

Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **The Territory: Warfare, Appropriation and Sovereignty**

Name of Author: **Polignac, F.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Cults, Territory and the Origins of the Greek City-State. Polignac, F.**

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **University of Chicago Press**

Pages scanned: **45 - 60**

Course of Study (Module name and number): **Armies and Navies CLAH6003**

Name of Designated Person
authorising scanning: *E. L. Harris*

Date authorised: 21.03.17.

Moodle/Powerpoint

the end of the harvest season.²⁶ In Laconia, Apollo played the same role as Hera in Argos: he guaranteed the fertility of the earth and nurtured and protected the young. It is certainly this last aspect of his activities that was acknowledged, with remarkable majesty, by the offerings of the famous archaic *kouroi* to be found in most of the sanctuaries of this god, the foremost beneficiary of this custom.²⁷ These statues represented a ritual form of consecration of the city's young people, the purpose of which was to obtain the god's protection over the society of which they were the future or new full members: the Apollo Kourotrophos, who ensured that the norms of civilization were passed on from one generation to the next, thereby became a "political" god as those norms came to define the city space.²⁸

In that Apollo and the feminine deities were responsible for two frequently combined tasks, the protection of fertility and the nurturing of the young, they seem to have been committed in particular to the renewal of the vital forces of society; but perhaps we should venture a little further. The notion of *trophē* was rich in nuances, incorporating a number of different images of growth: *trephein* meant not only to nourish and to bring up but also to gel, crystallize, and cohere similar elements.²⁹ The great deities of the *trophē*, who watched over the survival and vitality of the groups that honored them, acted as protectors of the cohesion and agglomeration of the individuals who made up the society, by gathering them all around their cult. The fact that they did so provided the grounds for their intervention in two other domains: warfare and initiation.

The Territory: Warfare, Appropriation, and Sovereignty

Vigilance was also exercised from the extraurban sanctuaries over the other threat that hung over the land: human aggression.

26. Athenaeus 4.138f. See the study by Calame, *Choeurs de jeunes filles* (1977) p. 305f.; and Pettersson, *Cults of Apollo* (1992), pp. 9–41.

27. As in the case of the *korai* for Athena, half the *kouroi* discovered have been dedicated to him. Cf. Ducat, "Kouros et Kolossos," p. 239.

28. Ibid., p. 243f. But I do not think that this should be seen as an attenuated form of *ver sacrum*.

29. Démont, "Remarques" (1978), p. 358–84.

Within the framework of the changes taking place in the eighth century, this took on a new intensity and assumed new forms. The military nature of some of the sanctuary offerings has already been noted.³⁰ From the end of the Geometric period and throughout the archaic period, panoply items (in particular, helmets, greaves, and shields) and arms (swords, spear- and arrow-tips) were deposited in sanctuaries such as Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia, Tegea, and Philia and, to a lesser degree, Amyclae, Hyampolis (Kalapodi), and Aegina (Aphaia). In certain sanctuaries, etiological rites and stories appear to have developed out of this practice. In Argolis, the *pompē* that led from Argos to the Heraion seems to have included armed participants, and a whole corpus of rites and myths concerning the shield was elaborated around the sanctuary. In the classical period, a bronze shield was the prize to be won in the games consecrated to Hera, perhaps for an armed race of the type known to have taken place in a number of festivals consecrated to this goddess.³¹ From the first century B.C. on, these games were accordingly known quite simply as *ex Argous aspis*. According to one tradition, the institution of this prize went back to the time of the Danaid dynasty: the arms of Danaos were supposed to have been passed on first to his son-in-law, Lynceus, then to his grandson, Abas. At Abas' death, the mere sight of these arms had been enough to quell a rebellion by the peoples subjected to the Argives. The shield of Danaos was at this point consecrated to Hera, and this was the episode from which the *aspis* originated.³² According to another legend, the sons of that same Abas, Acrisios and Proitos, were the ones who invented the shield in the course of their fratricidal struggle for the throne of Argos—or at any rate invented the Argive shield represented on the pyramidal structure situated between Argos and Epidauros, which commemorated their duel.³³ In Argive stories, after the "golden age" of rivers and the dynasty of Phoronides, which introduced the first human beings

30. Cf. chap. 1 above.

31. Hera Prodrómia in Sicyon (Pausanias 2.11.2), Dromia in Thera (IG 13.3.513). Cf. Ringwood-Arnold, "Shield of Argos" (1937), pp. 436–40; Amandry, "Concours argiens" (1980).

32. Hyginus *Fab.* 273.

33. Apollodorus 2.2.1; Pausanias 2.25.6.

into this region, Danaos, his ancestor Io, and his descendants thus came to represent the mythical establishment of two fundamental institutions of civilization: marriage and warfare, both of which are associated with Hera.

Apollo, who was the recipient of offerings of arms in Delphi and Delos, also received them at Amyclae, where, in the course of the Hyacinthia, those taking part in the festival were shown the breastplate of Timomachos, the Aegeid who was supposed to have conquered Amyclae for the Spartans and founded the Lacedaemonian military organization; and the most ancient bronze tripods deposited in the sanctuary were believed to be the tithe from the Messenian Wars.³⁴ The anecdote about Pythagoras claiming to recognize the shield of his "ancestor" Euphorbos, consecrated by Menelaos in the temple of Apollo of the Branchidai at Didyma also testifies to the practice of making offerings of this kind to this god.³⁵

In Sparta again, in the suburban sanctuary of Orthia, many figurines of warriors have been discovered, testifying to the protection the goddess afforded fighting men. And the sanctuary of Artemis at Amarynthos, to the east of Eretria, contained the text of an agreement concluded between the Eretrians and the Chalcidians to ban the use of projectile weapons in their battles (which many identify as the famous Lelantine War), found alongside a *stèle* commemorating an Eretrian military *pompē* of 3,000 hoplites, 600 horsemen, and 60 chariots.³⁶

However, many of these traditions and documents are of late date and may reflect changes that mostly took place after the archaic period. Thus, the predominant position assumed by the shield in the Argive games and the corresponding myths (Abas, Acrisios, and Proitos) does not appear to go back beyond the end of the Hellenistic period, although the presence of the shield

34. Aegeids: Pindar *Isthmian* 7.13–15; Aristotle *Rep. Lacedaem.* (frag. 532 Rose, Schol. Pind. *Isthm.* 7.18a). Tripods: Pausanias 3.18.7; when the Athenians and the Spartans signed the Peace of Nicias, the latter placed the *stèle* upon which the agreement was engraved in the sanctuary of Apollo, and on the occasion of the Hyacinthia, Athenian deputies came there to renew the alliance (Thucydides 5.18, 23).

35. Diogenes Laertius 8.1.4f.

36. Strabo 10.1.10, 12.

among other competition prizes, such as tripods and other bronzes, may go back further.³⁷ The intervention of Timomachos and the Aegeids (which, in any event, other traditions associate not with Amyclae but with the conquest of Laconia by the Heraklids) might also be a late intervention, and there is no evidence to determine to which conflict the agreement between the Eretrians and the Chalcidians related.³⁸ However, legends such as these can only have developed on the basis of precise data. Frequently, they reflect the particular association of a city to a piece of weaponry upon which, ever since the archaic period, its reputation had rested (the shields of Argos; the swords of the Euboeans, made famous in the war associated with them).³⁹ But above all, the appearance of pieces of weaponry in the archaic sanctuaries coincides with the changes that were taking place from the second half of the eighth century on: notably, the switch from "heroic" warfare, a matter of raids and individual exploits, to a stable and collective form of combat from which the hoplite phalanx was to emerge.

At the turn of the eighth and seventh centuries, weaponry was affected by modifications that testify to the progressive elaboration of new tactics, in which a fighting man no longer sought out encounters and single combat of the "Homeric" type, but was expected to integrate himself in a fighting body whose very weight and unshakable solidity were the factors that made it possible to win the day. Whether attacking or resisting without retreating, the phalanx derived its success from its compact mass. As a result, the items of a fighting man's panoply underwent a change: breastplates and helmets were redesigned for the purposes of combat in close formation, using spears and swords. But it was the shield known as the "Argive shield" that became the most important piece of defensive equipment: this round shield, now held by means of a double handle on the inner side, through which the left forearm and the hand passed, was the essential item in the cohesion of the hoplite phalanx. The wall of

37. The games of Hera are only definitely attested from the Argive reconquest of the 460s, but that does not necessarily mean that there was no form of the games in the archaic period; cf. Amandry, "Concours argiens" p. 242.

38. Timomachos: Cartledge, *Sparta and Laconia* (1979), p. 108.

39. Archilochus frag. 9 CUF.

shields, each one overlapping the next, ensured the protection of the whole line of men, instead of each separate shield protecting a single individual.⁴⁰

But this development itself stemmed from other more general changes. It resulted largely from changes in the ways in which the land was occupied. Homeric raids and the high deeds of champions, professional warriors, belonged to the world of the *oikoi* chieftains of the Geometric period, *basileis* who were more or less independent within a mainly pastoral society. As the land became increasingly used for agricultural purposes, prompting a new concept of the territory and its frontiers, the fundamental objectives of warfare gradually changed. It was no longer a matter of launching a swift expedition to seize domesticated animals. Instead, what became increasingly important was the constant defense of the arable land against invasion, for the effect of such an invasion would be to paralyze agricultural activities and destroy the crops. This was a task that could not be carried out by making swift, isolated raids. The need for constant protection obliged those who wished to reserve the land for their own use to take collective action. This took the form of group tactics, by means of which the enemy could be repulsed in a pitched battle on the plain. Conversely, territory could only be seized by dint of a common and sustained effort to ensure permanent possession of the land, rather than a temporary chance for pillage. In this way, the basic elements of archaic and classical warfare were elaborated: two armies drawn up in serried ranks would confront each other within a defined area, a plain, from which each would attempt to eject the other so as to remain in occupation of the terrain.

In this context, the consecration of pieces of weaponry in a sanctuary does not necessarily confer a warrior nature upon the deity concerned, but rather underlines the particular kind of protection expected or obtained from her in armed conflict. The

40. There is a wide bibliography from which it is particularly worth noting the following: Snodgrass, *Early Greek Armours and Weapons* (1964), and "Hoplite reform" (1965); Courbin, "La guerre à haute époque" (1968); Detienne, "La phalange" (1968); Garlan, "Défense du territoire" (1973), and *Recherches de poliorcétique grecque* (1974), pp. 20–44; Greenhalgh, *Early Greek Warfare* (1973); Cartledge, "Hoplites and Heroes" (1977).

end of the Geometric period certainly did see the eruption of a long series of territorial conflicts in Greece, some of which may have developed proportions and a ferocity unprecedented since the wars of the Mycenaean period: the wars between Chalcis and Eretria (the Lelantine War), supported by their respective allies (the Thessalians and Samians and the Milesians); possibly between Megara and Corinth; between Argos and its neighbors, Asine, destroyed in about 710, and Sparta (the Kynourian and Thyreatid Wars); between Sparta and Amyclae and between Sparta and the Messenians; and later, probably in the archaic period, between Thebes and Orchomenos. Their geographic distribution coincides exactly with the area of diffusion of the archaic *polis*, and all, one way or another, imply the existence of an extra-urban sanctuary.

As we have seen, a sanctuary of this kind was itself sometimes the cause of the conflict: in Boeotian traditions, which are marked by lengthy struggles between the two great rivals Thebes and Orchomenos for control of the rich plains of the region, the Orchomenian king, Clymenos, is said to have been killed by the Thebans during the festival of Poseidon Onchestos, whose sanctuary, halfway between the two cities, seems to have constituted a no-man's-land. The Theban action was a sacrilegious attempt to gain possession of the site.⁴¹ It was also over a sanctuary initially shared that the First Messenian War broke out. The sanctuary was that of Artemis Limnatis, and it was there that the crime presented as the cause of the war was committed. According to the Lacedaemonian version, the Messenians attacked some young Spartan girls and killed the king, Teleclos; according to the Messenians, a plot was hatched against the Messenian *aristoi*, who were attacked by young Spartans disguised as girls. The two versions of the incident can be seen as a historization of two myths concerning the foundation of the cult of Artemis and its rituals designed for adolescents (dressing up, initiatory deaths).⁴²

41. Pausanias 10.37.1. These episodes of legendary wars between Thebes and Orchomenos, echoes of possible confrontations in the Helladic period, were actualized in the conflicts of the archaic period, probably in the sixth century, when Thebes was establishing its authority over central Boeotia: Schachter, "Boiotia in the Sixth Century" (1989), p. 80.

42. Pausanias 4.4.1; Calame, *Choeurs de jeunes filles*, p. 253ff.

But whatever the circumstances may have been, the sanctuary clearly was involved in the outbreak of hostilities.

The case of these sanctuaries initially shared by different peoples is instructive, for the conflict that breaks out over possession of a sanctuary and its takeover by a single community reflects the crystallization of the notions of territory and frontiers and show how these were being applied. The history of the sanctuaries of the Isthmus provides another illustration. A number of different traditions would appear to allude to ancient frontier conflicts between Megara and Corinth and the existence of a double cult: the cult of Hera Acraia/Hera Limenaia, in the sanctuary of Perachora, has been interpreted as the sign of a switch in sovereignty, the abandonment of the former being seen to reflect Corinth's assumption of power toward the end of the eighth century.⁴³ However, there was in truth only one cult at Perachora; the second temple seems, rather, to have been a *hestiatorion* built at the beginning of the seventh century, when the lower cult site became too cramped.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the territorial consolidation of the two cities was a determining factor in the evolution of cults in the region: a geographical limit and at the same time a reference point for Corinth, the sanctuary of Perachora in the eighth century was the major rallying spot of the Peraians. The offerings there, like those in the Heraion of Samos, also testify to the considerable trading activity of the Corinthians, and its establishment enabled the city to assert its sovereignty on the promontory, whether or not this had been claimed by the Megarians. On the other side, the sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia had, ever since the proto-Geometric period, been a modest cult site frequented by the local populations and by travelers passing on a road alongside. But in the eighth century, the status of this sanctuary, too, changed, with the appearance of prestige offer-

43. For example, Dunbabin, "Hera Akraia at Perachora" (1951). The mention of Heraia and Peraia, two sites on the promontory of Perachora, among the five villages whose synoecism is supposed to have resulted in the formation of the city of Megara (Plutarch *Quaest. Graec.* 17) may be an indication of the subsequent conquest of this region and the sanctuary by the Corinthians; see also, below, the legend of Coroibos and Orsippos. But those traditions were certainly enriched, if not actually elaborated, at the time of the fifth-century conflicts; cf. Piccirilli, *Megarika* (1975), pp. 6–7.

44. See above, page 19, and note 21.

ings (a number of tripod cauldrons) and the first weapons there (helmets). The various building operations that accompanied this change (the creation of the first terraces with a long altar and the eventual construction of the first temple, in the first half of the seventh century) clearly demonstrates the importance that Corinth attached to this sanctuary, which from this time on would testify to its domination in the region.⁴⁵ This affirmation of the Corinthian presence in the Isthmus—whether rapid or gradual—may, in reaction, have encouraged the founding or expansion of the cult of the Megarian Apollo at Tripodiscos (Little Tripod), a village situated at the foot of the Geranian mountains and hence on the edge of a “wild” place that also constituted the frontier with Corinth. The tomb of its mythical founder, the hero Coroibos, used to be pointed out in the agora of Megara, where it was flanked by that of the legendary athlete Orsippos, believed to have been the Olympic champion in 720, that is to say, at the time of the legendary war between Megara and Corinth.⁴⁶ According to tradition, Orsippos had also reconquered a frontier territory. The history of the cult at Tripodiscos might thus represent the Megarian reaction to the expansion of the cults of the Isthmus upon which the Corinthians had embarked.

The Heraion of Argos illustrates another kind of connection between a territory's sanctuary and war and sovereignty. This was the cult site of a sovereign Hera, mistress of the plain of Argolis, which was spread out at her feet. Its central and dominating position made it, initially, one of those regional sanctuaries situated at the heart of the common activities by which neighboring communities were linked: one tradition had it that it was at first shared by the peoples of Mycenae and Argos.⁴⁷ On that

45. Perachora: Morgan, “Corinth” (1988), pp. 335–36; Sinn, “Das Heraion von Perachora” (1990); Isthmia: Gebhard and Hemans, “Excavations at Isthmia,” pp. 11–23; Morgan, “Sacral Landscape” (1994).

46. Pausanias 1.43.7–44.1; Piccirilli, *Megarika*, p. 127–30; Rigsby, “Megara and Tripodiscus” (1987). Coroibos had been ejected from Argos for having resisted vengeance taken by Apollo. The Delphic oracle, to appease the wrath of the god, ordered him to take a tripod and found a sanctuary for Apollo wherever the object slipped from his hands; this happened at a place that was thenceforward known as Tripodiscos.

47. Strabo 8.6.10 (C 372). This tradition and the one according to which the first *xoanon* of the Heraion had been brought from Tiryns after the destruction of

very account, it was also the stake in the struggles for influence between these two communities, and the sanctuary, its foundation myths, and the organization of its rites (in particular the procession) as early as the archaic period testified to Argos' determination to manifest its sovereignty there. However, the process of appropriation did not in this case take the form of a territorial war and the exclusion of neighboring cities (Mycenae, Tiryns, Nauplia) from the cult (which Argos was to take over later, at the time of the Argive reconquest, after 460). Instead, it was more or less voluntarily recognized by these cities that the Argives had won supremacy, first in the ritualized aristocratic competition (to make the richest offerings and the most lavish sacrifices) for which the sanctuary seems to have provided a venue in the eighth century, and later in the political organization of the plain and its immediate tangible expression, namely, the monumental refurbishing of the Heraion and the administration of the cult.⁴⁸ And if one accepts the date of the late eighth century for the construction of the great upper terrace, one cannot fail to notice the coincidence between the beginning of those building operations and a more violent manifestation of Argive power: the destruction of Asine. In fact, one wonders whether this war eliminating a close rival, and a “dryopian” city to boot, alien to the world of the plain of Argos, its political organization, and its cults, did not provide the Argives with both the opportunity and the means to turn the shared sanctuary into a symbol of their victory and their now unchallenged supremacy.⁴⁹

the town by the Argives (Pausanias 2.17.5) nevertheless bears the mark of the fifth-century conflicts in Argolis.

48. Morgan and Whitelaw, “Pots and Politics” (1991); Polignac, “Cit  et territoire”; all the studies show that Mycenae remained the city least dominated by the supremacy of Argos, although it did not have the means to avoid that domination completely.

49. However, this dating of the megalithic terrace is sometimes challenged: the Mycenaean hypothesis remained defended by Plommer, “Argive Heraeum” (1984); on the other hand, others tend to date it to the seventh century (the middle or third quarter), as does, most recently, Antonaccio, “Argive Heraion” (1992), pp. 90–98, who, while failing to resolve the problem, at least challenges the idea of a deliberate “pseudo-Cyclopaean” imitation put forward by Wright, “Old Temple Terrace” (1982). One of the difficulties involved in this problem is the lack of correlation between the construction of the terrace and that of the “first

What is more, this conflict directly affects the history of another cult associated with the determination of territorial boundaries: the cult of Pythaeon Apollo.⁵⁰ The temple that the people of Asine had built on the Barbouna hill around the mid eighth century was destroyed at the same time as the city of Asine, in about 720–710. It was immediately replaced by a new building in which the cult of Pythaeon Apollo was either installed or perpetuated; a cult that appeared simultaneously in Argos itself, on the outskirts of the town, in the Deiras sanctuary. It is hard to tell whether what occurred on this occasion was the appropriation of an Asinean cult by the Argives or the implantation of an originally Argive cult in Asine. Whatever the case may be, the Barbouna cult now testified to Argive expansion.⁵¹ Now, two frontier sanctuaries of Apollo in Kynouria—one on the coast between Tyros and Prasiai (Apollo Tyritas, attested from the late seventh century on), the other at Kosmas in the Paron area, on the edge of Kynouria and Laconia (Apollo Maleatas, which appeared toward the end of the seventh century)—both revealed sixth-century dedications to a “Pythaeus,” who can be identified as either Pythaeon Apollo or his son, who according to Argive traditions founded this cult. In this case, the cult seems to testify to the increasing influence of Argos over the small coastal cities that were later conquered by Sparta following its victory over Argos in the famous Battle of the Champions in 546.⁵²

This contest between 300 Argives and 300 Spartans, which

temple,” the date of which is equally uncertain (see Bergquist, *Archaic Greek Temples*, pp. 19–20; *contra*, Kalpaxis, *Früharchaische Baukunst*, pp. 43–44; Ström, “Argive Heraion” [1988]; Billot, “Terres cuites d’Argos” [1990], pp. 96–100).

50. The history of the cult of Pythaeon Apollo has recently attracted renewed interest: Piérart, “Oracle d’Apollon à Argos” (1990); Christien, “De Sparte à la côte est” (1992), 165, both tend to favor an Argive origin for the cult; Billot, “Apollon Pythéen et l’Argolide” (1989–90), the Argive appropriation of the Asinean cult, supported by patchily convincing arguments.

51. Asine and Argos: see the references for each site in the Bibliography, in particular, for Asine, Wells, “Asine Sima” (1990).

52. Faklaris, *Archaia Kynouria* pp. 209 and 223. The association of Pythaeon Apollo with thresholds and frontiers is also emphasized by the fact that in the town of Hermione, the temple of Pythaeon Apollo stood next to that of Apollo Horios (Protector of Frontiers): Pausanias 2.35.2.

was but one episode in the continuous battles between Argos and Sparta over the Thyreatis, seems to belong to a stream of confrontations of both a hoplite and a “chivalrous” nature, the regular features of which have been revealed by Angelo Brelich.⁵³ These battles, which involved groups of elite warriors in constantly disputed frontier regions, were regulated by preagreed conventions, which tended to limit their ferocity, and one of their characteristics was that they were frequently associated with deities, sanctuaries, and festivals of an initiatory nature. It may have been after the 546 victory that the Spartans set up the cult of Pythaeon Apollo on the agora, on the spot known as the *chōros*, the scene of the *Gymnopaedia*, one of the functions of which was, according to one tradition, to commemorate the Thyreatis victory.⁵⁴ Furthermore, it was in the seventh century that the two sanctuaries of Apollo at Kosmas and Tyros began to receive offerings of weapons and later, from the mid seventh century on, bronze figurines, the most ancient of which is that of a Laconian hoplite, found at Kosmas.⁵⁵ It is therefore quite possible that the cult of Pythaeon Apollo may have established between the city and these frontier regions, which were still hardly integrated, a link similar to that it had previously established between Argos and the outer limits of its influence. Similarities are noticeable in the conflicts between the Chalcidians and the Eretrians, which were ruled by an agreement banning the use of projectiles: whether there had truly been such a document or it was a tradition invented a posteriori about an ancient and in part legendary

53. Brelich, *Guerre, agoni, e culti* (1961), in particular pp. 22–34 for the Thyreatid wars and Pythaeon Apollo: the battles of the Three Hundred (Herodotus 1.82), the episode of the One Thousand in 418 (Thucydides V.41; Pausanias 2.20). Brelich’s analysis should be modified or corrected on a number of points (for instance, the cult of Pythaeon Apollo in Argos was not “federal” and the cults of Apollo at Thornax, close to Sparta, and at Kosmas, in Kynouria, are confused: pp. 33–34), but it correctly draws attention to the representations that the Greeks created of these frontier conflicts.

54. Pausanias 3.11.9. The history of the *Gymnopaedia*, particularly concerning their possible link with the Parparonia celebrated by the Spartans on the very spot of their Thyreatid victory, is obscure, however; see Bölte, “Lakonischen Festen” (1929), pp. 124–32; Brelich, *Guerre, agoni, e culti*, p. 31 n. 42; Faklaris, *Archaia Kynouria*; 226–27; Billot, “Apollon Pythéen et l’Argolide,” pp. 87–88.

55. Faklaris, *Archaia Kynouria*, pp. 211–14 and 219–22.

conflict, this agreement was certainly intended to confer a "chivalric" character upon it, and the choice of hand-to-hand battle calls to mind Archilochus' allusions to the *douriklutoi* lords of Euboea, who excelled in the use of the short sword.⁵⁶ The presence of a *stēlē* in the sanctuary of Amarynthos, situated to the east of Eretria, rather than between the two warring cities, certainly testifies to the attraction that the myths and rites of a deity of the frontier regions and initiations—in this case, Artemis—even when she was distanced from the central theater of operations, exerted on the history and memories of these boundary disputes.⁵⁷ They are all part of the same framework of experiences and representations.

The association between boundary disputes and the deities who presided over initiation, always on disputed frontiers and sometimes imperfectly integrated into the city's political territory, is even clearer in cases where the hoplite clash gave place to its opposite: cunning, of an ephebic or Artemisian type. Thus, the historical clashes between Athenians and Boeotians over the frontier district of Panacton (or Oinoe), a perfect example of a canton stranded "between the two frontiers" (*methorios*), constitutes the framework for the legend of the personal duel between Xanthos, king of Thebes, and Melanthos, the Neleid, who symbolized the Athenian *ephebeia* and triumphed over his opponent by cunning means.⁵⁸ And this story, in its turn, provided the etiology for the Athenian festival of the Apatouria, which marked the integration of young people into their phratries. On the Boeotian side, the corresponding legend was that of the clash

56. Cf. n. 37. Archilochus frags. 7 and 9 CUF.

57. Elsewhere, the rise of Eretria at the expense of Lefkandi in the eighth century (possibly following a progressive population transfer: see Bérard and Altherr-Charron, "Erétrie" [1981], pp. 237–38) and the consequential abandonment of the Lelantine plain (Lefkandi was destroyed in about 700) made the sanctuary of Artemis at Amarynthos the principal cult site in the Eretrian territory.

58. Thucydides applies the description *methorios* to contested frontier regions, whether they retained a special status as did Thyreatis—the Spartans installed the exiled Aeginetes there in 431 2.27.2—and Panacton, an area farmed in common with the Boeotians during the archaic period, or whether they were integrated into the political organization of the territory, as were Kynouria (4.56.2) and the Attic deme of Oinoe, bordering Panacton (2.18.1–2); cf. Daverio-Rocchi, *Frontiera e confini*, pp. 33–34 and 180–81, and Munn, "Panacton and the Attic-Boeotian Frontier" (1989).

with the Pelasgoi of Athens, and this was the presumed origin of the annual rite of the Tripodophoria, also strongly marked by "ephebeian" or "cryptic" associations, since it featured the nocturnal theft of a sacred tripod and its secret transfer to Dodona.⁵⁹ Also in the tradition of age-old enmity between neighboring peoples was the episode of the "Despair of the Phocidians," in which the latter, under threat of extermination by the Thessalians, won the upper hand through a cunning ploy. Now, this entire episode is dominated by the figure of Artemis, on account of both its extreme features (the threat of extermination, cunning) and the fact that it takes place in the Hyampolis pass, on the northern boundary of Phocis, where the sanctuary of Artemis was situated. Given that the root of this story seems to have been the liberation of Phocis from the Thessalian yoke in about 570, that victory may have occasioned the reconstruction of the temples of Kalapodi (in about 570–560) and the foundation of the great festival of the Elaphebolia, both of which celebrated the frontier sanctuary as the place where the unity and history of Phocis began.⁶⁰ And it was no doubt as a result of a similar process that the tales of the origins of the First Messenian War, which also revolved around the theme of cunning and disguise, and the myths and rites of the sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis eventually became totally confused.

The presence of the same deities, essentially Apollo and Artemis, in the same places shows that all these tales of warfare, complementary as much as opposed, in which history, rites, and myths are involved, had to do with the cyclical refoundation of the norms of civilization. Basically, the young people who retreated to the *eschatiai* were complying with the ritual inversion of religious rules that preceded their definitive integration;

59. On Melanthos and the Athenian *ephebeia*, the fundamental studies are Vidal-Naquet's *Black Hunter* (1986), pp. 106–28, and "Black Hunter Revisited" (1986). Tripodophoria: Strabo 9.2 (C 402); the conflict with the Pelasgians is explicitly situated at Panacton, in Proclus (ap. Photius *Bibl.* 321b32); cf. Munn, "Panacton and the Attic-Boeotian Frontier," p. 240.

60. Ellinger, "Le gypse et la boue" (1978), "Ruses de Guerre" (1984), "Hyampolis" (1987); and *Légende nationale phocidienne* (1993)—all essential works for an understanding of the way in which mythical and religious thought provided ancient Greeks with the categories for "interpretation" and the transmission of history as lived.

whereas the role of the elite phalanxes dispatched to the frontiers was to effect a temporary implantation of civic behavior there and to impose spatial order upon a no-man's-land on the edge of the civic territory. Of course, between these two poles of contrasting patterns of behavior, many combinations were possible, and elements of both were associated in the stories, cults, and myths connected with these local wars, the proliferation and regular repetition of which show that this double-faceted warfare truly constituted a favored way for cities to affirm their existence and perpetuate their cultural norms.

These conflicts fought out around the nonurban sanctuaries afford us a glimpse of how the *polis* came into being. The traditions that surround them show how there came a time when heroic warfare gradually gave way to political warfare, with the appearance of the first, aristocratic, hoplite phalanx, whose distinctive character, within an army now expanded to include a larger fraction of the social body, was preserved by the elite groups of fighting men of the archaic period from which it was composed: the Three Hundred of Sparta and of Argos and the Six Hundred of Phocis, for example.⁶¹ This regrouping of noble warriors into a new fighting force put an end to their ancient behavior as champions, for now, instead of launching themselves upon episodic plundering raids, they had to band together to defend the territory. This signaled the emergence of a new type of social organization and the birth of the territorially based community known as the *polis*, which gathered into a single decision-taking body all the local *basileis* who had previously been more or less independent of one another.

In the *Odyssey* (4.54–55), an image of such a grouping is provided by the city council of the Phaeacians. Although an imaginary place, Scheria already has the air of a city, far more than Homeric Sparta or Pylos, and the vagueness surrounding the composition and relations of the various actors in its public life—the *aristoi*, the *hēgētores*, and the *basileis*—reflects a first, fumbling attempt to set up new structures.⁶² The switch certainly did not take place all at once or without hesitations. The phalanx

61. Cf. Detienne, "La phalange" (1968), p. 134f. In Sparta, the brotherhood of the Aegeids was supposed to have introduced hoplite tactics, at the time of the war against the Amyclaeans (Aristotle frag. 532 Rose; Pindar *Isthmian* 7.13–15).

62. Cf. Mossé, "Ithaque" (1980), pp. 9–11.

did not spring ready-armed from the earth but was the end result of a long process in which ancient patterns of bellicose behavior lingered for quite a while and temporary fighting formations of warriors devised for particular campaigns may have taken some time to be adopted as a permanent form of military deployment. Some *basileis* or warrior heroes may have refused to submit to the new disciplines necessitated by the development of the phalanx (in the second half of the seventh century, still, the elegies of Tyrtaeus testify to the difficulties involved in imposing strict cohesion upon the Spartan hoplites fighting against the Messenians).⁶³ But that development certainly did constitute a fundamental change from the Geometric world of the *Odyssey*. In Ithaca the island nobles, the masters of the neighboring *oikoi*, were the ones who coveted Odysseus' possessions; and Telemachos and Odysseus' only social alliances were with the distant lords of Pylos and Sparta, with whom links had been forged through personal relations of hospitality and the exchange of gifts. But the fact that warfare evolved into permanent occupation of the land gave rise to more closely binding types of territorial solidarity, which sometimes took the form of synoecisms, that is to say, political unions, to the advantage of the dominant centers of the region, although this did not put a stop to trading or marital links between the great families of different cities—a tradition that was to continue throughout the archaic period.

A number of closely interlinked factors were thus all connected with the appearance of the nonurban sanctuary: the agrarian crisis, the evolving notion of territory leading to a new concept of frontiers, the establishment of the aristocratic phalanx, synoecism, and the birth of the city as a social organization founded upon the unity of a central preurban inhabited area with a surrounding terrain and constituted around a decision-taking body based on a group of hoplite nobles all considered equals in that they all bore arms and so possessed political power.

63. On one possible consequence of this attitude, their participation in the movement of colonization, cf. Ducat, "Thèmes de la fondation de Rhégion" (1974), p. 114. In general, the antagonism between "heroic behavior" and "hoplitic behavior" was only revealed gradually, and certain aspects of the former persisted in the latter in the archaic period (see also Lonis, *Guerre et religion* (1979), chaps. 1 and 2, and the review by Asheri in *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 59 (1981): 67–68.

As we have seen, the nonurban sanctuary was a key factor in these wars. Religious sites, like the land itself, were the objects of a process of appropriation crowned by the building of a sanctuary that designated the frontier the group claimed for its territory in the face of its neighbor-adversaries. The religious site was an *agalma*, a sacred emblem of the extension of one people's power, and when two peoples fought over it, it resembled the tripod to which both Apollo and Herakles laid claim. The dispute prompted each of the two adversaries to muster its vital forces in a new and more effective cohesion. But at what point in the formative process did the city come into being? To understand the notion of the *polis*, the nature of this emerging type of community, and its precise relation to the appearance of sanctuaries, let us return to the other major role of the nonurban cults, for which we have already encountered omnipresent evidence: namely, social integration.

Social Integration and the Constitution of the Polis

We have noted the kourotrophic character of these extraurban deities who are also involved in frontier wars contaminated by practices of cultural inversion, but we have barely touched upon the subject of their role in the body of rites designed to effect the "vertical" integration of young people, that is to say, their accession to the status of adult members of the community. Now, not only do the nonurban cults all incorporate aspects of the rite of passage,⁶⁴ but furthermore, their integrating action also operates "horizontally," thereby shedding light upon the social constitution of the *polis*.

Let us first consider the transition from adolescence to maturity. This transition was expressed by a movement away from the inhabited area, followed by a return to it. Between the withdrawal and the return, the young people took part in rites that manifested a temporary inversion of values. In this fashion, they obliterated their old selves and allowed their new qualities to

64. These rituals have been the subject of numerous studies since the publication of Jeanmaire's *Couroi et courètes* (1939); among others, see Brelich, *Paides e Parthenoi* (1969); Calame, *Choeurs de jeunes filles*; Brulé, *Filles d'Athènes* (1987); Sourvinou-Inwood, *Studies in Girls' Transitions* (1988).