

## §7 PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

There were a number of pilgrimages in the Hellenic world restricted to people of particular ethnic groups, notably those specific to the Ionian people. These religious celebrations were open only to those who were of the Ionian race, and comprised the Delia and the Panionia. The Dorians, too, had at least one pilgrimage in Asia Minor which, however, only involved five or six cities, while the Boeotians gathered as pilgrims every sixty years in order to celebrate a festival which clearly had, in pre-classical periods, a human sacrifice as its central rite.

Delos was the main Ionian religious centre, and though Ionians in Asia Minor had a meeting place at the Panionion where they would gather for political and religious purposes, it was to Delos that the Ionians primarily went to worship together. The Homeric *Hymn to Delian Apollo* makes clear Delos' primacy, and Apollo, according to myth, was born on this island. At the time when Leto was giving birth to Apollo, Delos was worried that the child Apollo would be contemptuous of her barren rock like form, and sink her beneath the waves. So Delos made Leto promise by the most binding of oaths that Apollo would build his first temple, which would serve as an oracular centre, on the island; Leto swore a mighty oath that Apollo would have on Delos his altar and temenos forever, and that he would honour Delos above all.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Apollo, born on Delos, as father of Ion and thus of the Ionian people, established this island as the main focal point of communal worship of the Ionian people, and Delos had primacy over Delphi in the Ionian mythical tradition.

The best source of information concerning the penteteric pilgrimage to the island of Delos by the Ionians comes from Thucydides, who states that in the winter of the year 426/5 the Athenians carried out a purification of Delos, "no doubt because of some oracle". Peisistratos had also carried out a purification of the island, but only that part in sight of the temple, and now the Athenians undertook a major purification, removing all the tombs of the dead and forbidding births and deaths to take place on the island in the future. All those about to die or give birth had to be taken to the nearby island of Rheneia.<sup>2</sup> Why the Athenians carried out the purification at this

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hom. Hymn Del. Apoll.* 49-89.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. 3.104.1-2, cf. 1.8.1. The purification of the island by Peisistratos is also mentioned by Hdt. 1.64.2, who notes that this was in order to obey an oracle; Diod. 12.58.6-7 states that the Athenians purified the island in the fifth century due to the plague, and at the command of an oracle; cf. Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 2.414; cf. ch. 4 nn. 60, 147, with text. Thucydides points out, 3.104.2, cf. 1.13.6, that when Polykrates, tyrant of Samos, conquered Rheneia, he dedicated it to the god Apollo, by binding it to Delos with a chain; for the date, see Parke *CQ* 40 (1946) 105-08. The

particular time is unknown, but it is possible that during the Peloponnesian War the Athenians sought to promote a festival which, if not Panhellenic, at least was not in enemy hands; the Delia did not involve their enemies; that is, it was a Panionian religious celebration exclusive of the members of the Peloponnesian alliance.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, throughout the war, the Athenians continued their participation in other festivals, but the exclusion of non-Ionians, and the participation of the members of the empire, must have been at least partially designed to strengthen ties between the head of the empire and the allies.<sup>4</sup>

After the purification had been carried out, the Athenians instituted a penteteric festival which was based upon an older festival; the new festival was known as the Delia or Apollonia.<sup>5</sup> Thucydides refers to this festival as existing in the distant past, but unfortunately he is not specific about the dates involved, stating that there was once a great gathering at Delos of the Ionians and islanders, with contests in athletics, poetry and music, and that each participating polis would furnish a *khoros*. However, the contests and the majority of the ceremonies were later discontinued, probably because of “disasters”.<sup>6</sup> The fact that the islanders and the Athenians are mentioned as continuing to send *khorois*, but that the Ionians of Asia Minor are not mentioned as doing so, has been taken as an indication that the latter were not present at this time, and could indicate that the domination by the Lydians and subsequently by the Persians of the Asia Minor seaboard put an end to the participation by the Ionians of this area in the festival.<sup>7</sup> The full programme lapsed until 426, when the Athenians revived the celebration in its ancient form, and in addition added horse-racing, a new event.<sup>8</sup> The main item of the re-established festival was a choral competition, with *khorois* singing in honour of the god; there were also athletic

---

island of Rheneia was to play an important part in Nikias' theoria to Delos; see below nn. 18-22, with text.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 2.414: “... the opportunity was taken to assert Athenian interest in Apollo, who at Delphi now seemed exclusively Peloponnesian and Dorian, and to start another international festival, the other four being, as it happened, in Peloponnesian hands....”; Parke *Greek Oracles* 109; cf. ch. 2 n. 45, with text.

<sup>4</sup> Barron *JHS* 84 (1964) 47 argues that the Delian festival and the sending of the cow and panoply (see below n. 126, with text) were both manifestations of Athens' stressing its Ionian links, as the traditional founder, with the member states of the alliance.

<sup>5</sup> For the festival and its name, see Nilsson *Griechische Feste* 144-49; Arnold *AJA* 37 (1933) 452-55; for its date, see also Laidlaw *Delos* 46-48. Delos was an oracular centre (*Hom. Hymn. Del. Apoll.* 81), though Thuc. 3.104 does not mention this, while for Delos as an oracular centre in late antiquity, see Gregory *CW* 76 (1982-83) 290-91.

<sup>6</sup> Thuc. 3.104.6.

<sup>7</sup> Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 2.415.

<sup>8</sup> Thuc. 3.104.6; cf. Bean *JHS* 73 (1953) 31.

contests.<sup>9</sup> Prizes were offered to the victorious,<sup>10</sup> and the festival thus differed from the four main Panhellenic festivals.

Thucydides quotes the *Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo* in support of his statement regarding the original celebration and states that the evidence of “Homer” attests to a great gathering of Ionians at Delos,<sup>11</sup> which suggests that Delos had been a pilgrimage site from at least the date of the composition of this *Homeric Hymn*. There is also the evidence from the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus in flattering Nausikaa compares her beauty to that of a “fresh young palm tree” shooting up by the altar of Apollo at Delos, which he had seen when he was there, with, as he states, an army at his back,<sup>12</sup> and clearly he is referring to the Trojan expedition. He had not travelled to Delos specifically for religious reasons, for he was *en route* to Troy; nevertheless, the reference to Delos as a religious centre is interesting, and this, with the evidence of the *Homeric Hymn*, indicates that Delos was probably one of the oldest pilgrimage sites in the Hellenic world. Myth also records that Theseus, returning home to Athens from Crete, celebrated games in honour of Apollo on Delos, crowning the victors with palm, and that the use of palm as a victor’s token at festivals stemmed from this occasion.<sup>13</sup>

Thucydides writes of a penteteric festival,<sup>14</sup> but the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* seems to distinguish between two different types of festival on Delos: the penteteric festival,<sup>15</sup> which was administered by a board of ten officials in Athens, elected by lot, which had charge of all the penteteric festivals except the Panathenaic,<sup>16</sup> and also a six-yearly festival.<sup>17</sup> At any rate, there was a four yearly religious expedition to Delos made by the Athenians, and other Ionians, and possibly a six-yearly one as well. Nikias, when he acted as the Athenian *khoregos* to Delos in the latter part of the fifth century, conducted the Athenian theoria to the island in an unusually splendid manner, and Plutarch’s account of Nikias’ theoria, using

---

<sup>9</sup> Plut. *Nik.* 3.5-7, *Thes.* 21.1-2; Thuc. 3.104.3-6; Luc. *Salt.* 16; Xen. *Comm.* 3.3.12; *Hom. Hymn. Del. Apoll.* 149-50 mentions boxing, dancing and song. That the festival centred around music and singing, see Arnold *AJA* 37 (1933) 452. Sokrates’ execution was delayed because the Delia was being celebrated: Plat. *Phaen.* 58a-b; Xen. *Comm.* 4.8.2. See also Homolle *BCH* 14 (1890) 493, 504-05.

<sup>10</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1639.13; 1635.68; Plut. *Thes.* 21.3; cf. Paus. 8.48.3; Homolle *BCH* 14 (1890) 492; cf. Arnold *AJA* 37 (1933) 454; Laidlaw *Delo.* 49.

<sup>11</sup> Thuc. 3.104.4, 6, quoting lines 146-50, 165-72 of the hymn at 3.104.4-5.

<sup>12</sup> Hom. *Od.* 6.162-65; Paus. 8.48.3 notes Odysseus’ mention of the palm.

<sup>13</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 724a-b, *Thes.* 21.3; Paus. 8.48.3.

<sup>14</sup> Thuc. 3.104.2.

<sup>15</sup> [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7.

<sup>16</sup> [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7.

<sup>17</sup> [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7; see Rhodes *Commentary* 607 on the hepteteric festival.

contemporary or near contemporary sources, gives detailed information about Athenian involvement in a specific celebration of the festival, and as such the account is unique, for while there is information about various pilgrimage celebrations, there is no comparable record of an individual celebration of a festival in a particular year.<sup>18</sup>

Nikias undertook the costs of conducting the *theoria* as a liturgy, as would have other wealthy individuals. Fourth century accounts, however, suggest that subsidies might be made by the polis; clearly not all liturgists were as wealthy as Nikias.<sup>19</sup> Plutarch records that the delegations from the cities which sent *khoroï* to Delos for the celebration would sail up to the island in no fixed order, and that a crowd would meet the ships and tell the *khoros* to start singing, even while they were disembarking, putting on their wreaths and changing their clothes, presumably into festive dress. This implies that they may not have been wreathed as they travelled on the ship, but Plutarch's statement may perhaps refer to their donning new wreaths upon their arrival and disembarkation.<sup>20</sup> Nikias, when he led the Athenian *theoria*, landed first on nearby Rheneia, with his *khoros*, sacrificial victims and other equipment. He bridged Rheneia and Delos with boats, decorated with gold, dyed robes, wreaths and screens. At dawn, the *khoros*, richly dressed, went in procession over the bridge, singing as they went.<sup>21</sup> Nikias could afford such lavish expenditure, and as a further gesture, bought a piece of land on Delos for ten thousand drachmas, and dedicated it to the gods: the proceeds were to go towards sacrifices, at which the Delians were to ask for blessings from the gods for Nikias. He erected a bronze palm-tree to Apollo, which was, however, later blown down by the wind and overturned in its fall the great statue erected by the Naxians.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Plut. *Nik.* 3.5, cf. 6-7; see ch. 1 nn. 96, 103 with text.

<sup>19</sup> See Davies *JHS* 87 (1967) 38 for the liturgical nature of the Athenian *theoria* to Delos. In particular, note that in 375/4 financial payments were made by the Delian Amphiktyony to *arkhitheroi* who were probably Athenian, and a grant of 7000 drachmas to an Athenian *trierarkhos* for conveying the *theroi* and the *khoroï*: (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1635.34-35; see bibliography at Davies *JHS* 87 (1967) 38 n. 70 for 371/0). In the fourth century, the eponymous *arkhon* appointed the *khoregoi* for Delos and an *arkhitheros* for the *triakonter* that carried the youths of the *khoroï*: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3. This *triakonter* was supposed to be Theseus', refurnished from year to year with new planks: Plut. *Thes.* 23.1.

<sup>20</sup> This could suggest that they had not been wreathed while travelling on the ship to Delos (cf. ch. 2 n. 34, with text), because there was no danger from pirates, this being the period of the zenith of Athenian naval power; for pirates, see ch. 2, n. 17, 22-33, 35-36, with text.

<sup>21</sup> Plut. *Nik.* 3.5-6.

<sup>22</sup> Plut. *Nik.* 3.7-8 (perhaps this is the palm tree mentioned at Plut. *Mor.* 397f). Callim. *Hymn Del.*, after mentioning Theseus' trip to Delos and the dancing there of those who had escaped from Crete with him, writes at 314-15: "Ἐνθεν δειλῶντα θεωρίδος ἱερὰ φοίβῳ / κεκροπίδαι πέμπουσι τοπήλα νηὸς ἑκείνης, for which see Mineur *Hymn to Delos* 244,

Later Athenian *theoriai* presumably did not match Nikias' standard of expenditure, and the reason why it is recorded is that it was unusual. Moreover, Plutarch discusses the *theoria* in the context of Nikias' liberality in khoregic and gymnastic displays, that is, in liturgies, as Nikias throughout his career attempted to win political popularity in Athens by these means.<sup>23</sup> The Athenian pilgrimage to Delos was, therefore, manipulated by Nikias for his own political advantage, and certainly the tale of his lavish expenditure would have been known throughout Athens prior to his departure, and then, upon his return, stories of the success of the *theoria* would also have circulated, not only in Athens but also throughout the empire. While *theoriai* from all states travelled to Delphi on political missions, seeking advice on political matters, it is nevertheless interesting that an actual pilgrimage could be exploited for a political end in this way, with the expenditure overshadowing the religious nature of the pilgrimage.

No inscriptions attest to the celebration of the festival after 314, and it seems that Athenian loss of control of the island led to the festival's abandonment or modification. In 166, however, the Athenians regained control of the island and reinstated the festival, with the programme including athletic and equestrian events.<sup>24</sup> According to Thucydides, the original festival, before it fell into decay, attracted participants from all over the Ionian world, and a similar status was acquired with the Athenian re-organisation of the festival in 426, when Ionians from Athens, the islands and Asia Minor came together to worship Apollo on his sacred island. The extent of popular participation, as opposed to the official sending of *theoriai*, for the history of the festival from the fifth century and later, is unknown, but the site was a major one and the participation of so many Ionian states and the number of the *khoroï*, as mentioned by Plutarch, imply that the festival was a major one which presumably attracted pilgrims other than those on official missions.

In addition to the festival at Delos, the Ionians of Asia Minor had their own Ionian celebration which centred around the association known as the *koinon* of the Ionians,<sup>25</sup> which seems to have had an early origin, a date between 900-700 being

---

note on line 314. Many Delians made a living from the pilgrims who visited Delos: Athen. 172f-173a; cf. ch. 4 n. 119, with text.

<sup>23</sup> Plut. *Nik.* 3.1-4; for the liturgy of the *gymnasia*, see Davies *JHS* 87 (1967) 35-37, 40.

<sup>24</sup> See Bruneau *Recherches sur les Cultes de Délos* 81-85, for the festival in the second century, with epigraphic evidence.

<sup>25</sup> For the Panionia, see Lenschau *Klio* 36 (1944) 227-36; Caspari *JHS* (1915) 173-88; Judeich *RhM* 82 (1933) 305-14; Lehmann-Haupt *Klio* 27 (1934) 74-77; Habicht *Gottmenschen* 17; most recently Ragone *RFIC* 114 (1986) 173-205. These works are largely concerned with the problem of the early history of the league, particularly the war with Melia; Magie *Roman Rule* 1.65-66, 2.866-

suggested for its foundation;<sup>26</sup> the deciding factor in determining this has to be the dating of the Ionian migration, and the consequent development of an Ionian “consciousness” amongst the member cities of the Asia Minor sea-board. This festival, the Panionia, held by the Ionians, presumably on an annual or penteteric basis, naturally involved the sending of official delegates by the cities of Ionia. Caspari believes that this festival must pre-date the Delian *panegyris* recorded in the *Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo*. The hymn, traditionally dated to the eighth or seventh centuries, attests to Ionians celebrating on the island of Delos, and Caspari supposes that the term Panionia would not have been applied to the festival if the Delian Ionian celebration were already in existence.<sup>27</sup> It can, however, be stated that the Ionians of the mainland clearly conceived of themselves as a separate group of Ionians, as is shown by the strong and enduring tradition of the twelve Ionian poleis in Asia Minor,<sup>28</sup> and even if the Delian festival were already in existence, it is still probable that the Ionians of Asia Minor would have taken the title of the Panionia for their festival, and called the place where they celebrated their festival the Panionion.<sup>29</sup> The *Iliad* may also refer to the celebration of this festival, according to Strabo, who records that “some suppose” that Homer had in mind the sacrifice performed at the Panionia when he wrote of Hippodamas that he “breathed out his life and bellowed just as a bull bellows when dragged by young men around the altar of the Helikonian lord”, and that they also infer from this that Homer lived after Ionian colonisation had occurred, since he mentioned the Panionian sacrifice in honour of Helikonian Poseidon in the territory of Priene. Another argument, which was thought more

---

69 provides a useful account of the Ionian koinon. For the cities involved in celebrating this festival, see fig. 7.1.

<sup>26</sup> Caspari *JHS* 35 (1915) 173-76.

<sup>27</sup> Hdt. 1.143.2-3; cf. Caspari *JHS* 35 (1915) 175-76.

<sup>28</sup> See below nn. 37-39, with text for evidence for the twelve cities.

<sup>29</sup> The political motivation of the founding of the koinon is not of relevance here. Vitruv. 4.1.4 (85) records that war was declared against Melite, i.e. Melia, by the Ionian cities, and it was destroyed: *Melite propter civium adrogantium ab his civitatibus bello indicto communi consilio est sublata*. That the koinon was established expressly to fight the Ionian city of Melia is rejected by Caspari *JHS* 35 (1915) 176; cf. Judeich *RhM* 82 (1933) 309, on the grounds that Melia was named as a member of the koinon by Vitruv. 4.1.4 (85). Caspari correctly agrees with Wilamowitz (*Kleine Schriften* 5.1, 137) that the primary purpose of the koinon was political; the koinon did not, as Caspari 176 notes, have a primarily religious focus, unlike the Delian meeting. It must be noted, however, that the revival of the Delian festival did coincide with Athenian domination of the Aegean, and that political control of this religious centre was always an important consideration. Judeich *RhM* 82 (1933) 307-08 argues that the koinon must in effect have been an Amphiktyony, and its primary purpose religious. Against this ought to be noted the attested political activity of the koinon, for which see Caspari 178-80; for evidence that the Panionion was a centre for political deliberation, see below n. 32.

convincing on this point, was based on what Homer stated about the bull, bellowing as he is taken to be sacrificed, for the Ionians considered that omens were favourable when the beast bellowed as it was being led to be sacrificed at the Panionion. On the other hand, others believed that Homer was not referring to the Panionian sacrifice but to that at Helike.<sup>30</sup>

The Panionion was an area of sacred land in Mykale (a promontory of the mainland opposite the island of Sarnos), facing the north, and dedicated to Poseidon Helikon.<sup>31</sup> It was customary for the Ionians to assemble here regularly and celebrate the Panionia,<sup>32</sup> the main activity of which was presumably a sacrifice to Poseidon.<sup>33</sup> In addition there were *agones*, at least in the second century.<sup>34</sup> Why the Ionians should have chosen to worship Poseidon is not stated, but it is presumably to be explained by the Ionian dependence on the sea, and may have had its origins in the seaward migration of the Ionian peoples in their past. All the cities were in close proximity to the Panionion, and Herodotos implies that the festival was of some importance, so there is no reason not to assume that the Panionia would have attracted many participants. The popularity of this pilgrimage would have relied entirely upon the spirit of association amongst the poleis that were involved. As the koinon was still meeting in the second century BC, it thus provides an example of a localised pilgrimage of long duration, continuing for at least five hundred years, and more, if it survived into the Roman period, despite changes in its site. It is worth noting that the arrangements for the *synoikismos* of Lebedos and Teos in the late fourth century involved the sharing of tents by the delegates of these two places when they were attending the Panionia.<sup>35</sup>

In the literary sources the koinon is usually referred to simply as a gathering of the Ionians at the Panionion; the epigraphic sources record what can be taken as the

---

<sup>30</sup> *Il.* 20.403-05: αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμὸν ἄισθε καὶ ἤρυγεν, ὡς ὅτε ταῦρος / ἤρυγεν ἐλκόμενος Ἑλικώνιον ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα / κούρων ἐλκόντων. Cf. Strabo 8.7.2 (384).

<sup>31</sup> Hdt. 1.148.1; Strabo 14.1.20 (639) see fig. 7.1.

<sup>32</sup> Hdt. 1.148.1; Strabo 8.7.2 (384), 14.1.20 (639); Diod. 15.49.1. It was at the Panionion that the Ionians assembled when they met to rebel against Cyrus, except Miletos, which had come to an agreement with the king (Hdt. 1.141.4). Later, when the Ionians rebelled in the reign of Darius, they met in the same place (Hdt. 6.7).

<sup>33</sup> Diod. 15.49.1.

<sup>34</sup> *RC* 52.27-28 records that the Ionian League had announced at its *agones* that it was awarding honours to Eumenes II (167/6 BC): διαγγελαί τε τὰς τιμὰς / ἔν τε τοῖς ὑφ' [ὑ]μῶν συντελουμένοις ἀγῶσιν

<sup>35</sup> *RC* 3.3; see ch. 3 n. 36, with text. The delegates from Lebedos were to share their tents with the Tean theoria because of the *synoikismos* of these two cities (*RC* p. 26).

official title: the koinon of the Ionians.<sup>36</sup> Herodotos' account of the foundation of the Panionia is as follows: at the time of the establishment of the festival, the whole Hellenic race was not numerous, and the Ionians were the smallest of the ethnic groups in size, and also the least considered of the Hellenes, for apart from Athens the Ionians had no major city. The Athenians and all the Ionians except twelve cities (namely Miletos, Myous, Priene, Ephesos, Kolophon, Lebedos, Teos, Klazomenai, Phokaia, Samos, Khios and Erythrai) eschewed the name of Ionians, and in fact the majority of them were ashamed of the name. These twelve cities, however, "rejoiced" in the name, and built a shrine for themselves, called the Panionion,<sup>37</sup> to which the other Ionian cities were denied access. In fact, only the city of Smyrna asked to be accepted as a member, and Herodotos here presumably means its request was accepted, which is confirmed by Pausanias and Strabo.<sup>38</sup> The Panionia was celebrated in the classical period by these twelve Ionian poleis, the original members, with Smyrna as a late addition.<sup>39</sup> Pausanias records that of these twelve original members Khios and Phokaia were late comers, and this also seems to be the case for Samos,<sup>40</sup> and Diodoros states that there were nine Ionian states who were accustomed to gather and celebrate at the Panionion.<sup>41</sup>

According to Herodotos and Pausanias, Smyrna was one of the twelve traditional Aeolian cities, from which Ionians from Kolophon drove out the inhabitants, occupying it themselves, and Pausanias writes that at a later time the Ionians allowed Smyrna to join the Panionion koinon.<sup>42</sup> Although he suggests no

<sup>36</sup> Hdt. 1.141.4, 142.1, 143.3; Paus. 7.5.1; Diod. 15.49.1; Strabo 8.7.2-3 (384-85); specifically as the koinon: Strabo 14.1.31 (644); *RC* 52.1 (restored), .22, .30, .34: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἴωνων].

<sup>37</sup> Hdt. 1.142.1, 3-4, 143.2-3; see fig. 7.1.

<sup>38</sup> Hdt. 1.143.3. The evidence of Strabo and Pausanias is discussed below nn. 42-44, with text.

<sup>39</sup> These twelve are named by Herodotos 1.142.3-4; Aelian *Var. Hist.* 8.5; Strabo 14.1.1-1.4 (632-34); Vit. 4.1.4 (85); *FGH* 239 *Marnor Parium* 27 (*IG* XII 5, 444.27); cf. Hdt. 1.145, 1.146.1; Vell. Pater. 1.4.3; Paus. 7.2.1-7.4.10.

<sup>40</sup> Khios (Paus. 7.4.10); Phokaia (Paus. 7.3.10); for Samos, Magie *Roman Rule* 2.867 tentatively cites Paus. 7.2.8-9, 7.4.2-3; *Put. Mor.* 303d; which evidence, however, is not decisive, but could be supported by Diod. 15.49.1 (nine cities in the koinon); see nn. 41, 62 below; cf. Lenschau *RE* 9 (1916) 1876.

<sup>41</sup> Diod. 15.49.1; cf. the list of Ionian cities in Vell. Pater. 1.4.3, who records no details on the koinon. Magie's *Roman Rule* 2.867 n. 48 citation of this passage from Paternulus as support for the Herodotean list must thus be qualified, as there is no direct correlation between the cities named by Herodotos and by Paternulus, who names nine mainland cities and various islands (six and *aliasque nobiles*) inhabited by Ionians; see also Aelian *Var. Hist.* 8.5; Paus 7.2.5.

<sup>42</sup> Hdt. 1.149.1 (cf. 150.1-2); Paus. 7.5.1: χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον καὶ Ἴωνες μετέδωσαν Σμυρναίοις τοῦ ἐν Πανιωνίῳ συλλόγου. Cf. Magie *Roman Rule* 2.868 n. 50.



date, this does seem to suggest that it took place not long after. Furthermore, this statement ought to be taken into conjunction with the fact that Herodotos, writing in the fifth century, states that the city of Smyrna had asked to be accepted into the koinon. Elsewhere, Pausanias makes it clear that he believed that this city had been accepted into the league by the seventh century: at the twenty-third Olympics, competitions for boxing were restored, and the successful competitor was Onomastos of Smyrna which was already part of Ionia.<sup>43</sup> Strabo also states that Smyrna was induced by Ephesos to join the koinon, giving a thirteenth polis in the koinon.<sup>44</sup> Therefore there were thirteen cities which celebrated the Panionia before the time of Herodotos, and presumably earlier. While an epigraphic reference to a koinon of thirteen cities is dated to 289-88 B.C.,<sup>45</sup> this ought not, however, to be taken as an indication that the koinon before this time had a membership of only twelve, increased to thirteen in the Hellenistic period, as the first *epigraphic* reference to the koinon only appears in 303;<sup>46</sup> there is no epigraphic attestation for the koinon in the classical period.

Vitruvius in his first century AD account of the Ionian cities of Asia Minor names thirteen cities;<sup>47</sup> these mirror the original twelve states as given by Herodotos, with the addition of Melia (which he refers to as Melite).<sup>48</sup> Vitruvius states that Melia was destroyed by the other cities, and that its position was taken by Smyrna, through the favour of king Attalos and Arsinoe.<sup>49</sup> This must be reconciled with the statements of Pausanias and Strabo, that Smyrna was a member in the classical period. The solution is not difficult, as Strabo makes clear that Smyrna had been destroyed by the Lydians, but that the inhabitants of Smyrna survived as a community, living in villages in the surrounding area. In this condition for four hundred years, the community was then reassembled into one city by Antigonos, and then by

<sup>43</sup> Paus. 5.8.7 (684 BC).

<sup>44</sup> Strabo 14.1.4 (633).

<sup>45</sup> Michel 485.1-2 (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 368.1). This decree, of around 290 BC, exists in two copies. Michel 485 comes from Smyrna, and contains the form: "Ἐδοξεῖν Ἰώνων τῶν κοινῶν τῶν τρεῖςκατὰ / δεκα πόλεων (.1-2), while the Milesian copy contains references only to the "koinon of the Ionians" (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 368.1, .6-7, .9, .34). Michel 485 also refers simply to the koinon, or the koinon of the Ionians: .8, .10-11. Magie *Roman Rule* 2.871-72 cites *IGR* 4, 1523 (2nd century AD) as having a reference to the thirteen cities: ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν τρισκατάδεκα πόλεων.

<sup>46</sup> *RC* 3.

<sup>47</sup> Vitruv. 4.1.4 (84-85) (referring not to the koinon, but to Ionians).

<sup>48</sup> Hdt. 1.142.3-4.

<sup>49</sup> Vitruv. 4.1.4 (85): *cuius loco postea regis Attali et Arsinoes beneficio Zmyrnaeorum civitas inter Ionas est recepta*. Wilamowitz noted that Attali is an error for Lysimachi: *Kleine Schriften* 5.1 p. 128, followed by subsequent authors; see Ragone *RFIC* 114 (1986) 192 n. 1.

Lysimakhos,<sup>50</sup> after which the community, re-established as a polis, could again take its place as a polis in the Ionian koinon, in accordance with Vitruvius' statement. That the polis had claimed back its place in the koinon<sup>51</sup> is demonstrated by the proclamation of one inscription of about 290 BC from Smyrna, where the koinon is referred to as the koinon of the thirteen poleis, whereas a copy of the same inscription at Miletos refers simply to the koinon.<sup>52</sup>

It has often been assumed that the koinon was disbanded by the Persians after the defeat of the Ionians at the battle of Lade in the fifth century which ended the Ionian revolt and their quest for freedom, and that it was revived after the conquest of the Persian Empire, and still based on the Panionion.<sup>53</sup> The belief that the Ionian league was disbanded has its origins in the view of Wilamowitz.<sup>54</sup> While Herodotos writes of the Ionians and the Panionion in the context of the Ionian revolt,<sup>55</sup> he is not commenting on the state of affairs in his own time,<sup>56</sup> and gives no evidence that the koinon was disbanded by the Persians. Caspari cites evidence from the Persian occupation, regarding the possible dissolution of the koinon, and notes that in the fifth century Artaphernes, the Persian satrap of Sardis, sent for representatives from all the Ionian states and forced them by oath to settle their differences by arbitration, rather than by raiding.<sup>57</sup> This is taken as an indication that the koinon was not in existence at the time,<sup>58</sup> and as evidence it is, admittedly, compelling. It must, however, be set against the history of arbitration amongst the Ionian states, for example, the dispute between Priene and Samos in the second century, which was arbitrated not by the koinon which was in existence at the time, but by Rhodes, a non-member of the

---

<sup>50</sup> Strabo 14.1.37 (646) states that after the four hundred years ἀνήγειρεν αὐτὴν Ἀντίγονος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Λυσίμαχος, καὶ νῦν ἔστι καλλίστη τῶν πασῶν. Strabo must mean that Antigonos was responsible for the initial refounding, which Lysimakhos completed. Perhaps the building programme, which saw Smyrna become the καλλίστη τῶν πασῶν in the region, took place under Lysimakhos.

<sup>51</sup> *Contra* most modern authors, particularly the last to have written on this point, Ragone *RFIC* 114 (1986) 191, who is incorrect in stating that Lysimakhos in around 290 BC carried out “una fondamentale riforma” of the koinon. Cadoux *Smyrna* 67-68, rejecting Paus. 5.8.7, followed by Magie *Roman Rule* 2.868, believes that Smyrna was not a member in the classical period.

<sup>52</sup> Michel 485; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 368 (discussed above, n. 45 with text).

<sup>53</sup> Tarn *CAH* 6.490.

<sup>54</sup> “Die Panionien bestanden zu Herodots Zeit nicht mehr; es war natürlich, daß Persien einen Bund auflöste, der bei Lade gegen sie gekämpft hatte....” (*Kleine Schriften* 5.1, p. 141).

<sup>55</sup> Hdt. 1.141-46.

<sup>56</sup> Hdt. 1.142.1: οἱ δὲ Ἴωνες οὗτοι, τῶν καὶ τὸ Πανιώνιον ἔστι, τοῦ μὲν οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν ὠρέων ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ ἐτύγχανον ἰδρυσάμενοι πόλις.

<sup>57</sup> Hdt. 6.42.1.

<sup>58</sup> Caspari *JHS* 35 (1915) 181.

koinon, and a Dorian state as well.<sup>59</sup> Diodoros records that as a matter of custom the Ionians met at the Panionion near Mykale, but that later on, as wars arose in this region, the Ionians were unable to celebrate the Panionia there, and so transferred the festival to a safe place, near Ephesos.<sup>60</sup> This transference of the festival to another site can probably be equated with the Ephesia of which Thucydides writes,<sup>61</sup> while Wilamowitz and Caspari take the Ephesian celebration as evidence of the dissolution of the league.<sup>62</sup> Diodoros gives the information concerning the move in a fourth century context (that is, in the fourth century, the Ephesian celebration was in existence): his account states that because of wars in the area the Ionians moved the festival to near Ephesos after consulting Delphi. Clearly, the Ephesian celebration of Diodoros is the fifth century Ephesia of Thucydides.

The Ionians were told by the oracle to take copies of the ancestral altars from Helike, which was opposed by the people of Helike as they had an oracle that they would suffer when Ionians sacrificed at the altar of Poseidon. The Ionians sacrificed, as allowed to do so by the koinon of the Achaeans, but the people of Helike scattered the possessions of the Ionians and seized their theoroi, thereby committing sacrilege. For this they were duly punished: Poseidon destroyed the city by earthquake and tidal wave.<sup>63</sup> Presumably, therefore, the festival was still celebrated at Ephesos in the fourth century, and the conditions that caused the move persisted, or the festival, having been transferred to Ephesos, remained there by force of circumstances. It is probable that the Panionia was subsumed by the Ephesia: the Ionians moved the

---

<sup>59</sup> *I. Priene* 37.

<sup>60</sup> Diod. 15.49.1.

<sup>61</sup> Thuc. 3.104.3.

<sup>62</sup> Wilamowitz *Kleine Schriften* 5.1, pp. 141-42; Caspari *JHS* 35 (1915) 182-83 argue that the koinon was re-established around 400 BC, but this ignores the testimony of Thucydides (3.104.3), who mentions an Ephesia. Both modern authors take the nine member states as mentioned by Diod. 15.49.1 to refer to a refounding of the league after its dissolution by the Persians, with only nine members instead of the original twelve, on the assumption that it had been disbanded by the Persians and now re-established. It is possible, however, that Diodoros is reflecting an early tradition of nine member states (see nn. 40-41 above, with text); even if this is not the case, he refers to nine cities celebrating at the Panionion who later moved their religious activities to Ephesos; Thuc. 3.104.3 states that in his time the Ionians had their festival at Ephesos, and so Diodoros is referring to a move which had taken place in the fifth century, and he cannot be taken as evidence for a dissolution, followed by a refounding with decreased membership; this argument avoids the complication of unattested reverses in the history of the koinon.

<sup>63</sup> Diod. 15.49.1-4, esp. 3: οἱ μὲν Ἴωνες ἔθυσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος κατὰ τὸν χρησμόν, οἱ δ' Ἑλικεῖς τὰ χρήματα διαρρίψαντες τῶν Ἰώνων τοὺς τε θεωροὺς συνήρπασαν, ἠσέβησαν τε εἰς τὸ θεῖον; cf. ch. 1 nn. 134-35, with text; ch. 2 n. 93, with text.

location of their celebration, but the league and its religious activity persisted.<sup>64</sup> There is no evidence that the koinon was dissolved, and there is therefore no need, if it were never dissolved, to postulate its refoundation, either by Alexander III (the Great) of Macedon,<sup>65</sup> or by Antigonos,<sup>66</sup> and there is reason to believe, in the Ephesian celebration mentioned by Thucydides and Diodoros, that the koinon still existed in the fifth and fourth century.

By the end of the fourth century, the Panionia was once again being celebrated at the Panionion.<sup>67</sup> However, this does not seem to have remained the case in the Hellenistic period. The celebration of the Panionia which is recorded in the letter of Eumenes II of 167/6 to the Ionian koinon took place at Miletos, and not at the site of the Panionion. Eumenes in this letter makes official response to the honours voted to him by the koinon, consisting of a gold crown and a golden statue, to be erected wherever he wished in Ionia.<sup>68</sup> He responded that since the honours had been voted to him while the festival was being celebrated at Miletos, and because that city alone of all the Ionians had built a temenos for his dynasty, and also that the Milesians counted themselves as his kin through the Kyzikenes, he would erect the statue in that polis, and at his own expense.<sup>69</sup> The koinon also arranged that a day in honour of

<sup>64</sup> Cf. *Magie Roman Rule* 1.66.

<sup>65</sup> *Magie Roman Rule* 2.868; Lenschau *RE* 9 (1916) 1890; Welles *RC* pp. 214-15 notes that "...the old band of the twelve cities had been dissolved by the Persians after the battle of Lade, and the new league, organized by Alexander, was a purely religious organisation. Meetings were held exclusively in Priene throughout the third century. Afterwards, as in this case [*RC* 52.60-61] ... the festival was held in other member states..."; cf. Wilamowitz *Kleine Schriften* 5.1, p. 141.

<sup>66</sup> *Tarn CAH* 6.371, cf. 490, argues that Alexander would not have refounded the league because the liberated cities of Asia Minor probably became members of the League of Corinth, and that the Ionian and Ilian leagues (discussed below) accord more with the "rule and policy" of Antigonos, though there is no evidence that the Ionian league was re-established by Antigonos, nor that the Ilian league was his creation. It seems that the re-establishment of this league would have cohered with Alexander's liberation of the Ionian cities, and that to restore a league that the Persians had disbanded would have been an appropriate action for him. On the other hand, the sources for Alexander's reign make no mention of this. Furthermore that the league was disbanded by the Persians is itself a conjecture, which need not necessarily be accepted. The League did play an important part in the Ionian revolt, but Persian treatment of the Ionians was lenient in the aftermath of the battle of Lade, and the tyrannies were ended and democracies re-established; if the Persians were attempting to placate Ionian resentment of their rule by doing this, it is probable that they were ready to allow the league to continue in existence. Note that Sokolowski *LSAM* 38, p.109 states that the association was re-organised under the Diadokhoi as a purely religious organisation to celebrate the festivals of the Panionia and Alexandria, with the league centred on Priene.

<sup>67</sup> *RC* 3.2: [ἕστις δ' ἂν] εἰς τὸ Πανιώνιον ἀποστέ[λλεται].

<sup>68</sup> *RC* 52.25-27.

<sup>69</sup> *RC* 52.56-68. Similarly, in 266 BC, the koinon had honoured Antiokhos I with sacrifices (Michel 486).

Eumenes be celebrated at each Panionia.<sup>70</sup> The question then is whether the celebration of the Panionia at Miletos in 167/6 constituted a special occurrence or otherwise, and it is possible that the Panionia was celebrated in different poleis at this period. None of the sources actually state that in the Hellenistic period the Ionian cities of the koinon actually celebrated the festival at the Panionion, and, on the other hand, there is the epigraphic evidence that it was celebrated at Miletos on at least one occasion. Possibly its site regularly changed for each celebration, and it was hosted by a different city, in the same way as the festival established in honour of Alexander was rotated amongst the cities.<sup>71</sup>

The cities of the Ionian league were not only involved in the worship of Poseidon at the Panionia, but after their liberation by Alexander celebrated a festival in his honour, which took place, apparently, on the date of Alexander's birthday. It is generally agreed that the festival was established in the lifetime of Alexander, for festivals in honour of deceased individuals were never celebrated on their birthday, the idea apparently being that the dead should not be honoured on the day on which they had been born.<sup>72</sup> In the third century there is evidence to suggest that the festival in honour of Alexander was hosted by the members of the league on a rotational basis, but in Strabo's day it was held at Teos,<sup>73</sup> and this festival took a common form: contests and sacrifices.<sup>74</sup> These would have attracted participants from the member cities, and presumably there were official delegations sent to represent the cities and to make sacrifices on their behalf.

The Panionion celebration seems to have gained additional features with the development of the Hellenistic kingdoms, such as the sacrifice to Alexander, and the day's celebration in honour of Eumenes. This regular pilgrimage was thus not only a traditional expression of unity amongst the Ionians, but served in the Hellenistic period as an demonstration of political loyalty to the monarchs who determined to what extent these cities were to retain their freedom, though it remained particularly an expression of the cultural unity of the koinon. Significantly, this ethnic festival continued to be celebrated despite the fact that its original location was changed, showing that the important feature was the ethnicity of the occasion, not the actual sacred site itself.

There were similar pilgrimages restricted to ethnic groups, such as the Dorians, and Herodotos compares the Panionion shrine of the Ionians with the shrine

---

<sup>70</sup> *RC* 52.51-54.

<sup>71</sup> See below n. 73, with text.

<sup>72</sup> Habicht *Gottmenschentum* 17.

<sup>73</sup> *OGIS* 222.24-25; Strabo 14.1.31 (644); Habicht *Gottmenschentum* 17, and 22-25 for the foundation date of the festival.

<sup>74</sup> *OGIS* 222.24-31; Strabo 14.1.31 (644).

of Triopian Apollo of the Dorians in Asia Minor. This shrine was common to the cities of Lindos, Ialysos, Kameiros, these three being cities on Rhodes, as well as to Kos, Knidos, and Halikarnassos, and even other Dorians were forbidden the use of this shrine, the Triopion, and thus by implication all other Hellenes must also have been excluded.<sup>75</sup> In fact, the first five of the named cities even excluded Halikarnassos from the use of the shrine when the law of the shrine was broken by a member of that city. For, Herodotus records, in the contests in honour of Triopian Apollo bronze tripods were awarded to the victor, but it was necessary for the victors not to carry the tripods out of the shrine but to dedicate them to the god in the temple. A Halikarnassan victor ignored this ruling, and took his tripod home, and as a result the city was henceforth excluded from participation in the festival by the other five cities.<sup>76</sup> For this reason the cities who participated were no longer known as the “six-cities” (hexapolis) but as the “five-cities” (pentapolis).<sup>77</sup> The festival must have been a major item in the local calendar, and it can be safely assumed that it formed the occasion of a pilgrimage by the inhabitants of the five (formerly six) cities involved.

Within Asia Minor, there was also a koinon in the region of the Troad, a political body which also met to celebrate the Panathenaia, a federal festival held in honour of Athena. The member cities were the old city of Ilium and its neighbours, and it is first attested in the late fourth century.<sup>78</sup> The koinon had as its focus and common sanctuary the temple of Athena, at Ilium, and the member cities sent representatives to Ilium “to transact business and to celebrate the Panathenaia”.<sup>79</sup> The best source of information on the koinon is a first century BC inscription,<sup>80</sup> which deals with the monies owed to the shrine of Athena by neighbouring cities,<sup>81</sup> while the second part of the inscription describes the arrangements for the celebration of the festival.<sup>82</sup> The emphasis of the inscription on celebrating the festival as in the past

---

<sup>75</sup> Hdt. 1.144.1; see fig. 7.2.

<sup>76</sup> Hdt. 1.144.2-3.

<sup>77</sup> Hdt. 1.144.1, 3.

<sup>78</sup> See Magie *Roman Rule* 2.869-70: *I. Ilium* (Frisch) xii-xiii. Magie believes that there were nine members, on the basis of *I. Ilium* 107, where there is a reference to nine members of the *synedrion*; the inscription is late and Frisch xiii believes that there were originally eleven and that this inscription testifies to a change in later times. The eleven (Frisch xii, with references) were: Ilium, Lampsakos, Abydos, Dardanos, Assos, Parion, Alexandria Troas, Skepsis, Gargara, Kalchedon and Myrlea; see fig. 7.3. The koinon may have been founded by Alexander (Magie *Roman Rule* 1.65-66) or Antigonos (Frisch xii; Tam *CAH* 6.49()); the first evidence for it comes from *I. Ilium* 1, 306 BC.

<sup>79</sup> Magie *Roman Rule* 1.66.

<sup>80</sup> *I. Ilium* 10; 77 BC.

<sup>81</sup> *I. Ilium*. 10.1-19.

<sup>82</sup> *I. Ilium*. 10.20-24.

implies that, despite its late date, it presents an accurate guide to the organisation of the festival in previous centuries.<sup>83</sup>

The title “the koinon of the Ilians” occurs only once, and there are variations.<sup>84</sup> It was administered by a *synedrion*; the way in which the members were chosen is unknown, but presumably they were appointed or nominated by the member states.<sup>85</sup> The festival itself was managed by this *synedrion* in association with *agonothetai*, the latter being perhaps chosen from amongst all the poleis, though, given that the common shrine was at Ilium, it is plausible to assume that these officials were chosen from amongst the local population. It should be noted, however, that another inscription records that the *synedrion* honoured the people of Parion for having chosen a particular individual to act as *agoranomos* for the Great Panathenaia,<sup>86</sup> and presumably each member polis elected an *agoranomos* when the festival required one, or perhaps the duty rotated.<sup>87</sup> In this capacity, the Parian official ensured the supply of grain for those who had come to attend the celebration, provided a doctor for those who fell ill at the *panegyris*,<sup>88</sup> and generally organised administrative details.<sup>89</sup> The koinon thus seems to have been a truly federal body, with officials being chosen from the member states. The fact that one individual, through the performance of his tasks, brought honour upon the *demos* of Parion ought to be taken as an indication that the responsibilities associated with the koinon, and the celebration of its common festival, were taken seriously by the members, and that all were involved at a practical level.

Details of festival organisation were, as the inscription testifies,<sup>90</sup> a matter for consideration by the *synedrion*, which along with the *agonothetai* dealt with both a large and small Panathenaia.<sup>91</sup> The celebration shared by the koinon might well have

<sup>83</sup> See *I. Ilion*. 10.22, .23, .37, .39.

<sup>84</sup> *I. Ilion* 1.17, .22, .36: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πόλεων; *I. Ilion* 24.16-17: τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Ἰλιέων; note *I. Ilion* 1.25-26: τῶν πόλεων τῶν κοινωνουσ[ῶν τοῦ]/ ἱεροῦ (also restored .57-58); *OGIS* 219.39-40: [ἡ πό]/λις καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλεις, as restored in *OGIS*, but see also as in *I. Ilion* 32.39-40, with p. 90: [ἡ τε Ἰλιέων πό]/λις καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλεις.

<sup>85</sup> The *synedrion* met at the celebration of the festival (*I. Ilion* 3.2-4); amongst the activities of the koinon were the honouring of individual member states (as in *I. Ilion* 1; 3), the regulation of financial matters involving temple funds (*I. Ilion* 10), and the festival (*I. Ilion* 10). For the festival, see Preuner *Hermes* 61 (1926) 113-33.

<sup>86</sup> *I. Ilion* 3.2-8, .18-22.

<sup>87</sup> Dittenberger *SIG<sup>3</sup>* 596, p. 123, n. 10 posits a board of *agoranomoi* with each state electing a member.

<sup>88</sup> For provisions for those falling sick at festivals, see also ch. 4 nn. 153-55, cf. n. 118, with text.

<sup>89</sup> *I. Ilion* 3.10-18, c. 200 BC.

<sup>90</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.

<sup>91</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.30-31.

been the extension of a pre-koinon Ilian festival which was subsumed by the koinon on its creation, and the Ilian celebration in honour of Athena, the city's most important deity, as can be seen from the presence of the shrine, might well have been enlarged. There could well have been a penteteric celebration as opposed to an annual one; alternatively, there may have been two celebrations in the same year, one of greater magnitude. The poleis were beset with some financial difficulties which had occasioned borrowings from the temple, and this had resulted in some financial stringency. While the inscription attests that several features of the festival were to be managed as before, this must reflect the fact that some changes have occurred. The stress on the *synedrion* and *agonothetai* making provision before all else for the Great Panathenaia could indicate problems with funding for this festival in the past,<sup>92</sup> while the provision that the various sacrifices are to be provided for from the revenues of the goddess might conceivably reflect a previous practice that the member states provided the necessary sacrificial beasts.<sup>93</sup>

One change is apparent: the *theoroi* from the various states seem in the past to have been paid out of a fund, but for the next ten years, according to the inscription, the poleis are to meet the costs of sending *theoroi*.<sup>94</sup> The cutback did not apply to the central body: if the *synedrion* needed to send out *theoroi* or ambassadors, the *agonothetai* and the *synedrion* were to make a judgement on the subsidy necessary, based on the revenue expected from the income of the sacred land.<sup>95</sup> The Great Panathenaia celebrated by the koinon consisted of gymnastic<sup>96</sup> and equestrian events;<sup>97</sup> olive oil was provided, presumably for athletic competitors.<sup>98</sup> Sacrifices, of course, were a major feature of the programme,<sup>99</sup> and a reference to a procession is restored,<sup>100</sup> but it would be possible to assume that one took place. The koinon was composed of a similar, if smaller, number of member cities as that in Ionia further south, and served the same purpose, while, in the religious sphere, the koinon's main festival served as a pilgrimage centre for those in the member cities, with the festival

<sup>92</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.34-35.

<sup>93</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.23-24; however, the provision might conceivably be a restatement of previous practice, though the absence of *καθότι πρότερον* from the specific clause gives room for conjecture.

<sup>94</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.36-38; cf. ch. 1 nn. 101-04, esp. 108, with text.

<sup>95</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.39-43.

<sup>96</sup> *I. Ilion* 30.

<sup>97</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.30.

<sup>98</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.26-27

<sup>99</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.22-26, cf. .19.

<sup>100</sup> *I. Ilion* 10.21.



playing a role of some significance in the religious and cultural life of the cities involved.

In addition to the main Panhellenic festivals, and such important festivals as those at the Panionion, Delos, and the Troad, there were other festivals at centres which did not bring worshippers from all over the Hellenic world, but which did attract visitors from not only the city of the cult concerned but from the neighbouring area, and often these could involve a fairly short journey for the worshippers concerned. Thus the festival of Artemis Skillous, near Olympia, attracted men and women from around the area. They had to encamp in tents, which presumably meant that they had come from places which were too far away to travel to Skillous and back again in one day.<sup>101</sup> Even if the festivities went on for several days, then celebrants who lived in towns nearby could be expected to return to their homes, unless the ritual involved sleeping at the site if, for example, it were an incubatory cult, although some may have chosen to stay at the site for the associated atmosphere, and because they might be weary after the day's festivities.

Strabo records that thirty stades (about six kilometres) from Nysa in Asia Minor there was a sanctuary at Leimon where the inhabitants of Nysa and "all the people about" went to celebrate their festivals. The distance involved might not qualify these celebrations for the definition of pilgrimage on a grand scale, but it surely qualifies as a local pilgrimage. Thirty stades is not a short distance for men accompanied by women, and presumably children, to travel, presumably requiring at least two hours. The people of Nysa, given the distance involved, may well have spent a night or more at Leimon, even though Strabo does not state this explicitly.<sup>102</sup> Such local pilgrimages, attracting pilgrims from the surrounding area, must have been common throughout the Hellenic world.

One of the most interesting religious celebrations carried out by "ethnic" groups in the Greek world was that of the Great Daidala, held at Plataea and to which cities all over Boeotia sent representatives. The Great Daidala, held every sixty years, was preceded by a series of Little Daidala, exclusively Plataean.<sup>103</sup> At the time of the Little Daidala, the Plataeans went to the forest not far from Alalkomenai where, Pausanias states, stood the largest oaks in all of Boeotia, and here they put out portions of boiled meat. Birds would flock to the meat, but the Plataeans paid attention only to the crows, and watched to see on which tree a crow alighted after having snatched some meat, and presumably it was the first crow to come along that

<sup>101</sup> Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.9; see Dillon *ZPE* 83 (1990) 82-83; ch. 3 n. 35, with text.

<sup>102</sup> Strabo 14.1.45 (650): εἰς ὃν ἔξοδεύουσι πανηγυριοῦντες Νυσαεῖς τε καὶ οἱ κύκλῳ πάντες.

<sup>103</sup> Paus. 9.3.5; Men. *Rhet.* 3.212.

was so observed. The tree on which the crow landed was chopped down and carved into a daidalon; as Pausanias states, daidalon was the name the men of ancient times gave to the *xoanon*, or wooden image. The role of the crow in the procedure is interesting, and once must have had some significance, now lost. Kerényi argues that the crow in the forest was a dark bird in a dark place; that the crow's landing on a particular tree was an oracle "by a creature symbolic of the dark of the moon".<sup>104</sup> The crow's oracular function can be accepted, but further speculation on the symbolism involved would be fruitless.

The Plataeans celebrated the Little Daidala every six years according to Pausanias' local informant, but Pausanias thought it must have been more frequently than this, presumably not accepting the guide's statement because to burn fourteen images every sixty years meant that there would need to be a celebration a little more than every four years.<sup>105</sup> At every Little Daidala, an image was carved from a log and when the Great Daidala was celebrated every sixty years, fourteen of these images, one created at each of the Little Daidala since the last celebration, were ritually burned at Mount Kithairon.<sup>106</sup> The Plataeans celebrated the Little Daidala amongst themselves, but at the Great Daidala all of the Boeotians participated, and the Plataeans were joined by the Koronaians, Thespieians, Tanagraians, Khaironeians, Orkhomenians, Lebadeians, and Tegeans, each of whom would be responsible for one of the Daidala. Pausanias also refers to "towns of less importance", which pooled resources for the sacrifice involving the remainder of the daidala, that is, six daidala.<sup>107</sup> Accordingly, several of the smaller towns would combine to look after one of the daidala, and there would be six groups, made up of several towns, with each group responsible for one daidalon.<sup>108</sup>

Kerényi explains the fourteen images as representing the fourteen nymphs which Virgil describes as attending Juno.<sup>109</sup> This is, however, a false analogy, and the fourteen are not to be explained by recourse to such mythology. The Great Daidala was celebrated every sixty years. This time period was chosen as a way of commemorating the period of the Plataean exile, during which period it had not been possible to hold the Little Daidala.<sup>110</sup> The question of which exile cannot be resolved:

<sup>104</sup> Kerényi *Zeus and Hera* 144; cf. Kerényi *Asklepios* 93.

<sup>105</sup> Paus. 9.3.3.

<sup>106</sup> Paus. 9.3.5, 7-8.

<sup>107</sup> Paus. 9.3.5-6; see fig. 7.4.

<sup>108</sup> Schachter *Cults of Boiotia* 1.248-49 argues that the list of cities in Pausanias does not represent the classical cities who participated in the Great Daidala.

<sup>109</sup> Virg. *Aeneid* 1.71; Kerényi *Zeus and Hera* 142.

<sup>110</sup> Paus. 9.3.5.

that of 427-387 or that of 373-38.<sup>111</sup> The fact that neither exile was sixty years in length, and that fourteen daidala, with one daidalon made every six years or so, exceeds the sixty year period, are chronological problems which are without resolution. Pausanias records that the fourteen daidala burned at the Great Daidala corresponded to the fourteen celebrations of the Little Daidala which the Plataeans had not held because of their exile.<sup>112</sup> Thus the first Daidala after the return from exile would have been one in which fourteen daidala were made at once, to enable a mass celebration of all the festivals which had not been celebrated while the Plataeans were in exile. In subsequent years, the Little Daidala would presumably have gone ahead as normal, with one daidalon being created at each festival. It is also clear that the fourteen daidala do not in any way correspond to a specific number of fourteen cities involved in the celebration of the Great Daidala, for Pausanias notes that in his day, as presumably in the classical period also, while there were eight cities each responsible for one daidalon, the other six became, at the Great Daidala, the responsibility of groups of towns who came together for the purpose of looking after a single daidalon per group.

The first celebration of the Great Daidala in which the daidala of the time of exile were burned set a precedent. Originally, at the Daidala which were held every six years or so, one daidalon had been carved, and the aetiological myth for the festival had been acted out: the daidalon was taken to the river Asopos, washed, and then dressed as a bride, placed on a cart, with a bridesmaid, taken up to Mount Kithairon, and burnt.<sup>113</sup> The first celebration after the exile, however, in which fourteen daidala were burnt, cannot have failed to have made a great impression on the Plataeans. The bonfire from fourteen daidala carved from oak trunks and the associated wood needed to burn these up, as well as the holocaust of sacrificial animals, must have been an awesome religious event. Granted that the bonfire associated with one daidalon had probably been spectacular, the bonfire of the Great Daidala must have surpassed this, and in fact Pausanias describes it as “the greatest of all fires”.<sup>114</sup>

Thus the practice of burning the daidalon made at each small festival was discontinued, and they were stored away until the Great Daidala. Naturally, with fourteen images, there was in fact a celebration of the sacrifice of fourteen maidens.

---

<sup>111</sup> Schachter *Cults of Boiotia* 1.250.

<sup>112</sup> Paus. 9.3.5.

<sup>113</sup> Paus. 9.3.7-8; Plut. fr. 157.6 (Sanjbach)

<sup>114</sup> Paus. 9.3.8. Nilsson *JHS* 43 (1923) 144 incorrectly describes the Great Daidala: there was not one daidalon, but many, and these were provided by Plataea, and not by other Boeotian towns. The daidalon need also not necessarily have been a representation of Hera; in fact Paus. 9.3.1-2 would suggest otherwise, for the daidalon of the myth was Plataea, daughter of Asopos.

The myth, however, was that only one maiden had been the bride-to-be of Zeus, and that she had been burned as an offering to Zeus as a sign of reconciliation between Zeus and Hera. With fourteen daidala, this became a problem, but the myth was preserved by singling out only one of the daidala at the Great Daidala for special treatment. Pausanias tells us that all of the daidala were drawn in wagons away from the river to Mount Kithairon, but only one image was adorned as a bride,<sup>115</sup> symbolising the archetypal bride of Zeus.

The creation of the Great Daidala must have effected a change in the Little Daidala, for as an image was no longer burned at this celebration, the ritual practices of this festival must have changed. Presumably there would have been some form of celebration on Mount Kithairon, which would have been sacrificial in nature. This celebration would have been very much reduced in significance since neither a virgin nor a daidalon were burned, and perhaps this explains why the Plataeans alone attended the Little Daidala, which no longer had the religious significance of the Great Daidala, and was not worthy of becoming the focus of a pan-Boeotian event.

How the daidalon which became the focus of the Great Daidala was chosen is unknown. The Great Daidala would have been held as part of the cycle of the Little Daidala, analogous with the Little and Great Panathenaia at Athens, where the Great Panathenaia was held at the same time of the year as the Little Panathenaia but was on a greater scale. The drawing of lots to see which state received which daidala can partly be explained by the fact that the state which was responsible for the most important daidalon would be the recipient of special honour. The daidalon which formed the focus of the Great Daidalon was accompanied by a bridesmaid,<sup>116</sup> but how she was chosen is unknown. Each polis would almost certainly have wanted one of their citizen women to perform this role, as a mark of honour for their city, and perhaps the Plataeans reserved the right for one of their citizens, or perhaps she was automatically chosen from the city responsible for the main daidalon. It is possible that sortition was used if the bridesmaid was chosen from amongst all of the participating Boeotian states. Pausanias, however, twice notes the use of the lot in the ceremony, and perhaps it can be expected that he would have mentioned a third use of

---

<sup>115</sup> Paus. 9.3.7: τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα κοσμήσαντες παρὰ τὸν Ἄσωπὸν. For the reading κοσμήσαντες which the manuscripts preserve, and which has been needlessly emended by editors (such as Rocha-Pereira) to κομίσαντες, see Dillon (forthcoming) *CQ* 1993, who also deals with the aetiological myth. That the central daidalon was dressed finds confirmation in κοσμήσαντες. On the leading role of the main image, see Schachter *Cults of Boiotia* 1.247; Nilsson *JHS* 43 (1923) 144.

<sup>116</sup> Paus. 9.3.7: τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα κοσμήσαντες παρὰ τὸν Ἄσωπὸν καὶ ἀναθέντες ἐπὶ ἄμαξαν, γυναικὶ ἐφιστάσι νυμφεύτριαν (see above n. 115 for this emendation).

the lot, as there are two examples of this connected with the rites. The role of this bridesmaid is unclear, as one is not mentioned in connection with the aetiological myth, but the myth may not have been recorded by Pausanias in all its aspects and it is possible that the archetypal daidalon, Zeus' bride-to-be, was accompanied by a bridesmaid.

Lots were cast to determine the order of the wagons in the procession up to the summit of Kithairon. An altar was constructed there in the shape of a house, and the daidala placed on it. Each of the cities sacrificed a cow to Hera and a bull to Zeus; the victims, "full of wine and incense", were placed with all the daidala. Individuals could also sacrifice, according to their means, and a holocaust of the victims took place; Pausanias notes that of all fires, this fire was the largest and could be seen from the furthest distance.<sup>117</sup>

Given the number of states involved, the Great Daidala was an important pilgrimage, involving people from all over Boeotia. The representatives of the states were not termed *theoroi* but they had the same responsibilities as were associated with a *theoria*, as their duty was to sacrifice at the Daidala on behalf of their state.<sup>118</sup> It is clear that some expense was involved in the celebration of the Great Daidala. The main cities were each responsible for one daidalon, but the smaller cities pooled resources.<sup>119</sup> The daidala themselves were provided by the Plataeans, but there would have been other expenses for participating cities. As noted above each city made a sacrifice of a cow and a bull,<sup>120</sup> and these did not form part of a communal feast, as they were consumed in a holocaust, an unusual rite for Greeks, but not one which is unknown for them.<sup>121</sup> In addition to this expense, there would have been other expenses associated with the feast, such as the provision of animals which could be sacrificed and eaten, and there was also a wagon to be provided for each daidalon, to take it from the river Asopos to Kithairon; perhaps this was a small expense, but it would have needed to be organised.

The festival was pan-Boeotian in character. The origins of the Great Daidala belonged to the fourth century, for Pausanias states that the Plataeans held the ceremony to mark their return from exile, and it is important to note that the Great Daidala, in which all the Boeotians including Thebes,<sup>122</sup> participated, centred around

<sup>117</sup> Paus. 9.3.5-8; cf. n. 114 above.

<sup>118</sup> Paus. 9.3.6, 8.

<sup>119</sup> Paus. 9.3.6: τῶν δὲ πολιτικῶν ὀπόσα ἐστὶν ἐλάσσονος λόγου, συντελεῖ αἰροῦνται.

<sup>120</sup> Paus. 9.3.8.

<sup>121</sup> For example, Paus. 7.18.11-13; cf. Nilsson *JHS* 43 (1923) 144-48.

<sup>122</sup> Paus. 9.3.6. When Kassander had rebuilt Thebes, the Thebans desired to be on good terms with the Plataeans, to participate in the common assembly, and to send a sacrifice to the Daidala.

a Plataean ceremony. The involvement of other Boeotian cities was, of course, an important factor in the celebration of the Great Daidala, but despite their involvement, the festival did not centre on a *koinon*, but on the city of Plataea. Moreover, Plataea did not have a central location, but is in fact in the southernmost part of Boeotia, hosting the event not by reason of its geographical position, but because of the antiquity of the religious celebration in question.

The aetiological myth seems to provide an adequate explanation of the ritual. The Daidala seems to represent a ritual adequately defined by the myth, but the myth seems to have lost some of its original components. The Great Daidala consisted of the burning of fourteen wooden images carved in the shape of women, images which were the bride-to-be of Zeus. At each of the Little Daidala, there would originally have been the sacrifice of a wooden daidalon, representing a would-be bride for Zeus who was burnt on an altar along with animal sacrifices. This can be nothing other than a reference to human sacrifice and the ceremony would once have consisted of choosing a maiden, later to be replaced by an oak. The bride would have been dressed for her part, borne up to the mountain, and there sacrificed, but whether she was burnt alive is uncertain. In its earliest form the bride was almost certainly a wife for Zeus, sacrificed on Mount Kitliron to this god, perhaps in his capacity as sky god. Originally, the sacrificial maiden would have represented Plataea, daughter of Asopos, whom Zeus alleged he was going to marry. When the human sacrifice was commuted, the story of the ruse of the wooden bride came into being, and a substitute victim, of wood, replaced a maiden of flesh and blood. Hera was placated with an offering of a cow being made by each of the fourteen groups involved, as it was only natural that Hera, upon her inclusion in the aetiological myth, also became a recipient of sacrifices which she had not hitherto received in the rite.

There are several examples in Greek religion of human sacrifices which were commuted.<sup>123</sup> It has been argued that one aspect of the myth, the bathing of the image, "looks very much like a ritual renewal of the cult image".<sup>124</sup> Each daidalon, however, is burned; the image is not renewed, but destroyed, and the daidalon itself is not a cult image. It is not worshipped, but sacrificed; it is not a deity but an offering to a deity. The sacrifice of a human, dedicated to a god, was an act of intense violence - the sacrifice of a human life. This life must have been thought to come into contact with the divine if the sacrifice was a form of sacred marriage. The worshippers could not simply walk away from the bonfire after such an act, and there was presumably a feast accompanying the bonfire; the consumption of the meat would have served as an act of exit. There must have been other rites of disengagement, but

<sup>123</sup> Paus. 1.22.6, 1.43.1, 7.19.3-9; 9.8.2, 9.33.4, 9.34.5; 10.25.10.

<sup>124</sup> Schachter *Cults of Boiotia* 1.246.

these remain unknown. The Daida a must surely represent the aspect of a sacrifice bringing beneficial energies to the community.<sup>125</sup> The uniting of a member of the community, a beautiful virgin, with the sky god in a ritual holocaust serves to unite the god with the sacrificers in a community of interest. The sacrifice bodes good for the community, and the fruits of the symbolic marriage will be beneficial to the community, which the sky god will continue to assist.

Of peripheral interest here is the Panathenaia to which the members of the Athenian empire were required to send offerings; as most of the members of the empire were Ionians, and the sending of these offerings was specifically designed to strengthen Ionian identification with the “mother polis” Athens. The Panathenaia does not seem to have formed the focus of any pilgrimage, except when Athenians from distant parts of Attica came into the city to join the celebrations, but is of interest in that some Athenian allies presented a cow and panoply at the Great Panathenaia; indeed, several colonies of Athens are known to have been granted the privilege of sending cow and panoply to this festival, thus strengthening Ionian ties and concepts of ethnicity.<sup>126</sup>

Pilgrimages made by members of a particular ethnic group were obviously an important type of pilgrimage. The nature of the pilgrimage activity, a sacrifice, a festival involving musical, gymnastic and other contests, was the same as for other festivals. It is the clientèle which was different. The exclusiveness of locality, of ethnic origin, was added to the usual variables in determining who could go on a pilgrimage. Kleomenes was warned not to enter the temple of Hera at Argos, or that of Athena on the Athenian acropolis, as he was a stranger and a Dorian.<sup>127</sup> How those not belonging to a particular ethnic group were debarred from a particular celebration is unknown. Those, however, who were not of the same ethnicity as those attending the festival would presumably have simply not attended; dialect differences could have betrayed the intruder. The number of these festivals indicate that they were considered to be important in promoting cohesiveness, or that they reflected an ethnic “consciousness”.

Ethnic pilgrimages were a ‘group effort’, unlike other festivals. At other festivals, such at Olympia, the festival was the responsibility of the state in which the festival was being celebrated: ethnic pilgrimages involved more group participation. The Eleans were responsible for the Olympic festival, and jealously guarded the

---

<sup>125</sup> Dahl *Political Violence* 11.

<sup>126</sup> For the details, see Barron *JHS* 84 (1964) 47; note the case of *I. Priene* 5, discussed in ch. 1 nn. 127-29, with text; cf. ch. 8 n. 197, with text. for the privileges granted to Astypalaia in the Epidaurian procession.

<sup>127</sup> See ch. 4 n. 6, with text.

prerogative. The ethnic pilgrimage involving the Troad koinon involved the cities working together to organise the festival. For the Daidala, the Plataeans organised the festival and provided the daidala, but the expense of the sacrifice of these daidala were shared out amongst the cities, with cities pooling resources in some cases. The ethnic pilgrimages were localised, and those in the immediate vicinity attended; the Boeotians went to the Daidala, Ionians to the Delia and Panionia. Yet the local nature of the festivals did not mean that they were insignificant: Ionians from all over the Ionian world travelled to Delos, the Boeotians to Plataea. These festivals were on a grand scale: the bonfire of the Boeotians could be seen for miles. The advantage of such festivals was that for those involved the festival site was nearer than for a Panhellenic event. Italians might travel all the way to Asia Minor for a festival, but for the people of Thebes, Plataea was close. The ethnic festivals of Asia Minor, the Panathenaia of Ilium, the Panionia, and the festival of Triopian Apollo, involved the main cities of the Greek area of Asia Minor. The cities taking part in these festivals straddle the Asia Minor seaboard, and effectively the festivals meant that pilgrimage was important as a feature of the religious activity of Greek Asia Minor. The main benefit, and presumably explanatory of the existence of these festivals, was that they enhanced and further promoted a group awareness and helped to preserve their Hellenic identity. Pilgrims attending these festivals, either as Ionians, Dorians, or Boeotians, did so in order to strengthen their consciousness of their own ethnicity and reinforce cultural links with neighbours sharing their own traditions.