchiad activity. Herodotus, our earliest source and in no way favourable to Cypselus, only describes the fear and attempted murder of the infant by Bacchiads, since their regime was at risk, in a folk-tale version of Cypselus' birth. There is no reason to assume any truth in the tale, which was likely appropriated from similar tales to embellish upon the second oracle, supposedly delivered to the Bacchiads, whose date is more difficult to argue from its more negative portrayal of Cypselus. There is no information in Herodotus' account of any specific anti-Bacchiad activity\(^{39}\), not even when he sums up Cypselus' rule with reference to stealing, killing, and exiling. In Nicolaus' account, however, we see Cypselus' birth and early career as a Bacchiad rationalised into a version where he is a very different sort of Bacchiad to the others, and it is the other Bacchiads who are to be dealt with. They now specifically become those whose property was taken and who were exiled. We should be careful of this rationalisation, which, though it may provide a simpler account, hides the complexity of the truth. Those who opposed Cypselus were not necessarily Bacchiads alone, nor necessarily all Bacchiads. Nicolaus may give us important details in Cypselus' genealogy and early career, and he may also reveal a basis for some of his policies, but he takes what Herodotus has said before him and produces a specifically anti-Bacchiad version of events for which there is no real evidence in Herodotus or the oracles quoted by him.

Pausanias says that Cypselus exiled (ἐξέβαλε) Bacchiads, possibly following Nicolaus (φυγαδεύσας)\(^{40}\) and the Ephoran tradition, but his action against his opposition may not have been so harsh. I have already argued that Nicolaus' statement of exile and appropriation of the wealth of Bacchiads is a paraphrase of Herodotus' sentence, with the omission of any killing by Cypselus and a rationalisation that those whom this

\(^{39}\) The term *mounarchoi* is the closest used which could encompass Bacchiads (Hdt. 5.92β.2).

\(^{40}\) Paus. 2.4.4; FGrH 90 58.7.
affected were Bacchiads alone. To this is to be added that not only does Herodotus not specify such activity as being directed towards Bacchiads, but also his own choice of verb (διώκω) is different again from the above two authors and need not imply exile at all. Herodotus writes that Cypselus 'pursued many of the Corinthians' (πολλοὺς μὲν Κορινθίων ἐδίωξε)\textsuperscript{41}. Salmon takes Herodotus' vagueness here to mean that Cypselus exiled not only Bacchiads but other citizens too, and Forsdyke follows Salmon, the assumption of both arguments being that Cypselus exiled Bacchiads, even though this is not necessarily what Herodotus says\textsuperscript{42}. The verb διώκω, when used by Herodotus clearly to imply exile from a territory is always accompanied by a geographical phrase of context or additional detail to make the exile explicit, including the use of a verb more clearly suggesting exile (φεύγω, ἐκβάλλω).\textsuperscript{43} The meaning in the vast majority of examples is 'pursue at speed', which is why it works well alongside other verbs which are more explicit about exile and when it is accompanied by a geographical context. However, mostly clustered in Book 6, are examples of its use as 'prosecute'\textsuperscript{44}. Two examples of the use of διώκω without clear reference to exile, without qualification of exile through the use of φεύγω, ἐκβάλλω, or any geographical context, appear close by in Book 5, and these refer to Cypselus and to Periander\textsuperscript{45}. Periander is described as completing whatever Cypselus left unfinished in terms of 'killing and pursuing' (κτείνων τε καὶ διώκων) before the detailed example is given of his tricking and stripping the women of Corinth, an example of neither killing nor exiling. My conclusion then is that Herodotus does not state that Cypselus, or indeed Periander, exiled Corinthians, but

\textsuperscript{41} Hdt. 5.92ε.2.
\textsuperscript{43} Hdt. 2.152.3 (Psammetichus had been exiled twice; φεύγω), 5.73.1 (ἐκβάλλω), 9.77.2-3 (ἐκ τῆς γῆς).
\textsuperscript{44} 1.68.5 (Lichas fled Sparta after the Spartans prosecuted him on a trumped up charge [οἱ αἰτίας ἔδιωξαν], but he returned voluntarily), 6.65.3, 6.82.2, 6.104.2 (the Athenians' prosecution of Miltiades for tyranny in the Chersonese, after the fall of Pisistratid rule), 6.136.1 (Miltiades again, this time after his return from Paros).
\textsuperscript{45} Hdt. 5.92ε.2, 5.92η.1.
that Cypselus prosecuted many Corinthians, the result of which he gives in his following
two clauses⁴⁶:

πολλοὺς μὲν Κορινθίων ἐδίωξε, πολλοὺς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε, πολλῶ δὲ τι
πλείστους τῆς ψυχῆς. (Hdt 5.92ε.2)

He prosecuted many of the Corinthians, robbing many of their money, and very
many more of their lives.

This statement falls very much in line with the warnings in the oracles that he would
'weaken the knees of many' (addressed to the Corinthians at large), 'attack the
mounarchoi, and bring justice to Corinth'⁴⁷, even if Herodotus would spin on this that
Cypselus' form of justice was no justice at all.

We have seen that Nicolaus' statement of Bacchiad exile is a reworking of Herodotus'
sentence above, except it is now clear that Nicolaus misinterpreted his source's use of
dιώκω, influenced presumably by the topos that tyrants exiled their enemies. The
choice of Corcyra as the place of sanctuary would foll
ow from accounts in Herodotus of
hostility between the island and Corinth, and from Herodotus' account that Periander
sent his son away from Corinth to Corcyra⁴⁸. In turn then, when he describes the
supposed exile of other enemies of Cypselus, Nicolaus, or his source, is again
influenced by this topos. The two details of exiled enemies are juxtaposed in Nicolaus' account, as examples of the same type of activity. The described action by Cypselus of

---

⁴⁶ The contrasting μέν and δέ, emphasise the expectation of (fair) trial, but which resulted in crimes
themselves.
⁴⁷ Hdt. 5.92β.3, 5.92β.2.
⁴⁸ This is the only case in Herodotus' account of what could be construed as exile by Periander. He
sent Lycophron to Corcyra after a long dispute, but more as an act of pity (Hdt. 3.52.6). The Corcyreans
crushed Lycophron when Periander intended to become a resident of the island and hand over his rule
in Corinth to Lycophron (Hdt. 3.53.7). The first Greek sea battle was between the two cities, Thucydides
(Thuc. 1.13.4) tells us, but dating this to during or before the Cypselids is insecure (see Salmon 1984: 218). There is certainly more evidence in the sources for hostility during Periander's rule, though
Herodotus says it was under his control (Hdt. 3.52.6), and Corinth was asked to supply a founder for
Corcyra's new colony at Epidamnus, according to an ancient custom (Thuc. 1.24.2). For details on the
various colonies and joint Corinthian-Corcyrean involvement see Salmon 1984: 209-17 and esp. 211.
exiling 'those who were not philoi (τούς μὴ φίλου) to new colonies founded and ruled by his own sons, 'so that he might rule more easily'⁴⁹ does seem strategically odd⁵⁰. However once we remove the topos of exiling enemies to make rule easier⁵¹, we are left simply with a policy of colonisation which embraces a Cypselid expansion based upon philia, between Cypselus and his sons, more distant family and the new colonists and their mother-city⁵². Indeed Nicolaus, who gives us the greatest detail on Cypselus’ rise and rule describes a framework of philia which supported both of these aspects, allowing him to become ruler and remain ruler of Corinth. An intriguing final piece of evidence comes from Thucydides’ statement that the Corcyreans founded Epidamnus but, according to tradition, asked Corinth to supply a founder⁵³. The Corinthian awarded this heroic honour is described as a Heraclid. We are told that the Bacchiads had previously called themselves Heraclids but took on their new name to celebrate Corinth’s early king and their descent from him⁵⁴. However the names appear interchangeable. For example the Bacchiads Archias and Chersicrates, who founded Syracuse and Corcyra respectively, are called Heraclids⁵⁵. This then would suggest that not only did Bacchiads remain in Cypselid Corinth as philoi to Cypselus, but also that they were awarded with office which would bring heroic honours, sanctioned, we can

⁴⁹ FGrH 90 58.7. For traces of Bacchiads elsewhere, and Salmon’s mistrust of any locations other than Corcyra, see Forsdyke 2005: 73 n. 199 and Salmon 1984: 195 and n. 29.

⁵⁰ Salmon (Salmon 1984: 215) assumes that these enemies ‘must have been insignificant’, which is an awkward resolution to an alleged action which begs questioning.

⁵¹ See Forsdyke 2005: 9 n.17 and chh. 2 and 6. A famous example of exile proved wrong is that alleged by the Alcmaeonids, who sought to distance themselves from the Pisistratids by claiming exile. Forsdyke (Forsdyke 2005, Forsdyke 2005: 121) argues that none of the exiles which Pisistratus is alleged to have instigated actually took place. Nicolaus does not call Cypselus a turannos though he does Periander (FGrH 90 60 intro.), but this is not reason enough to discount this alleged strategy as a topos of tyranny, especially in the context of a statement of supposed Bacchiad exiles.

⁵² This activity reliant on kinship-philia was quite extensive. See Mitchell 2013: 93-4.

⁵³ In the last quarter of the sixth century (Eus. Chronicles 2.88-9).

⁵⁴ Arist. fr. 611.19. The suggestively mythical lameness and unsightliness of King Bacaeus is reflected in Herodotus’ myth of Cypselus’ lame mother. Both the lame king and the son of a lame mother became basileus.

⁵⁵ Thuc. 6.3.2; Str. 6.2.4. Apollonius Rhodius calls Chersicrates Bacchiad (A.R. 4.1212, 1216).
assume, by the Cypselids themselves. The Cypselids were, after all, Bacchiads themselves, if rebranded.

Nicolaus reveals what Herodotus does not, providing detail on Cypselus' political career, on how he is able to amass support enough to gain and sustain rule with approval, all of which was possible through his network of *philoi*. As I have said, we should be careful of Nicolaus' assimilation to fourth-century demagoguery, in which Cypselus' support comes from the *demos* at large and he becomes their leader, and of his rationalisation so that all other Bacchiads, and essentially they alone, become a figure of hate\(^{56}\). Once such simplification has been removed there remains an account of Cypselus' rise which was only possible through his birthright as a Bacchiad to gain office\(^{57}\), and his acts of *charis* and beneficence\(^{58}\) which encouraged both justice and *philia*, all of which secured his legitimate sole rule.

*Philia* between Cypselus and Corinthians endured until his assumption of single rule. He was admired, not only for his bravery and wisdom, but for his beneficence ([δημ]-ωφελής\(^{59}\)); he was loved (ἐστέρχθη, ἐστέργετο\(^{60}\)) in his office as polemarch because of his *charis*, since he returned to those tried before him the wealth that he was due; having proved himself beneficial and gained *philoi* as polemarch, his *philoi* thought that he would be beneficial (χρησάμενοι\(^{61}\)) as their leader; as ruler he returned rights to those who had been deprived, and in reciprocation was able to benefit himself

---


\(^{57}\) Though military excellent was often a route to political prominence, as was the case with Pisistratus (Hdt. 1.59.4).

\(^{58}\) Charis is embedded in the related terms χρησάμενοι and ἔχρητο (FGrH 90 58.6), discussed below, which demonstrated the reciprocal benefaction to both Cypselus and his supporters. Nicolaus describes the people as ‘well-minded’ towards Cypselus (εὐνοι), and on the association of *eunoia, philia*, and *charis* see Mitchell 1997b.

\(^{59}\) FGrH 90 58.5.

\(^{60}\) FGrH 90 58.5, 6.

\(^{61}\) FGrH 90 58.6.
(ἐχρήτο62); he was never unloved (ἀποθύμιος63). In contrast to Cypselus’ philia the Bacchiads are echthroi (ἐχθρωδῶς64), and in contrast to the benefits he brings the basileus Patrocleides is a burden (ἐπαχθής) and lawless (παράνομος)65. We should not be concerned that Nicolaus does not specifically use the terms philia and charis, since he describes their nature and function so clearly. Reciprocation is made explicit, as is affection for mutual benefit. He does of course refer to those who are not his supporters generally as τοῦς μὴ φίλους66. The verb στέργω, which he uses twice to describe his relationship with his supporters is a synonym for φιλέω, and is perhaps a natural choice for its nuance of philia between inferiors and superiors, such as parents and children, rulers and citizens. Even ἀποθύμιος is well associated with philia and the reciprocal debt it invokes67. The clearest examples of στέργω and φιλέω as synonyms are in Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics68 and Diodorus69. A good example of the former used in the context of the utility of philia is at 1162b30. Here Aristotle describes the matter of repayment of a debt, where a delay in repayment is considered a matter of philia (φιλικὸν). For this reason in some states citizens cannot prosecute others for late repayment, since if they allowed such a delay on trust they should ‘love’ (στέργειν) those who had borrowed on this understanding of faith.

Our sources then present a picture of a ruler who placed great store in the support religious association could bring him. The Delphic oracles justified his rise to rule, dismissed any potential opposition to this as unjust, sanctioned what might seem to that

62 FGrH 90 58.6.
63 FGrH 90 58.8.
64 The contrast is also expressed in the opposites ἄσμενως and δυσμενεῖς (FGrH 90 58.6).
65 FGrH 90 58.6.
66 FGrH 90 58.6.
67 Especially Hes. Op. 710 (where the importance of the utility and reciprocity of friendship is emphasised); Hdt. 7.168.3; Semon. 7.35 (where it is associated explicitly with the contrast of echthroi and philoi).
68 Arist. EN 1126b22-3, 1156a15, 1157a28, 1162b30, 1164a10, 1167a3, 1168a22
69 D.S. 17.114.2
opposition to be violent action, and delivered an incontrovertibly fated scenario. Further justification is presented in subtle choice of vocabulary, where Cypselus is basileus and will bring justice to the city of Corinth in place of self-serving mounarchoi. Nicolaus provides more detail of Cypselus' just acts, and the philoi he amassed though his political office as polemarch, and describes a legitimate magistrate managing his office in favour of the citizens rather than himself, though the opportunity for exploitation was there and mounarchoi had abused the office before him. The Bacchiad Cypselus' political career began and developed within the system in place; his status as basileus was legitimate, even if its permanency was unprecedented. For all the threatening language of the oracles, the evidence for harsh or sustained hostility is slim. Herodotus, the most hostile source, sums up Cypselus' rule in a brief statement with no detail to qualify it, and the common interpretation, reiterated from early on, that he exiled his Bacchiad relations is unfounded, an explicable misinterpretation within commonplace topoi on 'tyrants'. Indeed any explicit account of Cypselus' hostile behaviour towards the ruling Bacchiads is missing in Herodotus, our earliest and most hostile source of evidence, while in fact a new interpretation that he brought the unjust protagonists of that regime to account by prosecution suggests that he worked within and developed upon an existing system\textsuperscript{70}. There is even some evidence to suggest that Bacchiads remained in Corinth and that one was awarded with the exceptional honour of colony foundation, alongside those founded by the Cypselids themselves\textsuperscript{71}. Cypselus' rise and rule were not marked by alienation, but rather by the embrace of gods, citizens, and those of his genos for the mutual benefit of all Corinthians.

\textsuperscript{70} A conclusion reached, though with a different interpretation of some of the evidence, by others, for example Anderson 2005: 215; Lewis 2009: 21.

\textsuperscript{71} See Salmon 1984: 209ff on Cypselid founders of colonies.
2.2 What purpose was served by Cypselus' expenditure on dedications at Olympia and Delphi?

We have seen that Cypselus associated the Panhellenic sanctuary at Delphi with his fate and right to rule in Corinth, the oracles suggesting that even before his birth his role as basileus was secure and sanctioned by the gods. Our sources tell us that even in childhood Cypselus associated with the shrines at Delphi and Olympia\textsuperscript{72}. The mythical origins and maturing of Cypselus may or may not have been imposed by later traditions\textsuperscript{73}, but they find some justification in the considerable dedications at the sanctuaries by Cypselus and his genos. These dedications were lavish\textsuperscript{74}; the importance of the expenditure involved was recorded by and alluded to by both literary sources and actual Cypselid dedicatory inscription. Moreover they all appear to have been private dedications by the genos, and the status of Corinthian state involvement is unclear. Such dedications may have strengthened Cypselus' relationship with the sanctuaries, justifying his rule in much the same way that the Delphic oracles did; they may have given the basileus promotion in status, as 'an accepted member of a community of cult that transcended individual poleis'\textsuperscript{75}, but what was their position in Cypselus' relationship with his citizens?

The treasury of Cypselus at Delphi was the first such monument at the sanctuary. Dedicated in the second half of the seventh century, it was placed, though not far from the temple of Apollo, on the easternmost edge of the sanctuary, dominating the visitor's

\begin{footnotes}
\item[72] Delphi: upon maturity, Cypselus consulted the Pythia and received Herodotus' third oracle (Hdt. 5.92ε.2).
\item[73] Olympia: Nicolaus says that Cypselus was taken by his father to the sanctuary for safe-keeping as suppliant to the god, until he planned to return to Corinth, consulting the oracle at Delphi first (FGrH 90 57.4-5).
\item[74] Aristotle compares them to the pyramids of Egypt, and works of Polycrates of Samos and the Pisistratids of Athens (Arist. Pol. 1313b21-5).
\end{footnotes}
experience as they entered and proceeded to the temple itself. Scott suggests that this was an assertion of Cypselus' powerful relationship with the site, his treasury acting as a boundary marker, asserting a dominance of space. Though it was the first treasury, if we can assume its purpose in part to be similar to later treasuries, then it not only incurred considerable expenditure at the outset, but was a statement of longer-term investment, with the facility to hold and display future dedications by Cypselus and perhaps by the city of Corinth. However, unlike all or most later treasuries this was Cypselus' private dedication, and not a dedication by the state as a collective. This is made clear by references to the Corinthians appealing to the Delphians to allow them to rededicate the monument in their name after the fall of the Cypselids, and our sources suggest that they were successful. More treasuries were built at the sanctuary from the beginning of the sixth century and were state investments, dedicated in the name of the citizens. The same was the case at Olympia. Without a clearer statement of Cypselus' own intentions in dedicating the treasury, we rely upon our literary sources.

Our sources write that both the treasury at Delphi and a gold colossus of Zeus at Olympia were dedicated by Cypselus as charites, repaying the gods in thanks for their past gifts. Unlike Gelon and the Syracusans' treasury at Olympia and the Athenians' treasury at Delphi, which were dedicated as charis, thanking the gods for victory in war, we have no evidence of a victory in war for Cypselus. Of course the monument served

---

76 Scott 2010: 42-4.
77 Plutarch (Plu. Moralia 400E) says that the building was rededicated, but Herodotus (Hdt. 1.14.2) reluctantly refers to it as the public treasury of the Corinthians and says that it should rightly be called the treasury of Cypselus. Inscriptions bearing the name Korinthos may corroborate this success (Scott 2010: 45). Pausanias, in the second century AD, simply refers to it as Corinthian (Paus. 10.13.3).
78 Inference of a genos’ private investment is conjecture, such Alcmaeonid or Solon’s interests in a possible early Athenian treasury (Scott 2010: 49).
79 For an example at Olympia, Pausanias appears to record the dedicatory inscription, that it was dedicated by ‘Gelon and the Syracusans’, Γέλωνος δὲ ανθῆμα καὶ Συρακουσίων (Paus. 6.19.7); and at Delphi the later Athenian treasury bore the inscription ΑΘΕΝΑΙΟΙ Τ[Ο]Ι ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝ[I ΑΠΟ ΜΕΔ]ΟΝ ΑΚ[ΡΟΘ]ΙΝΙΑ ΤΕΣ ΜΑΡΑΘ[I ΑΜ]ΗΣ (GHI 3 no. 19).
80 For references see below.
to bring *kudos* to both Cypselus and the gods of the sanctuaries, but there was likely an occasion for its construction and our sources provide possibilities. Plutarch writes that Cypselus dedicated the monument in thanks to Apollo, who he believed stopped his crying as an infant and saved him from capture by the Bacchiads sent to kill him. The reasoning may seem apocryphal, playing on the folk-tale in Herodotus, but the folk-tale was there for Herodotus to record, and it is possible that this folk-tale was created and promulgated by the Cypselids in the same way that the oracles may seem to justify Cypselus' accession and rule as *basileus*. Indeed the Cypselids dedicated at Olympia the supposed chest in which Cypselus was hidden, again, it is implied, because the gods had a hand in saving the infant. The chest, as Pausanias saw it, was of gold and ivory inlay, and his detailed description of it is further suggestive of its intricacy and detail as well as its value and renown. The verses inscribed on it may have been those of the Corinthian lyric poet Eumelus. Cypselus' own name, it was said, derived from his safety in that chest. Though we cannot date the tale of Cypselus' infant survival, except that it pre-dates Herodotus, the Cypselids certainly invested in the account if they did not create it themselves, and this gives credibility to Plutarch's statement that the treasury was dedicated as a thanks-offering. It was a *charistērion*, ostensibly at least, and an act of *charis* in return for the gods' gift in saving Cypselus, a very private affair, even if it were to have considerable impact on Corinth. The expenditure it involved was justified since it repaid Apollo for his prior gift to Cypselus;

---

81 Plut. *Moralia* 164A; Hdt. 5.92δ.
82 Compare a similar motif in Herodotus’ account of Cyrus’ infancy (Hdt. 1.107ff). Drews (Drews 1974) compares Cyrus’ folk-tale with that of Sargon the Akkadian.
83 Pausanias describes it in great detail (Paus. 5.17.5-19). See also D.Chr. 11.45, where it is said to have been dedicated by Cypselus himself. On the chest, its authenticity, and the possibility of its dedication by Periander see Scott 2010: 152 and n. 24.
84 Paus. 5.19.10.
85 Hdt. 5.92ε.1; Paus. 5.17.5.
86 Periander may have dedicated another chest at Delphi, near to Cypselus’ treasury (Scott 2010: 44 n. 15; Carter 1989, who argues that Periander dedicated both chests in an orchestrated move).
its very nature, as a treasury, allowed for, indeed proclaimed that there would be future acts of *charis* housed within in what would be an enduring and flourishing relationship of *philia* between Cypselus and Apollo.

The sources also define the statue of Zeus dedicated by Cypselus\(^\text{87}\) at Olympia as a *charistērion*. It was in fact remarkable enough to become a landmark by which other dedications might be located\(^\text{88}\). We are told that Cypselus prayed to Zeus Olympius that he would dedicate Corinth's wealth to the god if he became the city's ruler\(^\text{89}\), and that this was achieved by amassing a tenth of its wealth each year over ten years, at which point the statue was erected and dedicated. The promise of 'all the wealth of Corinth' may be an exaggeration of the contractual donation of *charis* in return for future *charis* (Cypselus' accession), explained by Aristotle and Agaclytus as achievable by taxing the citizens of Corinth for ten years to meet the promised sum. Whether or not this campaign of taxation was enforced\(^\text{90}\), it is likely that the Corinthians argued for a rededication of the statue after the fall of the Cypselids on the basis that it had been funded with their wealth. What is most significant is that the emphasis in both the promise of *charis* and the method of meeting the promise is upon wealth. The outlay of expenditure is what drives the deal between Cypselus and Zeus. This integral medium of expenditure which associates *philia* between ruler and god is made all the clearer from the evidence we have of the dedicatory inscription and details relating to it from literary sources.

\(^{87}\) On the possibility that Periander or another Cypselid dedicated it see Salmon 1984: 228 and Page 1981: 397.

\(^{88}\) Pl. *Phd*r. 236b1-4.

\(^{89}\) Arist. *Oec*. 1346a; Agaclytus referenced by Photius (FGrH 411 1.7-12). The reasons given by other authors, also mentioned by Photius, for a dedication by Periander are tyrannical *topoi*, such as to keep the citizens away from luxury and arrogance (Didymus) and keeping the populace occupied and too busy for political aspiration (Theophrastus). Note that both of these *topoi* offered as reasons for the dedication still depend upon the expenditure of Corinthian wealth.

\(^{90}\) Salmon argues against it (Salmon 1984: 132-9).
If I am not a statue of hammered gold,

You may destroy the family of Cypselids.

The entire family of Cypselids act as guarantors of the statue's quality, fabric and therefore value, which take precedence over other mentionable details. Indeed a satirical imitation of the inscription exaggerated the importance of its value, suggesting that the statue was in fact solid gold (πανχρύσεος) rather than hammered plating (σφυρήλατός), again stressing the notoriety of the expenditure on this charistērion. Strabo highlighted the statue as a good example of Cypselid wealth. Cypselid wealth used in religious dedication related directly to Cypselus' legitimacy as ruler. Through the examples of Cypselus' treasury at Delphi, the Cypselid dedication of Cypselus' chest at Olympia, and Cypselus' statue of Zeus at Olympia, we can observe again a correlation between a ruler's legitimacy and his philia with the gods, realised in acts of charites, and recognised specifically in acts of expenditure, either measurable by their own value or to be measured by the continued wealth which a treasury, say, would continue to secure. This expenditure secured enduring philia between ruler and gods, and accounts of Cypselus' divine assistance from Apollo in his saving as an infant, his growing to adulthood at Olympia, and his accession sanctioned by Zeus Olympius, along with the Delphic oracles justified the use of expenditure and corroborated the philia between Cypselus and the gods of Delphi and Olympia.

There are further hints of the private ambitions of the Cypselids through other dedications at Delphi and Olympia, which in fact suggest they may have been used

---

93 Str. 8.6.20: τοῦ δὲ περὶ τὸν οίκον τούτον πλούτου μαρτύριον.
these Panhellenic-international sanctuaries to broker *philia* with rulers in the Near East and Egypt. A bronze palm tree dedicated at Delphi by Cypselus intrigued even the ancient Greeks as to its significance and relevance to the sanctuary and to Apollo. This dedication along with that of a gold bowl dedicated at Olympia, whose weight appears to fit a Near Eastern standard of two minae, may suggest non-Greek influence on Cypselid dedication and reflect an extended Cypselid network. Periander certainly developed *philai* with Alyattes of Lydia and Thrasybulus of Miletus and his brother named his son, who succeeded Periander, Psammetichus, suggestive of further relations with Egypt. At Delphi, dedications from the Near East were positioned inside or immediately to the east of the temple of Apollo, and none were monumental such as a treasury. Their cluster in this locale may have been encouraged by Periander. A number were moved to the treasury of Cypselus after the fire at the temple, but others may well have been originally positioned within Cypselus' treasury. None of this activity can with any certainty be associated with Cypselus himself, but if Cypselus had established personal relationships of *philia* with the gods of these sanctuaries to justify and secure his rule, it would seem that Periander and other Cypselids embraced this potential to network and create new *philia* with other ruling élites.

Cypselus' expenditure on religious dedication at Delphi and Olympia formed *philia* with their gods, by the giving and promising of *charities*. These dedications displayed the measure of Cypselus' wealth. In the case of Zeus' statue, the Cypselids declared themselves guarantors of quality and value; in the case of Delphi's treasury, the

---

94 Plut. *Moralia* 164A, 399E-F.
95 Hopper 1955b. Its inscription (Ϙυψελίδαι ἀνέθεν Ἑρακλείας) has persuaded some to associate the dedication with a possible Corinthian colony on the Ambracian Gulf (Salmon 1984: 213; Hopper 1955a: 10).
96 Hdt. 1.19-25, 3.48.2; Nicolaus Damascenus FGrH 90 60.3.
97 Arist. *Pol*. 1315b24-6; Nicolaus Damascenus FGrH 90 60.4-6.
98 Scott 2010: 45 and n. 18.
99 Scott 2010: 45 and n. 20.
monumental nature of the dedication declared its expense, and its purpose declared future expenditure. These dedications were enveloped in accounts of Cypselus' birth, rise and rule, where, as philoi, the gods and the basileus gave charis and received charis in return, maintaining an enduring relationship. This very private philia, between Cypselus and his genos and the gods, is explained by the reasoning behind the acts of charites, relating specifically to Cypselus' life and career, to the exclusion of explicit benefit to the citizens of Corinth. The wealth of those Corinthians paid for the statue of Zeus Olympius; the civic nature of other treasuries which were established at the sanctuaries around the time of the fall of the Cypselid dynasty. These factors undoubtedly spurred the Corinthians in their appeal to have these dedications rededicated in their name. These dedications, then, are excellent examples of the significance of the use of wealth in expenditure on religious dedication, and the importance placed upon them in recognising and declaring the philia established by such acts of charis.

* * *

Cypselus the Bacchiad established a new dynasty of rule in Corinth. However this new dynasty was Bacchiad in all but name and re-design, finding legitimacy in genealogy, in political background and aspiration, and in its management of philia with Bacchiads and others. Justification and stability in the new regime came through prosecution of echthroi in the name of justice and through the careful management of philia with the gods of the most important Panhellenic sanctuaries at Delphi and Olympia. An elaborate design established and ensured Cypselus' right to rule and

---

100 Especially remarkable if they were taxed.
continued reign, in three component parts. In the first place were the oracles, Cypselid propaganda, predicting Cypselus’ significance and inevitability, divinely sanctioned, giving a basis for Cypselus’ *philia* with the gods. In the second place were accounts of Cypselus’ birth, divine rescue, duty to the gods in childhood, obedience to the gods in adolescence, and promises of *charis* to those gods, his *philois*. And in the third place, entwining these first two, displaying Cypselus’ *philia* with the gods of the sanctuaries and ensuring a continuing relationship, were the *charites* which Cypselus set up at the sanctuaries. By their very nature and fabric they were acts of lavish expenditure, and declared themselves to be such, by their role as a treasury or by declaration of their value as a statue. The Cypselid *genos* continued to exploit Cypselus’ heroic association with the gods with the dedication of chests, and by the opportunity to develop *philia* with the ruling élite of non-Greek nations who shared dedications at these Panhellenic religious sites. The political and economic successes of Cypselus were supported by his religious activity, but the interdependence of each of the three elements is evident. His rule and wealth supported his religious enterprise; his wealth and religious enterprise supported his rule; his religious enterprise and rule supported his wealth.
3 Deinomenid Philia and Rule

Hieron of Syracuse both used models for ruling inherited from his brother, and also innovated in his methods and ideologies of ruling. His inherited wealth was immense, his family invested a hereditary role as hierophants, he won Panhellenic athletic victories, and he ruled several of Sicily’s cities while founding another. In many of these respects he was seemingly like his brother-predecessor Gelon. Both also led campaigns against and defeated the enemies of Sicily, both built new religious centres, and both were entombed and commemorated as heroes. Both valued success in athletic victory at religious sanctuaries. These victories were commemorated in hymns which measured one's success in war, athletics and wealth against one’s mortality, and in line with one’s worship of the gods. Religious and financial contexts were evident in their military campaigns, particularly with respect to their outcomes. At every turn religion, wealth and rule were entwined, on a local scale in the ruler’s own city or cities, and on a Panhellenic scale at the most important shrines of the Greek World. But why were these elements fundamental and so closely associated to each other for successful rule? This chapter examines how Hieron’s religious activity related to policy, at home and abroad, how his policy relied on or was related to wealth, and how wealth related to or funded religious activity.

This chapter will therefore consider Hieron’s use and display of wealth, how Hieron managed his religious activity to establish the basis of good rule, and how his coinage supported his religious activity and therefore his rule.
3.1 The Use and Display of Wealth

3.1.1 Acts of charis at Olympia and Delphi

In competition and conflict, through monument and hymn, Hieron's religious activity is in evidence, and frequently in relationship with his political activity. As we shall see, his athletic victories at Delphi and Olympia and the hymns which accompanied them honoured the gods of the sanctuaries as well as brought glory upon himself and his city. His successes in the games and in war and diplomacy at Cumae and Locri were memorialised in monuments and dedications to the gods at the sanctuaries. His foundation of Aetna involved religious worship and display, in temples and in coinage. Religious iconography on his coinage of Aetna was just one way of demonstrating the connection between religious activity and money, and indeed his religious activity in Sicily and the Panhellenic shrines entailed considerable expenditure.

Expenditure on athletic competition could bring reward. To compete and win in the games was to bring honour, kudos, not only to oneself but also to one's city\(^1\), and, potentially through the help of the gods, to the gods themselves. The wise ruler or the competitor does not act against the gods but works with the gods, and in turn the gods bring him and his city great kudos. Pindar is very clear that the gods can hold back success or bring the desired glory, and no man should quarrel with their power: χρὴ δὲ πρὸς θεόν οὐκ ἐρίζειν, / ὃς ἀνέχει τοτὲ μὲν τὰ κεῖμων, τὸτ᾽ αὖθ᾽ ἐτέρως ἔδωκεν μέγα κύδος ('one must not quarrel with a god, who sometimes brings some things for men, and at other times to others gave great kudos')\(^2\). To compete was a religious act, a ceremony at a religious site in the shared name of oneself, one's city and the god, possibly therefore even the god or gods of one's own city. In this way Pindar described

\(^{1}\) As Pindar, for example, emphasises (e.g. Pi. P. 4.66).

\(^{2}\) Pi. P. 2.88-9. Other examples of god-given kudos in Pindar are O. 3.38-41, P. 2.49-52, and P. 4.66-7. An explicit example of the victor sharing that kudos with his city is O. 5.7-8.
Hieron 'crowning Ortygia, home of the river-goddess Artemis, with far-shining wreaths' for his victory in the games\(^3\). Not only was the ability to compete and win considered glorious, but also the expenditure involved was considered a glorious act in honour of the sanctuaries' gods. To use Pindar's own terms, Hieron used his wealth to find glory\(^4\), he toiled and spent money in competition to achieve 'god-built excellence'\(^5\). Meanwhile in a hymn to Chromius of Aetna, an important member of Hieron's court, Pindar associated wealth and _kudos_, which in combination are the height of achievement for man, both of which were given to him by the gods: ἱστω λαχῶν πρός δαιμόνων θαυμαστὸν ὄλβον. / εἰ γὰρ ἄμα κτεάνοις πολλοῖς ἐπίδοξον ἄρηται / κῦδος, οὐκ ἔστι πρόσωθειν θνατὸν ἐτι σκοπιᾶς ἄλλας ἐφάμασθαι ποδοῖν ('Let him know that he has been allotted wonderful wealth by the gods. For if as well as many possessions he earns the renown of fame, a mortal man cannot plant his feet on other, higher peak')\(^6\).

Hieron, like his brother Gelon, competed in Panhellenic competition, and he did so at great expense in the equestrian events\(^7\), winning three times at each of the games at Olympia and Delphi between 482 and 468BC\(^8\). He honoured the gods and their part in his victories by funding monumental dedications, _charistēria_, such as his chariot group set up near to the Altis grove at Olympia. The Altis, location for the Temple and Statue of Olympian Zeus and the most prestigious enclosure sacred to the hero worship of Pelops, was the sacred heart of the sanctuary and was the site of the earliest of such

---

\(^3\) Pi. _P_. 2.5-7.

\(^4\) As Pindar hoped he might himself (_P_. 3.110-11).

\(^5\) Pi. _O_. 5.15-6, _I_. 1.41-2 and especially _I_. 6.10-11.

\(^6\) Pi. _N_. 9.45-7.

\(^7\) It can have been at no mean cost that these events were entered, compared to other events, and this undoubtedly had some bearing on their prestige. Pindar describes the richly-worked reins of Hieron's horses at _P_. 2.8, an example of embellishment due to a considerable investment. Davies (Davies 1984: 29, 31, 99-102) compares propertied families of the sixth and fifth centuries in Athens to the liturgical class of Classical Athens, and argues for an association between the resources for and determination to compete in chariot-racing and political power. On the evidence in Pindar for the large expenditure on chariot-racing see Kurke 1991: 110-11.

\(^8\) In the chariot race at Delphi and the single-horse race at Olympia.
dedicatory monuments. Hieron's monument was a thanks-offering, a *charistērion*, as the inscription states: δῶρα Ἰέρων τάδε σοι ἐχαρίσσατο. Hieron recognised Zeus' favour in his victories and returned due thanks to him by erecting the monument in the god's honour. The full inscription makes this very clear: σόν ποτε νικήσας, Ζεῦ Ὁλύμπιε, σεμνὸν ἀγώνα / τεθρίππῳ μὲν ἄταξι, μουνοκέλητι δὲ δίς, / δῶρα Ἰέρων τάδε σοι ἐχαρίσσατο: παῖς δ' ἄνέθηκε / Δεινομένης πατρὸς μνήμα Συρακοσίου ('Victorious in your, Zeus, holy contest, once in the four-horsed chariot, twice in the single horse race, Hieron dedicated these gifts as *charis* to you: and his son Deinomenes set up this monument of his Syracusan father.'). However, the monument had two clear immediate goals, evident from the inscription, to give thanks to Zeus for his competition (σόν σεμνὸν ἀγώνα), and to memorialise Hieron the victor and his city (πατρὸς μνήμα Συρακοσίου). Hieron's son, presumably no longer a resident of Syracuse, still stressed the association of his father with Syracuse, his city of rule. These monuments then mark a moment of shared association and reciprocation, on the one hand for the god in his help given to the victor and his city in games which honour the god, and on the other hand for the victor in his thanks to the god while memorialising his own victory and displaying the *kudos* of him and of his city. This reciprocity, this channel for exchanging due honour, is *charis*. To incur expense by competing and to incur expense in monumentalising the victory were both religious acts, eminently justifiable in their expense for their religious context and purpose.

---

9 Scott 2010: 153.
10 Paus. 6.12.1, 8.42.8-10. Gelon had previously erected a chariot monument at Olympia for a victory in 488BC. On this see Paus. 6.9.4-5.
11 We cannot be sure of the exact date, which was after the death of Hieron (Paus. 8.42.8-10). Deinomenes' emphasis on his 'Syracusan father', though he himself was ruler of Aetna, demonstrates the alliance of city and dedication.
3.1.2 Monument and hymn, the gods as philoi, the ruler as euergetēs

The Greeks sought reliable assistance in the future not only from their mortal philoi but from their gods. The greatest problem here was the difficulty in securing reciprocity. If a man performed an act of charis for another man and this was not reciprocated, there may have been legal or social consequences. If a man performed an act of charis for a god, a greater level of trust was required and a belief that the god would act accordingly\(^\text{12}\). This did not stop the man finding methods to secure the reciprocation, as I shall outline below, and each of these involved emphasising their act or acts of charis in order to demonstrate that charis was duly expected in return\(^\text{13}\). Charis could be given in the form of prayer or hymn alongside sacrifice or other offering, or in the form of a monument. Parker\(^\text{14}\) shows how a man might use these acts in one of three ways to try to secure reciprocation from their god. They could ask for reciprocation within their prayer at the time of their sacrifice, or they could remind the god in their prayer of past sacrifices, or they could make the promise in their prayer of future sacrifices if the god gives them what they ask for\(^\text{15}\). In each of these three options, the giving of material goods is key. Furthermore, the use of the sacrificial victim as an indicator of the omens

\(^{12}\) This insecurity in what a man can expect from a god in return relates to what a citizen can expect in return from their ruler, as unequal philoi. To Bremer (Bremer 1998: 133) this makes the relationship between man and god not contractual, but purely one of ‘goodwill and friendship’. Nonetheless, the language of the relationship is the same as in contractual philia relationships of εὐκρατεία and borrowing and lending.

\(^{13}\) Naiden (Naiden 2013: 99), quoting Parker (Parker 1998: 109), argues that the dedicant is not attempting to ‘bargain’ with the god, but Parker’s point is merely to stress that the original meaning of charis suggests only delight. He does go on to admit that chari- words ‘underwent some pressure towards the meaning ‘gratitude’ from their constant contextual association with ideas of deserved reward’. Bargaining of a sort is certainly taking place, each partner demonstrating their desire to delight the other in the expectation of reciprocation, ‘a kind of charm war’ (Parker 1998: 109).

\(^{14}\) Parker 1998.

was a further way to read if the act of charis would be reciprocated, or if a further or alternative act would be required\textsuperscript{16}.

Dedicatory inscriptions\textsuperscript{17} displayed the same criteria, in some of which the dedicants express thanks (charis) to the god for past activity, and in others of which the dedicants call for favour (charis). Commonly, demonstrating that the thanks and favour are reciprocal and recompense, they are classed as an ἀμοιβή, most commonly in the phrase χαρίεσσαν ἀμοιβήν (‘a charis-giving recompense’). Further emphasising the reciprocation and exchange the prefix ἀντί (‘in return’) is attached to the verb of giving\textsuperscript{18}. One inscription particularly emphasises the enduring reciprocation, where the dedicant specifically calls his dedication an act of charis in return for a previous act of charis by the goddess Athena: ‘Mistress, Menandros dedicated you this first offering in fulfilment of a vow, paying back a favour (charis) … Protect him, daughter of Zeus, (returning?) a favour (charis) for this’\textsuperscript{19}. The same expression is found in Homer’s poems, for example when Athena in disguise departs the palace on Ithaca. She and Telemachus refer to each other’s φίλοι κηρ and φίλοι Ἑτορ (‘friend’s heart’). Telemachus offers a gift for which Athena will make recompense with a worthy gift in return (ἄξιον ἀμοιβής). This, says Telemachus, is what philoi xenoi give their xenoi (φίλοι ξείνοι ξείνοι δίδοσι)\textsuperscript{20}. In another example the Pylians ask Poseidon to give them pleasing recompense for their hecatomb (δίδου χαρίεσσαν ἀμοιβήν)\textsuperscript{21}. The reciprocity between the Pylians and Poseidon is reflected in the use of the same phrase to describe what they might expect

\textsuperscript{16} Parker 2011: 132-3.
\textsuperscript{17} Collected examples of the types discussed here are catalogued and discussed in Lazzarini 1976: 131-6.
\textsuperscript{18} Lazzarini 1976: 131-6.
\textsuperscript{20} Hom. Od. 1.307-18.
\textsuperscript{21} Hom. Od. 3.55-61. A further example by Theognis (Thgn. 1263-6) brings together much of the important terminology in one place (χάρις, εὐεργεσίας, ἀμοιβή).
from the god which is used in the above dedicatory inscriptions to describe the
dedications to the gods.22

A desire for reciprocation between man and god was key to and behind the act of
charis. Coming back to the inscription on Hieron's monument to his victories at
Olympia23 the reciprocity of the act is reflected in the normal Middle form of the verb,
ἐχαρίσσατο, where the action of the subject not only affects the object but reflects back
on the subject. Charis is here an exchange between man/city and god, and therefore a
religious act. The reciprocity can be delivered by means of a monument, as in the
examples above, or by means of hymn, such as the victory odes of Pindar,24 delivered
publicly. Both of these incur expense, which seems to be a necessary part of the
reciprocity since it is only though the victor's expenditure that the method of charis can
be arranged. Pindar is in fact explicit about the contractual nature of this expenditure
where the poet becomes something of a 'middle-man'. The reciprocal nature of the
charis comes through in Pindar's odes, which at times imply that, if a god helps to bring
victory to the competitor, the victor should repay the god with hymn, while at other times
the god awards the hymn to the victor, and at other times the hymn is addressed to the
gods or even to both gods and victors and their family. Nonetheless this relationship
between victor, poet and gods demonstrates a legitimate relationship between wealth,
kudos and religion. To give some examples: in Isthmian 126 the hymn repays Zeus for
help in victory ('I think we should sing to repay our neighbour, the son of Cronus, for his

22 On the comparable use of charis in hymn and epigram, see Day 2010: 246-53.
23 σόν ποτε νικήσας, Ζεῦ Ὅλυμπιε, σεμνὸν ἁγὼνα / τεθρίππῳ μὲν ἄτος, μουνικέλητι δὲ δίς, / δώρα
 ἱέρων τάδε σοι ἐχαρίσσατο: παῖς δ᾽ ἀνέθηκε / Δεινομένης πατρὸς μνήμα Συρακοσίου (Paus. 6.12.1,
8.42.8-10).
24 An example is O. 7.11-12.
25 There is limited evidence from the poems themselves for the locations of their performances. This
ambiguity in itself is suggestive of a more open and less intimate performance. It also provides the
opportunity for re-performance (see Carey 2007). One of the most notoriously public hymns was Pindar's
seventh Olympian, for Diogoras of Rhodes, which was displayed in gold lettering in the Temple of Athena
26 Pi. I. 1.52-4.
assistance in the horse-contest of chariots’), and similarly Pythian 4\textsuperscript{27} calls for the hymn to reach the ears of Apollo and Artemis for their help (‘Today, Muse, you must stand beside this man your friend, Arcesilas the king of well-horsed Cyrene, so that in his revelling you can swell the fair wind carrying hymns owed to the children of Leto and Delphi.’), while in Pythian 5\textsuperscript{28} the hymn is repayment for expenditure (‘[Arcesilas] has this graceful song of his beautiful victory as reimbursement for his expenditure.’) and in Olympian 3\textsuperscript{29} the hymn cancels a debt brought on through the help from a god (‘The victory crowns placed on his long-flowing hair exact of me this god-made debt’). These methods channel the shared and reciprocal charis between god and city (and its victor and ruler).

The correlation between hymn and monument is very much in evidence, from the architectural language Pindar used to describe his works to compare them with monumental building, and it is quite likely that many of the performances of the epinician odes took place at the monument in the sanctuary or alternatively, or additionally, at a parallel monument in the victor’s home city\textsuperscript{30}. Pindar always uses the term charis with religious connotation and context, whether it is the favour or gift from a god directly or through his craft as a poet of hymns on a mythological theme\textsuperscript{31}. Even charis personified, the divine Graces, the Charites, reward the victor with his crown\textsuperscript{32}. These odes then are religious in themselves, as are the poems on Hieron by Bacchylides and Simonides, and the Aetnaeae tragedy of Aeschylus, a play specifically

\textsuperscript{27} Pi. P. 4.1-3.
\textsuperscript{28} Pi. P. 5.105-6.
\textsuperscript{29} Pi. O. 3.6-8.
\textsuperscript{30} Thomas 2007: 149-52. Some architectural terms used by Pindar to describe his poetry are ἄγαλμα, μνήμα and ἔργον.
\textsuperscript{31} Examples are at O. 1.18, 30, 6.76, 7.11, P. 1.33, 2.17, N. 5.54, I. 5.21, 6.50, 7.17. Pindar’s epinician odes mostly follow a standard structure in which there is a central mythological allegory, in addition to other references to mythological figures elsewhere in the poems.
\textsuperscript{32} Pi. O. 2.48-51 and O. 7.
commissioned by Hieron, which focused on the mythical background to the environs of Aetna, the city of Hieron's foundation\(^{33}\). The odes mark out the victor in extraordinary quasi-heroic terms\(^{34}\), and make mythical comparisons with heroic figures but, just like the physical monuments at the Panhellenic shrines, they also importantly highlight the city to which the victor returns. His city shares in the *kudos* which this relationship of *charis* allows. The epinician poems were not offered freely, and incurred expense\(^{35}\) just like the monumental *charistēria*, and the poets talk of *charis* in both its religious and economic terms. A good example, and in direct relation to Hieron, is in the first *Pythian*, where Pindar describes the payment (μισθός) he will receive from Syracuse, Athens and Sparta 'as *charis*' which is enacted through the hymns he would compose for them on their victories in war\(^{36}\). Honourable *charis* is 'the best of all possessions'\(^{37}\), wrote Pindar, while Bacchylides advised Hieron: 'It's a god, a god that one should honour, for this is the best of riches'\(^{38}\). Wealth, in the name of *charis*, was not only used to fund religious activity, it was displayed in the name of religious activity.

### 3.1.3 Victory in war and monument

Victory in war was similarly celebrated in dedication, with its expense also marked and celebrated. Wealth funded contest, war, and rule, all of which were religious activities where the victor and ruler accepted the association with or the help of the gods,
following success in which the victor’s or ruler’s wealth would fund their religious celebration. That war was considered religious activity is clear from the way in which it is celebrated by Pindar and Bacchylides, comparable to the victories of athletic competition. Hieron is both ‘horse-loving’ and ‘warlike’\(^{39}\), Syracuse is a ‘sanctuary for Ares’ and a ‘nurse for horsemen’\(^{40}\), and the sons of Deinomenes owe their excellence in part to Nike and Ares, allowing the poet to sing his hymn, ‘woven with the help of the Graces’ (σοῦν Χαρίτεσσι)\(^{41}\). The Charites here assist with the production of the hymn as much as the Muse. Through these goddesses and through the poet charis is performed and expense delivered. War was celebrated in religious hymn and with religious offerings and monuments, such as temple building by Gelon after the Battle of Himera, by the Locrians after Hieron’s diplomacy for that state, and the monuments and dedications of victory in war at the Panhellenic sanctuaries. Diodorus stresses such detail in his account of Gelon’s religious activity after the Battle of Himera, telling us that he built two temples from the spoils, and ‘set up a golden tripod from sixteen talents, in the sanctuary at Delphi as a thanks-offering (charistērion) to Apollo’ (χρυσοῦν δὲ τρίποδα ποιήσας ἀπὸ ταλάντων ἐκκαίδεκα ἀνέθηκεν εἰς τὸ τέμενος τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς Ἀπόλλωνι χαριστήριον)\(^{42}\).

Gelon’s tripod, as well as those dedicated at Delphi by Hieron and possibly other Deinomenids, displayed their cost publically. Described by Bacchylides at the very start of his third epinician to Hieron\(^{43}\), the poet calls this expenditure the ‘best of wealth’ in that it honours a god (θεόν, θεόν τις ἀγαλαίζετω, ὥ γάρ ἀριστος δῆλων\(^{44}\)). The tripods were dedicated by Gelon after his victory at Himera in 480BC, and by Hieron after his

\(^{39}\) Bacchyl. Ep. 3.69.
\(^{40}\) Pi. P. 2.2.
\(^{41}\) Bacchyl. Ep. 5.31-6, 9.
\(^{42}\) D.S. 11.26.7.
\(^{44}\) Bacchyl. Ep. 3. 21-2, addressed to Hieron.
own victory at Cumae in 474BC. The bases of both were inscribed. Gelon’s\textsuperscript{45} tells us that the tripod was topped with a Nike statue, and that the work was carried out by Bion of Miletus. Although this inscription as we have it does not record the cost of the monument, this cost was recorded in some form, since Diodorus tells us that Gelon spent sixteen talents on it\textsuperscript{46}. The other tripod has a badly damaged inscription, whose reconstruction\textsuperscript{47} and topographical association also suggest that it is the dedication of a son of Deinomenes, and it is generally accepted to be Hieron’s\textsuperscript{48}. Reconstruction of this inscription also reveals the cost to Hieron for the monument (\[κε δὲ τάλαντα δεκα\] \πηπτά \μναί, ‘ten talents and seven minae’). Athenaeus, referencing Theopompus and comparing the dedications of Gelon and Hieron to those of Gyges and Croesus, both exceptional for their wealth, tells us that Hieron dedicated such a monument, and, in addition, an intriguing Simonidean epigram\textsuperscript{49} records the total expenditure (\[ξ \̓inkeloves Ἰέρων ὁ Δεινομέν[εος] / ἅνεθεκε τόπολλονι / Συραφόσιος/, / τὸν τρίποδα καὶ τὲν Νίκεν ἐργάσατο Βίον / Διοδόρο υἱὸς Μιλέσιος (ML 28).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure}
\caption{A diagram showing the arrangement of the tripods.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{45} D.S. 11.26.7: χρυσὸν δὲ τρίποδα ποιῆσαι ἀπὸ ταλάντων ἕκκαιδεκα ἀνέθηκεν εἰς τὸ τέμενος τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς Ἀπόλλωνι χαριστήριον.

\textsuperscript{46} D.S. 11.26.7.


\textsuperscript{48} Athen. 6. 231e – 232b and Theopompus FGrH 115 F193. It is hardly surprising that Diodorus does not mention Hieron’s monument, though he describes Gelon’s (11.26.7). Diodorus’ account is of course chronological, so there was no need to describe Hieron’s monument in his narrative at this point, if it was dedicated later by his son, and his cursory chapter on Cumae (11.51) is not welcoming of either such comparison or enrichment. See also Scott 2010: 88-90 and n.65, for an example of acceptance of the tripod as Hieron’s and its association with Cumae, as well references to other monuments of Hieron at Delphi. Scott links two other artefacts from Delphi, the ‘Polyzalus’ statue base and the ‘Delphi Charioteer’, a long tradition, but also follows Adornato (Adornato 2008), who does not link the base and statue, that the base had been that of a dedication of Hieron. He also suggests that the chariot group (Hieron’s, he says) may have imitated a sculpture by Hieron at Olympia, even though Pausanias, whom he references, writes that this was dedicated by Hieron’s son Deinomenes, after his father’s death. For further discussion on the arrangement and design of the tripods see Privitera 2003.

\textsuperscript{49} Simon. 34 ≈ Σ Pi. 1.152, where the former contains an additional central couplet on the expenditure: Φαμίλειον, Ἱέρων, Πολύζαλον, Ἐλευθερίαν, Θανάτοις δεκατάς, τοὺς τρίποδος θέμενα \iota ξ ἐκατόν λεπάν καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ταλάντον / Δαιμονίου χρυσοῦ, τὰς δεκάτας δεκάταν / βαρβάρα νικάσαντας ἔθνη· πολλάν δὲ παρασχεῖν / σύμμαχον Ἐλλάσιον χείρ’ ἐς ἔλευθεριον. Harrell (Harrell 2002: 454-5) is correct that there is insufficient proof that this epigram adorned the monument (if it did, it is now lost), but the inclusion of costs nevertheless highlights the significance of declared expenditure on a monument to the god. The epigram appears to give the total figure for all tripod monuments for all Deinomenid brothers (there are further nearby, possibly associated, tripods, dated to 480BC) though the scholiast (Σ Pi. 1.152b) provides an alternative that Gelon erected all four monuments as a kindness to his brothers (certainly the figure given here is considerably larger than both the cost quoted by Diodorus for Gelon’s tripod and that given by the reconstruction of Hieron’s
λιτρῶν καὶ πενήκοντα ταλάντων, ‘fifty talents and one hundred litrae’) on a number of tripods by all four Deinomenid brothers. Just as Theopompus compares Gelon and Hieron to Gyges and Croesus, both Bacchylides and Pindar compare Hieron to Croesus of Lydia, whose wealth, importantly here, was as exceptional as his generosity and expenditure at the sanctuaries of Greece. Bacchylides recounts how Croesus was saved by Apollo from death and servitude, because ‘he sent to Pytho (Delphi) the greatest gifts of all mortals’ and how no mortal would say that he ‘sent more gold to Loxias (Apollo)’ than Hieron. Indeed Herodotus too describes Croesus’ gifts to Delphi, whose family had a heritage of offering at the sanctuary, as did the Deinomenids. The aim of all of these poets and historians was to emphasise the use of wealth in religious activity such as war and dedication to victory in war, and to recognise the association of the gods in the ruler’s political activity and the kudos which success in all of these brings.

The location within a sanctuary of such display of monuments, and the wording of the epigrams emphasised the kudos of the individual but most importantly of the individual’s city. The Deinomenid tripods at Delphi were positioned on the very temple terrace facing all visitors as they reached the temple itself, and in competition with the monument to the Battle of Plataea, with which those at Himera and Cumae were compared. The language used in this dedication was significant, notably that Gelon

inscription), to explain the reference to the ‘Damareteian gold’ of the post-Himera treaty with Carthage (D.S. 11.26). Δαμαρετίου in the fourth line is metrically problematic, however. In any case, the significance is in that the epigram seeks to outline expenditure.

50 Pi. P 1.94, and Bacchyl. Ep. 3.15-16 where in Syracuse Hieron’s temples teem with sacrifices, his streets with hospitality.

51 Bacchyl. Ep. 3; Pi. P. 1.46-51; Hdt. 1.25.

52 Bacchyl. Ep. 3; Pi. P. 1.46-51; Hdt. 1.25.

53 Pi. P. 1.71-80; Hdt. 7.165-7 (who gives a Sicilian account that the Battle of Himera took place on the same day as that at Salamis), D.S. 11. 23-24 (who says that the battle happened on the same day as that at Thermopylae). On this and the synchronicity see Harrell 2002: 454, Harrell 2006, Prag 2010: 55-6. On the similarity to the Plataea monument see Scott 2010: 88.
did not label himself as ‘ruler’\textsuperscript{54} but only as ‘son of Deinomenes’ and, as we have noted, as ‘Syracusian’, both of which put emphasis on the victor’s city and heritage, rather than his ruling status in this act of charis. The inscription on Gelon’s chariot at Olympia\textsuperscript{55} ([Γέλων Δεινομένης Γελώ]ος ἀνέθεκε. / Γλαυκίας Αἴγινάτας ἐ[π]οίεσε.), dedicated in 488BC, when he ruled Gela but not yet Syracuse still displayed this city pride, and that on Hieron’s chariot, dedicated more than twenty years later, shows Hieron’s son (Δεινομένης πατρὸς Συρακοσίου) continuing this formula, with the emphasis on his late father’s city. Another series of finds supports this trend of emphasis on the city. Three recorded heraldic caducei dedicated at Olympia in the time of Hieron, bearing the inscription Συρακοσίων δαμόσιον (and vice versa), again suggest the importance of including the Syracusans as a populace with a place in Panhellenic Olympia\textsuperscript{56}.

The inscriptions of each ruler at Olympia, on monuments celebrating the victories at Himera and Cumae, also emphasise their city, its wealth and the wealth it shares with its gods. Remarkably here, because the war was waged and victory won not by the ruler alone, the citizens themselves are reckoned alongside their ruler. The victory was not won by a Syracusan ruler, but by ‘Gelon/Hieron and the Syracusans’. Hieron used this same formula\textsuperscript{57} (ἡιάρόν ὁ Δεινομένης / καὶ τοῦ Συρακόσιοι / τοῦ Δὶ Τυρ(ρ)άν’ ἀπὸ Κύμας) on three helmets dedicated at Olympia, celebrating his victory at Cumae\textsuperscript{58}. Hieron could not emulate his brother’s war monument at Olympia, as he had at Delphi, since Gelon had dedicated a treasury there, in which Carthaginian spoils were displayed. The treasury was the dedication of Syracuse and another could not be

\textsuperscript{54} It was uncommon for a ruler to style himself as such in the epigraphical tradition. One remarkable exception is the Delphic charioteer, if we accept the reconstruction of Γέλας ἀνάσσων, and even this was erased and replaced. See Robbins 1990: 317, Adornato 2008, and my note below.

\textsuperscript{55} IvO 143.


\textsuperscript{57} IvO 249 and ML 29.

\textsuperscript{58} In contrast to the much less personal and intimate celebration in Pindar’s first Pythian, where Hieron is ‘leader of the Syracusans’ (Συρακοσίων ἄρχω, Pi. P. 1.73), and elsewhere basileus.
constructed, or at least certainly no city had more than one treasury at the sanctuary. The phrasing of Pausanias' description of the treasury suggests that he is closely quoting the inscription itself (Γέλωνος δὲ ἀνάθημα καὶ Συρακοσίων), now lost. Gelon’s Syracusan treasury was built at Olympia between 480BC and 478BC, one of the three final treasuries constructed on the site, all of which were added at that time, filling the treasury terrace, and after which time no further treasuries were dedicated at the site. Through the presence of this building, Syracuse asserted its own status as a city in the Greek world, with a treasury on an equal footing and in a parallel location as those of the more ancient cities of mainland Greece. Even Gela, the previous seat of Gelon’s rule had a treasury, built in the sixth century and modified and embellished in the first quarter of the fifth century, presumably at the instigation of Gelon, or of Hieron. Olympia was πάγκοινον χώραν, ‘the territory common to all’, to all Greeks chiefly, though both Olympia and Delphi welcomed non-Greeks. In both of these Panhellenic sites, in inscription and in monument, the Deinomenids displayed and intimated their relationship with their gods and asserted the position of their cities where their wealth was held. This was still poignantly evident in the monument of Deinomenes to Hieron. Certainly, in the Treasury of the Syracusans, the opportunity was seized, decisively and

---

59 Curiously the Syracusan treasury at Delphi was not erected until the victory over the Athenian campaign in 413BC. Why did Hieron not erect one earlier? Paus. 6.19.7.
60 It had to be built soon after the victory at Himera. If it had been constructed after his death in 478BC, we might expect Pausanias’ account to have made some mention of Hieron’s involvement in the dedication, as we see in Deinomenes’ (son of Hieron) inscription on Hieron’s chariot group, especially given Hieron’s evident ambition.
61 Olympia’s treasuries were gathered alongside each other on a single terrace, possibly indicative of Elean control over the location of these monuments. There may have been some haste to fill the remaining space on the terrace by Syracuse and two other cities, all raised in the early fifth century. See Scott 2010: 191.
63 PI. O. 6.63.
64 Lydian dedications were welcome, for example, at Delphi though not in monumental structural form and positioned differently to dedications by most other Greeks (Scott 2010: 45-6). The Etruscans may have dedicated a treasury and a victory monument at Delphi (Scott 2010: 69, 90) and offerings at Olympia (Scott 2010: 190 n. 38, 215 n. 169).
to good effect, to have a part of Syracuse in Olympia, and significantly to have a building whose purpose it was to display the wealth the Syracusans shared with their gods\textsuperscript{66}.

We can also examine the epigraphical evidence to try to elicit a distinction between the private wealth of the ruler and the wealth of the city which he rules. Of the Deinomenid inscriptions at Olympia and Delphi, two detail the amount of money spent on their monuments' costs. These two alone, the Simonidean epigram and the inscription on Hieron's tripod, both at Delphi, make no reference to the ruler's city, while all of the others do. That is, the inscriptions on both Gelon's and Hieron's chariots at Olympia and Gelon's tripod at Delphi refer to the rulers as either Geloan or Syracusan. Hieron's Olympian helmets and Gelon's treasury at Olympia go further than marking the ruler's city by distinguishing the citizens themselves in an 'and the Syracusans' formula\textsuperscript{67}. If the declaration of one's city was important, even for the artists of two of the monuments, 'Bion of Miletus' and 'Glaucias of Aegina', we should question why this declaration was not made in the inscriptions which specify the expenditure on the monument, even if the two elements may not be mutually exclusive. It is possible that the monuments which declare their costs, the tripod of Hieron and the Deinomenid tripods collectively were privately funded by Gelon and Hieron, and so any mention of Syracuse is omitted to save confusion as to where the funds originated, private reserves or state reserves. However, it must be admitted that this is hardly an explicit statement of private finance. At the same time it is hardly clear that the monuments which mention the city or its citizens have been state-financed. In fact it is the lack of

\textsuperscript{66} Neer (Neer 2007: 226, 240-2) calls the treasuries at Olympia and Delphi 'the literal antithesis of a polis', to the extent that stone was often imported from the home territory, at great expense of course, to build them and that a dedication placed in a treasury 'in a way, never really left home at all'.

\textsuperscript{67} Even the problematic Γέλας ἀνάσσων inscription associated with the Delphi charioteer refers to the city, though its replacement does not, presumably through a lack of space where these two words were erased, leaving room only for the name Polyzalus.
clearly, the 'grey area' where we cannot tell from which reserves the cost was covered, which is perhaps more important here.

None of our literary sources explicitly say that Gelon or Hieron funded these monuments with private wealth or state wealth, even if this is a distinction we can make with regard to rulers. Not even Pindar, who calls on his ruling victors to spend, on athletic pursuits, monuments to the gods, and beneficence to their citizens, makes it clear from where the wealth must come. However, our literary accounts do make it clear that the rulers managed their cities' resources and wealth as much as they seemingly managed their own. Indeed, their own private wealth may have helped to generate state wealth, to the extent that there became little clear distinction between their private wealth and the wealth of the city. To give one example, Gelon, whom Herodotus has the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors describe as 'greatly powerful' and 'possessing a great part of Greece as lord of Sicily'68, can choose if and how much military support or food provisions to contribute to the effort against Persia69. Having sent away the ambassadors, Gelon entrusts his own envoy with 'a large sum of money and kind words'70, namely the promise of a treaty with the Persians, should they win against the Greeks. The association of the treaty with the money implies that it is his to use as he sees will benefit his rule and his people. Again, the division between the private wealth of the ruler and the wealth of the state is blurred. To come back to Hieron’s tripod at Delphi, Athenaeus71 tells us that Hieron, in order to find gold for his tripod, sent envoys to Greece who eventually acquired as much gold as they could carry in their hands from a certain Architeles in Corinth, to whom Hieron in return sent a ship loaded with food

68 σὺ δὲ δυνάμιός τε γὰρ ἥκεις μεγάλως καὶ μοίρὰ τοι τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐκ ἔλαχίστη μέτα ἄρχοντι γε Σικελίης (Hdt. 7.157.2).
69 Hdt. 7.158.4.
70 Hdt. 7.163.2.
71 Athen. 6.20.21-33 (Kaibel).
and other gifts. It is impossible to tell if the resulting relationship between Hieron and Architeles would appear to be one of xenia, that is private between the two men, in which case we might judge the expenditure by Hieron on the ship’s cargo as a private investment, or one of proxenia, in which case the expenditure was more likely from state wealth. Again nothing is clear, and the story has an apocryphal tone. We cannot well distinguish a ruler’s expenditure from private, possibly inherited, wealth and his expenditure from state funds, from our literary or epigraphical sources. However, a fuller examination of the extraordinary nature of state treasuries in Panhellenic sanctuaries may help us to develop our understanding of state finances.

I have discussed above how the treasuries in Panhellenic sanctuaries were pieces of the Greek states within this πάγκοινον χώραν and housed wealth which was shared between these states and the god of the sanctuary. A ruler, such as Gelon, might dedicate a treasury, whose inscription might celebrate his foundation, but it would seem that at the very least both the treasury and the treasure within were considered the shared, or invested property of the sanctuary and the city of the ruler, but not of the ruler alone. Gelon’s treasury inscription is explicit that the treasury is not his alone: Γέλωνος δὲ ἀνάθημα καὶ Συρακοσίων. By including his name Gelon precludes any future ruler from a greater claim than himself on the foundation of the treasury, but there is no doubt that the treasury is that ‘of the Syracusans’. We can compare Gelon’s treasury at Olympia with that of Cypselus, ruler of Corinth, at Delphi. Cypselus’ seventh-century treasury was the first at the sanctuary and was dedicated in Cypselus’ name alone. After the fall of the Cypselids the Corinthians appealed to the Delphians, who

---

72 Why must the ambassadors only carry away as much as their hands could carry, rather than as much as was required for the tripod? Compare, for example, the story of Alcmaeon who literally filled his boots, as well as his folds and hair and mouth, with gold from Croesus (Hdt. 6.125). For another comparison between Hieron and Croesus see Bacchyl. Ep. 3.

73 Paus. 6.19.7 (see above).
allowed the treasury to be rededicated in the name of the Corinthians themselves. This alteration from private to state possession was remarked upon by Herodotus and recorded also by Plutarch\(^{74}\), indicating that its original dedication was well remembered in spite of the change, perhaps remarkable for its anomalousness amongst the other state treasuries. The private nature of this first treasury could explain the inclusion within it of dedications from Gyges of Lydia and Midas of Phrygia\(^{75}\), with the former of whose dynasties the Cypselids shared ties of xenia\(^{76}\). One further example of a direct correlation between state finances and Panhellenic treasuries is the late sixth century treasury of Siphnos at Delphi. The Siphnians found themselves so very rich from their gold and silver mines that with a tenth of this wealth (χρημάτων) they erected a most magnificent treasury, and surplus wealth (χρήματα) was distributed amongst the citizens\(^{77}\). It is difficult not to see a coordinated decision here on how to invest state wealth, with both the expenditure at Delphi and the expenditure on the Siphnians themselves\(^{78}\).


\(^{75}\) Hdt. 1.14.

\(^{76}\) Gyges’ right to rule in Lydia was sanctioned by the oracle at Delphi after it had been challenged by the supporters of his murdered predecessor (Hdt. 1.13). Cypselus’ son Periander maintained what we can assume to be a relationship of xenia with Alyattes, father of Croesus, sending Corcyrean boys to him to serve as eunuchs (Hdt. 3.48.2). Alyattes himself sent a dedication to Delphi of a welded iron bowl and stand (Hdt. 1.25 and Paus. 10.16.1). Scott (Scott 2010: Appendix A nn. 4 and 26, relying on Jacquemin 1999) is quite likely wrong to attribute two treasuries to Gyges and Croesus of Lydia, based on the evidence of Strabo, who refers only to ‘dedications, which retain inscriptions on which the dedicants are also named’, though in unnamed treasuries (Str. 9.3.8: ἀποκείσθαι γὰρ ἐν θησαυροῖς, ἀπὸ λαφύρων ἀνατεθέντα, ἐπιγραφὰς σώζοντα ἐν αἷς καὶ ὀνομαθέντες). Herodotus’ and Pausanias’ accounts of Croesus’ dedications specify their locations as near to or within the threshold of the temple, within Athena’s sanctuary, and within the Corinthian treasury (Hdt. 1.50-1, 54, 90; Paus. 10.8.7), with no mention of a Lydian treasury. Asheri (Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella 2007: 85) affirms that here is no Lydian treasury at Delphi.

\(^{77}\) Hdt. 3.57. Pausanias (10.11.2) gives a slightly different version in which Apollo demanded a tenth of their wealth, and the Siphnians built the treasury to house this tribute. Their mines were later flooded when the Siphnians refused to continue paying the levy.

\(^{78}\) Another example of the use of surplus state wealth from mining is Themistocles’ idea to invest it in warships, his ‘wooden walls’ (Hdt. 7.144; Arist. Ath. Pol. 27.2; Plu. Them. 4.1).
That the Panhellenic treasuries and their contents were to some extent considered part-owned by the dedicating state, and can be seen as a type of investment, is evident from the opportunity they had to borrow back from the treasury the wealth stored within. The Corinthians, Thucydides tells us, at the start of the Peloponnesian War considered using the funds they had stored in the treasuries at both Olympia and Delphi to pay mercenary sailors\textsuperscript{79}, and they refer to the wealth in the treasuries as simply 'money/wealth' (τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ Ὀλυμπία χρημάτων). We do not know if they did borrow the funds, and it is not important for this argument, but if they did they may well have repaid with interest (charis). There is further contemporary evidence of citizens borrowing from one of their temples its wealth and repaying with interest, such as on the inscribed stele at Rhamnous in Attica, from the Temple of Nemesis. The accounts recorded on the stele show that money was being lent out in fixed amounts and in coined form, and calculations show that interest was being charged\textsuperscript{80}. The examples of the Corinthians borrowing from the treasuries at Olympia and Delphi and of the Attic borrowing from Rhamnous are a few decades later than any activity of Hieron, and therefore particularly the latter example shows a sophisticated system, managing loans to individuals in a community rather than from a Panhellenic treasury to its state, and functioning in a stricter monetized frame. Nonetheless, what can be argued from all of the above evidence is that the wealth stored in state treasuries in Panhellenic sanctuaries was still in some way the state’s to borrow, just as the temple’s wealth in local communities. These treasuries not only allowed the states to display proud dedications to the gods, but to display their own wealth in a setting which also promoted competition in the amount of wealth displayed. The sixth century Cnidian treasury may

\textsuperscript{79} Thuc. 1.121.3: ναυτικόν τε, ὧν ἵσχὺσειν, ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης τε ἐκάστοις οὐσίας ἐξαρτυσόμεθα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ Ὀλυμπία χρημάτων: δάνειαμα γὰρ ποιήσαμεν ὑπολαβεῖν οἴοι τ᾽ ἑσμέν μισθῷ μεῖζον τοὺς ξένους αὐτῶν ναυβάτας.

\textsuperscript{80} See Davies 2001: 117-19, and generally on the profitability of temple treasure.
even have displayed an inscription inviting visitors to view the treasure inside it\textsuperscript{81}. Similarly the visitors to Delphi in a comedy contemporary with Hieron, see the many dedications at the sanctuary as 'such wealth' (\( \chiρημα \)) as to make the poor dance in joy\textsuperscript{82}. By erecting a treasury at Olympia, Gelon used state funds to establish a state building which housed state wealth which could be seen and measured and, if required, borrowed. This was investment as much as pious dedication.

From this evidence in combination, it can be concluded that money regularly funded the religious activity of Hieron, in monumental building and offering and in dedication in hymn. These were considered acts of \textit{charis}, thanks, grace, embellishment and due, and they recognised the \textit{kudos} of Hieron and Syracuse. They reinforced the relationship between a victor and his city and their gods and the gods of the sanctuary. They were dedicatory acts, celebrating both victor and his gods, and also importantly the city from where the money came to fund the activity. The location of a city's monuments within a Panhellenic sanctuary heightened the display of the activity in relation to that of other cities, and the epigraphic formulae confirmed and added to this aspect. The wealth of Hieron was remarkable in its scale, and the poets compare him to Croesus not only in this respect but for the lavish expense on religious building and dedication at the sanctuaries. Indeed the epigraphical evidence on these buildings and dedications emphasise the expense of such monuments by giving an account of the expenditure. To spend money on such activity was in itself considered a major part of the religious act.

\textsuperscript{81} Scott 2010: 47-8.

\textsuperscript{82} Epich. Fr. 79 (Kaibel): \textit{κιθάραι, τρίποδες, ἅρματα, τράπεζαι χάλκιαι, \( / \) \( \chiειρόνιβα, \lambdaοιβάσια, \lambdaέβητες\) χάλκιοι, \( / \) \( κρατήρες, \ οδελοί- \) \( τοῖς \) \( γα \) \( μὰ \) \( υποδέλαιος \) \( / \) \( καλώτε \) \( βαλλίζοντες \) \( σιοσσον \) \( χρῆμα \) \( εἰ \) \( η \).}
3.2 Religious Activity and Good Rule

3.2.1 Ruler as Priest

The first recorded instance of Deinomenid use of religious practice to initiate a political move comes with their first ancestor on Sicily. Gelon (‘the man from Gela’), whose very name is synonymous with his supposed birthplace\(^{83}\), which he later came to rule, claimed his ancestral heritage from Telos, a small island off Knidos. Herodotus, whose account is hostile to Gelon\(^{84}\), tells us that he established his rule of Gela in part through machination and opportunity\(^{85}\), but also it would seem through his position as hierophant of a cult of Demeter and Kore, which his colonial ancestor Telines (‘the man from Telos’) had right to through his possession of the ħiρά of the goddesses, and which was secured for his descendants\(^{86}\). The evidence further suggests that Gelon imitated his ancestor’s act when he secured for himself rule of Syracuse. Both accounts in Herodotus, of Telines bringing home the banished Geloans and securing the priesthood, and of Gelon bringing home the banished *gamoroi* to Syracuse and securing rule bear a remarkable similarity to each other\(^{87}\). Both moves brought both *kudos* and authority within their cities. Additionally his religious position and his religious enterprise featured prominently in his political activity surrounding the war with the Carthaginians, for example in the building of temples to the goddesses after his victory at Himera, with a further temple at Etna planned but not built\(^{88}\), while as part of the settlement the Carthaginians had been required by Gelon to build two temples in which

---

\(^{83}\) Our sources do not reveal this information, but Herodotus, who outlines Gelon’s ancestry and its location in Gela, is silent on an alternative (Hdt. 7.153).

\(^{84}\) Compare Diodorus’ account, which suggests Gelon was elected (D.S. 13.94.5).

\(^{85}\) Herodotus’ account is generally unfavourable to Gelon, in contrast with Diodorus Siculus’ much more positive account.

\(^{86}\) Hdt. 7.153. On Gelon’s ‘machination’, it should be said that Herodotus’ account of Gelon is very negative. However Gelon became ruler of Gela, the more positive account of Diodorus describes a later Gelon, after the Battle of Himera, willing to give up rule of Syracuse, only to be hailed as ‘benefactor and saviour and king’ (D.S. 11.26.5-6).

\(^{87}\) Hdt. 7.153, 155.

\(^{88}\) D.S. 11.26.7.
the treaty was displayed\textsuperscript{89}. A shrine to Demeter unearthed in Catana-Aetna must then be Hieron's, who presumably took on both the roles of hierophant and ruler on Gelon's death, a formidable combination. Indeed his status as a priest-king is strongly alluded to in Pindar's comparison of him to Cinyras in the second *Pythian*\textsuperscript{90}.

Hieron, like Cinyras and Gelon, was priest, king, city-founder, and, on death, hero, and it is his foundation of Aetna in 476BC and his victory at Cumae in 474BC which provide the best examples of his religious activity and its political aim, to become a figure of heroic status. With heroic honours Hieron, like Gelon\textsuperscript{91} and Cinyras, could achieve cult status, a kind of confirmed continuation of the way in which the ruler is described in the religious hymns of the epinician poets, a joint and sustained *kudos* for both the city and its ruler. Diodorus Siculus confidently states\textsuperscript{92} that Hieron founded Aetna for two reasons, so that he would have a 'ready help' should need for it arise and so that he might be awarded heroic honours from the foundation of a large population\textsuperscript{93}. That Hieron may have at the very least hoped for heroic honours on his death for the foundation of Aetna is reasonable, not least because he had observed his elder brother Gelon achieving precisely the same thing. Gelon, by his death, had won a great victory at Himera, and had re-founded Syracuse. Hieron, by his death, had won what was


\textsuperscript{90} Parker (Parker 2011: 48ff) examines the roles, relationship and authority of priest and ruler, that the ruler ultimately has greater authority than the priest: but in combination we can imagine Gelon/Hieron’s authority to be supreme on both levels. On the comparison of Hieron and Cinyras, regarding their famous wealth, their priesthooods and their heroic status see Currie 2005: 259-60.

\textsuperscript{91} D.S. 11.38.5.

\textsuperscript{92} D.S. 11.49.2, but scepticism is wise, at least on the first reason given (Parker 2011: 122). Bonanno (Bonanno 2010: 129-30) sees the foundation as an act of colonisation due to a time of political turbulence, namely Hieron’s issues with Polyzalus, that the colony would stabilise any wavering at Hieron’s authority.

\textsuperscript{93} Examples of the founder of a city achieving heroic status: Hdt. 1.167.4 (Agylla), 1.168 (Timesius of Abdera), 6.38.1 (Miltiades of the Chersonese), though it was possible to be awarded the honour through athletic success: Smith 2007 and Parker 2011: 122 on the imagery, particularly in statuary, of warriors, athletes and heroes.
described as a comparable victory at Cumae\textsuperscript{94}, and had founded Aetna (or re-founded Catana as Aetna). Theron of Acragas, with whom connection by marriage was intimate (especially so if we can trust the scholia on Pindar) had also been awarded heroic honours\textsuperscript{95}. Such ambition may well have been fostered by these events within his extended family. Theron’s athletic achievements too were celebrated in Pindar’s song\textsuperscript{96} in the year of Aetna’s foundation, and it was Pindar that Hieron asked to sing of Aetna’s foundation, or perhaps more specifically of its new king, Hieron’s son Deinomenes.

\textbf{3.2.2 Ruler as Hero: Protector and Founder}

Currie suggests that Hieron was all but worshipped as a hero while alive, that the rules of Gelon and Hieron displayed some of the features of later Hellenistic ruler-cult\textsuperscript{97}, and that the titles given to Gelon by Diodorus Siculus (εὐεργέτης, σωτήρ, βασιλεύς) were not anachronistic. These terms were used in the contemporary literature of Pindar and Aeschylus to describe rulers who would be heroes, Theron and Hieron\textsuperscript{98}, and certainly the first two terms describe well some of the roles the posthumous hero would provide.

\textsuperscript{94} According to Pindar (Pi. P. 1.71-80). Diodorus dedicates seven chapters to a long narrative of the battle at Himera and its aftermath (D.S. 11.20-26), in contrast to that one very short chapter on Cumae (D.S. 11.51).

\textsuperscript{95} D.S. 11.53.2. The scholia on Pindar are remarkably elaborate, but tell us, for example, that Gelon married Theron’s daughter Damarete, who was later married to Polyzalus on Gelon’s death, while Theron married Polyzalus’ daughter (Σ Pi. O. 2, Drachmann 1903: 58:11-18 = Timaeus FGrH 566 F 93a). Hieron married into the families of both Theron of Acragas and Anaxilas of Rhegium, though according to Philistus and Timaeus his son Deinomenes had a Syracusan mother (FGrH 556 F 45 = FGrH 566 F 97 = Σ Pi. P. 1.112). Diodorus names Damarete as Gelon’s wife, but does not specify her father, nor does he make any further mention of marriage relations. For more on this intermarriage between the houses of Acragas and Syracuse see Vallet 1980.

\textsuperscript{96} The first and second Olympians, both on his chariot victory in 476BC.

\textsuperscript{97} Currie 2005: 171.

\textsuperscript{98} Hieron as basileus: Pi. P. 1.60, P. 3.70; Theron as euergetēs: Pi. O. 2.94; Hieron as euergetēs in which, Currie argues, the term sōtēr is paraphrased: Pi. P. 2.18-20. Cf. A. Supp. 980-2. On hero-worship and euergetēs see Habicht 1970: 156 n. 77, and on sōtēr see Habicht 1970: 156 n. 76, and Versnel 1970: 385-6 (with bibliography and historical examples in literature in nn. 2-3). The phrasing is not anachronistic, as Hornblower (Hornblower 1983: 48) believes, or necessarily Hellenistic, and we find much the same phrase in a poem of Ion of Chios, dating to the second quarter of the fifth century, praising Archidamus king of Sparta. It begins χαιρέτω ἡμέτερος βασιλεύς σωτήρ τε πατήρ τε (Jennings and Katsaros 2007: 8 n. 34).
for the city. A 'partial anticipation' by Hieron of heroic status is not only conceivable through Hieron’s ancestral background and perceivable through his actions in comparison with other rulers, but also in the vocabulary used by contemporary writers of these rulers who would become heroes. Both Pindar and Diodorus stress the relationship between how a man is honoured and wondered at while alive and how this continues after his death, in the form of worship as a hero, like a god. Their use of language links the two states and emphasises a natural transition. Battus was 'blessed among men while he lived, and then worshipped by the people as a hero' (μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα … δ’ ἐπειτα λαοσεβής). Similar patternation occurs in Diodorus’ descriptions of the heroic honours given to Theron and Diocles the Syracusan lawgiver. Theron, 'while he lived, enjoyed great approbation … and having died enjoyed heroic honours' (ζῶν μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς ἐτύγχαν … τελευτήσας ἠρωικῶν ἐτυχε τιμῶν). 'The Syracusans admired [Diocles] while he lived, and also honoured him with heroic honours after he had died' (ζῶντα ἐθαύμασαν οἱ Συρακόσιοι, ἀλλὰ και τελευτήσαντα τιμαῖς ἠρωικαῖς ἐτίμησαν). Diodorus also described Tennes of Tenedos in the same terms, and stresses that his good rule and his euergesia were what earned him his admiration. 'Ruling his city well and being benefactor to its inhabitants in many ways, while he lived he enjoyed great approbation, and having died he was thought worthy of heroic honours' (πολιτευόμενος δὲ καλῶς καὶ πολλὰ τοὺς ἐγχωρίους εὐεργετήσας ζῶν

---

100 P. 5.94-5: μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα / ἐναιεν, ἠρως δ’ ἐπειτα λαοσεβής.
102 Bosher (Bosher 2012: 108-11) argues, in the context of another argument that Aeschylus’ Persae was composed for a first performance in Syracuse or with a Syracusan audience in mind, that this play, in contrast with Herodotus’ Athenocentric and pro-democratic account of the Persian invasion, focuses on what makes a good or enlightened ruler as opposed to brutal tyranny. For Herodotus, tyranny makes a people weak, but a free democracy makes a people strong, and it was this which ultimately defeated the Persians. For Bosher, poets such as Aeschylus and Pindar are acting as apologists for tyrants, but this rather assumes that rulers like Hieron had anything to ‘apologise’ for.
μὲν μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς ἐτύγχανε, τελευτήσας δ᾽ ἀθανάτων τιμῶν ἡξιώθη)¹⁰³. Not only could heroic honours be awarded for the foundation of a city, for ruling well, for lawgiving, and for benefaction, but it could also be awarded for athletic achievement, and Hieron competed for success in this too. Conceptually all of this comes together in the epinicians of Pindar, and in the illuminating and summative lines of one of his fragments: ‘there come illustrious kings and those swift in strength and those men greatest in wisdom. For the rest of time by men they are called sacred heroes’¹⁰⁴. The first Pythian recalls Hieron’s chariot victory in 470BC but its scope and real interest¹⁰⁵ are Aetna’s foundation and Deinomenes’ rule, Hieron’s dynasty, Aetna’s destiny, and Deinomenid victory in war. The ‘talismanic’ contribution and the kudos that Hieron would have brought through the roles of founder and athletic victor to Syracuse and Aetna is convincingly explored by Dougherty and Kurke¹⁰⁶. These in turn help both to explain Hieron’s ambition and his achievement in these respects. Hieron was awarded heroic honours on his death¹⁰⁷, his tomb worshipped, and his ambition achieved through religious and political action. Hieron as hero, his descendants and his citizens at Aetna all shared continued kudos through his heroic honours and their worship of him. However, the Aetnaeans fostered their relationship of philia with their founding hero, with acts of charis at his tomb, as they did for their gods, for more practical reasons than kudos alone. In fact, despite any ambition or anticipation on the part of

¹⁰³ DS 5.83.3.
¹⁰⁶ Dougherty 1993: 93-7 and Kurke 1993. Further examples of the association between athletic victor and foundation myth in Pindar’s odes are given by Dougherty: Pythian 9, 4, and 5 on Cyrene, Olympian 7 on Rhodes.
¹⁰⁷ D.S. 11.66.4.
Hieron, ultimately the city of Aetna had much more to benefit from Hieron’s heroic status, and to award him those honours was to make an investment\(^\text{108}\).

A city’s hero was a protector of the state and could be called upon even after death to join them in battle against their enemies. In fact the location of the hero’s tomb, possibly not only containing but also displaying his bones\(^\text{109}\), was kept secret from the city’s enemies for fear that they might lose this advantage of a godlike figure on their side\(^\text{110}\). Examples of the establishment of hero cult for the assistance in war are those of Orestes and the Spartans and Aeacus and the Athenians\(^\text{111}\). The hero Echetlaus fought against the Persians at the Battle of Marathon\(^\text{112}\). Victorious athletes on their return to Sparta were considered heroes and fought in the front line in fact in front of their Spartan king\(^\text{113}\). Thucydides records the welcome by the citizens of Scione of the Spartan general Brasidas, who ‘garlanded him and approached him as if he had been an athlete.’\(^\text{114}\) The destruction of Hieron’s tomb in Aetna by the returning Catanaeans was not an act of intimidation, vandalism, or retribution, but a strategic manoeuvre to weaken the defending Aetnaeans. In turn, the declaration that Hieron was the founder of the new Aetna, and presumably the erection of a new monument in his honour, were not acts of respect or consolidation, but a means to make their new city more defensible\(^\text{115}\). Heroes were tied to a locality, were worshipped by their associated city, and their monument, temple, tomb or statuary could be placed within the city agora,

\(^{108}\) That the community could have more to benefit from heroisation than the hero, see Boehringer 1996: 37, 47.


\(^{110}\) Eckroth 2007: 105 and E. TrGF 5 F 370.77-89.


\(^{112}\) Paus. 1.32.4.

\(^{113}\) Plu. Lyc. 22.4, and Moralia 639e-f, where Plutarch describes city walls being partially demolished, as if since the victor returned there was no need of such defence.

\(^{114}\) Thuc. 4.121.1.

\(^{115}\) Str. 6.2.3.
especially where the hero was historical, such as a ruler or an athlete\textsuperscript{116}. The location of their monument could also be associated with or sited within the sanctuary of a god. Good examples are the tombs of Battus and Cinyras. The heroic tomb of Battus, the founder of Cyrene, stood at one end of the city's agora\textsuperscript{117}, and that of Cinyras stood within the temenos of Aphrodite at Paphos\textsuperscript{118}. The location of the hero's shrine was important, since it allowed and promoted active worship, either because of a mythological association with the location, or because of its position in a public space or at the sanctuary of a god\textsuperscript{119}. Only through worship, through acts of \textit{charis} at the shrine, did the citizens continue their relationship of \textit{philia} and secure return acts of \textit{charis} from the hero, whether in war or otherwise. The continuing and spiralling \textit{charis} which is shared between a ruler and his citizens, a hero and his people, and a people and its ancestors, and which is achieved through worship, through athletic competition and excellence, and through the use of wealth to achieve this is demonstrated by the example of Arcesilas' chariot victory at Delphi for the city of Cyrene. Near to Battus' tomb stood the tombs of ancestral rulers, who enjoyed 'the great excellence' of Arcesilas (μεγάλαν δ' ἀρετὰν), 'the wealth of their son, and the shared \textit{charis}' (σφὸν ὀλίβον υἱῷ τε κοινὰν χάριν)\textsuperscript{120}. One further way in which worship, excellence, expenditure and shared \textit{charis} and kudos could be ensured was through the establishment of local athletic games in the hero's honour. All of the Panhellenic games were founded in honour of dead heroes\textsuperscript{121}, and these local games, also founded in honour of a hero, emulated the same ideals and practices of the Panhellenic games.

\textsuperscript{117} Pl. \textit{P.} 5.93-5. Other examples of hero-cults in Pindar are listed in Currie 2005: 47-8.
\textsuperscript{119} Parker (Parker 2011: ch. 4) sets out the argument for the mutually beneficial relationship between a hero and the people, comparable to that between a god and the people.
\textsuperscript{120} Pl. \textit{P.} 5.96-103.
\textsuperscript{121} Σ \textit{Pl. 1. Ὑπόθεσις Ἑσθήμων} 1-2 (Drachmann 1926: 192).
We know of several examples of these local games\(^{122}\), which would continue to adorn the hero’s city and allow its citizens both to honour their hero and share in the kudos awarded by success in the competition, and to give and receive the charis nurtured in dedication and victory.

Pindar’s first Pythian knits together Hieron’s foundation of Aetna, his athletic victory, and his victory at Cumae by alluding to the expanse of the new territory under the ruler’s grip in mythological setting. The poem is dedicated to Hieron Aetnaeus\(^{123}\), like Zeus Aetnaeus of the same poem, who defeated the monstrous Typho, which he imprisoned beneath Etna the mountain and by the cliffs at Cumae\(^{124}\). This is unambiguous allusion to Hieron’s new territory, a claim both to the territory of Etna, mountain and surrounding land, and an influence and presence which reaches as far as Cumae. Strabo\(^{125}\) in fact tells us that there was a physical presence of Hieron’s Syracusans off Cumae on the island of Pithecusae. Whether it was a garrison or a colony cannot be made clear from his words (οἱ πεμφθέντες παρὰ Ίέρωνος τοῦ τυράννου τῶν Συρακοσίων ἐξέλιπον τὸ κατασκευασθὲν ὑπ᾽ ἑαυτῶν τεῖχος καὶ τὴν νῆσον), only that those sent by Hieron abandoned their ‘fortification’, as a result of earthquakes and eruptions. In Pindar’s poem the new extent of the territory and influence of Hieron, athletic victor and victor in war, is compared to the divine act of bringing safety to the entire region from Aetna to Cumae, the defeat of Typho by Zeus.

\(^{122}\) Nagy (Nagy 1986: 75 n. 21) lists games in honour of Miltiades, Brasidas, Leonidas and the murdered Phocaeans at Agylla. Currie (Currie 2005: 57) lists examples in Pindar’s poems, in honour of Tlepolemus (O. 7.80), Protesilaus (I. 1.58-9) and the Alcaedae (I. 4.67-8).

\(^{123}\) Pindar also addresses Hieron as his ‘guest-friend of Aetna’ (Ἀίνανος ξένος) at P.3.69.

\(^{124}\) The poet calls on Zeus to ensure a great destiny for Aetna’s citizens and kings (P. 1.67-8). From the account this must be Zeus Aetnaeus, discussed below.

\(^{125}\) Str. 5.4.9. He cites this and Pindar’s first Pythian as evidence of the presence of Typho at Cumae. Cf. Str. 6. 2.9.
Hieron’s ‘empire’, particularly with respect to Aetna was given religious expression in Aeschylus’ tragedy *Aetnaeae*\(^{126}\). Both the content and changes of scene and location in the play are suggestive of this, insistent of Hieron’s presence and influence, politically and religiously, in the region\(^{127}\), along with the possibility that the chorus comprised nymphs of Etna. The plot of the play appears in the surviving margin of a papyrus\(^{128}\), possibly a copy of the play itself. The scenes move between Mount Etna\(^{129}\) and Leontini and culminating in the Temenites area of Syracuse, the location of a shrine to Apollo and the city’s theatre\(^{130}\). The play’s structure by scene is 1-3: Rape of Thalia by Zeus, 4: Emergence of the Palici and establishment of their cult, 5: The coming of the Eumenides. Its religious focus is clear from the inclusion and aetiology of the Palici\(^{131}\), local indigenous divinities of the Aetna region now considered part of Greek culture within the play, the chorus of nymphs of Etna, and its culmination at Temenites, one of the earliest sanctuaries of Syracuse\(^{132}\). We should ask why Leontini was such an important setting within the play. Diodorus tells us that as part of the foundation of Aetna, Hieron removed the populations of both Catana and Naxos and ordered them to

\(^{126}\) *Aetnaeae* was produced ‘while Hieron was founding Aetna’ (*Vita Aeschyli* 9 = *TrGF* 3 T Al.30–32 Radt), though this need not necessarily mean 476BC itself, the date Diodorus gives us for the foundation. That the play related to the foundation of Aetna, see also this last reference, and for a fuller discussion on the whole see Herington 1967, Guardi 1980: 38-41 and Kowalzig 2008.

\(^{127}\) “[T]he consecration of Hieron’s empire” (Luraghi 1994: 344).

\(^{128}\) P. Oxy. 2257 Fr. 1. See Grassi 1956.


\(^{130}\) The shrine is one of the earliest in Syracuse. It is interesting that Aeschylus does not set the final scene at the shrine of Arethusa, the most important sanctuary of the city. Did the inclusion of Apollo rather than the more obvious Arethusa emphasise the divine nature of Syracuse for its many shrines? Was there allusion to Apollo at Delphi in the closing scene, since the first *Pythian* recalls Hieron’s victory there, as well as Apollo’s shrines in Delos and Lycia, and he is called on in the poem to make Aetna a land of brave men (*P*. 1.39-40)? Or was it to make association with the important shrine of Apollo at Naxos (Thuc. 6. 3.1), not a location for scenery in the play but very much part of Hieron’s territory?

\(^{131}\) On the Palici see Aeschylus *TrGF* 3 F 6; D.S. 11. 88.6-89; Macr 5. 19.17; Str. 6. 2.9. On the nymphs of Etna as the chorus of the play see Grassi 1956. On the invention of Greek etymology for the Palici as part of the cultural appropriation of indigenous local topography and cult see Dougherty 1993: 89-90.

\(^{132}\) Kowalzig (Kowalzig 2008) makes an argument that dramatic performance in Syracuse may have been produced in honour of Demeter and Kore rather than Dionysus, as in Athens, and Deinomenid priestly role in the worship of the goddesses was important in this institution.
live at Leontini\textsuperscript{133}. It is possible that Leontini’s importance in \textit{Aetnaeae} is a conciliatory gesture, a form of suppression, or a way to unite different ethnicities\textsuperscript{134}. Archaeological evidence for the increased population at Leontini is slim\textsuperscript{135}, especially for what must have been a considerable displacement of population (ten thousand replacements took up residence in Aetna and Naxos, according to Diodorus), though this increase in population did only last around fifteen years, from 476BC to 461BC. Hieron, as I shall discuss later, started to mint Leontini’s first coinage at this time, and its population was increased, according to Diodorus. This would suggest a heightened importance of the city under Hieron from 476BC, a trading city in part of Hieron’s network of cities. At the same time, Zeus Aetnaeus, central to the plot of \textit{Aetnaeae}, was adopted as the icon on the reverse of Aetna’s coins. The cult may well have pre-dated the foundation of Aetna, as the play itself might suggest, and if this is the case then it is another example of Hieron embracing localised religious practice to consolidate his position of authority over it. To establish this all the more firmly he may well have built or rebuilt a temple to the god, whose statue appears on Aetna’s coins. This is suggested by a fragment of Pindar, which puns on both the homonymity of Hieron the temple-builder (Σύνες ὁ τοι λέγω, ζαθέων ἱερῶν ὀμώνυμε πάτερ / κτίστορ Αἴτνας, ‘Listen to what I say, homonymous father of sacred temples, founder of Aetna’\textsuperscript{136}), and which is complemented by a mirroring pun in the first Pythian on the eponymity of Aetna and the mountain (τοῦ μὲν ἐπωνυμίαν κλεινὸς οἰκιστήρ ἐκύδανεν πόλιν γείτονα, ‘whose eponymous neighbouring city its famed founder delighted with honour’)\textsuperscript{137}. By the

\textsuperscript{133} D.S. 11.49. Strabo (Str. 6. 2.3) seems to be using Diodorus as his source. Σ Pi. P. 1, Drachmann 1910: 5.10-12 only makes reference to the renaming of Catana to Aetna.

\textsuperscript{134} ‘[I]ntegrating the Chalcidian’ (Luraghi 1994: 344).

\textsuperscript{135} There is a possible enlargement of cemeteries in the first quarter of the fifth century (Spigo 1980-81: 792-3).

\textsuperscript{136} Fr. 105 Bergk = Σ Pi. P.2 127.

\textsuperscript{137} Πl. P. 1.30-2.
inclusion of Leontini, the Palici, Zeus Aetnaeus, the nymphs of Etna and Syracuse in an aetiological play about the vast territory from Syracuse to Etna, Hieron consolidated the expanse which he ruled, and justified the consolidation of the cities, region and perhaps even ethnicities by grouping them all in shared mythological origins.

3.2.3 Ruler as Hero: Sōter and Bringer of Freedom

Hieron’s religious and political involvement, perhaps indicating further heroic ambition, in the Tyrrhenian Sea reached Epizephyrian Locri in South Italy. At some point between 478 and 476BC Locri was threatened with war by Anaxilas of Rhegium and his son Leophron. Our sources do not say if Locri appealed to Syracuse for assistance, but Hieron threatened Anaxilas himself with war and this was enough to bring an end to any conflict. Hieron’s aim may simply have been to come to the aid of an old ally, or this may have been another example of ambition to assert his authority in the territory between Sicily and Italy. In any case, on Pindar’s account, the Locrians were in his debt for averting war. The Locrians had offered to prostitute maidens to Aphrodite to secure her help against their enemy, but it would seem that after Hieron’s assistance and the war averted there was no need to resort to this extreme. Their debt of gratitude was repaid with an act of charis. Building on this religious allusion, Pindar’s description of a maiden singing in gratitude to Hieron πρὸ δῶρων may in fact refer to a temple constructed nominally to honour Aphrodite, replacing an older building, but

---

138 In Hipponium, the colony of Locri on the other side of the straits, Gelon is said to have built a lush garden, known as the Horn of Amalthea, for Persephone where she came from Sicily to pick flowers. Duris, referenced by Atheneus (Ath. 542a). Str. 6. 1.5.
139 Σ Pi. P. 2. 36c, 38, and P. 1.99a (which records the comedy of Epicharmus which may make allusion to the affair) and Justin. 21.3.
140 Justin. 21.3.2: cum Reginorum tyranni Leophronis ello Locrenses premerentur, voverant, si victores forent, ut die festo Veneris virgines suas prostituerent.
141 Pi. P.2.17.
142 Pi. P. 2.18
also ostensibly to pay honour to Hieron for his part in the safety of Locri. A new temple to the goddess was built in Hieron’s time, which may even have been funded or at least its construction influenced by Hieron. Stylistically and on account of its Ionic architecture, rarer in Sicily, association has been made with two further Ionic temples, at Catana and at Syracuse. Both of these latter temples have been dated to the late sixth century on stylistic grounds, and bear some decorative similarities to examples on Samos. However some of the similarities which the temple in Syracuse shares with Samian examples are not in fact found at Samos until the fifth century\(^{143}\), and so any dating on stylistic grounds is problematic here. If in time further evidence allows us to move the dates of the temples in Syracuse and Catana closer to that at Locri, their association may become deeper and better explained through the negotiation of Hieron. Hieron’s religious presence resonates where his political presence dominates, and as his political interests and activity expand north to include much of North Sicily and South Italy, so too religious activity and allusion accompany them.

Gelon’s victory at Himera, the decisive defeat of the non-Greek Carthaginians, was celebrated as an act of saving Greece and for this and his rule he was awarded heroic honours\(^{144}\). Hieron had heroic ambitions for himself, but how could he measure up to the model of heroism in this aspect? The evidence suggests that if Hieron could not quite match the earlier victory, he could at least associate the victories at Himera and

---


\(^{144}\) Hdt. 7.165-7, D.S. 11. 20-6. For further examination see Prag 2010: 55-9.
Cumae and appropriate the kudos of the earlier victory with his later victory. Pindar praised Hieron’s victory by comparing it to Gelon’s, and then comparing both of those to the Athenian and Spartan victories against the Persians at Salamis and Plataea. More telling is the reference to the poem Pindar was yet to compose or to be rewarded for on the defeat of the Carthaginians by ‘the sons of Deinomenes’ (ἀρέομαι / ... παρά δὲ τὸν εὐυδρὸν ἀκτάν Ἰμέρα παῖδεσσιν ὑμὸν Δεινομένεος τελέσαις, / τὸν ἐδέξαντ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ ἄρετά, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων, ‘I shall find reward in my hymn for Deinomenes’ sons and their achievements by the well-watered bank at Himera, which they received for their excellence, when the men who were their enemies were beaten in battle.) alongside others he was to compose for the Athenians and Spartans. That Pindar here conflates all of the sons of Deinomenes as victors at Himera is remarkable for its affinity to the epigram attributed to Simonides, who wrote in Hieron’s court, which is alleged to have accompanied the Deinomenid tripods at Delphi. The Simonidean epigram describes all of the Deinomenid brothers having a hand in erecting the tripods because they all had a hand in the freedom of the Greeks (βάρβαρα νικάσαντας ἔθνη: πολλὰν δὲ παρασχεῖν / σύμμαχον “Ελλᾶσιν χεῖρ’ ἐς ἔλευθερίαν) and Ephorus echoed this, that at Himera Gelon ‘freed not only the Siceliotes but the whole of Greece’ (μὴ μόνον τοὺς Σικελιώτας ἔλευθερώσαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ σύμπασαν

145 Pi. P. 1.71-80.  
146 Pi. P. 1.75-80. The use of the future tense here (ἀρέομαι) also applies to his hymns on Salamis and Plataea.  
148 Simon. 34.1-2, 5-6 (Ephorus FGrH 70 F 186.15-16).  
149 Pi. P. 1.75.
τὴν Ἑλλάδα150). Key are the assertions by Hieron and his poets that the Deinomenids kept the whole of Greece free (ἐλευθερίαν, ἐξέλκων δουλίας and ἐλευθερώσατι in the sources above), and that their victories compared to the freedom other Greeks secured from Persian threat.

The Simonidean epigraph on the Deinomenid tripods is mirrored by another supposedly by Simonides on the Plataea monument and its tripod, also on the temple courtyard at Delphi, each monument challenging the other. He wrote, ‘The saviours of Greece at large dedicated this, having delivered the cities from wretched servitude’ (Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχόρου σωτήρες τόνδ᾽ ἀνέθηκαν, / δουλοσύνης στυγερᾶς ῥυσάμενοι πόλιας151). In addition to all of this, Hieron commissioned Aeschylus to produce in Syracuse his Persae152, his play of 472BC on the Greek defeat of the Persians, in which the Battle at Salamis is celebrated. This was a bold act to draw attention from the rest of Greece to Deinomenid activity, and thereby draw comparison. In fact it may be that Hieron is behind the version of events that the Persians enlisted the Carthaginians to attack Greek Sicily in order to weaken a thinly spread Greek resistance, a version which is missing in Herodotus but appears in the work of Diodorus Siculus153. This in turn complements the account, according to Herodotus, of a Sicilian version of events, that the Battle of Himera took place on the same day as that at Salamis154. These

150 Ephorus is quoted by the Pindar scholiast (Σ Pi. P. 1.146b), who records an Athenocentric sentiment (to my mind) on Ephorus’ words. The scholiast gives two interpretations of σύμπασαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα, that on the one hand σύμπασαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα in fact referred only to Sicily though it was boastfully described by the historian as ‘all of Greece’, while on the other hand it referred to Attica as if, through ingratitude, to save Attica was to save all of Greece.

151 Simon. Fr. 102 (Diehl), quoted by Diodorus Siculus (D.S. 11.33.2). Though its authenticity has been doubted, Page is comfortable with an early date and agrees with Gomme that Diodorus’ unreliability regarding such a famous monument would itself be remarkable (Page 1981: 216-7).

152 Persae must have been produced between Spring 472 and Spring 468/7, possibly in 468BC, the year of Hieron’s Olympic chariot victory (Vita Aeschyli 18 = TrGF 3 T Al.30–32 Radt and Σ Ar. Ran. 1028 = Eratosth. Fr 109 [Strecker]). For a bibliography on the discussion of Aeschylus’ visits to Sicily, see Bosher 2012: 97 n. 2, and 103.


154 Hdt. 7.166.
elements would mean that the Deinomenid victory at Himera was not only against Carthaginians but also part of a planned barbarian invasion which included the Persians, and so the Deinomenids had in fact played as important a part in repelling the Persian attack as had Athens or Sparta. To return briefly to Aeschylus’ production of *Aetnaeae* and suggest a political connection with the production of *Persae*, it is interesting that *Aetnaeae*, which Hieron commissioned from Aeschylus, was written in Attic dialect and not that of Syracuse. It may be that the importance of Athens as the centre point for tragic performance was a factor in ensuring its dialect for other tragedy, or that Aeschylus’ own dialect determined that of the play. However, I suggest that there may have been an active choice of dialect, or at least of medium, so that *Aetnaeae* could be re-performed in Athens, just as *Persae* was performed in Syracuse. Bosher in fact argues that *Persae* itself was first performed in Syracuse, and if this is true, we have two tragedies, which debuted in Syracuse, both written in Attic dialect, and one of which was re-performed in Athens. If this was the case, then a re-performance in Athens of *Aetnaeae* was another excellent opportunity for Hieron to broadcast his heroic and religious activity on the Panhellenic stage\textsuperscript{155}. Added to this is a reference by a scholiast on Aristophanes’ *Frogs* that there were two versions of Aeschylus’ *Persae*, one of which included a section on the Battle of Plataea\textsuperscript{156}, although this is not the Athenian version, with its emphasis on the Athenian victory at Salamis emphasised, which has come down to us. This alternative version, which then included sections on both the battles at Salamis and Plataea, was commissioned by Hieron, and celebrated a more concerted Greek victory, comparing well to his own victory at Cumae. Pindar’s

\textsuperscript{155} Only the *vita Aeschyli* calls Hieron’s *Persae* a re-production, which Bosher dismisses (Bosher 2012: 103). For Bosher’s argument that *Persae* was first performed in Syracuse see Bosher 2012: 101-8. Taplin makes the point that as far as he is aware there is no evidence of tragic dialogue written in a dialect other than Attic before c. 300BC, and that even if the choruses comprised local performers, the words of the poet in these early days of the form were likely indispensable (Taplin 2012: 226-7, 240-1). He draws no conclusions from this, however.

\textsuperscript{156} *TrGF* 3 F 56, 56a.
announcement in a poem which celebrates Hieron’s victory at Cumae of his future poem to celebrate the battle at Himera, to sit alongside his other future poems to celebrate the battles at Salamis and Plataea, fits well with Aeschylus’ Syracusan version of *Persae*\(^{157}\). To summarise, the evidence suggests that Hieron amalgamated the successes at Himera and Cumae, on the justification that these successes were achieved by all of the Deinomenid brothers, and on Hieron’s behalf both Pindar and Simonides advertised this perspective. Himera was, then, also Hieron’s victory, since it was a Deinomenid victory. Hieron shared in and gained from the *kudos* of previous victories. Precedent for such combined family victory appears frequently in the epinician poems themselves, where Pindar lists and recalls past victories by family members to aggrandise both the family’s composite achievement and the most recent victory by the family member\(^{158}\). By associating himself with Gelon’s heroism and continuing to keep Greece free, and by ensuring enduring comparison with such victories elsewhere in Greece, Hieron hoped to secure heroic honours.

In conclusion, the religious authority and heritage of the Deinomenids, which they traced to their first years on Sicily, was used for political gain. It was used to celebrate victory in war and to advance presence in new territory, such as in Gelon’s temple-building after the Battle of Himera. This activity consolidated their authority in new cities under their rule, as with Hieron’s new sanctuary of Demeter in Catana-Aetna. Heroic ambition by Hieron, which could mean cult status after death, meant choosing certain types of political activity, such as Panhellenic competition, war and city-foundation, and presenting his politics in religious formats, *charistēria* such as monuments, hymn and mythical and aetiological drama, all to bring *kudos* both to himself and his cities, and


\(^{158}\) Examples are the Oligaethidae of *Olympian* 13, the extended family of Pytheas in *Nemean* 5 and *Isthmian* 5 and 6, and the Bassidae of *Nemean* 6.
Syracuse in particular. As part of Deinomenid expansion of territory religion was used to embrace and claim other cities and their heritage, and in turn Hieron was considered a religious figure himself, or was presented as such, not only in his priestly role but in his role as saviour and safe-keeper of cities such as Locri, if not all Greece. Clever appropriation and manipulation of the religious and political practice of other cities in time secured for Hieron the heroic honours he ambitiously planned for.

3.3 Coinage, Religious Activity and Good Rule

3.3.1 Coinage, koinonia, and charis

I have argued that expenditure on acts of charis such as hymn, or instead charistēria where they are monuments, channelled reciprocity between a city/victor/ruler and its gods and recognised the kudos of the city/victor/ruler and of the gods. I have argued that both the use of wealth itself and what it was spent on were important to demonstrate appropriate honour in order to share in that reciprocity embodied in charis. And I have argued that hymn, drama, victory monuments and treasuries at sanctuaries abroad ensured that the victor/ruler/city is represented and has a place abroad and the axis is open for the reciprocal charis to be channelled. Can the same not be true of the act of minting and distributing coinage? Wealth was used to produce coinage, in the acquisition of silver and the craftsmanship and artistry involved in design and production. The coinage displays the city's name and/or mark and often other marks to associate it with its gods, just as monuments and offerings to the gods might, in art and inscription. To Aristotle philia was koinonia159, 'communality', something in which the community could collectively participate. To both Aristotle and Plato coinage served the

159 Aristot. NE. 1171b32.
koinonia of the city\textsuperscript{160}. Seaford has well demonstrated the association between coinage and sacrifice\textsuperscript{161}. Sacrifice was itself a common act of charis for a god, either on a private level between a man and a god, or at state level, where the meat of the victim was distributed equally between citizens. The presence of the god at the sacrifice and taking part in the community meal at large-scale civic festivity and feasts was much later known as theoxenia, a term which recognises the relationship of philia between a god and the citizens\textsuperscript{162}. At a sacrifice prayers and offerings were made to the god, while the participating citizens received charis in return in the form of the distributed meat. Notably the meat received by the citizens is more and better than that given to the god, a true transaction of charis\textsuperscript{163} between philoi. Plato described sacrifice as one aspect of the koinonia between men and gods\textsuperscript{164}. That to sacrifice was to spend was inherent in the nature of the sacrifice and specifically the types of animals chosen as victims\textsuperscript{165}. The minting of coinage was done in the name of the city, even if controlled by the ruler,

\textsuperscript{160} Aristot. EN 1133b16-18; Pl. Rep. 371b.
\textsuperscript{161} Seaford 2004: 102-124.
\textsuperscript{162} West 1966: 306 and Gill 1974: 122-3. An example of a hymn sung at such an event is Pindar’s third Olympian, according to the scholion on the title (Drachmann 1903: 104 II. 11-12).
\textsuperscript{163} Hesiod (Hes. Th. 535-57) offers an aetiological tale to explain why the gods receive the poorer share. Although mortals ‘retain’ the greater share, the sacrifice was a gift like any conventional dedication. At one point in the Odyssey the victim is even described as an ἄγαλμα (Hom. Od. 3.438). See Seaford 2004: 62, Parker 2011: 137. West (West 1966: 305-6) agrees with Meuli (Meuli 1945: 185-286) that the offering of pieces of meat and fat placed on or wrapped around bones originated at a simple, shared regular meal, where the bones and meat were placed in the care of a god for the reparation and resurrection of the animal. This was a reparatory exercise to recompense for the hunting and/or bloodshed of the animal (see Burkert 1983: 16-21, 136-43). What had previously been a demand from the god to return the animal to life was later considered a gift, an act of charis, to the god, which then allowed an opportunity for prayer and charis in return. To receive the gift the god was thought to actually attend the meal, or otherwise the smoke of the sacrificial offering (the origin of the Greek θυσία) delivered the offering, and this gave rise to the problem that the god’s portion of the meal was considered mean in comparison with the portion eaten by men. The Prometheus aetiology would explain the reason for the inequality of the portions, the reason for man’s meanness and indeed lay the blame with Prometheus. Recognition of this inequality gave rise to (by the time of the composition of the Odyssey, since there is an example in Eumaeus’ hut, Hom. Od. 14.418-38) to the practice of trapezomata, additional table offerings, which increased the share given to the god. The burnt offerings (thysia) and the trapezomata together became man’s dōron to the god, an act of charis to please the god, from whom the dedicant would ask favour, charis, in return. On trapezomata and the order in which the thysia and trapezomata were introduced to the meal, see Gill 1974.
\textsuperscript{164} Pl. Smp. 188b-c.
\textsuperscript{165} On the breeds of animals used as indicative of wealth from the Homeric poems onwards, see Parker 2011: 137.
as I shall argue. It displayed a representative image of the city and most commonly a representation of the chief divinity of the city. It required expenditure in the acquirement of silver, whether through trade or mining. It brought to its citizens a value greater than its intrinsic value, thanks purely to the process of minting. Therefore the minting of coinage is parallel with the state worship and sacrifice and giving of *charis* to the city’s god. Both monumentalised and brought *kudos* to the god. Both brought a return in *charis* greater than that previously given. Both secured a relationship of *philia* between citizens and god, for the subsequent prosperity of the city and the *kudos* of both. Both served the *koinonia* of the city. We must examine if the minting of coinage was centrally controlled by the ruler of the city, how it promoted *koinonia* within his city, and if changes in policy along these lines can be seen reflected in the minting of the coins.

### 3.3.2 Control of the Mint

Three examples of the commencement and cessation of minting demonstrate that Hieron controlled the minting of coinage in his cities. Firstly, Naxos, once under the control of Hippocrates and then the Deinomenids, ceased minting coins, only restarting production after the fall of the Deinomenids \(^{166}\). Secondly, Leontini minted its first coins in 476BC, at the same time as Hieron founded Aetna, and the population of Leontini was altered in composition. Subsequent to the fall of the Deinomenids, it then, after brief production, abandoned its mints for two decades \(^{167}\). Finally, Aetna produced its own coinage immediately on its foundation by Hieron. This was the first coinage of Catana-Aetna, and once freed from Deinomenid rule, Catana continued to mint coins, but with its own KATANE legend, replacing the AITNA legend of Hieron’s city \(^{168}\). In

---

\(^{166}\) Kraay 1976: 281.

\(^{167}\) Mattingly 1992: 3, 6, 9.

each of these examples the initiation or cessation of minting coincided with a change in regime at the cities, suggesting that Hieron, as with the case of Naxos, controlled the city mints.

3.3.3 Iconography and Artistry of the coinage of foreign philoi

The iconography of the coinage can also reveal political involvement. A very clear example of the influence of the design of one city’s coinage on that of another is the Emmenid coinage of Himera, which retains the Himeran cockerel on the obverse but introduced the Acragantine crab on the reverse\textsuperscript{169}. On the evidence we have seen so far, it seems reasonable to suggest that Acragas controlled the mints of Himera and stamped its own city’s mark on that of the other to display the association between the two. At Syracuse the typical Syracusan quadriga obverse, like its alternative equine denominations, quite likely represents participation in athletic competition. It was adopted in Gela in around 485BC after Gelon moved his capital to Syracuse\textsuperscript{170}, displaying Syracusan influence on Gela. This Syracusan quadriga type was also adopted in Leontini for its first coinage under Hieron, and is found in the coinage of Cumae and Neapolis\textsuperscript{171}. It is not clear that these two cities were under Hieron’s rule, though they were at least at the very edge of his ‘empire’ and owed their security from Etruscan threat to Hieron, after the Battle at Cumae in 474BC. Hieron also had the physical presence of a garrison or colony at Pithecusae, discussed above. Though Hieron may have had influence over the politics of Cumae and Neapolis, it is not at all clear he had the same control over them as he had over Gela, Leontini and Aetna, so why would the same Syracusan iconography be adopted by all? It could be that both

\textsuperscript{170} Kraay 1976: 294.
Cumae and Neapolis displayed the image on their own coinage as an act of homage and dedication, a political message of allegiance, perhaps even obedience to the Syracusan domination and protection. Nonetheless, to ask this question from the opposite direction, even if Hieron insisted that the first coins of Leontini display a Syracusan mark, was this meant to be aggressive, a mark of ownership and domination, or was it a declaration of inclusivity, of the opportunity for Leontini to share in what Syracuse had to offer? The inclusion of Leontini so strongly in Aeschylus’ Aetnaeae and the appropriation of divinities local to North East Sicily to Hieron’s new Aetna’s religious practice may also be acts of suppression, but they are at least inclusive. That Leontini minted its first coins at this period may suggest inclusivity and opportunity for the city in a way which it lacked beforehand.

We have seen examples where the mark of the city on the coinage is represented abroad. The choice of Cumae and Neapolis to mint their coins with a Syracusan emblem is not so different from the choice of the Olympic victor from Croton, Astylus, who by dedicating his victories to the city of Syracuse sought to please Hieron and who certainly therefore shared in the channel of charis between Syracuse and Olympia172. In this way Hieron may have had the first coinage of Leontini stamped with the Syracusan quadriga obverse, but there was religious profit, kudos, at least to be gained by Leontini from the charis it would share with Syracuse and its gods. If we can accept a parallel of the role, use and manipulation of coinage alongside those of hymn, dedication and monument, then the production and use of coinage were in themselves to be seen as religious acts. The foundation of Aetna was a religious act, and so too then was the minting of its coinage, which displayed its city’s name and that of its god Zeus Aetnaeus, which recognised the kudos of city and ruler and paid honour to its god.

172 Astylus of Croton won races in three successive Olympiads (in 488, 484 and 480) but claimed he came from Syracuse at the last two of them in order to please Hieron (Paus. 6.13.1).
Coinage was minted, in part at least, to provide a means for charis, comparable to the religious acts of monumental display at sanctuaries which did precisely the same. At the same time the shared iconography reinforced the koinonia shared both within each city and within Hieron's 'empire'.

What of changes in iconography on coinage after the end of Deinomenid rule? Just as we have seen how after the fall of the Deinomenids the Leontini mints were abandoned with the removal of Deinomenid rule, and at Naxos minting resumed, reversing the situation prior to Deinomenid control, we might also expect that a complete change in regime in these cities would be manifested in a complete change in the iconography. Indeed this can be observed. At Naxos, where coins were minted from 461BC for the first time since Hippocratic-Deinomenid control, design returned to the pre-regime Dionysian inspiration (Dionysus/grapes). At Leontini, once minting finally began anew two decades later, the head of Apollo replaced the quadriga design of Syracusan influence. In contrast, in Syracuse after the removal of Thraysbulus, this city's coinage continued to display much the same design, a combination of Arethusa/Artemis reverse and the quadriga obverse. What this evidence reinforces is that the design belonged to or represented the city rather than its ruler, even if its ruler controlled the city mints. The quadriga type pre-dated Gelon and, therefore, continued throughout Deinomenid reign and beyond. This should be unsurprising when we consider how reverse designs related to the city specifically, such as with the 'punning designs' the cockerel of Himera (relating the bird of daybreak to the similarity between the city’s name and the Greek ἡμέρα), the crab of Acragas (relating to the Greek καρκίνος), or the lion of Leontini (λέων). The ruler himself is not depicted on coinage in this period, but instead the city

---

is symbolised, in the same way that the city was so significant in dedicatory monuments and inscriptions at the sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi. This demonstrates the continuity of the city in spite of changes in ruling regime, and how rulers such as Gelon and Hieron embraced the city’s identity and sanctity.

One further example will help to explore the relationship of iconography, city and rule. Catana did not mint coins until re-founded as Aetna by Hieron in 476BC, when it displayed the Syracusan quadriga obverse and the enthroned Zeus Aetnaeus on their reverse. Freed from Deinomenid rule in 466BC, with respect to its coinage, Catana in fact reinforced its changed status by wholly changing both obverse and reverse of its coins. Catana was not Aetna, nor was it allied or subservient to Syracuse, and so both the Syracusan quadriga type and the Zeus Aetnaeus on the reverse had to go. Similarly a new Aetna was founded by its ejected citizens, which was also neither allied nor subservient to Syracuse, which had its new democratic regime. Logically, the Syracusan quadriga type should be abandoned, and indeed it was, and, since the new Aetna was a re-foundation of the old, the Zeus Aetnaeus of the reverse should be retained, and of course it was

As well as the choice of iconography, the actual artistry of the coinage can demonstrate political association. The first obverse die for the quadriga type in Leontini appears, based on artistic detail, to have as its model an earlier die in Gela. Even if the design is essentially Syracusan, the artists may well have worked for more than one mint in more than one city. However, this connection with Gela, early in Leontini’s numismatic heritage was short-lived and replaced with a much closer connection with Syracuse. An early (probably in 475BC or later) obverse Leontini die moved, presumably with its artist, to Syracuse, and the lion’s head on the reverse of Leontini

---

175 Boehringer 1968: 74ff.
coins imitated the Arethusa head of the coins of Syracuse, where the goddess' four dolphins were replaced with four barley grains around the lion. It is possible that the initial connection between Leontini and Gela which ceased when the connection between Leontini and Syracuse became more pronounced may relate to heightened differences between Hieron, ruler of Syracuse, and his brother Polyzalus, possibly the ruler of Gela since Hieron's move from Gela to Syracuse in 478BC. The artists who worked on coins may have been migratory, moving to wherever the work was, but their work may well have been more forthcoming in cities which shared allegiance and from the ruler who controlled their mints.

What is clear is that certain political activity was both manifested in the minting of coinage or in the suppression of its minting, and manifested in the design on the coinage and may well have been meant to convey a political message as well as display artistic influences. Many or most of the designs on coinage were rooted in religious iconography, from a god or goddess to their associates or associated imagery, as if the coin was paid as a religious debt or due, or as if the god sanctioned the economic and political transaction. This would make coinage and its use a form and act of *charis* in itself, its production and distribution bringing *kudos* to the ruler and his city. Just as *charistēria* displayed a relationship between gods and the dedicant/victor's city, so too coins displayed the city of origin and its gods and were used reciprocally in the name of the city and its gods. Coinage was to some extent then something political and religious, as well as economic, representing its city both at home and abroad, much like the epinician hymns and monuments of Panhellenic victory. Coinage served the

---

177 Mattingly 1992: 6. On Polyzalus' rule at Gela we rely upon a reading of the inscription base, long thought to belong to the Delphic charioteer, where an original inscription 'ruler of Gela' was replaced with 'Polyzalus'. However this reading is uncertain as is the association of the statue with the base, found nearby but separately (see Robbins 1990: 317 and Adornato 2008, Adornato 2008). Herodotus (7.156) tells us that Gelon handed the rule of Gela to his younger brother Hieron on his move to rule in Syracuse, so it is possible to infer that Hieron gave the same honour to Polyzalus.
koinonia of the city and brokered relationships of philia. What we have observed here is
the cycle where money or coinage is used to cement a man’s religious relationship with
his peers and his gods, where such religious activity is inseparable from his politics, and
where his politics drives the mechanism of money and coinage.

* * *

Hieron, in his religious practice, in his expenditure, and in his politics imitated and
innovated. Each element worked with the other, facilitating, complementing and
justifying. The practical creation and functional use of coinage, displaying its city and its
gods, complemented the expense required for religious building and commemoration,
which in turn displayed the expenditure involved in honouring the divine and the role of
the city and the coinage it produced to facilitate the monuments. Such monuments,
memorialising victory in war or athletic competition, were designed to send political
messages, consolidate and immortalise moments in history for a ruler, and bring kudos
to him, his people and their city, justifying those acts by presenting them in religious
terms. Political acts which saved and secured the safety of other Greeks were
welcomed with religious, heroic adulation. In all of this, the facilitator, the market in
which rule and religion aligned and traded, was the concept of charis. Charis justified
the use of wealth and expense in a religious context and acted as a medium between
the two. Charis, the Charites and charistēria associated and legitimised expense on
political activity in religious setting, the philia between a ruler and his citizens and the
gods of their city and the Panhellenic sanctuaries. Through this expense Hieron
celebrated the political acts of himself and his city, positioned them in heroic terms, and
was finally honoured as a hero.
4 Pisistratid Philia and Rule

In this chapter I shall explore whether the framework of philia and the demands it places upon philoi, the act of euergesia, and the mutually profitable use of charis, can be found in the method of rule and the economic activity of the Pisistratids of Athens. Theirs is one of the best-documented dynasties, whose rule spanned the two generations immediately preceding that of Hieron and saw the introduction of coinage in the city of Athens. The literary sources focus on Pisistratus' attempts to secure rule and on the overthrow of his successor Hippias, though archaeological, epigraphic and numismatic evidence will shine considerable light on the activity of the rulers during their reign. In the first place I shall argue that this evidence suggests that the Pisistratids made use of both philia and euergesia to secure and maintain rule. This conclusion will allow me to examine Pisistratid rule under the same terms as rulers already discussed. The sources will show that bonds of philia and their associated acts of charis both within Attica and abroad were of significant importance to Pisistratid rule, bringing kudos, which the city, its citizens, rulers and gods enjoyed. I shall examine these based upon this geographical distinction of home and abroad, and argue that the same strategy is employed by Pisistratus and Hippias both in the rule at home and the political strategy abroad.

The following questions will be addressed in turn:

Were the Pisistratids euergetai and philoi to the people of Athens and Attica?

Was the rule of the Pisistratids dependent upon philia with overseas elite prior to their secure dynasty?

Was the rule of the Pisistratids dependent upon philia with the gods?
4.1 Were the Pisistratids *euergetai* and *philoi* to the people of Athens and Attica?

### 4.1.1 Pisistratus the ‘Tyrant’

In the first place it must be established if Pisistratus was, like Hieron, a *euergetēs* and a *philos* to his people, bestowing gifts (*charites*) to his city (*megaloprepeia*) and to his *philoi*, and if his sons behaved similarly. It need not matter if our sources do not constantly refer to the rulers’ activity specifically in these terms as long as that activity recognisably displays acts of *megaloprepeia* and *charis*. However, before determining acts of beneficence by the Pisistratids, it would be wise to address some of the negative accounts of their activity in the sources. Since the greatest detail and most negative account, chiefly in Herodotus, of Pisistratus’ actions concerns his three attempts to secure power in Athens, each of these will be briefly assessed before a more general assessment of his third and most enduring period of rule.

Pisistratus’ rule was famously unlike that of a tyrant, according to Aristotle\(^1\), and the period of rule under Hippias with his brother Hipparchus was singled out by Thucydides for its ‘excellence and intelligence’\(^2\). Both of these comments, however, aim to stress the remarkable nature of rule, in that although tyrannies, they both benefited the city and its people. More generally our sources, which focus on the beginning and end of the dynasty, make much of Pisistratus’ attempts to secure rule through machination, military force, and political association with aristocratic individuals and their families, and of Hippias’ final harsh years of rule and attempt to regain power. Our sources then call both Pisistratus and at least two of his sons ‘tyrants’\(^3\), even though only the elder

---


\(^2\) Th. 6.54.5: οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν ἄλλην ἄρχην ἑπαρχῆς ἢν ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς, ἀλλ’ ἄνεπιφρόνως κατεστήσατο: καὶ ἐπετήθευσαν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δὴ τύραννοι οὕτως ἀρετὴν καὶ ξύνεσιν.

\(^3\) These are Hippias and Hipparchus, the latter of whom did not rule as such, but was still labelled with the loaded term of ‘tyrant’. See Th. 6.54.2 and 6.55.1 on Hippias’ rule as the eldest son, while Th. 6.54.5 that they were both ‘tyrants’. There is a very separate problem in Thucydides’ terminology in 6.54-5.
apparently ruled\textsuperscript{4}. The Pisistratid dynasty ended in celebration, in which ultimately two of Athens' citizens were hailed as liberators and 'tyrannicides' and became symbolic of the new democracy, as it was emerging in the early fifth century. The long-standing commonplace view of archaic rulers such as Pisistratus as illegitimate usurpers has more recently been challenged\textsuperscript{5} so that although our sources may still label them 'tyrants' and there may have been similarities in the manner in which they ruled, they were not 'tyrants' as fifth- and fourth-century Greek writers came to define them. Clearly both Herodotus and the author of the \textit{Athenaion Politeia} had difficulty making the Pisistratids fit the mould. Part of that problem was the conflict between their source material and the later \textit{topoi} on 'tyrants', the motifs and expected characterisations, which shaped the fifth- and fourth-century definition of a 'tyrant' and which therefore came to be superimposed in the sources onto archaic rulers, who perhaps only matched up to that definition in very limited ways\textsuperscript{6}. With respect to Pisistratus Lavelle's work\textsuperscript{7} in particular has outlined and analysed these \textit{topoi}, which include machination and trickery, divine assistance and inevitability, violence, sexual misconduct, and the appropriation of armed protection in order to secure such illegitimately acquired power.

One such \textit{topos} is that of trickery. Herodotus tells us that Pisistratus' rule in Athens was prophesied to his father at the Olympic Games, who was advised not to marry and

\textsuperscript{4} Hippias and Hipparchus could have been co-rulers, as Mitchell argues (Mitchell 2013: 109). This issue is unimportant for my argument.

\textsuperscript{5} Most recently by Mitchell (Mitchell 2013: Introduction and ch. 1), but see also, for example, Anderson 2005.

\textsuperscript{6} On the difficulty of defining a 'tyrant' see most recently Lewis 2009: 8-14, and on the semantics of \textit{turannos} see Parker 1998. Anderson (Anderson 2005) shows that in the archaic period 'there was in fact no absolute distinction between \textit{turannoi} and orthodox leaders in Greek poleis.' McGlew (McGlew 1993) argues that the activity of archaic rulers provided vocabulary and a descriptive framework for later political discourse on conceptions of sovereignty, allowing later discourse to be retrojected and superimposed onto understanding of earlier rule.

\textsuperscript{7} On the sources for Pisistratus generally, and most importantly, see Lavelle 1993. On the rise of Pisistratus specifically see Lavelle 2005. Even more specifically on the Battle of Pallene see Lavelle 1991.
have children for fear of what his son would become. Herodotus says that Pisistratus took power in the first place through a trick (μηχανᾶται), where he feigned an attack on his person in order to attain an armed bodyguard, with whose help he captured the Acropolis. Eventually driven out by two of the leading men in the city, Lycurgus, of whom we know nothing, and Megacles the Alcmaeonid, Pisistratus only returned when Megacles sought his help for political supremacy over Lycurgus. The two of them plotted (μηχανῶνται) what even Herodotus considered the silliest trick in history, where Pisistratus returned to Athens in a chariot accompanied by a woman dressed as Athena, bringing her back to the Acropolis, her home in Athens. The Athenians were convinced and Pisistratus ruled a second time. Marrying Megacles' daughter the ruler refused to behave sexually appropriately with her and for this reason Pisistratus left Athens once more. When Pisistratus returned he had raised an army to attack Athens, and at Pallene ahead of the battle it was prophesied that his victory was imminent. Victorious and keen to avoid further conflict, he devised a stratagem (βουλὴν σοφωτάτην ἐπιτεχνᾶται) and encouraged the Athenians to return to their homes. The author of the Athenaión Politeía records another trick, where having secured Athens he disarmed its people by convincing them to leave their weapons so that he could address them in the propylaea of the Acropolis, where no arms could be taken. He then confiscated their weapons. The Athenian populace is portrayed as helpless in the face

8 Hdt. 1.59.1-3. Another example of a prophesied tyranny is that of Cypselus of Corinth (Hdt. 5.92).
9 Hdt. 1.59.3-5. See also [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 14.1-2, who follows Herodotus, but also attributes to the sage Solon a warning of Pisistratus' trick and aims at tyranny. Solon, like the sage Chilon who prophesied to Pisistratus' father at Olympia, often has attributed to him wise but unheeded warnings and at other times expedient moves which were more likely those of Pisistratus but which our later sources prefer to assign to what they consider a more worthy author. Solon's meeting with Croesus is another example, this time of an anachronistic impossibility (Hdt. 1.30-3).
10 Hdt. 1.60. See also [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 14.4.
12 Hdt. 1.62.3-63.
13 [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 15.4-5.
of Pisistratus' trickery and cleverness, and the divine support lent to him, making his rule inevitable. The fifth- and fourth-century *topoi* in the discourse of tyrants abound in our sources on Pisistratus, cloud what may well be less colourful activity, and are at odds with what they otherwise have to say about the nature of Pisistratid rule.

The sources celebrate Pisistratus' career, its success, and his rule of Athens, despite their depiction of him as a 'tyrant'. Pisistratus had earlier distinguished himself in Athens' on-going war with Megara over boundaries, at his height by reclaiming the island of Salamis and capturing the Megarian port of Nisaea\(^{14}\), and it was thanks to his reputation for these 'great deeds' that he was allowed a guard of club-bearers\(^{15}\). If Herodotus and the *Ath. Pol.* are correct that he was not given spear-carriers (and Herodotus is especially specific about this detail) and that he captured the Acropolis with their help then we should question the validity of such a guard against Athenian citizens potentially armed with more powerful weapons. In fact both Herodotus' and the *Ath. Pol.*'s vocabulary need not necessarily suggest a struggle to take the Acropolis at all, and ἔσχον and κατέσχε may merely indicate his control of the religious centre of the city. It may be that Pisistratus' attendants were more symbolic and honorary than a stratagem for a violent coup. He went on to rule without disturbing the status quo, neither changing existing laws nor magistracies, and 'he governed the city, decorating it beautifully and well' (ἔνεμε τὴν πόλιν κοσμέων καλῶς τε καὶ εὖ)\(^ {16}\). The *Ath. Pol.* describes his first rule as 'more in the interest of the city than of the tyrant' (πολιτικῶς

---

\(^{14}\) Hdt. 1.59.4. Lavelle 2005: 46-65 believes that Nisaea was a *sine qua non* for Pisistratus' first tyranny and the source of an enduring popularity for him in Athens.

\(^{15}\) Hdt. 1.59.4, and [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 14.1. On the substitution of the usual spear-bearers for club-bearers see Lavelle 1991: 318 n. 9 for bibliography. Both authors give the occasion for the award of the bodyguard as a trick by Pisistratus, where he wounded himself and blamed his political opponents. Lavelle argues that the club-bearers were comprised of citizens rather than mercenaries and that this is evidence of his election to rule (Lavelle 1991: 318 n. 9). Cf. Goušchin 1999: 19-21, who argues that Pisistratus was awarded his bodyguard after his selection as *aisymnetes*, an 'elective tyrant', quoting Arist. *Pol.* 3.1286b38-40.

\(^{16}\) Hdt. 1.59.6.
μᾶλλον ἣ τυραννικῶς)\(^{17}\), pre-empting the later description of his third rule in the same terms\(^{18}\). Once the *topoi* of trickery and violence are removed it would almost seem as if Pisistratus was awarded an honorary guard in return for his military service and given the approval of rule, through which, in return, he was benefactor to the city. This could be considered *philia* in action, *charites*, awarded and then awarded in return. More specifically, Pisistratus’ decoration of Athens (κοσμέων) involved acts of *euergesia*, the same behaviour Thucydides describes as characteristic of the whole Pisistratid regime (τὴν τε πόλιν αὐτῶν καλῶς διεκόσμησαν)\(^{19}\).

Pisistratus’ second rule was short-lived, but when we remove the *topoi* of trickery and sexual deviancy we are left with another example of *philia*. We have no reason to doubt Pisistratus’ collusion with Megacles, and it is his *philia* with the Alcmaeonid which secured rule for a second time. Indeed, if Pisistratus’ popularity endured with the people of Athens as it seems to have done, then there was political expediency in Megacles’ overture to Pisistratus. However, sexual inappropriateness towards Megacles’ daughter aside, our sources only suggest that Megacles’ acts of *charis* by helping Pisistratus to regain rule and by giving his daughter in marriage were not returned in favour by the ruler, and on this basis Pisistratus’ second rule ended.

### 4.1.2 Pisistratus’ Final Rule and Philia

There is further evidence of Pisistratid collusion with the Alcmaeonids, even in the source material in which the Alcmaeonids are portrayed as ‘tyrant-haters’ who assisted in the expulsion of Hippias and the end of Pisistratid rule. There appears to have been a longer gap before Pisistratus’ return and final period of rule, a gap of ten years

\(^{17}\) [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 14.3.  
\(^{19}\) Th. 6.54.5.
according to Herodotus\textsuperscript{20}. In this time Pisistratus benefited from his \textit{philia} with cities and individuals abroad, and it was with their assistance and financial support he was ready to resume rule of Athens. With the \textit{topos} of prophecy removed, the battle at Pallene seems to have been little battle at all. Not only are the Athenian citizens at large portrayed as helpless against the divinely inspired and inevitable return of Pisistratus, but they are idle and at leisure\textsuperscript{21}, and his supporters in the city come to fight on his side. In summary Herodotus says that some of the Athenians fell in battle (though his only description of the battle is of the Athenians fleeing as Pisistratus' army advanced) but others, including specifically the Alcmaeonids, fled their homes\textsuperscript{22}. Those from the city and the villages who joined his side 'found tyranny more preferable to freedom'\textsuperscript{23}. This is no impartial account in Herodotus, and it is generally recognised that the historian's sources were Alcmaeonid\textsuperscript{24}. It would be the Alcmaeonids, whose \textit{philia} was possibly shunned during Pisistratus' second rule, and who, in Herodotus' later account, would plot the removal of Pisistratid rule and would fight against Hippias' attempt, with Persian assistance, to restore himself\textsuperscript{25}. For Herodotus, the Alcmaeonids were tyrant-haters (\textit{μισοτύραννοι})\textsuperscript{26} and they more than anyone brought about Athens' liberation (\textit{Ἀλκμεωνίδαι δὲ ἐμφανέως ἠλευθέρωσαν})\textsuperscript{27}. Alcmaeonid influence on Herodotus' account is evident and it is as biased in its own favour as it is against the Pisistratids. The most damning indictment of the reliability of Alcmaeonid activity in Herodotus concerns their exile from Athens. The historian says that they fled the country after

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{Hdt.1.62.1} Hdt. 1.62.1. Also [Arist.] \textit{Ath. Pol.} 15.2.
\bibitem{Hdt.1.62.3} Hdt. 1.62-3.
\bibitem{Hdt.1.64.3} Hdt. 1.64.3.
\bibitem{Hdt.1.62.1} Hdt. 1.62.1.
\bibitem{Lavelle 1993} See Lavelle 1993: 75-6. Forsdyke sees a 'heavy overlay' of fifth century construction of tyrannical rule here (Forsdyke 2005: 121). Lavelle thinks that a flawed defence of the Alcmaeonids is what characterises Herodotus' 'history' of the Pisistratids (Lavelle 2005: 284 n. 77).
\bibitem{Hdt.5.62-5, 6.123.4} Hdt. 5.62-5, 6.123-4.
\bibitem{Hdt.6.123.1} Hdt. 6.123.1.
\bibitem{Hdt.6.123.2} Hdt. 6.123.2.
\end{thebibliography}
Pallene and remained in exile throughout the period of Pisistratid rule, but an inscribed archon list records that an Alcmaeonid Cleisthenes was archon in 525/4BC. This was the year after Hippias, son of Pisistratus and successor after his father's death in 528/7, was himself archon. In combination with a statement by Thucydides that the Pisistratids 'always took care that one of their own held the archonship', it becomes clear that any Alcmaeonid exile was at the very least not permanent and in fact they may well have associated and worked with the Pisistratids. Topoi aside, there is a strong argument that the overbearing Alcmaeonid apology in Herodotus' account sought to distance the Alcmaeonids from the Pisistratids. After the expulsion of Hippias and the creation of a new political system by this same Cleisthenes, it was dangerous to have colluded with the 'tyrants'. The establishment of ostracism sought to exile those who had been relatives and friends of the 'tyrants' (τῶν ἑκείνου συγγενῶν, τοὺς τῶν τυράννων φίλους). Of the first three citizens ostracised, one and possibly two were Alcmaeonids, relatives then perhaps, or at the very least philoi of the Pisistratids.

So far I have focused chiefly on the account in Herodotus of Pisistratus' attempts to secure rule, and on the largely Herodotean account in the Athenaion Politeia, and there are examples of the importance of philia in both securing rule and during his period of rule. So strong were the ties of philia that in the heated anti-tyranny movement of the early fifth century those who had been philoi sought to rewrite the historical record,

---

28 Hdt. 1.64.3, 6.123.1.
29 IG I3 1031. For a bibliography on the debate of reconstruction and of this Cleisthenes as Alcmaeonid, generally accepted, see Lavelle 1993: 22 n. 43.
30 Th. 6.54.6.
31 Anderson (Anderson 2000) argues that the Alcmaeonids were exiled from Athens, but not from Attica, and that the relocation of such exiles accounts for increased rural residence in evidence from archaeology.
33 See Lavelle 1988, who clarifies that the first three ostracised were relatives or friends, and the fourth was the first not to be such.
made insistent denials of *philia*, called themselves long-term ‘tyrant-haters’\(^{34}\), and claimed to have been elsewhere the entire time. It is now important to examine what our sources say more generally about his third and longest period of rule and the subsequent rule of Hippias, since it is during this more stable time that Pisistratus’ acts of *euergesia* to his city and citizens and *charites* to his *philoi* and gods ought to be most evident.

Herodotus dedicates less than one short chapter\(^ {35}\) to Pisistratus’ longest rule, in contrast to the much longer five chapters dedicated to his first two periods of rule. His description is perfunctory and in keeping with the rest of his negative account, and would seem to include more *topoi* on ‘tyranny’, specifically the use of mercenaries as a bodyguard, a preoccupation with acquiring wealth (there is no clear account of how the wealth was used and if it was spent on the city), and taking as hostage family members of those who had opposed him. Herodotus’ chapter cannot be dismissed summarily, however. The supposed hostages were sent to Lygdamis of Naxos, who supplied Pisistratus with money and men for his engagement at Pallene\(^ {36}\), and whom, according to the *Athenaion Politeia*, Pisistratus installed as leader of Naxos, having captured it\(^ {37}\).

Pisistratus’ interests in the Cyclades certainly feature in Herodotus’ chapter. Aside from his apparent *philia* with Lygdamis, we are told of his purification of the island of Delos, on the orders of an oracle, where he moved away graves located near to the temple\(^ {38}\). Elsewhere in the Aegean, from property on the River Strymon in Thrace Pisistratus was raising revenues. Herodotus’ account suggests that after his second rule Pisistratus

\(^{34}\) Although it is true that the Alcmaeonids were of course in the end responsible for ridding Athens of the Pisistratids (Hdt. 5.62ff).

\(^{35}\) Hdt. 1.64.

\(^{36}\) Hdt. 1.61.4. See also [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 15.2.


\(^{38}\) Thucydides confirms both details (Th. 3.104.1), and elaborates the interests of Polycrates of Samos in the island sanctuary.
stayed in Eretria until his return, but the *Athenaion Politeia* tells us that he went to the Gulf of Thermae in Thrace to a place called Rhaecelus, and from there to a location near Mount Pangaeus, from where he raised money, before returning to Eretria\(^{39}\). Pisistratid links with Eretria are clear, since the family withdrew there at the end of Pisistratus’ second rule, then came back to Athens from this island before the Battle of Pallene, and it may have been through Eretrian links that Pisistratus was able to engage in fund-raising in Thrace, presumably gold or silver mining\(^{40}\). Pisistratid wealth was important not only to support his return to power, in the form of *charites* he received from his *philoi*, but also to support his activity as ruler in the form of acts of *euergesia* to Athens. However, where Herodotus’ biased and negative account is rather lacking in detail on this activity, our other sources must be analysed.

In the *Athenaion Politeia* account\(^{41}\), Pisistratus was a *philos* to his citizens (φιλάνθρωπος\(^{42}\)) and a man of his people (δημοτικός\(^{43}\)). His rule was moderate and more in the interests of the city than like that of a ‘tyrant’. He was mild and inclined to pardon those who made mistakes. He lent money to the poor to help with their businesses and farms. He gave the populace no trouble, but in fact worked for peace and ensured righteous stability. He wanted to follow matters according to the city’s laws, never gave himself an advantage over others, and established itinerant judges to assist with local disputes around Attica. The noble families benefited from his ‘close association’ (ὁμιλία) and the general populace from his assistance with their private

\(^{39}\) [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 15.2. On the location of Rhaecelus see Lavelle 2005: 222-7. Lavelle (Lavelle 2005: 116-34) accepts the *Ath. Pol.* account on the basis that the argument that Pisistratus would have raised the revenues from mining to support his return to Athens is convincing. Although Herodotus implies the activity at Strymon was subsequent to Pallene, both he and the *Ath. Pol.* lay great emphasis on the accumulation of money and men in preparation for Pallene (Hdt. 1.61.3-4, *Ath. Pol.* 15.2).

\(^{40}\) Lavelle 1992, and Viviers 1987. Another famous example of an individual Athenian citizen with rights to mine precious metals in Thrace is Thucydides (Th. 4.105.1).

\(^{41}\) [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 16.


\(^{43}\) [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 16.8. The term itself is probably anachronistic.
needs. For these reasons he remained in office for a long time and his reign was frequently called the Golden Age of Cronos. All of the evidence here suggests a framework of philia between ruler and ruled. The distinction in relationship between noble and poor is most importantly one based on wealth. The form of the charites given to the nobles may have differed from that given to the poorer, based on what their needs were, but both forms invited reciprocation by their very nature. We have already seen in the Introduction how the language of loans reflects the nature of reciprocal charis, and how a debt of wealth repaid is only part of the repayment, since an additional payment (charis) is also required, to honour the benefactor and ensure continued good relations in case of future need of each other. There is no suggestion in the Athenaion Politeia account that the poor simply paid Pisistratus back more than he lent to them, but there is one very significant system which Pisistratus was able to put in place as a result of the increased revenue which the poorer enjoyed from their labour, as a result of the input from Pisistratus' loans. He taxed a tithe from the people. Our source does not imply that the reason for this was purely so that the ruler could profit personally, but rather so that such funds could be re-invested. There is no suggestion that the loans were a one-off or short-term ploy. Through this system Pisistratus was philos to the wealthier aristocrats of Athens, using his wealth to enhance, nurture and continue relationships of philia, supporting them. Through a system of loans and taxes Pisistratus was euergetēs and philos to the poorer citizens, who were able to enjoy a cycle of charites in the form of loans, itinerant judges and perhaps more. It is his nature

44 See also [Pl.] Hipparch. 229b.2-7.
45 Indeed Thucydides elaborates on the investment the Pisistratids made in the city (see below).
as 'philos to his people', which the Athenaion Politeia singles out as the greatest thing said of him⁴⁶.

Thucydides' account has little negative to say of Pisistratid rule, except that Hippias' actions became harsher at the very end of his rule, subsequent to the murder of his brother Hipparchus⁴⁷. Were it not for this murder, violence generally would have been very much alien to the regime which was otherwise 'without reproach', displaying 'excellence and intelligence'⁴⁸. He writes that the citizens enjoyed the laws which were in place prior to the regime, with the exception that the Pisistratids made sure that one of 'their own' (σφῶν αὐτῶν)⁴⁹ held the archonship. Assuming this to be true, 'their own' cannot refer solely to immediate family, on the additional evidence of both the archon list and the use of ostracism to expel both family and philoi of the 'tyrants'⁵⁰. 'Their own' surely included both family and the aristocratic philoi who benefitted from Pisistratid ὀμιλία, 'close association', xenia and suchlike.

Thucydides celebrates Pisistratid expenditure on euergesia in the city and links it to their tax on productivity. The focus of his narrative is the period of rule by Pisistratus' sons, but nonetheless he is here describing the entire Pisistratid regime. On taxation Thucydides gives a figure of five per cent⁵¹. There is no implicit suggestion that Hippias lowered the tax rate, though it is strange that the author of the Athenaion Politeia, with access to Thucydides' account, should dismiss it. Diogenes Laertius and Zenobius also quote ten per cent⁵². It is possible that as private revenues increased for the poorer, the requirement for loans was reduced and the ruler lowered the rate of tax accordingly.

---

⁴⁶ μέγιστον δὲ πάντων ἦν τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ δημοτικὸν εἶναι τῷ ἤθει καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 16.8, and see also 16.2).
⁴⁷ Th. 6.53.3, 59.
⁴⁸ Th. 6.54.5.
⁴⁹ Th. 6.54.6.
⁵¹ Th. 6.54.5.
⁵² D.L. 1.53, Zen. 4.76.
However, most enlightening is how Thucydides says the rulers used the revenue raised by taxation, in addition, presumably, to further investment in loans. He sums this up in three ways: firstly they beautified the city, secondly they supported wars to their end, and thirdly they maintained sacrifices in their temples. All three forms of expenditure are clear examples of *euergesia* and *megaloprepeia*, and we are reminded, for example, of the gratitude of the Syracusans to Gelon for his success in war, his rule, and his religious observation and building, and who too called him *euergetēs*. Thucydides gives two examples, specifically in the context of the archonship of the younger Pisistratus, son of Hippias. These are the altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora, and the altar of Apollo in the Sanctuary of Apollo Pythius, interestingly both religious monuments decorating the city.

4.1.3 Pisistratus’ Wealth and Coinage

There is in our sources no clear distinction made between the private wealth of the ruler and the public wealth which he managed. Indeed it is far from clear that there was any such necessary distinction to be made. The Pisistratids issued loans and as the result of increased revenue to those benefiting from those loans, wealth could be recouped in the form of taxation, before being loaned again to those in need. There is no suggestion that the taxes became the private wealth of the rulers any more than the loans were from their private purses. The closest suggestion of private wealth is that which Pisistratus accrued in order to finance his return to Athens and secure his third rule, for

---

53 D.S. 11.26.6. After his defeat of the Carthaginians, Gelon decorated Syracuse with temples to Demeter and Kore with the wealth acquired from spoils.

54 Th. 6.54.6-7.
example from mining in Thrace, which Herodotus suggests he continued to exploit alongside revenue, presumably the taxation, which he took from Attica.\(^{55}\)

Pisistratus’ wealth was harnessed in the production of the city’s coinage, whose iconography also demonstrated the interconnection of ruler, other elite, and the citizenry at large. Athens’ first coinage was minted during Pisistratus’ rule,\(^{56}\) and its fabric included non-Laurium silver, the local silver exploited in Athens’ later coins.\(^{57}\) It would seem that the silver which Pisistratus was mining as a private enterprise in fact contributed to state wealth through its use in the production of the city’s first coinage.\(^{58}\)

This coinage, the heraldic Wappenmünzen, was produced annually and probably displayed the mark of the eponymous archon.\(^{59}\) As noted we know from Thucydides that the Pisistratids controlled the office of archonship and, from the archon list, that representatives from various families held the position. In combination with the evidence of the nature of coin production Pisistratid ὀμιλία extended to allowing the archon to mint coinage bearing a mark to distinguish it from the previous archon’s coinage. If this is the case then it could be argued that these sponsored archons enjoyed the charites of their ruler and in the form of coin channelled their own charites to the other citizens.\(^{60}\)

---

\(^{55}\) Hdt. 1.64.1: χρημάτων συνόδοις, τῶν μὲν αὐτοθεν τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ συνιόντων.

\(^{56}\) C. 530BC (Dawson 1999), mid sixth century (Kroll and Waggoner 1984), between 546 and c. 535BC (Kroll 1981).

\(^{57}\) Dawson 1999: 74-5.

\(^{58}\) The Wappenmünzen silver appears to have had a number of sources, only some of which were probably from Thrace. The new vein of silver at Laurium, discovered in around 525BC provided a healthy source for Athenian coinage for some time, used in later Wappenmünzen and the Owls (Dawson 1999: 74-5). Pisistratid sources for silver varied until that point, which in itself suggests that these relied on trade and philia, as opposed to the later extensive Laurian seam which Athens could exploit in its own territory (Lavelle 2005: 131, 188). Athenian exclusive use of the Laurian seam suggest that either its discovery removed the need for foreign silver, or that foreign sources were no longer available.

\(^{59}\) Kroll 1981. This remains the most convincing hypothesis to date for the varying iconography. The hypothesis (Seltman 1924: xviii-xix, 19-38) that these marks were the coats of arms of the aristocratic families who produced them is no longer credible.

\(^{60}\) The denominations of the Wappenmünzen included small fractions from the start. These smaller denominations have been found mostly in Attica, circulating locally within their area of issue and intended
sponsored by their ruler and the archon, was channelled back to the ruler and the city treasury. It is a perfect cycle of *charites* within a reciprocal relationship of *philia*, and embraces and unifies the entire citizenship\(^{62}\).

The use and importance of the iconography on Athens’ coinage to demonstrate political relationships between the ruler and those being ruled can be further seen in the coinage subsequent to the fall of the Pisistratids\(^{63}\). If the treasury resided in her temple on the Acropolis during the reign of the Pisistratids, as is likely\(^{64}\), the channel of *charites* demonstrates *philia* from the citizens through its magistrates and ruler to their goddess and back again. If the loans and taxes were distributed and returned to Athena’s treasury, then these *charites* of expenditure and contribution were in fact religious acts, supporting the goddess and in turn her city\(^{65}\) and her citizens.

There can be little doubt that Pisistratus both behaved and was considered by posterity as *philoi* to the citizens of Athens. Although our sources do not discuss Pisistratus’ relationship directly in terms of *philia*\(^{66}\), we can infer from the language that is used, and from Pisistratus’ actions, that this is how they probably would have understood it. They describe the gifts he made to his city in decoration (*megaloprepeia*), in success in war, and in religious activity and obedience. His *philia* extended to those

---

61 Schaps (Schaps 2004: 126 n. 9) is hesitant that the tax was paid in coin, though he does not explain why. Seaford (Seaford 2004: 99) thinks that coinage greatly facilitated this expenditure and contribution.

62 Trevett (Trevett 2001: 25-6) thinks that because the Wappenmünzen lack the specifically Athenian symbol of the later Owls they reflect ‘a relatively weak sense of community’. The regularity of style, iconography aside, and of rate of production suggest otherwise (Kroll and Waggoner 1984: 331-2).

63 The later Owls, probably minted in Athens after the Pisistratid regime, with the uniform symbol of the head of Athena, denote a change in relationship between ruler (or rather, the lack of a ruler by now) and citizens, marking the new democratic politics in which they were produced. The philia symbolised in the new coinage was more directly between the citizens and their protective goddess, in whose temple the city treasury resided, by-passing the ruler and philos-archon who were philoi and facilitators.

64 Seaford 2004: 95-6.

65 Spahn (Spahn 1998) argues that the Pisistratid taxes were legitimised because they were religious levies.

66 The closest linguistically is the Ath. Pol.’s description of him as φιλάνθρωπος ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 16.8).
he nurtured as closer associates through magistracies and financial responsibilities, and to those poorer citizens whom he nurtured through subsistence loans. All of these philoi enjoyed the charites of their ruler and reciprocated by supporting his rule and, in the case of those who had received loans, by contributing to the state treasury. This financial network was a religious enterprise, in the name of Athena herself, uniting the population of Athens and Attica.

4.2 Was the rule of the Pisistratids dependent upon philia with overseas elite prior to their secure dynasty?

In the first section of this chapter we have seen some examples of Pisistratid philia, of the charites shared between these philoi, and of Pisistratid behaviour as euergetai performing megaloprepeia for their city. These networks of philia extended widely within Attica but also abroad. In this section and the next I shall explore these philiai and charites in greater depth, to determine how integral they were to rule and to determine the type of media they employed. Broadly speaking I shall examine this activity under the headings of religious, political and intellectual activity, but no examination of charites will neatly fit any these distinctions since, as we shall see, these all overlap. In the first place I shall look at the Pisistratid philia abroad from Attica with other elite prior to Pisistratus’ final and most extended period of rule, and then in the following and final section I shall look at philia both abroad and within Attica with respect to religious activity during this rule.

4.2.1 Eretria and Thrace

Pisistratus' association with Eretria is a little controversial, chiefly because of the seemingly conflicting chronologies in the sources. Herodotus suggests that the
Pisistratids spent ten years on Euboea, having gone there immediately after the end of Pisistratus' second rule, planning and amassing funds and men before they returned to Athens. After Pisistratus had secured rule he raised revenue from property on the River Strymon. Herodotus' account may simply be lacking detail, and the historian himself admits to keeping his account briefer than he might. The *Athenaion Politeia* account on the other hand does not specifically mention that the Pisistratids first went to Eretria, but it is implied since, after he settled at Rhaecelus and then raised funds at Mount Pangaeus, 'in the eleventh year he went back to Eretria', where he gained the support of the ruler oligarchs. Pisistratus benefited from his *philia* with the ruling Eretrians on his return to Attica, but there is also some evidence to suggest that it was with their support that he came to Thrace. Viviers argues that the fund-raising by the Pisistratids on Eretria at the beginning of the second exile supported Pisistratus' mission north but not his re-conquest of Athens, which was funded by his profits from mining in Thrace. This is an attempt to reconcile our sources, but there is, I think, no need. Both sources suggest Pisistratus' presence on Eretria at the very beginning and end of his second exile, and it is reasonable to argue that the Eretrians assisted the Pisistratids in both their expedition to Thrace and their return to Attica. Pisistratus 'settled with others' (συνωκισε) at Rhaecelus before moving on to Pangaeus, and Viviers thinks the 'others' to be Eretrians and that Rhaecelus was the Eretrian foundation of Dicaea. Lavelle instead thinks that the 'others' were Athenians who left Athens with Pisistratus, who himself founded a mercantile 'colony' Aenaea from which to exploit the Pangaeus.

---

67 Hdt. 1.61.2-62.1, 64.1.
68 οὐ πολλῶν λόγω εἰπείν (Hdt. 1.64.4).
69 [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 15.2.
70 One of many contingents which 'supported' (συμπροθυμουμένων) him ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 15.2).
72 [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 15.2.
mines. Our sources say nothing more of Pisistratid involvement with Eretria after Pallene, but archaeology has uncovered a well in Eretria, which bears structural similarities to Pisistratid building in Athens, and this could be evidence of Athenian charis for previous Eretrian support\textsuperscript{74}.

4.2.2 The Chersonese

If Eretrian philia helped Pisistratus to secure wealth from Thrace, philia with a powerful Athenian family\textsuperscript{75} helped him to secure wealth from a key position on the trade route through the Chersonese\textsuperscript{76}. According to Herodotus the Philaid Miltiades, an Olympic victor in the chariot race, 'because he was wearied by Pisistratus' rule and wanted to move on elsewhere', even though 'he held power', with 'every Athenian who was willing'\textsuperscript{77} founded a colony in the Chersonese at the invitation of local inhabitants. Miltiades' half-brother brother, Cimon, was exiled by Pisistratus, during which time he was also victorious in the Olympic chariot race. His second victory he dedicated to Pisistratus who allowed him to return to Athens, after which he was victor for a third time. After Pisistratus' death his sons had Cimon killed. Cimon's eldest son Stesagoras lived with Miltiades in the Chersonese, succeeded him, before he was murdered in a public meeting, at which point the Pisistratids sent the younger son of Cimon, another Miltiades, to rule in the Chersonese. This Miltiades was treated well in Athens by the

\textsuperscript{74} Viviers 1987: 194.
\textsuperscript{75} As we have observed in the Pisisratid relationship with the Alcmaeonids, both between Pisistratus and Megacles, and at the fall of the dynasty, political alliances between families in archaic politics can be precarious, temporary, and perhaps solely formed for opportunistic advantage. The same could be said of the Pisistratid relationship with the Philaids, but nonetheless we see the characteristics of philia in action.
\textsuperscript{76} On the relationship between Pisistratids and Philaids, later suppressed in the literary record, see Thomas 1991: 168-9.
\textsuperscript{77} Hdt. 6.35.3, 35.1, 36.1.
Pisistratids and knew nothing of their part in his father’s murder\textsuperscript{78}. He was also archon in 524/3BC, and therefore, like Cleisthenes the previous year, perhaps therefore either a supporter of the Pisistratids or a prominent figure whom the Pisistratids were keen to support\textsuperscript{79}. This Miltiades was later accused of tyranny in the Chersonese in the freshly anti-tyranny Athenian storm after the expulsion of Hippias, and some of Herodotus’ account and what we are told of his defence in his trial\textsuperscript{80} suggest attempted revision of the historical record, in order to distance the Philaids from the Pisistratids, just as the Alcmaeonids contrived\textsuperscript{81}. Once we remove the less than likely scenarios that the younger Miltiades enjoyed Pisistratid \textit{philia} with no knowledge of their family’s hand in his father’s death, and that the elder Miltiades was able to remove a presumably sizeable contingent of Athenians to the Chersonese without the sanction of the ruler Pisistratus\textsuperscript{82}, we are left with evidence of Pisistratid-Philaid \textit{philia}\textsuperscript{83}. The elder Miltiades founded a colony on the Chersonese with Pisistratid approval, in similar fashion to the earlier colony in Thrace\textsuperscript{84}, and the Pisistratids approved that his nephew Miltiades succeed in turn. The Pisistratids in fact established another colony opposite the Chersonese, ruled by Pisistratus’ son Hegesistratus\textsuperscript{85}, and complementing Miltiades’

\textsuperscript{78} Hdt. 6.103, 38-39.1.
\textsuperscript{79} Th. 6.54.6, IG I\textsuperscript{3} 1031, D.H. Antiquitates Romanae 7.3.
\textsuperscript{80} On this see Smith 1989: 44-5 and Cawkwell 1995.
\textsuperscript{81} Both the Philaids and the Alcmaeonids supposedly enjoyed the \textit{xenia} of Croesus of Lydia (Hdt. 6.37.1-38.1, 6.125), in marked contrast to the Pisistratids, of whom Hippias married his daughter to the son of the ruler of Lampsacus (Th. 6.59.3-4), who had warred against the elder Miltiades, capturing him before being persuaded by Croesus to release him. Hippias’s daughter was married because of the close relationship the ruler of Lampsacus enjoyed with the King of Persia. Our sources are touting polar opposites here, marking a Pisistratid association with the Persians and an attempt, particularly by the Alcmaeonids to disassociate their past with Pisistratids and Persians. See Herodotus on accusations that the Alcmaeonids aided the Persian attack on Athens (Hdt. 6.121-3).
\textsuperscript{83} On the Pisistratid-Philaid relationship see Davies 1971: 300. The authority of the Philaids in Athens, and in particular Miltiades’ Olympic successes, may have made them feel like a potential threat to the Pisistratids, and it is possible that some of the favour done to the Philaids by the Pisistratids was to appease the former.
\textsuperscript{84} Lavelle 2005: 227.
\textsuperscript{85} Hegesistratus also brought mercenary reinforcements from Argos, his mother’s home town (and therefore a source of \textit{philia} ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 17.4: ὃθεν καὶ ἕ πρός τοὺς Ἀργείους ἐνέστη φιλία)), to the
city, each colony strengthening the Athenian stronghold on this important trade route\textsuperscript{86}. Exile or not\textsuperscript{87}, Cimon dedicated his second Olympic victory to Pisistratus. Herodotus gives no reason for Cimon’s supposed murder by Pisistratus’ sons, and he was buried in Athens in great ceremony\textsuperscript{88}.

The Pisistratids then established bases in key locations\textsuperscript{89} in the Aegean to exploit and import commodities to Athens for the sake of Athens’ wealth, with the support of their philoi, and then installing their relatives and philoi to govern them. These same Athenian philoi were important and influential citizens of Athens, supported by the Pisistratids in their magistracies and other positions of authority\textsuperscript{90}, and who in turn reciprocated in gift to the Pisistratids, such as Cimon with his second Olympic victory. In turn and turn again, the rulers and their philoi exchanged charites, feeding their own power and wealth and the power and wealth of Athens as a whole.

4.2.3 Naxos

Pisistratus installed another philos, Lygdamis, as ruler of the island of Naxos, who in turn may have installed Polycrates as ruler of Samos\textsuperscript{91}. The Athenaion Politeia says that Lygdamis became ruler of Naxos after the Battle of Pallene, while the order of

\textsuperscript{86} Hdt. 5.94-5. Despite what our sources say of disputes between Miltiades and the Lampsacenes, there is no suggestion of conflict or competition between the two Athenian cities on the Hellespont.

\textsuperscript{87} Forsdyke (Forsdyke 2005, Forsdyke 2005: 121) thinks that the false claim of Alcmaeonid exile, inconsistencies in claims of Philaid exile and harm, and Pisistratus’ leniency at the Battle of Pallene suggest in fact that he did not exile opponents at all.

\textsuperscript{88} Hdt. 6.103.3.

\textsuperscript{89} A further example is Sigeum, where Pisistratus installed as ruler Hegesistratus, his son by his Argive wife (Hdt. 5.94.1), and to where Hippias on his expulsion retreated (5.65.3, 91.1).

\textsuperscript{90} The elder Miltiades ἐδυνάστευε, possibly archonship in all but name. Important families also held priesthoods, which I shall discuss later.

\textsuperscript{91} Polyaen. Strat. 1.23.2. Though Lygdamis may have played a hand in Polycrates’ accession, it has been argued that Polycrates was not the first in his family to rule in Samos (see n. 63 in chapter 5).
events is less clear in Herodotus⁹². In either case⁹³, each man assisted the other in becoming ruler, the one performing an act of charis and the other reciprocating. One small hint that the assistance and contributions which Pisistratus received from the cities for his return to Athens were out of debt for his past gifts is Herodotus' use of προαιδέομαι⁹⁴. In other words, Pisistratus was aided in his aim to take Athens for a third time by acts of charites from philoi with whom he had already established relationships as such, in Eretria, Naxos, Argos and Thebes. It was a network of associations, of philiai ready for exploitation because each philos would in turn receive recompense for their contribution. If Lygdamis was installed as ruler of Naxos subsequent to Pisistratus' taking Athens, it was out of reciprocation for his help, one ruler returning the charis. The use of reciprocity as the basis for beneficial bonds between individuals and other cities, or between kin in different cities has been observed well beyond the Archaic period⁹⁵.

Interstate networks functioned and benefited subscribers not only in political and economic terms, but also through religious activity. It was at the shrine to Apollo on Delos that Pisistratid and Naxian expenditure on religious activity was practised together, and from where Pisistratus' network of philia extended east to Samos. The sanctuary on Delos was important from the eighth century and an Athenian presence existed from this time in dedications which demonstrate a competitive elite displaying their gifts to the god as badges of their power⁹⁶. Shrines to Apollo Delios were also established in cities of these worshippers, as if to mirror the sanctuary on Delos and

---

⁹² [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 15.3, Hdt. 1.64.1-2.
⁹³ Lavelle (Lavelle 2005: 136-9) argues that Pisistratus installed Lygdamis first, possibly with the support of the Eretrians, but Costa (Costa 1992: 163-4) argues the opposite. Both are equally plausible.
⁹⁴ Hdt. 61.3: ἐνθαῦτα ἦγειρον δωτίνας ἐκ τῶν πολιῶν ἅπεις σφι προαιδέοντο κού τι, 'then he began to gather contributions from the cities which in some way owed him'. See also Lavelle 2005: 301 n. 102.
⁹⁶ Constantakopoulou 2007: 40.
bond these cities with Apollo’s island\(^\text{97}\), bringing \textit{kudos} to both Apollo and to the rulers and citizens of these cities. Monumental building and pottery suggests that the Naxians held some dominance over the shrine until the middle of the sixth century when there is more influence from elsewhere, including neighbouring Paros, whose marble sculpture and exportation at this time surpassed that of Naxos\(^\text{98}\). We are told that Lygdamis confiscated the marbles of the oligarchs he ousted as rulers and tried to profit from them\(^\text{99}\), and this and the dwindling of Naxian marble exports are taken as evidence that Lygdamis stymied Naxian marble production\(^\text{100}\). However Lygdamis did proceed with vast expenditure on monumental construction on Naxos itself, decorating his city as \textit{philos} and \textit{euergetēs} to his citizens, in the same way as the Pisistratids did\(^\text{101}\), and it was after his death that such activity on Naxos declined\(^\text{102}\). Lygdamis’ \textit{euergesia} on Naxos was complemented by his introduction of the island’s first coinage, displaying Dionysian imagery and with small denominations suggesting distribution throughout the populace\(^\text{103}\).

### 4.3 Was the rule of the Pisistratids dependent upon \textit{philia} with the gods?

#### 4.3.1 Delian Apollo

While Pisistratus began to decorate his own city, he also performed acts of \textit{charis} to Apollo on Delos. He firstly purified the sanctuary, by removing the graves of those who

---

\(^{97}\) There were sixth century temples to Apollo Delios on Naxos and Paros (Rutishauser 2012: 64).

\(^{98}\) Naxian marble exportation appears to begin again after the fall of Lygdamis in the 520s (Kokkorou-Alevras 2000; Costa 1992). On Naxian resources and sea power see Rutishauser 2012: 60-71.


\(^{100}\) Kokkorou-Alevras 2000: 148.

\(^{101}\) Examples are a colossal statue of Dionysus and a Temple to Apollo Delios (Gruben 2000: 138, 159-65).


\(^{103}\) Aglaosthenes, quoted by Pollux (Aglaosthenes FGrH 499 3), says wrongly that Naxos produced the first coinage in Greece. Sheedy (Sheedy 2006) gives the most comprehensive overview and analysis of Naxian coinage.
had died on the island away from the temple and onto the small nearby island of Rhenea, on the advice of an oracle. His other expenditure in the form of acts of charis for Apollo was the sanctuary’s first major stone temple and a large statue group associated with this temple. Polycrates of Samos also endeavoured to enhance his philia with Apollo by chaining the island of Rhenea to Delos in dedication. These philoi, Pisistratus, Lygdamis, and Polycrates formed their philiai by supporting each other in their intentions to rule, and enhanced their philiai both with each other and with their gods by networking through the Panhellenic sanctuary on Delos, and using their wealth to share in the kudos of the site and its god. From Pisistratus’ perspective, he was able to assert his authority and influence further east to the Cyclades and Ionian colonies, where until this point it had focused on Athens itself, Thrace to the north and the Chersonese to the north-east. In this period immediately after the fall of Croesus, with Persian attacks on Ionian cities, and Ionian displacement, Pisistratus as ruler of Athens, motherland of the Ionians, could by his activity at Delos deliver a ‘statement of assurance’ to the Ionians of Asia Minor, as their xenos and philos.

4.3.2 Ptöian Apollo

A uniformity in the presentation of association with religious sites, philia with the gods, and shared kudos can be seen both in the dedications made at the oracular sanctuary

---

104 Hdt. 1.64.4, Th. 3.104.1-2. Pottery dating to the 540s and originating on Delos has been found on Rhenea, and these may be associated with Pisistratus’ graves (Shapiro 1989: 48-9).
106 Th. 3.104.2. There was also a tradition that he founded the festival of Apollo Pythios and Delios (Suda s.v. Πύθια καὶ Δήλια), possibly that which the Athenians much later revived (Th. 3.104.2-6).
107 This network would be tested by the Spartan embassy to Lygdamis, seemingly to challenge his philia with Polycrates, that he would aid the Spartan attempt to overthrow Polycrates (Hdt. 3.39-60, Leahy 1957). Spartan philia with the Pisistratids would be tested when they were called upon to overthrow Hippias. They later regretted their actions, dwelling on past philia and believing they had been persuaded by the oracle of Delphi who had in fact been bribed by the Alcmaeonids (Hdt. 5.62-65.4, 90ff).
108 As it was considered to be, at least as early as the time of Solon (Sol. Fr. 4).
of Ptöian Apollo, and the in the shared use of craftsmanship employed to achieve this. At the sanctuary of Ptöian Apollo both Pisistratid and Alcmaeonid dedications have been found, dating to the third quarter of the sixth century, the former of which is a dedication by Hipparchus, the son of Pisistratus. These private dedications have been seen as competing declarations of religious activity by the Alcmaeonids and Pisistratids, but this is an unnecessary exaggeration. Both, however, may hold some evidence of broader activity than a simple dedication to a god at his sanctuary. The Alcmaeonid inscription celebrates a victory by Alcmaeonides at the Panathenaea, so its location at a Boeotian shrine is strange. Since the driver, whose name may suggest Boeotian origin, is named alongside the Alcmaeonid victor it is possible that the dedication allows this driver to share in a celebratory dedication at a sanctuary local to his family. The dedication is primarily by Alcmaeonides, so this may indicate not only the philia between victor and driver, but also a welcome opportunity for the victor to demonstrate philia for the god of the shrine, two acts of charis, to the driver who helped to win the victory and the local god who presumably supported the driver. The Pisistratid inscription was carved by the same hand as the inscription on the Altar of the Twelve

---

110 Pausanias refers to the oracle of Apollo Ptöios (Paus. 4.32.5, 9.23.3). Pisistratus’ purification of Delos was performed on the advice of an oracle. Herodotus and Thucydides both say this, though neither specifies which oracle (Hdt. 1.64.2: ἐκ τῶν λογίων, Th. 3.104.1: κατὰ τὸ χρήσμον). This may be our only evidence of Pisistratid association with Delphi, or it may be another example of association with the Ptöion, or possibly another oracle.

111 Raubitschek 1949: 338-40 (number 317), Bizard 1920: 236, Ducat 1971: 248, Jeffery 1990: n. 73. The Alcmaeonids famously renovated the Temple of Apollo at Delphi after a fire. There is no evidence of Pisistratid activity at Delphi, unless the oracular orders to purify Delos came from Delphi. Students see this as evidence that the Pisistratids shunned Delphi in favour of other sanctuaries, and that the two families competed in their religious activity. The flames of this fire have been fanned by a fanciful scholion on Pindar’s seventh Pythian, quoting Philochus that the Pisistratids started the fire at Delphi (Philoch. FGrH 328 F115. Σ PINDAR. Pyth. 7, 9b). Activity at the Ptöion increased considerably, and more so than other Boeotian sanctuaries, in the third quarter of the sixth century, suggesting perhaps that it became a popular alternative while the temple at Delphi was out of action (Ducat 1971: 459).

112 IG I3 1469.


114 IG I3 1470.
Gods in the Athenian Agora\textsuperscript{115}, dedicated by Hipparc"h"us' nephew, the younger Pisistratus, and as one of Hipparc"h"us' many herms which were erected on the roads of Attica. This may be no more than grateful re-employment, but, as we shall see, there is further evidence of Pisistratid uniformity and regularity in their portrayal within Athens and Attica.

The Pisistratids had bonds of philia in Boeotia and neighbouring Thessaly. Thebes had supported Pisistratus in preparation for Pallene, and the Thessalians helped Hippias in the Spartan expedition to expel him from Athens\textsuperscript{116}. There is a further suggestion through the nickname of one of his sons, who was known as both Hegesistratus and Thessalus, even though he was the son of an Argive wife\textsuperscript{117}. The Pisistratids may have built the main temple at the Ptöion, or at least one of the treasuries, and there is an identical architectural feature shared between a building at the sanctuary and a building in the Athenian Agora which may have been the residence of the Pisistratids\textsuperscript{118}. There was a long tradition of Pisistratus' hand in the publication of Homer's works\textsuperscript{119}, and his son Hipparc"h"us introduced recitation of them at the Panathenaea\textsuperscript{120}. In an analysis of the Catalogue of Women in Book 11 of the Odyssey\textsuperscript{121}, Larson argues, convincingly I think, that this was written with both an external and internal audience in mind, which in combination seek to reinforce bonds of xenia between Pisistratids and Athenians and Boeotians and Thessalians. Of the heroines listed in the Catalogue those from Attica, Boeotia and Thessaly are especially well-attested and Larson concludes that the Catalogue is a combination of earlier

\textsuperscript{115} IG I\textsuperscript{3} 948. For a summary of the debate on the author of both inscriptions see SEG 44 18-19.
\textsuperscript{116} Hdt. 1.61.3, 5.63.3.
\textsuperscript{117} Th. 1.20.2, 6.55.1, [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 17.3-4. He is characterised as young, rash and burdensome to his brothers in [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 18.2, quite contrary to the description by Diodorus Siculus (D.S. 10.17.1).
\textsuperscript{118} Larson 2000: 208-18.
\textsuperscript{119} Allen 1913, Hart Newhall 1908.
\textsuperscript{120} [Pl.] Hipparch. 228b 4-8.
\textsuperscript{121} Hom. Od. 11.225-332.
Boeotian and Thessalian material and traditional Athenian genealogies. The external audience for this part of the poem there were Boeotians, Thessalians, and Athenians in combination, sharing in mythological and genealogical ties of their communities and past. The internal audience for the Catalogue is the Phaeacians, who listen intently to Odysseus’ description in a context where they become xenoi to the hero, and who respond to his tale with extensive talk of xenia and philia and the gifts (charites) which philoi exchange122.

Abroad from Attica itself the Athenian Pisistratids formed, nurtured and exploited philia, at religious sanctuaries and in religious activity, in political and economic strategy, and in intellectual pursuit. At religious sites they created bonds of philia with deities, shared such bonds with other worshippers, their philoi and xenoi, and enhanced their philia with their allies. Politically and economically these philiai with friends overseas were strategically important to secure and retain rule, and helped finance further expenditure in the name of philia. And in intellectual activity, such as festival, competition, athletics, song, art and architecture, especially at religious sanctuaries philoi celebrated their bonds with gods and allies alike, through shared mythology and genealogy, and enjoyed shared kudos. All of this activity involved the investment of wealth in philia, for the mutual benefit of the philoi who reciprocate. These bonds of philia extended between gods, rulers, and citizens, within and between individual states. It remains to be ascertained whether the Pisistratids made use of the same methods within Attica, with the gods in their local shrines and with the Athenian citizens themselves.

4.3.3 Athens and Attica

In religious building and festivity in Attica, Pisistratid euergesia placed Athens centre-stage in Greece, united its citizens in philia with their gods, and, through this euergesia, with their rulers. The Pisistratids celebrated and embellished the Panhellenic Panathenaea festival in Athens, notably by Hipparchus' introduction of recitations of Homer as part of the competition\textsuperscript{123}, and it was ironically while organising the Great Panathenaea that Hipparchus was murdered\textsuperscript{124}. The popularity of Hipparchus' Homeric contests can be seen in the increased breadth of Homeric themes on Athenian vases of the last quarter of the sixth century\textsuperscript{125}. The dramatic festivals of Dionysus Eleutherius may have been instituted and sponsored by Pisistratus\textsuperscript{126}, and the rulers may have also sponsored building at Demeter's sanctuary at Eleusis\textsuperscript{127}. The Pisistratids began construction of the Temple to Olympian Zeus in the archaic Agora, on such a scale and with such a design as if competing with the temples of Asia Minor, of Hera at Ephesus and Samos\textsuperscript{128}. The religious activity of Pisistratus and his sons continued in the legacy of Hippias' son Pisistratus, who dedicated two altars, to the Twelve Gods in the new Agora and also to Apollo Pythios\textsuperscript{129}.

Not only through religious activity and promotion but also through more 'political' means the Pisistratids united the city's elites and non-elites and considered them all

\textsuperscript{124} Th. 1.20, 6.56-7, [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 18.2-3.
\textsuperscript{125} Shapiro 1989: 43-4.
\textsuperscript{126} The Marmor Parium (ep. 43), admittedly unreliably, dates the first performance of drama in Athens by Thespis to 534BC.
\textsuperscript{127} Hurwit 1999: 117, Shapiro 1989: ch. 4.
\textsuperscript{128} Aristotle simply attributes it to the Pisistratids (Arist. Pol. 1313b23), but Vitruvius says Pisistratus began construction (Vitr. 7. Pref. 15), which was abandoned on his death, because of political trouble (about which we have no other record). Houby-Nielsen (Houby-Nielsen 2009) argues that there is considerable East Greek influence on Attic art, social styling, and building.
\textsuperscript{129} Th. 6.54.6-7.
We know, despite the bias and revisionism in our sources, that the Alcmaeonids and Philaids held the highest offices in Athens under the Pisistratids, and there is no suggestion that the Pisistratids encroached on or disturbed the legitimate inherited priesthoods which belonged to certain families. In the archaic Agora Athens' largest temple was begun, and the new Agora became an important civic space, bounded by the younger Pisistratus' Altar to the Twelve Gods, the Pisistratid public fountain of Enneakrounos, the city mint, and possibly even the Pisistratid home. In this public space, the Athenian citizen saw his divine philoi, his ruling philos, the beneficial charites of these philai, and the machinery of these relationships in action. The new Agora became an arena for shared kudos, where all Athenians united in philia. From the Altar of the Twelve Gods, now considered the centre of Pisistratid Athens, distances to the towns and shrines were measured, and Hipparchus erected herms midway on the roads to signal the distance, assure the city-country traveller and pilgrim, and offer some sage advice of the ruling philos. Reaching out to citizens intellectually, alongside festivals dramatic and athletic, Hipparchus' herms, much like Homer's poems, became a popular motif in vase painting of the last two decades of the sixth century. Hipparchus' sponsorship of song extended to embracing further the

---

130 [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 16.9. See also Forsdyke 2005: 125-6. The text describes philia in all but name, since it emphasises Pisistratus' hospitality with the nobles and his assistance to the people generally in daily life.

131 Such as the Eteoboutadae who held priesthoods for Poseidon Erechteus and Athena Polias, and the Kerykes who held office at Eleusis (see Shapiro 1989: 71-2). Pausanias describes the fountain (Paus. 1.14.1).

132 The location of Athens mint in South East corner of the Agora belongs to the fifth century, but it is certainly plausible, given the Pisistratid renovation of this area, and their introduction of coinage at the same time, that the earlier mint stood on the same site. See Trevett 2001: 30.

133 The structure which has been identified as such may not in fact be a domestic building. On this see Camp 1986: 44-5; Camp 1991: 35; Shear 1994: 228-31; Mitchell 2013: 55 n. 122.

134 [Pl.] Hipparch. 228d-229a describes these herms and how through them Hipparchus sought to help the citizens seek education. Accepting Pisistratus' archonship of 522/1BC (in a reconstruction of the archon list, IG I 1 1031, SEG 10: 352 line 6; SEG 21: 96), in which he set up the altar, the herms must date to between 522 and 514BC, the year of Hipparchus' death. On the herms as a service to the citizens of Attica's countryside and the development of the Agora as a focal point see Shapiro 1989: 126.

possible Pisistratid *philia* with Polycrates of Samos and Ionian craft, by inviting the poet Anacreon to Athens as well as Simonides of Ceos, to enlighten the Athenian citizens\(^\text{136}\). The old view that Pisistratus centralised Attica, bringing its cults to Athens, focusing all eyes on the city, has been deservedly challenged\(^\text{137}\). Instead local cult activity and building at sanctuaries developed before and during the Pisistratid era, as it did in Athens. In fact Athens became more a hub than a focus, from where, to where, and through where the Athenian citizen and worshipper could access communities and sanctuaries, passing Hipparchus’ herms mid-way between each community and Athens, whichever the direction of travel, uniting all by embracing all, not forcing all to focus eyes on Athens alone.

* * *

Pisistratid rule, like those of Lygdamis and Polycrates, was secured only through *philia* and wealth. This wealth contributed to activity which fostered *philiai*, not only with citizens of Athens, by performing acts of *charis* appropriate to individuals’ different needs, but also with the gods of Panhellenic and local sanctuaries. Monumental building, hospitality and *xenia*, sponsorship of office, and loans all nurtured and continued these *philiai*, within Attica and abroad, and these same media of *philia*, these acts of *charis*, allowed these bonds, whether local or foreign, to function. Monumental building and festival in Athens, but also at Delos and at the Boeotian Ptöion united Athenians in *philia* and Athenians with *philoi* abroad. Similarly hospitality/*xenia* connected Pisistratus to the nobles of Athens as well as to his Eretrian friends.

\(^{136}\) [Pl.] *Hipparch*. 228c 1-6. Simonides was apparently a close *philos* of Hipparchus, who gave the poet money and gifts. On Anacreon’s presence in Athens see Aloni 2000.

\(^{137}\) Osborne 1994.
Sponsorship of office formed *philiai*, whether Pisistratus' sponsorship of archons and priests, or his sponsorship of Lygdamis' rule, and vice versa. And loans allowed *philiai* to form and flourish, whether to the poorer of Attica or in the form of wealth and military might such as Pisistratus' *philoi* granted him in 546BC on his return to Athens. The religious aspect to these media is clear, in the building and festival at religious sites, the ritual of *xenia*, and the sacred offices as archons, priests and rulers, but alongside their religious nature wealth was also core to the functioning of *philia*. Under Pisistratus, wealth given in loans and returned in taxes between *philoi* was facilitated by the city's first coinage, which was emblazoned with the marks of the noble *philoi* and was minted in one corner of the new Agora, beside public buildings born of the ruler's *euergesia*, funded by advantages of *philia*. In another corner a Pisistratid altar was the physical centre of the community of Athenians, of city and country, who made up Pisistratid *philoi*. In the final corner was the Pisistratid home itself, home of the ruler, *euergetēs*, and *philos*. 
5 Polycrates’ Philia and Rule

Contemporary with Pisistratus was Polycrates the ruler of Samos. In this chapter I shall again explore how philia was central to Polycrates' rule, both in acts of euergesia in Samos and acts of xenia with philoi abroad, how his religious activity related to these relationships and to the philia which he and his philoi shared with the gods, and how all such activity allowed philoi to share in the kudos which their expenditure on philia generated. Our evidence is limited, without significant epigraphical references or monumental building at the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi, for example, and the chronology cannot be refined with any certainty. Our literary sources are familiar, chiefly Herodotus, whose account is somewhat contradictory, empathetic and praising Polycrates' rule while at the same time appearing a little grudgingly critical. This historian's evidence, along with those of later authors, demonstrates, as they have for other rulers, some of the motifs, exaggeration, and fancy in accounts of 'tyrants'. In the first place I shall try to reconcile some of the negative details in our sources with the positive, in order to argue that in fact what is most in evidence are displays of engagement in philia. This relates in particular to the accusation of Polycrates' piracy in the Mediterranean and his extreme wealth. This conclusion will allow me to examine his use of wealth and its relation to these philiai. I shall then examine his use of wealth on these philiai, both abroad, where rather than piracy we may instead see examples of commerce as well as xenia, and on Samos, where the ruler's wealth was used in megaloprepeia for his city and people. Finally, I shall consider how Polycrates' re-introduction and reinvention of Samian coinage related to his expenditure on his citizens and his xenoi, and how its iconography related to Samian identity, both civic and religious. This will lead to discussion of Polycrates' and Samos' philia with gods, on
Samos and elsewhere, the expenditure on such activity, and its relationship to Polycrates' rule.

The following questions will be addressed in turn, in order to assess Polycrates' expenditure on *philia*, secular and religious, and the relationship between such activity and his rule:

Can we reconcile Polycrates' reputation for extreme wealth and piracy with evidence for his expenditure and *philia*?

How did expenditure on *philia* with colleagues both at home and abroad complement Polycrates' rule?

How did Polycrates' introduction of Samian coinage, and his use of wealth on religious activity complement his relationships of *philia* and his rule?

5.1 Polycrates and *Philia*

Polycrates was notoriously wealthy, defined by the extent of his power and the success of his activity as ruler. However, our sources are problematic and contradictory in explaining how he acquired and sustained his wealth, whether through inheritance, exploitation of *philoi*, or theft. Our most important source, in terms of its level of detail as well as its proximity to Polycrates' rule, chronologically and geographically, is that of Herodotus, who celebrates Polycrates' expenditure on his citizens, in other words his *megaloprepeia* on Samos, and sympathises with the ruler's undeservingly nasty end, at the hands of a supposed *philos*. At the same time, however, he relates that Polycrates abused his naval supremacy to rob from other Greek states, including those of his *philoi*, and that despite an undeserving end to his life, it was facilitated by the ruler's greed for wealth. Other sources refer to piratical behaviour, while also stressing his expenditure on activity which benefited the citizens of Samos, his *philoi* elsewhere, and
the gods, both in Samos and abroad. I shall argue that the inconsistencies arise from the overlaying by our sources and their sources on the one hand of ‘tyrannical’ attributes such as exploitation, theft and piracy and the exaggeration of these, and on the other hand of the network of *philia* which supported Polycrates’ rule. Our best sources in fact describe Polycrates’ reign through the motif of his *philiai*, which come through the inconsistencies as the defining features of the narrative of his rule.

### 5.1.2 Polycrates’ Power and Piracy

In the literary sources Polycrates’ wealth is commonly defined in terms of the extent of his power, and his actions which contributed to it. Herodotus says that after his accession¹ ‘very soon, his activity swelled and was shouted about throughout Ionia and the rest of Greece²’. He goes on to say that he was successful militarily, wherever this took him, for which he possessed a hundred penteconters and a thousand archers, ultimately taking many of the islands and cities on the mainland³. The historian also dedicates a chapter not only in justification of his lengthy account of Polycrates and the Samians of his time, but in which he describes their technological and architectural achievements, ‘the three greatest accomplishments of all the Greeks’. Specifically they are a tunnel which fed spring water to the city, the mole in the harbour, and the Temple of Hera⁴. Thucydides repeats that Polycrates had a powerful navy and that he had other islands ‘obedient to him’⁵, referring again later to his naval power⁶. Herodotus also

---

¹ The nature of his accession is problematic, and in fact his rule may have been part of an Aeacid dynasty, and not the result of a coup, as Herodotus writes. For scholarship on this see n. 63 of this chapter. For the most recent analysis of Polycrates’ chronology see Carty 2015: ch. 3.
² Hdt. 3.39.3.
³ Hdt. 3.39.3-4.
⁴ Hdt. 3.60.1.
⁵ ὑπηκόους (Th. 1.13.6). Thucydides uses here a term he elsewhere uses to refer to allies of the Delian League subject to Athens (Th. 6.20.2, 21.2, etc.), and other such subordination. If Polycrates had similar
describes Polycrates' primacy on Greek waters as chronologically the first of several (Minos excluded, whose claim is prehistoric), but there is nothing so blunt and exaggerated in these early sources as Himerius' claim much later, in the fourth century AD, that Polycrates' power not only enveloped Samos but 'the whole of the Greek sea, as far as eyes can see land'. Later exaggeration like Himerius' aside, Polycrates' influence was likely considerable and far-reaching, if we can rely upon some of the evidence and concordance in the earlier historians.

As ruler of Samos, we might assume that Polycrates controlled the city's revenue, but some writers emphasise an additional source for his wealth. Herodotus says that Polycrates 'had a great desire for money', and this was a weakness of his which led to his death at Oroetes' hands. Herodotus' earlier account of Polycrates' possession and employment of his naval force suggests that he acquired wealth through piracy, the exploitation of his naval supremacy. I quote the account in Herodotus here in full:

ἐν χρόνῳ δὲ ὀλίγῳ αὐτίκα τοῦ Πολυκράτεος τὰ πρήγματα ἦντο καὶ ἦν βεβωμένα ἀνά τε τὴν ἱωνίνην καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα: ὅκου γὰρ ἵθεσε ἑκατέρως καὶ χιλίους τοξότας, ἔκτητο δὲ πεντηκοντέρους τε ἐκατὸν καὶ χιλίους τοξότας, ἑφερε δὲ καὶ ἤγε πάντας διακρίνων οὐδένα: τῷ γὰρ φίλῳ ἔφη χαριεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἀποδιδόντως τά ἔλαβε ἢ ἄρχην μηδὲ λαβών. συχνὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν νήσων ἁραιρήκεε, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἥπειρου ἁστεα: ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Λεσβίους πανστρατιῆ βοηθέοντας Ἐλλάδα μηδὲ λαβών.
κρατήσας εἶλε, οἳ τὴν τάφρον περὶ τὸ τεῖχος τὸ ἐν Σάμῳ πᾶσαν δεδεμένου ὠρυξαν.

The historian focuses initially on Polycrates' achievements (τὰ πρήγματα), renown (βεβωμένα ἀνὰ τέ τὴν Ἱωνίην καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα), and particularly in his military activity (ὅκου γὰρ ἱθύσει στρατεύεσθαι, πάντα οἱ ἕχωρες εὐτυχέως). These are at the heart of the only example he gives, at the close of the passage, that Polycrates captured Lesbian forces which he compelled to contribute to Samos' city defences. This example supposedly represents the many islands and mainland cities which Polycrates 'had captured' (ἀραιρήκεε), and certainly Herodotus uses the same Greek verb (αἱρέω) in both clauses (ἀραιρήκεε, εἶλε). There is no ambiguity in his language that the Lesbians were prisoners (δεδεμένοι), but it is unsettling that neither are the Lesbian prisoners an example of an island or mainland city which Polycrates had captured, nor does Herodotus offer any other example, of which there were allegedly many (συχνὰς) to choose. The basic structure to Herodotus' account, encompassing his introductory focus and subsequent example, is (1) the military success and the scale of his navy, (2) the geographical extent of his power, and (3) an example of this, which results in a monumental work.

Thucydides later appears to rely on Herodotus' words:

καὶ Πολυκράτης Σάμου τυραννῶν ἐπὶ Καμβύσου ναυτικῶν ἱσχύων ἄλλας τε τῶν νῆσων ὑπηκόους ἐποιήσατο καὶ Ἄρηνειαν ἐλὼν ἀνέθηκε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δηλίῳ.

Thucydides (1) summarises Herodotus' description of Polycrates' naval power (ναυτικῶν ἱσχύων), (2) says that Polycrates made other islands 'obedient to him' (ἄλλας τε τῶν νῆσων).

---

11 Andrewes (Andrewes 1966: 119) notes this 'incident' as a poor example.
12 Th. 1.13.6.
nήσων ὑπηκόους ἐποιήσατο), and (3) gives an example of this, and the monumental work which followed. Thucydides' account appears so similar in structure to that of Herodotus as to owe some inspiration to it. Thucydides even repeats Herodotus' use of the verb αἱρέω when giving his example of a 'captured' island (ἐἶλε and ἕλων), and imitates the correlated introductory phrase (συχνὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν νήσων and ἄλλας τε τῶν νήσων). Thucydides makes no use at all of Herodotus' middle section, though this was picked up and developed by later writers. It is significant, however, that neither of these early writers, Herodotus nor Thucydides, gives an example of an island or a mainland city which Polycrates attacked with his navy and controlled, despite their concordance and despite each offering a different example. Rheneia was, certainly later at least, essentially uninhabited, and Strabo describes it as 'deserted', an unimpressive choice for a paradigm of a successful military campaign.

The assumption that Polycrates engaged in piratical behaviour has sustained even in the scholarship of today, but with increasing suspicion. Asheri remarkably quotes

13 D.S. 10.15.1: ὁ Πολυκράτης ὁ τῶν Σαμίων τύραννος εἰς τοὺς ἑπτακατάτους τόπους ἀποστέλλων τριήμερης ἔλησεν ἄπαντες τοὺς πλέοντας, ἀπεδίδου δὲ μόνοις τοῖς συμμάχοις τὰ ληφθέντα. τρός δὲ τοὺς μεμορμένους τῶν συνηθῶν ἔλεγεν ὡς πάντες οἱ φίλοι πλείονα χάριν ἔξουσιν ἀπολαβόντες ἄπετέπαλον ἢπερ ἀρχὴν μηδὲν ἀποβαλόντες.

14 Thucydides more or less repeats this sentence later in his work, where the context is specifically about Rheneia rather than Polycrates: ὁ Σαμίων τύραννος ἤχοσας τινὰ χρόνον ναυτικῷ καὶ τῶν τε ἄλλων νήσων ἀρέξας καὶ τὴν Ῥηνείαν ἑλὼν ἀνέθηκε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δῆλῳ ἱλόσε δήσας πρὸς τὴν Δήλον (Th. 3.104.2). One could argue that out of laziness Thucydides uses the same example twice, instead of finding a more persuasive example of Polycrates' aggression, but that is no better an argument that such aggression took place.

15 Str. 10.5.5. It may have had a relatively small number of inhabitants prior to Polycrates' dedication of the island to Apollo and Delos, who may have founded a 'small town' in the north-west of the island after this (Kent 1948: 245-7; nn. 6 and 7 demonstrate the difficulty in antedating either the town or the cemetery, which Pisistratus established, to earlier than the last quarter of the fifth century). Whatever the case, Polycrates' involvement with Rheneia does not appear to have been a significant military conquest, but rather a religious act, involving his own expenditure and possibly economic benefits to the sanctuary (Kent 1948).

16 Berve 1967: 109-10; Mitchell 1975: 84; Cartledge 1982: 256; Shipley 1987: 95; and generally, as in, for example, Pedley 2006: 156. Carty (Carty 2015) argues that Polycrates inherited an official position from his father, where he controlled donations of booty from Samian ship-owners who had been raiding; that this paved the way for his supremacy in Samos; that he then supplied captives through such raiding.
the family name of Syloson (a compound of σύλη-) as a reference to endemic piracy, but we cannot attribute piracy to Samians or to the Aeacids on that basis, any more than we can be confident of the tale that Cypselus was saved by being hidden in a chest. In fact a reference to σύλη in an inscription in a dedication related to the Temple of Hera by an Aeaces who may have been the father of Polycrates himself, suggests a different meaning for the this Greek word, implying a levy or tax. Though the ancient references in the works of Diodorus and Polyaeus add nothing, since they are merely reworkings of Herodotus, Herodotus himself does refer to other occasions of Samian looting. On this basis de Libero and Osborne are willing to accept Samian piracy, even if Polycrates did not engage in it himself.

The examples of Samian piracy before Polycrates’ time in Herodotus’ text are politically motivated allegations, claims made later in the context of constructing a history of the Spartan assault on Samos in 525BC, and therefore cannot be trusted easily. Indeed Herodotus tells us that in his own time the Samians allege that the Spartans led the assault on the island out of gratitude to previous Samian assistance to Sparta, a claim which the Spartans deny. The alleged acts of piracy relate to the golden bowl which the Spartans said they sent as a gift to Croesus of Lydia, and the

17 Stein-Höïkeskamp (Stein-Höïkeskamp 2009: 109) argues that to many at the time, the difference between piracy, war, and trade would not always be easily distinguished.
18 Asheri 2007: 440, but also Barron 1964: 218-9, and even Shipley (Shipley 1987: 71, following the commentary on M.L. 16, the Aeaces inscription). On this Heraion inscription of Aeaces see n. 20.
19 Hdt. 5.92c1 (κυψέλη), amongst other later literary sources, who repeat this.
20 M.L. 16 = IG 12.6.ii.561: Αεακης ανεθηκεν | ο Βρυχωνος : ος τηι | Ηρηι : την συλην : ε|πρησεν : κατα | την | επιστασιν, 'Aeaces the son of Brychon dedicated this, who managed the σύλη (revenue, tax, plunder?) for Hera during his office as overseer'). Barron (Barron 1964: 218-9) outlines the evidence for the date, but chooses c. 500BC, in part because he wishes to argue that this or any other Aeaces cannot be Polycrates’ father (despite Hdt. 3.39.1), instead a later relative (though presumably it cannot be the Aeaces of Hdt. 6.13.2, whose father Herodotus names as Syloson). See n. 63.
21 To the above references the following should be added: D.S. 1.95.3 and Max. Tyr. 29.8.
23 Hdt. 3.47.1. As Asheri remarks, ‘the version most favourable to Sparta is strangely attributed to the Samians’ (Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella 2007: 444), a claim of philia rather than piracy.
gold-embroidered corselet sent to Amasis in Egypt\textsuperscript{24}. Added to this, Sparta and Samos had endured a long-standing \textit{philia} between their states or at least members of their states, prior to but even possibly after their attack on Samos late in Polycrates' rule\textsuperscript{25}. There is considerable evidence for this relationship in the Spartan artefacts at Samos from the seventh and sixth centuries, pottery and in particular a bronze lion, originally part of a larger vessel. Dating to the middle of the sixth century, this was likely manufactured in Sparta, on the basis of its Laconian inscription, and then sent to Samos as a dedication at the Temple of Hera\textsuperscript{26}. The striking evidence for continued Spartan-Samian \textit{xenia} is the public burial given to one of the Spartans who excelled in the attack\textsuperscript{27}. For some reconciliation of these contradictions and complexities, we should return once more to the text of Herodotus.

**5.1.3 Reassessing Herodotus**

Herodotus' intimacy with Samos is clear from the level of his detail on its individuals of his own time and dedications at the Heraion. We are told from his brief biography in the Suda that he lived there after fleeing Halicarnassus\textsuperscript{28}, and wrote his \textit{Histories} there. However, the historical details and claims must have had their sources, which were very likely aristocratic, and Barbara Mitchell's analysis and conclusions\textsuperscript{29} are convincing that these post-Polycratean and post-Persian-invasion aristocrats gave Herodotus a distorted view of their past, and purposely avoided attribution to Polycrates the occasions and monuments for which he was likely responsible and would deserve

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{24} Hdt. 1.70.2-3, 3.47.1.  
\textsuperscript{25} Carty argues that there was a particular Samian faction which enjoyed Spartan \textit{xenia}, and which opposed Polycrates (Carty 2015: 69-73, 93-9).  
\textsuperscript{26} The inscription: 'Eumnastos the Spartiate to Hera'. See Cartledge 1982: 255-5. On Spartan dedications at this and other Greek sanctuaries see Neer 2001: 285-6, who supplies further bibliography.  
\textsuperscript{27} Hdt. 3.55; Osborne 1996: 279; Cartledge 1982: 250-1.  
\textsuperscript{28} Suda s.v. Ἡρόδοτος.  
\textsuperscript{29} Mitchell 1975: 75-81.}
approbation, attributing instead characteristics which would seem familiar of ‘tyrants’ and receive a welcome hearing. Additionally, Polycrates' likely medism, swapping his philia with the Egyptian Amasis for the Persian Cambyses, is played down as an opportunistic alternative to which he was invited after Amasis ended their philia. All of this would be all the more politically expedient for Samians who had been (and would be until 440BC) loyal members of Athens' Delian League, the Athens who most famously exiled its 'tyrants' and whose supremacy was the result of success against the Persians in living memory. Polycrates' biography in Herodotus' work becomes something of a tragic tale, somewhat distant in Samian history. Accusations of greed and theft came to explain his extreme wealth, and in turn his extreme wealth became the aetiological explanation for his fall and, as Herodotus attributes to Amasis' foretelling, his pitiful death.

Polycrates' remarkable wealth, much like that of the legendary Midas, is behind the story of the ruler's seal ring. This account is essentially one of folk tale, of a precious item lost and returned against unforeseeable odds, because of the owner's remarkable luck (εὐτυχία). It is also meant to be aetiological for the specific horror of Polycrates' death, predicted by his philos Amasis. Herodotus clearly stresses that Amasis and

---

30 The folk tale motif of good fortune is introduced from the very beginning in reference to Polycrates' military success: εὐτυχέως (Hdt. 3.39.3). It is then repeated emphatically: εὐτυχέων, εὐτυχίς (Hdt. 3.40.1), εὐτυχία, εὐτυχέσιν, εὐτυχέσι (Hdt. 3.40.2), εὐτυχέων, εὐτυχίς (Hdt. 3.40.3), εὐτυχία (Hdt. 3.40.4), εὐτυχέων (Hdt. 3.43.1), εὐτυχέσιν (Hdt. 3.44.1). When Herodotus returns, after a digression, to Amasis' prediction, we see it one final time, his death marking an end to such luck: Πολυκράτεος μὲν δὴ αἱ πολλαὶ εὐτυχίαι ἐς τοῦτο ἐτελεύτησαν τῇ ὥ Άμασις ὁ Ἀιγύπτου βασιλεὺς προεμαντεύσατο (Hdt. 3.126.1).

31 Hdt. 3.40-3 (the ring), 3.122-5 (his death). Polycrates' ring became notorious, to the extent that what would appear to be a fake, unengraved (the original was a seal ring, and therefore presumably engraved (Hdt. 3.41.1), even if we place any confidence in an original ring), was on display in the Temple of Concord in Rome in the first-century AD, even though this particular gem was then considered of relatively poor quality (Plin. H.N. 37.2, 4).

32 One is reminded of the strikingly similar and tragic tale of Croesus, famed for his wealth (Hdt. 1.30-45), who, despite the warnings of his philos-xenos Solon (Hdt. 1.30.2) of his mistaking wealth and success to date for blessedness, rather than luck (Hdt. 1.32.5-6: εὐτυχές, εὐτυχεύος), loses his son, however much he attempts to avoid this.
Polycrates were *xenoi* and *philoi*\(^3\), and that the fisherman gave the fish which contained the ring as a gift\(^3\), in which Polycrates received *charis*\(^3\). However, the story of the ring cannot be separated from the reference to Polycrates' piracy\(^3\), since both are aetiological explanations for his extreme and famous wealth, even if there is some contradiction between the achievement of that wealth through piracy and its achievement though luck. Indeed the contradictions and absurdities in what these accounts tell us about Polycrates' rule elucidate what we should treat with much suspicion and in what we can place more stock as a result. Taking the ring story first of all, which is an account of Polycrates' extreme success (εὐτυχία), the ruler is advised by a *philos* to dispose of a precious item, an item which would ordinarily in fact be reserved as a future gift to a *philos*, and the result of which action is the sad loss of the *philia* of the *philos* who had warned Polycrates of his demise. The absurdity of this tale is not only in the advice to purposely throw away an item of wealth\(^3\), but also that such advice from a *philos* is used to explain the loss of *philia*. To be more specific, Polycrates chooses to dispose of a seal ring of considerable value\(^3\), an example of a *κειμήλιον*\(^3\).

---

\(^{33}\) *ξεινίην* (Hdt. 3.39.2), *φίλον καὶ ξείνον* (Hdt. 3.40.2), *ξείνου* (Hdt. 3.43.2). Carty suggests that Polycrates may have inherited this *xenia* from his father, and the two statues in the Heraion from Amasis were gifts to Aeaces and Polycrates in turn (Carty 2015: 171-2).

\(^{34}\) δῶρον δοθῆναι and διδοὺς (Hdt. 3.42.1), δίδωμι and δώρου (Hdt. 3.42.2).

\(^{35}\) *χάρις* (Hdt. 3.42.2).

\(^{36}\) Hdt. 3.39.3-4.

\(^{37}\) There is no reason to interpret Amasis' criteria as anything other than an item of objective value, as opposed to emotional and subjective value, given the context of Polycrates' εὐτυχία in military exploits, and his alleged profiteering in piracy from *philoi*.

\(^{38}\) Polycrates chooses an emerald, set in gold. Herodotus even names the artist of the item (Hdt. 3.41.1).

\(^{39}\) Κειμήλιων (Hdt. 3.41.1). This is something Amasis says should be what Polycrates considers most precious and which he would be most pained to lose (Hdt. 3.40.4). Odysseus claimed he was busy gathering *κειμήλια*, as justification for his absence from Ithaca (Hom. *Od*. 19.282ff); this argument only worked because these items were of considerable value to the *oikos*. 
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κειμήλια are 'mainly preserved for the exchange of gifts'\textsuperscript{40}, stored so that they might be passed on to a descendant\textsuperscript{41} or a philos outside of the family\textsuperscript{42}. They are marked out as items to be used as gifts, charites, in recompense\textsuperscript{43} for items of value which could be exchanged\textsuperscript{44}, and therefore notably hold considerable wealth\textsuperscript{45}. Herodotus' only other use of the word κειμήλιον relates to another philia, that between Ariston and Agetus\textsuperscript{46}, who exchange gifts\textsuperscript{47}.

The significance of philia for Polycrates in every element of the content of the tale of his ring is clear. Polycrates chooses an item of considerable value to throw away, an item which should be destined for an act of charis towards a philos; this advice is given by an important philos; the disposed item is returned by an individual, a citizen, who does so as an act of charis towards his philos, his ruler; the absurd result is the loss of philia, which is only abandoned because of the important philos' close relationship with Polycrates. The tale is on the one hand an aetiological explanation for Polycrates' extreme εὐτυχία, taken to an absurd conclusion. Herodotus has Amasis warn Polycrates of the gods' envy of such extreme success and that he will suffer a cruel death, which he does, and so, on the other hand, the tale is an aetiological explanation

\textsuperscript{40} Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella 2007: 442.
\textsuperscript{41} κειμήλιον is not a term commonly found in prose. Examples of dynastic wealth, providing for future generations: Hom. II. 6.47(=11.132), 18.290, Od. 14.325(=19.294).
\textsuperscript{43} Marked out as recompense: Hom. II. 6.46-7, 11.131-2, where they are deemed 'a worthy recompense' (ἀξία ἀποινα). Representing a reward for previous charis given to philoi: Eur. Heracl. 591 and Rh. 654.
\textsuperscript{44} Exchanged (Hom. II. 18.290), or stored with philoi (Hom. II. 24.382).
\textsuperscript{45} These were therefore most commonly of worked precious metal: Hom. II. 6.48, 11.133, 18.289, Od. 2.75, 14.324. This characteristic is contrasted with cattle or flocks Hom. Od. 21.10 (with the metaphor or pun of ἐπίθειοι. κειμήλια could also be horses (Od. 4.600, 613), a fine robe of notable value (Hom. Od. 15.113, τιμηέστατον, and 101ff), or Iphitus' bow given to Odysseus as a xeinion (Hom. Od. 21.10-14). See also Hes. Fr. 2004-6; Eur. Fr. 773.12 (Nauck).
\textsuperscript{46} Ἀγητος ὁ Ἀλκείδεω, οὔτος δὴ ὁ τοῦ ἀρίστωνος φίλος (Hdt. 6.61.5). κειμηλίων (Hdt. 6.62.2).
\textsuperscript{47} δωτίνη δώσειν and διδόναι (Hdt. 6.62.1), ἔδωκε (Hdt. 6.62.2).
for the nature of this death. However, it fails on the former for its absurd conclusion, and it fails on the latter to convince of the gods’ involvement in Polycrates’ death. The former is a folk tale motif, while the latter is a literary device to give shape to the narrative. In themselves they add nothing to our knowledge of Polycrates’ rule, except that they highlight how immensely important philia was in Polycrates’ rule, whether with Amasis, or with his citizens.

We can compare the details leading to Polycrates’ death. Though Herodotus emphasises a supposed greed of wealth and success in Polycrates, the ruler does in fact embark on a relationship of philia with Oroetes, whom he plans to save from his alleged vital danger, ironically ignoring the advice of his daughter or other philoi.

Contradictions occur in this account by Herodotus too, who, for all his suggestion of Polycrates’ own hand in his downfall through greed, stresses both the unworthiness (repeating ἄξιος) of the ruler’s death, both for such a man and for his intentions and the unworthiness of any other Greek ruler, except the Deinomenids of Syracuse, to be compared to Polycrates for his expenditure on his citizens, his megaloprepeia.

---

48 The dream of Polycrates’ daughter in which her father was washed by Zeus and anointed by Helios and its interpretation as his crucifixion where he was ‘washed’ by Zeus with rain and ‘anointed’ by Helios with the sweat in the sun (Hdt. 3.124.1) are no vindication of the gods’ envy at Polycrates’ success, the reason given for the disposal of the ring (Hdt. 3.40, 126.1). That the gods’ envy as a reason for Polycrates’ death fails in the narrative explains its absence in the retelling by later authors. Strabo makes no mention of divine envy (Str. 14.1.16), nor Cicero (Cic. Fin. 5.92), while Valerius Maximus even has Neptune return the ring to Polycrates (Val. Max. 6.9 ext. 5).

49 Hdt. 3.122.3. Polycrates’ medism, or philia with the Persians is disguised by the ‘tyrannical’ topos of greed as the alleged reason, and by Herodotus’ insistence that Polycrates did not deserve the death he met at Persian hands.

50 φίλων (Hdt. 3.124.1).

51 Hdt. 3.123.1.

52 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιτόμων ἄξιος ὡς ὧν ἔστιν ἐπιτόμων φρονημάτων (Hdt. 3.125.2). Even the manner in which he was killed was not worthy of telling by his own murderer: ἀποκτείνας δὲ μὴν ὄκλα ἀξίως ἀπηγήσιος (Hdt. 3.125.3). Herodotus also stresses that the killing of Oroetes soon afterwards was retribution (τίσιες, Hdt. 3.126.1 and 128.5) for his murder of Polycrates. Polycrates’ death was not only unworthy of him, but was not sanctioned by the gods, in spite of Amasis’ prediction.

53 ἄξιος (Hdt. 3.125.2).

54 ὃς γὰρ μὴ οἱ Συρηκοσίων γενόμενοι τύραννοι οὐδὲ εἰς τῶν ἄλλων Ἕλληνων τυράννων ἄξιος ἦς Πολυκράτει μεγαλοπρεπείην συμβληθήναι (Hdt. 3.125.2). Elsewhere Herodotus stresses the scale of Deinomenid wealth and its importance in the Greek world (Hdt. 7.157.2).
I return finally to Herodotus' comment on Polycrates' piracy. The absurdity of this remark is that Polycrates' piracy is allegedly so extreme that he robs from his own philoi only to return their possessions, with the hope that their philia will become all the more resolute. Such an arrangement is entirely contrary to how philia and the inherent exchange of charis works, and its own absurdity can only be used as an excuse for the irrational character of the 'tyrant' Polycrates. The irrationality is introduced by the extreme nature of his supposed military campaigning, that he succeeded in every one of his military affairs, that he had huge numbers of both ships and archers, and that he raided everyone without exception. Even the Lesbians whom we are told he captured and set to digging the ditch around Samos, were the full force of that island. That this irrational argument for such supposed activity towards philoi is not well argued by Herodotus, is suggested by the author's clear statement that the idea was Polycrates' alone, and also by an absence of any criticism or supporting example. Once again our suspicion is alerted to absurdities and extremes, and we are left with evidence nonetheless of the importance of philia to Polycrates' rule.

The first, best, and most imitated source on Polycrates is Herodotus, with little which is new or of use added by other authors. However, Herodotus's account features exaggeration to extremes, resulting in absurdities, and even in inconsistencies in his own report. He describes Polycrates as a pirate, a robber-of-philoi, and lustful of money. It is his success in this behaviour, Herodotus suggests, which leads to Polycrates' murder and sad end, but at the same time the historian emphasises how undeserving the ruler was of this terrible death. The inconsistencies and absurdities in

---

55 Hdt. 3.39.3-4.
56 πάντα, and πάντας διακρίνων οὐδένα (Hdt. 3.39.3).
57 πανστρατιῆ (Hdt. 3.39.4). Not only that, but they dug 'the whole' ditch (τάφρον ... τάσαν, Hdt. 3.39.4).
58 Polycrates said it: ἔφη (Hdt. 3.39.4); and who could either confirm or deny this to Herodotus?
Herodotus’ account are explained by the inclusion of *topoi* we might expect from other accounts of ‘tyrants’ or of folk take, and this inclusion and the exaggeration of such motifs are at odds with other details, which are in fact more informative of Polycrates’ rule. On important historical details, such as Polycrates’ alleged capture of many other islands and cities, the sources give no credible examples, and on the Spartan invasion of Samos the given reasons conflict and the evidence suggests sustained *philia* between elements in each state. Indeed at each turn the importance which *philia* played in Polycrates’ rule on Samos is very clear, with his citizens, and with his *xenoi* in nearby states, Sparta, Egypt, and even Persia. Additionally the importance of the use of wealth on *charis* in those relationships is also very clear, for example with Amasis and Oroetes. Indeed the use of Samian wealth on *megaloprepeia*, to build monumental structures on the island, ‘the three greatest works of all the Greeks’, is highlighted by Herodotus in his closing comments on Samos, even used as justification for his lengthy account of its ruler.

### 5.2 Wealth and Philia

Before my later assessment of the place of religion within Polycrates’ networks of *philia*, I shall first outline the extent of those *philiai*, firstly abroad from Samos, and then on Samos itself, highlighting the most important examples of the use of wealth, as *xeinia* and as *megaloprepeia*. I shall demonstrate that these uses of wealth supported Polycrates’ rule, not simply through the potential financial or military support which a *xenos* might supply or through the popular approval of the Samian people, but through the shared *kudos* of associated magnificence in the use of each other’s wealth.
5.2.2 Xenia and the Use of Wealth

Greek interstate *philia*, then, could assist in securing and sustaining power and rule, to the mutual benefit of each *philos*. These *philiai* required expenditure in the form of gifts, whether in the form of military support or other *xenia*, and these gifts were also suitable at the religious sanctuaries of their *philoi*, such as the offerings by Spartans at the Samian Heraion from the seventh century. It might seem that the gods of one’s *philos* were also potentially one’s own *philoi*.

The example in our sources of a first *philia* between Polycrates and an individual in another Greek state is that with Lygdamis of Naxos. The sources say that Lygdamis at first assisted Pisistratus with military support to ensure his position as ruler in Athens, before Pisistratus repaid the debt and established Lygdamis as ruler on Naxos\(^59\). In turn, it is said that Lygdamis helped to install Polycrates as ruler on Samos\(^60\). These may be examples of opportunisti\(^c\) use of wealth to install supportive and useful *philoi*, but, since we know that Pisistratus was re-establishing a position as ruler which he had lost\(^61\), that Lygdamis had previously been in some important position on Naxos\(^62\), and that Polycrates’ rule followed that of at least his father Aeaces\(^63\), it is possible that these

---

\(^{59}\) Hdt. 1.61.4, 64.1-2; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol*. 15.2-3. Lavelle argues that Pisistratus assisted Lygdamis before his own restoration in Athens (Lavelle 2005: 138), but Costa argues the opposite (Costa 1992: 163-4). The order of things does not matter to my analysis. The significance of the need for and use of wealth is highlighted by Pisistratus’ campaign in the north of Greece to acquire wealth to assist him with his return to power (Hdt. 1.64.1; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol*. 15.2).

\(^{60}\) Polyaeon. 1.23.2. See Constantakopoulou 2007: 66.


\(^{62}\) Aristotle tells us that Lygdamis was a member of the oligarchy on Naxos (Arist. *Pol*. 1305a39-42), and that he held a *stratēgia* prior to his rule (Ath. 348c, quoting Aristotle’s *Constitution of the Naxians*: ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς στρατηγίας τύραννος ἰδεῖσθαι τῆς πατρίδος). Sheedy (Sheedy 2006) argues for two periods of rule for Lygdamis, which Costa dismisses (Costa 1992: 161).

\(^{63}\) For the arguments of earlier Aeacid rule and therefore dynasty see Shipley 1987: 68-72. A statue of c. 540BC, relating to the Heraion, with its inscription (M.L. 16), is important supporting archaeological evidence not only of the ruler of Polycrates’ father, but his important religious role as temple officiator. The inscription may post-date the statue (see Jeffery 1990: 330-1; Barron 1964: 218-9; Shipley 1987: 71), but that would not deny its earlier Aeacid dedication. In any case, Jeffery is comfortable that both the statue and its inscription could date to the period of Polycrates’ own rule, and that this Aeaces was indeed Polycrates’ father. On the arguments surrounding the problems of succession, which Herodotus relates (Hdt. 3.39.2), see Mitchell 2013: 109-10; Forsdyke 2005: 66-7; Shipley 1987: 72. On the debate of
philiai between individual geneis in other states pre-existed their individual period of rule. Still, if these were brand new philiai, then they nonetheless worked to good effect, and their importance to each ruler is perhaps suggested by some synchronicity of the duration of each rule, and also by Spartan individuals’ initiatives as philos to the Pisistratids and Samians. Philia between Spartan individuals and Samos was long-standing and established⁶⁴, and we are told that Spartans shared a similar philia with the Pisistratids. The Spartans regretted their hand in Hippias’ expulsion since the Pisistratids were xenoi⁶⁵. Instead of these philoi, ‘a people who did not deal in charis’ took their place in Athens⁶⁶.

Indeed Spartan behaviour towards the states of Athens, Naxos, and Samos in this period is suggestive of a network of complex relationships which required some careful management. Whatever the precise reasons for the Spartan assault on Samos in 525BC and their relationship with Polycrates himself⁶⁷, this assault followed soon after the death of Pisistratus, and we are told that the Spartans negotiated with Lygdamis on Naxos beforehand⁶⁸. The Herodotean account of continued Spartan philia with the

---

⁶⁴ See n. 26 above for the archaeological record.
⁶⁵ Hdt. 5.90.1 and 91.2: ξείνους. The Spartans feared that they had been tricked by the Alcmaeonids and their alleged bribery of the oracle at Delphi (Hdt. 5.62-65.4).
⁶⁶ Hdt. 5.91.2: δήμων ἀχαρίστω.
⁶⁷ It may simply have been the case that although Spartans shared philia with some Samians at this time, the Aeacids did not, but we cannot know. We also cannot assume from Herodotus that the persuasion by some Samians for Spartan assistance to end Polycrates’ rule indicates that there was no philia between Spartans and Polycrates, since the Spartan philia with the Pisistratids serves as a pertinent example of such a possibility.
⁶⁸ [Plu.] Apophthegmata Laconica 236D (=no. 67). Leahy (Leahy 1957) argues that the negotiations were for Lygdamis’ support of the Spartan assault on Polycrates’ Samos, such support being very useful, since Lygdamis was Polycrates’ philos. There is a tradition that the Spartans deposed Lygdamis at about this time (based on Plu. Moralia 869d (= de Mal. Her. 21) and Σ Aeschines 2.77, both of which are cursory lists of Spartan expulsion of tyrants. The dating is insecure, but assumed to be mid-to-late fifth century because of its association with the Pisistratids and Cleisthenes of Sicyon in the latter of these references, but the former reference includes the Cypselids and other tyrants of unknown dates.
Pisistratids after Pisistratus' death and during the rule in Athens of Hippias/Hipparchus, and also Spartan *philia* with and dedication at Samos after their failed attack on Polycrates' rule on the island, indicate the activity of a delicate network of *philoi*, whose balance was complex to control for each party. The Spartan activity also reinforces the evidence for a network of *philia* between Samos, Naxos, and Athens. At the same time, the contradictory reasons offered by Sparta and Samos, in Herodotus' account, for Sparta's attack on Samos, despite their contradictions, focus upon the use of wealth to aid or as gifts to *philoi*. The Spartans accuse the Samians of the theft of their gift to their *philos* Croesus, and of another gift which they were due to receive from their *philos* Amasis; the Samians allege that the Spartans assisted some aggrieved Samians in recompense for past Samian *euergetia*\(^69\). Despite the tension of the Spartan campaign to Samos, there is evidence that *philia* still endured between the Samians and at least some of the Spartans, since one of the most accomplished Spartan soldiers was honoured with Samian wealth and a public funeral. The son of this Spartan would be named Samius, and he honoured the Samians above all other xenoi\(^70\). The soldier's family and the Samians as a whole shared in the *kudos* associated with the *charis* afforded by the public funeral.

Something similar or the same could apply to *philia* between Greek individuals or rulers and others outside of the Greek world. Polycrates intended, after the end of his *philia* with Amasis of Egypt, to embrace the *philia* of the Persian Oroetes, saving him and inviting him to Samos as *xenos* in return for a share of Oroetes' wealth. The cruel

---

\(^{69}\) Spartan *xeinia* with Croesus (Hdt. 3.47.1) and with Amasis (Hdt. 3.47.1-3). Spartan recompense of Samian *euergetia*: εὐεργεσίας ἐκτίνοντες (Hdt. 3.47.1).

\(^{70}\) Hdt. 3.55.
joke is that, after killing Polycrates, Oroetes released the Samian's philoi who had accompanied him, telling them that they received his charis through their release. Other examples of the significance of the use of wealth in acts of charis to philoi outside of Greece are the Spartan gifts to Amasis of Egypt and Croesus of Lydia. Of Croesus' bowl, Herodotus says little, but the amount of detail and the admiration he shows for the expense of the corselet for Amasis, though it likely betrays a Spartan source, also intimates the level of expenditure on an act of charis from one state-philos to another. The cloth was embroidered with gold thread, each of which comprised three hundred and sixty discernible gold strands. Herodotus compares the corselet to that dedicated by Amasis at Athene's temple at Lindos, and lists other dedications by Amasis at religious sites in Greece. These include a gold-plated statue of Athene and a painting of himself to Cyrene, and two stone statues, in addition to the corselet, to the temple of Athene at Lindos. Herodotus makes it very clear that this type of dedication to the god of a Greek state's sanctuary could ordinarily be an act of charis, out of xenia, to the state's ruler. This is reinforced by his comparative comment that the dedications at Lindos were specifically not a result of xenia. In contrast Herodotus singles out the gifts of Amasis at the Heraion on Samos, two wooden images of himself which the historian witnessed himself, given as part of the xenia between both himself and Polycrates (κατὰ ξεινίην τὴν ἑωυτοῦ τε καὶ Πολυκράτεος). The kudos which we can expect the

71 Hdt. 3.125.3.
72 Hdt. 3.47.
73 Hdt. 3.47.3.
74 Herodotus again remarks on it being 'well worth seeing' (Hdt. 2.182.1).
75 As at Hdt. 2.182.2.
76 ἐς μὲν νυν Σάμον ἀνέθηκε κατὰ ξεινίην τὴν ἑωυτοῦ τε καὶ Πολυκράτεος τοῦ Αἰάκεος, ἐς δὲ Λίνδον ξεινίης μὲν οὐδεμίης εἶνεκεν (Hdt. 2.182.2). He says that Amasis dedicated the offerings at Lindos out of a mythological debt, because traditionally (λέγεται) the temple had been founded by Danaus' daughter, who fled Egypt and the sons of Aegyptus (Hdt. 2.182.2). The contrast with Samos might betray Herodotus' Samian sympathy and sources; Lloyd dismisses Herodotus' reasoning (in Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella 2007: 378; Lloyd 1988: 239).
Samians to have enjoyed in these precious gifts endured in Herodotus' account, which emphasises their expense and importance to the philoi involved.

Philiai between the rulers of states were fundamental to the establishment and security of rule, for each party. Such philiai were opportunistic, might even demand military support, but were fostered by a mutual understanding of each other's usefulness, and by acts of charis which supported and reinforced these associations and debts. Through the use of wealth and its investment in these acts of charis, and charis in return, reassurance was given of the sustaining philia. Dedication at a religious sanctuary within one's philos' state was one way of performing an act of charis for a philos, the benefit of which was presumably a shared kudos both for dedicating individual and their city and for the recipient ruler and his city\(^{77}\). Herodotus marks out no finer examples than the dedications of Amasis to Polycrates' Heraion on Samos.

5.2.3 Samian Megaloprepeia

We can probably assume that Polycrates, not only through the welcome dedication and gifts from xenoi, but also through his own expenditure in his own city, his megaloprepeia, brought kudos for Samos. The most magnificent and famed of his megaloprepeia must have been the three monumental works listed and highlighted by Herodotus\(^{78}\), and given as justification for his lengthy account of Samian affairs during Polycrates' rule. All three of these monuments were acts of euergesia, not only benefiting the citizens through the kudos they surely brought, but benefiting the citizens

---

\(^{77}\) Compare the most famous of examples, the sanctuaries at Olympia and Delphi.

\(^{78}\) The tunnel which brought fresh water to the city, the harbour mole, and the Temple of Hera. See n. 4 in this chapter.
financially, domestically, and religiously, and all three of which undoubtedly incurred vast expenditure\(^{79}\).

However, before I discuss shortly these notable monuments of infrastructure, there is some evidence of Polycrates' financial investment in *philoi* on a smaller scale. Alexis, a Samian writer of the island’s history, tells us that Polycrates possessed items which he would lend to those celebrating a wedding or even larger occasions. We are also told of his importation from a number of cities, in order to 'decorate Samos', of dogs, of animals for herding, and also of craftsmen, all 'at the greatest expense', and for all this his rule was 'worthy of wonder'\(^{80}\). Douris, another Samian historian, writes that Polycrates entrusted, as a gift, the subsistence of mothers who had become bereft of income, as a result of male family deaths in war, to the wealthy citizens of Samos\(^{81}\).

Examples of these 'craftsmen'\(^{82}\) of which we know are poets and a doctor of fame, namely Ibycus, Anacreon, and Democedes. Ibycus of Rhegium was invited to Samos by Polycrates or by his father\(^{83}\), but Polycrates' patronage of the poet is clear from an existing poem\(^{84}\) celebrating Polycrates' beauty, which will bring him immortal glory through Ibycus' song, and he will share in Ibycus' own glory, which comes through his

---

\(^{79}\) We must dismiss Aristotle’s generalisation (τὸ τυραννικὸν) that 'tyrants' (Ar. *Pol*. 1313b18-25) engage in large-scale building projects to keep their citizens busy and poor, quoting Polycrates' works as an example. On such typology see most recently Mitchell 2013: 32-4, 161-3. The same is true of the supposition that these projects created jobs for the city's poor (Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 110). Another example of this typology attributed to Polycrates is the tyrant's removal of the palaestra, which would be a place for potential rivals to foster support to overthrow the ruler (Ath. 13.78 (Kaibel)=Hieronymus Rhodius fr. 34 (Wehrli)). On the doubtful historicity of this act see Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 115 n. 28, though she herself perpetuates the *topoi* (see Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 109). On these *topoi* of tyranny, formed in ancient times, see Arist. *Pol*. 1313a39-b21, and on the palaestra specifically see Arist. *Pol*. 1313b1-6.

\(^{80}\) Alexis FHG F2 (quoted in Ath. 12.57 (Kaibel). The expenditure: ἐπὶ μισθοῖς μεγίστοις. Clytus says instead that Polycrates' imports were to gratify his own luxury, and Clearchus also depicts him as indulgent, as well as effeminate; *topoi* of the tyrant (Clytus fr. 2 and Cearch. fr. 44 (Müller), quoted in Ath. 12.57 (Kaibel)).

\(^{81}\) Duris FGrH 76 F 49 (quoted in Zen. 5.64). Polycrates' gift (δέδωκε and δίδωμι) instituted a maxim, 'I give you a mother' (μητέρα σοι ταύτην δίδωμι).

\(^{82}\) Alexis' word is τεχνίτης, which can apply to all artistic skills. The craftsmen are not listed by name in Alexis' text, but are given elsewhere.

\(^{83}\) See Wilkinson 2012: 6-8. The issue essentially lies in the dating of Polycrates' rule, his accession, and the variant sources on these matters.

\(^{84}\) Ibyc. 282 (=Page 263 = *P. Oxy*.1790 fr. 1).
singing\textsuperscript{85}. Anacreon of Teos, whose poetry was 'full of Polycrates'\textsuperscript{86} also enjoyed Polycrates' patronage, and after the ruler's death, Anacreon was invited to Athens by the Pisistratid Hipparchus. We are told Hipparchus managed this 'at great expense and with the persuasion of gifts\textsuperscript{87}, and with the aim that such a poet, along with Simonides of Ceos, might educate his citizens, and that the Athenians might be the best they could be\textsuperscript{88}. The medic Demoededes of Croton too was a close \emph{philos}\textsuperscript{89} of Polycrates, who was persuaded to come to Samos after Polycrates' expenditure of two talents. Prior to that he had worked in Athens and Aegina, and Herodotus is not only at pains to list his varying salaries, but also their increasing values\textsuperscript{90}.

Polycrates' investment in the infrastructure of his city was at vast expense. Of the three monumental works of Polycrates' rule\textsuperscript{91}, two may be said to have a more obviously economic purpose, the harbour mole, which could now give mooring to Polycrates' larger ships\textsuperscript{92}, and the tunnel, which fed spring water into the city from over a kilometre to its north. Polycrates' underground aqueduct was a remarkable feat of engineering. Its architect was Eupalinus\textsuperscript{93}, who arranged for the tunnel to be dug at either end, meeting at the middle, under the city's acropolis. Eupalinus was Megarian, and an aqueduct built for Pisistratus bears some similarity to that of Polycrates,

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{85} σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἀφθιτον ἔξεις | ώς καὶ ἄοιδάν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος (Ibyc. 282.47-8).
\bibitem{86} Strabo tells us this (Str. 14.1.16), though sadly the extant fragments do not give good account. Whether Anacreon was invited by Polycrates' father or by Polycrates himself is also debated (again, relating to the issues of dating and accession, and in this case, specifically based on the reading of Him. Or. 29.22 (Colonna)), but, as with Ibycus, Polycrates' patronage is evident.
\bibitem{87} [Pl.] \emph{Hipparch.} 228c: μεγάλοις μισθοῖς καὶ δώροις πείθων.
\bibitem{88} [Pl.] \emph{Hipparch.} 228b-c.
\bibitem{89} Herodotus calls him a \emph{hetairos}, and one of those who accompanied Polycrates on his visit to Oroetes (Hdt. 3.125.1).
\bibitem{90} Hdt. 3.131.1-2.
\bibitem{91} I follow Shipley in his dating of the monuments, and his backdating of Polycrates' rule to the 540s (Shipley 1987: 74-80). Aristotle indeed calls the three monuments \emph{ἔργα Πολυκράτεια} (Arist. \emph{Pol.} 1313b24).
\bibitem{92} Shipley 1987: 76.
\bibitem{93} Hdt. 3.60.3.
\end{thebibliography}
indicating that both works might be of the same architect\textsuperscript{94}. The undertaking of the Samian aqueduct's construction was vast\textsuperscript{95}, as was surely the expenditure on such a project, and its purpose was to ensure a fresh water supply for the citizens of Samos. There is no reason to think that the larger harbour was solely for Polycrates' Herodotean hundred penteconters\textsuperscript{96} and the protection which the mole would bring would presumably have helped all Samian seafaring, trade and fishing\textsuperscript{97}.

Additionally, to Polycrates and his rule is also attributed the invention of the Samaina, which was singled out by some sources as different to other ships, in that it had a wider hold\textsuperscript{98} and a boar-shaped prow\textsuperscript{99}, the purpose of which was that it could carry a greater load and go faster\textsuperscript{100}. It was also fully decked over\textsuperscript{101}. Given the similarity, as well as the differences, between the distinguishing features of the Samaina and the penteconter, it is quite possible that Herodotus' reference to penteconters is in fact to Polycrates' Samainas\textsuperscript{102}. It has long been wrongly assumed that Polycrates' Samaina was a warship, but it was not. Its design demonstrates this, and the sources do not

\textsuperscript{94} Shipley suggests a Megarian tradition for such building work, based on a fountain constructed for its ruler Theagenes (Paus. 1.40.1), and notes that these monuments are often associated with 'tyrants' (Shipley 1987: 77; Parker 2007: 34). On the tunnel's feat of engineering, see Goodfield and Toultmin 1965; Van der Waerden 1968; Burns 1971, who notes the contemporary Athenian tunnel (173). The Pisistratids did famously build a fountain in the Athenian Agora (Paus. 1.14.1).

\textsuperscript{95} Estimates for the time it would have taken for its construction vary from five to fifteen years (see Shipley 1987: 77), the most conservative estimate being based upon an assumption that work continued around the clock.

\textsuperscript{96} Hdt. 3.39.3.

\textsuperscript{97} We remember the gift of the fisherman to Polycrates in Herodotus' tale (Hdt. 3.42).

\textsuperscript{98} Plu. Per. 26.3; Hsch. σ.148 (referencing Didymus)

\textsuperscript{99} Plu. Per. 26.3; Hsch. s.v. σάμαινα, and σ.148 (referencing Didymus); Phot. Lexicon s.v. σάμαινα.

\textsuperscript{100} Plu. Per. 26.3: φορτοφορεῖν καὶ ταχυναυτέ̄ρ̄ν. Walinga (Walinga 1993: 93-9) disputes the interpretation of φορτοφορεῖν, preferring ποντοπορεῖν, which is attested in Plutarch and earlier literature. This makes little difference to his argument and mine that the Samaina was a trading vessel. Walinga extends his argument to venture that the Samaina was a vessel for transporting mercenaries, explicable by a reference to it having two banks of oars (mentioned only in Lysim, FHG. III 339, fr. 15), which he thinks suggests a need for urgency that mere grain transportation would not require (Walinga 1993: 96). Stein-Hölkeskamp (Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 109) perpetuates this alleged use of mercenaries without reference, though she makes an important observation that people's observation at the time did not generally or at least clearly differentiate war, trade, and piracy.

\textsuperscript{101} Hsch. s.v. σάμαινα, and σ.148 (referencing Didymus): κατέστρωντο δι’ ὅλου.

\textsuperscript{102} Walinga 1993: 94 and n. 74. Herodotus' focus is an alleged aggressive use by Polycrates of his naval power (Hdt. 3.39.3-4).
suggest otherwise. Its wider hold and its fully-covered deck mark it out as a trading vessel.\(^{103}\) The Samaina took its name from Samos, from where it originated, and there is even suggestion that Polycrates named it.\(^{104}\) Evidently this ship became iconic of Samos, recognised in its name, and in the presumed kudos which it brought to Samos and Polycrates, and, later, even in the iconography of the coinage of the Samians.\(^{105}\) It was presumably, in part at least, for this merchantman that Polycrates developed the harbour on Samos, investing heavily in Samian trade and in his citizens’ prospect of wealth.

Polycrates’ Samos enjoyed the rich dedications of its xenoι at its Heraion, and this inter-state xenia was fostered and even generated by each city’s ruler. This sharing of wealth in the form of charis decorated each xenos’ city and assured each philos of their lasting philia, surely sanctioned in fact by the gods to whom they dedicated. Polycrates himself decorated Samos with importation of goods and intellectuals and the construction of monuments which demonstrated his wealth, and his willingness to use it as euergesia for his citizens, and our sources emphasis both the scale of Polycrates’ megaloprepeia and the expenditure involved in such activity.

\(^{103}\) Walinga 1993: 95.

\(^{104}\) Lysim. FHG. III 339, fr. 15; Plu. Per. 26.3: Ath. 12.57.18-20 (Kaibel). If its derivation is Σάμος+αἰνός, and we can place trust in the suggestions that its name was sanctioned by Polycrates, then its meaning would be ’truly Samian’, using αἰνός in its adverbial sense. One can appreciate that an alternative meaning of ’terror of Samos’, with αἰνός in its nominal sense, might suggest a warship or a vehicle of piracy, but the sources which reference the name of Samaina do not support this whatsoever.

\(^{105}\) The prow of a ship on the reverse of coins of Samian Zancle (Samians colonised Zancle in Sicily during part of the first quarter of the fifth century) has been interpreted as a Samaina (Robinson 1946: 13-15, 20), the evidence being the notoriety of the Samian invention of the Samaina, but also because the Samian type of the lion’s scalp on the obverse of the Zancle coin. The direction of the prow, facing to the left, has even been interpreted as indicative of the Samian migration westwards (Boardman 1988). There are much later coins of Samos island which feature the same type (Robinson 1946: 15). Photius also references Didymus, who says that the Samaina was a coin type (Phot. Lexicon s.v. Σαμίων ὁ δήμος). Additionally, Plutarch tells us that after the revolt of Samos in the Peloponnesian War the Samians and Athenians branded their respective prisoners of war with their own coin types, Athenian prisoners branded with the ’owl’, the Samian prisoners with the ’Samaina’ (Plu. Per. 26.3-4). These Samians in Zancle, Sicily, wanted their coinage, and therefore perhaps themselves, to be considered distinctively Samian, and it would appear that the Samainas, even a generation after Polycrates’ death and which was continuously associated with Polycrates, became symbolic of Samos even outside of Samos itself.
5.3 Wealth, Coinage, and Religious Philiai

Polycrates' investment in his city, his citizens, and their xenoi was fostered not only in new infrastructure for trade and domestic wellbeing and necessity, in importation and invention of trading vehicles for both imports and exports, in religious occasion and decoration shared with Samians and xenoi alike, but also in the reintroduction of the city's coinage. Indeed the coinage of Samos complemented the desired facility for trade and use of wealth on its philoi, the desire to honour its city and its citizens, and the desire to honour its most important gods and perhaps share in the kudos which their shrines and their activity generated.

5.3.2 Introduction and use of Coinage

Samos minted some coinage in electrum from the early sixth century, which may have been sustained for only a generation. If Polycrates inherited this coinage\textsuperscript{106}, he quickly made changes, in fabric, in standard, in denominations, and in type. The new silver coinage\textsuperscript{107} initially featured the inherited type of the lion's head scalp and the Euboeic weight standard, but Polycrates replaced the type with that of a winged boar, removing the lion to the reverse, thereby creating Samos' first two-sided coins. He also changed

\textsuperscript{106} There is not enough evidence to prove that electrum coins produced in the intervening years are Samian (Barron 1966: 17). Barron and Kraay both believe Samos' first silver coinage to be that of Polycrates, and therefore that it was minted from c. 530BC, a date at one time accepted for his accession simply on the evidence of Eusebius and Thucydides, shown by Mitchell (Mitchell 1975: 81-2) to be erroneous (Shipley 1987: 74-5). This leads Barron to squeeze issues of silver Euboeic hektai, followed by Lydio-Milesian hektai, and followed then by the winged-boar drachms into a space of approximately eight years (c. 530-c. 522BC). It is possible to accept Barron's reconstruction of Samian coinage, but still allow for a back-dating of Polycrates' accession.

\textsuperscript{107} Kraay (Kraay 1976: 29) posits that since no electrum coinage can be dated to Polycrates' rule, the city's coinage may previously have been changed to silver, but we do not have such coinage, and Kraay himself believes that minting began again under Polycrates after a period of no production (Kraay 1976, Kraay 1976, Kraay 1976, Kraay 1976: 36). The silver was imported to the island through trade or possibly mined on the mainland opposite Samos (Kraay 1976: 29-30). Kraay also suggests that the leaden coinage, attested in Herodotus (Hdt. 3.56.2) was minted for internal use when a supply of silver, perhaps from the mainland, was temporarily cut off.
the standard to that of Lydio-Milesian, the significance of which I discuss below. That this new coinage was minted, after a period of inactivity, in a new fabric but retained the type and standard of the old coinage is striking for its suggestion of continuity in Samos’ coin production. That this conservative coinage was soon replaced by a new standard and type, in greater frequency and in smaller denominations, is striking for its innovation. While the former might indicate Polycrates’ willingness to demonstrate his debt to an Aeacid dynasty or Samian oligarchy, as well as his commitment to the economic opportunity which coinage could bring to the citizens of Samos, the latter must indicate some change in political and economic intentions.

The change in the standard used for Samian coinage, from Euboeic to Lydio-Milesian, has been seen as an abandonment of philia with Athens, which used the Euboeic standard, in favour of that with Persia and Persian Ionia\textsuperscript{108}. However, there is no need to see this move as indicative of any break in philia with Athens, but rather an opportunistic move, in the context of an initially conservative reinstated coinage, to reflect the potentially most favourable economic avenues for Samos. Polycrates’ bold reintroduction of Samos’ coinage and move to align it with Ionia may possibly have been a change from the city’s past trade tendencies, but nonetheless purposeful. Indeed such action may be more evidence of Polycrates’ interest less in piracy than trade with his island and mainland neighbours\textsuperscript{109}. That this move was related to trade

\textsuperscript{108} Barron 1966: 37; Kraay 1976: 36. Kraay is more cautious with his conclusion than Barron, stating only that this action demonstrated close ties with Persian Ionia.

\textsuperscript{109} See Shipley 1987: 82. Shipley is determined to argue against a discernible ‘economic policy’, arguing instead that Polycrates ‘capitalized on his social position as any other aristocrat would’ in favour of a general interest in trade. I agree; Polycrates’ economic interests were in trade with philoi, as a ruling aristocrat with others, and additionally as a ruler to his own people. These relationships of philia worked as long as each partner benefited, but they were not an ‘economic policy’ to the exclusion of other philoi or in that they endured beyond a mutually beneficial relationship. As an example, Shipley follows Cartledge (Shipley 1987: 83; Cartledge 1982: 252) that Polycrates’ importation of Spartan goods is no indicator of an ‘economic policy’, given Spartan hostility towards Samos late in Polycrates’ rule and Samian insistence that this action by Sparta was in fact the result of a previous Spartan debt (\textit{i.e. philia/xenia}) to Samians (Hdt. 3.47.1).
with philoi may be reflected in the end of Polycrates' philia with Amasis of Egypt, and the embrace of philia with Persia, the two occasions which mark out Polycrates' rule and its end in Herodotus' narrative\textsuperscript{110}.

Polycrates introduced a number of smaller denominations to his series, which Barron assumes is at odds with the literary tradition of Polycrates' megaloprepeia. This argument is based upon the assumption that larger denominations indicate a greater wealth, and greater expenditure, but the assumption is faulty. Barron uses this position to bolster his argument elsewhere that there was an earlier, different ruler called Polycrates, who ruled a more prosperous Samos, but there is no need of this conjecture either\textsuperscript{111}. Instead, as Shipley clarifies, the re-introduction of coinage, greater frequency of coins, and the greater issue of smaller denominations, indicate an increased prosperity based upon the acquisition and use of wealth by a larger number of citizens. This is entirely in line with the evidence for Polycrates' enthusiastic activity in trade, and not at all at odds with his megaloprepeia which supported the city and its prosperity, recorded in the literary tradition\textsuperscript{112}.

The change in type, or rather addition of a new type, that of the winged boar, must have been significant. This iconography appeared on contemporary coinage of Clazomenae, another Ionian city, which used the same Lydio-Milesian standard as Samos\textsuperscript{113}, and it would reappear on the coins of the fifth-century Samian ruler Aeaces, which Barron suggests is at odds with the literary tradition of Polycrates' megaloprepeia. This argument is based upon the assumption that larger denominations indicate a greater wealth, and greater expenditure, but the assumption is faulty. Barron uses this position to bolster his argument elsewhere that there was an earlier, different ruler called Polycrates, who ruled a more prosperous Samos, but there is no need of this conjecture either\textsuperscript{111}. Instead, as Shipley clarifies, the re-introduction of coinage, greater frequency of coins, and the greater issue of smaller denominations, indicate an increased prosperity based upon the acquisition and use of wealth by a larger number of citizens. This is entirely in line with the evidence for Polycrates' enthusiastic activity in trade, and not at all at odds with his megaloprepeia which supported the city and its prosperity, recorded in the literary tradition\textsuperscript{112}.

The change in type, or rather addition of a new type, that of the winged boar, must have been significant. This iconography appeared on contemporary coinage of Clazomenae, another Ionian city, which used the same Lydio-Milesian standard as Samos\textsuperscript{113}, and it would reappear on the coins of the fifth-century Samian ruler Aeaces, which Barron suggests is at odds with the literary tradition of Polycrates' megaloprepeia. This argument is based upon the assumption that larger denominations indicate a greater wealth, and greater expenditure, but the assumption is faulty. Barron uses this position to bolster his argument elsewhere that there was an earlier, different ruler called Polycrates, who ruled a more prosperous Samos, but there is no need of this conjecture either\textsuperscript{111}. Instead, as Shipley clarifies, the re-introduction of coinage, greater frequency of coins, and the greater issue of smaller denominations, indicate an increased prosperity based upon the acquisition and use of wealth by a larger number of citizens. This is entirely in line with the evidence for Polycrates' enthusiastic activity in trade, and not at all at odds with his megaloprepeia which supported the city and its prosperity, recorded in the literary tradition\textsuperscript{112}.

The change in type, or rather addition of a new type, that of the winged boar, must have been significant. This iconography appeared on contemporary coinage of Clazomenae, another Ionian city, which used the same Lydio-Milesian standard as Samos\textsuperscript{113}, and it would reappear on the coins of the fifth-century Samian ruler Aeaces, which Barron suggests is at odds with the literary tradition of Polycrates' megaloprepeia. This argument is based upon the assumption that larger denominations indicate a greater wealth, and greater expenditure, but the assumption is faulty. Barron uses this position to bolster his argument elsewhere that there was an earlier, different ruler called Polycrates, who ruled a more prosperous Samos, but there is no need of this conjecture either\textsuperscript{111}. Instead, as Shipley clarifies, the re-introduction of coinage, greater frequency of coins, and the greater issue of smaller denominations, indicate an increased prosperity based upon the acquisition and use of wealth by a larger number of citizens. This is entirely in line with the evidence for Polycrates' enthusiastic activity in trade, and not at all at odds with his megaloprepeia which supported the city and its prosperity, recorded in the literary tradition\textsuperscript{112}.

\textsuperscript{110} Hdt. 3.39-43, 125 (Amasis the Egyptian), 3.120-25 (Oroetes the Persian).
\textsuperscript{111} Barron 1966: 36-7; Barron 1964. Barron also references Richter (Richter 1960: 114), who compares some impressive sculpture of the period before Polycrates to the fewer examples of his rule. Barron gives as a case in point the dedications of Cheramyes, but the date of these is insecure; Boardman (Boardman 1978: 69) places them after the middle of the century, and therefore potentially during Polycrates' rule.
\textsuperscript{112} Shipley 1987: 84-5, 89.
\textsuperscript{113} Barron 1966: 21; Healy 1967: 315-16. Both note that later it appears on coinage of Ialysus, and later still, in the fifth century, it appears on coinage of Mytilene, as well as returning to Samian coinage after a period of other types. The latter at least is seen as recognition of and shared kudos in Aeacid rule and contribution to Samos, by its ruler Aeaces (Barron 1966: 36).
recognising the Aeacid dynasty and Polycrates' earlier coinage\textsuperscript{114}. Barron suggests that the winged boar of the Samian coins was copied from that of the coins of Clazomenae, but his argument rests upon a desire to find a purely mythological origin for the icon\textsuperscript{115}. A mythological explanation would be reasonable, given the relationship between the lion's head scalp, the standard type of Samos' coins, and the temple of Hera on Samos, where at the feet of Hera's statue lay the skin of a lion\textsuperscript{116}. However, a mythological origin is not the only possibility, and given Polycrates' investment in the Heraion, which is marked out by Herodotus as one of the three great works of his rule, a new type which featured a mythological figure from another city might seem a poor choice. An alternative origin is that of Polycrates' Samaina, and its boar-shaped prow\textsuperscript{117}. Indeed we know that the Samaina became a coin type\textsuperscript{118}. Although it has been assumed that the type of the ship on the Samian coins at Zancle represents the Samaina, this coinage was short-lived and the type did not feature on the coins of Samos itself, even if its use on the coinage of Zancle in the early fifth century was a reference to the mother-city\textsuperscript{119}. Although ships were commonly compared to horses, in a long tradition dating back to Homer and supported by contemporary reference in Herodotus\textsuperscript{120}, the coincidence of Polycrates' invention of the boar-headed Samaina, his introduction of the type of the winged boar to Samos' coinage, and the fact that the Samaina became a commonly-
known coin type and one compared with the owls of Athens, is more than suggestive. I propose that the winged-boar drachms of Polycrates display an iconography, which celebrates Polycrates' rule, his Samaina, and the civic unity and identity which the Samians enjoyed in the famed ship of its time, bearing the name of their city. Though the removal of Hera's lion's head scalp to the reverse has been seen as a 'relegation' of this Heraic and civic badge\textsuperscript{121}, there is no need of this interpretation. Samos' first two-sided coinage now exhibited icons of both its new, economic and civic icon, the Samaina, and its venerated, economic and religious icon, the temple of Hera.

5.3.3 Polycrates' Use of Wealth on Religion

Polycrates' most prestigious expenditure on a sanctuary in Samos\textsuperscript{122} was on a new temple to Hera. This replaced the older temple which had burned down within a generation of its completion\textsuperscript{123}, and was 'significantly larger' than its predecessor\textsuperscript{124}, deserving Herodotus' admiration as one of the three greatest works of the Greeks and 'the biggest of all temples'\textsuperscript{125}. Polycrates' investment in this temple was then extensive, perhaps so ambitious that the temple remained unfinished in his lifetime\textsuperscript{126}, though its unique scale was apparent to Herodotus\textsuperscript{127}, who refers to several of its dedications\textsuperscript{128}. Polycrates' relationship with dedication at Samian sanctuaries was lasting, since

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{121} Barron 1966: 35.
\textsuperscript{122} He may have also been responsible for a temple of Artemis, recently identified (Tsakos 1980; Shipley 1987: 78 n. 53; 81).
\textsuperscript{123} Shipley 1987: 78.
\textsuperscript{124} Walter 1976: 93; Shipley 1987: 78.
\textsuperscript{125} Hdt. 3.60.4.
\textsuperscript{126} And not for some considerable time (Kyrieleis 1993: 100).
\textsuperscript{127} Shipley 1987: 78. Barron (Barron 1964: 213-4) is especially gloomy in his account regarding Polycrates' building programme and achievement, though this is in the context of his argument for a more austere economic backdrop to Polycrates' rule, positing a more affluent earlier rule by another conjectural Polycrates (see n. 20). Compare Barron's assessment that Polycrates' temple was 'slightly bigger' than its predecessor with Walter and Shipley (Barron 1964: 213; Walter 1976: 93; Shipley 1987: 78).
\textsuperscript{128} Hdt. 1.70.3, 3.123.1, 4.88.1, 4.152.4.
\end{flushright}
surviving is a statuette from c. 570, possibly from the Heraion, which bears his name. Two especially large structures at the Heraion, the largest in the Heraion after the temple of Hera, one just to its south and the other just to its north on the Sacred Way, were temple-like in design, though their function was possibly as treasuries, whose design imitates that of temples. Both were built in the sixth century, and importantly the latter was begun at the same time as Polycrates' temple, which was later decorated with a peripteral colonnade in the last third of the sixth century. Several other buildings in the Heraion, smaller temples and treasuries, date to this time. Certainly, then, considerable investment in Hera's temple and other temples or treasuries took place in the mid-sixth century. Two important structures, whose construction began at the same time, can be dated to Polycrates' rule, the new and largest temple of Hera itself, which I have mentioned before now, and the large building, which was likely a treasury, just to the temple's north on the Sacred Way to the temple. However, not only was considerable expenditure outlaid on these buildings themselves, but also the Heraion sanctuary was a showcase for wealth, as Herodotus confirms, giving the example of Amasis' statues, which he saw for himself. If the complementary buildings, temples or treasuries, on the Sacred Way displayed the wealth of dedications, as at Delphi and Olympia, so did the temple of Hera itself.

Polycrates also used his wealth on religious acts of charis outside of Samos, on the island of Delos and its sanctuary of Delian Apollo. As I have demonstrated, the neighbouring island of Rheneia was insignificant in itself, save for its proximity to Delos.

---

130 Kyrieleis 1993: 103-6.
131 Kyrieleis 1993: 103-4. It had previously been dated earlier than this (see Shipley 1987: 79).
134 Hdt. 2.182.1. The Heraion continued to display votive dedications much later (Str. 14.1.14).
Thucydides says that Polycrates captured the island, quoting this occasion, twice\textsuperscript{135}, as his prime example of Polycrates' aggressive seizure of islands and mainland cities, but it can have been no military conquest, given what we know of the island's capability\textsuperscript{136}. What is clear is that Rheneia became central to a religious act of \textit{charis} by Polycrates to Delian Apollo and the sanctuary. If Polycrates benefited from this action, it was through his enhanced association with the sanctuary, the \textit{kudos} we can assume he received from this association, and future \textit{philia} and \textit{charis} in return from the god and his sanctuary on Delos\textsuperscript{137}. Polycrates' act, of chaining the island of Rheneia to Delos, and thereby dedicating the former to the latter, has a similar parallel in Herodotus\textsuperscript{138}, which describes the Ephesians, under the attack of Croesus, tying their city walls to the temple of Artemis, over a kilometre away, thereby dedicating it to the goddess and in return enjoying the goddess' protection. If the Delians and Apollo's sanctuary benefited from Polycrates' dedication, it may have been as much related to their wealth and income as to any such \textit{kudos} of enhanced territory and support of an important ruler, since we know that Delos benefited financially from the lease of land estates on Rheneia by the fifth century and later, and possibly soon after and as a result of Polycrates' dedication\textsuperscript{139}. Polycrates' expenditure on Delos, through his gift of the territory of Rheneia, then enhanced Delos' wealth in return. An act of \textit{charis} much less than piracy, Polycrates' gift established or enhanced his \textit{philia} with Apollo and his sanctuary.

\textsuperscript{135} Th. 1.13.6, 3.104.2.
\textsuperscript{136} See n. 15.
\textsuperscript{137} Shipley states that 'Polycrates embarked on a propaganda exercise designed to make him the leader of the Ionians through patronage of Apollo at Delos' (Shipley 1987: 96), but the evidence cannot stretch to such a bold reconstruction; no more than the evidence can support Lavelle's assertion that Pisistratus avowed 'Athens' claims to hegemony over the Ionians' through his dedications at Delos and his removal of the island's burials to Rheneia (Lavelle 2005: 139, 228-30).
\textsuperscript{138} Hdt. 1.26.1-2. \textit{C.f. Ael. VH} 3.26; Polyaen. 6.50. Cylon is said to have attempted to secure Athena's protection at his trial in Athens through the same method (Plu. \textit{Sol.} 12.1).
Polycrates' *philía* with Apollo's sanctuary on Delos continued, and in fact developed into an association with the Panhellenic site at Delphi, when he established a Pythian and Delian games on the island of Delos, shortly before he died. These may have been the quadrennial Delian games which Thucydides describes, where a great number of Ionian and other islands and cities gathered for athletic and poetic contest, and may have been the occasion for the composition and performance of the Homeric hymn to Apollo. We do not know if Polycrates competed or was victorious in these games (he did, after all, die shortly after their inauguration), but his act of their foundation would have brought to him a quasi-heroic status, and emphasised his piety and his *philía* with the god though his funding of the games as his gift. We know also that Polycrates was a patron of poets, such as Anacreon and Ibycus, who performed at Samos and for Polycrates, but it is also possible that these artists were potential victors for Samos and Polycrates at his games on Delos in the poetic contests. Funding these games and perhaps even some of their competitors allowed Polycrates and the Samians to share the *kudos* which the festival brought to the god and his sanctuary, enhanced the Samian *philía* with the god and Delos, and even

---

140 Suda s.v. Πύθια καὶ Δήλια.
141 Th. 3.104. The athletic contests at some point stopped taking place, though choral performances continued. The Athenians much later (426/5BC) purified the island, as Pisistratus once had, and re-established these events.
142 Burkert 1979; Burkert 1987: 54. See Munn 2006: 212 n. 120, for further bibliography on this, and on the unity of the hymn, which features both the Delian and Pythian sanctuaries, on both historical and thematic grounds.
143 Compare the foundation myths of the Olympian Games by Pelops (Pi. Ol. 1) or by Heracles (Pi. Ol. 10). Hieron of Syracuse, an Olympic and Pythian victor, founded the city of Aetna and may have marked the event with games (Σ Pi. P. 1, Drachmann 1910: 5:12-13), and the people of the Chersonese, who had asked Miltiades to found their city, honoured him posthumously with games (Hdt. 6.38.1). We know of no Panhellenic victories of Polycrates, or that he founded a city, but the foundation of jointly Pythian and Delian games at the Panhellenic sanctuary on Delos likely demonstrated his heroic intentions. Cleisthenes, the ruler of Sicyon, founded Pythian games in his city (Σ Pi. N. 9.1-20 Drachmann 1926; Braswell 1998: 59-60).
144 Parker 2007: 34.
145 There were musical contests (Th.3.104.4).
therefore potentially the *philia* and influence further abroad, with the cities of the celebrants and victors.

The *megaloprepeia* of Polycrates was not only the magnificent use of his wealth, but also the nurture of the wealth of his *philoi*. The *philia* between the ruler and his citizens was mutually beneficial, economically, and for their shared *kudos* in Samian achievement. Domestically, this expenditure was invested in infrastructure, opportunities for trade, and in religious activity which united Samians, even ruler and ruled. The Heraion at Samos was a hub for dedicants and their shared display of wealth, either as Samians or *xenoi* of Samians; the site expanded its monuments to accommodate this joint worship and display, all acts of *charis* to Samian Hera whose *philia* they shared. Polycrates began to invest in the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos in perhaps a similar fashion, before his death presumably curtailed the development of such expenditure. The revenue from new land estates on Rheneia and from athletic and poetic contests were gifts from Polycrates which then too associated Delian (and Pythian) Apollo with the Samian ruler, and therefore in turn with the Samian citizens. All of this religious activity brought gods, rulers, citizens, and all of their *philoi* closer; all shared in the *kudos* of its success. Such a network and such activity were only possible through the use of wealth, however, and it would seem for Samos that this wealth was essentially acquired through trade, not piracy. The benefit of trade, the use of wealth, and the religious *philia* which helped unite all Samians is embodied in Polycrates' new coinage, the shared and distributed emblem of Samian wealth, minted on a new standard which facilitated trade with its neighbours, displaying for the first time, on

---

146 Compare Nagy's (Nagy 1990: 192-7; Mitchell 2013: 70) view of the epinician hymn for victors at games, which associated the victor and his city with a mythological and heroic past, bringing them closer. So too, Polycrates' *euergesia* and the *kudos* its result carried, associated ruler and ruled and brought them closer, as *philoi*, mutually benefiting each other.

147 The international character of the dedications at the Heraion from the eighth century has often been noted (Kilian-Dirrmeier 1985).
obverse and reverse, the iconography of both Samian trade (the Samaina) and Samian religious centre (Samian Hera).

* * *

Polycrates was a wealthy ruler, notoriously so, but he invested his wealth in his philoi, namely his citizens, his xenoi and their gods. The expenditure took different forms, but all of these charites complemented the philia, which was nurtured between ruler, ruled, and friends abroad. Amid accusations of piracy, the writing of history was influenced by those who found philia elsewhere or who sought to distance themselves from Polycrates' activity after the end of his dynasty's rule. However, the ruler of Samos financed works of megaloprepeia, at great expense, which ensured through his euergesia the continuing economic progress and success of his city and its people; Samos' needs were met with a vast and reliable water supply; a safer harbour and new ships of trade brought kudos to the city as well as secured its finances and a wide sphere of economic activity, including broad-based importation; a new coinage, whose distribution facilitated commerce at many levels, for citizens of wealth large and small, displayed upon it the united symbols of Samos' wealth, the Samaina ship, and of Samos' religious fame, its temple to Hera. The Heraion was as much a hub for the display of wealth as Samos' harbour was for its trade, and the network of philoi benefitted from the shared kudos, which their display of wealth generated, in monument and in dedication. So too at Delos, Polycrates' gifts of new territory to the sanctuary and new games in Apollo's honour demonstrated his financial investment in the religious site, and a philia with Apollo. The charites of xenoi in dedication at the Samian Heraion, such as those of Amasis, were equally considered xenia to Polycrates, such was the
close relationship of ruler and gods, and this may have been further demonstrated by the construction of a treasury at the Heraion, to store the wealth of the ruler, his city, his people, and their shared god. There was a unifying nature in the city's coinage, and in the channel of its wealth, through interdependent *philiai* and through the hub of the religious sanctuary. Presiding over this channel of wealth and *charites* was Polycrates, whose rule was marked by the *kudos* which this activity propagated and whose position as ruler was sanctioned as a result.
6 Battiad Philia and Rule

The Battiad dynasty, based at Cyrene in North Africa but encompassing other cities in the region, spanned eight generations from the foundation of Cyrene\(^1\). Since Cyrene was itself founded and ruled by the first of these generations, we can observe here a long-standing sequence of rule which was legitimated by Delphi and Apollo Archegetes from the very first\(^2\). Since our sources remain largely the same as for those other rulers, in particular the works of Herodotus and Pindar, we can reasonably draw comparison to assess whether we can observe similar patterns in the rule of the Battiads. Not all of the eight Battiad rulers are given equal account in the sources, but we have sufficient detail on, in particular, Battus I, Battus II, Arcesilas II, Battus, III, Arcesilas III, and Arcesilas IV to allow us a decent examination of the dynasty. In the first place I shall interpret the enduring relationship between Delphi, Apollo and the Battiads, testing this as an example of *philia* and measuring how this *philia* complemented both Battiad rule and the stature of Apollo and Delphi, bringing *kudos* to *philoi*, and indeed how it extended *philia* between ruler, Cyreneans, and Apollo. This will allow me to examine an episode in Battiad rule for which we have a detailed account, during the reigns of Arcesilas III, and measure this moment in terms of *philia*. Finally I shall analyse Battiad *philia* with another Greek city, Samos, and with non-Greek regimes. This will involve some interpretation of Cyrenean trade and coinage, and their relation to such *philiai*.

The following questions will be addressed in turn, in order to assess the Battiads' expenditure on *philia*, secular and religious, and the relationship between such activity and their rule:

How important to the dynasty’s rule was the Battiad *philia* with Delphian Apollo?

---

\(^1\) From the mid-seventh century to the mid-fifth century BC (Osborne 1996: 15; Chamoux 1953: 205-9).

\(^2\) Compare the Delphic oracles which validated Cypselus’ ruler, as discussed in chapter 2.
Can the issues with the rule of Arcesilas III, as described by Herodotus, be viewed as breakdowns in *philia*?

Can the Battiad relationships with other states be considered *philai*, and did these relationships benefit Battiad rule?

6.1 Apollo and the Battiads

We are told by our sources that Apollo watched over the Battiads from even before the foundation of Cyrene, sending Battus, otherwise Aristoteles, in an oracle delivered at Delphi to Libya to be a future founder of a city. The accounts diverge as to the exact process of foundation, but Delphi’s significant involvement and the role of Apollo Archegetes are stressed in the sources. However, the relationship continues strongly beyond the foundation of Cyrene, and Delphi is consulted again and again by the Battiads and the Cyreneans. Apollo’s presence in Cyrene is paramount, both on the acropolis and in the agora, and the Battiad connection with the god is predominant in Arcesilas IV’s Pythian victory and Pindar’s hymns on this, and in Callimachus’ Hymn to Apollo. The enduring relationship of Apollo and the Battiads is evident in the very fabric of Cyrene, and I shall argue that this is an example of *philia* which is exploited by the city’s rulers in such a way as to bring *kudos* to their position, divinely sanctioned, perhaps seemingly inviolable. I shall also argue that the Battiads demonstrated this *philia* and encouraged their citizens to enjoy their own *philia* with Apollo, facilitated by their ruler, both in their religious and secular environment and activity.

---

3 I shall discuss later the significance of the variation in name from Aristoteles to Battus, which I argue is a regnal name.

4 As Pindar says, for example at Pi. P. 4.66.
6.1.1 Apollo, Delphi, and Battus’ Foundation of Cyrene

Herodotus gives us without bias two different accounts of the foundation of Cyrene, one which he has obtained on Cyrenean authority, and the other on Theran authority, the island whose colony Cyrene would be and which had been home to Battus I. Both accounts ultimately converge, but the differences lie in the earliest stages, focusing in particular upon the oracular consultations at Delphi and the role of Battus I. In the Theran account Battus is an attendant to Grinnus, son of the king of Thera, who consults the oracle. Although present at the consultation, Battus does not later form part of the initial Theran expedition to Libya, but only joins the settlers later whereupon he is made leader. Upon being told by the Pythia to found a city in Libya, Grinnus complains of his old age and points to the crowd of younger attendants, marking out Battus. The Cyrenean version gives much greater prominence to Battus, though its nature is one of folk tale. Battus here is the unimpressive stammering child of an exiled princess of Thera, betrayed by both her wicked stepmother and the gullible and severe king. This unfortunate start to life is a motif found in other folk tale or even heroic narrative. Battus consults the Pythia himself, rather than as attendant. The oracle itself names Battus as ‘founder’, imbuing him therefore with the heroic attributes which such an achievement sustained. Battus is unassuming, not purposely seeking such power and in fact tries to ask the Pythia how he might achieve such a task. The oracle cannot reply a second time, and Battus is left alone, markedly so when, after his first voyage to Libya...

5 Hdt. 4.150-59. Theran version of the preliminaries: Hdt. 4.150-153; Cyrenean version: Hdt. 4.154-156. From Hdt. 4.157 the two accounts agree that the first Theran settlers inhabited the island of Platea off the Libyan coast, before crossing to the mainland and ultimately founding Cyrene. For some analysis of the two accounts see Applebaum 1979: 9-11; Osborne 1996: 8-15; Mitchell 2000: 84-6.
6 Indeed ‘king’ as all Battias would be termed: βασιλέα (Hdt. 4. 153).
7 See Chamoux 1953: 81.
8 Not least Cypselus, ruler of Corinth, for example. On this, the ‘heroic traits’ attributed to Battus, and comparable legends see Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella 2007: 670, 682.
9 Βάττ’ … οἰκιστήρα (Hdt. 4.155.3). So also Pl. P. 4.5-6; Call. Ap. 67.
and return to Thera for support, he is violently rejected\textsuperscript{10}. The Cyrenean account which Herodotus reports portrays Battus as of royal stock, and as a divinely sanctioned founder and ruler, in spite of unlikely characteristics. He does not seek rule but he is granted it by Apollo\textsuperscript{11}. Though his Theran roots are acknowledged, his success as Cyrene’s founder in spite of the rejection by his mother city is made obvious.

A much later stele\textsuperscript{12} records an agreement made between fourth century Therans and the Cyreneans over Theran rights to land in the Libyan city, and details a version of the foundation which fits neatly with the Theran account in Herodotus. This correlation suggests that the Theran version in Herodotus sustained after the Battiads and was acceptable to the Cyreneans in a post-Battiad context\textsuperscript{13}, and that, in other words, the Cyrenean version which highlights Battus’ heroic involvement and Battiad superiority endured only as long as the Battiads ruled. It is possible that the Battiads themselves promoted this alternative Cyrenean version, having their family portrayed in a particular way. Indeed hymns of Pindar\textsuperscript{14}, contemporary with Arcesilas IV and commissioned by the ruler since they celebrate his Pythian victory of 462BC, elaborate on the Cyrenean version of the city’s foundation. Pindar corroborates the Cyrenean foundation story, that Battus consulted the Pythia directly, ‘in Apollo’s presence’\textsuperscript{15}. Thera is not forgotten however, since an additional prophecy by Medea predicts that Thera will be ‘mother city of great cities’\textsuperscript{16}, but also reaffirms that Battus will visit the Pythia in person\textsuperscript{17}. Arcesilas

\textsuperscript{10} Hdt. 4.155.4, 156.3.
\textsuperscript{11} The word order of the oracle highlights the proximity in relationship between god and benefactor: ἄναξ δὲ σε Φοίβος Ἀπόλλων (Hdt. 4.155.3).
\textsuperscript{12} ML 5 = SEG 9.3.
\textsuperscript{13} On the dubious authenticity of this document, and the argument that it is a re-hash of ideas to suit a new context, see Osborne 1996: 14-15; Antonaccio 2007: 211.
\textsuperscript{14} Pi. P. 4, 5.
\textsuperscript{15} Pi. P. 4.4-8: Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος.
\textsuperscript{16} Pi. P. 4.19-20. This further prophecy reinforces Battus’ legacy and status as founder. The cities (plural) must surely refer to Barca, Euesperides and Teuchira, Battiad foundations in Cyrenaica.
\textsuperscript{17} Pi. P. 4.53-4.
IV is the eighth generation since Battus, to whom now Apollo has granted glory (κῦδος)\(^{18}\). Pindar’s fifth *Pythian* also relates this same victory, but marks out Battiad association with Apollo. Apollo enjoys Arcesilas’ victory and its celebration\(^{19}\), just as the god, as Apollo Archegetes, aided Battus upon his arrival at Libya\(^{20}\), so that he should successfully found Cyrene, and his own oracle be fulfilled\(^{21}\). There is a suggestion that the hymn may have been performed at the festival of Apollo Carneia in Cyrene\(^{22}\), where we are told Battus, now worshipped as a hero\(^{23}\), founded sanctuaries for the gods, and honoured Apollo in procession\(^{24}\).

In the opening line of *Pythian* 4 Arcesilas is introduced as *philos*, beside whom the Muse herself is invited to stand.\(^{25}\) The ambiguity of to whom Archesilas is *philos*, whether poet, Muse, or Apollo, and the final position of the term on its line only emphasise this role and indeed allow all possibilities simultaneously; importantly, he associates with gods. The clearest demonstration of the *philia* between Archesilas and Apollo is in Pindar’s reckoning of the ruler’s expenditure (δαπάνη) on Apollo’s Pythian Games against the victory and hymn, a recompense (λυτήριον) which brings *charis* (χαρίεν)\(^{26}\).

Though the Cyrenean version of city’s foundation may not have endured after the fall of the Battiads, the *philia* between the founder Battus and Apollo continued in Cyrenean


\(^{19}\) Pi. *P*. 5.20-3.

\(^{20}\) An additional detail to the foundation story is that Battus came upon lions at his arrival in Libya, which he scared off with his stammering (Pi. *P*. 5.57-9), but the result of which was that he was supposedly cured of his speech impediment (Paus. 10.15.7).

\(^{21}\) Pi. *P*. 5.60-3: ὁ ἀρχαγέτας Ἀπόλλων.

\(^{22}\) Pi. *P*. 5.79-80. Burton does not rule this out, but is more sceptical of Farnell’s proposition that the hymn is in fact a processional song for the Carneia (Burton 1962: 135-6; Farnell 1932: 2.170).

\(^{23}\) Pi. *P*. 5.95: ἡρως.

\(^{24}\) Pi. *P*. 5.87-93.

\(^{25}\) Pi. *P*. 4.1-2: σάμερον μὲν χρὴ σε ταρ’ ἀνδρὶ φιλῳ / στάμεν. Braswell (Braswell 1988) argues that φιλῳ indicates a contractual relationship between Pindar and Arcesilas where the poet has been commissioned and will be paid to compose the poem. This is because he intends to discuss Demophilus’ involvement in payment for the hymn.

\(^{26}\) Pi. *P*. 5.105-7. The juxtaposition and apposition of λυτήριον and δαπάνη in line 106 serve to emphasise the contractual nature of this exchange between Arcesilas and Apollo.
tradition and literature. Callimachus’ Hymn to Apollo demonstrates this very clearly, in style and content. Williams notes Apollo’s close involvement in the city’s foundation, through oracle, physical guidance, and promise. In both the opening and closing lines of the hymn’s section on Cyrene and Battus, both ruler and god are closely aligned, framing the passage with Apollo’s benefaction to Battus and then Battiad benefaction to Apollo: Apollo ensures the secure foundation of Cyrene, and grants the gift of walls to its rulers; Apollo has owed no city more, while the Battiads repay with worship no god more than Apollo.

Callimachus, though much later, also gives in detail an account of Battus’ introduction of the cult of Apollo Carneius to Cyrene, echoing the account in Pindar. This might be a slight anachronism, since the temple has been dated to the mid-6th century date, while the tomb of Battus I dates to early 6th century, but a shrine such as this so early in the city’s history is significant nonetheless. In addition to this, Pernier has identified the Temple to Apollo with the city’s first prytaneum, before a separate prytaneum was erected in the agora. If this is the case, then we see in this important early building of the colony a union of ruling authority and cultic control, very much in line with the tradition of Battus’ foundation of cult along with the city itself and becoming its first ruler.

Malkin sees the likes of Battus as Apollo’s ‘personal designation, invested with religious authority: ‘the religious authority with which the oikist was invested resembled that of

---

27 Call. Ap. 65-96. Chamoux (Chamoux 1953: 81-2) views the poet’s celebration of this relationship as contributing to a ‘patriotisme cyrénéen’.
28 Emphatically phrased around the repeated καί (Williams 1978: 63).
30 Call. Ap. 77; Pi. P. 5.89-93.
33 Pernier 1935: 23.
Apollo himself, namely the authority to expound religion.' Indeed in the fourth-century inscription on Cyrene’s religious laws, Battus himself is called ‘Archegetes’. This integration of cultic control and political rule is further corroborated by what Herodotus tells us of Demonax’ reforms during the reign of Battus III, which redistributed some of the ruling and cultic authority of the Battiads to the people, but left certain sanctuaries and priesthoods with the rulers. Again, confirming the importance of Delphian Apollo in Battiad rule, not only was Demonax sent to Cyrene by Delphi after a Battiad consultation of the oracle, but Battus may have been assisted by an ambassador from Delphi in establishing the city’s cult from the start.

Although it was common for cities to consult the Pythia on the foundation of a colony, and to receive the assistance of Apollo Archegetes in the project, the *philia* between Battus and Apollo endured in the city’s and the family’s tradition, and was recalled by other Battiads. Even by the eighth generation of Battiad ruler, the combined enterprise of Battus and Apollo was celebrated in hymn. The Cyrenean version of the city’s foundation, presented by Herodotus, may more accurately reflect a more specifically Battiad version. Battus is portrayed as the *philos* of Apollo, and therefore all Battiads are *philoi* to the god, since *philia* extends across generations. It was a contractual bond formed from the requirement to found the city and its joint Battus-Apollo enterprise, but which sustained until its Battiad rulers were victors at Apollo’s games eight generations later, continuing to honour the god with expenditure, worship, and ...
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34 Malkin 1987: 27. On this topic and the example of Battus see Mitchell 2013: 74.
35 SEG 9.72.22. See Antonaccio 2007: 204. The reference in this inscription to ‘oracles’ (μαντίων, line 21) and the discovery of a βόθρος in Battus’ tomb in the agora (Chamoux 1953: 131) may even suggest that Battus’ tomb became an oracular shrine, like that of Delphi. Interestingly Herodotus refers to a Libyan practice of oracular consultation at tombs of their ancestors (Hdt. 4.172.3).
36 Hdt. 4.161.3: τεμενέα ... και ἰρωσύνας.
37 Hdt. 4.161; SEG 9.72.22-3 (a fourth-century inscription on the sacred laws of the Cyreneans; the Delphian is called Onymastes).
38 An example is at Naxos, Sicily, where an altar to Apollo Archegetes was erected at the foundation (Thuc. 6.3.1). On this topic and its scholarship see Malkin 1987: 17-29.
39 Particularly in the form of *xenia*. See Mitchell 1997a: 12-13 and n. 81.
hymn, giving charis to Apollo, receiving kudos\textsuperscript{40} in return. Such is the establishment of this philia that it is adopted and repeated in post-Battiad tradition. Such is the connection between the rule and the religious authority of the founder that subsequent to foundation the founder-ruler has an authority likened to that of Apollo himself.

6.1.2 The Enduring Philia of the Battiads, Delphian Apollo, and the Cyreneans

Just as the philia of Battus and Apollo at the city’s foundation endured in Cyrenean tradition long after the Battiads, that philia of Battiads and Apollo endured for their dynasty, and Apollo’s presence or involvement was important, whether in consultation at Delphi, in monument and worship in Cyrene and its satellite cities, or in participation at the games in the god’s honour. The monumental construction in Cyrene and the expenditure on this by the Battiad rulers facilitated citizen worship and dedication to Apollo, and therefore each citizen’s philia with Apollo for themselves. Within a generation of the foundation, the Temple to Apollo was constructed just to the north of the Acropolis\textsuperscript{41}, a fine building which was only modified minimally later\textsuperscript{42}, and the god’s sanctuary dominated others in the city. Connecting this sanctuary at the city’s western limit to the city’s agora at its eastern limit was the Skyrota Road\textsuperscript{43}, again attributed to Battus I. This processional way, described by Pindar\textsuperscript{44}, was designed to honour Apollo, but importantly to associate such celebration with Battus himself, whose tomb\textsuperscript{45}, the

\textsuperscript{40} P. 4.66.
\textsuperscript{41} Pernier 1935: 11ff; Chamoux 1953: 303-10.
\textsuperscript{42} Chamoux 1953: 308.
\textsuperscript{43} There has been debate as to the identification of the Skyrota. For a persuasive conclusion see Applebaum 1979: 14-15, contra Stucchi (Stucchi 1967: 50 n. 42). Most recently Scott, for example, accepts this identification (Scott 2012: 17).
\textsuperscript{44} P. 5.90-3.
\textsuperscript{45} Battus’ tomb was not the only tomb of a hero found to feature in a city’s agora. For more examples see Antonaccio 2007: 213; Malkin 2009: 374.
only royal tomb to feature in this respect, was located at the eastern end of the agora\textsuperscript{46}. A more emphatic arrangement of monuments to emphasise this \textit{philia} is within the agora itself, where, reflecting the tomb of Battus to the East is the shrine to Apollo Archegetes to the West. This civic space was defined by its shrines, both of ruler and god, and its layout remained very largely unchanged into the fifth century and the fall of the Battiads\textsuperscript{47}, so that Pindar’s description remains one fixed in Cyrenean history from its very beginnings. This stability in design reinforced the inseparability of ruler and Apollo, together enshrined in and encompassing both the agora and the entire city’s limits. This design embraced the civic activity of the agora as well as its religious activity and that of the sanctuary of Apollo, interconnected the ruler, his people, and their most important god, and demonstrated, in dedication, in processional festivity, and in monument, the ruler’s benefaction. Apollo, Battiad, and Cyrenean here demonstrated their \textit{philia} for each other.

Both Battiad rulers and the people of Cyrene continued to consult with Apollo at Delphi\textsuperscript{48}. A very good example which exhibits this shared \textit{philia} between god, ruler, and people are the oracular consultations of the Cyreneans, which resulted in the reforms of Demonax under Battus III, and that of the subsequent ruler Arcesilas III, which was in response to the reforms. Battus III, we are told, was lame\textsuperscript{49}, and the Cyreneans, considering this a disastrous sign, asked the oracle what they should do to benefit their city. As a result the arbitrator Demonax of Mantinea rearranged the Cyrenean populace into tribes, allotted certain sanctuaries and priesthhoods to the ruler, and distributed

\textsuperscript{46} Pi. \textit{P.} 5.93.
\textsuperscript{47} Scott (Scott 2012: 17-19) exaggerates the development of the agora, envisaging a reduction in ‘liminal dimension of the agora, if not its physical location’, to accommodate changes in political structure after the reforms of Demonax.
\textsuperscript{48} Herodotus gives three further occasions subsequent to the initial period of foundation (Hdt. 4.159.3, 161, 163).
\textsuperscript{49} Hdt. 4.161.1. That Herodotus calls him \textit{Άρκεσίλεω ὁ παῖς Βάττος} does not mean that Battus was also unfortunately young in age, as Plutarch says (Plu. \textit{Moralia} 260F), perhaps misreading Herodotus (see also Applebaum 1979: 17). Ogden sees this as a metaphor for weak rule (Ogden 1997: 60-1).
others amongst the people. We cannot assume that this action, both the embassy to Delphi and the reforms, was taken without the consent of Battus III, even if his wife and their son, his successor, Arcesilas III demanded back rights which the rulers had had previously. Indeed we are told nothing more about Battus III, but Herodotus’ account of Arcesilas III and his mother Pheretime portrays them both hateful to the populace\(^50\), creating a rebellious faction within the city\(^51\), exiled, seeking the advice of Delphian Apollo only to be forgetful of his advice and come to a bad end after vengeful violence against the nobles of Cyrene and its outpost Barca. Battus III’s initiative and legacy is reduced to nothing more than his infirmity and wholly contrasted with the ‘tyrannical’ behaviour of Arcesilas\(^52\). The successful rule of Cyrene, in the eyes of both its ruler and its people is measured through its relationship with and duty to Apollo at Delphi\(^53\).

By 462BC, the year of Arcesilas IV’s chariot victory at Apollo’s Pythian Games\(^54\), the Battiad ruler may have been experiencing political dissent in Cyrene, suggestive by a possibly political dispute with a certain Demophilus, who features in Pindar’s fourth Pythian hymn, and by the fact that this Battiad would be deposed, the last of the dynasty\(^55\). His decision to compete at the Pythian Games may have been politically motivated\(^56\), engaging in expensive and aristocratic behaviour and potentially achieving heroic victory, which would bring *kudos* for him and Cyrene, celebrated in two of Pindar’s epinician hymns. Certainly the occasion of his victory facilitated an affirmation

\(^{50}\) The whole city took responsibility for Arcesilas’ death, since they had all suffered ills by him (Hdt. 4.167.2).

\(^{51}\) στασιάζων (Hdt. 4.162.2). Compare Pisistratus’ attempt at *turannis* through *stasis* along with Megacles and Lycurgus, according to Herodotus (Hdt. 1.59.3).

\(^{52}\) Much like his grandfather Arcesilas II, ὁ χαλεπός (Hdt. 4.160; Plu. *Moralia* 260E-261B).

\(^{53}\) I shall discuss this episode in the following section.

\(^{54}\) The thirty-first Pythiad, according to Σ Π. *P. 4 =* Drachmann 1910: 92.10-11.

\(^{55}\) A scholiast on Pindar tells us that he was treacherously murdered by Cyreneans (Σ Π. *P. 4 =* Drachmann 1910: 93.10-12).

\(^{56}\) See Chamoux 1953: 173-5; Mitchell 1966: 108-10; Braswell 1988: 2-6; Mitchell 2000: 95; Mitchell 2013: 71, 74. A scholium on Π. *P. 4.467 (=* Drachmann 1910: 162-3) says that Demophilus was one of a number of Cyreneans who sought power for himself in place of Arcesilas.
of his legitimate position as ruler, as direct descendant of the city’s founder and hero, and of his family’s and Cyrene’s intimate *philia* with Apollo. Pindar sings that Apollo ‘gave’ his family the plain of Libya, to flourish and to found a ‘divine city’; Arcesilas, ‘favoured by heaven’, has ‘god-given power’ and ‘inherited glory’. So too the charioteer who drove to victory, and who may have been a relation to Arcesilas, is described as *philos* to Apollo. He dedicated his chariot at Apollo’s sanctuary, since the god had been his benefactor. A hint at the political unrest is Pindar’s description of Arcesilas healing his city, and the gods’ help in this are *charites*. Demophilus, upon his return to Cyrene, is pictured at the symposium by Apollo’s fountain with other ‘citizens’, just as he had been *xenos* at Pindar’s own town of Thebes. This closing scene of *philia* at the symposium contrasts with the description of the tyrannical Phalaris at the end of the first *Pythian*, who will not enjoy such close company (*κοινανίαν*) in halls. Whether his victory hymns were politically motivated or not, Arcesilas promoted his family’s *philia* with Apollo, on a perfect occasion to demonstrate the worthiness of his victory among his family’s glories and his rule, his *συγγενής γέρας*.

Battus I’s appointment as founder of Cyrene by Delphian Apollo, and therefore debt to and *philia* with Apollo was recognised and exploited from the first days of the city until the fall of the Battiads. Delphi and Apollo arbitrated and assisted in Cyrene’s
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57 Επιρεν, ἀστυ θείον (Pi. P. 4.259-61).
58 θεόμορ’, θεόσδοτον δύναμιν, συγγενής γέρας (Pi. P. 5.5, 13, 17-18).
59 Σ Pi. P. 5.34 (Didymus quoting Theotimus) says that Carrhotus was the brother of Arcesilas' wife; Σ Pi. P. 5.33 says that he was the father of Arcesilas' wife.
60 Pi. P. 5.44.
61 Pi. P. 4.275.
62 Pi. P. 4.293-6.
63 ξενωθείς (Pi. P. 4.299), the last word of the hymn.
64 Pi. P. 1.95-8.
65 Pi. P. 5.17-18. Arcesilas III had used similar justification in his attempt to regain his ancestors’ rights (τὰ τῶν προγόνων γέρας, Hdt. 4.162.2) removed by the reforms of Demonax.
development, and the god was considered a *philos* to the citizens at large, through Battiad design of the city’s layout. Apollo had shrines at the city’s limits, marked out in both particularly religious locations and more secular areas, and Battus I’s role in facilitating this *philia* for his people was manifest in his own heroic shrine paralleling that of Apollo as founder in the agora.

6.2  Battiad *Philia* and Apollo as Arbitrator

We have seen how the Battiad rulers exploited the foundation tale of Battus and his *philia* with Apollo as Archegetes and oracle, and how Battus designed Cyrene not only with their relationship in mind, but also to extend their *philia* to the Cyrenean populace as benefactor. With this in mind, I shall now examine an episode in Battiad rule in which two of the Battiad family were portrayed as lacking in their *philia* towards Apollo and the Cyrenean people. I shall argue that in each case Apollo’s *philia* with the Battiads is used as a measure against which a clear judgement is made, that both of these Battiads are said to have behaved in their own interests at the expense of Apollo and the Cyreleans, and therefore neglect of *philia* was as much a feature of less successful rule. The first Battiad is Arcesilas III, and the second his mother Pheretime, and the context is their reaction to the reforms of Demonax and their subsequent fall within the last third of the sixth century\(^6\).

6.2.1 Arcesilas III and *Philia*

The reforms of Demonax came as a result of Cyrenean concern for Battiad rule, at the time Battus III, ‘lame and not steady on his feet’ according to Herodotus\(^7\), though this

\(^{7}\) Hdt. 4.161.1.
need not be read literally. Ogden argues that it was Battus’ rule which was marked out as ‘lame’ as one of three scape-goats in the Battiad dynasty. It may have been that his rule was considered ‘lame’ in later Battiad terms simply because it resulted in concessions to the Cyrenean people at the expense of inherited Battiad authority. Certainly the rule of Battus II had seen greatly increased numbers of new citizens from other Greek states, and the rule of his successor Arcesilas II featured quarrelling between Battiad brothers, revolt, war, and Arcesilas’ murder. It may well have been in this tumultuous context, upon Battus III’s succession, that advice was sought from the Pythia, rather than simply because of Battus III’s supposed physical infirmity. The silence on Battus’ III involvement or reaction to the reforms of Demonax is remarkable, especially in contrast to the detailed reaction of Arcesilas III we are given. If Herodotus relied upon post-Battiad Cyrenean sources for this passage, then what we might be seeing is a reluctance by the mid- to late-fifth century Cyreneans to attribute the initiative for the consultation with the Pythia and therefore the reforms too to the Battiads. In turn, this could also help to explain the much more detailed account of the behaviour of Arcesilas III and his mother. We have little evidence to explore whether the ruler of Battus III could be viewed in its nature by terms of philia, but we could attempt to explore Cyrenean measure of philia and rule by the account given of Arcesilas and Pheretime.

Our sources for Arcesilas III are notably hostile. Herodotus portrays Arcesilas III as a tyrant, and negligent of his philia with Delphian Apollo. Since Herodotus uses the terms turannos and basileus interchangeably we should not expect Arcesilas necessarily to
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68 Ogden 1997: 60-1. The first is Battus I, the last is the final Battiad ruler, Arcesilas IV, whose fall was prophesied by the vision of a white crow (Heraclides Lembus frag. 17).
69 Again at the request of the Pythian oracle (Hdt. 4.159.3).
70 Hdt. 4.160. Plutarch even says that he stopped being a king and became a tyrant (Plu. Moralia 260F4-5).
71 Herodotus says only that ‘the Cyreneans sent to Delphi’ (Hdt. 4.161.1).
be labelled as the former, especially given the dynastic context of the Battiads, who are from the first called *basileis*, and since Herodotus himself argues that the name Battus is derived from a Libyan word for king\(^{72}\). The historian, for example, referred to Arcesilas II as *basileus* while Plutarch, typically, called him *turannos*\(^{73}\). Diodorus gives us an oracle of Delphi, presented to Arcesilas, in which Apollo berates Arcesilas and his predecessors, excepting Battus I, for their tyrannical behaviour; Battus I respected the gods and shared his wealth, whereas his successors neglected the gods and made private use of the city’s wealth\(^{74}\). Arcesilas III stood apart from a large section of his populace by creating a faction (στασιάζων)\(^{75}\), but defeated he became an exile (ἐφυγε)\(^{76}\). He gathered military support with the offer of payment, defeated his opponents, and took violent revenge upon them\(^{77}\). He is killed soon after he regained rule, so we do not see his ruling behaviour, but his attempt to gain greater authority and regain his position as king are viewed as ‘tyrannical’ behaviour by Diodorus. To remind us of a similar example, Pisisistratus formed a faction with an eye on *turannis* (καταφρονήσας τὴν τυραννίδα ἧγειρε ... στάσιν)\(^{78}\), later worsted he was forced into exile\(^{79}\), then to recruit mercenaries\(^{80}\), and fight to gain rule\(^{81}\). It is the acts of vengeance in which Arcesilas’ tale differs from Pisisistratus’, and then despite a warning given by the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, and the gift (διδοῖ)\(^{82}\) from Apollo to Arcesilas and his family that eight generations of Battiads should rule Cyrene. He slew and banished those who

\(^{72}\) Hdt. 4.155.2.
\(^{73}\) Plu. *Moralia* 260F4-5: ἀντὶ βασιλέως ἐγεγόνει τύραννος.
\(^{74}\) D.S. 8.30.1: τυραννικῶτερον.
\(^{75}\) Hdt. 4.162.2.
\(^{76}\) Hdt. 4.162.2.
\(^{77}\) Hdt. 4.163.1, 164.
\(^{78}\) Hdt. 1.59.3.
\(^{79}\) Hdt. 1.60.1, 61.2.
\(^{80}\) Hdt. 1.61.4.
\(^{81}\) Hdt. 1.62ff.
\(^{82}\) Hdt. 4.163.2.
were against his *stasis* (ἀντιστασιώτας)*83*, and burned alive those who had taken refuge in a tower*84*. Herodotus makes no explicit approval or condemnation of Arcesilas’ actions, but the nature of the account is clear in its violence against his own citizens. The historian only remarks that Arcesilas did wrong by the Delphic oracle, realising too late at his violence, perhaps unwillingly disobedient, perhaps willingly*85*, and working at his own terrible end (ἐξεργασμένος ἑωυτῷ κακόν)*86*. Apollo at Delphi had gifted Arcesilas eight Battiad generations of rule at Cyrene, but his came to an end almost immediately upon his return from exile, murdered by the Barcaeanans. When Arcesilas’ mother Pheretime appealed to the Persian viceroy in Egypt to help her avenge her son’s death, the people of the Cyrenean city of Barca complained similarly of the evils (κακὰ) Arcesilas had done them*87*.

### 6.2.2 Pheretime and *Philia*

While Arcesilas’ behaviour is measured against his dedication and appeal to Apollo and against his violence towards his own citizens, and therefore against his *philia* with both of them, his mother Pheretime’s behaviour is likewise measured against her *philia* with a *xenos*, Euelthon of Cyprian Salamis, and with the citizens of Barca. Like Arcesilas’ actions, Pheretime’s actions demonstrate a disregard for *philia* and a desire for violent revenge against those who were at one time *philoi*. Euelthon, the *xenos* with whom Pheretime takes refuge is noted by Herodotus for his dedication to Delphian Apollo*88*. Herodotus also emphasises the *xenia* Euelthon perform towards Pheretime by giving her all that she asked for, except for an army to avenge her son, repeating terms for
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*83* Hdt. 4.164.1.  
*84* Hdt. 4.164.  
*85* Hdt. 4.164.3-4.  
*86* Hdt. 4.165.1.  
*87* Hdt. 4.167.2.  
*88* Hdt. 4.162.3.
giving: ἐδίδου, διδόμενον, δοῦναι, διδομένω, δώρον, δωρέσθαι. Meanwhile she took everything he gave, but continued to ask for military support for revenge, arguing that although his gifts were nice (καλὸν) what she really wanted would be nicer (κάλλιον). In her single-minded attitude towards her xenos in spite of his generous gift-giving, the xenia broke down. After Arcesilas’ death, Pheretime appealed to Aryandes the Persian governor of Egypt, whom she ‘ordered’ to help her, which he did. The Persian-Egyptian force defeated the people of Barca, where Arcesilas had been killed, and Pheretime sought her own violent revenge, impaling the bodies of Barcaeans on the city walls, cutting the breasts from the women to also display on the wall, giving others to the Persians as booty. Herodotus does close Book Four with a comment on Pheretime’s revenge, which was overly violent (αἱ ἱλίην ἱσχυρὰς τιμωρίαι), of such a sort and so great (τοιαύτη τε καὶ τοσαύτη τιμωρίη) that she had offended the gods, losing her life to a festering illness of worms which ate here as she lived her last.

The actions and demises of both Arcesilas III and Pheretime are held up by Herodotus, in part at least, as examples of how not to rule, or behave as part of a ruling family. They both brought harm to their citizens for their own private interests, they both neglected the philia of or offended the gods, and more explicitly in Pheretime’s case, maltreated a xenos. In both examples Herodotus highlights the importance of Delphian Apollo, who gave a gift to Arce silas and to whom Euelthon had dedicated at great expense. Arcesilas is measured against his philia with Apollo and fails for his disregard.

89 Hdt. 4.162.4-5.
90 Hdt. 6.162.4.
91 Mitchell (Mitchell 2012) notes that the inappropriately masculine behaviour of Pheretime is highlighted by Euelthon’s ultimate dismissal of her. See also Lyons 2012: 25.
92 Hdt. 4.165.3, 200ff. The appeal was made on the basis that Arcesilas had been killed for his medism.
93 Damaged statues and monuments dating to the mid-sixth century may be evidence of this attack (Applebaum 1979: 26 and n. 117).
95 Hdt. 4.205. See also 2.120.5 for Herodotus’ belief that the gods greatly punish great wrongdoings.
Pheretime is measured against her xenia with Euelthon, who is also a philos of Delphian Apollo, and fails for her disregard. Herodotus here loudly demonstrates the importance to Cyrene of the union of philia which we have observed in the design and legacy of Battus I, between ruler, people, and Delphian Apollo, by giving us clear examples, and judgements upon them, of when this interconnected philia is neglected or abused by its ruling family.

6.3 Battiad Xenia and Trade

From its first settlement the citizens of Cyrene took advantage of connections with other states, both Greek and non-Greek. Some of these relations undoubtedly benefited the economic prosperity of the city, in particular through trade and export of its most important products, silphium and wool. Being on the edge of the Greek world and in its particular location Cyrene developed relationships not only with native Libyans, but with Egypt, and with Persia while it controlled Egypt, and each of these the Battiads used opportunistically to support their rule and their city. The coinage of Cyrene to some extent reflects these relations, facilitating trade, and its iconography reflects how the Battiads wanted their city to be viewed by the larger Greek community.

6.3.1 Philia and Opportunism with Non-Greeks

The Battid relationship with the Libyans was complicated, varied according to internal politics or where gains could be made. It was the Libyans who led Battus and his first citizens to the location of Cyrene itself, to a place better than the location the Greeks had chosen to inhabit for the previous six years. They moved from Irasa on the coast to the Fountain of Apollo, a natural spring where Battus would have his temple to Apollo
built, where an abundance of rain would assist with the fertility of their future crops. The Libyans, Herodotus tells us, did however lead Battus at night past a better location, the reason for which is not given and unclear. In any case Herodotus portrays the Libyans as assisting the Greeks. Later, when Arcesilas I invited more Greeks in great numbers to come to the colony, large tracts of Libyan land were stolen to accommodate them, and Herodotus considers the Libyans to have been ‘violently insulted’. A Libyan-Egyptian force attempted to regain the land, but was defeated by the Greeks. Arcesilas II feuded with his brothers, who founded Barca and encouraged Libyans to rebel against Cyrene. The rebellion was crushed. The reforms of Demonax which took place during the reign of the next Battiad, Battus III, set aside tribal right for the Libyans living in Cyrene who may have been dispossessed by the settlements under Battus II. In fact they were designated to the same tribe as the Greeks who had come from Thera, the founding city. The Battiad relationship with neighbouring Libyans was not consistent, and may even have been exploitative, though their mutual claim and interests were recognised internationally by the reforms of Demonax.

Battiad relations with Egypt also varied according to mutual interests. While the Egyptian king Apries assisted the dispossessed Libyans, and was worsted and suffered his own revolt as a result, his successor Amasis formed philiai with Greeks states, including Cyrene. Herodotus tells us specifically of his philia with Cyrene (φιλότητα,
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96 Hdt. 4.158. The Fountain of Apollo is also mentioned by Pindar (Pi. P. 4.294).
97 Chamoux (Chamoux 1953: 120) suggests that the entire purpose of the transfer was to move the Greeks from the territory of one tribe into another.
98 Mitchell argues that there must have been Greek-Libyan intermarriage from the foundation of the colony and that this made for a special racial and social integration (Mitchell 2000: 98).
99 Hdt. 4.159.4.
100 Hdt. 2.161, 4.159.4-6.
101 Chamoux (Chamoux 1953: 140, 221) argues that the perioikoi which Herodotus mentions are not Libyans but Greeks, though this has been loudly rejected (see Applebaum 1979: 18 n. 75).
φιλότητος)\(^{102}\), and of his marriage to Ladice, the daughter of a Battiaad ruler\(^{103}\), who in her love for Amasis, dedicated a statue of Aphrodite in Cyrene\(^{104}\). Amasis himself dedicated both a gilt statue of Athena and a painted picture of himself in Cyrene, as he did to Athena of Lindos and Hera in Samos\(^{105}\), the latter of which Herodotus also specifies was out of \textit{philia} (ξεινίην) for Polycrates the ruler of Samos\(^{106}\). When Egypt became part of the Persian Empire, Arcesilas III, as \textit{euergetēs}\(^{107}\), ‘gave’ Cyrene as a tributary vassal to Persia\(^{108}\), a \textit{philia} therefore, which we have seen allowed Pheretime to appeal to Egypt after her son’s murder. This \textit{philia}, in its transfer from Egypt to Persia, can be seen in Cambyses’ peaceful return of Ladice to Cyrene once he realised that she was a Battiaad\(^{109}\).

Cyrene flourished under Battus IV, who was presumably a Persian nominee\(^{110}\), and may well have remained under Persian control until the fall of the Battiaads\(^{111}\). Indeed Persian support for a Battiaad installation may well have prolonged the dynasty’s rule of Cyrene, and certainly our sources make no further mention of political strife within the city until the suggestions in Pindar’s poems in 462 in the subsequent reign. Considerable building projects during the rules of Battus IV and Arcesilas IV, for whom we have limited literary record, demonstrate this prosperity, in particular the Temple to Zeus Ammon, possibly begun under Battus IV\(^{112}\). By 500BC the head of Zeus Ammon

\(^{102}\) Hdt. 2.181.1.
\(^{103}\) Hdt. 1.181.1-2.
\(^{104}\) Hdt. 1.181.4-5. Herodotus saw it himself.
\(^{105}\) Hdt. 1.182.1.
\(^{106}\) Hdt. 1.182.2.
\(^{107}\) Hdt. 4.165.2: ἔδωκε, εὔεργεσίαι.
\(^{108}\) Hdt. 4.165.2-3.
\(^{109}\) Hdt. 2.181.5.
\(^{111}\) Mitchell 1966: 107, 112.
\(^{112}\) Mitchell 1966: 113; Mitchell 2000: 93. The exact date of its original construction is debated. Pesce (Pesce 1947-8), the first excavator dated it to the sixth century; Dinsmoor (Dinsmoor 1950: 86) dates it to soon after 540BC; Chamoux (Chamoux 1953: 325-8, 320ff generally on the temple) argues for a date of
appears on the coins of Cyrene and Barca\textsuperscript{113}, and the focus on this deity may well hint at a close embrace or enhancement of the Battiad and Egyptian-Persian \textit{philia}, if not only politically then also cemented in religious activity. This temple’s size was comparable to that of Zeus at Olympia or the Parthenon\textsuperscript{114}, and a major undertaking of expenditure. Battus IV’s expenditure on his city and its people under the Persians is also evident in the renovation of the façade of the Temple to Apollo in Parian marble and possibly other buildings in the agora\textsuperscript{115}. Battus IV then may have used Persian \textit{philia} not only to sustain his rule and the dynasty, but also for the sake of closer religious, political, and trade ties. Certainly we might expect the Persian overseer to promote Cyrenean trade with other states under its sway, such as Phoenician and Carthaginian enterprise in Northern Africa\textsuperscript{116}; indeed finds from the Temple to Artemis in Cyrene, for example, dating to no later than 500BC provide evidence of trade with Persian Rhodes, and perhaps also with Phoenicia and Central Africa\textsuperscript{117}. In return, the Persians took trust in Battus IV and subsequently Arcesilas IV, to control not only the Cyreneans but also the city of Barca, possibly even watching over some of the Libyan cities\textsuperscript{118}.

Ironically we can gauge that to some extent political stability in Cyrene and consequently economic boom for the city were in clear evidence while Cyrene was fostered by Persia. The submission to Persian authority by the Battiads may have sustained their dynasty under Persian support, and therefore the reforms of Demonax,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}[113]
\item Robinson 1927: ccxxxiv.
\item Chamoux 1953: 320.
\item Pernier 1935: 57; Applebaum 1979: 28.
\item Mitchell 1966: 105-6, who also estimates that Cyrenean lack of support for Dorieus’ colonisation attempt is evidence for the city observing Persian foreign policy.
\item Pernier 1935: 97.
\item Mitchell 1966: 107-8.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
ensuring the justified place of Libyans within Cyrene’s political structure, but also the lavish Battiad expenditure on the city and citizens may have tempered any political ambition of other elements in Cyrene, at least until the likes of Demophilus towards the end of the dynasty. Expenditure on religious activity appears to have been a priority, based on the archaeological evidence, in renovation on long-standing sanctuaries such as the Temple to Apollo and on new shrines which nurtured newer alliances, with Persian Egypt\textsuperscript{119}, which at the same time may have given Cyrene an enhanced identity, with the head of Zeus Ammon featuring on its coinage. The \textit{philia} which the Battiads enjoyed with Amasis was transferred to the Persians, and the Battiads continued to support an exchange of experiences, trade, and religious opportunity with their neighbour, and continued to ensure that such activity was presented to their own people at the obviously considerable expense of a benefactor.

6.3.2 Xenia and Trade with Samos, and the Role of Coinage

Cyrene’s closest \textit{philos} since its very foundation, we are told, was Samos\textsuperscript{120}. The two cities enjoyed φιλίαι μεγάλαι\textsuperscript{121} since a Samian merchant ship came to the aid of a stranded ally in the foundation story of Cyrene. Not only did fate take the ship to the Libyan coast where it saved the Cyrenean ally, but it also took it further off course beyond the Pillars of Hercules where the merchants made a vast profit. With these funds, the Samians dedicated an enormous bronze vessel in their Temple to Hera. Gifts were given and owed between Samian, Cyrenean, and Cyrenean \textit{philoi} and

\textsuperscript{119} Even though the Cyreneans may have adopted Zeus Ammon from quite early on (Robinson 1927: ccxxxiv).

\textsuperscript{120} So close was the \textit{philia} that one account gives a certain Samus as an ancestor of Battus I (Theochrestus FGrHist 761 F1).

\textsuperscript{121} Hdt. 4.152.5. Applebaum (Applebaum 1979: 11-12) postulates that there may have been a Samian contingent in the foundation party of Cyrene. Osborne (Osborne 1996: 13) postulates that the feature of the Samian merchant in the foundation story may have been born of known Samian trade with Thera. Sub-geometric pottery from Samos found on Thera may suggest such trade prior to the foundation of Cyrene.
expenditure generously given additionally to their gods. It was to Samos that Arcesilas III later turned for assistance, which he received, that he be reinstated to his reign; in typical terms of *philia* Arcesilas III would give tracts of land to those who gave him their support\(^{122}\). Indeed, evidence that such *philia* involved trade of goods as well as gifts of goodwill is the coinage of Cyrene, which began in the mid-sixth century and demonstrates relationships with Samian coinage\(^{123}\). The first Cyrenean coinage was of Attic-Euboeic standard, and in fact some early coins are over-strikes of Athenian issues, though even at this time the reverse often displayed two incuse oblong rectangles, similar to early Samian electrum issues. In around 500BC, under the prosperous Battus IV, the first inscribed coins of Cyrene were minted, coinciding with the type of the head of Zeus Ammon on the city’s coinage\(^{124}\) and the building of the temple to that god in Cyrene. And at this same time Samos started to mint coins on a new standard (the ‘Samian’ standard) which Cyrene also introduced amongst its own issues. There is even evidence of Samian overstriking on coins of Cyrene at this time\(^{125}\). This remarkable coincidence in coin production must surely demonstrate a very strong connection in trade between the two states\(^{126}\).

The Cyrenean coinage of this period displayed new boldly designed types, of the head of Zeus Ammon and of its most famous produce and export, silphium, with the name of the city around the border. This may be an assertive move by a newly-appointed Arcesilas IV\(^{127}\), all the more assertive since we see these same new types on

\(^{122}\) Hdt. 4.162.2, 163.1. This Cyrenean-Samian *philia* may well have been part of a wider trade network which included Sparta, evidence for which is the distribution of Laconian pottery (Nafissi 1991: 253-76).

\(^{123}\) Robinson 1927: xxix; Barron 1964: 216 n. 3.

\(^{124}\) Robinson 1927: cccxxxiv.

\(^{125}\) Barron 1966: 29-30.


\(^{127}\) Kraay 1976: 298.
the coinages of both Barca and Euesperides, Battiad cities\textsuperscript{128}. This uniformity in Cyrenean-Battiad iconography on coinage is perhaps similar to that of Syracuse, Aetna, and Syracuse-allied cities in Sicily under the Deinomenids, which displayed the Arethusa-horse rider iconography, and demonstrates an active attempt to portray a centralised and harmonious Battiad union. Such a portrayal of unity under Arcesilas can also be seen in a poem he commissioned; Pindar’s description of Thera as ‘the mother of great cities’\textsuperscript{129} also unifies these states as one, here due to their shared origins. Other ways in which this union between cities was demonstrated was in joint coinages, which displayed the names of two of the cities\textsuperscript{130}. If, under Persian observance and support of Battiad rule, Arcesilas IV enjoyed the political stability and economic prosperity of his predecessor in Cyrene we may also be seeing their development so that other cities in the Battiad sphere are contained and enhance rule and prosperity. It was surely in the interests of both Arcesilas and Persians alike to move on from the legacy of the Barcaean assassination of Arcesilas III and the Persian attack on Barca and enslavement of its citizens\textsuperscript{131}. Darius had, for instance, re-homed those exiles in a new town of Barca in Bactria\textsuperscript{132}.

The coinage of Cyrene was more than a vehicle for its expenditure and display of wealth but also a vehicle for its \textit{philìia} with other cities. In the example of Samos the standard employed by both cities facilitated trade and recognised an ancient \textit{philìia}; in the example of other cities of Cyrenaiaca the iconography used by them and Cyrene portrayed a \textit{philìia} of confederacy, focused on Cyrene and Battiad rule. The types of

\textsuperscript{128} At least by the time of Arcesilas IV these other cities were being portrayed as Battiad, though their origins may have been more independent. See Osborne 1996: 15-16.
\textsuperscript{129} P. 4. 19-20.
\textsuperscript{130} Mitchell 2000: 93-4. Another city under Battiad protection was Teuchira, founded by either Barca or Cyrene (Applebaum 1979: 27-8). That Cyrene featured less than Barca in later joint-productions is possibly indicative of a lesser role played politically by that city after the fall of the Battiads.
\textsuperscript{131} Hdt. 4.200-205.
\textsuperscript{132} Hdt. 4.204. See Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella 2007: 721 on this practice of deportation.
silphium and Zeus Ammon on Cyrenaic coinage are emblematic of important media of wealth and religious activity for the city, highlighting not only the origin of the mint but also the prosperity and the divine association of the city. The Battiads of Cyrene enjoyed their *philia* with Amasis of Egypt, but prospered in the period of its last two Battiad rulers in part due to Persian influence and *philia*, which brought a stability to Battiad rule, which had been emphatically volatile in previous reigns, and to Greek relations amongst its neighbouring Libyan peoples.

* * *

The Battiads employed systems of *philia* to assert and maintain their rule, to allow them outlets of beneficence which would portray themselves as good rulers, to traffic with other states and rulers in the transactions of either trade or gift-giving, and to ally themselves with gods, which brought *kudos* to them, their people, and their city. That these *philiai* could be manipulated or even abandoned in favour of others demonstrates their political use. These *philiai* provided frameworks for the use of expenditure and the return of wealth in kind, of *kudos*, and legitimacy. The benefits were not only the return of *charis* but also the value in the shared experience. Our sources consistently demonstrate the use and retention of these *philiai* as features of good rule, and give examples of where abuse and neglect of such *philiai* are indeed poor rule.
Conclusion

Early Greek rulers, in different cities and periods, used networks of friendships to acquire, sustain, or legitimise their rule. These *philiai* were formed not only with their citizens but also with their gods and even other rulers, within Greek states and beyond. Examples of the latter are Pisistratus and Lygdamis, and Hieron and Theron. That these *philiai* were considered utilities is indicated by their expendability and the opportunity for manipulation by others, for example the decision of Archesilas III to break his *philia* with Amasis of Egypt and begin an alternative relationship with Persia, or the choice of Spartan elite to abandon their *philia* with the Pisistratids, persuaded by the Alcmaeonids. Importantly, all of these relationships involved the use of wealth, in whatever form, a ‘currency’ inherent in the contractual notion of *philia*. Whether as developed civic infrastructure, dedication, or *xeinion*, each gift from a ruler was viewed as an act of *charis*, ensuring continuity of the relationship and creating a debt in return which secured the ruler’s position of authority.

The importance of the use of wealth on religion is very clear, within a ruler’s own city and outside. In addition it can be difficult to separate a ruler’s function as governor and as religious leader. For example the Deinomenids, Pisistratids, and Battiads all had religious responsibilities within their cities. Rulers such as these have long been labelled ‘temple-builders’, but I have argued that such *euergesia* was not solely for their own or even their city’s *kudos*, but an act of *charis* to both gods and citizens, with the aim of enhancing *philiai* with them, and with the ultimate goal of a shared *kudos* by all. Outside of the city rulers gave dedications and thanks-offerings (*charistēria*) at the shrines associated with *xenoi*, such as at the Samian Heraion, and at Panhellenic sanctuaries, such as Olympia, Delphi, and that of Ptöian Apollo. Such gifts to the gods, from the rulers individually, but also from the ruler and his city, competed with each
other, each ruler seeking the most prestigious location within the sanctuary or giving a more prestigious offering. These dedications included city treasuries, which housed the wealth given by each state to the god. That such gifts were considered by the city in terms of and valued as wealth can be seen by their option to borrow back the items when financially in need, and such behaviour is also seen with respect to a city’s own temples. The ambiguity between what was a ruler’s private wealth and what was his city’s wealth, and in fact that the two were probably indistinguishable, is demonstrated by the contention over the Corinthian treasury at Delphi, whether it was a private dedication by Cypselus or a dedication by the state of Corinth, and thus containing the wealth of one family or that of the city.

A city’s coinage was itself frequently associated with one of its gods, such as Arethusa at Syracuse or Apollo and Zeus Ammon at Cyrene. I have argued that the rulers had control of their city’s mints and that the city’s temples stored its wealth. The association of religion and wealth is then further reinforced, as is the ruler’s position as lynchpin and philos to citizens and god alike.

Philia was integral to the reign of early Greek rulers, who required the approval of both their citizens and gods. Expenditure on charites for these parties sought to ensure such philia, which then sanctioned and safeguarded the ruler’s continued authority. In particular, the use of wealth on religious activity, be that temple-building, dedication, competition at a sanctuary’s games or its subsequent victory hymn, demonstrated the ruler’s close association with the gods, all of which in turn brought a shared kudos to gods, citizens, and ruler.
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