

Naming and Mapping the Gods in the Ancient Mediterranean

Naming and Mapping the Gods in the Ancient Mediterranean



Spaces, Mobilities, Imaginaries

Edited by

Thomas Galoppin, Elodie Guillon, Asuman Lätzer-Lasar,
Sylvain Lebreton, Max Luaces, Fabio Porzia, Emiliano
Rubens Urciuoli, Jörg Rüpke, and Corinne Bonnet

Volume 1

DE GRUYTER

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 741182).



European Research Council
Established by the European Commission

ISBN 978-3-11-079649-0

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-079843-2

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-079845-6

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110798432>



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. For details go to <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Creative Commons license terms for re-use do not apply to any content (such as graphs, figures, photos, excerpts, etc.) not original to the Open Access publication and further permission may be required from the rights holder. The obligation to research and clear permission lies solely with the party re-using the material.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022941350

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2022 the author(s), published by Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

This book is published open access at www.degruyter.com.

Cover image: Bronze Coin from Seleucia in Pieria, Reign of Trajan, reverse: Betyl of Zeus Kasios within a shrine consisting of four pillars supporting a pyramidal roof surmounted by an eagle; beneath, ZEYC KACIOC (© private collection).

Typesetting: Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Claudio Biagetti

Founders, Leaders, or Ancestors?

Ἀρχηγέτης/-ις: Variations on a Name

The compound ἀρχηγέτης belongs to a group of divine names emphasising the role of a deity in the constitution of a social aggregate or a civic community.¹ As scholarship has at times pointed out, it combines the idea of *leading* (ἡγεῖσθαι) with the notion of *origin* (ἀρχή),² alluding to a primaevial act of foundation in a rather different sense than the more widespread κτίστης.³ Indeed, if one pays attention to the semantic background of its two etymological components, it can be stated that space (ἡγεῖσθαι) and time (ἀρχή) are intimately interwoven in this compound, which takes the shape of a sort of chronotopic unity.⁴

As the late Édouard Will remarked, the epithet ἀρχηγέτης/-ις is endowed with a multifaceted meaning that makes some modern translations (*founder* or *leader*) at the very least conventional and, in any case, semantically restricted.⁵ In this case, the par-

1 Brackertz 1976, 216–223; Leschhorn 1984, 180–185; Malkin 1987, 241–250.

2 Despite the inherent ambiguity of the term ἀρχή (*DELG* s.v. ἀρχή [B]), the notion of *origin* still seems to prevail over the meaning of *command* in the case of ἀρχηγέτης/-ις (cf. Malkin 1987, 243; Detienne 1994, 162). As C. Joachim Classen pointed out, “the early usage of ἀρχή leaves no doubt that it does not mark merely a beginning in time, [. . .] but the first link of a chain, the first step which is followed by others and has consequences as foundation or as determining factor” (Classen 1996, 24). In modern literature this lexical polyvalence has given rise to translations like *founder* or *leader*, as if they were interchangeable and/or referable to all possible contexts indiscriminately.

3 Cf. Casevitz 1985, 246. Οἰκιστής, another word semantically close to κτίστης (cf. Casevitz 1985, 248), appears to be used as a divine epithet only in few and questionable cases (see for example *BMC (Italy)* p. 353, Nr. 85 and p. 355, Nr. 105–108 for a Heracles ‘Οἰκιστάς’ in the late 5th-cent. coinage of Croton, or *I.Milet* VI 3, 1329, where the emperor Hadrian receives honours as Zeus Ὀλύμπιος, Σωτήρ καὶ Οἰκιστής – they are, as said, pieces of evidence that deserve a broader discussion).

4 The notion of *chronotopos* draws upon the vocabulary of the natural sciences and was first applied by Michail M. Bachtin to the Human Sciences in the thirties of the 20th century (Frank 2015).

5 Will 1995, 322–323: “Lorsque le mot, désignant un dieu, un héros ou un humain, a pour complément un nom de cité, on le traduit souvent par ‘fondateur’, ce qui est à éviter. [. . .] Lorsqu’un dieu intervient dans une fondation de cité en tant qu’*archègetès*, c’est en tant que celui ‘sous la conduite duquel’ ou ‘à l’instigation duquel’ l’entreprise a été menée: fonction bien connue de l’Apollon de Delphes, dont les oracles indiquaient aux émigrants la direction à suivre et/ou les circonstances où s’arrêter: le dieu est le ‘guide’, ‘celui qui dirige’ l’expédition [. . .], non celui qui ‘fonde’ la cité”. On the limits of the translatability of ἀρχηγέτης/-ις into modern languages, see Biagetti 2020.

Note: All dates are BCE, unless otherwise specified.

tial loss of connotations typical of every translation process has to cope with the parallel limitation of functions assigned to the gods ἀρχηγέται. Basically, these deities are more often regarded as protectors of the colonisation movements along the same lines as Apollo Archegetes, who supported some important colonial expeditions like the undertaking of the Chalcidians to the Sicilian Naxos, or the crossing of the Thereans to Cyrene.⁶ However, the contextualisation of every source in its own cultural, geographical, and chronological backdrop is not only needed; it becomes even more crucial in the attempt to grasp – whenever and wherever possible – the most authentic perception of this divine attribute.

Thus, the core of this paper will be a reconsideration of the view associating the epithet ἀρχηγέτης/-ις with the occupation of a land typical of colonial phenomena. Due to the large number of sources, one can tackle the question from many different standpoints and on different levels of interpretation. Hence, we will focus here on three major issues: first, the origin and spread of the compound ἀρχηγέτης/-ις in Archaic and Classical times; second, the gods the epithet is usually attached to and the way they are perceived by civic communities; third, its recurring connection with the royal power from the Archaic period down to Roman times.

1 Tracing the Origins

Although the origins of the compound ἀρχηγέτης/-ις are still open to debate, it is nevertheless indisputable that the earliest records point to a certain dissemination in Doric-Laconic milieu. Indeed, the word does not occur in Homeric poems, wherein functions comparable to those of an ἀρχηγέτης seem to be covered by the cognate ἀρχός,⁷ nor in Hesiod's, who makes extensive use of ἀρχή almost exclusively to mean "beginning".⁸ After all, it is worth stressing that ἀρχή is not very productive in the formation of compounds in Homeric poetry⁹ and not at all in Hesiodic tradition.

The earliest evidence of the use of ἀρχηγέτης/-ις can be found in a funerary inscription from Thera, dating to the late 7th or early 6th century (*IG* XII 3, 762, l. 2).¹⁰

⁶ See, for example, Robert 1969, 296: "Apollon était [. . .] le dieu archégètes traditionnel de la colonisation par son oracle de Delphes" (cf. *BE* 1976, Nr. 721). On the alleged Delphic connotations of the Apollo Archegetes, see below.

⁷ *Il.* 1, 144, 311; 2, 234, 493, 541, 618, 685, 703, 726, 778, 846; 4, 205, 464; 5, 39, 491, 577 . . . ; *Od.* 4, 496, 629, 653; 8, 162, 391; 10, 204; 21, 187.

⁸ *Hes. Th.* 45, 115, 156, 203, 408, 425, 452, 512; *Op.* 709; *fr.* 43a, 61 M.-W.

⁹ A single case of an adjective-noun compound may be found in *Il.* 5, 63 (ἀρχεκάκους). As for anthroponymic compounds, ἀρχή contributes to the formation of two names: Ἀρχέλοχος son of Antenor (*Il.* 2, 823; 12, 100; 14, 464) and Ἀρχεπτόλεμος, son of Iphitos (*Il.* 8 128, 312).

¹⁰ See e.g. Guarducci 1939–1940; Jeffery 1961, 144–146; Nafissi 2010, 105.

The reading of this text does not clarify whether the Therean ἀρχαγέτας is to be interpreted as a proper name or as a mere title of one of the deceased buried in the *polyand- rion*.¹¹ What is worth highlighting, however, is that ἀρχηγέτης has in all likelihood nothing to do with a deity in this context, but is rather supposed to refer to a mortal.

Indeed, attributing ἀρχηγέτης/-ις to a deity or a mortal constitutes a primary distinguishing point in the study of the term. If one looks at the recipient of the title, a trait of continuity in the case of Thera may be traced to Sparta, where according to a passage of the Archaic *rhetra* reported by Plutarch, the first rulers of the city, i.e. Eurysthenes and Procles, or the ancestors of the local royal houses, Agis and Euryphon, were regarded as ἀρχαγέται (Plut. *Lyc.* 6, esp. 1–3).¹²

A Doric background is implied by sources enlightening the initial phase of the spreading of ἀρχηγέτης/-ις as a divine name, too. The epithet occurs for the first time in the fifth Pythian Ode (v. 60), composed by Pindar in 462 to hail the victory of Arcesilaus the Cyrenean in the chariot race.¹³ Here, the poet recalls the foundation of Cyrene (ca. 631/0), emphasising the role played by Apollo as god ἀρχαγέτας.¹⁴ However, Pindar just sketches out a well-known foundation story that shares some features with the parallel account reported by Herodotus (4, 150–158).¹⁵ This myth assigns to the Delphic oracle the fostering of the expedition to Libya by Battos the Therean, and draws a parallel with the contents of the so-called Stele of the Founders (*SEG* 9, 3 = Meiggs – Lewis, *GHI* 5; first half of the 4th century), which records the ἀποικία of Battos as a venture led according to the prescriptions of Apollo Ἀρχαγέτας (ll. 10–11: κατὰ τὰν ἐπίταξιν τῷ Ἀπό[λ]λωνος τῷ Ἀρχαγέτα).¹⁶ The distant referent here is unquestionably the Delphic Apollo who, in the past, was regarded as the quintessential god of colonisation who metaphorically leads settlers to some kind of ‘promised land’.¹⁷

¹¹ For the interpretation of ἀρχαγέτας as a personal name, see Guarducci 1939–1940, who followed Boeckh 1836, 78–79 and F. Blass *ap. SGI* 4808.

¹² For the main terms of the debate, see Jeffery 1961, 144–146; Carlier 1984, 310–314; Nafissi 2010, 104–111 (with further references).

¹³ The chronology of the poem is established by *Sch. Pind. Pyth.* 5, *inscr.* (II, p. 171, 24–25 Drachmann).

¹⁴ Pind. *Pyth.* 5, esp. 55–88.

¹⁵ On these Herodotean chapters, see Nafissi 1980–1981, 186–194; Corcella/Medaglia/Fraschetti 1993, 332–350; Vannicelli 1993, 123–139; Malkin 1987, 60–69 and Malkin 2003. On the relationships between the texts of Pindar and Herodotus, see Calame 1990, 305–319; Nafissi 1980–1981, 194–199; Giangiulio 2001.

¹⁶ Significant textual improvements in Dobias-Lalou 1994 (= *SEG* 43, 1185). On the contents of this inscription, see *inter alia* Graham 1960; Jeffery 1961; Dušanić 1978.

¹⁷ Cf. *SEG* 9, 3, ll. 16–18: Καταγράφειν δὲ τῷδε τὸ ψάφισμα ἐν στάλ[αν] | λυγδίναν, θέμεν τὰν στά- λαν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ πατρῶιον τ[ῶ] | Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ Πυθῶ. Indeed, the traditions recording the selection of the ten ἀρχηγέται of the Athenian *phylai*, and the Aristotelian account mentioning the role played by the Pythia in selecting their names, strengthen this assumption (Arist. *AP* 21, 6; cf. Hdt. 5, 66, 2; Aristoph. *fr.* 135 Kassel-Austin). As for the Apollo Ἀρχηγέτης in the Sicilian Naxos, cf.

The case of Naxos in Sicily has been sometimes brought up to corroborate this image of Apollo as god ἀρχηγέτης and patron of the founders. According to a tradition mentioned by Thucydides (6, 3, 1), which probably drew upon the work of Antiochus of Syracuse,¹⁸ an altar to Apollo Ἀρχηγέτης was erected by the Chalcidian settlers of Naxos, the first Greek colony of Sicily (734).¹⁹ The use of ἀρχηγέτης in the Thucydidean narrative has led a significant part of modern scholars to take for granted an active role of the Delphic oracle behind this colonial enterprise.²⁰ However, Thucydides does not make mention of an involvement of the Delphic oracle as inspirer of the foundation, nor do later sources like Strabo (following Ephorus), Pausanias and Apianus point to any Delphic intervention.²¹ As a matter of fact, this assumption rests on the still widespread idea that every single colonial expedition must have been validated by an Apollinean response, an assertion that has been questioned by a number of studies dedicated to the dynamics of the Greek colonisation.²² As for the case of Naxos, what is more, the identification of Apollo Ἀρχηγέτης with the god of Delphi has been challenged by rejecting the connections between the Sicilian cult and the worship of Apollo on Delos, the latter being performed at a short distance from the homeland of the Cycladic component of the Naxian settlers.²³ A papyrus fragment of Pindar (*fr.* 140a Snell-Maehler = G8 Rutherford) shows that the epithet ἀρχηγέτης may have been occasionally associated with the Delian Apollo too, something that seems

Malkin 1986, 960: “Who was Apollo at Naxos? This seems to be the key question. Was he the god of colonization *par excellence*, namely, the god of Delphoi whose oracle played an important role in Greek colonization in the archaic period?”. Re-emerging from time to time in the scholarship (see e.g. Parke – Wormell 1956, I, 66–67; Forrest 1957, 165 and 172), such a view still meets some acceptance, however not without drawing some criticism (see below in this section).

18 Dover 1953; Luraghi 1991; Murray 2014.

19 The position where the altar stood has not been pinpointed so far. Though conclusive evidence is still lacking, it is usually assumed that it should lie along the coastline north of the ancient site, not far from the current church of *San Pancrazio* in modern Giardini Naxos (Muscolino/Cordano/Lentini/Struffolino 2014).

20 Malkin 1986; Ager 2008, 158; Murray 2014, 463–464, 468–470.

21 Strab. 6, 2, 2 (citing Ephor. *BNJ* 70 F 137a), 4; Paus. 6, 13, 8; App. *BC* 5, 109, 454–455. See also Ps. Scymn. 270–278; Steph. Byz. s.v. Χαλκίς (χ 17 Billerbeck – Neumann-Hartmann, with quotation of Hellenic. *BNJ* 4 F 82).

22 For the Greek foundations in Southern Italy, see the statistics provided by Hall 2008, 400–402. Notoriously, the impact of the Delphic Apollo on the Greek colonisation represents one of the most heatedly debated topics of the entire Greek history (see for example Parke – Wormell 1956, I, 49–81; Forrest 1957; Londey 1990; Lombardo 2011).

23 Scepticism has been expressed by Donnellan 2015, 47 (but cf. however p. 57, where she emphasises the alleged Delphic undertones of the Thucydidean narrative) and especially Sammartano 2018, 73–76. On the identification of the Apollo of Naxos with the god of Delos, see Brelich 1964–1965, 45–47; Brugnone 1980; Sammartano 2018, 76–79 (with further references); cf. also Van Compernelle 1950–1951, who considers plausible a Delphic endorsement behind the colonial undertaking to Sicily (181).

to undermine the Delphic undertones assigned to the Apollo Ἀρχηγέτης of Naxos.²⁴ What remains of this text, probably deriving from a *Paeian*, depicts the arrival of Heracles on Paros, where the Alcides landed abiding by the will of the Delian Apollo, here referred to as the ἀρχαγέτας Δάλου (= G8, 30 Rutherford).²⁵

Admittedly, the onomastic option followed by Pindar in the latter fragment has found so far just one mid-Hellenistic parallel for Apollo in the Delian epigraphy.²⁶ Nonetheless, this choice appears to be by no means the virtuosity of a great poet but may rather betray a good knowledge of Delian cult traditions. Since the second half of the 6th century, the attribute ἀρχηγέτης was tied to the local worship paid to Anios, a son of Apollo who is known by the *Cypria* to be the father of the Oinotropoi and the host of the Achaeans, some time before their expedition to Troy.²⁷ His cult took place in the Delian sanctuary named Ἀρχηγέσιον,²⁸ where French archaeologists retrieved hundreds of inscribed ex-votos addressing the dedicatee of the sanctuary as Ἄνιος, θεός, βασιλεύς and – of course – ἀρχηγέτης (*I.Délos* 35, 1–5).²⁹ Because of the title ἀρχηγέτης, Anios, whom the literary sources depict as soothsayer and king of Delos, is regarded by Francis Prost as *la concrétisation cultuelle du souvenir d'une ancienne colonisation*³⁰ – or, in other words, as the exemplary embodiment of a founding figure associated with a colonial settlement. In this respect, however, one wonders to what extent the notion of ‘colonisation’ is appropriate for a figure like Anios (be he a local semi-god or hero), given that his functions do not overlap those of, say, the Apollo of the Sicilian Naxos or Cyrene, and nor do they perfectly parallel those of a hero like Battos.³¹ A strict categorisation of every single ἀρχηγέτης or ἀρχηγέτις as a *patron of settlers* or *colonial leader* may be misleading. As for the gods ἀρχηγέται, it is perhaps wiser to address the intertwined issues concerning their function and the meaning of their attribute in more blurred terms. It is perhaps more convenient to turn back to approaches that lend attention to the symbolism of the socio-political organisation of space, and appeal to more

24 This fragmentary text re-emerged in an Oxyrhynchian papyrus dating to the end of the 1st or 2nd cent. CE (P.Oxy. 3, 408 = *LDAB* 3708 = *TM* 62527).

25 For a recent interpretation of the poem, see Lucarini 2011 (with further references).

26 *I.Délos* 1506 (145/4).

27 See for example *Cypr. fr.* 29 Bernabé; Simonid. *PMG* 537; Pherecyd. *BNJ* 3 F 140; Call. *Aet. fr.* 188 Pfeiffer; Lyc. *Alex.* 569–583. These and other literary sources were collected by Bruneau 1970, 413–420.

28 On the sanctuary, see Robert 1953; Prost 2001.

29 Cf. Prost 2001, 110 e Prost 2002, 305–306. Unfortunately, all these materials have yet to be published.

30 Prost 2002, 318. On Anios βασιλεύς or *rex*, see Dion. Hal. *AR* 1, 50; 59; Diod. 5, 79, 2; Verg. *Aen.* 3, 80; Serv. *Ad Aen.* 3, 80. On his mantic skills, see Diod. 5, 62, 2; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 21; cf. Pherecyd. *BNJ* 3 F 140.

31 Cf. Prost 2001, 114–117 and Prost 2002, 317–318. On this issue, see now, more cautiously, Boffa 2019, 187; cf. below, section 3.

inclusive and flexible notions like territorialisation.³² And this claims not to be a mere change in translation and/or terminology, but rather represents a shift in conceptual and interpretative parameters, which might allay some troubles in profiling the traits of another prominent deity regarded as ἀρχηγέτις: Athena at Athens.

In a disputed passage of the *Lysistrata*, Aristophanes alludes to Athena by evoking her as ἀρχηγέτις (Ar. *Lys.* 643–644).³³ This is the first reliable evidence attesting to the eponymic use in association with the city goddess.³⁴ Indeed, the poetic framework recommends some care in dealing with ἀρχηγέτις as a proper cult epithet, but it is worth noting that this poetic choice achieved some success from the 4th century onwards, since the attribute came to follow the name of Athena ever more often, both in public epigraphy and in literary sources.³⁵ It is hardly conceivable that Aristophanes meant to refer to any ‘colonial’ function of Athena by choosing the term ἀρχηγέτις. As a well-known mythographic and iconographic theme reports, after the conflict with Poseidon περὶ τῆς χώρας, Athena took possession of Athens by planting the olive tree and teaching the first native inhabitants to live in κοινωμία.³⁶ In a sense, she was not the very *foundress* of the *polis*, but the ‘*initiatress*’ of a new age of cultural, social, and political order.³⁷

A comparable conceptual and cosmological background presides over the emphatic use of the name ἀρχηγέτις by Sophron of Syracuse, an author of mimes who lived in the 5th century.³⁸ In one of his fragments he refers to Zeus as ἀρχαγέτας πάντων (Sophron *fr.* 41 Kassel-Austin), drawing upon a well-established poetical tradition that ascribed to the god the ἀρχή of the cosmic order.³⁹ Although this attribute

³² Cf. Detienne 1990; Malkin 1990.

³³ Cf. Anderson 1995, 50. The identification of the ἀρχηγέτις with Artemis, assumed and strenuously maintained by Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood (Sourvinou-Inwood 1971 and 1988, 136–159), has been repeatedly refuted and is outdated (Stinton 1976; Grebe 1999; Perusino 2002).

³⁴ An earlier inscription discovered on the slopes of the Acropolis (perhaps, a phyletic decree concerning a sacred property) is likely to date back to the mid-5th century and hints at an ἀρχηγέτις or ἀρχηγέτης whose identity is unfortunately no longer recognisable due to the serious damage sustained by the stone (*IG I³ 1, 252, l. 4: ἀρχεγετ[—];* cf. Papazarkadas 2011, 100). Indeed, the attribution of the name ἀρχηγέτις to Athena seems to have been affected by the cults paid to phyletic and demic eponyms, who were honoured as ἀρχηγέται from the end of the 6th cent. onwards (see above n. 17).

³⁵ Some examples from Hellenistic Athens are *IG II/III³ 1, 900 (273/2); II/III³ 1, 911 (270/69); II/III³ 1, 1239 (around 200); II/III³ 4, 1386 (mid-2nd cent.)*. Cf. Biagetti 2019.

³⁶ Apoll. *Bibl.* 3, 14, 1; Cornut. 20, 40 (cf. also Hdt. 8, 55; Paus. 1, 24, 5). For the representation of the struggle between Athena and Poseidon on the western pediment of the Parthenon, see the overview in Palagia 2005, 242–253.

³⁷ For similar functions of Apollo, cf. Malkin 1989 and Prost 2001.

³⁸ Hordern 2004, 2–4.

³⁹ See for example Terpand. *PMG* 697: Ζεῦ πάντων ἀρχά, πάντων ἀγήτωρ, | Ζεῦ, σοὶ πέμπω ταύτων ὕμνων ἀρχάν. More references in Gostoli 1990, 132–136. For Zeus as god of the order, see for example Linke 2006.

was rarely assigned to Zeus,⁴⁰ indeed it depicts very well his divine functions and, more significantly, its use is peculiarly meaningful in the work of the Syracusan Sophron, who was likely not unaware of the cult of Apollo Ἀρχηγέτης in Naxos.

As a preliminary conclusion, it can be said with a measure of confidence that, according to available evidence, the origins of the compound ἀρχηγέτης/-ις can be traced back at least to the end of the 7th century.⁴¹ However, the use of ἀρχηγέτης/-ις as a divine attribute of Apollo occurs in literary sources from the 5th century that attempt to record circumstances going back to the 8th or 7th century.⁴² Up to the end of 5th century, one encounters ἀρχηγέτης/-ις associated with the names of three Olympic gods, i.e. Apollo, Athena and Zeus. Nonetheless, the title was attached to other semi-divine figures like Anios on Delos or the heroes ἀρχηγέται in Attica.⁴³ Taken as a whole, if we look at the functions fulfilled by the gods and heroes ἀρχηγέται in the earliest evidence, they seem to take the shape of tutelary figures presiding over the occupation of a land and protecting at the same time the social and institutional order established on that land.

2 Mapping the Ἀρχηγέται

A second point of this overview looks into the identity of the deities honoured with the attribute ἀρχηγέτης/-ις in the Greco-Roman Mediterranean. As already shown, in Archaic and Classical times, the number of Olympic gods characterised as ἀρχηγέται was essentially restricted to Apollo, Athena, and Zeus. Evidence ranging from the Late Classical period to the Roman times demonstrates a consistent use of the epithet in divine onomastic sequences attested at Cyrene,⁴⁴ Delos,⁴⁵ and Athens.⁴⁶ Meanwhile, during the Hellenistic age, Apollo came to be named ἀρχηγέτης in some large

⁴⁰ See *I.Nordkarien* 406, ll. 6–7 (Reign of Claudius); very uncertain is the reading of *IG* I³ 1024, a (ca. 550, from Sounion): – – ρον Διὶ ἀ[ρ]χ[ε]γέτ[ε]ι].

⁴¹ *IG* XII 3, 762.

⁴² Cyrene: Pind. *Pyth.* 5, 55–88; Hdt. 4, 150–158. Naxos: Thuc. 6, 1, 3; App. *BC* 5, 109, 454–455.

⁴³ Anios: *I.Délos* 35, 5. On the Attic ἀρχηγέται, see above n. 17.

⁴⁴ *IG Cyrenaica* 011000 = *SEG* 9, 3, ll. 10–11 (beginning of the 4th cent.); *IG Cyrenaica* 011200, l. 26 (155). The identity of the Ἀρχαγέτας mentioned in *IG Cyrenaica* 109200 (1st half of the 3rd cent.) without any other specification remains an unsolved question (ll. 8–11: καὶ ἧ κα τοὶ ταμίαι | Προθεάρια | τῶι Ἀρχαγέται | θύωντι): although an identification with Apollo has been convincingly argued, nevertheless, the possibility that the recipient of the sacrifices mentioned in this inscription was in fact Battos cannot be ruled out (see Ali Mohamed/Reynolds/Dobias-Lalou 2007, 18, 30–35).

⁴⁵ *I.Délos* 1506, l. 10 (145/4).

⁴⁶ *IG* II/III³ 1, 900 (273/2); 1, 911 (270/69); 1, 1239 (around 200); 4, 1386 (mid-2nd cent.); 4, 12 (early Augustan age); 4, 1403 (mid-1st cent. CE); 4, 1406, fr. b (1st/2nd cent. CE); 4, 1393 (61/2 CE); 4, 1407 (Roman Imperial times).

cities of the Greek East, such as Hierapolis in Phrygia,⁴⁷ Halicarnassos,⁴⁸ Attaleia⁴⁹ and Apamea in Syria.⁵⁰

To reaffirm and enhance the role of the city god in the constitution of the *polis* – and, thus, reinforce the cohesiveness of the civic body in a new world dominated by the Hellenistic kingdoms and later by the Roman power –, the attribution of ἀρχηγέτης extends increasingly to other deities whose cults still display both tutelary and identity implications. In Hellenistic times, we know of Artemis Ἀρχηγέτης at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander,⁵¹ Leto Ἀρχηγέτις at Xanthos,⁵² and Dionysus Ἀρχαγέτας at Teos;⁵³ later on, one encounters Hera Ἀρχηγέτις at Samos,⁵⁴ the goddess Eleuthera Ἀρχηγέτις in Lycia,⁵⁵

47 *I.Hierapolis Judeich* 2, l. 1 (2nd cent. CE); *SEG* 62, 1216, l. 3 (2nd cent. CE); *Steinepigramme* 1, 02/12/01–04 (*Aufz.*), l. 1 (ca. 165/6 CE); *SEG* 56, 1500 (probably 2nd half of the 2nd cent. CE); Carettoni 1963–1964, 414–415, l. 1 (2nd cent. or 1st half of the 3rd cent. CE); *I.Hierapolis Judeich* 4 = *SEG* 57, 1367, l. 1 (205–207 CE); *SEG* 57, 1368, l. 1 (220–235 CE); *I.Hierapolis Judeich* 153, l. 5 (Roman Imperial times). *BMC (Phrygia)* p. 231, Nr. 23 (2nd cent. CE); p. 233, Nr. 34 (2nd cent. CE); p. 234, Nr. 46 (3rd cent. CE); cf. also *SEG* 62, 1191, l. 6 (1st cent. CE; from the rural shrine of Apollo at Güzelpınar, 10 km. north-east of Hierapolis).

48 Wilhelm 1905, 238, l. 3 (2nd/1st cent.); Wilhelm 1905, 239 (I), ll. 4–5 (2nd/1st cent.); Wilhelm 1905, 239 (II), l. 2 (2nd/1st cent.); Wilhelm 1905, 241, ll. 4–5 (2nd/1st cent.); Michel, *Recueil* 1200, l. 9 (1st cent.); *Syll.*³ 1066 = *IG* XII 4, 935, ll. 13–14, 16–17 (End of the 1st cent. BCE or beginning of the 1st cent. CE); *I. British Mus.* 893, l. 50 (1st half of the 1st cent. CE); *SEG* 44, 877, l. 7 (undated).

49 *IGR* 3, 780, l. 8 (Roman Imperial times); 781 = *SEG* 6, 651 = *SEG* 17, 586, ll. 4–5 (2nd cent. CE).

50 *SEG* 48, 1844, ll. 15–16 (Reign of Hadrian).

51 3rd/2nd cent.: *I.Magnesia* 37, l. 10 (Athens); 41, l. 6 (Sicyon); 46, l. 19 (Epidamnus); 50, ll. 18–19 (Paros); 52, ll. 11–12 (Mitylene or Eresos, together with Methymna and Antissa); 53, ll. 7–8 (Clazomenai [?] and Ionian cities); 54, ll. 8–9 + 89, ll. 25–26 (Technitai of Dionysus); 56, ll. 12–13 (Cnidus [?]); 60, l. 16–17 (unknown city); 61, l. 26 (Antioch in Persis); 62, l. 3 (unknown city); 63, l. 7 (unknown city); 64, l. 19 (unknown city); 79–80, l. 5 (Antioch of Pisidia or Alabanda); 85, l. 5 (Tralleis); 87, ll. 9–10 (unknown city); cf. also *I.Magnesia* 16, l. 21 (foundation decree of Leucophryena); 18, ll. 7–8 (Letter from Antiochus III); 19, ll. 8–9 (Letter from Antiochus, son of Antiochus III); 100, ll. 18–19 (decree with prescriptions concerning the cult of Artemis Leucophryene).

52 *SEG* 38, 1476, ll. 17–18 (206/5).

53 Rigsby, *Asylia* 154, l. 20–21 (170–140, from Aptera); 155, ll. 33–34 (170–140; from Eranna); 159, ll. 12, 23–24 (170–140; from the Arcadians in Crete); 161, ll. 19–20 (170–140; from an unidentified Cretan city). The Doric ἀρχαγέτας follows the dialect form used by the Cretan communities, which voted for the concession of the *asylia* to the city and territory of Teos. In connection with this, even though the use of ἀρχαγέτας makes good sense in Dionysus' role in the foundation of the Teian community (see below in this section), it cannot be denied that the recurrence of the divine name in the decrees from Crete alone is somewhat problematic and, at least in this case, it does not guarantee that the attribute was really in use among Teians (however, see below n. 57, where the use of ἀρχηγός in *SEG* 38, 1227 is attested).

54 *IG* XII 6, 1, 7, fr. b-d, ll. 46–47 (ca. 5); *IG* XII 6, 1, 305 (Reign of Augustus); *IG* XII 6, 1, 330 (1st half of the 1st cent. CE); *IG* XII 6, 1, 300 (Reign of Caligula); *IG* XII 6, 2, 581 (1st cent. CE); *IG* XII 6, 2, 727 (2nd half of the 2nd cent. CE); *IG* XII 6, 2, 610 = *SEG* 51, 1087 (306–311 CE).

55 Cyaneae: *SEG* 40, 1270 (Reign of Augustus); *IGR* 3, 700 (Reign of Antoninus Pius); Myra: *IGR* 3, 704, II A, l. 9 (Reign of Antoninus Pius); *IGR* 3, 714, ll. 15–16 (Roman Imperial times).

and Artemis Ἀρχηγέτις at Ephesos.⁵⁶ Obviously, almost all of these cults took place in the most representative sanctuaries of their respective communities. Moreover, many of them enjoyed renown well beyond the boundaries of their neighbourhoods and, in cases like the cults for Athena at Athens, Artemis at Ephesos and Hera at Samos, they even rose to a Panhellenic dimension.

Interestingly enough (and quite unsurprisingly), the emic point of view largely prevails in the available sources. A number of foundation stories were claimed to underpin the close ties between a human group and their divine patron and, as one would easily expect for an ἀρχηγέτης, they emphasised the intervention of the god in the birth of a city and/or its institutions. In some lucky cases, literary sources explicitly refer to local traditions underlining the genetic relationships between a god ἀρχηγέτης and the land or city under his protection. A couple of examples may be revealing. According to Diodorus (Diod. 3, 66, 1–2), the Teians maintained that Dionysus was born in their territory and proved their claim by showing a spring gushing with wine.⁵⁷ Glossing over the universally known role of Athena in the foundation of Athens, the Herodotean account of the foundation of Cyrene (4, 155–159) drew upon traditions reported by Cyrenians, who were concerned *inter alia* with highlighting the involvement of the Delphic Apollo in the establishment of the new settlement.⁵⁸ Although the epithet ἀρχηγέτης does not appear in the narrative of Herodotus, it is used by Pindar in a different version of the Cyrenean foundation myth (*Pyth.* 5, 60) that equally relied on local accounts.⁵⁹ In cases such as those of Teos, Athens and Cyrene, literary records parallel with epigraphical evidence, the latter attesting the use of ἀρχηγέτης or ἀρχηγέτις for Dionysus, Athena, and Apollo respectively.

As is the case with the literary sources, the inscriptions mentioning the ἀρχηγέται usually come from within a political community. Examples abound and are sometimes even spectacular, as the inscribed dedication on the gate of Athena ἀρχηγέτις in the Roman Agora of Athens shows.⁶⁰ In this respect, cases of gods ἀρχηγέται honoured outside their homeland are probably the most telling. In the second half of the 3rd century, for example, a decree of the Athenians relating to some Prieneans attending the penteteric Panathenaea was published at Priene: therein,

⁵⁶ *I.Ephesos* 1398, ll. 3, 14 (Julio-Claudian Age); *I.Ephesos* 27, l. 20 (104 CE).

⁵⁷ A core of this lore could well go back to the Archaic age, when Anacreon named the city Ἀθαμαντίς after Athamas, a homonymous descendant of the husband of Ino, who had hosted Dionysus shortly after the birth of the god (Anacr. *PMG* 118; Pherecyd. *BNJ* 3 F 102; Strab. 14, 1, 3; Paus. 7, 3, 6; cf. *SEG* 38, 1227 [ca. 204; letter of the kings of the Athamanes concerning the *asylia* of Teos], col. I, ll. 10–11: ὑπαρχούσας ἡμῖν συγγενείας πρὸς αὐτὸν | τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς κοινῆς προσηγορίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων).

⁵⁸ See esp. Giangiulio 2001 (with further references, esp. on p. 121, n. 14).

⁵⁹ See, once again, the remarks by Giangiulio 2001. On the personal relationship established by Pindar with his commissioners, see Angeli Bernardini 1985.

⁶⁰ *IG* II/III³, 4, 12 = *IG* II², 3175 (early Augustan era).

Athenians referred to Athena Ἀρχηγέτις as patron goddess of their city (*I.Priene*² 99 = *IG II/III*³, 1, 1239, ll. 11–12). In a striking contrast, a decree of the Prieneans, which was probably approved more than a century earlier, had already proclaimed to send civic envoys to Athens every four years to attend – once again – the Panathenaea for the Πολιάς of Athens (*I.Priene*² 5, ll. 1–6, 10–13). Various reasons could lie behind these two ways of naming the Athena of Athens in Priene; indeed, the fact that each decree was ultimately passed by a different city council is likely to be interpreted as the main ground for this apparent inconsistency.

Numismatics may provide an additional clue when literary and epigraphic sources fail to provide information in terms of self-representation. The laureate head of the young Apollo, for example, appears on the coins of the Sicilian Naxos only in the last quarter of the 5th century.⁶¹ As Lieve Donnellan pointed out, these issues followed some series of coins struck at Leontini since the 460s, which portray Apollo in a similar fashion.⁶² According to Diodorus (Diod. 11, 49, 2), Leontini, an ancient subcolony of Naxos, hosted a group of Naxians after the destruction of their city by Hieron of Syracuse (ca. 476). As Donnellan argues, the cult of Apollo Ἀρχηγέτης may have operated as a shared religious link between the mother-city and its colony during Naxians' exile.⁶³ No surprise, thus, when one century later the inhabitants of Tauromenion, a city founded in 358 on the ashes of Naxos (destroyed by Dionysius I in 403/2),⁶⁴ chose to revive in their new issues some motives of the old Naxian coinage,⁶⁵ even adding the legend ΑΡΧΑΓΕΤΑΣ to the profile of Apollo.⁶⁶

Again, the legend ΑΡΧΗΓΕΤΗΣ marks out some imperial series of bronze coins from the Phrygian Hierapolis, which bear on their obverse the bust of Apollo, the city god.⁶⁷ Literary tradition sheds little light on the origins of the city. The involvement of Apollo in the foundation of Hierapolis is supposed to be – as in other cases – inspirational only and largely indirect, whether one appreciates the elusive reference to his son Mopsos as a part of a more elaborated founding myth,⁶⁸ or embraces the modern assumption of a Seleucid establishment in the name of Apollo, the dynastic god of the Seleucids.⁶⁹ Indeed, as heir of an earlier indigenous deity, Apollo may well be regarded as the main patron of Hierapolis from the outset, something that should have contributed to making his temple the most magnificent

⁶¹ *BMC (Sicily)*, p. 120, Nr. 20–22; cf. Cahn 1944, 61–62, 90–93.

⁶² Donnellan 2012, 176; Donnellan 2015, 52–55.

⁶³ Donnellan 2012, 181; Donnellan 2015, 53–54.

⁶⁴ Diod. 14, 15, 2.

⁶⁵ Diod. 16, 7, 1; cf. Diod. 14, 87, 4–88, 4.

⁶⁶ *BMC (Sicily)*, p. 231, Nr. 15–17; p. 232, Nr. 25–26, 29–32; cf. Cahn 1944, 95.

⁶⁷ *BMC (Phrygia)* p. 231, Nr. 23 (2nd cent. CE); p. 233, Nr. 34 (2nd cent. CE); p. 234, Nr. 46 (3rd cent. CE).

⁶⁸ *Steinepigramme* 1, 02/12/01, ll. 13–17; *BMC (Phrygia)* p. 232, Nr. 32 (2nd cent. CE). See Pugliese Carratelli 1963–1964, 364–365 and, more recently, Guizzi 2014.

⁶⁹ See Kolb 1974, 268; cf. J. and L. Robert in *BE* 1976, Nr. 668 and 721.

and representative of the city;⁷⁰ on the other hand, however, the remarkable chronological consistency of both numismatic and epigraphic evidence suggests that the attribution of the title ἀρχηγέτης to Apollo occurred at a later stage, most likely between the 1st and the 2nd century CE.⁷¹

3 The Ἀρχηγέτης and the *Genos*

The allusion just made to Apollo as a tutelary god of the Seleucids leads us to the last point of this overview, i.e. the connections between the epithet ἀρχηγέτης and the monarchic sphere. Since Archaic times, the term ἀρχηγέτης has shown a special relationship with kingship. The Apollo Ἀρχαγέτας of Cyrene was not only the patron of the founder and king Battos; he was also regarded as a divine counterpart of Battos himself, who – like Apollo – was locally revered as ἀρχαγέτας.⁷² As pointed out above, two royal ancestors of Sparta, the distant mother-city of Cyrene, were also called ἀρχαγέται in the Archaic *rhetra*.⁷³ If one looks at the mythical and cultic relationships between the god and the founder-king, the case of Cyrene parallels that of Delos to some extent.⁷⁴ There, the figure of the ἀρχηγέτης Anios, alleged son of Apollo and king of the island, received a cult from the 2nd half of the 6th century in the sanctuary named Ἀρχηγέσιον and, like the Cyrenians, the Delians too could address Apollo as their ἀρχηγέτης.

Some centuries later, at the beginning of the Hellenistic era, the Seleucid kings recognised Apollo as their divine ancestor and protector. Indeed, epigraphical evidence echoes the royal claims pointedly.⁷⁵ In an honorary decree issued by Iasos dating to the

70 On the indigenous cult of Apollo Κάρ(ε)ιος, see Pugliese Carratelli 1963–1964, 362–363; Ritti 1989–1990, 862–863 and Ritti 2017, 104–106. On the temple of Apollo at Hierapolis, see Ismaelli 2017a, 320–322 (for the Julio-Claudian age) and Ismaelli 2017b. The earliest piece of evidence that attests to the use of ἀρχηγέτης in the area of Hierapolis (*SEG* 62, 1191) comes from the suburban sanctuary of Apollo Κάρ(ε)ιος at Güzelı̇nı̇r (1st cent. CE).

71 To posit that the cult of Apollo Ἀρχηγέτης goes back to the times of the foundation of Hierapolis (cf. Ritti 1989–1990, 862; Guizzi 2014, 35) means, in practical terms, that already in the 3rd century BCE the attribute ἀρχηγέτης would have been a possible option in the divine onomastic sequences of the local Apollo, an assertion that enjoys no real support in available evidence. Similarly, identifying the temple B of Apollo as the one of the god Ἀρχηγέτης might be somewhat appropriate for the sacred building erected in the 1st or 2nd century CE, but certainly not for the earlier stages of it (cf. esp. Ismaelli 2017a, 320–322) – unless, of course, new discoveries prove the local use of ἀρχηγέτης also for the Hellenistic period.

72 *IG Cyrenaica* 016700 = *CGRN* 99, l. 22 (325–300). On the monumental tomb of Battos in the agora, see Pind. *Pyth.* 5, 92–95 (with Σ *ad loc.*). On the archaeological activities carried out on the site of the tomb, see Parisi Presicce 2007.

73 Plut. *Lyc.* 6, 1; 3.

74 See above, § 1.

75 See *I.Erythrai* 205, ll. 74–76 (around 281).

beginnings of the 2nd century, Apollo is explicitly stated to be the θεὸς ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ γένους τῶν βασιλέων, the god ancestor of the royal stock,⁷⁶ a claim that is expressed in a similar fashion in a couple of contemporary inscriptions from Ilion (ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ γένους).⁷⁷ An indirect reference to the godly roots of the Seleucids may be found in a decree of Tralleis/Seleucia that details an agreement of *isopoliteia* with Miletos (218/7) and that prescribes a common sacrifice for Apollo Didymaeus as shared ἀρχηγέτης τῆς οἰκειότητος.⁷⁸ An anecdotal tradition preserved by Iustinus substantiates the epigraphic information on the divine descent of Seleucus I, reporting the colourful story of a dreamlike intercourse between his mother Laodice and the god.⁷⁹ Returning briefly to the aforementioned notion of *chronotopos* (and without stressing too much a concept that may sound eccentric in this context), while keeping its temporal undertones unchanged, the name ἀρχηγέτης reduces its spatial connotations to the sole Seleucid *genos*, thus contributing to bringing out the preferential and almost exclusive relationship between the members of the royal family and Apollo, their alleged ancestor.

Since the beginning of the Roman imperial age, likewise, Greek-speaking authors made use of the divine attribute ἀρχηγέτης/-ις to put forward Aphrodite as the ancestress of the Julian family.⁸⁰ This onomastic choice belongs to a larger trend that sees an increase in the number of gods honoured as ἀρχηγέται from the reign of Augustus onwards.⁸¹ By means of this title, some civic communities came to lend new emphasis to their genetic connection with a divine ancestor: major examples like the Athenian Athena, the Ephesian Artemis and the Samian Hera have already been recalled in the previous pages. Except for Athena, none of these goddesses were called ἀρχηγέτιδες before and this is conceivably the result of – first and foremost – the Augustan promotion of ancestral cults.⁸² However, much more can be said about this. The imperial cult often took place next to the most representative deity of one *polis* and evidence from Athens, Samos and Ephesos shows that

⁷⁶ *I.Jasos* 4, ll. 54–55 (200–190).

⁷⁷ *I.Ilion* 31, ll. 13–14 (281); 32, ll. 26–27 (around 280 or 197). In consideration of the evidence coming from Ilion, Jeanne and Louis Robert suggested restoring the phrasing τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τοῦ | γένους Ἀπόλλωνος] in *CID* IV 98, A, ll. 13–14, an Amphictyonic decree for Antiochus III dating to 201/0 (*BE* 1955, Nr. 122).

⁷⁸ *I.Milet* I 3, 143 = *I.Tralles* 20, ll. 65–66; cf. *I.Milet* VI, 1, pp. 176–177. On the notion of οἰκειότης, its meaning and uses in Antiquity, see esp. Will 1995 and Sammartano 2007 (with further references).

⁷⁹ Iust. *Epit.* 15, 4; cf. Euphor. *fr.* 119 Lightfoot; App. *Syr.* 56, 284–285.

⁸⁰ Strab. 14, 2, 19; Cass. Dio 43, 22, 2. For Aeneas ἀρχηγέτης of the Romans, see Strab. 13, 1, 27; Cass. Dio 1, p. 4 Boissevain (= Zonar. *Epit.* 7, 1). Other references in Biagetti 2020, 31–34.

⁸¹ Similarities and differences between the Hellenistic ruler cult and the Roman imperial cult have often been highlighted by scholars (for an overview, see esp. Price 1984, 23–77 and Chaniotis 2003, 442–443 with further references).

⁸² On this point, see recently Brélaz 2017. Essential insights into the religious policy of Augustus can be found in Scheid 2005.

the emperor enjoyed the title of ἀρχηγέτης or κτίστης, perhaps – but not certainly – as a consequence of some kind of benefactions towards the community.⁸³ Interestingly, as happens to heroes and kings in Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic times, the figure of the Roman emperor tends to be aligned with that of a god, thus becoming a counterpart of the city deity.⁸⁴

4 Scattered Thoughts from an Ongoing Inquiry

At the end of this overview, some aspects of ἀρχηγέτης as an onomastic attribute of a god deserve some more consideration.

First, ἀρχηγέτης is usually regarded as an epithet which *puts the god and space in equation* almost prototypically. Indeed, a strong interconnection between a divine patron and the land settled in his name is apparent, being at the root of the symbolic dimension of territorialisation. However, explaining the function of a divine ἀρχηγέτης as that of a quintessential god of colonisation – as frequently happens with Apollo – is, in my opinion, misleading: such an interpretation does not fit the available evidence and does not account for other implications that the use of the epithet discloses.

Second, what emerges from a great number of sources is the paramount importance of the god ἀρχηγέτης as the supreme and most representative symbol of the group identity. Marking the god's regulative intervention at the very dawn of the community (since the ἀρχή, as one could say), the epithet ἀρχηγέτης describes the function of the deity who inspired the constitution and the organisation of a social aggregate. Symbolic and indirect as it generally is, his primordial agency is recalled precisely by the attribute ἀρχηγέτης and re-asserted from time to time in the ritual practice of the major sanctuary of the community.

A third point worth stressing is the linkage between a patron deity and kingship. The genetic association of a god ἀρχηγέτης with a mythical or historical ruler usually stems from the desire of a group or a community to enhance the prestige of their own origin. At times, the dynamics of this process led to the superimposition of the attributes of the divine ancestor onto a human founder (or re-founder) and, by a logical consequence, to the establishment and legitimation of a cult for both.

83 Athens: *IG II² 3237* (ἀρχηγέτης); Samos: *IG XII 6, 1, 400* (κτίστης); Ephesos: *I.Ephesos 252* (κτίστης). It is perhaps Augustus who is evoked as ἀρχηγέτης in *I.Olympia 53* (l. 29: . . . , καὶ γενόμενος ἀρχηγέτη[ς] | [–]), a decree passed most likely between 6 BCE and 2 CE in the council of an unknown *polis* of Asia Minor. For the celebration of the imperial cult in the context of sanctuaries dedicated to ancestral gods, see esp. Price 1984, 146–156. Pont 2007 casts doubts on the connection between the attribution of the title κτίστης to Roman emperors and acts of building euergetism (but see now Heller 2020, 258, 264).

84 On the heroic echoes of the title κτίστης in the Roman era, cf. Heller 2020, 25, 37.

Indeed, for different reasons, the case of Seleucids is a good example of such a transfer and requires some more thinking.⁸⁵ The deities ἀρχηγέται who inspire and protect the common life are reminiscent, in the end, of an Aristotelian passage from the *Politics* where the image of the ideal statesman (or statesmen) is equated with that of a god among men (θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις), intervening to overlap the founding principle of the community itself (νόμος).⁸⁶

Bibliography

- Ager, Sheila (2008), “Rescuing Local History: Epigraphy and the Island of Thera”, in: Craig Cooper (ed.), *Epigraphy and the Greek Historian*, Toronto-Buffalo-London, 150–176.
- Ali Mohamed, Fadel / Reynolds, Joyce / Dobias-Lalou, Catherine (2007), “Recently discovered inscriptions at Cyrene”, in: Lidio Gasperini / Silvia M. Marengo (eds.), *Cirene e la Cirenaica nell’Antichità. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi. Roma – Frascati*, 18–21 Dicembre 1996, Tivoli, 17–49.
- Anderson, Carl A. (1995), *Athena’s Epithets. Their Structural Significance in Plays of Aristophanes*, Stuttgart-Leipzig.
- Angeli Bernardini, Paola (1985), “L’attualità agonistica negli epinici di Pindaro”, in: A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare, Vandœuvres - Genève*, 117–149.
- Biagetti, Claudio (2019), “Una menzione di Atena Ἀρχηγέτις in P.Hib. I 15. Note sull’epiteto e sul suo impiego ad Atene”, in: *Kernos* 32, 29–48.
- Biagetti, Claudio (2020), “Una questione di principio: come tradurre l’attributo divino ἀρχηγέτης/-ης?”, in: *Hormos* n.s. 12, 131–157.
- Boeckh, Augustus (1836), “Über die von Herrn v. Prokesch in Thera entdeckten Inschriften”, in: *Abhandlungzn Der Preussischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften (Ph.-Hist. Kl.)* [1838], 41–101.
- Boffa, Giovanni (2019), “Il culto del fondatore nella documentazione epigrafica. Alcune osservazioni”, in: *Axon* 3, 179–191.
- Brackertz, Ursula (1976), *Zum Problem der Schutzgottheiten griechischer Städte*, Diss. Berlin.
- Brelaz, Cédric (2017), “Auguste, (re)fondateur de cités en Asie Mineure: aspects constitutionnels”, in: Laurence Cavalier / Marie-Claire Ferriès / Fabrice Delrieux (eds.), *Auguste et l’Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 75–90.
- Brelich, Angelo (1964–1965), “La religione greca in Sicilia”, in: *Kokalos* 10–11, 35–54.
- Brugnone, Antonietta (1980), “Annotazioni sull’Apollo Archegete di Nasso”, in: *Φιλίας χάριν. Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni*, Roma, I, 277–291.
- Bruneau, Philippe (1970), *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale*, Paris.
- Cahn, Herbert A. (1944), *Die Münzen der sizilischen Stadt Naxos. Ein Beitrag zur Kunstgeschichte des griechischen Westens*, Basel.
- Calame, Claude (1990), “Narrating the Foundation of a City. The Symbolic Birth of Cyrene”, in: Lowell Edmunds (ed.), *Approaches to Greek Myth*, Baltimore-London, 277–341.
- Carettoni, Gianfilippo (1963–1964), “Scavo del tempio di Apollo a Hierapolis (rapporto preliminare)”, in: *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene* 41–42, 411–433.

⁸⁵ A paper on this topic is under preparation.

⁸⁶ Arist. *Pol.* 3, 13, 1284a.

- Carlier, Pierre (1984), *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg.
- Casevitz, Michel (1985), *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien. Étude lexicologique: les familles de κτίζω et de οἰκέω-οἰκίζω*, Paris.
- Chaniotis, Angelos (2003), “The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers”, in: Andrew Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Malden (MA) - Oxford - Victoria, 431–445.
- Classen, C. Joachim (1996), “Ἀρχή – Its Earliest Use”, in: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 15, 20–24.
- Corcella, Aldo / Medaglia, Silvio M. / Fraschetti, Augusto (1993), *Erodoto. Le Storie. Libro IV. La Scizia e la Libia*, Milano.
- Detienne, Marcel (1990), “Apollon Archégète. Un modèle politique de la territorialisation”, in: Marcel Detienne (ed.), *Tracés de fondation*, Paris, 302–311.
- Detienne, Marcel (1994), “Manières grecques de commencer”, in: Marcel Detienne (ed.), *Transcrire les mythologies. Tradition, écriture, historicité*, Paris, 159–166.
- Dobias-Lalou, Catherine (1994), “SEG IX, 3: un document composite ou inclassable ?”, in: *Verbum* 17, 243–256.
- Donnellan, Lieve (2012), “Apollo Mediating Identities in Ancient Greek Sicily”, in: *BABESCH* 87, 173–186.
- Donnellan, Lieve (2015), “Oikist and Archegetes in Context: Representing the Foundation of Sicilian Naxos”, in: Naoise Mac Sweeney (ed.), *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies. Dialogues and Discourses*, Philadelphia, 41–70.
- Dover, Kenneth J. (1953), “La colonizzazione della Sicilia in Tucidide”, in: *Maia* 6, 1–20.
- Dužanić, Slobodan (1978), “The ὄρκιον τῶν οἰκιστῆρων and the Fourth-century Cyrene”, in: *Chiron* 8, 55–76.
- Forrest, W. George (1957), “Colonisation and the Rise of Delphi”, in: *Historia* 6, 160–175.
- Frank, Michael C. (2015), “Chronotopoi” in: Jörg Dünne / Andreas Mahler (eds.), *Handbuch Literatur & Raum*, Berlin-Boston, 160–169.
- Giangiulio, Maurizio (2001), “Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene”, in: Nino Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, 116–137.
- Gostoli, Antonietta (1990), *Terpander*, Roma.
- Graham, Alexander J. (1960), “The Authenticity of the ὄρκιον τῶν οἰκιστῆρων of Cyrene”, in: *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80, 94–111.
- Grebe, Sabine (1999), “Jüngere oder ältere Mädchen? Aristophanes, *Lysistrate* 641–647”, in: *Museum Helveticum* 56, 194–203.
- Guarducci, Margherita (1939–1940), “Fu Prokles re di Thera?”, in: *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene* 1–2 (n.ser.), 41–45.
- Guizzi, Francesco (2014), “Mopso protettore di Hierapolis”, in: *Scienze dell’Antichità* 20, 31–44.
- Hall, Jonathan M. (2008), “Foundation Stories”, in: Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, II, Leiden-Boston, 383–426.
- Heller, Anna (2020), *L’âge d’or des bienfaiteurs. Titres honorifiques et sociétés civiques dans l’Asie Mineure d’époque romaine (Ier s. av. J.-C. – IIIe s. apr. J.-C.)*, Genève.
- Hordern, James H. (2004), *Sophon’s Mimes. Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Ismaelli, Tommaso (2017a), “Hierapolis di Frigia in età augustea e giulio-claudia: spazi sacri ed immagine urbana tra radici anatoliche e modelli romani”, in: Laurence Cavalier / Marie-Claire Ferrière / Fabrice Delrieux (eds.), *Auguste et l’Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 309–329.
- Ismaelli, Tommaso (2017b), “Architettura, decorazione e spazio sacro a Hierapolis di Frigia. Il tempio severiano del Santuario di Apollo”, in: Patrizio Pensabene / Marina Milella / Francesca Caprioli (eds.), *Decor. Decorazione e architettura nel mondo romano. Atti del Convegno, Roma 21–24 maggio 2014*, Roma, 683–698.
- Jeffery, Lilian H. (1961), “The Pact of the First Settlers at Cyrene”, in: *Historia* 10, 139–147.

- Kolb, Frank (1974), "Zur Geschichte der Stadt Hierapolis in Phrygien: Die Phyleninschriften im Theater", in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 15, 257–270.
- Leschhorn, Wolfgang (1984), "Gründer der Stadt". *Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte*, Stuttgart.
- Linke, Bernhard (2006), "Zeus als Gott der Ordnung. Religiöse Autorität im Spannungsfeld von überregionalen Überzeugungen und lokalen Kulturen am Beispiel der Zeuskulde im archaischen Griechenland", in: Klaus Freitag / Peter Funke / Matthias Haake (eds.), *Kult – Politik – Ethnos. Überregionale Heiligtümer im Spannungsfeld von Kult und Politik. Kolloquium, Münster, 23.-24. November 2001*, Stuttgart, 89–120.
- Lombardo, Mario (2011), "Delfi e la colonizzazione in Occidente", in: Luisa Breglia / Alda Moleti / Maria Luisa Napolitano (eds.), *Ethne, identità e tradizioni: la "Terza" Grecia e l'Occidente*, Pisa. 139–159.
- Londey, Peter (1990), "Greek Colonists and Delphi", in: Jean-Paul Descœudres (ed.), *Greek Colonists and Native Populations. Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in Honour of Emeritus Professor A. D. Trendall*, Canberra Oxford, 117–127.
- Lucarini, Carlo M. (2011), "Per l'interpretazione di Pind. fr. 140a S.-M. (= G8 Ruth.)", in: *Philologus* 155, 3–13.
- Luraghi, Nino (1991), "Fonti e tradizioni nell'archaiologia siciliana (per una rilettura di Thuc. 6, 2–5)", in: *Hesperia* 2, 41–62.
- Malkin, Irad (1986), "Apollo Archegetes and Sicily", in: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 16 (3 ser.), 959–972.
- Malkin, Irad (1987), *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, Leiden-New York-København-Köln.
- Malkin, Irad (1989), "Delphoi and the founding of social order in Archaic Greece", in: *Metis* 4, 129–153.
- Malkin, Irad (1990), "Territorialisation mythologique: les 'autels des Philènes' en Cyrénaïque", in: *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 16, 219–229.
- Malkin, Irad (2003), "'Tradition' in Herodotus: The Foundation of Cyrene" in: Peter Derow, Robert Parker (eds.), *Herodotus and his World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, Oxford, 153–170.
- Murray, Oswyn (2014), "Thucydides and the Altar of Apollo Archēgetēs", in: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 6 (5 ser.), 447–473.
- Muscolino, Francesco / Cordano, Federica / Lentini, Maria Costanza / Struffolino, Stefano, "San Pancrazio e il falcone. Culti antichi e recenti da Taormina a Naxos", in: Teresa Alfieri Tonini, Stefano Struffolino (eds.), *Dinamiche culturali ed etniche nella Sicilia orientale dall'età classica all'epoca ellenistica*, Trento, 231–260.
- Nafissi, Massimo (1980–1981), "A proposito degli Aigheidai: grandi ghéne ed emporía nei rapporti Sparta – Cirene", in: *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia di Perugia* 18 (n.s.), 183–213.
- Nafissi, Massimo (2010), "The Great Rhetra (Plut. Lyc. 6): A Retrospective and Intentional Construct?", in: Lin Foxhall / Hans-Joachim Gehrke / Nino Luraghi (eds.), *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, Stuttgart, 89–119.
- Palagia, Olga (2005), "Fire from Heaven. Pigments and Akroteria of the Parthenon", in: Jenifer Neils (ed.), *The Parthenon. From Antiquity to the Present*, Cambridge, 225–259.
- Papazarkadas, Nikolaos (2011), *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*, Oxford - New York.
- Parisi Presicce, Claudio (2007), "La casa di Batto, il culto dell'eroe fondatore e il regime democratico a Cirene", in: *Karthago* 27, 245–264.
- Parke, Herbert W.; Wormell, Donald E. W. (1956), *The Delphic Oracle*, 2 vols., Oxford.
- Perusino, Franca (2002), "Le orse di Brauron nella *Lisistrata* di Aristofane", in: Bruno Gentili, Franca Perusino (eds.), *Le orse di Brauron. Un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide*, Pisa, 167–174.

- Pont, Anne-Valérie (2007), “L’empereur «fondateur»: enquête sur les motifs de la reconnaissance civique”, in: *Revue des études grecques* 120, 526–552.
- Price, Simon R. F. (1984), *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge.
- Prost, Francis (2001), “Peuples, cités et fondateurs dans les Cyclades à l’époque archaïque”, in Valérie Fromentin, Sophie Gotteland (ed.), *Origines Gentium*, Bordeaux, 109–121.
- Prost, Francis (2002), “L’alphabet des Déliens à l’époque archaïque”, in: Christel Müller, Francis Prost (eds.), *Identités et cultures dans le monde méditerranéen antique*, Paris, 305–328.
- Pugliese Carratelli, Giovanni (1963–1964), “I χρησμοί di Apollo Kareios e Apollo Klaros a Hierapolis in Frigia”, in: *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene* 41–42, 351–370.
- Ritti, Tullia (1989–1990), “Hierapolis di Frigia: santuari e dediche votive”, in: *Scienze dell’Antichità* 3–4, 861–874.
- Ritti, Tullia (2017), *Storia e istituzioni di Hierapolis*, Istanbul.
- Robert, Fernand (1953), “Le sanctuaire de l’archéète Anios à Délos”, in: *RA* 41 (6 ser.), 8–40.
- Robert, Louis (1969), “Les Inscriptions”, in: Jean des Gagniers, Pierre Devambe, Lilly Kahil, René Ginouvès (eds.), *Laodicée du Lycos. Le Nymphée. Campagnes 1961–1963*, Paris, 247–389.
- Sammartano, Roberto (2007), “Sul concetto di *oikeiotes* nelle relazioni interstatali greche”, in: Giovanna Daverio Rocchi (ed.), *Parole e valori della Grecia antica*, Milano, 207–235.
- Sammartano, Roberto (2018), “L’Apollo *Archegetes* di Naxos e l’identità dei Sicelioti”, in: *Historikà* 7, 69–89.
- Scheid, John (2005), “Augustus and Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation”, in: Karl Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge, 175–193.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane (1971), “Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 641–647”, in: *Classical Quarterly* 21, 339–342.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane (1988), *Studies in Girls’ Transitions. Aspects of the arkteia and age of representation in Attic iconography*, Athens.
- Stinton, Thomas C. W. (1976), “Iphigenia and the Bears of Brauron”, in: *Classical Quarterly* 26, 11–13.
- Van Compernelle, René (1950–1951), “La fondation de Naxos et les sources littéraires. Contribution à l’histoire de la colonisation grecque en Sicile”, in: *Bulletin de l’Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 27, 163–185.
- Vannicelli, Pietro (1993), *Erodoto e la storia dell’alto e medio arcaismo (Sparta – Tessaglia – Cirene)*, Roma.
- Wilhelm, Adolf (1905), “Zu Josephus”, in: *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 8, 238–242.
- Will, Édouard (1995), “*Syngeneia, Oikeiotès, Philia*”, in: *Revue de Philologie* 69, 299–325.

Short References

- BE: *Bulletin épigraphique* in *Revue des études grecques*.
- BMC: *British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins* (London, 1873–1927).
- BNJ: I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill’s New Jacoby*, Brill Online, <https://scholarlyeditions.brill.com/bnjo/>
- CGRN: Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge / Jan-Mathieu Carbon / Saskia Peels, *A Collection of Greek Ritual Norms (CGRN)* (Liège 2017), <http://cgrrn.ulg.ac.be/>
- DELG: Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris 1968.

- I. British Mus.: The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* (Oxford 1874–1916).
- I. Délos: Inscriptions de Délos*, publiées par F. Durrbach (Paris 1926–1937).
- I. Ephesos*: H. Wankel, R. Merkelbach et alii, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos, I-VII* (IGSK 11–17; Bonn 1979–1984).
- I. Erythrai*: H. Engelmann, R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai, I-II* (IGSK 1–2; Bonn 1972–1973).
- I. Hierapolis Judeich*: W. Judeich (ed.), *Inschriften*, in C. Humann et al. (ed.) *Altertümer von Hierapolis (67–202)* (Jahrbuch des kaiserlich deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Ergänzungsheft 4; Berlin 1898).
- I. Iasos*: I. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos* (IGSK 28 1/2; Bonn 1985).
- I. Ilion*: P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Ilion* (IGSK 3; Bonn 1975).
- I. Magnesia*: O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin 1900).
- I. Milet: Milet VI. Inschriften von Milet, 1–3* (Berlin 1997–2006).
- I. Nordkarien*: W. Blümel, *Inschriften von Nordkarien* (IGSK 71; Bonn 2018).
- I. Olympia*: W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia* (Berlin 1896).
- IG: Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin 1873 –).
- IG Cyrenaica*: C. Dobias-Lalou (dir.), *Inscriptions of Greek Cyrenaica* (Bologna, 2017). <https://igcyr.unibo.it>
- IGR: Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes* (Paris 1906–1927).
- LDAB*: W. Clarysse (ed.), *Leuven Database of Ancient Books*, <https://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/>
- Meiggs – Lewis, *GHI: Russell Meiggs, David M. Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1969.
- Michel, *Recueil*: Ch. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques* (Bruxelles 1897–1900).
- P. Oxy.*: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London 1898 –).
- PMG*: D.L. Page, *Poetae melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962).
- Rigsby, *Asyria*: K.J. Rigsby, *Asyria. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1996).
- SEG: Supplementum epigraphicum graecum* (Leiden 1923 –).
- SGDI*: Hermann Collitz, Friedrich Bechtel (eds.), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, 4 vol., Göttingen 1884–1915.
- Steinepigramme*: Reinhold Merkelbach, Josef Stauber (eds.), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten, I-V*, München 1998–2004.
- Syll.*³: W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*, 3a ed. (Leipzig 1915–1924).
- TM: Trismegistos. An Interdisciplinary Portal of the Ancient World*, <https://www.trismegistos.org>