

DOI: 10.31857/S032103910013863-2

RHODES BEFORE THE SYNOECISM AND THE CULT OF ZEUS ATABYRIOS

Alain Bresson

The University of Chicago, Chicago, USA

E-mail: abresson@uchicago.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-6622-2533

The question has been asked whether there already existed a federal state regrouping the three Rhodian cities in the Archaic and early Classical period, before the start of the process of unification of the Rhodian cities at the end of the fifth century BCE. This essay argues that although the existence of a formal Rhodian federal state remains unproven, there existed other institutional structures that linked the three Rhodian cities. They shared a common membership in the Hellenion of Naucratis in Egypt, a sanctuary that was managed by nine cities of western Asia Minor on the model of an amphictiony. The organization of their common cult of Zeus Atabyrios also had the characteristics of an amphictiony. A new restoration of an early Hellenistic dedication of the attendants of the cult proves the existence at that time of a rotating priesthood of this god between the three cities. This may suggest that such a system existed already before the synoecism and even that the organization of the common priesthood of Halios, the cult of the unified Rhodian state, was modeled on that of the previous organization of the cult of Zeus Atabyrios.

Keywords: Rhodian unification, synoecism, amphictyony, federal state, Zeus Atabyrios

РОДОС ДО СИНОЙКИЗМА И КУЛЬТ ЗЕВСА АТАБИРИЯ

А. Брессон

Университет Чикаго, Чикаго, США

E-mail: abresson@uchicago.edu

Автор статьи рассматривает вопрос, существовало ли федеративное объединение трех родосских городов в позднеархаический и раннеклассический период, до начала процесса синойкизма родосских полисов в конце V в. до н.э. В статье отстаивается точка зрения, согласно которой, хотя существование формального родосского федеративного государства остается недоказанным, в этот период существовали другие институциональные структуры, объединявшие три родосских города. Так, их объединяло совместное участие в Эллинии Навкратиса в Египте, святилище, которым управляли девять городов Западной Малой Азии по модели амфикитии. Организация общего культа Зевса Атабирия также имела характеристики амфикитии. Новое восстановление раннеэллинистического посвящения служителей культа доказывает, что в то время имела место своего рода ротация жрецов этого бога между тремя городами. Это может означать, что такая система существовала еще до синойкизма, и даже что организация единого жречества Гелиоса, главного божества объединенного родосского государства, копировала более раннюю модель культа Зевса Атабирия.

Ключевые слова: объединение Родоса, синойкизм, амфикития, федеративное государство, Зевс Атабирий

Talking inscriptions with Yuri Vinogradov was always a fascinating experience. Having such a discussion in the freezing basement of the lapidarium at the Novodevichy Convent at the end of a Moscow winter was also a test of endurance. I do not remember whether that day we mentioned in our conversation the dedication from Neapolis Skythica to the Rhodian god Zeus Atabyrios, but we might well have¹. In any case, this inscription is only one among the many documents illustrating the close relations established between Rhodes and the Black Sea in antiquity, thus unwittingly prefiguring the friendship that was to come to exist between the modern scholars working on these two regions. It also provides the link that will allow me to dedicate this essay to the memory of our distinguished colleague.

The process of political unification of the three cities of Rhodes, Ialysos, Camiros and Lindos, was started in the winter of 411 BCE. Until this moment, the cities of the island were in the Athenian alliance and had democratic regimes. But, as explained by Thucydides (VIII. 88. 1–4), following its victory at Syme over an Athenian contingent the fleet of the Lacedaemonian navarch Astyochos set sail for Rhodes. The Lacedaemonians were invited by the local oligarchic party in Rhodes, whose prominent members, such as the Diagorid family at Ialysos, were by then in exile². Landing at Camiros, they summoned the people of the three cities and persuaded them to join them in their fight against Athens. The consequence of these events was that oligarchic regimes replaced democracies. Until then, Rhodes was not a unified state. It was precisely in 411 that the three cities formed a common federal state.

This can be implied from a proxeny decree found at Lindos for an Egyptian interpreter from Naucratis, in Egypt, which mentions that the *honorandus* would be “*proxenos* of all the Rhodians”, a formula characteristic of federal states³. Still in 408, according to

¹ *IOSPE*³ III. 594: Διὶ Ἀταβυρίῳ Ποσίδεος Ποσιδέου | χαριστήριον (middle – second half of second century BCE on the basis of paleography by I. Makarov).

² On the Diagorids see Bresson 1979, 149–161.

³ *I. Lindos* 16 (with Bresson 1980, 300–307 [= 2000, 28–36], and Demetriou 2012, 126–128). That Rhodes was in this period a federal state was the brilliant hypothesis of Kinch

Diodorus (XIII. 70. 2), Lysander received the help sent “by the cities of Rhodes”. However, the Athenian pressure remained very strong⁴. It is certainly to reinforce their political structure that the Rhodians decided to make a new step, that of the fusion of their three cities into one, homonymous to the island. The date of the Rhodian synoecism referred to by Diodorus (XIII. 75. 1) and Strabo (XIV. 2. 6–11) has been fixed to the end of 408 BCE⁵. In the following year (407), the Rhodians inaugurated the priesthood of Halios, their eponymous god⁶.

This is the story as it is commonly told and accepted by most scholars. However, an alternative scenario has been suggested by V. Gabrielsen⁷. For him, there existed a federal Rhodian state already before 411. The proxeny decree for an Egyptian interpreter at Naucratis assigned by Kinch to the period 411–408 BCE, which clearly refers to a Rhodian federal state, could also be dated to before 411 or after 408 (probably rather after 408 but a similar decree could have been passed before 411)⁸. Gabrielsen puts a strong emphasis on the use of the ethnic *Rhodos* (on both a collective basis and for individuals)⁹. Instead of a radical transformation that would have taken place all at once in 408/407 BCE, the fusion of the three cities into one state would have been only a slow process extending over a long period. The downgrading of the councils, *boulai*, of the three former cities into local councils of *mastroi* or the creation of the deme system would have taken place long after 408/407. Even the creation of the common priesthood of Halios would not have taken place before 358 BCE¹⁰.

Without any doubt, this thought-provoking article forces us to reexamine a series of questions relating to the formation process of the Rhodian state. The extreme poverty of the epigraphic dossier from fourth-century BCE Rhodes does not allow us to document the history of Rhodes in this period. But the view that the priesthood of Halios was only introduced in 358 cannot be accepted, if only because the unified Rhodian coinage introduced in 408/407 BCE has the head of the god as its main type on the obverse, a view that everyone accepts and that R. Ashton’s studies on Rhodian coinage have also reinforced¹¹. Besides, the names mentioned in the initial part of the list of the priests of Halios fit perfectly with a date in 408/407 BCE¹². If indeed Gabrielsen has brought forward a series of arguments in favor of the view that the inscription of the Rhodian federal state could be dated before 411 or after 408/407 (whether or not we accept his view is

in: Blinkenberg, Kinch 1905, 34–48. The fact that the decree was passed by a council alone, not by a popular assembly, fits well with both the structures of a federal state and with a period of oligarchic regime, although this view has been challenged (see below and n. 13).

⁴ On the context of the synoecism, see Wiemer 2002, 53.

⁵ The date has been fixed to October 17th, 408 by Badoud 2015, 23 (see also p. 163 on the question of the date of the synoecism).

⁶ Badoud 2015, 23.

⁷ Gabrielsen 2000.

⁸ By contrast, there is no doubt about the date of the *I. Lindos* 16 app. (Bresson 1980, 300–301 [= 2000, 27–28]; Demetriou 2012, 124–126), a proxeny decree of the city of Lindos dating to before 411 (Lindos was a democracy when the decree was passed).

⁹ Gabrielsen 2000, 181–183.

¹⁰ Gabrielsen 2000, 187, 202, n. 49.

¹¹ Ashton 2001, 79–82 for the earliest coinage of Rhodes.

¹² Badoud 2015, 23 and 159 for the date.

another matter), he has not disproved (and admittedly does not claim to have) Kinch's hypothesis on the date of the decree referring to a Rhodian federal state, which could well remain fully valid¹³.

Only a long and detailed study could allow us to examine all the points that have been made by Gabrielsen. It suffices here to say however that the existence of a formally fully organized federal state before 411, with a permanent common council, magistrates, regular common assemblies and one single common ethnic in all circumstances for Rhodian individuals in foreign territories, remains unproven. But, indeed, it is also clear that beyond episodes of occasional cooperation (for colonization or for military expeditions) there existed before the synoecism institutional links between the three Rhodian cities, although in themselves these links did not imply the existence of a formally established federal state¹⁴.

Even before the synoecism, the Rhodian cities entertained mythical bonds with one another¹⁵. Homer mentions that the hero Tlepolemos led nine ships to Troy arriving from the three cities of the island (*Il.* II. 653–670). For Pindar (*Ol.* VII. 60–76), Halios had begotten seven sons with goddess Rhodos, and one of them begat “Camiros, Ialysos the eldest, and Lindos”, each settling separately. The three cities bearing their names were thus supposed to be tied by close kinship links. But this close relationship also manifested itself in the fact that according to Herodotus (*II.* 178. 1–3), Rhodes, as a common entity, was one of the nine *poleis* of western Asia Minor that were in charge of the management of the Hellenion of Naucratis, founded in the 560s by Pharaoh Amasis. The *emporion* was managed by chief administrators named *prostatai* who were designated by the cities. Thus, the management of the Hellenion, which was still in existence in Herodotus' time, had all the characteristics of an amphictyony. For Rhodes, the system supposes direct collaboration between the three cities to designate the *prostatai* (“presidents”) of the *emporion*¹⁶. Besides, there existed clear similarities (with admittedly also true differences) between the coinages of the late Archaic and fifth-century Rhodian

¹³ Gabrielsen 2000, 179 and 200, n. 9 considers that the existence of a decree of the Rhodian *boula* (alone) from the Hellenistic period, when Rhodian democratic institutions were fully operative, disproves the view that the proxeny decree of the *boula* I. *Lindos* 16 would have been voted in a period of oligarchic government. Indeed, it was routine for a council to vote decrees on its own. For technical reasons, they could also be inscribed on stone (see *inter alia* for democratic Athens Rhodes 1972, 82–87). The decree of the Rhodian *boula* in question, *Syll.*³ 44, republished in Badoud 2015, 358–359, no. 16 (173 BCE), l. 10–16, is part of a dossier of four documents relating to the honors granted to Eudemos of Seleukeia on the Kalykadnos. The second and third documents, l. 4–10, are based on the first one, l. 1–4, the decree of the people for Eudemos. The fourth one, the decree of the *boula*, regulates the details of a diplomatic mission in Syria, which among others will meet with Eudemos: this falls exactly in the diplomatic prerogatives of a council. It remains that in democratic Rhodes just like in democratic Athens it was the people who voted on the decrees committing the city.

¹⁴ See already Cordano 1974; Bresson 1979, 156–161; 1980, 308–309 [= 2000, 37–40].

¹⁵ On the creation of a common Rhodian mythical world, see Hornblower 2004, 132–137, and Kowalzig 2007, 224–266.

¹⁶ On the institutions of Naucratis, see Bresson 1980, 291–349 [= 2000, 13–64, with map on p. 39].

cities¹⁷. In parallel to the question of the Rhodian participation to the Hellenion, this paper will reexamine one specific question: that of the organization of the common cult of Zeus Atabyrios.

On Mount Atabyrios, the highest summit of the island, existed a cult that was common to all Rhodians. Mythological traditions point to the existence of this cult in the earliest phases of Rhodian history¹⁸. Founded in 581 BCE, Akragas, the Sicilian colony of Gela, itself a colony founded by the Rhodians (some Rhodians might also have joined the Geloans for the foundation of Akragas) also had its cult of Zeus Atabyrios (Polyb. IX. 27. 7). This shows that already at an early date a common cult to Atabyrian Zeus was rendered by the Rhodians. Excavations on the site of Mount Atabyrios have revealed the existence of dedications dating back to the seventh century BCE, with even a votive inscription dating to the end of this century¹⁹.

We have an impressive series of later dedications and other testimonies relating to the cult of Zeus Atabyrios all over the Rhodian territories and beyond²⁰. A priest of Zeus Atabyrios belonging to the association of *damosioi*, the slaves that were the property of the Rhodian state, is mentioned in the city of Rhodes²¹. But the organization of the official cult of Zeus Atabyrios is known to us through one inscription only, dating to a little before 270 BCE (see the restored text below)²². Coming from the sanctuary of Zeus Atabyrios, its three fragments were originally published separately by G. Jacopi in 1932, who did not recognize that they belonged to the same inscription²³. In 1933, F. Hiller von Gaertringen first combined two of them²⁴. Then in 1989 I. Papachristodoulou combined the third one and proposed to see in the sequence of the three series of names *theoroi* representing the three cities of Rhodes and sent by each of them²⁵.

Commenting upon the now combined three fragments, the present writer suggested that, in its initial part, supposedly with three missing lines, the text referred not to *theoroi*, a term more appropriate to envoys sent to a foreign sanctuary, but to *hieropoioi*²⁶. The document was thus to be connected to the Lindian decree IG XII. 1 761. In this document, the Lindians honored their three *epistatai* and other fellow tribesmen who had successfully made the case before the court of all the Rhodians that “the choice in Lindos

¹⁷ Bresson 1981; Nicolet-Pierre 2006; Stefanakis, Dimitriou 2015 (non vidi); Stefanaki 2015; Mielczarek 2015.

¹⁸ Strab. XIV. 2. 12, C655; Steph. Byz.s.v. Ἀτάβυρον; Apollod. *Bibl.* III. 2. 3; Diod. V.59. 2. See Morelli 1959, 46–49 (sources) and 138–141, with full references.

¹⁹ Jacopich 1928; Jacopi 1932, 236–237, no. 144 (Morelli 1959, 47).

²⁰ To the references of Morelli 1959, 46–49, add three references from the Peraia: I. *Pérée* 185 and 186 = I. *Rhod. Peraia* 2 and 1 (Loryma); *HTC* 26 (Pisye).

²¹ IG XII. 1 31, l. 4–5. An inscription from Camiros of the mid-imperial period (IG XII. 1 786 and *TC App.* no. 38, l. 7, with detailed app. crit.) might refer to a priest Διὸς [Πολιέως] καὶ Ἀτα[βυρίου] from the city of Rhodes; the reading Ἀτα[βυρίου] is unfortunately uncertain. If the restoration were correct, it would imply that the Zeus Polieus of the city of Rhodes was no other than Zeus Atabyrios.

²² Badoud 2015, 444 for the date.

²³ Jacopi 1932, no. 150, 151, 186.

²⁴ Hiller von Gaertringen 1933, 17.

²⁵ Papachristodoulou 1989, 70, n. 293 and photo pl. I (see *SEG* 39: 719).

²⁶ Bresson 1994, I, 251–253 and II, catalogue, 182–183, no. 17.

of their priests, *hierothytai*, *hieropoioi* and all those in charge of public administration” (l. 39–40: ταὶ αἰρέσεις γίνονται ἐν Λίνδῳ τῶν ἱερέων κ[αὶ] ἱεροθυτῶν κα[ὶ] ἱεροποιῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ κοινὰ τασσομέν[ω]ν) would be made among those who traditionally had the right to do so (that is Lindians from the island of Rhodes only)²⁷. If priests and *hierothytai* (the junior attendants who served the cults with the priests) are well attested in Lindos, in this decree the surprise came from the reference to the office of *hieropoios*, of which we do not have a single mention among the attendants of the official Lindian cults²⁸. The restoration of the mention of *hieropoioi* in the inscription from Mount Atabyros provided the solution to the enigma²⁹.

A further advance was made by N. Badoud. While endorsing the view that *hieropoioi* must have been mentioned in the document relating to the public cult of Zeus Atabyrios, he proposed a new and improved edition of this text³⁰. He showed that the supposed missing lines at the beginning of the text were an illusion and that the text was complete at the top. He also showed that line 1 must have been a reference to an eponym priest of Halios, Eukles. Amphora stamps attest to the existence of an eponym of that name between 280 and 270 BCE, a date fitting with the paleography of the stone and various prosopographical connections³¹. He recognized *hieropoioi* (and restored their name on line 4) in the three groups of envoys (l. 4–9 *hieropoioi* from Lindos, followed by those from Ialysos l. 10–15, and Camiros l. 16–21). This fits perfectly with the role of *hieropoioi* and the restoration must be adopted. There remains the question of line 2, for which, Badoud has suggested to restore [ἀρχι(ι)εροποι]ός, a function and a word not attested, but that would be the equivalent of the Lindian ἀρχι(ι)εροθύτας. There would be a “head of the *hieropoioi*” as in Lindos there was a “head of the *hierothytai*”.

There is however a better solution. We have here a list mentioning *hieropoioi* as attendants to the cult of Zeus. But a cult needs a priest. In the catalogues of the Rhodian state and of the Rhodian communities (Lindos and Camiros) the *hierothytai* or *hieropoioi* always accompany a priest³². Here, we would have attendants, but no priest. It is thus clear that on line 2, one should restore the reference to the priest of Zeus, in the form ἱερατεύσας rather than ἱερέυς because of the space on the line, which invites a comparatively longer restoration. In Camiros, for the role of the priest, it is almost

²⁷ The decree is republished by Badoud 2015, 372–375, no. 22, who dates it shortly after 304 BCE. Later Lindian documents show that indeed only Lindians from the island could be in religious or public office in Lindos: see Bresson 1988 and Badoud 2015, 171–172.

²⁸ By contrast at Camiros the junior attendants were called *hieropoioi*. At Camiros and Ialysos, there was no rejection of members of demes from the other islands or the Peraea for religious or public office.

²⁹ Bresson 1994, loc. cit. above n. 26.

³⁰ Badoud 2015, 445–446, no. 66, photo fig. 142, which includes several restorations for the names of the *hieropoioi*.

³¹ Badoud 2015, 253, *ad annum* 278. In Mount Atabyros inscription, l. 1, Eukles, obviously without a patronymic and with no demotic, can be no other than the eponymous priest of Helios: ἐπ’ (ἱερέως) + name of the priest of Halios only is the ordinary form of dating (although not the only one) of a long series of Rhodian epigraphic documents as well the dating formula of Rhodian amphora stamps.

³² For Lindos, see *IG XII*. 1 and *I. Lindos* (passim); for Camiros *TC* and *TCS* (passim). The exceptions are rare (*hierothytai* alone *I. Lindos* 45, c. 320 BCE; Badoud 2015, 227 for the date).

a rule to have δαμιο(υ)ργήσας rather than δαμιουργός in similar dedications. Inscriptions from Camiros also show that the *hieropoioi* are mentioned more frequently in the form ἱεροποιοί than ἱεροποιήσαντες, following the name of the priest, the *damourgos*, itself in the form δαμιο(υ)ργήσας³³. Line 2 should thus be restored: [ἱερατεύσας Δι]δός ἐκ Καμύρου³⁴.

The question remains why we do not have here the mention of the *epiclesis* of the god, Atabyrios. Indeed, mentions of the name of Zeus are usually accompanied by an *epiclesis*. But the rule is not absolute³⁵. Two inscriptions from Panamara, in Caria, even present formulars that closely parallel that of the sanctuary of Zeus Atabyrios, the *epiclesis* of the local Zeus, Panamareus, being omitted³⁶. Besides, in Lindos it is only in the course of the fourth century that the *epiclesis* Lindia was appended to the name of Athena and still at the end of the fourth century we have mentions of Athena alone³⁷. In Camiros, most of the time Athena appears with the *epiclesis* Polias. However, and interestingly in lists of priests of the mid-third century BCE, this *epiclesis* is casually omitted³⁸.

On Mount Atabyrios, Zeus was at home and at the time of the dedication it apparently still seemed better to keep the traditional form of “priest of Zeus” rather than “priest of Zeus Atabyrios”. The precision ἐκ Καμύρου was added to commemorate the fact that, that year, the priest was from Camiros. Consequently, one must assume that there existed a triennial rule and that each of the Rhodian cities provided a priest every three years, just as it was the case with the priest of Halios.

³³ Mention of δαμιο(υ)ργήσας with ἱεροποιοί: *TC* 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 14bis, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, [24], 25, [26], [28], 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, [35], 36, 39, [45], 46, 52, *TCS* [53c?]; with ἱεροποιήσαντες: *TC* 17, 23, 27, 32, 38, 40, 44, [51], 52, *TCS* 53d. Mention of δαμιουργός: *TC* 42, 43, 50, 53, *TCS* [33a]. In Camiros, the δαμιουργός was the eponymous priest of Hestia and Zeus Teleios (Morelli 1959, 135).

³⁴ According to P. Weiß (2016), the formula ἱερατεύσας meant “having assumed the priesthood”, not “having served in the priesthood”. In any case, the eponym priest of Helios, the priest of Zeus Atabyrios and the *hieropoioi* were in function in one and the same year.

³⁵ The abstract form of the name of the god, with no mention of *epiclesis*, is found all over the Greek world in oaths (one of very many possible examples is *IG* XII. 4 1 152, l. 30, from Calymna, c. 208 BCE or shortly after). But the omission of *epiclesis* can also be observed in cases where it seemingly would be expected. This phenomenon of simplification appears for instance in the tablets of Dodona, where the *epiclesis* of the local Zeus, Naios, is frequently omitted: see ex. gr. Lhôte 2006 no. 46, l. 1 (c. 350–200 BCE), etc., when other tablets give the name of the god in full, ex. gr. *ibid.* no. 5, l. 3, τὸν Δία τὸν Ναῖον (350–280 BCE). At Stratos, in Acarnania, in the second century BCE manumission act *IG* IX. 1² 2 394, l. 4, the *epiclesis* of the local Zeus is omitted (it was clear for everyone that it was the local Zeus of Stratos).

³⁶ See *IK* 21 (Panamara) 202, l. 6–8 and 205 + II p. viii, l. 4–6, for priests and priestesses ἱερατεύσαντες εὐσεβῶς μὲν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς, τὸν Δία καὶ τὴν Ἥραν. These inscriptions date to the second century CE, but the logic of the omission of the *epiclesis* remains the same.

³⁷ Until ca. 371 (*I. Lindos* 36, with date Badoud 2015, 277) the *epiclesis* Lindia is not appended to the name of the goddess. Then a majority of inscriptions mention it. But still in 304 BCE or right afterwards (*I. Lindos* 51, l. 2 [= Badoud 2015, 352–358, no. 15], the dedication of the vessels to the goddess, with date Badoud 2015, 80–82), *Lindia* is omitted. Much later, c. 50 CE, the *epiclesis* Lindia is also omitted in the dedication *I. Lindos* 430, l. 9.

³⁸ See *TC* 26, l. [1], and 29, col. I–II, l. 11.

The text should thus be read:

- [ἐπ' ἱερέω]ς Εὐκλεῦς
 [ἱερατεύσας Δι]ὸς ἐκ Καμίρου
 [— —]σιστράτου Κυμισαλε[ύς]
 [ἱεροποιοί] ἐγ Λίνδου
 5 [Πολυκράτης Τι]μομβρότου Νεπτίδα[ς]
 [— —]Θ]ευπόμπου Κλάσιος
 [Νικαγόρας? Π]αναιτ[ίου] Ἀργεῖος
 [— — —]κράτεως Ἀργεῖος
 [— — —]ου Πάγιος
 10 [ἐξ Ἰαλ]υσσοῦ
 [— —]Μέλα]νος? Κρυασσεύς
 [— — —]υχάρμου Ἐριναιεύς
 [— — —]μου Ὑπερεγγεύς
 [Ἀλκιμέδων Στρά]τητος Ποντωρεύς
 15 [— — —]ακτος Ποντωρεύ[ς]
 [ἐκ Καμί]ρου
 [— — —]μάχο[υ] Ἠριε[ύς]
 [— — —]ρο[. Ἀ]μνίστιος
 [— — —]ε]υς Εὐθηνίτας
 20 [— — —]Κυ]μισαλεύς
 [— — —] Τύμνιος

We follow Badoud's restorations and signal only the differences between our readings and his text. L. 2: [ἀρχιεροποι]ὸς? B., [ἱερατεύσας Δι]ὸς Br.; l. 5: Νεπτίδας B., Νεπτίδα[ς] Br.; l. 7: [Π]αναιτίου B., [Π]αναιτ[ίου] Br.; l. 17: [—]μάχου Ἠριεύς B., [—]μάχο[υ] Ἠριε[ύς] Br.; l. 18: Ἀμνίστιος B., [Ἀ]μνίστιος Br.; l. 19: Ἀμνίστιος per lapsum B., Εὐθηνίτας Br.; l. 21: Τύμνιος B., Τύμνιος Br.

Although it must be dated to the 270s BCE, well after the synoecism, the document is nevertheless of primary significance for the organization of the cult of Zeus Atabyrios and for the links between the Rhodian cities before the synoecism. Remarkably, in *Olympian 7* Pindar announces he comes to the island with Diagoras to sing the praise of Rhodes, the spouse of Halios (v. 15), and not only, as one might have expected, that of Ialysos, Diagoras' homeland. He then tells us that the three cities of the island had been founded by the three grandsons of Halios, "Camiros, Ialysos the eldest, and Lindos" (v. 73–74). Finally, the poet launches a prayer to Zeus Atabyrios (v. 87–93) already announced in the very beginning of the ode (v. 9: *hilaskomai*), where he asks the protection of this god for Diagoras and his family³⁹. As observed by F. Cairns, Zeus is mentioned several times in the poem (v. 23, 34, 43, and 55ff.). In these instances, he appears in his role of supreme god. It is only in the final lines that the specific Atabyrian Zeus is referred to. But then the god appears as the major deity of reference of all the Rhodians⁴⁰.

Pindar wrote *Olympian 7* for the victory of the Ialysian aristocrat Diagoras for boxing at Olympia in 464 BCE, more than half a century before the synoecism. But then already the reference to Zeus Atabyrios clearly has a pan-Rhodian character. Cairns has made the attractive suggestion that before the synoecism this cult had the character of an amphictyony⁴¹. This in turn invites us to suggest that the organization of the cult of the god revealed by the inscription of the early third century also already existed before

³⁹ Bresson 1979, 163–173.

⁴⁰ Cairns 2005, 79.

⁴¹ Cairns 2005, 79.

the synoecism. This form of structural cooperation would also perfectly explain how the Rhodians, as a single body, were able to manage their common sanctuary, just like they managed their common participation in the Hellenion of Naucratis, also as a single body.

A system of triennial rotation regulated the access to the priesthood of Halios between Ialysos, Camiros and Lindos since its creation in 408/407 BCE, each of the three cities providing a priest every three years⁴². If the hypothesis presented above about the management of the sanctuary of Zeus Atabyrios is correct, the system of triennial rotation for the priesthood of Halios may not have been a creation *ex nihilo* but simply have consisted in applying to the new common priesthood of Halios the old system that had prevailed for centuries for the management of the priesthood of Zeus Atabyrios. Of course, this is not the only possible scenario: life priesthoods rotating between the three cities would be another one, but perhaps less likely to maintain the common character of the cult.

To conclude, in connection with the several pre-synoecism sources illustrating the pan-Rhodian character of the cult of Zeus Atabyrios, the new restoration of the name of the priest of this god in an early Hellenistic dedication of the attendants of this cult invites to consider that this common management of the cult existed already before the synoecism. Gabrielsen was right to insist on institutional links between the three Rhodian cities. But these links did not necessarily take the shape of a formal federal state. As for their common cult to Zeus Atabyrios, the three Rhodian cities managed it as an amphictyony, as suggested by Cairns, just like they managed their common participation in the Hellenion of Naucratis, itself another amphictyony. In all likelihood, it was in 411 only that the three Rhodian cities formed a federal state, before the further step of complete unification into one single state in 408/407 BCE.

References

- Ashton, R. 2001: The coinage of Rhodes 408 – c. 190 BC. In: A. Meadows, K. Shipton (eds.), *Money and Its Uses in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford, 79–115.
- Badoud, N. 2015: *Le temps de Rhodes: une chronologie des inscriptions de la cité fondée sur l'étude de ses institutions*. Munich.
- Blinkenberg, C., Kinch, K.F. 1905: Exploration archéologique de Rhodes (Fondation Carlsberg), III^e Rapport. *Bulletin de l'Académie royale des Sciences et des Lettres de Danemark* 2, 29–125.
- Bresson, A. 1979: *Mythe et contradiction. Analyse de la VII^e Olympique de Pindare*. Paris.
- Bresson, A. 1980: Rhodes, l'Hellénion et le statut de Naucratis. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 6, 291–349. (= Bresson 2000, 13–63).
- Bresson, A. 1981: Notes rhodiennes. *Revue des Études Anciennes* 83/3–4, 211–226.
- Bresson, A. 1988: Richesse et pouvoir à Lindos à l'époque hellénistique. In: S. Dietz, I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*. Copenhagen, 145–154.
- Bresson, A. 1994: *Recherches sur la société rhodienne (480 av. J.-C. – 100 ap. J.-C.)*. Diss. Besançon.
- Bresson, A. 2000: *La cité marchande*. Bordeaux.
- Cairns, F. 2005: Pindar Olympian 7: Rhodes, Athens, and the Diagorids. *Eikasmos* 16, 63–91.
- Cordano, F. 1974: Rhodos prima del sinecismo e Rhodioi fondatori di colonie. *La Parola del Passato* 29, 179–182.
- Demetriou, D. 2012: *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean. The Archaic and Classical Greek Multiethnic Emporia*. Cambridge.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2000: The synoikized polis of Rhodes. In: P. Flensted-Jensen, T.H. Nielsen, L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History*. Copenhagen, 177–205.

⁴² Badoud 2015, 154–155.

- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1933: [Rev.] G. Jacopi, A. Maiuri, "Clara Rhodos 2". *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 195, 16–24.
- Hornblower, S. 2004: *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford–New York.
- Jacopich, G. 1928: Esplorazione del santuario di Zeus Atabyrios. *Clara Rhodos* 1, 88–91.
- Jacopi, G. 1932: Nuove epigrafi dalle Sporadi meridionale. *Clara Rhodos* 2, 165–255.
- Kowalzig, B. 2007: *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford–New York.
- Lhôte, É. 2006: *Les lamelles oraculaires de Dodone*. Geneva.
- Mielczarek, M. 2015: Pomiędzy Wschodem i Zachodem. Mennictwo ośrodków Rodos w okresach archaicznym i klasycznym [Between East and West. Coinage of the Rhodian poleis in the Archaic and Classical periods]. *Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia* 61, 13–22.
- Morelli, D. 1959: I culti in Rodi. *Studi Classici e Orientali* 8, 1–184.
- Nicolet-Pierre, H. 2006: Monnayages archaïques dans le Dodécanèse: un état des questions. *Οβολός* [Obolos] 8, 45–64.
- Papachristodoulou, I.C. 1989: *Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι Ῥοδιακοὶ δῆμοι. Ἱστορικὴ Ἐπισκόπηση: Ἡ Ἰαλυσία* [The Ancient Demes of Rhodes. Historical Survey: Ialysos]. Athens.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1972: *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford.
- Stefanakis, M.I., Dimitriou, E. 2015: *Ta nomismata tes nesou Rodou kata ten arhaiotata: Ialuso—Lindos—Kamiro—Rodos* [The Coinage of the Island of Rhodes in Ancient Times: Ialysos—Lindos—Camiro—Rhodes]. Athens.
- Στεφανάκης, Μ.Ι., Δημητρίου Ε. *Τα νομίσματα της νήσου Ρόδου κατά την αρχαιότητα: Ιαλυσός—Λίνδος—Κάμιρος—Ρόδος*. Αθήνα.
- Stefanaki, V.E. 2015: Corpus des monnaies aux dauphins attribuées à Potidaion/Poseidion de Carpathos. In: U. Wartenberg, M. Amandry (eds.), *ΚΑΙΡΟΣ, Contributions to Numismatics in Honor of Basil Demetriadi*. New York, 231–253.
- Weiß, P. 2016: Öffentliche Leistungen: nach, am Ende oder während der Amtszeit? Zum Formular des Typs ἀγορανομήσας ἀνέθηκεν. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 200, 274–276.
- Wiemer, H.-U. 2002: *Krieg, Handel und Piraterie: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos*. Berlin.