COMPETITION AND COMMUNITY IN THE PANHELLENIC SANCTUARY

AGON AND *HOMONOIA*:

THE DYNAMICS OF COMPETITION AND COMMUNITY

IN THE PANHELLENIC SANCTUARY

By:

SARAH-JANE EVANS, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

MASTER OF ARTS (2010) McMaster University

(Classics) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: *Agon* and *Homonoia*: The Dynamics of Competition and Community in the Panhellenic Sanctuary

AUTHOR: Sarah-Jane Evans, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Sean Corner

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 101

Abstract

The aim of this thesis has been to explore agonism, and the relationship of individual and collective in Classical Greece, through the lens of athletic competition at the panhellenic sanctuaries. This study moves beyond the presumed dichotomy of *agon* and *homonoia* upon which the standard view of agonism in modern scholarship has been predicated to explore the ways in which agonism functions precisely within and is structured by *polis* society, even as the *polis* must negotiate constantly between the interests of collective and individual.

The evidence of both athlete and *polis* commemorations of athletic victory suggests a dynamic tension between promoting the self and remaining, and identifying oneself as, a member of a community. When appropriately channeled into civic benefaction and mutual advantage, agonism enables the self-interest of the individual to function within and remain structured by the *polis*; when it is not channeled in this way, it creates conflict and *stasis*. Just as in the relationship of athlete and *polis*, so too the interaction of *poleis* with each other in the panhellenic sanctuary reveals a tension between the desires for self-promotion and membership in the collective. This creates for *poleis* an ambivalent dynamic of at once mutual striving and competitive distinction within a common landscape that brings local values, mythologies and heroes to the attention of a panhellenic audience.

Rather than equating agonism strictly with conflict or commonality then, this study appreciates agonism as a fundamental aspect of Greek life that was both a product of and productive of rivalry and emulation at the level of athlete and *polis*,

and *polis* and panhellenic community. The evidence of both athlete and *polis* monuments suggest that the realization of competition as peer rivalry and emulation allowed room for distinction as predicated on commonality and civic benefit, rather than individualism and egoism.

Acknowledgements

I warmly thank my supervisor, Dr. Sean Corner, for his unfailing support in all aspects of this thesis. His guidance, enthusiasm, knowledge and insight have been vital to the completion of this study and have contributed greatly to my growth as both student and scholar. I also value greatly the advice and constructive criticism of the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Daniel McLean and Dr. Spencer Pope. I would like to express my sincerest thanks to the entire faculty in the Department of Classics at McMaster for their support and direction, with especial thanks to Carmen Camilleri, our Administrative Assistant, for her invaluable advice and constant care. Thanks to all of my friends, especially Gord Zaroski and Louise Savocchia, who have brainstormed and commiserated with me over the past two years. Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for their endless support, love and encouragement.

This thesis is dedicated to Mum, Laura and Mark: you make me proud to be someone you can be proud of. All my love.

Table of Contents

Chapter One - Greek Agonism: A Reexamination of Dichotomies

1.1 Introduction - Adkins, Williams and the Dichotomy of Individual and Community

Several ancient authors, including Euripides and Diogenes Laertius, give voice to some negative views on thef role of athletics and athletic competition in Greek society.[1] Perhaps the best-known criticism of athletics comes from Xenophanes, who claims that "even if a man should win a victory in the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia... even if he should become a most glorious symbol for his fellow citizens, and win proedria at the games and his meals at public expense as well as some especially valuable gift from the state... there is little joy for a state when an athlete wins at Olympia, for he does not fill the state's coffers"[2]. Such sentiments have contributed to the view of modern scholarship that athletic competition was at odds with the interests of the *polis*. At the same time, however, we find a more ambivalent appreciation of contention in Hesiod's discussion of the two types of *eris*, strife: "For one fosters evil war and battle, being cruel: her no man loves...[the other] stirs up even the shiftless to toil; for a man grows eager to work when he considers his neighbour, a rich man who hastens to plough and plant and put his house in good

[1] Euripides *Autolykos* fr.282; Diog. Laert. 1.55; Isocrates. Athenaeus cites Euripides as the source for his own condemnation of athletes (*The Deipnosophists* 413c-f).

[2] "ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν... νίκην τις ἄροιτο/... ἔνθα Διὸς τέμενος/ πὰρ Πίσαο ῥοῇς ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ/... ἀστοῖσίν κ' εἴη κυδρότερος προσορᾶν,/ καί κε προεδρίην φανερὴν ἐν ἀγῶσιν ἄροιτο,/ καί κεν σῖτ' εἴη δημοσίων κτεάνων/ ἐκ πόλεως... σμικρὸν δ' ἄν τι πόλει χάρμα γένοιτ' ἐπὶ τῶι,/ εἴ τις ἀεθλεύων νικῶι Πίσαο παρ' ὄχθας·/ οὐ γὰρ πιαίνει ταῦτα μυχοὺς πόλεως" (Xenophanes fr. 2 translated by Miller, 2004).

order; and neighbour vies with his neighbour as he hurries after wealth."[3] Within these two distinct approaches to the value and relevance of rivalry and competition in Greek life, we find the beginnings of our question.

Agon, competition, was a vital aspect of ancient Greek culture. The Greeks placed a heavy emphasis on competition, a fact which is particularly evident in the large number of officially organized and sanctioned competitive athletic events. Agonism's central role in Greek culture has traditionally been understood in contradistinction to *homonoia*, oneness or concord within the community. In this view, Classical Greek culture has at its heart a conflict between a heroic agonistic ethic of the social elite and an egalitarian civic ethic of the *polis* community.[4] This binary opposition equates competition with zero-sum conflict and offers little room for Hesiod's second kind of *eris*, a competition of mutuality and emulation.[5] This conception of agonism as a diametric opposite to *homonoia* needs to be reexamined.

Appreciation of agonism as one of the driving forces of ancient Greek culture was first noticed in the works of Friedrich Nietzsche and then taken up by Jacob Burckhardt, who argued that Greek society was structured around a desire to obtain personal *timê*, honour, through conspicuous public display.[6] According to

---

[3] "ἠ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμόν τε κακὸν καὶ δῆριν ὀφέλλει,/ σχετλίη· οὔ τις τήν γε φιλεῖ βροτός... ἥ τε καὶ ἀπάλαμόν περ ὁμῶς ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει/ εἰς ἕτερον γάρ τίς τε ἴδεν ἔργοιο χατίζων/ πλούσιον, ὃς σπεύδει μὲν ἀρόμεναι ἠδὲ φυτεύειν/ οἶκόν τ' εὖ θέσθαι" (Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 11-24 translated by Evelyn-White, 1914).

[4] See e.g. Kurke 1991, 1993, 2001; Dougherty and Kurke 2003; Nicholson 2003; Neer 2001, 2004.

[5] Though athletic competition played an important role in various ancient cultures in and around the Mediterranean Sea, the Greeks were unique in their treatment of organized competition as a unifying force that helped establish social and cultural bonds throughout the Greek world (See Poliakoff 1987; Golden 1998; Crowther 2007).

[6] Nietzsche 1920, 369-79; 382-6. See Duplouy 2006, 276-278 for a summary and analysis.

Burckhardt, agonism as an institution was not fully developed before the Archaic period; however, the importance of personal victory as a prime motivator was already well established in the Homeric epics.[7]

AWH Adkins has written extensively on the origins of the heroic aristocratic ethic, focusing on the central role that agonism played in Homeric society. He posits an opposition between the competitive values of individual superiority and success, and the cooperative values of community.[8] For Adkins, competitive values are the driving force in Homeric society. Homeric society has a results culture that attributes social standing to performance, reputation and external achievement. Homeric heroes were concerned with results rather than intentions, achievements rather than character, performance rather than moral excellence, and skill rather than virtue.[9] Homeric heroes lived in constant pursuit of *timê*, honour, which they obtained through the demonstration of *aretê*, prowess. As a result, heroes competed publically with each other, in peace as well as war, in order to prove themselves worthy of their positions as *hoi aristoi*, the best members of their society.[10] Adkins argues that, because Homeric honour and status both come as a result of outperforming others, the Homeric hero is highly egoistic and motivated by his desire for personal glory.

---

[7] Burckhardt 1998, 71; Burckhardt considers 'true' agonism to relate strictly to organized athletic competitions in the Archaic and Classical periods.
[8] Adkins 1970, 11; Adkins 1960, 6.
[9] Adkins 1960, 46.
[10] Adkins 1972, 12ff; Dodds 1951, 158.

At the same time, however, Adkins argues that Homeric society has a shame culture. A hero's estimation of his own worth comes not from a personal sense of morality or character, but from the demonstration of his *aretê* to others in external achievement. *Timê*, then, is completely reliant upon how one appears in the eyes of others and in living up to society's standards and expectations.[11] For Adkins, then, agonism is paradoxically both wholly egoistic and wholly heteronomous and Homeric man is entirely self-regarding and entirely other-regarding.

The moral philosopher Bernard Williams critiques Adkins' position. He argues that the Homeric *agon* is neither about total conformity to an external code nor reducible to pure egoism.[12] Williams' reading points out Adkins' failure to recognize a tension between egoism and heteronomy in his model, a tension that rises from two assumed false dichotomies: the dichotomy of egoism and altruism; and the dichotomy of autonomy and heteronomy. According to Williams, both of these dichotomies are problematic because "it is a mistake to think that Homeric shame involves merely adjustment to the prejudices of the individual, [and] it is another mistake to think that Homeric shame involves merely adjustment to the prejudices of the community"[13]. Adkins' shame-results culture, Williams notes, relies on external validation for individual *aretê* and cannot, as a result, function without

[11] Adkins 1970, 11; 1960, 154. Adkins progresses from this discussion of Homeric society to an analysis of the Homeric hero as a moral subject. As a result of his shame-guilt culture, Adkins argues, the Homeric hero has an inadequate understanding of himself as a subject. Williams raises issues with the teleological assumption of a Kantian notion of self as the end, underlying this view (Williams 1993, 77ff).
[12] Williams 1993, 80.
[13] Williams 1993, 81.

the regard of and for community. This collapses the dichotomy between egoism and altruism. Further, feelings of shame are provoked not merely by failure in the eyes of others, but by falling short in one's own eyes, not in passive conformity to society's standards, but as one sees oneself through the eyes of an internalized, ideal other, the sort of man one oneself respects.[14] Thus, the dichotomy of autonomy and heteronomy also collapses.

Williams establishes the need for an account of agonism that can allow for competitive self-assertion and yet also be about other-regard, that can be about shared norms and common social perceptions and, at the same time, admit autonomy. This has important implications for the later period. If in Homer we cannot simply identify competition with egoism in opposition to altruism, and if agonism implies both heteronomy and autonomy, as per Williams' argument, neither can we regard Archaic and Classical culture in terms of a neat division between a competitive, egoistic value system of the elite and a cooperative, communal value system of the *polis*. Rather than equating competition only with conflict, Williams argues that competition may equally be a product of and productive of cooperation.[15] Complicating the standard view argued by scholars requires a rethinking of agonism that appreciates it as integral to, rather than as being at odds with, the communitarian *polis* ethic.

[14] Williams 1993, 84.
[15] Williams 1993, 82, 100.

1.2 Greek Agonism and the Elite in the Archaic and Classical Periods

Moving into the Archaic period, athletics becomes the quintessential expression of an agonistic Greek culture. Modern scholarship is almost unanimous in its agreement that self-promotion through athletic participation was a right monopolized by the elite.[16] Burckhardt for example accepts out of hand that organized athletic competitions were restricted to members of the aristocracy who had the right to compete as equals.[17] Adkins too considers social status to be a central element of the right to participate in competition and associates the ethic of agonism with the elite *aristoi* who, in this view, are the successors of the Homeric hero class in post-Dark Age Greece.[18] The panhellenic sanctuaries are vital sites for considering this interaction of agonism, the individual and the collective in the Greek world. Scholars argue that these sanctuaries, and particularly the games they hosted, acted as gathering places for aristocracy and both enabled and encouraged social and competitive interaction among an exclusive panhellenic elite outside of civic community.

While there is no evidence of actual restrictions against the participation of non-elites in Greek athletics, it is generally agreed that the high cost of participating

---

[16] E.g. Rose 1974; Kurke 1991, 1993, 2003; Morgan 1990; Constantakopolou 2007; Morris 2000; Golden 1998; Neer 2003, 2004. Young (1984: 107-70) argues for a greater diversity among competitors at the panhellenic festivals; however, his examples are generally viewed as exceptions within an overwhelmingly elite-dominated field (e.g. Hall 2003, 26).

[17] Burckhardt 1998, 163.

[18] Adkins 1972, 22; Adkins 1970, 78. Adkins traces the development and evolution of arête through Greek history and argues that, while some of the material correlates of *aretê* may change, away from landed wealth to trade and to political influence for example, the primary distinction between *hoi agathoi* and *hoi kakoi* remains constant (Adkins 1972, 22ff).

in athletics was an effective deterrent to the lower classes.[19] Furthermore, an athlete in the Archaic period required not only the wealth necessary to afford to participate, but also inborn excellence and the divine favour that, as in Homeric society, only *hoi aristoi* possessed.[20] This limited the field of competition to the aristocracy, thus, according to the *opinio communis*, delineating the elite from the community and establishing them as a group who, in their demonstration of competitive excellence, demonstrated their inborn superiority as a class. At the same time, so it is thought, as the aristocratic exclusivity of athletics stood in opposition to the inclusive *polis*, so too did the individualism of the zero-sum competitive ethic stand in opposition to the egalitarian and cooperative ethic of the *polis*. Since Greek athletics were connected to cult worship and ritual in the sanctuary, these competitions provided elite athletes with a very public opportunity for both the conspicuous consumption of wealth and the reinforcement of their personal athletic prowess above and beyond the abilities of their opponents.[21] In this schema, agonism and its expression in competitive athletics delineated the elite from the rest of society and created two distinct and conflicting sets of cultural values: the heroic, individualistic agonism of the athlete and the civic, communitarian ideals of the developing Greek *polis*.

---

[19] Golden 1998, 143. Equestrian events are considered to have been particularly costly and, as a result, were the most significant victories to win (Miller 2004, 234; Serwint 1987, 76; Golden 1997, 330; etc.). Nicholson argues that this identification of equestrianism with the elite is the reason for both the designation of a winning chariot by the name of its sponsor and the general lack of interest in the lower class charioteers (Nicholson 2003, 102-103).

[20] Smith 2007, 83; Willcock 1995, 15; Kurke 1991, 3, 85-159; Nicholson 2003, 101-10; Golden 1998, 80.

[21] Morgan 1990, 93. Many scholars see the elite interest in the public sanctuary in terms of a shift away from the lavish grave goods of the earlier periods towards a more permanent and visible declaration of personal wealth and *aretê* (Downie 2004, 21; Kurke 2003, 79).

However, just as we cannot simply identify competition with egoism in contradistinction to community in the Homeric texts, we also cannot accept such a dichotomy in the context of the Archaic and Classical Greek worlds. The problems in this schema arise from the assumptions being made about competition and, by extension, the dichotomy of civic community and elite individualism. We must reconsider to what degree agonism was an elite ethic, and whether it is properly understood as stratifying and individuating as opposed to egalitarian and communitarian.

1.3 Athletic Self-Promotion and the Athlete's Place in the *Polis*

Indeed, scholars recognize that the notion of a dichotomy between *agon* and *polis* cannot be held without at least some qualification. Agonism tends to be viewed as the last stronghold of the egoistic, heroic ethic of the elite. This ethic was in conflict with the direction of the developing *polis* and scholars argue that, as a result of the increasing egalitarianism of the Greek state, the elite were wary of the danger of being too blatantly self-promoting.[22] As a result, athletes looked for a means by which to prevent their egoistic ethic from being perceived as a threat to the social cohesion of the community while still obtaining the social regard which their heroic ethic required. In this view, though the elite formed a panhellenic class apart in organized athletics, they were still careful not to endanger their connection to their

[22] Tyranny is appreciated as the exemplar of taking individualism so far that it becomes a danger. For a discussion of the relationship between tyranny and athletic self-promotion in athletic epinicians, see Thomas 2007, 143-5; Nagy 1990, 156ff.

individual *poleis*. As the *polis* grew more powerful, therefore, elite athletes needed to become more circumspect in their self-glorification.[23]

There are two main methods by which victorious athletes typically commemorated themselves: epinician odes and victory statues. The epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides are closely associated by scholars with the aristocracy of Archaic Greece and its desire, so it is proposed, simultaneously to disguise and promote its heroic, egoistic ethic. The epinician praises the individual victor and immortalizes the athlete's achievements and as a result, Thomas argues, reinforces the values of athletic prowess, lineage and glory commonly associated with the *aretê* of the elite.[24] However, this emphasis on personal achievement presents a threat to the cohesion of the egalitarian community. It is in order to prevent their patron's self-aggrandizement from being recognized as an egoistic pursuit, scholars argue, that Pindar and Bacchylides represented these victories as public goods enacted on the part of the victor to the benefit of his community.[25] Kurke argues that one of the functions of Pindar's odes is to reintegrate the athlete into his house, his class and his *polis* so as to limit the social tensions caused by exclusivity without sacrificing participation in a transregional elite.[26]

---

[23] Fitzgerald 1987, 21; Kurke 1991, 229, 232ff; 1993, 141; Golden 1998, 84-85; Goldhill 1991, 136.
[24] Thomas 2007, 142. Thomas notes that these values are also advocated by the egalitarian demos, though she sees this as an appropriation of aristocratic values on the part of the demos rather than an equal sharing of the same ethical system; it is also important to note, however, that no clear distinction between upper and lower class victors is made within Pindar's odes (Golden 1998, 87).
[25] Golden 1998, 85.
[26] Kurke 1993, 6.

The epinician fell out of style in the fifth century BC, and was superseded by the practice of erecting statues of the victorious athlete, both in the athlete's home *polis* and in the sanctuary at which the victory was won. Scholars argue that, like the epinician, the victory statue was born of the desire to find an outlet for conspicuous egoistic self-promotion at a time when other avenues of elite competition were being closed.[27] The ability to immortalize victories in epinicians and statues was of central importance to the self-promotion of the athlete at the panhellenic level as well as among his fellow citizens.[28]

In the Classical Period, scholars see a shift in the type of glory that elites were attempting to derive from this sort of conspicuous display. In focusing more heavily on the concept of both victories and their commemorations as acts of patronage for the community in the panhellenic arena, the elite began adapting their egoistic ethic to align themselves more closely with the benefits they could get from being benefactors to their *poleis*.[29] Following this view, we could presume that the heroic ethic of the elite should have diminished in importance as the *polis*' power increased; however, scholars suggest instead that, for the elite athlete who measured his personal worth through the lens of both athletic and political

[27] Smith 2007, 135-6.
[28] Neer 2004, 85-86.
[29] Carey 2007, 201. Raschke goes further than this in her analysis to argue that the victory statue habit was an earmark of an increasingly democratic sentiment among free Greeks interested in competing and cooperating freely with each other (Raschke 1988, 48).

achievement, presenting his personal athletic achievements as achievements of the whole community neatly aligned the two elements of his search for *aretê*.[30]

In addition to commissioning personal victory monuments therefore, victorious athletes turned to other benefactions, such as public works or feasts, to celebrate their achievements. When turned towards largess, scholars argue, this type of conspicuous consumption "simultaneously demonstrated [the victor's] piety, expanded the space for celebration and thereby the audience, and through a feast... took the opportunity to display his generosity and exploit the potential for patronage"[31]. By focusing his personal desire for *aretê* onto community-oriented displays of his excellence, then, the athlete continued to be driven by an elite egoistic agonism, albeit validated by the approval of the *polis* community.

In this way, the scholarship of the Archaic and Classical periods has been built on a dichotomy between elitist agonism and civic community. However, just as Williams argued that the Homeric hero cannot be at once completely self-directed and wholly other-regarding, it is likewise not feasible to accept that the athlete was interested in nothing but his own personal glory when acting as the representative of his *polis* in the public eye of the collected Greek peoples. Scholarship has accordingly understood the acceptance of agonism by the civic community as the result of the elite finding a place within the *polis* for its elitist practices. By presenting agonism as a form of *philotimia*, scholars argue, elite athletes could

[30] Oliver 2007, 199; Sinn 2000, 51; Kurke 1991, 167-169; 1999, 133-134; Hornblower and Morgan 2007, 5, 17.
[31] Carey 2007, 202; Raschke 1988, 40.

indulge their desire for zero-sum competition without being opposed by the communitarian ethic of the *polis*.[32] This does not, however, explain the *polis*' interest in agonism.

The Greek *poleis* harnessed the elite desire for personal glory, or *philotimia*, to the benefit of the community.[33] Many *poleis* granted rewards to citizens who were victorious in the panhellenic games. Such rewards included honourary statues or coins, seats of honour in the theatre/games, and exemption from taxes. Spartan victors at Olympia earned the right to fight at the king's side in the phalanx.[34] This, and the fact that athletic victory could be seen as a declaration of political ambition[35], helps clarify the personal benefit that athletes could gain from their victories; however, it does little to explain why *poleis* would reward athletic victory in this fashion. The benefit that the *polis* received from other kinds of civic benefactions, such as public works and building projects, is fairly self-evident; it is clear that the *polis* must also have gained something from treating athletic victory as a benefaction.

The panhellenic sanctuary was at once a neutral and highly contested space, and the elements that made it an ideal location for the conspicuous display of personal glory for the elite also made it valuable for the display of the aspirations of

[32] Tyrell 2004, 142; Sinn 2000, 29-30; Kurke 1993, 141; Goldhill 1991, 109.
[33] Fisher 2009, 540. Burckhardt argues that, in the Archaic period, the *polis* failed to make use of elite *philotimia* and, as a result, its prominent citizens focused on shameless self-promotion rather than the service of the state (Burckhardt 1998, 72).
[34] Golden 1998, 76; O'Sullivan 2003, 75; Fisher 2009, 530; Xenophanes fr. 2; Plut. Lyc. 22.4.
[35] Thomas 2007, 142; Sinn 2000, 47.

the *polis*.[36] One of the key ways in which a *polis* could gain personal prestige at the panhellenic level was through the achievements of its citizens. Athletes, particularly at the panhellenic games, acted as the representatives of their *poleis* and the focus of civic consciousness, competing in their own names and those of their *poleis*. Currie argues that *poleis* 'often' dedicated statues of their victorious athletes in the panhellenic sanctuaries and the rewards granted to victors make it clear that *poleis* were interested in ensuring that their citizens continued to perform well in the panhellenic games.[37] The standard scholarly view suggests that this connection allowed athletes to continue their customary self-serving behaviour under the guise of public benefit, but also that, at the same time, the *polis* appropriated the *timê* of athletic victory for itself.

Thus, the appearance of *polis*-made monumental dedications in the Archaic period is viewed as the clearest incursion of the interests of *poleis* into the previously elite-dominated panhellenic sanctuary.[38] Civic treasuries, by collecting existing elite dedications, channeled their value firmly into a new political *polis* framework. The main goal of a state treasury, Neer argues, was to nationalize the individual dedications of its citizens at the sanctuary and, as a result, claim ownership of the dedicator's relationship with the gods and enhance the reputation

[36] Constantakopulou 2007, 46; Morgan 1990, 2-3; Fisher 2009, 530.
[37] Currie 2005, 155; Carey 2007, 202.
[38] Rups 1986, 253-255; Neer 2001, 282-285, 326-328; 2004, 64-65; Snodgrass 1986, 54; Sinn 2000, 30. Sinn particularly affiliates the fourth century with the transfer of authority in the panhellenic sanctuary from the elite to a 'large middle class'; however, civic monuments began to be erected in the sanctuaries at least as early as the sixth century.

of the *polis* by extension.[39] Even as scholarship accepts and acknowledges the implication of the athlete in his *polis* and the interest and presence of the *polis* in the sanctuary, then, it remains committed to the premise that agonism is elitist and fundamentally at odds with the *polis* and so must explain away this confusion by arguing that either the athlete is only feigning interest in the civic community or the *polis* is appropriating an agonistic ethic for its own benefit.[40] This study seeks to build on the many insights of this scholarship, but also to move beyond a presumed dichotomy of *agon* and *homonoia* to explore the ways in which agonism functions precisely within and is structured by *polis* society, even as the *polis* constantly had to negotiate both the tensions of competition and between collective and individual.

Moreover, the relationship between athlete and *polis* must be seen in the context of the *polis*' role as itself a contestant in a peer *agon*, as a competitor with other *poleis* in a panhellenic community. By erecting a treasury or military victory monument in a panhellenic sanctuary, Valavanis points out, *poleis* set themselves up in direct competition with other *poleis* that had erected monuments.[41] States frequently commissioned monuments to celebrate and commemorate military victories and alliances in order to promote their own status and power within the panhellenic domain of the sanctuary. This desire to be compared to other *poleis* played a central role in both the proliferation of civic monuments within the

[39] Neer 2001, 284; Neer 2004, 64.
[40] See Fisher 2009 for his insightful argument as to why "the values associated with the competitive spirit, manly success and courage (*aretê, andreia*), honor (*timê*), competitiveness for honor (*philotimia*), love of victory (*philonikia*), strife should not be seen... as exclusively aristocratic or elitist values" (Fisher 2009, 525).
[41] Valavanis 2004, 228.

panhellenic sanctuary and the *polis*' encouragement of the self-promotion of its victorious athletes.[42] As *poleis* claimed for themselves the victories of their athletes, so they themselves entered into an *agon* at the panhellenic level, in rivalry with other *poleis*. This *agon* has the potential to create conflict among the Greek *poleis*; however, it remains predicated upon a sense of communion and community between the *poleis* as they meet in common at the panhellenic sanctuaries. Just as the athlete felt the need to reconcile his personal *timê* with his place in the city, so too did the interactions of *poleis* reveal a constant ambivalence between the promotion of the individual *polis* and the appreciation of a common, panhellenic identity supported by the existence of the neutral space of the sanctuary.

1.4 Conclusions

We have seen that self-regard and regard for others, individual self-assertion and common belonging, are all at play in the dynamics of competition, and that, while agonism may be a force for conflict and distinction, it may equally promote mutuality and commonality. This study will examine the dynamics of *agon* and *homonoia* as they played out in the context of the panhellenic sanctuary of the Classical Period, in the relationships of both the athlete to his *polis* and the individual *polis* to the panhellenic community. The panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia, Nemea, Isthmia and Delphi provide a clear context in which to explore the dynamics of conflict, competition and community in the relationship of individual

[42] Snodgrass 1986, 55: Snodgrass argues that this heavy emphasis on individual *polis* dedications was the reason why the panhellenic sanctuaries were comparatively slow to gain monumental temples in the Archaic period; Sinn provides the specific example of Phidias' chryselephantine Zeus at Olympia as a personal dedication to the god on behalf of the Eleans rather than a cult statue (Sinn 2000, 64).

and collective in Greek culture. The particularly Greek ethic of competitive interaction is much richer and more complex than a dichotomy of *agon* and *homonoia*, or elite athlete and *polis* community, can readily account for. In attempting to complicate this increasingly untenable dichotomy, this study will propose a more complex, tense dynamic of egoism and egalitarianism, and conflict and community in Greece. Chapter two will focus on the self-commemoration of the athlete within the panhellenic sanctuary and will consider the evidence of both epinicians and victory statues. The question of the relation of the athlete to his *polis* will inform the related question of the stake and presence of the *polis* in the sanctuary, which will be the subject of the third chapter. While this study will draw evidence from all the panhellenic sanctuaries, I will focus on the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi in the fifth and fourth centuries BC to establish manageable parameters and allow for close examination of these issues.

Chapter Two - The Athlete's Identity: Individual Self-Representation and the Athlete as Citizen

2.1 Introduction - Dedications and the Athlete, *Oikos* and *Polis*

It is clear from the ancient evidence that athletes took care to immortalize their victories in order to obtain as much benefit from them as they could beyond the immediate rewards of winning a panhellenic crown.[1] The ways in which victorious athletes chose to commemorate themselves and their achievements reveal a great deal about their personal goals in striving for athletic victory as well as the expectations that their fellow Greeks had of them. This chapter will explore the relationships between the individual athlete, his victory, his *oikos* and his *polis* as they are figured in these victory memorials. Is athletic victory exclusively concerned with the triumph of the individual in an international aristocratic society or is it also about the implication of the athlete in his civic community?

Scholars argue that athletic victory commemorations embodied the central values of *aretê*, beauty and athletic prowess generally associated with the heroic value system of the Greek elite.[2] However, as Carey argues, it was the athlete's fellow citizens who were the principal audience for such display.[3] Athletic victory yielded popularity both at home and abroad and could, as a result, act as a stepping stone for political achievement. The athlete could expect the honour he had won at the panhellenic games to translate into material, social and economic benefits in his

[1] Crotty 1982, 4; Smith 2007, 83.
[2] E.g. Thomas 2007, 142; Crotty 1982, 16; Carey 2007, 201; Currie 2005, 144-146; Raschke 1988, 39; etc.
[3] Carey 2007, 203.

home *polis*. In some *poleis*, such as Athens, victors had a better chance than other citizens of being chosen for political positions and were often selected for diplomatic posts.[4] Currie notes that "literary sources often mention the athletic credentials of people who distinguished themselves in battle,"[5] and it was also not unusual for athletes to become oikists for new colonies.[6] Such rewards stemmed from the fact that the athlete acted not just for himself but also for his community. Already in Homer *aresthai*, to win *kudos*, often takes a beneficiary in the dative for whom the hero wins *kudos*, most frequently his race or his people.[7] Rather than competing solely for his own glory, then, the Homeric hero also won glory for his social group. This concept of personal victory on behalf of the collective appears frequently in athlete-funded memorials to panhellenic victory. Victory proclamations at the panhellenic sanctuaries, as well as any subsequent mentions of the victory in inscriptions and literature, included the name of the victor's family and city.[8]

Thomas argues that "it is the supreme elevation of the victor as victor (rather than as member of a family or *polis*) that is most prominent"[9] in victor commemorations in sanctuaries and *poleis*. Other scholars including Leslie Kurke argue, rightly I believe, that scholars need to focus on the mutual implication of the athlete's identities as an individual, a member of his *oikos* and a member of his *polis*

---

[4] Sinn 2000, 48; Golden 1998, 144.
[5] Currie 2005, 149-50; e.g. Plut. Lyc. 22.4.
[6] Dougherty 1993, 120. Dougherty observes that the civic role of the athlete was similar to that of the oikist.
[7] Kurke 1993, 132.
[8] Currie 2005, 155.
[9] Thomas 2007, 165; See Jones 1962, 29-46, 82-137; Goldhill 1986, 9-106 etc. for this emphasis on the personal agency of the athlete.

within this context.[10] Kurke suggests that the victor's real *kudos* was dependent on the approval of his wider community and that one of the main roles of victory commemorations was to aid in the athlete's reintegration with the family and community he had removed himself from by leaving to participate in the panhellenic games.[11] According to this logic, there is a larger complex of identities at play in the self-representation of the athlete than is suggested by the dichotomy of elite individual and egalitarian *polis*.

2.2.1 Pindar

The two main forms of victory commemoration funded by athletes were the epinician, most common in the sixth and fifth centuries BC, and the victory statue, which rose in popularity as the epinician waned and continued to be popular into the Hellenistic period. Pindar was active as an epinician poet from c498-446 BC and is the best surviving example of the genre. His epinicia were arranged by the Hellenistic scholiasts into books corresponding to the four panhellenic games and total 45 poems ranging from 20 to 124 lines in length.[12] These odes could be performed at both the sanctuary and the athlete's home *polis*, and put a strong emphasis on the connection of local mythic tradition with a wider panhellenic *mythos*.[13] They spend very little time focusing on the actual event of the victory and turn instead to consider the history of the victor's family and *polis*, as emplotted in local and panhellenic myths. This lack of interest about the victory itself shifts

[10] Kurke 1991, 19.
[11] Kurke 1991, 124.
[12] Race 1997, 34-35.
[13] Currie 2005, 17; Gentili 1988, 116-118; Race 1997, 15, 19-23; Erskine 2005, 131.

Pindar's focus to the conditions that both enable and result from victory and the ways in which the victorious athlete can be best understood within the context of his family lineage and the mythic past of his homeland.[14]

2.2.2 Athlete and *Oikos*

The close association of the achievements of the individual and the achievements of his family was not a new concept in Pindar's time. The discourse between Sarpedon and Glaucus in Homer's *Iliad* on the glory of their paternal lineages is an early example of the Greek appreciation for the fact that the achievements of the individual reflected well on his *oikos* and vice versa.[15] In a similar fashion, Pindar's epinicians frequently consider the achievements of an individual victor through the lens of the broader history of his *oikos* and establish him as figure who is intrinsically connected to the good reputation of his family.

Kurke argues that the *oikos* was the agent responsible for the commemoration of the athlete in epinicians and victory monuments.[16] She points to the several odes commemorating winners in the boys events who would not have been able to commission the odes themselves.[17] Though this evidence does not necessarily implicate the *oikos* in all commissions of victory odes, the argument is supported by the close literary connection between athlete and family in the odes themselves. About half of Pindar's epinicians make direct reference to the athlete's *oikos* and Pindar invariably presents birth as an important factor in the athlete's

[14] Carey 1995, 91.
[15] Homer, *Iliad* 12.359ff.
[16] Kurke 1991, 20.
[17] O8, O10, P10, P11, N5, N6, N7, I6, I8; possibly also O14, P8, N4, I7.

victory.[18] That we find this heavy emphasis on familial glory in even those odes that were not likely commissioned by the *oikos* suggests a mutual interest on the part of athletes and their *oikoi* to implicate each other in the victory; rather than an individual championing a personal victory then, the well-born athlete is identified with the reputation of his *oikos.*

Pindar identifies the athlete's current victory with a family tradition of excellence. Megakles' *oikos* in Pythian 7 is "the mighty race of the Alcmaeonidae (Ἀλκμανιδᾶν εὐρυσθενεῖ/ γενεᾷ)"[19] and Pindar cites not only Megakles' current victory but also "two from Cirrha - yours, Megacles, and your ancestors' (δύο δ' ἀπὸ Κίρρας,/ ὦ Μεγάκλεες,/ ὑμαί τε καὶ προγόνων)"[20] as the occasions for his praise. Pythian 8 favourably compares the wrestler Aristomenes to his uncles who also won panhellenic wrestling events as part of their contribution to the glory of the *oikos.*[21] This connection of recent athletic victory with previous athletic victory is common in Pindar and, as Kurke argues, "the poet frequently acknowledges athletic expenditure as 'competitive honorific activity' in which the victor has revealed himself and his family as 'the best'"[22]. For Pindar, the current victory is a

---

[18] Carey 1995, 88; Tyrell 2004, 99. As complied by Kurke (1991, 20), the odes that praise the athlete's *oikos* are: O2.48-51; O3.37-8; O6.71-81; O7.15-17; O8.15-17, 67-76; O9.83-99; O13.1-2, 29-46, 97-113, P6.5-6, 45-6; P7.13-18; P8.35-38; P9.71-72; P10.11-16; P11.13-14, 43-50; N2.17-24; N4.73-90; N5.41-46, 50-54; N6.11-22, 25-26, 31-44, 58-63; N8.16; N10.33; N11.19-20, I2.28-32; I3.9-17b; I4.1-5, 25-29; I5.17-19; I6.3-7, 57-62; I8.61-66.

[19] P7.2-3 (translated by Race, 1997).

[20] P7.15-17 (translated by Svarlien, 1990).

[21] P8.35-38; see Crotty 1982, 18.

[22] Kurke 1991, 99; see O10.64; O13.43, P3.74; N11.13-4. The later Greek sophist Philostratus reveals the continuation of this view even into the Roman Principate when he argues that "it is human nature to set a higher value on abilities that have been handed down from father to son. Therefore, the

continuation and affirmation of the glory already achieved by the athlete's *oikos*. For this reason, Pythian 9 concludes with praise, not of the victor Telesikrates, but of his ancestor Alexidamos and the "many winged wreaths of victories he had won (πολλὰ δὲ... πτερὰ δέξατο νικᾶν)"[23]. By celebrating the symbols of Alexidamos' victory, Pindar glorifies Telesikrates by extension.

On the other hand, athletes who fail to achieve the same success at the games suffer joyless homecomings and harm both themselves and the happiness of their *oikoi* with their failure.[24] The fear of disgracing the traditional glory of the *oikos* features in several Pythian odes,[25] while the "grace of a good name (εὐώνυμον...χάριν)"[26] is championed as the greatest possession an athlete's descendents can receive from him. Because, as Kurke argues, the victor and his entire *oikos* benefit from his victory, or suffer from his failure, the consolidation and perpetuation of glory through athletic victory is a household concern.[27] In addition to living up to the glorious tradition of the past, the athlete can also make up for past failings in his *oikos* through a new victory.[28] Nemean 6, for example, praises Alcimidas for redeeming his father's disgrace through his victory in the Nemean

---

Olympic victor who comes from a family of Olympic victors is more glorious" (Philostr. *VS* 611 (translated by Golden, 1998)).

[23] P9.125 (translated by Race, 1997).

[24] See e.g. P8.81-87.

[25] See e.g. I3.13-14

[26] P.11.57-58 (translated by Race, 1997).

[27] Kurke 1991, 38; Mackie 2003, 41. Kurke argues further that the reintegration of the athlete into his *oikos* is a central goal of the epinician and that, without this temporal framework of traditional glory, the glory of the athlete's victory has no perpetuity (Kurke, 1991, 58-60).

[28] Carey 1995, 87; Crotty 1982, 118.

games, and for putting an end to the obscurity that has plagued his *oikos*.[29] The athlete is a representative of his *oikos* at the panhellenic games and, if victorious, naturally shares his victory with his *oikos* since the praise of his family's glorious history in turn increases the prestige of his current victory even as that victory adds to and evokes the family's tradition of glory.[30] In Pythian 9, Pindar claims "someone exacts a debt from me to reawaken/ As well the ancient glory of his [Telesikrates'] ancestors (ἐμὲ δ' οὖν τις... πράσσει χρέος, αὖτις ἐγεῖραι/ καὶ παλαιὰν δόξαν ἐῶν προγόνων)"[31] as a natural and necessary part of his praise of Telesikrates. The current victory becomes the occasion through which the *oikos* can legitimately celebrate its glorious past.[32]

Athletic prowess is not the only kind of ancestral glory that a victory at the panhellenic games can perpetuate. Pythian 7 praises the victor Megakles' *oikos*, the Alcmaeonidae, for its good reputation across Greece, and makes reference to their rebuilding of the façade of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi in the sixth century B.C.[33] This act, itself connected to the practice of making personal dedications within the sacred space of the panhellenic sanctuary, is a clear point of pride for the Alcmaeonidae. Megakles' victory at the Pythian Games provides an opportunity to

---

[29] N6.17-24.

[30] e.g. N6.59-63. This close connection between familial fame and personal achievement is not limited solely to athletic commemorations. As Strauss notes, "the young men of Plato's dialogues are often flattered with references to the greatness and fame of their families. Hippothales for example, lover of Lysis, wrote verses about Lysis' father, grandfather, and ancestors, playing up their horses, wealth, victories at the Panhellenic games, and kinship with Herakles himself (Pl. Lys. 205c)" (Strauss 1993, 72).

[31] P9.103-105 (translated by Race, 1997).

[32] Kurke 1991, 43.

[33] P7.10-11.

promote it and once again integrates the athlete's accomplishments into his family identity. His role as a member of his *oikos* is not separate from his identity as a successful individual, but rather is part of that identity to the end that, by showing his pride in his *oikos* he invariably shows pride in himself as well.

2.2.3 Athlete and *Polis*

Just as the epinician's emphasis on the inherited glory the athlete receives from his family creates ties between the athlete and the traditions and achievements of his *oikos*, so too praise of his *polis* is an integral part of the praise of the athlete. Goldhill notes that it is difficult to separate the praise of the individual from praise of his *polis*, and Dougherty adds that, from an epinician standpoint, praise for the victor and his native *polis* are naturally linked.[34] Pythian 7, for example, begins with an invocation of Athens as the 'fairest prelude' (κάλλιστον προοίμιον) with which to champion the victory of Megakles.[35] By establishing from the outset a sense of mutual implication between the athlete and his *polis*, the epinician poet can situate the achievements of the athlete within the *polis*' own tradition of inherited excellence.

One of the athlete's main goals, according to Pindar, is to win fame. The athlete expends time and effort to avoid falling into the sort of obscurity that comes with either the failure to achieve victory or the denial of the due praise that such an achievement should merit.[36] Kurke and Crotty see the main duty of the epinician as

[34] Goldhill 1991, 137; Dougherty 1993, 122.
[35] P7.1-2.
[36] C.f. O8.63-64; O1.81-83; N1.10-12.

being to help the athlete reintegrate into his *polis* community.[37] The concept of *nostos*, the return home, ties neatly into Kurke and Crotty's reading since, in this view, the athlete's departure from the *polis* is invariably followed by a return home again to share his newfound glory with his fellow citizens.[38] The athlete cannot win victory at the sanctuary without leaving the *polis* and cannot receive his due praise for the victory without returning home, and so there is a balance between the two extremes of the athlete's journey which are both necessary elements of his quest for glory.[39] Pythian 7's Megakles is an athlete who is unable to return home with the glory he has obtained and, as a result, Pindar is grieved that "envy requites [his] noble deeds (φθόνον ἀμειβόμενον τὰ καλὰ ἔργα)".[40] On the opposite end of the scale, Olympian 12 praises the benevolence of the city-goddess Tyche for allowing the victorious Ergoteles, having been previously driven from his homeland by civil war, to return home with the glory he has won at Olympia.[41] The *nostos* returns the athlete to his homeland and enables him to earn the praise of his fellow citizens in recognition of the victory he has won.

Pindar's epinicians prolong and extend the moment of victory, moving it beyond the moment of the athlete's crowning in the panhellenic sanctuary and

---

[37] Kurke 1999, 134; 1993, 140; 1991, 6; Crotty 1982, 106.
[38] Crotty 1982, 132; Kurke 1991, 17; c.f. O5, P12, N9, P9, P4, O6, N2, P8.81-86, O8.69, P1.35.
[39] Kurke 1991, 25-27. This ring structure is echoed by the style of Pindar's epinicians themselves, Kurke argues, in the way that they shift outwards to disparate topics, including the athlete's *oikos* and *polis* and mythological narrative, yet continually return to the central topic of the praise of the athlete for his victory (Kurke 1991, 49). C.f. N4.73-5; N3.26-28 - Pindar's narrative goes all the way to the Pillars of Herakles, the edge of the world, before drawing back and returning to the main thrust of the ode.
[40] P7.19 (translated by Race, 1997).
[41] O12.17-19.

immortalizing it in a way that is an encouragement to praise, even as the poem is itself worthy of praise. Pindar presents the praise he offers to the athlete as an appropriate and necessary response to his achievements: a praise that all others, particularly the athlete's fellow citizens, should also accord him.[42] Pindar uses his ode to situate the athlete and his personal victory within the context of his family and *polis*, helping to reconcile the individual to his wider community.

The danger of *phthonos*, envy, to the glory and reputation of a victorious athlete is a common theme in Pindar's epinicians. *Phthonos* appears frequently in Pindar as the antithesis of praise because it can undercut the value of an athlete's victory or make the athlete fearful of celebrating his own achievements lest he risk incurring the jealousy of others.[43] The tension that *phthonos* creates in society is particularly dangerous when it occurs among an athlete's fellow citizens, where it is damaging to both the outstanding individual's position in society and also to the cohesion of the *polis* itself.[44] Pythian 7 presents an extreme example of the danger that envy holds for the successful athlete: Megakles is in exile at the time of his Pythian victory, and Pindar grieves that such a state of affairs has arisen from the undue jealousy of his fellow Athenians.[45] According to Crotty, the athlete relies on the epinician poet to "persuade the audience of the praiseworthiness of athletic

[42] Crotty 1982, 58. Much work has been done addressing Pindar's tendency to qualify his relationship with his patrons in the context of the *xenia* relationship of shared friendship and mutual obligation. See Kurke 1991, 135ff.
[43] E.g. I2.43-48; O6.74-75.
[44] Gentili 1988, 107; Fisher 2009, 537; Mackie 2003, 18.
[45] P7.18-19; Crotty 1982, 10-12; Kyle 1987, 157.

endeavor and, more specifically, of the current victory"[46] so as to prevent the sorts of situations, like Megakles', where the athlete is punished for his endeavours rather than rewarded.

In order to keep the *phthonos* of the athlete's fellow citizens from overwhelming the positive praise he receives from his victory, Pindar establishes the victory as an element of *megaloprepeia*, expenditure for public benefit. He advises victorious athletes to be conscientious in seeking what Pythian 11 claims are "common excellences (ξυναῖσι... ἀρεταῖς)"[47]. Instead of only a personal achievement, then, the athlete's victory can become a benefaction to the *polis*, achieved through much toil and personal expense towards a public end.[48] Many of Pindar's epinicians equate athletic achievement with financial wealth and identify both of them as praiseworthy means by which a man can prove his virtue.[49] In this way, athletics, rather than serving the individual interests of the athlete, are instead characterized as a way of making the athlete's wealth useful to the community.[50] In Goldhill's words, Pindar's poetry "strives to articulate the place of the outstanding individual within the norms of social discourse, and with regard to the limits of

[46] Crotty 1982, 16.
[47] P11.54 (translated by Svarlien, 1990).
[48] Serwint 1987, 7; Fisher 2009, 536-538; Golden 1998, 85. Golden goes on to argue that the decline of the epinician in the mid fifth century BC was a result of the elite having become 'weary' of this image, though he does not address the fact that the later statue trend also fits into this concept of athletic victory as public benefaction.
[49] E.g. O2.55; I3.1-3; Fisher 2009, 537.
[50] N1.31-32; Burton 1962, 23.

mortality that the divine frame ensures, and also within the history of achievement and transgression that myth expresses"[51].

Pindar establishes firm boundaries for how far *megaloprepeia* extends by presenting the ideal athlete as a moderate (*metrios*) elite man who deserves to be praised by his fellow citizens for bestowing his victory on the city without claiming an undue amount of glory for himself.[52] Ober argues that elites were prone towards showing themselves to be moderate and hardworking in their public actions in order to deflect the resentment and envy prompted by their wealth.[53] The 'dramatic fiction', as Ober terms it, of the elite-*metrios* depends upon the collusion of the ode's audience, the athlete's fellow citizens, who choose to accept the athlete's claim to absolute altruism even as the ode praises and promotes the athlete and his family beyond the level of an ordinary citizen. Pindar plays into this tension in his odes by simultaneously praising the athlete and redirecting that praise to praise of the *polis*, integrating the athlete and his *polis* so that praise of the one automatically results in praise for the other. Pythian 9 claims that "in holy Pytho the son of Karneiadas/ Has joined [Kyrene] to flourishing good fortune,/ For by his victory there he made Kyrene glorious (ἐν Πυθῶνί νιν ἀγαθέᾳ Καρνειάδα/ υἱὸς εὐθαλεῖ συνέμειξε τύχᾳ/ ἔνθα νικάσαις ἀνέφανε Κυράναν)"[54], and athletes who show justice and moderation are invariably the ones most worthy of praise in Pindar's odes.[55]

---

[51] Goldhill 1991, 138; Mackie 2003, 33.
[52] Kurke 1991, 209; I3.1-3; N11.13-17; I6.65-73.
[53] Ober 1989, 221ff.
[54] P9.71-73 (translated by Race, 1997).
[55] Carey 1982, 129-30.

The main way Pindar's odes present the athlete's victory as a public benefaction is by sharing the victory, and its attached glory, with the *polis* as a collective whole. Competing in the panhellenic games required a massive expenditure of time and money on the athlete's part and so, by representing this effort as a sacrifice for the benefit of the *polis*, rather than an expression of egoistic self-promotion, Pindar turns the victory into a sign of the athlete's commitment to his *polis* and the *polis'* good reputation on the panhellenic stage. Pindar presents Pythian 9 as "a crowning song for chariot-driving Kyrene (διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας)"[56] that Kyrene was only able to receive because Telesikrates added his victory at Delphi to the already considerable glory of his *polis*. Olympian 5 begins with an invocation of the victor's *polis* and the immediate dedication of the victory *kudos* to the continued glory of the *polis*.[57] Because the epinician establishes the athlete's success as something that the whole *polis* has a share in, the victory, as Crotty terms it, "becomes a paradigm for all human effort"[58] that encourages emulation among his fellow citizens rather than conflict. Rather than replacing competition, this sort of emulation instead allows for competition in which one competitor may seek to outdo another, not in a zero-sum relation that denigrates the other, but rather, in a rivalry predicated on and productive of mutuality and commonality.

---

[56] P9.3-4 (translated by Race, 1997); Carey 1995, 88.
[57] O5.1-8.
[58] Crotty 1982, 16. This distinction is also reminiscent of Hesiod's discussion of the two kinds of *eris*, strife, and the benefits that good strife has for the community (Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 11-24).

Pythian 7 takes this one step further and connects not only Megakles' athletic victories with the glory of Athens but also the restoration of the façade of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi by the Alcmaeonidae in the sixth century BC. Pindar praises this as a dedication made by all of 'Erechtheus' citizens' (Ἐρεχθέος ἀστῶν) rather than, as was actually the case, an undertaking conducted at the personal, private expense of the Alcmaeonidae.[59] Kurke argues that the reciprocal advantage inherent in this conflation of public and private activity establishes that "their membership in the Athenian *polis* is itself part of the monument of praise the poet constructs for the Alcmaeonidae. But the glorious reputation of Athens - what makes it the most beautiful *krepis* of songs - depends, in turn, on the *megaloprepeia* of the Alcmaeonidae".[60] Pindar's description of Athens as a *krepis*[61], a foundation or altar base, connects it with the other main form of victory commemoration: the votive statue. In this metaphor the *polis* itself acts as a foundation that presents the athlete and his accomplishments to his fellow Greeks, and sets him up as something to be admired.[62]

Crotty suggests that Pindar often separates the more exclusive praise of the athlete's *oikos* from the praise of the *polis*[63]; however, it is not uncommon to find both the *oikos* and the *polis* mutually implicated in the victory of the athlete in

---

[59] P7.10-11; Hdt. 5.62.
[60] Kurke 1991, 191; P7.1-2.
[61] P7.3.
[62] Pindar champions the epinician over the victory statue, using terms borrowed from sculpture to promote the superiority of poetry (e.g. N5.1-5). The scholiast's note for Nemean 5 suggests that a statue could take the place of a poem as a commemoration (Σ 1a, III 89 Drachmann; O'Sullivan 2003, 77-80).
[63] Crotty 1982, 60.

Pindar.[64] In the same breath as he praises Megakles' *oikos*, Pindar ties this praise to his praise of Athens, establishing both family and city as possessing the most "illustrious reputation in Hellas (ἐπιφανέστερον Ἑλλάδι πυθέσθαι)"[65]. Olympian 7 claims both that common glory comes upon Rhodes whenever the victor's *oikos*, the Eratidae, wins victories and that the whole city holds a festival to celebrate, not just the *oikos*.[66] Pindar integrates the athlete into not only his *polis* but also, since the athlete's *oikos* is implicated in all praise of the athlete, his *oikos*.

The ultimate symbol of victory at the panhellenic level was the crown. Kurke argues that the crown was the physical embodiment of the glory that came from panhellenic victory.[67] Pindar in many passages draws a connection between the victor's crown and the dedication of the victory to the public good.[68] Olympian 9 concludes with the dedication of Epharmostos' victory crown upon the altar of Aias, a local hero, and scholars suggest that it was fairly common practice for athletes to dedicate their victory crowns upon their return home in a visual symbol of the transfer of their glory to the *polis*.[69] In a similar fashion, Pythian 9 describes Telesikrates as the crowning glory of his *polis* and uses the image of the victory crown to emphasize the complete integration of the individual and his *polis* within the context of panhellenic athletic victory.[70] Thucydides' Pericles uses athletic

[64] C.f. O13.1-5; P8.21-4; I5.19-22.
[65] P7.5-9 (translated by Race, 1997).
[66] O7.93-4.
[67] Kurke 1993, 131, 138-140; 1991, 205.
[68] E.g. P12.1.5-6; O4.8-12; P12.4-6; I1.10-12; O3.6-8; etc.
[69] O9.107-112; Kurke 1993, 140; Dougherty 1993, 140.
[70] P9.4.

metaphor to speak of the final prize (στέφανον) that crowns the lives of the fallen warriors in his Funeral Oration, which, Scanlon argues, further supports the close connection of victorious, crowned athlete and citizenship.[71]

2.2.4 Mythology

Mythology figures prominently in the epinician and, in all but the shortest odes within Pindar's corpus, plays a central role in structuring and organizing the ode. Pindar uses mythological episodes to bridge between the different sections of his odes in order to create one continuous narrative. In Pythian 9 for example, Pindar transitions from praise of the *polis* of Kyrene, to praise of Telesikrates' athletic accomplishments, to a warning against the dangers of *phthonos,* and finally to praise of Telesikrates' ancestors, through the medium of myth.[72] Pindar's mythic episodes mirror and expand upon the themes and issues he raises to praise the athlete, his *oikos* and his *polis* and create a connection between the current victory and a traditional, heroic past into which the athlete can fit himself.

The mythic heroes in Pindar's epinicians share the same values as contemporary athletes and endure similar experiences. Odysseus' journey is, in Crotty's view, the best example of the *nostos* of a hero-athlete and, in Pythian 4, Jason is treated as both a stranger and a fellow citizen after returning home with the Golden Fleece.[73] Like the athlete, Jason left his home in search of glory and must reintegrate himself into his community. His return from Colchis parallels Arkesilas'

[71] Scanlon 2002, 209; Thuc. 2.46.1.
[72] The marriage of Apollo and Cyrene (4-70); the heroes of Thebes (79-88); bride competitions (105-125).
[73] Crotty 1982, 110; P4.78.

return from Delphi, a connection that is reinforced by the fact that both hero and athlete are responsible for restoring order to their homelands upon their return.[74]

In Pindar's odes, Jason, and other heroes, also suffer the same resentments that threaten athletes because, even in the mythic past, jealously does "does violence to the illustrious, and upholds the rotten glory of the obscure (ἃ τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιᾶται,/ τῶν δ' ἀφάντων κῦδος ἀντείνει σαθρόν)"[75]. Pindar's version of the myth of Pelops in Olympian 1 relates that Pelops was born with an ivory shoulder and states that the story of the gods cannibalizing him was a false rumour spread by a neighbour who was envious of the favour that Poseidon had shown to Pelops.[76] Like athletes, heroes needed to be careful not to rise too far above their accepted place in society or else risk incurring the resentment of others. In Pythian 11, Pindar states that it is impossible to determine fact from fiction regarding Clytemnestra's murder of Agamemnon, since even "townsmen are scandalmongers (κακολόγοι δὲ πολῖται)"[77] when they envy the prosperity of another. The stories of these heroes are paradigmatic and serve as a warning to the athlete: like these heroes, athletes need to tie their deeds and accomplishments back to their communities in order to be accepted as common benefactors.

When the civic hero serves as a model for the athlete, the athlete's victory becomes assimilated to the deeds of local heroes such that victory becomes a patriotic service. Praise of the athlete goes hand in hand with the praise of the *polis*

[74] P4. 247-262; 270-276; Mackie 2003, 33.
[75] N.8.34 (translated by Svarlien, 1990).
[76] O1.47-51; c.f. P11.29.
[77] P11.24-25 (translated by Race, 1997).

and its glorious tradition of heroic excellence. When Nemean 3 praises Aegina as the ancient homeland of the Myrmidons and their leader Achilles, it connects the athlete Aristocleides to the island's heroic past and establishes his victory as something worthy of that tradition.[78] This connection between individual athlete and civic hero is similar to the relationship between the athlete and his ancestors in his *oikos*: the athlete lives up to and perpetuates a collective tradition of glory.[79] As a citizen of Aegina, Aristocleides looks to Achilles as an example of Aeginetan worth and glory and also as a civic ancestor. Pythian 9 follows the courtship of the girl Kyrene, daughter of the king of the Lapiths, by the god Apollo and the subsequent foundation of the *polis* of Kyrene following their marriage.[80] This extended foundation narrative is unique to Pindar and takes up just over half of the 125 line epinician. It is devoted to a local tradition that would have the most meaning for the citizens of Kyrene, rather than the panhellenic audience of the athlete's original victory. Through the retelling of this myth, the epinician connects Telesicrates' athletic victory to his identity as a citizen of Kyrene with whom all Cyrenaeans share a common mythic past and, by extension, a current panhellenic victory.[81]

At the same time as Pindar includes the local heroes and myths of the athlete's *polis* in his epinicians, he also takes care to integrate these *polis* traditions

---

[78] N3.9-18.

[79] Fisher 2009, 531. Mackie argues that athletes might also hold competitive feelings against civic heroes even as they assimilate with them (Mackie 2003, 30-31). This fits with our appreciation of the interrelation of conflict and emulation in Greek agonism.

[80] P9.4-70.

[81] Mackie 2003, 40. Strauss notes that the Greek *poleis* often appropriated familial terminology and metaphors to describe the collective state; for example, "fifth century drama frequently describes Athenians as descendants of the various mythical kings of Attica" (Strauss 1993, 44).

into a larger panhellenic tradition. By including both local and panhellenic myths, such as the foundation myths of the panhellenic sanctuaries or the Homeric epics, Pindar at once asserts the *polis*' own distinctive history and weaves it into a common panhellenic tradition.[82] In Olympian 2 for example, Cadmus, a hero of the athlete's hometown of Akragas, is named alongside Peleus and Achilles as one of the heroes worthy of sitting at the side of Kronos and Rhea, while Isthmian 5 lists locations where the heroes from the Trojan War are worshipped, ending with the athlete's hometown of Aegina.[83] This has the dual effect of raising the glory of local heroes to panhellenic status and creating common links between the local mythoi of the Greek *poleis*.

In Pythian 9, Pindar mentions three heroes - Iolaos, Herakles and Iphikles - whose achievements he connects to the glory of the city of Thebes, expanding on his themes of the value of great men to their *poleis* and the value of the man who lives up to the glory of his ancestors.[84] Pindar relates particularly Theban traditions about these heroes, which serves the double purpose of identifying all three, even Herakles, as Theban heroes, so making a claim upon these panhellenic heroes before a panhellenic audience, and also integrating Theban traditions into a panhellenic network of Greek mythic traditions. Even though these Theban heroes are not Telesikrates' civic ancestors and the glory of Thebes would not normally add to the glory of Kyrene, by incorporating this Theban narrative into his praise of

[82] Erskine 2005, 130-131.
[83] O.2.77-80; I5.30-35.
[84] P9.79-89.

Telesikrates, Pindar connects their good reputation with Telesikrates' and sets him up as the next in line in a general tradition of heroic excellence that is modeled by the Theban heroes even as the Kyrene myth attaches him and his glory to his own *polis*. This recounting of Thebes' mythic past also has the added benefit of recalling Telesikrates' recent athletic victory at the Theban Iolaia, thereby tying that victory back into the current glory of his Pythian victory. This seamless intermingling of minor and major heroes, and local and panhellenic myth, is characteristic of Pindar's epinicians. The great deeds of the past redound to the glory of the *polis* while the athlete, neatly assimilated to the greatest heroes of Greek myth, partakes of that tradition of heroic excellence.[85] The athlete is presented within a tradition of common, civic heroes and so, through his own heroized victory, is bound into his *polis* and its local myths even as he performs on the panhellenic stage. At the same time, the *polis* participates in panhellenic community through its heroes, both mythic and athletic, establishing itself as a rival and peer of other *poleis*.

2.2.5 Audience

In fulfilling its role as a mechanism for garnering more praise for the athlete's achievements, the epinician often exhorts its audience to join in celebrating the victory. The epinicians themselves make infrequent reference to the location of their performances; however, scholars generally agree that they were usually performed in the athlete's home *polis*.[86] The principal audience of the epinician, by this logic,

[85] Kurke 1991, 200.

[86] Currie 2005, 57. Currie suggests further that the odes could either be performed at the victor's house or in a public space such as a local sanctuary. I do not wish to address the relationship between

would have consisted mainly of the athlete's fellow citizens. This fits with the interest the epinician has in integrating the athlete's personal victory into a tradition of *polis* benefaction and reciprocal glorification.[87]

Scholars suggest that the epinicians in the Pindaric corpus that lack the characteristic central myth portion were likely created on the spot following a victory and performed at the sanctuary.[88] This implies that the shorter epinicians would have had a different audience, one made up of Greeks from across the Mediterranean and not simply from the athlete's *polis*. The connection between length and location is difficult to prove; however, it is a logical explanation for the otherwise strange absence of mythic narratives in the shorter odes. Only 25 lines in length and lacking any mythic element beyond the mention of Erechtheus, the mythic founder of Athens, Pythian 7 is a case in point. And indeed, in this case we know that the ode could not have been performed at home since Megakles was in exile at the time of his victory. What is striking then is that Pythian 7 nevertheless follows the common Pindaric pattern of combining praise of the victor and his *oikos* with praise for his *polis*.[89]

Even as an exile, Megakles still takes part in the reciprocal relationship between athlete and *polis* evident in Pindar's epincians. He has a share in the glory of Athens and in return Athens gains glory through not only Megakles' current

---

the epinician and the symposium here, however it is interesting to note that, just as the text of the epinician has ties to both the *oikos* and the *polis*, so too did its public performance if one follows Currie's model.

[87] Kurke 1991, 191.

[88] Gentili 1988, 20; Currie 2005, 17.

[89] P7.5-8.

victory but also, as previously mentioned, through the glorious history of the Alcmaeonidae. It is likely that part of the motivation for this is an attempt to ensure a positive return to Athens for Megakles once his term of exile is over; however, this does not, to me, seem like a complete explanation. Megakles explicitly identifies himself and his victory with Athens. This emphasis on his relationship with the *polis* establishes his identity as an Athenian citizen as a central aspect of his personal, and familial, identity. His *philotimia* is anchored in the community of the *polis* and embodies an ideal of civic reciprocity in which his personal interest is considered to be identical to the collective interest of his audience.[90] Pindar presents Megakles as a representative of his *polis* in the same way as he does for the athletes in his longer epinicians, which suggests that part of the glory that came from winning a panhellenic event came precisely because of the athlete's ability to represent and glorify his *polis* as its representative on the panhellenic stage. This suggests that the athlete's relationship with and membership in his community is a crucial condition for his *philotimia* and that his *timê* as an individual is indissoluble from his *timê* as a citizen.

This is consistent with the other short epinicians. All of these odes make some reference to their victors' home *poleis*, particularly in relation to the way that

[90] Ober 1989, 227. Ober is referring here specifically to Demosthenes' trial against his guardians in his speech 'On the Crown' (Dem. 28.19-20); however, I believe this observation has further ramifications for Greek expectations and ideologies about benefactions beyond the immediate instance about which Ober speaks.

the current victory of the athlete adds to the glory of his *polis*.[91] The constancy of this praise in the extra-*polis* odes, particularly given the limited space available in the short epincians, suggests that praise of the *polis* had relevance before a panhellenic audience as well as a local, citizen audience. An interesting example is Olympian 12, which mentions two different *poleis* in connection with the victor, Ergoteles. Like Megacles, Ergoteles had been exiled prior to his victory at the games;[92] however, where Megacles still presents himself as a citizen and representative of Athens, Ergoteles consciously connects his victory with the glory of his new home, Himera, rather than his original *polis* of Knossos. Pindar identifies Ergoteles as a citizen of Himera and prays on his behalf for Himera's continued glory.[93] Ergoteles' exile is significant for the negative implications it has for Knossos and the benefit he now provides for Himera. Pindar establishes Ergoteles as heir to and successor of Himera's history and, as a result, Himera gains the glory that Knossos has lost by exiling Ergoteles. When performed in the panhellenic context of the Olympic Games, then, this epinician would have had just as much impact on the reputations of both *poleis* as it did on Ergoteles' own personal reputation. The athlete's personal gain in garnering glory was indissoluble from both his identity as

[91] O4.10-12; O5.1-4; O11.12-16; O12.19; O14.19-20; N2.16, 24; N3.21-22; I3.11-13; Nemean 2 includes an invocation to praise for the victor's fellow citizens (N2.24), which may weaken the theory that the short odes were performed at the sanctuary; however, it is the only short ode that does so and the general agreement among scholars that epincians were performed on subsequent occasions following the victory means that this exception need not discredit the entire theory.
[92] O12.13-16.
[93] O12.1-2, 18-19.

a citizen and his *philotimia*, framed and delimited as civic benefaction. Concomitantly, his *polis* had an equal stake in its citizens' victory and glory.

2.3.1 Athletic Victory Monuments

The right to erect an athletic statue at a panhellenic sanctuary was limited exclusively to victors.[94] Scholars suggest that the Greek practice of erecting statues of victorious athletes started at least as far back as the sixth century BC; however, placing these statues in public civic centres and sanctuaries became especially popular as the practice of commissioning epinicians fell into disuse in the mid-fifth century.[95] The victory statue put the athlete's image on display in the public sphere and, like the epinician, explored the relationship of civic, familial and personal achievement in the figure of the triumphant victor.

Most modern studies of victory statues are art historical and so touch only peripherally on the cultural and social significance of the victory statue habit.[96] An exploration of these subjects will provide a useful correlative to our understanding of Pindar and the goals inherent in the public commemoration of athletic victory. Extant bases and literary sources indicate that victory statues were made primarily of bronze and, as a result, few originals have survived into the modern period.[97] The

[94] Spivey 1996, 89. Pliny claims that, in the Classical period, only triple victors were granted the right to erect victory statues at Olympia (Pliny NH 34.16). Though this right was granted to the victorious athlete, it was possible for him to leave the duty of putting up the statue to his *oikos* or, in some cases, to his *polis* (Keesling 2003, 175).
[95] Lattimore 1988, 245; Raschke 1988, 41; Barber 1990, 248.
[96] e.g. Ridgway, Spivey, Serwint, etc; Several scholars, notably Kurke, consider victory statues within the context of their analysis of Pindar's epinicians, which will be helpful for this study.
[97] Ridgway 1981, 177. Roman copies of panhellenic victory statues are also rare and Ridgway argues that there are two main reasons why few survive; "(1) statues within Panhellenic *temene* were not allowed to be copied; and (2) statues were usually copied not because of the reputation of their

majority of information about athletic victory statues comes from surviving statue bases and inscriptions, as well as Pausanias' account of the sanctuary of Olympia.[98] This section will consider victory statues dedicated in the panhellenic sanctuary and the athlete's home *polis*, taking into account both the victory inscription and the statue's physical appearance.

2.3.2 Inscriptions

Inscriptions are of central importance in reading and understanding victory statues, not only for their survival into the modern period, but also because they provide an indication to the viewer of how to understand the statue. Inscriptions, in Keesling's analysis, put the name of the individual into the public sphere in a highly visible manner.[99] As she notes, until the advent of the portrait statue trend in the freestanding sculpture of the late Classical-early Hellenistic period, "no certain examples of self-representation (i.e. dedicating a portrait statue of oneself) other than athletic victor portraits can be identified from the evidence [sic] statue bases and extant sculptures".[100] The athlete had access to a form of public self-promotion not available to other citizens and so athletic victory was a particularly useful

makers or their aesthetic value, but because of the suitability of their theme to Roman interests and contexts. I would therefore surmise that any athletic image not explicitly representative of a sport or not exhibiting an action pose would be omitted from reproduction, except perhaps as a convenient torso or head type" (Ridgway 1997, 340).

[98] Serwint 1987, 65. At the beginning of this narrative, Pausanias states that he is mentioning only those statues that are either "particularly well made" or else are dedicated to athletes "who themselves gained some distinction" (Paus. 6.1.2), which suggests that the actual number of victory statues in the sanctuary is larger even than that which he provides evidence for.

[99] Keesling 2003, 24.

[100] Keesling 2003, 170. It was however possible to dedicate statues of other specific people or more generic images, such as *kouroi*. Hellenistic portrait statues generally referred to philosophers, orators, etc, rather than athletes (Ridgway 1997, 345).

benefaction for displaying to the viewer not only the name of a dedicator, but also the physical person of the athlete himself.

In many cases, the statue is presented as a substitute for athlete, literally turning him into a monument of his own victory. A fifth century victory inscription invites the viewer to "come to know Theognetos looking upon him, the boy Olympic victor"[101], eliding the statue with the athlete it represents, showcasing his name, physical self and athletic accomplishments. At Olympia, Keesling notes, many fifth century victory statues were "also inscribed with formulas urging the viewer to 'stand and look' at the monument in order to see in it the good qualities of the individual represented,"[102] thereby creating a link between the individual athlete and the public presentation of the values that were associated with the athletic achievement.

Athletes at the games were always introduced as citizens of a *polis*. Ancient evidence suggests that athletes were actually required to compete in the name of a *polis* rather than as independent competitors. Pausanias recounts the story of Lichas who, though he entered the chariot race at Olympia in the name of the Theban people, claimed the victory for himself as an individual. Lichas was subsequently scourged by the judges and the victory was recorded in the name of the Thebans, rather than of Lichas.[103] In order to participate in the panhellenic games, Nielsen

[101] Ebert 12 = Anth. Pl. 16.2; Steiner 1998, 132.
[102] Keesling 2003, 181; Keesling adds that, in Athens, this formula appears only in funerary inscriptions.
[103] Paus. 6.2.2-3.

argues, an athlete needed "to be a citizen of a recognized Greek state"[104]. Heralds ritually announced all participating athletes by their name and ethnic at the beginning and end of each event.[105] Victory announcements made at the sanctuary during the athlete's crowning ceremony likewise identified athletes not simply as triumphant individuals, but within the context of their *polis* and *oikos*. In Sophocles' *Electra*, for example, "the announcement of the winner by the herald identified Orestes and confirmed his status, as a citizen of Argos (although he was an exile)... and the son of a prominent citizen (Agamemmnon)"[106]. This announcement connects the athlete to both his *oikos* and his *polis* and, as with the epinician, publically implicates both of these groups in the victory.

The inscriptions on victory statues often repeat the information that would have been included in the victory announcement.[107] As a result, as Keesling observes, Pausanias is able to identify "not only the names of the victors, but also their patronymics, home cities and the events in which they competed"[108] from the inscriptions on the victory statues he sees. The repetition of victory announcements in the statues' inscriptions acted, along with the statues, as substitutes for the

---

[104] Nielsen 2004, 107. Nielsen suggests that, by the sixth century BC at least, a 'recognized Greek state' needed to accept the terms of the sacred truce announced at the outset of the games in order to be considered eligible to participate. See Nielsen 2004, 109 for analysis of an inscription from Olympia (c.525-500 BC) that supports the view that the athlete did not participate independently from his *polis* at the panhellenic sanctuaries.

[105] Crowther 1994, 145; Nielsen 2004, 108.

[106] Okell 2004, 35; Sophocles *Electra* 698-751. Conversely a lack of prestige on the part of either the athlete or the *polis*, then, had negative implications for both. Isocrates says of Alcibiades that "he held the gymnic games in contempt since he knew that some of the athletes were lowborn and from small city-states" (Isoc.16.33 (translated by Nielsen 2004)).

[107] e.g. Paus. 6.10.6; 6.13.9; Kurke 1993, 143; Serwint 1987, 11.

[108] Keesling 2003, 29; Kurke 1991, 5; Nielsen 2004, 109.

original event or, as Kurke terms it, as 'scripts' for its reenactment and thereby immortalized the moment of the victory announcement for all visitors to the sanctuary to see.[109] The practice of including this information in the victory statue inscription added to the glory of the athlete's *oikos* and home *polis* in the same way that inclusion of the *oikos* and *polis* did in Pindar's epinicians. The statue represented the athlete at his personal moment of victory, the inscription permanently connected his *oikos* and *polis* to that moment and, just like the victory announcement, it proclaimed athlete, *oikos* and *polis* as sharers in the victory to all participants and visitors to the sanctuary.[110] An interesting example is the family of Diagoras of Rhodes. Pausanias relates that, in addition to being a famous boxer in his own right, Diagoras also had the glorious distinction of watching both of his sons win Olympic crowns in the same Olympiad (464 BC).[111] The victory statues erected at Olympia by Diagoras' family members are mentioned together in Pausanias' account, which seems to suggest that the statues were erected alongside each other, with each statue adding to the *kudos* of the others and increasing its own *kudos* in turn.[112]

Athletes erected victory statues in their home *poleis* as well as in the panhellenic sanctuaries. Kallias son of Didymias was an Athenian pankratist who dedicated a statue at Olympia and two statues on the Athenian acropolis, for one of

[109] Kurke 1993, 144.
[110] Currie 2005, 155.
[111] Paus. 6.6.1.
[112] Valavanis 2004, 431. The inherent challenges of Pausanias' narrative make it difficult to accept this entirely at face value, however.

which we have a base which records his athletic victories at the four panhellenic festivals and the Panathenaia.[113] In many such cases, the inscription in the *polis* mirrors the inscription from the sanctuary. A lost statue of the athlete Agias from his hometown of Pharsalos, for example, was inscribed with an inscription that was an almost verbatim copy of the epigram on Agias' statue at Delphi.[114] This clear link between the way the athlete was commemorated at the *polis* and the panhellenic sanctuary is reminiscent of the correlation between Pindar's long and short epinicians. In the panhellenic context, the athlete is interested in showing himself as a citzen and, in his *polis*, he brings home his international fame and sets it up as a civic benefaction.

The fact that athletes had the right to dedicate statues of themselves when no political office or other civic benefaction afforded the same privilege suggests that the *polis* had a certain interest in not only allowing but also encouraging this form of self-commemoration.[115] Inscriptions on victory monuments explicitly identify the statue as a representation of the athlete even if the athlete himself was not the one who dedicated it.[116] When placed within the public space of the *polis*, victory statues were a visible symbol of the achievements of the *polis*' citizens which, by extension,

---

[113] Paus. 6.6.1; DAA no. 164; Keesling 2003, 171.

[114] Geominy 2007, 84. When victory statues in *poleis* did not repeat the epigrams of victory monuments from the sanctuaries, they often included less detailed information about the athlete. They did not always mention the athlete's *polis* since, with only a few exceptions, athletes were not usually commemorated at *poleis* other than their own (Keesling 2003, 111).

[115] Oliver 2007, 183; Keesling 2003, 177. Keesling also suggests that "the honor of a portrait statue became meaningful in Athens in the fourth century precisely because few individuals were expected to represent themselves" (Keesling 2003, 170).

[116] Keesling 2003, 175. Many of the athletes Pausanias mentions are not known from any other context beyond their statuses as panhellenic victors and victory inscriptions do not characteristically provide information about the roles and positions, if any, that these athletes fill in their home *poleis*.

had a positive impact on the reputation of the *polis*. One example of a non-Athenian athlete with a victory statue in Athens is Phayllos of Croton, and Keesling suggests that he "may have chosen to dedicate a statue on the Acropolis in part to commemorate his participation in the battle of Salamis"[117]. Here as well, then, the placement of a victory statue within the *polis* made an explicit association between the victor's identity as an athlete and his investment in the good reputation and pride of the *polis*.

2.3.3 Physical Appearance

Scholars generally agree that the athletic victor statue grew out of the *kouros* style of freestanding male statue that first appeared in the seventh century BC.[118] *Kouroi* were nude and largely generic, with few to no personal attributes or characteristics by which the statue might be identified as a specific person. Osborne argues that the universality of the figure played a large part in its appeal as a sculptural trope because it rendered the *kouros* as "a template in which any man [could] fit himself"[119]. Unlike a victory statue, a *kouros* was not meant to represent a specific individual identified by an attached inscription. No surviving *kouros* inscription describes the statue as a likeness of the dedicator; rather, these

[117] Keesling 2003, 171.
[118] e.g. Steiner 1998, 125; Lattimore 1988, 253. Lattimore suggests further that the shift from marble to the more dynamic medium of bronze had a strong impact on the development of the victory monument; Pausanias (Paus. 7.5.9; 8.40.1) provides several examples of *kouroi* that may represent athletes, rather than divinities as most *kouroi* are thought to depict.
[119] Osborne 1997, 510.

inscriptions confirm the *kouros*' status as a generic dedication that was significant explicitly for its generic form.[120]

This sense of universality is also characteristic of victory statues since, at the same time as they are meant to be representations of specific athletes, they do not include any physical features or characteristics that would identify them as individuals. Victory statues are more concerned with representing the athlete according to an artistic ideal of what an 'athlete' should look like than with accurately depicting his actual face and physical appearance.[121] Victory statues are easily identifiable as athletes through their poses and attributes; however, they are not able to be identified as specific individuals without the relevant inscription.[122] The victory statue represents the athlete both as an individual and as a generic figure who is important as a person precisely because he has fulfilled his duties as an athlete.

There is, scholars argue, a certain degree of objectification inherent in the representation of the athlete within the civic space or panhellenic sanctuary. In the same way that the epinician at once praises the victory of the athlete and is itself an object worthy of praise, the victory statue stands for the athlete's panhellenic victory and also presents the athlete as monument to his own achievement. Steiner claims

---

[120] Stewart 1990, 109-110; Keesling 2003, 170. There are several *kouroi* identified by scholars according to the names in their inscriptions (e.g. the Aristodikos *kouros*); however, none of these examples use a formula that explicitly identifies the statue as a representation of the dedicator in the fashion of victory statues. The Anavyssos *kouros* inscription names the dead man as Kroisos and, while this is clearly a monument for the dead Kroisos, it is not a statue 'of Kroisos' explicitly (Stewart 1997, 66).

[121] Ridgway 1997, 345. Sculptures attempting to depict individuals accurately and realistically do not begin appearing before the late fifth century BC and do not become popular until into the fourth.

[122] Hyde 1921, 57; Ma 2007, 205, 207.

that, "by placing the nude body on display and surrounding it with onlookers both internal and external to the scene, the artist reproduces and reinforces the real-world athlete's role as provisioner of visual entertainment".[123] By placing a statue of himself in the public space of either the panhellenic sanctuary or his home *polis*, then, the athlete visually recreated the circumstances of his victory by turning himself into a memorial.

As represented in victory statues, the ideal Greek athlete is young, well-muscled and beardless. Athletes, even if adults, are normally represented as ephebes, figures on the cusp of manhood.[124] The athlete embodies the beautiful ideal of youthful, manly excellence. Several gods and heroes, including Apollo and Theseus, were typically depicted as ephebes and, Stewart argues, ephebes "were supposed above all to be paragons of inventiveness, dexterity, and dash"[125]. Regardless of the actual age of the athlete, then, the victory statue youthened him to conform to a standard ideal of heroic athletic prowess. The statue of Agelaos from the Daochos monument at Delphi aptly reflects this stereotypical picture of the athlete. Likely erected c. 336 BC by Daochos I, the Daochos monument depicts

---

[123] Steiner 1998, 128-9. In Steiner's view, the unwillingness of victory statues to meet the spectator's eye is an expression of due modesty and *aidos*, shame, on the athlete's part that helps mitigate the envy of others. Steiner presents this argument in relation to the eroticization of the victor statue, however it is also telling of the way in which the athlete keeps from appearing too proud in the face of his personal victory and the statue's very public commemoration of it. (Steiner 1998, 136; 144; Stewart 1990, 52).

[124] Oliver 2007, 523. Occasionally there is some differentiation in age between victory statues. Serwint observes variation in the development of the musculature in statues of victors in the youth events and those of the regular adult events. The degree of definition in the muscles of the 'adult' athletes, however, is far greater than would be the case were the athletes the ages that they appear to be, as can be seen for example in copies of Myron's Discoboulos or the Motya Charioteer (Steiner 1998, 132). See Mackie 2003, 42-43 for a discussion of the 'youth' of athletes in Pindar's epinicians.

[125] Stewart 1997, 139.

Agelaos, Daochos' uncle, as a youthful, triumphant nude, though, by this point in time, Agelaos cannot have been a young man, and his statue is complemented by an epigram that details his victories in the Pythian Games.[126] Occasionally, however, athletes were also depicted as mature men with beards, such as the head of the Olympic Boxer. This type of victory statue, while not entirely uncommon, seems to have been reserved for statues of athletes who participated in the heavier events, such as the pankration and boxing. Serwint argues that this type of statue looks to the mythic tradition of the adult, bearded Herakles for its inspiration.[127] Statues of pankratists and boxers also often boast cauliflower ears and other small contusions that reflect the violence of their sport, but they usually still fit the standard view of the well muscled, youthful athlete.[128]

The victory statue, then, is primarily concerned with making the athlete recognizable as such to the viewer and relies upon the attached inscription to contextualize its generic depiction of the victorious athlete. In her discussion of Pausanias' account of the victory monuments on the Athenian acropolis, Keesling argues that "Epicharinos was not a famous athlete, so it stands to reason that Pausanias identified his victor statue by reading the inscription on its base [and]... because the inscription says nothing about athletics, Pausanias must have

---

[126] FD III.4, 460 - monument; SIG^3, 274 vi - inscription. Geominy argues for a later date for the monument based on stylistic comparanda (Geominy 2003).
[127] Serwint 1987, 281. Serwint goes on to note that bearded athletes are more common in vase painting than they are in sculpture and, in this context, are more likely suggesting an age difference between competitors rather than representing an ideal.
[128] Ridgway 1997, 345. For a discussion of the various types of athletes represented in sculpture and the distinction in the different way they are muscled as a result of their specializations, c.f. Serwint 219-240.

recognized the statue as a victor's dedication from its pose"[129]. The inscription explicitly identifies the athlete celebrated by the statue, connecting a standard depiction of idealized athletic excellence to a particular victory, athlete and *polis*, sometimes intermediated by the *oikos*.

Though they did not possess any attributes that might identify them as specific individuals, victory statues often bore items that identified them as athletes. Scholars divide victory statues into two broad categories: athletes enacting their events and athletes at rest.[130] Athletes involved in athletics are, of course, readily identifiable and the dynamism of their poses would doubtless have been quite striking, both aesthetically and by virtue of the skill and cost of their fabrication.[131] Athletes at rest often carried attributes, such as strigils or oil bottles, that identified them as athletes. The most common, and for this study, most interesting, of these attributes were the symbols of victory that the athlete wore: the fillet and the crown. The fillet was the first symbol of victory that the athlete received between winning and actually claiming the crown.[132] Roman copies of Greek victory statues often depict the figure wearing a fillet or tying it on: a second century AD copy of Polykleitos' Diadoumenos from Delos is one of the best examples of this pose.[133] The consistent presence of this sculptural element in the Roman context, where it would not have carried the same significance, suggests that it was quite common in Greek

[129] Keesling 2003, 29.
[130] Lattimore 1988, 252-253; Ridgway 1997, 343. See Serwint 1987, 68-135 for a close analysis of the variations and types of poses found within victory statues.
[131] E.g. Myron's Diskoboulos; Valavanis 2004, 420.
[132] Kurke 1993, 145. Fillets could also be worn in statues of priests, heroes and divinities.
[133] Valavanis 2004, 370.

athletic art. Steiner argues that statues of athletes "just prior to or immediately after the bestowal of the crown [were] the statue-makers' choice motif"[134] and several extant statues, such as the Motya charioteer, have no attributes of athletic victory beyond carved holes for an attached victory crown.[135] As mentioned in relation to Pindar's epinicians, the crown was the physical embodiment of the athlete's victory at the panhellenic games since, as Steiner notes, "the moment when the athlete achieved supreme glory was not the instant of the win but the subsequent occasion when he stood before the audience to claim his crown."[136] The crown, together with the statue's heroic nudity and youthful vitality, represented the victorious athlete in a way that would have been instantly recognizable to a Greek observer.

The athlete is almost always represented in the nude in Greek art and sculpture.[137] Most scholars suggest that this is a reflection of reality, since literary sources and art as far back as the sixth century BC state that Greek men ritually exercised in the gymnasium and competed in athletic events in the nude.[138] Stewart

---

[134] Steiner 1998, 134.
[135] Serwint 1987, 77, 112; Steiner 1998, 135.
[136] Steiner 1998, 133.
[137] In the context of this paper, I use the term nudity with the understanding that it does not preclude the presence of items associated with an athlete's sport, such as boxing gloves etc. Depictions of clothed athletes are somewhat more common in vase painting than in freestanding sculpture; however, only athletes whose events included armour or clothing (charioteers, *apobatai* and *hoplitodromoi)* are regularly not depicted in the nude. Serwint suggests that charioteers were not typically presented in the nude since it was the owner of the chariot team, rather than the charioteer, who was considered to be the victor (Serwint 1987, 196). Several scholars, including Bonfante and Steiner, argue that the victory statue's nudity has a distinctly erotic appeal. In vase painting, the athlete is often depicted being crowned by Eros, Love, and the characteristic representation of the athlete as an ephebe connects him with the traditional ephebe role of *eromenos* (Bonfante 1989, 554; Scanlon 2002, 245ff; Steiner 1998, 133; Stewart 1997, 201).
[138]Serwint 1987, 201; Plato states that the practice of Greek competing in the nude was a recent development in his time (Plato, *Republic* 5.452 c-d). See Serwint 1987, 176ff; Fisher 2009, 534 for discussions of the probable origins of this practice.

argues to the contrary and points out that nude statues were created earlier than it was conventional for athletes to compete unclothed.[139] Nudity again is a heroizing feature that links the athlete visually with heroes and gods: the other figures most often depicted in the nude in Greek art. In this way, the connection between the athlete and the hero in epinician was also played out in sculpture.

Even as the athlete is given some heroic honours, however, he is not actually heroized. The evidence of inscriptions indicates that victory statues were usually "equal in height and thickness to the victor himself"[140] and, unlike *kouroi*, it was rare for these statues to be much larger than life size. Super-human size was normally reserved for gods or heroes and so it is likely that it was considered unseemly for likenesses of athletes.[141] Athletes claimed extraordinary honours through their self-promotion in the panhellenic sanctuary and the *polis* and, while the *polis* allowed and encouraged this to the benefit of the larger community, there were limits to how far the praise of the individual could go. Posthumous hero cults were afforded to some successful athletes, though not to most, and Kurke argues that the establishment of a hero cult was a recompense for an imbalance of *kudos* in the

[139] Stewart 1990, 106; Osborne 1997, 506. Art historians also point out that the Greeks had a preoccupation with the beauty of the male form and so depicting athletes in the peak of physical health in the nude appealed to their aesthetic tastes (Clark 1956, 24, 184).
[140] CEG 394; Steiner 1998, 125; Ridgway 1997, 345; Tyrell 2004, 188. Ridgway cites the bronze head of the Olympic Boxer as a good example of the generally life-size dimensions of victory statues and suggests that the Youth from the Antikythera Wreck may be an example of an over life-size victory statue from the Hellenistic period.
[141] It is unclear whether the choice in size would have been left to the discretion of the athlete or whether, particularly in the panhellenic sanctuaries, there were guidelines dictating the acceptable dimensions for a victory statue (Lattimore 1988, 251).

athlete's lifetime, rather than an element of his glory as an athlete.[142] Undue praise of the athlete threatens the balance of power in the community and so the *polis* needs to take care to channel and reconcile the athlete's *philotimia* to the collective good.

2.3.4 Victory Statues Dedicated by *Poleis*

Pausanias provides several examples of *poleis* dedicating victory statues in recognition of their citizen-athletes and many scholars believe it was not uncommon for the *polis* to have a hand in commemorating its citizens at the panhellenic sanctuary.[143] By dedicating a statue of a victorious athlete, a *polis* made a direct claim on the prestige and *kleos* that came with both the victory and the athlete's good reputation. As we have seen, athletes were not averse to joining praise of their *polis* with praise of themselves; the two are mutually implicated through the athlete's complex identity as at once an individual, a member of a family and a citizen of a *polis*. When the praise of the athlete is undertaken by the *polis*, it ties his *timê* as an athlete to his identity as a citizen and, at the same time, shows the *polis* both partaking of and identifying with the athlete's victory. The diction of the dedicatory inscriptions on such statues emphasizes this: these inscriptions usually state that the people have dedicated the athlete, rather than a statue of him, and so

[142] Kurke 1993, 151; Dougherty 1993, 128; Lattimore 1988, 252-253; Fisher 2009, 531; Miller 2004, 160-165. Several of the athletes of Pindar's epinicians received posthumous hero cults: Hieron (O1, P1-3); Theron (O2-3); Diagoras (O7); Arkesilas (P4-5) (Currie 2005, 3). For a reading of posthumous hero cult as something actively sought after by athletes, see Currie 2005, 8-10, 127-134.

[143] E.g. Paus. 6.3.8; 6.2; 6.8.5; 6.13.11; 6.15.6; 6.17.2; 17.2; 17.4; Raschke 1988, 40; Currie 2005, 155; etc. These statues could be "set up not only by the main elements of government such as the People or the Boule, but also by subsets of the polis (tribes and demes) or other groups such as religious cults, bands of soldiers, and even private individuals" (Oliver 2007, 181).

reinforce the concept of the athlete as a representative of his *polis* who is dependant upon his fellow citizens for the glory he receives.[144] The people dedicate the athlete to the god through his representation in the statue and the athlete himself is both a representative of the *polis* at the panhellenic sanctuary and an intrinsic part of the glory of the *polis*.

Polis-funded victory monuments, then, were closely tied to the *polis*' interest in promoting itself on the panhellenic stage through the vehicle of its victorious citizens. These athletes were identified with civic heroes and received a certain degree of heroization from the *polis*' celebration of their victories. For the most part, *poleis* dedicated posthumous statues of victors, some of whom had won panhellenic victories as much as two centuries earlier.[145] The glorification of deceased athletes could be taken farther than those granted to the living athlete: the heroism that was limited in life was converted into the remembrance of a civic hero. This identification of athletic victory with civic heroism encouraged emulation rather than conflict, and contained the distinction of the outstanding individual within a larger community of mutuality and commonality. Celebrating a historical athlete added to the glorious history of the *polis* and provided a model of civic benefaction for other citizens to aspire to.

[144] Ma 2007, 209.
[145] Raschke 1988, 41.

2.4 Conclusions

The athlete's self-representation in both the panhellenic sanctuary and the *polis* reveals a complex tension between his identity as at once an individual, a member of an *oikos* and a citizen in a *polis*. Though scholars suggest that the athlete's role as a successful individual is the most important identity in epinicians and victory statues, our analysis suggests instead that, rather than seeing three separate identities competing with each other in these commemorations, we should consider the athlete's identity as a member of both his family and the civic community as intrinsic elements of his identity as an individual.

The evidence of both Pindar's epinicians and the victory statues suggest that the victorious athlete was concerned with promoting himself, not exclusively as an individual, but also as a member of both his *oikos* and *polis*. The athlete's victory at once validates and perpetuates two different traditions of excellence: the family history of his *oikos*, and the heroic, mythic tradition of his *polis*. Pindar praises the athlete by praising both his familial and civic ancestors, connecting the athlete's current victory to communal traditions of excellence that he both justifies and perpetuates for future generations. The inscriptions on victory statues identify the statue by name, *polis* and *oikos*, turning the generic ideal of the 'athlete' into a specific person who glorifies his family, *polis* and self by winning. The panhellenic crown figures prominently in the epinicians and the victory statues and, in the same way, the athlete himself becomes a crowning glory for his *oikos* and *polis*. The image

of the crowned athlete evokes not only the victory itself, but also perpetuates its glory through the very act of celebrating it.

The evidence of *polis*-funded rewards for victorious athletes and *polis*-funded victory statues indicates that the *polis* not only allowed but also facilitated the glorification of the athlete. Acting in the role of civic benefactor, the athlete is a representative of his city who acts as model for emulation for his fellow citizens. He is connected to a tradition of civic heroism that glorifies him and, concomitantly, integrates him into the *polis* community so that his praise does not exceed the acceptable limit of praise for an individual.

The athlete is further celebrated in the context of a panhellenic concept of athletic heroism. Pindar connects *polis* myth with panhellenic myth to raise the local to the level of the panhellenic and situate the *polis* within a shared community of Greek cultural identity. The self-commemorations of the athlete reveal not an international aristocratic world removed from the identity and ideals of the *polis*, but the panhellenistic agonism of elite athletes acting as representatives of their *poleis* and articulating relations between Greek *poleis* as a panhellenic community of states. Thus, we turn now to the other ways in which the *polis* represented itself at the panhellenic sanctuary, in order to explore how the *polis* itself engaged in an *agon* with other Greek states, not only through its athletes, but as a competitor in its own right in a contest of peer cities.

Chapter Three - *Polis* Self-Promotion and the Panhellenic Sanctuaries: Inter-*Polis* Rivalry and Emulation

3.1 Introduction - Peer Polity Interaction and the Neutrality of the Panhellenic Sanctuaries

The previous chapter has argued that the panhellenic sanctuaries were ideal locations for athletes to promote themselves, as integrally members of an *oikos* and a *polis*, to the wider Greek world. *Poleis* also contributed to the promotion of their athletes by funding victory statues that combined praise for the athlete with praise for the *polis*. In addition to promoting themselves through their athletes, the *poleis* also directly promoted themselves as participants with other *poleis* in a panhellenic agon. This chapter will explore the self-representation of *poleis* in the panhellenic sanctuary. Is the way that the *polis* represents itself different from the way the athlete represents himself? How do the needs and interests of the individual *poleis* interact within the context of the panhellenic sanctuary? Like the athlete, the *polis* can take advantage of the shared space of the sanctuary to display its individual glory and prestige to the Greek world. How the *polis* chooses to do this, and the ways in which the sanctuary becomes a centre for political rivalry as well as athletic contests, reveals a great deal about the nature of inter-*polis* competition and the *poleis*' placement of themselves in a panhellenic community.

The significance that the panhellenic sanctuaries had for the development and spread of Greek culture is perhaps best articulated by Renfrew's theory of peer-polity interaction. In Renfrew's paradigm, peer-polity interaction "designates the full

range of interchanges taking place... between autonomous (i.e. self governing and in that sense politically independent) socio-political units which are situated beside or close to each other within a single geographical region, or in some cases more widely"[1], and centres on this interaction as the impetus for growth, and parallel development, among these polities. In applying the peer-polity model to the early development of the western Greek colonies, Snodgrass argues that the panhellenic sanctuaries granted the Archaic Greeks common arenas "in which the innovations, advances and attainments of each individual *polis* could be rapidly communicated to others"[2]. Despite their autonomy, Renfrew argues, these polities develop together and exhibit similar advancements in such fields as art, literature, war and politics.[3]

In Renfrew's model, one of the main means by which polities interact is through competition. Polities express their wealth and status through expansive gestures that are easily recognizable as such by all polities.[4] As a result of this competition, neighbouring polities often try to emulate and surpass each other and "may be spurred to ever greater displays of wealth or power in an effort to achieve higher inter-polity status"[5]. This competitive emulation promotes simultaneous social, political and cultural changes in different polities and can include not only

[1] Renfrew 1986, 1. Renfrew presents this growth model in opposition to less complex models that focus on either exogenous or endogenous impetuses for change (e.g. Hall 1997, 76).
[2] Snodgrass 1986, 54.
[3] Renfrew 1986, 5. This model of cultural growth is presented by Renfrew as an alternative to models that allow only for either endogenous or exogenous change and not the mutual growth of similarly sized polities.
[4] Renfrew 1986, 8.
[5] Renfrew 1986, 8.

athletic display, but also monumental displays of art and architecture that showcase the polity's affluence, artistic skill and pride.

In order best to compete with each other through a system of shared expansive gestures, polities required a neutral ground upon which they could display their wealth, power and status to their own citizens and the citizens of other polities.[6] For the Greek *poleis*, the extra-*polis* panhellenic sanctuaries were ideal locations for this conspicuous display. The sanctuaries, and especially the stephanic games they hosted, encouraged participation from across the Greek world. They offered a forum for interaction among the members of disparate *poleis* that was "superior to that offered by the channels of normal diplomacy"[7] and were valuable as centres for arbitration and the conducting or renewing of peace treaties.

The sanctuaries were open to all Greek peoples as well as some foreign kingdoms.[8] At the same time, their very importance in the interaction and competition of Greek states saw them become themselves the object and prize of competition. In theory, a *polis* in control of the sanctuary also had control over the panhellenic festivals celebrated there and was able to control access to the sanctuary and games, admitting or rejecting individuals and states at its discretion.[9]

---

[6] Renfrew 1986, 16.

[7] Snodgrass 1986, 54; Sinn 2000, 77; Bowden 2003, 69. Many *poleis* sent delegations to the panhellenic sanctuaries during the games, particularly if they had athletes competing. Bauslaugh notes, however, that "sanctuaries, although they often served as repositories of interstate agreements and through oracles constantly provide advice about interstate affairs, rarely acted as arbitrators" (Bauslaugh 1991, 55).

[8] E.g. King Croesus of Lydia made many dedications at the sanctuary at Delphi (Hdt 1.50-51). Olympia, however, allowed only Greek *ethne* to participate in the Olympic Games.

[9] Crowther 2007, 47. In a later example of this sort of control, Dio Cassius relates an incident from the first century BC wherein "the favorite for the wrestling was so unpopular with the Eleans that they

Threat of expulsion from the sanctuary was one of the main bargaining chips that the perpetually demilitarized sanctuaries could bring to bear against *poleis*.[10] The fact that this threat could be considered a deterrent to a *polis*' behaviour suggests the strong significance that participation in the panhellenic games had for *poleis* as well as for athletes.

With the exception of Delphi, which was managed by the Delphic Amphictyony, a coalition of *ethne*, mostly from Thessaly and Central Greece, the panhellenic sanctuaries were each under the control of a local *polis* or regional group that took responsibility for their upkeep and management.[11] These groups took care to separate their own interests from the public stance of the panhellenic sanctuary. Officially, the Eleans' control of Olympia had no impact on the political impartiality of the sanctuary: Elis had its own distinct identity as a *polis* and, as a result, could involve itself in interstate politics without technically impacting the sanctuary's neutral stance.[12] The panhellenic sanctuaries were at once appreciated

---

actually cancelled the event rather than allowing him the chance to win an Olympic victory" (Dio Cassius 80.10; Miller 2004, 127).

[10] Bauslaugh 1991, 168; Bonner and Smith 1943, 6.

[11] Olympia=Elis; Isthmia=Corinth; Nemea=the local *polis* of Kleonai which acted as a surrogate for Argos. Regarding the Delphic Amphictyony: see Hall 2007, 83-91; Miller 2004, 96; Bowden 2003, 71; Singor 2009, 588. Scholars' views conflict regarding the existence of the league any earlier than 346 BC and Hornblower notes that it is largely Thucydides' lack of mention of the Amphictyony that has led scholars to believe that it did not exist in the fifth century, however he suggests that this is an omission on Thucydides' part (Hornblower 1992, 178). Further, Bowden suggests that the Amphictyony must have taken on responsibility for Delphi by 548BC to rebuild the temple of Apollo (see Lefèvre 1998, 14 n.26) (Bowden 2003, 70).

[12] Bauslaugh 1991, 43. Unsurprisingly, the reality was not quite as idyllic as this; according to Herodotus, the Eleans were advised in the sixth century BC to refrain from participating in the Olympic games to reinforce the fairness of the games, but did not concede to this request and indeed the Victor Lists from Olympia show that the citizens of Elis won more victories there than the citizens of any other *polis*, including Sparta (Hdt. 2.160; Miller 2004, 125; Crowther 2007, 53). It is also the case however, that the Elean judges had a reputation for fairness (Rups 1986, 57).

as common, neutral ground for competitive emulation and also as an object of that same competition as *poleis* and regions vied for influence in and control over them. As Bauslaugh argues, the "principle of complete and permanent detachment from normal interstate relationships... was fundamental to the legitimacy of the sanctuary's respected status"[13] and so, even as they competed over them, the Greeks adhered to this principle so that they could continue to compete within them in a panhellenic context. The inviolability of shrines and sanctuaries was a basic principle for the Greeks and the panhellenic sanctuaries were particularly reliant upon it since they needed to maintain their reputation as neutral centres.[14] The need for healthy, beneficial inter-*polis* relations and the desire to gain control over the valuable sanctuaries were in constant tension.

This chapter will consider the interaction of the Greek *poleis* within the highly contested landscape of the panhellenic sanctuary through the dedication of *polis*-funded votives. The first section will discuss the placement of votives in the sanctuary, paying particular attention to evidence of interaction and competition between them. The second section will concentrate on the treasury and the third will then return us to the issue of the individual's connection to his community as we explore the interaction of individual and *polis* in *polis*-funded votives.

[13] Bauslaugh 1991, 40, 41 n7, 43.
[14] Bauslaugh 1991, 225 n60. Thucydides states that it was common practice to leave alone all sanctuaries when invading the territory of another *polis* (Thuc. 4.97.2-3).

3.2 Monument Placement in the Sanctuary

Little evidence survives for the allocation and organization of votive space in the panhellenic sanctuaries. It seems clear from the close grouping of several types of monuments, such as treasuries or multiple dedications from the same *polis*, that a certain degree of planning went into the placement of monuments.[15] Downie suggests that the administrators of the sanctuaries had some control over the allocation of sites for votives and that with this authority they could "simultaneously augment the wealth and reputation of the sanctuary and publicize an alliance"[16]. Partida argues on the other hand that, since most of the treasuries at Delphi were constructed by island *poleis* rather than the *poleis* and ethnic groups that made up the Delphic Amphictyony, the groups officially in control over the sanctuaries did not have much authority in regards to the erection and placement of monuments.[17] Lack of evidence makes it difficult to come to any concrete conclusions; however, it is likely that *poleis*, like athletes, at least required permission to erect a monument or dedication but, as we shall see, appear to have had a certain amount of say in the position of their monuments.[18]

Within the cluttered and competitive *temenos* of the panhellenic sanctuary, the monuments and other votives that filled it represented the interests and cultures

[15] Pausanias' account of the Athenian acropolis suggests that the thematic grouping of votive monuments was also practiced at local sanctuaries as well as panhellenic ones (e.g. Paus. 1.24.1-4; Keesling 2003, 14).
[16] Downie 2004, 9. Ridgway argues that, in the Archaic period at least, sculptural programs and messages should have been authorized solely by the religious bodies at Delphi (i.e. the local priesthood and the Delphic Amphictyony) (Ridgway 1994, 204).
[17] Partida 2000, 284-5.
[18] Neer 2004, 72-73.

of the *poleis* that dedicated them. *Poleis* took advantage of the impartial, open environment of the panhellenic sanctuaries to put their own monuments, and the achievements they commemorated, before the collective Greek eye. They were understandably interested in securing good locations for their monuments. Barber argues that the preferred placement of monuments "was governed by the aim of achieving the maximum impact on the viewer through good visibility and/or a meaningful thematic relationship to other monuments"[19]. At Delphi, the earliest plots to fill were those closest to the temple or along the Via Sacra and, for treasuries, the preferred location was around the first bend of the Via Sacra.[20] Placement alongside the Via Sacra ensured that a *polis*' monument would be seen and appreciated by all those visiting the sanctuary, acting as a visual reminder of the *polis*' piety, wealth and prestige. Even after the 'prime' locations were filled, *poleis* continued to strive for visibility and prominence in the placement of their monuments.[21] Treasury XII at Delphi, attributed to Kyrene, was a good distance away from the Via Sacra, but thanks to its location beside the eastern *peribolos* wall it was visible from the entrance to the sanctuary.[22] Statues and monuments could also be placed on bases and platforms in order to increase their height and make

[19] Barber 1990, 252.
[20] Rups 1986, 92; Partida 2000, 29. It was not uncommon, particularly at Delphi, for new monuments and treasuries to be built on top of earlier structures. Whether these earlier monuments had been dedicated by the same *poleis* as their successors is unclear, though the reuse of materials from earlier monuments in new ones suggests that the new *polis* had a certain amount of claim on both the space and the monument (Neer 2004, 72; Partida 2000, 79-80).
[21] Keesling 2003, 12. Evidence suggests that, already in the sixth century, overcrowding limited the degree to which aesthetics dictated the placement of votives.
[22] Rups 1986, 92

them easier to see.[23] Most scholars agree that the monuments and votives were designed to be understood and appreciated in relation to the monuments surrounding them.[24] They were inevitably considered in comparison and competition with their neighbours. As with the competition of athletes, this use of the shared environment to promote themselves over one another creates for the *poleis* an ambivalent dynamic of, on the one hand, mutual striving and emulation and, on the other, differentiation and distinction, all within a common landscape.

Multiple monuments from the same *polis* advertized that *polis*' wealth.[25] The series of fifth century Athenian dedications in Delphi - the Athenian Treasury, the Marathon Base, the colossal statue of Apollo and the Stoa of the Athenians - functioned together to promote Athens' glory and its prowess in war. The cumulative impact of these dedications as a visitor climbed the Sacred Way towards the temple underscored the glory, and particularly the costly war spoils, that Athens had gained from its victories. The order in which Pausanias describes the athletic victory statues at Olympia suggests that they were generally grouped by *polis* where possible: the placement of the statue of a Spartan victor near other statues of victorious Spartan athletes added to the *kleos* of all.[26] The association of a statue or monument with other examples of the *polis'* wealth and accomplishments placed the current dedication with an existing glorious tradition.

---

[23] Barber 1990, 251; Keesling 2003, 78.
[24] E.g. Rups 1986, 119, 138; Ridgway 1996, 191; Neer 2004, 191; Barber 1990, 251-252. Several other theories have also been suggested, though they have met with less approval (see Rups 1986, 4-6 for a brief summary).
[25] Partida 2000, 56.
[26] Raschke 1988, 41.

Poleis rivaled one another, but as fellows in a larger panhellenic community. The treasuries at Olympia stand along an isolated terrace in the northeastern edge of the *temenos*, demarcated from the rest of the sanctuary space.[27] These treasuries are generally uniform in size and style. Rups points out that, prior to the construction of the Metröon in the Hellenistic period, the treasuries were all visible simultaneously, and suggests that this may well have encouraged the standardization, while Drees argues further that they were probably planned as a unit.[28] The Treasury Row at Olympia underscores community and similarity between the treasuries at the same time as each treasury champions its own individual *polis*. The sharp incline of the sanctuary at Delphi made a similar treasury orientation impossible there; however, the close grouping of treasuries into shared 'neighbourhoods' betrays the way in which treasuries were meant to act as complement and competitor to one another.[29]

The variety of styles and sculptural decorations of the votives at Delphi speaks of the desire of *poleis* to distinguish themselves in the dense landscape of the sanctuary. Pausanias tells us that, in 369 BC, the Arcadians placed their monument to their victory over the Spartans directly opposite a Spartan monument that commemorated the victory of Aegospotamoi which, in turn, had been constructed

[27] A similar orientation also dictates the placement of treasuries in an arc along the Sacred Way at the sanctuary of Delos (Rups 1986, 204).
[28] Rups 1986, 90; Drees 1967, 121. Whether there was an actual standard style imposed on the construction is indiscernible.
[29] Partida 2000, 108. The remains of three early treasuries from Delphi are aligned in a similar fashion to the Olympian treasuries; however, they were destroyed during the reconstruction post 548 BC (Rups 1986, 151).

across from the Athenian monument to their victory at Marathon.[30] Because of the close topographical relation between the monuments, each subsequent dedication challenged the power and prestige represented by the previous, no visitor to the sanctuary would have been able to see the Spartan monument without being forcibly reminded of their subsequent defeat by the Arcadians commemorated so close by. Using the shared medium of military victory monuments, each *polis* fights for preeminence among its rivals and seeks to join its success on the battlefield with a visible triumph on the stage of the panhellenic sanctuary.

Like other types of monuments dedicated by *poleis*, *polis*-funded athletic victory statues were also in competition with one another. Like the athletes themselves, the statues were rivals because they were the representatives of rival *poleis*. Sometime between 470-450 BC, the Spartans commissioned Myron to create a statue of the athlete Chionis, who had been a triastes in the twenty-ninth Olympiad (664 BC). Pausanias mentions Chionis' statue immediately after that of the triastes runner Atylos of Kroton, a triple champion in the 480s, and scholars argue that Sparta's aim in erecting the statue of Chionis was meant to claim priority and challenge the preeminence of Atylos.[31] The landscape of the panhellenic sanctuaries offered equal importance and opportunity to all votives contained therein and each new monument had to prove itself worthy of praise in competition with the existing

[30] Paus. 10.9.7; Barber 1990, 250; Rups 1986, 138. Partida argues that the deliberate placement of monuments commemorating military victory near the monuments of one's defeated enemies would be "tactless and unethical" in a religious context; however, this seems to be a misinterpretation of the nature of inter-*polis* interaction within the panhellenic sanctuary (Partida 2000, 79).
[31] E.g. Smith 2007, 99; Downie 2004, 9; Hyde 1921, 19 n.111.

monuments. This tendency towards constructing monuments to challenge the claims made by other *poleis* was especially common at Delphi. Dedications at Delphi showcasing the victory of one *polis* over another were popular throughout the late Archaic and Classical periods and actually increased over time, in marked contrast to Olympia where such dedications were rare.[32] Rups suggests that Delphi was more diverse than Olympia in both the peoples and monuments it attracted and, as a result, fostered an environment where inter-*polis* competition was more acceptable and indeed expected.[33]

3.3 Treasuries

Early scholarship on treasuries approached them mainly in terms of their function as storage space for votives; however, archaeologists and art historians argue that their function is inextricably tied to their visual appearance and physical form.[34] A treasury made a blatant statement about a *polis*' wealth and prosperity since it implied not only that the *polis* could afford to construct it, a costly endeavour on its own, but also that the *polis* had enough wealth to fill it.[35] Votive offerings in their own right just as much as the items they contained, treasuries were civic

[32] Some examples at Olympia include: the Carthaginian Treasury (480 BC) which celebrated a Carthaginian victory over Phoenicians; the shield on top of the Megarian Treasury which was dedicated because of a victory over the Corinthians (Paus. 6.19; Rups 1986, 85-87).
[33] Rups 1986, 87. Partida argues against this based on the assumption that promoting ostentation and rivalry at a panhellenic sanctuary would have been 'preposterous' given their status as cosmopolitan centres (Patrida 2000, 284). This interpretation fails to take into account the central importance that competition on all levels had within the panhellenic sanctuaries.
[34] E.g. Partida 2000, 277; Rups 1986, 255; Neer 2001, 275.
[35] Rups 1986, 253-254. The Athenian Treasury expanded on this notion with the construction of the Marathon Base beside the treasury to display the Athenian spoils of war from the Persian Wars (Valavanis 2004, 297-298).

dedications that reveal a great deal about the role of and interaction between a *polis*' votives and the space of the sanctuary.

Treasuries are unique to panhellenic sites.[36] Treasury building at both Delphi and Olympia began in the sixth century BC, continuing until the fifth century at Olympia and until the mid-fourth century at Delphi. Many scholars associate treasuries closely with the civic ethic of the Greek *polis* in the Archaic and Classical periods and indeed it seems quite significant that no treasuries were built at Delphi in the Hellenistic period.[37] Each treasury gathered and showcased the votives of its dedicating *polis,* enhancing the reputation of the *polis* on a pan-Greek level.[38] As Snodgrass notes, "when little Siphnos, with its territory of 75 square km and its population of perhaps two to three thousand, built its splendid treasury at Delphi, it was directly challenging comparison with Corinth"[39].

Unlike other votive offerings that could be just as easily dedicated by *poleis*, *oikoi* or individuals, treasuries were distinctly civic dedications. Though some of the votives stored inside treasuries could be dedicated by individual citizens or tyrants,

---

[36] The best examples of treasury buildings come from Delphi, Olympia and Delos, which gained panhellenic status in the Hellenistic period (Neer 2001, 280; Neer 2004, 64). No evidence of treasury buildings has been found at Isthmia. A series of buildings known as *oikoi* have been found at Nemea that resemble the treasuries at Olympia; however, they are larger and have a different design that has led scholars to suggest that they were more likely, as Valavanis states, "club rooms that served as meeting places for pilgrims" (Valavanis 2004, 315; Neer 2001, 279-280).

[37] Rups 1986, 92. The Treasury of the Cyreneans was constructed shortly after 338 BC, the same year as the Battle of Chaeronea, and was the last treasury to be constructed at Delphi. Chaeronea, Rups argues, was the symbolic end of "the old *polis* system - and, by implication, the end of the treasuries"

[38] Valavanis 2004, 59-60; Neer 2001, 284. Pausanias also makes mention of the presence of votives belonging to other *poleis* being housed in some treasuries (e.g. Paus. 6.19.4-6; Partida 2000, 290-1) though most of these examples seem to be rather late and he is not aware of the reasons for this anomaly.

[39] Snodgrass 1986, 54.

such as the chariot of the tyrant Kleisthenes in the Treasury of the Sikyonians at Delphi, no treasury inscriptions anywhere in the Greek world name an individual as the dedicator of the building before the Hellenistic period, even in the case of tyrants.[40] The only treasury known to have been named after an individual, rather than for the citizens of a *polis*, is the Treasury of Kypselos, which the Corinthians successfully petitioned to have changed to the Treasury of the Corinthians shortly after Kypselos' fall from power.[41] Another interesting case is that of the Treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians, which was constructed at Delphi to commemorate the liberation of Acanthas from Athens in 423 BC. Neer suggests that this was a largely posthumous honour awarded by the Acanthians: Brasidas died a just year after the Battle of Amphipolis and the Acanthians likely took this opportunity to grant him special honours and, at the same time, attach him to the memory and glory of the *polis*.[42]

Ancient sources indicate that the reasons for constructing treasuries varied from *polis* to *polis*. According to Pausanias, several treasuries, including the Athenian and Theban, were erected with spoils to commemorate military victories, while some *poleis*, such as Potidaea and Siphnos, erected them as a sign of piety or to appease the gods, and the reason for the construction of some treasuries, including

---

[40] Valavanis 2004, 281; Partida 2000, 81, 281-2. Dedicatory inscriptions on treasuries were not standardized, and indeed we have few surviving examples of such inscriptions: at Delphi, only the Siphnian, Corinthian and perhaps the Athenian Treasuries boast dedicatory inscriptions.
[41] Hdt. 1.14; Plutarch *de Pyth Orac* 400 D-E; Rups 1986, 249, 255; Parke 1967, 57-58; Walker 1977, 58. Pausanias mistakenly identifies the Treasury of the Sikyonians at Olympia as the dedication of the tyrant Myron (Paus. 6.19.1) (Rups 1986, 22).
[42] Neer 2001, 278; Partida 2000, 106; Plutarch Syll 79.

the Knidian Treasury, is not known.[43] Each treasury celebrated a specific moment in the history of a *polis* and, by so doing, established a lasting monument that would continue to celebrate the *polis* into the future. We have several examples of treasuries being erected as part of broader building programs designed to celebrate periods of great prosperity and prestige for a *polis*. Though scholars' views conflict on the exact timeline for the construction of the Athenian Treasury, its dating and close affiliation with the Marathon Base make it clear that it was related to the boom in Athenian culture and activity in the early decades of the Classical period.[44] Likewise, the construction of the Siphnian Treasury was part of a larger Siphnian building program that included a refurbished agora and civic buildings such as a new prytaneion at a time of great financial power for Siphnos.[45] That the Siphnian Treasury was a part of this *polis*-oriented building program underscores the connection that treasuries had to the collective identity of the *polis* and also reveals it as a vehicle for promoting this civic identity beyond the territory of Siphnos to the wider Greek world.

Rups defines a treasury as "a small rectangular building consisting of a one-doored cella with a *pronaos*, often but not exclusively distyle-in-antis" that is designed to house dedications made to the sanctuary by a *polis*.[46] Beyond a general adherence to this basic layout, there was a considerable amount of variation in the

---

[43] Paus. 10.11.4-5; 10.13.5-6; Rups 1986, 96; Neer 2001, 281.
[44] Partida 2000, 50-55; Valavanis 2004, 222. For a discussion of the debate over the dating of the Athenian Treasury see Rups 1986, 133ff.
[45] Neer 2001, 310. Several other treasuries, including the Treasury of the Athenians and the Treasury of the Cyrenaeans, both at Delphi, were also part of larger civic building projects (Partida 2000, 159).
[46] Rups 1986, 229; Neer 2001, 276.

architecture and sculptural programs of treasuries.[47] While this is particularly evident at Delphi, even at Olympia the treasuries are not completely uniform in dimension and decoration.[48] As a result of the constant tension at play in peer competition in the panhellenic sanctuaries between patriotism and panhellenism, the treasuries betray a dynamic equilibrium between distinction and emulation in the peer competition of their dedicating *poleis*. One of the clearest instances of the *poleis* distinguishing their treasuries from each other is the fact that many treasuries were built with foreign materials, often imported from the *polis*' local quarries. At Olympia for example, Cyrenaean limestone was used for the pedimental sculpture on the Cyrenaean Treasury, a distinct local red clay was used by the Geloans for the terracotta on their treasury, and the Sikyonian Treasury had been pre-built at Sikyon using Sikyonian limestone, then transported to Olympia and reconstructed there.[49] The cost of shipping the stone in for construction of a treasury would have been considerable, and so the use of imported materials clearly emphasized the wealth of the *polis* and the cost of the treasury.[50] Choosing to import building materials from the area local to the *polis* also showcased the pride the *polis* had in its own territory and resources. Such a choice might even be made at the expense of

[47] Partida 2000, 30.
[48] See Rups 1986, 23-67 (Olympia), 90-160 (Delphi); Partida 2000, passim (Delphi).
[49] Rups 1986, 29, 38, 49; Neer 2001, 279. According to Valavanis, it was not unusual for architectural pieces to be made in the home *polis* and then transported and set in place in the panhellenic sanctuary (Valavanis 2004, 63).
[50] Neer 2004, 78-79. On transport costs see Snodgass 1980, 139-143.

quality of material: the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi uses Naxian marble for the entablature, but it also employs an inferior Siphnian marble for the walls.[51]

Imported building materials did not only come from the *polis*' local region; certain stones had their own reputation around the Mediterranean and so could easily distinguish the treasury and impress its worth upon a viewer. The use of both Pentelic and Parian marble for the Cyrenaean Treasury is a good example of this.[52] It is likely that the use of a particular stone could also be intended to indicate the interaction between *poleis* by either emphasizing an alliance or, alternatively, belittling a defeated enemy. Neer argues that the Athenian Treasury was made of Parian marble because the Parians fought against Athens at Marathon; the use of Parian marble at once emphasized the Parians' defeat and suggested a reconciliation based on the munificence of Athens.[53]

The origins of the crews who constructed the treasuries seems to have depended largely on the discretion of the commissioning *poleis*. Local building crews were clearly available at the sanctuaries and, judging for example by the fact that the majority of Archaic roofs on the Delphic treasuries are Corinthian-style, there seem to have been teams of specialists also in residence.[54] The use of local building techniques would have emphasized the commonality between the treasuries, especially in light of their generally close proximity to each other within the

[51] Neer 2001, 279; Neer 2004, 78; Rups 1986, 108.
[52] Rups 1986, 143.
[53] Neer 2004, 79-80. Neer also suggests that that the use of Parian marble was meant to remind the Athenian viewer of the general Miltiades' recent failure on Paros so that, even while celebrating the battle he won at Marathon, the treasury did not celebrate Miltiades himself.
[54] Partida 2000, 63.

sanctuary. Cultural sharing within the panhellenic sanctuary was a common occurrence, and there are several examples of treasuries that amalgamate building techniques from across the Greek world in their construction. For example, the dowel holes between the wall courses on the Athenian Treasury indicate the fixing of metal grills, which was a technique unique to Delphi, even though the clamping method used for the walls reveals the hand of Aegean masons.[55] It was also highly unusual for Athenian monuments to have carved metopes at this time: Ridgway argues that this feature was probably adopted from nearby monuments.[56] The Theban Treasury boasts several Athenian elements in its construction, which Partida ascribes to a pro-Athenian faction in Thebes following the democratic revolution there.[57] There is little evidence to support or refute this claim; however, such a deliberate stylistic choice would have been best expressed in the panhellenic sanctuary, if anywhere. It was also common for building crews to use techniques and building styles particular to the part of the Greek world from which the *polis* came. The Syracusan Treasury at Delphi boasts metopes that are the same size as the triglyphs: this practice is characteristic of architecture in Magna Graecia; however, it is very unusual in Delphi, where the usual ratio is 1:1:5.[58] Such anomalies in treasury construction made them easily distinguishable from each other and ensured that

[55] Patrida 2000, 48, 56.
[56] Ridgway 1981, 17. Ridgway notes that the Parthenon metopes are the earliest examples of sculpted Athenian metopes aside from those on the Treasury of the Athenians.
[57] Patrida 2000, 196.
[58] Rups 1986, 138-139.

they stood out as distinct, individual votives, rather than simply as generic treasury buildings.

Treasury entablatures are particularly poorly represented in the material record and so any treatment of the sculptural programs of the treasuries is unfortunately narrow. What evidence we do have suggests a certain intermingling of panhellenic and local *polis* influences. The Siphnian Treasury, which is one of the best preserved treasuries at Delphi, shows this combination in styles and influences quite clearly. It is the earliest completely Ionic structure on the Greek mainland and as Partida points out, "although an East Greek (Aegean or of the Ionian coast) crew is induced from workmanship, we cannot disregard a degree of local intervention in iconography. The lions on the sima and the Phocian dialect... on the frieze cannot be explained otherwise"[59]. The intermingling of local and East Greek iconography on the Siphnian Treasury is characteristic of the interaction of panhellenism and patriotism we have been seeing in the panhellenic sanctuaries and serves to individualize the Siphnian Treasury at the same time as it connects it to a collective Greek whole.

The sculptors of the Siphnian Treasury seem to have been particularly interested in fitting its sculptural program, and by extension Siphnos, into a wider tradition of Greek mythology and culture. The east pediment of the Siphnian Treasury depicted the battle between Herakles and Apollo for the Delphic Tripod, while a figure from the more fragmentary west pediment has been tentatively

[59] Partida 2000, 38; Ridgway 1994, 54; Neer 2001, 288.

identified as either Leto or Artemis.[60] These distinctly Delphic cult scenes tie the Siphnian Treasury to its physical location in the sanctuary of Apollo. Even for as obscure an island as Siphnos, claiming connection to a collective Hellenic mythology, and more explicitly the cult of Delian Apollo, reinforced the validity and value of its treasury and established Siphnos as an equal sharer in the panhellenic tradition epitomized by the sanctuary of Apollo.[61]

Within the larger commonality of the mythic imagery represented on the treasuries, there was variety and individuation. For instance, the Sikyonian Treasury at Delphi boasts several metopes that refer to travel and colonization, themes that would have had particular resonance for the *polis* of Sikyon, including the Dioscuroi, Europa and the bull, and the Argonauts.[62] In a similar way, scholars suggest that the sculptural program of the Metapontine Treasury at Olympia may have contained a Bacchic scene which would have been appropriate for Metapontum since it was rich in vineyards.[63] The metopes on the north and south faces of the Athenian Treasury respectively depict the labours of Herakles, the quintessential panhellenic hero, and the Isthmian labours of Theseus, Athens' own *polis* hero. This treasury is the first example of the combination of Theseus and Herakles in monumental sculpture and

---

[60] Rups 1986, 112; Neer 2001, 292.
[61] Partida 2000, 40; Rups 1986, 113. Watrous has argued that these scenes had been planned by the Delphic priesthood as a symbolic warning against hubris (Watrous 1982, 159-172; Ridgway 1996, 164). This view is not generally accepted, both due to uncertainty over the degree of control the sanctuary authorities had over sculptural programs and the fact that this is the only treasury in Delphi for which architectural sculpture explicitly related to the cult of Delphic Apollo has been discovered (see Neer 2001, 293-294).
[62] Partida 2000, 76.
[63] Rups 1986, 43.

creates a parallel between the two heroes.[64] Though outnumbered by the Herakles metopes on the north side of the Treasury, the Theseus metopes are on the south face of the building which was the most visible from the Sacred Way. This gives prominence to the local, Athenian tradition of heroism, while still connecting it to the panhellenic tradition of Herakles. Raschke points out that Theseus was particularly associated with the, at the time, newly developed Athenian democracy, and as a result, was uniquely suited to being depicted on a monument to the people and *polis* of Athens.[65] The placement of these paired metope friezes in the panhellenic sanctuary would likely have created a sense of rapprochement between the two heroes that visually bolstered Theseus' reputation as an Athenian hero and, by extension, Athens' reputation as a *polis*.[66]

Treasuries continued to promote the power and prestige of their dedicating *poleis* long after they had been constructed. The treasuries at Delphi began to accrue inscriptions related to their *poleis* on their walls and bases in their later years.[67] Usually these inscriptions relate to treaties and individuals connected with the *polis*

---

[64] Partida 2000, 56; Ridgway 1994, 157; Neer 2004, 74. Neer argues that this serves the double role of raising Theseus to the level of panhellenic hero and Atticizing Herkales (Neer 2004, 76). Theseus and Herakles subsequently appear together on the Temple of Hephaistos in the Athenian agora (449-415 BC) (Partida 2000, 48).

[65] Raschke 1988, 45; Boardman 1985, 159; Neer 2004, 75.

[66] Boardman 1982, 12. Valavanis 2004, 221. This is the first time in Athenian art that any hero other than Herakles is depicted in an interview with Athena, which exalts Theseus even further (Neer 2004, 76). It has also been suggested that this placement of metopes is meant to establish a sense of rivalry between the two heroes (e.g. Davie 1982, 25) while Plutarch claims that Theseus' Isthmian deeds were an effort on the part of the hero to emulate the glorious exploits of Herakles (Plutarch, *Life of Theseus*, 6). This corresponds with our appreciation of competition as productive of both rivalry and emulation.

[67] Rups argues that the Delphic treasuries were better suited to this function than those at Olympia due to both their location within the sanctuary and the more regular visitor attendance at Delphi (Rups 1986, 227).

whose treasury it is, so the majority of inscriptions on the Athenian Treasury involved the Athenians, while the Theban Treasury focused on honourary inscriptions and "various degrees of proxeny and texts of adjudications by the Amphictyony" related to the Thebans.[68] That this was not one of the intended originally purposes for the treasuries is evidenced by the fact that we find no non-dedicatory inscriptions on Delphic treasuries dating earlier than the fourth century.[69] Nevertheless, this use of the treasuries as 'bulletin boards' for collecting inscriptions relating to a particular *polis* is consistent with the function of treasuries as pieces of the *polis* within the panhellenic sanctuary, celebrating the *polis*' citizens and displaying the *polis*' relations and interactions in the Greek world.

3.4 *Polis*-Funded Votives and the Individual

As the evidence of the treasuries suggests, the majority of *polis*-funded dedications in the panhellenic sanctuaries related to the political and military interactions of Greek *poleis*, whether to celebrate a new treaty or glorify a military victory.[70] Monuments served to immortalize the events on account of which they

---

[68] Valavanis 2004, 221-222; Rups 1986, 120; 130; Neer 2001, 277. The Siphnian Treasury is an exception to this trend: most of the inscriptions on the Siphnian Treasury are honourary and have nothing to do with either Siphnos or the treasury. Rups suggests that this may have been the result of Siphnos' loss of power shortly after completing its treasury: without the political and financial ability to maintain its treasury, Siphnos simultaneously lost control over who could use its treasury as a bulletin board (Rups 1986, 116).

[69] Rups 1986, 130; 227.

[70] *Poleis* traditionally offered a tenth of the victory spoils when making a dedication to a god but, as Sinn observed, "who could have withstood the temptation of making one's victory shine even more brightly by erecting a more magnificent statue? Thus the cities kept competing with each other in displaying the splendor of their monuments" (Sinn 2000, 20). There are, of course, other war victory monuments in the panhellenic sanctuaries dedicated by tyrants or foreign kings, for example the dedications of the Deinomenid family, the tyrant dynasty of Syracuse, at Delphi; however, they are not the focus of this chapter.

had been erected and, even more than that, immortalized the power, reputation and prestige that the *polis* gained from these events. This sort of visual commemoration transformed the *polis*' military successes into political influence.[71] The political landscape of the Greek world was in a constant state of flux as individual *poleis* warred, made alliances, and warred again. As a result, the individual victories and treaties were necessarily short-lived; however, a *polis* could try to harness the benefits that came from that single moment in a monument that ensured a lasting memorial to the *polis*' current glory.[72]

As with the treasuries in particular, so in general monuments at Delphi often represented the local myths, people, eponymous figures and emblems of their home *poleis*, rather than only Delphic cult imagery.[73] Group monuments started appearing in the panhellenic sanctuaries following the Persian Wars. The Arcadian Base at Delphi (c.369 BC) commemorated an Arcadian victory over the Spartans and consisted of nine bronze statues depicting Apollo, Nike, Callisto and six Arcadian heroes.[74] The Arcadians used the occasion of their victory over the Spartans to celebrate their local heroes and thus immortalized the victory by connecting it to their tradition of heroic excellence.[75]

---

[71] Hölscher 2006, 27.
[72] Hölscher 2006, 28; Valavanis 2004, 228.
[73] Rups 1986, 86.
[74] Paus. 10.9.5-6; Walker 1977, 39; Bommelaer 1991, 104-106.
[75] This monument was placed across the Sacred Way from a previous Spartan dedication (c.405 BC) and "to double the insult, the Arcadians employed a sculptor who had worked on the Spartan dedication" (Walker 1977, 39; Ridgway 1997, 240).

Depicting local heroes on monuments in the panhellenic sanctuary allowed a *polis* to place itself in the common panhellenic tradition and, at the same time, to promote its own mythic history over and above the variants advocated by other *poleis*. An Argive dedication at Delphi from the second quarter of the fourth century BC showed the kings and queens of Argos from Danaos to Herakles. Hall notes that this connection of Argos to the "Danaid/Perseid genealogy, especially in the extra-local and panhellenic domain of Delphi, must have acted as an effective dam on the fluid and dynamic properties that oral myths can often exhibit"[76]. It monumentalized the Argive mythic tradition and, in so doing, challenged the rival claims of other *poleis*. This monument is located close to two other Argive dedications respectively depicting the Seven against Thebes and the Epigonoi, both dedicated c.456 BC. Together, these monuments establish a tradition of Argive prestige and heroism at the sanctuary and present Argos as a *polis* with a rich mythic history and powerful heroes with whom all its citizens can claim a civic sense of connection and kinship.[77]

The Marathon Base was constructed with a tithe from the Athenian spoils at Marathon in the second quarter of the fifth century and, according to Pausanias' description, showed seven of the ten eponymous heroes of the Athenian tribes in the centre, Athena, Apollo and Miltiades, the victorious Athenian general, on one side and Theseus, the Attic king Kodros and probably Philiaos, the eponymous founder of

[76] Hall 1997, 82.

[77] It is also interesting to note that this monument commemorated an alliance between Argos and Thebes against the Spartans and so would have been a strong claim about the power of Argos and the tradition of glory that it brought to this alliance.

Miltiades' *genos*, the Philiaidai, on the other.[78] Again, the presence of Athenian heroes on this monument presents and champions them to a panhellenic audience and integrates them into a common network of Greek mythology.

The presence of Miltiades on this monument, however, takes us back to the relationship of the victorious citizen and his *polis*, to the heroized individual and the *polis*' heroes, and the accommodation of personal distinction in the civic community. Miltiades fell out of favour in Athens not long after the Battle of Marathon and most scholars suggest that this monument was probably commissioned by his son Kimon as part of an effort to rehabilitate him.[79] This posthumous Miltiades stands alongside the gods, an honour generally reserved for heroes in Greek art, and both he and his ancestor Philiaos are presented as equals to the eponymoi. Such a configuration exalts Miltiades in a way that seems to go far beyond the appreciation appropriate for an individual citizen. Neer argues that this monument represents the "glory-mongering of the Philiaidai", in trying to claim for their own *oikos* the victory of the collective, and that it stands in opposition to the civic values represented by monuments such as the Athenian Treasury.[80] While it is true that the threat of *stasis* from the conflict between the individual aspirations of members of the elite and the common interests of the civic community was a constant source of tension in Greek

[78] Paus. 10.10.1-2; Strauss 1993, 107-108; Barber 1990, 253; Valavanis 2004, 224. Pausanias also notes that statues of the Hellenistic kings were added in the Hellenistic period.
[79] Ridgway 1981, 170; Bommelaer 1991, 110. Strauss suggests that the statue of Theseus may have taken the place of the eponymous hero Ajax since since Ajax's "connections with the island of Salamis might recall the victory of 480 by Kimon's rival Themistocles" (Strauss 1993, 108).
[80] Neer 2004, 80-83. Neer compares this monument to Miltiades' dedication of a helmet from the spoils at Marathon at Olympia. The inscription on this helmet includes neither Miltiades' ethnic or patronymic, which Neer takes as evidence that Miltiades is claiming sole credit for the victory at Marathon (Neer 2004, 81).

society, we must consider, on the other hand, the way in which monuments such as this assimilated the celebration of the outstanding individual to a tradition of common, shared patriotic heroes.

Neer, as we have seen, also argues that the central purpose of a treasury was to nationalize the votives stored inside, thereby transferring their value away from the individual dedicator and towards the *polis*.[81] Our evidence for the votives stored in the treasuries is scanty; however, Strabo says that spoils of war were particularly appropriate and Pausanias makes mention of several martial votives being stored in the treasuries at Olympia.[82] That personal dedications could also be stored in civic treasuries is evidenced by Xenophon's claim that he put a dedication in the Athenian treasury in his own name and that of his friend, Klearchos.[83] Though Xenophon's is one of the few concrete examples of this type of dedication, most scholars agree that individual citizens regularly placed votives within their *polis'* treasury.[84] This raises the question of how much control an individual citizen had over the placement of his dedication in the sanctuary and whether a *polis* was able forcibly to store its citizens' votives in its treasury. Xenophon's account seems to suggest that placing his dedication in the Athenian Treasury was a voluntary action. Neer argues, however,

---

[81] Neer 2001, 284; Neer 2004, 64, 80; Singor 2009, 600.

[82] Strabo 9.3.8; Paus. 6.19.6-7. All the Delphic treasuries were empty by the time of Pausanias' visit to the sanctuary (Paus. 10.11.1). Other types of civic dedications, including tithes and peace offerings, also appear to have been appropriate to place in treasuries, and Rups suggests that the dinnerware used by the *poleis*' delegates to host meals during the Pythian or Olympian Games may well have been stored in the treasuries when not in use (Paus. 10.12.2; 6.19.2-3; Rups 1986, 237).

[83] Xen. Anab. 5.3.5; Neer 2004, 82.

[84] E.g. Neer 2001; 2004; Morgan 1990; Ridgway 1996. Neer notes that Polemon's list of some of the contents of the Byzantine and Metapontine treasuries at Olympia are similar to the dedications made by two Perinthians at the Samian Heraion (Neer 2001, 275-276; Polemon ap. Athenaeus 11.479f-480a; Klaffenbach 1953 [inscription from the Samian Heraion]).

that *poleis* would have put "considerable pressure on elites to use a treasury once it had been built" in order to convert "upper-class ostentation into civic pride"[85]. Votives placed outside the treasury, such as the Marathon Base, automatically championed the individual instead of the collective and so the treasuries, and their iconography, were explicitly geared towards championing the opposite. Thus Neer suggests that the iconography of the Athenian Treasury deliberately referred to that of the Alkmaionid Temple on the terrace above, thereby tying the Athenian Treasury to the central building of the sanctuary and appropriating the dedication of the Alkmaionid *oikos*.[86] In his view, the iconographic connections between the treasury and the temple place the temple in Athens' sphere of control rather than the Alkamaionids', turning it from an independent, clan dedication, to a civic Athenian one.

Yet one might interpret the treasuries not in terms of a zero-sum contest of individual versus civic glory, but as representing the accommodation of individual distinction within, and as contributing to, the common glory. Neer's theory focuses on a shift between personal, elite display and collective, civic pride. It is clear that treasuries were closely tied to the civic identities of their *poleis* and those *poleis* were inevitably concerned with claiming a stake in the dedications of their citizens; however, Neer's strict binary opposition between *polis* and elite individual imposes too strict a dichotomy on what was in reality a far more complex situation. We have

[85] Neer 2001, 284.
[86] Neer 2004, 86.

already seen examples of individual athletes voluntarily presenting their own victories as civic benefactions, including the Alkmaionid temple in Pythian 7, and it is clear that *poleis* promoted the *philotimia* of their elite citizens when it was framed in this way.[87] Rather than viewing the relationship of individual and *polis* in these monuments as one of conflicting interests, we can see evidence of a delicate balance. The Marathon Base is a good example of the ability of a war monument to combine the desire for personal glory with a civic pride that defines and connects the individual to his identity as a citizen. By depicting Miltiades in common with the eponymoi, the Marathon Base at once raised him to a level above the regular citizen and also tied him to a tradition of common patriotic heroism. Heroes were a part of the collective, civic cult of the *polis* and so Miltiades' visual heroization in this monument establishes him as a part of the collective pride of the *polis* even at the same time as they promote his and his *oikos*' prestige. The monument might be read as celebrating Miltiades as leader of the Athenians, fighting in their tribal contingents, as represented by the eponymoi. Regardless, Miltiades - posthumously - joins the patriotic heroes of the *polis*' past and his achievements are showcased as civic benefactions as well as personal successes.

Appreciated in this way, Miltiades' statue on the Marathon Base is neither solely a celebration of the glorious individual nor simply a proxy figure through which his *polis* celebrates itself. Rather, it can be plausibly argued that, on the one

[87] For example, we have already discussed the numerous rewards that athletes received from their *poleis* in recognition of a victory at the panhellenic games.

hand, he and his *oikos* are seeking an extraordinary recognition in Athenian society that is in tension with the ideals of civic equality and, on the other hand, that his personal glory is contained and channeled into an Athenian heroic tradition that his fellow citizens can have pride in. Miltiades appears as both a victorious individual and a powerful representative of his *polis* and so, by promoting the glory of Miltiades and the Philiaidai, the Marathon Base simultaneously promotes Athens' glory as a *polis* that has citizens like him in it.

Individuals could be treated as the representatives of their *poleis* in other types of monuments as well. This tendency seems to have been particularly useful in monuments that celebrated alliances. For example, the Samians erected a statue of the Spartan general Lysander after he liberated them from the Athenians in the Peloponnesian War and the Achaeans did the same for the Pantarches, a citizen of Elis who negotiated a peace between their two peoples.[88] In these cases too, the individual's distinction is attendant upon his service to his city. The individual's statue is a symbol of the good relations between his *polis* and the dedicating *polis* and the dedicating *polis* is able to praise the civic whole through its praise of the individual citizen.

War victory monuments at the panhellenic sanctuaries were generally dedicated by *poleis* rather than by individuals. Triumph in war was a collective achievement shared by all the citizens of a *polis* and so, while individuals could be celebrated by a monument or statue, the dedications themselves were the property

[88] Paus. 6.3.14; 6.15.2; Drees 1967, 104.

of the *polis* as a whole.[89] A good example of this distinction is the snake tripod dedicated at Delphi in c479 BC to commemorate the Greek victory at the battle of Plataea. The tripod's original dedicatory epigram named Pausanias, the Spartan general who commanded the Greek troops, as dedicator; however, a complaint was brought to the Delphic Amiphictyony to have the inscription changed to remove his name and include the names of all the Greek *poleis* who participated in the battle.[90] This inscription styled Pausanias as the supreme commander of the Greeks and claimed the victory as his own personal achievement.[91] This glorifies the individual over the collective and so goes beyond the bounds of acceptable self-promotion. Where the Marathon Base praised Miltiades as the leader of the Athenians within the context of his *polis* and its heroes, the inscription on the Serpent Column set Pausanias up as a man apart, leaving off both his ethnic and the identities of the *poleis* who fought under him. Two different accounts of this event survive: Apollodorus states that the charge was brought against the Spartan people, rather than against Pausanias himself, while Thucydides claims that the Spartans themselves brought Pausanias to trial.[92] In Apollodorus' account, the fact that it was the Spartan people who were considered to be at fault emphasizes the basic assumption that an individual is the representative of his *polis* and so, if Pausanias is

---

[89] Barber 1990, 253.
[90] Thuc. 1.132.2; Hdt. 8.82; Demosthenes, *Against Neaira* 59.96-98; Paus. 3.8.2; 10.13.9; Bonner and Smith 1943, 2. Bonner and Smith suggest that the Delphic Amphictyony had enough authority in the sanctuary to compel the Spartans to change the inscription but not to force them to pay a fine.
[91] Ἑλλήνων ἀρχηγός, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων,/ Παυσανίας Φοίβῳ μνῆμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε (Demosthenes, *Against Neaira* 59.97.7-8).
[92] Demosthenes, *Against Neaira* 59.96-98; Thuc. 1.132.

guilty, so too are the Spartans. Thucydides' version, on the other hand, focuses on the *hubris* of Pausanias, toward the Greeks but also with respect to his own *polis*, and punishes him for going too far in his self-promotion.[93]

3.5 Conclusions

Polis monuments aim at promoting and glorifying the *polis* within the neutral space of the panhellenic sanctuary. They engage each other in rivalry and emulation, competing within a system of shared culture, mythology and art. In this way, they reveal an interest in pursuing their own preeminence and yet still claiming a place as part of the collective whole. The panhellenic sanctuaries provide space for the appreciation of and participation in a collective panhellenic identity and enable the Greek *poleis* to meet in common within a rivalry of peers. *Polis*-funded monuments allow for differentiation within commonality as each *polis* promotes itself, not solely as an autonomous individual, but as a contributor to and sharer in the common glory of the Greeks. *Poleis* champion their patriotic, civic identity through local mythologies, building techniques and heroes which they then situate within a larger panhellenic mythology and identity. The complex inter-state relations of alliance and conflict, reciprocity and rivalry reveal themselves in the interaction of *polis*-funded monuments in the panhellenic sanctuaries.

Polis monuments that include the names and statues of individual citizens grant distinction to the individual while integrating him into the collective, civic

[93] Thucydides notes that the Spartans also criticized Pausanias for other types of inappropriate behaviours, particularly Medizing (Thuc. 1.130.1-2).

whole. As a result, a relationship of reciprocity and mutual dependence is established between individual and common *timê*, *idion* and *koinon*. *Poleis* express a willingness to celebrate their successful citizens even as the incorporation of the successful individual into the claims of the civic whole betrays the constant need to harness and channel the desire for personal glory for the good of the *polis*. In their celebration of the athlete, *poleis* are concerned not only to acknowledge and contain the heroism of the athlete but also to promote themselves in the community and rivalry of Greek *poleis*. Taken too far outside the realm of the *polis*, the aggrandizement of the individual was threatening to the stability of the *polis*. Thus the *polis* sanctioned but also delimited praise of the individual, and at the same time personal glory was framed as civic benefaction and the accomplishments of the individual assimilated to a civic tradition of shared, patriotic heroism.

Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to explore agonism and the relationship of individual and collective in Classical Greece through the lens of athletic competition at the panhellenic sanctuaries. Epinician odes and victory monuments reveal a tension between promoting the self and remaining, and defining oneself as, a member of a community. This tension can lead either to a conflict that threatens the balance of power within society or to a dynamic equilibrium that enables the self-interest of the individual to function within and remain structured by the values and interests of the *polis* community. Through the course of this study, we have observed that the athlete's complex identity as at once an individual, a member of his *oikos* and a citizen of a *polis* is not analyzable according to a dichotomy between self-interest and common interest, egoism and altruism, individualism and collectivism, and that agonism, interaction through competition, may be as productive of community as it is divisive, implicated in mutuality and commonality as well as distinction.

We began by questioning the accepted dichotomy of agonism and *homonoia* as it applies to Greek society. Following Williams' argument, we found that Adkins' shame-results culture, with its interpretation of agonism as paradoxically completely egoistic and yet also wholly heteronymous, failed to articulate properly the interaction of individual and community in the Homeric epics. So likewise, the standard scholarly view of a divide in later Greek society between an egalitarian and

communitarian civic ethic and an individualistic ethic of heroic agonism stands to be challenged and complicated.

Scholars associate Greek agonism explicitly with the elite and see athletics, particularly at the panhellenic games, as the last stronghold of an egoistic, competitive ethic based on zero-sum competition for personal, individual power and influence. In this view, elites presented their athletic achievements as benefactions to their *poleis* in order to disguise the selfish, non-communitarian motivations beneath while the *polis* for its part appropriated this essentially aristocratic and uncivic activity for itself. While it is true that the elite largely dominated the panhellenic games and that athletics were a vehicle for status distinction, elite *philotimia* was not necessarily at odds with the bonds and ethic of civic community. The evidence of the athletic commemorations commissioned by both athletes and *poleis* suggests that this standard view is an oversimplification. Certainly, if they were not framed by and channeled into the interests of the *polis*, the personal ambitions of the elite individual had the potential to threaten the stability of the *polis* community. The praise of the individual over and above the praise of the *polis* resulted in conflict and *stasis*. The realization of competition as peer rivalry and emulation allowed room for distinction as predicated on commonality and civic benefit, rather than individualism and egoism. The dynamic negotiation of this tension was a central feature of Greek society.

While Pindar's epinicians celebrate the athlete and encourage his fellow citizens to praise him as an outstanding individual, they do so through praise of his

oikos and his *polis*. In the epinician, the athlete's glory is increased by the praise of his ancestors' great deeds, both his actual ancestors and, through the use of local *polis* mythology, his mythic, civic ancestors. The athlete is accordingly celebrated as a civic hero and his glory contributes to the common glory of the *polis*. He enjoys celebrity on the panhellenic stage but, because he is celebrated as a citizen of his *polis*, his praise is contained in the praise of the *polis*. Most epinicians were likely performed in the *polis* where the athlete could promote his victory to his fellow citizens; however, the evidence from the shorter epinicians, likely performed at the panhellenic sanctuaries, demonstrates the interest of the athlete in identifying himself with his *oikos* and his *polis* abroad as much as at home. He gains glory as a member of an *oikos* and a *polis* and concomitantly contributes to their glory through his personal achievements. Just as in the epinician, the inscription from the victory statue mirrors the heraldic announcement at the panhellenic sanctuary and identifies the athlete by his name, his family and his *polis*. The athlete carries on the traditions of excellence evidenced by his *oikos* and *polis*, at once validating and perpetuating their glory.

Thus the athlete's victory is framed as a civic benefaction. Upon the athlete's return home (*nostos*), the victory crown acts as a visible symbol of the dedication of the athlete's victory to his civic community. By implicating the *polis* in his victory, the athlete tries to prevent *phthonos* among his fellow citizens and earn their praise instead. Concomitantly, the *polis* encourages the athlete's pursuit of praise and glory since, when it is tied to his identity as a citizen, it reflects positively on the *polis* as

well. By channeling the self-promotion of the athlete, the *polis* integrates its outstanding citizens into its collective glory. The *polis* supports the athletic aspirations of its citizens by offering rewards to successful athletes. It allowed athletes to erect victory statues within the city and itself raised monuments to victorious athletes. The *polis* builds its own reputation through the good reputation of its citizens. At the same time, it depended on the benefactions and leadership of its elite citizens to thrive and, in enabling these citizens to pursue their own glory, provided itself with representatives to the wider Greek world who increased the glory of the *polis* through their own achievements.

The *polis* has a stake in the panhellenic sanctuary, not only through its claim to the victories of its citizens, but also as a contender in its own right in an *agon* of Greek states. Treasuries and other *polis*-funded monuments place the *polis* within the panhellenic sanctuary and showcase its wealth and, often, its military prowess to the rest of Greece. These monuments often challenged each other's claims to glory, each *polis* striving to stand out within the cluttered space of the sanctuary. Even as they tried to one-up one another, *polis* monuments functioned within a shared system of architectural and cultural tropes, developing a common, collective identity as symbols of Greek power and authority. Within the neutral space of the panhellenic sanctuary, *poleis* engaged in peer rivalry that resulted in both distinction and commonality, contention and emulation.

Bibliography

Adkins, AWH. *Merit and Responsibility*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1960.

-----. *From the Many to the One*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1970.

-----. *Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the end of the Fifth Century*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1972.

Allan, Arlene. "From Agonistes to Agonios: Hermes, Chaos and Conflict in Competitive Games and Festivals," in *Games and Festivals in Classical Antiquity. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Edinburgh 10-12 July 2000*, edited by Sinclair Bell and Glenys Davies, 45-54. Oxford: BAR International Series, 2004.

Barber, Robin. "The Greeks and Their Sculpture: Interrelationships of Function, Style and Display," in *Owls To Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, edited by E.M. Craik, 245-260. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1990.

Bauslaugh, Robert. *Concept of Neutrality in Classical Greece*. Berkeley and Los Angeles and Oxford: U California P, 1991.

Boardman, John. "Herakles, Theseus and Amazons," in *The Eye of Greece: Studies in the Art of Athens*, edited by Donna Kurtz and Brian Sparkes, 1-28. London: Cambridge UP, 1982.

-----. *Greek Sculpture: The Classical Period, A Handbook*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1985.

Bommelaer, Jean-François. *Guide de Delphes: Le Site*. Paris: De Boccard, 1991.

Bonfante, Larissa. "Nudity as a Costume in Classical Art," *American Journal of Archeology*. 93:4 (Oct. 1989): 543-570.

Bonner, Robert J and Gertrude Smith. "Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony," *Classical Philology*. 38:1 (Jan. 1943): 1-12.

Bowden, Hugh. "The Functions of the Delphic Amphictyony before 346 BC", *Scripta Classica Israelica*. 22 (2003): 67-83.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Greeks and Greek Civilization*. Translated by Sheila Stern. New York: St. Martin's P, 1998.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Translated by John Raffan. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985.

Burton, RWB. *Pindar's Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation*. London: Oxford UP, 1962.

Cairns, Douglas. "Myth and Polis in Bacchylides' Eleventh Ode," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 125 (2005): 35-50.

Carey, Christopher. "Pindar and the Victory Ode," in *The Passionate Intellect*, edited by Lewis Ayres, 85-103. London: Transaction P, 1995.

-----. "Pindar, Place, and Performance," in *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Catherine Morgan, 199-210. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.

Carmina Epigraphica Graecae, edited by Peter Allan Hansen. 1989.

Clark, Kenneth. *The Nude: A Study in Ideal Form*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1956.

Constantakopoulou, Christy. *The Dance of the Islands: Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire and the Aegean World.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.

Crotty, Kevin. *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins UP, 1982.

Crowther, Nigel B. "The Role of Heralds and Trumpeters at Greek Athletic Festivals," *Nikephoros.* 7 (1994): 135-55.

-----. *Sport in Ancient Times*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2007.

Currie, Bruno. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.

Davie, John N. "Theseus in Classical Athens," *Greece and Rome*. 29:1 (1982): 25-34.

Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley UP: California, 1951.

Dougherty, Carol. *The Poetics of Colonization*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993.

Dougherty, Carol and Leslie Kurke. "Introduction," in *The Cultures Within Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 1-22. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Downie, Susan Marjorie. *The Political Uses of Hero Cult at Olympia and Delphi.* PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2004.

Drachmann, A.B. *Scholia Vetera in Pindar Carmina. III. Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas, Epimetrum, Indic.* Leipzig: B.J. Teubner, 1927.

Drees, Ludwig. *Olympia: Gods, Artists and Athletes.* London: Pall Mall P, 1967.

Duplouy, Alain. *Le Prestige des Élites.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2006.

Ebert, Joachim. *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an Gymnischen und Hippischen Agonen.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972.

Erskine, Andrew. "Unity and Identity: Shaping the Past in the Greek Mediterranean," in *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*, edited by Erich Gruen, 121-137. Munchen: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.

Fisher, Nick. "The Culture of Competition," in *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Hans van Wees, 524-541. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Fitzgerald, William. *Agonistic Poetry. The Pindaric Mode in Pindar, Horace, Holderlin, and the English Ode.* Berkeley: U California P, 1987.

Fontenrose, Joseph. "The Cult of Apollo and the Games at Delphi," in *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, edited by Wendy J. Raschke, 121-140. London: U Wisconsin P, 1988.

Fouilles de Delphes. Tome 3. Fasc. 4, edited by J. Pouilloux. 1943.

Gentili, Bruno. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece From Homer to the Fifth Century*, translated by A Thomas Cole Baltimore and London: John Hopkins UP, 1988.

Geominy, Wilfred. "The Daochos Monument at Delphi: The Style and Setting of a Family Portrait in Historic Dress," in *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context*, edited by Peter Schultz and Ralf von den Hoff, 84-98. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Golden, Mark. "Equestrian Competition in Ancient Greece: Difference, Dissent, Democracy," *Phoenix.* 51: 3/4 (Autumn-Winter 1997): 327-344.

-----. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Goldhill, Simon. "Intimations of immortality: fame and tradition from Homer to Pindar," in *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*, edited by Simon Goldhill, 69-166. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Hall, Jonathan. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

-----. "Culture or Cultures? Hellenism in the Late Sixth Century," in *The Cultures Within Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 23-34. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Hesiod. *Works and Days*, edited and translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Project Gutenberg: www.gutenberg.org, 2008.

Hölscher, Tonio. "The Transformation of Victory into Power: From Event to Structure," in *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*, edited by Sheila Dillon and Katherine E. Welch, 27-48. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Hornblower, Simon. "The Religious Dimension to the Peloponnesian War, or, What Thucydides Does Not Tell Us," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* 94 (1992): 169-97.

Hornblower, Simon and Catherine Morgan. "Introduction," in *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Catherine Morgan, 1-44. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.

Hyde, Walter Woodburn. *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art.* Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1921.

Jones, John. *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1962.

Keesling, Catherine M. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Klaffenbach, G. "Archiaische Weiheninschrift aus Samos." *MdI.* 6 (1953): 15-20.

Kurke, Leslie. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1991.

-----. "The Economy of Kudos," in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, edited by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 131-163. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

-----. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999.

-----. "Aesop and the Contestation of Delphic Authority," in *The Cultures Within Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 77-100. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Kyle, Donald. *Athletics in Ancient Athens.* Leiden, The Netherlands: EJ Brill, 1987.

Lattimore, Steven. "The Nature of Early Greek Victor Statues," in*Coroebus Triumphs: The Alliance of Sport and the Arts*, edited by Susan Bandy , 245-256. San Diego: San Diego State UP, 1988.

Lefèvre, F. *L'amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions.* Athens: École Française d'Athènes, 1998.

Lefkowitz, Mary R. *The Victory Ode: An Introduction.* Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes P, 1976.

Low, Polly. *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece: Morality and Power.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Ma, John. "Hellenistic Honorific Statues and Their Inscriptions," in *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, edited by Zahra Newby and Ruth Leader-Newby, 203-220. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Mackie, Hilary. *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise.* Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2003.

Malkin, Irad. "Introduction," in *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* edited by I. Malkin, 1-28. Washington: Harvard UP, 2001.

Mattusch, Carol C. "The Eponymous Heroes: the Idea of Sculptural Groups," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, edited by WDE Coulson, et. al., 73-82. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 37, 1994.

McLaughlin, Grainne. "Professional Foul: Persona in Pindar," in *Games and Festivals in Classical Antiquity. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Edinburgh 10-12 July 2000*, edited by Sinclair Bell and Glenys Davies , 25-32. Oxford: BAR International Series, 2004.

Miller, Stephen. G. *Ancient Greek Athletics.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2004.

Mitchell, Lynette. *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece.* Oxford: Classical Press of Wales, 2007.

Morgan, Catherine. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Morris, Ian. *Archaeology as Cultural History.* London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.

Nagy, Gregory. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past.* Baltimore and London: John Hopkins UP, 1990.

Neer, Richard. "Framing the Gift: The Siphnian Treasury at Delphi and the Politics of Public Art," in *The Cultures Within Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 129-152. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

------. "The Athenian Treasury at Delphi and the Material of Politics," *Classical Antiquity.* 23:1 (Apr. 2004),:63-94.

Nicholson, Nigel. "Aristocratic Victory Memorials and the Absent Charioteer," in *The Cultures Within Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 101-128. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Nielsen, Thomas Heine. "Victors in Panhellenic Games as Evidence for *Polis* Identity," in *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, edited by Mogens Herman Hansen and Thomas Heine Nielsen, 107-110. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.

Nietzsche, F. *Gesammelte Werke* (Musarion Ausgabe) II. 1920.

Ober, Josiah. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology and the Power of the People.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.

Okell, Eleanor. "Orestes the Contender: Chariot Racing and Politics in Fifth Century Athens and Sophocles' *Electra,"* in *Games and Festivals in Classical Antiquity. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Edinburgh 10-12 July 2000*, edited by Sinclair Bell and Glenys Davies, 33-44. Oxford: BAR International Series, 2004.

Oliver, GJ. "Space and the Visualization of Power in the Greek Polis: The Award of Portrait Statues in Decrees from Athens," in *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context*, edited by Peter Schultz and Ralf von den Hoff, 181-204. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Osborne, Robin. "Men Without Clothes: Heroic Nakedness and Greek Art," *Gender and History.* 9:3 (1997): 504-528.

O'Sullivan, Patrick. "Victory Statue, Victory Song: Pindar's Agonistic Poetics and Its Legacy," in *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by David J. Phillips and David Pritchard, 75-100. Swansea: Classical P of Wales, 2003.

Parke, HW. *Greek Oracles.* London: Hutchinson U Library, 1967.

Partida, Elena C. *The Treasuries at Delphi: An Architectural Study.* PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2000.

Pindar. *Odes*, translated by Diane Svarlien. Perseus Digital Library: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection:Greco-Roman, 1990.

Pindar. *Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, edited and translated by William H. Race. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge and London: Harvard UP, 1997.

Poliakoff, Michael B. *Combat Sports in the Ancient World.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1987.

Race, William H. 1997. "Introduction," in Pindar. *Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, edited and translated by William H. Race. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge and London: Harvard UP, 1997.

Raschke, Wendy J. "Images of Victory: Some New Considerations of Athletic Monuments," in *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, edited by Wendy J. Raschke, 38-54. London: U Wisconsin P, 1988.

Raubitschek, Anton Erich. "The Panhellenic Idea and the Olympic Games," in *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, edited by Wendy J. Raschke, 35-37. London: U Wisconsin P, 1988.

Renfrew, Colin. "Introduction," in *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*, edited by Colin Renfrew and John F. Cherry, 1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Ridgway, Brunilde. *Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.

-----. *Prayers in Stone: Greek Architectural Sculpture ca. 600-100 BC.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 1996.

----. *Fourth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture.* Madison, Wisconsin: U Wisconsin P, 1997.

Rose, Peter W. "The Myth of Pindar's First Nemean: Sportsmen, Poetry, and *Paideia*," *HSCP.* 78 (1974): 145-175.

Rups, M. *Thesauros: A Study of the Treasury Buildings as Found in Greek Sanctuaries.* PhD diss., John Hopkins University, 1986.

Serwint, Jean. *Greek Athletic Sculpture from the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC.* PhD diss., Princeton University, 1987.

Singor, Henk. "War and International Relations," in *A Companion to Archaic Greece,* edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Hans van Wees, 585-603. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Sinn, Ulrich. *Olympia: Cult, Sport, and Ancient Festival,* translated by Thomas Thornton. Princeton: Markus Weiner P, 2000.

Smith, R.R.R. "Pindar, Athletes and the Early Greek Statue Habit," in *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire,* edited by Simon Hornblower and Catherine Morgan, 83-140. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.

Snell, Bruno. *Discovery of the Mind: The Greeks Origins of European Thought.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1953.

Snodgrass, Anthony. *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment.* London: U California P, 1980.

-----. "Interaction by Design: the Greek State," in *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change,* edited by Colin Renfrew and John F. Cherry, 47-58. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Spivey, Nigel. *Understanding Greek Sculpture: Ancient Meanings, Modern Readings.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1996.

Steiner, Deborah. "Moving Images: Fifth Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure," *Classical Antiquity.* 17:1 (Apr. 1998): 123-50.

Stewart, Andrew. *Greek Sculpture, An Exploration.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1990.

-----. *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Strauss, Barry S. *Fathers and Sons in Athens.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum. Third Edition, edited by Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen. 1915.

Thomas, Rosalind. "Fame, Memorial, and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinikian Poetry - an Historical Study," in *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire,* edited by Simon Hornblower and Catherine Morgan, 141-166. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.

Tyrrell, Wm. Blake. *The Smell of Sweat: Greek Athletics, Olympics, and Culture.* Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Pub., 2004.

Valavanis, Panos. *Games and Sanctuaries in Ancient Greece,* translated by David Hardy Los Angeles: Getty P, 2004.

Vatin, Claude. *Monuments Votifs de Delphes.* Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, 1991.

Walker, Alan. *Delphi.* Athens: Lycabettus P, 1977.

Walsh, John. "The Date of the Athenian Stoa at Delphi," *American Journal of Archaeology.* 90:3 (July 1986): 319-336.

Watrous, Livingstone Vance. "The Sculptural Program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi," *American Journal of Archaeology.* 86 (1982): 159-172.

Willcock, Malcolm M. *Pindar Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Williams, Bernard. *Shame and Necessity.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U California P, 1993.

Young, David C. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics.* Chicago: Ares, 1984.

-----. "How the Amateurs Won the Olympics," in *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity,* edited by Wendy J. Raschke, 55-75. London: U Wisconsin P, 1988.

Zanker, Paul. *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*, translated by Alan Shapiro. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 1995.