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Introduction
Monumental dedications at Delphi have the potential to offer a great deal of insight into the political development of their dedicating community. Dedicating a major monument at a pan-Hellenic sanctuary was a significant political act. It was an assertion of community identity, a conscious decision to spend resources at an external site in full view of the Aegean world. Moreover, such offerings required considerable monetary investment from the dedicating community. For an emerging polity to leverage collective, community resources for the purpose of constructing a monument outside of the local territory required a level of political organization not seen before the Archaic period. Thus monumental dedications from the Archaic period at the pan-Hellenic sanctuary of Delphi may offer a means of exploring political development that has been largely disregarded in modern scholarship.

Traditional research has focused on the role of the pan-Hellenic sanctuary in the Classical and Hellenistic period, on games and oracles. The same Classical bias has applied to treatments of early monumental dedications. Anthony Snodgrass has said, “to erect a treasury at a pan-Hellenic sanctuary was to put one’s city forward as belonging to an elite among the poleis.”¹ This statement reflects the attempts of many scholars to explain Archaic monumental dedications by connecting them with the later role of pan-Hellenic sanctuaries as a significant place of interaction between poleis in the Classical period. However, it is a significant oversimplification, at least for the Archaic period, to cursorily label the dedicating community as a polis. This evolutionary approach applies a

¹ Snodgrass, Anthony M. “Archaeology and the Emergence of Greece” 2006:249
polis-centric bias to early monumental dedications – the Archaic context is not given appropriate attention.²

Snodgrass and others work backwards from the polis dominated pan-Hellenic sanctuaries of the Classical period and view Archaic monuments as evidence of the early polis and part of a linear trend leading to the Classical state of affairs. Ancient writers applied a similar method to explain the development of the polis in general. Francois De Polignac criticizes their approach (noting Aristotle in particular) in his influential text on the role of cult in the origin of the Greek city: “texts employ a terminology and concepts elaborated from the ‘final’ result of the phenomenon that they set out to analyze. That terminology and those concepts are confined by the meaning attributed to them by those who were examining the city of the classical period.”³ This criticism is equally valid for past studies of pan-Hellenic dedications in relation to political identity.

Snodgrass exemplifies the polis-centric perspective, derived from the Classical period use of the pan-Hellenic sanctuary, that ignores the possibility of alternative forms of community political identity. The current study focuses instead on the Archaic period and the political development of dedicating polities from 800-500 BCE. As shall be seen below, treasuries and other monumental dedications in this period can come from a range of communities. Furthermore, identification of a community as a polis can be problematic. When applying Snodgrass’ own criteria, some communities that he might call a poleis

² Watrous 1982; Neer 2001; Pedley 2005; Snodgrass 2006; Scott 2011
fall short of this label. The varied circumstances of dedicating communities are particularly evident when one considers audience, a key component in interpreting dedications.

**Why Dedicate? What is the Intended Audience?**
Before progressing further with questions of political development, it is necessary to discuss briefly why Archaic polities made dedications, and the range of possible audiences. John Pedley, in his introductory text on Greek religion, describes “dedication” as a system of reciprocal exchange between gods and mortals: worshipers hoped to receive divine aid in return for their offerings, or gave thanks for recent successes. A secondary purpose, Pedley acknowledges, is to draw attention to the status or wealth of the donor through more lavish dedications.⁴ In Pedley’s view there are distinct audiences, the divine and the mortal. The issue of political development, however, requires more specific consideration of subcategories of audience, and it is important to explore the latter category particularly in more detail.

A local dedication could thus target both the divine and the local community. Examples of such local dedications can be local temples, smaller shrines, and the votive offerings therein: objects and structures existing within and clearly visible to the local community. As objects of public display, dedications were often meant to demonstrate to the rest of the community the economic or social status of the dedicatory in an acceptable, religious context.⁵

---

⁴ Pedley, John Griffiths. “Sanctuaries and the Sacred in the Ancient Greek World” 2005:11
⁵ Pedley 2005: 11
Christopher Simon, in a study of votive buildings and offerings from the Ionian coast, notes a shift from a limited range of dedication types to a wide variety of objects often associated with daily life at the end of the 8th century. According to Simon, this suggests an increasingly personal form of dedication; votives were more reflective of the dedicator than the deity, even if the god was still the primary audience. Deposits become larger and more varied over the course of the 7th and 6th centuries, and often include labeled objects. To label a dedication, large or small, was to put the dedicator in public view along with the object, and is a sure sign of the importance of the local audience.

At pan-Hellenic sanctuaries, such as Delphi and Olympia, there is a larger range of possible audiences than at local sanctuaries. As in the local dedications, the divine audience is the god to whom the sacred space is dedicated. While local shrines might be intended for almost any incarnation of any deity, the pan-Hellenic sanctuary by its very nature honored a deity with supra-local significance. In the case of Delphi that deity was Apollo, with a specific focus on his role as god of prophecy. One of the most important draws to the sanctuary was the oracle of Apollo, called the Pythia. The Pythia represented the ultimate expression of Apollo’s prophetic power, and was an important political institution that advised individuals and political leaders on a range of topics, from marriage and planting crops to warfare and the foundation of colonies. This political function, deriving from the divine audience, contributed significantly to

---

7 Simon 1997: 133
Delphi's pan-Hellenic influence, and it is for this reason that dedications at Delphi should be considered even more inherently political, with greater consideration of audience, than at any other pan-Hellenic sanctuary.\textsuperscript{8}

The mortal audience at a pan-Hellenic sanctuary, which by its very definition does not belong to a single community, could be any of three general groups: the sanctuary bureaucracy, visitors from the dedicating community, and visitors from other polities. The first possibility, the pan-Hellenic religious bureaucracy, includes the priests, the administrators, and the general institution of the sanctuary. At Delphi, the oracular tradition is of particular concern because of its political dimension. The potential benefits of impressing the bureaucratic audience that controlled the Pythia and relayed oracular predictions are realized in history. Herodotus writes of the construction of the Alkmeonid temple to Apollo, and how afterward the oracle would always tell the Spartans, “free Athens.”\textsuperscript{9} While it is important to recognize this audience, the most valuable distinction for this study is between the two categories of visitors.

Some monumental dedications demonstrate the precedence of group interests over individual, and consolidate authority over the wealthy elite. The primary audience for these dedications is the dedicating community itself, rather than the pan-Hellenic world, and the dedications showcase the strength, unity, and uniqueness of that community through a single monument on foreign soil. Such dedications belong to communities that should be designated as \textit{ethne},

\textsuperscript{8} Morgan, Catherine. “Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC” 1990: 148-90
\textsuperscript{9} Herodotus 5.62-3
rather than *poleis*. In other cases, the target audience of monumental dedications was the pan-Hellenic community at large, and the intent was to demonstrate political and cultural dominance over other polities within that community. With these monuments, the dedicating polity, as an active member of the pan-Hellenic community, can accurately be described as a *polis*. Distinguishing the target mortal audience is therefore key to the present arguments about political development. Consciousness of these audiences is one of the most important markers to differentiate an *ethnos* from a *polis*, and even, as Colin Renfrew has argued, may have been a driving force in the evolution of political identity.

Renfrew’s theory of Peer Polity Interaction (hereafter PPI), discussed in greater detail below, treats interaction at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries as one of the key modes of exchange and influence between developing polities. According to this theory, competitive dedication plays an important role in both the connection between communities around Greece, and in the development of each individual polity. Thus, PPI provides a theoretical basis for the decision to focus on the human audience because it shows a correlation between awareness of pan-Hellenic audience and political development. Much of the following assessment of monumental dedications will try to recognize signs that one of these two groups of visitors is the primary, intended audience. The religious audience will be included where relevant, while the divine audience will not be considered at all. Greater consideration will also be accorded to the function of contemporary local dedications as objects than to their divine audience. This is

---

10 Renfrew, Colin, and John F. Cherry. “Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change” 1986: 8
not to say that the divine audience is unimportant, but that the possible human audiences are simply more relevant to assessing political development of the dedicating community.

Overview of the Study: Chapters 1, 2, 3, & 4

Three examples of important monumental dedications from Delphi have been chosen for analysis of political development: the Naxian sphinx, the Chian altar, and the Siphnian Treasury, each dating to the 6th century BCE. The emphasis on communities in the Cyclades contrasts with traditional scholastic focus (as in Snodgrass) on mainland powers and their presence at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries like Delphi. More importantly, these polities will provide a more varied representation of political development, as they were late to join the pan-Hellenic fold and adopt practices and traditions comparable with the paradigm of Greek *poleis*, Athens.

Chapter 1 will cover the theoretical concepts important to this study, particularly the theory of Peer Polity Interaction and the meaning of the political identity terms *ethnos* and *polis*, and establish archaeological criteria for analyzing political development. Chapter 2 will assess the selected dedications within this framework of established scholarship, concentrating primarily on intended audience. Chapter 3 will introduce relevant Archaic archaeology from the dedicating community, which will be subjected to the established general archaeological criteria; the level of political development indicated by the dedications and by local will be outlined and compared. Based on the dedications and local archaeology of these three polities, Chapter 4 will consider
the value of dedicatory practice as an indicator of political development, and
discuss what this line of inquiry reveals about the difficulties in assigning labels
to political identity in the Archaic period.
Chapter 1 – Methodologies
In order to address this topic productively, it is necessary to begin with the relevant theoretical concepts. Colin Renfrew and John Cherry's theory of Peer Polity Interaction explains how Greek polities develop from *ethne* to *poleis*, and justifies the political relevance of dedications at a pan-Hellenic sanctuary like Delphi. PPI has been applied effectively to the Greek states on a broad scale, and will serve as a framework to approach this specific issue in the Archaic period.

The next task is to evaluate prevailing scholarship on the terms *ethnos* and *polis*, namely the work of Anthony Snodgrass and Catherine Morgan, specifically the relationship between these two identities and their respective level of political development. Understanding these terms will allow for a more considered assessment of the degree of political development as it relates to an established identity label, and of the problems in assigning rigid characteristics to them. The contributions of Francois De Polignac on the connection between religion and the early state, even though not directly related to pan-Hellenic dedications, will be addressed briefly as well.

Following the discussion of these terms, the next task will be establishing criteria to identify *polis* and *ethnos* in the archaeological record, also based on the work of Snodgrass and Morgan. This set of specific archaeological criteria will serve as a critical foundation for analyzing the level of political development suggested by dedications.
**Peer Polity Interaction**

The theory of Peer Polity Interaction, proposed by Colin Renfrew and John Cherry, provides a theoretical framework with which to consider questions of the interplay between individual political units (polities) in a society and the rise of political complexity. The city-states of ancient Greece provides an outstanding model for this theory, and its application in this context is hardly new; Cherry and Anthony Snodgrass in particular have written extensively on the cultural and political relations of the Greek polities at various points in history. In the case of pan-Hellenic sanctuaries, a focal point for contact between such entities, the theory of PPI is particularly significant.

Peer Polity Interaction is a theory designed to examine change over time. Previous approaches to studying the development of societies have often emphasized exogenous change, or change coming from an external source. This usually coincides with a focus on dominant and subsidiary sociopolitical units. Alternatively, endogenous change, or change originating entirely from within the socio-political unit, requires viewing that unit in isolation. In Peer Polity Interaction, change is assumed to be neither an isolated internal function, nor purely driven by outside forces. Instead, PPI represents change at the regional level, occurring from a combination of internal factors and external influences, both of which are visible in the forms of interaction.\(^{11}\)

Peer polity interaction offers an interesting perspective from which to study developments in a civilization of fairly equal, independent socio-political groups. It should not, Renfrew warns, be used as a means of explaining the

\(^{11}\) Renfrew 1986: 6
spatial distribution of a particular trait across similar socio-political groups in a region at a single point in the archaeological record; such an application is entirely circular, with PPI explaining an anomaly in the archaeological record, and this feature being used to validate PPI. To summarize Peer Polity Interaction in Renfrew's own words: “our aim is the explanation of a temporal pattern, namely the changes which have taken place in the degree of complexity and the organizational aspects of a given society.”

At its most basic, Peer Polity Interaction describes a range of interactions between equal entities that are the driving force behind political development. The approach of PPI demonstrates two general principles. First, the theory precludes examining a given socio-political unit in isolation, as it is the development of common traits between polities over time that the theory of PPI seeks to address. Secondly, PPI avoids emphasizing the dominance of one socio-political unit, or polity, over others. Although such hierarchical relationships often exist, models analyzing the interaction of core and periphery groups are well established in archaeological theory and, according to Renfrew, overused in discussions of cultural exchange. Instead, PPI focuses on interaction between equals, hence “peer” polities.

The polities of the PPI theory are examples of Renfrew's early state model (ESM), which is a spatial representation of the relationship between similar polities in a given area grouped into what is commonly referred to as a civilization. The key distinction is between the ‘state’ unit as an individual

---

12 Renfrew 1986: 7
13 Renfrew 1986: 1
political entity and the broad civilization into which modern scholars have assembled them: an example would be Athens as a polity within the larger Greek civilization. Characteristics of the civilization that serve as reference points for archaeologists and anthropologists generally include similarities in the political organization of the member polities, a shared writing or spoken language, shared weights and measures, and common religious beliefs. Renfrew describes the component polities as typically maintaining a strong sense of independence, and often in direct competition with one another. While ‘state’ does not denote a particular size or base level of complexity, it must be “an autonomous socio-political unit” and “the highest order socio-political unit in the region in question.”\(^\text{14}\)

The relationship between the polities within a civilization has a few essential characteristics. Considerable change in the social structure and political organization in one polity will occur nearly or entirely simultaneously with similar developments in other polities. Such change generally takes the form of increasing complexity, organization, and a consolidation of power in the political center of the polities. Important cultural markers used to identify a group of polities as a civilization, such as a common architectural style, writing system, and religious practices, will develop similarly. Most importantly, these changes arise organically, that is they develop within the civilization through interaction and cultural exchange between the polities, rather than being imported or driven by an external stimulus.

\(^{14}\) Renfrew 1986: 2
At the core of the theory of PPI, therefore, lies interaction and exchange between polities as the driving force behind political development. Although the possible modes of exchange are essentially unlimited, Renfrew categorizes the most typical examples into general categories: competition and competitive emulation, symbolic entrainment and transmission of innovation, and the increased exchange of goods.\textsuperscript{15} Warfare also presents a clear source of interaction between competing polities. The organization necessary for large-scale or long-term warfare promotes the consolidation of power within the polity’s sociopolitical system. Hoplite warfare, with part-time, citizen soldiers fighting in a linked formation both literally and symbolically affirms the responsibilities of the citizen class upon which Greek democracy is based.

Renfrew’s first category, competition and competitive emulation, is particularly important to this study. To begin with, competitive emulation – visible displays of wealth and power as a route to increased inter-polity status – promotes political development as “a process favoring intensification, in that the resources utilized fall within the category of production beyond subsistence.”\textsuperscript{16} For a competitive display to be effective in increasing inter-polity status, furthermore, “the magnitude of these gestures has to be measured along some scale, and the gestures are thus similar in kind.”\textsuperscript{17} Competitive emulation often takes place through monumental dedications at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries. Renfrew mentions the Siphnian treasury at Delphi as specific examples, and

\textsuperscript{15} Renfrew 1986: 8
\textsuperscript{16} Renfrew 1986: 8
\textsuperscript{17} Renfrew 1986: 8
Anthony Snodgrass further develops pan-Hellenic monuments as competitive dedications in his discussion of PPI and the emerging *polis*. Monumental offerings at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries were an important form of competitive display, and thus a significant part of the process of developing and demonstrating political identity.

PPI also shows the value of audience as an interpretive tool. Within this framework, monumental pan-Hellenic dedications are an example of competitive emulation, for which audience is inherently a critical factor. Understanding this function of pan-Hellenic monuments stresses the connection between dedication and target audience, and justifies the focus of this study on mortal dedicatory audience, the importance of which was discussed previously.

The theory of PPI, therefore, clearly applies to any study of dedications offered by polities in the Archaic Period, as it pertains to the development of emerging communities, the role of interaction between peer states, and the function of pan-Hellenic sanctuaries. PPI argues that the monumental dedications at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries feature in political growth, and thus may provide insight into that subject. Most importantly, this theory also serves as the basis for considering target audience in assessing political development; it is the audience that makes a monumental dedication a form of competitive emulation, and thus a political action in the context of PPI.

---

18 Renfrew 1986: 13
*Polis and Ethnos: How do we Understand Political Identity?*

Catherine Morgan pinpoints a key issue in the study of early state formation in the Greek world: that the political terminology in academic use is fundamentally limited and cannot fully describe the great variety of political situations or the gradual development of political systems in the Archaic period.19 Such terminology, however, must be involved in any discussion or analysis of early Greek political development. It is therefore best to rely on existing scholarship, specifically the work of Catherine Morgan and Anthony Snodgrass, to fashion acceptable definitions of key terms like *ethnos* and *polis* as they will be used in the coming assessments.

Snodgrass suggests the most basic definition of the *polis* as “a polity consisting of a settlement and its territories, politically united with one another and independent of other polities.”20 He sees the roots of the *polis* established as far back as the Late Bronze Age, with the consolidation of the *polis* as the dominant form of Greek political identity during the Archaic period. Snodgrass, quoting Renfrew, suggests that the *polis* is “legitimized in the eyes of its citizens by the existence of other states which patently do function along comparable lines.”21 Thus the rise of the *polis* is also tied to the emergence of the pan-Hellenic community.

Snodgrass also outlines common, observable characteristics that define a *polis*. One defining quality of the *polis* identity, he argues, is the development of codified law: “by its very existence and, even more important, by its exhibition in

---

19 Morgan, Catherine. “Early Greek States: Beyond the Polis” 2003: 4
20 Snodgrass 2006: 235
21 Snodgrass 2006: 239 (quoting Renfrew 1982a: 289)
public, a law-code represented a major step in the advance of the *polis* idea."

Another, even more important part of the *polis*, according to Snodgrass, is a hoplite army. He says “the emergence of the Archaic heavy infantryman (*hoplite*), with the attendant changes in equipment, tactics, social stratification and political obligation, stands close to the heart of the idea of the *polis*,” and calls the hoplite army “our earliest and most positive proof of its [the *polis*] reality.”\(^{22}\) Snodgrass notes one additional *polis* indicator and attributes to it significance equal to that of a hoplite army: dedicating a pan-Hellenic treasury. He says “whereas to muster a hoplite army was one way of staking a claim to be a fully fledged *polis*, to erect a treasury at a pan-Hellenic sanctuary was to put one’s city forward as belonging to an elite among the *poleis.*”\(^{23}\)

Tied intimately to any discussion of *ethnos* or *polis* is the question of identity. In the Classical period, citizenship in a *polis* is fundamental to personal identity.\(^{24}\) In the Archaic period, where political organizations were less defined, how they perceived their communal identity is less certain. *Ethnos* is a term frequently applied to non-*poleis*, indicating a common bond based on ethnicity. Ethnicity exists at the most basic level, where members of a given community emphasize shared cultural traits to create a significant identity outside of familial units.\(^{25}\) It is important to understand ethnicity as a deliberate rather than natural development, in Morgan’s words, “the process of choice by which a

\(^{22}\) Snodgrass 2006: 243
\(^{23}\) Snodgrass 2006: 249
\(^{24}\) Snodgrass 2006: 235
\(^{25}\) Morgan 2003: 10-1
tier of identity is constructed.” Morgan defines *ethnos* as "socially and often politically real outcomes of a process of definition.” The *ethnos* is the visible result of this process. While the *ethnos* may not be rigid, it is still an entity rather than an abstract process, and thus a possible identity alternative to the *polis*.

Morgan takes into account both *poleis* and *ethne* as part of a system of tiered identities. In this light, “whatever their precise form of internal organization, political communities called *poleis* were entities with which their members could identify in a different (complementary or conflicting) way than with the *ethne* to which they might simultaneously belong.” Morgan stresses that the *polis* is not the more advanced replacement for the *ethnos*, but an alternative identity based in an alternative set of ideals and values. While the *ethnos*, as an outcome of the process of defining ethnicity, appears first, Morgan argues that it persists as a group identity once the *polis* identity has developed.

Francois de Polignac investigates the early Archaic emergence of the *polis* through the construction of sanctuaries. His approach stresses contemporary context that is fundamental to this study; in attempting to study the origins of something as complex as the Greek city, it is important not to work backwards from the recognized *polis* of the Classical period, or to be too heavily reliant on the Athenian model.

One of De Polignac’s main points, and one particularly relevant to this study, is the relationship between new sanctuaries and emerging communities in

---

26 Morgan 2003: 11  
27 Morgan 2003: 10  
28 Morgan 2003: 6  
29 De Polignac 1995: 3
the Archaic period. While religion in the Dark Ages was mostly practiced at natural locations and utilized everyday items, the Archaic period saw a rise in dedicated cult space with defined borders, the appearance of archaeological features like altars and temples, and objects with specifically votive functions. The creation of dedicated sacred space in general, De Polignac continues, was socially significant because it tied people to a particular area – “the creation of a sanctuary stabilized the cult... a place of mediation between the men and the gods who, together, were attached to this particular territory.”

De Polignac ascribes additional political significance to extra-urban sanctuaries; these sites, he argues, physically marked the borders of a polis’ territory, segregating it from its neighbors much in the same way that the sanctuary walls separate sacred space from secular. In terms of political identity, De Polignac argues “the formation of the polis was accompanied by the development of large, extramural sanctuaries.” Thus, the emergence of sanctuaries can be tied to both the social and political self-definition of emerging Greek communities in the Archaic period. Though De Polignac may frame his analysis in terms of the polis, his arguments about the role of the sanctuary in the definition of emerging polities may also apply to the ethnos. Catherine Morgan even argues that sanctuaries can be used to demarcate ethne as well as poleis.

---

30 De Polignac 1995: 15-7
31 De Polignac 1995: 20
32 De Polignac 1995: 32-41
33 De Polignac 1995: 25
34 Morgan 2003: 16-24
In the relationship between *ethnos* and *polis*, both Morgan and Snodgrass’ views strongly conflict. Snodgrass views *ethnos* as nothing more than the name given to the developing *polis* identity, a *polis*-in-progress. Morgan emphasizes the *ethnos* as a significant identity that exists entirely separately from the *polis*. The two can exist simultaneously because the citizen identifies with both units in a different ways.\(^{35}\) Building on Morgan, *ethnos* and *polis* can be recognized as two forms of state identity present in the Greek Archaic period. Morgan is correct in principle: identity is not fixed, nor can the emerging community identities of the early Archaic be described adequately in terms of the development of the *polis* only. A slight alternative to Morgan’s perspective is to define *ethnos* as a transitional form of sociopolitical identity deriving from the process of determining ethnicity, which emphasizes the interests of the group over the individual, rather than an entirely parallel identity. It is less fixed, and thus eventually becomes secondary to (or at least less visible than) the *polis*, which itself is an alternative, more firmly developed form of political identity derived from external standards common to the wider Greek community, and whose validation rests by the recognition of similar organizations in the pan-Hellenic community.

The work of Snodgrass and De Polignac displays a strong, *polis* centric bias. The most immediate concern is with Snodgrass’ claim “to erect a treasury at a pan-Hellenic sanctuary was to put one’s city forward as belonging to an elite

\(^{35}\) Morgan 2003: 4-16
among the \textit{poleis}.”\textsuperscript{36} Archaic monumental dedications at Delphi in fact represent a range of dedicators and target audiences, and the role of treasuries should not be restricted so sweepingly. Morgan has effectively argued for recognizing the \textit{ethnos} as an established political identity in the Archaic, and thus the \textit{ethnos} should be considered as a possibility when analyzing the political identity of pan-Hellenic dedicators. De Polignac is guilty of the same \textit{polis}-centric analysis as Snodgrass – he may be open minded about how a developing \textit{polis} presents itself in the archaeological record, but he does not consider alternative terminology. Because of the contextual nature of his work, however, De Polignac’s study of sanctuaries in the development of the Greek state is not overly limited by his restricted terminology.

Snodgrass’ conception of the \textit{polis} and its characteristics is also problematic. Even if Snodgrass and Renfrew are correct in principle, based on PPI, it seems more likely that it is interaction with, not simply the existence of, comparable polities that fully legitimizes the \textit{polis}. If this is true, then recognition of the \textit{polis} as the dominant political form for the Greek polities is contingent on upon recognizing ties to a broader, pan-Hellenic community. It is also difficult to define the \textit{polis} according to a set of unvarying characteristics, as Snodgrass has done with hoplite warfare and treasury building. Morgan points out that no specific form of political organization is automatically a \textit{polis}.\textsuperscript{37} There may, therefore, be variation in the kinds of physical evidence encountered. However, the focus of this study – showing the variety of dedicators at pan-Hellenic

\textsuperscript{36} Snodgrass 2006: 249
\textsuperscript{37} Morgan 2003: 5-6
sanctuaries – means that despite the recognized limitations, an attempt must still be made to characterize political identities like ethnos and polis according to a set of archaeological criteria.

**Archaeological Criteria**

Attempting to identify poleis or ethne through analysis of the archaeological record is inherently problematic. The impact of emerging and changing state identity on the material record is unclear, and therefore working backward from archaeology to the level of development of a polity is to some extent a matter of speculation and careful judgment. The best method one can hope for, while acknowledging limitations, is to outline a set of archaeological criteria that indicate the existence of either an ethnos or a polis, which can then be applied to the dedications and host communities. Snodgrass and Morgan suggest a range of physical features that indicate an ethnos or a polis, which will be utilized as part of a comprehensive set of criteria in order to assess most precisely the level of political development of Chios, Naxos, and Siphnos as host communities of the dedications in question.

Snodgrass sets forth several criteria that he suggests may be construed as definitive indicators of a polis. Most important among the archaeological indictors is the construction of a monumental temple at an independent cult sanctuary, especially one to a patron deity.\(^\text{38}\) This feature separates the polis (according to Snodgrass) from the more basic cult sites of its immediate predecessor, the tribal system, and the combined political/religious centers of

\(^\text{38}\) Snodgrass 2006: 212
the Late Bronze Age kingdoms. De Polignac concurs, arguing “such construction work also presupposes the existence of centers of decision capable of mobilizing those resources and implies deliberate choice, since the building only took place at a limited number of [religious] sites.” Also essential is the existence of an urban center. This typically includes a town, cult areas with monumental temple buildings, all often enclosed within fortifications. Snodgrass suggests that, while fortifications are rightly considered a common feature of many poleis, they may not have such weight that their very presence denotes its existence. Snodgrass specifically argues that this urban center, particularly a dedicated cult site with a monumental temple, must exist for a polity to be called a polis, and that it differentiates the polis from the ethnos.

In the archaeology of an inter-state site like Delphi, markers of polis existence are often the material representation of institutions inherent to the polis. Elements like law codes typically appear in epigraphic evidence, particularly in connection with consultation of the Delphic oracle. Emphasis on the hoplite system of warfare may appear through the dedication of armor and the trademark bronze shield. Snodgrass cites a rise during the 7th century in the dedication of hoplite armor, both personal and from defeated enemies. This showcases a style of warfare tied to being a polis and, he suggests, “will have impressed the citizens of other poleis with the prowess of one’s own.” Thus

39 Snodgrass 2006: 202
40 De Polignac 1995: 19-20
41 Snodgrass 2006: 203
42 Snodgrass 2006: 250
showcasing hoplite warfare, particularly through the dedication of armor, targets the pan-Hellenic audience indicative of a *polis* offering.

At a pan-Hellenic sanctuary like Delphi, the primary indicator of the *polis* is the construction of a treasury. ⁴³ This, Snodgrass claims, is the direct, physical manifestation of the interaction and competition of the *polis* within the pan-Hellenic community. Because Snodgrass rejects the *ethnos* as a political institution, he provides no criteria for the recognition of *ethnos* involvement at Delphi, attributing all signs of emerging state identity to the formation of the *polis*.

Catherine Morgan strongly refutes Snodgrass’ claim that an urban center is the first marker of the *polis*. To quote, “there is no archaeological support for a contrast between the *polis* as an urbanized state form and the generally unurbanized and thus politically backward Archaic and early Classical *ethnos.*” ⁴⁴ Urban development has roots as early as the beginning of the 8ᵗʰ century and is a gradual process spanning various levels of political development. Closely linked to the process of urbanization and equally important to the emerging political identities is the definition of borders. In the archaeological record, Snodgrass emphasizes the construction of state sanctuaries as a key facet of urbanization; ⁴⁵ the placement of sanctuaries as border markers has been widely accepted after De Polignac.
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⁴³ Snodgrass 2006: 249
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⁴⁵ Snodgrass 2006: 210-8
Neither one of these developments, however, is exclusive to the *ethnos* or the *polis*, as Morgan demonstrates. Morgan cites four examples, a *polis* and an *ethnos* with developed, central state sanctuaries, and a *polis* and an *ethnos* with important border sanctuaries.\(^{46}\) Morgan also does not acknowledge monumental temples as necessarily indicative of a *polis*. Rather, the clearest suggestion of a *polis* according to Morgan is monumentalization of the civic space within a city, the construction of walls to physically define the civic area, and the existence of a civic building like a bouleuterion.\(^{47}\)

Snodgrass and Morgan’s differing approaches to assessing political development in the archaeological record, separated by general criteria and dedication specific criteria, are as follows (see figs. 1&2): for dedications specifically, Morgan offers no specific criteria, and Snodgrass’ claim of dedicating a treasury has already been challenged. His claim that *polis* dedications represent elements like hoplite warfare, law codes, and colonization seems more likely, but the best indicator of *polis*-hood will still be a targeted pan-Hellenic audience.

Subsequent analysis will draw upon criteria from both, adapting for weaknesses and including specific references to pan-Hellenic sanctuaries (see Fig. 3). The criterion best represented in the archaeological record is monumental architecture. In their general archaeological criteria, Snodgrass and Morgan emphasize monumentalization as an indicator of a *polis*; Snodgrass specifies a monumental temple at a local sanctuary, while Morgan points to

\(^{46}\) Morgan 2003: 45-105  
\(^{47}\) Morgan 2003: 62-69
monumentalization of civic architecture. Despite Morgan’s resistance to monumental temples as an indicator, both aspects of monumental architecture seem to suggest a polis level of development. For Morgan, the developed cult sites can be constructed by both ethne and poleis. De Polignac’s work helps to justify this position and still allow monumental temples to be considered indicative of poleis.

De Polignac, like Snodgrass, places all construction of religious sanctuaries within the polis, with a monumental temple as the clearest sign. The way in which De Polignac assesses the development of sanctuaries in general, with a focus on community self-definition and marking social and political space, suggests these archaeological features are part of the development of an ethnos as well. It is the monumental temple that truly distinguishes the community as a polis, because leveraging community resources for monumentalization of public buildings, both civic and religious, is a significant investment in the visibility and permanence of the state organization, and suggests a strong, centralized government indicative of the polis. Thus, Morgan can be correct that a demarcated sanctuary with a basic temple does not indicate a polis, even if a monumental temple does. For the purpose of this study, the most important polis indicator will be architectural monumentalization of the urban center, whether civic or cult. These criteria will be applied in Chapter 3 to assess the identity of the dedicating community.
### Fig. 1

#### Snodgrass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criteria</th>
<th>Polis</th>
<th>Ethnos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Urban center</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No urban center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed cult sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monumental temple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patron deity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Usually fortifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedication Specific Criteria</th>
<th>Polis</th>
<th>Ethnos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of a treasury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Representation in dedications of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Hoplite warfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Legal codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fig. 2

#### Morgan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criteria</th>
<th>Polis</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Ethnos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Must have urban center – but urban center can already exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of a unique material style (of pottery, for example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monumental civic architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of an urban center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demarcation of assembly space and construction of walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bouleuterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defined territory (sanctuaries as border markers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of temples at state sanctuaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedication Specific Criteria</th>
<th>Polis</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Ethnos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Epigraphic evidence of legal/political decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expression of social roles (gender, wealth, class) in votive offerings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Fig. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criteria</th>
<th>Polis</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Ethnos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                  | • Monumental religious architecture, specifically temples  
|                  | • Monumental civic architecture | • Defined territory (sanctuaries as border markers)  
|                  | | • Construction of temples at community sanctuaries | • Development of an urban center |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedication Specific Criteria</th>
<th>Polis</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Ethnos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intended audience is pan-Hellenic community</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Intended audience is visitors from dedicating community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2 – The Dedications
The Development of Delphi

Morgan cites changes in the material expression of religious beliefs as some of the most dramatic developments of the 8th and 7th centuries. The close connection between state authority and religious practices makes the assessment of dedicatory practices invaluable to the study of the political developments occurring in the same period. The early 8th century brings a considerable rise in dedications making use of expendable wealth, and a transition from the dedication of objects from daily life to expensive, purpose built objects like bronze tripods. An even more visible representation of this trend is the construction of monumental dedications like temples. In the early Archaic period, the focus of monumental construction tended to be in local, 'state' sanctuaries as a means of defining spatial, social, and political identity, rather than engaging in such practices at a remote, inter-state sanctuary like Delphi. During this time, materials from sanctuaries like Delphi, while relatively limited in quantity, become important as a means of comparative assessment of the reflection of ethnos versus polis interests in dedicatory practice.

It is difficult to identify precisely the consolidation of Delphi as an inter-state sanctuary. Developed over time on the site of a pre-existing village, at what point in time the sanctuary space became important to the pan-Hellenic community has been a subject of debate. While major dedications like tripods

48 Morgan 1990: 1
49 Snodgrass 2006: 258-67
have been traced back as far as c. 800 BCE (the earliest meaningful indicators of cult activity), significant use of the sanctuary is usually dated to the mid to late 8th century, with the settlement gradually disappearing from this point until the *terminus ante quem* of around 570 BCE, when dedications like the Naxian Sphinx helped to define sanctuary borders.\(^{51}\)

For the roughly eighty year period between the first monumental dedications (ca 750 BCE) and the dedication of the Naxian sphinx (570 BCE), monumental dedications at Delphi were exclusively the work of the mainland and western Greek powers, and were generally buildings placed on the western side of the sanctuary. In contrast, the first eastern dedications in the latter quarter of the seventh century were objects made of precious metals rather than structures, and have all been found on the eastern side of the sanctuary.\(^{52}\)

In any case, early votives from the sanctuary tend to reflect the interests of individuals or groups from foreign communities rather than the local village. Among the votive dedications from this period are objects with significant elite connections, including (in addition to bronze tripods) figurines of warriors and charioteers, as well as chariot fitments.\(^{53}\) The personal nature of these offerings demonstrates the importance of the individual elite as the earliest source of major extra-state dedications. The shift to objects representative of a group in the later 8th century suggests an attempt by emerging *ethne* to assert their power

\(^{51}\) Morgan 1990: 129
\(^{53}\) Morgan 1993: 28
over the individual elite through the institutionalization of dedicatory responsibilities.

The establishment of the Delphic oracle, likely coinciding with the increased use of the sanctuary in the mid-8th century, has a significant connection to emerging state authority. The primary role of the oracle was as a guide for communities, rather than individuals; it addressed significant public affairs such as warfare, the adoption of legal codes, and colonization, issues important both as necessary precursors to the formation of a traditional *polis*, and throughout the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

Morgan cites the foundation of the Delphic oracle as “a crisis in political authority,” specifically the struggle between the interests of the individual elite and the emerging *ethnos*. There exists no singular institutionalization of affairs at Delphi, but rather the growth and variation of participation at the sanctuary. Elements like the Delphic oracle represent the interests of communities and endure, while the personal pursuit of competitive elite dedication jeopardize the unity of emerging *ethne* and present ideal targets for adaptation and institutionalization.55

Anthony Snodgrass also traces the emergence of the Greek state through practices at Delphi. He makes no mention of the *ethne* as a relevant political identity, however, focusing solely on the development of the *polis*. Snodgrass places particular emphasis on the role of the Delphic oracle in this process because of its importance to issues of colonization and law codes that he believes
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54 Morgan 1993: 29  
55 Morgan 1993: 29-30
(as discussed previously) are innate to the *polis* system. In the founding of colonies, the weight of the Delphic oracle’s instructions cannot be underestimated. Snodgrass notes that the oracle did not just serve as an advisor in such affairs, but had enough authority to actually initiate the establishment of a new colony, describing a typical example from the late 8th century.\(^{56}\) With such influence, Snodgrass argues, the oracle may have become a tool for external pressure within the pan-Hellenic community. He suggests that oracular demands that were undesirable to the polis and its citizens resulted from pressure from other members of the community as in the case of Cyrene in 630s discussed by Herodotus.\(^{57}\)

Examples of Delphic sanction of particular leaders or legal reforms support its image as an institution with supreme (ostensibly divine) pan-Hellenic influence. Whatever the source of the oracle’s advice, the effects of its counsel lead Snodgrass to argue that by 650 BCE, “Delphi had acquired great prestige as an arbiter who in some sense stood above the authority of any single *polis*.\(^{58}\) While the apparent origin of the oracle’s power was divine (Apollo), Snodgrass suggests that piety alone could not support such a complex function throughout the Aegean world. Instead, he proposes that the oracle’s significant influence derives from the use of Delphi as a pan-Hellenic sanctuary. The oracle had the authority to represent the pan-Hellenic community as a whole, in which

\(^{56}\) Snodgrass 2006: 247
\(^{57}\) Snodgrass 2006: 247, Herodotus 4.150-8
\(^{58}\) Snodgrass 2006: 248
each *polis*, no matter how influential, was still just one member, making the oracle an institutional expression of *polis* values.  

Unlike Morgan, Snodgrass engages only briefly with dedicatory practice at Delphi, doing so with a characteristically strong bias towards the *polis* identity. Although he initially mentions the existence of early dedications from individuals and polities, he turns quickly to the more visible treasuries of the late Archaic period, which he deems the peak of a process of developing dedication at Delphi. Snodgrass equates the dedication of a treasury with the existence of a hoplite army in terms of *polis* organization: in short, to have either was to be a *polis*. His subsequent discussion of smaller dedications (from Olympia) revolves around sanctuaries as sites for pan-Hellenic interaction, further demonstrating Snodgrass’ assessment of dedications purely in terms of the rise of the *polis* and its establishment as a member of the pan-Hellenic community.  

For the purposes of this study, Snodgrass’ discussion of early dedicatory practice at Delphi is unhelpful, not for its economy, but for its failure to address a host of purposes and results of dedication. Moreover, his evaluation (not unexpectedly) is framed entirely within a system of *polis* and pan-Hellenic values that may not apply to all dedicating communities in the Archaic. As Morgan discusses, part of the early development at Delphi involved the *ethnos*, the first state unit to develop, seeking to consolidate its power over the individual elite; its assumption of dedicatory responsibilities presented an ideal means to do this, and simultaneously helped to define the *ethnos* by stressing differences from

---

59 Snodgrass 2006: 247-8
60 Snodgrass 2006:234-57
other *ethne*. Thus the dedications of early Delphi seem to include two possible
types of monumental offering: those by *ethne*, whose intended audience was the
people of the dedicating polity, and *polis* dedications, which targeted the broader
pan-Hellenic community.
Fig. 4 – Delphi Site Plan: Naxian Sphinx (7), Chian Altar (12), and Siphnian Treasury (5) circled in red.

Pedley, John *Sanctuaries and the Sacred in the Ancient Greek World*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005. Pg. 137 Fig. 71
The Naxian Sphinx

The Naxian sphinx was erected in the middle of the 6th century, around 570 BCE. The monument was situated just north of the Sybil’s rock, a large stone associated with the Sybil of Delphi, on a smaller rock next to the center of the polygonal wall bounding the south terrace of the temple of Apollo, and right on the Sacred Way.61 A fluted column of coarse Naxian marble stood 9.32 meters high, 0.97 meters wide at the base, tapering to a diameter of 0.74 meters at the ionic capital.62 The column stood atop a foundation, bearing an inscription attributing the monument to the people of the island of Naxos.

On a pedestal at the top of the pillar sat a female sphinx, sculpted from the same island marble as the base. The sphinx measures 1.35 meters in length, and 2.32 meters in height from the feet to the tips of the wings, bringing the total height of the monument to 11.64 meters.63

Its facial features are significantly worn and the tail is almost completely missing. Portions of the wings and the feet have been restored in plaster for the piece’s display in the Delphi museum. The face is oval shaped with slightly triangular eyes, and the mouth is drawn in a somber expression. The hair is braided and held back by a fillet tied at the base of the neck, and tresses hang down the back and the sides.64 The breast is feathered in an extremely geometric pattern similar to the stylization of the hair. The wings curve out,
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61 PoulSEN, Frederick. “Delphi” 1920: 97
63 De La CostE-Messeliere 1950: 24
64 PoulSEN 1920: 97
away from the body and turn back to point almost at the head, presenting a nearly square profile.

_Scholarship and Analysis_
The Naxian sphinx was the first monumental dedication by an Aegean island and the first in island marble, and breaks from the western trend. Similar sphinx figures dedicated by the Naxians at Delos suggest a special connection with this creature for the Naxian people. In her publication of a long ignored head of a sphinx found on Siphnos (out of context, in the wall of a house), Sheedy addresses a number of other examples of Cycladic sphinxes. Some of these finds, despite being found on different islands, share similarities in the shape of the head, facial features (such as cheeks and mouth), and the design of the hair with the Delphic example. While none are a perfect comparison to the Naxian sphinx at Delphi, the existence of a number of stylistically similar sphinx sculptures from different areas is enough to suggest a Cycladic connection to them.⁶⁵

The Naxians, therefore, deliberately chose a dedication that was specific to their home region, rather than following the precedent of western monuments. The location of the Sphinx, however, suggests that they sought to unify this uniquely Naxian dedication with the Delphic setting. The dedication was placed next to an area devoted to the cult of Ge.⁶⁶ The Sphinx, as a chthonic animal, ties the choice of iconography to the sanctuary by way of its proximity to an area devoted to a chthonic cult.

---

⁶⁶ Scott 2010: 46
In a broad article on the setting of freestanding Greek sculpture, Brunilde Ridgway touches on the Naxian sphinx as an example of Archaic art. She uses the Naxian sphinx to highlight the importance of the statue pedestal as a component of overall sculptural presentation. Monumental columns in particular required special consideration of their setting.\textsuperscript{67} Thus with the Naxian Sphinx, which the Ionic column lifted well above the height of other dedications, it is as important to consider the nature and placement of the column as it is to assess the Sphinx at its peak. Of particular interest is a study of the temple of Artemis in the Delion on Paros (490-480 BCE), which has returned three fragments of Sphinx \textit{akroteria} from the corners of the roof, indicating they were in fact used for this purpose, albeit a century later, at the very end of the Archaic period.\textsuperscript{68} The height and positioning of the column meant that, when viewed from below, it was on the same level as the entablature of the temple of Apollo so that it looked like one of these sphinx \textit{akroteria}.\textsuperscript{69}

From a political perspective, the Naxian sphinx clearly showcases its island origins, building on a dedicatory tradition of island and eastern Greeks deviating from mainland precedents. The use of fine, local Naxian marble, which would have been expensive to import, suggests an intent to make the offering characteristically Naxian from its conception. The choice of iconography, the sphinx, also reinforces Cycladic traditions in a foreign context. Overall, these

\textsuperscript{68} Sheedy 1988: 367
\textsuperscript{69} Scott 2010: 47
choices show a deliberate effort to make the dedication openly indicative of the local style and customs of the dedicator, in this case Naxos.

The Naxian sphinx, however, seems to be the island community's attempt to insert this distinctively Naxian element into the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi. The Naxians integrated their dedication seamlessly within the framework of Delphi. The placement of the chthonic animal near the chthonic cult of Ge, rather than farther east with the other non-monumental eastern dedications, connects the chosen subject with its surroundings. The ten-meter high Ionic column is equally important to the setting. Not only would the sphinx have been visible from almost every point in the sanctuary, other archaic examples of sphinx akrotelia suggest that the akroterion illusion here may well have been deliberate. It was a way for the Naxians to literally add their own distinctly Cycladic touch to the great temple without actually modifying its architecture.

The intended primary audience of the Naxian sphinx seems to be visitors from the island of Naxos rather than the rest of the pan-Hellenic world, as a collection of known finds suggests an association between the sphinx and the Cyclades. It is likely that this subject was chosen because it resonated more with Cycladic, and particularly with Naxian visitors, rather than mainlanders. The use of local Naxian marble is certainly far more likely to have been perceived by Naxians than others. The akroterion illusion, similarly, would only have worked from a specific viewpoint; it is possible that many visitors would have walked right by without realizing this attribute had they not already known to look for it.
Thus the Naxian sphinx showcased Naxos, to Naxos, in the context of an inter-state sanctuary. As the first monumental dedication from the Cyclades (and standing almost 40 feet tall), it certainly would not escape the notice of foreign visitors. Yet the sphinx showcases Naxian style and materials in a manner that spoke directly to the Naxian people, with other visitors far less likely to recognize the full range of associations – subject, material, and placement – with the island of Naxos. This indicates a primary audience of Naxian visitors, and may suggest that the dedicating community should therefore be defined as an *ethnos.*
Fig. 5 – The Naxian Sphinx

Photo: Neer, Richard T. *Greek Art and Archaeology: A New History, C. 2500-c. 150 BCE*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2012. Pg. 132 Fig. 5.18
The Chian Altar

The Chian altar has been subject to multiple reconstructions over the years. Extant in situ is a foundation of four courses of grey limestone, topped with one course of white marble. On the south side of the white marble course an inscription reads “the Delphians gave προμαντεία to the Chiotes” (προμαντεία being the right of consulting the oracle first). Surmounting this foundation is a full course of orthostats in a black stone (possibly of Chian origin), along with three orthostats of the same material in a second course, all of which served as a revetment for a large core. A number of blocks found in the immediate area belong to the altar, including part of the cornice, in white marble, and bearing a dedicatory inscription from the Chians, “the Chiotes (gave) the altar to Apollo.”

The altar stood nearly intact until at least the 5th century CE, based on the numerous crosses cut into the stone around the latter inscription. Restorations in 1920 and 1959 of the eastern face of the altar along the Sacred Way restore eight and seven courses respectively between the marble foundation and the cornice. Of course, the marble cornice that tops the altar today was not the uppermost surface in antiquity. Cuttings for clamps and pry-holes for crowbars show that at least one more course existed above this engraved marble cornice. The corners of the Chian altar were likely decorated with akroteria: a pair found at Delphi may reasonably be attributed to the altar.

The date of the altar is the subject of significant debate. Letter forms in the inscriptions seem later than the Archaic (while there are no comparanda
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71 Amandry 1986: 209
from Chios, there are other Archaic Ionian inscriptions at Delphi), although Herodotus saw the altar when he visited, setting a terminus ante quem of about 450 BCE. On the other hand, the profile of the extant marble cornice bears many similarities to the architecture of the Siphnian and Massalian treasuries, suggesting a significantly earlier date, possibly late 6th century. 72 Photographs taken by Amandry present an additional, interesting element to this dispute.

While sections of the foundation were uncovered during the 1959 restoration, Amandry saw hook clamps, and hidden rectangular dowels sealed with lead through a horizontal pour channel, construction techniques which give the existing altar a date in the Hellenistic period, at least 3rd century BCE. This leads Amandry to conclude that, based on the methods used to fit the blocks together, the Chian altar standing today is in fact a Hellenistic copy of the original altar seen by Herodotus. It is impossible to prove that the inscriptions existed on the original altar. However, Amandry offers one possibility: attention to detail in the construction of the blocks would account for the late 6th century style moldings, while the same care might not be taken with the technique of incision for the inscriptions. 73 This solution to the dating problem makes the inscription about προμαυτεία - which, because it involves the oracle, has a political dimension - part of the original, late Archaic altar.

Scholarship and Analysis
Given the centrality of any altar to the religious function of a sanctuary, it is surprising that the Chian dedication at Delphi has come under little scrutiny.

72 Amandry 1986: 211
73 Amandry 1986: 216
This may be a result of the issues with reconstruction and dating discussed above, which make it challenging to develop more elaborate arguments about the political significance of the dedication and the presence of the Chian community in Archaic Delphi. Yet the importance of this dedication to religious ritual (however many courses are restored) and the political nature of the inscription regarding προμαντεία (though dating is problematic) make more complex analysis a worthwhile endeavor.

As Amandry points out, the Chian dedication is inherently unique.74 This is a monumental dedication, in close proximity to the temple, with a significant religious function. With an inscription clearly attributing their dedication, the Chioites placed themselves in this very important context in a manner highly visible to all visitors. The altar is first mentioned by Herodotus in the fifth century, but no other records offer further insight into the precise chronology or occasion for this dedication. The only hint is the second description, which says that Delphi awarded the Chians προμαντεία, the right of first access to the oracle. Given the heavy involvement of the Pythia in political affairs, it is likely that such an award was political as well. Chios certainly had a hand in Delphic politics by the middle of the third century, within a century of the earliest date Amandry proposes the altar could have been rebuilt.75 Thus while the precise circumstances may never be known, it seems certain that there was an important political context for the dedication of the Chian altar.

74 Amandry 1986: 205
75 Amandry 1986: 219
The unique nature of the altar provides the best insight into the Chian political identity. The altar was more than a monumental dedication – it was a functioning part of the sanctuary, equaled in religious significance only by the temple to Apollo. Such a dedication required more planning and consideration than even a treasury, and could not be achieved without extensive communication with the bureaucratic powers at Delphi. Rather than supporting an argument for a specific political identity or the lack thereof, consideration of the altar’s function within the sanctuary suggests that the dedicating community was likely have been highly involved in political affairs and the administrative concerns of Delphi. In theory, this level of engagement with the pan-Hellenic community would identify Chios a polis.
Fig. 6 – The Chian Altar: 1959 Restoration from the East

The Siphnian Treasury

The Siphnian Treasury is one of the most ornate and best-preserved monuments of the sanctuary at Delphi and has been widely studied for its beautiful examples of architectural sculpture. Built on a raised foundation of local limestone, the building’s elevation and position along the sanctuary’s Sacred Way ensured maximum visibility; any visitor to the sanctuary would have an immediate and unrestricted view, whether they entered through the southeast or southwest entrance. The treasury faced west and was constructed in the Ionic style with a 4:3 ratio (8.54m by 6.13m). It had a *distyle-in-antis* porch, on which 2.5m high caryatids replaced the standard pair of ionic columns. Three types of marble (Siphnian, Naxian, and Parian) were used in the structure, which was built in a distinctly Eastern Greek style.\(^7\) The treasury received significant architectural decoration in addition to the sculpted pediments and four continuous, ionic friezes.

The western (front) pediment has been almost entirely lost. Scholars have suggested that it may have portrayed Apollo riding in a quadriga (four horse chariot), but there is little physical evidence remaining to substantiate these claims. The eastern (back) pediment, which would have been the more visible to visitors as the southeastern entrance to the sanctuary came into greater use, is largely preserved. It depicts, in Parian marble, the struggle between Herakles and Apollo over the Delphic tripod. Zeus stands in the center

\(^{7}\) Partida, Elena C. “The Treasuries at Delphi: an Architectural Study” 2000: 36; a nine course wall, seven layers of double orthostats interrupted by two layers of stretchers.
holding the tripod\textsuperscript{77}, flanked by the aforementioned gods. Artemis holds back Apollo as Herakles tries to run off with the tripod on his back. Beneath the eastern pediment, a frieze shows a scene from the Trojan war. Divided in half, one part illustrates physical combat between two heroic figures, each supported by his companions and chariots. The other part portrays the gods arguing over the scene and the heroes each supports.

The northern frieze has received the greatest scholarly attention, and would have been the most visible sculptural element for visitors walking past. It runs from east to west, following the path from the southeastern entrance to the top of the hill and the temple of Apollo. This frieze depicts the gigantomachy, the famous battle between the Olympians and the giants. The gods ride chariots and fight alone or in pairs in the manner of the Homeric hero, while the Giants, outfitted in hoplite armor, fight in a phalanx formation. Also notable on this frieze is the signature (located on a giant's shield) of the sculptor responsible for this, and the sculpture of the eastern frieze and pediment.

The western frieze has generally been understood to show the Judgment of Paris, although this attribution is controversial.\textsuperscript{78} It is constructed in three sections to match the division of the porch by the two columns. One block depicts Athena riding in a chariot drawn by four winged horses with a male attendant; the central block has a female deity (potentially Aphrodite or Artemis), more horses and a chariot, and part of a palm tree; the third block is

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{77} Pedley 2005: 142; Zeus according to Pedley, has also been labeled as Athena.
\end{quote}
lost. The south frieze continues the use of horses and chariots, this time as part of a procession interpreted as part of either the nuptial race of Pelops, or more frequently as the abduction of the daughters of Leukippos.

Scholarship & Analysis
Images, description, and interpretation of the Siphnian treasury have been widely published for many decades, far more so than any of the other dedications under consideration. The building appears in basic Greek art and religious textbooks as a representative of Ionic design, the high quality of Greek architectural sculpture, and as one of the best-preserved examples of a theasauros, or treasury building. More advanced scholarship has been particularly interested in the sculptural program, not just for its technical excellence, but also for its content. Any art form so visibly placed on such any important structure merits consideration for its intended message and audience. For the Siphnian treasury, the pediments and the four continuous friezes have been the subject of much scholarly analysis.

In assessing the current standing of scholarship on the Siphnian treasury, it is important not to dwell overmuch on research in the immediate aftermath of early Delphian excavation circa 1900. While some early scholars (like Dinsmoor) make important observations and will be addressed accordingly, mistakes in early reconstructions – like the reconstruction of the Cnidian treasury with parts belonging to the Siphnian treasury – mean more recent studies should receive more attention. Therefore, the primary scholarship on the Siphnian building
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79 Pedley 2005: 139-43
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used here will be the studies of Livingston Vance Watrous in 1982 and Richard T. Neer in 2001.

The first important scholar to publish in English a study of the architecture and sculpture of the Siphnian treasury was William Bell Dinsmoor in 1912 and 1913.\textsuperscript{80} As an early work published shortly after the original excavation reports and assessing a range of structures (not just the Siphnian treasury), much of Dinsmoor’s work is concerned with correctly identifying various foundations and matching them with known buildings attested to by Pausanias.\textsuperscript{81} Dinsmoor recognizes twenty-three treasury foundations in the sanctuary of Apollo, with only thirteen treasuries named in ancient sources. At the date of his writing, the only structure incontestably identified by other scholars was the Athenian treasury, and his identification of the Siphnian treasury is limited to the location of its foundation.\textsuperscript{82}

In his second paper, focusing on the four Ionic treasuries he identified as being constructed prior to 424 BCE (Cnidian, Clazomenian, Massaliot and Siphnian), Dinsmoor devotes greater consideration to the Siphnian treasury and its reconstruction. His observations of structural elements, material, and dimensions are on point, as is his dating of the building to 525 BCE, based on Herodotus and confirmed by construction techniques.\textsuperscript{83} In reconstructing

\textsuperscript{80} Dinsmoor, William Bell. “Studies of the Siphnian Treasuries.” \textit{Bulletin De Correspondance Hellénique} 36.1, 1912 and “Studies of the Delphian Treasuries II: The Four Ionic Treasuries.” \textit{Bulletin De Correspondance Hellénique} 37.1, 1913
\textsuperscript{81} Pausanias 10.9.1-32.2
\textsuperscript{82} Dinsmoor 1912: 449
\textsuperscript{83} Dinsmoor 1913: 8-19; this date is widely accepted, and Partida refutes claims of a later, post-Persian date (2000: 43-4)
architectural sculpture, Dinsmoor is one of the first to assign twelve extant frieze sections and additional fragments conclusively to the Siphnian treasury, and suggest the contribution of two sculptors to the same building resulting in markedly different styles. Dinsmoor offers that the general layout of much of the frieze, high relief with a raised ‘frame’ on the top and bottom is a style not uncommon in Asia Minor, but does not postulate the subject of the frieze.

Livingston Vance Watrous, on the other hand, approaches the sculptural program of the Siphnian treasury in its entirety as representing the interests of the Delphic bureaucracy. Assessing various stylistic and iconographic aspects, his primary assertion is that all of its elements convey a single, consistent theme, namely a denunciation of hubris with specific reference to Athens and its tyrant Peisistratus. This claim rests on the important supposition that the scenes depicted on the treasury are not reflective of the Siphnian donors, but the priestly authorities of the sanctuary of Delphi. The sculptural program is then sharply political, a moral extension of the political rivalry between Athens and Delphi.84

Watrous develops his claims by assessing each extant section of the Siphnian treasury’s architectural sculpture in turn, beginning with the well known north frieze. For this frieze, Watrous’ argument hinges on his identification of the giants with allies of Peisistratus. He notes the odd decorative elements of the giants’ hoplite helmets, among them a kantharos, goat and cow horns, a horse’s head, and a trident which match symbols and icons common in

the art and especially coinage of Naxos, Paros, Eretria, Thessaly, and Boeotia — supporters of Athens against the Peloponnesian league.\textsuperscript{85} Watrous also points out that Athena is one of the only gods represented on the right side of the scene (with the giants). Finally, Watrous identifies the armored figure leading the charge of the gods with the Spartan god Karneis based on the ram’s head on his cheek piece.\textsuperscript{86} This effectively casts the gigantomachy as the struggle between Peisistratus and the Peloponnesian league (in which Delphi, religiously at odds with Athens, supported the Spartans), with Athens as the arrogant giants.

Interpretation of the east pediment rests on the representation of the mythological struggle for the Delphic tripod. The Delphi/Athens rivalry here is relatively straightforward. Watrous cites John Boardman’s connection of Herakles with the tyrant Peisistratus. Just as Herakles tried to steal the tripod, and thus oracular power, from Apollo, Peisistratus attempted to establish a competing oracle in Athens. In the pediment of the Siphnian treasury, Zeus, the central figure, mediates the struggle and retains the tripod for Apollo. The common, contemporary Athenian depiction of the same myth, on the other hand, emphasizes Herakles, often with Athena supporting him.\textsuperscript{87}

The eastern frieze depicts a battle scene from the Iliad on the right, with the assembly of the gods watching on from the left. Watrous identifies this scene as the death of Sarpedon, a mortal son of Zeus. In this relatively minor tale, even Zeus could not prevent the foretold death of his son. Highlighting human

\textsuperscript{85} Watrous 1982: 165  
\textsuperscript{86} Watrous 1982: 166  
\textsuperscript{87} Watrous 1982: 167
mortality in a scene directly next to the immortal gods emphasizes the

distinction between the two groups, a separation that is fundamental to the
Greek concept of hubris.\textsuperscript{88}

The west and south friezes offer other examples of hubristic offenses
against the gods. The west frieze is identified as a portrayal of the Judgment of
Paris. While this is more in issue of \textit{ate}, or blindness, rather than \textit{hubris}, it is a
related concept in which the folly of man provokes divine retribution.\textsuperscript{89} For the
southern frieze, Watrous goes against common identification of the frieze as
illustrating the abduction of the daughters of Leukippos. Rather, he changes the
order of the blocks and restores it as Theseus’ rape of Helen.\textsuperscript{90} This would
present another example of a struggle between Athens and Sparta in which the
Athenian has gravely offended the gods, and a mirror to the political allusion on
the opposite frieze.

Although Watrous’ arguments are well developed and his theory seems
entirely plausible, this interpretation is invalid without also assuming that the
Delphic bureaucracy, rather than Siphnos, determined the subject of the
sculptural program. For a building of such intrinsic political (and physical) value
for the dedicating community, assuming that Siphnos would allow the sculpture
to express entirely Delphic concerns seems problematic. Watrous’ support for
his claim is that concern with \textit{hubris} is a common trait of the Delphic oracle. This
argument is somewhat circular, however, because proving that the entire

\textsuperscript{88} Watrous 1982: 172
\textsuperscript{89} Watrous 1982: 168
\textsuperscript{90} Watrous 1982: 170
sculptural program addresses *hubris* is significantly more difficult if it is not already assumed to reflect the interests of Delphi. While the consideration of the sculpture’s political relevance to the sanctuary may be important, all connection to the Siphnian dedicators should not be dismissed so easily.

Richard Neer approaches the specific question of the political relevance of the treasury, using the Siphnian treasury as a case study. In his preliminary discussion, Neer introduces general questions of motivation, ideological function, and formal design in the construction of treasuries. His study assumes that the dedication of a treasury is an extension of the *polis* into interstate territory, where the building and the votives it contained refer their glory back to the community in the eyes of other *poleis*. While he takes a typically *polis*-centric approach, he ends his introduction with a crucial recognition that each treasury “ought to be considered individually as the product of local and *domestic* political concerns.”

From the beginning of his analysis of the Siphnian treasury with the eastern pediment, Neer refutes Watrous’ arguments for a comprehensive, Delphi-centric exposition on *hubris* in the sculptural program. Simply put, he finds no reason to believe that the dedicating community would fully relinquish control over the iconography of such an expensive offering. Furthermore, while the scene on the east pediment can certainly be argued to function as a political allegory, this reading is prompted entirely by existing knowledge of contemporary history and discord between Athens and Delphi. The sculpture
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91 Neer 2001: 287
itself lacks any innate quality that would suggest something more than a mythological scene relevant to the sanctuary. 92

Neer interprets the east scene on a variety of levels. With its hierarchical arrangement and Zeus as a mediator, he argues it reflects a functioning, ordered civic community. The myth itself, which ended in the opening of the oracle to all, is a fitting welcome to visitors entering the sanctuary from the east. For Siphnos in particular, the prominently displayed tripod, a symbol of epic and athletic victory, signals the Siphnians’ desire for elite achievement. 93 This latter point is especially important. The tripod, a symbolic dedication and prize for the individual elite since the early 8th century, is here co-opted for a community building; according to Neer, the east pediment “removes the tripod – a favored offering – from the realm of elite athletics and makes into a token of mediation within a larger community.” 94

Neer interprets the east and north frieze according to Siphnian political history as reflecting the balance between elite and common interests. On the east frieze, the gods and battling heroes of the Iliad are depicted side by side in a unified diptych. Neer restores the left portion of the gods with Hermes in the missing section holding scales to weigh the souls of the dead heroes. These scales would be small enough to fit the missing section, thus of the type used in the marketplace to weigh metal, and an expression of the Siphnian community

92 Neer 2001: 293-4
93 Neer 2001: 296
94 Neer 2001: 297
politics of shared revenue from mining operations. Balanced on the other side are the Homeric heroes, reflecting the elite theme of epic, single combat.95

The north frieze, in which Neer follows Mary Moore’s restoration, would have contained the Moirai, or Fates96, but a literal translation of the word could be ‘allotments,’ referring to the portion of silver distributed among the citizens. In front of them, Hephaestus literally throws ore at the enemy giants. The Siphnians had only the most basic military force, and may have felt a connection to the heroic style of warfare practiced by the gods on this frieze, as opposed to the standard Greek hoplite formation (which relied on the entire citizen population). However, the addition of Hephaestus and the Moirai suggests that this hesitance to develop a fully civic military philosophy is not incompatible with the community emphasis of distributed wealth.97

For the west frieze, Neer immediately questions the widely held identification of the Judgment of Paris. This interpretation, however, relies on the right-hand block, which does not survive, showing Hera with Paris. There are also issues with this on the blocks that do exist, as neither chariots, nor the unidentified male with Athena, are usually included in scenes of the Judgment of Paris. Instead, recent work on the left block has indicated that Athena leads this male figure to her chariot, suggesting the Apotheosis of Herakles, a popular scene in the Archaic period. If this block is indeed a self-contained
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95 Neer 2001: 312
97 Neer 2001: 313-14
representation of the apotheosis, then the frieze would depict two scenes (matching the west frieze), with the middle and right blocks forming a second, independent scene. Neer suggests the goddess in the middle is Artemis, palm fronds make Delos the setting (fittingly, as the birthplace of both Artemis and Apollo), and the scene would be her murder of the hunter Orion. While there is no comparable evidence to support this claim, it is no less likely than what would be an extremely unusual representation of the Judgment of Paris.

With the southern frieze, for which the smallest portion of blocks remains, Neer hesitates to assert any particular identification. The scene is clearly an abduction, with a male figure pulling a female away from an altar into a chariot, and a procession of horses and chariots continuing across the frieze. While identification of the specific abduction story varies widely, the exact identity of the figures does not matter in Neer’s assessment of the south frieze. With the inclusion of the altar, the abduction is clearly an interruption of a religious ritual. The dignified flight of the captors, however, suggests that this is not a crime against the gods like the west frieze depicts, but a sanctioned abduction. A ceremony may be interrupted, but it is for the greater good because of future benefit for the maiden and the gods.

Neer presents this as an allegory for the role of the treasury building itself. Storing votives in a treasury was not a challenge to individual dedicatory traditions, but a way to redirect such practices to support civic identity. Where
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98 Neer 2001: 318-9
99 Neer 2001: 322
100 Neer 2001: 323-4
the east and north friezes represented a balance between elite and common, the south supports the existence of the treasury by placing it within the balanced exchange between gods and mortals. The west frieze then would provide a counterpoint to this, depicting scenes of exchange in which a mortal is either punished or rewarded.

Neer concludes his paper by qualifying his analyses. The iconography of the sculptural program in the Siphnian treasury was likely not planned to represent a specific idea and achieve an overarching effect (like showcasing *hubris* to vilify the Athenians, as Watrous claims). Observable themes, rather, are a manifestation of Siphnian political and social values at the time of the treasury's construction, and a deliberate attempt to express these themes.

The methodological approach Neer takes in his analysis of the Siphnian treasury serves as an excellent foundation to reassess the structure specifically as a means to discern the political identity of the dedicating community. While Watrous' search for a political message is interesting, assuming that Siphnos had no bearing on the iconography is a fatal flaw, and entirely unlikely. The result of Neer’s efforts, his argument that the iconography reflects the balance between elite and general civic interests in Siphnos, has significant merit. If we take a step back, however, and do not assume that Siphnos was necessarily a polis, the sculptural program can be read slightly differently, as a reflection on Siphnos’ overall political identity, rather than simply the choices of its constituents.

The east pediment, first and foremost, suits beautifully the Delphic context of the treasury, a declaration of the Siphnians' piety. One of the first
things a visitor would see upon entering the sanctuary would be a myth in which Apollo retains his oracular power. The choice of this specific Delphic myth stresses proper civic order; Herakles attempts to upset the balance, but Zeus as arbiter restores the tripod to its rightful owner. Figures are scaled to fit the pediment, but also the hierarchy of the divine order. The subtext is that Siphnos understood the necessity of an organized society. The pediment below displays a common sculptural subject, and the gods watching the Homeric heroes shows a respect for the gap between the two worlds befitting the sanctuary setting. With Neer’s restoration of Hermes, there is a symbol particularly meaningful for the Siphnian donors, market scales used to weigh precious metals, the source of their great wealth.\textsuperscript{101} This takes a familiar scene with religious undertones (which Watrous recognizes), and introduces a specifically Siphnian element, aligning them with the epic tradition portrayed.

The north frieze presents a gigantomachy, a common choice for architectural sculpture. This Siphnian example, however, has many unique qualities, and provides more insight into Siphnian political identity than any other element of the treasury. The iconographic centerpiece of this eight-meter frieze must be the phalanx of the giants. To begin with, this is the only extant archaic Greek sculpture to depict a phalanx.\textsuperscript{102} Even in archaic pottery, there are only seven known examples of a phalanx.\textsuperscript{103} To display a phalanx at all is surprising, and clearly conspicuous; to display a phalanx in an apparently

\textsuperscript{101} Neer 2001: 297-302
\textsuperscript{102} Neer 2001: 303 (cf. Stewart 1997: 89)
\textsuperscript{103} Neer 2001: 304
negative manner is altogether astonishing. Fighting against the gods, these unquestionably evil, barbarian (they have eastern names) hoplite giants fight in the style that contemporary writers and modern scholars (Snodgrass) alike call the embodiment of the polis.\textsuperscript{104} This is, at the very least, a total rejection of a fundamental aspect of \textit{polis} values, if not of the \textit{polis} identity label entirely.

Neer focuses primarily on the gods’ side of the frieze, which complements this assessment of the giants. With Moore’s restoration of the \textit{Moirai}—linguistically associated with the Siphnian practice of distributing ore from their silver mines—next to Hephaestus, there is a unit within the charge of the gods with specific relevance to Siphnian politics. While Neer’s assessment of this element is sound and fits within his framework of elite and common, a more broadly political interpretation of the giant phalanx suggests a slightly different meaning, especially when one also considers the scales displayed prominently on the east frieze. While the Athenians (the \textit{polis} archetype) also had silver mines in this period that were ostensibly a community asset, they primarily funded Themistokles’ navy, suggesting a high degree of state control. Siphnos, on the other hand, actually distributed (albeit unequally) the majority of their mineral wealth, an equally communal with notably less political centralization.\textsuperscript{105}

Clearly the association of Siphnian distribution practices with the gods is a positive one, but not just for the elite allocating the precious metals. Rather, as a political process that is distinctively Siphnian (i.e. the opposite of Athens) and

\textsuperscript{104} Neer 2001: 304
\textsuperscript{105} Neer 2001: 308
central to their civic identity, this grouping may be interpreted with the scales on
the east frieze as a metonym for Siphnos, extending the positive sentiment to the
political system as a whole. At the same time, the western portion of the north
frieze portrays the military mainstay of the traditional polis, the hoplite phalanx,
in a manner that is at the very least contrary to expectation, and can be
interpreted negatively. Thus the allotments of silver represented by the scales
and Hephaestus glorify the unique nature of Siphnian politics, the treatment of
the phalanx shows a clear move away from the expectations of a *polis*, and the
two themes are united in a way that seems to contrast Siphnos with the
archetypal *polis*, Athens.

With the poor preservation of the west and especially the south frieze,
thorough assessment becomes much more difficult. Neer’s analysis of these
sculptural elements is fundamentally sound because it focuses on the blocks that
actually remain, rather than what images scholars think would have been there
to reinforce the scenes they think might have been displayed. Neer characterizes
rape, interrupting the ritual, as part of a “long-term transactional order.”
Essentially, what is seen as negative in the short term actually balances out and
is acceptable in the long term, because she and her family will receive eternal
glory.\(^{106}\) While Neer presents these two friezes as an allegory supporting the
treasury, they may also be reassessed in light of questions of political identity.

If the treasury was an alternative, for the good of the *polis*, from the
prevailing tradition of sacral and votive offerings, then Siphnos can similarly be

\(^{106}\) Neer 2001: 325
recognized as a deviation from the standard expectations of the *polis* for the
good of the Siphnian community. Essentially, what these friezes say is
“interruption of the norm is acceptable as long as it fits within a balanced system
of overall exchange.” If even the disturbance of a religious rite with rape fits
within a system of ‘long-term transactional order’, then political deviations from
the standard for the good of the particular community are equally sanctioned.
While Neer stops discussing allegorical deviation at the level of proper religious
conduct, it may also apply deviation from standard notions of the *polis*. This
secondary interpretation may be more distant from the sculpture than Neer’s,
but it responds to the same sentiment that different can be acceptable, and fits
with the political history of Siphnos and with the themes of the north and east
friezes.

Taken as a whole, the Siphnian treasury suggests a dedicating community
that understood itself to be fundamentally different from its contemporary
*poleis*. Neer makes a number of insightful observations concerning the political
interpretation of the treasury iconography. The scales in the hands of Hermes
draw attention to Siphnian success in commerce and their silver mines. The
Fates may be associated with the allotments of silver from the Siphnian mines. In
the Gigantomachy, Hephaestus throws ore, connected with the Siphnians, at the
hoplite giants; this is a positive association for the Siphnians with the gods, and
seemingly negative one for the hoplite phalanx, which is associated with the
malevolent giants. While Neer presents these observations in the context of
commerce, this study emphasizes their possible political meaning, that these
themes challenge preconceptions of the ‘proper’ *polis* and promote Siphnos as a unique, non-*polis* identity. These differences are not just expressed, but justified by the long-term transactional motifs (on the west and south friezes) and by the sheer opulence of the treasury, which was beyond any other dedication in the sanctuary.

The very action of expressing these differences, however, is a recognition of and engagement with the pan-Hellenic world, the sign of a dedication from a *polis*. The choice to dedicate a treasury, in the tradition of mainland *poleis*, may also suggest recognition of the pan-Hellenic community. Purely in terms of target audience, therefore, Siphnos should be classified as a *polis*. One cannot escape the fact, however, that everything else about the building seems to suggest that Siphnos resisted contemporary expectations of a proper *polis*, not to mention haphazard, modern definitions. The pan-Hellenic audience indicates that Siphnos cannot be termed an *ethnos*, but the iconography makes identifying it as a *polis* problematic.
Fig. 7 – The Siphnian Treasury: Reconstruction

Photo: Siphnian Treasury at the Sanctuary of Apollo
Archaeological Museum of Delphi. ARTSTOR AIC 970005
http://library.artstor.org/library/secure/ViewImages?id=8DlkFMoLTQzKQ%3D%3D
Fig. 10 – Siphnian East Pediment


Fig. 11 – Siphnian North Frieze Detail: Giants as Hoplite

Photo: Siphnian Treasury, North Frieze detail
Archaeological Museum of Delphi. ARTSTOR Lessing Art 10311441067
http://library.artstor.org/library/secure/ViewImages?id=%2FThWdC8hlywtPygxFTx5RnksX3wqe1w%3D
Conclusion

Even in a relatively brief study of these dedications in isolation, it becomes clear that to describe their dedicators all simply as ‘poleis’, is inadequate at best. While it is problematic to assign a political identity, ethnos or polis, on this basis alone, these three dedications demonstrate a clear range of political motives, intended audience and effect, and the expression of community values. It is precisely this breadth of factors, however, that shows how important it is to reevaluate issues of political identity and the emergence of the polis for many Greek states in the Archaic period. To base all arguments on discussion of dedications alone would be, in a sense, to approach these dedications out of context: they are extensions of the dedicators. Judgments about the political values of the dedicating community, especially when it comes to assigning distinguishing identities like ethnos or polis, must supported by archaeological data from the local area of each dedicator.
Chapter 3 – The Dedicators
Analytical Methodology
Before analyzing local archaeology on the islands of Chios, Naxos, and Siphnos, it is important to return to the assessment criteria (see figs. 1-3) developed in Chapter 1 based on the work of Morgan and Snodgrass.\textsuperscript{107} Two key elements in both of their criteria are monumentalization and urbanization. Both scholars agree that a \textit{polis} should have monumental public buildings: Morgan focuses specifically on civic structures and Snodgrass on temples, yet both seem to be strong archaeological criteria for defining a \textit{polis}.

For Snodgrass, a developed cult sanctuary with a monumental temple is a key indicator of the existence of a \textit{polis}; since he does not recognize the \textit{ethnos} as an established entity, urbanization, particularly in the form of such a temple, must always denote a \textit{polis}. Other archaeological features of urbanization, such as urban planning and house architecture, are difficult to assess in the archaeological record, and in any case may not be specific to a \textit{polis}. The presence of an urban center, without monumental public buildings, does not fall outside of Morgan’s criteria for an \textit{ethnos}. Morgan believes that an \textit{ethnos} can have an urban center, sanctuaries, and even temples, preferring to focus on the monumentalization of civic space and political buildings as the significant indicator of \textit{polis} development.

Snodgrass’ alignment of urban development with the \textit{polis} derives from his \textit{polis}-centric approach, and thus evidence of an urban center other than a monumental temple will not be used directly as an archaeological criterion in this study. Even so, such information is included where possible because it helps

\textsuperscript{107} Pgs. 21-7
to develop a comprehensive picture of each individual polity, and may also offer an interesting point of comparison between polities.

These two areas of monumentalization, one religious and one civic, are both significant *public* buildings – they are planned and funded by the community, for community use – and thus both have political importance and will be considered as criteria for a *polis*, as discussed in Chapter 1. Monumental temples are far easier to recognize in the archaeological record than civic space, therefore the presence of one will be the most valuable indicator in assessing political development.

How is a building to be recognized as monumental, when the concept of ‘monumental’ is inherently subjective? A basic standard will be the choice of construction material; while there are examples of large wood and mudbrick temples, a stone temple suggests an attempt to make a dedication to the gods that is visibly expensive and requires significant effort. Marble also represents a greater monetary investment than limestone or another local rock. Another consideration will be degree of craftsmanship; a temple of unworked stones clearly cannot compare to the carefully assembled blocks of many later Archaic and Classical temples. One final consideration is the location of the temple. De Polignac has shown that urban and extraurban sanctuaries both often have monumental temples. Constructing a basic stone building somewhere like a marble quarry, however, avoids the significant cost of transporting the marble or shipping in marble from a foreign quarry to build sanctuaries in urban areas.
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Ultimately, the key issues in monumentalization are the cost, the quality, and the level of effort and organization required.

**Evidence and its Limitations**

The following pages provide a reconstruction of the archeological history of Chios, Naxos, and Siphnos in the periods contemporary with their dedications as a basis for analysis of the political development of each island. In approaching the data collectively and synthesizing as much relevant data using the best information available, this chapter will offer hypotheses about political identity that are stronger than any isolated weakness in the dating or validity of specific objects or events.

Archaeological evidence is not without its limitations. The archaeological data presented here are restricted by the areas of these Cycladic islands that have been excavated. Most common are smaller settlements outside of the island’s main city and extraurban sanctuaries. While harbor towns and sanctuaries are useful, materials from the primary urban center are generally unavailable. Furthermore, many of the deposits come from very early in the Archaic period, significantly predating the 6th century dedications in this study.

Chronology is a second concern. Textual sources, stylistic dating of architectural fragments, and ceramic dating all contribute to establishing a chronology of the archaeological development at each site. Most dates are assigned based on the analysis and comparison of ceramic finds, a process that is often imprecise (especially for the early Archaic), and change as new information becomes available. The dates incorporated into this argument are the most recent
evaluations available and usually the efforts of the archaeologist who excavated and published the material; it would be beyond the scope of this paper to re-evaluate every one of these dates. Understanding the timing of construction is important in assessing political development, especially when the ultimate objective is to align this information chronologically with the Delphic dedications.

Given these limitations, the best solution is to look at all the local evidence collectively and avoid basing judgments on single examples that may not be the most reliable. To that end, a wide range of archaeological data will be included, presenting material evidence from the early Archaic to the early Classical period to show the trajectory of development over the course of the Archaic period. While some of the early finds from these sites are of limited value when considered in isolation, they will be included as a necessary part of that archaeological trajectory and support judgments based primarily on evidence that is contemporaneous with the dedications.

Contemporary historical accounts will supplement the material evidence. Historical information offers a different perspective in assessing political development and augments the political picture drawn from the archaeological remains. Historical data, however, though valuable, will be used with care. While resources like the historian Herodotus often provide excellent details about the history and politics of many states, the veracity of some of his statements is admittedly questionable. Herodotus at one point provides information about monumental buildings for which there is no other source. Historical references
to monumentalization that do not appear in the archaeological record must be treated cautiously, and in the context of whatever archaeological evidence does exist. Used cautiously, however, contemporary sources are useful in the way in which they present a general sense of a community.

**Naxos**  
*Archaeological Evidence*  
The site of Yria was a major cult site on Naxos as early as the Late Bronze Age, located in the central western part of the island. The earliest remains of a temple structure date to the 9th century. The building was small, roughly 5m by 10m, and constructed of mudbrick and wood with three wooden interior columns to support the roof. In mid 8th c, this first building was replaced by another temple, similarly constructed of mudbrick and wood, but three times the size (11m by 15m). This second temple had three rows of interior columns, also made of wood, but this time mounted on marble bases.\(^{110}\)

This larger iteration of the original temple structure lasted less than 100 years before it was significantly enhanced in the early 7th century. Building partly on the walls of the existing structure, the third phase of this temple reduced the number of interior column rows to the canonical two, though the columns themselves were again wood on a marble base. More importantly, this temple adopted a prostyle form, one of the first prostyle temples in Greece.

---

Based on a decorative marble waterspout associated with this temple, it seems likely that the façade would have been adorned with a terracotta frieze.\textsuperscript{111}

In the middle of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century, the temple was completely replaced by a new, monumental version. The new temple was 13m by 29m, a second expansion in the size of the temple at this site. The side and rear walls were granite; the roof and beams were made of wood; everything else was marble – the porch and façade, the columns, and even the roof tiles. The front wall of the temple featured a monolithic door jamb common in Cycladic architecture. The most significant feature of the new temple is the extensive use of marble, an important local resource, and an investment that made the building far more durable than its mudbrick and wood predecessors. Indeed, this iteration of the cult temple remained largely untouched until it was converted into a church in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century CE.\textsuperscript{112}

Another monumental temple was constructed about fifty years later at the site of Sangri, a few miles southeast of Yria. This structure sports a square floor plan of the type associated with the rites of the Thesmophoria, suggesting the temple was dedicated to Demeter.\textsuperscript{113} This temple to Demeter at Sangri outstripped the temple at Yria in its use of marble. Every wall, and even the roof beams and ceiling were constructed of the local stone. While initially scholars believed the temple to have Ionic columns on the exterior and Doric in the interior, recent study has shown the inner columns were most likely a variation
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of the Ionic capital adorned with a ring of leaves. This temple was also converted into a church, and much of it remains standing today.\footnote{Ohnesorg 2005: 138-41}

Also worthy of note are the recent, Archaic period findings at the marble quarry of Philerio, a few miles northeast of Yria. The quarry had a fairly well developed sanctuary located on a hill across from the main quarry, with the first cult structure dating to the late 8\textsuperscript{th} century. This building was small, 5m by 4m, with walls of irregular marble chunks (partially worked, but carefully constructed) and two marble column bases in the interior, similar to the bases at Yria, although fewer in number. A low terrace extended to the west of the building, and became the site of a larger structure in the third quarter of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century. The west wall of the first building was rebuilt as a shared wall with the new one. The plan of this building was unusual, with alternating acute and obtuse angles and walls of irregular length giving it the shape of a parallelogram. This second building bore the same style of monolithic, marble threshold found in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century temples of Yria and Sangri.\footnote{Lambrinoudakis, Vassilis. "A New Early Archaic Building on Naxos. Some Thoughts on the Oikos of the Naxians on Delos." \textit{Architecture and Archaeology in the Cyclades: Papers in Honour of J.J. Coulton}. Ed. Marina Yeroulanou and Maria Stamatopoulou. 2005: 82-83}

Another cult building appeared before the middle of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century down the southern slope from the first two structures. This was a small temple, a mere 3m by 4m, built entirely of megalithic marble blocks, and oriented towards the south, the direction of approach for the original cult buildings. A votive column base was discovered in situ at the northeast corner of the building. Interesting
small finds from this area (besides pottery) include numerous marble tiles (suggesting a marble roof), additional marble votive columns, and an unfinished votive sculpture of a sphinx. The proportion and rendering of the Sphinx – essentially in two dimensions – indicates an early date for this votive piece, which suggests that it pre-dates the sphinx at Delphi.116

A final feature of note from this site at Naxos is an eleven-kilometer long aqueduct, emerging from a large spring on the hillside and carrying water to the city of Naxos. A series of intermediate reservoirs allowed the aqueduct to also provide irrigation water for the fertile valley between the quarry and the urban center. Similarities between the pipes used for Naxian aqueduct and examples from Samos and Athens (the aqueduct of Peisistratus), led archaeologists to date the find to the late 6th century and the reign of the tyrant Lygdamis.117

Archaic History
Lygdamis provides an excellent transition into discussion of the history of Naxos. Not much is known of Naxian history as it developed over the course of the Archaic period. Rather, using references from various contemporary sources, it is possible to piece together Naxian history in broad strokes, with specific attention to its political history and the transition from oligarchy, to tyranny, to popular rule.

Lygdamis’ rise to power plays a central role in this transition. Before 550 BCE, Naxos seems to have been under the rule of oligarchs. Over the third quarter of the 6th century Lygdamis became increasingly popular, although he

116 Lambrinoudakis 2005: 83-4
117 Lambrinoudakis 2005: 80
only consolidated his tyranny with help from Peisistratos.\textsuperscript{118} Lygdamis’ reign was not long, and he was apparently deposed by the Spartans in 524 BCE.\textsuperscript{119} The next major event in Naxian politics was the expulsion of Lygdamis and other elite by the \textit{demos} c. 500 BCE.\textsuperscript{120} The context in which local elite might be exiled suggests, at least by 500 BCE, a level of political development consistent with democracy, if not indicative of a \textit{polis}.

Military statistics recorded by Herodotus seem to confirm this democratic status. Herodotus describes the Naxian military strength as consisting of 8,000 shields. According to Eric Robinson, the unusual terminology here seems to indicate a full citizen levy (rather than hoplites), poorly equipped, indicative of a newly democratic state. Additionally, Herodotus mentions a large number of Naxian warships. As always, the ability to crew a significant number of ships, and an even greater number of slaves or other individuals of low status to man them, is indicative of a highly organized political institution.\textsuperscript{121}

\textit{The Naxos Dedication in Light of its Contemporary History}

As discussed in the previous chapter, the Naxian Sphinx when examined in isolation suggests that Naxos falls closer to an \textit{ethnos} than a \textit{polis}. Though highly visible as the first monumental dedication from the Cyclades, the dedication does not, however, seem to focus on the pan-Hellenic audience. The choice of a votive column does not align with the mainland tradition of
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treasuries (like Siphnos), nor does it represent a significant feature of religious
function (like the Chian Altar) Rather, the monumental sphinx highlights Naxian
heritage in a way that suggests the intended audience for this foreign dedication
was likely the local, Naxian community. By this measure, it can be theorized that
the dedicating community is certainly culturally advanced, but has not yet
reached polis status.

Archaeological and historical data from the island of Naxos itself confirm
this assessment. Recalling the archaeological criteria for ethne and poleis, both
Snodgrass and Morgan place a great deal of emphasis on the level of
development at cult sanctuaries. According to Morgan, the development of a
local sanctuary tied to the state can indicate either an ethnos or a polis;
Snodgrass and Morgan' criteria regarding monumental architecture (discussed
previously), however, suggest that the monumentalization of any temple, even at
an already developed cult site, would be the work of a polis.

The cult site of Yria is a perfect case to which to apply this criterion. As a
continuously occupied site, the successive phases of its cult temple demonstrate
its importance to the Naxian community, a feature consistent with either an
ethnos and a polis. For around 300 years (9th to mid-6th c.), and despite three
phases of temple construction, expansion, and changes in layout, the temple
there was not monumental, but made of less permanent materials like wood and
mudbrick. Only in the middle of the 6th century did the Naxians finally build a
monumental temple entirely (or almost entirely) out of stone. The temple at
Sangri reinforces the chronological picture of the temple phases at Yria. Similarly
monumental, but slightly more opulent because it was built entirely of expensive marble, the temple at Sangri dates to around the end of the 6th century, about 50 years after the monumental temple at Yria. Thus the Delphian sphinx predates both temples, the one at Yria by a small margin, the one at Sangri by over fifty years.

Another cult building of note is the small marble temple at the quarry from Philerio. Constructed during the first half of the sixth century, it appeared roughly contemporaneously with the dedication of the Naxian Sphinx, and may have slightly preceded it. The greatest value of this structure lies in its votive contents. The numerous votive columns archaeologists found in and around the building set a religious precedent for the monumental column at Delphi. Even more excitingly, the temple contained a partially finished, votive representation of a sphinx. If, as Lambrinoudakis proposes, the relative stylistic simplicity of this sphinx in comparison to its Delphic cousin means the former predates the latter, then this suggests that the Naxians’ choice of a monumental sphinx on a votive column was rooted in their local religious tradition.

The basic chronology of Naxian archaeology in the 6th century corresponds at least approximately with political changes attested to by Herodotus and others. The rise of the tyrant Lygdamis would have occurred just after the dedication of the sphinx at Delphi, and roughly around the same time as the monumental temple at Yria. Though there is no evidence to suggest a connection between Lygdamis and this temple, a tyrant leveraging the political value of a monumental temple has a number of parallels elsewhere in Greek
history, with Lydgamis’ ally Peisistratos a notable example. Sometime in the last quarter of the 6th century Naxos fell under some sort of democratic rule, a political form closely associated with the polis, and at almost the same time or shortly after, the all-marble monumental temple at Sangri was built.

According to these dates and the criteria set forth, the chronology of Naxian development in the 6th century seems relatively straightforward. The Naxians’ dedicated their Sphinx at Delphi in a period of oligarchy, when cult sites were well developed but lacked monumental temples. Around the time when Lygdamis rose to tyranny on the later side of the middle of the century, the first monumental temple appears. After the tyrant is expelled and the demos takes control, an even more lavish monumental temple is constructed. Thus the polity of Naxos transitions from an ethnus to a polis, starting with Lygdamis’ rise ca. 550, and culminating in the manifestation of democracy around 500 BCE. Admittedly, much of this interpretation relies on the precision of archaeological dating, and thus is not indisputable. However, given the archaeological and historical data currently available, this theory explains the political identity of Naxos in the 6th century, identifies Naxos as an ethnus up until the middle of the century, and supports the previous, independent interpretation of the Naxian Sphinx as a dedication by an ethnus.

Chios
Archaeological Evidence: Acropolis
John Boardman’s excavations with the British School have covered the acropolis, a series of houses, and the harbor of the settlement of Emporio, an ancient town located about halfway up the eastern coast and within the modern
city of Chios. The houses and use of the acropolis generally predate the 
excavated features of the harbor, although some acropolis construction was 
contemporaneous. A rough overview of the relative chronology of these areas is 
as follows:

**Fig. 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8th c.</th>
<th>7th c.</th>
<th>6th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First signs of use</td>
<td>• Altar A (late 7th)</td>
<td>• Athena Temple and Altar B (mid 6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Earliest occupation of houses (late 8th)</td>
<td>• Remains of first temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Excavated temple dates to late 6th early 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Megaron Hall (mid 7th)</td>
<td>• Boardman recognizes 6 phases, 690-500 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Houses abandoned by end of 7th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the acropolis is a lightly enclosed area of about six acres. The wall 
itself is of very simple construction (Boardman even calls it “wretched”). It is 
about 2m thick throughout and is comprised of small stones that could easily be 
lifted or carried by a single person; stones are not faced, and are unevenly 
aligned. Boardman comments that he does not believe the wall could have risen 
more than 2m in height, given its rough construction. This was not, in his view, a 
wall designed to withstand siege, but a simple deterrent for small raiding 
parties.\(^{122}\) In any case, this wall effectively demarcated the acropolis peak from 
an early date.

The earliest small finds from the acropolis, decorated vase fragments and 
seemingly votive terracottas, date the earliest use of the area to the 8th century. 
The first major feature from the area is small stone platform. Boardman named

---

this feature ‘Altar A,’ although its function is in fact unknown. Materials\textsuperscript{123} in the fill surrounding Altar A date it to the end of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{124}

Within the enclosed area lay an early temple to Athena, which was built around the pre-existing Altar A. The attribution to Athena is based on a fragment of a plate bearing an armed female figure and the rim of a cup inscribed with the name ‘Athena.’\textsuperscript{125} The temple was a simple rectangular plan, about 10m by 6m, and had a shallow enclosed porch with a roughly square cela. As with the acropolis wall, construction of the temple appears to have been quite simple. The floor is not level-cut rock; instead, parts of the floor appear to have been filled in by excess building materials, while in other parts rock would have risen above the average floor level.\textsuperscript{126} The blocks of the walls, though worked, were of low quality stone, and not particularly large or well assembled. Overall, the building is characterized by its plainness, both in form and workmanship. Objects from deposits immediately below and above the temple floor – including black-figure Chian chalices from 575-550 in the former group, and a black-figure Chian kantharos from 550-525 in the latter\textsuperscript{127} – date the building to just after the middle of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{128}

Just north of the temple lay a second altar (Altar B), which Boardman assumes to be contemporaneous based on similarities in construction and the

\footnote{123} Fragments of early Chian chalices and a clay whorl of the same type as one found in the lowest levels elsewhere (Boardman 1967: 8)
\footnote{124} Boardman 1967: 9
\footnote{125} Boardman 1967: 23
\footnote{126} Boardman 1967: 10
\footnote{127} Boardman 1967: 17
\footnote{128} Boardman 1967: 12-17
lack of any other altar associated with this period. This altar was 2.5 m. wide by 7 m. long, and included only one or two courses (one in situ) leaving it about 1 m. high. Specific aspects of the use of this altar are unknown, as the area was very disturbed and no pottery was discovered.¹²⁹ Both the temple and Altar B would remain in place until they were rebuilt in the 4th century.

Flanking the acropolis wall stood the Megaron Hall – presumably named so because of its narrowness and similarities with this ancient type of building, although Boardman does not make this clear – a rectangular structure with a two columned porch and three columns in a row down the center of the main room. The overall length of the building is 18.25 m., with the width ranging from 6.40 m. to 6.85 m. The structure had a prominent position on the hillside, in full sight of the town, with views of the entrance to the acropolis and the Athena temple. The Megaron Hall resembles the latter in the simplicity of its construction techniques.¹³⁰ The interior of the hall was significantly disturbed, making dating problematic; Boardman settled on early or mid 7th century, based on a few pottery fragments with a heavy cream slip and the resemblance to the acropolis wall and temple. Boardman assumed a residential function of this building based on structural similarities with a large group of houses in the town to the west of the Acropolis wall.¹³¹

¹²⁹ Boardman 1967: 16
¹³⁰ Boardman 1967: 32-3
¹³¹ Boardman 1967: 34
Archaeological Evidence: Town

Here, in an area of about 10 acres, there have been over fifty houses identified. The houses take two basic forms, “megaron”-houses and bench-houses. The megaron-houses all face south and have the distinguishing two-columned porch with a doorway leading to a single room with a few (1-2) interior columns. The bench-houses were of poorer construction, and closely tied to the megaron-houses. Boardman references a particular example, in which the bench-house is placed on the existing terrace supporting the megaron-house, and even incorporates one of its walls into the new structure. A few finds from inside bench-houses suggest they were constructed after the megaron-houses. The construction of additional houses in an already populated area and making use of existing structures may indicate a population increase. Boardman suggests the former predate the earliest finds around the Athena sanctuary from the late 8th century. Small finds, none of which date to after the end of the 7th century, suggest the houses were mostly abandoned by that time.

Archaeological Evidence: Harbor

Occupation of the area of around the harbor, specifically its associated sanctuary, is significantly more complex. Boardman divides the occupation into six phases, covering a period from 690-500 BCE. The earliest remains are a temple of the 6th century, which is nearly impossible to reconstruct from the

---

132 Identified as houses based on the large number of almost identical buildings, and internal features like hearths, possible bed alcoves, and some domestic materials.
133 Boardman 1967: 35
134 Boardman 1967: 37
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minimal remains, a small deposit of worked stone underneath the floor of a later structure. This second temple dates to the late 6th or early 5th century, seemingly built to replace the older temple. The c. 500 BCE temple is of much higher quality than the Athena temple on the acropolis; it was made of Chian blue marble, with white marble inlay and other decorations.\(^\text{136}\) Interestingly, the altar connected with this temple has some notable similarities to the Chian altar at Delphi, specifically in the crown, and the general use of colored marble accents.\(^\text{137}\)

*Archaic History*

According to local tradition, the island of Chios was unified around 800 BCE by a king named Hector.\(^\text{138}\) Chios was blessed with a significant area of arable land, and seems to have begun producing high quality wine as early as the middle of the 8th century. Even at this early stage, much of this wine was likely produced for export. Distribution of pottery suggests that even early in the Archaic period, Chios enjoyed profitable trade with neighboring coastal cities like Old Smyrna and Erythrae. The Chian trade network grew substantially over the course of the Archaic period, and its people enjoyed great prosperity.\(^\text{139}\) The depiction of amphorae on Chian coinage from the 6th century demonstrates just how important wine export was to Chian society.\(^\text{140}\)

\(^\text{136}\) Boardman 1967: 68-82
\(^\text{137}\) Boardman 1967: 78-9
\(^\text{138}\) Pausanias 7.4.6
\(^\text{139}\) Roebuck, C. "Chios in the Sixth Century BC."
\(^\text{140}\) Roebuck 1986: 82-3
It is clear that Chiote society was developed enough to sustain extensive agriculture and support a large trade network of imports and exports. Roebuck assumes that land in Chios, as in most other Greek polities, was owned by both large and small-scale landowners, the former worked by laborers and slaves, the latter by ordinary farmers. The elite, large-scale landowners also likely played a significant part in trade. According to his argument, the lyric poet Alcaeus from nearby Lesbos provides an example of the small-scale island landowner involved with both sailing and farming grapes.\textsuperscript{141} While this is hardly a complete picture, the degree of social structure necessary to maintain this organization, even if it does not firmly indicate a \textit{polis}, certainly could support one.

The most valuable information about the political structure of Chios comes from the so-called 'Constitution of Chios,' a public inscription from the 6\textsuperscript{th} century. The stone was discovered in 1907, in the support wall of a modern road near the village of Tholopotami in southern Chios.\textsuperscript{142} Precise dating is uncertain and has been placed anywhere from 600 to 550, with the most recent estimation suggesting a date of about the 570s.\textsuperscript{143} The inscription mentions the political offices of the \textit{demarchos} in the singular and “kings” in the plural. The \textit{demarchos} was likely an important magistrate, given his treatment on this stone, and the later mention of popular councils suggests \textit{basileus} was little more than a civic title, possibly a holdover from ‘King Hector’ and past oligarchic rule. One thing that is clear from this fragmented inscription is the effort to keep political

\textsuperscript{141} Roebuck 1986: 82-4
\textsuperscript{142} Jeffery, L. H. "The Courts of Justice in Archaic Chios." \textit{The Annual of the British School at Athens} 51, 1956: 157
\textsuperscript{143} Jeffery 1956: 157-67 and Robinson 1997: 92
figures, namely the *demarchos* and *basileis*, under the purview of the *demos*. The inscription also mentions specific powers and responsibilities of both the assembly of all citizens, and a popular council, made up of 50 men from each tribe. Thus these two groups have a degree of influence that clearly indicates Chios was under popular control in the first half of the 6th century.\(^{144}\)

According to Herodotus, the Chians contributed 100 triremes to the naval battle against the Persians at Lade.\(^{145}\) Roebuck uses this figure to place the number of free men of military age at 20,000 (200 per ship), suggesting a total population of Chios at between 60,000 and 80,000.\(^{146}\) Even assuming Herodotus exaggerated and only 50 Chian ships were actually present, it still represents a significant political connection to the Aegean community. While a population of 80,000 would have Chios nearly rival Corinth in size, even a population of 30,000\(^{147}\) (not to mention tremendous wealth and trade networks) would make Chios a significant political and power in the eastern Aegean. By the close of the 6th century, Chios appears to have had a large population, tremendous wealth, and significant involvement in the pan-Hellenic world.

*The Chios Dedication in Light of its Contemporary History*

The next step is to compare the stage of political development implied by Chios’ Delphic monument with the archaeological and historical information from the island itself. As discussed previously, the primary factor in assessing the political identity of Chios though its dedication is the vital religious function

\(^{144}\) Robinson 1997: 90-101

\(^{145}\) Herodotus 6.8

\(^{146}\) Roebuck 1986: 81

\(^{147}\) A conservative estimate for 50 ships based on Roebuck’s calculations
of the altar. As a centerpiece of religious rites associated with the temple, the Chian altar was by its very nature unique. No other polity could duplicate this form of monumental dedication, and two inscriptions acknowledging the Chians meant that the altar’s origins could not be mistaken. To dedicate such an important religious feature at a pan-Hellenic sanctuary would have required a high level of cooperation with that pan-Hellenic community. Accordingly, the act of dedicating this altar suggests that Chios enjoys a high degree of political organization and awareness of its involvement in the broader pan-Hellenic community, features that would make it a polis.

The collection of archaeological data from the town of Emporio, published by John Boardman and the British School, contains few major indicators of political development. The first houses put the development of a local community to the 8th century at the latest, with continuous activity at the acropolis from the end of the 8th. While cult use of the acropolis begins at this point and there may have been an altar (Altar A) as early as the 7th century, the first temple was not built until the mid 6th century; although made of rock, the Athena temple is hardly monumental to the same degree as surviving temples on Naxos from the same period. As Boardman points out, all architecture from the acropolis and nearby town, from the 8th century to the mid 6th, is relatively simple: stone is roughly worked, if it is worked at all.

This information alone, particularly the poor quality of the ‘monumental’ temple to Athena, might suggest an ethnos rather than a polis; viewed in the larger context of the entire area, however, abandonment of the town coincides
with development of the harbor area, and the relatively poor quality of the
temple (built slightly after this transition) could be due to this shift in local focus
to the harbor. The monumental temple excavated at the harbor, dating to right
around 500 BCE, is significantly more opulent than its slightly earlier
counterpart on the acropolis. Even the first version of the harbor temple, which
was contemporary with the Athena temple, seems to have been of higher quality;
the worked marble pieces belonging to the former, while limited, are certainly
more extravagant than the roughly worked blocks of the Athena temple. When
the archaeological material is viewed collectively, the Athena temple represents
the continuation of cult practices on the Acropolis, with a new focus on the
harbor area leading to the construction of monumental temples here in the 6th
century.

Chian coinage (from the 6th c.) depicting an amphora is a good indicator
of the importance of trade to Chian society (and may explain the settlement shift
toward the harbor). Pottery distribution, as Roebuck argues, shows that Chios
had an extensive trade network with substantial import and export. Although an
ethnos could exhibit significant economic development, the ability of Chios to
sustain this level of trade indicates that by the 6th century it had reached a level
of social and political organization necessary for a polis to at least be possible
when the altar was dedicated. Herodotus’ hints at overall population and
military proficiency during the battle with the Persians at Lade, even if
drastically overestimated, suggest a level of naval organization usually
associated with strong, centralized poleis like Athens. The level of political, and
specifically military bureaucracy required to coordinate the conscription of sailors and the outfitting of warships also implies a *polis* state, based on the example of the Athenian navy. While referring to a point about a quarter century after the dedication of the Chian altar, and admittedly unreliable, Herodotus’ comments do suggest Chios is a *polis* rather than an *ethnos*.

The most politically illuminating historical find, however, is the ‘Constitution of Chios.’ According to the inscription, 6th century Chios was under popular control. There were important civic positions (the *demarchos*) and remnants of past monarchy or oligarchy (the *basileis*), but both were, as described in the decree, subject to the will of the people. Though there is no particular form of government that absolutely denotes a *polis*, the degree of democratic political organization suggested by the inscription certainly supports the archeological evidence for identifying Chios as a *polis.*\(^{148}\)

Archaeological evidence for a *polis*, the monumental temples from the Emporio harbor, both postdate (one slightly, one more significantly) the 570 BCE date of this decree. Thus over the course of the 6th century, from the ‘Constitution’ in 570 through the second harbor temple around 500 and the Chian fleet at Lade, multiple forms of evidence suggest that Chios was a *polis* when the Delphic altar was dedicated.

### Siphnos

*Archaeological Evidence*

Excavations on Siphnos at took place shortly before World War II under the supervision of the British School at Athens at sites in the modern town of

\(^{148}\) Robinson 1997: 95-101
Kastro on the eastern coast. Publication of excavation reports was delayed by the outbreak of the war and the subsequent evacuation of Greece. Due to these unfortunate circumstances, many of the objects discovered during the excavations were lost or destroyed. The excavations were published without the authors being able to return to the site to examine any of the remaining finds. Fortunately, architectural elements and many of the major finds were well documented and photographed, and thus J.K. Brock's presentation of the Greek portion of the excavation remains a valuable avenue to assess the nature of Archaic Siphnian society.

Construction of Medieval and modern buildings has destroyed the vast majority of Archaic and Classical materials, limiting the opportunity to assess the political and social nature of Siphnos in the Archaic period through any broad survey of the settlement. The focus of the excavations was almost entirely on Archaic materials from the acropolis, specifically the fortification wall, temple foundations, a votive deposit, and houses on the hillside. Given the importance of elements like worship and fortification to sociopolitical organization (mentioned previously), these isolated elements may still be of significant use to shed light on Archaic Siphnos.

Portions of the ashlar wall surrounding the ancient acropolis were still visible at the time of the excavation. The wall was constructed of regularly sized marble blocks, the use of marble being an uncommon and particularly notable feature. The exact height of the wall is unknown, with the current remains of six courses at most reaching about the level of the ancient foundations. Dating of the
wall is similarly imprecise. Excavations uncovered signs of construction and the cutting of marble in the middle of the sixth century, leading Brock to set this as a *terminus post quem*, while the disturbance of later buildings prohibits setting any certain *terminus ante quem*. Brock notes that the use of isodomic marble blocks is otherwise only found in buildings constructed after the Persian Wars, but suggests that construction was at least begun by the end of the 6th century, much closer to the *terminus post quem* and around the time of the Siphnian dedication at Delphi.  

Another important feature of the acropolis summit excavated by Brock was the foundations of an ancient building placed beneath medieval and modern structures. A modern church on the highest point of the hill limited the area that archaeologists could excavate, thus they only uncovered a few blocks of the foundation. They did, however, discover a sizable votive deposit of mostly 7th century objects, leading Brock to date the building, presumably a temple, to that century. More specifically, the finds from the votive deposit date from 700-550, but one or two objects seem to be even closer to the end of the 6th century. Brock’s hypothesis suggests further development of the 7th temple building or expansion of the acropolis in the mid to late 6th century. From the chips of marble found in the votive deposit, Brock suggests that the temple may have been replaced by a marble one. Additionally, similarities between the earth composition at the level of the marble in the votive deposit and one other

---
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undisturbed area at the base of the acropolis wall lead Brock to suggest that the 7th century temple was outfitted or rebuilt in marble at the same time as the acropolis wall, which he dates to the late 6th century.\textsuperscript{151}

One final structure, or series of structures, of note in the acropolis excavations is a series of houses (based on the discovery of numerous loom weights and whorls) dating to three different periods. A set of two, possibly three, Geometric houses by the western corner of the later acropolis wall date to the mid 8th century, based on Geometric pottery discovered in one. While it is difficult to assign a precise date to Geometric Cycladic pottery, this deposit certainly dates before the votive deposit in the acropolis temple.\textsuperscript{152} The houses follow a simple square layout and have their east walls built directly into a cliff face. The designation of these structures as houses rests primarily on the number of cooking vessels and loom weights discovered therein.

A second grouping of Geometric houses on the northeast slope of the hill dates to later in the geometric period, with an undisturbed deposit consisting of layers containing both Geometric and early 7th century pottery, suggesting that the house was constructed no later than the beginning of the 8th century, and occupied through the beginning of the 7th.\textsuperscript{153} Farther to the south another Geometric house was excavated, built in a similar style to the others. Pottery found at floor level here suggests a date of construction of the late 8th century with occupation through the middle of the 7th. Another house nearby breaks

\begin{itemize}
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\end{itemize}
from the pattern of geometric houses. Constructed with the same orientation but slightly larger and with a different layout, it has pottery deposits that date the house to the first half of the 6th century, considerably later than any of the Geometric houses.\footnote{Brock 1949: 15-16}

*Archaic History*

Information on the history of Siphnos in the Archaic period from contemporary sources is sparse. Only Pausanias and Herodotus discuss the Siphnians at this time, and even their statements are limited. Pausanias provides a brief explanation of Siphnian wealth as he passes their treasury in Delphi. They built the treasury building, he says, to house a tithe requested by Apollo (presumably through the oracle) in honor of the wealth of their gold mines. When they became greedy and ended their tribute, the sea rose and flooded the mines. The degree of Siphnian wealth widely acknowledged, and while Pausanias offers an interesting possibility behind the Siphnians’ decision motivation to erect a treasury, he reveals nothing significant about their Siphnian society or political organization.\footnote{Pausanias 10.11.2}

Herodotus mentions the Siphnians within the context of the conflict between the Spartans and Polycrates of Samos (3.57-58). While his discussion is thus somewhat limited, this establishes a fairly precise date of 525 BCE for the Siphnos that he describes. After the Spartans gave up their siege, Samian rebels who had fought against Polycrates fled and sought money from the Siphnians, who Herodotus says were at that time “at the height of their prosperity” and

\footnote{Brock 1949: 15-16}
“richer than any other of the island peoples.” ¹⁵⁶ Unlike Pausanias, Herodotus attributes this wealth to both gold and silver mines, and goes on to say that the bulk of this mineral wealth was shared annually among the citizens of Siphnos. He also suggests that one tenth of this output funded the treasury at Delphi, but does not give any more specific cause for its construction. The Siphnians, as in Pausanias, do consult the oracle, but they do so after the treasury has been dedicated to ask how long their prosperity will last. Herodotus also mentions that the πρωτόνειον (town-hall) and agora were adorned with Parian marble, a major civic investment and a significant display of wealth. When the Samian force attacked, Herodotus states the Siphnians were soundly defeated and lost 100 talents.

In his article on the Siphnian treasury, Richard Neer detours into a discussion on Archaic Siphnos. He attempts to go beyond the limited contemporary sources to assess the social and political importance of the mines through comparison with Athenian mining operations like Laureion. His first major point concerns extracting material from the mines, a job that in other Greek polities was always carried out exclusively by slave labor. The scale of the Siphnian mines and the size of the island suggest a high ratio of slaves to citizens. The practice of distributing the wealth of these mines would reinforce the distinction between the slaves working the mines and the citizens profiting.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Hdt. 3.58 (Translation by Aubrey de Selincourt, 1954)
¹⁵⁷ Neer 2001:306-7
Another consequence of this profit sharing would be a significant variance in the wealth of individual citizens. Again basing his arguments on comparison with practices at Laureion, Neer suggests that individuals, rather than the Siphnian state would have owned the slave workforce, and the wealthy elite would control the extraction of silver and gold. In attempts to distribute the wealth of the Laureion mine in Athens, the rich ended up with a far greater share than the average citizen, and Neer suggests the same result in Siphnos, highlighting the distinction between elite and commoner, along with citizen and slave. Even so, the very practice of annual distribution would reinforce community values for the Siphnian citizens.158

Neer also suggests an important difference between Siphnos and the Athenian mining at Laureion. In Athens, profits from the Laureion mines were taken over by the state to fund the construction of Themistokles’ navy. The ability of the Athenian government to assume public resources and repurpose them for military use at such a magnitude demonstrates a high level of control. Though the Siphnians did adorn some civic areas in Parian marble, they were complete unable to defend them against the Samian raid. Neer also points out that, while Athens minted coins with Laureion silver and Paros minted coins with silver from its mine at Thasos, the Siphnian government chose not to mint an appreciable number of coins with its silver. According to Neer, such comparisons suggest a considerably less centralized government than Athens.159

While it is certainly possible to accuse Neer of taking his arguments too far,
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given that he bases them mostly on assumptions and comparative data, he does point out some issues in the picture of Siphnos derived from Herodotus and Pausanias. Neer rightly focuses on inconsistencies, like the fact that Siphnos outfitted its civic space with expensive marble, but then could not repel an attack by a war-wearied band of Samians, and develops a plausible, political explanation.

_The Siphnos Dedication in Light of its Contemporary History_

The Siphnian treasury is easily the most complex of the examples under consideration. The choice to dedicate a treasury follows the precedent set by mainland and western _poleis_, showing a recognition of and participation in the tradition of the pan-Hellenic community. The iconography of the architectural sculpture seems to simultaneously address a pan-Hellenic audience, an indicator of a _polis_, and yet also characterize Siphnos as separate from that political community of _poleis_. The inherent contradictions make it problematic to classify Siphnos as a _polis_ based solely on this analysis, although the established criteria do suggest this identity. A basic overview of Siphnian archaeology and history in many ways reflects the very same issue.

The primitive houses on the slope of the acropolis are early enough and few enough that they cannot sufficiently suggest either a _polis_ or an _ethnos_, especially not for the late 6th century when the Siphnians constructed their treasury. The rest of the evidence from the acropolis has far more to offer. Votive deposits show continuous religious function, with the first monumental temple built in the 7th century and re-outfitted in marble in the late 6th, at the same time
as the acropolis wall. This monumental temple, especially the marble version, at a continuously occupied site matches a major criterion for the polis identity. The marble wall, while by itself inconclusive, adds to the monumentalization of the public religious space on the acropolis, and could be argued to fulfill Snodgrass’ polis criterion of civic fortifications.

Herodotus’ account of Siphnos verifies the trend of rendering important state architecture in marble, but introduces significant challenges to identifying Siphnos as a polis. His description of Siphnos refers to the agora and the πρυτανεία, a civic building, being clad in marble by 525 BCE, the date of the events he discusses. This example of monumental civic architecture aligns precisely with Morgan’s criteria for a polis, and would fit with Snodgrass’ standards as well. Subsequent events in Herodotus’ narrative, however, prompt doubts about the existence of a Siphnian hoplite army, which Snodgrass claims, “stands close to the heart of the idea of the polis.”¹⁶⁰ According to Herodotus, when the Samian rebels came looking for money, Siphnos was completely unable to defend its marble city and its mineral riches, suggesting the lack of an organized hoplite army. The Samians ravaged the countryside and forcibly took 100 talents from Siphnos. The contradiction is clear: how can Siphnos fully meet one major criterion of a polis, monumental public architecture, yet apparently lack another, a hoplite army? It is precisely this discrepancy that makes Siphnos such an interesting case study. While both the treasury at Delphi and archaeological and historical evidence from Siphnos itself provide major

¹⁶⁰ Snodgrass 2006; 243
indicators of a *polis*, they also contain notable features that make such a
designation problematic.

**Summary of Findings**

This study will conclude with a brief overview of each island polity and its
dedication. The Naxian Sphinx showcases the individuality of Cycladic and
especially Naxian culture. It does so, however, in a way that would have been far
clearer to Naxian visitors, suggesting that this group was the target audience for
the monument, and that the community of Naxos was an *ethnos* in 570 BCE when
the Sphinx and column were erected. At the island of Naxos, the appearance of
multiple monumental temples at previously occupied sites indicates a transition
from *ethnos* to *polis* in the last quarter of the 6th century, nearly fifty years after
the Naxians dedicated their Sphinx.

The Chian altar at Delphi is unique among the sanctuary’s dedications
since it was the only altar associated with the monumental temple of Apollo.
Dedicating such an important cult object would have required direct
engagement with the Delphic religious bureaucracy, suggesting a high level of
political organization and overall participation in the pan-Hellenic management
of the sanctuary. This external primary audience (not Chian visitors) suggested a
*polis* identity. The overall trajectory of archaeological and historical evidence
supported this designation. The appearance of monumental architecture slightly
before the altar dedication, and the sizable Chian navy slightly after the
dedication, both indicate a *polis* – thus it follows that Chios was a *polis* when it
constructed the altar of Apollo at Delphi.
The Siphnian treasury engages directly with a pan-Hellenic audience, with Siphnos representing itself in contrast to the standard, mainland *polis*. Based on the primary pan-Hellenic audience alone, Siphnos should be classified as a *polis*. The themes addressed in the iconography of the treasury, however, suggest that the Siphnians may not have fit with contemporary expectations of a *polis* and may not have considered themselves one. Historical and archaeological information gathered about the dedicating community presents similar contradictions: Siphnos seems to have had the monumental architecture of a *polis*, but lacked a hoplite army to defend itself from pirates.
Conclusion
Having analyzed the monuments from Naxos, Chios, and Siphnos and assessed contemporary archaeological and historical data, it is possible now to return to some of the questions raised in the introduction. Are dedicatory practices at Delphi a reliable indicator of the dedicators’ political identity? If so, what do the case studies reveal about the polities dedicating at Delphi? Finally, what has this study – centered on criteria to identify ethne and poleis – shown about the limitations of political terminology?

Do the monuments in this study suggest that dedications accurately represent the political identity of the dedicators? In theory, there should be a connection between political development and pan-Hellenic dedications. Peer Polity Interaction clearly points out the importance of cultural exchange through pan-Hellenic sites like Delphi. PPI has also been used to identify the pan-Hellenic community as the specific audience of polis dedications. Thus much of the focus on the dedications in this study has been on their target audience, and whether or not each dedication suggests pan-Hellenic engagement and polis status.

The test for the first question is fairly obvious – does the analysis of domestic data tend to support the assessment based exclusively on the Delphic dedication? Based on the case studies presented, it seems that examples of pan-Hellenic monumental dedication can be used effectively to shed light on questions of political identity. In the case of Naxos, initial assessment of the monumental Sphinx suggested that Naxos had not yet reached polis status, and was thus an ethnos. Archaeological and historical data, chiefly the accounts of Herodotus and the later date of the first monumental temples, also indicate that
Naxos was an *ethnos* at the time of the dedication, although the transition to *polis*
seemed to have happened little more than twenty years later at the time of the
construction of the monumental temple at Yria. With respect to the Chian altar,
its central religious function and the inscriptions it bears immediately suggests
that it was dedicated by a *polis*. Archaeological and especially historical
information from Chios itself seems equally clear about the island’s political
identity in the late 6th century.

The study of audience has highlighted that dedicators at Delphi may in
fact be either *ethne* or *poleis*. Analysis has indicated that the Naxian dedication
targeted a far different audience than the Chian altar. While the latter engages
with the pan-Hellenic community in such a way that Chios must be described as
a *polis*, the former seems to have been designed specifically to be more
meaningful to Naxian and Cycladic visitors than mainlanders. This focus on the
domestic rather than pan-Hellenic audience (supported by contemporary
archaeology from the island of Naxos) suggests that Naxos should most
accurately identified as an *ethnos*. Not all monumental dedications at Delphi,
therefore, are the work of *poleis* interacting with the pan-Hellenic community.

The interpretation of the Siphnian treasury presents an even more
complex case. From the beginning, fundamental contradictions are evident: the
sculpture of the Siphnian treasury addresses a pan-Hellenic, *polis* audience, but
suggests that Siphnos did reflect the Athenian model of a *polis* identity.
Contemporary archaeological and historical data fail to resolve this
contradiction. Archaic Siphnos exhibited a level of public monumentalization,
both religious and civic, characteristic of a *polis* according to both Snodgrass and Morgan, but lacked the middle class hoplite army (the very embodiment of a *polis*, according to Snodgrass) to defend it. Though less conclusive than the cases of Naxos and Chios, Siphnos is perhaps a more valuable sign that dedications can be a reliable indicator of political development. Not only does the political identity of the dedicator seem to manifest itself in the pan-Hellenic monument, but the dedication also acknowledges other elements central to those identities that may not be addressed in archaeological criteria, hinting at the variability in political identity.

The Siphnian treasury, with all the difficulties in defining it as a *polis*, demonstrates the limitations of political terminology. When not trying to apply to Siphnos an exact political identity like *polis*, the anomalies of its treasury and contemporary archaeology are far less confusing. It is possible that Siphnos is not trying to distinguish itself as a *polis*, but to establish itself a Cycladic polity, capable of pan-Hellenic interaction, that is unique in comparison to the mainland, Athenian archetype of the *polis*. This theory is consistent with the iconographic issues within the context of a monumental dedication that addresses the pan-Hellenic community. If the degree of civic monumental architecture on the island of Siphnos accurately represents a level of political development equivalent to a *polis*, then the relative military frailty may just be one of the ways in which Siphnos defies the traditional expectations of a *polis* as outlined by Snodgrass.¹⁶¹

¹⁶¹ Snodgrass 2006: 243-5
Why does the iconography of their treasury seem to set Siphnos apart from the contemporary polis standards? Siphnos, seemingly, is a polity that resists definition as a polis, especially according to Snodgrass’ criteria. Morgan points out “the failure of the political terminology in general use... adequately to describe and explain the variety of situations evident in the record.”162 Her solution is the recognition of alternative political identities and the adoption of terminology like ethnos. This study of Siphnos where alternative identities have been considered and archaeological criteria for defining the polis have been carefully laid out, demonstrates that attempting to distill the polis into specific and consistently present features is inherently problematic.

Siphnos exemplifies the danger of polis-centricity in the study of pan-Hellenic sanctuaries. If, as Snodgrass says, to dedicate a treasury is to be a polis, then why does Siphnos seem to lack a hoplite army?163 This study has shown that a polis-centric bias extends to realm of the pan-Hellenic sanctuary, building on Catherine Morgan’s similar efforts in early state development and general archaeology. Not only should some of the dedicating communities be recognized as ethne, Morgan’s political alternative to the polis, there are also polities involved in pan-Hellenic dedication that resist definition entirely. The political diversity among Greek states in the Archaic period is too significant to categorize them all as poleis. Political development and identity seem to be reflected in monumental dedications at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries, and so to study these dedications in terms of the polis only is to ignore a productive avenue of study.

162 Morgan 2003: 4-5
163 Snodgrass 1986:54
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