PANHELLENISM
AND
THE BARBARIAN

in

Archaic and Classical Greece

Lynette Mitchell

The Classical Press of Wales

2

DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES OF
THE HELLENIC COMMUNITY

Realizing the community

Hellenic identity was political, and it was through Panhellenism that the community of the Hellenes was 'imagined to be'. However, in order for the idea of Hellenic community to have power, the otherwise independent and autonomic peoples of the Greek peninsula and Asia Minor consciously had to decide that they formed a wider community and to subscribe to membership in it. There needed to be a realization that there *was* a community, that it was different from other communities, and that the boundaries of belonging were defined.

The basis of the Hellenic community was the new communities that formed after the collapse of the Mycenaean civilizations. But the processes through which the symbolic community was realized were long, slow and complex, and involved two different aspects. The first was internal, what Jonathan Hall has called 'aggregation', that is, a building up of Hellenic identity piece by piece from local identities. The second was external, and arose out of the pressure created by different cultural communities coming into contact with each other. It was this awareness of sameness and confrontation with difference, and the general acceptance and then diffusion of this realization through common centres, especially cult centres, that resulted in the self-conscious imagining of the community of the Hellenes, probably in the first quarter of the sixth century.

The Hellenic community, when it emerged, was defined in the first instance through cult, and possibly also kinship as a rationalization of these bonds. It must originally have been principally an elite identity,[1] though it emanated from and was controlled by the city-states. However, the fact that Hellenic identity was promoted by individual *poleis* and not generated by a central source also weakened the community. Not only did the *poleis* compete with each other in their claims to be the source of Hellenic identity, but also they generated other politically potent identities which competed with and undermined the more abstract identity of the Hellenes.

In this chapter we will look at the processes through which Hellenic identity was realized in the archaic period. We will consider the way in which

it arose out of shared cultural and cult traditions, and how it was crystallized through contact with cultures which were identified as different, although the negotiation of the boundaries of difference was neither simple nor uniform. We will also see how individual communities responded to this sense of communality: on the one hand by expressing sameness and difference in moments of self-conscious awareness of the Hellenic community; and on the other by competing with each other, and so creating the crisis for the community of the Hellenes as the demands and needs of the Hellenic community competed with other loyalties and interests.

The beginnings of community
Although the community of the Hellenes only achieved definition in the sixth century, this was the culmination of a process of evolution which covered centuries. The process finds its beginnings in the early Iron Age, as new social groupings formed after the collapse of the Bronze Age world in the Aegean.[2] In the first instance, however, the picture that emerges is of relative insecurity: Mycenaean house ruins started being used as burial sites at Tiryns, at Argos there was a clear resiting of the settlement at about 1100 BC, and at Asine Mycenaean occupation ended before the site was resettled.[3] By 1050 BC depopulation on a significant scale and impoverishment of communities had taken place, though Lemos points out that the picture that now emerges is one of 'substantial interaction' between protogeometric communities rather than isolation as had previously been thought.[4] In the final stages of the Late Helladic period (*c.* 1200–1050 BC) some Bronze Age sites continued to be occupied or were resettled (for example, Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos, Asine, and Athens), while others were abandoned (Iolcus and perhaps also Miletus), and new sites were settled (Perati on the edge of Attica).[5]

The significant factor about these communities, which can be seen from the numbers of their graves and the quality of their grave goods, is that, although the evidence of field survey shows that settlements were nucleated rather than 'scattered into isolated pockets', they were few in number, small and poor.[6] Although some features of the earlier Bronze Age society were maintained, much was lost or changed: the knowledge of a Greek language remained, but the ability to write it was lost; a memory of the cultic significance of sanctuaries remained, although not knowledge of the gods that were worshipped there (for example, Zeus at Dodona seems to have replaced a mother goddess; the Argive Heraeon seems to date from the Bronze Age, but the cult of Hera is archaic).[7]

When the communities of the Aegean started to recover after the collapse and destruction of the twelfth and eleventh centuries, the shape of the society

was different from that of the preceding period. In the re-organization that took place at Lefkandi a new kind of political organization seems to have been based around some kind of chief, who was buried amidst lavish display and conspicuous consumption of wealth, and whose descendants were keen to legitimize their rule by associating themselves with their leader through their own rich burials.[8] It is at this time also that Snodgrass argues for the development of the tribal system, which he claims can be detected in regional patterns in material culture and which roughly corresponds to groupings of those using the same dialect and alphabet.[9]

As further evidence of early organization, in the early Iron Age groups of states seem to have begun to collaborate to form regional power bases. The Euboeans dominated a regional grouping, a *koinē* in north-eastern Greece, from the eleventh to the ninth centuries which included Scyros, Boeotia, Phocis, East Locris and Thessaly.[10] Coulson has also argued for a western Greek *koinē* in the early Iron Age involving western Messenia, Achaea, Elis, Acarnania, Ithaca and Epirus.[11] These groupings were on a relatively small scale, and waxed and waned with the vagaries of Iron Age fortunes. The Euboeans' influence, for example, seems to have dwindled by the end of the eighth century, possibly in the wake of the Lelantine War.

From the late-eleventh century, a larger region marked by some sharing of ideas and cultural forms was also starting to develop, when communities adopted iron technology. An artistic *koinē*, which itself encompassed a number of localized artistic sub-regions, was created by Attic Protogeometric, which included Athens, Corinth and Argos from southern Greece, Thessaly, Euboea, Scyros and Macedonia from the north, and Rhodes, Cos, Smyrna, Samos, Miletus and Caria from the east Aegean.[12] The western Greeks (including Laconia) and the Cretans developed independent traditions, the former drawing on Sub-Mycenaean to form an independent style, while the latter's antecedents are obscure.[13] This Protogeometric *koinē*, however, disintegrated in the early ninth century, and there was a reversion to local styles, which developed independently out of the earlier style.[14]

In the mid-ninth to mid-eighth centuries another wider cultural grouping developed, however tentative and riddled with aberrations and inconsistencies, which covered the major Aegean centres united by the Attic Middle Geometric pottery style: the Argolid, Corinth, Boeotia, the Cyclades, Miletus, Samos, Thessaly and Crete (though these last two only after *c.* 800 BC).[15] Although Laconia and Messenia remained isolated until after 750 BC and western Greece was dominated by Corinthian influence from the Middle Geometric period onwards,[16] at the very least this general conformity to a single style in the rest of Greece indicates contact and a shared artistic fashion among a number of communities in the Greek peninsula and Asia

Minor, even penetrating Crete which had largely remained impervious to Aegean artistic styles in the early Iron Age.[17]

In a similar way, the Homeric poems were also important in creating a broad-based cultural community. Composed as a synthesis of local traditions, versions of the Homeric stories (although not necessarily in their final forms) seem to have been widely disseminated by the mid-eighth century.[18] Not only was a Euboean wit able to pun on Nestor's cup at Pithecussae (ML 1), but also, while hero-cult probably did not arise out of epic (and some heroes were unconnected with the Homeric stories), there was an increased interest during the eighth century in the stories of the heroic past reflected in the proliferation of hero-cult at former Mycenaean tombs and in heroic themes in vase-painting.[19] The themes of the poems of glory, honour and heroism had widespread appeal and currency, perhaps, as Morris suggests, as an ideological tool for keeping the *dēmos* in its place, or, with Coldstream, as an escape for the oppressed.[20]

Homeric epic points to an important feature of the development of this nascent community, and that is, as Jonathan Hall has already argued, that it was 'aggregative',[21] since it was built up piece by piece 'from within' as the formerly isolated communities of the Aegean shared in the same cultural and religious events, and began to see themselves as belonging together. A good example of this process of aggregation at work is the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* which, as Hall has shown, was a composite of a number of local genealogies which together formed a genealogy for all the Hellenes (we will have more to say about the *Catalogue* later).

It is likely that we are also seeing this process when the peoples of Asia Minor begin to assert their origins as colonists from the Greek mainland.[22] In the late-seventh century, Mimnermus wrote about the foundation of Colophon by Andraemon from Pylos, and about the capture of Smyrna (fr. 9, 10 West *IE*[2]). In the early-fifth century, Panyassis of Harlicarnassus made a poem about Codrus (king of Athens) and Neleus and the colonization of Ionia (T1 Davies *EGF*), and Hellanicus thought that the people from Priene originated from Thebes (*FGrHist* 4 F 101). On this basis, Hall has argued that the 'Greeks' of Asia Minor invented migration myths in order to secure their interests with the mainland, and, while he does not rule out actual migrations from the Greek mainland to Asia Minor, he suggests that a self-conscious Ionian (and Aeolian) identity developed in the first instance among the communities of Asia Minor.[23] Lemos, on the other hand, argues that the archaeological record taken together with the linguistic evidence and the literary tradition puts it beyond question that there was a movement of people in the Late Helladic IIIC and Sub-Mycenaean periods, as people in the after-shock of the dramatic changes that took place (whatever their cause)

looked for safer places to live.[24] In either case, what we seem to be seeing in the creation of these stories is an attempt by the peoples in Asia Minor to connect themselves, in an intimate and unquestionable way, to the peoples of the mainland, and so to stake a claim in a shared identity.

At the same time as the sense of shared culture and values was developing, other types of groupings with shared interests were also forming. The Olympic Games, for example, although they began as a local festival in western Greece, seem to have achieved wide-ranging importance for the elite (if the Victor Lists can be trusted) on both the Greek mainland, and in Italy, Sicily and Asia Minor by the mid-seventh century (Onomastus is a victor from Smyrna in 688 BC; Daeppus of Croton in southern Italy in 672; Lygdamis of Syracuse in 648).[25] It is also notable that the first Olympic victor from Asia Minor dates to the seventh century (Onomastus), that his victory roughly coincides with the invention of the earliest migration myths, and that the stories of foundation by mainland heroes seem to have originated and been told in Asia Minor by poets like Mimnermus, Panyassis and Ion of Chios, and only later were picked up and exploited by the mainland Greeks. However, while primarily a cult event, at some point the games became specifically Hellenic and were limited to the Hellenes,[26] and Hellenic officials, *Hellanodikai*, were appointed from among the local Eleans (Hellanicus, *FGrHist* 4 F 113; Paus. 5.9.5).[27]

Yet shared culture and shared cult do not of themselves amount to a common communal identity. While these artistic and religious *koinai* provided a basis for that identity, in that they engendered a sense of similarity, the crystallization of the limits of community was important. As Anderson points out in reference to the post-Enlightenment 'nation': 'The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations [his italics].'[28] Barth has also talked about the importance of boundaries for limiting the ethnic group, although whether we want to call the Hellenes an ethnic group or not is another matter.[29] In fact, in the context of the Hellenic community, since it was not supported by the political, institutional and geographical boundaries of the nation-state, we can only say that there was a 'political community' at the point when the boundaries of belonging were defined. Although 'personal identity' as an external and objective analytical category is weak (the essence of identity is that it is about *self*-representation), group or communal identity calls for a level of subscription by the group to group-membership, which requires a self-conscious assertion by the group that the symbolic community does exist. To call oneself a Hellene was to make a political statement about membership of the community. For this assertion of identity to have power,

the community needed to self-consciously share an awareness of its existence. While there was not necessarily an attempt to limit and assert a conscious collective identity before the sixth century, the spread of Homeric epic and the influence of the cult at Olympia formed the background against which a common bond could develop.[30]

Finding difference

However, the earliest references to the 'Panhellenes' and 'Hellas' do not necessarily suggest the demarcation of the symbolic community. In Homeric epic there is no cultural concept of 'Hellenes' (though *Achaioi* is used as a collective name for the whole force: e.g. *Il.* 2.235) and the Achaeans are not qualitatively differentiated from the Trojans.[31] Hellas, on the other hand, refers only to a region in northern Greece and the Hellenes are the people whom Achilles ruled (*Il.* 2.683–5; Thuc. 1.3.3). The name 'Panhellenes' is known in the poems, though (if the line is genuine) it seems to serve to distinguish them from the Achaeans and may be referring only to northerners (*Il.* 2.529–30).[32] Likewise, the *Iliad*'s 'Catalogue of Ships', which lists all those who participated in the Trojan campaign, did not define membership of the symbolic community, although it approaches a statement of those who belonged and helped to provide a context in which the idea of community could solidify.[33] It does not mark out the boundaries and limitations for those who belonged and those who did not, and is only inclusive in a general sense, since it tells us 'who were the leaders of the Danaans and their lords' (*Il.* 2.487), but does not provide any clear sense of why this group, more than any other group, is pursuing a common cause other than their being bound by oath to do so. Nevertheless, it is certainly true that in Homeric epic, and the *Iliad* in particular, there is some sense of the group, and of group cohesiveness, not least because it was possible later to 'read' the community back into poems at a later stage, so that Homeric epic and what became its 'barbarian war' was an important expression of and a defining moment for Hellenism in the Panhellenic imagination. In this sense Homeric epic is proto-Panhellenic in that it created the conditions for the Hellenic community, without actually defining it.

Other early references to the 'Panhellenes' are more difficult to assess. The 'Panhellenes' seem to have a wider significance for Hesiod, who says that in winter 'the sun does not show the Boneless One [that is, the octopus] a pasture to head for, but turns toward the city and people of the dark men, and shines more slowly on the Panhellenes' (*W&D*, 526–8). Likewise, Archilochus says that 'dregs of the Panhellenes run to Thasos' (fr. 102 West *IE*), and in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* the 'Panhellenes' are used to denote the suitors for the hand of the daughters of Proetus (fr. 130 Merkelbach/

West[3]). Again, Hesiod in the *Works and Days* refers to the great host which left Hellas for Troy (653), Alcman speaks of Hellas, nurse of heroes ("Ελλας βωτιάνειρα) (fr. 27 Page *PMG*), while Xenophanes refers to the *Hellas gē*, the Greek land (frs. 6, 8 West *IE²*).[34] However, while the *Catalogue of Women* as a whole may have represented an early attempt to imagine the community, the reference to the 'Panhellenes' in the story of the daughters of Proetus, and these other early examples, are vague. These early non-Homeric examples of the use of 'Panhellenes' and 'Hellas' seem to represent a stage in the development of Panhellenism in which the symbolic community was 'coming into being'. They probably indicate the first stages in its formation in that they provide a framework within which Hellenic identity could develop, since they indicate an awareness of community without attempting to define it. In this sense, some of these references to the 'Panhellenes' and 'Hellas' are panhellenic in the weaker sense, since they anticipate the community, though some of the later examples (particularly [Hesiod]) probably belong to a period when the notion of the Hellenic community, and so Hellenic identity, was becoming more clearly defined.

Knowing the moment at which the Olympic Games became explicitly Hellenic, and specifically excluded non-Greeks, could then be significant for pinning down an important expression of the symbolic community. A date in the sixth century is attractive, but is difficult to prove since most of our evidence for the explicitly Hellenic nature of the Games and for the exclusion clause, which limited participation in the Games to those who could prove Hellenic descent, relates only to the fifth century. Pindar refers to an 'Aetolian' *Hellanodikas* of Olympia in 476 BC (*Olymp.* 3.10–15),[35] and inscriptional evidence referring to an *Hellanozikas* also provides a date of the second quarter of the fifth century.[36] Herodotus also tells the story of Alexander I of Macedon who had to prove his Argive descent before he could take part in the Games (5.22), but this story is probably no more than Macedonian propaganda, and only shows that the exclusion criterion was in place at the time Herodotus was writing at the end of the fifth century.[37] We need to look elsewhere if we are to find a definite early statement of Hellenic identity.

In fact, the migrations of the early archaic period present themselves as one possibility, when nascent Greeks came into direct contact with those who were culturally different from themselves. Indeed, anthropologists are generally agreed that communities can only realize independent identities in relation to other groups.[38] Jonathan Hall, however, has rejected the notion that Hellenic identity was formed in the face of cultural outgroups,[39] and, while he concedes that 'the nature, intensity and perceptions of encounters between Greek and indigenous populations varied significantly from area to area',[40] he seems to suppose that the formulation of identity (ethnic or

otherwise) through the awareness of difference must have been instantaneous rather than a process of negotiation that could span generations. In fact, the sense of communal difference which seems to have solidified in the sixth century, sharpened at least in part by the increasingly difficult political relationships between the Hellenes and their neighbours in Asia, had been prefigured by a long period of cultural interaction with other cultures, and especially the peoples of Asia.

From the mid-tenth century,[41] it was possibly Euboeans, with confidence born from their control over a regional *koinē* and maritime experience in the north Aegean, who were at the heart of the recovery of the communities of the Greek peninsula after the collapse of the Mycenaean civilization during the twelfth century.[42] They founded a colony in the West at Pithecussae at least as early as 750 BC or perhaps earlier and were also involved in the port on the Levantine littoral, Al Mina, in the early years of the eighth century.[43] Others were not far behind. There is also evidence that Athens and Crete were taking part in exchanges with Asian civilizations from the ninth century, and there are signs of Corinthian involvement in the West from perhaps the tenth century and certainly the ninth.[44] At the same time there is evidence that the Ionians of Asia Minor were in contact with the Assyrian empire, and probably even paid tribute to the Assyrian kings (though they were not necessarily directly under their political control) from the mid-seventh century.[45]

However, an awareness of the temporal depth of this negotiation of boundaries must go hand in hand with an understanding that the results were variable not only across time but also from place to place (as Hall recognized), as different communities reacted to and against each other in a variety of ways. Indeed, there is ample evidence from other situations when different cultures have come into contact that complex interactions can result, for instance, when the power balance between communities is unequal, or where one culture is imposed on another. Guy and Sheridan give the example of the Indians in South America, who, as subjects of the Spanish Empire, transformed the religious rituals of Christianity imposed on them by the Jesuits and Franciscans to express their own religious ideas and practices:

> During Semana Santa (Holy Week), for example, Rarámuri ceremonial participants in former mission communities group themselves into two organizations – the Soldiers (sontárisi) and Pharisees (pariséo) – and perform rituals rooted in the Passion plays taught them by Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries... According to Tarahumaras, the Universe is arranged in a series of levels with God (represented by images of Jesus) and God's wife (represented by images of the Virgin Mary) occupying the highest level and the devil dominating the lowest. God and the devil do not represent absolute good and absolute evil, however: Rarámuri emphasize balance rather than the ultimate triumph of good over evil, and for most of the year, God and the devil possess equal power.

During the Holy Week, however, the devil gets God drunk and seduces his wife with his brilliant guitar playing. Seriously weakened, God and his wife seek refuge in Tarahumara churches. The Soldiers and the Pharisees march in order to protect God until he can regain his strength and restore balance to the Universe. Otherwise the world would be destroyed. Promises of an afterlife and Christian redemption from sin play little or no role in Rarámuri religious philosophy. The ceremonies from Holy Week may spring from Europe, but their meanings are highly Tarahumaran.[46]

Likewise, Staats describes how the indigenous Amerindians of Guyana actively resisted the Christian colonialism of missionaries through the development of the Alleluia religion, which transformed Christian ritual to express indigenous theologies.[47]

Furthermore, the expression of culture on the borders is also not static or unchanging. In talking about the development of 'cowboys' on the American frontiers, Slatta describes the frontier as a 'membrane', where influences passed in both directions, though because of the power relations more in the direction of the indigenous peoples than the cattle ranchers.[48] In relation to the frontiers of the Spanish empire in South America, Guy and Sheridan argue that 'frontiers' are 'contested ground', with historical and changing dimensions:

> ...we view frontiers as zones of historical interaction where, in the brutally direct phrase of Baretta and Markoff, 'no one has an enduring monopoly on violence'. Along frontiers in both north and south America, as around the world, different polities contend for natural resources and ideological control, including the right to define categories of people and to determine their access to those resources. Those polities often exhibited immense differences of organization, population, and technology, yet frontiers marked the social and geographical limits of power among the polities themselves. Frontiers were, in the most basic sense, contested ground.[49]

An important element in Guy's and Sheridan's analysis of borders is its temporal aspect, where 'contestation' is 'historical' and 'changing'. Likewise, when talking about ethnic identity, Siân Jones also emphasizes its temporal character:

> that ethnic identity is based on shifting, situational, subjective identifications of self and others, which are rooted in ongoing daily practice and historical experience, but also subject to transformation and discontinuity.[50]

In a similar vein, Homi Bhabha, in the context of the development of the nation and nationhood, describes not only how identities form at the points where cultural difference is recognized, but also how this process of definition is on-going and ever-changing.[51] Although the analogy between Bhabha's model of the nation and the *polis* is neither complete nor satisfactory, the

idea of contestation and 'shifting signification', as identity is produced by confrontation with difference and then redefines itself in the light of the refinements this produces, is useful for us. It is this phenomenon of shifting and variable signification (in varying degrees of intensity) which seems to be at work at different points along the borders of the Greek sphere of influence. Here 'meaning' is created discursively, gradually, and not always consistently. It should not be surprising, then, that in the contested ground, where the idea of Hellenic community and its boundaries is being hardened and being given form and meaning, there was more than one response. In some places there was assimilation to varying degrees. In others the response to another culture was more robust. It is to the variety of experience on the edges that we shall turn next.

Life on the edges

The process of negotiation is slow, and, as Jones noted, not always continuous. In some places, and at some times, it was felt more strongly than others, and depended on a range of issues, including the power relations between communities, or the contest over resources. In Egypt, as we shall see, the awareness of difference seemed to have been felt more keenly than in the Black Sea regions. Furthermore, the ways in which Greeks came into contact with the non-Greek world was variable. In some cases the nascent Greeks were travelling but not settling, in others communities were being founded, and in Asia Minor 'Greeks', who had long lived beside 'non-Greeks', began in the archaic period to assert difference from their neighbours and similarity with the communities of the Greek mainland. In this sense, Hall is right to suggest that a core/periphery model is simplistic. In this section we look at and attempt to trace the development of experiences of 'finding the edges'. In the first place, we will consider the experiences of early Greek seafarers as reflected in Homer, and especially the *Odyssey*, where we seem to find some of the earliest expressions of difference (although not so much between Greeks and non-Greeks as between men, monsters and gods). We will then turn to the actual and very variable experiences of those who migrated from the Greek mainland from the eighth century onwards to different locations around the Mediterranean. Finally, we will look at the experience of the communities of Asia Minor, who developed a strong sense of affinity not only with the Greeks on the mainland, but also of difference with their immediate and (sometimes predatory) neighbours.

Mortals, gods and beasts

The Greeks were in large part a sea-faring people and their lives were in many ways dominated by the sea. Familiarity with the sea and sea-travel is reflected

in Hesiod's *Works and Days*: Hesiod's father migrated from Aeolian Cyme to Helicon in Boeotia (635–40), and Hesiod understands that men think travel by sea and trade will bring them wealth and escape from poverty, though he himself has skill neither in sea-faring nor in ships (*W&D*, 645–94). Archilochus, too, talks about sailing, and his life, at least as presented in his poetry, centres around the sea (cf. frs. 116, 122.6–9, 212, 213 West *IE*): drinking Ismarian wine while reclining on shipboard (fr. 2; cf. fr. 4 West *IE*), the difficulties of sea travel (frs. 24, 106 West *IE*), experiencing sea-borne raids (fr. 89 West *IE*), and praying for a 'sweet homecoming' (fr. 8 West *IE*).

In keeping with this connection with the sea and travel by sea, the *Odyssey* is a story of wandering and wanderers, a story of returns, and seems to echo closely a period in Greek history when the Greeks were wandering themselves and exploring (though seemingly purposefully and with clear intent) the possibilities of the Mediterranean.[52] The *Odyssey* shows familiarity with peoples and places known to the Greeks, even if indirectly, from the early Iron Age, and it has been suggested that the development of the narrative of the poem in its formative stages owed much to the Euboeans.[53] Phoenician traders abound (though they are often up to no good: the swine-herd Eumaeus was stolen as a child for the slave-market, 15.403–84; and Odysseus pretends that he was tricked by a Phoenician trader who intended to sell him into slavery: 14.285–98). Menelaus is driven off-course and wanders over Cyprus, Phoenicia and Egypt before returning home in the eighth year (3.299–300, 4.81–5). As part of his disguise as a Cretan trader, Odysseus tells Eumaeus an invented story of his journey to Egypt, Phoenicia and (on his way to Libya having been shipwrecked off Crete!) Thesprotia in north-western Greece (14.245–320).

In his travels, Odysseus also meets people and monsters who have different customs and hold different values to himself and his companions. It seems, however, that the poems are not concerned with the cultural differences between Greeks and Trojans; rather, they display little sense of 'non-Greekness' and are more concerned with the relationship between gods and men and what it is to be heroic.[54] In fact, it is often said that in epic there is little qualitative differentiation between Greeks and non-Greeks,[55] and it has sometimes been argued that in the archaic period the Greeks had no sense of the anti-Greek against which they defined themselves.[56] Danaans and Trojans alike are expected to pay their dues to the gods, and subscribe to the heroic value system (put succinctly by Sarpedon: *Il.* 12.310–28). Yet, as Hartog has shown in his analysis of what he calls the 'anthropology' of the poem, the *Odyssey* investigates and gives expression to travel through known and unknown spaces by exploring the differences between men, gods and beasts, and provides what Hartog has called a 'repertoire of Otherness' on which

later authors were to draw.[57] However, the *Odyssey* does not just explore confrontation with difference in an absolute sense. Odysseus not only meets those who are absolutely different, but also those who are, in varying degrees, similar to himself. Further, just as not all those who are unknown are absolutely dangerous, neither is Odysseus nor his companions always innocent in their interactions with those they meet. In this way, Odysseus in his adventures illustrates the complexities of travel and travelling: in the unknown there is similarity as well as difference, and not all dangers are external.

In the first place, during Odysseus' return journey from Troy to Ithaca he meets a number of strange and sometimes terrible peoples. Odysseus' standard of acceptability is measured by whether the people he meets are violent, wild and unjust, whether they accept strangers and are god-fearing in intent (e.g. 6.119–121, 9.175–6) – a question which he also ironically puts to the disguised Athena when he finally comes to Ithaca (13.200–1) – and whether they are civilized and 'bread-eating' (e.g. 10.101). The answer is not always positive, and many of those he meets are not only monstrous, but also live outside accepted societal norms.[58] The Cyclopes, for example, are isolationist, with no respect for society or its restraints and responsibilities:[59] they are 'arrogant and lawless'; they neither till the land, nor have assemblies, nor laws; they live on mountains or in caves, each one laying down the law for his children and wives; and they do not respect each other (9.105–115, cf. 428). They have no ships, and so no contact with the outside world (9.125–9). Polyphemus himself not only eats the companions without compunction, but also brags that he is not afraid of Zeus or the gods, since the Cyclopes are their betters (9.275–6). The Cyclopes may be non-Greek, but even more than this they are not men but monsters.

Other creatures and peoples Odysseus meets are more ambivalent. The Laestrygonians, for example, might have an *agora* (market), but they are also out-sized, violent and ready to devour Odysseus' comrades without warning (10.103–24).[60] The danger of the Lotus-eaters is not that they kill the companions, but that they give them lotus to eat so that they forget their desire to return home (9.91–8).[61] Circe, who is learned in medicines (πολυφάρμακος), drugs the companions so that they forget their homelands and turns them into pigs (10.229–36), but when she is over-powered and neutralized with the help of Hermes' herbs, she restores the companions and helps Odysseus find his way to Hades, tells him how to escape the dangers of the Sirens, Scylla and Charybdis, and warns him about the cattle of Helius. Aeolus, too, is initially helpful. The incestuous marriages of his children are transgressive,[62] but he himself is, at least initially, benign and willingly provides Odysseus not only with gifts of hospitality, but also with the bag of winds. It is only when Odysseus is forced to return with his sorry tale of

the companions' treachery that Aeolus rejects him as one hated by the gods (10.1–76). Although the Phaeacians are responsible for bringing Odysseus back to Ithaca and Phaeacia acts as a gateway between the 'known' and 'unknown' and 'real' and 'unreal', the Phaeacians are also dangerous in their way.[63] Not only does Nausicaa appear as a further threat to Odysseus' homecoming narrowly averted (Odysseus' meeting with Nausicaa is ironic in that it does not fulfil the expectations which the narrative suggests for it: 6.25–70, 239–45, 255–88; 7.311–16), but also there is a dangerous and transgressive face to Alcinous' court. Alcinous too is married incestuously to his sister Arete (7.54–68),[64] and danger and hostility lurks just beneath the surface as Odysseus was mockingly challenged by Euryalus and Laodamas to take part in the games (8.97–255, esp. 143–66).

The ambiguous nature of these peoples and creatures of Odysseus' adventures exclude absolute 'Otherness'. They are like, as well as unlike. Furthermore, they are understandable. The peoples of this fantastic world may have different reactions from the value system by which Odysseus judges them, but that value system is still a consistent yard-stick and a point of reference for the ways in which he understands them. By it, the Cyclopes can be judged as those who do not respect Zeus, the laws, and the customs of hospitality. The Laestrygonians, like the Cyclopes, do not work the land (9.108, 10.98), and this is part of their difference. The Phaeacians, on the other hand, do grow crops of grain and fruit, although the crops they grow are enhanced by the gifts of the gods (6.259–61, 7.112–32). Dougherty has also brought out the polarity which is created between the Cyclopes and the Phaeacians judged by Odysseus' yardstick: the Cyclopes representing the absolute of non-civilization, and the Phaeacians a civilized utopia (an early version of nature *versus* culture).[65] All these peoples inhabit the same world, even if their place in that world is marked out as different relative to Odysseus.

But the dangers Odysseus faces are not just caused by the peoples he meets. Odysseus and his companions are not just observers in this world; they are also responsible for action and reaction. Part of the power of the poem is that they are forced to suffer the consequences of their own actions.[66] Just as they meet danger, they are also dangerous in their own right: they bring danger with them and their actions bring it on themselves. When Odysseus arrives on the Cyclops' island, Polyphemus asks him whether he comes for trade, or whether 'like a pirate he wanders aimlessly hazarding his soul and bringing trouble to others' (9.252–5).[67] And Odysseus and the companions are not averse to brigandage. When they first left Troy, they raided the island of the Cicones, sacked their city and stole their wives and treasure (9.39–42). It is small wonder then that the Cicones retaliated in like manner by driving Odysseus and his men away (9.47–61). Even the cattle of Helius, who are

responsible for the final downfall of the companions, are an avoidable danger. Odysseus and his companions were warned not only by Teiresias, but also by Circe, and brought their doom upon themselves by eating the forbidden animals (12.260–419).

That Odysseus' adventures are acting as metaphor for Iron Age wandering and the experiences of early travellers is suggestive, and the poem itself makes the link between the real and the imaginary travel through Menelaus' parallel journey in the 'known' world which anticipates and prefigures Odysseus' journey in the lands beyond Phaeacia.[68] Like Odysseus, Menelaus is also blown off course while rounding Malea (3.287), but rather than being sent into the never-never world of monsters, Menelaus travels to Cyprus, Phoenicia and Egypt to wander among men of other languages (ἀλλόθροοι) (3.302, 4.82–3).[69] Here he meets the Ethiopians, Sidonians and Erembi, and comes to Libya (4.86–9). The geography of Menelaus' journey is not necessarily realistic – the Sidonians are out of place in Egypt and the Erembi are otherwise unknown – but the people are real. These Ethiopians do not live at the edges of the earth (cf. Hom. *Od.* 1.22–4), but in a place that can be located within the Greek experience.

Similar questions to those asked of the peoples of Odysseus' travels can be asked of the people Menelaus meets. Unlike the Cyclops Polyphemus, whose answer to a request for guest-gifts was to eat two of Odysseus' companions (9.259–90), Menelaus and Helen had received guest-gifts from the Egyptian Polybus and his wife Alcandre (4.120–37). However, Helen, like Circe, gives Telemachus and Peisistratus drugs of forgetfulness, which she obtained from an Egyptian woman, for in Egypt the earth 'bears most drugs, many of which when mixed are good and bad, and each man is a physician with knowledge above all men' (4.219–32). The Libyans also, like the Cyclopes, have an abundance of milk and cheese, and Libya, like the island of the Cyclopes, is a fertile land of wonders where the lambs are born with horns (4.85–9, 9.107–9).[70]

There is a similar link between metaphorical travel and real travel in the contrast between Odysseus' fantastic (although, within the terms of the poem, actual) journey, and his 'lying' travelling stories. Odysseus tells Eumaeus the 'lying' story of a journey from Crete to Egypt with his companions, who, against his advice and 'giving in to wantonness and in a knowledge of their own strength', attacked the Egyptians, killing the men and carrying off the women and little children (14.245–84). When the Egyptians retaliated, Zeus helped them, so that all Odysseus' companions were killed although Odysseus himself was saved. Odysseus then says that he stayed in Egypt for seven years, but in the eighth accompanied a Phoenician trader to Phoenicia. When the Phoenician attempts to betray

Odysseus to slave-traders in Libya (they are supposedly engaged in a joint trading venture), Odysseus is once again saved by Zeus, who destroys the ship and all on it except Odysseus, who is washed ashore on the coast of Thesprotia (14.285–320). In another version of the story, told later to the suitors, Odysseus is sent straight from Egypt to Cyprus (17.424–44). There are echoes here of both the episode with the cattle on Thrinacia, and the battle with the Cicones. Odysseus' journey home to Ithaca is a metaphorical description of real-life travel. It comes to terms with the role of the traveller as an actor in a wide and dangerous world. Yet the traveller, whether trader or adventurer, is not a passive bystander. Those he meets are dangerous, and threaten him with their difference, just as he threatens them. On the other hand, difference and strangeness can be accommodated. Circe can give Odysseus the advice he needs. Others, like Aeolus and Alcinous, provide guest-gifts. Some dangers can be controlled.

To sum up: the fantastic world of Odysseus' travels offers a complex reading of travel and the experience of difference, made even more problematic by Odysseus' involvement in that world. Odysseus and his companions are not passive observers, but are actors who provoke reaction. They are responsible for some of the dangers they experience. By the same token, Odysseus can judge this world by *his* standards. The result of this externally imposed judgement is in one instance the creation of an opposite: the Cyclopes are the absolute Other, an uncivilized non-human. Other creatures are more ambiguous: the Laestrygonians have a political life in an *agora*; Circe is dangerous but provides assistance; Aeolus provides help but ultimately turns Odysseus away as one hated by the gods. The Phaeacians, on the other hand, provide a polar opposite to the Cyclopes. These creatures are magical, their world is a fantasy one, but they also share similarities with Odysseus and the world he knows.

This spectrum of difference that reaches towards sameness and goes past it to the idealism of utopia (typified by the extremes presented by the Cyclopes and the Phaeacians) acts as a metaphor for the real-life encounters of real-life travel. So much is generally conceded. Dougherty, for example, who argues that Odysseus' adventures need to be located historically within the context of Greek Iron Age maritime exploration, offers a sensitive reading of Odysseus' adventures.[71] She discusses the contrasts between Phoenicians and Phaeacians, and the Cyclopes and Phaeacians as models of eighth-century exchange and colonial settlement, seeing the Phaeacians as particularly crucial to these sets of contrasts, and argues that Odysseus' travels, and particularly encounters with 'Others', such as the Cyclopes, provided a model for the Greeks' attempts at self-definition.[72] But Dougherty's analysis depends on Odysseus' explicit awareness within the poem that he is Greek,

so that the monsters he meets can also be explicitly anti-Greek. She has also seen in Odysseus' adventures a specific metaphor for the real-life travel of the Euboeans. But one should hesitate in making so direct a comparison. In the first place, although the Euboeans appear to have been the first Greeks to travel widely in the Mediterranean and it has been argued that they influence the story at an important period in its history, neither were they the only Greeks to travel in the early Iron Age, nor is the *Odyssey* just a Euboean story. The point about Odysseus is not that he is Greek as such, but that he is human, an eater-of-bread, and his adventures relate to the experiences of mankind rather than specifically the Greeks. The interest and historical importance of the poems is that he is nonetheless a Greek man with Greek values, unselfconsciously presenting a Greek view of the world. As the product of an oral tradition which seems to have been felt right across the Greek world, the *Odyssey* reflects proto-Panhellenic themes and concerns of a number of early Iron Age communities of the Greek peninsula and Asia Minor, and the complicated and variable experiences of coming into contact with the unknown. What Odysseus does show is just how complicated it can be to find, and then define, difference.

Migration and settlement

More than just wandering the seas, the practicalities of the migrations of the eighth to sixth centuries brought different peoples and communities into contact with each other. This movement of peoples (whether it happened piece-meal or on a more organized basis) must have applied pressure to ideas of belonging and community, although not necessarily everywhere to the same degree,[73] and, as for Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, it is the variability of experiences in negotiating difference and similarity which is so striking.[74] Some settlements, for example, were established in the face of conflict (Hdt. 1.166, cf. 4.158; Thuc. 6.3–6).[75] At the same time, we know (or are able to guess) that in a number of cases, settlers intermarried with the indigenous population. Herodotus (retrojecting from the late-fifth century onto the post-Trojan-War period) says that at Miletus the Greeks married native Carian women, having murdered their parents (1.146.2). Although interpreting archaeological evidence for intermarriage is more complicated than was once thought,[76] when it did happen, there is evidence for cultural conservatism and the accentuation of cultural traits in order to reassert identity: at Cyrene Herodotus tells us that the women (who we must assume were indigenous) maintained the local practice of abstaining from the meat of heifers out of respect for Egyptian Isis (4.186). On the other hand, Marshall has discussed the way in which attitudes of Cyrenaicans to Libyans fluctuated in relation to the degree of hostility and political pressure between the two communities.[77]

Elsewhere there seem to be indications of relatively high levels of cultural integration between Hellenes and non-Hellenes. Hall argues that this was the case in Sicily between Greek settlers and the indigenous Sicels.[78] Dougherty, on the other hand, suggests a more subtle and complex picture in relations between Greeks and Etruscans which involved variously 'conflict, collaboration and peaceful interaction'.[79] In the Black Sea the evidence also suggests a variable relationship between Greeks and non-Greeks (and a non-uniform penetration of Greek cultural artefacts into indigenous population groups).[80] On the other hand, Domínguez has argued that in Iberia Greek culture was significant only in so far as it contributed to a 'vocabulary' through which the Iberians could create their own identity and cultural expressions.[81]

As a means of establishing a sense of difference, language seems to have been significant, at least at a superficial 'front-line' stage. Some Greeks serving as mercenaries in Egypt in the sixth century described themselves as *alloglōssoi*, those of a different language (ML 7 (4) a; cf. Hdt. 2.154.4). Whether or not they were adopting the style given to them by the Egyptians, the fact that they called themselves *alloglōssoi* indicates the degree to which they saw themselves not only as a minority group, but also as a differentiated group within Egyptian society. The knowledge that language both divides and unites is also implicit in the epic poems. It has sometimes been said that the world of epic is naively monoglot, but, although the characters in these stories are always able to understand each other, there is an awareness of different languages and the implications of language for demarcating difference. While the Greeks moved in silence, the Trojans and their allies bleat without ceasing like ewes listening to their lambs, 'for there was not one sound for all of them, or one voice, but their tongues had been mixed, and there were men called from many lands' (*Il.* 4.427–38; cf. 2.802–6, 3.1–6). Athena, disguised as Mentes, lord of the oar-loving Taphians, describes herself as a merchant sailing over the wine-dark sea to men of other languages (ἀλλόθροοι ἄνθρωποι, *Od.* 1.183). In the *Iliad*, the Carians, who had lived closely with the Hellenes of Asia Minor, are notoriously described as *barbarophōnoi* (2.867), a description which seems to have meant little more than that they did not speak Greek, or (as Strabo suggests) that they spoke Greek badly (14.2.28). We have already seen in the previous chapter how Hipponax and Anacreon refer in derogatory terms to those who do not speak Greek. Language, however was not always a reliable marker either of unity or of absolute difference, as it could be used to differentiate other kinds of groups. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus describes Crete as a land where 'languages' (γλῶσσαι), or perhaps 'dialects', are mixed one with another: 'therein are Achaeans, great-hearted Eteocretans, Cydonians, thrice-divided Dorians, and noble Pelasgians' (19.175–7).[82]

55

Cult was also an important means for defining and giving substance to difference. This is most obvious at Naucratis where a cult centre with Panhellenic significance was established, the Hellenion, which was probably built in the 570s when the Egyptian pharaoh Amasis regularized the Greek settlement at Naucratis and put it on an official footing.[83] Herodotus says:

> Amasis, being in favour of the Greeks (φιλέλλην), honoured them, and gave to those who came to Egypt Naucratis as a *polis* to live in, and to those of them not wishing to dwell there, but to those sailing there, he gave land to set up altars and sanctuaries for the gods. The largest sanctuary of these, which was also the most famous and most used, was that called the Hellenion. These were the cities who set it up: of the Ionians, Chios, Teos, Phocaea, and Clazomenae; and of the Dorians, Rhodes, Cnidos, Halicarnassus, and Phaselis; and of the Aeolians, only the city of the Mytilenaeans. This is the sanctuary of these cities, and these are the cities which provide officials (προστάται) for the port. Any other cities that lay claim to a share in it, do so without justification. Separately, the Aeginetans built a sanctuary of Zeus by themselves, the Samians a sanctuary of Hera, and the Mytilenaeans a sanctuary of Apollo. (2.178)

Pointing to the early foundation date for the Mytilenaean temple of Apollo, Hall sees in the Hellenion the culmination of his aggregative model of the development of the Hellenes, and emphasizes the fact that this 'aggregative construction of identity should see its material realization outside Greece'.[84] He suggests that this can be explained by analogy with the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Delphi and Olympia which were an 'effective arena for competition and emulation between *poleis* precisely because they were outside the territorial orbit of their main participants'.[85] Yet while the Hellenion was certainly a statement of commonality, as Hall claims, it must also be significant that such a positive statement of identity was not made in Greece but in *Egypt*, though not just for the reasons Hall gives.[86] We have already noted that the Greeks in Egypt were described as *alloglōssoi*, which is perhaps an indication of the Egyptians' own

Fig. 1. Red-figured pelike, depicting Heracles slaying Bousiris, *c.* 470 BC. National Archaeological Museum, Athens 9683; photograph courtesy of the Museum.

sense of superiority over other cultures. Furthermore, as Hartog has pointed out, Egypt was a place that was forming in the Greek mind during the early archaic period as somewhere that was Other.[87] In the *Odyssey* Egypt is tacitly compared with the strange and fantastic lands of Odysseus' wandering, since, like Circe and her island, the land of the Lotus-eaters or the Sirens, it too produces drugs which bring on forgetfulness (4.119–232). Margaret Miller, in her analysis of the Bousiris myth in Athenian art, also shows that the Egyptianness of the locality and ethnicity of Bousiris and his court in opposition to the Greek Heracles had started to become important in the sixth century (see, for example, *Fig.* 1).[88] The Hellenion, then, appears not only to be a statement of unity, but also a statement of difference. It was in the interaction of these two forces – one of inclusion and one of exclusion – that the Hellenic community 'came into being'. Furthermore, it is probably significant that it was the *Greeks of Asia Minor* that made this strong statement of identity, as it was the Greeks of Asia Minor who in this period were the most politically and culturally vulnerable and who seem to have felt a need to make strong statements about their relationship to the community of the Hellenes.

Greeks and their neighbours in Asia Minor

Nevertheless, not all relations between the Greeks in Asia Minor and their neighbours were difficult or strained. A good, and positive, example of cultural negotiation is provided by the relationship between the Greeks and Carians in southern Asia Minor. Despite the close association between the two groups, the Carians were certainly considered by the Greeks to be non-Greek. Yet Carian artistic trends were influenced by Greek geometric art,[89] the Carians, or at least their Lelegian antecedents, were included in the Greeks' own myths of origins (the Lelegians are on the same level as the Pelasgians, for example, Hom. *Il.* 10.429 – and the traditions concerning them are equally varied and confused: Hdt. 1.171.2–3; Thuc. 1.4.1, 8.1–2; Strabo 7.7.1–2; 9.2.3; 12.8.5; 13.1.58; 14.1.3, 2.27), and Herodotus speaks of Ionians (probably here the generic name for the Greeks of Asia Minor whether Dorian or Ionian[90]) and Carians serving as mercenaries together in Egypt (2.152.4, 154.2, 163.1; 3.11.1; 8.22.1–2; cf. Archilochus, fr. 216 West *IE*: 'And I will be called a mercenary like a Carian').

While Jones in particular has warned of the difficulties in using archaeology to define the limits of ethnic groups,[91] there are also signs of a degree of cultural exchange between Carians and Greeks: 'Carian-type' tombs at Lelegian sites have produced Greek Protogeometric pottery; at Iasus Lelegian buildings are juxtaposed with Greek-style cist burials; at Miletus there are Carian-type shrines;[92] and the cult of Artemis at the Carian-Greek

site of Ephesus incorporated both Anatolian and Greek features.[93] The mother of Herodotus, the historian who was interested in the relationship between Greeks and barbarians (and particularly the grey and muddy transitional areas), possibly had a Carian name (the Suda calls her Rhoeō, Ῥοιώ), and Panyassis (either his cousin or uncle) certainly did (Suda s.v. Panyassis).[94] While names tell us little about actual intermarriage between Greek and non-Greek groups, they do suggest a level of cultural interchange. Herodotus' family may or may not have been of mixed Carian-Greek descent, but the level of acculturation between the two certainly was such that Carian names were acceptable in a Greek family (or *vice versa*), and that, despite Panyassis' Carian name, he actively asserted a Greek identity (he wrote epic poems about the Greek foundation of Asia Minor), which his contemporaries accepted, just as later the Greek identity of his kinsmen, Herodotus, was also accepted without question.

What is important, however, is not what the Greeks and Carians did, but what they said about themselves and their identities,[95] and the Greeks certainly distinguished themselves from the Carians. In Greek representations of the Carians, as we have seen, the Carians spoke a language that Greeks identified as 'barbarian' (even if this label did not have in Homer the pejorative overtones it acquired later), although the mixed Greek-Carian city of Iasus at least was inscribing in Greek in the fifth century.[96] The Carians borrowed from Greeks (and Herodotus says the Greeks borrowed from the Carians: 1.171.4), and at times developed close political relations with their Greek neighbours.[97] It is striking that, despite the apparent levels of cultural assimilation that occurred in Caria between Hellenes and Carians, the two communities asserted a cultural separateness.

However, the most powerful statements of difference between the Greeks and their neighbours in Asia Minor seem to have come in their relationships with the Lydians. For the Ionian poets, Lydia was synonymous with wealth and luxury, and came to represent the 'oriental' and exotic. Archilochus in the seventh century despises the wealth of Gyges 'rich in gold' (fr. 19 West *IE*), while for Alcaeus at the turn of the seventh century the Lydians are wealthy benefactors:

> Father Zeus, the Lydians, indignant at the turn of events, gave us two thousand staters in the hope that we could enter the <holy city>, although they never received any benefit from us and did not know us.
>
> (fr. 69 Lobel/Page; transl. Campbell)

Consistent with the respect for Lydian wealth, Lydia was also seen as the home of luxury and exotica. Alcman (who may have been connected with Sardis: cf. frs. 16, 13a Davies *PMGF*) in the seventh century refers to a Lydian headband (fr. 1.68–9 Davies *PMGF*) among a list of luxury items.

58

A little later Sappho has 'a gay leather strap' which 'covered feet, a fine piece of Lydian work' (fr. 39 Lobel/Page) and a decorated headband from Sardis (fr. 98.10–11 Lobel/Page).[98] Even after the Persian conquest of Lydia in the 540s, Anacreon is said to call living luxuriously 'living in the Lydian style' (Λυδοπαθεῖς, fr. 481 Page *PMG*), and Xenophanes, with some edge, says:

> Having learned useless luxury (ἁβροσύνη) from the Lydians,
> while still free from hateful tyranny,
> they come into the market-place wearing purple cloaks,
> as often as not in their thousands,
> proudly glorying in their beautiful locks,
> steeping their body odour in rare unguents.   (fr. 3 West *IE*²)

Lydia represents all that is fair ('I have a beautiful child, who looks like a golden flower,' Sappho says, 'my darling Cleis, for whom I would not take all Lydia...': fr. 132 Lobel/Page), all that is luxurious, and all that is decadent. The Ionian poets effectively 'orientalize' the Lydians.[99]

Recently, Lesley Kurke and Ian Morris have argued that this orientalizing of the Lydians belonged to a political discourse that identified the aristocratic lifestyle with Lydia and the civilizations of Asia, and have argued for competition within the archaic elite between those who emulated Asian *habrosynē* ('luxury') and those who identified with a 'middling' ideology and rejected the culture of *lydopatheis*, Lydian high-living.[100] According to Kurke, poets sympathetic to this lifestyle of *habrosynē* deliberately, and politically, celebrated it as a means of self-definition. Sappho, for example, says, 'I love *habrosynē*' (fr. 58.25 Lobel/Page). For Kurke, rejection of *habrosynē* was a political and ideological choice, attacking the traditional elite and espousing and supporting the values of the *polis*, which anticipated control by the *polis* of elite wealth during the sixth century. While this argument has its attractions and has been widely accepted, whether the rejection of the oriental was a question of class is not so clear. The evidence Kurke provides is slight and rests primarily on two fragments of Xenophanes. Morris' argument is much more complex and sustained, but even he admits that there is no consistency within individual poets, and assumes that 'class' was a significant site of ideological contestation in archaic society. Further, not all his assumptions are proved. For example, it is not clear that Homeric epic was used by the elite to promote the elite culture of the individual hero and to suppress *polis*-centred ideologies, as he claims.

In fact, not all tension in archaic society was class tension, but there was considerable conflict among the elite, a phenomenon which often led directly to tyranny. Solon, for example, is aware of the rivalries between political leaders and the consequences for the constitution and the people:

> From a cloud comes the force of snow or hail,

and thunder is from bright lightening.
But by great men the city is destroyed,
and the *dēmos* unwittingly falls into the slavery of monarchy.
Raised too far, it is not easy to restrain them
later, but then it is necessary to put a positive gloss on it.   (fr. 9 West *IE*[2])[101]

Furthermore, a feature of the class tension that did exist, as Kurke herself points out, was not so much the rejection of aristocratic values and practices by the non-elite but their annexation. In the archaic period at least, the desire of the lower classes was to be upwardly mobile and to share the privileges of the elite, rather than to develop a bourgeois mentality.[102] Furthermore, on her own account, the attitude to Asian luxury remained ambiguous into the fifth century, and 'Lydian luxury' was simultaneously adopted and vilified. Margaret Miller has also argued that, despite the sometimes negative reaction to orientalism in the fifth and fourth centuries, *orientalia* were used as status symbols in late archaic and fifth-century Athens, becoming 'democratized' towards the end of the fifth century and being adopted by a broader spectrum of the population as a tool for social differentiation in the Empire.[103] We will return to this in chapter 4.

Further, neither Kurke nor Morris takes account of the complexities of, or changes in, the political relationship between Lydia and Ionia in the late-seventh and sixth centuries. The orientalizing of Lydia can also be explained by relations between the Greek communities of Asia Minor and their neighbours in the archaic period. Throughout the archaic period, the eastern Greeks were a hard-pressed and much conquered people. In the mid-seventh century, it is probable that the Ionians paid tribute to the Assyrians.[104] At the same time, from the seventh century western Anatolia was dominated by the Lydians. The Lydian Gyges (*c.* 685–645 BC) and his successors in the seventh and sixth centuries maintained an aggressive policy towards the Greeks living on the coast (Hdt. 1.14–19.1; Paus. 4.21.5, 9.29.2; Nicolaus of Damascus, *FGrHist* 90 F 62, 64), probably in order to maintain access to the harbours on the Aegean.[105] Mimnermus describes the fall of his city, Smyrna, which was captured by Alyattes (*c.* 610–560 BC; Hdt. 1.16; Nicolaus of Damascus, *FGrHist* 90 F 64), and says of his brother that:

His strength and bravery were not like yours,
as I have heard from older men who saw
him on the plain of Hermos with his spear
routing the Lydian cavalry's thick ranks.
Pallas Athena ne'er had cause to fault
his acid fury, when in the front line
he hurtled through the battle's bloody moil
against the stinging missiles of the foe.
No warrior of the enemy remained

> his better in the strenuous work of war,
> so long as he moved in the swift sun's light.   (fr. 14 West *IE²*; transl. West)

Meanwhile, during the seventh century and much of the sixth, the Cimmerians also threatened the region, launching wave after wave of invasion from the north until they were finally put down by Alyattes (Hdt. 1.16). The seventh-century Callinus from Ephesus refers to the Cimmerian attacks (fr. 5a, b West *IE²*), and they may have remained a memory, though a distant and less threatening one, for Anacreon (eleg. 3 with apparatus West *IE²*) in the late-sixth or early-fifth century.[106] The last of the Lydian Mermnad dynasty, Croesus (*c.* 560–540s BC), developed the policy of disciplinary action into one of subjugation and exaction of tribute, launching a series of actions against individual Greek cities (Hdt. 1.26–7), while at the same time establishing friendly relations with the islands.[107] Herodotus describes how Croesus at the height of his power controlled 'nearly everyone except the Cilicians and Lycians living between the River Halys and the coast: the Lydians, Phrygians, Mysians, Mariandyni, Chalybes, Paphlagonians, Thracians (both Thynian and Bithynian), Carians, Ionians, Dorians, Aeolians, and Pamphylians' (1.28). It is probably these predatory incursions on the communities of Asia Minor that gave rise to or intensified ideas of a symbolic community, and of the membership of the Greeks of Asia Minor in the community.

Furthermore, the polarization of 'Greek' and 'barbarian' was encouraged by current theoretical and philosophical speculations in Asia Minor. There was a philosophical tendency to understand cosmogony and the generation of the universe through systems of polarities. By the end of the sixth century, the Greek philosopher Anaximander had created a map of the world and was credited with writing a *Periodos gēs*, a 'journey around the world' (DK 12 A 2),[108] and other early attempts to conceptualize the world imagined it divided into two symmetrical parts. Hecataeus of Miletus at the end of the sixth century in his own *Periodos gēs* described the two continents of Europe and Asia (which he probably represented as equal: cf. Hdt. 4.36.2) as surrounded by Ocean (cf. Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 1 F 17, 18a). Although we know very little about Anaximander's map, other than the fact that it was said to have been improved and made more detailed by Hecataeus (Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 1 T 12a),[109] we might guess from Anaximander's cosmogonical speculations that he saw the world as the centre of the universe, and that he too divided the earth into two equal continents, particularly as he also seems to have seen opposites as essential to his originative substance.[110] Dividing the world in two encouraged a sense of cultural or ethnic difference.[111]

Nevertheless, for their part the Lydians admired and supported Greek culture. Gyges probably sent Greek and Carian mercenaries to help Psammetichus I of Egypt in his revolt against the Assyrians.[112] Alyattes at the

turn of the seventh century also used Colophonian cavalrymen (Polyaenus 7.2.2), and, before he himself succeeded to the throne, Croesus collected mercenaries from the coast for his father (Nicolaus of Damascus, *FGrHist* 90 F 65).[113] Gyges (Hdt. 1.13–14.1), Alyattes (Hdt. 1.25) and Croesus (Hdt. 1.46–55, 92.1) also appealed to Greek oracles and made sumptuous dedications at Delphi and other Greek sanctuaries (though Alyattes did so in appeasement for burning the temple of Athena at Assessus), and Croesus also helped in the re-building of the temple of Artemis of Ephesus by providing columns (Hdt. 1.92.1; cf. Tod 6).[114] And we have seen how at least some Greeks in Asia Minor in the seventh century admired Lydian culture.

It is in the relations between the Greeks of Asia Minor and the Lydians that we can find a clue to the Greek orientalizing of Lydia and the sharpening of the sense of the Lydians' difference. As powerful neighbours, the Lydians were dangerous as well as potential benefactors. They were conquerors of the Greeks, but left them more or less to their own devices without interfering with the Greeks' internal political arrangements. Their lifestyle was emulated as something desirable and even attainable for some. Nevertheless, the power relation was unequal and unalterable. Some among the Greek communities may have desired luxury items from Asia, and even acquired them perhaps as a means of marking out their social position. Others found in cultures of Asia an idiom through which they could explore their own Greekness (we will return to this in a later chapter). Still others, however, found 'Lydian luxury' either disquieting or a symbol not so much of class but, like Xenophanes, of a servitude and a 'hateful tyranny' too difficult to bear. In this context, it is perhaps easier to see why in the sixth century the Greeks of Asia Minor felt the need to bind themselves to the Greeks of the mainland by participation in the cult activities at Olympia and by telling stories of their kinship.[115] These were good stories to tell on the fringes, where claims of belonging might need to be asserted both for the benefit of the mainland Greeks and for home consumption in order to create and bolster confidence in a Hellenic identity. In any case, while these stories may have originated in Asia Minor, they were soon accepted on the mainland. In the early sixth century, Solon is already claiming Athenian precedence among the Ionians when he calls Athens the oldest land of Ionia (fr. 4a West *IE*[2]). In this context it also seems appropriate that it was the Greeks of Asia Minor who made positive, strong and self-conscious statements of Hellenic identity, especially in the founding of the Hellenion at Naucratis.

But we still need to explain how this Hellenic consciousness was adopted by the peoples of the mainland and acquired power there. Cult may have been an important vehicle for its dispersal. Colonial settlements and even fictive colonial settlements maintained connections with their 'founders'

(e.g. Thuc. 1.56.2; cf. 1.25.3–4), and there were strong cultic links between colony and mother-cities (so that, for example, the Athenians were able to exploit the Panathenaea as a festival for their 'colonists'), providing another forum for transmitting ideas across the Aegean.[116]

Even more important must have been the transregional cult centres such as Olympia and Delphi.[117] These were places where elite groups from the mainland and Asia Minor were able to meet and exchange ideas, and the Olympic Games as well as the other stephanitic festivals (that is, the festivals at Olympia, Isthmia, Delphi and Nemea at which victors were awarded 'crowns') must have become important focal points for sharing and expressing Panhellenic sentiments. We have already seen how Onomastus of Smyrna was recorded as a victor at Olympia in the early-seventh century. The Panhellenic Games were also important centres for deciding membership of the symbolic community.[118] In the first instance, from at least the fifth century, heralds were sent out to invite cities to attend the irregular, annual, or penteric games and to announce the sacred truce (e.g. Thuc. 5.49.1–3), so active decisions were made about which cities did have the right to belong.[119]

In addition, once exclusion clauses were in place, the games in the stephanitic circuit could also became important *fora* for testing the boundaries. While we only know for certain of the exclusion clause at Olympia, and then only in the fifth century, the specifically 'Hellenic' nature of the other games in the circuit may suggest that the other Games had exclusion clauses also. The use of Hellenic officials, the *Hellanodikai*, also suggests their explicitly Hellenic character. This is the point of Herodotus' story concerning Alexander I at the Olympic Games – whether Alexander ever actually took part in the games or not, for the story to work at all it must have been a function of the *Hellenodikai* to arbitrate on the 'Greekness' of contestants, and Nemea had *Hellanodikai* as well as Olympia.[120] As a result, the foundation of the stephanitic festival circuit may represent another important early realization of the community: in 582/1 the Corinthians established games at Isthmia in imitation of those at Olympia;[121] Delphi (possibly under the influence of Corinth) also followed suit only months later; and Nemea (under the control first of Cleonae and then Argos)[122] soon also established a Panhellenic festival. Catherine Morgan suggests that it is the self-consciousness of Corinth's actions in founding the games at Isthmia and institutionalizing of ritual that marks the shift from panhellenic games (in the weak sense) to Panhellenic Games which deliberately espoused and promulgated Panhellenic values.

The moments of realization of the Hellenic community
However, the force of Hellenism was not felt equally everywhere across

the Greek world, and, even at the end of the sixth century, there was not a Panhellenic sympathy for the difficulties of the communities of Asia Minor. After the fall of Lydia, the Ionians appealed to the Spartans for help against the Persian attack. According to Herodotus, the Spartans refused, but sent a ship to Asia to see what was going on and to issue Cyrus with a threat of reprisals if he harmed any Greek city (1.141.4, 152). Cyrus was not impressed. The Spartans failed to follow through. It was a similar story at the time of the Ionian Revolt. Before going to Athens, Herodotus says Aristagoras, the erstwhile tyrant of Miletus, visited Cleomenes, the Spartan king, appealing to the Spartans' kinship with the Ionian Greeks (5.49.3: ἄνδρες ὁμαίμονες). Whether or not his speech is genuine, even in spirit, the historical fact is that Sparta (even if Cleomenes' daughter Gorgo did not intervene) did not join the Athenians and Eretrians in fighting beside the Ionians, whether because Susa was three months' journey from the sea (5.50.3), or because the Spartans were more concerned with looking after their interests at home. That the symbolic community could be at various times a more powerful idea for some than for others is another significant element of Panhellenism.

Jonathan Hall, for his part, has argued that it was the Thessalians through their control of Olympia who were responsible for the ethnogenesis of the Hellenes, and the Olympic Games were the single *locus* for the generation and dispersal of Hellenic identity.[123] Indeed it is now a commonplace that Greek religion is *polis* religion, and Sourvinou-Inwood makes the point that even Panhellenic cult was based in the *polis*.[124] However, the control on participation in the Games by individual *poleis* points to another element in the crystallization of Hellenic identity: that it was not generated by a single centre at a single time. Indeed, what is striking about the realization of the Hellenic community was that there was no single 'moment' of creation. Rather, there were a number of 'moments' among the *poleis* when individual communities created and defined the symbolic community.

One moment, as we have seen, may have been made through the Hellenion at Naucratis. Inscriptional evidence found at the probable location of the sanctuary testifies to the fact that, although it was not necessarily a sanctuary for all *Hellenes*, it was a sanctuary *for the gods of the Hellenes* (τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων),[125] so stands as a self-conscious realization of the Hellenes as a community with community gods. Another may have been the foundation of the stephanitic festival circuit as a sequence of self-consciously Hellenic Games. In addition, as we discussed in the previous chapter, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* seems to limit membership of the group.

In all these examples, the Hellenic community was defined through cult. However, cult probably also assumed kinship, as the exclusion criterion at Olympia seems to indicate. By the mid-sixth century at least, the *Catalogue*

of Women also provides a genealogy of the sons of Hellen. The importance of this genealogy probably rests in the fact that, despite the omissions and the fudged attempts at including those who did not easily belong to the main stemma (in particular the Arcadians and the Inachids), its vision was to produce a comprehensive genealogy for all those imagined as belonging to the community of the Hellenes.[126] While it failed to be comprehensive, it tried to make a statement of those who belonged, and so constituted another 'moment' of crystallization of the idea of the Hellenic community.

Importantly, it was individual communities and *poleis*, probably in competition with each other, that created these expressions of the symbolic community. As we have seen, a group of cities from Asia Minor founded the Hellenion at Naucratis in order to assert, on the one hand, their solidarity with the Greeks of the mainland and, on the other, their difference with the Egyptians. The Corinthians may have established explicitly Panhellenic games at Isthmia and Delphi out of a regional Peloponnesian rivalry with Olympia. The *Catalogue of Women* may have achieved its final form at Athens in the mid-sixth century – a centre which seemed to feel a sense of the Panhellenic community (and its potential) at this time with the launching of the Panathenaea in about 566/5 BC as a Panhellenic event (Fornara 26).[127]

This phenomenon of continuous invention and reinvention of the symbolic community, with multiple 'moments of realization', was one of the chief factors contributing to the durability of the community of the Hellenes and giving it vibrancy. The stories of the Hellenes could be constantly told and retold, made and remade, to meet the demands of individual states as well as the needs of the whole community.

However, that Hellenic identity was not generated and maintained by a single centre was also symptomatic of the weakness of the symbolic community. While Panhellenism, in telling the story of a community and its identity, served to create community among the disparate states which subscribed to it, the fact that there was no consensually agreed 'story' meant that individual states could exploit the variety and diversity of Panhellenism and Panhellenic stories for their own ends. Further, the fact that individual states could generate their own Panhellenic stories of community points to a fundamental tension among the Hellenes: the tension between the community as a whole and competing local identities.

Notes

[1] Nagy 1979, 6–7.
[2] The cause or causes of the destruction (which came in more than one wave) are unclear (see Snodgrass 2000, 296–359; for possible causes, see also Renfrew 1979; Osborne 1996, 28–32).

[3] Coldstream 2003, 371; Snodgrass 2000, 361–3; Osborne 1996, 28–30. But it is well to note Osborne's warning (23) that 'we should not overdo the emphasis on the contraction of occupation of the countryside of southern Greece in the late 12th and 11th centuries BC, not least because more archaeological excavation is likely to modify the picture to some extent.' Lemos 2002 also makes the point that, although there was movement of some peoples as far as Cyprus and Cilicia 'looking for a better and safer place to live' (193), the lack of permanence of settlements can also be overstated (1, 191–3), this was the beginning of a period of stability, and some settlements had been founded in the Sub-Mycenaean period.

[4] Snodgrass 1980, 20–1; Lemos 2002 (who revises the work of Snodgrass and Desborough).

[5] Snodgrass 2000, 361–3. On Miletus: Greaves 2002, 75–6 (who argues that, while there are no sub-Mycenaean buildings at Miletus, the pottery of sub-Mycenaean type found at the temple of Athena must be significant given the scarcity of sub-Mycenaean pottery in Asia Minor).

[6] Dickinson 1994, 86–8; Snodgrass 2000, xxx, 360–86. Lemos 2002, however, makes the point that it is no longer appropriate to see these communities as isolated.

[7] Dodona: Dakaris 1993, 7–8; Sakellariou 1997, 36. Hammond 1967, 319 with 321–2, 325–7, 368–9. Argive Heraion: Osborne 1996, 31. On continuity/discontinuity at cult sites: Snodgrass 2000, 394–401; de Polignac 1995, 27–31; cf. C. Morgan 2003, 108.

[8] His cremated remains were placed in a bronze vessel which was probably itself an heirloom; a woman wearing gold jewellery was buried with him (probably his wife, possibly as a human sacrifice), as well as four horses; and an apsidal building of obscure purpose was erected over the tomb: Popham et al. 1982; Osborne 1996, 41–7; now esp. Lemos 2002, 140–6, 164–8.

[9] 1980, 24–8.

[10] Desborough 1976; Lemos 1998; 2002, 213–17; cf. Coldstream 2003, 372, 379.

[11] Coulson 1991, 44, although note C. Morgan 1990, 104 who, although she recognizes a basic difference between east and west Greece, writes: 'In studying the social dynamics underlying activity at a sanctuary like Olympia, it is clearly inadequate to consider the west as a single entity.'

[12] On the Protogeometric period, see now Lemos 2002; cf. R.M. Cook 1972, 8–11; Coldstream 1983a, 18.

[13] R.M. Cook 1972, 11; Lemos 2002, 193–5.

[14] Coldstream 1983a, 18.

[15] Coldstream 2003, 73–106; 1983a.

[16] On Laconia and Messenia: Coldstream 2003, 157–64. On western Greece: Coldstream 2003, 167–90; R.M. Cook 1972, 26.

[17] On Crete, see esp. S.P. Morris 1992, 150–94.

[18] For the process of composition, there are at least two trends in modern interpretation. Nagy 1990, 52–81 argues that the process of Homeric composition was both critical and synthetic, so that as the poem, which was made up of local traditions, was constantly recomposed by travelling *aoidoi*, the process of Panhellenization required that it became more universal so that the epichoric elements were 'sloughed off'. The other consequence of the Panhellenization of the poems, according to Nagy, was that they increasingly became more static until they reached a form that was 'fixed', so that they

were no longer recomposed by poets, but instead were simply repeated by rhapsodes. Although most commentators agree that the epics were a synthesis of local traditions (e.g. Janko 1982, esp. 89–91; M.L. West 1988; Griffin 1995, 3–4), Nagy's model rejects the single poetic genius (on which see, for example, Griffin 1977; 1995, 4–8), and assumes a late date for fixity (cf. Seaford 1994, 144–54). Most other commentators assume that the point of fixity must have occurred in the 8th or 7th centuries (cf. Janko 1982, 93–4, 228–31; M.L. West 1997, 627), when the poems were written down (e.g. I. Morris 1986; B.B. Powell 1991).

[19] Coldstream 1976 makes a direct link between hero-cult and epic. Snodgrass 1980, 38–40; 1982 connects hero-cult with land ownership. Bérard 1982 finds a connection between hero-cult and the development of the *polis*, seeing in hero-cult a mediation between aristocratic elitism and the ideology of equality in the emerging *polis*. de Polignac 1995, 128–49 also links hero-cult with the rise of the *polis* and the need for the elite to assert their status. Seaford 1994, 109–23 associates hero-cult with death-ritual and the need to create solidarity within the *polis* for groups for those who were not kin. For an analysis of the various theories, see Parker 1996, 33–9. Heroic narrative in vase-painting: Osborne 1998a, 53–67.

[20] I. Morris 1986, esp. 128–9; 1996a.

[21] Especially, 1997, 47.

[22] Doubt has recently been cast on the migration myths as stories explaining actual movements of peoples. Osborne 1996, 35–7 for example, dismisses the alleged similarities in pottery styles between Attica and Ionia as only broadly compatible, and suggests that the more nearly matched similarities in cultural, religious, and dialectic traits can be explained through the needs of early archaic societies to assert their own identities by building links 'through inference from the observed realities of the archaic period'. Likewise Jonathan Hall 2002, 68 points to the fact that the 'Ionian migration myths' are by no means consistent.

[23] J. Hall 1997, 52; 2002, 67–73.

[24] Lemos 2002, 193.

[25] C. Morgan 1990. For the Victor Lists themselves: Moretti 1957. For a recent analysis of their usefulness as evidence for the development of the games: J. Hall 2002, 241–6.

[26] On Panhellenic games and cult: Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 300; S. Price 1999, 39.

[27] On Elean *Hellanodikai*: Golden 1998, 42.

[28] B. Anderson 1991, 7.

[29] Barth 1969; cf. Eriksen 1993, 36–8. For doubts about the appropriateness of 'ethnicity' as an analytical category in the ancient Greek context: Just 1998; Renfrew 1998.

[30] See esp. Konstan 2001, 30: 'In themselves, however, common traits, whether recognized as such or not, do not constitute an ethnic self-awareness. Rather, ethnicity arises when a collective identity is asserted on the basis of shared characteristics... Ethnic self-awareness is thus a reactive phenomenon.'

[31] However, see now Mackie 1996 who argues that Homer differentiates a Trojan 'language'.

[32] This line was regarded as spurious in antiquity, and many commentators still consider it to be a later interpolation; it is also not agreed what it might mean. Kirk 1985, 202 thinks it has here its later broad sense 'all Greeks'. Contrasting it with the only

use of *Hellenes* in the *Iliad* (2.684), a use which refers to the inhabitants of the region close to Phthia, '...a sense present in all the five uses of Hellas in the *Iliad*', he thereby dismisses it as interpolation (cf. 229 on 2.684). M.L. West 1966, 292 on the other hand, thinks that Homer is referring only to the northern Greeks. Cf. the usage of Hellas in the formula καθ᾽/ἀν᾽ Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος in the *Odyssey*, in which Kirk (above) claims that Hellas probably represents central and northern Greece as distinct from the Peloponnese; see also Malkin 1998, 146–7 on the geographical implications of the formula.

   On the relationship between the names 'Hellenes' and 'Panhellenes', Jonathan Hall 2002, 125–34 has argued that 'Panhellenes' is derived from 'Hellas' rather than from 'Hellenes', and that the 'pan-' prefix '...actually emphasizes not the unity but the diversity of the various population groups inhabiting the common land of Hellas (however broadly or narrowly that is defined at any one time)', and that the term Hellenes is not used in its broadest sense to designate all Hellenes until the end of the 6th century. Hall is certainly right that it is easy to document an early change in the denomination of the term Hellas, with its most restricted sense of a small region in Thessaly in the Homeric 'Catalogue of ships' (the composition of which Kirk argues was gradual) and including at least all of mainland Greece in Hesiod (*W&D* 653), which is not reflected in our evidence in the use of Hellenes. Nevertheless it is true that the community of the Hellenes for the most part called its members *Hellenes* and described itself in terms of this constituency (e.g. the sanctuary at Naucratis is the Hellenion, the officials at the Olympic games are called *Hellanodikai* and in the Delian League at Athens they are *Hellēnotamiai*; cf. Fowler 1998, 10). Fifth-century usage, though rare, of *Panhellenes* focuses on inclusion (e.g. Eur. *IA* 350, 414; *Suppl.* 526, 671; Ar. *Peace* 302). 'Hellenes' and 'Panhellenes' were not the only names for this group. The people that were later to call themselves Hellenes were probably previously known (at least by outsiders) as Ionians. The earliest reference to the Ionians is in an Assyrian document dating to just after 738 BC: Braun 1982, 15. This is a report to Tiglath-Pileser III about 'Ionian' incursions on the Levantine coast. These may have been Euboeans (rather than Eastern Ionians, as is usually assumed: e.g. Braun 1982, 1; Malkin 1998, 148), who were probably the first Greeks to explore the Mediterranean, and who were involved at Al Mina in the early 8th century. The Greeks were given the name 'Graeci' in the West: Malkin 1998, 147–50; 2001, 198–200.

[33]   For the 'Catalogue of Ships', see esp. Kirk 1985, 168–240; cf. Dickinson 1986, 30–1; McInerney 1999, 120–7. Kirk suggests that the Catalogue (whatever its antecedents) must have been included in the larger epic no later than the early 7th century, with different pieces of the Catalogue entering the tradition at different times as the poem developed. It is also worth noting that the 'Catalogue of Ships' includes the Aetolians, while Aetolus' position in the Hellenic genealogy of the 6th-century *Catalogue of Women* is marginal (Aetolus' grandfather, Aethlius, is probably the son of Hellen's sister; the connection with the main stemma of the children of Hellen is through one of the daughters of Aeolus, Calyce, who bore Endymion, Aetolus' father, to Aethlius: Paus. 5.1.3; [Hes.] fr. 10 (a) 31–63 Merkelbach/West[3]): M.L. West 1985, 52, 141; J. Hall 1997, 47. West also argues that Aethlius' family was originally an independent tradition, tracing the Aetolian and Elean kings to Zeus Aethlius.

[34]   This notion of a 'centre', which seems to be conceived in geo-cultural terms, is important.

[35]   The 'Aetolian' *hellanodikas* is Oxylus, who received Elis to rule after he guided the

Heracleidae on their return to the Peloponnese. See Verdenius 1987–, 1.17 (*hellanodikai* at Olympia were drawn from the local Elean population).

[36] Inscriptions: Buck 61; Buck 1955, 259–60 dates this to the 6th century, although Jeffery 1990, 220 no. 15 gives it a date of about 475–450 BC.

[37] On Alexander I: Borza 1990, 110–13. Jonathan Hall suggests a 6th-century date for the introduction of exclusive criteria for participation in the games (2002, 154–68). As evidence of a 6th-century date, he cites the Herodotean story of Cleisthenes of Sicyon and the competition for the hand in marriage of his daughter Agariste (Hdt. 6.126–31). But this story is suspect. Hall himself admits that the details are 'almost certainly the product of narratological embellishment', and that the whole story is reminiscent of the myth of the daughters of Proetus who were wooed by the Panhellenes. It also resembles the story of the suitors of Helen, which was also known to [Hesiod] (frs. 196–204 Merkelbach/West³). Consequently, the gathering and trial of suitors from all over Hellas looks very like a trope, which is used here in a deliberately archaizing and heroizing manner to promote the status either of the Orthagorid dynasty at Sicyon or more probably of the Athenian Alcmaeonidae, since Herodotus says that this story attached itself to the Alcmaeonids and became part of their family mythology. This does not mean that the marriage itself did not take place (and there is probably no reason to doubt it), but it is unlikely that the marriage was contracted in this way. Hall 2002, 162–3 n. 157 also argues for a connection between the exclusion criterion and the development of Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, though the most telling evidence against this link is the time lag between the formulation of the *Catalogue* and the entries on the lists for the 8th- and 7th-century victors which he maps onto the main branches of the genealogy (Aeolians, Dorians, Ionians and Achaeans). Hall himself admits that 'we cannot assume that ethnicities were already fully formed in the 8th and 7th centuries', and suggests that the compilers of the lists assigned the early victors in accordance 'with 6th- and 5th-century views of qualification to enter the Olympic Games'. This, however, does not explain why the compilers clustered the earliest victors around western Greece and only broadened their range to central Greece at the beginning of the 7th century.

[38] Eriksen 1993, 11–12 for example, says that 'ethnicity' is primarily relational: 'For ethnicity to come about, the groups must have a minimum of contact with each other, and they must entertain ideas of each other as being culturally different from ourselves. If these conditions are not fulfilled, there is no ethnicity, for ethnicity is essentially an aspect of a relationship, not a property of a group'; cf. Barth 1969, 13–14.

[39] While he does concede on the basis of anthropological principle that a non-oppositional model of identity is unlikely, he argues instead that the contestation must have occurred vertically between status groups if it occurred at all (2002, 164–7). Even then he suggests the possibility that Hellenic identity might be anomalous (that is, that it alone is an identity entirely from within in the absence of an outgroup), and 'challenges the view' that 'the watershed for this process [of constructing a singular Hellenic consciousness] was the 8th century' (p. 91, cf. 6).

[40] 2002, 121.

[41] 10th-century moulds bearing designs for bronze tripods typical of Cyprus from the 12th century onwards have been found at Lefkandi: Catling and Catling 1980 who supposed from these moulds that contact between Lefkandi and Cyprus had been continuous. Cf. Coldstream 1982, 265; Ridgway 1990, 64–5; 1992, 17, 22; Popham 1994, 12. Cyprus and Crete: Morris 1992, 129 argues that 'in the domain of metallurgy,

Crete and Cyprus belonged to the same network connecting resources and craftsmen since the Late Bronze Age.' See also Osborne 1996, 27.

[42] Desborough 1976; Lemos 1998.

[43] Date of Pithecussae: Ridgway 1992, 46 gives a date of 750 BC, although Boardman 1999a, 165–8 pushes this back to 770. Al Mina: The exact nature of the earliest levels at Al Mina is still unclear. Kearsley suggests a *pied à terre* for traders (1995) or a base for mercenaries which, on the analogy of Naucratis, became a trading port in its next phase (1999). Kearsley's 8th-century date for the foundation levels at Al Mina is now also largely accepted (1989, with Popham and Lemos 1992, although their criticisms do not affect the dating of the earliest levels, and Kearsley 1995, esp. 67–81); Boardman 1999b, 152–3 who pushes the date back a generation before 750 BC, concedes that the dating of Al Mina to the 9th century must be abandoned. For Euboean settlement at Al Mina: Boardman 2002.

[44] Athens and Crete: Coldstream 1982; Osborne 1996, 47–51. Corinth: D'Andria 1990, 283; Malkin 1998, 62–93 *passim*.

[45] Dalley and Reyes 1998; Lanfranchi 2000.

[46] Guy and Sheridan 1998, 12–13.

[47] Staats 1996.

[48] Slatta 1990, 223.

[49] Guy and Sheridan 1998, 10.

[50] S. Jones 1997, 13–14.

[51] Bhabha 1990b, 297–302.

[52] Dench 1995, 37; Malkin 1998, 4; cf. Dougherty 2001, 81–101. Malkin, in particular, sees a strong correlation and interaction between Odysseus' wandering and returns, and what he terms the Greek proto-colonization period of the 9th to mid-8th centuries: 1998, esp. 1–119. For the purpose of proto-colonial exploration and the pursuit of metal by Greeks and non-Greeks: S.P. Morris 1992, 124–49; Osborne 1996, 113–15.

[53] M.L. West 1988 with 1992 and Lenz 1993 (a reply to the much less successful article by B.B. Powell 1993).

[54] See esp. Vidal-Naquet 1981; cf. Hartog 2001a, 21–2.

[55] e.g. E. Hall 1989, 14–15; Konstan 2001, 31–2.

[56] Malkin, following J. Hall 1997, writes (1998, 18): 'In the archaic period we will find no Greeks in the sense of self contrasted with non-Greeks as absolute others.'

[57] Hartog 2001a, 21–36; cf. Vidal-Naquet's important and influential essay, which among other things analyses the 'non-human' creatures Odysseus meets: Vidal-Naquet 1981.

[58] Vidal-Naquet 1981; Hartog 2001a, 21–36.

[59] See esp. Hartog 2001a, 25 who discusses how in the space occupied by Odysseus' journey 'there is no communication between one being and another.'

[60] Vidal-Naquet 1981, 84.

[61] Hartog 2001a, 28 notes that 'this world [that is, the world of Odysseus' adventures], devoid of any true sociability, is immobile. It is a world where nothing is remembered, where no itinerant bard lives, and where all those cast ashore will be wiped out: the lotus is a flower of oblivion, and Circe's drug is a *pharmakon* that effaces all memories of one's homeland.'

[62] Vidal-Naquet 1981, 87.

[63] The Phaeacians both know about the Greeks, though they consider Euboea to be

70

the 'furthest of all lands' (*Od.* 7.321), and know the story of Troy and Odysseus and the Trojan horse (*Od.* 8.499–520). On the role of the Phaeacians in providing a 'restorative framework' for Odysseus which looks forward to the real world beyond Phaeacia as well as back into the fantasy world he is leaving: Segal 1962; Vidal-Naquet 1981, 90–4; Hartog 2001a, 31–2; Dougherty 2001, 102–57.

⁶⁴ On Odysseus and Nausicaa, Dench points to 'hints of a version of the Nausicaa story in which Odysseus and Nausicaa married': Dench 1995, 37 n. 26. For Alcinous' incestuous court, see Hartog 2001a, 31–2.

⁶⁵ Dougherty 2001, 122–42; cf. Dillery 1995, 43.

⁶⁶ Cf. Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, 15–16.

⁶⁷ On the connection between trade and piracy: Braun 1982, 14.

⁶⁸ The link between the two stories is made more pointed and more ironic by Menelaus' connection with Odysseus' fantasy world through his visit to Proteus, the old man of the sea, who tells him about his own homecoming and apotheosis. He also tells Menelaus about the fate of the other heroes including Odysseus, who he says is trapped on Calypso's island with no means of escape (*Od.* 4.485–569).

⁶⁹ Athena disguised as the Taphian Mentes says that he is visiting Ithaca on his way to men of other languages (*Od.* 1.183).

⁷⁰ Note also the Hippomolgi of *Iliad* 13.5–6.

⁷¹ Dougherty 2001.

⁷² Dougherty 2001, 81–157, quotation from p. 101.

⁷³ Cf. Malkin 1998, 149. Note also Malkin 2001 who talks about colonization and exclusion in relation to Greek perceptions of Epirus.

⁷⁴ While Jonathan Hall 2002, 104–11, using Sicily as his example, points to patterns of cultural integration as the result of colonization, Malkin 1987, 263 (cf. 2001, 7–9) highlights the creative force in this movement, and the opportunities it presented for 'refining and defining the *polis*.'

⁷⁵ Cf. Dougherty 2001, 134–40. Note also Dougherty 1998, esp. 187–8.

⁷⁶ G. Buchner 1979, 133–5, and J.N. Coldstream 1993, 91–4, have argued for mixed marriages at Pithecussae on the basis, for example, of fibulae, some of which were locally made, of a type found in southern Etruria but unknown to the Euboeans, found in graves. Shepherd 1999 has now demonstrated, from an analysis of fibulae in graves in a number of Sicilian sites, the complexity of this evidence for identifying ethnic affiliations, and the problems in generalizing from it to all colonial situations in Italy and Sicily.

⁷⁷ Marshall 1998.

⁷⁸ J. Hall 2002, 104–11.

⁷⁹ Dougherty 2003.

⁸⁰ Tsetskhladze 1998; Heinen 2001; Okhotnikov 2001.

⁸¹ Domínguez 1999; cf. Aguilar 1999.

⁸² On the subjectivity in differentiation of language from dialect: Gellner 1983, 44. While it is sometimes assumed that language goes beyond narrative and provides an objective test of belonging, 'common language' is also discursive and representational: J. Hall 1995; 1997, 21–2, 179–81. On dialects, their correlation with regional groupings, and inconsistencies and differences within regions, see J. Hall 1997, 143–81. On a common 'Greek' language, see also Murpurgo Davies 1987, 17 (= 2002, 167–8).

⁸³ For the Greeks at Naucratis, see Austin 1970, 22–33; Braun 1982, 37–43; Boardman 1999a, 117–32. On the date of the foundation of the Hellenion: Austin

1970, 22–4; Möller 2000, 106.

⁸⁴ J. Hall 1997, 49–50.

⁸⁵ J. Hall 1997, 50. For the significance of the liminality of sanctuaries, see C. Morgan 1990, 3; cf. de Polignac 1995, 21–5.

⁸⁶ Cf. Malkin 1998, 60; 2001, 9.

⁸⁷ Hartog 2001a, 48.

⁸⁸ M.C. Miller 2000, 420–4. This is in contrast to other mythical scenes of foreign heroes, who are represented as Greek, often in contrast to 'foreign' attendants: Bérard 2000.

⁸⁹ Coldstream 1993, 97.

⁹⁰ Jeffrey 1990, 354–5.

⁹¹ S. Jones 1997 identifies two main areas of difficulty in the relationship between archaeology and ethnicity: firstly, '…the assumption that a one-to-one relationship exists between variation in *any* aspect of material culture, stylistic or otherwise, and the boundaries of ethnic groups has been questioned. Drawing on numerous anthropological and historical examples it has been shown that the relationship between variation in material culture and the expression of ethnic difference is complex' (p. 108), and that '…archaeologists cannot assume that degrees of similarity and difference in material culture provide a straightforward index of interaction' (p. 115); secondly, the problematic issue of 'the existence of archaeological cultures at all' (pp. 108–9).

⁹² Coldstream 2003, 97; 1993, 97; cf. S. Mitchell 1990, 106 [also quoted by Coldstream]: 'Greek Ionia was grafted onto native Caria and the geographical division between the two was an arbitrary one.'

⁹³ Kuhrt 1995, 2.570.

⁹⁴ On Panyassis: Matthews 1974, 5–20.

⁹⁵ S. Jones 1997, 108, 113; cf. J. Hall 2002, 19–29.

⁹⁶ Language: Hornblower 1982, 11. Carian inscriptions: Hornblower 1982, 112–13; Rhodes with Lewis 1997, 333.

⁹⁷ Hornblower 1982, 11.

⁹⁸ Cf. Sappho frs. 44.7 (ἄβραν Ἀδρομάχαν), 140.1 (ἄβρος Ἄδονις, though note also fr. 128) Lobel/Page.

⁹⁹ The Lydians noticeably (and perhaps notably) do not make an appearance in Homer.

¹⁰⁰ Kurke 1992; 1999, esp. 20, 185; I. Morris 1996b, esp. 28–6; 2000, 178–85.

¹⁰¹ That power remained in the hands of an elite was a dominant theme in the archaic period. For example, the implication of the 7th-century Dreros law (ML 2), as Osborne 1996, 186–8 has shown, was that it was intended not to control relations between the elite and the people, but as self-regulation by the elite of the distribution of powers. Likewise, at Corinth, an elite family seem to have held power before it was taken by Cypselus (himself from the same elite family: Hdt. 5.92β.1–ε.2). At Athens, Thucydides and Herodotus provide the story of Cylon's attempt to seize tyranny in the 7th century, which Thucydides says he attempted with the help of his father-in-law, the tyrant of Megara (Thuc. 1.126.3–5; Hdt 5.71.1). Against the backdrop of widespread dissatisfaction tyrannies arose out of the contest between elite-led groups to secure control (e.g. Solon frs. 32–3 West *IE*²), and that political power in the archaic period (and even later) was created through vertical groupings in society, so that significant tensions arose between elites and their political followers and dependents, rather than just between

elites and non-elites. Another fragment of Solon's poetry, for example, shows how Solon saw the *dēmos* and its leaders working together (fr. 6 West *IE*²), and, although obscured by anachronistic interpretations (the *Athenaion Politeia* provides an ideological edge to the story), it seems from the accounts of Herodotus (1.59) and the *Athenaion Politeia* (13.4) that Peisistratus seized power at Athens in the factional fighting between aristocratic leaders on the back of a regional power-base. Similarly, while Peisistratus used elite networks to secure control of Athens in the 6th century, the archon lists also indicate that (ML 6), even after he had assumed tyranny, Peisistratus needed to placate other elite factions through appointment to prominent public positions. Indeed, Peisistratus' career seems to indicate that his hold on political power depended largely on his ability to manipulate his elite rivals (*Ath. Pol.* 14.3–4), even though it seems that he was also willing to try other and new means of broadening his political base by a direct appeal to the people when he effected a return after a period of exile with the help of his pretend-Athena (*Ath. Pol.* 14.4).

[102] For this reason, Morris' claim (1996b) of a 'middling class' is dangerous and misleading.

[103] M.C. Miller 1992; 1997.

[104] Dalley and Reyes 1998, 97–8.

[105] Mellink 1991, 645–8.

[106] See Mellink 1991.

[107] Mellink 1991, 651; Kuhrt 1995, 2.569.

[108] C.H. Kahn 1960, 81–4. The section of the *Catalogue of Women* describing the outlying mythical peoples of the earth Strabo says was also called the *Periodos*, ([Hes.] frs. 150–1 Merkelbach/West³), and Romm 1992, 27–30 emphasizes how these early geographical writings implied 'encyclopaedic comprehensiveness' and points out that the essence of this new literary and geographical genre was its 'all-encompassing scope rather than its medium of representation...'

[109] The extant fragments of Anaximander are concerned with the relationship of the world to the cosmos: that the world was cylindrical and shaped like a column, that people walked on the flat side, and that it was fixed and still because of its equilibrium (DK 12 A 10. 11.3; Arist. *De Caelo* B13, 295b11–12).

[110] For the Ionians, the world was imagined as round, 'as if drawn by compasses', and surrounded by Ocean (Hdt. 2.23; 4.8.2, 36.2) and being divided (initially) into two equal parts (Europe and Asia: Hdt. 4.36.2), but later three parts (Europe, Asia and Libya: Hdt. 2.16.2, 17.2). On Anaximander's map: Hartog 2001a, 89. Indications from Herodotus suggest that the internal structures of these maps were geometrically arranged. Immerwahr 1966, 207 n.43 makes a link between maps and the lists of the early geographers, and points to Herodotus' description of Aristagoras' map, in which Aristagoras shows Cleomenes the extent of the Persian empire by describing the nations in a list ('They live next to each other, as I will tell you...': 5.49; cf. Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 1 F 207). Myres 1953, 32–7; cf. id. 1896 also suggests geometry as the basis for ancient maps and the use of rectangles to plot space, giving the example of Scythia, which Herodotus describes as a perfect square (4.101), whose rivers 'divide the land into north-south strips, each cross-divided into tribal territories.' Herodotus also tells us that, in traditional maps, the world was cut symmetrically by rivers ('I am not able to guess for what reason, although there is one earth, it has three names, all of women, and why the borders made for it were the Egyptian river Nile and the Colchian Phasis (or some say the Maiatian

river Tanais and the Cimmerian straits), nor can I learn the names of those who divided the world...': 4.45). C.H. Kahn 1960, 84 n. 1 also suggests that the 'great rivers' (Ister, Nile and Phasis), which drew their source from Ocean and flowed into the central sea, 'represent so many equal radii from the circumference to the centre.' Herodotus gives a sense of this in his description of the Scythian rivers, which he uses to form some kind of grid (4.47–58), but with the Ister flowing from the north-west (from the land of the Celts beyond the Pillars of Heracles) into the Euxine sea (2.33). Herodotus guesses (since nobody knows the source of the Nile by experience) that the Ister is mirrored by the Nile, which also flows from the west through Libya and into the sea at the Delta (2.31, 33–4). Opposites in Anaximander's cosmogonical speculations: Kirk et al. 1983, 108, 114–15, 119–20, 128–30.

[111] Greek maps (as indeed Greek philosophy) were probably also influenced by maps from Asia which were strictly geometrical. Kahn points to the similarities with an extant map of the earth from Mesopotamia which is approximately contemporary to the maps of Anaximander and Hecataeus, and which depicts the earth 'surrounded by the "Bitter River", or salty Ocean. Precisely as in the maps described by Herodotus, the circumference of the earth and the Ocean are here represented as perfect circles, and there is even a small, deep hole in the centre of the chart which was probably left by the scribe's compass' (C.H. Kahn 1960, 83). As Kahn (p. 84 with p. 80) shows, this strictly geometric rendering of the world is in keeping with Anaximander's geometric and mathematical approach. Systems of 'opposites' as well as 'similars' in Hesiod: Kirk et al. 1983, 36.

[112] Mellink 1991, 645; Braun 1982, 36. Mellink links Herodotus' 'bronze men of the sea' (2.147–52) with possible mercenaries sent by Gyges, although Braun (37) doesn't think that this necessarily follows, but suggests Psammetichus 'began by recruiting casually arrived pirates, then, as Diodorus says (1.66.12) "sent for mercenaries from Caria and Ionia", and after having promoted himself from King of Saïs – the title the Assyrians had given his father Necho – to the "King of Egypt" of the Rassam Cylinder, took the final step of throwing over Assyrian suzerainty with the help of still more Greek and Carian troops from Gyges.'

[113] Braun 1982, 37.

[114] Cf. Kuhrt 1995, 2.570. Note also that from the archaic period to the 4th century AD the priesthood of Artemis of Ephesus was held by a Persian family: S. Mitchell 1993, 2.29.

[115] Likewise, the poem that has come down to us as the *Iliad* with its strong Panhellenic agenda almost certainly went through a significant phase in its development in Asia Minor: see Allen 1921, 147 and n. 1; M.L. West 1988, 172.

[116] As 'mother-city' of the empire, the Athenians required from her 'colonies' the ritual duties owed: *IG* i³ 34.41–2 (= ML 46); *IG* i³ 1.57 (= ML 69); schol. Ar. *Clouds* 386; compare Athens' real colony of Brea which is required to send a cow and panoply for the Great Panathenaea and a phallus for the Dionysia: *IG* i³ 46.15–17 (= ML 49.11–13). See also Schuller 1974, 112–17; Hornblower 1992, 197; Parker 1996, 142–3. On 'colonies' and 'mother-cities' more generally: Graham 1964.

[117] Cf. Snodgrass 1986.

[118] See also Hansen and Nielsen 2004, 108: 'The framework of the Panhellenic festivals was thus highly politicized, in the most literal sense of the word'.

[119] On heralds and the sacred truce: Rougemont 1973; Dillon 1997, 1–20. An

inscription from the 2nd century BC gives a list of cities invited to the games at Delphi: Plassart 1921. See also Parker 2004 for the phenomenon of mobility generated through festivals, especially in the Hellenistic period (although he notes that the practice of proclaiming festivals other than the four original stephanitic festivals emerged in the 4th century). For a 'Panhellenic' declaration of a sacred truce at Eleusis, the Argive Heraeon and the Epidaurian Asclepieion, as well as the four stephanitic festivals, see Boesch 1908, 101; P. Perlman 2000, 14–16.

[120] For *Hellanodikai* at Nemea: S.G. Miller 1990, 26. The earliest evidence for *Hellanodikai* at Nemea (Vollgraff 1916, III = *ISE* 41), however, may date only as early as the end of the 3rd century BC. For a discussion of the date, see Amandry 1980, 226–7 n. 30.

[121] On the stephanitic festival circuit: see C. Morgan 1990, 16, 39, 212–23; 1993, 33–7; Gebhard 1993, 167.

[122] C. Morgan 1993, 33; Gebhard 1993, 167. Mosshamer 1982 gives a date of 582/1 for the first of the stephanitic games, but argues that Delphi held the first Panhellenic games. On later developments in the stephanitic cycle, see Golden 1998, 33–5.

[123] J. Hall 2002, 154–71.

[124] Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 297–8.

[125] On the inscriptions: Hogarth 1898/9, 44–5; A.B. Lloyd 1988b, 3.224. For the doubts about the identification of the Hellenion, however: Bowden 1996.

[126] *Pace* J. Hall, who thinks its significance resides in the so-called 'Hellenic genealogy' which sets out the relationship between Hellen and his sons Aeolus and Dorus, and his grandsons Ion and Achaeus (frs. 9, 10a.20–4 Merkelbach/West³). Hall believes that the 'Hellenic genealogy', or at least the stemma of Deucalion-Hellen-Aeolus was invented on the initiative of the Thessalians, and that Dorus was 'an original expression of Dorian identity' by the Spartans (J. Hall 2002, 161–2). While it is certainly true that the community of the Hellenes seems to have adopted this genealogy, it seems more likely, as M.L. West 1985, 52–60 argues, that the 'Hellenic genealogy', or perhaps more properly the 'Deucalonid genealogy' (including Dorus, Aeolus, Xuthus, Achaeus and Ion as local culture heroes), was not a creation of the Thessalians as such, but a local genealogy of northern Greece including Thessaly and the facing coasts of Euboea (which seems to have operated as an independent region from the second half of the 10th century: Desborough 1976; Lemos 1998; cf. Fowler 1998, 11: 'The stemma Deukalion → Hellen → Doros/Aiolos thus has Thessaly stamped all over it'; L.G. Mitchell 2001) which was recycled for a new use.

[127] *Catalogue* composed at Athens: M.L. West 1985, 168–71. Panathenaea as Panhellenic festival: S. Price 1999, 39.