The Eleian Mantic *Gene*

ABSTRACT

The Eleian *manteis* who practised at the altar of Zeus in Olympia appear to have belonged to two separate *gene*, the Iamids and the Klytiads. This paper first considers the identity and number of the Eleian mantic *gene* and then questions the long-held assumption that the Iamid *genos* was the first to become established at Olympia. It is argued that the foundation myths that appear in Pindar and Pausanias are probably the result of the embellishment of pre-existing tradition in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. While neither archaeology nor further textual evidence entitles us to assume that mantic activity at Olympia predated the late Archaic period, an early Classical inscription, certain of the sculptures on the temple of Zeus and a later series of inscriptions from Olympia do make it possible to infer that two mantic houses, of which the Iamids were one and the Klytiads likely the other, were practising at Olympia from that time or earlier. Some reflection upon the limitations of myth as historical evidence is offered before the conclusion is reached that we cannot be certain that the Iamids constituted the senior house.

Scholars have sometimes surmised that, by virtue of their greater antiquity, the *Iamidai* held a senior position among the Eleian *gene* who practised divination at the altar of Zeus Olympios in Olympia.[1] Such scholars may have overestimated the value of the foundation myths recorded by Pindar and Pausanias as evidence for earlier times, so an examination of the context in which these myths appeared is warranted. It is first necessary, however, to consider the available evidence for the Eleian *manteis* in order to establish the number and identity of the *gene* to which they belonged.

1. THE GENE

Several Eleian *manteis* ('seers') are said to belong to the *Iamidai*. The earliest evidence for this *genos* ('clan') of seers is a passage of Pindar's sixth Olympian ode, which suggests that the Syrakousan Iamid Hagesias, whose Olympic victory of 468, 472 or possibly 476 BC the ode celebrates, was once 'a custodian of the mantic altar of Zeus at Pisa'.[2] We also have evidence from later writers of Iamids who lived at a time before their own. Herodotos reports that Kallias, 'an Eleian *mantis* of the *Iamidai*,' aided the Krotonians in their late-sixth century war against Sybaris and that his descendants

[1] Weniger (1915) 68, cf. 78; Schachter (2000) 294-5; Taita (2007) 94, cf. 103, 120.

[2] Pind. *Ol.* 6.4-11; cf. scholia in Drachmann (1903) 155-6, 6a-8b. Taita (2007) 256 suggests that Hagesias' presence at Syrakousai indicates the existence of an Eleian *epoikia* there. For the date of the ode, see the discussion in Luraghi (1997) 74-5.

Antichthon 48 (2014) 14-36

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

remained in Kroton until the historian's own time.[3] In Pausanias' account of the Second Messenian War, Theoklos, the *mantis* who attends the Messenian hero Aristomenes, is a descendant of Eumantis, 'an Eleian of the *Iamidai* whom Kresphontes had brought to Messenia'.[4] Theoklos' son Mantiklos is active during the same war and later participates in the Messenian colony at Sicilian Messana.[5] Pausanias describes the Eleian Satyros, a multiple victor in the Panhellenic games late in the fourth century BC, as belonging to the *genos* of the Iamids.[6] We also learn from Pausanias that in the late third century BC the Eleian Iamid *mantis* Thrasyboulos acted as diviner for the Mantineians when they defeated the Lakedaimonians led by Agis, the son of Eudamidas.[7]

The affiliation of the most famous of the Eleian seers, however, has been a matter of dispute. Early in the fifth century BC, with his brother Agias, Teisamenos emigrated from Elis, was granted Spartan citizenship and became the state *mantis*.[8] In this role he practised divination for the Spartans and their allies at the battle of Plataiai, performing the role of seer in a total of five victorious battles.[9] Herodotos, in a passage open to various interpretations, appears to describe Teisamenos as τὸν ἐόντα Ἠλεῖον καὶ γένεος τοῦ Ἰαμιδέων Κλυτιάδην, 'being an Eleian and a Klytiad of the clan of the Iamids'.[10] Weniger concludes from this statement that, although born an Iamid, Teisamenos was adopted into a different Eleian mantic *genos*, that of the *Klytiadai*.[11] There is, nevertheless, considerable evidence to suggest that Teisamenos was an Iamid in adult life. Pausanias directly states that he was 'one of the Iamids from Elis' and in a later passage reports the existence of a tomb in Sparta 'for the diviners from Elis who are called the Iamids'.[12]

The branch of the Iamids that Teisamenos and Agias established at Sparta appears to have prospered there for some centuries. Another Agias, whom Pausanias describes as the son of Agelokhos, son of Teisamenos, divined for Lysandros at Aigospotamoi, for which service one statue of him was erected at Delphi next to that of his commander and another at Sparta.[13] Xenophon's

[3] Hdt. 5.44.2, 45.2; Zoumbaki (2005) 207-8.8. On Kallias' move to Kroton, cf. Diod. 12.9.2-6, 10.1-2; Taita (2007) 345-63.

[4] Paus. 4.16.1, 5; Zoumbaki (2005) 419.3.

[5] Paus. 4.21.2, 12, 23.5, 9-10; Zoumbaki (2005) 419.4.

[6] Paus. 6.4.5; Moretti (1959) 126-7.462; Zoumbaki (2005) 319-20.7.

[7] Paus. 6.2.4, 8.10.5; Zoumbaki (2005) 188-9.21; cf. Roth (1982) 229-30.

[8] Hdt. 9.33.1; Paus. 3.11.5-8; Plut. *Arist.* 11.2; Bradford (1985) 10-11.21, 119.702; Zoumbaki (2005) 342-3.30.

[9] Hdt. 9.35.1-36.1; Paus. 3.11.7-8; Plut. *Arist.* 11.2.

[10] Hdt. 9.33.1.

[11] Weniger (1915) 72.

[12] Paus. 3.11.5, 3.12.8: τοῖς ἐξ Ἤλιδος μάντεσι, καλουμένοις δὲ Ἰαμίδαις; cf. Weniger (1915) 75; Roth (1982) 229.

[13] Paus. 3.11.5, 10.9.7; cf. Weniger (1915) 73; Mora (1984) 38; Bradford (1985) 11.23.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

report of the conspiracy of Kinadon shows that a *mantis* called Teisamenos was among the inner circle of conspirators, and several seers of that name are evident in Sparta from the first century BC until at least Pausanias' time.[14] If Teisamenos and his descendants were in fact Klytiads, we should expect Pausanias to have discovered this from either his Lakedaimonian guide or an inscription on the tomb and to have described them as such. No evidence remains, however, to suggest that the Spartan seers of Eleian origin called Teisamenos or Agias were Klytiads, and it is highly likely that they were Iamids.[15]

Scholars have proposed various explanations for Herodotos' apparent description of Teisamenos as 'a Klytiad of the clan of the Iamids'. How and Wells, viewing the appearance of Κλυτιάδην as a late gloss, point out that it 'does not occur in Paus. III.11.6, a passage obviously derived from this,' and that 'Cicero plainly distinguishes the Iamidae and the Klytidae.'[16] We ought to be cautious, however, about simply deleting a word from an ancient text because we do not understand the implications of retaining it, and neither the deletion nor the retention of Κλυτιάδην seems sufficiently well supported. Epigraphic evidence from an unexpected quarter, fortunately, offers a third alternative. Pritchett's reading of an inscription found near the site of the battle of Plataiai of 479 BC, first published by Dittenberger and datable to the early fifth century, shows that the dedicants of an offering at the temple of Eleusinian Demeter are likely to include the same Teisamenos who practised divination for the Spartans:[17]

[Δ]άματρο[ς] τόδ'ἄγαλμα [---]
[ἐ]νθάδε γ'[ε]ἰσοράοντι σέ[βας---]
[Τ]εισαμενός, φυδάδας καὶ [---]

Pritchett rejects both Röhl's suggestion that φυδάδας in line three is a gentile name of Teisamenos and Peek's belief that it is a patronymic derived from Κύδας, concluding that it is the second *nomen* in a list of three dedicants, of whom Teisamenos is the first.[18] We should keep in mind, however, that the comma did not appear in the restorations of either Dittenberger or Peek. Schachter, following Hansen's restoration of the third line of the inscription, also without the comma, maintains that if there were in fact three dedicants,

[14] Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.11: παραχρῆμα τόν τε μάντιν Τισαμενὸν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς ἐπικαιριωτάτους συνελάμβανον; Wilamowitz (1886) 179; Weniger (1915) 73-4 with nn.1-4; Parke (1967) 177; Roth (1982) 228-9; Mora (1984) 38; Bradford (1985) 119.703; Taita (2001) 39-85; Hornblower (2004) 184.

[15] Cf. Luraghi (1997) 72; Taita (2001) 42.

[16] Cic. *Div.* 1.41.91: Elis in Peloponneso familias duas certas habet, Iamidarum unam, alteram Clytidarum, haruspicinae nobilitate praestantes; How and Wells (1912) 301; cf. Godley (1946) 198-9, n. 2; Roth (1982) 229, nn. 27, 29. Cicero's Clytids are clearly the Klytiads.

[17] *IG* 7.1670; Pritchett (1979) 145.

[18] Pritchett (1979) 146, 150; Röhl (1883) no. 143; Peek (1937) 233; cf. Roberts (1887) 225, who also points out that the third line may have been in prose.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

we should expect another καὶ before φυδάδας.[19] He plausibly concludes that φυδάδας denotes a subgroup of the Iamid clan and that 'Herodotos might really have written γένεος τοῦ Ἰαμιδέων Κυδάδην, that is, "a member of the family of Kydadai, of the *genos* of Iamidai".' Schachter explains that 'the change to Κλυτιάδην would be attributable to later scholarly intervention at the time of the preparation of the major recension of the text, with a familiar name being put in place of an otherwise unattested one.'[20] Schachter's suggestion that Κυδάδην should replace Κλυτιάδην in the text of Herodotos provides the most acceptable solution that has yet been offered to the problem presented by the historian's description of Teisamenos.

The conclusion that Κλυτιάδην may not have appeared in the original text of Herodotos renders doubtful our only literary testimony for the presence of Klytiad *manteis* at Olympia during the Archaic period.[21] We are thus obliged to accept that the last two lines of an inscription at the base of a statue dedicated to celebrate the Olympic victory in 292 BC of the Eleian Eperastos, son of Theogonos, documented by Pausanias, constitutes our earliest secure evidence for the presence of this mantic *genos* at Olympia:[22]

> τῶν δ' ἱερογλώσσων Κλυτιδᾶν γένος εὔχομαι εἶναι
> μάντις, ἀπ' ἰσοθέων αἷμα Μελαμποδιδᾶν.
>
> I profess to be a *mantis* of the clan of the sacred-tongued Klytidai,
> From the blood of the Melampodidai, equal to the gods.

There is, on the other hand, a considerable amount of later evidence from Olympia to suggest that the Klytiads, along with the Iamids, were one of two mantic clans whose members held high office there over a long period of time. In thirty-eight of eighty-four inscriptions on marble, registers of Eleian officials headed Διὸς ἱερά dating from 36 BC to AD 265, the names of the *manteis*, at first two and later four, can be determined.[23] In every case where the document is sufficiently complete, the *genos* of the *mantis* follows his name. In *IvO* 64, a particularly well-preserved inscription, for example, the

[19] Schachter (2000) 294 n. 14, cf. n. 12; *CEG* 1.176.328.

[20] Schachter (2000) 294 and n.12; Taita (2001) 42 n.10. Since, as Johnstone (2008) 110-16 points out, the mantic *gene* may have been guilds rather than kinship groups, it is also possible that the Kydadids were Teisamenos' actual birth-clan. In this case novice *manteis* would have been, rather than the scions of a mantic family, promising youths recruited and trained by a master. It is unlikely that Peek (1937) 233 is correct in making φυδάδας a patronym formed from Κύδας, since Herodotos at 9.33.1 describes Teisamenos as the son of Antiokhos; cf. Schachter (2000) 294.

[21] While there are certain epigraphical traces of Klytiads at Khios during the fourth century BC, we can only speculate as to their provenance: Frazer (1898) 55; Weniger (1915) 59; Roth (1982) 231 with n. 41; Dillery (2005) 174 n. 24; Flower (2008) 40 n. 54.

[22] Paus. 6.17.5-6; Moretti (1959) 134 no. 530; Zoumbaki (2005) 156.10.

[23] *IvO* 59, 62, 64, 65, 69, 75-7, 80, 81, 84-6, 90-3, 95, 99, 100, 102-4, 106-8, 110, 114-22; Weniger (1915) 53-66; Roth (1982) 227. Weniger, 53-9 places the inscriptions in chronological order, but excludes *IvO* 108; cf. Taeuber (1991) 113.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

two *manteis* are Κάλλιτος Ἀντία Κλυτιάδης and Παυσανίας Διογένους Ἰαμίδης. These inscriptions reveal that by the Roman period two houses practised *mantike* at the altar of Zeus and thus, although providing no proof, allow us to entertain the possibility that the Iamids had shared this office with the Klytiads in earlier epochs as well.

In certain references, such as that of Herodotos to the unnamed Eleian *mantis* who had once attended Polykrates of Samos but was later found neglected among the slaves of Dareios in Susa by the physician Demokedes of Kroton, no *genos* is specified.[24] An Eleian *mantis* called Basias, too, was one of the 10,000 Greeks engaged by Kyros early in the fourth century BC to aid his claim to the Persian throne, but we are not informed of his affiliation.[25] Perhaps in these cases the author either did not know or simply chose not to record the *genos* of the *mantis* concerned, and these seers may well have been either Iamids or Klytiads. We need not consider them individual practitioners, nor assign them to some otherwise unknown band of Eleian *manteis*.

Not long before the battle of Plataiai, a certain Tellias, 'a *mantis* of Eleia', aided the Phokians in their war against the Thessalians.[26] Herodotos calls another *mantis*, Hegesistratos, 'an Eleian man and the most noteworthy of the *Telliadai*'.[27] At some time before Plataiai, the Spartans had captured and bound Hegesistratos, intending to put him to death because 'they had suffered much that was untoward from him', but the seer had escaped by cutting off a part of his own foot. He took refuge at Tegea and later served as *mantis* to Mardonios at Plataiai. He must have eluded the Lakedaimonians again after the Persian defeat, since they later caught him carrying out mantic duties (μαντευόμενος) at Zakynthos and killed him.[28] Herodotos' statement that Hegesistratos was 'the most noteworthy of the Telliads' implies that there were others, and Philostratos has his dramatic subject Apollonios include the Telliads among the mantic clans, along with the Iamids and Klytiads.[29] As a result, it has been suggested that these *manteis* were members of an additional *genos*.[30] Weniger, on the other hand, pointing out the limitations as evidence of this one isolated remark in Philostratos, views them rather as 'an offshoot, moving towards independence, of one of the two

[24] Hdt. 3.132.1-2. The evidence for identifying this seer with the Iamid Kallias mentioned above, who practised *mantike* in Kroton, is not compelling: Hdt. 5.44.2, 45.2; *contra* Mora (1984) 32-3.

[25] Xen. *Anab.* 7.8.10; Zoumbaki (2005) 126-7.4.

[26] Hdt. 8.27.3; Paus. 10.1.3, 8; cf. 13.7; Zoumbaki (2005) 331-2.4.

[27] Hdt. 9.37.1; Ἡγησίστρατον, ἄνδρα Ἠλεῖόν τε καὶ τῶν Τελλιαδέων ἐόντα λογιμώτατον; Zoumbaki (2005) 177-8.2.

[28] Hdt. 9.37.1-38.1.

[29] Hdt. 9.37.1; Philostr. *Life of Apollonios* 5.25: 'οἱ δὲ Ἰαμίδαι,' εἶπε, 'καὶ οἱ Τελλίαδαι καὶ οἱ Κλυτιάδαι καὶ τὸ τῶν Μελαμποδιδῶν μαντεῖον'; How and Wells (1912) 301.

[30] Roth (1982) 233-4; Pritchett (1985) 53; Taita (2006) 346.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

legitimate seer houses of Olympia-Elis'.[31] We hear of no other Telliads; they are not mentioned in any inscriptions from Olympia, and Cicero knows only the Iamids and Klytiads.[32] Herodotos, in fact, may have been Philostratos' sole source for their existence. These considerations suggest that, rather than constituting a third Eleian mantic clan, the *Telliadai* were simply the sons or pupils of Tellias, who belonged to either the Klytiads or the Iamids.[33] As a consequence, the remainder of this article focuses upon these two *gene*.

2. The Foundation Myths and their Historical Contexts

According to Pindar's sixth Olympian ode, the Iamids were descended from Iamos, a native of Arkadian Phaisana. Iamos' parentage was entirely divine. His mother Euadna was the daughter of Poseidon and the nymph Pitana, herself the daughter of the river Eurotas. Pitana had instructed her servants to hand the newly born Euadna over for safekeeping to Aipytos, the son of Elatos, who ruled over Arkadians at Phaisana and lived on the Alpheios. There Euadna became pregnant to Apollo and gave birth to Iamos. Aipytos, while so bitterly angry when he heard of her pregnancy that he went off to consult the pythoness at Delphi about his insufferable misfortune, changed his attitude when he discovered the truth from the god himself. Apollo, we are told, once his son Iamos had become an adult, led him to the site of Olympia, where he bestowed upon him the gift of divination and instructed him to wait for Herakles to come and found the festival. He was then to establish an oracle on top of the altar of Zeus.[34] Pindar is clearly willing to place the arrival of the Iamids at Olympia well before the return to the Peloponnese of the Herakleids and their allies, the Aitolians, led by Oxylos, who were considered the ancestors of the Archaic and later Eleians.[35] This would make the members of this *genos* very ancient practitioners indeed of *mantike* at the altar of Zeus Olympios.

This passage of Pindar, however, constitutes the earliest appearance of the myth of Iamos' birth in the surviving literature, and Pausanias, apparently the only other ancient author to mention it, acknowledges Pindar alone as his source.[36] Wilamowitz sees such unusual features as the doublet in which Pitana bears Euadna by Poseidon and then Euadna Iamos by Apollo,

[31] Weniger (1915) 79: 'einen selbständig gewordenen Seitenschößling eines der beiden gesetzmäßigen Sehergeschlechter von Olympia-Elis.'

[32] Cic. *Div.* 1.41.91; cf. Weniger (1915) 66 with n. 2.

[33] If so, since Hegesistratos opposed Teisamenos during the campaign at Plataiai, the Klytiads should be preferred; cf. Weniger (1915) 79. The conclusion of Mora (1984) 31 that the Telliads were replaced by the Klytiads, 'una stirpe originariamente estranea al santuario', relies upon his conjecture (37-8) that Teisamenos played a central role in the removal of the Telliads and their replacement by the Klytiads, which in turn depends upon retaining Κλυτιάδην in the passage of Herodotos discussed above.

[34] Pind. *Ol.* 6. 29-77.

[35] Pind. *Ol.* 3.12; Hdt. 8.73.1-2; Strabo 8.3.33, 10.3.2-3; Paus. 5.3.6-4.4.

[36] Paus. 6.2.5; cf. Roth (1982) 223 with n. 12.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Aipytos' guardianship of Euadna and Poseidon's apparent lack of concern for either his child or grandchild as evidence that Pitana's maternity of Euadna was a recent addition to an existing myth. In his view, the myth recorded by Pindar makes the eponymous nymph of Pitana (one of the five *obai* or constituent villages of Classical Sparta[37]) the grandmother of Iamos and the river Eurotas his great-grandfather in order to connect the genealogy of the Iamid Teisamenos with Sparta and in particular with the neighbourhood of Pitana. Teisamenos, Wilamowitz reasons, must have taken up residence in Pitana upon receiving the Spartan citizenship and, having thus acquired the right to claim the eponymous nymph of his new home as an ancestor, adjusted his genealogy accordingly.[38]

While the arguments of Wilamowitz are not quite conclusive, it would seem more than coincidental that, not long after two Iamids had acquired Spartan citizenship, a myth of which we have no other record is reported which includes in their genealogy the eponyms of both the river of Sparta and a significant quarter of the city. The extravagant praise that Pindar bestows upon the progeny of Iamos in this ode, furthermore, suggests that he wished to please Teisamenos, who must still have been venerated by many in Greece when the ode was composed, not many years after he had divined for the Spartans at Plataiai.[39] Pindar may thus have played a significant role in disseminating an Iamid genealogy which had recently been expanded for the purpose of affirming the position of the new Spartan citizens, Teisamenos and his brother Agias.

The Arkadian aspect of the Iamid genealogy is also of interest. Pindar describes the people of Phaisana, the birthplace of Iamos, as 'Arkadian',[40] but a scholion to the same ode reports that Didymos, contradicting those who saw Phaisana as an Arkadian *polis* and citing the fifth book of the *Eliaka* of the Alexandrian Istros, maintained that it was actually a part of Elis. Either Pindar was wrong, the scholiast concludes, or [the Eleian district of] Pisa was subject to the Arkadians at the time.[41] Stephanos of Byzantion informs us that the place in the Peloponnese later called Phaistos was once known as Phrixa, and the similarity between the names Phaistos and Phaisana has led

[37] Scholion in Drachmann (1903) 166, 50a.

[38] Wilamowitz (1886) 178-82, (1966) 308; Parke (1967) 176-7; Nilsson (1972) 77-8; Roth (1982) 223-4, 226-7; Mora (1984) 36-7; Luraghi (1997) 80; Taita (2001) 51-2.

[39] Pind. *Ol.* 6.50-51, 71-74; Hdt. 9.35.1-36.1; Paus. 3.11.7-8; Plut. *Arist.* 11.2.

[40] Pind. *Ol.* 6.34.

[41] Scholion in Drachmann (1903) 167, 55a; Istros *FGrH* 334 F 41. 'Pisa' as a district of Eleia: Niese (1910) 26-47; Inglis (1998) 61-9; Nafissi (2003) 28-33; Luraghi (2008) 79 with n. 36, 76, 213; Bourke (2011a) 11. Taita, citing the same scholion, assigns Phaisana to a site on a ridge above the right bank of the Alpheios, a little below its confluence with the Erymanthos: Taita (2007) 53-5; Sperling (1942) 86 nn. 38-9; Paus. 6.21.3. Her argument, however, lacks convincing philological support.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars to associate Phaisana with Phrixa.[42] The identity of this community appears to have fluctuated over time. Herodotos lists it among the six 'Minyan' cities of the western Peloponnese, most of which were ravaged (ἐπόρθησαν) by the Eleians during his own lifetime,[43] but the mid-fifth century Pherekydes describes Phrixa as Arkadian.[44] Before the turn of the fourth century BC it must have become associated with Elis, since the Eleians agreed to give it up as part of the price of peace with the Spartans. After this it became part of a new state formed in southern Eleia, that of the Triphylians.[45] The transmutations of the political affiliation of Phrixa indicated by these texts may help to explain the apparent confusion in our sources concerning the ethnicity of Phaisana: an independent 'Minyan' city at some time during Herodotos' lifespan but considered Arkadian by the mid-fifth century BC, it would seem, Phaisana/Phrixa had been incorporated into the Eleian district of Pisatis before the end of the fifth century, when, upon the Spartan victory in the Eleian War, it became a part of the newly-constructed state of Triphylia. Although clearly located in marginal territory, Phaisana was thus Arkadian at the time when Pindar wrote the sixth Olympian.[46] This relatively new state of affairs may have provided the inspiration for a further augmentation, in addition to the introduction of Eurotas and Pitana, of an older and simpler Iamid genealogy.

The myth reported by Pindar makes the Arkadian hero Aipytos the ruler of Phaisana. Pausanias, indeed, provides an extensive genealogy of Arkadian kings from eight generations before the Trojan War down to the Second Messenian War,[47] in which Aipytos, the son of Elatos, becomes king of the Arkadians but dies from snakebite while out hunting. His tomb, Pausanias also tells us, could be seen near Mt Kyllene in north-east Arkadia.[48] Apollodoros, however, who appears familiar with a more complete version of

[42] Steph. Byz. Φαιστός; Wilamowitz (1886) 176; cf. Parke (1967) 176 n. 28; Roy (2000) 138 n. 24. Although the scholiast clearly placed Phaisana within Pisa, generally conceived of as lying to the north of the Alpheios, Pausanias places Phrixa, too, within Pisa, even though it lay to the south of the river: Paus. 6.21.6; Roy (2000) 138 n. 24; cf. (2004) 491 n .4. Location of Phrixa: Yalouris (1973) 170-1; Pritchett (1989) 70-1; Nielsen (2004) 545.309.

[43] Hdt. 4.148.4.

[44] Pherec. *FGrH* 3 F 161.

[45] Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.30; Polyb. 4.77.9.

[46] Nielsen has convincingly countered the claim of earlier scholars that the coinage bearing the legend ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ indicates the existence of an Arkadian Confederacy from early in the fifth century BC, suggesting instead that the coins were issued periodically by an organisation responsible for holding the pan-Arkadian festival of Zeus Lykaios: Nielsen (1996) 39-61; cf. Roy (1972) 334-41, (2000) 136. The people of Phaisana/Phrixa may have expressed their Arkadian identity by participating in the management of the *Lykaia*, a festival with which Pindar himself was certainly familiar and one held not too far distant from their home: Pindar *Ol.* 9.95-6; *Ol.* 13.108; *Nem.* 10.48.

[47] Paus. 8.1.3-5.13. He claims to have pieced this together from various pieces of information gathered from 'the Arkadians': 8.6.1.

[48] Paus. 8.4.7, 16.2, 17.1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the now fragmentary passages of Hesiod's Arkadian genealogy,[49] says nothing of Aipytos, reporting only two sons of Elatos, the son of Arkas – Stymphalos and Pereus. Instead of focusing on the progeny of Elatos, he records the line of descent from Arkas' second son Apheidas, whose son Aleus in Pausanias' version succeeds Aipytos rather than his own father.[50] While the tomb of Aipytos is also mentioned in the *Iliad*, no genealogical context is provided, and the source of a fragment of Hesiod that names Aipytos and his two sons, the *Homeric Lexicon* of Apollonios Sophista, describes him merely as 'one of the Arkadian heroes'.[51] Aipytos does not seem to have appeared as Elatos' son in any of Apollodoros' sources, which included Hesiod but apparently not Pindar.[52] It looks as if Pausanias or his source, perhaps on the sole authority of Pindar's description of him as the son of Elatos,[53] inserted the otherwise enigmatic hero Aipytos into an older Arkadian genealogy that had been known from at least Hesiod's time.[54] In this genealogy, Auge, the daughter of Elatos, is seduced by Herakles.[55] Once made the son of Elatos, Aipytos becomes Auge's sibling and thus the contemporary of Herakles,[56] for whom Iamos in Pindar's ode must wait to come and found the festival in honour of Zeus.

Luraghi suggests a contemporary setting for the introduction of Aipytos into the Iamid genealogy. Arguing that the victory for which Pindar's ode was composed may have been won in 476 BC rather than in either of the two following Olympiads, as often believed, he finds it possible to relate 'the fusion of Spartan and Arkadian descent' (represented by the figures of Pitana and Aipytos respectively) in the genealogy of the Iamids to a short-lived reconciliation between the Spartans and Arkadians in the years after Plataiai.[57] The mythical association between the two peoples that Pindar brings to light by means of the variant of the Iamid genealogy he reports, Luraghi feels, would make more sense if the ode were composed before the

[49] Apollod. *Lib.* 3.8.1, 9.2; Hes. frr. 19.31-7, 111, 112 Most.

[50] Apollod. *Lib.* 3.9.1.

[51] *Il.* 2.603-4; Hes. fr. 116 Most. Despite Luraghi (1997) 81 n. 69, this fragment (= fr. 166 M-W) does not appear to suggest that the genealogy of Aipytos appeared in the *Ehoiai*. The status of Aipytos as a hero rather than an Arkadian king is further suggested by the report that, while his tomb was near Mt Kyllene in northern Arkadia, upon the peak of which stood a temple of Kyllenian Hermes, there was a temple of Hermes Aipytos in Tegea: Paus. 8.17.1, 47.4.

[52] The one mention of Pindar that appears in Apollod. *Lib.*, at 2.4.2, is probably a gloss: Frazer (1921) 156 n. 1.

[53] Pind. *Ol.* 6.33: Εἰλατίδᾳ.

[54] On the composition of the Hesiodic Arkadian genealogy, see West (1985) 154-5. Wilamowitz (1886) 174-9, cf. (1966) 308, suggests that Aipytos had appeared in an earlier version of the Iamid myth, but there is no compelling reason to believe so.

[55] Apollod. *Lib.* 3.9.1.

[56] Cf. Luraghi (1997) 81 n. 69.

[57] Luraghi (1997) 83; cf. 82.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

battles of Tegea and Dipaia, where the Spartans fought certain of the Arkadians, and not too long after Plataiai, and thus at a time when they enjoyed peaceful relations. Although the lack of an accurate means of precisely dating either the ode or the battles permits no more than conjecture about their chronological relationship, the broad context of the sixth Olympian in a period of intermittent conflict between the Spartans and the Arkadians makes it seem reasonable to see in the inclusion of an Arkadian hero in the Iamid genealogy a plea for reconciliation. Considering Herodotos' recognition of the role of Teisamenos at Tegea and Dipaia, the famous Iamid seer may also have been active in seeking such a rapprochement, just as he appears to have been instrumental in arranging a truce between the Spartans and Messenians in the campaign at Ithome not too long afterwards.[58]

Hall, observing that in mythology 'traditional materials could be reconfigured and modulated to stake claims about the natural order and to advance partisan interests', explains that 'myth was most effective not when it was invented *ex nihilo* but when it represented itself as a modulation of a pre-existing theme.'[59] As Patterson further notes, 'it was possible to make political use of myth not merely in terms of attaining prestige but in real, practical, and strategic terms.'[60] The passages of Pindar's sixth Olympian under discussion appear to exemplify the adaptation of pre-existing mythology for both of the purposes discerned by Patterson. Regarding the first of these, by allocating Aipytos to a specific position in a widely-known mythical chronology, Pindar provides an 'authentic' temporal setting for Apollo's instruction to the young Iamos to wait at Olympia for Herakles to come and found the festival, itself perhaps an innovation intended to convince the listener of the great antiquity of the Iamids and thus amplify their prestige in the wider Greek world. Regarding the second purpose, while Pitana appears to have been introduced into a pre-existing record of Iamos' ancestry in order to provide a mythical connection between the Iamids and the Spartans, the addition of Aipytos may have served to promote an attempt at reconciliation between the Spartans and the Arkadians in which the Iamid Teisamenos occupied a central position.

Despite the doubts about the value of Pindar's genealogy as evidence for the origins of the Iamids which these considerations encourage, we might yet wish to assume from the sixth Olympian that an older tradition existed which held that at some earlier time the founder of the Iamids, who until then lived in a community in the district of the middle Alpheios, had become established at Olympia, and it is possible that such a tradition recorded the

[58] Hdt. 9.35.2; Paus. 3.11.8.

[59] Hall (2007) 332-3. Aside from the case studies presented by Hall, a further example can be seen in the apparent adaptation by Pindar's contemporary Bakkhylides of the myth concerning the rivalry between the brothers Proitos and Akrisios for control over Argos in order to comment upon contemporary affairs in the Argolid: Bourke (2011b) 133-7.

[60] Patterson (2010) 22.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

truth about the provenance of the members of this mantic *genos*. Even so, however, we would still not be able to discern even the approximate date of their arrival at Olympia.

When attempting to determine the origin of the Klytiads, we are again provided with a mythological explanation, though from a much later source. After quoting the inscription at the base of the statue of the Hellenistic Klytiad *mantis* Eperastos, Pausanias explains that the eponym of the Klytiads was descended from the mythical seer Melampous. He gives the line of descent from Amythaon down through Melampous, Mantios, Oïkles, Amphiaraos and Alkmaion to Klytios.[61] Klytios, he reports, had gone to Elis to escape living with his mother's brothers, who had killed his father Alkmaion.[62] The myths concerning Alkmaion recorded by both Apollodoros and Pausanias make it clear that Klytios would have been living at Psophis, where his mother Arsinoe/Alphesiboia had remained with her father Phegeus when Alkmaion left to settle at the mouth of the Akheloos in Akarnania.[63] This Psophis was in north-western Arkadia, at the junction of the Aroanios with the Erymanthos, a tributary of the Alpheios, and directly accessible by road from Eleia.[64] Klytios' flight to the region of Elis can be placed within the period of the Trojan War, when his maternal uncles are said to have ruled at Psophis.[65] According to the mythological accounts found in Pausanias and to a certain extent Apollodoros, it would seem that Klytios, some of whose ancestors had practised divination, came to Eleia from north-western Arkadia at the time of the Trojan Wars.

It must be made clear, however, that, although Apollodoros provides information about those whom Pausanias designates as ancestors of the eponymous founder of the Klytiads, he does not actually mention this figure. Pausanias himself, furthermore, names Klytios in only one relatively short passage, immediately after he records the inscription at the base of the statue of Eperastos, and he does not appear in the passages of the eighth book of the *Periegesis*, where Pausanias recounts the adventures of Alkmaion. Neither Apollodoros nor Pausanias, indeed, apart from the brief passage in the *Eliaka*, reports that Alkmaion had any children by the Psophian princess whom he had taken to wife before leaving for the Akheloos.[66]

Eperastos' claim of descent from 'the Melampodidai, equal to the gods', like Pindar's assertion of the divine origin of Teisamenos and the rest of his

[61] Paus. 6.17.6. At least two of these, Melampous and Amphiaraos, were believed to have practised *mantike*: Paus. 1.34.4, 44.5, 2.13.7, 4.36.3, 5.5.10, 8.18.7-8, 9.31.5; cf. 1.43.5, 8.47.3.

[62] Paus. 6.17.6; cf. Apollod. *Lib*. 3.7.5; Paus. 8.24.8.

[63] Apollod. *Lib*. 3.7.5; Paus. 8.24.8-9; cf. Hdt. 2.10.3; Thuc. 2.102.2-6.

[64] Polyb. 4.70, cf. 68-73; Paus. 8.23.8-24.3, 24.12; Leake (1830) 240-1.

[65] Paus. 8.24.8.

[66] Apollod. *Lib*. 3.3.5; Paus. 8.24.8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

genos, reflects what appears to have been perceived as a 'universal truth', that the power of divination must have a divine origin.[67] The pre-existing myth that Alkmaion, a descendant of Melampous, had sojourned in Psophis and married the king's daughter, coupled with a tradition that the Klytiads originated in Psophis or its vicinity, may have provided a local mythographer of the time of Eperastos or earlier with the inspiration to supply the Klytiads with a 'legitimate' claim to mantic authority by linking them to a heroic seer such as Melampous. While Pausanias may have learned of the details of this genealogy only during his visit to Olympia, perhaps even from one of the Klytiad *manteis* of his own day whose names are recorded in the inscriptions on marble mentioned above, it is thus possible that it dates from the third century BC or earlier.

Even though we might date the myth of Klytios' descent from Melampous through his father Alkmaion to as far back as the early Hellenistic period, however, it could still have been an invention of that period designed to provide the Klytiads with a pedigree comparable with that of the more genuinely antique Iamids. If we were to employ the same method for assessing the significance of this myth as that which we have already applied to the Iamid foundation story in Pindar, on the other hand, we would not be so hasty in dispensing with the possibility that a long-standing tradition had placed the provenance of the Klytiads in Psophis. If we are justified in detaching from Pindar's mythical tale the clearly supernatural claims that an Iamid founder called Iamos was descended from Apollo and the daughter by Poseidon of a Lakonian nymph and that his mother was sheltered by a mythical Arkadian hero, while at the same time retaining the origin of the Iamids in the middle valley of the Alpheios, then we can rightly preserve the origin of the Klytiads in the upper reaches of the Erymanthos, even though we might feel obliged to strip the story of Klytios' origin recorded by Pausanias of its associations with the exploits of Alkmaion, the descendant of Melampous. In each case, the myth of descent from the gods and heroes, designed to provide the *manteis* themselves with an aristocratic pedigree and their oracular pronouncements with divine authority, seems to tell us more about the beliefs, values and politics of the epoch in which it was formulated than it does about the origin of the relevant mantic house. It remains possible, however, and equally likely for both houses, that their members passed down through the generations ancient legends of their origins, the one at Phaisana on the Alpheios, the other at Psophis on its tributary, the Erymanthos. Despite this possibility, unless we are prepared to endow a mythological temporal framework with the status of actual chronology, we cannot learn from these myths when either house arrived at Olympia, nor, as a consequence, whether one of them arrived before the other.

[67] On myth as 'true' because it 'exhibits universally true features', see Munz (1956) 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. Further Evidence

The earliest surviving literary references to mantic activity at the altar of Zeus Olympios seem to be those found in the text of Pindar.[68] The remains of the altar, furthermore, which, Pausanias informs us, was made from the ashes of the victims sacrificed to Zeus, have not been found, so it cannot be dated.[69] Neither philology nor archaeology appears to provide a wholly secure means of dating mantic practice at Olympia to a time any earlier than the Classical period.[70] Certain later texts, on the other hand, suggest that the oracle was functioning well before Pindar's time.

Some passages are clearly inadmissible as evidence. Although a scholion to the sixth Olympian interprets certain lines near the beginning of the ode to mean that Hagesias' Iamid ancestors had accompanied the eighth-century BC Korinthian colonists of Syrakousai, Pindar appears to have meant instead that Hagesias himself had participated in a recent refoundation.[71] Herodotos associates Olympia with prophecy at a time just before the birth of Peisistratos,[72] but mentions no *mantis*. In Sophokles' *Oidipous Tyrannos*, the Theban elders declare that they will no longer consult the oracles at Delphi, Abai or Olympia if they do not tell the truth,[73] but this may be an anachronism. Strabo tells us that the temple of Zeus became famous at first because of the *manteion* of Zeus Olympios, but when the oracle failed it maintained its reputation because of the Olympic festival and competitions.[74] He does not say, however, that the oracle predated the festival, just that the former became famous earlier but the latter outlasted it. A passage from Plutarch concerning the deposing of a Lakedaimonian king early in the fourth century BC could be understood to indicate that the Spartans had consulted the oracles at Olympia and Delphi from the beginning of the Archaic period, but Plutarch gives no indication of when the custom he reports originated, and the consultation of Olympia in place of Delphi may be a later innovation.[75] Pausanias informs us that Eumantis, an 'Eleian of the *Iamidai*',

[68] Pind. *Ol.* 6.5, 70; 8.1-8.

[69] Parke (1967) 180-2. Paus. 5.14.10 indicates that there was once an oracular altar at Olympia dedicated to the Earth goddess Ge. As Taita (2007) 90-2 explains, however, it need not have been particularly ancient.

[70] Paus. 5.13.8.

[71] Pind. *Ol.* 6.4-11; scholia in Drachmann (1903) 155-6, 6a-8b; Wilamowitz (1966) 307; Malkin (1987) 96-7; Luraghi (1997) 74-7; Dillery (2005) 193.

[72] Hdt. 1.59.1; Parke (1967) 185.

[73] Soph. *OT* 898-903. Two passages from Xenophon offer evidence for the consultation of the oracle by Spartan kings in the late fifth and early fourth centuries BC only: Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.22, 4.7.2. Even though the name of the inquirer differs, both Arist. *Rhet.* 2.23.12, 1398B (Hegesippos) and Plut. *Mor.* 191B (Agesilaos: cf. 208F) appear to refer to the same event reported at Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.2.

[74] Strabo 8.3.30.

[75] Plut. *Agis* 11.2-3; Parke (1945) 106-12; cf. (1967) 188-9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

had been brought to Messenia by Kresphontes.[76] Like Kresphontes himself, however, Eumantis seems a mythical figure.

Pausanias also reports that Theoklos and his son Mantiklos, supposed descendants of Eumantis, practised divination for the Messenians during what has become known as the Second Messenian War.[77] While these passages are from Pausanias' *Messeniaka*, the historicity of which is largely considered doubtful,[78] the unreliability of the Olympiad dates provided by Pausanias may yet allow us to consider Theoklos and Mantiklos actual figures of the decades around the turn of the fifth century BC.[79]

Several passages of Herodotos suggest that Eleian *manteis* were indeed practising at Olympia and elsewhere by this time. At 3.132.1-2 the historian reports that an Eleian *mantis* had attended Polykrates of Samos and later became a slave of Dareios, which would date mantic activity in Olympia to at least as far back as the 520s BC. At 5.44.2 and 45.2 we find that the Eleian Iamid *mantis* Kallias aided the Krotonians in their war c. 510 BC against Sybaris. At 8.27.3 and 9.37.1 Herodotos makes it clear that the Eleian *manteis*, Tellias and Hegesistratos, were practising *mantike* outside Eleia before the Persian War. At 8.133.1 and 134.1, in the context of the prelude to the battle of Plataiai, he compares oracular practice at Olympia to that of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes. Finally, at 9.33.1-35.2, the Iamid Teisamenos emigrates from Elis to Sparta at some time before this battle. Although they can take us back no further, these passages from Herodotos suggest that Eleian *manteis* were practising their art in Olympia from at least as early as the period of Polykrates' tyranny at Samos in the 530s and 520s BC.

There may already have been two discrete Eleian mantic *gene* by that time. Among the sculpted figures on the east pediment of the temple of Zeus Olympios at Olympia, built in the 460s and 450s BC, two seem to represent seers. Ashmole and Yalouris believe that the old man seated on the ground behind the chariot of Oinomaos is Iamos, while the younger-looking man on Pelops' side is also a seer. There is much to be said in favour of interpreting these two figures as seers. It is unlikely that they are grooms, as Pausanias conjectures, since the figure on Oinomaos' side, who appears to be looking into an ominous future, shows signs of apprehension; besides, 'the anxious seer as a tragic character' is found represented on painted vases from nearly a century earlier, also seated on the ground, with an attitude of grief.[80] Seers connected with Zeus, in fact, seem often to have sat on the ground: those at Dodona did so, and there are other examples.[81] The name of Melampous, the

[76] Paus. 4.16.1.

[77] Paus. 4.16.1, 5, 21.2, 12, 23.5, 9-10; cf. Taita (2007) 94 n. 37.

[78] Luraghi (2008) 3-6 and the works referred to therein.

[79] Shaw (2003) 94-144; Paus. 4.23.5-10.

[80] Paus. 5.10.6; Ashmole and Yalouris (1967) 14-15; Flower (2008) 40 with n. 49.

[81] *Il.* 16.233-5; Aulus Gellius 10.15.14; Malalas 12, 286-7; Parke (1967) 1, 23-5; *LIMC* I, 753; V.1, 615.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

archetypal seer, furthermore, means 'blackfoot', which indicates a close connection with the earth.[82] The skyward gaze of the figure on the side of Oinomaos, too, 'ist für Priester und Seher charakteristisch.'[83] There seems little doubt that Ashmole and Yalouris are correct in identifying these two figures on opposite sides of the generally symmetrical sculptural group on the east pediment of the temple of Zeus Olympios at Olympia as seers.

According to Simon, however, the younger-looking figure reminiscent of Apollo on Pelops' side is Iamos, while the more ancient one near Oinomaos represents a Klytiad forbear. In her view, this older seer cannot be Klytios himself, who lived a generation later than Oinomaos and Pelops, so he must be Amythaon, the father of Melampous, and therefore Klytios' ancestor, who lived in the time of Pelops.[84] Pausanias reports in one passage, indeed, that Amythaon held the Olympic festival during the time of Pelops' sons and thus a generation before Pelops' grandson Agamemnon led the Greeks against the Trojans.[85] Elsewhere, however, he places Amythaon six generations earlier than Klytios, who fled to Elis during the Trojan War.[86] There is also a difficulty with the attendance of Iamos at the famous chariot race. If Herakles was a great-grandson of Pelops and if Iamos was already around in Pelops' day, Iamos would have had a long wait at Olympia in order to obey his divine father's instruction to found an oracle when Herakles arrived.[87]

The various mythologies are clearly inconsistent, and we need not devote any more time to them here. What we must keep in mind, instead, is that the sculptures on the temple of Zeus Olympios may well follow an earlier, epichoric mytho-chronology of their own. There is, furthermore, no reason to insist that precise chronological considerations influenced the decision to represent the two seers on the temple pediment. They may have been included with a similar purpose in mind to that which prompted the placement of two figures representing local streams, the Kladeos and the Alpheios, in its opposite corners.[88] The largely symmetrical arrangement of the sculptures on the pediment appears to have been a response to two factors: the shape of their architectural frame, and the oppositional theme of the chariot race. The pairs of streams and seers seem to have been added because their duality rendered them conveniently compatible with this composition.

This is not conclusive evidence: although it seems unlikely, the sculptor may have added an extra seer to achieve symmetry, even though there was

[82] Paus. 5.10.6; Ashmole and Yalouris (1967) 14-15.

[83] *LIMC* V.1, 615.

[84] *LIMC* I, 753; V.1, 615.

[85] Paus. 5.8.2, 9.40.11; Apollod. *Epitome* 2.10, *Lib.* 2.4.6.

[86] Paus. 6.17.6, 8.24.8; cf. 2.18.4-8.

[87] Paus. 5.13.2; Pind. *Ol.* 6.64-70.

[88] Paus. 5.10.7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

just one house; and the sculpture could refer to a recently added house. The most plausible conclusion that we might draw from the inclusion of two seers in the pediment sculpture, however, is that the Eleians of the mid-fifth century BC believed that two mantic houses had long been established at Olympia. In addition, an inscription from Olympia dated to around 475 BC assigns to the *manteis* the joint responsibility, with the *proxenoi*, of excluding from the altar of Zeus any transgressors of an agreement between two communities, the Anatians and the Metapians.[89] This inscription suggests that from at least the beginning of the Classical period more than one seer held an officially recognised post at the altar of Zeus Olympios and thus supports the inference from the archaeological evidence offered above that two mantic houses had been practising there for some time.

In the earliest of the lists of sacred officials at Olympia from the Roman period which retain the relevant sections (running, though not continuously, from 36 BC to AD 181), the names and affiliations of two seers are recorded, in almost every case one Iamid and one Klytiad.[90] In the more recent in the series of inscriptions, running up to AD 265, where four *manteis* are mentioned, we still find that all belong to either the Iamids or the Klytiads.[91] It is not possible to draw any secure conclusions from this evidence about the *genos* to which the *manteis* belonged who appear to have joined the Iamids in holding office at Olympia during the Archaic and Classical periods. It does, however, raise the distinct possibility that they were Klytiads.

The scarcity of evidence for the Klytiads from the Archaic and Classical periods, we must keep in mind, does not compel us to doubt their presence at Olympia at that time: we have, after all, only a handful of textual references to the Iamids, all from the Classical period. It is unlikely that we would have heard of Hagesias if not for his friendship with Hieron of Syrakousai, which may have made possible both his Olympic victory and the commissioning of Pindar to compose an ode to celebrate it.[92] Kallias is reported in the Classical literature only for his part in the war of Kroton against Sybaris, the first Teisamenos and his apparent grandson, the second Agias, purely because of their own feats in the military sphere and Teisamenos' later namesake solely in connection with the conspiracy of Kinadon.[93] These notices of Iamid seers, moreover, share a common feature – they all concern *manteis* who had left, or whose antecedents had left, Eleia during a relatively short time-span,

[89] *IvO* 10; Minon (2007) 97.14.

[90] *IvO* 59, 62, 65, 69, 75, 76, 77, 81, 84, 85, 86, 90, 91, 95, 102. The exceptions to the apparently normal practice of parity between the two *gene* are *IvO* 80, where there are two Iamids, and *IvO* 92, where there are two Klytiads.

[91] *IvO* 103-4, 106-8, 110, 114-22.

[92] Pind. *Ol.* 6.4-11, 165; scholia in Drachmann (1903) 155-6.6a-8b, 193.165.

[93] Hdt. 5.44.2, 45.2, 9.33.1; Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.11; Paus. 3.11.5, 10.9.7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

around the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth centuries BC.[94] The absence of references to the Klytiads from our sources might thus be attributed to something more than just the random nature of the surviving evidence: a tendency to remain in their homeland. There are at least two plausible and potentially complementary explanations for this: their specific mantic practices did not lend themselves to warfare, so they were in less demand abroad and attracted little attention from writers mainly concerned with military events;[95] and/or the Iamids had played a significant role in contemporary conflicts within Eleia and were actually obliged rather than enticed to seek a new life in foreign lands, whereas the Klytiads had taken little part and so had no reason to leave.[96] These conjectures, of course, raise issues beyond the scope of this article, but they do serve to illustrate just how hesitant we ought to be to conclude from the lack of solid historical evidence for their presence in early times that the Klytiads were latecomers to Olympia.[97]

4. Conclusion

The monuments described by Pausanias were 'repositories of local narratives'.[98] While *periegesis* is to some extent thus restrained from invention because it entails reporting myths related to features of the landscape, poetry by its very nature is a creative genre not necessarily confined by existing notions, so Pindar was more at liberty to elaborate upon or adapt the material available to him. We cannot be sure, on the other hand, that he did any more than incorporate into his poetry new versions of old myths which were in currency at the time. Even if he played no role in their elaboration, however, he was certainly free to select as he wished from the available myths, in whichever version he found appropriate. Whatever part he had in devising them, Pindar may thus have seized the opportunity presented by Hagesias' victory at Olympia to give a public airing to the most recent embellishments of the Iamid genealogy.

It is sobering to reflect upon the fact that, once we set aside the myths recorded by Pindar and Pausanias, explicit evidence remains for neither the provenance of the Eleian mantic houses nor the date at which their members first practised at Olympia. Flower asserts, too, that 'all of the various types of divination practised in Greece, including extispicy, . . . originated in the

[94] Depending upon our view of Archaic Peloponnesian chronology, the Theoklos and Mantiklos of the *Messeniaka* might constitute further examples of Iamid *manteis* employed abroad in the same period: Paus. 4.16.1, 5, 21.2, 12, 23.5, 9-10; Shaw (2003) 94-144.

[95] Cf. Luraghi (1997) 73.

[96] Hdt. 4.148.4; Paus. 5.10.2; Bourke (2011a) 11.

[97] Schachter (2000) 294-5 suggests that the lists of Olympic officials inscribed on stone from 36 BC may reflect the introduction of the Klytiads as part of an Augustan re-organisation. As he recognises (293), however, Cicero refers to the *Clutidae* in a work that was probably composed early in 44 BC and thus before the establishment of the principate: Cic. *Div.* 1.41.91.

[98] Hall (2007) 331.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

ancient Near East and probably arrived in Greece between the eighth and sixth century B.C.'[99] This need not be taken to imply, of course, that the Greeks knew nothing of divination in earlier periods. While their practices were most probably open to inspiration from the East, *manteis* may already have existed among the Eleians, having arisen within Eleia itself, in the original homeland of an immigrant population or in a neighbouring region. Oriental influences, too, need not have been direct and may yet have come to Olympia from other parts of Greece, such as Arkadia, with seers who had themselves acquired certain forms of *mantike* either directly or indirectly from the East. A consideration of the broader context, it is clear, reveals that a wide range of plausible historical constructions is available to us.

This article, although primarily concerned with a specific historiographical problem, also raises the more general question of the value of mythology as historical evidence. In some cases, it seems, a careful consideration of the literary and socio-political context of a particular myth may enable us to distinguish contemporary innovation from older tradition, which, stripped of clearly supernatural elements, such as descent from the gods and heroes, might contribute to our knowledge of the human past. The credibility of the phenomenon for which the myth recounted by Pindar offers an explanation, the presence of Iamid *manteis* at the altar of Olympian Zeus in his own day, is reasonably secure. The city of Psophis, too, is historical, and there seems little reason to doubt that Phaisana was also a real place. The origin of the Klytiads and Iamids respectively in these locations, however, is to some degree less certain, since such details might be added or altered as traditional tales develop over time: as Munz explains, myth-makers may at some time 'distend' an existing tale by endeavouring 'to locate single parts of the myth in space and time and thus intrude more and more factual elements into it'.[100] Claims of descent from gods and mythical eponymous heroes are far less reliable. Even if such heroes did exist at some far distant time, it would be a simple matter for a clan member, bard or poet to make the leap from an ancestral origin in a certain locality to descent from its local hero, and, as we have seen, there might well have been an incentive for devising such claims. The stories of the descent of the Iamids from Poseidon, Apollo, Eurotas and Pitana and of the eponymous ancestor of the Klytiads from Melampous and the rest down to Alkmaion thus have historical value to the extent that they illuminate the thought and politics of the age in which they arose. They tell us little, however, about the more distant past which they purport to refer to.

On the basis of Pindar's ode, Weniger seats the Iamids in the valleys of the Alpheios and the Eurotas, claiming that 'Olympia is their residence and homeland from the beginning.'[101] While the Iamids, he believes, came from

[99] Flower (2008) 24-5.

[100] Munz (1956) 3.

[101] Weniger (1915) 68, cf. 78; cf. Parke (1967) 175; Wardle (2006) 324-5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the southern regions of the western Peloponnese and were associated with the upper Alpheios, Pisatis, the Dorians and the Herakleids, the Klytiads belonged to the northern districts of Eleia and were connected to 'Aiolos and the old heroes of Elis'.[102] More recently, Taita, concluding that Phaisana 'was originally a part of the district of Πίσα', has suggested that the Iamids were Pisatan rather than Arkadian or Eleian in origin.[103] Both of these reconstructions, unfortunately, rely heavily upon mythology, and especially upon the one passage from Pindar's sixth Olympian ode that places the arrival of Iamos in Olympia at around the time of Herakles. As pointed out above, this chronology may well have been introduced into an earlier myth in order to emphasise the antiquity of the house of Iamos to which Teisamenos belonged, and the most that we can justly assume from Pindar's tale is that by his day a tradition existed according to which an Iamid antecedent had moved to Olympia from the middle Alpheios at some earlier time.

Two extremities of choice are available to us: we can accept the mythological accounts without reservation and give the Iamids just a few generations start over the Klytiads, or reject them entirely and conclude that we know nothing of the origin of either house of Eleian *manteis*. Some may wish to accept the myth in which an Iamid progenitor arrives from the middle Alpheios during the Bronze Age but reject the one that makes Klytios flee Psophis soon afterwards. Such a decision, however, would rely upon no greater support than the belief that, because it predates that of Pausanias by more than half a millennium, Pindar's report enjoys a greater claim to veracity. As we have seen, Pindar or his sources may have adapted an existing myth in response to contemporary circumstances, so, whatever we might think of the context in which the myth of Klytios came into being, it would be insufficiently cautious to give the Iamos myth greater credibility on the basis of its superior antiquity alone. An alternative path between the two extremities of choice mentioned above might be to retain from Pindar's poem the simple fact of the provenance of the Iamids in the middle Alpheios valley and from Pausanias' report that of a Klytiad origin in the upper reaches of the Erymanthos. Even so, we would still know nothing of the actual date of the establishment of either house at Olympia, and so could not award either of them chronological precedence.

If we accept the mythology unreservedly, we must conclude that, although the Iamids arrived a few generations earlier, both houses came to Olympia from locations further upstream near the end of the Bronze Age. If we assume, on the other hand, that both were the product of local developments, that they came from Psophis and Phaisana respectively during the Archaic period, or that they originated elsewhere, then we cannot say that one of the houses began to practise at the altar of Zeus before the other. Whatever the case, until further evidence is unearthed, only an argument

[102] Weniger (1915) 78-9; cf. Roth (1982) 227.

[103] Taita (2007) 55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

from the silence of the sources or a selective and highly speculative use of mythology as a foundation of historical knowledge might provide one house with an incontestable primacy over the other. As matters stand, Pindar's sixth Olympian ode strongly suggests that there were Iamid *manteis* in Eleia from 468 BC at the very latest, and the reports of Herodotos attest to their presence in southern Italy by c. 510. While no evidence specifies a Klytiad presence until at least Hellenistic times, there is both epigraphical and archaeological support for the view that two distinct houses were in existence from a time earlier than Pindar's. We can conclude with confidence that Iamids were practising *mantike* at Olympia from at least the late Archaic period, but we cannot be sure that theirs was the senior house.[104]

The University of New England GRAEME BOURKE
gbourke3@une.edu.au

[104] I wish to thank Adjunct Assoc. Prof. G.R. Stanton of the University of New England, who read an earlier draft of this paper. I am also grateful to the anonymous readers for *Antichthon*, who offered helpful suggestions for its improvement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashmole, B. and Yalouris, N. (1967). *Olympia: The Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus.* London.

Bourke, G.F. (2011a). 'The Statue of Zeus at Olympia and the *Polis* of the Eleans', in J. McWilliam, S. Puttock, T. Stevenson and R. Taraporewalla (eds), *The Statue of Zeus at Olympia: New Approaches*, 9-22. Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Bourke, G.F. (2011b). 'Bakkhylides 11 and the Rule of the "Slaves" at Argos', *Chiron* 41, 125-48.

Bradford, A.S. (1985). *A Prosopography of the Lacedaemonians: From the Earliest Times to the Death of Alexander the Great.* Chicago.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dillery, J. (2005). 'Chresmologues and *Manteis*: Independent Diviners and the Problem of Authority', in S.I. Johnston and P.T. Struck (eds), *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination*, 167-231. Leiden.

Dittenberger, W. (1892). *Inscriptiones Graecae.* Vol. VII. Berlin.

Dittenberger, W. and Purgold, K. (1896). *Inschriften von Olympia.* Berlin.

Drachmann, A.B. (ed.) (1903). *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina.* Vol. I. Leipzig.

Flower, M.A. (2008). *The Seer in Ancient Greece.* Berkeley.

Frazer, J.G. (1898). *Pausanias' Description of Greece.* Vol. IV. London.

—— (1921). *Apollodoros: The Library.* Vol. I. Cambridge MA.

Godley, A.D. (1946). *Herodotus.* Vol. IV. Cambridge MA.

Hall, J.M. (2007). 'Politics and Greek Myth', in R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*, 331-54. Cambridge.

Hansen, P.A. (1983). *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca.* Berlin.

Hornblower, S. (2004). *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry.* Oxford.

How, W.W. and Wells, J. (1912). *A Commentary on Herodotus.* Vol. II. Oxford.

Inglis, A. (1998). *A History of Elis, ca. 700-365 B.C.* Harvard Dissertation.

Johnstone, S.I. (2008). *Ancient Greek Divination.* Chichester.

Leake, W.M. (1830). *Travels in the Morea.* Vol II. London.

Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae. (1981). Vol. I. Zürich.

Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae. (1990) Vol. V.1. Zürich.

Luraghi, N. (1997). 'Un mantis eleo nella Siracusa di Ierone: Agesia di Siracusa, Iamide di Stinfalo', *Klio* 79, 69-86.

—— (2008). *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory.* Cambridge.

Malkin, I. (1987). *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.* Leiden.

Minon, S. (2007). *Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VI-II siècle avant J.-C.).* Vol. I. Geneva.

Mora, F. (1984). 'Gli indovini elei e la guerra', in M. Sordi (ed.), *I Santuari e la guerra nel mondo classico: Contributi dell'Istituto di storia antica* 10, 31-40. Milan.

Moretti, L. (1959). 'Olympionikai, I vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici', in *Atti della accademia nazionale dei Lincei* 8.8, 53-198. Rome.

Most, G.W. (2007). *Hesiod: The Shield, Catalogue of Women and Other Fragments.* Cambridge MA.

Munz, P. (1956). 'History and Myth', *The Philosophical Quarterly* 6.22, 1-16.

Nafissi, M. (2003). 'Elei e Pisati. Geografia, storia e istituzioni politiche della regione di Olimpia', *Geographia Antiqua* 12, 23-55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Niese, B. (1910). 'Drei Kapitel eleischer Geschichte', in *Carl Robert zum 8. Marz 1910: Genethliakon*, 3-47. Berlin.

Nielsen, T.H. (1996). 'Was there an Arkadian Confederacy in the Fifth Century B.C.?', in M.H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek* Polis, 39-61. Stuttgart.

—— (2004). 'Triphylia', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical* Poleis, 540-6. Oxford.

Nilsson, M.P. (1972). *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece.* New York.

Parke, H.W. (1945). 'The Deposing of Spartan Kings', *CQ* 39, 106-12.

—— (1967). *Oracles of Zeus.* Cambridge.

Patterson, L.E. (2010). *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin.

Peek, W. (1937). 'Verbesserungen zu boiotischen Epigrammen', *Hermes* 72, 232-9.

Pritchett, W.K. (1979). 'Plataiai', *AJPh* 100, 145-52.

—— (1985). *The Greek State at War.* Vol. III. Berkeley.

—— (1989). *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography.* Vol. VI. Berkeley.

Roberts, E.S. (1887). *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*. Part I. Cambridge.

Röhl, H. (1883). *Imagines Inscriptionum Graecarum Antiquissimarum*. Berlin.

Roth, P.A. (1982). *Mantis: The Nature, Function and Status of a Greek Prophetic Type.* Bryn Mawr College PhD Dissertation.

Roy, J. (1972). 'An Arcadian League in the Earlier Fifth Century B.C.?', *Phoenix* 26, 334-41.

—— (2000). 'The Frontier between Arkadia and Elis in Classical Antiquity', in P. Flensted-Jensen, T.H. Nielsen and L. Rubinstein (eds), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History*. 133-56. Copenhagen.

—— (2004). 'Elis', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical* Poleis, 489-504. Oxford.

Schachter, A. (2000). 'The Seer Teisamenos and the Klytiadai', *CQ* 50, 292-5.

Shaw, P.-J. (2003). *Discrepancies in Olympiad Dating and Chronological Problems of Archaic Peloponnesian History.* Stuttgart.

Sperling, J. (1942). 'Exploration in Elis, 1939', *AJA* 46, 77-89.

Taeuber, H. (1991). 'Elische Inschriften in Olympia', in A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Achaia und Elis in der Antike, Akten des 1. Internationalen Symposiums Athen, 19-21 Mai 1989, Meletemata* 13, 111-3. Athens.

Taita, J. (2001). 'Indovini Stranieri al Servizio dello Stato Spartano: un' "epoikia" elea a Sparta in una nuova iscrizione da Olimpia', *Dike* 4, 39-85.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press

—— (2006). 'L'indovino Kallias di Elide e le relazioni fra Sibari e Olympia in epoca arcaica', in P. Amann, M. Pedrazzi and H. Taeuber (eds), *Italo-Tusco-Romano: Festschrift für L. Aigner-Foresti zum 70. Geburtstag am 30. Juli 2006*, 345-63. Vienna.

—— (2007). *Olimpia e il suo vicinato in epoca arcaica.* Milan.

Wardle, D. (2006). *Cicero:* On Divination *Book 1*. Oxford.

Weniger, L. (1915). 'Die Seher von Olympia', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 18, 53-115.

West, M.L. (1985). *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*. Oxford.

Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U. (1886). *Isyllos von Epidauros*. Berlin.

—— (1966, first edn 1922). *Pindaros*. Berlin.

Yalouris, N. (1973). 'Ὁδηγός ἀρχαιότητων ἀρχαίας Τριφυλίας (νῦν Ὀλυμπίας)', *Olympiaka Chronika* 4, 149-82.

Zoumbaki, S.B. (2005). *Prosopographie der Eleer bis zum 1 Jh. v. Chr.* Paris.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S006647740000472X Published online by Cambridge University Press