Symbolic and Pragmatic Aspects of Warfare in the Greek World of the 8th to 6th Centuries BC

Catherine Morgan

For over sixty years now, discussion of hoplites has taken pride of place in the study of Early Iron Age and Archaic Greek warfare. The emergence and military significance of the phalanx tactic have attracted particular interest, but attention has also focused on the social role of hoplites in relation to the rise of the *polis*, and to a lesser extent, in forging overseas links via mercenary service (see, e.g., Andrewes 1969 ch.3; Cartledge 1977; Forrest 1966, 88-97, 104-22; Holladay 1982; Salmon 1977; Snodgrass 1965; Snodgrass 1980, 99-107; Snodgrass 1993; Bowden 1993). That the political significance of military service has consistently been considered alongside strategy and tactics is one of the most positive aspects of this approach, since early soldiers cannot be isolated from the 'civilian' societies of which they were members. Yet the general direction of most approaches to hoplites, and more specifically, assessment of their role in the political context of the polis, tends to produce a partial and biased view. An increasing weight of archaeological evidence from regions such as Thessaly (which lay outside the confines of the polis world as conceived in modern scholarship and only rarely enter into discussion of early warfare), combined with growing recognition of the need to consider Greece within its wider Mediterranean context, presents a highly complex picture. Furthermore, as Victor Davis Hanson has stressed (1991a, 7-11), the experience and attitudes of fighting men, amply attested through Archaic poetry and their own treatment of equipment and booty, must play a more influential role in assessing the nature and social impact of early warfare.

At the heart of this problem lies the model of hoplite reform, developed initially through the 1920s by Martin Nilsson (Nilsson 1929) and archaeologically elaborated by Hilda Lorimer (Lorimer 1947). Both saw the adoption of equipment and tactics as a sharp change, and one inextricably linked to socio-political developments, especially the rise of tyranny. Various aspects of this equation have long been debated, and in recent years the entire model has been subject to extensive methodological criticism, to the extent of being described by Frank Frost (1984, 293, citing the work of Anthony Snodgrass and Robert Drews among others) as 'among the great non-events of history'. Objections have been raised to the treatment of archaeological data, and especially to the conflation of material evidence from different regions, and to treatment of ceramic iconography which disregards function and syntax (Morgan 1999a, ch. II.4; van Wees 1994, 138-46).[1] Equally, critiques have focused on the mismatch between an idealised 'hoplite class' and the variety of social and economic statuses represented within the phalanx (Foxhall 1997; van Wees, this volume), and also on evidence for massed combat in Homer and the Archaic poets, with very varied assessments of its nature and role (Latacz 1977; Hanson 1991b; Pritchett 1985, 7-44; Snodgrass 1993, 47-56; van Wees 1994. Raaflaub 1997 further assesses the implications of such critiques).

It is not my intention here to revisit such well-trodden ground. Instead, I merely note that even though important insights have emerged from more broadly based

assessments of the role of military force in early Greek poleis, there is surely more to be gained from setting them within the context of the wider Mediterranean world. Indeed, the intensity and complexity of interaction between individuals and communities ostensibly very different in character is one of the most striking features of our period, before any oppositionally defined Hellenic identity acquired political salience (Purcell 1990; Hall 1997, 40-51). Depending on the purpose of a particular conflict, it would surely be wrong to underrate the significance of factors such as demographic mobility and shared social codes for the organisation and role of warfare. War of conquest, for example, is attested in a variety of forms in the early Greek world. Territorial acquisition is exemplified by the Spartan conquest of Messenia (Cartledge 1979, 113-19; Morgan 1990, 99-103), and the obliteration (or near so) of a single community following the sack of Asine (Pausanias 2.36.4-5; 3.7.4; 4.14.3; Frödin & Persson 1938, 15-20, 149-51, 437).[2] By contrast, war can serve both as a mechanism for structuring external and internal relations and as an economic opportunity with significant implications for manpower mobility, the manufacture and circulation of equipment, and the circulation of men and material wealth as booty (discussed generally by Fried 1968; Carman 1994; Keegan 1993, ch.2; in the case of the Maya by Freidel 1986; in Greece by Rihll 1993). In this last sense, war is a continuation of commodity trade and gift exchange by other means.

It is these last issues, and specifically the contribution of the material record to the understanding of early warfare, which lie at the heart of this chapter. The following discussion will review the distribution and treatment of military equipment across Greece in an attempt to trace common traits as well as distinctive local patterns of behaviour. Arms and armour will be seen to have been regarded more as commodities, valued for their metal, than as symbols of the role of military force in defining personal status and group identity. Previous associations between patterns of deposition in graves and sanctuaries and emergent polis identity thus require a more nuanced approach. Stressing the contrast between material behaviour and social values, the place of warfare in defining aristocratic status is considered in the ostensibly different cases of Athens and Thessaly, revealing striking simi-larities transcending political boundaries. Finally, human mobility is considered as an integral part of the socio-economic organisation of warfare.

However, before moving to consider archaeological interpretations, it is worth pausing to note important historiographical questions arising from traditional approaches to the hoplite reform. As formulated by Nilsson and interpreted at least as late as the 1960s by scholars such as Forrest and Andrewes, the reform model may seem to owe more to contemporary experience of European military dictatorships and their mobilisation of the middle classes than to Aristotle (*Pol.* 1297b16-28). Yet while the direct intellectual impact of such experiences may wane with the passage of time, certain perceptions of the role of force in a legitimate political society appear more deeply rooted. Plato's notion (*Leg.* 625e-626e) of the constancy and centrality of war for Greek states, the relationship between war and law, and the meaninglessness of peace as a concept, may seem to foreshadow Hobbes' discussion of Warre (Hobbes 1651, ch. 17 [noting also Tuck 1991, xvi-xvii]). At least in the Archaic and Classical Greek world, peace was not a well defined concept but at best a utopian ideal ('more propaganda than religion' according to Burkert 1985, 186; Shipley 1993, esp. 19). Even in Athens, which has provided our fullest and earliest evidence, the personification of Peace appears first in the works of Euripides and Aristophanes in the last quarter of the fifth century, and her cult is attested only in the fourth (Stafford 1998, ch. 6; Spiegel 1990, 99-125; Shapiro 1993, 45-50). It is, however, a major step beyond this evidence to accord order maintenance the same central place as it is assumed to hold within modern state systems, and to suggest that early Greek states can be seen in Weberian terms as those agencies within society which possess a monopoly of legitimate violence, thus removing force from the hands of private individuals or sectarian interests (Weber 1978, 901-10). There are certainly cases in the modern record where this monopoly, if it existed, was not exercised, although this is usually interpreted as a matter of expediency, or a failure of will or means, rather than as a challenge to the theoretical ideal or perception of entitlement (Gellner 1983, 3-4). In the case of early Greece, however, a number of scholars (notably Frost 1984, discussed below), have cast doubt on whether specialisation

of order maintenance really was a major function of states, a view that accords well with a recent trend (exemplified by Foxhall 1997, 118-22) towards diminishing emphasis on institutions *per se* in favour of concentration on the diverse rôles of the elite who ran them. This is not to deny that warfare was central to Greek society, but rather to suggest that its complex and varied nature entwined it inextricably with many other areas of thought and activity, making it important to understand the relationship between the value structures inherent in each. To deal fully with this question requires detailed consideration, case by case, of issues such as the balance of force and other 'control' devices such as law or divination (Morgan 1990, 151-58; Hölkeskamp 1992; Osborne 1997; Thomas 1996). Also related is the role of sanctuaries in articulating these connections, for example as contexts for the display of written law (Effenterre 1994) or booty, and possibly also for the hiring of mercenaries. These are important issues for research, although beyond the immediate scope of this chapter.

The treatment of equipment in *poleis* and *ethne*

In view of the perceived connection between warfare and polis formation, it is of obvious interest to compare archaeological evidence from regions of Greece characterised in modern scholarship as *poleis* and *ethne*. Before doing so, however, it is worth pausing to examine certain preconceptions about differences in the role and conduct of warfare in such regions. Drawing largely upon Thucydides' description (1.5-6) of endemic raiding in fifth century Aetolia, Akarnania and Lokris as typical of the politically and socially primitive conditions of previous centuries, a variety of historians concerned with constitutional development, from Victor Ehrenberg (1969, 22-24) to Jacob Larsen (1968, 6-7) and Giovanna Daviero Rocchi (1993, 107-12), have stressed piracy and individuals' carriage of arms as symptomatic of a lack of secure authority outside the confines of the polis, and thence suggested that *ethne* in general lacked the political structures that would enable warfare to be brought under state control.[3] Clearly, there are fundamental historiographical problems in assessing the extent to which Thucydides' generalities were based on detailed knowledge of the regions he describes and/or were conditioned by their rhetorical context (Hansen 1997a; Hornblower 1991, 23-25 and pers.comm.). Criticism should indeed be levelled against such far-reaching interpretation of Thucydides' very brief remarks, although it may be noted that occasional comments by other (generally later) authors could also be seen in the same light. In the case of Achaia, for example, Pausanias (7.7.1) remarks on the fact that (with the exception of Pellene) the disasters of war and pestilence touched the region less than any other part of Greece, and that (7.6.3-9) Achaia was only very selectively involved in other Greek conflicts.

Yet connecting these references and selectively citing post-Geometric archaeological evidence for supposedly different patterns of treatment of arms and armour in ethne carries the real danger of creating a false picture. Every aspect of this equation has a wider context and alternative explanations. To take but one example, the early seventh century panoply burial at Ag. Konstantinos in Arkadian Azania, near modern Kalavrita (*Delt* 17, 1961-62, 131-32, pl.156) has been cited (e.g. by Snodgrass 1980, 100) as evidence for the continuity in ethne of burial with arms, a practice which in future poleis had ended in Late Geometric (an argument discussed further below). But this is a unique case in an area where most other Archaic and early Classical graves contain only pottery, and given continuing research in this area, it is increasingly hard to dismiss this pattern as bias of discovery (Morgan 1999b, 416-24). Equally, in Achaia immediately to the north, where Archaic burials are somewhat more plentiful (albeit often disturbed; Morgan and Hall 1996, 169-93), only one grave from a group (dating *c.* 700 BC or slightly later) near Kato Mavriki (possibly a deme of Aigion) contains weapons, a late Naue III sword and an iron knife (Kourou 1980). Two isolated cases, barely post-Geometric, hardly suggest a continuing practice. Offensive weapons do continue to appear in graves in certain specific areas, albeit often for particular reasons (see below). But it must be emphasised that significant collections of weapons, let alone panoply burials, are exceptional wherever and whenever they oc-

cur, be it eighth century Argos (where the evidence for three panoply burials from the Theodoropoulou and Stavropoulou plots and Tomb 45 of the Odeion area, dating from LGI onwards, is summarised by Foley 1988, 86-88), seventh century Achaia or Eretria (the Heroon at the West Gate; Bérard 1970), early fifth century Corinth (where the earliest evidence for defensive equipment, a bronze helmet and fragments perhaps of a cuirass or boots, appears in Grave 262 of the North Cemetery; Blegen et al. 1964, 215-16; Dickey 1992, 91-92), or fourth century Athens (Kolonnos Hippios: Alexandri 1973). To find a break in this pattern one has to move far north into Macedonia (e.g. Sindos from the sixth century onwards: Snodgrass 1999, 138-39; or the contemporary cemetery at Ag. Paraskevi near Thessaloniki: Sismanidis 1987, e.g., pl. 164:1), a region closer to Thrace in this respect (Archibald 1998, ch. 8). Further south, not even a remote area like Azania, regarded by ancient commentators as a particularly wild, primitive and ill-known part of Arkadia (Pikoulas 1981-82; Heine Nielsen & Roy 1998), is an exception.

As noted, offensive weapons are more common than defensive in Archaic graves, and do indeed tend to occur in areas conventionally described as ethne. Nonetheless, even by contrast with the already patchy eighth century picture (further discussed below), their distribution is restricted, and certain militarily active regions (such as Thessaly)[4] have produced relatively little evidence. As comparison between Thessaly and Epirus highlights, the deposition of weapons in graves tends to occur in regions which show high levels of metal consumption overall, and while it may reasonably be argued that these weapons reflect a continuation of earlier gender symbolism, the decision to include them in graves is surely symptomatic of an attitude to a resource rather than to warfare per se. In Epirus, preliminary excavation reports of the Archaic and Classical cemetery on the Ioaninna University campus indicate that, regardless of grave type or date, male burials (including some child graves) usually contained at least one spearhead and a knife (often a strigil too), while women had jewellery and often phialai.[5] Whilst it would be unwise to generalise from preliminary accounts of a small sample of graves, the fact that some burials contained few or no goods implies some hierarchy of resource disposition, although it is not yet possible to identify how this operated. The location of the cemetery in a small gorge meant that burials were densely packed together and often cut into each other, and under these circumstances, later, fifth and fourth century, evidence tends to be best preserved, with most Archaic finds displaced into fill between graves. There are at least two instances where Illyrian helmets were used as ossuaries; one, however, is a child burial (tomb 52), and since children were usually buried in vessels, it is unclear whether the helmet was more than a convenient receptacle (Delt 32, 1977, 151). Archaic finds, which include many iron spearheads, knives, strigils and tools, along with much bronze sheet and such luxuries as a late seventh century griffin protome (Delt 31, 1976, 209), suggest no fundamental change from Classical practice. Immediately north of Ioannina, the Vitsa cemeteries present a broadly similar (if less rich) picture (Vokotopoulou 1986, 291-305). In view of the Early Iron Age weapons finds from this cemetery, discussed by Randsborg in this volume, the extent to which Archaic mortuary offerings represent a basic continuity of values is a matter of some interest. It should, however, be noted that Archaic evidence from both sites dates mostly to the sixth century, and the seventh is still poorly represented throughout Epirus. Furthermore, since exploration in the region as a whole is still relatively limited, it is hard to assess the significance of the fact that at present, rich metal finds in graves seem to be largely confined to these two extensive cemeteries in one small part of the region. A late sixth or fifth century grave at Prakio, Koutseli contained one Illyrian helmet (Delt 23, 1968, 292), but isolated graves elsewhere have not produced weapons. In other regions, such as Thessaly, Phokis, or Lokris, where metal offerings per se decline, there is also a marked post-eighth century decline in weapons burials, and the few exceptions which prove the rule are significant phenomena in their own right (as will be discussed).

An obvious and simple explanation for the rarity of military equipment in graves is its cost and inheritance value. Our earliest piece of direct evidence for equipment costs is a late sixth century Athenian decree (ML 14), according to which Kleruchs on Salamis were obliged to provide their own arms to the value of 30 drachmae. If this is a fair reflection of the level of expenditure normally required by an average hoplite (and as-

sessment of the wider literary tradition would tend to support this; Jarva 1995, 148-54), then the equipment itself must have been of some monetary worth, quite apart from the symbolic value of inheritance within the family. There is therefore no absolute necessity to infer any accompanying change in statements of military values *per se*, be they direct expressions of personal interest or identification with particular divine characteristics, but at best a change of means. Miniature terracotta and bronze arms and armour continued to be dedicated at a wide range of sanctuaries, including a significant number sacred to Apollo or located in regions such as Arkadia where mercenary service was an important economic activity (see below). Equally, military imagery is prominent when painted or sculpted decoration becomes popular in elite tombs from the fourth century onwards, most strikingly in the lunettes of the Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles (*c.* 200 BC) which may represent an array of typical equipment or captured trophies, and thence apotropaic, status and triumphal values well paralleled in other public, non-funerary contexts (Miller 1993, 48-59).

Yet while the practical and financial aspects of resource management were clearly very important, one should not forget the ideological stress on metal stemming from the symbolic/moral qualities conferred by its gleaming brightness—a consistent theme in literary sources from very early times (Constantidou 1992). Hence for example, Homeric images of brightness (*Iliad* 19.359-63; 14.340-3), developed to the point of fantasy in the description of the equipment of certain heroes (van Wees 1994, 131-37), or the description of the mercenaries who aided Psamettichus as 'men of bronze' (Herodotus 2.152). In a much-cited passage, Alkaios (Lobel-Page Z34) refers to the gleam of the armour and weapons hanging in the great hall, a description which, while sometimes taken as evidence for the state of contempo-

rary equipment (Page 1955, 209-33), surely shows a romanticised appreciation of the equipment and the heroic status it implies (Burnett 1983, 123-26; van Wees 1995, 148-54). The basic context of display and the status thus reflected are plausible enough. As Page points out (1955, 222), Alkaios' description bears comparison with Herodotus' reference (1.34.3) to weapons hanging on the wall of Croesus' palace. And if Viviers (1994, 244-49) is correct in his interpretation of the so-called 'sanctuary' at Afrati on Crete as an *andreion*, with the rich arms finds from the site (Hoffmann and Raubitschek 1972, ch. V) hung on its walls rather than offered as votives, then we would have a rare and striking archaeological instance of what may have been a much wider phenomenon. It is rather the heroic tone of Alkaios' description that places it in a register above the straightforwardly documentary.

Finally, it is worth citing one passage which, while ostensibly reflecting a very different attitude to the value of equipment, also fits within the context of this close equation of practicality and morality. In *Ep.* 6, Archilochus describes how he discarded his shield to save his own life, accepting that the shield is now the property of one of his Saian adversaries. As Burnett notes (1983, 41-42), the juxtaposition of the anti-heroic and the realistic, of shame and practicality, highlights the difficulty faced by the poet in choosing life over an outdated form of honour. The significance of this choice is also reflected in the tradition (spurious or not) reported by Plutarch (*Moralia* 239b) that it was this action that caused the Spartans to drive Archilochus out of their territory when he travelled there, since Sparta, where the suppression and defence of a conquered territory lay in the hands of an armed minority, is precisely the region where one would expect to find old values, equating valour with preservation of equipment, most keenly defended.

The significance of dedication

In short, whereas there is no apparent diminution in desire to symbolise what arms and armour represented to those who used them, when it came to disposing more or less permanently of a valuable resource, in a wide vari-

ety of Greek communities practicality, and thence morality, intervened. And so like many truisms, the view that ethne continued to bury arms and weapons after southern poleis had ceased to do so presents a basic truth

in a highly deceptive fashion. In view of the unevenness of the picture and the complexity of likely underlying factors, it is dangerous to seek an explanation in terms of fundamental political differences in attitudes to warfare. Nonetheless, Anthony Snodgrass, for example, has sought to trace a relationship symbolic of emergent polis values in the apparent chronological coincidence between the decline in burial with arms in a number of early poleis, the introduction of the hoplite panoply and the transfer of metal dedications to sanctuaries (see most recently Snodgrass 1980, 53-54, 99-101). In particular, he stresses the communal-symbolic dimension of the decision to deposit those items of equipment deliberately removed from circulation in the public context of the shrine rather than the private context of the grave, and regards this as a recognition of a communal, state, right to a monopoly of force. Yet apart from difficulties with the concept of monopoly of force raised earlier, and also the negative fallacy of implying that states which did not match up to this 'polis' ideal were somehow retarded (Archibald forthcoming), there are significant chronological problems with this proposition.

Arms and armour dedications do indeed appear during the late eighth and early seventh century at a number of shrines belonging to single communities or regions (whether or not one regards these as poleis), including Ano Mazaraki (Gadolou 1998), Kalapodi (Felsch 1987, figs. 18, 19) and Aigina (Maaß 1984). Yet they are by no means as popular as at Delphi (Perdrizet 1908, 98-99: Kilian 1977) and especially Olympia (Kunze 1956; 1958, 118-38; 1967b; 1991, 7-23; 1994; Jarva 1995, 111, fig. 61), and numbers generally remained low at all of these shrines (Olympia included) at least until the latter part of the sixth century (see also Pritchett 1979, 290-91 on inscribed dedications). At Isthmia, for example, the only Corinthian shrine to receive arms and armour in any quantity, the earliest three items date around the very end of the eighth or the early seventh century (Jackson 1999), but finds remain rare until the sixth century. This is striking when one considers that in the Corinthia as a whole, the almost total disappearance of grave offerings from the mid-eighth to the late seventh century (Dickey 1992, 101-8) left shrines as the principal, if not the only, contexts for the display of wealth, status and group affiliation (Morgan 1994)—and when grave goods resumed,

they included occasional instances of weapons (notably the fifth century panoply burial noted above). At Isthmia, the second half of the sixth century and the first decades of the fifth saw a peak of armour and weapons dedications. Over half of the extant helmet dedications made before the temple fire of c. 470-450 BC (over 130 of at least 200 which survive in very fragmentary condition) date after 550, for example, although no evidence has yet been discovered of types which developed after the 470s (Jackson 1992). Furthermore, in cases such as Isthmia or Olympia where the sample is comparatively large, there seem to have been a bias towards particular pieces of equipment, especially helmets and to a lesser extent, shields, which does not compare with earlier patterns of funerary offering (Jarva 1995, 111-12; cf. Snodgrass 1999, 136). This pattern of dedication is not unusual, although in the case of Isthmia it is necessary to consider the factor of the shrine's panhellenic role following the foundation of the Isthmian Games c. 582/0. Alastar Jackson (1992) is surely right to attribute both the extent of sixth century armour dedication and the swift decline in the post-Persian war period (echoed at Olympia) to this international aspect (although when one considers armour in the broader context of votive behaviour it is also necessary to take into account the general decline in votives during the fifth century discussed by Snodgrass 1989-1990). In short, if the evidence for a rapid symbolic removal of warfare from the private to the collective domain is as tenous as this in a region which has produced, in the work of the Macmillan Painter, what is sometimes seen as the earliest visual evidence of any form of phalanx[6] (and certainly a diverse collection of early military imagery)[7] then it is hard to think of a better case elsewhere. Indeed, the extent to which evidence is focused on a few key sites, and especially Olympia, at least through the seventh century, is a matter of some note.

As Snodgrass (1980, 100-2) acknowledges, this shift in the context of weapons dedications may reflect a concern to conserve resources, not least since it allows a freer choice of occasion. But clearly, even allowing for local variation, this was at best a more gradual process than might be implied by a simple interpretation in terms of state-politics, and one which should be nuanced by consideration of interrelated symbolism in other contexts.

Displays of equipment in the halls of the elite, as mentioned above, which are most unlikely to be represented in the archaeological record (Afrati is at present unique), should not be overlooked. Equally, it would be a mistake to reject death as a continuing context for military symbolism, and the assumption of translatable meaning in dedications at 'public' sanctuaries and 'private' graves is not so clear. It is therefore worth exploring the role and meaning of military dedications in these two contexts more fully, to assess the extent to which they represent different strands of behaviour or different nuances within an overarching complex of elite values.

It is certainly true that personally owned equipment could be dedicated at sanctuaries, but in so far as we have direct evidence for the purpose of such dedications, they are generally given as thank offerings or prayers seeking reciprocity from the deity. Thus, for example, two epigrams of Simonides preserved in the Palatine Anthology record the dedication of a bow used in the Persian wars (Bergk 143) and a soldier's dedication to Zeus Panomphaius of an ashen spear, its point worn by long use in battle (Bergk 144), and an epigram by Anacreon (Bergk 107) celebrates the dedication to Athena of a shield which had protected its owner, Python. A helmet dedicated to Zeus at Olympia bore signs of wear (Jeffery 1991, 229), and an inscribed bronze strip (*SEG* XI.1214, dating to the third quarter of the sixth century and probably, but not certainly, from Olympia) may be a label attached to a dedication of arms by the Spartan Eurystratides, and bore the formulaic prayer for reciprocal reward 'do thou also give grace'.

Yet such cases are few in number when compared with dedications of booty (captured weapons or material goods or ransom acquired after battle) which account for the great majority of military dedications especially from the sixth century onwards (Jackson 1991; Pritchett 1979, 290-91). There is no reason to assume that these automatically carried communal significance. The stripping of bodies for personal gain was a battlefield practice of long standing, attested from Homer onwards (Pritchett 1979, 277-78), as also the ransoming of prisoners. Such practices may indeed benefit the community as a whole. Thus, for example, an inscription from the Athenian acropolis (Raubitschek 1949, no. 168, *c.* 505-500 BC) records the erection of a monument funded by a tithe of the ransom paid for those taken prisoner after an Athenian victory over the Chalkidians and Boiotians which, if it is that described by Herodotus (5.77) when 700 Boiotians and an unknown number of Chalkidians were captured and ransomed for 2 minas each, was one of the first major victories by the new democracy and the first to be publicly commemorated in this way. Nonetheless, since there is ample evidence that these practices continued to enrich individuals (see e.g. Miller 1997, ch. 2 on Persian War spoils), there is no reason to assume that dedications of equipment and spoils did not reflect a wide spectrum of interests, ranging from the purely personal to the purely communal. Indeed, I have argued (Morgan 1993) that at least until the sixth century, and arguably even until the post-Persian war formalisation of panhellenism as a political concept (Sinn 1994), both Olympia and Delphi lay to a significant extent outside the formal structure of most of the communities whose members frequented them (whatever that structure may have been). At least at Olympia, however, it is possible to set military dedications within a wider trend in material values. As Snodgrass notes (1980, 105), weapons dedications increase markedly from *c.* 675-650 BC, coincident with a decline in the personal dedication of native as opposed to imported eastern tripod dedications (Amandry 1987). This raises the possibility of inter-related changes in status symbols and metal consumption reflecting a shift in the nature of expression of status via control of equipment and resources in living circulation (Langdon 1987), or perhaps more precisely, via symbolic recognition of the opportunities offered by conflict. Related to this is the process by which Later Archaic tripod dedications tend to be focused on shrines in comparatively few areas (Delphi and Athens, for example, rather than the Peloponnese) and to serve as rulers' offerings and victory monuments (choregic monuments in the case of Athens), changes which reflect less a simple decline in tripod offerings *per se* than an evolution in their meaning (Amandry 1987). Whatever the case, it is important to stress that treatment of arms and armour should not be considered in isolation, but as part of a broader complex of practical and ideological responses to different aspects of personal wealth and status.

Finally, while questions of propaganda and display have rightly been emphasized in assessments of the de-

velopment of certain sanctuaries in particular as contexts for military dedications, it is also worth considering the wider role of sanctuaries as places for mercenary hiring and metallurgy (in the sense of equipment supply and maintenance). Evidence for metalworking at shrines is considerable, and it is clear that at least some sanctuaries (Kalapodi and Philia, for example) were involved in weapons production (Risberg 1997; Kilian 1983). An added factor in the potency of military display is the real and constant fear that, whatever the sanctions of impi-

ety, sanctuaries could become arsenals if dedicated weapons fell into the wrong hands (Pritchett 1991 160-68; Hornblower 1991, 197-98, 229, commenting on Thucydides 1.143.1). Thus mutilation or 'killing' of weapons and armour (noted at Kalapodi by Felsch in Hägg 1983, 147, and also evident at Olympia, Delphi and on the Athenian Acropolis, Jackson 1983) was both a symbolic and a practical means of removing or at least diminishing their power.[8]

The Athenian exception? Warfare and aristocratic values

My observations so far have tended to downplay, or at least to nuance, the idea that there was any significant change in attitudes to warfare during the eighth to sixth centuries, however this may have been reflected in the deposition of material goods. Yet at first sight, the case of Athens may seem to contradict this conclusion, not least since the ending of burial with arms here provides one of the sharpest disjunctions in the material record of any contemporary region. Nonetheless, I suggest that if Early Iron Age and early Archaic data are considered in their wider social (and indeed archaeological) context, then much of the disjunction inferred from weapons alone disappears. Indeed, the case of Athens illustrates the way in which attitudes to war and individual status came to be so closely bound up within a complex of aristocratic values that they can be inferred from other aspects of funerary practice, irrespective of the simple presence or absence of weapons (the latter governed rather by cross-cutting, but not coterminous, attitudes to material possessions).

Recent analysis of arms and armour in Early Iron Age Athenian graves has highlighted the selectivity evident in their deployment, and their strong symbolic connection with aristocratic male gender roles (van Wees 1998, with bibliography). Athens is not unusual in this respect. At Lefkandi, far from being common, weapons (daggers, swords, axes, knives, spearheads and arrowheads) are found clustered together in a limited number of graves (Catling & Catling 1980, 252-58, noting that the association of different weapons types argues against specialisation in different forms of warfare). In the North Ceme-

tery at Knossos, almost all weapons are made of iron and are found in male graves; as Snodgrass (1996) notes, this reflects a strong hierarchy of disposition which correlates with other funerary accoutrements, and also tends to be hereditary since burial with arms was most often a recurrent feature in re-used tombs (in T285, for example, it recurs over the 200 years or so of the tomb's use).

In the case of Athens where the Archaic literary and iconographical record is unusually full, there is strong evidence to suggest that, despite an apparent shift in the nature of grave goods, social attitudes to war and its connection with personal status may have been slower to change than has traditionally been supposed. The iconographical case has recently been made by Hans van Wees (1998), and here I merely note one further point which expands upon his argument. Given the bonding and educative role of the symposium, it is hardy surprising to find that the military values expressed in the lyric poetry performed there (Bowie 1990) are reiterated in a variety of Archaic funerary epigrams and votive inscriptions, allowing for the generally fragmentary condition of the latter (Robertson 1997; Guarducci 1988, esp. no.36; see also e.g. *IG* i³ 1240 (epitaph of Croisus from Anavyssos); Raubitschek 1949, e.g. no. 13). Considered in this light, the emphasis placed upon banqueting and symposiastic values by Sanne Houby-Nielsen in her analysis of funerary offerings in the Kerameikos from the late eighth century onwards (Houby-Nielsen 1992; 1995) appears both persuasive and suggestive. If warfare was indeed an integral part of the complex of aristocratic individualistic values reiterated in a range of intercon-

nected contexts in Archaic Athens, then the physical presence or absence of weapons seems almost irrelevant, since war cannot be thought out of the sphere of death and the ancestors.[9] However, a basic discrepancy between the practical treatment of equipment and ideological attitudes to warfare is evident here, as throughout the Archaic Greek world. If ideology carried with it ideals of material behaviour, these could rarely, if ever, be fulfilled. This last point connects further with an issue to which we will return, namely the prevalence of mobility of manpower via mercenary service or 'friendly assistance'. However embedded in local values a particular cause and the manner of its pursuit (in terms of command and tactics), those who were commanded, who did the fighting and had to look to their weapons, seem in very many cases to have included outsiders.[10]

On the basis of similar patterns of evidence from graves and state sanctuaries, I have argued that during the eighth to sixth centuries weapons disposal should *primarily* be considered in the context of attitudes to metal as a commodity. This is not to imply that this is the only factor determining its disposition, merely that it is of great, and in some regions probably paramount, importance. In Achaia, for example, eighth century weapons burials coincide with a peak of weapons dedications at one of the few pre-Classical shrines so far excavated, the sanctuary of Artemis at Ano Mazaraki in the territory of Aigion (Gadolou 1998). Equally, the Archaic Epirote cemetery evidence outlined earlier finds echoes in dedications at nearby Dodona.[11] As a general rule, wherever lavish metal disposal is regarded as desirable, it tends to occur in all forms of context in which offerings are normally made, and involves a variety of artefact types, often including arms and to a lesser extent, armour. Under these circumstances, it is the point at which shrines break the pattern, however late this may be, that is of particular interest. It is relatively rare for this to be a matter of cult; a probable exception is the sixth century Pyre of Heracles at Oiti in Thessaly, where weapons were found in some quantity together with sacrificial ash, bone and the usual forms of pottery and votive (*Delt* 1919, par. 25-33; Béquignon 1937, 204-30; *Delt* 43, 1988, B1, 224; *Delt* 44, 1989, B1, 166; *Delt* 45, 1990, B, 174). More generally, however, since shrines and graves are not straightforward alternatives and the symbolic as-

pect of warfare stands partially beyond the practical, a particularly interesting phenomenon evident from the latter part of the Archaic period onwards in a variety of state systems, is the place of military force in ethnogenesis or the crystallization of regional-political consciousness. Since recognition of putative shared descent is central to ethnic consciousness (Hall 1997, 25-28), exclusion is as important a means of defining group membership as inclusion, and this can be represented (whether or not actually achieved; Purcell 1990) in a variety of ways, including subordination of population, territorial conquest, migration, and colonisation—all processes potentially involving violence and mobility (Demand 1990, chs.1-4; Dougherty 1993—literary evidence is extensive, see e.g. Thucydides 6.2-5 on the myth-historical ethnography of Sicily, Archilochus fr. 52 on Thasos, or Strabo 14.1.4 on Smyrna and Colophon). This surely explains the frequency with which shrines, as records of local identity though collective history, contained mementos of victories (the fetters at Tegea being a striking example; Herodotus 1.66). The sanctuary of Artemis at Kalapodi offers a particularly vivid illustration of commemoration of such a key military event not merely by specific dedications but by a broader change in dedicatory practice. Here the replacement of metal votives such as dress ornaments by weapons, body armour, and solid bronze rings during the second quarter of the sixth century has plausibly been seen as symbolising the liberation of Phokis from Thessalian occupation (dated, albeit controversially, around the time of the battle of Keressos in *c.* 575-570 BC) and the consequent foundation of the Phokian League (Felsch, Keinast and Schuler 1980, 81-84; Morgan 1997, 175-84). The events surrounding this victory (variously recounted by Herodotus 8.27-28, Plutarch *Moralia* 244b-e and Pausanias 10.1) formed a central element in the charter myth of the Phokian ethnos, and so the decision to symbolise it via a change in votive practice at the longest-established regional sanctuary may seem unsurprising (Ellinger 1993, esp. 13-22; Pritchett 1996, ch. II). Indeed, there are interesting parallels to be drawn between the rôle of military history in Phokian national identity and the long-discussed place of Marathon in fifth century Athenian thought (Castriota 1992 *passim*; Miller 1997, 31-32; Whitley 1994). There is, however, a striking discrepancy between the collective

military history which lay at the heart of the identity of many *ethne* and Thucydides' claim (1.5-6) that 'armed robbery' or the personal pursuit of violence was a primitive way of life which still continued in 'much of Hellas' (notably Aetolia, Akarnania and Ozalian Lokris) unchecked by state authority.

Clearly, attempts to characterise both Archaic attitudes to warfare and the treatment of military equipment according to simplistic conceptions of state type raise critical issues in the interpretation of ancient political terminology (Hansen 1997b; 1998) and its application to the archaeological record. Proper examination of such complex historiographical issues is beyond the scope of this conference, but it should be noted that there is ample archaeological and literary evidence to show that a wide range of phenomena regarded as characteristic of emergent poleis from the eighth century onwards (including, for example, 'urban' development and the development of city shrines, see e.g. Snodgrass 1980 chs. 1, 2) occured much more widely (Morgan 1997; 2000). One way forward is to see ethne and poleis not as parallel forms of state but as different tiers of identity, operative at the same time but salient in different contexts (Archibald 2000). Sooner or later every polis invoked some form of ethnic affiliation, and sooner or later, as the work of the Copenhagen Polis Centre in particular has shown, communities explicitly called *poleis* are found within areas categorized in modern scholarship as *ethne* (see e.g. Morgan and Hall 1996 on Achaia; Heine Nielsen 1996 a, b, Heine Nielsen 1999, Morgan 1999b on Arkadia; Archibald 2000 on Thessaly). However, the precise details of the balance between identity perceived in terms of dominant group ethnicity and of political order varied greatly according to time and place (Morgan forthcoming).

The result is a complex spectrum of political orderings, and this in turn has important implications not only for our understanding of warfare as a mechanism which could reflect and sustain internal social ordering, but for the breadth of approach necessary to obtain a rounded picture of how warfare served to articulate inter- and intra regional relations. In the latter sense, it could, as suggested earlier, be seen as an aspect of trade and *xenia* (Herman 1987, 97-105), and in the case of mercenary service, as a development of seasonal labour

and the raids for booty so well documented in Homer (Jackson 1993). Indeed, a close conceptual link with the formalised structure of inter-regional personal obligations is evident in the terminology for foreign military service used in the Archaic period, and usually translated by the modern word mercenary (for which there is no adequate alternative even though it carries clear implications of personal hire for payment which may not always be relevant). The terms most usually used by Archaic authors have clear social connotations. In addition to its usual meaning of guest-friend or stranger, the term *xenos* is used by Homer (*Odyssey* 14.102) in the sense of hireling, and acquires more complex military connotations from the fifth century onwards (*xenikos* applied to mercenary ships or troops, for example, as Herodotus 1.77). A more common term in early literature is *epikouros*, one who comes to the aid of another—as e.g., Homer *Il.* 5.614 2.815, 3,456; Herodotus 1.64 in connection with the forces of Peisistratos; or Archilochus *Ep* 6, where the *epikouros* is contrasted bitterly with the true friend or *philos*. Whether or not the service thus described was directly paid is hard to establish. In discussing the activities of Peisistratus and his sons, for example, Herodotus (1.61) draws a distinction between the purchase of Argive mercenaries (*misthotoi*) and the aid given by Lygdamis of Naxos of his own accord (*ethelontes*), and while he wrote around a century after the event, the extent to which his vocabulary genuinely reflects sixth century attitudes is a matter of some debate. Nonetheless, the fact that the vocabulary directly attested in Archaic sources draws on established usage for social relations must surely reflect the mechanisms by which much military mobility was articulated. By contrast, overtly financial or military terms, such as *misthophoros* (e.g. Thucydides 1.35) or *summachos* (e.g. Aeschylus *Pers.* 793; Thucydides 1.35, 7.50), appear in fifth century and later sources (although a military sense is at least implicit in Sappho's prayer to Aphrodite (1.28) to be her *summachos* in winning a desired lover). Yet even during the fifth century, the extent to which it is possible to draw any clear distinction between paid mercenaries and other forms of foreign 'ally' remains a matter of debate (see e.g., Hornblower 1991, 190, 403 with reference to Thucydides 1.115.4 and 3.18.1).

It is, however, worth noting in that the financial implications of hiring mercenaries were considerable. In-

deed, mercenary pay has plausibly been cited as a factor behind the development of coinage not least in its homeland, Lydia, to provide rewards when xenia or booty were insufficient (Cook 1958, 261; Kraay 1964, 88-91; see also Wallace 1987 for a more recent general review). Few cities could afford to sustain paid mercenary forces—hence perhaps the continuing rhetorical emphasis on duty (Robertson 1997) combined with the reciprocal obligations of *xenia*—and this may in turn underlie later rhetorical distrust of paid outsiders. For example, when at the allied congress in Sparta in 432 the Corinthians described the Athenian fleet as 'bought' (Thucydides 1.121.3), they can hardly have been referring to the entire fleet (since, as Hornblower 1991, 198-99 rightly emphasizes, Athenian rowers were also paid at this time), but were rather making the rhetorical and moral point that it contained purchasable foreigners.

Warfare and Society in Archaic Thessaly

At this point it is worth pausing to consider one case study, that of Thessaly, which illustrates well many of the issues raised so far. Thessaly is a region with a complex military history over and above the activities of its cavalry for which it is famed (along with the fertility of its extensive plains, and the wealth of its aristocracy, expressed in cattle ownership and horse breeding).[12] It consists of two major plains surrounded by mountains (Philippson 1897, chs. I-IV; Philippson 1950; Sivignon 1975), and politically, it was divided into four tetrads or *moirai*, at least by the fifth century, regarded as the oldest aspects of Thessalian organisation (Hellanikos of Mytilene, *FrGHist* 4.51). Each contained major settlements (Trikka and Aiginion in Hestiaiotis, Metropolis and Arne-Kieron in Thessaliotis, Pharsalos in Phthiotis and Larisa and Pherai in Pelasgiotis) surrounded by a perioikic area (Sordi 1958; Sordi 1992; Helly 1995). There is a growing body of evidence for long-term Early Iron Age occupation in many centres of later importance, chiefly (but not exclusively) derived from rescue excavation in or near modern centres in tetrads and perioikic areas alike, including Iolkos (Intzesiloglou 1994 with bibliography; Sipsie-Esbach 1986), Larisa (Tziaphalias 1994a, 155-56) and Pherai (Apostolopoulou Kakavoyianni 1992; Dougleri Intzesiloglou 1994). Equally, there is no major chronological discrepancy in the appearance of major public works in comparison with many southern centres; hence, for example, sixth century fortification walls at settlements such as Pharsalos (Katakouta and Touphexis 1994) and temple building from the second half of the seventh century in the case of Gonnoi (Helly 1973, 72-74). Evidence that big sites served as physical centres of political power thus appears as compelling in Thessaly as in many parts of what has been regarded as the polis world, and is echoed in later traditions associating leading Thessalian families with particular cities (the Aleuads at Larisa for example). From a Classical perspective, Zosia Archibald has stressed the political and geographical cohesion of the region, citing sources such as Herodotus (6.27, 9.1) and Thucydides (1.102.4, 2.22.3 etc.) as reporting the collective voice of what she describes as a 'caste' of leaders with bases in different cities (Archibald 2000). I suggest that while the case for such cohesion is not quite as strong during the Archaic period, the process by which it may have come into being bears interesting comparison with changes evident elsewhere, notably in Athens. Warfare provides a good starting point for documenting this process, since the circumstances of conflict—who had the power to decide which issues should be fought over, by whom and under whose command—raise fundamental questions concerning the forces defining different tiers of group membership.

In later times, the sixth century was seen as a key period of Thessalian military greatness. To a significant extent this reflects the reforms attributed to the probably legendary King Aleuas (Sordi 1958, 65-68, 71-72; Helly 1995, 118-24). As many other early reforming rulers, including oikists and tyrants or would-be tyrants, as well as certain possible Thessalian contemporaries,[13] Aleuas is credited with a number of major reforms, including law and land division (Axenidis 1947, 43-48; scholiast to Pindar *Pyth.* X.5, Harpokration *FrGHist* 1.52). Indeed, the comparison is highlighted by Plutarch's account (*Mor-*

alia 492a-b) that Aleuas was selected for office by the Delphic lot oracle following the last minute addition of his name to the list of candidates by his uncle (he was previously omitted as of unsuitable character), a story which closely resembles the topos of the oikist *malgré lui* of colonial foundation legend (Malkin 1987, 26-91). That the Aleuad territorial divisions served military purposes at least by the fourth century is made explicit by Aristotle (*Constitution of the Thessalians* quoted by Harpokration and a scholiast to Euripides *Rhesus* 311, Rose fr. 497, 498), who states that each kleros possessing the necessary amount of power produced fifty hippeis and eighty hoplites. But whether as reported by Aristotle they should be seen as real institutions of the sixth century, let alone primarily military in initial intent (as argued by Helly 1995, 193-219, ch.V), are much more controversial questions (see e.g. the table ronde on Helly 1995 in *Topoi* 7(1) 1997, 165-262; Axenidis 1947, 43-47). Perhaps more pertinently, while issues of land division and tributary labour can have military implications, the extent to which any Archaic changes were felt at a primarily national rather than a local level is debatable, and there seems much to commend the view that Archaic Thessalian land division was a feudal readjustment at best (Link 1991, 151-57). Here it is interesting to note that the only other action of likely regional significance attested for the Archaic period is the elder Skopas' fixing of the level of tribute payable by *penestai*, probably at some point during the first half of the sixth century (Xenophon *Hellenika* 6.1.9). Very little concrete is known about penestai (Ducat 1994 offers the most complete review), but it seems that they were probably bound to a landlord rather than the state, and could fight alongside landlords (Demosthenes 23.199, citing Menon of Pharsalos), forming a substantial force of followers if Theocritos' reference (*Idylls* 16.34-35) to the large number of penestai in the halls of Antiochus during the second half of the sixth century offers any guide.

Accounts of eighth century and Archaic Thessalian wars usually consist of fragmentary details offered by later sources often in problematic contexts. Nonetheless, insofar as they command any credence, they too hint at highly localised power structures. During the Lelantine war, according to Plutarch (*Moralia* 760e-761b), the Chalkidians requested the assistance of Kleomachos of

Pharsalos with his cavalry, and when he fell in battle they buried him in the Agora at Chalkis. In the First Sacred War, Eurylochus was the (probably Aleuad) leader of the Thessalian contingent, and responsible for the destruction of Krisa (scholiast to Pindar *Pyth.* X.5, Boekh 298; Strabo 9.42.1; Hippokrates *Ep.* 36.17 (Herscher 1873, 941)).[14] Finally, Herodotus (5.63.3) reports that *basileus* Kinneus, probably of Gonnoi, commanded the Thessalian cavalry who assisted the Peisistratids against the Spartans in 512. In all three cases, it seems that a named leader answered a personal request or took the initiative to act. Equally, both Thucydides (1.31) and Aristotle (*Pol.* 1306a) stress that factional strife among aristocrats was the chief source of Thessalian weakness. Hence perhaps Larisa's voluntary submission to Persia in the 480's (Herodotus 7.6.2), a relationship similar to (and perhaps more inviting than) other more local possibilities, and one which Martin (1985, 34-35) has sought to connect with the city's first issue of coinage for the payment of tribute. There are plenty of parallels for such international relations elsewhere. The Peisistratids, for example, notoriously relied on help of various kinds from international connections; Herodotus (1.60-64) describes how, prior to Peisistratus' attempt at a third period of power, he and his sons took pains to secure gifts from all cities who were in any way in their debt and used the profits to pay mercenaries. Equally, the offer of the city of Magnesian Iolkos to the deposed Hippias must surely imply friendly ties in southern Thessaly (Herodotus 5.94.1; Camp 1994).

The institutional basis of command in the three Thessalian conflicts cited is unclear (only Kinneus is explicitly called *basileus*), but as Axenidis (1947, 42-43) has argued, it seems hard to believe in permanent institutional pan-Thessalian leadership at such an early date, or even recruitment on a wider basis than local ties. Much has been made of Herodotus' statement (5.63.3) that Kinneus' expedition went *'koine gnome'* (by common decree or consent). The exact import of the phrase is hard to establish, although it seems somewhat unusual in an otherwise straightforward account of aid between *xenoi*. If it is other than a euphemism for an action popular in this part of Thessaly, one might conjecture that it implies some dispute or need for additional support. Yet it is hardly a sufficient basis on which to reconstruct a

regular national debate, let alone a federal military structure. At first sight, this impression of local mobilisation sits ill with the interpretation of Aleuad land division in regional-military terms. One might well question the historicity of the division, let alone its initial purpose. But it is worth emphasizing that hints of local substructures linger as late as the fourth century (a point recognised by Wade-Gery 1924, although he erroneously attributed changes under Jason to the effects of Thessalian urbanisation). Indeed, Xenophon's mention (*Hellenika* 6.1.8-9, 12, 19) of Jason's ability as *tagos* to dispose of traditional tribute and army strength, including horsemen, hoplites, and peltasts from the surrounding allies, hints at varied contributions raised according to long-standing local groupings and also the strength of local resources at the time—a more complex and nuanced picture than that presented by Aristotle's mathematics.

In certain key respects, this picture seems to differ little from that evident in many Archaic poleis. Pertinent comparison may be made with Frank Frost's (1984) analysis of evidence from pre-Kleisthenic Athens, in which he highlights the lack of evidence for any regionally-based mobilisation, and argues for earlier conflicts being a matter of aristocratic families selecting issues of conflict (land being especially important), answering calls for help or seizing opportunities offered by unforeseen circumstances to mobilise their followers (willing or bound: van Wees 1999), call on their friends, and extract as much *kudos* as possible 'in the service of the polis'. Thus, for example, the decision to pursue and evict Kylon and his followers (Herodotus 5.71; Thucydides 1.126.3-6) was essentially an Alkmaeonid operation (Frost 1984, 286-287), and the temporary capture of Sigeum by Peisistratus for his son Hegesistratus (Herodotus 5.94-95) owed more to his desire for family *kudos* than to any real threat (Viviers 1987; Frost 1984, 288 describes it as a failed attempt at colonisation). Certain aspects of Frost's argument seem somewhat overstated (such as his diminution of the role and importance of the naukrariai, see e.g. van Wees 1999, 32; or the preexistence of the concept of public warfare, van Wees 1992, 174-75), and it would obviously be wrong to dismiss the rôle of state institutions in Archaic Athenian political life, if only as means of enhancing the power and status of leading individuals and their families (a point which

Frost himself emphasizes elsewhere: Frost 1994). Nonetheless, his approach does circumvent certain basic difficulties arising from the assumption of state-institutionalised warfare. It takes fuller account of the aristocratic values emphasized above, as well as common, cross-regional concerns for territorial and property defense (whether conceived in terms of cultivation or stock rearing), aid to friends, and the maintenance of boundaries with subject groups. As a result, it deals better with the embeddedness of tyrannical actions in aristocratic traditions, an embeddedness which may be detected in warfare as in many other areas of action. Thus, for example, Peisistratus' imposition on Athenian citizens of payment similiar to the pre-Solonian *hektemoroi* has plausibly been interpreted by Harris (1997, 110-11) as a form of protection, akin to the Persian 'tribute' formalised by Darius but nonetheless probably something of a bargain after the impositions of local lords.[15] Here too, however, the idea of soldierly autonomy must be called into question. Snodgrass, for example, in assessing social change attendent on the hoplite 'reform' suggests that those who qualified for military service could have established the strong condition that it was the state they served, not some aristocratic grouping and not for purposes of civil strife (Snodgrass 1980, 100-2, although see now Snodgrass 1993, 60-61). But this begs the fundamental question of the extent to which the average Archaic state, of whatever form, was more than 'some aristocratic grouping' with all that that entailed in terms of the use of followers in the pursuit of personal interest.

To return briefly to Thessaly, it is worth pausing to consider one unusual Archaic cemetery which raises interesting questions of comparison. At Ag. Giorgios near Larisa, *c.* 6km from Krannon, lies a tumulus cemetery *c.* 4km in extent and with some 40 tumuli noted to date (Tziaphalias 1990; 1994b). It probably belonged to the polis whose remains have been found at nearby Palaiochora and which may be ancient Ephyra, a dependent of Krannon. Two tumuli (Xirorema and Karaeria) have been partially excavated; Xirorema contained 31 graves of which 25 date around the end of the seventh century, and the remainder belong to a separate fifth century level cut into the tumulus top. At Karaeria, 18 groups of burials within periboloi date to the first half of the sixth century. The two tumuli share many features in com-

mon; both contained secondary cremations (generally inurned) with a rich variety of mainly metal goods (weapons, jewellery, vessels, wreaths etc), many of which were burnt. Weapons (mainly offensive) are plentiful and largely of Thessalian manufacture. The main distinction between the tumuli is that Xirorema contained male and female burials but Karaeria only male. This point in particular has led to the suggestion that Karaeria had some ceremonial dimension, perhaps also implied by the presence of three wagons (including two in one grave) which show signs of burning, perhaps having transported the deceased to the pyre.

The Karaeria tumulus has been tentatively interpreted by the excavator as a polyandrion connected to some conflict as yet unknown (Tziaphalias 1994b, 188). This is possible, although it should be noted that there are at present no archaeological parallels for a polyandrion at this early date (at least in the old Greek world), and it is unfortunate that the rite of cremation here precludes analysis of patterns of trauma. There is no evidence to support any geographically or chronologically consistent attitude to the location of the burial of war dead during Early Iron Age and Archaic times. The term polyandrion is not attested in Archaic sources, and during the fifth century, the more usual term, polyandros, occurs rather in the general sense of populous or numerous in people. (e.g. Aeschylus *Pers.* 73, 899, 533; *Ag.* 693). There is, however, every reason to assume that the practice predates the term, and by the very end of the Archaic period, there are literary hints of the existence of formal mass military tombs. An epigram attributed to Simonides (Page 1975, Simonides no. 2) refers to such a memorial set up at public expense near the Euripos and under the folds of Dirphys in Euboia, and this has been equated with a polyandrion created after a battle with the Athenians in 507 BC (Page 1981, 89-191, preferring it to be a Euboian rather than an Athenian tomb). But references to significantly earlier monuments tend to occur in much later sources, and none have been located and investigated. Thus Pausanias (2.24.7) reports polyandria at Kenchreai of the Argive dead from the battle of Hysiai in *c.* 669/8 (the earliest reported case of such a monument), as well as the polyandrion of the Oresthasians (*c.* 659) in the agora at Phigaleia (8.41.1), and that of the Argives and Lakedaimonians in the Thyreatis *c.* 550

(2.38.5). Excavated tombs reasonably securely identified as polyandria are fifth century or later (Pritchett 1985, 125-39); an early example, the Marathon tumulus (noted, almost certainly mistakenly, as exceptional for its battlefield location by Thucydides 2.34.5) is an unusual monument with archaising traits and heroizing connotations stressed in recent scholarship (Whiteley 1994; Pritchett 1985, 126-29 for a review of evidence from the soros and the Plataean tomb). Only one possible Archaic polyandrion has been tentatively identified at Akragas in Sicily. Here a pit within the earliest colonial cemetery on the hill of Montelusa which contained twelve bodies and over one hundred and fifty Greek vases, stands out as unusual in the context of the cemetery, and despite the lack of weapons, was therefore interpreted by the excavators as a polyandrion commemorating an unknown battle (Griffo 1946; *Fasti Archeologici* 1, 1946, 91). The case for the Akragas identification has not been published in detail, but parallels with Ag. Giorgos-Karaeria are clear. Both identifications are tentative, and both rest on the apparently anomalous form or content of the burial(s) in question, rather than on physical anthropological evidence or any clear expectation of what a polyandrion of this period might look like.

In view of these uncertainties, it is important to emphasize that even in our limited state of knowledge there are alternative interpretations of the Ag. Giorgios-Karaeria tumulus, and further research at an extensive cemetery may well add to the range of possibilities. The extent of similarity between Karaeria and Xirorema in rites, offerings and chronological focus, combined with the absence of any demonstrable marker, raises the possibility that the Karaeria tumulus contained an interest group, an interpretation akin to Sanne Houby-Nielsen's characterisation of the dead in some of the most spectacular Kerameikos mounds as symposium groups (Houby-Nielsen 1995). In both cases, the tumuli in question share mortuary customs with the rest of the cemetery, but appear more lavish and show strong gender bias. In view of the compelling evidence for the widespread embeddedness of warfare among a complex of aristocratic values, it is tempting to suggest that evidence from Karaeria represents the same overall package symbolised via other indicia (perhaps as Morris 1998, 38 suggests, more traditional ones). The question of the re-

gional context of these finds is more problematic, however. Morris (1998, 38) points to a parallel for lavish weapons burial in a tholos tomb at Iolkos (*Praktika* 1915, 157-59) and notes also the Krannon tumuli in suggesting that the Karaeria tumulus is not a polyandrion but rather forms part of a wider Thessalian pattern of elite burial. Yet in view of the extent of recent excavation of Thessalian tumuli and the amount of material at present under study (as well as the uncertain chronology of Iolkos and Krannon), it would be unwise to rush to conclusions about the extent of local variation in the role of the material celebration of warfare across Thessaly. Equally, no interpretation of the Ag. Giorgos tumuli can be excluded until further excavation has been completed at the site.

Human mobility

To return to broader issues, the final aspect of early warfare to be considered in this chapter is human mobility. As emphasized earlier, even a brief review of literary sources closest to our period shows clearly that using outsiders at least to supplement local forces was hardly unusual. Not only was there no evident social stigma in fighting for others, but there are instances where this seems to have been commemorated or at least depicted without comment. Thus, for example, Alkaios (Fr. 350, cf. Strabo 13.2.3) celebrated his brother Antimenidas' service in Nebuchadezzar II's Palestinian campaign which culminated in the siege of Ascalon in 604. Sanctuary dedications have already been mentioned and will be considered again presently. Iconographically, there are a number of seventh century depictions in different media of the use of foreign equipment. In Corinth, for example, an MPCI/II aryballos (C2096, near the Huntsmen Painter) from grave B20 in the Lechaion cemetery (Eliot & Eliot 1968, 348-50 with bibliography) shows a conflict between two groups of varied individuals, including archers and naked and clothed warriors (some with hoplite equipment). While a variety of mythological interpretations have been offered for this scene, noting in particular the presence of the Boiotian shield, one must allow the possibility that the variety of figures and equipment depicted also reflects an ethnic mix which, even if shown in a mythological context, would be at least credible to the viewer. And as noted, while one might regard mobilisation via 'friendly assistance' and directly paid service as separate ends of a spectrum of 'mercenary' activity, both carry important social and economic implications, not least when assessing the role of warfare in representing internal state order. Even in cases where there seems to be strong emphasis on citizen obligations, there is often some indication that it might occasionally be necessary to call upon outsiders. In Ozalian Lokris, for example, where an inscription of *c.* 525-500 (*ML* no. 13) concerning land settlement implies that those who accepted an allotment also accepted shared responsibility for regional defence, there was an additional provision whereby, under pressure of war, a majority of 101 men chosen from the best citizens could decide to bring in at least 200 fighting men as additional settlers.

For those who undertook military service abroad, rewards in booty, if not in direct pay, could be considerable. Almost casual reports of raids for booty and brigandage of various forms are numerous (for example, Pritchett 1991, 324-26 lists the better documented cases of piratical raids), and the luxury enjoyed by eastern commanders on campaign must have been a particularly attractive target. Indeed, Assyrian epigraphical evidence attests to the capture of such riches; in 709, for example, Sargon captured the royal tent and trappings of the Chaldaean king of Babylon, Marduk-apla-iddima (Luckenbill 1926, no. 39), wealth which he described in the so-called Display Inscription of 707 BC (Luckenbill 1926, no. 67). How far down the ranks captured wealth penetrated (and in what quantity) are much debated and largely unanswerable questions. Even in case of Persian war booty, where evidence is much more plentiful, there remains much scope for interpretation (Miller 1997, 43-46), although in cases such as the Neo-Assyrian expansion, the sheer extent of campaigning makes it hard to accept that the average soldier would not profit (Kuhrt 1995, 518-19). On occasion, however, rewards are re-

corded. The dedicatory inscription (*SEG* 37, 994) on an Egyptian basalt statue erected by Pedon in his native Priene in the late seventh or early sixth century states that he received from Psamettichus a gold arm ring and a city for his service (Bettalli 1995, 69-70). There is no reason to doubt that conspicuous wealth could have been a powerful lure, the basic existence of which would have been largely unaffected by the changing fortunes of the kingdoms and empires of the east during the Early Iron Age and Archaic period. The Near East as a source of Greek mobility of varying kinds has long been stressed (see e.g. Purcell 1990, 38-44), and the assumption that the movement of humans as commodities attested by the Prophets (e.g. Exekiel 27:13 in the case of Tyre) refers simply to slavery (whatever form that may have taken in the various societies of the Archaic world) may be an oversimplification. Thus, for example, Rosalinde Kearsley (1999) has raised the possibility that military motivation lay behind Greek settlement at Al Mina from the mid-eighth century onwards, with movement of human labour perhaps the counterpart of the long history of material interchange between the old Greek world (especially Euboia) and the east (Popham 1994).

The main geographical areas from which Archaic and early Classical Greek mercenaries came (Caria, Lycia and the north and central Peloponnese) have often been emphasized in highlighting the importance of opportunism and poverty as motivating forces. It would, however, be a mistake to regard this as a complete picture. Whether or not one interprets Archilochos's famous celebration of his spear (*Ep.* 2) as a trading of normal pleasures for a soldier's life (Burnett 1983, 38-39, nn. 15-16) or an ironic analogy with Odysseus' activities at Ismaros (*Od.* 9.451), it does not sound like a counsel of despair on the part of an impoverished citizen of a poor island. Lycians, Carians and Ionians lived particularly close to areas of patronage and conflict (see Bettalli 1995, part I for a recent review of Archaic evidence). This in turn could spill into their home territory—hence, for example, Kallinos' exhortation to his fellow Ephesians to resist Kimmerian invasion: West fr. 1; Pritchett 1985, 35-36). There is ample literary and epigraphical evidence from the seventh century onwards to suggest that they exploited such opportunities. This ranges from problematic mentions of

'Yawan' on cuneiform military texts from Nineveh (Brown 1983) and on Babylonian ration tablets (Kuhrt 1995, 608—noting with Brinkmann 1989 that the term may refer to Anatolians rather than Ionians), to various sources recording Psamettichus I and his Saïte successors' use of foreign troops (Kuhrt 1995, 636-41) and Herodotus' statement (3.1) that Ionian and Aeolian Greeks were part of the doomed force sent by Cambyses into Egypt. The reputation of Carians as mercenaries (and armourers: Snodgrass 1964b) was particularly well attested. It is, for example, reported by Aelian *de nat. an.* 12.30, and born out by grafitti in Egypt (including that at Abu Simbel, Ray 1982). A scholiast to Plato *Laches* 187b cites Archilochos' comment (*Ep.* 24) 'and I shall be called *epikouros* like a Carian', in explaining the expression 'putting the risk on the Carian'. There may be a qualitative and a quantitative increase in evidence for Greek military service when one comes to the Persian empire of the early fifth century, but as Miller (1997, 100-3) emphasizes, there is no reason to doubt that this reflects a long tradition of such activity (Purcell 1990, 38-44, a point also recognised by Parke 1933, 3-6). Given the complex nature of interconnections across the Archaic Mediterranean, in everything from trade and manufacture to intermarriage or migration, it need be no more surprising to find Ionians working in Egypt than in Athens, and indeed, similarities in the role of rulers' followers may on occasion have made for an easy translation. And as Fields suggests (1994a, 108-9), references to eastern ruler dedications at Greek sanctuaries, such as the Pharoah Necho II's dedication at Didyma of the linen corselet which he wore at the victorious outcome of his Palestinian campaign in 601 (Herodotus 2.159), may at least in part have been motivated by a desire to maintain connections with, and display status to, those communities of importance as sources of mercenaries. Furthermore, the importance of eastern influences upon the development of certain items of military equipment has long been argued (see, e.g., Snodgrass 1967, 90-91, on the sixth century composite corselet), and consideration of the kind of context where ideas and improvements might be exchanged (to the benefit of Greek or non-Greek parties) again highlights the importance of long-term military interconnections. Indeed, the dissemination of equipment and techniques to neighbouring areas

(initially discussed in the case of Etruria by Stary 1979, 183-98) is a complex issue of great importance, albeit beyond the immediate scope of this chapter.

To turn to the Peloponnese, the military reputation of Arkadia may have early origins, to judge from Homer's references to *aneres anchimachitai* (*Il.* 2.604) and *epistamenoi polemizein* (*Il.* 2.611). Likewise, Ephorus (*FrGHist* 70F54) places the origin of instruction in hoplomachia in mid-sixth century Mantineia. Herodotus (8.26.2) is the first source explicitly to mention Arkadian mercenaries in the aftermath of Thermopylae. Nonetheless, accounts of earlier conflicts certainly mention Arkadians fighting abroad, even though they do not specify whether they were paid hands or allies. Thus Pausanias (8.39.4, 8.41.1) notes that Oresthasion sent one hundred hand-picked men at the behest of Delphi to aid the Phigaleians during the Second Messenian war (and even allowing for the considerable historiographical difficulties surrounding this late account, it is wholly plausible that the Oresthasians were allies of the rebels if not mercenaries). By the fifth century, however, evidence is more plentiful. An inscription from Olympia of the first quarter of the century (*SEG* 11, 1222) records the offering of a bronze group by Praxiteles, a Mantineian emigré who described himself as 'of Syracuse and Kamarina' (perhaps a mercenary who had served among the ten thousand employed by Gelon or a colonist involved in the refoundation of Kamarina), and Pausanias (5.27.2) also saw inscribed dedications made by Phormis, another of Gelon's mercenaries who described himself as 'Arkas Mainalios'. It has been argued, notably by Callmer (1943, 99), that fifth century population increase forced Arkadians into mercenary activity. Yet the traditions noted above and the archaeological record combine to suggest that military service had a much longer history. As noted earlier, archaeological attention has focused on the dedication of miniature arms and armour at a number of sanctuaries, including, most strikingly, Bassai from the second half of the seventh century onwards (coincident as ever with a major expansion in the level of metal dedication). Snodgrass (1974) interprets the Bassai votives as the dedications of Cretan mercenaries, whereas Cooper (1996, 73, 75-79) suggests they were offered by Arkadian mercenaries to symbolise the tools of their trade. The Bassai miniatures may be particularly

realistic, but the fact that comparable shields, swords, and arrowheads are found widely distributed, especially (if hardly exclusively) at Apollo shrines (Fields 1994a, 104-6), would seem to require a balance of general explanation with appreciation of local circumstances. In addition to finds from other Arkadian sites (Lousoi, Tegea, Alipheira, Gortys, and Glanitsa, for example; Voyatzis 1990, 198-201; Iozzo and Pagano 1995, *passim*; Cooper 1996, 72 table 3-2), they appear in the Kynouria (Faklaris 1990, e.g. pl.92), Samos (Brize 1997, 133-35 with earlier bibliography, connecting these finds with initiation rites) and especially on Crete (Hoffmann & Raubitschek 1972, 2, 7; Jarva 1995, 112 with bibliography), to give a far from exhaustive list.

If geography was an important in factor in the east, it is rather poverty that has tended to feature in discussion of Peloponnesian mercenaries. As I will suggest, this distinction may be more apparent than real, although it does in large measure reflect the emphasis of our earliest literary sources. According to Herodotus (5.49), when Aristagoras of Miletus tried to persuade Kleomenes of Sparta to intervene on behalf of the Ionian cities, he used the argument that 'you must needs then fight for straitened strips of land of no great worth—fight for that with Messenians, who are as strong as you, and Arkadians and Argives, men who have nothing in the way of gold or silver, things for which many are spurred by zeal to fight and die'. Arkadians, and to a lesser extent Achaians, did indeed live in mountainous regions (significant parts of which had poor soils), and often maintained pastoral economies. And as Fields (1994b, ch. 4) has emphasized, the situation of Arkadia compares well with the early modern mercenary traditions of Switzerland, Scotland, and Corsica. It is thus tempting to cite the relative poverty of most parts of Arkadia in the kind of resources central to polis economies elsewhere to argue that mercenary service somehow filled a gap in subsistence provision, or was even a counsel of depair. Yet it would be unwise to press this case. While most parts of Arkadia (with the exception of the eastern plains) are poorly suited to the cultivation of cereals, olive and vine, they support such a wide range of other plant and animal resources that it is misleading to regard the region as a whole as poor by any absolute standards (Roy 1999). Furthermore, where we are given information about the

precise origin of early Arkadian mercenaries (generally in later sources, notably Xenophon's *Anabasis* ; Roy 1967, 302-9; Roy 1972), they come from the east of the region (Tegea and Mantineia in particular) where some of the finest agricultural land is concentrated. This would certainly suggest that rather than simply filling a gap, military service was a form of activity that could be integrated into complex economic strategies to permit the exploitation of a diverse range of available resources. But if it was in essence just one economic choice among many, its social consequences and implications for gender rôles as well as other subsistence activities should not be underestimated. Clearly, women could undertake most subsistence tasks, but unless there were other household members (notably children) to help, household duties must have limited their mobility. Upland transhumance, for example, would have coincided with the summer fighting season, and so unless extra hands were available, it may have been necessary to keep livestock on close land throughout the year (see e.g. Xenophon *Hellenika* 7.5.15 on the pasturing of cattle close to Mantineia, tended by children and the elderly). It is therefore worth stressing the economic constraints and social consequences for communities locked into the mercenary cycle.

Clearly, the case of Arkadia begs the question of the extent to which it is possible to make any meaningful distinction between the motives for undertaking military service in different parts of the Greek world. But perhaps more pertinently, given the growing body of evidence for the importance of community of place in eastern Arkadia in particular by the eighth or early seventh century (Morgan 1999b), it raises important issues concerning the comparative role of warfare in the definition and maintenance of internal community order. Of particular relevance here is the problem of definition of community territory. Arkadia may have been one of the few parts of Greece where there was a major disjunction between territories defined in terms of subsistence and those relating to such diverse needs as defence, tax, or exile. Under such circumstances, it seems hard to relate hoplite tactics to the maintenance of any territorially defined social interests (following the hoplite reform model) or to regard hoplite warfare as a necessarily useful means of solving local disputes. Furthermore, the

broader implications of manpower mobility are worth reiterating, especially as there is no convincing tradition of early Arkadian colonisation.[16] There are certainly interesting comparisons to be made with colonisation as it is increasingly coming to be understood, less it terms of the tidy budding off of polis from polis (a rationalisation current from Thucydides onwards), and more as a messy mix of adventurism and exile, often involving participants from different areas, and revealing complex pragmatic and ideological approaches to such issues as the definition and control of territory and relations with local populations (Purcell 1990; 1997; Morgan 1999c). In neither case need the permanent or temporary removal of part of the adult male population imply absolute stress on land. Survey data from many regions of Greece present a remarkably consistent picture of highly centred settlement in Geometric and Archaic times, with intensive exploitation especially of marginal land a phenomenon of the Classical period at the earliest (Foxhall 1997, 122-29). Rights of access to land and perceived overcrowding may therefore have been primarily social constructs, but practical responses to these problems show significant areas of overlap (see e.g. Morgan & Hall 1996, esp. 198-203, 214-15, on Achaia; van Wees 1999, on broader questions of aristocratic control of land and resources). Both colonisation and war involve the removal of dependents from households. Mercenary service had the advantage of combining material reward with a (hopefully temporary) reduction in the number of mouths to be fed, but in the case of colonisation, where the promise of reward was probably less direct, a balance may be found in the much-debated question of right of return (noting for example, the compulsory enlistment and severe restriction on return imposed in the case of settlement at Kyrene by the Spartan colony of Thera; Herodotus 4.146-58; Malkin 1987, 60-69).

Clearly, military mobility forms part of a complex pattern of commercial and political interaction and cannot be understood in isolation. I suggest that the Early Iron Age and Archaic period saw a wide spectrum of activity, ranging from the hiring of individuals or groups for material reward to 'borrowings' of men such as the Spartan contingent who aided Samian exiles in the 520s BC (Herodotus 3.54-56) and cross-regional military alliances, such as those which may be publicly symbolised

in the names and attributes of the giants on the frieze of the Siphnian treasury at Delphi (Watrous 1982; Brinkmann 1985). From the viewpoint of internal community ordering, it is therefore dangerous to assume that the role of hoplite warfare as a social structuring force would have extended beyond the level of leaders and issues to govern also the patriotic attitudes of fighting men. Indeed, the assumption of an overlap between army and people (in the sense of *demos*) should not be relied upon; Snodgrass (1980, 90), for example, has commented on the Cretan use of the term *stratos* for the body politic, but since the oldest attestations of the term carry the neutral sense of mass, to which military meaning may then be added (as e.g. *Il.* 1.53, 13.308), there is no necessity to suppose a specifically military interpretation during our period. Patriotism and defence of the polis are indeed lauded from Homer onwards, but as noted, largely in the terminology of heroic obligation to show courage and loyalty (Robertson 1997). It is surely in the context of the obligations arising from *xenia* that one should understand the laconic or downright cynical tone of *Theognidea* (887-88) 'do not pay too much attention to the loud-shouting herald: it is not for our native land that we are fighting', rather than as a simple reflection of some patriotic duty to fight harder for one's homeland than for allies and fellow aristocrats abroad. Indeed, it is most striking that no pre-Persian war funerary epigram explictly states that the deceased died fighting for his country (Robertson 1997, 150-51). The ideal of fighting as *promachos* was regularly stressed, but even when the battle ended in defeat and death, 'dying for one's country' was not praised. The more individualistic ethos of mourning in military elegy is perhaps understandable given the sympotic context of its performance and the class bonds it thus reinforces (Bowie 1990). More significant is the fact that inscriptions, as public statements, do not stress patriotism in any modern sense as one of the qualities to which a good aristocrat would aspire.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have sought to stress the complexity of connections between a diverse range of issues in an attempt to illustrate the extent to which early Greek warfare formed part of a complex of cross-cutting trade and social networks (as discussed, e.g., by Foxhall 1998), both embodying and reinforcing widely shared social and material values. I have also stressed the need to consider the wider context when attempting to use the practice of war and the treatment of equipment as evidence for emerging citizen attitudes in individual communities. Archaeological evidence of equipment can serve as an indicator of such values only to the extent that it was manufactured in a surviving and valued resource (metal), and in the context of wider attitudes to that resource. Shifts in the disposal of weapons and armour do not in themselves offer evidence for a growing role of the state in the exercise of force. Equally, separation of the practical means of pursuing war from the politics of causes and leadership should extend beyond the material to include the acquisition of manpower. Much remains to be done to present a truly rounded picture, and several key issues have received only scant attention in the limited space here available. Emphasis on international connections and the relationship between war and trade, for example, demands much greater attention to the control and organisation of sea transport and naval warfare (de Souza 1998; Gabrielsen, this volume). The provision of military equipment (in the sense of the origins of styles and technologies as well as the location of major manufacturing centres, see, e.g., Bakhuizen 1976 on Chalcis) has significant economic implications (not least for the development of metalworking). Geographically, Crete, the home of significant and varied early military dedications, demands closer attention, not least because of its proximity to Cyprus and the Levant and the existence of a large and much-debated body of evidence for interchange in men and materials between these areas (Hoffmann 1997).

Much of the evidence discussed in this chapter dates comparatively early in the Archaic period. As is clear from the chronological balance of evidence cited by Lise Hannestad in her contribution to this volume, new currents in the representation of warfare emerge during the period *c.* 520-480 BC which to a significant extent de-

velop from the values discussed here (and certainly reflect the great importance of international connections). Changes in other areas are to some extent parallel—for example, a development in the role of festivals as contexts for the performance of battle narrative represents an innovation, but also a logical extension of the structure and role of earlier Archaic events (Bowie 1986; Boedeker 1995; 1998). The transition between late Archaic and Classical attitudes to warfare is a major issue in its own right, and it is of course essential to recognise the constant shift in attitudes to material goods of all kinds. Thus, for example, Snodgrass (1989-90) has convincingly interpreted the general decline in votive offerings at sanctuaries from the fifth century as a reflection of a new tendency to convert wealth of various forms (booty included) into other forms of art (especially sculpture). Yet I concur with van Wees (1998) in suggesting that a major shift in the social role of military force is really a phenomenon of the fifth century at the earliest, and that there is a much higher degree of continuity in attitudes to the conduct and significance of war between the Early Iron Age and the Archaic period than has often been supposed.

Department of Classics, King's College, London

Bibliography

Ahlberg, G. 1971. *Fighting on Land and Sea in Greek Geometric Art*. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.

Alexandri, O. 1973. Kranos [Boiotiourges] ex Athinon, *AE*, 93-105.

Amandry, P. 1987. Trépieds de Delphes et du Péloponnèse. *BCH* 111, 79-131.

Amyx, D.A. 1988. *Corinthian Vase-Painting of the Archaic Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Amyx, D.A & P. Lawrence. 1975. *Corinth* VII, ii. *Archaic Corinthian Pottery and the Anaploga Well*. Princeton, N.J.: ASCSA.

Anderson, J.K. 1991. Hoplite weapons and offensive arms, in Hanson 1991c, 15-37.

Andrewes, A. 1969. *The Greek Tyrants*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Antonaccio, C. 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Apostolopoulou Kakavoyianni, O. 1992. Evrimata tis protogeometrikis kai geometrikis periodou apo tis Feres, in *Praktika. Diethnes Synedrio gia tin Archaia Thessalia sti Mnimin tou Dimitri R. Theochari*. Athens: TAP, 312-320.

Archibald, Z. 1998. *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Archibald, Z. 2000. Space, hierarchy and community in Archaic and Classical Macedonia, Thessaly and Thrace, in Hodkinson & Brock, 213-33.

Axenidis, T.D. 1947. *Larisa kai i archaia Thessalia* I, Athens: Sideri.

Bakhuizen, S.C. 1976. *Chalcis-in-Euboea, Iron and Chalcidians Abroad*. Leiden: Brill.

Béquignon, Y. 1937. *La vallée du Sperchios des origines au IVe siècle*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Bérard, C. 1970. *Eretria* III. *L'Hérôon à la porte de l'ouest*. Bern: Francke.

Bettalli, M. 1995. *I mercenari nel mondo greco* I. *Dalle origini alla fine del V. sec. a.C.* Pisa: ETS.

Blegen, C., H. Palmer & R.S. Young. 1964. *Corinth* XIII. *The North Cemetery*. Princeton, N.J.: ASCSA.

Boedeker, D. 1995. Simonides on Plataea: narrative elegy, mythodic history. *ZPE* 107, 217-29.

Boedeker, D. 1998. The new Simonides and heroization at Plataia, in Fisher and van Wees 1998, 231-49.

Bowden, H. 1993. Hoplites and Homer: warfare, hero cult, and the ideology of the polis, in Rich & Shipley 1993, 45-63.

Bowie, E. 1986. Early Greek elegy; symposium and public festival. *JHS* 106, 13-35.

Bowie, E. 1990. *Miles ludens?* The problem of martial exhortation in early Greek elegy, in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 221-29.

Bradley, R. 1990. *The Passage of Arms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brinkmann, J. 1989. The Akkadian words for 'Ionia' and 'Ionian', in R.F. Sutton (ed.), *Daidalikon. Studies in Memory of Raymond V. Schoder S.J.*, Wauconda, Ill.: Bolchazy-Carducci, 53-71.

Brinkmann, V. 1985. Die aufgemalten Namensbeischriften an Nord- und Ostfries des Siphnier-schatzhauses. *BCH* 109, 77-130.

Brize, P. 1997. Offrandes de l'époque géométrique et archaïque à l'Héraion de Samos, in J. de la Genière (ed.), *Héra: images, espaces, cultes*. Naples: CJB, 123-37.

Brown, R.B. 1983. Greeks in Assyria: some overlooked evidence, *CW* 77, 300-3.

Buchholz, H.-G., & J. Weisner. 1977. *Kriegswesen* (*Arch.Hom.* E1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. (trans. J. Raffan). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burnett, A. P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets*. London: Duckworth.

Callmer, C. 1943. *Studien zur Geschichte Arkadiens bis zur Gründung des arkadischen Bundes*. Lund: Gleerup.

Camp, J. 1986. *The Athenian Agora*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Camp, J. 1994. Before democracy: Alkmaionidai and Peisistratidai, in W. Coulson (ed.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 7-12.

Carapanos, C. 1878. *Dodone et ses ruines*. Paris: Hachette.

Carman, J. 1994. *Material Harm: Archaeological Studies of War and Violence*. Glasgow: Cruithne.

Cartledge, P.A. 1979. *Sparta and Lakonia*. London: Routledge.

Castriota, D. 1992. *Myth, Ethos and Actuality. Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens*. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Catling, H.W, & E.A. 1980. Objects in bronze, iron and lead, in M.R. Popham, L.H. Sackett & P.G. Themelis (eds.), *Lefkandi* I. *The Iron Age*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Christiansen, J. 1992. *Greece in the Geometric Period*. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.

Constantinidou, S. 1992. The importance of bronze in early Greek religion. *Dodone*, 137-64.

Cook, R.M. 1958. Speculation on the origins of coinage. *Historia* 7, 257-62.

Cooper, F. 1996. *The Temple of Apollo Bassitas* I. *The Architecture*. Princeton, N.J.: ASCSA.

Dakaris, S. 1993. *Dodona*. Athens: TAP.

Daviero Rocchi, G. 1993. *Città-Stato e Stati federali della Grecia Classica. Lineamenti di Storia delle Istituzioni Politiche*. Milan: LED.

Demand, N.H. 1990. *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece. Flight and Consolidation*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press.

de Souza, P. 1998. Towards thalassocracy? Archaic Greek naval developments, in Fisher & van Wees 1998, 271-93.

Dickey, K. 1992. Corinthian Burial Customs, ca. 1100 to 550 BC (PhD diss. Bryn Mawr College).

Dougherty, C. 1993. It's murder to found a colony, in C. Dougherty & L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 178-98.

Dougleri Intzesiloglou, A. 1994. Oi neoteres archaiologikes evreunes stin periochi ton archaion Feron, *Thessalia*, 71-92.

Ducat, J. 1994. *Les Pénestes de Thessalie*. Besançon: Université de Besançon.

Dunbabin, T.J. 1962. *Perachora* II. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Effenterre, H. van. 1994. Ecrire sur les murs, in H.-J. Gehrke (ed.), *Rechtskodifizierung und soziale Normen*. Tübingen: Günter Narr, 87-95.

Ehrenberg, V. 1969. *The Greek State* (2nd ed.). London: Methuen.

Eliot, C.W.J., & M. Eliot. 1968. The Lechaion cemetery near Corinth. *Hesperia* 37, 345-67.

Ellinger, P. 1993. *La légende nationale Phocidienne* (*BCH* Supp.27). Paris and Athens: Boccard.

Felsch, R.C.S., et al. 1987. Bericht über die Grabungen im Heiligtum der Artemis Elaphebolos und des Apollon von Hyampolis 1978-1982. *AA*, 1-99.

Faklaris, P.V. 1990. *Archaia Kynouria. Anthropini Drastiriotita kai Periballon*. Athens: TAP.

Felsch R.C.S., H.J. Kienast & H. Schuler. 1980. Apollon und Artemis oder Artemis und Apollon? Bericht von der Grabungen im neu Entdecken Heiligtum bei Kalapodi, 1973-1977. *AA*, 38-123.

Fields, N. 1994a. Apollo: god of war, protector of mercenaries, in K.A. Sheedy (ed.), *Archaeology in the Peloponnese*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 95-113.

Fields, N. 1994b. The Anatomy of a Mercenary: from Archilochos to Alexander (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne).

Fisher, N. & H. van Wees (eds). 1998. *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. Swansea: Bristol Classical Press.

Forrest, W.G. 1966. *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

Foxhall, L. 1997. A view from the top. Evaluating the Solonian property classes, in Mitchell & Rhodes 1997, 113-36.

Foxhall, L. 1998. Cargoes of the heart's desire: the character of trade in the Archaic Mediterranean world, in Fisher & van Wees 1998, 295-309.

Fried, M.H. 1968. *War. The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression*. Natural History Press.

Friedel, D. 1986. Maya warfare: an example of peer polity interaction, in C. Renfrew & J. Cherry (eds.), *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 93-108.

Frödin, O. & A. Persson. 1938. *Asine. Results of the Swedish Excavations 1922-1930*. Stockholm: GLAF.

Frost, F.J. 1984. The Athenian military before Cleisthenes. *Historia* 33, 283-94.

Frost, F.J. 1994. Aspects of early Athenian citizenship, in A.L. Boegehold & A.C. Scarfuro (eds.), *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 45-56.

Gadolou, A. 1998. Chalkina kai siderenia opla apo to iero sto Ano Mazaraki (Rakita) Achaia. Mia proti parousiasi, in *Praktika tou E Diethnou Synedriou Peloponnesiakon Spoudon, 6-10 Septemvriou 1995*. Athens: Society for Peloponnesian Studies.

Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Griffo, P. 1946. Ultimi scavi e ultime scoperte in Agrigento. *Quaderni di Archeologia Agrigento* 3, 30-31.

Guarducci, M. 1988. Epigraphical notes, in G.M.A. Richter, *Archaic Gravestones of Attica*, repr. Bristol and Oak Park, Ill.: Bristol Classical Press/Bolchazy-Carducci, 155-72.

Hägg, R. (ed.). 1983. *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC. Tradition and Innovation*. Stockholm: Åström.

Hall, J.M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hammond, N.J.L. 1967. *Epirus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hansen, M.H. 1997a. A note on the classification of Aigition as a polis, in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, 173-75.

Hansen, M.H. 1997b. *Polis* as the generic term for state, in T. Heine Nielsen (ed.), *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 9-15.

Hansen, M.H. 1998. *Polis and City-State. An Ancient Concept and its Modern Equivalent*. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences..

Hanson, V.D. 1991a. The ideology of hoplite battle, ancient and modern, in Hanson 1991c, 3-11.

Hanson, V.D. 1991b. Hoplite technology in phalanx battle, in Hanson 1991c, 63-84.

Hanson, V.D. (ed.). 1991c. *Hoplites. The Classical Greek Battle Experience*. London: Routledge.

Harris, E. 1997. A new solution to the riddle of the *seisachtheia*, in Mitchell & Rhodes 1997, 108-12.

Hatzopoulos, M. & L. Loukopoulou (eds). 1980. *Philip of Macedon*. Athens: Ekdotike Athenon.

Heine Nielsen, T. 1996a. Arkadia. City ethnics and tribalism, in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis*. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, 117-63.

Heine Nielsen, T. 1996b. *Pollon ek polion.* The Polis Structure of Arkadia in the Archaic and Classical Periods (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Copenhagen).

Heine Nielsen, T. 1999. The concept of Arkadia: the people, their land and their organisation, in Heine Nielsen & Roy 1999, 16-79.

Heine Nielsen T., & J. Roy. 1998. The Azanians of northern Arkadia. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 49, 5-44.

Heine Nielsen T. & J. Roy (eds.). 1999. *Defining Ancient Arkadia*. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences.

Helly, B. 1973. *Gonnoi* I. *La cité et son histoire*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Helly, B. 1995. *L'état thessalien: Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les tagoi*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranée.

Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herscher, R. 1873. *Epistolographie Graeci*. Paris.

Hobbes, T. 1651. *Leviathan*, London (ed. R. Tuck, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1991).

Hodkinson, S. & R. Brock (eds.). 2000. *Alternatives to the Democratic Polis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoffmann, G. 1997. *Imports and Immigrants: Near Eastern Contacts with Iron Age Crete*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hoffmann, H. & A.E. Raubitschek. 1972. *Early Cretan Armorers*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 1992. Arbitrators, lawgivers and the 'codification of law' in Archaic Greece. *Metis* 7, 49-81

Holladay, A.J. 1982. Hoplites & heresies. *JHS* 102, 94-103

Hornblower, H. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides* I. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Houby-Nielsen, S. 1992. Interaction between chieftains and citizens? 7th cent. B.C. burial customs in Athens. *Acta Hyperborea* 4, 343-74.

Houby-Nielsen, S. 1995. 'Burial language' in Archaic and Classical Kerameikos. *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* I, 129-91.

Intzesiloglou, B.G. 1994. Istoriki topografia tis periochis tou Kolpou tou Voulou, in *Thessalia*, 31-56.

Iozzo, M. & M. Pagano. 1995. Cataloghi degli oggetti, in *Scavi di Pallation. ASAtene* 68-69 (51-52, 1990-1991), 119-80.

Jackson, A.H. 1983. Some deliberate damage to Archaic Greek helmets dedicated at Olympia. *LCM* 8 (2), 22-27.

Jackson, A.H. 1991. Hoplites and the gods: the dedication of captured arms and armour, in Hanson 1991c, 228-49.

Jackson, A.H. 1992. Arms and armour in the panhellenic sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia, in H. Kyrieleis & W. Coulson (eds.) *Symposium on the Olympic Games*. Athens: DAI, 141-44.

Jackson, A.H. 1993. War and raids for booty in the world of Odysseus, in Rich & Shipley 1993, 64-76

Jackson, A.H. 1999. Three possible early dedications of arms and armour at Isthmia, in Morgan 1999a, ch. I.4, 161-66.

Jarva, E. 1995. *Archaiologia on Archaic Greek Body Armour*. Rovaniemi: Pohjois-Suomen Historiallinen Yhdistys.

Johansen, K.F. 1923. *Les vases Sikyoniens*. Paris: Champion.

Katakouta, S., & G. Touphexis, 1994. Ta teichi tou Farsalou, in *Thessalia*, 189-200.

Kearsley, R. 1999. Greeks overseas in the 8th century BC: Euboeans, Al Mina and Assyrian imperialism, in G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Ancient Greeks West and East*. Leiden: Brill, 109-134.

Keegan, J. 1993. *A History of Warfare*. London: Pimlico.

Kilian, K. 1975. *PBF* XIV, ii. *Fibeln in Thessalien von der mykenischen bis zur archaischen Zeit*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Kilian, K. 1977. Zwei Italische Kammhelme aus Griechenland, in *Etudes delphiques* (*BCH* supp.4). Paris: Boccard, 429-42.

Kilian, K. 1983. Weihungen aus Eisen und Eisenverarbeitung im Heiligtum zu Philia (Thessalien), in Hägg 1983, 131-46.

Kourou, N. 1980. Tafiko sounolo apo tin periochi Aigiou, in *Stele: Tomos eis mnimin Nikolaou Kontoleontos*. Athens: Phil. Nik. Kontoleontos, 313-17.

Kraay, C.M. 1964. Hoards, small coinage and the origin of coinage. *JHS* 84, 76-91.

Krentz, P. 1985, The nature of Hoplite Battle. *Cl Ant* 4, 50-61

Kuhrt, A. 1995. *The Ancient Near East c.3000-330 BC*. London: Routledge.

Kunze, E. 1956. Schildbeschläge. *Olympia Berichte* V. Berlin: de Gruyter, 35-68

Kunze, E. 1958. Helme. *Olympia Berichte* VI. Berlin: de Gruyter, 18-151.

Kunze, E. 1967a. Waffenweihungen. *Olympia Berichte* VIII. Berlin: de Gruyter, 83-106.

Kunze, E. 1967b. Helme. *Olympia Berichte* VIII. Berlin: de Gruyter, 111-83.

Kunze, E. 1991. *Beinschienen. Olympische Forschungen* XXI. Berlin; de Gruyter.

Kunze, E. 1994. Chalkidische Helme IV-VII. *Olympia Berichte* IX. Berlin: de Gruyter, 27-100.

Langdon, S. 1987. Gift exchange in the Geometric sanctuaries, in T. Linders & G. Nordquist (eds.), *Gifts to the Gods*. Uppsala: Academia Upsaliensis, 107-13.

Langdon, S. (ed.). 1993. *From Pasture to Polis*. Colombia/London: University of Missouri Press.

Larsen, J.A.O. 1968. *Greek Federal States. Their Institutions and History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latacz, J. 1977 *Kampfparänase, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirchlichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*. (*Zetemata* 66), Munich: C.H. Beck.

Link, S. 1991. *Landverteilung und sozialer Frieden im archaischen Griechenland*. (*Historia* Einzelschriften, 69). Stuttgart: Steiner.

Lorimer, H. 1947. The hoplite phalanx with special reference to the poems of Archilocus and Tyrtaeus. *BSA* 42, 76-138.

Luckenbill, D.D. 1926. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maaß, M. 1984. Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel. Neue Funde von Waffenweihungen. *AA*, 263-80.

Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden: Brill.

Martin, T. 1985. *Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Miller. M.C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC. A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, S. 1993. *The Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles: a Painted Macedonian Tomb*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Mitchell, L.G. & P.J. Rhodes (eds.). 1997. *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*. London: Routledge.

Morgan, C.A. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles. The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, C.A. 1993. The Origins of pan-Hellenism, in R. Hägg & N. Marinatos (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches*. London: Routledge, 18-44.

Morgan, C.A. 1994. The evolution of a sacral 'landscape': Isthmia, Perachora, and the early Corinthian state, in S. Alcock & R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the Gods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 105-42.

Morgan, C.A. 1997. The archaeology of sanctuaries in Early Iron Age and Archaic ethne: a preliminary view, in Mitchell & Rhodes 1997, 168-98.

Morgan, C.A. 1999a. *Isthmia* VIII. *The Late Bronze Age Settlement and Early Iron Age Sanctuary*. Princeton: ASCSA.

Morgan, C.A. 1999b. Cultural subzones in Early Iron Age and Archaic Arkadia?, in Heine Nielsen & Roy 1999, 382-456.

Morgan, C.A. 1999c. The archaeology of ethnicity in the colonial world of the eighth to sixth centuries BC: approaches and prospects, in M. Bats & A. Stazio (eds.), *Frontieri e Confini. Atti della 37° Convegno di Studi Sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto Ott. 1997*. Taranto: Istituto per la Storia e l'Archaellogia della Magna Graecia, 88-145.

Morgan, C.A. 2000. Politics without the polis: cities and the formation of the Achaian ethnos, ca. 800-500 BC, in Brock & Hodkinson 2000, 189-211.

Morgan, C.A. Forthcoming. Ethne, ethnicity and early Greek states, ca.1200-480: an archaeological perspective, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Washington: Center for Hellenic Studies/Harvard University Press.

Morgan, C. A., & Hall, J. M. 1996. Achaian poleis and Achaian colonisation, in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* vol.3. Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, 164-232.

Morris, I. 1998. Archaeology and Archaic Greek history, in Fisher & van Wees 1998, 1-91.

Nilsson, M. 1929. Die Hoplitentaktik und das Staatswesen. *Klio* 22, 240-49.

Osborne, R. 1997. Law and laws: how do we join up the dots? in Mitchell & Rhodes 1997, 74-82.

Page, D. 1955. *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Page, D. 1975. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Page, D. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parke, H. 1933. *Greek Mercenary Soldiers. From the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Payne, H. 1931. *Necrocorinthia. A Study of Corinthian Art in the Archaic Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Payne, H. 1933. *Protokorinthische Vasenmalerei*. Berlin: Keller

Perdrizet, P. 1908. *Fouilles de Delphes* V, i. *Monuments figurés, petits bronzes, terres cuites, antiquités diverses*. Paris: Thorin et fils.

Pikoulas, I.A. 1981/2. H Arkadiki Azania. *Praktika tou B Diethnous Synedriou Peloponnisiakon Spoudon, Patrai 25-31 Maiou 1980*, II. Athens: Society for Peloponnesian Studies, 269-81.

Popham, M.R. 1994. Precolonisation: early Greek contact with the east, in G. Tsetskhladze & F. de Angelis (eds.), *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation*. Oxford: OUCA, 11-34.

Poulsen, E. 1994. *Asine* II. 6:2. *The Post-Geometric Settlement Material and Tombs of the Hellenistic Period*. Stockholm: Åström.

Pritchett, W.K. 1979. *The Greek State at War* III. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pritchett, W.K. 1985. *The Greek State at War* IV. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pritchett, W.K. 1985. *The Greek State at War* V. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pritchett, W.K. 1996. *Greek Archives, Cults and Topography*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Purcell, N. 1990. Mobility and the polis, in O. Murray & S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 29-58.

Purcell, N. 1997. Review of G. Tsetskhladze & F. de Angelis (eds.), *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation*, Oxford 1994. *Antiquity* 71, 500-1.

Raaflaub, K. 1997. Soldiers, citizens and the evolution of the early Greek *polis*, in Mitchell & Rhodes 1997, 49-59.

Rafn, B. 1979. *Asine* II:6:1. *The Graves of the Early Fifth Century BC*. Gothenburg: Paul Åström.

Raubitschek, A. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*. Cambridge, Mass.: AIA.

Ray, J. 1982. The Carian inscriptions from Egypt. *JEgyptianArch* 68, 181-98.

Rich, J. & G. Shipley (eds.). 1993. *War and Society in the Greek World*. London: Routledge.

Rihll, T. 1993. War, slavery and settlement in early Greece, in Rich & Shipley 1993, 77-107.

Risberg, C. 1997. Evidence of metalworking in early Greek sanctuaries, in C. Gillis, C. Risberg & B. Sjöberg (eds.), *Trade and Production in Premonetary Greece: Production and the Craftsman*. Gothenburg: Paul Åström, 185-96.

Robertson, G. 1997. Evaluating the citizen in Archaic Greek lyric, elegy and inscribed epigram, in Mitchell & Rhodes 1997, 148-57.

Robertson, N. 1978. The myth of the First Sacred War. *CQ* 72, 38-73.

Roy, J. 1967. The mercenaries of Cyrus. *Historia* 16, 287-323.

Roy, J. 1972. Arcadian nationality as seen in Xenophon's *Anabasis*. *Mnemosyne* 25, 129-136.

Roy, J. 1999. The economies of Arkadia, in Heine Nielsen & Roy 1999, 320-81.

Salmon, J. 1977. Political Hoplites? *JHS* 97, 84-101.

Shapiro, H.A. 1993. *Personifications in Greek Art*. Bern: Akanthus.

Shipley, G. 1993. Introduction: the limits of war, in Rich & Shipley 1993, 1-24.

Sinn, U. 1994. Apollon und die Kentauromachie im Westgiebel des Zeustempels in Olympia. *AA*, 585-602.

Sipsie-Esbach, M. 1986. *Protogeometrische Keramik aus Iolkos*. Mainz: Volker Spiess.

Sismanidis, K. 1987. To archaiko nekrotafeio tis Agias Paraskevis, in *Amitos. Timitikos Tomos gia ton Kathigiti Manoli Androniko,* vol. 2 Thessaloniki: Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki, 787-803.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1964a. *Early Greek Armour and Weapons*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1964b. Carian armourers: the growth of a tradition. *JHS* 84, 107-18.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1965. The Hoplite Reform & History. *JHS* 85, 110-22.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1967. *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1974. Cretans in Arcadia?. *Antichità Cretesi: Studi in onore di Doro Levi* II. Catania: Università di Catania, 196-201.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1980. *Archaic Greece. The Age of Experiment*. London: Dent.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1989-1990. The economics of dedication at Greek sanctuaries. *Scienze dell'Antichità* 3-4, 287-94.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1993. The 'hoplite reform' revisited. *DHA* 19.1, 47-61.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1996. Iron, in J.N. Coldstream & H.W. Catling (eds.), *Knossos North Cemetery. Early Greek Tombs*. London: Thames & Hudson, 575-97.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1999. *Arms and Armor of the Greeks*. Revised edition, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Spiegel, J. 1990. *War and Peace in Classical Greek Literature*, Jerusalem.

Stafford, E. 1998. Greek Cults of Deified Abstractions (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London).

Stary, P. 1979. Foreign elements in Etruscan arms and armour: 8th to 3rd centuries BC. *PPS* 45, 179-206.

Thessalia. Thessalia. Dekapenta chronia archaiologikis evreunas 1975-1990. Apotelesmata kai prooptikes. Athens: Kapon. 1994.

Thomas, R. 1996. Written in stone? Liberty, equality, orality and the codification of law, in L. Foxhall & A.D.E. Lewis (eds.), *Greek Law in its Political Setting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 9-31.

Tuck, R. (ed.). 1991. *Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tziaphalias, A. 1990. Agios Georgios Larisas. *Archaiologia* 34, 44-49.

Tziaphalias, A. 1994a. Dekapente chronia anaskafon stin archaia Larisa, in *Thessalia*, 153-78.

Tziaphalias, A. 1994b. Agios Georgios Larisas, in *Thessalia*, 179-88.

Viviers, D. 1987. La conquête de Sigée par Pisistrate. *AntCl* 56, 5-25.

Viviers, D. 1994. La cité de Dattalla et l'expansion territoriale de Lyktos en Crète centrale. *BCH* 118, 229-59.

Vokotopoulou, I. 1986. *Vitsa. Ta Nekrotafeia mias Molossikis Komis*. Athens: TAP.

Voyatzis, M.E. 1985. Arcadia and Cyprus: aspects of their interrelationship between the twelfth and eighth centuries B.C. *RDAC*, 155-63.

Voyatzis, M.E. 1990. *The Early Sanctuary of Athena Alea at Tegea and Other Archaic Sanctuaries in Arcadia*. Gothenburg: Paul Åström.

Wade-Gery. H.T. 1924. Jason of Pherae and Aleuas the Red. *JHS* 44, 55-64.

Wallace, R.B. 1987. The origins of electrum coinage. *AJA* 91, 385-97.

Watrous, L.V. 1982. The sculptural program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi. *AJA* 86, 159-72.

Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society* (G. Roth & C. Wittich eds.), Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wees, H. van 1992. *Status Warriors*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Wees, H. van 1994. The Homeric way of war: the Iliad and the hoplite phalanx. *Greece and Rome* 41, 1-18, 131-55.

Wees, H. van 1995 Princes at dinner. Social event and social structure in Homer, in J.P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 147-82.

Wees, H. van 1998. Greeks bearing arms. The state, the leisure class and the display of weapons in Archaic Greece, in Fisher & van Wees 1998, 333-78.

Wees, H. van 1999. The mafia of early Greece: violent exploitation in the seventh and sixth centuries BC, in K. Hopwood (ed.), *Organised Crime in Antiquity*. London: Duckworth, 1-56.

Wells, B. 1990. The Asine sima. *Hesperia* 59, 157-61.

Whitley, J. 1994. The monuments that stood before Marathon: tomb cult and hero cult in Archaic Attica. *AJA* 98, 213-30.

Notes

1   While variation between regional schools of Archaic vase painting has been stressed (notably by van Wees *op.cit.*), it is also important to consider the potential impact of regional variation in syntax and subject matter in ostensibly more homogeneous Geometric painting. The pioneering study of battle depictions, Ahlberg 1971, is essentially a study of Attic material, and while finds from other regions are noted, potential differences are not considered. This remains a topic for future study.

2   For Archaic and Classical evidence, see Poulsen 1994, 29-30; Rafn 1979; Wells 1990.

3   This is not, however, a universally held view: see, for example, Rihll 1993, 86-88, who stresses the insecurity of most poleis.

4   At Demetrias, for example, metal finds consist largely of personal ornaments: *Delt* 40 1985, 186-91; *Delt* 42 1987, 246-51. At Argissa Magoula, a Boiotian fibula was found by chance along with an Archaic shieldband and a human figure hydria handle: Kilian 1975, 2, 3. The exceptional case of Ag. Giorgios Larisa is considered below.

5   *Delt* 21 1966, 287; *Delt* 31 1976, 206-9; *Delt* 32 1977, 149-52; *Delt* 33 1978, 181-83; *Delt* 34 1979, 240; *Delt* 35 1980, 301-3; *Delt* 36 1981, 271; *Delt* 38 1983, 229.

6   The recent consensus of opinion does not view the depiction on the Chigi Vase as an orthodox phalanx, although for widely differing reasons. Thus, for example, van Wees 1994, 143 sees the formation as more open and fluid than that of the Classical phalanx, with differential degrees of motion between ranks, whereas Krentz 1985, 52 sees it as unduly tight. See also Anderson 1991, 18-20.

7   Huntsmen Painter Group: Perachora aryballos (Dunbabin 1962, 15-17); Corinth CP 2096 from Lechaion (Eliot and Eliot 1968, 348-50). Chigi Group: Syracuse museum, Gela aryballos (Johansen 1923, 99 pl.34:2); Corinth CP 2649 (Amyx and Lawrence 1975, pl.1 no.1); Villa Guilia 22679, olpe from Veii (Payne 1931, 71, fig.17; *EAA* VII (1966), plate opposite p.138 for detail of hoplites; Amyx 1988, 32, no.3); London BM 1889.4-18.1, aryballos from Thebes (Amyx 1988, pl.11:1a-b = 'Macmillan Aryballos'); Berlin 3773, aryballos from Kamiros (Johansen 1923 pl.32:1a-e); Louvre CA 1831, aryballos (Payne 1931, pl.1:5). Misc: Snodgrass 1964a, pl. 28, alabastron in Berlin.

8   A similar argument could be made for certain instances of weapons in burials, as e.g. Camp 1986, 30-31 on the EG warrior cremation from the Athenian Agora (although in this case at least, one might argue that wrapping a sword around the urn was simply a practical way of fitting it into the grave). The extent of mutilation in western European votive deposits of all kinds is noted by Bradley 1990, 113, 176.

9   On the treatment of heroic burials and their relationship to ancestor cult: Antonaccio 1995, 221-43. Van Wees 1998, 363-65, makes an analogous point in emphasizing that the omission of weapons from symposium scenes in Attic vase painting does not necessarily imply their absence in real life, but rather derives from artists' emphasis upon other aspects of the event. On sculptural representations, see Hannestad, this volume.

10 Parke 1933, 3-13 rightly acknowledges the role of mercenary service, especially in connection with tyrants, but focuses on paid mercenaries rather than non-local contingents acquired via other social channels; see discussion below.

11 These remain largely unpublished: for brief notes see Hammond 1967, 429-438; Carapanos 1878, pl.57:6, pl.58:1, 3, 5, 9; Snodgrass 1964a, 41, 47, 232; see also the hoplite figurine of *c.*530-510, Dakaris 1993, figs. 25-26.

12 Warrior imagery among small-scale Thessalian bronzes is particularly striking. See, e.g., Buchholz and Weisner 1977, 18, 23, pl.XIII (Karditsa warrior); Christiansen 1992, no. 24; Langdon 1993, 194-97 (LG helmeted warrior of smiting god type, Menil Collection, Houston, with parallels from Philia and Volos).

13 Other comparable Thessalian reformers are cited in later sources, notably Skopas the elder, grandfather of Simonides' patron Skopas the Drinker (Xenophon, *Hellenika* 5.1.19, 6.1.12), and Thessalos (Charonax, reported by Stephanos of Byzantion s.v. Dorion, *FrGHist* III.338.8). That the aristocracy maintained rights of government, and thence presumably other reforming powers, is clear in Pindar's praise of the family of his Aleuad patron Thorax (*Pyth.* 10.69-72).

14 Robertson 1978, 64-65 suggests that he was mentioned, or his importance inflated, to flatter one of Philip II's senior generals of the same name.

15 This view is not undisputed. For the suggestion that the Peisistratid imposition represents a mild continuity of an accepted tax practice, see van Wees 1999, 21-22, 32; this volume.

16 Cypriote foundation legends: Voyatzis 1985. For the supposed foundation of Gortyn from Tegea: Pausanias 8.53.4 (compare e.g. Conon 26 *FGrHist* 36, who has it founded from Lakonian Amyklai).