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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: PAUSANIAS AS A ΣΤΗΛΟΣΚΟΠΑΣ

ΣΤΗΛΟΣΚΟΠΑΣ (?), “the tablet-glutton,”¹ is the nickname given by Herodicus to Polemo of Ilium, the early second century B.C. periegete, quoted in Athenaeus (6.234d). The uncertainty about the formation of this epithet has prompted A. S. Arvanitopoulos to correct it to ΣΤΗΛΟΣΚΟΠΑΣ (ὁ σκόπον τὰς στήλας, “the examiner/student of inscribed stelai”), thus rendering more appropriately and in a flattering way the interests and activities of Polemo.² Be that as it may, this epithet is the only Greek word known which comes close to the modern term epigraphist. Pausanias, the second century A.D. periegete, rightly deserves this epithet. C. Habicht in his recent work has convincingly argued that Pausanias has incorporated inscriptions into his "ΕΛΛΆΔΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΥΓΝΑΣ to a greater degree than any other ancient author known to us. As he admits, however, his discussion of the inscriptions and Pausanias is only an example of the epigraphical wealth that can be found in the work of this author.³ His method was to divide the information provided both by inscriptions and Pausanias into categories of mythology, archaeology, and history. Habicht’s examination of certain examples, even if highly selective,⁴ has

---

¹ LSJ s.v. στηλοσκόπας. Frazer (1965, vol. 1, lxxxiii and note 7) translates it “monument-tammer.”

² Arvanitopoulos 1929a, 42. See also Arvanitopoulos 1929b, 60-64.

³ Habicht 1984, 40-56, and Habicht 1985, 64-94.

⁴ This is implied in Fehling’s review (1988, 18-19) of Habicht’s book Pausanias’ Guide to Greece (1985). Fehling raises objections to Pausanias’ reliability, which are based on literary considerations (1988, 18):
strongly suggested that Pausanias' information is reliable and trustworthy. Habicht's somewhat general approach concerning the inscriptions as sources of information for Pausanias *Ελλάδος περιήγησις does not by any means diminish his conclusions. Instead his work invites further and more in depth examination.

In this study a different approach from Habicht's is followed. First, all the instances in the *Ελλάδος περιήγησις where Pausanias claims that he is reading an inscription and either provides a text or a summary of it are examined, regardless of the problems of accuracy and reliability. This will aid in better understanding why Pausanias employs inscriptions in his text, what kind of epigraphical interests he displays, and accordingly, whether attributing to him the epithet ορνάκας is justifiable.

Once Pausanias' attitude towards inscriptions is established, the major issue to be examined is his accuracy and reliability. Books 5 and 6 provide an ideal test case. They deal with Elis and Olympia where excavations have yielded a plethora of inscriptions. The selection of these two books is warranted by the sheer number of inscriptions which

H[abicht] does not deny that one of P[ausanias]'s aims is to create a readable work of literature, but he ignores some of the consequences. One of these is the presence of fictions as a literary embellishment. In his work on the sources in Herodotos, especially in his "The place of Herodotus' source-fictions in literary history" (1989, 154-174) where Pausanias occupies a significant place, Fehling notes (157): Antiquarian literature is closely connected with historical literature. In his fictive Confirmations, as in everything else, Pausanias is a close and also a crude imitator of Herodotus.

Granted, but to what extent Pausanias' close imitation of Herodotus should lead *ex silentio* to the same conclusions which Fehling reached concerning the sources in Herodotus? For example, were all inscriptions which Pausanias read on the statues of the Olympic victors at Olympia "literary embellishments" and "source-fictions?" Fehling's selection of passages where Pausanias' narrative indicates that inscriptions and hearsay are used as source-fictions is not, therefore, representative (see note 22 below). Too many "epigraphical" passages are overlooked. West, for example, (1985, 278-305), who studied all the instances where Herodotus is employing "epigraphical information", does not dismiss outright Pausanias' information. In one case where the exegete's testimony is brought to bear, she, pace Fehling, accepts it as valid (1985, 303 and note 115).

The fact that Pausanias is an imitator of Herodotus by no means implies that he did not visit the places and read inscriptions he says he did. We may believe that Herodotus' use of inscriptions was fictitious; but did Pausanias hold the same belief? Or did he set out in the second century A.D. to do exactly what he believed Herodotus had done, namely visit and collect *in situ* information for his work? After all Herodotus was his model and there is no reason to suppose that Pausanias was for a moment sceptical about Herodotean methodology.
can be compared with Pausanias’ text. After a brief introduction to the structure and content of books 5 and 6 (Chapter II), the author’s reliability can be tested vis-à-vis direct epigraphical evidence: the inscriptions that he claims to have read and are in fact extant (Chapter III); and indirect epigraphical evidence: inscriptions that have been found which corroborate his text; for some of these Pausanias implies that he has read them, although he does not actually say that he did, for others he implies nothing (Chapter IV). Finally, the conclusions reached from the thorough examination of the eighty-nine epigraphical instances in books 5 and 6 should provide a good indication of Pausanias’ use of inscriptions for the remaining passages in these two books, and also the remaining eight books. The five Appendices provide lists of: all the passages that directly imply inscriptions;^5 all epigraphical expressions Pausanias employs in his work;^6 all metrical inscriptions identified as such by Pausanias;^7 in light of the discussion in Chapters III and IV, the remaining passages in books 5 and 6 that are indicative of epigraphical evidence;^8 and the passages in books 5 and 6 that present textual problems which are resolved thanks to inscriptions.^9

In the *EXXaSos TTepvifynoS as a whole there are 223 instances where Pausanias asserts that he is reading an inscription:^10 in book 1 there are sixty-one, thirty-nine of which he saw on tombs in Athens’ cemetery and three in Marathon’s tombs; in book 2 there are fourteen, three of which are πολυάθυμια;^11 in book 3 there are four; in book 4

---

5 Appendix A: Epigraphical References in Pausanias’ *EXXaSos TTepvifynoS.

6 Appendix B: Epigraphical Expressions in Pausanias’ *EXXaSos TTepvifynoS.

7 Appendix C: Metrical Inscriptions in Pausanias’ *EXXaSos TTepvifynoS.

8 Appendix D: Remaining Epigraphical References in Pausanias’ *Ηλλαδῶν A, B.

9 Appendix E: Critical Notes on Pausanias’ *Ηλλαδῶν A, B.

10 See Appendix I, Epigraphical Passages in Pausanias’ *EXXaSos TTepvifynoS, where all 223 instances are listed by books.
there are four; in book 5 there are fifty-one, twelve of which are inscribed on Ζάνες¹² and one is the Kypselos Larnax; in book 6 there are forty-five; in book 7 there are six; in book 8 there are twenty-two; in book 9 there are seven; and in book 10 there are nine. Without addressing the question of accuracy and reliability for the moment, it is important to examine how Pausanias signifies that he is reading inscriptions, and then try to establish his method and interest in “quoting” them.¹³

As one might expect, most of these passages employ cognate forms of γραϕ-, which primarily means “scratch” and in Pausanias is used to describe things both painted and inscribed, though of course inscriptions in antiquity were also painted. Only through the context of each passage can it be determined whether it is a painting or an inscription. For example, the chamber to the left of the Propylaia at Athens (1.22.6-7) and the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi (10.25-31) are both described as ἕκκεμα γραϕᾶς ἔχον (“a chamber with paintings,” not inscriptions), both the works of the Thasian Polygnotos.¹⁴ These paintings also had names on them which were γραϕὲμενα, that is the names were probably painted and not inscribed, so that the spectator would not be confused. There are only two passages in all of the Εξασσως Περιγιντοῖς which are vague enough to be confusing, both of them in book 1. When discussing the reasons why the Athenians added the tribe Hadrianis to honor the Roman Emperor for his contributions to the city,

¹¹ LSJ s.v. πολυανδρετον “common burial place”.

¹² The Ζάνες were statues of Zeus, paid for by the fines exacted from athletes who were caught violating the rules of the Olympic Games. They were set up on the left side of the road leading from the Metroon to the Stadion, in front of the treasuries.

¹³ The majority of the examples in this introductory discussion are drawn from books other than 5 and 6 which are discussed in more detail below.

¹⁴ Unless otherwise indicated, all translations throughout are those of Frazer 1965, vol. 1, and the text citations are from the new Teubner edition of Pausanias by Rocha-Pereira 1973-1981. The three major commentaries by Frazer 1965, Hitzig 1896-1910, and Papachatzis 1974-1981 have been consulted extensively and are indispensable tools for any one who is interested in Pausanias.
Pausanias reports: ἐστιν οἱ πάντα γεγραμένα Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῶν θεῶν ἱερῶ (1.5.5), probably the Res gestae of Hadrian. When he mentions the Prytaneion, Pausanias adds ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τε οἱ Σῶλονος εἶστι γεγραμένοι (1.18.3). In both cases the larger context implies that Pausanias saw and read inscribed texts.

Besides the forms of γραφ-, the majority of the 223 passages contain words which immediately suggest inscriptions. Expressions like τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, τὸ ἐλέγειον, τὸ λαμβεῖον (occurs only once in 7.23.7), ἡ στήλη, or τὸ πολυάνθρωπον together with some form of the verb γράφω or some other verb, or some form of the verb γράφω by itself, or a combination of the two provide ample evidence that Pausanias is dealing with an inscription. The meanings of stele and polyandrion are easily understood, but the three metrical terms invite some attention, because of their treatment in Pausanias’ text. Pausanias consistently employs elegeion for “the elegiac distich.” His one use of iambeion occurs in a passage where he summarizes and does not quote the text (7.23.7), but the meaning of the word is clearly “iambic meter.” Epigramma generally denotes a “metrical inscription;” it may occur with elegeion, or by itself, in which case it implies elegiac distichs and hexameters.

In three exceptional instances Pausanias specifically comments on the meter of the epigramma he is quoting. When describing the Larnax of Kypselos (5.17.5-19.10),

---

15 See Appendix B (Epigraphical Expressions in Pausanias’ Ἐλλάδος Περιήγησις) where the passages are listed by the expressions employed by Pausanias in each book.

16 For the metrical inscriptions quoted by Pausanias in books 5 and 6 see: Gallavotti 1978a, 3-27; 1978b, 28-38; and 1979, 3-29. For general comments on metrical inscriptions and those quoted by Pausanias see: IGM, passim, and Gallavotti 1979b, passim. See also Appendix C (Metrical Inscriptions in Pausanias’ Ἐλλάδος Περιήγησις) which is a list of all passages where metrical inscriptions are mentioned by Pausanias.

17 LSJ s.v. λαμβεῖον.
Pausanias quotes many inscriptions, among which is the caption for Helen and Aithra, whom the Dioskouroi carry off (5.19.3):

\[ \text{ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς ἔπος τε ἐξαμέτρων καὶ ὄνοματός ἔστιν ἕνος ἐπὶ τῷ ἐξαμετρώπῃ προσθήκῃ.} \]

Τυνδαρίδα ἑλέναι φέρετον, Ἄθραν δὲ ἐλκέτον Ἀθάναθεν.

τοῦτο μὲν δὲ τὸ ἔπος οὕτω πεποίηται.

The meaning of Pausanias' comment on the inscribed caption is clear.\(^\text{18}\)

Similarly, he discusses Phormis from Mainalon in Arkadia who changed his ethnic on account of his successful participation in campaigns with Gelon and Hieron, from which he profited greatly, so that he sent dedications to Apollo at Delphi and Zeus at Olympia (5.27.1-2). At Olympia Pausanias saw Phormis' sculptural group of two horses with the two charioteers and read the inscription (5.27.2):

\[ \text{τῷ προτέρῳ δὲ τῶν ὑπόπων ἔπιγραμμα ἐπεστίν ἐπὶ τῇ πλευρᾷ, τὰ πρώτα οὐ σὺν μέτρων· λέγει γὰρ δὴ οὐτών·} \]

Φόρμις ἀνέθηκεν Ἀρκάς Μαίναλιος, νῦν δὲ Συρακόσιος.

Clearly, Pausanias expected the inscription to read metrically, but he could not understand the first line (— Ἔνυν — —). It should have been part of an hexameter, because of the dactylic pentameter (\textit{hemiepes}) in the second line.\(^\text{19}\) Consequently he observes that the first words are not metrical.

---

\(^\text{18}\) See IGM 186 with Bergk's suggestions. Gallavotti (1978a, 12-13; 1978b, 31; 1979b, 67-68) suggests, \textit{contra} Pausanias, that this can be a dactyllo-anapaestic lyrical meter of the Stesichorean type, found at the beginning of a strophe from the \textit{Iliupersis}. In view of the fact, however, that the inscriptions quoted by Pausanias from the Kypselos Larnax are all in hexameters, it is unlikely that for only this one depiction of an epic event the poet-composer (the Korinthian Eumelos according to Pausanias' guess in 5.19.10) would employ a lyrical meter.

\(^\text{19}\) See IGM 55, where it is suggested that this inscription shows the oldest tripartite form of a dedicatory epigram. Gallavotti (1978a, 26; 1978b, 36; 1979b, 8-9) suggests that the first line is actually a reizianus with resolution, a meter attested in tragedy and Pindar. His reference, however, to Pausanias' book 10.7.5-6, which is unique and where the text itself warrants Aeolic meters, does not corroborate the meter for 5.27.2, mainly because of the distinct character of the two dedications and Pausanias' own comments in both passages (see note 20 below).
Finally, when discussing the Pythian Games and their various contests (10.7.2-8), Pausanias states that the contest of singing to the flute (αἰσθές άλος) was discontinued in the second Pythiad, "because they deemed the music was inauspicious. For the tunes were most doleful, and the words sung to them were dirges." He supports his statement with this proof (10.7.5-6):

μαρτυρεῖ δὲ μοι καὶ τοῦ Ἐχεμβρότου τὸ ἀνάθημα, τρίτους χαλκοὺς ἀνατέθεις ταῖς Ἰππαλεί τινὶ ἔν θήβαις· ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ὁ τρίτους εἶχεν·

'Ἐχέμβροτος Ἀρκάς θήκε τῷ Ἰππαλεῖ
νικήσας τὸς ἀγάλματος ἐν ἄθλοισ,
"Ελλησί δ' ἀείδων μέλεα καὶ ἐλέγουσ.
κατὰ τούτο μὲν τῆς αὐλωδίας ἑπαύσθῃ τὸ ἀγώνισμα.

Obviously, Pausanias understands the meter and music of these lines to be a representative sample of Echembrotos' poems (this epigram being one of his compositions) which were primarily dirges and melic songs. According to Pausanias, therefore, the mention in the epigram of these kinds of poems justifies the discontinuation of the contest of the αἰσθές άλος in the second Pythiad.  

In addition to metrical comments Pausanias often gives information about the script, the date, and the way in which an inscription is cut. Thus, on the wall of the temple of Demeter in Athens (1.2.4), and on the dedication of Miltiades at Olympia (6.19.6), there are inscriptions written 'ΑΤΤεῖος γράφματι τοῦ ἀνάθημας; the sanationes at the temple of Asklepios

20 See the metrical suggestions in IGM 138, and especially Gallavotti (1979b, 107-115) who discusses the possibilities and arrives at the following metrical units:

reizianus (υ - υ υ - -) + hemiepes (υ υ - - -)

hemiepes ( - - - υ υ -) + enoplios ( - - υ υ - υ -)

reizianus ( - - υ υ -) + hypodochmiac (υ υ υ - -).

Gallavotti's discussion is fully justified in this case by the observation of Pausanias, who probably could appreciate the poem's music as well. This example, however, of the combination of reizianus + hemiepes does not imply that in 5.27.2 the same meter should, or may, occur. Phormis' dedication follows the standard form of an epigram, whereas Echembrotos' victory in singing to the flute warrants an epigram commemorating the very victory on account of which it was dedicated, and therefore composed in the same metrical units.
at Epidauros are written ἀφεττά τῆς Δωρίδος (2.27.3); and one of the stelai on the tomb of Epaminondas near Mantinea is described as ἀρχαῖα καὶ ἐπὶ γραμμα ἔχουσα Βοιώτοιον (8.11.8).²¹

Furthermore, the antiquity of either the object inscribed or the script of an inscription is often produced as evidence for the date or for a claim of some kind. In the sacred grove of Asklepios at Epidauros Pausanias sees an ἀρχαῖα στήλη “with an inscription stating that Hippolytos dedicated twenty horses to the god,” and he goes on to relate a story that he heard from the people of Arikia corroborating the text of the inscription (2.27.4). Elsewhere Pausanias observes that an inscription he reads is inscribed ἀρχαῖον γράμματα (5.22.3; 8.25.1), and the dedication of the Spartan Eutelidas commemorating his Olympic victory in 628 B.C. is ἦ τε ἐν τῶν ἀρχαῖα τοῦ Εὐτελίδα καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν βάθρων γράμματα ἀμφαρα ἕπος τοῦ χρόνου (6.15.8). In these instances the periegete provides firsthand and personal observations, relevant to the date of the inscription and the monument.

There are, however, two cases where Pausanias clearly states that his report is based on hearsay. In the agora at Phigaleia he sees the statue of Arrachion the pankratiast which, according to his description, is a kouros (8.40.1):

τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀρχαῖοι καὶ οὐχ ἡκίστα ἐπὶ τώι σχήματι· οὔ διεστάσι μὲν πολὺ οἱ πόδες, καθεῖνται δὲ παρὰ πλευράν αἱ

²¹ Pausanias' interest in languages is evident by his frequent references to various Greek dialects and languages other than Greek, which are not related to inscriptions. See also no. 87 below for an example in which Pausanias appears to be arguing on the basis of dialectical phonology.

Rocha-Pereira's Index (1981), s.vv. γλῶσσα, διάλεκτος, φωνή lists the following passages:

γλῶσσα: 'Αττική 5.15.7. 'Ελληνική 1.22.1; 2.4.5. Κυρινίου 10.17.9. Λακώνων ἡκίστα εὑρέθων 3.15.2. Φανδικέων 9.12.2.

διάλεκτος: Αἰολίων 9.22.3. 'Αττική 5.11.7; 5.13.8; 5.15.2; 5.15.7. Δαριών 4.27.11; 4.34.8. 'Ηλείων 5.15.2. Καρική 9.23.6.

φωνή: Αἰγυπτίων 9.12.2. 'Αργείων 2.37.3. 'Αρκαδική 8.25.6. Βοιωτίων 10.19.11. Γαλατίων τῶν ὑπὲρ Φυγίας 10.36.1. Δωρίδος 2.29.5; 2.37.3; 3.19.6; 3.22.1; 4.27.11; 4.34.8; 5.15.12; 9.22.3. 'Ελλάδιος 10.23.8. 'Ηλείων 5.3.2; 5.15.7; 5.21.2. Κελτών 10.19.11. Κορινθίων 5.17.5. Μεσσηνίων 3.26.9; 4.20.2. Ρωμαίων 2.4.5.
Then he reports Arrachion’s victories at Olympia in 564 B.C. (8.40.1-2), relying evidently not on the epigram but probably on a catalogue of Olympic victors. Similarly, he tells the story which he heard from the Boiotians of Mt. Helikon about Hesiod (9.31.4):

Pausanias, however, makes clear his reservations in accepting this story. For he goes on to report other traditions about what Hesiod had composed and which are in conflict with the Boiotian version: (sc. Εργα) κεχωρισμένη τῆς πρωτέρας (9.31.5-6).

In book 5 Pausanias’ descriptions of the direction of the script in inscriptions are equally important. Among the dedications that he saw in the Heraion at Olympia, there was the diskos of Iphitos on which the declaration of the truce, announced by the Eleians every four years, was inscribed: οὸς εὐθὺς ἔχει γεγραμμένη, ἀλλὰ ἐς κύκλου

---

22 Knox (1989, 3-22) has convincingly argued that Hesiod’s Works and Days is a more innovative and original composition than the Theogony whose tradition left the poet with little room for innovation. In this sense, Pausanias’ cautious reporting of the doxa of the Boiotians that Hesiod composed only the Erga, although he does not believe it, may very well be an ancient interpretative doxa of the poet’s work. Fehling (1989, 173 and note 21) dismisses completely Pausanias’ account as fantasy. However remote Pausanias’ story may be about the lead tablet inscribed Erga, the possibility that the Boiotians “showed” Pausanias lead tablets should not be dismissed totally, especially when local pride and propaganda is taken into consideration. More importantly, however, Pausanias not only does not make up the story (there is no expression like “I think,” or “in my opinion”), but he is himself sceptical about it.

23 For a thorough discussion of these passages and the problems of the various directions of script, see: Zinn 1950-51, 1-36. Also useful are: Guarducci EG vol. 1, 407-417; Jeffery LSA 43-50, although she does not mention Pausanias; Klaffenbach 1982, 80-83; and Woodhead 1981, 24-34.
σχήμα περίτειαν ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπάκοι τὰ γράμματα (5.20.1). In this case the direction of the script is simply dictated by the shape of the object. There are two instances, however, where Pausanias notes the direction of the script, one inscription is cut retrograde and the other boustrophedon. He is actually the only ancient literary source of such descriptions. Near the great temple of Zeus he saw a sculptural group of the men “who, when Hector challenged a Greek to single combat, dared to cast lots who should fight him.” This monument was dedicated by the entire Achaian race to Zeus at Olympia, and of the eight statues ἐπὶ μόνῳ τῷ ἑγάλλματι Ἀγαμέμνονι τὸ ὄνομα ἐστὶ γεγραμμένον. γέγραπται δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τὰ λαϊκὰ ἐκ Σέξιδων (5.25.9).

Likewise, before embarking on an elaborate detailed description of the Larnax of Kypselos, which he saw in the Heraion at Olympia, Pausanias states (5.17.6):

tῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ λάρνακι ἐπιγράμματα ἐπεστὶ τῶν πλείστων, γράμματα τῶν ἀρχαίων, γεγραμμένα· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐς εὐθὺν αὐτῶν ἔχει, σχήματα δὲ ἄλλα τῶν γραμμάτων βουστροφηδόν καλοῦσιν Ἑλληνες. τὸ δὲ ἐστὶ τουῖνδε· ἀπὸ τοῦ πέρατος τοῦ ἐποὺς ἐπιστρέφει τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ δεύτερον ὑσπερ ἐν διαύλου δρόμων. γέγραπται δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ λάρνακι καὶ ἄλλως τὰ ἐπιγράμματα ἐλιγμοίς συμβαλέσθαι χαλεποῖσ.

In this passage there are three different ways of inscribing archaic letters: some of the inscriptions run straight on; others are written in boustrophedon; and all are inscribed in winding lines, because they are attached to the figures portrayed, a fact which makes them difficult to read. What is interesting is that Pausanias explains the word boustrophedon not by paraphrasing it (βοῦστροφηδόν) and using the oxen-plowing-the-field metaphor. Instead, being at the site of the Olympic Games, he compares the direction of the letters in the inscriptions to that of the runners in the diaulos (ὑσπερ ἐν διαύλου δρόμων).

24 These passages in Pausanias are the only two instances describing the direction of lettering in Greek Literature (according to a search done on the TLG database and Ibycus system at the Ohio State University, Department of Classics). The adverb βουστροφηδόν is not attested before this period. It occurs only in Pausanias and also in Harpokration (Lexikon, s.v. [220.9-11]), a near contemporary of Pausanias according to Lesky 1981, 1138-1139.
All the aforementioned observations that Pausanias offers in relation to inscriptions, about their meter, dialect, their state of preservation in his time, direction and method of inscribing, fall clearly within the scope of the epigraphist. Yet, in the Ἐλλάδος περιήγησις these observations per se do not prove an epigraphical zeal on Pausanias' part. The inscriptions are connected rather with the tradition or practice of the periegetic genre and are employed in order to support or reject an argument or story in which Pausanias is interested. This raises the most important question about Pausanias and inscriptions, which also touches upon his methodology in composing the Ἐλλάδος περιήγησις, namely what he saw in them that he valued as significant enough to incorporate them in his work.

Indeed Pausanias' work follows the tradition, well-established by his time, of a periegete, whose function at a major site in Greece would not have been much different from his modern equivalent, the tour guide.25 Plutarch paints a vivid portrait of a Delphic periegete in his treatise, De Pythiae Oraculis (359C):26 ἐπέρασαν οἱ περιήγηται τὰ συντεταγμένα μηθὲν ἤμων φροντίσαντες θεωτέντων ἐπιτεμείν τὰς ῥήσεις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων. Though Plutarch's derogatory remark may still find a sympathetic audience, the most significant detail is the extensive (τὰ πολλὰ) use of epigrammata. No doubt, the periegete read aloud such epigrammata in order to substantiate his speech (τὰς ῥήσεις) which, one may assume, was carefully outlined ahead of time.

Pausanias, however, does not use the term periegetes. He prefers the word exegetes, a fact which has caused much debate.27 F. Jacoby has shown convincingly that


26 See also 396C, 397D, 400D, 401CD. The text is: Flacelière 1974.
the function of the *exegetai* in Athens is not related to, and cannot be interpreted using the testimony of Pausanias. Jacoby argues for a very limited and specific meaning of the word ἐξιγνητής, i.e. “expounder of sacred rites or customs, modes of burial, expiation, etc.”; his purpose is to dissociate the *exegetai* in Athens from the genesis of the Atthidographers. The primary meaning of the word, however, is “one who leads, adviser” and in Pausanias’ text the word has been understood as “guide, cicerone, to temples, etc.” At Olympia there have been found inscriptions recording the official cult personnel among whom an *exegetes* (twenty times) and a *periegetes* (four times) are listed. Although very few of these inscriptions are completely preserved, they seem to

27 The word *periegetes* is not found in Pausanias after a search done on the TLG database and Ibycus system at the Ohio State University, Department of Classics. The word *exegetes* is found nineteen times in Pausanias:

book 1: 13.8; 34.4; 35.8; 41.2; 42.4;
book 2: 9.7; 23.6; 31.4;
book 4: 33.6;
book 5: 6.6; 10.7; 15.10; 18.6; 20.4; 21.8-9; 23.6;
book 7: 6.5;
book 9: 3.3;

See also Frazer 1965, vol. 1, lxxvi-lxxvii, and Habicht 1985, 4-8.

28 Jacoby (1949, 8-70; 236 notes 42, 43, 1; 237-304; 399, and the bibliography there) is mainly concerned with the three groups of *exegetai* in Athens, i.e., ἐξιγνητής ἐξ θυσίαυσεων, ἐξιγνητής ἐξ θεομακτικῶν, and ἐξιγνητής πυθήρηται and their relationship with the Atthidographers, and the genesis of the *Athsis* at Athens. His discussion and arguments are relevant to Pausanias, because Pausanias is often quoted as evidence for the various theories proposed before Jacoby.

Recently, Winkler 1985, 234-242 reverts to the pre-Jacoby argumentation of the meaning of *exegetes*, in order to connect Apuleius with the *exegetes*, aretalogoi and confessors, thus bringing together all three groups. Pausanias is indeed Apuleius’ contemporary, but his usage of the word *exegetes* is not as closely connected with the *aretalogoi* and confessors as Winkler tries to suggest.

29 LSJ s.v. ἐξιγνητής II.

30 LSJ s.v. ἐξιγνητής.

31 IO 59.22, 61.2, 62.15, 64.20, 66.3, 76.4, 80.8, 86.10, 91.14, 92.15, 95.12, 102.13, 103.18, 104.16, 106.14, 116.14, 117.16, 121.16, 122.13, 140.2. The number of times, twenty, is approximate, since in some of the inscriptions the word is partially restored.

32 IO 77.9, 83.2, 110.17, 120.10. The IO editors explain the four instances of the periegete as a “wohl durch den populären Sprachgebrauch veranlaßte Nachlässigkeit” (p. 141).
show that the periegete and the exegete are not different offices, since the two officials never occur together on the same list and are ranked after the manteis.

Even so, Pausanias apparently rejects the use of the word περιηγητης in his work and prefers ἔκτης. This preference for the term exegetes is perfectly understandable given the derogatory remark in Plutarch about the periegetes. The main difference between these two words, as Pausanias implicitly defines them, is that the periegete's knowledge is superficial and therefore he simply "describes" something without any attempt at explanation; whereas the exegete "knows" his subject and he "explains" what he is reporting. In addition to the absence from Pausanias' text of the word περιηγητης, further evidence for this distinction is Pausanias' own definition of his work (5.21.1): τὸ σὲ ἀνδὶ τοῦτον μοι πρόειναι ὁ λόγος ἐσ τὸ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐσ τὸν ἀναθημάτων ἔξηγης. This programmatic statement in book 5 reveals that Pausanias understands his activity and work to be not a περιηγητης but an ἔξηγης. Accordingly, the title of his work, which is not his own, does not do him justice.33 Whenever Pausanias refers to earlier or later books in his narrative he uses, like Herodotos, the word λόγος. This is not a superficial association. Pausanias' logoi for Greece are developed in a way similar to Herodotos' logoi for the territories surrounding Greece. In that respect Pausanias implies that his work is a kind of history. This and the repeated use of the word exegetes, with which Pausanias implicitly but

33 See Habicht 1985, 5 and note 28, although he accepts the conventional title (1985, 2 and note 5). Gurlitt (1890, 34) suggested as a title ἔξηγης "Ελλάδος and Trendelenburg (1911) had lectured on Pausanias' Hellenika. For the history of the transmission of Pausanias' work see also Diller's articles (1955, 268-279; 1956, 84-97; 1957, 169-188), and Papachatzis' discussion (1974-81, vol. 1, 32-59).

34 For Pausanias' definition of his work as a narrative comprised of λόγοι and Θεωρήματα see Robert 1909, 8-68, Nörenberg 1973, 235-252, and Habicht 1985, 20-27. The issue of whether Pausanias favors more the stories than the monuments and therefore he is not as trustworthy (Robert), or both are treated equally by him (Nörenberg) is rather superficial and irrelevant. See also the Conclusions.
definitely associates himself, certainly distinguish and elevate Pausanias' work from that of earlier periegetes.

Pausanias, therefore, may be better understood as an exegete, i.e., an author who, within the broad framework of a description of Hellas, is purveying various stories that survived to his time about the history, archaeology, religion and mythology, geography and topography, *inter alia*, of a particular place. For these stories the most trustworthy evidence available were the inscriptions, the monuments, and the local periegetes/exegetes. In fact, Pausanias, when he describes his own work throughout the ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ, elucidates his methodology on sources in similar terms. When he finishes his discussion of Athens, he declares (1.39.3):

τοσαῦτα κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀθηναίοις γνωριμοῦτα ἂν ἐν τε ἅλογοι καὶ δεικνύμενοι, ἀπέκρινε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς οἱ λόγοι μοι τὰ ἐς συγγραφὴν ἀνῆκοντα.

A similar programmatic rule to be followed in the description of Lakonia is stated in more detail (3.11.1):

ὅ δὲ ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ μοι τῇ Ἀττιδῖ τιμάτωμα ἐγένετο, μὴ τὰ πάντα με ἐφεξῆς, <τὰ δὲ> μᾶλλον ἦν ἐπιλεξάμενον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν εἰρηκέναι, δηλώσω δὴ πρὸ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Ἔπαρτιάτας· ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἠθέλησεν ὁ λόγος ἀπὸ πολλῶν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλων ἀφηνήσεως, ὅπερ δὲ ἐκαστῷ παρὰ σφίν θέσεις ἐγνώσει, ἀποκρίναι τὰ δειολογώσατα. ὦς οὖν εὖ βεβολευμένος οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπου παραβήσομαι.

These two statements are representative for understanding Pausanias' method of composition and hold true for all ten books. Indeed they conform to the broad periegetic principles which involve story-telling substantiated by the monuments, inscriptions, or the local exegetes. In Plutarch the periegete rattles off many stories which

---

35 Similar programmatic statements can be found elsewhere in Pausanias: book 1: 3.3; book 2: 13.3; 14.4; 29.1; 34.11; book 5: 21.1; book 6: 1.1-2; 17.1; 23.1; 24.6; book 8: 2.5-7; 3.6; 8.3; 10.1; 54.7; book 10: 9.1; 32.1. The ones in books 5 and 6 are discussed in Chapter II.
he corroborates with epigrams with no attempt at explanation. Pausanias, the exegete, composes a description of Greece following similar principles, but with a different purpose in mind. His effort is aimed at “explaining” the sites and the monuments (θεωρημάτα), by bringing together stories (λόγοι) from inscriptions or the local exegetes. The size of such a task is bound to be limited to the most memorable and noteworthy (γνωριμότατα, διευθυνότατα) stories and monuments. Pausanias’ aim is to create a clear narrative, if possible, by resolving conflicting evidence about these logoi. The end result is what Pausanias calls an ἔντονος ἐξεγέρσις of Greece, or the Ἑλλάδος περιγραφής as it came to be known by the Byzantine and Medieval scribes and scholars.

Inscriptions, as Pausanias uses them, are the very story of a monument. Most importantly they are the only primary and contemporary evidence that Pausanias has relative to these monuments and therefore an integral part of understanding it. Moreover, because what they communicate is in a written form, the inscriptions acquire a more authoritative aura than hearsay, and consequently Pausanias treats them as one of his most reliable sources. Indeed he seldom questions an inscription and is occasionally led astray by them. For him inscriptions appear to have constituted for the most part objective and therefore trustworthy information which preserve and enliven the history and customs of the past. Of course Pausanias is not interested in everything inscribed, but only in those inscriptions which pertain to his qualification of τὰ διευθυνότατα. Thus, the majority of the 223 inscriptions quoted, summarized, or alluded to are, not surprisingly,

See Habicht’s (1985, 21 note 83) brief discussion on the word θεωρημάτα.

Markedly absent for example are scores of public decrees which Pausanias must have seen. Even so, the number of 223 inscriptions, which he claims to have read, is still very impressive. Gallavotti’s (1978a, 3) statement that only in books 5 and 6 does Pausanias show an interest in inscriptions needs qualification. In Αττικα (book 1) Gallavotti finds only five epigraphical passages as opposed to my count of sixty-one, perhaps because he considers only those which are directly quoted by Pausanias. See Appendix A for the numerical disposition of inscriptions quoted, summarized, or simply mentioned by Pausanias in each book.
commemorative dedications in major sanctuaries, noteworthy funeral stelai, and various religious inscriptions. These groups of inscriptions provide Pausanias the necessary information to support a particular story that he wants to include in his work or to enhance a certain detail.

Instances illustrating this use of inscriptions by Pausanias are abundant. There are also counter examples, where Pausanias, by not having the benefit of insessional information, cannot provide an explanation for a monument. On the road from Korinth to Sikyon for example Pausanias sees the tomb of the Messenian Lykos whom he cannot find on the list of Olympic victors among the pentathletes. Since the tomb’s shape strikes him as different, it offers him the opportunity to introduce the burial custom peculiar to Sikyon: ἐπὶ γραμμα τὸ ἄλλο ἐπιγράφουσιν οὐδέν, τὸ δὲ ἱστομα ἐφ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ πατρόθεν ὑπειπόντες κελεύοντο τὸν νεκρὸν καθερευ (2.7.2). No doubt, Pausanias experienced the same frustration and difficulty which modern epigraphists experience in dealing with the notoriously uninformative tituli sepulcrales from classical and hellenistic Greece. He did not encounter the same problem, however, in the public cemetery of Athens, which he has just finished describing and where the full names and sometimes the cause of death are inscribed. So, in Athens’ public cemetery he recorded thirty-nine inscribed tombs (1.29.3-16). Likewise, outside Thebes there is no epigram on the polyandrion, erected for those who had died fighting against Philip of Makedon. As Pausanias explains, the reason is: ἔμοι δοκεῖν, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐνικότα τῇ τόλμῃ ἀφέσε τὰ ἐκ τοῦ σάλμον ήκολούθησε (9.40.10). Again, descending from the Arkadian city of Orchomenos Pausanias observes heaps of stones that commemorate fallen warriors, but there is no inscription, nor do the Orchomenians know when or with whom these men died fighting (8.13.3). At Olympia too, because of the absence of inscriptions in certain cases, Pausanias reports the local exegete’s opinion, for example,
that a statue was a Zeus dedicated by Mummius \( (\text{άλεγγετο} \ 5.24.4) \), or that another portrays Aristotle from Stageira \( (\text{μηνονένουσιν} \ 6.4.8) \).\(^{38}\)

Beyond these uninscribed and therefore non-informative examples, the majority of the dedications are inscribed and a brief examination of representative cases will elaborate more fully Pausanias’ methodology in dealing with them. His approach is sometimes astonishingly close to modern standards. In the beginning of book 4 Pausanias discusses the history of Messene and the Mysteries of Andania. His exposition is based on an inscription which he read in the chapel of the Lykomids at Phlya in Attika and part of which he quotes \( (\text{οίον ἰναιν ἐσ πιστών συντελεῖ} \ \tauο ο λόγου \ 4.1.7-8) \). Actually, the information he provides before \( (4.1.5-7) \) and after \( (4.1.9) \) the inscription is an elaboration of the text of the partially quoted inscription.\(^{39}\) In a similar manner, in the agora of Tegea Pausanias reads the inscription on the base of a statue of Philopoimen \( (8.49.1) \), which he quotes \( (8.52.6) \). The information on the history of the man, however, reported by Pausanias \( (8.49.1-52.6) \), is an elaborate paraphrase of the epigram itself. In both cases Pausanias appears to be redundant, since he provides the same information twice. This, however, is also an implicit way by which the reader is led to believe that what Pausanias is reporting is true. By quoting the actual text of the inscription Pausanias proves, as it were, that his own paraphrase of the same text is reliable and true.

There are further examples which illustrate his treatment of inscriptions. On the Sacred Way in Athens Pausanias sees the tomb of Phytalos and quotes the epigram inscribed on it, as evidence of what he has just said \( (1.37.2) \):

\[
\text{ἐν τούτωι ταί χαρώι φύταλον φασιν οίκωι Δήμητρα δέξασθαι,}
\text{καὶ τὴν θεὸν ἀντὶ τούτων δούναι οί τὸ φυτὸν τῆς συκῆς.}
\]

\(^{38}\) Other examples where the absence of inscriptions creates problems for Pausanias can be found in: book 5: 23.1; 26.6; book 6: 2.9; 3.1; 4.8; 17.4.

\(^{39}\) An inscription with regulations for these Mysteries, dated 91 B.C., has been found: \( IG \ V.1, 1390 \).
Pausanias heard the story about Phytalos probably from the local periegetes (φασιν), but he was also able to test its veracity. He read the epigram on Phytalos’ tomb, which related the same information, and accordingly the local story is validated. Likewise, in Thebes the bridal chamber of Alkmene, built by Trophonios and Agamedes, is shown to him among the ruins. The inscription, however, was not extant, and therefore Pausanias is cautious. He stresses twice the fact that his report and his quote of the epigram depend upon information supplied by the Thebans (9.11.1-2):

By using φασι and λέγοντων Pausanias clearly emphasizes that the story he narrates is only a report as he heard it from the Thebans. The fact that the inscription is no longer extant makes him cautious about the report. In the cases of Phytalos, Philopoimen, and the Mysteries in the Messenian Andania Pausanias’ method of reporting does not differ from that of the Thebans: the story of a specific monument is narrated and then an inscription is quoted as hard evidence. The only difference with Pausanias is that he sees and quotes the hard evidence, the inscriptions: they are the “primary” evidence which substantiate a story and hence are employed extensively in his narrative.
Pausanias is also confronted with and can distinguish cases of rededicated/reinscribed statues, a common practice from Hellenistic times onwards. Near the temple of Demeter in Athens Pausanias sees a male on horseback "hurling a spear at the giant Polybotes, in reference to whom the Koans tell the myth about Cape Chelone," and reckons him to be Poseidon. "But the existing inscription," he concludes, "assigns the statue to someone else" (1.2.4). Also in Athens, the names on the statues of Miltiades and Themistokles in the Prytaneion have been changed into those of a Roman and a Thracian (1.18.3). Pausanias encounters a similar case at the Argive Heraion where a statue of Orestes has been reinscribed so as to portray the Emperor Augustus (2.17.3). In the agora of Mantinea the city reinscribed the statue of Podares, who died in the battle against Epaminondas and the Thebans "three generations before my time..., so as to make it apply to a descendant and namesake of Podares, who lived late enough to enjoy Roman citizenship" (8.9.9-10).

Furthermore, there are cases where Pausanias uses the inscriptional information to argue carefully and reach conclusions about the historicity of certain facts. In his brief overview of the history of the Achaian race he concludes that the Achaians did not participate in the battle of Plataea, because, if they had done so, their name would have been inscribed together with those of the other cities and nations on the base of the statue of Zeus at Olympia (7.6.4). This inscribed monument was dedicated by all Greeks who fought at Plataea, and indeed, Pausanias read the inscription and summarized its contents in his description of Elis (5.23.1-3, no. 50 below). Likewise, an inscription Pausanias reads at Olympia and quotes concerning the victory of the Achaian Oibotas from Dyme seems to dispute the city's name. As he points out, however, the inscription preserves the older name of Dyme, Paleia (7.17.6-7, 13-14 = 6.3.8). Similar topographical information provided by inscriptions is corroborated by Pausanias' own in situ observations: the city of Tritaia is in Arkadia (6.12.8 = 8.27.5); the Myonians, whom
Thucydides mentions (3.101), come from Myonia, a city in Lokris (6.19.4-5 = 10.38.8); the deserted city of Halike on the road from Hermione to Mases was once inhabited, since it is attested at Epidauros in the inscribed sanationes which were read by Pausanias in the precinct of Asklepios (2.36.1 = 2.27.3).40

All these illustrations, scattered throughout the Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις, clearly attest to Pausanias' interests in inscriptions. There remain two final examples which serve as a convenient recapitulation of the foregoing presentation, the Larnax of Kypselos in the Heraion at Olympia (5.17.5-19.10, and no. 55 below) and Polygnotos' paintings in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi (10.25.1-31.12). These are the most elaborate and lengthy descriptions/explanations in the entire Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις. Each has many inscriptions, those on the Larnax were probably cut in the wood, while the walls of the Lesche were surely painted. Pausanias, however, treats them both in the same manner.

In his description of the Larnax of Kypselos Pausanias states in the beginning that there are many inscriptions associated with the figures portrayed (17.6), and then he proceeds to present successively each one of the five fields into which the Larnax is divided. The descriptions of the first, second and fourth fields are quite elaborate, while those of the third and fifth are almost non-existent. This discrepancy is due to the fact that Pausanias and also the local exegete had no inscription for guidance. As he observes, the only alternative that is left to him for the third and fifth fields is guesswork (ἐκάζειν 18.6-8; 19.7-8). He was better off, however, with the first, second and fourth fields. Yet even here, if the name is not inscribed, no definite information is provided by Pausanias, unless the scene represents a very well known mythological episode. In a depiction of Herakles there is a woman behind him whose name is not inscribed. The only information, therefore, Pausanias can provide is that: "she is playing on a Phrygian, 

40 Careful and meaningful observations by Pausanias can also be found in: book 2: 27.4; book 5: 10.2; book 6: 2.9; 13.10-11; book 10: 11.6; 24.2; 36.9.
not a Greek flute" (17.9, to which 18.2 is similar). The episode of Herakles slaying the Hydra has no inscription, too, because none is needed. Herakles is "easily recognized both by the subject and his figure" (17.11, to which 18.4 is similar). On the second field, Pausanias describes a woman carrying in her hands two boys with their feet turned different ways: on her right arm a white boy asleep, on her left arm a black boy that looks to be asleep. "The inscriptions," he concludes, "show, what is easy to see without them, that the boys are Death and Sleep, and that Night is nurse to both" (18.1). Later on, when he sees Artemis depicted in a strange way, her inscribed name alone is of no assistance to him. So, he simply describes the representation of the goddess without any explanation (19.5): οὐκ οἶδα ἐφ' ὅταν λόγοι πτέρυγας ἔχουσα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἄμων, καὶ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ κατέχει πάραβαλιν, τῇ δὲ ἄτερα τῶν χειρῶν λέοντα.41

A similar approach is taken by Pausanias in his description of Polygnotos' paintings which are divided into three major themes: the Iliupersis, the Apoplous, and the Nekyia of Odysseus. The major fault that Pausanias finds with Polygnotos is the names assigned to each figure. In the Sea-Scene,42 in which Menelaos, his ship, and its steerman Phrontis are depicted, there are also painted other figures dismantling the tents, whose names Pausanias cannot find in Homer's Odyssey. Therefore, he reaches the conclusion which is difficult to prove or disprove in light of the evidence (10.25.3): τῶν δὲ ἔλλων

41 For further discussion on the larnax of Kypselos see: Frazer 1965, ad loc.; Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc.; Jones 1894, 30-80; von Massow 1916, 1-117; Tsountas 1925, 147-154; Mayer 1931, 95-96; Myres 1946, 122; Friedländer 1987, 56-60 no. 54; Cosi 1958, 81-83; Gallavotti 1978a, 12-14, 1978b, 30-31; Carter 1989, 355-378. See also Chapter IV no. 55 below.

42 The labels for the scenes are from the recent and thorough study of Polygnotos' paintings by Stansbury-O'Donnell 1989, 203-215; and Stansbury-O'Donnell 1990, 213-235. He rejects previous reconstructions and interprets Pausanias' text more literally and as a reliable source. He divides the Iliupersis into three major scenes: the Sea-Scene, the Altar-Scene, and the Land-Scene; and the Nekyia into another three major scenes: the Odysseus-Scene, the Achilles-Scene, and the Heroes-Scene. See also Frazer 1965, ad loc., and Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc.
Not far away, above Helen and other figures Helenos is seated in a purple cloak, profoundly dejected (10.25.5): ἕλενον εἶναι τεκμήριον ἐν τὸν Πριάμον καὶ πρὶν ἤ (καὶ) τὸ ἑπιγραμμα ἐπιλέξασθαι. Finally, in the Heroes-Scene of the Nekyia above Penthesileia, two women are depicted carrying water in broken pitchers, the one young, the other older, whose names were not inscribed (10.31.9): ἦσαν μὲν ἡς οὐδὲν ἑπιγραμμα ἐπὶ ἑκατέραι τῶν γυναικῶν, ἐν κοινῷ δὲ ἔστιν ἐπὶ ἀμφοτέραις εἶναι σφῆς τῶν οὐ μεμνημένων.

These two last illustrations highlight the most basic contribution an inscription makes to the understanding of a work of art in its totality. They are the captions whose presence is crucial in directing and instructing the viewer. Furthermore, they constitute primary evidence which is, at least in appearance, more "objective" than the stories of the local periegetes/exegetes. Pausanias was indeed helped immensely by them, especially at Olympia, where even the limited number of dedications that he incorporates in his work is astonishing. An uninscribed statue means little to him, it has no potential for a "story," unless it represents something immediately recognizable. The inscriptions on bases, stelai, shields, etc., provide Pausanias with the crucial and trustworthy information on which he bases many of his arguments and explanations. Not only the content, but also the outward appearance of the inscriptions is studiously recorded when it is an essential and significant contribution to the composition of the Ἐλλάδος Περιήγησις (ἄξιολογότατον ἐν τοῖς λόγοις καὶ τοῖς θεαρημασίν). Pausanias, who associates himself with the exegetes, distances himself from the periegetic principles of his predecessors. His work must have differed in many ways from earlier periegetic literature; otherwise it would not have been quoted so often and, in all likelihood, would not have survived. In that respect, Pausanias rightly deserves to be called στηλοσκόπας,
a serious student of inscriptions which offer so much to the ἀξιονός, as he defines his activity, of the sites and monuments.
CHAPTER II
PAUSANIAS' NARRATIVE METHOD IN 'ἩΛΙΑΚΩΝ A AND B

'ἩΛΙΑΚΩΝ A and B, books five and six of Pausanias' Ἑλλάδος περιηγητικός, form a unity and are dedicated, as the name indicates, to the description of Ἡλίας. This region, to whose description Pausanias devotes two books, is the only such exception in his work and thus it acquires a prominent place by occupying one-eighth, or 13% of the entire work. The primary reason for this exceptional treatment is the presence of Olympia in Elis, the site of the Panhellenic Olympic Games every four years, much celebrated in antiquity. The whole region of Elis is described by Pausanias in less than twelve chapters, but on Olympia he spends approximately forty-two. The sheer length of Pausanias' treatment and the extensive excavations at Olympia by the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, which have brought to light over one thousand inscriptions, provide the perfect test case for studying Pausanias' methodology and use of inscriptions.

A general discussion, however, of the scope and content of Pausanias' books 5 and 6 is warranted by way of introduction to the epigraphical commentary. Pausanias' work is a synthesis of different elements of which the inscriptions are only one. The major role of inscriptions throughout the Ἑλλάδος περιηγητικός has already been evaluated. The following overview will not only reveal the context within which Pausanias employed

---

43 The percentage is Habicht's (1985, 4 and note 20). See also Papachatzis 1974-81, vol. 3, 14ff.. The division of books is Pausanias' own.

44 E.g. Pindar Olympia 1.5-7.
inscriptions, but it will also communicate a sense of topography, i.e. what places in Elis Pausanias visited, where he saw inscriptions, in short his narrative method and technique for this region. Thus, the parameters within which Pausanias worked and the goals to which he aspired in his exegesis of Elis and especially of Olympia will be clearly defined.

In his introduction to the description of Elis Pausanias offers a brief sketch of the tribal division of the Peloponnese into five regions (μορφα). It includes the Dorian, the non-Dorian, and the immigrant (ηπηλύθων) peoples, of which the most recent are the Korinthians (5.1.2):

... καὶ σφισίν, ἀφ’ οὗ τὴν γῆν παρὰ βασιλέως ἔχουσιν, εἶκοσιν ἔτη καὶ διακόσια τριῶν δέοντα ἐστε ἐμὲ.

This statement à propos of the latest newcomers in the Peloponnese is the only instance where Pausanias provides a direct and certain date for his \textit{floruit} and a \textit{terminus} for the composition of his work: 217 years after the refoundation of Korinth by Caesar in 44 B.C. (A.D. 174) is the \textit{terminus post quem} for books five and six.

\textbf{45} 5.1.1: Ὑπὸ δὲ Ἑλλήνων Πελοποννήσου πέντε εἶναι μῶρας καὶ οὗ πλειονάς φασίν, ἀνάγκη σφῆς ὁμολογεῖν ὡς ἐν τῇ Ἀρκαδίᾳ οἶκοισιν Ἡλείοι καὶ Ἀρκάδες, δεύτερα δὲ Ἀχαιῶν, τρίτες δὲ ἐπὶ ταῦτας αἱ Δοριέων. γένη δὲ οὗκεν Πελοπόννησον Ἀρκάδες μὲν αὐτόχθονες καὶ Ἀχαιοὶ. καὶ οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ Δοριέων ἐκ τῆς σφετέρας ἄνεσιν, οἳ μένοι Πελοπόννησος γε ἐξεχώρουσαν, ἄλλα ἐκβαλόντες ἢνας νέμονται τῶν Αἰγιαλῶν τὸ ἄρχεσαν, νῦν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν τούτων καλούμενον.

Cf. the end of his description of the Peloponnese (8.54.7); Ἄκυς μὲν Πελοπόννησου μορφαὶ καὶ πόλεις τε ἐν ταῖς μούραις καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῃ πόλει τὰ ἀξιολογυτάτα ἐστὶν ἐς μνημη.

\textbf{46} 5.1.2: οὗ δὲ Ἀρκάδες διατελοῦσιν ἐς ἄρχης καὶ ἐς τάδε τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἔχουσες. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἐπιλύθησαν ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων. κορύφῃσι μὲν γὰρ οἱ νῦν νεώτατοι Πελοπόννησοι εἰότα, καὶ σφισίν, ἀφ’ οὗ τὴν γῆν παρὰ βασιλέως ἔχουσιν, εἰκοσιν ἔτη καὶ διακόσια τριῶν δέοντα ἐστε ἐμὲ. Ἀργοπυκνὲς δὲ καὶ Δοριέως, οἱ μὲν ἐκ Παρνασσοῦ, Δωριέως δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ὀλύμπης ἔστείναι Πελοπόννησοι εἰόταν ἀφιγιμένοι.

\textbf{47} For other indirect chronological hints and discussions on them see: Frazer 1965, vol. I, xvi-xix; and Habicht 1985, 9-12.

\textbf{48} For a general assessment of the evidence for the composition of the whole work see: Settis 1968, 1-63. The Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus, built between the Heraion and the Metroon at Olympia during
This tribal division of the Peloponnese is identical to Pausanias' geographical route. Having entered through the Isthmos, he describes first the eastern and southern parts of the Peloponnese which are inhabited by Dorians (Argolidokorinthia in book 2, Lakonia in book 3, and Messenia in book 4). Then, turning north at the southwestern part of the Peloponnese he enters the non-Doric regions of Elis, Achaia and Arkadia (books 5-6, book 7, and book 8 respectively). This simplified division furnishes Pausanias with a convenient framework for his description which comes full circle and finishes in the heart of the Peloponnese. This statement, therefore, crucial for the dating of his work, and appearing right in the middle of his description of the Peloponnese (approximately halfway through the entire work), is not accidental, but emphasizes the author's narrative method.

After this brief introduction to the new, non-Doric unit of his work, Pausanias embarks on an account of the mythistoric past of Elis (5.1.3-4.6), which is followed by its more recent history (5.4.7-5.2) and by a note on the flora and fauna (the Eleian βόσκος, flax or cotton, and the impregnation of mares 5.5.2). Then, he begins the geographical description of Elis with the various towns, villages or sites that he encounters as

A.D. 156-160, is not mentioned by Pausanias, which may be an indication that his visit to the site took place prior to that time; cf. Gurlitt 1890, 341ff.; and Habicht 1985, 9-11. See, however, especially no. 80 below.

49 This convenient geographical and tribal correspondence, evident in Pausanias' treatment of the Peloponnese, has prompted various speculations as to the partial publication of the Έλλαδος Περιήγησις: books 2, 3, and 4 may have appeared as a volume; books 5-6, 7, and 8 as another one. See Papachatzis 1974-81, vol. 2, 1-2 and the notes; vol. 3, 1-2 and the notes.

For the whole work, however, and especially for book one see: Habicht 1985, 7-12, and the notes where previous bibliography can be found. Habicht rightly points out that the arguments proposing separate publication of book 1 or other books are not at all so strong as their proponents claim them to be.

50 5.1.3: τα δὲ οὔτε παλαιότερα οὔτε αὐτόν τοιάδε εὑρίσκον.

51 5.5.2: τὰ μὲν θεία εἰς πόλεμον τοιαῦτα ὑπῆρχεν Ἡλείως, ὡς περὶ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ παρόντι ἀπαρθημέναι μετρίως.
he travels northward from Messenia (5.5.3-6.8). At the same time he relates any stories of special note that the particular place and its monuments have to offer. Crossing the river Neda, the natural boundary between Messenia and Elis (4.36.7), Pausanias arrives at Samikon and Lepreon with its temple of Demeter (5.5.3-6); he then mentions the river Anigros (5.5.7), Mt. Lapithas and the tributary of Anigros the river Akidas (5.5.8-10), and the Cave of the Anigridai Nymphs (5.5.11). Advancing further north he arrives at Samikon or Samia (5.6.1), the Homeric Arene (5.6.2-3), Skillous with the river Selinous, where Xenophon lived and built the temple of the Ephesian Artemis (5.6.4-6), and Mt. Typaion which borders the Alpheios and Olympia (5.6.7-8). The river Alpheios and its mythological profile together with its seven tributaries form the geographical preamble to the most important site of the Peloponnese (5.7.1-5).52

Before the description of Olympia and its monuments Pausanias recounts a long history of the Olympic Games based on the Eleian antiquaries (5.7.6-9.6).53 It consists of their mythical institution (5.7.6-8.5), the gradual re-establishment of the various competitions in historical times (5.8.6-9.2), the present order of the Games (5.9.3),54 and the umpires (5.9.4-6).55 He finally enters the Altis with a solemn statement, indicative of his high admiration for the Olympic Games as well as for the Eleusinian rites (5.10.1):56

52 The names of the tributary rivers which recall the surrounding mountains and regions of Achaia and Arkadia are: Helisson, Brentheates, Gortynios, Bouphagos, Ladon, Erymanthos and Kladeos (5.7.1).

53 5.7.6: ἐσ δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν Ὀλυμπικὸν λέγουσιν Ἡλεῖον οὶ τὰ ἄρχαιότατα μνημονεύσατε.

54 5.9.3: ὁ δὲ κόσμος ὁ περὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐφ' ἡμῖν.

55 5.9.4: τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγωνοθετοῦσιν.

56 On account of this statement Pausanias is characterised as “un homme de piété sincère” by Heer 1979, 224. The second half of her book is devoted to Pausanias’ religious beliefs as they can be surmised from his scattered comments. For Eleusis see pp. 127-189; for Zeus see pp. 211-221. Also Habicht 1985, 156.
The elaborate description of this holy place will occupy Pausanias for the next forty-two chapters which extend over to book six (5.10.1-6.21.3).57

First in order are the major buildings within the Altis:58 the temple of Zeus with details about its Pheidian statue, its order and measurements, its pediments and the various dedications that stood inside the temple or in its pronaos (5.10.2-12.8). Then, the temenos in honor of Pelops, the Pelopeion, is described (5.13.1-7), followed by the altar of Zeus, its construction and the procedure observed for the sacrifice (5.13.8-14.3). At this point Pausanias deems it appropriate to include an account of all the other altars (sixty-eight) inside or outside the temenos (5.14.4-15.12).59 Their enumeration and description are not based on the topography of the Altis but follow the calendar according to which the Eleians make monthly sacrifices.60 In this long section on the altars Pausanias also intersperses brief reports on several buildings: the workshop of Pheidias (5.15.1 and also no. 61), the Leonidaion (5.15.2 and also no. 62), the Theokoleon (5.15.8), the Gymnasion and the Palaistrai (5.15.8, also mentioned later 6.6.3, 21.2), and the Prytaneion with its ἐστιατόριον, inside which the Eleians give banquets for the Olympic victors (5.15.8-9, 11-12).

57 Trendelenburg’s (1914, 23 f.) discussion of Pausanias’ topographical principals at Olympia is helpful; see, however, also Gurlitt 1890, 341-429.

58 For the various buildings in the Altis and their history see: Mallwitz 1972, passim.

59 This number does not include the five altars mentioned later on: 5.22.1; 6.20.3; 20.6; 20.11-12; 20.15.

60 5.14.4: ἐπακολουθήσει δὲ ὁ λόγος μοι τὴν ἔστειλεν τφεῖν, καθ’ ἡμέρα πρώτην θέλειν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων νομίζοντες.

Also 5.14.10, and 5.15.10-11 where the procedure of the sacrifice is outlined. For a discussion of these passages in Pausanias and a plan of the actual location of the altars see Weniger’s articles of 1909, 1915, and 1920, and also nos. 58, 63, and 64 below.
The second most important building in the Altis is the temple dedicated to Hera, the Heraion, whose presentation parallels in length that of the temple and altar of Zeus (5.16.1-20.5). Just as he related the history of the Olympic Games before the description of the temple of Zeus, Pausanias discusses by way of introduction the penteëteric Heraia, whose games consist of a race among virgins, a rare reference to exclusively female competition (5.16.1-8). Within the temple Pausanias sees the statues of Hera and other gods (among them the Hermes of Praxiteles) and the images of Eurydike and Olympias, mother and wife of Philip II (5.17.1-4). The offering that astonishes Pausanias most in the Heraion is the Larnax of Kypselos, described with great care and detail (5.17.5-19.10), after which he reports more statues and dedications (5.20.1-5). From the Heraion Pausanias moves to the description of the House of Oinomaos (5.20.6-8), the Metroon (5.20.9) and the Philippeion (5.20.8-10), which conclude his account of the buildings within the Altis.

Olympia no doubt was in Pausanias' time a vast museum whose careful description created difficulties for him. The temples, together with the dedications and offerings housed in them, were the easiest part of his task. The sheer number of statues, however, that the temenos contained around A.D. 150 was overwhelming and Pausanias had to devise a methodology which would impose some sort of order on his exposition (5.21.1):

61 In addition to this race Pausanias also reports that the sixteen women (ἐκκακεῖς καὶ κακές) in charge form two choral groups, called the chorus of Physkoa and the chorus of Hippodameia (5.16.6-7), which recall Alkman's Parthenelion. The similarity between Pausanias' report about the Heraia and Alcman's Parthenelion has been discussed by G. Nagy "Dramatic Mimesis and Spartan Poetic Traditions: the Case of Alcman's Parthenelion," during the Third Annual Colloquium on the Classics, held at Ohio State University in May 26-27, 1988: The Enigmatic Text: Approaches to Greek Tragedy.

For a recent discussion of the Heraia see Scanlon 1984, 77-90 and the bibliography there.

62 In terms of its length the elaborate and detailed description of the larnax of Kypselos stands out from the whole work, as does the account of the paintings of Polygnotos in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi. See pp. 20-22.
This programmatic statement, which is further qualified later on, offers some insight as to Pausanias’ methodology in tackling the problem of the numerous dedicatory statues. First and foremost he considers his activity not as a περιγραφή but as an ἔξηγήσεις. Then he distinguishes two categories of statues which stand out as most remarkable: dedicatory images of divinities, and statues of humans (athletes, or private citizens). Following this plan he begins his explanation with the so-called Zanes (representations of Zeus), the statues erected from the fines collected from athletes caught cheating (5.21.2-18). When Pausanias is finished with this distinct group, he continues with another subgroup of Zeus’ images (5.22.1-24.11), the dedications by city-states and private citizens (5.22.1):

Ταύτα μὲν τὰ κατειλεγμένα (sc. Ζάνες) ἐπὶ αἰτίαις τοιαύτης ποιηθέντα εὕρισκον. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀγάλματα Δίως δημοσίαι τε καὶ ύπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀνατεθέντα ίδιωτῶν.

Pausanias ends with a final group of statues representing deities other than Zeus (5.25.1):

Τοσαῦτα ἐντὸς τῆς Ἀλτεως ἀγάλματα εἶναι Δίως ἀνηρμηνεύσμεθα ἐστὸ ἀκριβέστατον. . . ὁπόσα δὲ ἄλλα παντὸς καὶ οὗ μίμησις ἐστὶ Δίως, ἐπιμηνήσῳμεθα καὶ τούτων εἰκόνας δὲ οὗ τιμῆς τῇ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, τῇ δὲ ἐστὶς αὐτοὺς χάριτι ἀνατεθείσας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, λόγῳ σφάς τοῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄθλητὰς ἀναμίςομεν.

---

This group offers an appropriate place for a narrative break, and, in fact, its conclusion ends book 5.

In the beginning of book 6 Pausanias restates his methodology by laying out as clearly as possible the guidelines that he is following (6.1.1-2):

```
"Επεται δέ μοι τώι λόγωι τώι ἐς τά ἀναθήματα τό μετά τούτο ἡδη ποιήσασθαι καί ὑπην ἁγνιστῶν μνήμην καί ἀνθρών ἄθλητῶν τε καί ἰδιωτῶν ὁμοίως. τώι δὲ νικησάντων Όλυμπίασιν οὐχ ἀπάντων εἰσίν ἑστηκότες ἀνδριάντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποδειχτέαμενοι λαμπρά ἐς τον ἁγώνα, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλοις, ὅμως οὐ τετυχήκασιν εἰκόνων. τούτοις ἐκέλευσεν ἀφεῖναι μὲν ὁ λόγος, ὅτι οὐ κατάλογος ἐστὶν ἄθλητῶν ὁπόσοις γεγονασί Όλυμπικά νίκαι, ἀναθήματων δὲ ἄλλων τε καὶ εἰκόνων συγγραφή. οὐδὲ ὁπόσων ἑστήκασιν ἀνδριάντες, οὐδὲ τούτοις πᾶσιν ἐπέεξει, ἐπιστάμενος δόσοι τώι παραλόγωι τοῦ κλήρου καὶ οὐχ ὑπὸ ἴσχυος ἀνέβηντο ἡδη τῶν κότινοι, ὁπόσοις δὲ ὁ ἄντωος (ἐλέγχει) ἐς δόκαν ἦ τοῖς ἀνθρώπηι προαχεύει ἀἀενον ἔτερων πεποιηθέαμα, ὅσατα καὶ ἀντος μηθήσωμαι.
```

This is a significant statement which has often been overlooked by scholars grappling for an answer to the question of why Pausanias incorporated so many victory statues. He makes clear that his main purpose is neither an Olympic victory list, nor a complete catalogue of all the statues that he saw set up within the Altis. His exposition is selective and includes only those athletic or non-athletic statues that are noteworthy because of the fame either of the dedicator, or of the dedication’s artistic quality (6.1.3; 16.9). Once his

---

64 Papachatzis comments that Pausanias appears to be saddened because he cannot include a full Olympic victory list (1974-81, vol. 3, 327, note 1; cf. vol. 3, 16, note 3). He goes one step further to suggest that the reason for Pausanias’ extensive study and description of the victors is because they provided him with the best chronological framework for Greek history (1974-81, vol. 3, 21f.), and also because his description of Elis would thus acquire special value (1974-1981, vol. 3, 16-17, note 4).

However, as Papachatzis himself admits elsewhere (1974-81, vol. 3, 23-24, note 3), Pausanias never uses the Olympiads and the name of the stadionikes alone for accurate chronological reference, but he also provides the Athenian archon. In addition to the dates Pausanias provides for the Messenian Wars to which Papachatzis refers (4.5.10; 4.13.6; 4.15.1-3; 4.23.4; 4.23.10; 4.24.5; 4.27.9), there are other instances as well: 2.24.7; 6.19.13; 7.16.10; 7.25.4; 8.27.8; 8.39.3; 8.54.4; 9.1.8; 10.2.3; 10.3.1; 10.5.13;10.23.14. See also Habicht 1985, 20-23 and Hermann 1988, 119-183.
description of the statues within the Altis is completed, he proceeds with those outside it (6.17.1):

\[
\text{ταύτα μὲν δὴ τὰ ἀξιολογώτατα ἀνθρη ποιουμένωι τὴν ἔφοδον ἐν τῇ Ἀλτίς κατὰ τὰ ἧμιν εἰρημένα· εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Λεωνίδαιου πρὸς τὸν βωμὸν τὸν μέγαν ἀφικέσθαι τῇ δεξιᾷ θελήσειας, τοσάδε ἔστι σοι τῶν ἀνηκόντων ἐς μνήμην.}
\]

This final group ends his exegesis of dedicatory statues inside and outside the Altis (6.17.1-18.7).

Approaching the end of his narration on Olympia Pausanias concludes with the monuments that form a special category and with the constructions which are outside the temenos. The treasuries are not considered by Pausanias to be mere buildings, but dedications of a special kind and form. This is the reason why he does not mention them earlier and appends them here after the dedicatory statues (6.19.1-15). With the treasuries Pausanias has completed the exegesis of the Altis and he moves outside in order to account for other memorable monuments: the hill Kronion behind the treasuries with its altars and ruins, the Hippodameion, the Stadion, the Hippodromos and various scattered altars and sanctuaries (6.20.1-21.3).

Leaving Olympia Pausanias moves westward into Pisatan territory, towards the boundaries of Elis and Arkadia. He visits the river Erymanthos, the ridge of Sauros with ruins of sanctuaries, the river Diagon and Leukyanias with the temple of Dionysos Leukyanites, the ruins of the city of Phrixa with its sanctuaries, the ruins of the city Harpina with its altars and the river Harpinates, the tomb of the suitors of Hippodameia, the ruins of the temple of Artemis Kordaka and the tomb of Pelops, and the ruins of the cities of Pisa (6.21.4-22.5).

Then returning to Olympia Pausanias advances north and east to the Eleian Pylos, now ruined (6.22.6), Herakleia and river Kytheros (6.22.7), Letrinoi (6.22.8-11), and Elis, the last major city in Elis (6.23.1-26.3), providing information about their
memorable monuments. From Elis he ventures further north to Kyllene (6.26.4-5). After a short report again on Eleian flax, an apparent attempt at a thematic ring composition,\textsuperscript{65} he reaches the boundaries of Elis and Achaia, i.e. the river Larisos and Mt. Araxos (6.26.10), which bring him to the next region of the Peloponnese to be described in book 7, Achaia.

This overview of Pausanias' geographical route and methodology defines clearly not only the natural boundaries within which the narrative develops, but it also highlights the author's interests as he moves from place to place. Within the broad framework of geography and topography, the mythical and historical past occupies a significant place. Brief notes on flora and fauna are not excluded by Pausanias from his narrative. Yet Pausanias is captivated by the living present that each city has to offer and especially its relics of the mythistorical past, as they retell their story and connect past and present. Seldom does Pausanias abandon a place, be it a city, mountain ridge or a river, without mentioning a temple, dedication, or statue. Religion and tradition are given a prominent standing, especially when the site warrants such treatment as is the case with Olympia. For all these combined represent the local history, customs and tradition.

The narrative of Elis is composed of all these elements and it requires \textit{in situ} observation. Admittedly, the temples with their cult images and offerings do not create as many difficulties for identification as do individual monuments. Inconsistencies, however, were bound to arise about an explanation, and Pausanias, in addition to using the local exegetes and his extensive readings in literature, resorted also to inscriptions to create a consistent narrative from all these sources. His avowed interest in inscriptions and the reasons for it throughout his work have already been assessed in Chapter I.

\textsuperscript{65} The Eleian flax "presents an opportunity" to talk about the land of Seres 6.26.6-9, in a way similar to his note on the flora in 5.5.2 and his comment on the Hebrews.
his Eliaka it is overwhelming. Within the Altis he saw over two hundred dedicatory statues and constantly employed their inscriptions, because they provided him with readily accessible and indisputable information for his exegesis.

66 See Appendix A and Chapter I.
CHAPTER III

DIRECT EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE IN 'HAIKWN A AND B

The excavations at Olympia have unearthed a great number of inscriptions that Pausanias has apparently employed for the composition of his books 5 and 6. These present an ideal test case for Pausanias’ approach to epigraphical evidence. There are eleven instances in which Pausanias claims to have read inscriptions which have been found at Olympia, and so his version of them can be compared with the actual texts.

A comparison between the text of Pausanias and that of the inscription is presented in this and the next chapter in the following manner: first the text of Pausanias is quoted from the new Teubner edition by M. H. Rocha-Pereira, but with modifications, since she has paid attention only to those inscriptions which Pausanias explicitly states that he is reading and quoting. Indeed, her readings are based almost exclusively on the manuscripts. Then follows an Apparatus Criticus in which variant readings in Pausanias’ manuscripts are discussed and adopted in light of the text of the inscriptions (see also Appendix E: Critical Notes on Pausanias’ 'HAIKWN A and B). For this the more detailed Apparatus Criticus of Hitzig and Blümner is consulted, because they were conscious of


Papachatzis’ text is also consulted, although it is basically that of F. Spiro, the previous editor in Teubner, because Papachatzis sometimes adopts different readings: N.D. Papachatzis. Παυσανίου Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις, vols. 1-5. Athens: Ekdotike Athenon, 1974-81 (abbreviated Papachatzis 1974-81).
the peculiar nature of Pausanias' text and consistently employed the text of the inscriptions for its improvement. The textual signs, however, and the sigla codicum are those of Rocha-Pereira. After Pausanias' text the edition of the inscription with an epigraphical commentary, where necessary, follows. The inscriptions found at Olympia have been published by W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold in 1896, while subsequent discoveries have appeared in the Bericht volumes of the excavators. The more significant of them have enjoyed further study, but there are some which have attracted little or no attention. I have tried to see and re-examine as many inscriptions as possible, a process which proved to be very rewarding. Two more items conclude the presentation of each case: a select bibliographical note, where the first place, literally and figuratively, is occupied by the three prominent commentators of Pausanias, whose work is indispensable: Frazer, Hitzig and the recent one by Papachatzis. Finally a commentary in which Pausanias' text and the inscription, their relation, and the problems they raise are discussed in detail apropos of Pausanias and his use of inscriptions.

The text of Pausanias has always been treated as a reliable source for restorations in partially preserved inscriptions, especially the ones from Olympia, but seldom vice-versa. Notwithstanding the high quality of previous textual criticism on Pausanias' work, inscriptions, which Pausanias used and are still extant, have not always been used to improve his text, in spite of its problematic transmission. The new Teubner edition by

---


70 See the List of References under Bericht.


72 For a re-evaluation of the codices see especially: Diller 1955, 268-279; id. 1956, 84-97; id. 1957, 169-188. For the history of Pausanias' manuscript tradition see also Papachatzis 1974-81, vol. 1, 32-59.
Rocha-Pereira is a case in point, as will be evident in this and the next chapter. Pausanias' claim or implication that he is reading an inscription presents a unique opportunity to look at the exegete's text in light of the very same inscriptions which he employed in his work and which have been found. The present study's direct and detailed confrontation of two differently oriented texts, one literary, the other a caption on a monument, will make their interdependency evident. More importantly, it will assess Pausanias' treatment of the epigraphical evidence in his *Eliaka*, and therefore his methodology and the reliability of his work.

1.

5.10.4: ἕν δὲ ὁλυμπίας λέβης ἐπίχρυσος ἔπι ἑκάστῳ τοῦ ὀρόφου τοῦ πέρατος ἐπίκειται καὶ Νίκη κατὰ μέσον μάλιστα ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀποθημένου ἐπίχρυσου καὶ αὐτή. ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς Νίκης τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀσπίς ἀνάκειται χρυσῆ, Μέδουσαν τὴν Γοργόναν ἔχουσα ἐπειραγμένην. τὸ ἐπιγράμμα τοῦ ἔπειρα τῇ ἀπαθείᾳ τούτῳ ἀναθέντα δειλοὶ καὶ καθ' ἡμείνα αἰτίαν ἀνέθεσαν: λέγει γὰρ δὴ οὕτως:

ναὸς μὲν διάλαν χρυσάν ἔχει, ἐκ δὲ Τανάγρας τοῖς Λακεδαίμονιοι συμμαχία τ' ἀνέθεν
dòρον ἀπ' Ἀργείων καὶ 'Αθηναίων καὶ Ἰώνων
tάν δεκάταν νῖκας οὖν εὑνεκα τῷ πολέμῳ.

ταύτης τῆς μάχης μνήμην καὶ ἔν τῇ Ἀθήνῃ ἐποιησάμην συγγραφή, τα Ἀθηνησιον ἐπεξίων μνήματα.

Apparatus Criticus:

The readings of the manuscripts for the epigram are problematic and many emendations had been proposed, especially for line 8, before IO 253 was discovered. Although these emendations are now irrelevant, they are included here, because they are indicative of how closely Pausanias' text follows the inscription.

7. χρυσάν is omitted in Va 8 τοῖς Λακεδαίμονιοις Pa Pd Ag L Lb V R Va; Jacobs' emendation to τοῖς Λακεδαίμονιοις was accepted by Siebelis, Bekker, Schubart-Walz, and Dindorf; τῆς Λακεδαίμονιοις Ms Vb and the editors before Siebelis; Kayser proposed before τοῖς to read δεῖκν; τοῖς was suggested by Müller and it was accepted by Schubart, Hitzig, Papachatzis and Rocha-Pereira; Λακεδαίμονιοι was Buttmann's emendation, accepted by Müller, Kayser, Schubart, Hitzig, Papachatzis and Rocha-Pereira;

συμμαχίας γε τέθεν Va Vb (but omits γε) Pa, and the editors before Schubart, except Clavier who read συμμαχίας τέθεν; συμμαχίας Pd Ag R V L Lb; συμμαχίας γε R in the margin; τ' ἐν θεν L Lb; τανθεν V P; τ' αν θεν Pd Ag; R has above the line τε between αν and θεν; Pa has ταν τεθεν, but ταν is erased;
IO 253: three joined fragments of white-yellowish marble found: fr. a, which is the tallest, on February 8, 1881, at the south end of the South building, west of the Bouleuterion; fr. b on March 14, 1876, below the east façade of the temple of Zeus, in the second intercolumnium; and fr. c on March 31, 1880, inside the temple of Zeus. The stone, as joined, is broken except the top and the lower part of its back, where the smooth original surface is preserved. The fragment is now on display in the New Museum, in the Gallery of Sculptures from the Temple of Zeus.


Maximum: Height: 0.265m. Width: 0.24m. Thickness: 0.166m.

Letter Height: 0.015-0.024m.

The letters are clearly cut and lean to the right. Their shapes are (Jeffery, LSAG 114, fig. 33): α2, γ3, δ1, ε4, ν2 and ν3, ρ1, υ3, χ1 (blue). The omicron is cut with the so-called tridental drill which, it is presumed, the cutters employed for circular letters, although there is no hard evidence for it (see Raubitschek 1951, 343-344 plates 35-37; Duncan 1961, 179-188 plates 30-31; and for engraving techniques in Attic Epigraphy Higgins-Pritchett 1965, 367-371 plates 97-100).

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: gamma—the slanting strokes are clearly visible; if a kappa were inscribed, part of its vertical should be visible in the lower part of the letter space.
Line 2: tau—only an upper horizontal stroke.
Line 4: epsilon—only the right tips of the three horizontal strokes.
Line 5: kappa—only the right part of the slanting strokes; rho—only parts of two strokes, the upper segment of a vertical and a horizontal; iota—the top of a vertical stroke.

Restorations:
Line 1: \( \vafos \) IO editors, Preger, Roehl, Jeffery, although the letter space seems not to support the digamma; \( \vafos \) Guarducci, Meiggs/Lewis, Clairmont, Hansen; \( \vafos \) Gallavotti.
Line 2: \( \sigma\mu\mu\alpha\chi\zeta\alpha \) IO editors, Roehl, Meiggs/Lewis, Clairmont, Guarducci; \( \sigma\nu\mu\alpha\chi\zeta\alpha \) Preger, Jeffery, Lazzarini, Hansen.


Commentary: Pausanias’ text, upon which the restorations of the inscription are based, clearly refers to the battle fought at Tanagra in 458/7 B.C., sometime after which the golden shield was dedicated at Olympia. This and the meaning of the word \( \phi\nu\alpha\eta \) (= \( \delta\sigma\pi\ze \) as Pausanias understands it\(^{73}\)) are the only two points of agreement among scholars.

\(^{73}\) See also Aristotle Rhetorica 1407a, 1412b-1413a; Politica 1457b; and Athenaeus 10.433c.
The dominant structure in the Altis is the temple of Zeus which Pausanias describes in detail, first its exterior, and then its interior. On the middle top of the east pediment, he says, there is an inscribed golden shield which supports a Nike statue. Before quoting the epigram Pausanias notes that it mentions the dedicators and the reason for the dedication. Pausanias' description of the location indeed agrees with the find spot of two of the IO 253 fragments (b and c); they were found below the east façade of and inside the temple of Zeus. Moreover, the substance of his epigram vis-à-vis that of the actual inscription has never been questioned. On the contrary, his text has always been the only source for the restoration of the fragmentary inscription, and, in turn, the inscription has lent support for some emendations and improvements of the exegete's text (see the Apparatus Criticus).

The legitimate disagreements stem from the obvious differences between the two texts. Pausanias says “the epigram was on the shield”, while the inscription found is on marble. In line 4 of the epigram Pausanias' text has the Doric τὸ πολέμω, whereas on the stone the Ionic genitive τοῦπολεµον is inscribed. The shape of the two chi's in lines 1 and 2 is not Doric (see Jeffery's Lakonian alphabet, LSAG 183 fig. 39). Finally, on the stone there are traces of two more lines (5 and 6), which are missing from Pausanias' narrative. The combination of these three details suggests at first sight two versions of the same inscription: a Doric and a non-Doric, probably Korinthian version.

The reconciliation of these three differences in details has resulted in various hypotheses. The IO editors, proposed that the text was not inscribed on the shield itself, but on a base onto which the shield was mounted. Thus Pausanias' expression τὸ ἐπὶ γραμμα τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπολύται should refer to the dedication as a whole (the shield and its base) and should be translated “the epigram concerning, or about, the shield”.

---

74 See their reconstruction and also Papachatzis 1974-81, vol. 3, 244, plate 226.
In lines 5 and 6 they suggested that the name of the sculptor, or sculptors (Korinthians because of the traces on the stone) must have been inscribed, since Korinth was famous in the fifth century B.C. for her workshops, but they did not try to explain the absence of these lines from Pausanias' text.

Heiberg hypothesized two dedications: one general by the Peloponnesian League within the temple of Zeus, and one Corinthian on the temple's roof. Wolters objected to the reconstruction of the \textit{IO} editors, because of the measurements they offered and the difficulty of reading the epigram from a distance of 20-22 m. He, in turn, assumed that the marble block must have stood somewhere in front of the temple, like a \textit{stele}.

Guarducci, accepting Wolters' arguments and objections, suggested that there were two epigrams: one inscribed on the inner part of the shield on the roof, as they interpret Pausanias (but Pausanias also says that in the middle of the shield there is the Gorgon Medousa, in which case Guarducci's suggestion weakens); and the other, inscribed on marble and probably of Korinthian craftsmanship, which stood in front of the temple, thus agreeing with the find spot of \textit{IO} 253. Her hypothesis gained cautious acceptance with minor modifications both from Jeffery, who further suggested that the alphabet is probably Korinthian, and Meiggs/Lewis.\textsuperscript{76}

Gallavotti (1978a 5-6 and 1978b, 28), by applying the methodology of textual criticism, compares line by line the inscription and the readings that the codices of Pausanias provide, and he concludes that it is not necessary to suppose two epigraphical

\textsuperscript{75} See \textit{IO} (p. 372) for other examples in Pausanias (6.1.4, 7; 10.7; 12.7). Both Papachatzis and Gallavotti accept this generic understanding of the expression \textit{γραφεῖν ὀνόματι} + dative not only because of other parallels found in Pausanias, but also because in the middle of the shield the Gorgon Medusa was engraved, thus limiting the space for the epigram to the outer rim. Papachatzis (1974-81, vol. 3, 251) translates "

\textit{τὸ σχέτικῳ μὲ τὴν ἀσπίδα ἔγραμμα...}"

Gallavotti (1978a, 5) "l'iscrizione 'relativa allo scudo'."

\textsuperscript{76} Jeffery (1980b, 1233-9) believes that the same epigram was inscribed both on the shield and the stone stele; Meiggs/Lewis (36 [27]) accept the two different texts, only stipulating that the epigram was engraved on the outer part of the shield.
texts for the following reasons: in line 1 the assimilated ηγε on the stone may have been changed by a scribe to χε in the manuscripts of Pausanias as a “grafia scolastica” (5). In line 4 instead of the Doric genitive, Gallavotti (6) favors the reading τδι(ι) πολέμω(ι), since the reading τδ πολέμω may be explained as an “errore della tradizione manoscritta”; he translates the dative as locative “per vittoria nella guerra”, or causal “conseguita mediante la guerra”. Moreover, Gallavotti rightly argues that Pausanias’ omega does not reflect, strictly speaking, the epigraphical practice of the fifth century B.C., because the diphthong ου and the dative ending at that time would be inscribed as ω, which is frequent in, but not exclusive to, the Korinthian alphabet. It may have been Pausanias’, or a scribe’s correction of the inscription’s τς πολέμου, so as to make the epigram’s dialect consistent. Finally, Gallavotti argues that the omission of lines 5 and 6 of the epigram by Pausanias may be a case of haplography, if his restoration of line 6: ζήν Σεκυλων καμ[κάσες ἐν πολέμωι] is correct (lines 4 and 6 would thus end with τδ(ι) πολέμω(ι); see Apparatus Criticus and Restorations). Furthermore, Gallavotti (1978a, 9-11) suggests that both the Nike statue and the shield formed one dedication and that this fact was reflected in the epigram. Although interesting, this is not supported by Pausanias’ text which is the basis for the restorations in IO 253, or the new architectural evidence published by Grunauer. There is no indication that the syntax and meaning of the epigram, as it is transmitted by Pausanias, require Nike as the subject of ἔχει, and thus ναφῖν instead of ναὸς in line 1, so as to make the relation between the


78 Gallavotti observes (1978a, p. 5) that in the epichoric alphabets of the Peloponnesian the shape ο represents both the Doris minor and the Doris severior of the ου sound, and only much later was the Ionic omega adapted. Later he concludes (p. 11), pace Jeffery (LSAG 129-130): “la scrittura della dedica non è propriamente corinzia, come non è laconica. Non presenta l’alfabeto ufficiale di Corinto, o di altra città della lega peloponnesia, negli anni che seguirono la battaglia di Tanagra.”
akroterion and the shield evident. Moreover, there is no evidence that the two offerings were dedicated at the same time, and the fact that the shield served as support for a Nike statue need not imply that the two were originally, or intentionally associated.

Grunauer and more recently Clairmont have re-examined all previous scholarship, taking into consideration new architectural evidence which indicates that the east façade of the temple of Zeus was totally rebuilt during the fourth century B.C. Thus, the shield with its inscribed base came down during that reconstruction and, according to Grunauer, who accepts the IO editors’ hypothesis, the fifth century base was replaced by a new block, re-inscribed with the old inscription.

Clairmont believes that in the fourth century B.C. they decided to engrave the epigram on the shield with the Doric genitive, which was given preference in the fourth century, and which, therefore, Pausanias saw ἀκροτέριον τῇ γενετίκῃ ἄξονος. The distance, however, of 20-22m. from the ground up to the roof, where the dedication stood, and the small size of the letters on the shield create the problem of the readability of the text. For him “by far the most obvious conclusion is that a literary source is the origin for Pausanias’ quotation of the epigram.”

No doubt the recent conclusions of Grunauer concerning the total reconstruction of the east façade of the temple of Zeus shed new light on this highly problematic dedication. The “two-dedications theory” appears to be less probable now, although not inconceivable. The interesting problems which this dedication creates are not limited to architecture alone (Clairmont), nor to textual criticism and grammar (Gallavotti).

Gallavotti’s interpretation of Pausanias’ text goes indeed too far, but his arguments on the lettering, his explanation for the omission of lines 5 and 6, and his correction for

79 Gallavotti’s statement (1978a, 9) which begins “In realtà, se consideriamo la figurazione dorata dell’acroterio per sé stessa, con la Nike e lo scudo in un complesso architettonico unitario, come lo descrive Pausania...” is simply not supported by Pausanias’ text. See also the criticism of Clairmont 1982, 84, notes 18 and 19.
line 4 are attractive and palaeographically sound. Pausanias’ text and that of the inscription are different only in orthographic and dialect details. The existence of lines 5 and 6 (or even of more lines) remains an open question. The IO editors’ suggestion that the Korinthian artist’s name was inscribed in what followed is less likely than that Sparta’s allies were mentioned in these lines (HCT, Gallavotti), or even something different. Pausanias is unlikely to have missed the inscribed name of the artist, and thus not included it either in his statement before the quote or in the quotation itself. For, as will become evident, Pausanias is very much interested in the artists of the monuments and he consistently mentions their names, and sometimes even their teachers and stylistic schools.

As for Sparta’s allies in the battle at Tanagra the historical sources are not helpful. Pausanias himself refers to his Attika and his description of the battle in his account of the memorial he saw in the Kerameiksos of the Argives who fell at Tanagra (1.29.8-9; he also saw a memorial of the Kleonaians who came with the Argives 1.29.7). This monument presents the opportunity to explain why Argos fought on the side of Athens, and in his brief description of the battle he mentions only the Athenians, Argives and Kleonaians on the one side and the Lacedaemonians and Boeotians on the other, with the Thessalians betraying Athens and fighting with Sparta. In Thucydides the two camps are: the Athenians, the Argives, the cavalry of Thessalians who betrayed them, and the other allies (καὶ τῶν ἀλλων ξυμμάχων ὡς ἐκαστος 1.107.5-7; cf. ἦν αὐτῷ on the stone); and the Lacedaemonians and their allies (λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ξυμμάχοι 1.108.1). The latter expression according to Gomme (HCT vol. 1, 313-314) is the regular title of the Peloponnesian League in Thucydides, which leads him to conclude that “the names of Sparta’s allies were listed below the epigram” (HCT vol. 1, 315-316). On the same assumption Guarducci has suggested that IO 253 was a Korinthian dedication, whereas
Pausanias' epigram of four lines only was set up by the Peloponnesian League. Either way, the traces on the stone indicate that Korinth or Korinthians had something to do with this dedication, either as participants at Tanagra for propagandistic reasons (even if they did not participate), or as artists (or artist) of the monument.

Grunauer is right in reverting to the IO editors' theory that the shield stood on a base, on which the inscription was engraved. There is no reason to suppose with Clairmont that the shield was inscribed in the 4th century for the first time, in order to prove Pausanias' text accurate by translating literally the expression ἐπὶ τῆς ἄσπις, especially when Clairmont himself believes that Pausanias did not read the inscription, but copied it from a literary source. The distance of 20-22 m. from the ground up to the roof where the dedication stood was indeed great and the reading of the inscription would be very difficult, but perhaps not impossible. After all, the nature of Pausanias' subject, the exegesis of the Altis, requires him to read the inscription himself or to enlist the help of the local guides who would have had a copy, in order to provide a more detailed account.

Moreover, the IO editors give parallels for Pausanias' use of the expression ἐπιγραμμα ἐπὶ τῆς ἄσπις on p. 372; these are not very helpful, because the inscriptions to which the passages refer are not extant. There are, however, four

---

80 Guarducci 1936, 131-132; also EG 1967, vol. 1, 472. Clairmont (1982, 82, note 16), however, argues that the absence of the Korinthians from Thucydides (1.105-108) and Diodorus (11.79-83) is significant and an indication that in all probability they did not participate in the battle.

81 Clairmont (1982, 84) admits that such an action would be a "novum."

82 Wolters (1928, 128-129), after he moves the inscription to the ground, observes (129): Pausanias konnte das Epigram also, wie jeder Besucher der Altis, in aller Bequemlichkeit lesen, und keine Zelle war —wie mitunter irrig vermutet wird— infolge der Aufstellung für ihn unsichtbar, auch die beiden letzten Zeilen nicht, die aber abzuschreiben ihn nicht reizte, ihn oder meinetwegen irgendeinem andern ὑποκόπτει. Diese Zeilen enthielten also sicher keine so interessante Nachricht, wie J.L. Heiberg (p. 459) glaubte erschließen zu dürfen.

This line of argument, however, can also support the thesis that the block with the inscription was on the roof.
passages in books 5 and 6 in which Pausanias employs this expression that can be elucidated by inscriptions. Three of them are inscriptions on stone bases, while no. 7 below is engraved on a bronze tablet which was attached to the base of the statue base. It is clear from these four examples that the preposition ἐν + the dative indicates place. And this is the natural translation when it is combined with inanimate nouns or pronouns. When, however, ἐν is followed by animate nouns or pronouns, this translation is awkward. At any rate, the expression indicates in general terms the place “on, or about, which” something is inscribed.

The differences in details between the two texts is not strong evidence to suggest that Pausanias did not read the inscription at Olympia. Pausanias mentions the inscribed shield not because of its ornamental or artistic value; he is primarily interested in the “story” that the shield tells, namely who dedicated it to Zeus and for what reason. The discovery of IO 253, therefore, strongly suggests that Pausanias took his text and account from the inscription.

83 First: 5.24.3 = IO 252 = below no. 2; second: 26.5 = IO 267, 268 = below no. 4; third: 27.8 = IO 271 = below no. 5; fourth: 6.4.11 = SEG 1223a = below no. 7. These four cases are not mentioned by the IO editors (above, note 75).

84 See below no. 2: ἔτεσιν δὲ καὶ ἐξεργασίαν ἔπει αὐτῷ (sc. Ζηνί στάσιμα); no. 4: τὰ δὲ ἔπει τοῖς ἀναθηματιν ἐπιγράφοντα . . . διέσωσιν; no. 5: ἄγαλμα, κηρυκείαν Ἐρμής ἔκων: ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ἔπει αὐτῷ; and no. 7: Ἑρωτέλησε δὲ οἱ Φιλάνορος . . . καθάπερ γε τὸ ἐπὶ γραμμα τὸ ἔπει αὐτῷ φησιν.

85 Other examples in Pausanias’ books 5 and 6 where the expression ἐπίγραμμα ἔπει τῆς δόσις καὶ ἐπὶ ἐπὶ is used, but the inscriptions have not been found, are: 5.25.10; 27.11; 6.19.4, 13.

86 Except for the five instances (the present one, and those discussed above, notes 83 and 84), there are altogether thirty-one instances of the expression ἐπίγραμμα ἔπει + the dative in books 5 and 6.

Book 5: 15.5; 20.1; 21.4; 21.6-7; 21.8; 24.1-2; 24.2; 24.7-8; 25.9; 25.10 (two); 27.2; 27.7; 27.11.

Book 6: 1.4; 1.7 (two); 2.9; 3.2-3; 3.7; 7.9; 10.7; 12.7; 13.5; 13.7; 13.10-11; 14.9-10; 15.2; 15.8; 16.4; 19.4; 20.14.

Pausanias also uses six times the expression ἐπίγραμμα ἔπει + the genitive in books 5 and 6, which seems to indicate more clearly place. Book 5: 10.3; 10.5; 15.11-12; 24.11; 27.12; book 6: 20.14.
2.

5.22.2-4: Παρά δὲ τὸ ἰπποδάμειον καλούμενον λίθου τε βάθρου ἐστὶν κύκλος ἤμισος καὶ ἀγάλματα ἐπὶ αὐτῷ Ζεὺς καὶ θεῖος τε καὶ ἱμέρα τὸν Δία ὑπὲρ τῶν τέκνων ἱκετεύοντα. ταῦτα ἐπὶ μέσῳ τῷ βάθρῳ: οἱ δὲ ἤθη σχῆμα ἀντισταθμίσεως ὃ τε Ἀχιλλεύς παρέχεται καὶ οἱ Μέμινοι ἐπὶ ἐκατέρω τοῦ βάθρου τῷ πέρατι ἐκάτερος. ἀνθετήκας δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ἀλλιώς κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ, ἀνὴρ βάρβαρος ἀνδρὶ Ἑλληνὶ, ὁ δυσσεῦς μὲν Ἐλένω, ὅτι οὕτωι μᾶλλον ἐπὶ σοφίας δόξαν ἐν ἐκατέρω τῷ στρατεύματι εἰλήφσαν, Μενελάω δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἔχθος τὸ εξ ἀρχῆς Ἀλέξανδρος, Διομήδης δὲ Ἀλνείας καὶ τῶι Τελαμώνωι Ἀλάντι Δηνόβος. (3) ταῦτα ἔστω ἔργα μὲν λυκίου τοῦ Μύρωνος, Ἀπολλωνιάται δὲ ἀνέθηκαν ὁι ἐν τοῖς Ἰονίωι καὶ δὴ καὶ ἔλεγον γράμμασιν ἔστω ἄρχαίοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Δίως τοῖς ποσί.

μνάματι Ἀπολλωνίας ἀνακειμέθα, τὰς ἐνὶ πόντῳ Ἰονίῳ φοίβος ὥκια ἀκερακόμας.

οἱ γὰς τέρμαθ᾽ ἐλόντες Ἀβαντίδος ἐνθάδε ταῦτα ἔστασαν σὺν θεοῖς ἐκ θρόνου ἁκάται.

Ἡ δὲ Ἀβαντίς καλούμενη χώρα καὶ πόλισα ἐν αὐτῇ θρόνοιν τῆς θεσπρωτίδος ἢσαν ἠπείρον κατὰ ὅρη τὰ Κεραύνεια. (4) σκεδαιμονεῖτε γὰρ Ἐλληνικόν, ὃς ἐκομίζοντο ἐξ Ἰλίου, τῶν νεωτών δικοί τε ἐκ θρόνον τῆς ἐπὶ Βοιαγίῳ ποταμῷ καὶ Ἀβαντες ἀπὸ Ἐὔβοιας ναυσὶν ὀκτὼ συναφύταιροι πρὸς τὰ ὅρη κατηγορήσαν τὰ Κεραύνεια. οἰκήσαντες δὲ ἐνταῦθα καὶ πόλιν οἰκίσαντες θρόνοιν, καὶ τῆς γῆς ἐφ᾽ ὅσον ἐνέμοντο Ἀβαντίδος ὄνομα ἀπὸ κοινοῦ λόγου θέμενοι, ἐκπέπτουσιν ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀπολλωνιατῶν ὁμόρρων κρατήσειν πολέμῳ. ἀποκισθῆναι δὲ ἐκ Κορυφᾶς τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν, *** οἱ δὲ Κορυθώιοι αὐτοὶ μετενίαν λαφύρων.

Apparatus Criticus:

12 ἄρχαίον is the reading of all mss. and the editors before Siebelis, in which case it would modify ἐλέγετον. It is emended to ἄρχαίος in light of Valekenaer's emendation in Herodotos 5.59, and everyone has subsequently accepted it. Hitzig refers to similar expressions in Pausanias 5.17.6 and 6.19.6 14 ἀπολλονίας is the reading in Pa; τὸν ἐνὶ Βα.; τὰν Hitzig, Papachatzis and the editors of the inscription, but Rocha-Pereira reads for some reason τὰς 15 ιονίῳ Βα Ββ P; Ἰονίῳ φοίβος ἢκια is the reading in Pa Πd Ag Ms L Λb and all editions except Siebelis' who accepts the emendation of Passov and Friedemann and reads ἢκιαν Ιονίῳ φοίβος; Preger reads Φοίβος; ιονίῳ φοίβος δὲ is άκερος ἀκερακόμας Βα; ἀκερακόμας Ββ 16 οἱ γὰς τέρμαθ᾽ καὶ οὐτοῖν διόνυσαι Πδ Αγ (cf. 5.21.1); οἱ Π., Siebelis, and Jacobs; Preger emends it to τοῖς; οἱ οἱ all other editors; τέρμα θέλοντες Λb Πδ Ms Βα Ββ Ρ; τέρματα ἐλ.; Πδ Πδ Πδ λέοντες Λb; τέρμαθ᾽ θέλωντες Λb; ἔνθας Ββ 17 ἐστάσαι Πδ Λb; ἐστάσαι Μs Βα Ββ; R has ἁ above the η; ἐστάσαιν Αγ.Λ.Βα; σὺν τοῖς all mss. and the editors before Schubart-Waltz; σὺν θεός is the conjecture of Welcker and Müller and is accepted by the other editors after them; Buttmann read ἐστάσαιν ἄθανάτοις, while
Clavier proposed έστασέν τε ἀπὸ τῶν; ἐκ θρόνι τοῦκ. Facius; Clavier and Papachatzis prefer a more expanded emendation έστασέν τε ἀπὸ τῶν; ἐκ θρόνι τοῦκ.; Siebelis preferred a shorter restoration conveying the same meaning as Clavier’s and Papachatzis’ 'Απολλωνίαν, διὸ Κορίνθους; Spiro proposed <τὴν δὲ Κορίνθους εἶναι ταύταν ἄποκρίνθαν> and Rocha-Pereira, on account of Strabo 7.316, prefers <ἐτι καὶ ἐκ Κορίνθου φαίνει.> 

Kunze 1956c, 149-153, pl. 80 (V. Bericht 1956): two joined fragments of Parian marble, broken on the sides except the top. They form part of a monumental, semicircular base of which six other uninscribed fragments survive. The two inscribed fragments were found in July 1941, built-into a post-classical wall, south of the Kladeos Baths and in November 1953, in the same building complex. The fragments are now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum. Vidi, Phot.

Fragments as joined: Height: 0.10m. Width: 0.57m. Thickness: 0.282m.

The Diameter of the base was originally: ca. 5.50m.

Letter Height: ca. 0.024m.

c. aut paulo post 440 B.C. STOICH.

The letters are deeply and clearly cut, but the script presents unresolved problems, primarily because Apollonia’s script is not attested. Kunze (152) argued for a “post-Korinthian” script of Apollonia, Hammond (1967, 433) suggested that the letter-cutter was an Eleian from Elis’ colonies in Epirus, who used the Eleian script as a basis combined with individual characteristics, and Jeffery (LSAG 229) classed it hesitantly as “Eleian(?), ca. 475-450,” which she later (1980a, 54) described, on account of the sculptor Lykios’ date, as an Eleian or Apolloniate script of the 440s (or even later).

The shapes of the letters are neither Korinthian nor Kerkyraean, as might be expected since these cities participated in the colonization of Apollonia; nor are they Attic or Ionian, the scripts that Lykios son of Myron, an Athenian, would employ.

According to Jeffery (LSAG 206 fig. 40) the letter shapes are: α1, β2, F1, ν1, ν2, π1, ο1, ϕ2. The shape of the lambda is closer to the Korinthian λ2 (LSAG 114 fig. 33), than the Eleian λ1; Eleian ο1 also appears in post-epichoric Korinthian. At any rate, the absence of an Apolloniate script hinders further scrutiny, and both possibilities for the script remain valid: either basically Eleian with some variations, or post-Korinthian Apolloniate.
The inscription comprises two elegiac distichs. Noteworthy are the two synizeses in line 1 and line 4: 'Ἀπολλώνιας and Ἡδεὺς.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: alpha—only the upper triangular part and a faint trace on the left side of the middle right slanting stroke.
Line 2: iota—only the upper half.
Line 3: alpha—only the upper triangular part; rho—only the upper top of a vertical and a slanting stroke; alpha—only the upper triangular part; theta—only the top part of a circular stroke.

Restorations:
Line 2: ἑφθαλίῳ the digamma was postulated from Pausanias' text by Boeckh (CIG I p. 41) and Preger.
Line 3: οὐ γείς is restored by all editors except Kunze who restores Pausanias' οὐ (ou.


Commentary: The date is based primarily on Pausanias' remark that the monument was the work of the Athenian Lykios, son of Myron, and his interesting observation on the antiquity of the inscription (ἐλεγεῖ τοῦ γράμματος ἐστὶν ἄρχαιος, an expression relative to Pausanias' own time). Eckstein, who assembled all eight surviving fragments and reconstructed the base, upon which stood the thirteen bronze statues of gods and heroes, suggested the decade 460-450 B.C. Beaumont, who studied the topography of Apollonia, concluded that in 435 B.C. Apollonia allowed Korinth to move troops through Abantis. Jeffery, following Beaumont's conclusion and examining the epigraphic evidence for Lykios, son of Myron from Athens, argued for a date in the 440s or even
later. She reasoned that ca. 450 B.C. Lykios' father Myron was at his peak and it "might seen odd that ... Lykios was already receiving such huge commissions" (Jeffery 1980a, 54).

Apart from the problems of script discussed above, the apparent differences in orthography between the inscription and Pausanias' text are only natural for the second-century A.D. Attic style of Pausanias. The absence of the digamma, for example, in line 2, and the transcription of the long omikrons into omegas are expected changes. In that respect, it is interesting that no attempt has been made in this instance by scholars to postulate that Pausanias did not see and read the inscription, or that he read a different version of it, as was the case for no. 1 above.

Without Pausanias' detailed description of this monumental sculptural group of thirteen bronze statues dedicated at Olympia by the city of Apollonia, on the northwest coast of Epirus, the eight surviving fragments of the base would offer no clues. The fragmentary inscription is restored thanks to Pausanias' text, which is proven a reliable source. Before the discovery of the two inscribed fragments, the IO editors had suggested that IO 692 (two huge fragments on which the name MEMNON is inscribed) was part of the Apolloniate dedication, since Memnon's name would be inscribed underneath his statue. This association is now to be ruled out, because IO 692 is inscribed on black limestone, in more archaic script, and, if the fragments of the two were to be combined, the measurements for the base would be too big.

---

87 The inscriptions discussed by Jeffery are: IG I², 537 (only the patronymic is preserved), IG I², 400 (the patronymic is partly restored), and this dedication of the Apolloniates whose επιστήμη clause does not survive.

88 The IO editors' suggestion (IO 692) was followed by Frazer 1965, ad loc., Hitzig 1896-1910, ad loc., and surprisingly by Papachatzis 1974-81, vol. 3, 310-311 note 4 (mention of IO 692) and note 6 (the Apolloniate epigram which unexpectedly he does not quote). By noting both inscriptions, Papachatzis implies that they belong to the same dedication.
Nevertheless, an interesting question arises: were the names of the heroes and gods inscribed on the base underneath them? An answer to this question is crucial and involves not only Pausanias’ interest in inscriptions, but also the extent to which the identification of such monumental dedications was immediate and relatively easy. Eckstein’s explanation is the natural and generally accepted one (1967, 20; the emphasis is mine):

Bei dem Weihgeschenk der Apolloniaten dagegen waren die Helden, allem Anschein nach, nicht durch Namensbeischriften auf dem Bathron gekennzeichnet. Pausanias wird seine Hinweise für ihre Benennung aus ihrer Anordnung im Gesamtaufbau sowie aus charakteristischen Einzelheiten ihrer äußeren Erscheinung (Waffen, Schildzeichen o. ä.) entnommen haben; kaum daß die Namen der Figuren selbst aufgegraviert waren.

Granted that the statue of Zeus (or even Thetis and Eos) would offer clues for identification, how did Pausanias come to identify the heroes on each side of the base? If the armour was distinctive, what kind of distinction did the weapons offer? Why, for example, not suppose that the weapons mounted on the heroes were actually those captured during the battle, since the epigram mentions in line 4 that the dedication is a 6εικαςτή? Pausanias makes an interesting distinction between Greeks/Achaeans and barbarians/Trojans in the first paragraph, quotes the epigram in the second, and in the third he gives the background which led to the capture of Thronion and the eventual dedication. In paragraph three, however, the distinction between Greeks and barbarians is not valid, unless the Abantes from Euboia and the Lokrians from the Aitolian Thronion are to be understood as barbarians. Hammond (1967, 384-389) has discussed the mythological allusions of this passage to the epic Nostoi which refer to this region, the Gulf of Valona in modern Albania. All the heroes represented in the dedication are connected with Epiros and Illyria in one way or another. Pausanias’ distinction between Achaean Greeks and barbarian Trojans, therefore, is somehow lost at the end; unless of course he assumed that the last two lines of the epigram refer to the statues of the Trojan heroes which in this case would represent the Illyrian tribes, associated and perhaps allied
with the inhabitants of Thronion and the region of Abantis. Even so, Apollonia itself did claim both Greek and Trojan heroes as her ancestors. Praschniker saw in Apollonia a limestone fragment with the name Ἀλφεκας inscribed, and Kunze suggested that a dedication similar to the one at Olympia may have stood in Apollonia.

Apparently, in paragraph one Pausanias offers his personal explanation of the actual set up of the statues, as being paired Greek vs. barbarian. This by no means implies that the Apolloniates understood the dedication the same way. In fact, the city of Apollo, colonized by Kerkyra and Korinth, appears to claim as their local heroes both Greeks and Trojans, whom the epic tradition placed in this region.

3.

5.24.3: τοῦ ναοῦ δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ μεγάλου Ζεὺς πρὸς ἀνατολᾶς ἥλιου, μέγεθος μὲν δώδεκα ποδῶν, ἀνάθημα δὲ λέγουσιν εἶναι λακεδαιμονίων, ἴση καὶ ἀποστάσις Μεσσηνίων δεύτερα τότε ἐσ πόλεμον κατέστησαν ἐπεστὶ δὲ καὶ ἐλεγεῖον ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Δέξο ἄναξ Κρονίδα Ζεῦ Ὁλυμπίες καλὸν ἄγαλμα ἰλάωι θυμῷ τοῖς λακεδαιμονίοις.

Apparatus Criticus:

3 τότε is the emendation by Schubart-Walz of the mss. ὅτε or ἔτε; it is accepted by Hitzig and Papachatzis; Porson and Rocha-Pereira suppress ὅτε 5 For the epigram Hitzig states: "inscriptionem dedit qualis est in codd. edd., cum hic id solum quaeratur, quid Pausanias ipse scripsisse putandus sit." Ἀλδινα; Ms Vb P R; Ἀλδινα or Ἀλδινα is the conjecture of Koraes; Ἀλδινα is the reading in IO 252; ζεὺς Ag Pd (where it is corrected to ζεὺς); ὅλυμπιε Pa 6 τοῖς is the reading in the mss., while IO 252 reads τοῖς.

IO 252: two fragments of bluish-grey, Peloponnesian marble which form part of a hollow cylindrical base. They were found: fr. a on March 16, 1876, ten steps southeast.

89 Praschniker 1922-24, 189-190 no. 3, and Hammond 1967, 413 note 4. For the topography of the region and Pausanias' remarks see Hammond 1967, 494ff..

90 For a fuller discussion of the literary and archaeological evidence for Apollonia see Hammond 1967, 384-389.
of the southeast corner of the Temple of Zeus; fr. b, which is small and preserves
the first four letters, on January 2, 1879, on the southeast side of the temple of
Zeus. The letters are inscribed along the top edge which is partially chipped and
badly weathered. The fragments are in the Altis, in situ.


Fr. a: Height: 0.78-0.79m. Diameter: 1.27-1.28m.

Fr. b: Height: 0.027m. Width: 0.11m. Breadth: 0.09m.

Letter Height: the letters are only partially preserved.

cia. 500–460 B.C.

toὶ Λακεδαίμονι[ος].

The letter shapes are (Jeffery LSAG 183 fig. 39): 61 (the English D shape), e4, f1, η1, v3, ξ1 or ξ2,
π1, υ1. The shapes of the epsilon (slanting to the right with a tail) and of the upsilon (tailed) are rather
archaic according to Jeffery (LSAG 196).

Remains of Dotted Letters (the first four letters from the facsimile in IO):
first omikron—only the upper right part of a curving stroke.
digamma—only the middle slanting stroke and the central part of a vertical.
alpha—only the upper part of a triangular shape.
xi—only the tip of a slanting stroke.
delta—a vertical stroke and faint traces of its curving part.
suppressed iota—only the bottom half.
second iota—only part of a vertical stroke.
gamma—only part of a vertical stroke.
tau—only the vertical stroke.
third and fourth iota—only the bottom part of a vertical stroke.
epsilon—only part of a vertical and the bottom slanting stroke.
fifth iota—only the bottom third of a vertical.
last omikron—only the bottom part of a curving stroke.

Restorations:
Κρονίςα(ι) Meiggs/Lewis, Jeffery, Gallavotti, Hansen; Κρονίςα IO editors, Preger, Roehl.
Κρονίςα[punctuation] A.M. Cirio (in Gallavotti 1978b, 33) suggests restoring the trace of a vertical
stroke as punctuation, thus dividing the hexameter into two hemistichs.

[Ζ]εθ or Ζεθ IO editors, Preger, Roehl; Ἁεθ Meiggs/Lewis, Jeffery, Gallavotti, Hansen.

Ηλέφοι[ι θυ]μδι τοὶ Λακεδαίμονι[ος] Preger;
Ηλέφοι[ι θυ]μδι τοὶ Λακεδαίμονι[ος] Friedländer-Hoffleit;
Ηλέφοι[ι θυ]μδι τοὶ Λακεδαίμονι[ος] Roehl;
Ηλέφοι[ι θυ]μδι τοὶ Λακεδαίμονι[ος] Meiggs/Lewis, Jeffery; Ηλάφ θυμδι τοὶ Buck.
Ηλέφοι[ι θυ]μδι τοὶ Gallavotti, Hansen.
Commentary: Pausanias cannot make out from the inscription the event which the Lacedaemonians commemorated with the dedication of the twelve-foot-high statue of Zeus. So, he reports the information that presumably the local exegetes provided (λέγουσιν εἴτε). The phrase ἡνίκα ἀποστάσιν Μεσσηνίων θεύτερα τότε ἐς πόλεμον κατέστησαν, characteristic of Pausanias' vague style, can refer both to the revolt of the Messenians in 465/4 B.C., the generally accepted date, and the second Messenian war in the seventh century B.C.

According to Jeffery (LSAG 195-66), the lettering of this inscription excludes a seventh century B.C. date, but it does not help in providing a more fixed date, because of the scarcity of archaic Lakonian inscriptions. Jeffery (1949, 30 and LSAG 196) suggests further that, because of the circular shape of the base, the statue was probably not entirely anthropomorphic. Instead it was probably “a human head and arms surmounting a circular core sheathed in bronze, the lower end of which was inserted directly into the hollow base”. This would not favor 465/4 B.C., because the dedication would have been similar to Apollo of Amyklai, the Apollo Karneios, and the Athena Chalkioikos, all of which represent the archaic style which the Spartans favored in the late sixth and early fifth century. Without totally rejecting Pausanias' implied date, Jeffery opts for a date ca.

91 Recently Bauslaugh (1990, 661-668) has argued convincingly that two inscribed bronze spear butts which have resisted interpretation were in fact Messenian dedications at Olympia from the spoils of their successful ten-year long uprising and resistance against Spartan rule in the 460s.
500–490, which is accepted by Wallace, Huxley and Meiggs/Lewis. den Boer (1956, 162-177), however, has argued convincingly that the scanty evidence for a Messenian revolt ca. 490 B.C. amounts to nothing more than political propaganda in order to exonerate Sparta by providing a more serious excuse for their delay and eventual absence from Marathon. He also emphasizes that Pausanias is not among the sources supporting a Messenian revolt in the early fifth century B.C. Likewise, Dörig questions the validity of a Spartan dedication ca. 490 B.C., and favors on sculptural considerations the later date, 464 B.C., “even if the capture of Ithome was not the real reason for the dedication.”

Since the epigram itself does not mention the Messenians, nor does it provide any other clue, Pausanias is clearly cautious about this bit of information. In other instances, where his information is more reliable, Pausanias is more assertive of what he reports. In this case, however, he does not offer any explanation, and final judgment on the reliability of this information lies with his reader. The difficult task of disentangling the web of Messenian history was undertaken by Pearson (1962, 397-426). His Quellenforschung has raised justified reservations about the reliability of Pausanias’ sources, Rhianus and Myron whom he calls “‘creators’ of Messenian history” (425), especially if den Boer’s and Dörig’s theses are taken into consideration.

---

92 There is mention of a Helot revolt during the Persian Wars in Plato’s Menexenos 240c, Leges 692d-e, 698d-e, and Strabo 8.4.10, which den Boer (1956, 167-177, and especially 170 note 21) believes to be political propaganda.

93 Pearson’s judgment on Pausanias and his use of earlier sources, however, misses the point (1967, 425 note 62):

The etiquette of scholarship does not permit one to accuse a respectable author like Pausanias of lying or dishonesty; but it is considered within the rules of the game to say that he pretends to be reporting at first hand when he is really reporting second hand. Pausanias, however, does not endorse, the way he does elsewhere, what he is reporting on Messenian history. The very fact that he did not “create” a consistent account is indicative of the problems he saw in his sources, which he could not, or would not solve.
Apart from the historical problems, Pausanias’ text of the epigram and that of the inscription bear some dialectic differences, which are attributed by Gallavotti to the transmission of the text, or to Pausanias himself. Since the manuscript tradition does not suggest any serious variations, it is more natural that Pausanias, writing in the second century A.D. in the Attic dialect, chose to transcribe the inscription, in order to make it more understandable for his reader. Accordingly, there is no reason to postulate, as Ahrens did,\(^{94}\) that the stone was mutilated in Pausanias’ time, and so Pausanias, or the local exegetes restored the inscription. For Pausanias would have noticed the damage to the monument and he would have mentioned it, as he frequently does.\(^{95}\)

4.

5.26.1: Μεσσηνίων δὲ τῶν Δωριέων οἱ Ναύπακτον ποτὲ παρὰ Ἀθηναίων λαβόντες ἁγαλμα ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι Νίκης ἐπὶ τῷ κύονι ἀνέθεσαν· τούτῳ ἦστιν ἔργον μὲν Μενθαίνον Παιώνιου, πεποίηται δὲ ἀπὸ ἀνθρῶν πολεμίων, ὅτε Ἀκαρνάσι καὶ Ολυμπιάδες ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ἐπολέμησαν. Μεσσηνίοι δὲ αὐτὸι λέγουσι τὸ ἀνάθημα σφισίν <ἐναι> ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργου τοῦ ἔν Σφακτηρία νήσῳ μετὰ Ἀθηναίων, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιγράψαι τὸ ὀνομα τῶν πολεμίων σφᾶς τῷ ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων δείματι, ἐπεὶ Ολυμπιάδων γε καὶ Ἀκαρνάνων οὐδένα ἔχειν φόβον.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

5-6 Facius indicated that εἳναι should be suppressed after σφισίν; Clavier reinserted <εἳναι>; Dindorf indicated that there seems to be a lacuna; Spiro and Papachatzis prefer to restore <πραξθέντος εἳναι> after Ἀθηναίων; Hitzig and Rocha-Pereira indicate a lacuna after σφισίν without restoring anything.

10 259: a triangular, prism-shaped, base of Parian marble, comprising of twelve prism-shaped blocks mounted one on top of the other, upon which stood the Nike statue, a total of 9.30m. high. They were found on December 20, 1875, thirty-

---


\(^{95}\) See especially the examples in pp. 7-9 and 16-17.
seven meters southeast of the southeast corner of the temple of Zeus. The width of this base starts at 1.94 (course 1 from the ground up) and gradually narrows down at the top to 1.12m. (course 12). IO 259 is inscribed on the third course from the ground, while on the first two courses the Messenians inscribed ca. 140–135 B.C. the Judgment of the 600 Milesians (IO 52). The triangular block with the inscription and the statue of Nike are exhibited in the Gallery of the Nike of Paionios in the New Museum. The remaining triangular bases, IO 52 included, are in situ, in the Altis, to the east-southeast of the temple of Zeus.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 5. Vidi.

Height: 0.585m. Width and Breadth: bottom 1.86, top 1.82.
Letter Height: ca. 0.003m. (lines 1-2); ca. 0.002m. (lines 3-4).

ca. 421 B.C.

The letters are very well preserved and inscribed in the Ionic script which suggests that Paionios was probably responsible for the inscription and also that the Messenians, once they settled in Naupaktos, perhaps used the Athenian/Ionic script. The signature of the sculptor, line 3, and the much debated line 4 are cut in smaller letters. Line 4, in itself extraordinary, "though incised by the same hand, may have been an addendum after lines 1-3, since it is slightly smaller and less well-plotted", according to Jeffery (1980a, 1234 note 4).

According to Jeffery (LSAG 325 fig. 46), the shapes of the letters are: α3, ε1, θ3, κ1, λ3, μ4, ν4, σ1 (four-bar sigma), ν2, ω6.


96 It was rendered in favor of the Messenians for the dispute of the Lacedaemonians and Messenians over their boundaries on Mt. Taygetos, and especially over possession of Dentheliatis.
Commentary: In the three cases discussed (nos. 1–3) Pausanias quoted in his narrative the actual text of the inscription he read. In this and the remaining instances, however, Pausanias does not directly quote the inscription. Instead he incorporates its information into his text, trying at the same time to clarify the problems of the inscription’s content.

The first line of the dedication is understood by Pausanias as “the Messenians of Naupaktos” and for the phrase ἄνδρα τῶν πολέμων in line 2 he is of the opinion (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ) that the Akarnanian Oiniadai should be understood, against whom the Messenians fought and won in 455/4 B.C. More importantly, Pausanias also reports the opinion of the Messenians themselves. They told him that the dedication commemorated the victory over the Lacedaemonians at Pylos in 425 B.C., when they helped the Athenians. Their reason for not inscribing on the stone ἄνδρα τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, so they say, was simple fear. So they used instead the “safe” formula ἄνδρα τῶν πολέμων.

Pausanias’ attempt at explanation stems from the vagueness of the inscription itself. His own view favors a date which is too early for the statue’s style, according to Frazer (644–645). After all, as Pausanias himself says in 4.25, the Messenians lost Oiniadai one year later (454/3 B.C.) and returned to Naupaktos. It seems, therefore, rather unlikely that such a short-lived victory alone prompted this dedication. Moreover, the inscription itself speaks of two groups, Messenians and Naupaktians, a detail which is overlooked by Pausanias and which suggests that Messenian settlers were living in Naupaktos. Pausanias, however, includes in his text the Messenian explanation, also confirmed by Thukydides (1.103.3. 4.9.1; 36.1; 41.2), which is more in line with the style of the statue of Nike itself. The exegete’s personal conclusion as to what this monument commemorated is proof enough that its original intent was already lost by Pausanias’

97 There is another case where the inscription that Pausanias is quoting has been found, but it has not been published. See Appendix D direct epigraphical references book 6.10.4-5.
time. So, Frazer's (645) generally accepted suggestion that the dedication was set up jointly for all Messenian operations before and during the Archidamian War makes the best out of the scanty evidence for it.98

The last two lines of the inscription, the signature of the artist Paionios, create similar problems. They are inscribed in the Ionic/Attic dialect, except for the word ναὸν, whereas the first two lines are appropriately in Doric. For the shapes of the letters of the entire inscription, however, the Ionic alphabet is employed. Elsewhere Pausanias provides more information about Paionios and his city Mende. Apparently Pausanias, based on his understanding of line 4 τάκρωτηρία ποιῶν ἕντο τὸν ναὸν ἐνῖκα, thinks that Paionios was the sculptor of the East pediment of the temple of Zeus: τὰ μὲν δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐν τοῖς ἄντοις ἐστὶ Παίωνιος, γένος ἐκ Μένδης τῆς θρακίας (5.10.8). Pomtow, on account of Paionios' claim about τάκρωτηρία, and the lettering in line 4 (see above the epigraphic comments), proposed that line 4 was a later addition.99

Harder (1954, 192-198), however, has convincingly argued that such an explanation is not necessary, and he further pointed out the interesting relation between the first two and the last two lines. The statue of Victory commemorates two agones: the Messenian victory, and also Paionios' victory in the competition for the sculptures on the roof of the east façade. Thus, the word τάκρωτηρία, does not refer to the pedimental sculptures, as Pausanias thought, but rather to the sculptures on top of the roof of the east façade. Pausanias mentions them without reference to the artist and among which there was another Nike: ἐν ὶ Ὀλυμπίαι λέβης ἐπὶ Κρυσοῦ ἐπὶ ἑκάστην τοῦ ὄρφον τῷ

98 For contemporary dedications of Nike statues by the Athenians see Meiggs/Lewis 74 (p. 224): IG II2 4037-12, dated ca. 350-320 B.C., and especially Jeffery 1980a, 1233-1239.

A parallel triangular Nike dedication was found at Delphi. It is thoroughly discussed in comparison with the one in Olympia by Pomtow 1922, 55-112. See also: FD III. iv 1-5, 163-5; Bousquet 1961, 69-71; and Jacquemin 1982, 191-204.

99 Pomtow 1922, 81, note 2, and Jeffery 1980a, 1234 note 4.
Jeffery has argued (1980a, 1233-1239) that line 4 refers to these Nikai, which were commissioned to commemorate the alliance in 420–418 B.C. among Athens, Elis, Mantineia, and Argos. This is an attractive interpretation of line 4 and the statements found in Pausanias, even if, as Jeffery admits (1980a, 1239), “it must remain uncertain”.

The birthplace of Paionios is also questioned. In describing the sculptures of the pediments Pausanias says of Paionios that his genos is from the Thracian Mende (γένος ἐκ Μένθης τῆς θρακίας 5.10.8), a city which had sent a dedication to Olympia when they captured the city of Sipte. This is the last dedication mentioned by Pausanias at the end of book five (5.27.12):

τῶν δὲ ἐν θράκικι Μενδαίων τὸ ἀνάθημα ἐγγύτατα ἀφίκετο ἀπατήσαι με ὧς ἀνδρὸς εἰκών εἶν Πεντάθλουν .... Μενδαίοις δὲ αὐτοῖς γένος τε Ἐλληνικὸν καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας ἐστίν, οἰκοῦσι δὲ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἀνώ τῆς πρὸς Αἰνω πόλει.

The combined information of these two passages suggests that Paionios was not from the Chalkidic Mende, but from the Ionian Mende north of Ainos in Thrace. Unfortunately the Ionic alphabet used for the inscription does not lend strong support for one of the two Mendai. Meiggs/Lewis, who are alone in rejecting totally the existence of a second Mende in Thrace, rightly point out that Jeffery’s belief that the Chalkidic Mende’s alphabet was not Ionic is an open question. Even if the Chalkidic Mende’s alphabet was Ionic that alone does not suffice to disprove the existence of another Mende in Thrace. Pausanias’ testimony ought not to be lightly dismissed.

---

100 See no. 1 above. For a recent re-evaluation of the evidence and the bibliography concerning the artists of the pediments of Zeus' temple at Olympia see: Herrmann 1987a, 21-28; id. 1987b, 309-338. Also Dörig 1987, passim, who rejects Pausanias’ names of Paionios and Alkamenes altogether and favors a Spartan sculptor.
The problems raised by this dedication and Pausanias' report of it are evidence of his methodology. Pausanias is interested not just in the dedication itself, but also in its story. He does not simply repeat what he read on the monument, but rather he attempts an interpretation: in this case he offers two versions of the possible historical events that led to the dedication. His research for an exegesis of the dedication, even if it leads him to the wrong conclusion, is worthy of appreciation. For he reports the “primary” evidence and shows to his reader how and why he arrives at his conclusion.

5.

5.26.2: τὰ δὲ ἀναθήματα Μικύθου πολλὰ τε ἄριστον καὶ οὐκ ἐφεξῆς ὅταν εὐρισκον, ἀλλὰ ἵνταν μὲν τοῦ 'Ἡλείου καὶ Ἐκεχειρίας στεφανοῦσι τοῦ ἵψιν, τούτων μὲν τῶν τεκόνων ἔχεται τοσάδε ἀναθήματα τῶν Μικύθου, Ἀμφιτρίτη καὶ Ποσειδών τε καὶ Ἐστία· Γλαῦκος δὲ ὁ ποιήσας ἔστιν Ἀργείος. παρὰ δὲ τοῦ ναόν του μεγάλου τὴν ἐν ἀριστερά πλευρὰν ἀνέθηκεν ἄλλα, Κόρην τὴν Δήμητρος καὶ Ἀφροδίτην Γαμυμνήθην τε καὶ Ἀρτεμίν, ποιήτων δὲ ὁ Ὀμήρος καὶ Ἡσίοδος, καὶ θεοὺς αὖθις Ἀσκληπιίδων καὶ Ὀγείαν. (3) Ἀγών τε ἐν τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἔστι τοῖς Μικύθου φέρων ἀλτήρας, οἱ δὲ ἀλτήρες οὕτως παρέχονται σχῆμα τοῖνδε· κύκλου παραμηκεστέρου καὶ οὐκ ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον περιφεροῦς εἰσὶν ἡμῖν, πεποίηται δὲ ὡς καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους τῶν χειρῶν διιέναι καθάρει τὶ δικαίως. τούτων μὲν σχῆμα ἔστι τὸ εἰρημένον· παρὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἀγώνος τὴν εἰκόνα διόνυσος καὶ ὁ Θράδες ἔστιν ὁ Ὀρφεύς καὶ ἄγαλμα Δίδος, οὗ δὴ καὶ ὀλγῳ πράτερον ἐπεμνήσθην. ταύτα ἔργα ἐστίν Ἀργείου Διονυσίου· τεθηκαί δὲ ὕπο τοῦ Μικύθου καὶ ἄλλα ὁμοῦ τούτως λέγουσι, Νέρωνα δὲ ἀφελεσθαί φασὶ καὶ ταύτα. (4) τοῖς δὲ εὐργασμένοις αὐτά, γένος οὕσιν Ἀργείοις, Διονυσίῳ τε καὶ Γλαῦκῳ, διδάσκαλον σφιχὼς οὐδένα ἐπιλέγουσιν· ἡλικίαν δὲ αὐτῶν ὁ τὰ ἔργα ἐς ὁλυμπίαν ἀναθεῖσιν ἐπιδείκνυσιν ὁ Μικύθος. τοῦ γὰρ δὴ Μικύθου τοῦτον Ἡρόδωτος ἐφη ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ὡς Ἀναξίλα τοῦ ἐν Ἀργώι τυραννόσαντος γενόμενοι δοῦλος καὶ ταύτας τῶν Ἀναξίλα χρημάτων ὡσπερ οὐτων ἀπών ὁχοῦτο ἐς Τεγέαν τελευτήσαντος Ἀναξίλα. (5) τὰ δὲ ἔποιησαν ἀναθήματα καὶ πατέρα Μικύθων Χοίρον καὶ Ἐλληνίδας αὐτῶι πόλεις Ῥηγίων τε πατρίδα καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς πορομοίων διδώσαν· οἰκεῖν δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐπιγράφεται ἐν Τεγέαι φησὶν αὐτῶι, τὰ δὲ ἀναθήματα
Apparatus Criticus:

1 the ms. read Mikythos' name in some instances μικύθον and in others μικύθον.

26-29 these lines have been variously emended and the text printed here is that of Hitzig, Papachatzis, and Rocha-Pereira. Earlier attempts, however, for improving Pausanias' text are indicative of how instrumental the discovery of an inscription may be, in this case IO 267, for the variant readings in the ms. and the emendations of the exegete's text. Most ms., Siebelis, and Bekker read δηδωσαν οικεϊν· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄτυγρ. ἐν Τεγέας φησίν αὐτόν, except L, where οὐκ is inserted before ἐν; Lb Ms V Va Vb, and the Aldina, Xylander, Kuhn, read φασίν; Facius and Clavier read δηδωσαν οικεϊν καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄτυγρ. ἐν Τ. φασίν αὐτόν; Koraes reads δηδωσαν οικεϊν δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄτυγρ. ἐν Τ. φασίν αὐτόν, which Bekker accepted; Goldhagen conjectured: Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἄτυγράμματα—Μεσσήνην δηδωσαν οικεϊν. τὰ δὲ ἐν Τεγέας φασίν αὐτόν sc. οικεϊν; Smal. put an asterisk before φησίν, thinking that a negative had dropped out; Schubart-Walz, Dindorf, and Schubart inserted οὐ, but the discovery of IO 267 put the matter to rest, i.e. that no negative should be restored.

IO 267: block of greyish-white Peloponnesian marble, found on May 20, 1879, southeast of the Heraion. The block is intact and preserves only the right part of the inscription, while on its surface there are footprints of the bronze statue. On the sides there are T clamps, to which other blocks were fitted; the left one contained the left half of the inscription. The base is now exhibited in the Entrance Hall of the New Museum Λ(ευκά) 525.


Height: 0.29m. Width: 0.975m. Thickness: 0.76m.

Letter Height: 0.015-0.025m.

paulo post 467 B.C. STOICH. ?29?

[Míkýthos ho Χολρὸς 'Ρεγίνος καὶ Μεσσά]νος, Φοικέον ἐν Τεγέει,
[---] κλαί χρεμάτων ἡσσα Foi πλείστα ἔγεν-
[eto ---] ἐλθόν, ἔπειτα (or ἐπει τά) 
ε[ύξαμεν].
IO 268: fragment of greyish-white Peloponnesian marble, found on January 15, 1878, northeast of the temple of Zeus. This fragment is the same height as IO 267; its letter shapes are also very similar to IO 267. It is now in Αντικυμήν 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.29m. Width: 0.44m. Thickness: 0.49m.

Letter Height: 0.02-0.025m.

Paulo post 467 B.C.

NON-STOICH.

[Μίκυθος ὁ Χοίτρου Ῥηγίνος καὶ Μεσσηνίος, ἰοδεύω ἤν Τεγέει, ταγάλματα τάδε θεοίς ἀνέθηκε πάσιν] καὶ θεαῖς πάσαις.

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] καὶ χρεμάτον δισάοι πλείστα ἐγένη, ἐπειτα (αἰ ἐπεὶ τὰ) εὐξαμεν.

IO 269: five fragments of greyish-white Peloponnesian marble, found: fr. a, broken on all sides except the top, on December 8, 1876, on the north side of the temple of Zeus; fr. b, broken on all sides except the top, on December 31, 1878, to the northeast of the temple of Zeus; frs. c and d, broken on all sides, on January 14, 1879, to the south of the temple of Zeus; fr. e, broken on all sides except the bottom, on December 30, 1878, in the east trench. All five fragments have letter shapes and interlinear spacing similar to the previous two inscriptions, and so all editors, except the IO, associate them with the lost beginning of one of the two previous inscriptions. Since none of these fragments preserves more than five letters, this association must remain tentative. These five fragments may also belong, as the IO editors suggest, to a new third base dedicated by Mikythos.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos.: fr. a 100; fr.b 501; fr. c 522a; fr. d 522b; fr. e 498. Vidi, Phot.
Fr. a height: 0.19m.; width: 0.10m.

Fr. b height: 0.10m.; width: 0.07m.; thickness: 0.10m.

Fr. c height: 0.11m.; width: 0.08m.; thickness: 0.03m.

Fr. d height: 0.11m.; width: 0.055m.

Fr. e height: 0.10m.; width: 0.12m.; thickness: 0.045m.

Letter Height: 0.02-0.025m.

paulo post 467 B.C.

The letters are very well preserved and inscribed in the Chalkidic-Euboian script. IO 267 is in stoichedon, as seems to be IO 269 (fragments a, d, and e). In the first two inscriptions the letters from the middle toward the left tend to lean to the left, and those from the middle toward the right tend to lean to the right.

The shapes of the letters, common to all three inscriptions, are (Jeffery, LSAG 79 fig. 27): γ3 (only in IO 267), ε4, θ3, θ2, θ1 and θ2, ν1 and ν4, ξ3 (only in IO 267), τ1, ρ3, ο3, ν2 (only in IO 267), ξ3.

The letters that create problems and may perhaps suggest a different stone-cutter are: H4 (appears only in IO 267 line 3, and not in IO 268 line 3), λ2 (in IO 267), λ3 (in IO 268).

H4 and λ3 are the mason’s slips according to Jeffery (LSAG 244-245) who writes: IO 268 is “the same in all respects, except that it has λ3. The best explanation for this seems to be that suggested by Purgold, that the inscribing was done by an Eleian mason who, following an original draft of the text written in the Chalkidic script of Rhegion and Messene, on one occasion at least lapsed and cut his own form of lambda. Heta in the form H4 does not recur elsewhere in Rhegion or Elis, and may be another slip; the normal Rhegine at this time would be the open type (cf. 11).”

There are, however, more slips evident in 268:101 in line 1 the two letters are clearly inscribed after an erasure, which only Roehl and Gallavotti recognized. It seems that the cutter missed the digamma and started to inscribe an omikron whose stroke is visible and probably an iota, and then erased the two letters and reinscribed the digamma and omikron. The erasure, the non-stoichedon layout, the omission of the breathing mark in line 3, the different shape of the letter lambda, and, in general, the carelessness in cutting the letters suggest to me a different stone cutter from IO 267, whose letters are more elegantly and carefully laid out and cut.

101 Gallavotti 1978a, 24 note 17 saw these differences in the published photographs.
Remains of Dotted Letters in IO 269:
fr. b: only the bottom part of a slanting stroke.
fr. c: only the bottom of a vertical stroke.
fr. d: line 1: only the bottom left part of a slanting stroke, perhaps the shape of γ2 (Jeffery 206 fig. 40, and 244 note 8).
fr. e: line 1: only the bottom of a vertical stroke.
line 2: of the first vertical stroke only the bottom tip; of the second, a full vertical stroke at the edge of the break of the fragment.

Restorations:

IO 267 Line 4: reading ἐπείτα or ἐπεὶ τὰ depends on what is restored before it.

IO 268 Line 1: in the erasure the cutter started writing an omicron (its stroke is visible) and perhaps an iota.

The restorations of IO 267 and 268 are obviously the same. Many attempts (see below) have been made to restore 267 from Pausanias' paraphrasing of it, and all, even those for lines 1 and 2, must remain tentative, because they are based on assumptions.

The first assumption is that the inscription was cut on two blocks of similar size, and so, since in line 3 there are 29 letter spaces, the same number of letters should be restored in lines 1, 2 and 4 (only Roehl did not follow this).

The second concerns the end of the text and line 3. Roehl, the IO editors and Zingerle, all assumed that there was a fifth line inscribed on the lost left block. They also assumed that, since there was another block to the left, there may have been another one to the right as well. So, they restored the missing letters of ἐγέν[ετο] at the end of line 3 as if the line extended to an adjacent block.

To this Preuner (followed by Jeffery and Gallavotti) argued convincingly that, if the cutter had more letters to inscribe, he would continue until the empty space that remains after εὐξάμην was filled and then he would start a new line. The same explanation applies for line 3 as well, since it seems to have been the only one with excess letters.

Finally, I have resisted the temptation to associate the fragments of IO 269 with 267, because to associate these fragments with tentative restorations does not make either the restorations certain or the association conclusive; and also because of the real possibility that 269 may have been a third base of the many dedications of Mikythes in the Altis (as the IO editors suggested).

Proposed Restorations for IO 267:

Roehl

[Tὰ ἀγάλματα τάθε Μικύθος ὁ Χώρον, Ἱηγίνος καὶ ἀπὸ πορθμοῦ]

[καὶ κτλ.]

[καὶ κτλ.]

[ἔπει γὰρ ἐμοὶ ἐς τὴν ἴντρυκὴν τέχνην ἄναλαματα χρόνου καὶ πόνου]

[καὶ χρησάματα, ὁς σάφει, πλεύτα ἐγέν[ετο]]

[καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπέρνηα — — — — — — — — ἐπὶ πᾶν] ἐλθὼν, ἐπείτα

εὐξάμην

5 [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

102 Only Roehl associates 268 and the fragments of 269, despite the fact that three fragments of 269 suggest the stoichedon style.
Preuner suggested that fragments a, b, and c of IO 269 fit in the first half of lines 1 and 2 (he does not say where, but see Gallavotti below). Jeffery accepted Preuner’s restorations, except for ἐπεὶ τὰ in line 4 which she reads ἐπείτα.103

Zingerle accepted the IO editors restorations and modified their and Preuner’s last two lines:

[Io 5] [ητρός δαπανηθέντων, ἐσ ἀλμπίτην] ἑλθὼν, ἐπείτα ἐυξάμεν.

Gallavotti associates 267 and all five frs. of 269, reading from left to right and from top to bottom: lines 1-2: fr. c, fr. a, fr. b; lines 3-4: fr. d, fr. e:


Commentary: All three inscriptions are dated to a little after 467 B.C., the year of Mikythos’ departure from Rhegion and immigration to Tegea.

103 Jeffery’s reference (LSAG 244 note 8) to her text in the “Transliteration of Plates. The underlined letters there are those preserved on fragments a-c of IO 269,” is a slip, since there are no underlined letters in the text (410 pl. 49 no. 8).
The case of Mikythos' dedications is a perfect example of Pausanias' methodology and utilization of sources. Earlier, in his section on the dedicatory statues of Zeus, he described one beardless Zeus dedicated by Mikythos (5.24.6):

\[ \text{Ε̇στι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος Ζεύς οὐκ ἔχων πω γένεια, κεῖται δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀναθήμασι τοῖς Μικύθου. τὰ δὲ ἐς Μικύθου, γένος τε ὀποίον ἦν αὐτῷ καὶ ἄνθος ὕπου τὰ ἀναθήματα ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν ἀνάλλα ἀνέθηκεν, ὦ ἐφεξῆς μοι λόγος δηλώσει.} \]

Pausanias does not include here a detailed account of all of Mikythos' dedications, because in this section only the statues of Zeus are discussed. This beardless Zeus is among the many dedications of Mikythos, who, however, had also dedicated other statues, representing other gods. So Pausanias postpones his discussion of Mikythos and refers his reader to a later passage in his book, where he mentions all the dedications of Mikythos in the Altis (5.26.2-5). He describes three architectural groups, which included fifteen statues in all, scattered in the sanctuary, all works by Glaukos and Dionysios of Argos. He also reports the information, probably received from the local exegetes, that many other statues dedicated by Mikythos were taken to Rome by Nero. Pausanias offers no topographical detail as to where in the Altis these offerings were set up. The Nike of Paionios, which he mentions immediately before Mikythos, is to the southeast of Zeus’ temple. The find spots of the fragmentary bases, however, indicate that Mikythos' dedications were set up in the area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus, on its north-northeast side.

Of all the statues one in particular draws Pausanias' attention, not because of its artfulness, but because of its peculiarity: the personified Agon holds in its hands ἀλτῆρες, which are in turn described in detail. In fact, Pausanias mentions that the athlete Hysmon's statue holds "ancient leaping-weights" (ἀλτῆρας ἄρχας 6.3.10).
Such ἀλτήρες have been found in Olympia and elsewhere and resemble Pausanias’ description.104

After the description of the statues, Pausanias argues in two paragraphs for the date of the two sculptors and for the reason of the dedication. For the two Argive sculptors, Glaukos and Dionysios, Pausanias’ sources (perhaps a treatise on sculptors, and/or the local exegetes) are of no help for dating them, since their teacher is not mentioned. Pausanias, however, follows an indirect path. Mikythos’ life provides an indication of an approximate date for the sculptors’ *floruit*. And for Mikythos’ career he turns to the historian Herodotus, who gives the following account (7.170.4):

\[\text{οδ Μίκυθος, οἰκήτης ἑών Ἀναξίλεω, ἐπίτροπος Ῥηγίου κατελέειπτο, οὕτως ὡς περ ἐκπεσὼν ἐκ Ῥηγίου καὶ Τεγέην τὴν Ἀρκάδων οἰκήσας ἀνέθηκε ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀνδριάντας.}\]

Pausanias’ version of Herodotus’ text shows some interesting deviations: οἰκήτης... ἐπίτροπος is understood by Pausanias as θοῦλος καὶ ταμίας, while ἐκπεσὼν ἐκ Ῥηγίου καὶ Τεγέην τὴν Ἀρκάδων οἰκήσας becomes in Pausanias ἐπιών οὐχοῖτο ἐσ τεγέαι. The first expression does not pose any difficulties, save for Pausanias’ more degrading θοῦλος. The second instance is more problematic. By using ἐκπεσὼν ἐκ Ῥηγίου Herodotus implies that Mikythos was ousted from Rhegion. According to Diodorus (11.48, especially 11.66), however, Mikythos left Rhegion on his own volition, after nine years as its regent (476–467 B.C.): the reason for his immigration to Tegea was that he was asked by Anaxilas’ sons to provide an account of his administration, during which his justice and honesty as a regent triumphed. Herodotus’

---

104 It was common for pentathletes’ statues to hold in their hands leaping-weights which were used in the pentathlon (see the excellent discussion of Ebert 1963). See: *J. Bericht* 1937, 82-84, pl. 25, and Papachatzis 1979, vol. 3,229, pl. 205: one of them is of stone and bears the inscription: ‘Ἀκματεὸς λακεδαμώνιος νικὸν ἀνέθηκε τα πέντε ἀσκονικτεῖ.’
ἐκπεζὼν "is a little inconsistent", when compared with Diodorus' version. Herodotus' ἐκπεζὼν, however, may not refer to ousting, but to the account that Mikythos was forced to provide, which implies a break in the trust between Mikythos and his wards. At any rate, Pausanias' expression is rather too general to offer any clues on Mikythos' immigration to Tegea. One may argue that Pausanias is fusing the two accounts (and perhaps other ones as well) into one in his narrative.

Finally, the details on Mikythos' life and his reason for dedicating so many sculptural groups may be derived, as Pausanias notes (26.5), from the epigrams which are inscribed on the dedications. All editors, trying to restore the lost left part of the inscriptions, follow closely the language of Pausanias, because his last paragraph is obviously nothing more than a close paraphrase of the inscription in the style of the Ἐλλάδος περιήγησις. Although the substance of the inscription is known thanks to Pausanias, its actual restoration cannot be absolutely determined and must remain tentative.

5.27.8: οὐ πόρρω δὲ τοῦ Φενεατῶν ἀναθήματος ἄλλο ἔστιν ἄγαλμα, κηρυκεῖον Ἑρμῆς ἔχων ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ Γλαυκίαν ἀναθείναι γένος Ἑρηνίων, ποιήσαι δὲ Κάλλιωνα Ἡλείων.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

3 κάλλιωνα Ag; the other mss. and all editors read Κάλλωνα. IO 271, however, has the correct form of the name with one lambda Κάλλον, and it is accordingly to be accepted in Pausanias' text. For a similar change in a name's spelling see no. 49 below.

IO 271: two joining fragments form a base of dark grey volcanic rock. They were both found in the yard of the palaistra: fr. a on April 24, 1878, and fr. b on January

---

20, 1881. The right side of the text is preserved by fr. b, but the left, fr. a, is broken. The dedication is inscribed on the front; whereas the sculptor's signature is inscribed along the front edge of the top (the facsimile in IO is misleading). The fragments are now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.29m. Width: 0.715m. Thickness: 0.305m.
Letter Height: 0.02-0.025m.

ca. 440-410 B.C. NON-STOICH.


Front: [Γ]λυκίσ τὸ Αγκη[δε]ο  
[τ]ό Τεμπέτος ἱππότων.

The letters of the artist's signature are very badly weathered, but those of the dedication are well preserved. Line 1 is inscribed in the Eleian script and dialect, while lines 2-3 are in the Chalkidic-Buboian script of Rhegion (as in no. 5 above, Milythos' dedication), but with Ionic influences. This is perhaps an indication that the two texts were not inscribed by the same cutter.

For line 1 the shapes of the letters are (Jeffery, LSAG 240 fig. 40): ε4, κ2, λ2, ν2 or ν3, π1, ρ3. The gamma shape is not on Jeffery's figure 40, because its shape is Ionic, which she mentions together with π3 and α2 (219). Since there is no sigma inscribed on this line, this is probably an inadvertent slip. The shape of the omikron is also Ionic (see IO editors, 399).

For line 2-3 the shapes of the letters are (Jeffery, LSAG 79 fig. 27): γ4, δ4, ε1, κ2, μ4, ν3, π1, ρ3, α2, υ2. The shape of the eta is Ionic H, as Jeffery notes (245), as is that of the lambda Λ.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: iota--only a faint trace of the bottom of a vertical stroke; rho--only the upper right curving stroke and the slanting tail.

Line 2: alpha--only the bottom right part of a slanting stroke; upsilon--only a left slanting stroke.

Line 3: eta--only a faint trace on the left side of the middle part of a vertical stroke.

Restorations:
Line 1: on the stone the shape Α is inscribed.

[Γλαυκ]ικιαν Roehl, Loewy, IO editors, Guarducci, Gallavotti, Jeffery.
Καςλον Guarducci, Gallavotti.
[‘Ερμε]ικιαν Hansen.


Commentary: The date of the inscription is based primarily on the letter shapes and the *floruit* of the Eleian artist Kalon. The Chalkidic-Euboian script and dialect with Ionic influences of lines 2 and 3 are definitely later than the Mikythos inscription (above no. 5, dated a little after 467 B.C.), as is the Eleian script of the hexameter in line 1 (the Ionic shape of the gamma, the epsilon, rho, and lambda).

Moreover, Pausanias saw at Olympia another work by Kalon. A group of thirty-seven statues representing a chorus of thirty-five boys, their music teacher and the flute-player (5.25.2-4). This monument was dedicated by the Messenians of Sicily, commemorating the members of the group, all of whom perished in the Straits of Messene on their way to a festival at Rhegion. Pausanias reads on the base an old inscription which gives him the name of the dedicators, the Messenians at the Strait, who changed the name of the city Zankle to Messene in 494 B.C. Therefore, this old inscription should be dated after 494 B.C., since Pausanias' observation about the antiquity of the inscription (τὸ μὲν δὴ ἐπίγραμμα ἐδίπλα στὸ ἄρχατον... 5.25.4) is relative to his own time (cf. the expression ἔλεγετον γράμμασιν ἐστὶν ἄρχατοις in no. 2 above, dated around or after 440 B.C.). Pausanias, however, also knows of an elegiac poem that the sophist Hippias composed at a later date (i.e. after the dedication) for this misfortune. Hippias' *floruit* is 436 B.C. These two dates set the *terminus post* and *ante* for this work of Kalon. The letter shapes of *IO* 271, however, as well as the dialectic nuances of the Rhegine script, according to the *IO* editors, support a date ca. 420–410 B.C., while Jeffery and others suggested the third quarter of the 5th century...
(450–425 B.C.). Recently Dörig, in his extensive study of Kalon's career, returned to the late date of the IO editors, for this conforms with the statue's artistic style. Kalon's career, therefore, may have covered the period ca. 440–410 B.C.

Pausanias clearly implies where this dedication was set up in the Altis: he mentions Glaukias' offering of Hermes after the dedication of another Hermes statue by the city of Pheneos, and before the bronze bull of the Eretrians (no. 15 below) which has been found in situ, thirty-two meters east of the northeast corner of Zeus' temple. The two fragments, however, were not found where Pausanias saw the statue, but in the Palaistra, quite a distance from the original position of the statue within the sanctuary.

As was the case with the previous inscriptions, quoted or summarized, here too Pausanias incorporates the inscriptive information into his text by making the necessary stylistic/orthographic changes. The name of the Eleian sculptor in Pausanias' manuscripts is transmitted with two lambdas, perhaps as a scholastic duplication of the archaic (?) form; and the very common feature of the Eleian dialect, the rhotacism at the end of the artist's ethnic ( فإله), is dropped in favor of the usual form. The quantity of the first syllable of the artist's name is, as the meter requires, short.

Finally, Pausanias' brief mention of this dedication does not provide any help for the restoration at the beginning of line 1. The difference in script and dialect between the signature of the sculptor and the dedicatory text may be an indication that not all three lines were inscribed by the same cutter. Bannier (1926, 542) has shown that, when the artist's signature is inscribed by a different hand and in a different script and dialect, the artist usually includes in his signature the god in whose honor the dedication is offered.

106 Dörig (1976, 125–146) proposed that the Hermes of Sala della Biga is Kalon's Hermes described by Pausanias as holding the caduceus.

107 For a similar change in a name's spelling see no. 49 below.

108 See IO pp. 399–400. Gallavotti (1978a, 27) argues that it is not an hexameter, but an ithyphallic plus an enoplian.
Thus, the statue of Hermes is a double dedication to Hermes both by Kalon and Glaukias. This explanation fits in interestingly with Harder’s observations about the two inscriptions on the base of Paionios’ Nike (no. 4 above, IO 259), although there the cutter appears to have been the same person. The Nike statue was a double dedication as well: it was set up to commemorate a military victory of the Messenians, and at the same time Paionios with his signature implied that the statue was also commemorating his own victory for the commission of the akroteria.

7.

6.1.6: ἐς δὲ τὴν Ἀρχιδάμου Κυνίσκαν ἐς τὸ γένος τε αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς Ὀλυμπικαῖς νίκαις, πρῶτερον ἐπὶ ἐδήλωσα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις οὔ ἐς τοὺς βασιλέας τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων ἔχουσι. πεποίηται δὲ ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι παρὰ τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦ Τρωίλου λίθου κρητίς καὶ ἄρμα τε ὕψων καὶ ἀνὴρ ἠνίκοχος καὶ αὐτῆς εἰκών, Ἀπελλοῦ τεχνη, γέγραπται δὲ καὶ ἐπίγραμμα ἐς τὴν Κυνίσκαν ἔχον.

Apparatus Criticus:
1 the mss. and editors read ἐς δὲ τὴν; Schubart, based on Dindorf’s conjecture, read ἐς ἐς τὴν, which later editors accepted
5-6 the mss. and editors read ἐπιγράμματα ἐς . . . ἔχοντα, except Ms Va Vb Pa which read ἐπιγράμμα (Pa has also a correction to ἐπιγράμματα); Schubart-Walz, based on Pausanias 3.8.2, emended to ἐπιγράμμα ἐς . . . ἔχον, which is accepted by all later editors.

IO 160: a circular base of black limestone found on June 11, 1879, in the north part of the Prytaneion. The epigram is inscribed on top of the base and the artist’s signature on the front side. Pausanias’ description, λέον κρητίς, implies a huge pedestal onto which the chariot with the three statues were mounted, and does not correspond with this round base, which shows a footprint trace and would support only one statue, i.e. Kyniska. The present base may have been a semicircular projection attached to a long pedestal supporting the charioteer, the
chariot and the horses. It is now on display in the Gallery of the Olympic Games of the New Museum \(\lambda(\Theta\nu\nu)\) 529.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 696. \textit{Vidi, Phot.}

Height: 0.49m. Thickness: 0.47m. Diameter: ca. 1m.

Letter Height of the epigram: 0.01-0.015m.; of the signature: 0.01-0.02m.

\textit{paulo post} 396 B.C. \textit{NON-STOICH.}

\textbf{Upper surface:} \vspace{0.5cm}

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
\text{Σπάρτας μὲν [βασιλῆς ἐμοὶ]} & \\
\text{πατέρες καὶ ἄδελφοι, ἥματι δ’ ὁκυπόδων ὑπόπων} & \\
\text{νικῶσα Κυνίσκα έἰκόνα τάνθ’ ἔστασε· μόναν} & \\
\text{δὲ λαβεῖν στέφανον.} & \\
\text{vacat 0.09 m} & \\
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

\textbf{Front side:} \vspace{0.5cm}

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
\text{Απελλέας Καλλικλέος ἐπόμεν.} & \\
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

The letters are laid out awkwardly. The letter cutter appears to be very sloppy in that lines 2-5 are very crowded and the letters lean, some to the left and some to the right. The text is in the Doric dialect.

\textbf{Remains of Dotted Letters:}

Line 2: alpha--only the bottom left part of a slanting stroke.

Line 3: tau--only the bottom of the vertical stroke; alpha--only the bottoms of the two slanting strokes; sigma--only the bottom slanting stroke.

Line 4: the tau of στέφανον the tau is inscribed under epsilon. All editors before Ebert (1966) read from the drawing of 10 160 which read λαβέν στέφανον. Ebert's new drawing is accurate. The iota is crowded, but clearly visible.

\textbf{Restorations:}

The text is also known from an epigram in the \textit{Anth. Pal.} 13.16:

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
\text{Σπάρτας μὲν βασιλῆς ἐμοὶ πατέρες καὶ ἄδελφοι·} & \\
\text{άρματι δ’ ὁκυπόδων ὑπὸ ποιν νικῶσα Κυνίσκα} & \\
\text{εἰκόνα τάνθ’ ἔστασα. Μόναν δὲ ἐμὲ φαμι γυναικῶν} & \\
\text{Ἐλλάδος ἐκ πάσας τόνδε λαβεῖν στέφανον.} & \\
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

\textbf{Apparatus Criticus by F. Buffière:}

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
\text{Lemma B: ἐπὶ τριάνθ̃ ἔξαμετροι πεντάμετρον.} & \\
\text{I.G. V, 1, 1564 a. 2 ἀρματι : ἀματι P del. in lapide 3 τάνθ̃’ ἔστασα lapis :} & \\
\text{τάνθ̃’ ἔστασα P. δ’ ἐμὲ Brunck: δὲ μὲ P.} & \\
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

Apparently Buffière has not seen the stone, because the second epsilon of ἔστασι in line 3 is clearly visible.

Line 2: all editors restore \(\zeta[\mu\nu\nu]\), except Hansen who restores \(\zeta\nu\nu\nu\), to indicate that the restoration is based on a correction of the \textit{Anth. Pal.} manuscript, which, however, may have been correct on the stone.
Line 3: all editors read ξτασε, except Hansen who corrects to ξτασω, because in epigrams before 300 B.C. there is no example of an interchange of first and third persons. Gallavotti (1978a, 5), however, correctly suggests that άρματος ές έκπεφθαν ήπιπον νυκτίδα Κυνίκα / είκοσα τάνς έστατα (lines 2-3) are parenthetical. The ές of line 4 and not the one of line 2 corresponds to the μαν of line 1.


Commentary: The lettering and the Ionic dialect of the inscription and the evidence for the sculptor Apelles, son of Kallikles, of whom very little is known, suggest an early fourth century B.C. date. This date is supported by the information that Pausanias and other ancient sources provide about Archidamos and his children, Kyniska, Agis, and Agesilaos. Pausanias' internal reference is to the beginning of his Lakonika, where he reports the history of the Spartan royal house of the Eurypontidai (3.8.1-2):

'Αρχιδάμου βε ώς έτελεύτα καταληψύντος παίδας Αγίς τε πρεσβύτερος ὃν ἢλικία παρέλαβεν ἀντὶ 'Αγνησιλάο τὴν ἁρχήν. ἐγένετο δε 'Αρχιδάμω Καί, θυγάτηρ, ὄνομα μὲν Κυνίσκα, φιλοτιμότατα δε ἦς τὸν ἀγώνα ἐσχέ τὸν Ὢλυμπικόν καὶ πρώτη τε ῥποτρύφησε γυναικέω καὶ νίκην ἀνέσθε Ολυμπικήν πρῶτην. Κυνίσκας δε ὠστερον γυναιξι καὶ ἄλλας καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος γεγόνασιν ὸλυμπικαί νίκαι, διν (η) ἐπίφανεστέρα ἐς τὰς νίκας «οὐδεμία» ἐστὶν αὐτής. δοκοῦσι δε οἱ Σπαρτιάται μοι ποίησιν καὶ ἐπαινοῦν τὸν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἡκιστα ἄνθρωπον θαυμάσαι. δι' ὧν μὴ τῆς Κυνίςκαι τὸ ἐπίγραμμα ἐποίησεν οὕτω δὴ, καὶ ἔτη πρότερον Παυσανία τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ τρίποδι Σιμωνίδης τῷ ἀναβέντι ἐς Δελφοὺς, ἄλλο (δε)

109 For a discussion of Apelles, his family and the Megarian School see: Robert 1900, 194-195; Löwy, IGB 99 and 100; Picard 162-165; Moretti, IAG 17, pp. 43-44; and Ebert 1972, 111-112, no. 33.

110 Xenophon Agesilaos 9.6 and Plutarch Agesilaos 20.
Agis succeeded his father in 427 and reigned until 398 B.C.; Agesilaos ruled from 398–358 B.C. Xenophon and Plutarch say that Agesilaos persuaded his sister to take up horse-rearing which led to her victory at Olympia.\(^\text{111}\) The Lakedaemonians, however, participated in the Games only after 401/399 B.C., when their aggression towards Elis subsided.\(^\text{112}\) This information suggests a date from 396 B.C. to 376 B.C., when Kyniska, born ca. 440 B.C., would be in her fifties or sixties. Her age is of course not a factor, since in the equestrian events, as today, the owners of the horses and chariots did not participate themselves in the competition.

Pausanias also saw another dedication by Kyniska: smaller than life-size bronze horses standing to the right of those entering the pronaos of the temple of Zeus (5.12.5). The name of the sculptor on that base is preserved (\(IO\) 634) and is the same Apelles, as in \(IO\) 160, although Pausanias does not mention him. Scholars have assumed on the basis of the sculptor’s name that this base belonged to a second consecutive victory by Kyniska. After Robert (1900, 195), the generally accepted dates for these two dedications have been the 96th and 97th Olympiads (396 and 392 B.C.), although Förster’s (1891, 24 no. 326) suggestion of the 100th and 101st Olympiads (380 and 376 B.C.) is not to be entirely dismissed.\(^\text{113}\)

---

\(^\text{111}\) Cartledge (1987, 149-150) has argued that the reason why Agesilaos did not participate himself in the Olympics, but let instead his sister, was his magnanimity (\(\mu\varepsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\phi\nu\chi\omicron\alpha\)) as it is defined by Aristotle in his \textit{Nikomacheian Ethics} 1124b-25a, and also because during this period Agesilaos was trying to assert his concept of “panhellenism.” There is no evidence, however, that Agesilaos "might well have been suspicious of the tone of this epigram and would undoubtedly have disapproved mightily of the portrait statue of Kyniska also at Olympia..." On the contrary, and as Cartledge later points out, Kyniska’s victory apparently did not cause Agesilaos any political damage, and in addition, according to Pausanias, she was heroized at Sparta, just as Euthymos and Theogenes were in their cities (nos. 24 and 53 below). Her epigram, albeit proudly, does not state anything more than other athletic epigrams do.

\(^\text{112}\) The Eleians banned the Spartans from the games in 420 B.C., because during the truce they occupied Phyrkos and Lepreon. The war of 401/399 ended with a truce for which see: Pausanias 3.8.3-7; 5.4.8; Thukydidès 5.49; and especially Xenophon \textit{Hellenika} 3.2.21-31.
Pausanias in his description of the dedication of Kyniska (6.1.6, quoted above) does not give the epigram, composed for the extraordinary victory of Kyniska in the tethrippon-race.\textsuperscript{114} The epigram, itself three hexameters and a pentameter (the signature being in prose),\textsuperscript{115} is not inscribed in metrical divisions. Nevertheless, it is obvious that he read it, since in his own reference to the \textit{Lakonika} (3.8.1-2 quoted above), his language seems to be a prose rendering of the epigram. In almost identical language Pausanias mentions Kyniska one more time, when he describes her heroon near the Spartan region of Platanistas, a place where games were held (3.15.1):

\begin{quote}
Προς δὲ τῷ Πλατανισταί καὶ Κυνίσκας ἐστὶν ἥρωιον, θυγατὲρος Ἀρχιδαμοῦ βασιλεύοντος Σπάρτησι. πρώτη δὲ ἱπποτρόφησε γυναικῶν καὶ Ὑλυμπίασι πρώτη νίκην ἀνείλετο ἄρματ.
\end{quote}

In both of these passages Pausanias underlines the achievement of Kyniska as being the first equestrian victory of a woman in Panhellenic Games. Moreover, it is very interesting that Pausanias' ἱπποτρόφησε is very close to Xenophon's ἄρματοτροφεῖν (\textit{Agesilaos} 9.6) and Plutarch's ἱπποτροφή (\textit{Agesilaos} 20). This may suggest that Pausanias is aware of both Xenophon and Plutarch. It is more probable, however, that the case of Kyniska was very well-known, in fact the first example of a woman's victory in the Panhellenic arena of the Olympic Games. In that respect, Pausanias' omission of the epigram may be understandable. Kyniska's accomplishment would have received much publicity in antiquity and presumably her epigram too was widely known (after all it is transmitted in the \textit{Anthologia Palatina}). So Pausanias would perhaps not deem it essential to include a widely circulated and well known epigram in his text.

\textsuperscript{113} See Moretti, IAG 17, p. 43.

\textsuperscript{114} For other victories by women see Moretti, IAG 17, p. 41-43, and especially Kaldis-Henderson 1979, 316-392.

\textsuperscript{115} Gallavotti (1979a, 5) suggests that the signature may be an iambic catalectic trimeter.
6.4.11: Ἐργοτέλης δὲ ὁ φιλάνορος δολίχου δύο ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι νίκας, τοσαύτας δὲ ἄλλας Πυθοῖ καὶ ἐν Ἰσθμῷ τε καὶ Νεμέων ἀνηργη-
μένος, οὐχ ἰμέραῖος εἶναι τὸ ἔξ ἀρχῆς, καθάπερ γε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῶι φησὶ, Κρής δὲ εἶναι λέγεται Κυψέσιος· ἐκπισωπὸν δὲ ὑπὸ στασιωτῶν ἐκ Κυνσσοῦ καὶ ἐς ἰμέραν ἀφικόμενος πολιτείας τετύ-
χηκεν (δι) καὶ πολλὰ εὐρατὸ ἄλλα ἐς τιμῆν. ἐμελεῖν οὖν ως τὸ ἐκδός ἰμέραῖον ἐν τοῖς ἀγώσιν ἀναγωρευθήσεσθαι.

Kunze 1953, 138-145, pl. A: fragment of a bronze tablet, broken on the right side. The borders of the other sides are also broken, but the text of the inscription at the left, top and bottom is preserved intact. From the length of the preserved text it seems that almost half of the tablet is lost to the right. It was found during the excavations before World War II and was re-discovered in the Museum among other artifacts of that period. Its exact find spot, however, remains uncertain: it is not logged in the excavation notes. Many finds indeed were transferred during the War hastily and without clear records to the Museum. Between lines two and three (below nu and pi, and above alpha and delta) and in approximately the middle of the tablet there is a hole where the tablet was attached to a stone base. It is now in the Ἀποθήκη of Bronzes of the New Museum.


Height: 0.043m. Width: 0.156m. Thickness: ca. 3/4 of 0.001m.
Letter Height: 0.004-0.006m.

464–450 B.C. STOICH.

The letters are well spaced out and clearly cut. The settlers at Himera were Dorians, but their script is the Chalkidic-Euboian with Ionic influences (Jeffery, LSAG 246). The shapes of the letters are (Jeffery, LSAG 79 fig. 27): α4, γ4, ε4, η3, θ1, μ2 (but tailed), ν4 (but tailed), π1, ρ1, ο2, υ3. The shape
of the omega is Ω (not on Jeffery’s list because the omikron was used for it). The shape of the lambda Λ is also not on Jeffery’s list.

Remains of Dotted Letters:

Line 1: gamma and tau—only the bottom two-thirds of a vertical stroke; kappa—only a trace of the vertical stroke which coincides with the break of the tablet.

Line 2: iota—only a faint trace of the upper part of a vertical stroke.

Line 4: the iota’s stroke falls on the break; nu—only part of the left vertical and a trace of the middle slanting, both of which occur along the line of break.

Restorations:

Following Hansen, I do not restore the right part of the inscription. The restorations that have been proposed are many and not at all unanimous. The epigram is metrical, two elegiac distichs, and the gist of what might have been inscribed is conveyed by Pausanias’ narrative, which scholars attempting to restore it follow.

   ἀνένθη[ε] φιλάνορος, ὃς ποτε ποσαίν Ebert.
   ἀνένθη[ε] φιλάνορος, ὃς ποτε διόσασ Barrett.
   ἀνένθη[ε] ὅ φιλάνορος, ὃς ὄλιχον ἐλς Gallavotti.
   ἀνένθη[ε] φιλάνορος ἀγαθὸς υἱος;? Jeffery.

Line 2: Πυθ[ε] αἰς ὄλιχον Kunze, Ebert, Jeffery with question mark.
   Πυθ[ε]ς ὄλιχον Barrett.
   Πυθ[ε]ς ἐν τεμένει Gallavotti.

Line 3: Βίος ὅ Ἄιθμα καὶ Νεμέαι δίς Kunze, Jeffery with question mark.
   Βίος ὅ Ἄιθμα καὶ Νεμέαι δίς Ebert.
   Βίος ὅ ἐν Νεμέαι τε καὶ Ἅιθμωτ Barrett.
   Βίος ὅ ἐν Νεμέαι τ’ Ἄιθμωτ τε Gallavotti.

   μν[ἄμ] ἀρετᾶς ἑμεναι OR μν[ἄμ] ἀρετᾶς μεγάλας Ebert (1966), OR
   μν[ἄμ] ἀρετᾶς ἐπορευ Ebert.

   SEG XI, 1223a; XIV, 900; XXIII, 254; XXIX, 414. Kunze 1956d (= V. Bericht 1956),
   153-156, fig. 61, 62. Moretti 1957, 91 no. 224, 94 no. 251. Ebert 1966b, 398-399,

Commentary: On the basis of the lettering (especially the archaic shapes of theta and nu)
Jeffery (246) dates this inscription not later than 450 B.C. Clearly, the dedication was set
up by Ergoteles after his many victories in the dolichos race which have been dated between 478–464 B.C. and two of which are preserved in the inscription (σύν ολυμπιάδες). Since there is no way of determining whether Ergoteles set up the monument immediately after his second Olympic victory (464 B.C.), or even later, only a tentative date (464–ca.450 B.C.) can be suggested.

The find spot of the tablet is uncertain. The exegete mentions the statue of Ergoteles between the dedication of Kyniskos from Mantinea (no. 19 below) and Poulydamas from Skotousa. These are assumed to have stood in the area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus, to the east southeast. Pausanias starts his description of athletic statues from the Heraion and moves southward, passing by the east side of Zeus’ temple.

Pausanias’ information on Ergoteles once again follows the methodology seen in the previous cases. He sees the dedication, reads the epigram on its base, and renders its substance in prose. One specific detail of the epigram, however, Ergoteles’ citizenship in the city of Himera in Sicily, needs clarification, which Pausanias readily provides for his reader and potential visitor of the Altis. It is probable that the elaboration on Ergoteles’ past may have come from Pindar’s twelfth Olympian Ode, composed for Ἠργοτέλες Ἰμερας Ἀλυκοθρῆμων, more specifically its epode (Pind. Ol. 12.13-19):\(^{118}\)

\(^{116}\) For the dates of Ergoteles’ victories for which the main sources are the scholia of Pindar’s Olympia 12, composed for Ergoteles, and P.Oxy. 222, see the discussion in Kunze (1953, 138-145), Ebert (1972, 20), and especially Barrett (1973, 23-35), whose exhaustive study of Ergoteles’ career and the history of Himera suggests with convincing arguments the following dates for Ergoteles’ victories (p. 25): first Olympic victory 472, first Pythie 470, second Pythie 466 which is also the date for Pindar’s Olympia 12, and second Olympic 464.

\(^{117}\) See especially Herrmann 1988, 132-134.

\(^{118}\) The Twelfth Olympian Ode is very short and consists of one choral triad: strophe, antistrophe and epode. The text is that of Bowra 1968. For a detailed analysis of Pindar’s Olympia 12 see: Nisetich 1977, 235-264 and the bibliography there.

Nisetich accepts and further elaborates on Barrett’s suggestion about the relationship between the first two stanzas and the epode that the ode is celebrating and “looking forward to Ergoteles’ own case: his disaster in Knossos, turning, against all expectation, into security and distinction at Himera. But in part it is looking back to Himera herself and to all the unforeseen vicissitudes of recent years: the expulsion of Terillos turning into subjection to Akragas; then defeat by Hieron turning into release from Akragas, but
As Barrett has observed, the ode is not a true Olympian, inasmuch as it was composed for the career of Ergoteles in general and Himera’s recent freedom. More specifically, the occasion for its composition is Ergoteles’ second Pythian victory in 466 B.C. In lines 13-16 Pindar refers to the expulsion of Ergoteles from Knossos on account of an internal στάσις, which turned out to be for Ergoteles’ own good: he became a renowned athlete and twice a periodonikes. That Pausanias is likely to have been aware of Pindar’s Ode is indicated by his fondness for referring to Pindar’s poetry. Moreover, there is a more direct linguistic linkage. Both texts display ambiguity in regard to Ergoteles’ victories: Pindar concerning the Isthmian, Pausanias the Nemean and Isthmian. 

---

119 The term Periodonikes for an athlete that won the períodos, i.e. all four major panhellenic games, has been examined by Knab 1980. The issue of whether the períodos was “enlarged” especially in Hellenistic and Roman times, and if so which new games were counted toward achieving the status of a periodonikes has been thoroughly discussed recently by Stefanis (1988, 270-290). He offers fresh arguments against the generally adopted views, established by L. Moretti and L. Robert, that various games replaced others in the períodes especially from Roman times on.

120 Rocha-Pereira (1981, Index Auctorvm s.v. Πίνδαρος) lists twenty-seven direct references by Pausanias to Pindar’s works.
Barrett’s supposition for Pausanias’ ambiguity is that it may have come “from a similar formal ambiguity in the inscription” (1973, 25 note 8). In Pindar of course there is mention of only one Olympic victory, one Isthmian (according to Barrett) and no Nemean, all of which should have occurred after the date of the twelfth Ode (466 B.C.).

Pausanias’ discussion of Ergoteles’ career, therefore, is not limited to one exclusive source: the inscription, Pindar, or some other one (e.g. an Olympic Victor List). His primary purpose is to provide an explication of the athletic statues in the Altis in the first twenty chapters of book six. In Ergoteles’ case, in addition to the details the inscription offers him, Pausanias also adds the other victories that he won and explains his immigration to Himera. Thus, Pausanias presents to his readers an extended account for this athlete and not one limited to what the epigram on the base of Ergoteles in the Altis contained.

121 The characterization is Barrett’s (1973, 25, notes 8 and 9). He explains convincingly Pausanias’ τοσαύτας δὲ ἄλλας Πυθοῖς καὶ ἐν Ἰσθμίῳ τε καὶ Νεμέεσσας τρεις διὰ παντὸς ἡμείς Ἀθηναίοις ἄποικοι παραποίησαμεν τοσαύτας δὲ ἄλλας Πυθοῖς καὶ ἐν Ἰσθμίῳ τε καὶ Νεμέεσσας τρεις.

6.9.4: Τὰ δὲ ἐς τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ Γέλωνος οὐ κατὰ ταῦτα διεξάγεται ἐμοὶ τε παρίστατο καὶ τοῖς πρότερον ἢ ἐγὼ τὰ ἐς αὐτὸ εἰρηκόσιν, οὗ Γέλωνος τοῦ ἐν Σικελίᾳ τυραννήσαντός φασιν ἀνάθημα εἶναι τὸ ἄρμα. ἔπιγραμμα μὲν δὴ ἐστὶν αὐτῷ Γέλωνα Δεινομένους ἀναθέταναι Γελώνον, καὶ ὁ χρόνος τούτῳ τῷ Γέλωνι ἐστι τῆς νίκης τρίτη πρὸς τὰς ἐβδομηκοντα ὀλυμπιάδας. (5) Γέλων δὲ ὁ Σικελίας τυραννήσας Συρακοῦσας ἔσχεν Ὑμηρίλιδου μὲν Ἀθηναίοις ἄρχοντος, δευτέρω δὲ ἔτει τῆς δευτέρας καὶ ἐβδομηκοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος, ἣν Τυκράτης ἐνίκη ὁ Κρότωνιάτης στάδιον. ἡλία εὖν ώς Συρακούσιον ἦδη καὶ οὗ Γελώνον ἀναγορεύειν αὐτὸν ἐμέλλειν· ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὸ...
IO 143: three fragments of a huge base of Parian marble, found in the north half of the Palaistra: fr. a in May, 1884; fr. b on April 1, 1878, approximately three meters from its north wall; fr. c on April 22, 1878, in a Byzantine building by the Palaistra’s north corner. The inscribed faces of the three fragments are preserved except at the edge of fr. c. The back side of fr. a is preserved, while those of frs. b and c are broken (for a reconstruction of the monument see Eckstein). They are now set up on top of another huge base, the dedication of Praxiteles (IO 266 and 631) in the area east-southeast of the temple of Zeus and north-northwest of the Nike of Paionios (no. 4 above).

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. 382a (a b), 382b (c). Vidi, Phot.

Fr. a: Height: 0.262m. Width: 0.0838m. Thickness: 1.16m. (the left), 1.17m. (the right).

Fr. b: Height: 0.267m. Width: 0.0837m. Thickness: 0.80m.

Fr. c: Height: 0.262m. Width: 0.0815m. Thickness: 0.51m.

Letter Height: 0.025-0.035m.

488–485 B.C. NON-STOICH.

The letters are well spaced out and clearly cut. The dialect is Doric, but the script does not show any distinctive shapes for conclusive characterization. It is assumed by all editors that the dedicatory inscription is in the Geloan or Syracusan script, and the signature in Aeginetan (similarly Dittenberger in the Sylloge).

According to Jeffery (LSAG 109 fig. 32) the shapes of the letters of the signature are: α2, ε4, ν3, α1 (three-bar sigma), ν2, Punctuation 1 (three dots).

For the dedication the shapes of the nine letters are (Jeffery, LSAG 262 fig. 43): α1, ε3, θ1, ν2, α2 (four-bar sigma), Punctuation 1 (three dots).

It should be pointed out that the letter shapes of the dedication are also found in Aigina, but there seem to be major and distinctive differences: the crossbar of the alpha in the dedication is downwards from left to right, in the signature it is upwards; the sigma in the dedication is a four-bar, in the signature it is a three bar; and the nu in the dedication is the short, tailed one, in the signature it is a lambda shape plus
the third stroke. It is very difficult to imagine one mason cutting such different letter-shapes, unless this is an instance of an erratic use of different shapes.

**Restorations:**

**Line 1:** There have been different suggestions for what was inscribed on the adjacent block:

- **Kunze:** [Γέλον Δελνομένεος Γελοῖος.]
- **Dittenberger,** (Syll.4 33): [Γέλον o Δελνομένεος ἀνέθηκε [τὸν Δί o Γελοῖος].]
- **Jeffery:** [Γέλον o Δελνομενεος.]
- **Gallavotti:** [Γέλον o Δελνομενεος ἀνέθηκε Γελοῖος.]

All three fragments seem to be of approximately the same width and therefore the letter spaces available on the missing fragment should be the same as that of fragment b. There are 18 letters including three iotas and two punctuation marks inscribed on fr. b. Kunze’s restoration (21 letters including two iotas) requires more space than the stone would allow. The other restoration (15 letters including one iota), followed by all editors, is preferable and is supported by another inscription of Gelon, which preserves the identification of the dedicator. It is on a base of limestone found in situ at Delphi, onto which a golden tripod was mounted; it is the dedication for Gelon’s victory at Himera in 480/479 B.C. and reads (Syll.4 34): Γέλον o Δελνομενεος ἀνέθηκε τόπολαλον ἴωραφάνταις. τὸν τριτοθα καὶ τεν : Νίκεν : ἄργαθατο Βίον o Αἰοδόρο vίδη : Μιλέσιοσ.

Gallavotti’s restoration of Gelolos at the end of line 1 is impossible, because the space is uninscribed, unless he meant that the epithet was inscribed as the second line on the missing block, as did Dittenberger, Syll.4. It is not necessary to assume with Gallavotti that the dedicatory inscription was metrical, but it is necessary to postulate, unlike Jeffery who ignores it totally, that the epithet Γελοῖος must have been inscribed, otherwise Pausanias’ arguments would not be necessary.


**Commentary:** The case of Gelon illustrates in detail Pausanias’ methodology and way of argumentation when he discusses the dedications at Olympia. м Clearly Pausanias is not interested in the dedication per se. In Gelon’s case he does not quote the inscription,
but uses its information. The epithet, which he reads on the inscription and which
unfortunately is not preserved on the stone, puzzles him. It is clear from the text that here
Pausanias follows three sources:
the inscription: ἐπίγραμμα μὲν δὴ ἔστιν αὐτῶι Γέλωνα Δεινομένους ἀναθεῖναι
Γελώιον;
an Olympic Victors List: καὶ ὁ χρόνος τούτωι τῶι Γέλωνι ἔστιν τῇς νίκης τρίτη
πρὸς τὰς ἐβδομήκοντα ὀλυμπιάδας;
and a historical source: Γέλων δὲ ὁ Σικελίας τυραννήσας Συρακούσας ἔσχεν
ﻫ' ὑβριλιθεὶς μὲν Ἀθηνησίων ἀρχοντος, δευτέρω δὲ ἔτει τῆς
dευτέρας καὶ ἐβδομήκοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος, ἢν Τισικράτης ἔνικα
Κροτωνιάττης στάδιον.

This last placed the beginning of Gelon’s tyranny at Syracuse in the year of the Athenian
archon Hybrilides (491/490 B.C.), the second year of the seventy-second Olympiad, in
which Tisikrates of Kroton won the stadion. In commenting on Gelon’s dedication
Pausanias sets out to correct “those who have spoken on the subject before” and who
maintained that the chariot was dedicated by Gelon, the tyrant in Sicily.

The state of the evidence does not allow us to know why Pausanias favors the
historical source he is using. In any case, he confuses the dates and wrongly puts
Gelon’s capture of Syracuse in 491/490 B.C., instead of 485 B.C., three years after
Gelon’s Olympic victory (488 B.C.). Even so, as Habicht aptly puts it (148),
“Pausanias’ reasoning is flawless.” In fact, the date modern scholars accept for 1043 is
based on similar argumentation: the epithet Γελώιον indicates that Gelon dedicated the
chariot before his becoming tyrant of Syracuse in 485 B.C., the year when his ethnic
Geloos would have been changed into Syrkousios (as Pausanias argues). Another very
important element in Pausanias’ discussion of Gelon’s date is his way of making
chronological references: in addition to the Olympic Register, he appears to be consulting a

kind of corresponding list between Olympiads and Athenian Archons. This detailed chronological referencing by Olympiad and stadionike and also by the Athenian Archon is followed by Pausanias as a rule in cases where he argues the date of an individual or event and wants to be specific.\footnote{124 See above Chapter II, p. 30-31, note 64.}

10.

6.14.12: \(\text{παίδα δὲ ἐφ᾽ ἵππου καθήμενον καὶ ἐστηκότα ἄνδρα παρὰ τὸν ἵππον φησὶ τὸ ἔπιγραμμα εἶναι Ξενόμβροτον ἐκ Κῶ τῆς Μεροπίδου, ἐπὶ ἵππου νύκτι κεκηρυγμένον, Ξενόδικον δὲ ἐπὶ πυγμή παιδων ἀναγορεύθεντα· τὸν μὲν Παντίας αὐτῶν, Ξενόμβροτον δὲ Φιλότιμος Αλιγνήτης ἐποίησε.}

\(\text{IO 170: three joining (fr. a+b, fr. b+c) fragments of grey Hymettian-like marble, veined with white and blue, found: fr. a on December 26, 1878, southeast of the temple of Zeus; frs. b c on November 9, 1880, in a late wall, south of the Bouleuterion. The fragments preserve the uninscribed borders, and on the upper surface there are marks which indicate that a statue and a horse were standing. They are now in Άποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.}

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. 514 (a), 959 (b c). \(\text{Vidi, Phot.}\)

Height: 0.195m. Width: 0.72m. Thickness: 0.655m.

Letter Height: 0.008-0.015m.

ca. 350\(^{7}\) B.C. \(\text{NON-STOICH. ca. 32}\)

\(\text{[...8-9...]μένοις ἔτημα φάτις, ἱππότις [νίκαν]}
\(\text{[εἶναι] Καλλίσταν κεῖναι Ὀλυμπιάδι,}
\(\text{[ἀ]ι] Κύων ὡ [Ἑ]ξινοδί]κον Πισάκων ἄξολον}
\(\text{πρώτος ἐλών Ἐροποσ νάφου ἑσαγάγετο}
\(\text{5 τοῖο[σ], ὅπωρον ἐ[ρ]λάις, Ξεινόμβροτο[σ] Ἐλλάο}
\(\text{ἄφθιτον ἀεὶ[δεί] μυνῄνα ἱπποσύνας.}

\(\text{\footnote{124 See above Chapter II, p. 30-31, note 64.}}\)
The letters are somewhat crowded but clearly cut, and indicate a date around the middle of the fourth century (JO editors). The epigram is composed in three elegiac distichs, and the dialect is Doric.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: four vertical strokes—the first and third only 2/3, the second and fourth only the upper tips; lambda—only an upper triangular shape.
Line 2: kappa—only a vertical stroke.
Line 3: nu—only a left vertical and the bottom part of a right vertical; omikron—only a bottom curving stroke; epsilon—only the bottom part of a vertical stroke; the middle strokes of the alphas are missing; epsilon—only the vertical and the upper horizontal; theta—only a faint trace of a curving stroke.
Line 4: nu—only the bottom of the right slanting stroke; the middle strokes of the alphas are missing; epsilon—only the vertical and the upper horizontal; gamma—only a vertical stroke.
Line 5: omikron—only a trace of a curving stroke at the right side; nu—only two vertical strokes.
Line 6: epsilon—only the upper left corner.

Restorations:
Lines 1, 2, 3 and 5 create problems, because of Pausanias' statement that the epigram he is reading pertains to both the father Xenombrotos and his son Xenodikos. For the justification of various restorations see Ebert.


Commentary: The date of the inscription, ca. 350 B.C., is based totally on the letter style (JO editors). Moretti, taking into account Pausanias' information about the sculptors Philotimos of Aigina and Pantias of Chios, suggests tentatively the 90th

125 Hyde (1980, nos. 133, 134) prefers a date ca. or after 330 B.C.
126 See also Amandry 1957, 66.
Olympiad (420 B.C.) for the victory of Xenombrotos, and the 95th (400 B.C.) for the victory of Xenodikos. These dates are of course too early for the lettering of the inscription. Moretti explained this discrepancy by postulating that Xenombrotos' dedication may have been erected when his victory was fresh, but that in the middle of the fourth century the inscription was reinscribed.

In addition to the dates, there is another discrepancy between Pausanias' text and the epigram. The epigram celebrates the victory of Xenombrotos in the horse race, whereas Pausanias says, not so clearly, that the epigram speaks of both the father's equestrian victory and his son's in the boys' boxing. Ever since Robert, the majority of scholars have maintained that this dedication is not the one Pausanias describes, but a later one, since the inscription mentions Xenombrotos alone. The solution has been to postulate two dedications: one which Pausanias describes that mentions both father and son; and the base that has survived and which was dedicated many years after the victory of Xenombrotos by him, or after his death by some of his relatives, or even the Koans.127

Pausanias' language is ambiguous and presents two possibilities: either that there were two dedications side by side with two inscriptions (Hansen), or only one with two statues and one inscription (IO 170) as the majority opinion holds. Pausanias' narrative about Xenombrotos is supported by the information of the epigram and the physical marks on the upper surface of the base: the latter indicate that Xenombrotos was represented as standing in front of or beside his horse, as Pausanias states; the epigram

127 Hyde (1980, 53-54), followed by later editors, argues: "denique totum epigramma ἔγραψεν ὁ Πολιτικός - κτιστὸν potius quam votivum est ac multis annis non solum post victoriam sed etiam post Xenombroti mortem compositum esse videtur ... His omnibus permotus cum Roberto statuo hoc monumentum posteriore aetate aut a civibus eius aut a nepotibus vel pronepotibus dedicatum esse. Adde quod duo maiora baseos illa fragmenta prope curiam inventa sunt, ita ut statua extra Alteos muros in foro posita fuisse videri possit. Quibus omnibus perperis hanc Xenombroti statuam Alexandri aetate nullo modo priorem esse posse statuo; cui sententiae etiam litterarum formae faveant, quas, opinor, Dittenbergerus Purgoldiusque quarto sequculo modo non tribuissent, nisi et de monumenti natura et de Pantiae artificis aetate minus recte iudicassent."
mentions that Xenombrotos was victorious in an equestrian event (the ambiguity in the epigram, ἵπποσύνας in line 6, is retained by Pausanias’ ἐπὶ ἄποικον νῦκην); and Pausanias’ expression ἐκ Κᾶρ Μεροπίδος appears to be a direct reference to Μεροπίς νῦσσων in line 4 of the inscription.128 These two “coincidences” are the reason why Xenombrotos’ dedication is included in this chapter.

That is not all, however. According to Pausanias the dedication represented a horse and a man by its side, i.e. Xenombrotos, while the horse was mounted by a boy, Xenodikos, the son. Pausanias’ narrative surely implies that the jockey was Xenodikos, a winner in the boys’ boxing event, in which case in all probability he would have been portrayed with gloves in his hands. This would be the easiest way to guess the event in which an athlete was victorious (the other being the Olympic Register). Given this physical appearance of the dedication, one assumes that whatever is inscribed below would refer to both the boy and the man. Perhaps Pausanias did as well. But it is more likely that he simply added the information about Xenodikos without paying attention to his choice of words, and so leaving the phrase ὁ τὸ ἄργυρωμα ἐπιγραφή to refer to both the father and the son. To us this is an inconsistency and lack of clarity.129 But apparently Pausanias was not bothered by it, because it made no difference anyway: the father’s epigram was certainly praise for the son too. All the more so, if, as the majority opinion holds, Xenombrotos’ victory preceded that of his son, in which case the epigram was already inscribed when Xenodikos won, and so perhaps only the signature of his statue’s sculptor an/or the identification of Xenodikos were simply added.

128 Similarly Sherwin-White 1978, 57 note 141, where she discusses the mythological connection of the island with Merops and further references may be found.
129 See especially Habicht 1985, 141-164 (chapter VI: A Profile of Pausanias), where he discusses mistakes made by Pausanias, which are by far very few, if one considers the nature of Pausanias’ work and the amount of information that has been corroborated by other independent evidence.
11.

6.16.8: Λακεδαιμονίωι δὲ Δεινοσθένει σταδίου τε ἐγένετο ἐν ἀνθράσιν ὅλυμπικῇ νύκῃ καὶ στήλην ἐν τῇ Ἀλτεί παρὰ τὸν ἀνθριάντα ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Δεινοσθένης. ὅδιον δὲ τῆς ἔσε Λακεδαιμονα ἐξ ὅλυμπιας ἐπὶ ἐτέραν στήλην τὴν ἐν Λακεδαιμονι μέτρα δὲ εἶναι σταδίους ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἐξακοσίους.

Apparatus Criticus:
3 ἡμοσθένης Vb 4 ἐξακόσια Vb; Clavier accepts Facius' conjecture ἐξακοσίους (λέγουσι); Schubart-Walz conjectured μέτρα εἴη ἐν στάδια ὅς ἐξήκοντα τε καὶ ἐξακοσίως; Hitzig indicates a lacuna, since he thinks a verb of saying has been suppressed in the mss.; Frazer thinks that something like φησί ο λέγει τὸ ἐπὶ γραμμα has been dropped out; Goldhagen restores φησίν which is accepted by Papachatzis and Rocha-Pereira.

IO 171: two joining fragments of a stele of grey limestone, found: fr. a on November 5, 1880, fifteen meters east of the Byzantine church; fr. b on January 21, 1881, in the court of the Palaistra. The stele is preserved, except for the bottom and a triangular piece from the top that are broken away. The text is intact, save for a few letters that are chipped away because of the break between the two fragments; it is inscribed very close to the left and right borders. The stele is now in ἀποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. 956 (a), 1056 (b). Vidi, Phot.
Height: 0.75m. Width: 0.55-0.555m. Thickness: 0.19-0.20m.
Letter Height: 0.015-0.025m.

paulo post 316 B.C. NON-STOICH. ca. 14

Δειν[οσθένης]
Δε[ιν]οσθέθε[νεος Λα-
κεδαιμ[όν]ιος τα-
ὶ Διὶ Ὥ[λι]μπ[ι]ω
5 ἀνέθη[κε], Ὄλυμπ[ια
νικᾶς στάδιον.
[ἀπὶ]ὸ τᾶς τὰς στά-
λας ἐλ Λακεδ<α>-
Ιμονα ἐξακάτι-
10 οὶ τριάκοντα, ἀπ—
The stone cutter made two mistakes in lines 8 and 11. The script is Ionic; for the Doric dialect and the interesting phenomena in lines 6, 7, and 8 see Bourguet. Gallavotti (1979a, 24) suggests that the first part of the inscription (ll. 1-6) may be metrical:

\[\text{— — } \nu \nu -- \nu \nu -- \nu \nu -- \nu \nu = \text{iambic meter + 2 anapaests, and}\]
\[\text{— — } \nu \nu -- \nu -- \nu -- \nu -- \nu -- \nu -- \nu -- \nu = \text{2 iambic meters + 2 anapaests}\]

Remains of Dotted Letters:

Line 8: the stone cutter corrected a delta with the addition of a middle stroke into an alpha.
Line 11: of the epsilon, which seems to be erased, only an upper vertical stroke.

Restorations:

Line 11: the editors' \(\tau \alpha \varepsilon\), followed by Bourguet, (or even a correction to \(\tau \alpha < \upsilon \alpha > \varepsilon\), \(\delta \varepsilon\)) is meant to correct the awkward syntax. The parallel of line 7 \(\tau \alpha \varepsilon\), however, may have influenced the word in line 11.


Commentary: The date of the inscription, 316 B.C., is inferred from the information provided by Eusebius (Rutgers 1980, 68 note 2) and Diodoros (19.17.1) that the stadionike of the 116th Olympiad was a Lakedaimonian \(\Delta \mu o s \theta e \nu \varsigma\) in Eusebius (and also in one manuscript of Pausanias), or \(\Delta \epsilon \nu m o \mu \varepsilon \nu \varsigma\) in Diodoros. These two names seem to be "clerical errors (Frazer)." The name Deinosthenes, therefore, which the manuscripts of Pausanias preserve, is indeed the correct one. Of course, the setting up of the stele and the statue beside it took place not long after Deinosthenes' victory in 316 B.C., a date which is supported by the lettering as well.

There is no doubt that Pausanias read the inscription which in this case was his only source about Deinosthenes. Instead of quoting it, he offers an abridged version. The usual expression "as the inscription says (\(\tau \delta \ \varepsilon \tau \zeta \gamma \rho \sigma \mu \alpha \phi \eta \sigma \nu\))" is here replaced by the
word *stele* which does not always require a verb, since seldom is a *stele* uninscribed. Moreover, the information the inscription provides, at least in the first section (lines 1-6), is the same as that in Pausanias: the name of the athlete, Deinosthenes, and the event in which he was victorious in Olympia, the stadion race. Pausanias omits only the patronymic of Deinosthenes.

So far so good. Pausanias’ statement, however, that Deinosthenes also records on the *stele* the distance between the *stele* at Olympia and one in Lakonia as being 660 stades has been thought of as a misunderstanding by the exegete. Pausanias does not understand “correctly” the inscription, because he does not repeat in his narrative exactly what the *stele* records. So, the *IO* editors conclude that he misunderstood what he read. But did he?

The second section of the inscription (lines 7-14) refers to three *stelai*: the one at Olympia, another, 630 stades away, at Lakedaimon, and another one, the first, 30 stades away again at Lakedaimon. The meaning of the second τασε in line 11, which the *IO* editors comment (297-298):

Diese Angabe (sc. Pausanias’) ist ersichtlich aus unserer Urkunde geschöpft, dieselbe schien aber von dem Schriftsteller misverstanden zu sein, da man nach der allerdings nächstliegenden Erklärung des Wortlautes der Inschrift unter der πρακτα στάλκα die nächste von Olympia aus gerechnet verstand, so dass 630 Stadien die Gesamtsumme wäre, die jene 30 mit umfasste.

The same “misunderstanding” on Pausanias’ part of the inscription is assumed also by Moretti, *IAG* 79-80 no. 31.

130 *Stelai* with no inscription at all are usually those with reliefs. Gallavotti (1979a, 22, note 6) correctly says that “la stele di Deinosthenes era solo un’iscrizione, senza la figura dell’atleta”. Of course, the translation of this passage requires some additional word, perhaps a verb of saying, to indicate that the stele was inscribed.

131 As will become evident later on, the omission of the patronymic is not unusual in Pausanias. Especially in his narrative of the athletic dedications Pausanias sometimes omits it for no apparent reason.

132 The *IO* editors comment (297-298):

133 The probable location of the first stele has been assumed to have stood in the sanctuary of Apollo at Amyklai, which approximates the distances recorded in the inscription. This is supported by a passage in Thukydides (5.18.9), who says that an inscribed stele of a treaty between the Athenians and Lakedaimonians should be set up, among other places, ἐν Λακεδαιμονί, ἐν ἐμυκλαίᾳ. See Frazer 1960, vol. 4, 50-51.
editors read τὰς ἥλια, or even propose to be emended to τὰ <ὑπῆρ>ς ἥλια, has been understood by the IO editors just like the one in line 7, i.e. "from this stele in Olympia" (pace Pausanias). The second τὰ ἥλια, however, is obviously used as a parallel to the one in line 7, and it cannot be translated the same way, since it refers not to the stele at Olympia, but to the stele at Lakedaimon in lines 8-9. This is what precedes the demonstrative and there is no need to emend the inscription. The hypothesis that Deinosthenes was a hemerodromas and bematistes is attractive as an explanation. There exists, however, no other instance of an individual setting-up interstate horoi.

Pausanias is not interested in all the details of the inscription, nor is he preoccupied with the number of stelai and their exact location. But that in no way implies that he did not read the inscription correctly. The straightforward translation of lines 7-14 can only give the sum of stades that Pausanias calculated, i.e. 630+30=660 stades, and demands the existence of three stelai: "the distance from this stele (at Olympia) to (that in) Lakedaimon is 630 stades, and from that stele (in Lakedaimon) to the first stele 30 stades". At least the substance of this translation is what Pausanias conveys in his text in a summary form.

---

134 There have been found in Olympia two bases of such a hemerodromas and bematistes. He was Philonides from Crete and served Alexander in that capacity (no. 43 below = IO 276 and 277).
CHAPTER IV
INDIRECT EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE IN ΗΛΙΑΚΩΝ A AND B

In Chapter III the examination of epigraphical evidence concentrated on the cases where Pausanias claims that he is reading an inscription which he quotes or paraphrases in his narrative and which has actually survived. There are many more instances, however, in Pausanias' ΗΛΙΑΚΩΝ A and B, where, although the exegete does not explicitly state that he is reading epigraphical texts, his narrative strongly indicates that he is employing the information which was inscribed on the dedications. The present chapter concentrates on these instances which constitute the indirect epigraphical evidence, and again compares Pausanias' text against the actual inscriptions. Of course, this by no means implies that Pausanias employed only inscriptions for the composition of his exegesis of Elis; it rather suggests that the inscriptions on the monuments were the basis and the starting point for his narrative which, as will become evident, he enriched through autopsy and by information gathered from other sources. But, for the great majority of the monuments Pausanias saw in the Altis the only information he could include in his narrative came from the inscriptions.

The indirect epigraphical evidence in Pausanias' ΗΛΙΑΚΩΝ A and B needs further qualification because of Pausanias' own methodology and because of the archaeological excavations at sites outside of Olympia with which Pausanias was also familiar. The indirect evidence falls naturally into four parts. Part A (nos. 12–48), which includes the majority of the cases, is an examination of the passages where Pausanias sees and
explains a monument at Olympia without explicitly stating that it was inscribed. These monuments, it turns out, were in fact inscribed and in most cases the epigraphical text resembles rather closely what Pausanias says. Part B (nos. 49–54) examines similar cases, except that the inscribed monument is not found in Olympia where Pausanias saw it, but in another part of the Greek World where a copy, very similar or identical to the Olympic dedication, was set up. Although Pausanias' information derives from the inscription at Olympia, nevertheless, the copy available from another site contains the same information, and, therefore, corroborates the inscription which Pausanias records at Olympia. Part C (nos. 55–82) examines instances in Ἡλέκτρας A and B where Pausanias' information about the buildings and the altars, the priesthoods, the games, and the cult personnel is corroborated by the discovery of inscriptions in Olympia. These are cases that cannot either prove or disprove the premise that Pausanias read and quoted from these inscriptions. Since these texts were at Olympia, and therefore presumably at his disposal, he may very well have read all, some, or even none of them. Yet, the fact remains that the information of these texts is in agreement, and therefore helps to verify, the exegete's narrative. Finally, Part D (nos. 83–89) treats cases similar to those in Part C, except that here the epigraphical evidence, which attests to Pausanias' narrative, comes from outside of Olympia. These are places which in all probability Pausanias visited and was familiar with, and where again he may, or may not, have seen and read these inscriptions, whose information, however, supports his narrative.

Such a comparison is certainly worthwhile, even for the cases in Parts C and D where there is no a priori assumption that Pausanias indeed read the inscriptions. Pausanias' reliability and accuracy of reporting information can be tested vis-à-vis inscriptions that provide more or less the same information. As in Chapter III, the interdependency of the two texts will prove in most cases to be most interesting, and in certain cases even to improve the readings of the codices of Pausanias' text. For many of
the same epigraphical texts that Pausanias used in the second century A.D. in order to compose his work have been recovered through excavations and can improve Pausanias’ text, whose manuscript tradition has suffered much over the centuries. More importantly, the methodology of the exegete, which has been questioned many times, and in particular his interest in inscriptions and their place in his narrative, can be assessed and evaluated in light of these inscriptions.

A. INSCRIPTIONS SEEN BY PAUSANIAS IN ELIS

12.

5.21.2: πρὸς δὲ τῇ κρηπίδι (sc. of Mt. Kronion) ἀγάλματα Διὸς ἀνά-κεινται χαλκᾷ. ταῦτα ἔποιήσε ἡμὲν ἀπὸ χρημάτων ἐπιβληθείσης ἀθηταῖς ζημίας ὑψίσασιν ἐς τὸν ἄγωνα, καλοῦνται δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιγραφῶν Ζάνες. (3) πρῶτοι δὲ ἄριστον ἐς ἐπὶ τῆς ὁγθῆς ἐστησάν καὶ ἐνενήκστῃς ὀλυμπιάδος. Εὐπωλὸς γὰρ Θεσσαλὸς 5 χρήσασι διέφθειρε τοὺς ἐλθόντας τῶν πυκτῶν, Ἀγήτωρα Ἀρκάδα καὶ Πρύτανιν Κυζικηνόν, σὺν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ φορμῶν Ἀλικαρνα-σέα μὲν γένος, ὀλυμπιάδι δὲ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης κρατήσαι. τούτῳ ἀθητῶν ἀδίκημα ἐς τὸν ἄγωνα πρῶτον γενέσθαι λέγουσι, καὶ πρῶτοι χρήσασιν ἐξημώθησαν ὑπὸ Ἡλεῶν Εὐπωλὸς καὶ οἱ δεξά- 10 μενοὶ δῷρα παρὰ Εὐπώλου. δῦο μὲν δὴ ἐς αὐτῶν ἔργα Κλέωνος Σκυωνίου· τὰ δὲ ἐφεξῆς τέσσαρα οὕτω ἐποίησεν οὐκ ἰσμὲν.

IO 637: a base of black limestone, found on June 6, 1879 in situ, in the area between the Metroon and the treasuries on the way to the stadion. It is the second base from the west and, although badly weathered especially on the front, it is essentially intact. On the top side there are traces of the footprints of the bronze statue. The base is now in situ.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 678. Vidi, Phot.
Height: 0.345m. Width: 0.81m. Thickness: 0.81m.
Letter Height: 0.008-0.015m.

388 ante

Κλέων Ζικυώνιος ἔποι[ησεν].

The letters are badly weathered, but the inscription is still readable. The letter-cutting is good and quite deep (each stroke is ca. 0.003m. wide).

Remains of Dotted Letters:
iota–only the bottom part of a vertical stroke.


Commentary: The date for Kleon’s signature is based on Pausanias’ information that the first six and oldest Zanes, two of which were the work of Kleon, were erected during the 89th Olympiad, 388 B.C., on account of the Thessalian Eupolos’ payment to the three boxers.

Pausanias, after he has finished his discussion of the buildings inside the Altis (briefly commenting on some of them which were outside), proceeds to an explanation of his methodological approach in tackling the problem of the various dedications in the temenos. Then he starts describing the dedications to Zeus, in particular the group of Zeus statues paid for by the fines imposed by the Eleians upon cheating athletes, the famous Zanes.135 Pausanias’ discussion is chronological and extensive, since he relates the reasons why each group of Zanes was erected, the athletes involved, the inscriptions which were written on the statues, and for some of them the artist who created them.136

---

135 See also above Chapter II, pp. 28-29.

136 None of the inscriptions Pausanias read on the statues has been found. Presumably they were inscribed on bronze tablets which were fastened on the base or above it on the statue. See no. 8 above, and nos. 16, 31, and 38 below, all of which are inscribed tablets which have been found in Olympia and which Pausanias read.
In this sense the discussion of the Zanes forms a coherent unit (5.21.2-18) and stands out in book 5 along with the description of the Kypselos Chest (5.17.5-19.10, and no. 55 below).

The first fine imposed by the Eleians, as Pausanias was told probably by the local exegete, produced a sum of money large enough to commission six, nearly life-size, statues of Zeus. Of these Pausanias says that the first two were the work of Kleon from Sikyon, but he does not know who made the remaining four. In exactly the same area that Pausanias saw the Zanes standing there were found sixteen bases, of which the second from the west bears the signature of Kleon the Sikyonian (5.21.2):

\[\text{\textit{\text{\'I\'o\'n\'o\'t\'i \gamma\'a\'r\'e \'e\'p\'i \tau\'o\' s\'t\'a\'b\'i\'o\'u\' t\'h\'n \d\'e\'d\'o\'n \t\'h\'n \a\'p\'o \t\'o\'u \M\'e\'t\'r\'o\'i\'o\'u\',
\'e\'s\'t\'i\'n \e\'n \\'a\'r\'i\'s\'t\'e\'r\'a\'i \k\'a\'t\'a \t\'o\' \p\'e\'r\'a\'s \t\'o\'u \d\'r\'o\'u\'s \t\'o\'u \K\'r\'o\'n\'i\'o\'u \l\'e\'s\'o\'u
\t\'e \p\'r\'o\'s \a\'u\'t\'ώ\'i \t\'o\'i \d\'r\'e\'i \k\'r\'e\'p\'i\'s \k\'a\'l \a\'n\'a\'b\'a\'s\'a\'i \d\'e \'a\'u\'t\'ῆ\'s\' \p\'r\'o\'s \d\'e \t\'h\'i \k\'r\'e\'p\'i\'d\'i \a\'g\'ά\'l\'m\'a\'t\'a \D\'i\'o\'s \a\'n\'ά\'k\'e\'i\'n\'t\'a \x\'a\'l\'k\'ά\'.}}\]

This base corroborates not only Pausanias' topographical information, but it also attests to the exegete's epigraphical interest. These Zanes placed on the left-hand-side of the way leading from the Metroon to the stadion were the last dedications one could see before entering the stadion. They thus alerted and warned both competitors and spectators of the consequences of violating the rules of the Olympic Games. The first base is complete and there is no inscription on it. Pausanias says it too was the work of Kleon from Sikyon; perhaps the signature was inscribed on the bronze tablet on which the ελεγέςα were inscribed (5.21.4).

137 For other works made by Kleon of Sikyon in Olympia and elsewhere see Marcadé 1953, I. 60.
13.

5.24.4: ὅ δὲ ἐν τῇ "Αλτεί μέγιστον τῶν χαλκῶν ἐστὶν ἁγαλμάτων τοῦ Δίος, ἀνετέθη μὲν ὑπὸ αὐτῶν Ἡλείων ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς Ἀρκάδας πολέμου, μέγεθος δὲ ἐπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι ποδῶν ἐστι.

IO 260: a monumental block of conglomerate, found October 21, 1876, opposite the east front of Zeus’ temple. On the back side there are two holes which supported the weight of the base to allow it to stand. The left and right sides have a raised border, 0.05m. in width, which, however, does not run all the way from top to bottom. The base is now in the Altis, in situ.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 90. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 1.34m. Width: 0.70m. Thickness: 0.425m.

Letter Height: 0.10m. (except for the omicron: 0.03-0.04m.).

paullo post 363 ante
NON-STOICH. ca. 5

The letters are very well and monumentally cut. All terminal strokes end in a small triangular serif. The right stroke of the pi is shorter.


Commentary: The lettering suggests a fourth century date (IO editors). Xenophon in his Hellenika 7.4.13-35 records the war between the Eleians and the Arkadians and Pisatans for control over the sanctuary in 365-364 B.C. The truce which returned control of the sanctuary to the Eleians occurred in 363 B.C., the terminus post quem for the dedication of this monument.

Among the many statues of Zeus Pausanias records in the Altis the highest (twenty-seven feet or ca. nine meters) is the bronze Zeus dedicated by the Eleians themselves on
account of the truce which ensued after the war with the Arkadians and their allies the Pisatans for control over the sanctuary. The sheer size of the block, found in roughly the same area where Pausanias saw it (between the Pelopion and the temple of Zeus), and especially the monumental lettering of the inscription have led the IO editors correctly to identify the base and its inscription with this passage of Pausanias. The recovered base, over a meter high, is the front side of the pedestal onto which the bronze Zeus was mounted. So strong a support was certainly needed for a statue which was at the least over seven meters, if the height of the base is included in Pausanias’ calculation. And these colossal proportions of the monument are indeed matched by the inscription’s letter height.

The use of the digamma, the long alpha, and the rhotacism, have been rightly explained by the IO editors as archaisms on the part of the Eleians. What is striking is the laconic wording the Eleians chose to commemorate the conclusion of their struggle with the Arkadians: “of the Eleians for homonoia.” Yet, though the word ὕμνον ("unanimity, concord") is rather a rare choice to serve as a summary of the conflict, it was perhaps a natural choice for the Eleians. They had an altar to Homonoia on which they sacrificed every month (Pausanias 5.14.9). In any case, the word is but a laconic summary of Xenophon’s version of the dispute’s resolution (Hellenika 7.4.35):

τοῦ τε γὰρ ἱερὸ τοῦ Διὸς προστάναι οὐδὲν προσδείσθαι ἐνόμιζον (sc. τὸ κοινὸν τῶν 'Αρκάδων), ἀλλ’ ἀποδιϊότες ἄν καὶ δικαιότερα καὶ σωιότερα ποιεῖν, καὶ τῷ θεῷ οἷοςθαι μᾶλλον ἄν οὕτω χαρίζεσθαι. βουλομένων δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τῶν Ἡλείων, ἔθοξεν ἀμφοτέροις εἰρήνην ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἐγένοντο σπονδαῖ.

Apparently, both parties came to one mind as it were of their own will and thus decided to end their conflict over control of the sanctuary peacefully.

---

138 For a similar example see below no. 73 = IO 39, and in general Buck 1973, 262-263.
This event is only hinted at by Pausanias in two brief comments. The first occurs in his overview of the history of Elis where he summarizes the many conflicts of the Arkadians and the Pisatans against the Eleians (5.4.7):

υπερβάντων δὲ ὅσοι σφίσειν ἐγένοντο κίνδυνοι πρὸς Πισαῖους τε καὶ Ἀρκάδας ὑπὲρ τῆς διαθέσεως τοῦ ἄγῳνος τοῦ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, ....

The second is when he records the victory statue of the athlete Sostratos from Sikyon, nicknamed Akrocheiristes, who won many victories in the pankration (6.4.2, no. 52 below):

... Ὀλυμπίασι δὲ καὶ Πυθοῖ, τῇ μὲν δύο, τρεῖς δὲ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ. τήν τετάρτην δὲ ὀλυμπιάδα ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκατόν —πρώτην γὰρ δὴ ἐνίκησεν ὁ Σώστρατος ταύτην—οὐκ ἀναγράφουσιν οἱ Ἡλεῖοι, διότι μὴ ἀυτοὶ τὸν ἄγινα ἄλλα Πισαῖοι καὶ Ἀρκάδες ἔθεσαν ἀντ' αὐτῶν.

The 104th Olympiad (364 B.C.) was organized by the Pisatans and Arkadians who were in control of the sanctuary, and so the Eleians omitted it from their official register as ἀνολυμπιάς. Pausanias’ historical account, though not as detailed as Xenophon’s, offers the background of the conflicts between the Eleians and the Arkadians and Pisatans. In light of it, his brief mention of the colossal dedication and his exegesis of it is enough for the identification of the base with its laconic inscription.

14.

5.25.7: Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τείχους τά τε Ἀκραγαντίνων ἀναθήματα καὶ Ἡρακλέος δύο εἰσίν ἀνδριάντες γυμνοί, παιδὲς ἡλικίαν τῶν δὲ ἐν Νεμέαι τοξευόντι ἐοικε λέοντα. τούτων μὲν δὴ τῶν τε Ἡρακλέα καὶ ὅμοι τῷ Ἡρακλεὶ τὸν λέοντα Ταραντίνος ἀνέθη-κεν Ἰπποτίων, Νικοδάμου δὲ ἔστι Μαίναλιο τέχνη.

Kunze 1958, 6 (= VI. Bericht, 1958): a block of marble found built in a late wall during the winter of 1954/55 in the area to the south of the Leonidaion. Kunze mentions
in his general report, and only in passing, "drei interessante Schriftdenkmäler"; he
gives the text only of Hippotion's epigram. On the upper surface there are
footprints which indicate that the Nemean lion was mounted on this base, just as
Pausanias notes, while the statue of Herakles must have stood on another,
adjacent base. The epigram and the signature are inscribed on the front side of the
base, and the inscription has not yet been fully published. Therefore, the text
below is only Kunze's preliminary publication of the inscription in the VI.
Bericht, in which no measurements or other details were included.

420-350 ante

[\'Ιππ]οτίών[ν]: θατρίς δὲ Τάρας: παῖ[ς] δὲ 'Εμπεδοτίμου
[λυσώτ]όμενος σὲ Ζεὺ δῶρ' ἀνέθηκα τάδε.
Νικόδαμος: ἔποιήσε.

no. 171.

Commentary: The date for this dedication of Hippotion, 420-350 B.C., is based on
the career of the sculptor Nikodamos from Mainalon, who was active in the late fifth and
the first part of the fourth century. Pausanias elsewhere (6.6.1) notes that Nikodamos
also made the statue of the athlete Androstenes, the pankratiast from Mainalon who,
according to Thukydides (5.49.1), won in the 90th Olympiad (420 B.C., see also
Marcadé, Moretti, and no. 23 below).

139 Surprisingly this and the other two inscriptions, which Kunze mentions without providing their
texts, have not been included in the SEG volume XVII (1959) where the other inscriptions published in
the VI. Bericht are included. Nor have they appeared in any subsequent volume of SEG. But see BE
1959, 190, no. 171.
Pausanias, after his description of the various temples in the Altis, proceeds with the
statues of Zeus which were dedicated by cities, individuals, or by the athletes who
cheated in the Games and were fined (5.21.1-24.11). The next group of dedications that
he mentions towards the end of book 5 are the statues of other gods or heroes (ὅποσα ἢ
ἄλλασα καὶ οὐ μέμησές ἐστι Διός, ἐπιμνησόμεθα καὶ τούτων 5.25.1). Among
them is the sculptural group of the statues of Herakles shooting the Nemean lion,
dedicated by Hippotion from Taras, the work of Nikodamos from Mainalon (for the
sculptor see also no. 23 below). They are set up, Pausanias adds, on the same spot along
the Altis wall together with the statues of the Akragantine youths (no. 66 below).140
Pausanias does not offer any hint as to where in the Altis this wall was, but probably he
refers to the old south wall of the Altis, to the south of the temple of Zeus. Indeed, this
spot in the Altis, as Papachatzis (1974-81, vol. 3, 318 notes 2 and 4) suggests, is ideal
for Pausanias' comment about the statues of the Akragantine youths who were portrayed
with their right hands raised, as if praying to Zeus (5.25.5). These statues, therefore, set
up on the southern corner of the Altis wall, appropriately faced the temple of Zeus to
whom they were praying. This presumed position of the Akragantine youths is in
agreement both with the find spot of Hippotion's base and also with Pausanias'
topography.

More importantly, however, the information conveyed by the exegete and by the
inscription on Hippotion's base is essentially the same and the one corroborates and
confirms the other. Specifically, the epigram's hexameter contains the name of the
dedicator, his ethnic and his patronymic, while the pentameter makes a very general
statement that in effect provides no information. The mere fact that it was set up in the

140 Κατα χαί 6 ἔπι τοῦ τεύχους οὗτοι τῆς Ἀλτεως 5.25.5 = ἕπι 6 ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ
tεύχους τά τε Ἀκραγάντιχον ἀναθήματα καὶ Ἡρακλέους θύο εἶσεν ἄνθριάντες γυμνοῖς, . . . 5.25.7.
Altis would naturally make the monument an offering to Zeus by Hippotion. Below the epigram the signature of the sculptor Nikodamos is inscribed without his ethnic or patronymic. Pausanias reports all of the substantive information, except for the dedicator's patronymic, Empedotimos. There is no apparent reason for this omission, since Pausanias, as will be observed, includes or overlooks the patronymics of many other dedicators without following any particular rule. An additional detail, omitted in the inscription, but supplied by Pausanias, is the ethnic of the sculptor Nikodamos, Mainalios. Pausanias knows only this Nikodamos from Mainalon,¹⁴¹ and, therefore, he may have assumed that the signature was of the same artist, or he may have taken his ethnic from a source book on the works of artists in Olympia. What is even more significant is the fact that the inscription does not provide any explanation why Hippotion set up this rather elaborate sculptural group in the Altis, other than that it was offered as a prayer to Zeus. Likewise, Pausanias in his narrative does not give any exegesis for this monument, as to why for instance Hippotion dedicated in the Altis a statue of Herakles shooting the Nemean lion. The only apparent reason for such an omission by the exegete can be that he did not find anything about this Hippotion either from the local exgetes or in the literature that he had at his disposal. Accordingly, he did not hazard a presumption.

All this strongly suggests that Pausanias' narrative about Hippotion's monument is based solely on the inscription on the base and on his personal observations at the time of his visit to Olympia. The base was found in the general area where Pausanias saw it, and it also supports his brief description of the two statues and the way they were portrayed.

5.27.9: βοῶν δὲ τῶν χαλκῶν ὃ μὲν Κορυκαῖων, ὃ δὲ ἀνάθημα 'Ερετριέων, τέχνη δὲ 'Ερετριέως ἐστὶ Φιλησίου.

IO 248: the inscription is cut on the eastern side of the upper surface of the base, found January 26, 1877, in situ, thirty-two meters east of the northeast corner of the temple of Zeus. The base is comprised of two Parian marble blocks which are mounted on a pedestal of local shell-limestone. On the upper surface there are four footprints where the feet of the bull were fixed and which show that the bull was oriented towards the south with his two left feet in a moving position. To the right of the inscription there is a cut probably for a bronze tablet which perhaps stated the reason for the dedication. One bronze ear and a horn of the bull have been recovered, weighing six and twenty pounds respectively. The base is now in the Altis, in situ.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 118. Vidi.

Height of inscribed upper surface: 1.183m.

Width of inscribed surface of both blocks: 3.073m.

Thickness: 0.287m.

Letter Height: 0.055m.

480\textsuperscript{7} ante

Φιλέσιος ἐποίε.  
'Ερετριὲς τῶν Δί.

\textsuperscript{142} So far the excavations at Olympia have not produced an example of both an inscribed tablet and an inscribed base, although that does not mean that such did not exist.

\textsuperscript{143} Jeffery (LSAG 80) states that the inscription is in stoichedon style, probably an oversight, since the second line from the sigma in 'Ερετριές on is not stoichedon (one could say that it is partially stoichedon).
The letters are nicely spaced, and the script and dialect of the inscription is Euboean Ionic. The shapes of the letters are ($LSAG$ 79 fig. 27): ε4, λ3 (Ionic lambda, but the stroke slanting to the left is not shorter than the one slanting to the right), π1, ρ3, σ2, φ2. Apart from the obvious orthographic characteristics (ε for η or εv, and ο for ω), worth noting is the krasis in the dative Δη for Διη.


Commentary: The date of this inscription, 480? B.C., is based on Jeffery who on account of the shapes of the letters, especially that of the lambda and the four bar sigma, concludes that they are rather late archaic (the IO editors follow Fraenkel’s date, the beginning of the fifth century, which agrees with Jeffery’s).

Pausanias, after he has described the statues of Zeus in the Altis and towards the end of book five, also describes statues which are not representations of Zeus, but of other gods, or are of particular interest. Such dedications are the Hermes dedicated by Glaukias of Rhegion (see no. 6 above) and the two bronze bulls, dedicated by the Korkyraians and the Eretrians. For the Korkyraian bull he records an incident that happened at Olympia and for more details he refers his reader to his $Phokika$ (10.9.3-4), since the Korkyraians had dedicated two bulls, one at Olympia and one at Delphi (see no. 51 below). He says nothing further about the Eretrian bull, however, and this can only suggest that there was no further information available at the time of his visit to Olympia. The bronze tablet affixed on the upper surface to the right of the inscription, if the mark is indeed from the original tablet and not from a later re-use, must have been lost, otherwise he would have mentioned it, if not quoted or summarized it.

There is no evidence available to elucidate the circumstances of this dedication. If the date is correct, one may speculate that the dedication was presumably made on account of the successful conclusion of the Persian War in which the Eretrians participated. The frequency of bull-dedications in the beginning and throughout the fifth century has been
discussed by Orlandini in connection with the two dedications to Demeter Chthonia in Hermione, the works of Kresilas and Dorotheos. That the bull at Olympia, however, was portrayed as moving may or may not indicate that it is \( \delta \varepsilon \theta \upsilon \zeta \alpha \nu \varphi \mu \varepsilon \nu \sigma \).\textsuperscript{144}

Finally, Gallavotti, discussing the rare phenomenon of the artist’s signature being cut before the dedicator’s identification, argues that “la successione logica” would be the opposite. But that is not supported by Pausanias, as he claims. Pausanias may have reversed the order in this dedication for stylistic purposes and not because of “the logical sequence,” since a few lines earlier (27.2), for example, he first records the names of the sculptors and then quotes the epigram of the dedicator. Surely that cannot be an indication that the signatures on that base were inscribed first. At any rate, Pausanias offers no exegesis for the dedication of the bronze bull by the city of Eretria to Zeus, the work of the Eretrian Philesios, no doubt because he could not find any (unlike the Korkyraian bull for which see no. 51 below), and so it remains a puzzle.

16.

6.1.4: πλησίου δὲ τοῦ Κλεογένους Δεινόλοχος τε κεῖται Πύρρου (τε) καὶ Τρῳλίου Ἀλκίνου. τούτοις γένος μὲν καὶ αὐτόῖς ἐστιν ἕξ "Ἡλίδος, γεγόνασι δὲ σφίσιν οὐ κατὰ ταῦτα αἱ νίκαι· ἄλλα τινὶ μὲν ἑλλανοδικεῖν τε ὅμοι καὶ ὑπηρέτην ἀνελέσθαι νίκας τῷ Τρῳλῷ δίωσ, τελεία τε συνωρίδι καὶ πῶλων ἄρματι. (5) ὁλυμπιάδι δὲ ἐκράτει δευτέραι πρὸς ταῖς ἐκατόν, ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ καὶ νόμος ἐγένετο Ἡλείους μηδὲ ὑπίπους τοῦ λοιποῦ τῶν ἑλλανοδικοῦντων καθιέναι μηδένα. τούτου μὲν δὴ τὸν ἀνδριάντα ἑποίησε Λύσιττουs.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

4-5 after Τρῳλίου all mss. read 6ε which all editors suppress following Bekker. It seems preferable to assume that 6ε is a corruption of 6νο, since the words immediately following specify victories in two events.

\textsuperscript{144} This suggestion comes from Pausanias’ Book 1.14.4, where he describes the temple of Demeter, Kore and Triptolemos, near the Athenian Pnyx and adds: πρὸ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ θέατον ἐστὶ θεοῦ χαλκοῦσ oτα ἐδ θυσίαν ἄγμενος. For another bull dedication see no. 80 below (Regilla).
IO 166: a bronze tablet, found June 6, 1879, in the north part of the Prytaneion, whose surface has suffered from oxydation. On the back side there are traces of two clamps for the mounting of the tablet onto the stone base which has not been found and which probably was also inscribed with the signature of Lysippos. The tablet is now in the National Museum at Athens (XaXxd Collection).

National Museum Bronzes No. 6164 (Olympia Museum Inv. No. 691).

Height: 0.075-0.08m. Width: 0.277-0.281m. Thickness: 0.006m.

Letter Height: 0.002-0.005m.

The letters are clearly but not elegantly cut and in lines 1 and 3 are crowded. Individual characteristics of letter shapes are: the pi’s right vertical stroke is shorter than the left, and the left slanting stroke of the lambda is shorter than the right.

The dialect of the two elegiac distichs is Ionic, because it follows the literary tradition of epic and elegiac poetry (Gallavotti 1979a, 3-4). Otherwise the Doric or Elean dialects would be expected, since the dedicator is an Elean.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of IO):

Line 1: chi—only the upper part of two slanting strokes.
Line 3: upsilon—only the upper part of two slanting strokes.


Commentary: The date of the inscription, a little after 372 B.C., is based on Pausanias’ information that Troilos as an Hellanodikes and participant in the Games won in the 102nd Olympiad (372 B.C.). This date is also accepted by Moretti.
Pausanias, after he has completed his explanation of the various dedicatory statues to Zeus and other gods in the Altis, begins an exegesis of the victory statues that he does not consider to be offerings to Zeus. Of the great number he saw he includes only those which he deems deserving to be acknowledged in his work, and among them he also mentions briefly other non-athletic dedications and buildings. He starts with a group of statues of Eleian victors which was set up to the right of the temple of Hera. From this group only Trollos’ bronze tablet has been found not in situ, but in the north part of the Prytaneion which lies northwest of the temple of Hera. Pausanias’ brief topographical clue seems to indicate that he starts his exegesis from the area between the temple of Hera and the Pelopeion, i.e. to the north-northeast of Zeus’ temple walking east- and southwards, where most of the victor statue bases have been found.

The bronze tablet was affixed to the base of the bronze statue, where apparently Lysippos’ signature was also inscribed and was read by Pausanias, as all editors assume.

145 In two instances in Book 5 Pausanias refers his reader to his discussion of victory statues that is to follow: 5.21.1: ἐν δὲ τῇ "Ἄλτει τὰ μὲν τιμῆι τῇ ἐς τὸ θείον ἀνάκεινται, οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι τῶν νικῶν ἐν ἄθλοι κάποιοι σφήνη καὶ ὅπειροι ἐδόθηνται. τῶν μὲν δὲ ἄνθρωποι ποιημέναι καὶ ὅπειρος μνήμης, ἀνεκάθιστος δὲ ἄλλο οὐ μυμήθη ἐστι Δίας, ἐπιμνημόσυνα καὶ τούτων. εἰόναι δὲ χρῆ τιμῆι τῷ πρὸς τὸ θείον, τῇ δὲ ἐς αὐτοῖς νάρτην ἀνατεθέασα τοὺς ἄνθρωπους, λόγῳ σφήνη τῇ ἐς τοὺς ἀθλητὰς ἀναμείξομεν.

He opens book 6 as follows (6.1.1-2): Ἑπεσταὶ δὲ μοι τῷ λόγῳ τῇ ἐς τὰ ἀναθήματα τὸ μετά τοῦτο ἡ δοκεῖα καὶ ὅπως ἀνεκάθιστος μνήμης καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἀνέθησαν τε καὶ ἔτι ὁμοίως. τῶν δὲ νικήσαντων Ἰωμήσασθαι οὐκ ἀπάντων εἰςν ἐστιν βασιλέας ἄνθρώποις. ὅπως δὲ ἐκεῖνοι ἐτιμήσησαν καὶ οὐ ποιήσασθαι, ὅπειρος οὐ τετυπήσασθαι εἰκόνα. τούτως ἐκέλευσεν ἀφεται με ὁ λόγος, ὅτι ἐς καταλαλῶς ἐκεῖνος ἀθλητῶν ὁπόσοις γεγόναι Ἐλλησπόντι νικαὶ, ἀναθήματα δὲ ἄλλως καὶ ἐκόλομος ἐνυπότητος, ὅπερ δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἀντικεῖσαν ἄνθρωποι, ὅπερ τοῦτος πάλιν ἐπέεισεν, ἐπιστάμενος δὲ τῷ παραλόγῳ τοῦ κλήρου καὶ οὐχ ἐπὶ γιγνόμενο ἄνελιχνον ἡ δοκεῖ τοῦ κόπτων, ὁπόσοις δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνος ἐς δόξαι καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρωπους ὑπέρχασιν ἐπικληθήσασα, τοσσάτο καὶ αὐτοῖς μνήμης μετακειμένοι. For Pausanias’ purpose in enumerating so many victory statues and his methodology see Chapter II, and also the excellent discussion of Herrmann 1988, 119-183.

146 See Papachatzis 1974-1981, vol. 3, 328 note i, and especially Herrmann 1988, 132-134, who also has a drawing (p. 133) of Pausanias’ routes (Ἐφόδοι) in the Altis for the victory statues.
Although the base has not been found, the epigram inscribed on the bronze tablet and Pausanias' brief mention of Troilos' dedication seem to be in agreement and therefore suggest that the exegete read and copied from the epigram the information he needed for his brief note: the Eleian Troilos, son of Alkinos (lines 1-2 and 4), was an *Hellanodikes* (the epigram's 'Ελληνων ἄρχων becomes in Pausanias Ἕλλωνος ἄρχων), when he won with his victorious horses. The epigram does not refer to the event, and so Pausanias adds information which he either extrapolated from the representation of the dedication, or he secured from the Olympic Register about the particular horse races and the date.

The text of Pausanias and lines 3-4 of the inscription, however, create some problems, especially the meaning of the clause τὸ ἕκεντρον..., because the word ἐκεῖς, is variously interpreted: to the *IO* editors' explanation that the word in the epigram refers to the next Olympiad Wilhelm responded that the word may also refer to the next event of the same Olympiad, since the first sentence of the inscription must be understood for this clause too. And this clearly is how Pausanias read and understood it (so too Moretti). Ebert has pointed out that without the testimony of Pausanias the information of the epigram would not create any undue problems (so also Hansen): the words αἱρεῖς ἐκεῖς would mean that the second victory took place in the next Olympiad 368 B.C. In that case Troilos could not have been an *Hellanodikes*. This second interpretation, if accepted, would entail two further implications: 1) that in line 3 the words ὑπὸς ἀθλοφόρως indicate the synoris and the foals chariot race in 372 B.C., the victories recorded by Pausanias who ignored, or was ignorant of, Troilos' victory in the following Olympiad (the ὑπὸς of line 4); 2) that the ἕκεντρον clause is not to be understood as depending on the previous main clause 'Ελληνων ἄρχων, but as a second main clause with ἕκεντρον νυκτὸς. While possible, this surely forces things.
The word ἑπεξῆς is used in the epigram to convey the meaning of order and/or time ("successively, continuously, thereupon, immediately afterwards"\textsuperscript{147}). What is not clear, however, is that it refers to consecutive Olympiads. In that respect, it is highly probable that the epigram may be understood the same way Pausanias and Wilhelm read it:

I was an Hellanodikes at Olympia when for the first time Zeus granted me the victory with my victorious horses and also the second time immediately afterwards with my horses again.

In this case, the chronological order of the two victories does not imply consecutive Olympiads, but consecutive events during one and the same Olympiad, i.e. 372 B.C. Moreover, in addition to reading the epigram, Pausanias also checked, as is unanimously presumed, the Olympic Register from where he took the date for Troilos’ victories, the 102nd Olympiad (372 B.C.). It seems, therefore, rather improbable that Pausanias did not check the Register to find out whether τὸ ἕπεξ ἔτερον meant a victory of Troilos in the next Olympiad, a fact which would prove his comment about the enactment of the new restriction on the hippic events, which as Pausanias’ text implies was already in place for the gymnastic competitions. Pausanias’ testimony, therefore, for Troilos is not at odds with the epigram, and it emphasizes that his main interest in Troilos’ dedication is the fact that his was an extraordinary case which forced the Olympic authorities to change the rules of the Olympic Games on account of the athlete’s appearance of impropriety, i.e. to be a judge of the Games and also enter his own horses for competition.

\textbf{17.}

\textbf{6.3.2:} μετὰ δὲ τὸν Χαιρέαν Μεσσηνίδος τε πᾶς Σόφιος..., καὶ τῶι μὲν τοὺς συνθέοντας τῶι παίδων παρελθεῖν, ....

\textsuperscript{147} LSJ s.v. ἑπεξῆς II. 2 and 3.
IO 172: fragment of grey limestone, found in the Kladeos river at the close of the excavations of 1885. It is broken on all sides, except the top edge. The fragment is now in Ανοικτή 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 802. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.23m. Width: 0.14m. Thickness: 0.9m.

Letter Height: first two lines 0.02-0.03m., last two lines 0.01-0.013m.

**paulo post 364 ante**

[Σῶ]φιος [ι- nomen patriis -]?
[Μέ]σσανίος.

[ἄγγελλ]ο νήκμα Μεσσ[ηνίου, ὡς ?στεφανωθείς?]
[?Πισην? η]ρύχην παῖς στ[άδιον Σόφιος].

vacat ca. 0.10m.

The letters are quite elegant and the end-tips of strokes thicken slightly. The letter style, according to the IO editors, suggests the end of the fourth century B.C. The letters of the first two lines are inscribed considerably taller than those of the elegiac distich (lines 3-4) so as to form a caption. Individual characteristics of letter-shapes are: the sigma’s upper and lower strokes are long and slanting, and the middle angle is sharply and narrowly cut.

Μεσσανίος in line 2 suggests the Doric dialect, but νηκμα (line 3) with the final μα being assimilated to μα because of the initial μα in Μεσσηνίου is an Attic-Ionic form. It is not uncommon for the identification inscription to be in the dialect of the athlete’s city, but for the epigram to be in the Attic-Ionic “epic” dialect. See for example nos. 6 and 16 above.

**Remains of Dotted Letters:**
Line 4: rho—only the right upper part of an arc; tau—only the left tip of the horizontal stroke.

**Restorations:**
Lines 3-4: IO editors [τοῦθε κλέ]ε νήκμα Μεσσ[ηνίου, ὡς ποτε Πιση] [πρόθος α]κη]ρύχην παῖς στ[άδιον Σόφιος].
Peek [ἄγγελλ]ο νήκμα Μεσσ[ηνίου, ὡς υυ — υ] [Πισηνι κη]ρύχην παῖς στ[άδιον Σόφιος].
Ebert [ἄγγελλ]ο νήκμα Μεσσ[ηνίου, ὡς στεφανωθείς] [Πισηνι κη]ρύχην παῖς στ[άδιον, Σοφίου].

**Bibliography:** Frazer 1965, ad loc. Hitzig 1896-1910, ad loc. Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc.
SEG XI, 1243 (W. Peek); XXIII, 257. Moretti 1957, 132 no. 496. Ebert 1966b, 390 no. II. Ebert 1972, 159-161 no. 51. Hansen, CEG 2, 823.
Commentary: The date of this inscription, after 364 B.C., is based on the information Pausanias provides about the Messenian Olympic victor Damiskos who won in 368 B.C. (6.2.10):

The fate of the Messenians in the Olympic competition is according to Pausanias directly related to their political persecution. After their expatriation at the end of the First Messenian War (736 B.C.) the Messenians are absent from the Olympic Register, except for the two athletes who came from Messene in Sicily and won twice: Leontiskos in wrestling in 456 and 452 B.C., and Symmachos in the stadion race in 428 and 424 B.C. When Epaminondas and the Thebans and their allies defeated the Lakedaimonians at Leuktra in 370/369 B.C., the Messenians were repatriated and in the following Olympic year a Messenian appeared again in the Olympic Register: Damiskos won the boys’ stadion in 368 B.C. The victory, therefore, of the Messenian Sophios, stadionike in the boys’ category can be dated in the Olympiads after 368 B.C., i.e. in or after 364 B.C., a date supported by the letter-style of the inscription. Accordingly, Moretti has tentatively suggested the 119th Olympiad (304 B.C.).

148 The Ολυμπιαδῶν Ἀναγραφή (a Stadionike list) of Sextus Julius Africanus preserved by Eusebius (Rutgers 1980) also attests to the absence of Messenian victors from the Olympic Games of that period.
The statue of the Messenian boy Sophios came after, according to Pausanias, that of the Sikyonian boy Chaireas. The find spot of the inscription, the Kladeos river, is unfortunately of no help for the area where the statue of Sophios stood originally in the Altis. Similarly, the only topographical indication that Pausanias has offered so far for the location in the Altis of each statue which he notes is the general area “to the right of the temple of Hera” (6.1.3, see notes 145, 146). The information on Sophios provided by Pausanias is more or less what the inscription contains. Indeed the identification of the inscription with Pausanias’ brief mention of Sophios does not rest on the epigram, but solely on his partially preserved name in lines 1 and 2. Once securely identified, the epigram has been variously restored with Pausanias’ text as a guideline.

Peek’s restorations, accepted by Ebert and Hansen with minor changes, are sound except for line 1, where after the name Σφυός they assume the name of the athlete’s father was inscribed, a restoration which is not certain from the extant remains, hence my question marks. For the end of line 4 the IO editors and Peek restore Σφυός, and Ebert prefers Σφυός, in order to agree with Μεσσηνίου (in hyperbaton). Hansen rejects altogether the restoration of the name, because the name of the victor is not repeated in epigrams, but that is not entirely true (compare his examples with no. 24 below). Pausanias’ brief mention of Sophios’ statue does not help in the restoration of line 1. Apparently, he did not have any more information about the athlete. His extensive overview, however, of the participation in the Olympics of the Messenian athletes is crucial for the date of this text.

18.

6.4.1: Ἐξεταί δὲ τοῦ Λυσάνδρου τῆς ἐκώνος Ἐφέσιός τε πύκτης τοὺς ἐλθόντας κρατήσας τῶν παίδων—δυναμὶ δὲ οἶ ἢν Ἀθηναῖος—.
Apparatus Criticus:
3 'Ἀθήναιος is a correction by the editors of the mss.' reading: Ἀθήναιοις; Ἀθηναίος
Ms Lb Va Vb P Pa Pd.

IO 168: a base of black limestone, found December 13, 1879, 56.30 meters westward of
the Leonidaion. The inscription is cut on the upper part of one of the short sides
in whose middle there is a projected lifting boss. The footprints on the top
indicate that the statue was life-size and it portrayed Athenaios in an attacking
posture. The fragment is now in Ἀποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.
Height: 0.185m. Width: 0.405m. Thickness: 0.945m.
Letter Height: 0.012-0.015m.

saec. IV ante
Ἀθήναιος Ἀρπαλέου Ἐφέσιος.
The letters are evenly spaced out across the width of the block. After Ἀθήναιος there are three dots inscribed, although no punctuation is necessary. The letter style is elegant and according to the IO editors belongs to the fourth century B.C.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
iota—only the lower half of a vertical; omicron—only the lower part of a curving stroke.

Morreti 1957, 123 no. 438.

Commentary: The date for the inscription, fourth century B.C., is based solely on the
lettering, since Pausanias does not offer any clue about the Olympiad when Athenaios
won. Moretti has placed Athenaios’ victory tentatively in the 107th Olympiad (352
B.C.).

Pausanias does not give any hint as to where in the Altis this statue was situated, as
is the case with most of the victory statues he describes, except that he saw them in the
general area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus (no. 16 above and notes 145,
116. The find spot of the base is approximately 200-250 meters away from this area, which may suggest that perhaps the base was displaced (IO editors).

The text of the inscription adds only the name of Athenaios' father, Harpaleos, to Pausanias' information who in turn adds to the inscrptional information the event and the category in which Athenaios was victorious. These details may have come either from the Olympic Register, or been deduced from the statue which undoubtedly portrayed a boy boxer. The reason for Pausanias' omission of the patronymic is not clear, and as will become obvious, there is no apparent explanation why for some athletes he records the father's name, while for others he does not. Nevertheless, the inscription and Pausanias' comment are the only evidence for this boy victor, Athenaios, the son of Harpaleos, from Ephesos, who was victorious in the boys' boxing event at Olympia.

19.

6.4.11: Κυνόσκωι δὲ τῳ ἐκ Μαυτινειας πῦκτην παιδὶ ἐποίησε Πολύκλειτος τῆς εἰκόνα.

IO 149: a base of white Peloponnesian marble, found March 23, 1877, in the floor of the Byzantine church. The inscription is cut along the outer edge of the upper surface on which there are also three large holes into which the bronze statue was fitted. The base is now on display in the Entrance Hall of the New Museum Λ(ειμ)υνα 526.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 165. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.16-0.18m. Width: 0.61m. Thickness: 0.54m.

149 In many cases the iconography of the statue was most probably instrumental for the visitor in understanding the dedication: it would make clear the category and the event in which the athlete was victorious. One may argue, therefore, that to inscribe these details would be redundant, and this may be the reason why they are omitted from many victory inscriptions.
Letter Height: 0.02-0.035m.

Paulo ante 450 ante


5 νομα.

The letters are quite worn in places and the chisel used by the cutter produced wide strokes (especially at the end of line 3, where perhaps a different chisel was used). The letters are inscribed continuously on the outer edge of the base. The text is here printed in lines which represent the letters as inscribed on each side of the upper surface. In line 4 the three v's indicate the space that the cutter chose to leave empty between the omicron and the pi of πῦ[κ]τ[ας] in line 1. Instead of crowding the letters of line 5 in at the end of line 4, he inscribed them in a direction vertical to the omicron of line 4 and parallel to the first word of line 1.

The inscription is an elegiac distich:


The letter-style may be either Arkadian or Eleian (LSAG 208) and not later than 450 B.C. The letter shapes are (LSAG 206 fig. 40): α3, ε1, μ1, ν2, ξ2, π1, ρ3, σ1, υ2, χ2.

Remains of Dotted Letters (all are very worn, but their shapes are still visible):
Line 1: tau—only a very faint vertical stroke; alpha—only a trace of a lambda shape; second tau—only the bottom tip of a vertical and the upper right and left tips of the horizontal; omicron—only a faint trace of a curving stroke; nu—only the upper right slanting stroke.
Line 5: alpha—only a right slanting and a faint trace of the bottom left slanting strokes.

Restorations:
Line 1: πῦ[κ]τας τὸν ἀνέθεκεν (sc. εὐκόνα) Moretti following Pausanias' text, but there is clearly a faint trace of an omicron shape on the stone. Also Gallavotti defends the stone's τὸν ἀνέθεκεν on the basis of another inscription (below no. 34). Pausanias may simply be using εὐκόνα as a variaatio.


Commentary: The date of this inscription, sometime before 450 B.C., is based on the letter style which cannot be later than the middle of the fifth century, and on Pausanias' information that the statue was the work of Polykleitos. He must be the elder one; Amandry's dates for him are 465-425 B.C. Accordingly, Moretti has suggested tentatively the 80th Olympiad (460 B.C.) as the date for Kyniskos' victory.
Continuing his exposition of athletic statues in the general area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus and east-southeastwards, Pausanias mentions Polykleitos’ bronze statue of Kyniskos, the boy from Mantinea, victorious in the boxing event (no. 16 above and notes 145, 146). His brief note does not include Kyniskos’ father, but does identify the sculptor. The ἄρτοκλησ clause was probably, as the IO editors suggest, inscribed on the lower part of the base which is now lost.

Surprisingly, the expression in the epigram ἄρτοκλησ... Μαντιναῖας has been understood as an allusion to the synoikismos of the city of Mantinea which took place in the sixth century for some, the fifth for others, or at any rate before the victory of Kyniskos. This need not be so. The Olympic Register compiled by Moretti from the available evidence shows that Kyniskos’ victory is the sixth victory of a Mantineian for the years ca. 500-450 B.C., and after him only one other Mantineian is known to have won in Olympia. Therefore, it may very well be that ἄρτοκλησ... Μαντιναῖας is in reference to the renown gained by these six victories and not a historical reference to the foundation of the city. At any rate, Pausanias’ brief note clearly derives from the inscription on the base of Kyniskos.

6.6.1: ἐν δὲ Ὀλυμπίαι παρὰ τοῦ Πουλυδάμαγτος τὸν ἀνδριάντα δύο τε ἐκ τῆς Ἀρκάδεων καὶ Ἀττικὸς ὁ τρίτος ἐστηκεν ἄθλητης. ..., Ναρκίδαν δὲ τὸν Δαμαρέτου παλαιστὴν ἄνδρα ἐκ Φιγαλίας Σικυώνιος Δαίθαλος (sc. ἐποίησεν), ....

Moretti 1957, nos. 163 (Agametor), 193 (Epikradios), 202 (Dromeus), 254 (Pytharchos), 256 (Protolaos), 265 (Kyniskos), and 514 (Timarchos).
IO 161: three joining fragments of yellowish-grey limestone, found: fr. a February 29, 1880, in front of the east side of the temple of Zeus; fr. b May 2, 1879, in the southeast hall; and fr. c March 9, 1878, in the Byzantine east wall to the south of the base of the Eretrians (IO 248 = no. 15 above). The inscribed surface is worn and the fragments are brocken: a on the left (it joins on the right with b and the bottom with c and preserves the top border); b on the bottom (it is joined with a on the left and preserves the right and top edge), and c on the right and the upper left part where it is not joined by a (it preserves the back of the block). The three fragments are now stored in Αναθήμα 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.26m. Width: 0.595m. Thickness: 0.325m.

Letter Height: 0.015-0.018m.

400–350 ante

NON-STOICH.

[-υυ -υυ -υυ] Ολυμπίαι ισχύος έσχον
[-υυ -υυ -ταρίδα].. γάρ ίσα νν
[-υυ -υυ -υυ] ενίκων κα[λ] τρίς εν 'Ιθμοί
[-υυ -υυ - Θαρηκ[δας Φιγ[α]λεύς. νννν

vacat ca. 0.025

[Δαίδαλος ἐπιφήσε Πατροκλὲος Φιλειά]σιος.

The letters are nicely laid out and carefully cut. Characteristic shapes of letters: the omicron is quite large occupying the whole space of the line; the iota extends beyond the height of the other letters; the upsilon’s slanting strokes curve nicely outwards; the vertical stroke of the phi does not extend beyond the round stroke; and the top and bottom strokes of sigma slant.

The inscription is comprised of two elegiac distichs, while the signature of Daidalos is inscribed after an empty space and in prose.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: iota—only a faint trace of the middle part of a vertical stroke.
Line 2: iota—it is dotted because the vertical may be part of another letter (see restorations).
Line 4: upsilon—only the bottom part of a vertical stroke.
Line 6: omicron—only the right part of a curving stroke is visible.

Restorations for lines 1-4 of this inscription are only tentative and for this reason they are not included in the text (similarly Hansen):

IO editors: [οῦ τε μόνα τιμᾶν ἐν] Ολυμπίαι ισχύος έσχον
[kυ[δα]νον γενεάν π]ατρίδα θ’ [α] γάρ ἴσα
Marcadé accepts the restorations of Preuner except for the end of line 3. He reads 'Ιθμοῖ which, he points out, is also attested at Delphi.

Peek:

Ebert:


Commentary: The date for the inscription, the first half of the fourth century B.C., is based on the scanty evidence for the career of Daidalos which points to the first part of the fourth century, a date which is also supported by the letter style. The ethnic Θερασίες, is attested only in this inscription.151 It has been understood to refer to an incident in Sikyonian history, the tyranny of Euphrone ca. 368 B.C., on account of which Daidalos may have been forced into exile, or left voluntarily, and became a citizen of Phleious (Preuner, Marcadé). Moretti, however, has rightly pointed out that Daidalos may have

---

151 See Marcadé 1953, 22-24 where all epigraphical and literary evidence for Daidalos is discussed. Only one inscription has the ethnic Sikyonios, and none Phleiasios (except IO 161). Pausanias knows only Daidalos the Sikyonian whom he mentions five times as the sculptor of statues: four of them in Olympia and one in Delphi (6.2.8, 3.4, 3.7, 6.1; 10.9.6). In the Altis the signature of Daidalos the Sikyonian is also preserved on another base which is assumed to have been one of the Zanes (IO 635).
been honored with citizenship by Phleious on another occasion (see also Ebert), and so he has tentatively placed Narykidas’ victory in the 99th Olympiad (384 B.C.).

Pausanias, continuing his exposition of athletic statues in the general area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus (no. 16 above and notes 145, 146), reaches the statue of the famous Poulydamas from Skotousa (6.5.1-9). The life and career of this extraordinary athlete is then presented at length by Pausanias, as though to establish it as a reference point in the account of the Altis. In any case, this digression also marks a convenient break for the reader who until now has been overwhelmed by a narrative which is crowded with names of the victors, sometimes the date of their victory, and often the sculptor. After Poulydamas Pausanias returns to his usually concise narrative and mentions a group of three victory statues: two of Arkadian athletes and one of the Athenian Kallias (no. 21 below). One of the Arkadian statues, the wrestler Narykidas son of Damaretos from Phigalia, is the work of Daidalos the Sikyonian.

These fragments of the pedestal, on which the statue stood, were found scattered in the Altis in the general area where Pausanias probably saw it, i.e. to the north northeast or to the east of the temple of Zeus. The fragmentary text of the inscription mentions an Olympic victory (only one?) of Narykidas and three in the Isthmian Games, while the word ἀσ in line 2 implies that he probably was victorious in the Pythian and Nemean Games as well. Moreover, at the end of line 6 the letter traces of Daidalos’ ethnic can only be ΣΙΩΣ, whereas Pausanias refers to him only as Sikyonios.

A comparison between the inscription and the brief note of Pausanias suggests that the exegete, in all probability, did not read the epigram and the signature inscribed on Narykidas’ pedestal. The different ethnic Phleiasios on the base is surprising and differs from his more widely known ethnic Sikyonios. And yet, such differences interest Pausanias and usually offer him the opportunity for an exegesis. Moreover, Pausanias, if he read the inscription, passed up the wealth of information that the epigram offers,
namely the multiple victories of Narykidas (see e.g. no. 8). This is the kind of information which Pausanias invariably includes in his portraits of the athletes, since to him this information pertains to what he calls the exegesis of the monuments in the Altis. Indeed, Narykidas’ case is so far the only exception. There is no plausible explanation for this, except that Pausanias did not take careful note of the inscription. Even so, the inscribed base of Narykidas’ statue, found in Olympia, does corroborate Pausanias’ claim that he saw such a dedication, even if he did not read carefully what was on it, or did not read the epigram at all.

21.

6.6.1: ἔν δὲ Ὀλυμπίαι παρά τοῦ Πουλυδάμαντος τὸν ἄνδριάντα δύο τε ἐκ τῆς Ἀρκάδων καὶ Ἀττικὸς ὁ τρίτος ἔστηκεν ἀθλητής. ..., Καλλίας δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι παγκρατιαστή τὸν ἄνδριάντα ἀνή ρ Ἀθηναῖος Μίκων ἐποίησε ο ζωγράφος.

5.9.3: ὃ δὲ κόσμος ὁ περὶ τὸν ἄγωνα ἔφ’ ἡμῶν, ὡς θύσεωι τῶι θεῷ τὰ 5 λερεία πεντάθλου μὲν καὶ δρόμου τῶν ὑπ’ ὡραν οὐστερα ἀγωνισμάτων, οὕτωσιν κατέστη σφίνυν δ’ ὁ κόσμος ολυμπιάδθι ἐβδόμη πρὸς τὰς ἐβδομήκοντα τὰ πρὸ τούτων δὲ ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ἡγον τῆς αὐτῆς ὁμοίως καὶ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὑπ’ ὑπ’ ἄγωνα. τότε δὲ προῆκατισαν ἐς νύκτα οἱ παγκρατιάζοντες ἀτε οὐ κατὰ καιρὸν ἐσκληθέντες, αἰτοὶ 10 δὲ ἐγένοντο οὗ τε ὑπ’ ὑπ’ καὶ ἐς πλέον ἔτι ἢ τῶν πεντάθλων ἠμιλλας καὶ ἐκράτει μὲν Ἀθηναῖος Καλλίας τοὺς παγκρατιάζοντας, ἐμπόδιον δὲ οὐκ ἔμελλε παγκρατίωι τοῦ λοιποῦ τὸ πένταθλον οὐδὲ οἱ ὑπ’ θύσεωι.
Olympia Museum Inv. No. 119. *Vidi, Phot.*

Height: 0.31m. Width: 0.775m. Thickness: 0.915m.

Letter Height: 0.022-0.03m.

*paulo post* 472 ante

Καλλίας Διδυμός: Ἄθηναῖος
παγκράτιον.
Μῖκων: ἔποιησεν: Ἄθηναῖος.

The letter style is quite elegant and the strokes are deeply cut (0.001-0.002m.). The script and dialect are appropriately Attic-Ionic, since both the victor and the sculptor are Athenians. The letter shapes are (*LSAG* 66 fig. 26): α3, α7, ι2, η2, ι3, μ3, ν2, α2, ι6. Punctuation 4, except for the shapes of gamma (Γ), lambda (Λ) and omega (Ω).

The surface of the stone, where the word Μῖκων is inscribed, is very worn, but the shapes of the letters are visible, if with difficulty.

**Bibliography:** Frazer 1965, ad loc. Hitzig 1896-1910, ad loc. Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc.


**Commentary:** The date of this inscription, a little after 472 B.C., is that of Pausanias who in book 5 notes that Kallias' victory in the pankration took place in the seventy-seventh Olympiad. Pausanias knows from some source that during that year the event of the pankration was delayed and the athletes were invited to start the event at night, because the horse races ran late and the pentathlon event took more than the usual time to finish because of fierce competition.\(^{152}\)

After Poulydamas' statue in the general area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus (no. 16 above and notes 139, 140) Pausanias mentions a triad of victory statues, two of Arkadians (no. 20 above) and one of the Athenian pankratiast Kallias, whose

---

\(^{152}\) This is not an ancient problem. Even during the modern Olympics the time schedule is often extended, because of tough competition among the athletes.
The statue was the work of the Athenian painter Mikon. The sculptor is called by Pausanias a ζωγράφος, which implies that sculpting was not Mikon’s main interest. Even so, Pliny reports that Mikon’s athletic statues were highly praised (Mikon athletis spectatur, HN 34.88). The inscription is brief, containing essentially the same information as Pausanias, but adding the name of Kallias’ father, Didymias. Apparently, the exegete’s information in this case derives entirely from the Olympic inscription.

A similar dedicatory base of ca. 450-440 B.C. has been found near the Propylaia at Athens. Its inscription includes, in addition to the Olympic, all the other victories of Kallias (IG 12 606 = DAA 164 and PA 7823, circular base of Pentelic marble):

```
Καλλίας Δ Initialise ύψος ἀνέθηκεν.

νίκαι:

"Ολ[υμλ]πίας

Πυθεια: δίς

"Ισθμια: πεντάκλια

Νέμεια: τετράκλια

Παναθέναια μεγάλες.
```

This inscription proves that Kallias was a periodonikes, i.e. he won the periodos (all four major Panhellenic Games) at least one time, although Pausanias is silent about it, and also he won once in the Great Panathenaia. The total number of his victories, thirteen, is quite an impressive accomplishment for so difficult an event as the pankration. What is even more interesting is that Kallias also appears to have been active in the political life of

---

153 According to Kirchner the stone reads ΜΕΛΛ. Gallavotti (1979a, 29), however, proposes that, since an inscription on the Propylaia could hardly have been careless, after Kallias’ ostracism the inscription at the end was changed from μεγάλα to read μη δίκαια, i.e. "one Panathenaic victory and no more", a kind of damnatio memoriae.

This would be something new and there is no evidence for such a case. In addition, there is no compelling argument to read μη δίκαια, since Kallias would not have been able to participate in the Panathenaic Games after his ostracism anyway. Such an action would be justified, if there was evidence for a false addition on the stone of more than one victory.

154 Pausanias does not use the term periodonikes, for which see no. 8 above [Ergoteles son of Philanor from Himera] and especially note 119.
Athens. Pseudo-Andokides indicates that he was ostracized (*Against Alkibiades* 4.32: ...καλλίαν τὸν Διδυμίου τῷ σώματι νικήσαντα πάντας ἄγωνας τοὺς στεφανηθέρους ἐξεστράκισατε...), and there have been found three ostraca with his name in the Agora excavations, while six more have been found elsewhere. These nine ostraca are not proof beyond doubt that Kallias was in fact ostracized, and Vanderpool (1970, 25-26) rightly cautions against it, all the more so because the passage in Andokides is historically suspect. His comment (1970, 26), however, that “athletes generally do not make politicians” goes too far. Kallias is not an exception, since the brother of Chremonides, for example, Glaukon, had a similar career (see no. 47 below).

Pausanias’ information is based on the Olympic inscription. The inscription found at Athens is further corroborating evidence about Kallias. His athletic and political career, however, is further elucidated by the Athenian ostraca and Pseudo-Andokides. As Moretti has surmised from the tentative date of the Athenian dedication, ca. 450-440 B.C., Kallias by having a successful career as an athlete was able to acquire political clout in Athens, not unlike Alkibiades. This may have caused a move against him which may or may not have succeeded. During this period Ephialtes and Perikles were the dominant figures in the political scene at Athens. Kallias’ political career may have paralleled that of Thukydides son of Melesias with whom he probably was acquainted. He may indeed have suffered ostracism. At least the nine ostraca show that he received nine votes for that dubious honor.

155 There are three ostraka from the Athenian Agora. Thompson (1948, 193-194) reports the find of one ostrakon in the Agora excavations of 1947, dating from the second quarter of the fifth century; Vanderpool (1949, 409 with select bibliography) lists two ostraka which were also found in the Agora. See now Lang 1990, 65.
22.

6.6.2: ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις Ἑυκλής ἀνάκειται Καλλιάνακτος, γένος μὲν 'Ρόδιος, οὐκ οὖν δὲ τοῦ Διαγορίδῶν· θυγατρὸς γὰρ Διαγόρου παῖς ἦν, ἐν δὲ ἀνδράσι πυγμῆς ἔχειν 'Ολυμπικῆς νίκην. τούτου μὲν δὴ ἢ ἐκλών Ναυκύδους ἔστιν ἔργον·

6.7.2: Διαγόρου δὲ καὶ οἱ τῶν θυγατέρων παῖδες πῦξ τε ἦσκησαν καὶ ἔχον Ὀλυμπικᾶς νίκας, ἐν μὲν ἀνδράσιν Ἑυκλῆς Καλλιάνακτος τε ἦν καὶ Καλλιπάτειρας τῆς Διαγόρου, ....

5.6.7: Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν ὅθέν, πρὶν ἢ διαβήκαι τὸν Ἀλφσίον, ἔστιν ὅρος ἐκ Σκιλλόντος ἐρχομένως πέτρας ὑψηλᾶς ἀπότομον· ὁνομάζεται δὲ Τυμαίον τὸ ὄρος. κατὰ τούτου τὰς γυναῖκας Ἡλεί— ὅσι ἐστὶν ὥθειν νῦμοι, ἦν φωραθώσιν ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα ἔλθουσι τὸν Ὀλυμπικὸν ἦ καὶ ὅλως ἐν τοῖς ἀπειρημέναις σφόδροι ἡμέραις διαβάσαι τὸν Ἀλφσίον. οὐ μὴν οὖθε αὐλάναι λέγουσιν οὐδεμιᾶν, ὅτι μὴ Καλλιπάτειραν μόνην· εἰς δὲ οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην Φερενύκην καὶ οὐ Καλλιπάτειραν καλοδῦσαν. (8) αὕτη προσοποθανόντος αὐτῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐξεικάσασα αὐτὴν τὰ πάντα ἀνδρὶ γυμναστὴ ἤγαγεν ἔς Ὀλυμπίαν τὸν ὑδάν μαχούμενον· ἐκώντως δὲ τοῦ Πεισιρδοῦ, τὸ ξύμα ἐν δὲ τοὺς γυμναστὰς ἤχουσιν ἀπειλημένους, τοῦτο ὑπερηφάνου ἡ Καλλιπάτειρα ἐγγυμνώθη. φωραθέοις δὲ ὅτι εἶ ἡ γυνή, ταύτην ἀφύσιν ἀξίμιον καὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῆς καὶ τῷ πολὺ αἰδῶ νέμοντες —ὑπήρχον δὲ ἀπάσιν αὐτοῖς Ὀλυμπικαὶ νίκαι—, ἐποίησαν δὲ νόμον ἐς τὸ ἔπειτα ἐπὶ τοῖς γυμναστάθι γυμνοὺς σφᾶς ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐσέρχεσθαι.

10 159: a base of black limestone, found March 3, 1878, in the Byzantine east wall, between the base of Kallias (no. 21) and that of Philesios (no. 15). The measurements of the footprints on the upper surface indicate that the statue was bronze and about lifesize. The inscription is cut on the front edge of the upper surface.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 356.

Height: 0.298m. Width: 0.635m. Thickness: 0.705m.

Letter Height: ca. 0.02m.

350–290 ante

NON-STOICH. 23-24
The letter style is elegant and all strokes end in triangular serifs, which perhaps suggests a Hellenistic date for the inscription.


**Commentary:** The date of this inscription is based totally on the letter style which does not agree with the date for Eukles' victory in boxing. The generally accepted view is that Eukles won near the end of the fifth century (Moretti suggested the 94th Olympiad, 404 B.C.), and that the inscription on the base was later renewed, between the middle of the fourth and the beginning of the third centuries (hence 350–290 B.C.).

Pausanias, as he continues his enumeration of victory-statues in the Altis' general area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus, comes to the statue of Eukles son of Kallianax of Rhodes who won in the boxing event and whose statue was the work of Naukydes. Eukles, Pausanias adds, belonged to the Diagorid family of Rhodes, since his mother Kallipateira was the daughter of the paterfamilias Diagoras who was himself an Olympic victor, as were other members of his family. Later on (6.7.1-7), Pausanias devotes more space to the history of this famous family and mentions again the statue of Eukles together with the other statues of his relatives that were erected in Olympia on account of their victories (for the arrangement of the family's statues see below no. 26, and also nos. 27-28).

The text of the inscription verifies Pausanias' narrative about the statue of Eukles, his father, and the sculptor, with the exception that the signature adds the name of the sculptor's father, Patrokles. The absence from the inscription of the event in which Eukles was victorious probably caused Pausanias no difficulty, since the statue doubtless depicted him as a boxer. Most likely, Pausanias also checked the Olympic Register.
In addition to the statue of Eukles and its inscription, Pausanias also utilized other sources, since he provides far more information about Eukles and the other members of the Diagorid family than the inscriptions on their bases offer. The information that Pausanias offers about Eukles’ father Kallianax and his mother Kallipateira requires elaboration, since it is pertinent to the evidence of other authors. Pindar composed Olympian 7 in order to celebrate the victory of Diagoras, uncle of Eukles, in the boxing event of 464 B.C., the date given by the Scholiast (Drachmann 1964). In the last epode of this long ode Pindar writes (Ol. 7.92-93):  

μὴ κρύπτε το κοινον / σπέρματι απὸ καλλιάνακτος.

This line was understood, by the Scholiast, as a reference to an ancestor of Diagoras. Pouilloux has rightly pointed out that Pausanias’ information on the family’s ancestry does not mention any Kallianax (4.24.3):

τοῦς Διαγόρους καλουμένους ἐν 'Ῥόδων, γεγονότας ὅλη ἀπὸ Δαμαγήτου τοῦ Δαμαγήτου τοῦ Δαμαγήτου τε καὶ τῆς Ἀριστομένου θυγατρὸς.

That Diagoras’ father was Damagetos is verified by Pindar who mentions him (πάτερα τα Δαμάγητον ἀδήντα Δέκα Ol. 7.17). Kallianax, so far as can be surmised, was not a name in the Diagorid family. The three sons of Diagoras were named, according to the customary onomatology, after their ancestors. None of them is named Kallianax, and in fact the first son of Diagoras is named after his grandfather, Damagetos. Pouilloux hypothesized further that Kallianax married Kallipateira, Diagoras’ daughter, in the same year in which Diagoras won. This event would account both for Pindar’s blessing for the

---

156 The lines of the text refer to the Teubner edition by Snell 1955.

157 Drachmann 1964, on line 92: μὴ ἀπόκρυπτε τὸ κοινὸν καὶ διαδηλοῦ τοὺς πολλοὺς τοῦ καλλιάνακτος γένος (πρόγονοι γὰρ τοῦ νεκροῦν σιτος ἐνθέως), ἄλλα ύμνει. Although the prevalent meaning of πρόγονος is “ancestor,” the meaning “step-son” (LSJ s.v. πρόγονος III) is also attested in Euripides’ Ion 1329, in Dionysios’ of Halikarnassos De Isocrate 18, in the Monumenti Ancyrani versio Graeca 16.9, in Lucian’s Calumniae non temere credendum 26, in SEG VI, 667 (inscription from Attalia), and so on.
couple’s future offspring and for his introductory remarks in the first strophe where he compares the composition of this ode and his relation with Diagoras to that between a father and his son-in-law.\footnote{There is no need to suppose (with Pouilloux) that Diagoras’ victory and the marriage of his daughter fell in the same year. Along this line, one could similarly hypothesize that the line is a reference to the birth of Eukles, or a reference to Kallianax and his family, with whom Pindar may have been personally acquainted, and so on.

Verdenius objected to Pouilloux’s suggestion first that Eukles in the 420s-410s B.C., when he won at Olympia, would be “well past his forties (1976, 252),” to which Bernardini (1983, 190 note 80) rightly replied that Diagoras himself in 464 B.C. must have been in his forties (one may also add at least the athletic careers of Theogenes of Thasos and Euthymos of Lokroi, who must have reached at least their forties while active athletically). Verdenius replied with “a more cogent objection than the chronological argument...in 1976” (1987, 86 note 121), namely that Pouilloux’s suggestion “makes the sentence (sc. lines 92-93) a kind of appendix and leaves the asyndeton unexplained (p. 86).”}

In addition to the evidence in Pausanias which corroborates Pouilloux’s identification for lines 92-93 in Pindar, it should be pointed out that Diagoras was so prominent that the gens became known after him as the Diagorids of Rhodes, whereas previously they were presumably called the Eratidae (\textit{Ol.} 7.93). Pindar ends the ode with a prayer to Zeus (\textit{Ol.} 7.87-95): first he prays for Diagoras who inherited a “sound mind” from his ancestors (\\textit{\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omega\nu...\\delta\zeta\ \\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\nu\ }91), and then he adds \\textit{\mu\nu \ \kappa\rho\omega\pi\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\omega\gamma\nu\nu\ / \ \sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\nu}’ \ \\epsilon\\pi\omicron\ \\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\nu\alpha\kappa\alpha\kappa\tau\omicron\sigma\ (92-93). It would seem rather surprising if Pindar, who has just praised Diagoras’ ancestors, singled out one of them, i.e. Kallianax, in order to point out the need for “growth (Young 1968, 94-95)” of Diagoras’ family and “the continuity of its tradition (Verdenius 1987, 86)” (see also his arguments in note 145). There is little question that Pindar is here praying for the future of the family. Kallianax, the son-in-law of Diagoras and himself surely a member of another noble family, fits perfectly in this context. For thus, the Diagorids can hope for the continuation of the Diagorid tradition in winning victories at Olympia—a Pindaric prayer fulfilled by Kallianax’s son Eukles in 420-410 B.C.
Similar problems arise from Pausanias' testimony for Eukles' mother, Kallipateira. Although Pausanias is specific that Eukles was the son of Kallianax and Kallipateira (6.7.2), nevertheless, in the beginning of his *Eliaka* he speaks of Peisirhodos as her son (5.6.7-8). When Pausanias enters the territory of Olympia and reaches Mt. Typaion he says that this is the cliff from which the Eleians hurl down those of the women that are caught attending the Olympic Games, since only virgins and the priestess of Demeter Chamyne were allowed to attend and not married women. In the long history of the Games, however, only once was there a challenge to this Olympic rule by Kallipateira, or as some say (ἐὰν εἴη 5.6.7) Pherenike, the daughter of Diagoras. The mother of Peisirhodos became his trainer and dressed up as a man, but when her son won she jumped over the barrier which caught the cloak and her sex was discovered. She was let go, however, because of the tradition and glory of her family whose male members had been Olympic victors, but the Olympic Boule instituted another rule on account of this incident, that the trainers of the athletes must attend the Games naked.

The same version of this anecdote is repeated only once more in the ancient sources by Flavius Philostratos (a younger contemporary of Pausanias, born ca. A.D. 160-170) in his *Vita:the* 17. There Philostratos notes that in all athletic competitions the trainers wore a cloak (τριπέτησα), except in Olympia, where as the Eleians say (ὡς ἐστιν ἡ τρίπετησα) after Pherenike's incident they passed a rule that all trainers must be naked. Both Pausanias and Philostratos heard (ὡς ἡ τρίπετησα) this anecdote probably from the Eleian exegetes and are the only two who preserve it.

The Scholiast of Pindar (Drachmann 1964, 196-199), however, who presumably takes the information from Aristotle and Apollas, gives a different version of the challenge to the rule which excluded married women from attending the Games: Kallipateira (or

---

159 See Kaldis-Henderson 1979, 331-344, who discusses sex discrimination during the Olympic Games.
Aristopateira) applied to the Olympic authorities for permission to attend the Games, which was granted because she was a daughter, sister, and mother of Olympic victors. Later authors present the same story, except that they change the mother's name to Pherenike. As Kaldis-Henderson (1979, 346) has argued, Pausanias seems to conflate two stories. He attributes the incident of Pherenike to Kallipateira without noticing that later on he contradicts himself, when he clearly states that Eukles and not Peisirhodos was the son of Kallianax and Kallipateira. The aetiological aspect of his version was far more important for his narrative than the mere grant of the privilege to attend the Games. Even so, Pausanias in this case provides clear indications that for the composition of his work he did not depend on one source exclusively, namely the inscriptions. He tried to corroborate his own observations in the Altis with other evidence, be that the exegetes' explanations, or those of earlier authors (see also below the discussion of the other members of the Diagorids nos. 26-28).

6.6.3: Νικόδαμος δὲ ὁ πλάστης ὁ ἐκ Μαυναλοῦ Δαμοξενίδαν ἀνθρα πύκτην ἐποίησεν ἐκ Μαυναλοῦ.

Apparatus Criticus:

1 all mss. read παλαιστής, except Va Ms and V on the margin which read: πλάστης, and R which deletes it and in one margin has πλαστής and in the other παλαιστής.

IO 158: a base of black limestone, found October 18, 1879, between the Heraion and the Pelopeion near the base of Pythokles (IO 162, 163 = no. 30 below). From the single footprint that survives on the upper surface it is surmised that the bronze

160 All this information is conveniently gathered by Kaldis-Henderson 1979, 346-349.
The statue was lifesize. The inscription is cut on the front edge of the upper surface of the base which is broken on the left side.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 702.

Height: 0.28m. Width: 1.70m. Thickness: 0.47m.

Letter Height line 1: 0.015m.; line 3: 0.02m.

420–375 ante; saec. I ante

Νικόδαμος ἐποίησε.

νακοτσσεις

Δαμοξε[νέ]ς Μαίναλιος.

The letter shapes of the two lines (1 and 3) are quite distinct (in addition to their difference in height): in line 1 the shapes suggest the fourth century B.C. (the middle bar of the alpha is cut higher; the top and bottom strokes of sigma slant; the nu leans to the right), whereas in line 3 they suggest the first century B.C. (the alpha has a broken middle bar; the top and bottom strokes of the sigma are almost horizontal and extend to the left; and the nu is not leaning).

Line 2: Marcadé (1953, 84 note 2) read below ἐπερχοςε traces of letters from a graffito (?) of a proper name which of course does not belong to the inscription. He reads the beginning: Ἀρπο- or Ἀνο-, and the end: -έλης or -έδης.


Commentary: There are two dates for this inscription: 420–375 B.C. for line 1, the signature of the sculptor whose floruit is the late fifth and early fourth centuries (see Marcadé’s discussion of Nikodamos’ career); and 100–1 B.C. for line 2 which is suggested by the letter style. The inscription of the victor, therefore, is a renewal of an older one that was inscribed probably on another side and was totally damaged. Moretti, therefore, has placed tentatively Damoxenidas’ victory in the 99th Olympiad (384 B.C.).

Pausanias, as he continues his enumeration of victory statues in the general area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus, reaches the work of Nikodamos of Mainalon made for his fellow-citizen the boxer Damoxenidas. The base of Damoxenidas was not found in its original position, but is correctly assumed by the IO editors to have stood...
near the statues of Kallias (no. 21 above), Eukles (no. 22 above), and Euthymos (no. 24 below), i.e. to the east of the northeast corner of the temple of Zeus.

The two texts are again very brief and corroborate each other. The only noticeable differences are that Pausanias mentions the event in which Damoxenidas was victorious, and adds the ethnic of the artist, whereas the inscription does not include this information. As with the previous athletic dedications, the pose of the statue would render unnecessary the inclusion of the event on the base. This of course does not exclude the possibility that Pausanias in addition to the inscription used also the Olympic Register for the victory of Damoxenidas. Likewise, he knew Nikodamos' ethnic from other works of his which he saw in the Altis.  

24.

6.6.4: ὁ δὲ ἐσ Εὐθύμων τὸν πύκτην, οὔ με εἰκὸς ὑπερβαίνειν ἢν τὰ ἐσ τὰς νῖκας αὐτῶι καὶ τὰ ἐσ δόξαν ὑπάρχουν τὴν ἄλλην. γένος μὲν δὴ ἡ ἢν ὁ Εὐθύμων ἐκ τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίαι Λοκρῶν, οὐ χώραν τὴν πρὸς τῶι Ζεφυρίωι τῇ ἀκραί νέμονται, πατρὸς δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο Ἀστυκλέους. εἶναι δὲ αὐτὸν οὐ τούτου, ποταμοῦ δὲ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι τοῦ Κακίνου φασίν, δὲ τὴν Λοκρίδα καὶ Ἰργίνην ὄρισσιν τὸ ὁ πρὸς τέττιγας παρέχεται θείμα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τέττιγες οἱ ἐντὸς τῆς Λοκρίδος ἁχρὶ τοῦ Κακίνου κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς ἀλλοις τέττιξιν ἀδιστό. διαβάντων δὲ τὸν Κακίνων οὐδεμίαν ἔτι οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰργίνηι τέττιγες ἀφιάσι (τὴν) φωνὴν. (5) τούτου μὲν δὴ παῖδα εἶναι λέγεται τὸν Εὐθύμων: ἀνελομένωι δὲ οἱ πυγμῆς ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι νῖκην τετάρτη πρὸς ταῖς ἐβδομήκοντα ὀλυμπιάδι οὐ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ὀλυμπιάδα ἐμελλε χωρῆσειν. θεογένης γὰρ ὁ Θάσιος ὀλυμπιάδι ἐθέλων τῇ αὐτῆι πυγμῆς τε ἀνελέοθαι καὶ παγκρατίου νῖκας ὑπερβαλέτο πυκτέων τὸν Εὐθύμων, οὐ μὴν οὔδε ὁ θεογένης ἔπι τῷ παγκρατίῳ λαβεῖν ἐστιν θέου τὸν κότινον ἂτε προκατεργασθεὶς τῇ μάχῃ πρὸς τὸν Εὐθύμων. (6) ἔπι τούτω δὲ ἐπιβάλλουσιν οἱ ἐλλανοδίκαι τῷ θεογένει τάλαντον μὲν ἱερὰν

161 Pausanias saw four more statues of Nikodamos: 5.25.7; 5.26.6; 6.3.9; 6.6.1.
ες τον θεόν ζημίαν, τάλαντον δὲ βλάβης τῆς ἐς Εὐθύμων, ὅτι ἐπη-


pelai τῇ ἐς ἐκείνων ἐθύκει σφίσιν ἐπανελέσθαι τὸ ἀγώνισμα τῆς


πυγμῆς· τοῦτων ἕνεκα καταδικάζουσιν αὐτὸν ἔκτισαι καὶ ἄδαι τῷ Εὐθύμῳ χρῆματα. ἐκτῆ δὲ ὁλυμπάδι ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐβεβηκόντα τὸ μὲν τῷ θεῷ τοῦ ἀργυρίου γινόμενον ἐξέτισεν ὁ Θεὸς γένης,


καὶ ἀμεβόμενος αὐτοῦ οὐχ ἐσθήθην ἐπὶ τὴν πυγμήν· καὶ ἐπὶ ἐκ εἰ-


νῆς τῇ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς μετ' ἐκείνην ὁλυμπάδος τὸν ἐπὶ πυγμή


στέφαυον ἀνέλετο ὁ Εὐθύμως. ὅ δὲ οἱ ἀνδριᾶς τέχνη τῇ ἐστὶν Πυθαγόρου καὶ θέας ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ἄξιον. (7) ἐπανήκου ὃ ὅ ἐς Ἰταλίαν τότε δὴ ἐμαχᾶσατο πρὸς τὸν Ἰρω· τὰ δὲ ἐς αὐτὸν εἶχεν οὔτως. Ὁ οὐσεῖα πλανώμενοι μετὰ ἄλωσιν τὴν Ἰλλίου κατενεχθή-


ναι φανὶν ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἔς τε ἄλλας τῶν ὑ Ὑταλίαι καὶ Σικέλια


πόλεων, ἀφίκεσθαι δὲ καὶ ἄς Τεμέσαν ὅμοι ταῖς ναυσὶ· μεθυσθὲν-


tα ὁν ἐνταῦτα ἕνα τῶν ναυτῶν παρθένον βιάσασθαι καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἀντὶ τούτου καταλευσθῆναι τοῦ ἀδικήματος. Ὁ οὐσεῖα


μὲν δὴ ἐν ὠδεύν λόγῳ θέμενον αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀπώλειαν ἀποτελέοντα οἴχεσθαι, τοῦ καταλευθέντος δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τῶν δαίμων οὐδένα ἀνείναι καίρον ἀποκείμοντα τὸ ὁμώς τοὺς ὑ Ὑ τῇ Τεμέσῃ καὶ ἐπεξερχόμενον ἐπὶ πάσαν ἥλικεν, ἐς η Ἡ Πυθία τὸ παράπαν ἔξι Ἰταλίας ὁρμημένους φεύγειν Τεμέσαν μὲν ἐκλιπεὶν οὐκ εἰτα, τὸν δὲ Ἰρω σφῶς ἐκέλευσεν ἵλασκεθαι τέμενός τε ἀποτεμομένους οἰκο-


dομήσασθαι ναόν, διδόναι δὲ κατὰ ἄτοσ αὐτῶ γυναῖκα τῶν ὑ Ὑ τῇ


Τεμέσῃ παρθένου τὴν καλλισθήν. τοῖς μὲν δὴ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προστηταγμένα ὑπουργοῦσι δείμα ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίμων ὑ Ὑ τὰλλα ἢν


οὐδέν· Εὐθύμως δὲ—ἀφίκετο γὰρ ἐς τὴν Τεμέσαν, καὶ πασὶ τῇρ-


καίτα ὁ ἔθος ἐποίειτο τῷ δαίμονι—πυθόνες ταῖς παρόντα


σφίσι, καὶ ἐσθήθην τε ἐπεθύμησεν ἐς τὸν ναόν καὶ τὴν παρθένον ἐσελθων θεάσασθαι. ώσ δὲ εἶδε, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐς οἶκτον, δεύτερα δὲ ἀφίκετο καὶ ἐς ἔρωτα αὐτῆς· καὶ ἡ παίς τε συνοικίσει κατώμυν-


το αὐτῶ σώσαντι αὐτήν καὶ ὁ Εὐθύμως ἐνσεκεσμένος ἔμενε τὴν


ἐφόδον τοῦ δαίμωνος. ἐνίκα τε δὴ τῇ μάχῃ καὶ ἐξηλαύνετο γὰρ


ἐκ τῆς γῆς—ὁ Ἰρως ἀφανίζεται καταδίκης ἐς θάλασσαν καὶ γά-


μος τε ἐπιφανῆς Εὐθύμῳ καὶ ἀνθρώπως τοῖς ἐνταῦθα ἐλευθερία


τοῦ λουποῦ σφίσιν ἦν ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίμωνος. ἦκουα δὲ καὶ τοιοῦτε ἔτι


ἐς τὸν Εὐθύμων, ὡς γῆρως τε ἐπὶ μακρότατον ἀφίκοιτό καὶ ὡς ἀπο-


θανεῖν ἐκφυγὼν αὐθίς ἔτερον τινα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἄλλουν ἀπέλθαν


τρόπον. οἰκεῖσθαι δὲ τὴν Τεμέσαν καὶ ἐς ἐμε ἀνδρός ἦκουα


πλεύσαντος κατὰ ἐμπορίαν. τὸ δὲ μὲν ἦκουα, γραφῇ δὲ τοιὰδε


ἐπιτυχών οἶδα· ἦν δὲ αὐτῇ γραφῆς μίμημα αἵραξαν. νεανικός


Σύφαμος καὶ Κάλαβρός τοις ποταμῶς καὶ λύκα πηγή, πρὸς δὲ ἤρωθον


tει καὶ Τεμέσα ἦν ἡ πόλις, ἐν δὲ σφίσι καὶ δαίμων οὔτινα ἐξέβαλεν


ὁ Εὐθύμως, χρόαν τε δεινῶς μέλας καὶ τὸ εἴδους ἀπαν ἐς τὰ μάλι—
στα φοβερός, λύκου δὲ ἀμπύρχετο δέρμα ἐσθήτα: ἔτυθετο δὲ καὶ ὄνομα λύκαν τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ γράμματα.

6.7.1: τάϋτα μὲν δὴ ἐς τοσοῦτο εἰρήσθων:

Apparatus Criticus:
13, 16, 18, 23 I have corrected the reading of the mss. θεαγένης into θε<ο>γένης, for which see the Apparatus Criticus in no. 53 below.
23-24 after θε<ο>γένης Spiro indicates a lacuna, because αὐτὸν may refer to the god and to Euthymos and so he restores: θεαγένης, <τὸ δὲ τῇ Εὐθύμῳ οὐκ ἐξέτισεν, ἀλλὰ> ἀμεταμένος.

IO 144: a base of Pentelic marble, found March 5, 1878, opposite the northeast corner of the temple of Zeus, two meters east of the southeast corner of the base of the Eretrians (no. 15 above). The measurement of the footprint on the upper surface suggests that the statue was lifesize. The base is virtually intact, and the inscription is cut on the front. The base is now on display in the Entrance Hall of the New Museum Ἀ(Θώμας) 527.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 357. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.333–0.336m. Width: 0.882–0.884m. Thickness: 0.855m.

Letter Height: 0.015–0.02m.

paulo post 472 ante

STOICH. 14 (lines 1-2)

23 (lines 4-5)

Εὐθυμὸς Λοκρὸς Ἄστυκλέος τρίς Ὀλύμπι Εὐκυκλ. εἰκόνα 8' ἐπιτύπωσεν [Πηνύδ ξ λοτοῖς ἐσοφάν].

vacat 0.025–0.031m.

Εὐθυμὸς Λοκρὸς ἀπὸ Ζεφυρίῳ ἀνέθη η κ ε.

5 Πυθαγόρας Σάμιος ἐποίησεν.

vacat 0.015m.

The letters in the double square brackets of line 2 are inscribed spaced out and in rasura by a different cutter who also added the last word in line 4.

Roehl restores the erasure exempli gratia: [Πατρίς Δαυλομένη] or [Παίσις φύλω γενέτεροι].

Gallavotti 1984, 220 note 15 exempli gratia: [Πυγμάχος ὃν ἀγαθός] or Εἰκόνα 6' ἐπιτύπωσεν [Πυκτής μέγα ὑπετρόχος ἄλλων].

His second suggestion (another hexameter) would just fit in the space that is erased.
The first two lines of the inscription are an elegiac distich, whereas the last two contain the signatures of the victor and the sculptor in prose.

The letters are carefully laid out and elegantly cut and the dialect and lettering are Ionic. According to Jeffery’s table for the “Ionic Dodekapolis” the letter-shapes are *(LSAG* 325 fig. 46): α3, γ1, ε4, η2, θ3, κ5, λ3, μ4, ν5, ρ1, σ1, υ4.

For the shapes of the corrections in lines 2 and 4 Jeffery writes *(LSAG* 331):

The dedication of the boxer Eudymos at Olympia (19), whose third victory in 472 supplies the *terminus post quem* for the inscription, offers a timely warning against the infallibility of letterforms alone as a basis for absolute dating, for in this instance a correction to the first inscription, which was made *in rasura* over the first by a different cutter, is actually earlier in appearance than the original (cf. *epsilon*, *nu* in the first and in the second); the difference in age and outlook between two masons at work in one particular generation is an incalculable factor.\(^{162}\)

The two letters, however, which Jeffery believes in appearance at least may suggest an earlier date, do not appear in her table (325 fig. 46): the second cutter’s epsilon leans to the left or is straight and the horizontal strokes are parallel, characteristics which suggest a variation of the epsilon of the original mason; likewise the nu of the second cutter does not come close to any of the four shapes in Jeffery’s table, but its shape is rather a variation of the style of the original mason, since there are three nus in the corrections of which the two in *ἀράπας* and *ἐρεμηκε* are like Jeffery’s ν4 except for its right vertical, which is not extended upwards. The nu in *τηνις* is like Jeffery’s ν3, only that it leans to the right.

And yet, there is a letter which suggests that the second mason’s style is not earlier but later. The rho in the original is ρ1, whereas in line 2 it resembles Jeffery’s ρ3, since the vertical stroke extends above the loop. How much later the inscription was erased must remain open. In all probability, however, the inscription on the base was “corrected” as soon as possible, because presumably what was originally inscribed must have offended someone.


Commentary: The date of this inscription is based on Pausanias’ own statement (6.6.6) that Euthymos’ last victory in boxing took place during the 77th Olympiad, i.e. 472 B.C. It is during this year or sometime after it that his statue was dedicated, since in the first line of the inscription it is mentioned that Euthymos won three times. Pausanias in his overview of Euthymos’ career provides also the dates for the two earlier victories of the Lokrian athlete: the 74th Olympiad, 484 B.C. (6.6.5) and the 76th Olympiad, 476 B.C. (6.6.6; see also Moretti 1957, nos. 191, 214, 227).

---

\(^{162}\) The last general statement has now been modified, at least as far as the Hellenistic period of Attic Epigraphy is concerned, by the work of Tracy 1990, *passim*, where further references can be found.
In the Altis Pausanias saw numerous athletic statues, but for only four did he feel compelled to devote considerable space in his exposition, perhaps because he had at his disposal far more evidence for these athletes: Poulydamas from Skotousa (6.5); Euthymos from Lokroi Epizephyroi (6.6.4-11); the members of the Diagorid family (6.7, no. 22 above and nos. 26-28 below); and Theogenes from Thasos (6.11.2-9, no. 53 below). Except for the Diagorids, these other extraordinary athletes received special honors and after their deaths they became heroes with a cult and numerous anecdotes were circulated about them and their heroization (see Fontenrose 1968, 73-104 where all cases of hero-athletes are discussed).

Pausanias starts out Euthymos' story by admitting that it is not right for him to pass over the victories and fame of Euthymos and ends section six by offering his judgement of Pythagoras' work as being most worth seeing. The methodological principle of τὰ μᾶλλον ξένον has been laid out by Pausanias in the beginning of book six and has been followed ever since (6.1.1-2 and no. 14 and notes 145-146 above). This criterion for his selection of statues to be mentioned is also combined with another one, i.e. the brevity of the information. Pausanias has implicitly adopted a concise and abridged exegesis of the athletic statues along the way, perhaps for reasons of space, or perhaps because he was forced to it for lack of evidence. So far, Pausanias' exegesis of athletic statues has been very brief, often as brief as the inscriptions themselves. It contains the athlete's name and his ethnikon, often his patronymic, the event in which he won, and the signature of the sculptor.

For Euthymos the Lokrian, however, Pausanias had more to go on than the brief inscription on his base, which, however, agrees with and confirms Pausanias' narrative about Euthymos' Olympic career. Euthymos son of Astykles from the Italian Lokroi won three times, and his statue was the work of Pythagoras, whose ethnikon Samios is not
mentioned by Pausanias, who calls him elsewhere Rheginos. To this Pausanias adds the episode during the 75th Olympiad (480 B.C.), that explains why Euthymos did not win: Theogenes participated in the boxing event and defeated Euthymos, but later failed to win in the pankration, because he was exhausted by the competition with Euthymos (no. 53 below). Nevertheless, the Eleians fined Theogenes with the heavy fine of two talents: one to Zeus and one to Euthymos, because they realized that he entered the boxing event solely to deprive Euthymos of victory. In the next Olympiad (76th) Theogenes paid the fine imposed for Zeus, but not the one talent to Euthymos. Instead he did not enter the boxing event (perhaps he also abstained in the subsequent 77th Olympiad) in which Euthymos won his second victory.

This being the substance of Euthymos' career, much discussion has been devoted to the reasons why the inscription at Olympia was corrected after it was set up, and in particular how it can be restored. Roehl postulated that the original text in the second line recorded either the city of Lokroi or Euthymos' father as setting up the statue. His assumption that the donor's name was originally inscribed in the pentameter was based on the change of the verbs from the first person to the third (ἐν Κεφαλείᾳ, ἔστησεν). The Eleian officials consequently objected and the inscription was corrected in two places in order to emphasize that the dedication was made by Euthymos.

All this is probable, but, as Jeffery has concluded, "the reason for the alteration on this base must remain conjectural" (331). Gallavotti has recently discussed the information about Euthymos that is found, not in so much detail, in Kallimachos (Aitia fr. 98-99, 635 Pfeiffer), Strabo (6.255), Pliny (HN 7.152), and in sources later than Pausanias. He has rightly pointed out that the end of line two need not exclusively contain the donor's name, simply because of the change of person in the verb ἔστησεν;

163 All in book 6: 4.4, 6.1, 13.7, 18.1. In addition to 6.6.6, Pythagoras without an ethnikon is also mentioned in 6.7.10 and 6.13.1.
the epigram of Kyniska is a case in point (above no. 7). The original version may have included a boastful claim of Euthymos' success in the three Olympiads in the boxing event which offended the Eleians and perhaps other athletes. Notable too is the implication of the addition of the verb ἄνεπηκε: the officials were compelled to add it, because apparently the verb ἔστησεν conveyed only the meaning of setting up and of paying the expenses for the statue, and not the privilege the victorious athletes were granted by the Olympic Boule to dedicate their statue in the Altis.

Pausanias concludes his exegesis of Euthymos' career with an anecdote, an aition explaining the capture of Temesa by the Lokrians and the heroization of both the daimon and Euthymos. All this information, Pausanias clarifies, is hearsay (ἡκούσα 6.10), as is also the confirmation he received from a merchant sailor that Temesa was still in his time inhabited, and that the local Lokrian tradition claims (ὁ ἐν γέφυροι ... ὁσίῳν) that Euthymos' father was the river Kaikinos (6.6.4). This last Lokrian tradition about Euthymos' father is now corroborated by a Lokrian terracotta find depicting Kaikinos on one side and on the other a young beardless figure with the inscription Εὔθυμος, which suggests that Euthymos was associated with Kaikinos perhaps in a local Lokrian cult (see Moretti 1957, 86 no. 191, and Fontenrose 1968, 73-104).

A similar approach in corroborating evidence is taken by Pausanias for the other anecdote of Euthymos and Temesa. He too happened to see a copy of an ancient painting portraying the city Temesa, the daimon Hero (his name was painted and read "Lykas"), the young Sybaris, the river Kalabros and the spring Lyka. Pausanias does not make it clear where he chanced to see this copy (perhaps on a bowl), but the way he brings together the evidence is very interesting methodologically: first he narrates the stories he heard and/or read, and then, by way of testimony and proof, he adds his personal observation (αὐτοὶ ζά) of a work of art in support of his narrative. Thus, for the athlete Euthymos Pausanias utilized the inscribed base at Olympia, traditional evidence passed by
word of mouth, perhaps written works, and another inscribed work of art, all of which he combined in an interpretative and sensible manner, much the same way modern classicists strive to do.

25.

6.7.1: μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦ Εὐθύμου... ἔστηκε... καὶ πύκτης Ἡλεῖος Ἀρμίδης, λαβόντες νίκας ἐν παισί.

IO 156: a large base of grey marble, found March 15, 1878, in the Byzantine east wall immediately south of Euthymos’ statue (no. 24 above). The measurements of the footprints on the upper surface indicate that the statue was bronze and about life size. The inscription is cut on the front edge of the upper surface.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 370.

Height: 0.34m. Width: 0.87-0.88m. Thickness: 1.045m.

Letter Height: ca. 0.015m.

saec. I ante

The text is that of Ebert (1972, 87-88) who had a squeeze of the inscription at his disposal and prints a different facsimile from that of the IO editors.

The substitution of the beta for the digamma in Βαλειόνυ, and the shapes of the letters, especially the middle broken bar of the alpha, suggest that the inscription is not the original, but a renewed version in the first century B.C.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of Ebert 1972, 88):

Line 1: beta and alpha—only very faint traces of their shapes; tau—only part of the horizontal; iota—only the bottom part of a vertical stroke.

164 Beta for digamma in the Eleian dialect may lie behind a place name which Pausanias records in 5.3.2: ... αὐτῷ τε τὸ καρπὸν Βάδου ὀνομάζουσι καὶ ποταμὸν τὸ βέοντα ἐν θάλα σῇ ὀφθαλμῷ Βάδου ἐπιχειρεῖν φωνήν.
Line 2: epsilon−only a faint trace of its shape; alpha−a faint trace of the right slanting stroke; mu−a very faint trace of its shape;omicron—the left part of a curving stroke; lambda—only part of a right slanting stroke; iota—only the bottom part of a vertical stroke; alpha—the left and right slanting strokes.

Restorations:


Commentary: The date of the inscription is based on the letter style, which suggests the first century B.C. The original date of the dedication of Charmides’ statue is thought to have been the middle of the fifth century B.C. Scholars have come to this conclusion, because Pausanias saw the statue between the dedication of Euthymos and those of the Diagorids, dedications of fifth century athletes. It is not certain, however, that this was the original place of the statue, since it may have been moved when the inscription was renewed. At any rate, Moretti has placed the victory of Charmides tentatively in the 84th Olympiad (444 B.C.).

After his excursus on Euthymos Pausanias returns to his usual brief mention of victory statues, one of which is the Eleian boxer Charmides, victorious in the boys’ category. The inscribed base which is found in Olympia near that of Euthymos seems to agree with the topographical detail of Pausanias.

---

165 See especially Hyde 1911, 53-67; 1912, 203-229; 1913, xxx-xxxi; 1921, 342 and 340-353.
The laconic information of Pausanias about Charmides seems to be the same as that of the epigram, except for one detail, that Charmides won in the boys’ category. The fact that in the epigram there is no mention of this indicates that Pausanias may have taken it either from the Olympic Register (so Ebert 1972, 88), or from the representation of the statue, or even, although less probably, from some other source. It also appears that there was no inscribed signature of the sculptor on the base, nor does Pausanias seem to know him. The epigraphical information, therefore, and Pausanias’ reference to the statue of Charmides are not inconsistent, but complement each other.

26.

6.7.1: θειάσμενος δὲ καὶ τούτους ἔπὶ τῶν Ἀρδίων ἀθλητῶν ἀφίξει τὰς εἰκόνας, Διαγόραν καὶ τὸ ἐκείνου γένος· οἱ δὲ συνεχεῖς τε ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἐν κόσμῳ τουσίδε ἀνέκειντο, ..., Δωριεὺς δὲ ὁ νεώτατος παγκρατίων νικήσας ὀλυμπιάδαν ἐφέξης τρισ. ... (2) οὕτωι μὲν ἄδελφοι τε ἔσι καὶ Διαγόρου παῖδες. ... (4) Δωριεὺς δὲ τοὺς Διαγόρου παρέξ ἢ Ὀλυμπιάσαν Ἰσθμίων μὲν γεγονασιν ὀκτώ νίκαι, Νεμείων δὲ ἀποδέουσαι μᾶς ἐσ τὰς ὀκτώ· λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὡς Πύθεια ἀνέλοιτο ἄκοντι. ἀνηγορεύοντο δὲ οὕτωι τε καὶ ὁ Πεισίρωδος θουρίω, διωχθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιστασιωτῶν ἔκ τῆς Ῥόδου καὶ ἐκ Ἰταλίαν παρὰ θουρίους ἀπελθόντες. χρώμιω δὲ ύστερον κατῆλθεν ὁ Δωριεὺς ἐσ Ῥόδον· καὶ φανερῶτα δὴ ἀπάντων ἀνήρ οἷς φρονήσας οὕτως τὰ Ἀλεξαμονίων φαίνεται, ὡστε και ἐναυμάχθησαν ἐναντία Ἀθηναίων ναυσίν οἰκείαις, ἐς τριήμερων ἀλοὺς Ἀττικῶν ἀνήχησι ζων παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις. (5) οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὶν μὲν ἢ Δωριεὰ παρὰ σφᾶς ἀναχθῆναι θυμᾶτι τε ἐς αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπειλαῖς ἔχρωντο· ὡς δὲ ἐς ἐκκλησίαν συνελθόντες ἄνδρα οὕτω μέγαν καὶ δόξης ἐς τοσοῦτο ἥκοντα ἔθεάσαντο ἐν σχήματι αἱμαλλωτίου, μεταπίπτει σφίζειν ὃς αὐτόν ἢ γνώμη καὶ ἀπελθεῖν ἀφίασιν οὐδὲ ἔργον οὐδὲν ἄχρι ἐργάζονται, παρόν σφίζοι πολλά τε καὶ σὺν τῷ δίκαιῳ δράσα. (6) τὰ δὲ ἐς τοῦ Δωρίεως τὴν τελευτήν ἐστίν ἐν τῇ συγγραφῆ τῇ Ἀτθίδῳ Ἀνθρωπίνην εἰρημένα, εἶναι μὲν τηνικάτα ἐν Καύνω τὸ βασιλέως ναυτικόν καὶ Κόσμων ἐπ’ αὐτῶι στρατηγόν, Ἀρδίων δὲ τῶν δήμων πεισθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Κόσμων ἀπὸ Ἀλεξαμονίων μεταβαλέσθαι σφᾶς ἐς τὴν βασιλέως καὶ Ἀθηναίων συμμαχίαν, Δωριεὰ δὲ ἀποδημεῖν μὲν τότε ἐκ Ῥόδου περὶ τὰ
ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου χωρία, συλληφθέντα ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν Λακεδαιμο-
νίων αὐτῶν καὶ ἀναχθέντα ἐς Σπάρτην ἀδικεῖν τε ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμο-
νίων καταγγυμηθηναι καὶ ἐπιβληθήναι οἱ θάνατον ζημίαν. 7 ἐν
δὲ τὸν διὸν εἶπεν 'Ἀνδροτίων λόγον, ἑθέλει μοι φαίνεται Λακε-
δαιμονίους ἐς τὸ ἱσον ἔτι Ἀθηναίους καταστήσα· ὅτι καὶ Ἀθη-
ναίοις ἐς θρασύλλον καὶ τούς ἐν Ἀργεῖον ὀμοί ὁμοί θρασύλ-
λων στρατηγῆσαντας προπετείας ἐστίν ἔγκλημα. Διαγόρας μὲν
δὴ καὶ τὸ ἀπ' αὐτῶν γένος δόξης ἐς τοσοῦτο ἀφύκουτο.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

7 λέγεται is Sylburg’s correction which is adopted by all editors for the mss.’ reading λέγοιτο.

IO 153: three joining fragments of Parian marble which formed the pedestal on which the statue stood. They were found: fr. a December 1, 1877, built in a late wall, seven meters east of the base of Telemachos which was found in its original position on the south edge of the terrace of the temple of Zeus, between the east Byzantine wall and the small gateway of the south terrace wall (IO 177, no. 36 below); fr. b November 17, 1877, ten meters west of the Nike of Paionios (IO 259, no. 4 above); and fr. c October 31, 1877, near fragment a. The inscription is mutilated; the bottom and right margins are only partially preserved by fragments b and c respectively.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. a 256, b 244, c 223.

Height: 0.30-0.305m. Width: 0.535m. Thickness: 0.79-0.795m.

Letter Height: ca. 0.015m.

* paulo post 424 ante

* [Δωρίεως Διαγόρα Ὁθύριος?]

  5 Πυθόι πῦξ

  ... vacat

partly STOICH.

* [Ἰσθμοὶ πῦξ] vacat

  15 [Ἰσθμοὶ πῦξ] vacat

  Ἰσθμοὶ [ἰ] vacat

  Νεμή[ί] πῦξ vacat

  Νεμή[ί] πῦξ vacat
The letters are nicely and carefully cut and their shapes are that of the archaic Ionic alphabet (IO editors). The letter shapes are (LSAG 325 fig. 46 "The Ionic Dodekapolis"): 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 1 (but considerably smaller in height), 5, 2 and 3.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of the IO editors):

- Line 4: iota—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
- Line 7: xi—only a bottom horizontal.
- Line 9: iota—only the bottom tip of a vertical.
- Line 11: mu—only the upper right corner of two slanting strokes; xi—only the top horizontal.
- Line 18: pi—only the tip of a right vertical stroke.
- Line 19: epsilon—only the upper left corner; eta—the upper tip of the left vertical and the bottom tip of the right vertical strokes; iota—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
- Line 21: epsilon—only the upper left corner.
- Line 23: pi—only the tip of the upper left corner.

Restorations:

Line 1: Foucart and the IO editors restore contra Pausanias 6.7.4: 'Ρόδιος, and explain that Pausanias' statement that Dorieus and Peisirhodos were proclaimed Thourioi is not correct, because in other authors (Xenophon and Diodorus) there is no evidence that Dorieus won his victories after he moved to Thourioi (see, however, HCT 2, 260-261 and the commentary below).

Line 5: Foucart and the IO editors restore only three Pythian victories, although there seems to be space for one more. Pausanias does not count all of Dorieus' Pythian victories and mentions only the one he won without a contest. A fragmentary inscription, however, which was found at Delphi and was thought to be a record of Dorieus' victories (Pomtow 1909b, 766-768), mentions four Pythian victories. By restoring one more Pythian victory, for which there seems to be space, the two columns of the Olympic inscription seem to have equal number of lines, a fact which may suggest that the cutter's intention was to divide all the victories of the athlete by two and inscribe them in two columns of equal length (Foucart's printing of the two columns seems to suggest correctly that they were equal in length).

Since its discovery, this fragmentary inscription has been assigned to two athletes, the Rhodian Dorieus (Foucart and IO editors), and the Thasian Theogenes (Treu followed by Roehl, Loewy, and Pouilloux). As Foucart and the IO editors have shown, however, there is not enough space on the stone to accommodate the greater number of victories of Theogenes, especially in the second column. Their argument that Pausanias does not mention that Theogenes won at Delphi without a contest ('κοιντα') is now irrelevant. At Delphi there has been found an inscription recording Theogenes' victories (no. 53 below), and one Pythian is without a contest. Those in favor of Theogenes restore after Treu:

```
[Θεαγένης Τιμοσθένεος]  [Ἰσθμοῦ πυξ]
[Θάσιος ἐνύκησεν τάδε]  [Ἰσθμοῦ πυξ]
[Ὀλυμπίτην πυξ]  [Ἰσθμοῦ πυξ]
[Ὀλυμπίτην παγκράτιον]  5 Ἰσθμοῦ πυξ]
[Πυθοῦ πυξ]  Ἰσθμοῦ πυξ]
[Πυθοῦ πυξ]  Ἰσθμοῦ πυξ]
```

Commentary: The date for the inscription, a little after 424 B.C., is surmised from a passage in Thukydides where the historian describes the first embassy of the Mytileneans to Sparta. The ambassadors went instead to Olympia to plead their case, because the Lakedaimonians as well as their allies were attending the Olympic Games (88th Olympiad, 428 B.C.), during which Dorieus the Rhodian won his second Olympic victory (3.8.1). Thus the dates of the three Olympic victories of Dorieus, which according to Pausanias were successive, are fixed in the 87th Olympiad=432 B.C., the 88th Olympiad=428 B.C., and the 89th Olympiad=424 B.C. (Moretti), sometime after which his statue was dedicated at Olympia, because the text of the inscription provides a catalogue of all his victories at Olympia, Nemea, Delphi and the Isthmos.

Pausanias, after his elaborate narrative on Euthymos and the brief mention of two other statues, reaches the group of the six statues of the Diagorid family, which stood to the east of the temple of Zeus. The athletic accomplishments of Diagoras’ family, i.e. three generations of this family had been victorious in Panhellenic competitions, and especially of Dorieus are reason enough for Pausanias to be more elaborate in his exposition.
The order in which Pausanias mentions the statues of the Diagorids (Akousilaos, Dorieus, Damagetos, Diagoras, [Eukles], and Peisirhodos) is different from that of the Scholiast in Pindar’s *Olympian* 7 (Διαγόρας Ἀκουσίλαος, Δορίες, Δαμαγέτας, Διαγόρας, [Εὐκλῆς], and Πεισίρροδος), who on the authority of Aristotle and Apollas also enumerates the dedications of the family at Olympia and includes measurements of the statues (Drachmann 1964, 196-198). His order is Diagoras, Damagetos, Dorieus, Akousilaos, Eukles, and Peisirhodos. The discrepancy of the two accounts has been explained in two ways by the *IO* editors: Dittenberger proposed that between the time of Aristotle and Pausanias the statues were rearranged in the Altis, during which period the inscriptions on the bases of Eukles, Damagetos and Diagoras were also renewed for some reason. Purgold, however, noticed that basically the two accounts are the same. The statues of Diagoras and his sons are listed in reverse order (those of Eukles and Peisirhodos are listed last in both accounts): one from left to right and the other from right to left, depending on whether one reaches the group of statues from the north or from the south. Even if one assumes that Pausanias knew Aristotle’s work, he cannot be accused of copying him, since in the Altis he saw the statue of Eukles separated from those of his family among the statues of Nikodamos of Mainalon, Androstenes of Lechaion (6.6.1) and Agenor the Theban (6.6.2).

Moreover, the information which Pausanias offers for the victories of Dorieus has proven crucial for the restoration and identification of this fragmentary inscription, particularly his comment that Dorieus won in the Pythia without a fight (λέγεται οὐκ ἐπὶ καὶ ἀπὸ τὴν ἔνοφον ἄκοντι 6.7.4). More importantly, there seems to have been another statue of this athlete at Delphi on whose base was a summary of all his victories and agrees partly with Pausanias’ account. A fragmentary inscription without

---

166 Foucart (1887, 292-293) correctly remarks: "Peut-être même dans ce passage λέγεται n’ait-il pas le sens vague on dit, on rapporte; mais il est dit dans l’inscription."
the athlete's name of the fourth century B.C., cut stoichedon (28 letters) on a dark limestone base, is reported by Pomtow (1909b, 766-768 = Moretti 1953, 57-60 no. 23):

\begin{verbatim}
[Δωρείους Διαγόρα ?'Ρόδιος?]
[ἐνίκησε παγκράτιον ᾗκαὶ πυγμήν?].
'Oλύμπια τρίς, Πύθια τετράκις,
"Ἰσθμικά δίκαια, Νέμεα ἑπτάκις,
5 Παναθήναια τετράκις, Ἀσκληπίεια
tετράκις, Ἐκατόμβοια τρίς,
Λύκαια τρίς.
\end{verbatim}

In this inscription the name of the victor is restored by Pomtow on the basis of the number of victories that the text records. Although only the Nemean victories of Dorieus (line 4) agree with Pausanias' number seven, the stoichedon style allows for the exact restoration in line 3, i.e. the number of his Olympic victories τρίς, which thus also corroborates Pausanias' number. In line 4 the number eight is restored thanks to Pausanias' observation that Dorieus won eight victories at the Isthmian Games ('Ἰσθμικάν μὲν γεγονασιν ὅκτω ἐν 6.7.4), although the three available letter spaces also allow the restorations [ἐπτ]άκις or less probably [ἐνν]άκις. The number of Dorieus' Pythian victories is not mentioned by Pausanias, except for the one won without a contest, and it was assumed to be three after the restorations of Foucart and the IO

167 The question marks within the restoration of line 1 is to caution the reader that Dorieus' ethnic may have been Θουριός, as Pausanias' text suggests.

168 Moretti (1953, 59-60) concludes: "In conclusione non vedo gravi difficoltà contro l'attribuzione a Dorieo della iscrizione esaminata. Naturalmente non possiamo escludere che essa appartenga a un atleta a noi sconosciuto che in qualche specialità (eccettuato per ovvi motivi lo stadio e anche, in linea di massima, le gare ippiche) aveva colto in quegli agoni straordinari e reiterati successi."

169 The restoration [ἐνν]άκις would be a varia lectio of the adverb ἐννέακις, since in LSJ s.v. the only form found is ἐνάκις.
editors for *IO* 153. Thanks to the fragmentary inscription from Delphi, however, that number can now be correctly restored as four.

The ethnic of Dorieus has been assumed to have been Rhodios, the ethnic of the Diagonid family (Thukydides 3.8.1, 8.35.1; Xenophon *Hellenika* 1.5.19), although Pausanias is very explicit that both he and his nephew Peisirhodos were declared Thourioi (ἀνηγορεύωντο δὲ οὗτος τε καὶ ὁ Πεισιρχόδος θούριοι, διωκθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιστασιατῶν ἐκ τῆς Ῥόδου καὶ ἐς Ἰταλίαν παρὰ θουρίους ἀπελθόντες 6.7.4). Pausanias' information must have come from the inscription at Olympia. The verb employed is the technical term for declaring the winners in the games and implies that Dorieus participated in the games as a citizen of Thourioi. There is no evidence for the time when Dorieus was forced into exile from his city Ialyssos. It has been proposed, however, that Dorieus was already in exile by 428 B.C., and so his Panathenaic victories were won before 428 B.C., while all his other victories were before 431 B.C. and after 429 B.C.\(^{171}\)

There is corroborating evidence, however, for Dorieus' ethnic Thourios in Pausanias. Very similar to Dorieus' case is that of Ergoteles of Knossos (above no. 8) who was forced into exile and became a citizen of Himera under which ethnic he won victories in the Panhellenic Games. Pausanias' narrative about Ergoteles is verified by the

---

\(^{170}\) Moretti (1953, 58) does not notice, nor does he explain, the difference between *IO* 153 (three Pythic victories) and the Delphic inscription (four Pythic victories), but he refers to Pontow's "ingegnosa ma non convinentissima" explanation about Pausanias' mention of only one Pythic victory, the one without a contest.

Likewise, without noticing the difference between *IO* 153 and the Delphic fragment concerning the Pythic victories, Pontow (1909b, 767) assumes that Pausanias' information about Dorieus' victories came from another inscription at Olympia where Dorieus' victories were inscribed in summary form like the one in Delphi and which was broken away except for the legible part of the one Pythian victory without a contest. That is not necessary, since Pausanias seems to be summarizing *IO* 153, although his omission of the four Pythic victories cannot be explained.

\(^{171}\) See Gomme (*HCT* 2, 260-261). His argument that "Ἰαλύσιος would hardly have been officially used for Ἰταλίαν in 428" does not take into account the fact that the ethnic Rhodios is also used on the bases of Diagoras and his eldest son Damagetos.
inscription that was found, and interestingly enough in both instances Pausanias uses the same verb ἀπορεῦομαι (6.4.11 and no. 8 [Ergoteles], 6.7.4 and no. 26 [Dorieus]). It seems very likely, therefore, that Pausanias derived his information from the inscription, as he did in the case of the Himeraios Ergoteles.

And yet, the inscription was only one of his sources for the career of Dorieus. The detailed information which Pausanias provides for this athlete is far more than that for the other members of the Diagorids. Dorieus emerges as among the more famous members of the family, second only to Diagoras himself, because he was also active in Rhodian politics and became involved in the later stages of the Peloponnesian War. In addition to Dorieus' career as an athlete, Pausanias singles out two incidents which are indicative of his methodology.\(^\text{172}\) The first attests to Dorieus' fame as an athlete: Dorieus eventually returned to Rhodes from his exile and openly took the side of the Lakedaimonians (6.7.4; also Xenophon *Hellenika* 1.1.2ff.). Later, in 407 B.C., he was captured by the Athenians, but suffered no punishment, because the Athenian ekklesia, when he was brought in front of them, let him go on account of his remarkable athletic accomplishments (the Athenians alone had crowned him four times in the Panathenaic Games), his fame and stature (6.7.4-5; also Xenophon *Hellenika* 1.5.19). The behavior of the Athenians recalls that of the Eleians when they captured Kallipateira / Pherenike, the daughter of Diagoras, attending the Olympic Games. Both incidents are included by Pausanias as proof of the extraordinary leniency that the Diagorids enjoyed outside Rhodes on account of their athletic tradition and fame. For Dorieus' death Pausanias relies on the account of Androtion, the Athidographer (τὰ δὲ ἔσ τοῦ Δωρίεως τὴν

\[^{172}\] Thukydides in 8.35 mentions Dorieus' participation on the side of the Lakedaimonians, while a citizen of Thourioi, which Pausanias omits: 'Εκ δὲ τῆς Πελοποννήσου τοῦ αὐτοῦ χειμῶνος Ἰπποκράτης ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος ἐκπεύθυσε δέκα μὲν θυρώαις ναυσίν, ἐν ὅρχε Δωρίεως ὁ Διαγόρου τρίτον αὐτὸς, μὴ δὲ λακωνικῆ, μὴ δὲ Συρακοσική, καταπλητ ἔσ κυόδου.
FGrH 324 F 15): after Konon persuaded the Rhodians to change camps, Dorieus fled again to the Peloponnese where he was captured and killed by the Lakedaimonians on account of his ἀδελφεία towards them. Pausanias’ quote from Androtion highlights his methodology. It is not employed solely as evidence of how Dorieus come to his end. Pausanias is interested in revealing to his readers what was behind Androtion’s statement: if at all true (ἐὰν δὲ τὸν ἄνηφρον ἀνδροτέουν λόγον 6.7.7), then Androtion’s intention with this story was to provide a parallel between the Athenian haste to punish Thrasyllus and the other generals after Arginousai (προσεπειάς ἐστὶν ἔγκλημα 6.7.7) and that of the Lakedaimonians against Dorieus.

As was the case with Eukles (no. 22 above), so too for Dorieus’ career Pausanias employs more than one source. His narrative enables the identification of two fragmentary inscriptions as belonging to Dorieus, and preserves a fragment from the Atthis of Androtion. Furthermore, it provides evidence that Pausanias consulted also Xenophon and perhaps Thukydides. The exegete, however, does not offer a historical exposition of Dorieus’ career. Instead he emphasizes two incidents of the athlete’s life for different purposes: the first attests to Dorieus’ athletic career and fame which won him acquittal; and the second offers Pausanias the opportunity for an interpretative comment on Androtion’s version of Dorieus’ death.

27.

6.7.1: θεσαύρεις δὲ καὶ τούτους ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρθῶν ἀθλητῶν ἀφίξῃ τᾶς εἰκόνας, Διαγόραν καὶ τὸ ἐκεῖνον γένος· οἱ δὲ συνεχεῖς τέ ἄλληλοις καὶ ἐν κόσμῳ τοιῷδε ἀνέκειντο,... πρῶτερον δὲ ἐτὶ τὸν Δωρίκος ἐκράτησε καὶ Δαμάγητος τοὺς ἐσελθόντας ἐστὶ παγκράτιον. (2) οὗτοι μὲν ἄδελφοι τέ εἰσι καὶ Διαγόρου παῖδες,... (3) Διαγόραν δὲ καὶ ὅμοι τοῖς παισίν Ἀκουσιλάωι καὶ Δαμαγήτωι λέγουσιν ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν ἔλθεν· νικήσαντες δὲ οἱ νεανίσκοι διὰ τῆς
IO 152: the left bottom part of a base of white marble, found December 19, 1879, built in a late brick wall of the Leonidaion. It is broken on the top and right sides. The fragment is now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum. Olympia Museum Inv. No. 729. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.19m. Width: 0.49m. Thickness: 0.31m.

Letter Height: 0.02-0.03m.

360-290 ante

Δαμάγητος Διαγόρα [Π'Ωθιός].

The letters are sharply and deeply cut and tend to lean to the right. The ends of strokes finish in deeper cut dots which are sometimes triangular. This style suggests a Hellenistic date.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
The facsimile of the IO editors is misleading for the dotted rho, because no traces of the sigma, clearly visible on the stone, are indicated. The rho is cut after an erasure and only a very faint trace of a vertical stroke remains. The cutter initially incised the letter sigma which he erased clumsily (ΔΑΜΑΓΗΤΟΣΙΑΓΟΡΑΣΣΙΟΔΙΟΣ). Of the sigma there are clearly visible the end-tips of the upper and lower slanting strokes and also traces of its middle slanting strokes.


Commentary: The date for the inscription, middle of the fourth to beginning of the third centuries B.C., is based solely on the letter style and it does not agree with the date for Damagetos’ victories in Olympia which Moretti tentatively places in 452 B.C. and 448 B.C. According to the IO editors, Damagetos’ victories cannot be later than 436 B.C., a terminus ante quem that is derived from Pausanias’ comment (6.7.1, 3) that the victories of Damagetos in the pankration and his brother Akousilaos’ in boxing were won in the same Olympiad and before those of Dorieus whose first Olympic victory took place in
432 B.C. The inscription, therefore, was reinscribed at a later date, as was that of Eukles (no. 22 above).

Among the statues of the Diagorids which stood to the east of the Zeus temple (Eukles no. 22 above, Dorieus no. 26 above, Diagoras no. 28 below, Akousilaos and Peisirhodos) Pausanias also saw the present one commemorating the victory of Damagetos, the eldest son of Diagoras, in the pankration. The find spot of Damagetos’ base, the late brick wall of the Leonidaion, does not of course help for the location in the Altis of the Diagorids group of statues (nos. 22 and 26 above and no. 28 below). Nevertheless, it was used by Treu and Hirschfeld (in Frazer 1965, vol. 4, 26) as proof that Pausanias never saw the statue, since it had already by his visit been used for the construction of the brick wall. The IO editors, however, have rightly pointed out that the Roman restoration of the Leonidaion, to which the wall belonged, was later than Pausanias’ visit and that furthermore the fragment of the base was used for a doorway of a Byzantine and not a Roman construction.

The brief text of the inscription and the narrative of Pausanias are in agreement about Damagetos, except that the inscription does not mention the event in which Damagetos was victorious. Pausanias, however, as he did with Eukles (no. 22 above) and Dorieus (no. 26 above), knows more about Damagetos and his brother Akousilaos, whose statue base has not yet been found. The anecdote that he reports was probably in wide circulation, since it is also known to the Scholiast of Pindar’s Olympian 7 (Drachmann 1964, 197, 198). Both Pausanias and the Scholiast note that they heard the story (Λέγονταν, or Ἐφη, or Λέγεται) and essentially provide the same account: when the two sons won in different events, they took their father Diagoras upon their shoulders and made a victory parade under the cheering and blessings of the spectators for Diagoras’ accomplishments. Once more Pausanias’ methodology is evident: in addition to the brief information of the inscription he embellishes his narrative with this anecdote.
about Damagetos and Akousilaos, which serves as an exegesis of the athlete and his career.

28.

6.7.1: θεασάμενος δὲ καὶ τούτους ἐπὶ τῶν Ἄρδων ἀθλητῶν ἀφίξης τὰς εἰκόνας, Διαγόρας καὶ τὸ ἐκεῖνον γένος· οἱ δὲ συνεχεῖς τε ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἐν κόσμῳ τουσίδε ἀνέκειντο,...,(2), ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς κεῖται καὶ ὁ Διαγόρας, πυγμής ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἀνελόμενον νίκην· τοῦ Διαγόρου δὲ τῆς εἰκόνας Μεγαρεὺς εἰργάσατο Καλλικλῆς θεοκόσμου τοῦ ποιήσαντο τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐν Μεγάροις τοῦ Διὸς. (3)... Διαγόρας δὲ καὶ ὁμοίος τοὺς παισίν Ὀκουσιλάωι καὶ Δαμαγήτωι λέγουσιν εἰς Ὀλυμπιάν ἐλθεῖν· νικήσαντες δὲ οἱ νεανίσκοι διὰ τῆς πανηγύρεως τὸν πατέρα ἐφερον βαλλόμενον τε ὑπὸ τῶν Ἐλλήνων ἄνθεσι καὶ εὐθαίμονα ἐπὶ τοῖς παισὶ καλούμενον· γένος δὲ τοῦ Διαγόρας τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς Μεσσηνίου πρὸς γυναικῶν ἢ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀριστομένους ἔγεγόνει θυγατρός. (7)... Διαγόρας μὲν δὴ καὶ τὸ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ γένος δόξης ἐς τοσοῦτο ἀφίκοντο·

4.24.3: τὰ μὲν δὴ λεγόμενα ἐς τοὺς Διαγόριδας καλούμενον ἐν Ἄρδωι, γεγονότας δὲ ἀπὸ Διαγόρου τοῦ Δαμαγήτου τοῦ Δωρίους τοῦ Δα-μαγήτου τε καὶ τῆς Ἀριστομένους θυγατρός παρῆκα, μὴ οὐ κατὰ καιρὸν δοκοῖν γράφειν.

10 151: five small fragments of white marble of which abc and de join together. They were found near the Metroon, abc December 2, 1880, and de November 21, 1876. The fragments are broken all around, except the upper surface of the stone where the inscription is cut. The fragments are now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.
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350–290 ante

vacat

Διαγόρας Δαμαγήτου Ἄρδως.
The letters are clearly cut and the strokes end in triangular serifs. The size of the omicron is considerably smaller in proportion to the other letters and the strokes of the four-bar sigma are cut sharply and slanting.

**Remains of Dotted Letters** (from the facsimile of the *IO* editors):
gamma—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.

**Bibliography:** Frazer 1965, ad loc. Hitzig 1896-1910, ad loc. Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc.

**Commentary:** the date for the inscription, middle of the fourth to beginning of the third centuries B.C., is based on the letter-style and it does not agree with the date for Diagoras' victory in Olympia, which, according to the Scholiast of Pindar's *Olympia 7*, took place in the 79th Olympiad, 464 B.C. (Drachmann 1964, 195 and Moretti). The inscription on Diagoras' statue base, therefore, was reinscribed at a later date, as were those of Eukles (no. 22 above) and Damagetos (no. 27 above).

Among the six statues of the Diagorids (Eukles no. 22 above, Dorieus no. 26 above where the order in which the statues are mentioned by Pausanias is discussed, Damagetos no. 27 above, Akousilaos and Peisirhodos) which stood to the east of the temple of Zeus, Pausanias also saw the one commemorating the victory of Diagoras, the paterfamilias of the Diagorids. Of the six Diagorid statue bases only two were found in the general area east of the temple of Zeus where Pausanias very probably saw them, that of Eukles (no. 22 above) and that of Diagoras.

The text of the inscription is similar to that of Damagetos, i.e. very brief and not the original one, and the only verification it provides about Pausanias' information is the name of Diagoras' father Damagetos (4.24.3 and the discussion in no. 22 above; for the omission of the boxing event from the inscription see also nos. 22 and 26 above). There is no evidence outside Pausanias for the reconstruction of the Diagorid family tree, which he perhaps excerpted from a Messenian history, which he employed for the composition
of his *Messeniaka*. Pausanias, however, in his narrative also includes the signature of the sculptor, which was probably inscribed on the base of the statue: he was Kallikles son of Theokosmos from Megara, who also made the statue of Zeus in his city and about whom very little is known.\footnote{No signature of Kallikles son of Theokosmos has been found yet, but his son Apelleas is known from the inscription on the statue base of Kyniska (above no. 7); see also Moretti (1953, 43-44) who discusses the evidence and provides a family tree for Kallikles.}

Although Pausanias’ reference, sometimes in great detail (no. 26), to all the victories of the members of the Diagorids is in effect a tribute to Diagoras himself, nevertheless, the only additional information Pausanias offers for the paterfamilias is the anecdote he heard in connection with the victories of Damagetos and Akousilaos during the same Olympiad (see the discussion no. 26 above). He is completely silent about Pindar’s *Olympian 7*, although Pausanias is familiar with his poetry,\footnote{For example Pausanias refers twice to two Olympian odes: 6.2.5 = *Ol*. 6.43-70, and 5.10.1 = *Ol*. 10.45. For more references to Pindar see Rocha-Pereira 1973-1981, 257, *Index Auctorum s.v. Πῦθας*.} and some of the information he provides about the Diagorids can also be found in Pindar’s Scholiast. This silence, however, seems to have no apparent reason, especially because in other instances he includes such stories, and lets his reader decide on their plausibility. There are two details mentioned by the Scholiast which Pausanias probably knew. The first deals with Diagoras’ birth, namely that Diagoras was not the son of Damagetos, but of Hermes (Drachmann 1964, 196, 199), and the second that, according to a certain Gorgon (*FGrH* 515 F 18), *Olympian 7* was inscribed in golden letters and dedicated in the temple of Athena Lindia at Rhodes (Drachmann 1964, 195).

Even so, the Diagorids occupy a significant place in Pausanias’ narrative and deservedly so. Because of their extraordinary accomplishments (the father, his three sons and his two grandsons were all Olympionikai and some of them were victorious in many
other games as well), Pausanias employed not only the inscriptions he read in Olympia, but also other works which had information about them, thus offering an overview of their dedications. The Olympic inscriptions of the Diagorids furnished Pausanias the minimum information for his narrative, which he further embellished, where possible, with information from other sources. This combination of information from autopsy and from literary accounts is what Pausanias understands to be an exegesis of a monument in the Altis.

29.

6.7.8: έγένοντο δὲ καὶ Ἀλκαινέτων τῷ Θεάντω Λεπρεάτῃ καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς παισίν Ὀλυμπικαὶ ρίκαι. .... 'Ελλάνικον δὲ τὸν Ἀλκαινέτου .... ἐπὶ πυγμὴ παίδων ἀναγορευθήσαι τὸν μὲν ἐνάτη πρὸς ταῖς ὁγθοικοντα ὁλυμπιάδι, ....'

5.5.3: ἔθελονσι μὲν δὴ οἱ Λεπρεάται μοῖρα εἶναι τῶν Ἀρκάδων, φαύνονται δὲ Ἡλείων κατήκου τὸ ἐξ ἄρχης ὄντες· καὶ όσοι αὐτῶν Ὀλυμπια ἐνίκησαν, Ἡλείους ἐκ λεπταῦ σφᾶς ὁ κήρυξ ἀνείπε. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐποίησεν ὑπὲρ Ἐλπίδος εἶνη πόλισμα Ἡλείων.

Apparatus Criticus:

7-8 καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης . . . Ἡλείων is deleted by Schubard, Hitzig, and Rocha-Pereira. Frazer and Papachatzis (1974-1981, vol. 3, 272 note 2) do not delete it and Papachatzis' explanation that this sentence is closely connected with the previous one and supports Pausanias' refutation of the claim of the Lepreatai is sensible and sound.

IO 155: a base of reddish-violet marble, found March 11, 1878, in the Byzantine east wall to the south of the base of the Eretrian dedication (IO 248 = no. 15 above). On the upper surface of the base there are the left footprint and a hole into which the right foot of the statue was fitted. From the original inscription, which was cut on the upper surface in front of the statue, only very faint traces of strokes remain. When the inscription was renewed, it was cut again on the upper surface but to the left of the statue. The base is now in Ἀποθήκη 10 of the New Museum. Olympia Museum Inv. No. 361. Vidi, Phot.
Height: 0.21m. Width: 0.67m. Thickness: 0.58m.

Letter Height: 0.017-0.02m.

saec. I ante

[- - - - - - vestigia - - - - - - ]

'Ελλάνικος Αλειτός ἐκ Λεπρέου.

The letters of line 1 are no longer discernible; those of the second line are very worn but clearly legible. They are cut inconsistently, their width varies (the epsilons are from 0.1-0.2m. wide), and some of them jump above the imaginary line. Characteristic letters are the alpha with broken middle bar, and the wide epsilon with a short middle stroke. According to the IO editors this style suggests the first century B.C.

Restorations:

Line 1 which presumably contained the original version can be restored exempli gratia: [ 'Ελλάνικος Φαλείτος ἐκ Λεπρέου].


Commentary: The date, first century B.C., which is based solely on the letter style, is only for line two. The date for the original inscription, i.e. line one, is given by Pausanias who states that Hellanikos' victory was won during the 89th Olympiad (424 B.C. and Moretti), after which the statue was dedicated.

After his elaborate exposition on the Diagorids Pausanias reverts to the brief mention of statues which he encounters in the general area between the Heraion and the Pelopion and moving southwards. The statues of Alkainetos and his sons Theantos and Hellanikos probably stood in the vicinity of the Diagorid dedications. Of the three mentioned only Hellanikos' statue base has been found near the base of the Eretrians (no. 15 above), an area near which two of the Diagorid statue bases were also found (Eukles no. 22 above, and Diagoras no. 28 above).

Although the text of the inscription has only four words, Hellanikos the Eleian from Lepreos, it verifies Pausanias' narrative. The footprints on the surface of the base, which indicate that the statue represented a boy victor (IO editors), may explain the omission from the inscription of the event in which Hellanikos won. The statue would be a
representation of a boy boxer. Furthermore, this very brief text supports the statement that Pausanias made when he visited the city of Lepreos. There the citizens of Lepreos told him that they consider themselves Arkadians and not Eleians, but Pausanias does not agree with them. He refutes their claim with two proofs: first "the herald at Olympia proclaimed the winners from Lepreos as Eleians from Lepreos" (ἡλετοις ἐκ Ἀπερέον 5.5.3), an expression identical to the inscription of Hellanikos. The second proof is a literary one, Aristophanes' *Birds* 149-150 (see Kakridis 1974, ad loc.). According to the Scholiast the comic poet uses the Eleian city as a pun on leprosy and in the masculine gender in order to correspond with the tragic actor Melanthios' gender whom he ridicules as a leper. Interestingly enough, Pausanias borrows from Aristophanes the masculine gender for the city's name, in spite of the Scholiast's comment, perhaps following Didymos, that the city's name is neuter. This is further evidence that Pausanias' reference to Aristophanes should not be obelized from the text.

The inscribed base of Hellanikos at Olympia, therefore, attests not only to Pausanias' narrative in Book 6 about his statue, but also, together with the evidence from Aristophanes, is proof for his refutation of the citizens' of Lepreos claim that they are part of Arkadia.

---

175 Hellanikos is not the only athlete from Lepreos that is mentioned by Pausanias. In addition to Hellanikos' father Alkainetos and his brother Theantos Pausanias also saw dedications by the boxer Labax son of Euphron (6.3.4); the pankratiast Antiochos (6.4.9); and the stadiodromos Xenon son of Kalliteles (6.15.1).

In *Bericht V.* Kunze (1956, "Weihung eines Lepreates," 156-157) has published a fragmentary metrical inscription of another athlete from Lepreon, Kordaphos son of Alkanor, whom Pausanias does not mention (see also Moretti 1957, 97 no. 267).

176 Rocha-Pereira in her edition of 5.5.3 accepts Fraenkel's correction Λέπρεος for the mss.' λεπρεός (Vb R Lb P Pd V, while L reads λεπρεός with o above the o). Frazer, Hitzig and Papachatzis correctly retain the mss.' reading, correcting only the accent Λέπρεος; for, otherwise, Pausanias' reference to Aristophanes would miss the point.
30.

6.7.10: ... τὴν δὲ ἐφεξῆς ταύτην, πένταθλον Ἡλείον Πυθοκλέα, Πολύκλειτος ἔστιν εἰργασμένος.

IO 162, 163: a base of black limestone, found June 4, 1879, between the Pelopeion and the Heraion. The marks on the upper surface of the base suggest that the original statue was removed and replaced by another one, at which time the original inscription was also reinscribed (IO 163). The inscriptions are cut on the opposite longer sides of the upper surface, except for IO 162 line 1 which is cut on the front side. In the empty space of the upper surface between IO 162 line 2 and IO 163 and closer to IO 162 but facing the shorter side there are also cut the letters IB. The base is now on display in the Gallery of the Olympic Games of the New Museum, Α(ὑπὸ) 532.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 675. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.245m. Width: 0.50m. Thickness: 0.58m.

Letter Height IO 162: 0.012-0.015m.; IO 163: 0.01-0.017m.

162: 420–390 ante

Πυθοκλῆς 'Αλείος.
Πολύκλειτος [ἐποίε? 'Αργείος].

163: saec. I ante–saec. I post

τὸ (?) in medio spatio titulatorum
Πυθοκλῆς 'Αλειος.
[Πολύκλειτος ἐποίει 'Αργείος.

Petersen 1891, 304-306: a pedestal of marble, found in 1891 in Rome, in the via Cavour, near the Baths of Titus.

Height: 0.91m. Width: 0.80m.

Letter Height is not given.
ca. 100 post

160

The letter shapes of the two lines of IO 162 differ: line 1 is in the Ionic alphabet and line 2 in the Argive. This is evident by the shape of two letters which appear in both lines: the omicron in line 1 is round and the lambda is cut with two slanting strokes, whereas in line two, according to Jeffery's Argive alphabet (LSAG 151 fig. 37), the omicron is o (the rhomboid-shaped) and lambda λ2.

The letters of IO 163 are cut inconsistently and vary in height and width. They become smaller from left to right, and some of them jump above the imaginary line. The style suggests a date from the first century B.C. to the first century A.D. Likewise, the style of the inscription from Rome suggests a first century A.D. date, especially because of the lunar-shaped sigma and epsilon.

Restorations 162:
Line 1: Jeffery restores Πυθοκλῆς Χαῖτος, although the lettering suggests the Ionic alphabet. The IO editors restore correctly Πυθοκλῆς Ἀλετος from IO 163, despite the fact that in the Roman inscription the event was also inscribed.
Line 2: Πολύκλειτος Ἀργεῖος IO editors, but see Gallavotti's (1979a, 12-13) discussion for the orthography of Polykleitos' name (see also below no. 33). Given the orthography of Polykleitos' name (ε = ι), the ending of the verb ἀποτελεῖ may also be restored as ἀποτελεῖ.


Commentary: The date for the original inscription (162), late fifth to early fourth centuries according to the IO editors, is based on the letter style, the career of the Argive Polykleitos (both the elder and the younger have been proposed), and the information of P.Oxy. 222 that Pythokles' victory was won in 452 B.C., the 82nd Olympiad (accepted by Moretti). The date for the reinscribed text (163), first century B.C. to first century A.D., is solely based on the lettering.

After Alkainetos and his two sons Theantos and Hellanikos (no. 29 above) Pausanias reaches the dedication of the Eleian Pythokles who won in the pentathlon and whose statue was the work of Polykleitos. The statue base was found in the general area,
where Pausanias saw it, between the Heraion and the Pelopion, and where presumably it
was originally set up.

Both Pausanias' text and that of the inscription are very brief and provide the same
information: the name of the athlete Pythokles, his ethnic Eleios, and the sculptor the
Argive Polykleitos. That in the Olympic inscriptions the event was not inscribed is not
surprising, since the portrait of the statue would be indicative. There is no mention by
Pausanias, however, of the letters IB which were inscribed on the upper surface of the
pedestal, which, according to the IO editors, represent the number twelve. The IO
editors have also suggested that the marks on the upper surface of the base of the statue of
Pythokles by Polykleitos and the letter style of the renewed inscription favor the idea that
the statue was removed from Olympia by the Romans, perhaps by Nero himself, and the
Eleians subsequently placed another statue on the empty base. After the discovery in
Rome of Pythokles' base which dates from the Hadrianic or Antonine era, the IO editors' sugges-
tion gained support and Foucart went one step further. Although the measurements of the
footprints on the statue base at Rome do not agree with those of the bases at Olympia, Foucart
insisted that the number twelve was inscribed to indicate that Pythokles' original statue was the
twelfth one removed by Nero from Olympia. The base in Rome, therefore, supported the original and not a copy.

There is no conclusive proof that the two bases, on which Pythokles' statues stood,
constitute a case of removal by the Romans. The base in Rome may well have supported
a copy, as Petersen suggested. Furthermore, Pausanias does not mention that Pythokles'
statue was removed, although elsewhere in his work he records many incidents of statues
that had been removed (some of them restored only to be removed a second time) by,
among others, Mummius, Sulla, Augustus, Claudius, and of course Nero. His claims in
these cases are based on information he received from the local exegetes, or in some
instances from inscriptions that mentioned the restoration of the statue by a Roman emperor.177

31.

6.8.5: Μετὰ δὲ τὸν Βαύκιδά εἰσιν ἀθλητῶν Ἀρκάδων εἰκόνες, ... καὶ Ἕλεος ἐκ Πελλάνας Φίλιππος κρατήσας πυγμή παῖδας, ... τὰς δὲ σφισιν εἰκόνας, ..., Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ Ἀζάνος Μύρων τὴν εἰκόνα ἐποίησε.

5.8.3: ἔθηκε δὲ (sc. τὰ Ὀλύμπια) καὶ Ἀὐγέας καὶ Ἰερακλῆς ὁ Ἀμφιτρύνων ἐκ τῆς Ἡλινίδ, ὁπόσους δὲ ἑστεφάνωσεν οὕτως νικῶντας, ... (4) ... Τυνθάρεω δὲ οἱ παῖδες ὁ μὲν δρόμωι, Πολυδεύκης δὲ πυκτεύων.

IO 174: a bronze tablet, found May 19, 1878, east of the northeast corner of the Palaistra. It is virtually intact, except for the bottom right corner. On the back side there are traces on the three corners for the fastening of the tablet onto the base of the statue. The tablet is now in the Ἀποθήκη of the New Museum (Χαλκᾶ Collection).

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 419. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.085m. Width: 0.23m. Thickness: 0.003m.

Letter Height: 0.003-0.005m.

390–270 ante

5.25.8, 26.3; 6.9.3; 7.16.8, 22.5, 22.9; 8.46.1-4; 9.27.3-4, 33.6; 10.7.1, 19.2. See also Habicht 1985, 122 and notes 18-21.

177
The inscription comprises three elegiac distichs and is in the Doric dialect (worth noting is the partial assimilation to the following stops, labial and palatal, of the nu in the accusative endings τὸ 

μ 

Πολυσελεκτος χεράν of line 2).

The letters are clearly and sharply cut and evenly spaced, except for line 4 where more space is left. Indeed near the center of the line there is a vacat. The letter style suggests the beginning of the third century B.C. or late fourth century B.C. (IO editors178). The end-tips of the strokes are cut deeper and end in dot-like serifs.

The most obvious characteristics of this cutter are that the vertical strokes of the iota, the upsilon, and the phi tend to extend beyond the imaginary top and bottom lines within which the rest of the letters are cut, and also that the round letters (theta, omicron and omega) are cut smaller than the other letters and above the bottom imaginary line.


Commentary: The commonly accepted date for the inscription, late fourth to early third century B.C., is based solely on the letter style, on account of which Moretti tentatively dates Philippos’ victory in the first Olympiad of the third century, the 122nd (292 B.C.).

After the statue of Euanoridas (no. 69 below), Pausanias continues his discussion of victory statues in the general area between the Heraion and the Pelopion and southwards and reaches a group of three statues dedicated by Arkadians (6.8.5). Among them, Pausanias writes without mentioning any epigram, there is the Azanian Philippos from Pellene, victorious in the boys’ boxing event, whose statue was the work of Myron. The name of the athlete and the event are mentioned in the epigram of the tablet, and so it has been assumed that Pausanias’ Philippos is the same as the one in the inscription.

178 Their suggestion, however, that the phi of this inscription is similar to the phi found in an inscription from Oropos (IG VII.1 4254) does not lend any support for dating an inscription which may have been cut by an Eleian or an Arkadian. The fact that Myron sculpted the bronze statue, if it is in fact the Athenian Myron, does not mean that the orthography of the epigram need be Athenian. Quite the contrary, time and again the inscriptions, that have been found in Olympia cut on statue bases and that contain the athlete’s identification and the sculptor’s signature, strongly suggest that the athlete’s and sculptor’s local orthography and dialect were followed. Whether one or more cutters were involved for the letter-cutting of different texts cannot be answered conclusively, except to speculate that the sculptor presumably would be responsible for his signature.
This association, however, involves a chronological difficulty. The tablet on stylistic grounds belongs ca. 390–270 B.C., whereas the Athenian sculptor Myron, if he is the famous one, was active during the first half of the fifth century. In order to explain this problem many solutions have been proposed, e.g. that there were two Arkadian boy boxers victorious in Olympia, that there were two sculptors named Myron, and so on (see Moretti IAG no. 33, and Ebert 1972, 167-168). Furthermore, it seems that two victories are mentioned in the epigram, one in lines 1-3, and the other, with ἀλλὰς, πάτερ Ζεόκυκλας πάλιν in lines 3-4.

The information, however, that Pausanias includes in his narrative appears not to have been drawn from this inscription. Philippos is not simply from Arkadia. He is an Azanian from Pellene, a detail noted by Pausanias as if to distinguish him perhaps from another Philippos. In addition, if he read the epigram, the exegete overlooks some interesting details: the way in which Philippos achieved his victory by defeating four boys from the islands ἀρετικάτα μάχα (lines 5-6); and also the nomos of Polydeuces, displayed by the Pelasgian boxer, which Pausanias mentions in his mythological account of the games (5.8.3-4). These are the sort of details that usually elicit from Pausanias an exegesis of some kind (instead of Pelasgian, for example, one would expect the epithet Azanian in the inscription). As it is, it seems that Pausanias did not take his information for the Azanian Philippos from this tablet.

A similar chronological problem arises from another passage in Pausanias where again an Athenian Myron is said to have been the sculptor of the statue of Lykinos (6.2.2), whose victory according to Pausanias himself in 5.8.10 took place in the 99th Olympiad (384 B.C.), when for the first time the chariot race for foals was introduced. In addition to Pausanias, there is also epigraphical evidence for a later Athenian sculptor Myron whose floruit is in the second half of the second century B.C. (see Marcadé 1957, II 78), a date which also does not agree with that of IO 174.

Hyde 1980, 39-41 even suggested what Pausanias might have read on the base (p. 40):

Nύρων Ἀθηναῖος ἐποίησεν
Φιλιππος Ἀζάν ἐκ Πελλάνας ἐπεσκέψασεν.
6.8.5: Μετὰ δὲ τὸν Βαύκιδα εἶσιν ἄβλητῶν Ἄρκαδῶν ἑἰκόνες, ... καὶ Κριτόδαμος ἐκ Κλεῖτορος, ἐπὶ πυγμῇ καὶ οὗτος ἀναγορευθεὶς παῖδων· τὰς δὲ σφίσσιν ἑἰκόνας, ... τὴν δὲ τοῦ <Κριτοδάμου> Κλέων, ... τὴν εἰκόνα ἐποίησε.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

3 <Κριτοδάμου> is a correction of the reading of the mss.: Δαμοκρήτου. Before the Olympic inscription (IO 167) the editors could not decide which of the two names of the mss. was the correct one: in the first instance the mss. give Κριτόδαμος (line 2) and then they change the name to Δαμοκρήτου (line 3). See Hitzig's (1896-1910, vol. 2.2, 474) apparatus for the readings in earlier editions. Since the discovery of IO 167, Frazer, Hitzig, and Papachatzis have all accepted the mss' reading for line 2 to be the correct name and consequently have corrected line 3 to read Κριτοδάμου. Rocha-Pereira, however, in the latest Teubner edition of Pausanias (1973-1981, vol. II, ad loc. p. 96) reads Κριτοδαμος in line 2, and Δαμοκρήτου in line 3, which is unintelligible, because one and the same person is given two names and only one can be correct while the other is an anagram.

**IO 167:** a base of black limestone, found April 26, 1879, in front of the Southeast Hall, to the east of the Roman triumphal gate. The upper left and the bottom right corners are broken away, but the inscription is not affected because it is cut approximately at the middle of one of the long sides. The base was fitted into another block, as the border at the bottom side suggests. On the upper surface, along the left break, there are two holes which supported the right foot of the bronze statue that stood on the base. The base is now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.27m. (0.22 inscribed surface + 0.05 the border). Width: 0.77m.

Thickness: 0.365m.

Letter Height: 0.009-0.015m.

There are infinite possibilities for such explanations which rarely win universal acceptance. Only new evidence can resolve such difficulties.
The letters are clearly and very sharply cut. Lines 3 and 4 are spaced out more than lines 1 and 2. The cutter has the tendency to inscribe the letters so that they lean to the left slightly, especially in line 2, where even the triple-dot punctuation mark is inscribed leaning to the left.

Characteristics of individual letters: the top and bottom strokes of the four-bar sigma are sharply slanting up- and downwards; the right vertical of the nu is shorter than the left; the omicron and part of the rho are well-rounded circles; the slanting strokes of the upsilon are very open; and the omega is half of a well-rounded circle with two horizontals on the left and right that extend its width to ca. 0.023m.


Commentary: The date for this dedication, first quarter of the fourth century B.C., is based on Pausanias' information about the sculptor Kleon from Sikyon, whose works were also the first two Zanes in Olympia (above no. 12), which were dedicated in the 98th Olympiad (388 B.C.). Accordingly Moretti places the victory of Kritodamos tentatively in the 101st Olympiad (376 B.C.), a date supported by the letter style of the inscription.

In his brief discussion of the three Arkadian dedications he saw in the general area between the Heraion and the Pelopion and southwards (Philippos from Pellana being one of them, for whose dedication see no. 31 above), Pausanias also mentions the statue of Kritodamos son of Lichas. He was a victor in the boys' boxing event, as was Philippos, and his statue was the work of the Sikyonian Kleon (no. 12 above). Pausanias again provides few clues as to exactly where in the Altis he is, but the find spot of the base, although not in its original position, seems to agree with the general area where Pausanias may have seen it, i.e. to the east (north or south) of the temple of Zeus.

More significantly, the two texts corroborate one another, except for two details that by now have become customary. Pausanias omits the name of Kritodamos' father, Lichas, while the inscription does not give the event in which the athlete was victorious.
The signature of the sculptor, however, the city of the athlete, and his name occur in both texts. In fact, thanks to the inscription found at Olympia the manuscript tradition of Pausanias on this passage can be improved: as is argued in the Apparatus Criticus above, one of the two readings preserved in the manuscripts for the name of the athlete, Kritodamos and Damokritos, must have been a copyist's error of anagrammatism. IO 167 securely identifies the first reading of Pausanias' manuscripts for the name of the athlete as the correct one, and accordingly Pausanias' text is properly emended in the second instance (line 3) from Damokritos to Kritodamos.

6.9.2: μετὰ τούτου τὴν εἰκόνα Εὐνοκλῆς τε Μαινάλιος ἔστηκε παλαιστᾶς καταβαλῶν παιδίας ..., Εὐνοκλέους δὲ τὸν ἀνδριάντα Πολύκλειτός ἐστιν εἰργασμένος.

IO 164: a quadrangular base of coarse-grained yellowish marble of Peloponnesian origin, found January 16, 1878, four meters northeast of the Nike of Paionios (above no. 4), in the east Byzantine wall. On the upper surface there remain the footprints of the bronze statue which was approximately life size. The inscription is cut on two sides of the base: the first two lines of the inscription are cut on the front margin of the upper surface in front of the footprints of the statue; the signature is cut on the left margin of the upper surface; and the epigram is inscribed on the upper part of the front side. The base is now on display in the Gallery of the Olympic Games of the New Museum, λ(ειων) 530.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 308. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.235m. Width: 0.45m. Thickness: 0.45m.

Letter Height: 0.07-0.019m.
ca. 410-380 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 21

Σενοκλῆς : Ευθύφρονος
Μανάλιος
Πολύκλετος ἑποίσε.
Μανάλιος Σενοκλῆς νύκασα
5 Ευθύφρονος υῦδο ώπτῆς μου-πάλαν τέσσαρα σύμμαθ' ἐλών.

vacat 0.013m.

The letters of the first three lines are well spaced out, except for line 1 where the triple-dot punctuation is inscribed between the letters sigma and epsilon which are closer together. These letters are also cut deeper and therefore their strokes are wider than those of the last three lines, which suggests that the cutter employed different chisels for some reason (the letter shapes are not different enough to indicate a different cutter).

The letters of the elegiac distich are more elegant, cut with thinner strokes and closer, and tend to lean to the right, while lines 5 and 6 toward the end are cut below the horizontal imaginary line. The distich is inscribed in two lines metrically.

The script of the inscription is Ionic, but its dialect appears to be Doric, because of the orthography of the words νύκασα in line 4, μουστάκαν in lines 5-6, and τέσσαρα in line 6. More specifically:

Line 3: the orthography of the signature of the sculptor, but not the script, recalls an earlier example (no. 30 above), where ε = ξι. The stone has Ει which some editors transcribe as an ει, but the trace of the right vertical stroke is not as deep and is too close to the epsilon (if the cutter wanted to add an iota he had enough space to do so).

The stone has also ΕΠΟΪΣΕ which all editors transcribe ΕΠΟΙΕ, but it is not clear whether it is a mistake of the cutter, or a contraction of -ωνη- (see Dubois 1986, vol. 2, 297).

Lines 5-6: the IO editors and Moretti (IAG 20) read μο<νυμπολάν and correct τέσσαρα to τές<σαρά, because metrically the syllables μο- and τε- of these two words are long. There is no reason, however, to suppose a mistake on the part of the cutter: μοσπηλάν can be explained either by epic lengthening, or by the presence of the digamma (μουφοπάλαν Gallavotti 1979a, 14 and Dubois 1986, vol. 2, 297-298), while the sigma in τέσσαρα may be an indication of an unvoiced affricatum phoneme /ts/ (Dubois 1986, vol. 1, 78-79; vol. 2, 298).

Remains of Dotted Letters:

Line 4: I have not dotted the mu in Μανάλιος, as most editors do (except Moretti), because, in addition to the right slanting stroke, there is on the stone a clear trace of the middle slanting stroke.


Commentary: The date for this inscription, end of the fifth and beginning of the fourth centuries B.C., is based solely on the letter style, since the sculptor Polykleitos cannot be
conclusively identified as the elder or the younger (see also no. 30 above). Accordingly, Xenokles' victory cannot be securely dated, and Moretti's tentative date for it, the 102nd Olympiad (372 B.C.), seems to be rather late.

After his brief exposition of the Arkadian statues (nos. 31 and 32 above), Pausanias continues his narrative with the statues dedicated by Promachos from Achaian Pellene, Timasitheos from Delphi and Theognetos from Aigina (6.8.5-9.2), after which he reaches the statues of two more Arkadians, Xenokles from Mainalon and Alketos from Kleitor (6.9.2). Of these statues only Xenokles' base has been found, four meters northeast of the Messenian Nike (no. 4 above). This find spot is probably not far away from the original position where Pausanias saw his bronze statue.

Both Pausanias' narrative and the text of the inscription are once more in agreement as far as the athlete's name, his ethnic, and the signature of the sculptor are concerned. The customary omissions, however, are also present: Pausanias again ignores the name of Xenokles' father, Euthyphron, and the identification of the athlete on the base (lines 1-2 of the inscription) does not mention the event in which Xenokles was victorious, and even in the epigram only the event and not the category is mentioned. The information of the two texts, therefore, does not conflict but is supplementary: Xenokles, the son of Euthyphron, from Mainalon, was victorious in the boys' wrestling event, and his statue was the work of Polykleitos.

Moreover, Pausanias' comment about Xenokles, παλαυστάς καταβαλὼν πατέας, is not one of Pausanias' common expressions and does not seem to be a variatio. It may be a description of the statue, but Pausanias' choice of words and the text of the inscription suggest otherwise. The technical language and the details of the pentameter

---

181 The majority of the editors, however, opt for the younger Polykleitos (Hansen CEG 2, 233-234 no. 825).
are not recorded by Pausanias, and it is not clear that he understood lines 4-6 to be an epigram, perhaps because of the way they were inscribed. The verb καταβαλόν, however, seems to be a translation of the inscription’s ἄλων.182 Granted that Xenokles’ case does not constitute overwhelming evidence for Pausanias’ interest in inscriptions, especially when the absence of the epigram is noticed, still it is not the evidence to disprove the author’s interest in inscriptions either. As it is, and notwithstanding the possibility that Pausanias may have also checked the Olympic Register, the substance of the two texts strongly suggests that Pausanias saw the statue of Xenokles and read the inscription on the base from which he derived the information he relates about Xenokles.

6.10.9: ... καὶ Τέλλωνα Ὀρεσθάσιον ... ἐν παισίν ἀνελομένους νίκας, ... τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ αὐτῶι κατειλεγμένους πυγμῆς ... τὸν δὲ Τέλλωνα ὡς τίς εἰργάσατο, οὐ μημονεύουσιν.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

1 Tέλλωνα Ὀρεσθάσιον is Bekker’s correction of the mss.’ readings: τέλλωνα ὡν ἐσ θάσιον Lb Ms Va Pd Ag (Ag has τέλλωνα); τέλλωνα καὶ δυτα θάσιον L; Tέλλωνα θασιον Vb Pa and the editors before Bekker 2 τελλωνα P Ag, τελλωνα Pd.

10 147, 148: a base of white, presumably Peloponnesian, marble, found December 1, 1877, built in a late wall, outside the east Byzantine wall near the south Altis wall, to the south of Zeus’ temple. The right side and the border of the front side of the upper surface of the base where the copy (148) is cut are broken away. There are two inscriptions on the upper surface: the original (147) is very worn and is cut on

182 Gallavotti (1979a, 14) remarks, “termine tecnico è anche ἄλων = καταβαλόν, come ha tradotto Pausania.” For the technical terms ἀρτής, and μαυσοπάλη see also Ebert 1972, 109-110 (μαυσοπάλη is attested in another epigram of the athlete Chelion from Achaian Patrai, which Pausanias quotes in 6.4,6). There is no apparent explanation for Pausanias’ omission of the technical details of Xenokles’ victory, only the hypothesis that for some reason Pausanias did not think they were important enough for, or fit the criteria and purposes of his account.
the border of the left, longer side of the base, while the copy (148) is cut on the border of the front side. The footprints on the upper surface indicate that the statue was bronze and life size.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 254.

Height: 0.48m. Width: 0.58m. (the measurement of Ebert; the IO editors give 0.57m.). Thickness: 0.66m.

Letter Height is not given by the editors.

147: post 472 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 28

[Τέλλων τόνθ'
    ἄνέθε[κ]ε
    Δαμίουνος
    γίδ[ς]
    [ὁ πύκτ]ας
    Ἀρκάς
    ὁρεσθάσιος
    παῖς
    Δι[δος]
    [ἀθλον ἕλων?].

148: saec. I ante

NON-STOICH.

Τέλλων τόνθν ἄνεθηκε
    Δαμήμονος
    γίδ[ς]
    ὁ πύκτας
    Ἀρκάς
    ὁρεσθάσιος
    παῖς
    Δι[δος]
    ἀθλον ἕλων?].

The script of the elegiac distich 147 is Arkadian, the dialect Doric, and the letter shapes are (LSAG 206 fig. 40): α3, ε3, η3, ο3, ι3, ο2, which Jeffery dates to the second quarter of the fifth century (475-450 B.C.). In laying out the inscription the cutter of 147 did not consider the meter, unlike the cutter of 148 who inscribed the elegiac distich in two lines.

The lettering of the copy (148), especially the broken middle bar of the alpha and the change of the doric elements in 147 into Ionic in 148 suggests the first century B.C. (the IO editors see a resemblance of IO 148 to IO 155, 156, and 158).

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of Ebert 1972, 64 no. 14):

147 Line 1: delta and alpha—only the middle upper triangular part; upsilon—only the right slanting stroke.

Line 2: tau—only a faint trace of a vertical; two alphas—only two slanting strokes; rho—a trace of a vertical and a faint trace of an upper curving stroke; alpha—only two slanting strokes; second rho—only the upper right part of a curving stroke; two alphas—only two slanting strokes; iota—only the bottom part of a vertical; delta—only the bottom horizontal; iota—only the bottom tip of a vertical.

148 Line 2: omicron—only the left part of a curving stroke; alpha—only the upper triangular part of two strokes; iota—only the upper tip of a vertical; sigma—only an upper horizontal.

Restorations: according to the IO editors 147 was inscribed in two lines, but see Ebert 1966a and 1972 no. 14, whose are the restorations in the text.

IO editors: Τέλλων τόνθν ἄνεθηκε
    Δαμήμονος
    γίδ[ς]
    Ἀρκάς
    ὁρεσθάσιος
    παῖς
    ἀνδ Πυμαχέας.

Line 2: Hansen (CEG 1, 381) prints: παῖς Σ. [υυ—υυ], hence the question mark.

Commentary: The date for *IO* 147, after 472 B.C., is based on the information of *P.Oxy.* 222 where a Tellon from Mainalon, the area where Oresthasion was also located, is recorded as a victor in the boys' boxing event of the 77th Olympiad (472 B.C., see also Moretti), a date which is also in agreement with the letter style. The date for *IO* 148, first century B.C., is exclusively based on the lettering.

Pausanias, continuing his exegesis of athletic dedications in the Altis, briefly mentions in a paragraph four statues dedicated by victorious boys, one of which is the boy boxer Tellon from the Arkadian Oresthasion, but whose sculptor "is not remembered (οὐ μνημονεύεται)." The subject of this verb is absent, but it can be easily understood to be the Eleian exegetes, or less likely those responsible for setting up the monument who did not inscribe the signature. The statue base of Tellon has been found in the general area where Pausanias probably saw it, i.e. between the chariots of Kleosthenes (6.10.6-8) and Gelon (6.12.1 = no. 9 above) to the south of the temple of Zeus near the south Altis wall, and it bears, as Pausanias' comment implies, no signature of the sculptor. There is no certainty that originally there was an artist's signature, because, if it existed, there is no apparent explanation why the Eleians chose not to re-inscribe it too, as they did with the epigram and a number of other reinscribed signatures.

Be that as it may, the brief narrative of Pausanias about Tellon and the two fragmentary versions of the epigram corroborate and supplement each other: Pausanias does not mention the athlete's father who, according to the inscription, was Daémon. He

---

183 See Ebert 1972, 64 and the bibliography there.
records, however, the event in which Tellon was victorious, which in turn assists in the restoration of the epigram. Moreover, thanks to the text of IO 147 and 148, which preserve the city of Tellon Oresthasion, the emendation of Pausanias' text which Bekker conjectured can be accepted definitively, since it is proven to be the correct one.

The case of the Arkadian Tellon attests once more to the fact that Pausanias' information about the athletic dedications in the Altis is primarily derived from the inscriptions on the monuments themselves. The fact that the Olympic Register on the P.Oxy. 222 changes Tellon's city from Oresthasion to Mainalon may explain the corruption in Pausanias' manuscripts. Oresthasion was obscure, indeed hardly known, while Mainalon was the better known city of the area. That Pausanias records it accurately reveals that his information derives primarily from the inscription.

35.

6.13.6: ... καὶ Ἀριστίωνα Θεοφίλους Ἐπιδαύριον, τὸν μὲν ἄνδρῶν πυγμῆς, ..., Πολύκλειτος ἐποίησε σφᾶς ὁ Ἀργεῖος.

Apparatus Criticus:
1 Only the ms. Ag has ἀριστίωνα. Θεοφίλους is Schubart's reading after the ms. P, which all later editors accept. Before Schubart the editors preferred the prevalent reading of the mss.: θεοφίλους Lb Ms Vab Pad Ag (Θεοφίλους L).

IO 165: a quadrangular base of black limestone, found October 30, 1879, in the east Byzantine wall, approximately ten meters south of Paianios' Victory (above no. 4). The base is preserved almost intact, except for the extreme right front and the right back. The footprints on the upper surface suggest that the bronze statue was life size. The inscription is cut on the upper surface, on its border in front of the footprints and is very badly weathered. The base is now on display in the Gallery of the Olympic Games of the New Museum, Λ(υθνα) 531.

Height: 0.216m. Width: 0.625m. Thickness: 0.54m.

Letter Height: 0.012-0.02m. (except for the phi, whose height is 0.03m.).

\textit{ante} 350 \textit{ante}

\textit{Αριστίων Θεοφίλεος Επιδαύριος
Πολύκλειτος ἐποίησε.}

The letter style of the inscription is elegant and the letters are carefully laid out and cut, except towards the end of both lines where they tend to lean to the right. According to the \textit{IO} editors “nach ihrem orthographischen und paläographischen Charakter, in dem sich keine Spur der Altertümlichkeiten von No. 164 [above no. 33] mehr findet, fällt die Inschrift in die Mitte des vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.,...”. The significant orthographic element is in the signature of Polykleitos, which in \textit{IO} 164 (above no. 33, and also no. 30 = \textit{IO} 162, 163) has epsilon for epsilon iota.

Characteristic letter shapes are: of the epsilon the upper horizontal is shorter and curves upwards, its middle stroke is the shortest and its vertical stroke extends above the upper horizontal; the middle bar of the theta does not cross the circle; the right stroke of the pi is shorter and the upper vertical stroke is extended to the right; and the upper curving part of the omega is cut as a rhomboid.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: lambda—only a faint trace of the right slanting stroke.


Commentary: The date for the inscription, middle of the fourth century B.C., is based on the letter style and the spelling —ει— in the signature of Polykleitos (compare nos. 30, 33 above). In \textit{P.Oxy.} 222 there is an entry of an athlete named Ariston, victor in the boxing in the 82nd Olympiad (452 B.C.), who is clearly another man. His ethnic is missing from the papyrus and the date of his victory is too early for the letter style of \textit{IO} 165 and for possible identification with the Epidaurian athlete Aristion.\textsuperscript{184} This would be possible only if \textit{IO} 165 were a renewed version of an older inscription, but there are no traces on the base to support this, and no other evidence corroborating the \textit{P.Oxy.} 222 entry. Accordingly Moretti has placed Aristion’s victory tentatively in the 103th Olympiad (368 B.C.), sometime after which Aristion dedicated his statue.

\textsuperscript{184} Papachatzis’ (1974-81, vol. 3, 352 note 3) accepts the Ariston of the papyrus to be the same as Aristion and notes the discrepancy in the dates.
After his exegesis on the runner Chionis and other famous runners, Pausanias continues his narrative with more athletic dedications (6.13.5-6) and reaches the statue of the athlete Aristion, son of Theopile, from Epidauros, victorious in the men’s boxing event, another work of the Argive Polykleitos. The statue base of Aristion, like that of Tellon (no. 34 above), has been found in the general area where Pausanias saw it, i.e. between the chariots of Kleosthenes (6.10.6-8) and Gelon (6.12.1 = above no. 9) to the south of the temple of Zeus near the south Altis wall.

The text of the inscription is exactly the same as Pausanias’ brief statement about this athlete: the athlete’s name, the name of his father (unlike previous cases where Pausanias ignores it), his ethnic, and the signature of the sculptor, all are in agreement. The only discrepancy between Pausanias’ text and the inscription is again the event in which Aristion was victorious, the men’s boxing, which of course Pausanias may have taken from the representation of the statue, or an Olympic Register. Finally, as was the case earlier, the inscription confirms the correct accent of the name of Aristion’s father, Theopile, in the uncontracted form of the genitive case, which is preserved in only one of Pausanias’ manuscripts, and thus it improves his text, albeit marginally.

36.

6.13.11: Ἡλείοις δὲ ἀνδράσιν...καὶ Τηλεμάχῳ Τηλεμάχου, τῷ μὲν ἐπὶ ὕππων νίκη γέγονεν ἢ εἰκὼν, ....

Apparatus Criticus:
I the mss. read Τηλεμάχου, Τηλεμάχου μὲν; Hitzig, following IO 174, corrected it to Τηλεμάχου Τηλεμάχου, τῷ μὲν. Most editors before Hitzig kept the mss. reading, except Siebel who thought that the name of the father was dropped out, and Gurlitt (1890, 420 note 34) who read: Τηλεμάχη τῷ Τηλεμάχου, τούτῳ μὲν. Papachatzis and Rocha-Pereira retain the mss. reading. A very common scribal error, however, occurs when identical words, in this case the name and the patronymic, with different endings follow one after the other. Furthermore, Pausanias usually does not repeat an immediately preceding name, but employs the article with the μὲν...δὲ particles (see e.g. 6.12.6 and 6.13.6).
IO 177: a base of coarse grey limestone, found May 15, 1877, in situ on the south edge of the terrace of Zeus' temple, between the east Byzantine wall and the small gateway of the south terrace wall. The traces of the footprints on the upper surface indicate that the bronze statue was life size. The inscription is cut on the front side of the base and is very worn. The base is now in the Altis in situ.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 189.

Height: 0.33-0.34m. Width: 0.79m. Thickness: 0.79m.

Letter Height is not given by the IO editors.

ca. 320–250 ante

NON-STOICH.

Τηλέμαχος Τηλεμάχου
Ολύμπιοι τεθρύππωι, Πύθια κέλητε.[1].
Φιλωνίδης ἐποίησε.

The letters are spaced out well and are cut carefully and symmetrically. Lines one and three are indented three letter spaces, which may suggest that they were shorter than line two and therefore the ethnic of this athlete was not inscribed after his father’s name in line one.

Individual characteristics of letter-shapes are: the middle bar of the epsilon is half the length of the other horizontals; the right vertical of the pi is only one third the height of the left; and the omicrons, thetas, and omegas are almost half the size of the other letters and are cut either on the middle, or on the bottom of the letter space.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of IO):
Line 1: tau—only a vertical stroke; alpha—only the left slanting stroke.
Line 2: alpha—only the right slanting and the upper part of a left slanting strokes.

Roehl, IGB 142. Moretti, IAG 87-89 no. 34. Moretti 1957, 135 no. 531.

Commentary: The date of the inscription, end of the fourth and first half of the third centuries B.C., is based totally on the lettering and the absence of rhotacism (IO

185 Loewy (IGB 142) proposes the period from the beginning of the Hellenistic times up to and not later than the middle of the second century B.C.
Accordingly, Moretti has placed the Olympic victory of Telemachos tentatively in the 122nd Olympiad (292 B.C.).

Continuing his exegesis of athletic statues in the Altis, Pausanias reaches the statues of two Eleians, one of whom is Telemachos, whose statue was set up on account of his equestrian victory at Olympia. His statue base has been found apparently in situ, where Pausanias must have seen it. The inscription on Telemachos' base, however, offers information about the athlete which Pausanias ignores: Telemachos, the son of Telemachos, won in the four horse chariot race in the Olympic and in the horse race in the Pythic Games, and his statue was the work of Philonides.¹⁸⁶

Both Pausanias' brief remark and the text of the inscription are in agreement about the name of the athlete, his father's name, and the event in which Telemachos was victorious, even though Pausanias' description is too general. There are also omissions which cannot be easily explained: Pausanias gives no date for the victory of Telemachos; no mention of the athlete's ethnic is inscribed; and finally, the Pythic victory and the signature of the otherwise unknown sculptor Philonides are ignored by Pausanias. These omissions suggest that Pausanias in his narrative is not consistent, and that his interests are not always on details. Even so, his information and that of the inscription are not in conflict, but complement each other. More importantly, the inscription that has been found in Olympia not only corroborates Pausanias' narrative, but also helps once again in improving of Pausanias' text (see Apparatus Criticus).

¹⁸⁶ "Questa iscrizione, che per sè non riveste grande interesse, ci permette di risolvere un problema attinente alle liste degli olimpionici" Moretti, IAG 87-88 no. 34.
37.

6.13.11: ἀνέθηκε δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀθηναίων δήμος Ἀριστοφάνεια Λυσίου,
παγκρατιαστᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀγώνι τῷ ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι κρατήσαντα ἀνδρᾶς.

Apparatus Criticus:

I Λυσίου is the mss. reading accepted by all editors after Bekker. Editors before Bekker corrected the mss. to Λυκίου.

IO 169: a fragment of greyish-blue Hymettian marble, found October 12, 1876, to the south of the east Byzantine wall, near the base of Telemachos (no. 36 above). It was part of the pedestal on which the statue of Aristophon was mounted, and it is broken on the right and bottom sides, but the top and part of the left edge are preserved. The fragment is now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 85. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.13m. Width: 0.22m. Thickness: 0.29-0.30m.
Letter Height: 0.013-0.02m.

350–300 ante

The letters are spaced out and are cut clearly. Their style, according to the IO editors, indicates the fourth or at the latest the beginning of the third centuries B.C., but see Kirchner’s date for IG II² 4397 below.

Restorations: the restoration of this very fragmentary text as that of the base of Aristophon was first made by the IO editors and is based: 1) on Pausanias’ implied topography of the statue; 2) on the fact that hymettian marble would be used primarily for an Athenian dedication; and 3) on IG II², 4397 (below) which is another dedication from Athens, this time of Aristophon himself, also inscribed on hymettian marble. The question marks serve as a caution sign that the restorations may have been slightly different.

IG II², 4397: a small base of Hymettian marble was found preserved intact in the Propylaia, on the Akropolis. It is now in the Epigraphical Museum (EM 9012).

Height: 0.14m. Width: 0.32m. Thickness: 0.22m.
Letter Height: the first two lines 0.018m.; line three 0.008m.

350–300 ante

NON-STOICH.
lines 1-2 ca. 15
line 3 ca. 27

'A ρ ι σ τ ο φ ω ν Λυ σ ι ν ο u
Ε ι ρ ε σ ι δ η s 'Α σ κ λ α π ι ω i.

The letters in the first two lines are considerably taller than those of the third, and their style suggests the second half of the fourth century B.C. (Kirchner). The IO editors further comment that: 187 "Im Material und Schriftcharakter genau übereinstimmend hat sich auf der athenischen Burg eine Weihinschrift gefunden,..., die schon Rangabé mit dem Pankratiasten des Pausanias in Beziehung gesetzt hatte, und die nach Köhler's Urteil aus der zweiten Hälfte des vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. herrührt."

Restorations: the restoration in line three is Kirchner's.


Commentary: The date of the two inscriptions, 350–300 B.C., is based on the letter style of IG II², 4397 (Kirchner) which also accommodates IO 169 (see also note 187). Accordingly, Moretti dates the victory of Aristophon tentatively in the 117th Olympiad (312 B.C.), after which the Athenians dedicated the statue in honor of Aristophon in Olympia.

Continuing his brief exegesis of athletic statues in the Altis and immediately after the statue of Telemachos (no. 36 above) which has been found in situ, Pausanias mentions next the statue dedicated by the city of Athens in honor of Aristophon, son of Lysinos, who won in the men's pankration. The find spot of the fragment, to the south of the east Byzantine wall near the base of Telemachos, agrees with Pausanias' implied

187 Professor S.V. Tracy examined a squeeze of IG II² 4397 at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton and informs me that the lettering has small apices and on the basis of the letter nu the inscription dates probably before 340 B.C.
topographical direction, since Aristophon’s statue comes after that of Telemachos in his
narrative and therefore must have been set up near it. This and the fact that an inscribed
fragment of Hymettian marble would in all probability be an Athenian dedication led the
IO editors to the conclusion that the fragmentary inscription was that of the pankratiast
Aristophon whose statue is mentioned by Pausanias. An additional confirmation for this
identification is also presented by the inscribed base also of Hymettian marble found on
the Akropolis, which is a dedication to Asklepios by Aristophon, son of Lysinos from the
deme of Eiresidai.

Once the fragmentary inscription was identified with this passage in Pausanias, its
restoration followed Pausanias’ text. Furthermore, the Athenian dedication by
Aristophon himself to Asklepios confirms the reading of Pausanias’ manuscripts of the
father’s name as Λυσίνου, which troubled earlier editors who corrected it to Λυκίνου.
Thus, Pausanias’ text provided important evidence for the restoration of IO 169 and in
turn his narrative is verified by the Athenian dedication to Asklepios of Aristophon son of
Lysinos who, excluding Pausanias and these two inscriptions, is otherwise unknown.188

38.

6.14.1: Φερίας δὲ Αἰγινήτης —οὗτος γὰρ δὴ παρὰ τὸν Ἀθηναίον
'Αριστοφῶντα ἀνάκειται— ὁγθόη μὲν πρὸς ταῖς ἐπομήκοντα
ολυμπιάδι κομιδὴ τε ἔδοξεν εἶναι νέος καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτήδειος πω
νομισθεὶς παλαίειν ἀπηλάθη τοῦ ἄγινος, τῇ δὲ ἐξῆς —κατε-
δέχθη γὰρ τηνικὰτα ἐς τοὺς παῖδας— ἐνίκα παλαίων.

188 IG Π² 2699, a private horos, inscribed on Hymettian marble, mentions an Aristophon Eiresides
who, Kirchner tentatively identifies with Aristophon, son of Lysinos. The name and the demotic alone,
however, for lack of stronger evidence, are not enough for definite identification, especially in Athenian
prosopography.
Kunze 1938, 129-130: a fragment of a bronze tablet, found in the excavations of the winter of 1937-1938 in the South Hall, located behind the Bouleuterion. The top and bottom edges are preserved, but judging from the part of the inscription that remains the tablet’s left and extreme right sides are broken away. The tablet was mounted on a base which supported the statue of Pherias, and now it is in the Αποθήκη of the New Museum (Χαλκά Collection).

Height: 0.046m. Width: 0.117m. Thickness: 0.001m.

Letter Height: ca. 0.008-0.01m.

Paulo post 464 ante NON-STOICH.

[— ὥ — ὥ — ὥ ἸΟΛΥΜΠΑΙ, ἱυὲ Ὑάρτης θ',
[— ὥ — ὥ — ὥ πά]λαν Φερίας vacat.

The letters are carefully cut and the style is plain. The dialect of this elegiac distich is Doric and the script is Aiginetan. Characteristic letter shapes are (LSAG 109, fig. 32): the alpha is between α3 and α4, ε4 (but slightly bent to the left), μ4 (but more open), ν3, α2, ν3, δ3, χ1. The lettering of this inscription suggests the fifth century B.C. (Kunze), but Jeffery by comparing it to other Aiginetan inscriptions suggests the 440’s B.C. (Jeffery, however, in her text of the inscription, LSAG 404 pl. 17 no. 21, reads incorrectly an epsilon instead of a pi in the beginning of line one: Ἰμπεναί).

Restorations:
Only Ebert has attempted a restoration for this epigram:

[Ἀγιναν στεφάνος θ', ἱυὲ Ὑάρτης θ',
[παῖδας νικάσας μονοπά]λαν, Φερίς.

He seems, however, to ignore the discrepancy in the cases in the end of lines one and two: ἱυὲ Ὑάρτης is in the vocative, while Φερίς is in the nominative case.

An alternative could be to assume that the two lines are two sentences, as if it were a stichomythy between the dedicator and the athlete (see for example the epigrams of Kyniska above no. 7, Euthymos above no. 24, and Xenokles above no. 33):

[Ἀγιναν στεφάνος θ', ἱυὲ Ὑάρτης θ',
[παῖδας νικάσας μονοπά]λαν Φερίς.

Commentary: The date for the inscription, post 464 B.C., is that of Pausanias who states that Pherias entered and won the wrestling competition in the 79th Olympiad (464 B.C., accepted by Moretti), sometime after which he or his city dedicated the statue at Olympia, a date which is also consistent with the letter style.\(^{189}\)

Next to the statue of the Athenian athlete Aristophon (no. 37 above) Pausanias saw in the Altis the dedication of the Aiginetan athlete Pherias, who won in the 79th Olympiad (464 B.C.) the boys' wrestling event. This boy athlete, Pausanias also adds, tried to enter the wrestling competition in the 78th Olympiad (468 B.C.), but he was not allowed participation, because his age and his stature did not persuade the judges that he was ready for wrestling.\(^{190}\) This fragmentary tablet was found in the South Hall, an area which agrees with Pausanias' implied topography that the statue of Pherias stood next to, or near that of Aristophon (no. 37 above), and perhaps to the east of the Telemachos base (no. 36 above).

\(^{189}\) Jeffery's comment (LSAG 112) that "perhaps Pherias was already an adult when he made his commemorative offering" may be true, but the letter style alone cannot rule out a date in the late 460's or 450's B.C.

Ebert (1972, 78) suggests further that it is probable that Pherias' victory may be even earlier than Pausanias' date, since in P.Oxy. 222 the entry for the boys' wrestling in the 76th Olympiad (476 B.C.), usually restored with the athlete Theognetos of Aigina, may be restored \[ \Theta\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma\varepsilon\ \Lambda\gamma\nu\upsilon\varepsilon \nu\hbar\tau\eta\varsigma. \] The manuscripts of Pausanias, however, do not endorse Ebert's proposition for a scribal error (OH for OE Olympiad) in this passage, nor is there any other evidence to support a correction in the manuscripts of Pausanias (the P.Oxy. 222 cannot be the evidence, since the name is restored).

\(^{190}\) The categories in the ancient Olympics were only two, men and boys (see Ebert 1972, 78 and further bibliography there; and also no. 65 below which, however, describes games in the first century A.D.). Pausanias' remark about Pherias clearly implies that age alone was not exclusionary from the competition, at least in the boys' category, nor was it fixed; the physical appearance of the athlete was obviously of importance and supposedly the judges may have allowed athletes to participate disregarding the age limit, if there was one. See also Pausanias' stories about the Rhodian athlete Nikasylos from Tralleis (6.14.2-3 = no. 89 below) who, although very young, entered the boys' category in Olympia and lost, but later during the Olympia in Smyrna he participated in all three categories and subsequently defeated boys, ephebes, and men.
Pausanias' brief comment on Pherias and the fragmentary inscription from the athlete's dedication are again in agreement, except for the regular discrepancy, i.e. the omission by Pausanias of Pherias' father, Chares. Furthermore, the ethnic of Pherias and the boys' category, both mentioned by Pausanias, are elements which in all probability were also mentioned in the epigram and therefore assist in its restoration. And yet, Pausanias' narrative implies that the inscribed bases in the Altis were only one of his sources. The story that Pausanias includes about Pherias originated probably from the local exegetes, or from his inquiries in Aigina, and obviously it only serves as an excuse for Pausanias to incorporate other examples of outstanding athletic accomplishments. Just as he has done earlier with the claims of the Spartan Chionis (6.13.2-3 = no. 88 below), here too Artemidoros from Tralleis, one of the athletes surpassing Pherias, comes from Pausanias' favorite place, Asia Minor (no. 89 below).

39.

6.15.1: Ἀρχίππωι δὲ Μυτιληναῖωι τούς ἐς τὴν πυγμὴν ἐσελθόντας κρατήσαντι ἄνθρας ἄλλο τοιόνυμε προσποιούσιν οἱ Μυτιληναῖοι ἐς δέξαν, ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐν ἔλαμπται καὶ Πυθοῖ καὶ Νεμέας καὶ Ἰσθμῶι λάβοι στέφανον ἡλικίαν οὐ πρόσω γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τῶν εἰκόσι.

Apparatus Criticus:
1, 2 all the mss. and the editors read Μυτιλήναει - which appears also in 8.30.2 and 10.24.1. Only Dindorf corrects to Μυτιλήναει, and Papachatzis (1974-81, vol. 3, 420 note 1) who follows Spiro's edition but prints here the correct spelling Μυτιλήναει.

ID 173: a round base of dark grey marble, found April 21, 1876, to the south of the temple of Zeus, between the south terrace and the north building of the

191 Kunze (1938, 130) is probably right that "die Vorgeschichte des Sieges aber hat Pausanias schwerlich aus dem Distichon geschöpft," although there may have been inscribed an extraordinary claim which Pausanias proceeds to refute (6.14.1-3).
Bouleuterion. The inscription is cut near the upper edge which is broken away, and therefore only the first letter of the first line is legible.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 59.

Height: 0.385m. Diameter: 1.13m.

Letter Height is not given by the IO editors.

320–280 ante

'Α[ρχιππος]
Καλλιφάνους
Μυτιληναῖος.

The letters are spaced generously and the style is plain. Characteristic letter shapes are: the omicron is half the size of the other letters and is inscribed in the middle of the letter space; the slanting strokes of the kappa are shorter than the vertical stroke; and the four-bar sigma's top and bottom strokes are cut slanting up- and downwards. According to the IO editors this style suggests the end of the fourth or the beginning of the third centuries B.C.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the IO facsimile):
Line 1: alpha—only the bottom part of a left slanting stroke.

Moretti 1957, 132 no. 503.

Commentary: The date for the inscription, end of the fourth and beginning of the third centuries B.C., is based totally on the letter style. Accordingly, Moretti dates the Olympic victory of Archippos tentatively in the 120th Olympiad (300 B.C.).

Pausanias, continuing his exegesis of the dedications in the Altis, reaches the statue of Archippos from Mytilene. He won in the men's boxing event and the Mytileneans add that he won in all four Panhellenic Games before he became twenty years old. The round pedestal onto which Archippos' statue was mounted was found in an area which agrees with Pausanias' topography, i.e. between the base of Telemachos (no. 36, found in situ) and that of Epitherses (no. 40 below), to the south of the temple of Zeus. The find spot of the base and the fact that Archippos is the only Mytilenean athlete whose
statue Pausanias saw in Olympia and whose name fits the space on the stone led the *IO* editors to identify this base with Archippos’ dedication and therefore to restore the first line of the inscription ‘‘Ἀρχιππός.” This is a plausible restoration and corroborates Pausanias’ text, but it does not account for the additional information which he includes. Pausanias, as is his wont, omits Archippos’ father’s name, Kalliphanes.

Pausanias’ remark about Archippos (ἐκκλησία των Προσπονησίων οἱ Μυτιληναῖοι ἐς Ὀλυμπιάδα) suggests that Archippos’ monument was dedicated by the Mytilenaeans who presumably had also inscribed his accomplishments on the base: before he was twenty years old Archippos won victories in the men’s boxing event in Olympia, Delphi, Nemea, and Isthmos (see for example below no. 40, the dedication of the Erythraeans for Epitherses). This information can scarcely have been in the Olympic Register, and the language of Pausanias does not suggest that he got it from the local exegetes. In all likelihood, therefore, and in addition to the surviving inscription, the Mytilenaeans had inscribed another text, perhaps an epigram on bronze, where their fellow countryman’s athletic accomplishments were pointed out not only for Archippos’ fame but their own as well.

40.

6.15.6: Ἐρυθραιῶν δὲ οἱ ἰωνεῖς Ἐπιθέρσην τὸν Ἡμηρόδωρον, δύο μὲν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ πυγμῆς, διὸς δὲ Πυθοτί νίκας καὶ ἐν Νεμέᾳ τε καὶ ἐν Ἰσθμῷ λαβόντα, οὕτωι μὲν τὸν Ἐπιθέρσην τούτον, …ἀνέθεσαν…. 

192 There are three more Mytilenean athletes attested in the ancient sources, all of whom were stadionikai, but whose statues in the Altis, if they had any, Pausanias does not mention: see Moretti 1957, 89 no. 209 (Skamandrios), 130 no. 482 (Parmenion), and 156 no. 770 (Valerios). None of these names, however, could be restored here.
186: a base of Pentelic marble, found January 14, 1879, to the south of the temple of Zeus, opposite its sixth column counting from the west, only eleven steps from the south Altis wall. The stone is smooth, and on the back side there are holes for clamps which suggest that this block was fastened to another one and therefore it is only part of the pedestal onto which the statue of Epitherses was mounted. On the upper surface there is also a single footprint. The inscription is cut on the front small side, and on the front border of the upper surface there are also traces of another inscription, totally unreadable.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 520.

Height: 0.33m. Width: 0.81m. Thickness: 0.985m.

Letter Height is not given by the IO editors.

\[ \text{NON-STOICH. ca. 20-30} \]

\[ \text{vacat} \]

\[ \text{Pυθόκριτος Τιμοχάριος} \]

\[ \text{ν Ρόδιος ἐπόπε.} \]

The letters are carefully inscribed, and their strokes are cut deep and wide, except the sculptor’s signature, and they end in triangular serifs. The letter cutter employs empty spaces inconsistently: in line 2 he has left an empty letter-space; in line 3 there is a half letter space empty between the two words; in line 4 the end of the first word is inscribed leaning to the left while the beginning of the next word leans to the right so as to create a third of a letter space empty; and in line six the first two words are separated from the last two by an empty space.

Characteristic letter shapes are: the middle bar of the alpha is broken; the middle stroke of the epsilon is shorter and the top horizontal sometimes is longer than the bottom; the pi’s vertical strokes are of equal height; the theta does not have a horizontal middle stroke but a period; the right vertical of the nu is shorter; and the sigma’s top and bottom strokes are horizontal and parallel.

Commentary: The date of the inscription, late third and beginning of the second centuries B.C., is based on the career of the sculptor Pythokritos son of Timocharis from Rhodes. There have been found more signatures of this sculptor in Rhodes which are dated ca. 203–165 B.C. (see Moretti IAG 46), a date with which the lettering of IO 186 is also in agreement, although the script of Erythrai is not known. Accordingly, Moretti (1957, 143 no. 610) dates the athlete's victory tentatively in the 149th Olympiad (184 B.C.)

Continuing his exegesis of the dedications in the Altis Pausanias reaches the statue of Epitherses, son of Metrodoros, a dedication of the demos of Erythrai in Asia Minor (Ionia). Epitherses, Pausanias continues, was victorious twice in the Olympic Games, and also twice in the Pythia, Nemea, and Isthmia. The inscribed pedestal of Epitherses' statue has been found in Olympia in the general area where it must have stood, as Pausanias' indirect topography implies, i.e. near and next to that of Archippos (no. 39 above), to the south of the temple of Zeus.

Except for the sculptor's signature, which the exegete totally ignores for some reason, but which is the only evidence for dating the Olympic inscription, Pausanias' narrative is an almost word by word copy of the inscription:

the city of Erythrai <dedicated this statue> of Epitherses son of Metrodoros, who won in the men's boxing event in the Olympics twice and the periodos.

The underlined words and the way in which Pausanias integrates this information into his narrative highlight the fundamental and programmatic principle followed by him. Pausanias' main interest is the exegesis of the monuments, athletic or otherwise, in the Altis, and the case of Epitherses provides an excellent example.

While transcribing the text on the base of Epitherses' statue, Pausanias makes three exegetical comments on the inscription which, as he thinks, is not so clear. First Pausanias points out that the Erythraians are Ιωνες, i.e. from Asia Minor, the favorite
place of Pausanias. Secondly, he does not use the word περιοδωσος, which apparently was confusing to him or his readers, but he translates it as he understands it, i.e. that Epitherses won victories in the other three major panhellenic games, the Nemea, Pythia, and Isthmia.193

Finally, Pausanias understands the meaning of line four to be that Epitherses was victorious twice in all four major games, since he assumes that πς refers both to the Olympia and the periodos. The only other evidence for Epitherses, outside Pausanias, is the Panathenaic record of probably 198 B.C. where the winner of the boxing event is an Erythraian, son of Metrodoros, who cannot be any other person than Epitherses and whose name is accordingly restored securely (IG II2 2313-38):194

\[ \text{πυγμην} \]
\[ [ \text{ Επιθέρσας} ] \text{ Μητροδόρου Ερυθραίος}. \]

This of course does not help to support or reject Pausanias’ understanding of line four of the Olympic inscription, and only Moretti has rejected it by proposing the alternative reading: to take πς with Olympia alone and not with periodos, in which case a comma must be placed after πς. At any rate, although there is no evidence to support either one of the readings, Pausanias’ exegesis of line four cannot be rejected by grammatical and syntactical rules alone which are not always applicable on epigraphical texts, but only by strong evidence against his information.

The dedication of Epitherses, therefore, attests not only to the epigraphical interests of the exegete, but is also an excellent example of his methodology. It illustrates admirably what Pausanias calls “the exegesis of the monuments in the Altis” (5.21.1 and

---

193 For the absence of the title periodonikes from Pausanias’ narrative see especially no. 8 above, note 119.

194 For the date of IG II2 2313 and a reconsideration of the Panathenaic inscriptions see now: Tracy 1991, 189-236, especially 218-219 and 221-223.
Chapter II. Pausanias reads carefully the inscription which in itself is an exegesis of the statue, and he records its information in his narrative with some explanations. These, he judges, are necessary for his readers so that they will not be confused, when visiting Olympia, and will understand better the monument of Epitherses and the Erythraians.

41, 42.

6.15.7: Δημήτριον δὲ τὸν ἐλάσσαντα ἐπὶ Σελεύκου στρατιάι καὶ ἄλωντα ἐν τῇ μάχῃ καὶ τοῦ Δημήτριου τὸν παῖδα Ἀντίγονον ἀναθήματα ἵστω τὶς Βυζαντιῶν δυνας.

IO 304: two joining fragments of grey limestone were found: fr. a May 8, 1876, to the south side of the temple of Zeus at the sixth column from the west, very near IO 186 (no. 40 above); fr. b November 4, 1878, to the south east of the temple of Zeus. Part of the base is broken at the back and at the right. In addition the inscribed surface is broken away on the left. The inscription is cut on the upper part of the front side of the pedestal onto which the statue of Antigonos was mounted, but no traces of its footprints are preserved. Fragment a is now in situ in the Altis, while fragment b is in ἀποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.23m. Width: 0.68m. Thickness: 0.65m.

Inscribed surface: Height: 0.21m. Width: 0.32m.

Letter Height: 0.02-0.03m.

paido post 301 ante

NON-STOICH.

[δ] Δάμος ὁ Βυζαντ[ῶν]
[βα]σιλῆ Ἀντίγονον.
190

IO 305: two fragments of grey limestone were found: fr. a January 19, 1879, in the excavations of the Baths; and fr. b in the summer of 1879, in the Palaistra, and it is broken all around except for the top border. Fragment a preserves part of the bottom and b some of the top. The inscription was cut on the front side of the pedestal onto which the statue of Demetrios was mounted. Both fragments are now in Ανακριτή 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. 527 (a), 869 (b). Vidi, Phot.

Fr. a: Height: 0.18m. Width: 0.15m. Thickness: 0.12m.
Fr. b: Height: 0.14m. Width: 0.31m. Thickness: 0.235m.

Letter Height: 0.017-0.028m.

The letters of both inscriptions are very similar and suggest that they were inscribed by the same cutter (the letters in 305 are slightly smaller); they are nicely spaced out and the strokes are deep. Most end in triangular serifs. Prof. S.V. Tracy suggested that the letter style of both 304 and 305 is later than IO 45.

Characteristic letter shapes are: the middle bar of the alpha is broken; the right vertical of the nu is shorter and its shape is peculiar, indeed idiosyncratic (according to Prof. S.V. Tracy); the omicron is small and is cut in the middle of the letter space; and the top and bottom strokes of sigma slant.

Remains of Dotted Letters:

304: Line 1: alpha–only the bottom parts of the slanting strokes; tau–only the bottom part of a vertical.

305: Line 1: mu–only the bottom part of the left vertical.
Line 2: alpha–only the bottom tip of the right slanting stroke; lambda–only the bottom half of the left slanting stroke.

IO 45: six fragments of grey marble, of which all but f are joined. Five (a-e) were found in 1879: fr. a May 8, in the temple of Zeus; fr. b January 24, to the south of the temple of Zeus; fr. c January 17, to the south of the temple of Zeus; fr. d January 15, in the cella of the temple of Zeus; and fr. e January 24, to the south of the temple of Zeus, in the second column from the west. Fr. f was found in October
18, 1877, to the northeast of the Byzantine tower. The preserved text of the inscription comes from the end of a decree and fragment $d$ seems to preserve part of the last line, since the space below has no letter traces. Fragments $a$ and $f$ preserve the top and the left and right edges. On top there is a dowel hole into which another block, containing the beginning, was attached. All fragments are now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.


Frs. $a+b+c+d+e$: Height: 0.14m. Width: 0.46m. Thickness: 0.12m.

Fr. $f$: Height: 0.065m. Width: 0.17m. Thickness: 0.20m.

Letter Height: 0.005-0.01m.

306–301 antec

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tás} & \quad \text{προαι?} - \\
\text{ρέσιος ἔνεκεν.} & \quad \text{ἐλέσθαι δὲ τῷ πέντε μὲν ποτ' Ἀντίγονον,} \\
\text{δὲ ποτὶ Δαμάτριον, οὗτος τὰς γίμας ἀπαγγέλουντι καὶ} & \\
\text{διδαχοῦντι} & \\
\text{αὐτοῦς, ὅτι ἡ πόλις δὲν τε ἐνεργεῖται [χάριν αὐτοὺς} & \quad \text{ἔξωσεν φίλῳ [έσται]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{5 [εἰ]ς τῷ ὑπόλοιπον χρόνον:} & \quad \text{πράσσειν δὲ αὐτοὺς} \\
\text{παρὰ Δαμάτριον ἀγγέλους πρεσβεύειν} & \\
\text{σοι} & \\
\text{μετὰ τὰς βρονδᾶς ὡς ταῖς πρεσβεῖαιν} & \quad \text{ἀποσταλώντι?} \\
\text{τοῖς βασιλέας τὰν ταχύσταν,} & \quad \text{ἐφ' ὀδιά τε δοθήκε αὐτῶς.} \\
\text{τὸ δὲ} & \\
\text{ἀγγύ?} & \\
\text{10 [μιον ἐπεμελεῖσθωσαν μετὰ?] τὰς βρονδᾶς ὡς ταῖς πρεσβεῖαιν} & \\
\text{ναῦται} & \end{align*}
\]

The letter cutter is somewhat careless (see lines 3 and 5) and cuts the letters in varying widths and heights. He places them very close together.
Characteristic letter shapes: the middle horizontal of the epsilon is shorter than the top and bottom, one of which is usually longer than the other; the verticals of the nu are quite short and the left slants to the right, while the right vertical sometimes slants to the left; the omicron is small and usually cut in the middle of the letter space; the bottom half of the sigma is shorter than the top; and the horizontal of tau sometimes slants to the left or to the right.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 2: pi—only the upper part of the left vertical and the beginning tip of the horizontal strokes.
Line 3: epsilon—only the bottom horizontal; tau—only the bottom half of the vertical; second tau—only the vertical; iota—only a faint trace of the bottom half of a vertical stroke.
Line 4: iota—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
Line 5: sigma—only a faint trace of the upper slanting stroke; tau—only the horizontal; omicron—only the upper left part of a curving stroke; alpha—only a faint trace of the bottom left slanting stroke.
Line 7: alpha—only the apex; second alpha—only the right slanting and the upper part of the left slanting strokes; nu—only the bottom part of the left vertical; second nu—only the bottom half of the left vertical stroke.
Line 8: beta—only a faint trace of the upper part of an arc; omicron—only the upper half of a curving stroke; tau—only the bottom tip of the vertical; second tau—only the horizontal; rho—only the loop and a trace of the vertical; iota—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.

Restorations are those of the IO editors:
Line 3: the nu in ἄναγγελος Ἰούντιον was inserted by the cutter above the letters upsilon and tau, as the IO facsimile indicates. Clearly he initially omitted it and preferred to add it in the interline rather than to erase and reinscribe.
Line 5: the ω in angle brackets were omitted by the cutter; this omission is a clear case of haplography.


Commentary: A common date for all three inscriptions, 306–301 B.C., had been arrived at through two probable associations: first, all three inscriptions are inscribed on fine-grained limestone, not often used at Olympia; and secondly, since in all three of them both an Antigonos and a Demetrios are called kings and in IO 45 the Antigonos is mentioned before the Demetrios, it followed that it is Demetrios’ father Monophthalmos and not his son as Pausanias notes. Although IO 45 does not preserve the name of the city, the IO editors assumed that it is Byzantion on the basis of the limestone used for IO 45, 304 and 305, and the narratives of Diodoros (18.72.6) and Polyaenos (4.6.8). This then formed the basis for the terminus post quem, 306 B.C., the year when, after Demetrios’ victory at Salamis in Cyprus against Ptolemy, father and son were
simultaneously proclaimed kings and ruled together. Consequently, the *terminus ante quem* must be 301 B.C., the year when Antigonos died at Ipsos. But the argument that Demetrios and his son Antigonos Gonatas were never kings at the same time is not relevant to dating and identifying *IO* 304 and 305. The lettering of *IO* 45 appears to be earlier than that of *IO* 304 and 305. Moreover, the fact that all three were inscribed on the same stone cannot count for much, simply because the Byzantines (if indeed *IO* 45 is a Byzantine decree) could have employed the same material for their dedications for thirty or more years. Although lettering alone cannot be the definitive criterion, it does appear that *IO* 304 and 305 are of a later date than *IO* 45, and so *IO* 45 is dated sometime after the year of Antigonos Monophthalmos' death (301 B.C.).

After the athletic monument of Epitherses (no. 40 above), Pausanias continues his exegesis of the dedications in the Altis with more athletic and state dedications and reaches the statues of Demetrios and "his son" Antigonos, both dedications of the city of Byzantion. Only the find spot of Antigonos' base, i.e. to the south of the temple of Zeus, very near the base of Epitherses, coincides with Pausanias' implied topography which is assumed to have been the original position of the two statues which Pausanias saw, and also perhaps the area where the honorary decree (of the Byzantines?) was set up.

Pausanias, however, does not explain why the statue he saw portrayed Antigonos Gonatas and not Monophthalmos, although he would have some reason for his identification.\(^{195}\) Both dedications (*IO* 304, 305) are very brief and the only information they provide is the dedicator, the demos of Byzantion, and the honored persons, king Antigonos and king Demetrios. The texts of *IO* 304, 305 and Pausanias' brief note of them do not then contradict each other. There is no good reason to reject Pausanias'

---

\(^{195}\) He would certainly have seen other statues of the kings elsewhere and probably knew what they looked like.
identification. All the more so, because IO 45 is very fragmentary. Only the last part of
the decree is preserved and that with many gaps, one of which for example is the apparent
absence of the clause mentioning the setting up of the decree and the kings’ statues in
Olympia, and especially the absence of the dedicators, “the Byzantines”. The substantive
information of this decree is that a city state (for all we know it may be any city) voted to
send five ambassadors to king Antigonos Monophthalmos and five to his son king
Demetrios, who will express to them the citizens’ gratitude for the kings’ assistance
against someone and crown them. The fact that both IO 45 and IO 304, 305 are inscribed
on stone, made of the same material, may indeed support a possible connection of all
three inscriptions (IO editors), but such a connection is by no means indisputable,
because of the fragmentary nature of IO 45 and the lack of strong corroborating evidence.
Since IO 45 (if it was actually a measure past by Byzantion) suggests that Byzantion
enjoyed good relations with Monophthalmos and Demetrios, it is equally possible that
these relations continued after Antigonus’ death. And so, there is a case to be made in
support of Pausanias’ identification.196 These two statues then portrayed Demetrios and
Antigonos Gonatas and were dedicated at Olympia by Byzantion on account of the
crushing defeat the kings dealt to the Gauls in Thrace in 276 B.C., who would no doubt
have been harassing Byzantion (see E.L. Hicks in Frazer ad loc.). That incident may
have provided the perfect reason for such a dedication. For it is important to point out
that the identification of Antigonus either as the Monophthalmos or Gonatas is not
possible from the inscriptions on these two bases alone, nor is the association of the two
with IO 45 based on solid ground. Only further evidence can securely solve this
problem.

196 Habicht (1984, 55) calls Pausanias’ identification of the two statues an “occasional error,” correctly
so insofar as without IO 45, if one accepts it to be a decree of Byzantion, Pausanias’ comment cannot be
rejected.
43.

6.16.5: ... καὶ Ἀθηναίων Ζώτου, γένος μὲν ἐκ Χερσονήσου τῆς Κρήτης, Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ ἡμεροδρόμος τοῦ Φιλίππου.

Apparatus Criticus:
1. all mss. and editors before Hitzig read Ζώτου, but according to Hitzig Ζάτου "veram scripturam esse docet inscripition Olympiae reperta."

IO 276: a base of yellow sandstone, found March 21, 1879, built in the southwest corner of the Altis. Only the upper right corner is missing.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 579.

Height: 0.35m. Width: 0.75m. Thickness: 0.69m.

Letter Height: 0.014-0.03m.

c.a. 336–323 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 17

ca. 336–323 ante

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: beta—only the loop and the upper part of the vertical.

IO 277: a fragment of a base of grey limestone, found November 27, 1879, to the north of the Byzantine church, in a late wall, nearby the find spot of IO 276. The fragment preserves the left and bottom borders, i.e. the beginning of the inscription, and it is now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 721. Vidi.

Height: 0.345m. Width: 0.12m. Thickness: 0.30m.

Letter Height: 0.014-0.03m.

c.a. 336–323 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 17?
Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: alpha—only the extreme bottom part of a left slanting stroke.
Line 3: alpha—only part of the left slanting stroke.

The two fragmentary stones have the same height and they were identical. The letter style, however, is quite distinctive. The letters of IO 276 are cut deeper, whereas in 277 the strokes are thinner and the tips end in triangular serifs. Characteristic letters are which suggest different cutters are the epsilon (in 276 the middle bar is very short; in 277 it is equal in length to the top and bottom horizontals), and the sigma (the top and bottom strokes in 276 slant sharply, with the bottom one being at times shorter; in 277 sometimes they are parallel, other times the top slightly slants, while the bottom curves).


Commentary: The date for these inscriptions, during 336-323 B.C. or after, is self-evident and is based on the inscription itself where Philonides calls himself a hemerodromos and bematistes of Asia of king Alexander, i.e. that he served under Alexander from the beginning of the king’s expedition to Asia probably until his death. There is also the possibility, however, that Philonides dedicated these statues not while in the service of Alexander, but at some point after he returned to Greece, perhaps following Alexander’s death.

Continuing his exegesis of the monuments in the Altis, Pausanias reaches the statue of Philonides son of Zoiotes from the Kretan Chersonesos, who was the hemerodromos of Alexander, the son of Philip. Both fragmentary bases, onto which the statues of Philonides were mounted, were found in or very near their original position, the southwest corner of the Altis. The find spot of Philonides’ base, the extreme west of the south terrace wall, is an indication that with this statue Pausanias reached the southwest
border of the Altis and consequently the dedications that he records after Philonides’ were not set up in the same area (no. 44 below and following). Pausanias’ topography from the base of Telemachos until now (nos. 36-43), could be generally followed, since the bases that have been found suggest that he was walking on the south terrace to the south of the temple of Zeus in a direction from east to west. Apparently after Philonides’ monument Pausanias moved out of the Altis proper, because the majority of the inscribed bases were found outside the west wall of the Altis and near the Leonidaion (Hyde 1912, 213-214, and especially Herrmann 1988, passim).

In addition to the topographical point of reference, Pausanias’ very brief information about Philonides is also confirmed by the texts on the bases: Philonides the son of Zoitos from the Kretan city Chersonesos was the hemerodromos of Alexander. Moreover, Zoitos, the name of Philonides’ father, is preserved in IO 276, and thus the correct spelling of the name with the iota adscript can support a correction of Pausanias’ manuscripts where the iota had fallen out (see the Apparatus Criticus). The only omission on Pausanias’ part from what is inscribed on Philonides’ bases is apparently the second title of Philonides, i.e. bematistes of Asia, which is generally assumed to be something different from a hemerodromos. More specifically, a bematistes is “someone who measures by paces,”197 while a hemerodromos is “someone who runs a day’s distance.”198

In the ancient sources, however, there is no such clear cut distinction between the two functions (Livy for example explains: hemerodromos vocant Graeci ingens die uno

197 LSJ s.v. βηματιστής, who, however, translate the word in IO 276 wrongly as “quartermaster”, for which see Matthews 1974, 164. For the possibility that this may have been a Makedonian word see Kallérís 1954, vol. 1, 130-131 no. 45.

198 LSJ s.v. ἡμεροδρόμος, Matthews 1974, 161-165, and Kallérís 1954, vol. 1, 181-182 no. 81 who stresses the fact that in IO 276 the Doric (Makedonian) form hemerodromas is inscribed.
cursu emetientes spatium 31.24). In that respect, Pausanias’ omission of the second title of Philonides, bematistes, implies obviously that the two were rather similar, or at least that the title “hemerodromos of Alexander” alone conveyed also the meaning of “measuring by paces”. In fact, a corps of bematistai seems to have been established for the first time by Alexander for the measurement of his new conquests in Asia, whereas hemerodromoi were known long before him, the most famous being the Athenian Philippides (Herodotos 6.105-106). Furthermore, there is no clear evidence about the function of a hemerodromos (how fast did or could he run; was he “power walking”, in which case he could also be measuring; did he run from sunrise to sunset, and so on). Likewise, “measuring by paces” may not have been the exclusive task of the bematistes alone, since both running and walking involve “pacing”. What is even more important for the present discussion is that at least in antiquity the authors discussing hemerodromoi and bematistai did not regard them as athletes in the sense that they trained for a competition. Rather they describe them as professional road planners/topographers, since the primary goal of both the hemerodromos and a bematistes was to measure and establish the best and presumably the fastest route for military transportation and communication between cities, a very important and necessary accomplishment whose ramifications the Romans realized and developed even further. It is, therefore, rather

---

199 In addition to Philonides there are also attested Baeton, a bematistes who is said to have composed a work called Stathmoi (Athenaios 10.442b), and also Diognetos (Pliny *HN* 6.61: ...Diognetus et Baeton itinerum eius mensores scripsere...). For the complete title inscribed on Philonides’ base Kallérís (1954, vol. 1, 182 note 4) correctly notes: “... Il se peut donc qu’un ou plusieurs autres des ‘bematistes’, qui n’étaient pas des Crétois ..., aient également assumé la fonction d’’hémérodromas’.”

200 Modern scholarship (among others Bilinski 1959-1960, Matthews 1974, Krenkel 1976, and Matz 1991) refers to Philonides as a kind of an athlete, the parallel of a modern Marathon runner. That is true only insofar as “athlete” is used in the broadest possible sense so that it can also explain other non-athletic statues in the Altis.
unlikely that Pausanias' omission of the second title is an oversight, or that Philonides' statues in Olympia were set up on account of Philonides' "athletic" accomplishments.

The discovery of a third inscription of this same Philonides in Aigion in Achaia, which preserves only the beginning and is perhaps a dedication of the citizens of Aigion, may offer some suggestions, because of its place of finding, about the reason for all three dedications of Philonides (Bingen 1954, 407-409):

\[ Θεός. Τύχα ἀγαθά. \\
Φιλωνίδαι Ζωίτου \\
Κρήτη Χερσονα- \\
[σ]ψι [- - - - - - -] \\
[- - - - - - - -]. \]

The *communis opinio* about this honorary decree and by extension about the two Olympic dedications is that they were set up on account of an accomplishment of Philonides, which is recorded by Pliny (*HN* 7.84 and 2.181), i.e. they commemorate his run from Sikyon to Elis and back in one day. Although Pliny does not state why Philonides ran that distance, it would be quite surprising if it were simply for the athletic aspect of the event, what Matthews calls "a great feat" (1977, 166). The Olympic inscriptions do not record that he was an Olympic victor, and the fact that Pausanias mentions him among other athletes does not necessarily imply that Philonides was an athlete.\(^{202}\) The professional and experienced *hemerodromos* and *bematistes* of Alexander was no doubt an important enough individual to be granted permission by the Olympic Boule to set up his statues in the Altis. Philonides' one day run from Sikyon to

---

\(^{201}\) For discussions of this inscription see also Bengtson 1956, 35-39; Robert 1959, 24-26; Bilinski 1959-1960, 69-80 who proposes that the monograms on the stone are the numbers which Pliny gives for Philonides' run from Sikyon to Elis, but see the comments of Robert in *BE* 1961, 169 no. 333.

\(^{202}\) This of course does not imply that the "agonistic" spirit was absent from Philonides' career, since this was the Hellenic trait par excellence. Along these lines was composed the epigram on the base of the sophist Gorgias (no. 48 below), but this alone would hardly persuade the Eleians to grant permission for an individual dedication in the Altis.
Elis and back may have been commissioned in order to measure or prove that the distance between Sikyon and Elis was one day’s running. This, apart from its practical advantages, would have certainly played favorably with the Eleians and would be reason enough for permission to set up his statues in the Altis. This may have been the reason for the decree from the Achaian Aigion in honor of Philonides. The citizens of Aigion may have commissioned him to measure for example the distance between Aigion and some other city, or even Philonides may have already done this on his way from Elis back to Sikyon.

44.

6.16.5: μετὰ δὲ τούτου (sc. Philonides) ... λευνίςας τε ἐκ Νάξου τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἀγαίῳ, ψωφιδίων ἀνάθημα Ἀρκάδων, ....

10 294: a base of black limestone, found April 10, 1880, built into a Byzantine building on the west wall of the Altis, in front of the east end of the north side of the Leonidaion. The front side on which the inscription is cut is very damaged, while on the upper surface there are traces of the footprints of the bronze statue. The base is now in Ἀποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.29m. Width: 0.57m. Thickness: 0.52m.

Letter Height: 0.015-0.02m.

350–300 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 18

hydrate ἡ ψωφιδίων
Λεωνίς[δ]ήν λεώτρην [Νάξιον]
Διὶ Ὠλυμπίων ἀνέθη[κεν].

The Ionic dialect of the inscription is that of Leonidas' homeland Naxos and not of the dedicator, the Arkadian city of Psophis.
The letters are generously spaced and some lean to the left, while their style is plain. Characteristic letter shapes are: the middle bar of the epsilon is shorter, while the bottom horizontal is slightly extended; the vertical strokes of the mu are slightly curved outwards; the omicrons and omegas are small and are cut above the imaginary bottom line; and the right vertical of the pi is shorter than the left and the horizontal extends beyond it. This style, according to the IO editors, suggests a date in the second half of the fourth century B.C.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: eta--only the bottom parts of two vertical strokes.
Line 2: lambda--only a trace of the right slanting stroke; omicron--only the left side; upsilon--only the bottom tip of the vertical.
Line 3: theta--only the bottom.

Restorations are those of the IO editors:
Line 1 is restored thanks to Pausanias' information, whereas Leonidas' ethnic in line 2 is restored thanks to Pausanias and IO 651 (no. 62), since both record the same individual, Leonidas the son of Leotes.


Commentary: The date for the inscription, second half of the fourth century B.C., is based totally on the letter style and it also agrees with the time when the Leonidaion, the building dedicated by Leonidas, was constructed (330–320 B.C., see no. 62 below).

Immediately after Philonides' dedication in the Altis (no. 43 above) and in the same paragraph Pausanias mentions briefly the Eleian athlete Brimias and then Leonidas from the Aegean island of Naxos whose statue was a dedication made by the Arkadian city Psophis. The way in which Pausanias continues his narrative from the statue of Philonides onwards offers no hints as to where in the Altis he saw the monument of Leonidas. The find spot of Leonidas' base, however, in the area outside the west wall of the Altis and in front of the Leonidaion, may be an indication that Pausanias from here on lists dedications which were set up outside the Altis proper.

Even though topographically Pausanias is of little help about the original position of the dedication, nevertheless his brief note on Leonidas is crucial for the restoration of the fragmentary inscription: in line 1 the dedicator, the city of Psophis, and in line 2 the ethnic of Leonidas, Naxos. Leonidas is also known from another inscription which Pausanias
either misread or did not read at all. In his brief excursus on the Leonidaion (5.15.2) Pausanias says that the building was a dedication of an Eleian Leonidas. This statement is disproved by the inscription on the building's epistyle which records a Leonidas son of Leotes from Naxos as the dedicator (IO 651, no. 62 below). This inscription and the present one refer clearly to the same Leonidas. Pausanias, however, does not name Leotes, Leonidas' father in either place (5.15.2 and 6.16.5).

45.

6.16.5: μετὰ δὲ τούτον (sc. Philonides)..., 'Ασάμωνος τε εἰκὼν ἐν ἀνδράσι πυγμή νευκηκότος, .... ὁ δὲ 'Ασάμων καί .... Ἡλεῖοι μὲν ἔσαν, πεποίηκε δὲ ..., 'Ασάμωνι δὲ Πυριλάμητης Μεσσήνιος.

Apparatus Criticus:
1 the mss. read: ἀσάμωνος Ρ, ἀγάμωνος Ρδ Αγ Λ Μα, while Clavier reads ἀσόμονος. 3 the mss. Ρδ Αγ read: ἀγάμωνι.

SEG XXXIII, 329: a base of limestone, found during the German School's excavations of 1982 under the direction of A. Mallwitz in the so-called "Spolienhaus", whose identity is uncertain and which is located in the southwest section of the site, immediately to the south of the Leonidaion. The inscription is cut on the upper part of the front side. The discovery of this inscribed base is reported only briefly and without measurements or an Inventory Number.

cia. 225? ante

'Ασάμων 'Ιππάρχου
'Ηλεῖος.
vacat

The letters of this inscription (see the photograph published by Touchais) are well spaced out and elegantly cut, and the athlete’s ethnic is inscribed in the middle of line 2. The tips of the strokes end in triangular serifs while the verticals are somewhat curved.

Characteristic letter shapes, which Prof. S.V. Tracy informs me suggest a late third century B.C. date, are: the middle bar of the alpha is broken; the bottom stroke of the epsilon is horizontal but the middle and upper strokes are slanting upwards and thus the epsilon leans to the left; the mu’s right stroke is slanting more than the left; the horizontal of the pi extends to the left and the right of the verticals of
which the right one is shorter; and the sigma is wide and short and the upper stroke is slanting upwards whereas the bottom is almost horizontal.


Commentary: This inscription is dated very generally in the Hellenistic period on the basis of its letter style, since the only other evidence for the victory of the athlete Asamon is the Messenian sculptor Pyrilampes. The base bears no signature of the sculptor, although Pausanias states that Pyrilampes made Asamon’s statue (Pausanias also mentions two other works by a Messenian Pyrilampes 6.3.13; 15.1). There has been found in Olympia a base with this sculptor’s signature which by its lettering (especially the lunate sigma) is dated in the middle of the first century B.C. (*IO* 400 and *IGB* 274), but it is not certain whether he is the same Pyrilampes or another member of the family, since the date for *IO* 400 seems to be rather late. Moretti (1957, 125 no. 452) who tentatively dated Asamon’s victory in the 110th Olympiad (340? B.C.) now believes that the date for his victory is much later, “at least a century”, than he previously thought.

Immediately after the Arkadian dedication of the Naxian Leonidas (no. 44 above) and in the same paragraph, Pausanias mentions briefly the statue of the Eleian athlete Asamon who was victorious in the men’s boxing event and whose statue was the work of the Messenian Pyrilampes. The find spot of Asamon’s base, in a building immediately to the south of the Leonidaion, is in the same general area where Leonidas’ base was found.

---

203 The Messenian Pyrilampes, Pyrilampos in the inscriptions, belonged to the fourth generation of a family of sculptors for which see the stemma in Loewy, *IGB* 193 no. 273, and also nos. 272, 272a.

204 Moretti 1987, 70 no. 452: “A giudicare dai caratteri epigrafici, la data dell’ iscrizione sarrebbe più tarda, di almeno un secolo, di quella che gli avevo assegnato (340 a.C.?).”
and also supports Hyde’s proposition that after the statue of Philonides Pausanias moves to dedications which were outside the Altis proper and near the Leonidaion (no. 62), although Pausanias does not say so.

Pausanias’ brief information on Asamon, however, and the identification inscription on the base corroborate and complement each other. Although only the name of the athlete, which in the manuscript tradition underwent some changes, and his ethnic are the common information in the two texts, it does not necessarily follow that Pausanias did not see the inscribed base of the athlete. Pausanias omits Asamon’s father’s name, Hipparchos, which is the only addition of the inscription to Pausanias’ brief note about the athlete. In turn, although there is no signature inscribed on the base, Pausanias, perhaps drawing from another source, notes that the sculptor was the Messenian Pyrilampes. Likewise, the event in which Asamon was victorious, is not inscribed, since probably the representation of the statue would be enough. The combination of these two brief testimonies is so far the only information about the Eleian athlete Asamon. Once more Pausanias’ narrative is verified by an inscribed base from which he probably took some of his information about Asamon.

46.

6.16.9: καὶ παρ’ αὐτὸν (sc. Ptolemaios who is on horse back) Ἡλεῖος ἀθλητὴς Παιάνιος ὁ Δαματρίου πάλης τε ἐν Ὁλυμπίαι καὶ τὰς δύο Πυμίκας ἀνηρημένοις νίκαι.

6.15.10: πρῶτῳ δὲ γεγονάσιν ἀνθρώπων αἱ δύο νίκαι τῶι Κάπρωι τούτῳ. τὸν μὲν δὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ παγκρατίου καταγωνισθέντα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ δεδή-λωκεν (δὲ) ὁ λόγος ἢδη μοι (see 6.15.5): παλαιῶν δὲ κατέβαλεν Ἡλεῖον Παιάνιον ὀλυμπιάδα πάλης τὴν προτέραν ἀνηρημένον (i.e. 141st = 216 B.C.) καὶ Πύθια παιδῶν τε πυγμῆ καὶ αὕτης ἐν ἀνδράσι πάλης τε καὶ πυγμῆ στεφανωθέντα ἐπὶ ἡμέρας τῆς αὐτῆς.
IO 179: a base of grey limestone, found February 16, 1881, built into a water basin in an early Byzantine building, behind the south part of the Echo Hall. On the upper surface there are footprints of an approximately lifesize statue, while the inscription is cut on the upper part of the front side.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. is not given by the IO editors.

Height: 0.265m. Width: 0.83m. Thickness: 0.535m.

Letter Height is not given by the IO editors.

The letter style of the inscription is careful, but the letters are crowded so much so that the strokes of ΑΜΑ and ΗΑΕ touch at the bottom. The letter shapes (especially the broken bar of the alpha) agree with the date Pausanias offers about Paianios' victory, late third century B.C. For the spelling, the long alpha instead of an eta in Damatrios and the eta instead of a long alpha in Eleios, see the comments of the IO editors.


Commentary: The date for the inscription, a little after 216 B.C., is based on Pausanias' information about the Eleian Paianios who in the 142nd Olympiad (212 B.C.) was defeated in wrestling by another Eleian athlete Kapros. Paianios, Pausanias adds, was victorious in 216 B.C. (the 141st Olympiad), soon after which he dedicated his statue at Olympia (see also Moretti).

Pausanias mentions briefly the dedication of the Eleian athlete Paianios, the son of Damatrios, victorious in the wrestling event, between the statues of Philonides, Leonidas and Asamon (nos. 43-45) on the one hand, and that of the Athenian Glaukon (no. 47 below) on the other. The find spot, therefore, of Paianios' inscribed base, behind the southern part of the Echo Hall, indicates that his dedication was removed from its original position. Pausanias mentions him among athletes whose statues have been found near
their original position, in the area outside the west wall of the Altis and near the
Leonidaion, where probably Paianios’ statue stood too.

The text of the inscription on the base of Paianios is only three words which
comprise the identification of the athlete, his name, his father’s name and his ethnic.
Pausanias, however, in addition to this information, offers more details about his career,
details which were not inscribed on his base, but were taken from other sources:205 he
not only adds the event in which Paianios won in Olympia, but that he also won twice in
Delphi. Moreover, a little earlier, in his brief note on the career of another Eleian athlete
Kapros, Pausanias records the athletes whom Kapros defeated, one of them being
Paianios. Pausanias adds (6.15.10) that Paianios was victorious in the previous
Olympiad (216 B.C.) and also in Delphi in the boys’ boxing and in the men’s wrestling
and boxing in the same day. The discrepancy between this and the later passage about the
number of the Pythian victories of Paianios is not, as Frazer notes (1965, vol. 4, 52),
“through forgetfulness perhaps” of Pausanias. The exegete in the later passage narrates
the Olympic victory of Paianios in the men’s category and, therefore, may be excluding
his victory among the boys. Or, as Hitzig suggested (1896-1910, vol. 2.2, 618),
Pausanias’ statement “two Pythian victories” may be a reference to all three, if Pausanias
counts as one the two victories which Paianios won in the same day.

All this additional information that Pausanias reports on Paianios is yet another
example of the exegete’s methodology while at Olympia. The inscriptions he reads on the
Olympic monuments form only the elementary core of the information to be incorporated
in his narrative. In some cases this is the only source available, whereas in others the

205 Hitzig 1896-1910, vol. 2.2, 618: “Die Inschrift zeigt auch, dass er hier sich noch anderer Quellen
bediente als epigraphischer.”
epigraphical evidence is complemented by others, as is the case with the monument of the athlete Paianios.

47.

6.16.9: ... ἐστιν... καὶ ἄρμα ἄνδρος Ἀθηναίου Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Εὐσκλέους·
ἀνηγορεύθη δὲ ὁ Γλαύκων οὗτος ἐπὶ ἄρματος τελείου δρόμῳ.

IO 178: two joining blocks of grey limestone, both of which were found built into later walls, northwest of the Byzantine church: a January 14, 1880, and b April 22, 1880. Block b is broken all around while a preserves the bottom part, which was ornamented with an elaborate moulding. On the upper surface of both blocks there are holes for the attachment of the chariot which, judging from the dimensions of the base, was considerably smaller than life size. The two lines of the inscription are cut on the upper part of the front; the two blocks are now standing outside of the New Museum, in its west stoa.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. a 752, b 870. Vidi, Phot.
Height: 0.76-0.77m. Width: 0.68m. (a 0.32 + b 0.36) Thickness: 0.46m.
Letter Height: 0.015-0.021m.

282–242 ante

Διὶ Ὀλυμπίῳ Γλαύκων
Εὐσκλέους Ἀθηνάοις.

The letters of the inscription are cut carefully, well spaced out, and elegantly. The strokes are highly ornamental, as they are slightly curved and end in triangular serifs.

Characteristic letter shapes are: the slanting strokes of the kappa are cut small in proportion to its vertical; the middle slanting stroke of the nu extends to the left beyond the vertical; and the strokes of the omicron and omega are nicely rounded.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: lambda—only a trace of the bottom part of a left slanting stroke.

Commentary: Although there is abundant information about the Athenian Glaukon, who together with his brother Chremonides was politically active in Athens in the middle of the third century B.C., his Olympic victory cannot be safely dated. Moretti (1957, 136 no. 542) suggests tentatively the 127th Olympiad (272 B.C.), i.e. before the outbreak of the Chremonidean War in 267 B.C., since after the war Glaukon’s political career at Athens ended with his exile to Egypt, and since his athletic achievements would normally precede a successful political career.

Pausanias, after the dedication of Paianios (no. 46 above), continues his exegesis of the Olympic monuments with two athletic dedications, the statue of the Eleian Klearetos and the chariot of the Athenian Glaukon. The latter is the last dedication Pausanias mentions in his first ἱστορία inside and outside the Altis. He started (6.6.1) near the area between the temple of Hera and the Pelopeion and moved south- and eastwards, keeping to his right the temple of Zeus, and then westwards until he reached the area outside the Altis, in the vicinity of the Leonidaion (see notes 145-146). The find spot of the two blocks of Glaukon’s base, northwest of the Byzantine church, is indeed in the same general area where the dedications of Leonidas and Asamon have been found (nos. 44 and 45 above), outside the west wall of the Altis and in the vicinity of the Leonidaion, presumably near their original position.

The text on the chariot base of Glaukon is as brief as Pausanias’ narrative. In addition to his name, his father’s name, and his ethnic Pausanias only adds the event in which Glaukon won, the chariot race for full grown horses, a detail which need not be
inscribed, since it could be easily surmised from the representation of the chariot, or it could be taken from the Olympic Register.

What is significant in the case of Glaukon’s athletic dedication is that Pausanias does not add any other information about him, although he was very active in the early part of the third century B.C. His activity is attested by the discovery of other inscriptions in Athens, Rhodes, the Arkadian Orchomenos, Boeotia, and Olympia, where he is honored for his services. Ptolemy III Euergetes even set up a statue in his honor at Olympia, which Pausanias does not mention (IO 296).

The Athenian Glaukon together with his brother Chremonides became allies of Ptolemy II Philadelphos and Sparta’s king Areus (no. 73 below) in the so-called Chremonidean War of 267–261 B.C., to which Pausanias alludes at 3.6.2-6. However, the names Chremonides and Glaukon, except for the latter’s athletic dedication here, are not to be found in Pausanias’ work. This surprising omission of any historical comment on Glaukon’s career has no apparent explanation, since it runs counter to his customary approach. Pausanias usually takes the opportunity a monument in Olympia offers to comment, explain, and complement the epigraphical information with other evidence and thus provide a concise “historical” account of the honored person. Notwithstanding this, the text of IO 178 confirms Pausanias’ narrative on Glaukon which, it seems, is exclusively based on the inscription itself, since the information of both is identical.

48.

6.17.7: 'Ανδριάντας δὲ ἀναμεμελημένους οὐκ ἐπιφανείσιν ἀγαν ἀναθήμασιν...καὶ τὸν Λεοντίνον Γοργίαν ἱδεῖν ἔστιν ἀναθεί-

206 For other inscriptions honoring Glaukon see especially Étienne 1975, 56-58, and also Pouilloux 1975, 376-382, and Buraselis 1984, 136-160.
ναὶ δὲ τὴν εἰκόνα ἐς Ὁλυμπίαν φησὶν Εὐμολπός ἀπόγονος τρίτος Δημικράτους συνοικήσαντα ἅλελφη τῇ Γοργία. (8) οὕτος οἱ ζαργίας πατρὸς μὲν ἢν Χαρμαντίδου, λέγεται δὲ ἀνασώσασθαι 5 μελέτην λόγων πρῶτος ἢμελημένην τε ἐς ἄπαν καὶ ἐς λῆσθιν ὅλγου δεῖν ἱκουσαν ἀνθρώποις· εὐδοκιμήσα τε Γοργίαν λόγων ἔνεκα ἐν τε παιηγύρει τῇ Ὁλυμπική φασὶ καὶ ἀφικόμενον κατὰ πρεσβεῖαν ὡμοὶ Τισία παρ’ Ἀθηναίους. καῦτοι ἄλλα τε Τισίας ἐς λόγους ἐσηνέγκατο καὶ πιθανώτατα τῶν καθ’ αὐτὸν γυναικὶ Συ- 10 ρακουσίαι χρημάτων ἐγραψεν ἀμφισβήτησιν. (9) ἀλλὰ γε ἐκείνου τε ἐς πλέον τιμῆς ἀφίκετο οἱ Γοργίας παρὰ Ἀθηναίαις, καὶ ’Ιάσων ἐν θεσσαλίς τυραννήσας Πολυκράτους, οὐ τὰ ἐσχατα ἐνεγκαμέ- νου διδασκαλεῖν τὸν Αθήνησι, τούτου τοῦ ἀνδρός ἐπίπροσθεν αὐτὸν ὁ ’Ιάσων ἐποιήσατο. βιῶναι δὲ ἔτη Γοργίαν πέντε φασὶν 15 ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκατόν· Λεοντίνων <δὲ> ἑρμωθεῖσαν ποτὲ ὑπὸ Συρακο- σίων τὴν πόλιν κατ’ ἑμὲ αὕθις συνεβαίνει οἰκεῖσθαι.

10.18.7: ἐπέχρυσος δὲ εἰκῶν, ἀνάθημα Γοργίας τοῦ ἐκ Λεοντίνων, αὐτὸς Γοργίας ἔστιν (εἰκῶν).

Apparatus Criticus:

5 all mss. and some editors before Hitizg read: Καρμαντίδου. Hitizg,207 Papachatzis, and Rocha-Pereira read Καρμαντίδου after Suda s.v. Γοργίας, a reading which is also supported by IO 293, which Pausanias read and of which he gave an abridged version in his narrative.

IO 293: a base of black limestone, found December 16, 1876, ten meters northeast of the northeast corner of the temple of Zeus. The base is intact, but the inscribed surface has suffered much damage. The letters are all legible, albeit with some difficulty and effort. The base is now on display in the Entrance Hall of the New Museum in Olympia Λ(έοντας) 524.


Height: 0.55m. Width: 0.645m. Thickness: 0.635m.

Letter Height: 0.008-0.01m.

207 Only Hitzig takes into account the Olympic inscription for the correct reading of Gorgias’ father: “Χαρμαντίδου recepí e Suida s. Γοργίας et in scripione Olympica.”
400–350 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 30-40

χαρμαντίδου Γοργίας Λεωντίνος.

vacat ca. 0.0027m.

τὴν μὲν ἀδελφὴν Δημήκρατης τὴν Γοργίαν ἔσχεν,

εἰς ταύτης δ' αὐτῷ γέγενται Ἐπίκρατης,

5 Ἐπίκρατους δ' Ἐυμολίνος, ὅς εἶκόνα τὴν δ' ἀνέθηκεν

dισοῦνα, παθεῖσα καὶ φιλοκράτει ἔνεκα.

vacat ca. 0.06m.

Γοργίου ἀσκήσαι ψυχῆν ἀρετῆς ἐς ἀγώνας

οὕδεις πωθ' θυντῶν καλλίουν' ἡώρε τέχνην·

10 οὗ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος γυάλοις ἐκὼν ἀνάχειται

οὗ πλούτου παράδεινγμ', εὔσεβεις δὲ τρόπων.

vacat 0.015m.

The style of the letters is plain and the strokes are cut somewhat crowded and deep (the width of a stroke is ca. 0.004m.). Characteristic letter shapes are: the horizontals of the epsilon are equal in length; the right vertical of the pi is very short; the left and right strokes of the mu are slightly curved and slanting; and the top and bottom horizontals of the sigma are slanting up- and downwards.

The dialect is Attic with assimilation of the nu in line 3, while the identification in line 1 in which the patronymic precedes the name, has been suggested to be an indication of the Gorgianic style (IO editors). The inscription is inscribed in three sections which are divided by empty spaces and which present: section one (line 1) the identification of the honored person; section two, in two elegiac distichs (lines 3-6), the dedicator, his family relation with Gorgias and the reason for the dedication; and section three, two more distichs (lines 9-11), Gorgias' achievement (lines 8-9) and a reference to his statue in Delphi with a justification for its extravagance (lines 10-11).

Remains of Dotted Letters:

Line 5: epsilon—only the vertical and a trace of the bottom horizontal; iota—a trace of its upper part.

Line 6: alpha—only the right slanting stroke; second alpha—only a trace of the left slanting stroke; sigma—only the bottom horizontal/slanting stroke; epsilon—a trace of the vertical stroke.


Commentary: The date for this inscription, first half of the fourth century B.C., is based on the letter style, which cannot be later than 350 B.C., and also on the text of the inscription itself. In it the grandnephew of Gorgias, Eumolpos, explains his lineage and devotion to Gorgias with whom he studied (lines 3-6). It is an open question, however, whether Eumolpos made this dedication in Olympia while Gorgias was still alive (483–
376 B.C.), or posthumously. Hence, the tentative date of the first half of the fourth century B.C.

As he continues his exegesis of the most noteworthy monuments, athletic or private, which were set up in the area to the north of the north façade of the temple of Zeus, Pausanias reaches two statues which were "standing amid less illustrious offerings (Fraser)" (ἀνεπιστάμενος οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος ἢγαν ἀναθημασίαν 6.17.7). One of them is this statue of Gorgias from Leontinoi whose base has been found in the same general area, ten meters north of the northeast corner of Zeus' temple, where very probably Pausanias saw it, as he moved northwards from the Leonidaion towards the Great Altar of Zeus, passing by in front of the west side and then in front of the north side of the temple of Zeus.

What is even more remarkable, in addition to the topographical agreement, is that the case of Gorgias is another notable example of Pausanias' approach to inscriptions and their contribution to his narrative. Although Pausanias only indirectly refers to the inscription on Gorgias' base, his narrative is undoubtedly based to a great extent on it. Pausanias states that the statue was dedicated by Eumolpos as he himself "says (in the inscription)" (φησιν 17.7), the grandson of Deikrates who married Gorgias' sister. For some reason, Pausanias chooses in this case not to quote verbatim the epigraphical text, but extrapolates from it the information that he judges relevant to his narrative which concentrates on the dedicator and the honored person, and accordingly Hippokrates, Eumolpos' father, is omitted.

Gorgias, Pausanias continues, whose father was Charmantides (for its spelling, which is corrupted in the manuscripts of Pausanias, see the Apparatus Criticus),

---

208 This is Frazer's translation of the verb φησιν, for which he correctly assumes that Pausanias is referring to the epigram which he read on the base of Gorgias' statue. Similar is Papachatzis' translation: "λέει (ὁ Ἐυμόλπος οὖν) στὸ ἐπιγράμμα".
revitalized interest in the study of speaking, i.e. rhetoric, by among other things delivering a speech in Olympia (his Olympikos in 392 or 388 B.C.); by visiting Athens (427 B.C.) with Tisias, another teacher of rhetoric with a specialty in forensic rhetoric, in contrast to Gorgias' specialty in epideictic oratory; and also by his visit to Jason, the tyrant of Thessaly who held Gorgias in higher esteem than Polykrates, another distinguished Athenian rhetorician. This last detail of Gorgias' travel to Thessaly, probably in his later years, is known only by this brief comment of Pausanias. The ramifications of his visit on Thessalian politics and especially the influence of his teachings on Jason and his political career have been often overlooked. The general statement of Pausanias about the revival of rhetoric as a major achievement of Gorgias is the subject of the first distich of the third section of the inscription (lines 8-9), where Eumolpos describes Gorgias' techne of preparing the soul for the agones of virtue. This brief statement is further expounded in Plato's Gorgias 460a and has caused debate over Gorgias' belief that he does not teach virtue (Guthrie 328-333, 481 note 20). Whatever Gorgias' personal beliefs may have been, Plato's Gorgias 460a, the inscription and Pausanias communicate the same view: Gorgias' achievement was to elevate rhetoric as a skill for exercising the soul into virtue. It seems especially appropriate that his statue was set up among dedications which commemorated another kind of agon at the site of the athletic agones par excellence, where Gorgias delivered his Olympikos.

All the other complementary information, however, is apparently derived from other sources: that Gorgias lived 105 years; and that Leontinoi, which was destroyed by the Syrakusans, i.e. the tyrant Dionysios in 403 B.C., was in Pausanias' own time inhabited again, a remark that may imply that Pausanias is reporting from personal observation after

209 For the influences of Gorgias' teachings on Jason's political career see now Kyrkos 1984, 229-247. Apparently Gorgias tried with success in Thessaly what Plato tried to do unsuccessfully in Sicily with the tyrants, i.e. to try and put in practical usage his theories of government.
he visited Leontinoi. Pausanias, it seems, overlooks, at least in this instance, the last distich of the third section of the inscription (lines 10-11) in which Eumolpos refers to Gorgias’ personal dedication of his statue at Delphi and tries to justify its extravagance by the extraordinary achievements and the *eusebia* of his teacher. When in Delphi, however, Pausanias saw and included this gilt statue in his *Phokika* (10.18.7).

Thus, when the narrative of Pausanias is tested vis-à-vis the text of IO 293 the methodology of the exegete concerning epigraphical evidence is yet again evident: Pausanias, when he does not quote, takes from the inscription only the information essential for his narrative, which he further complements with information drawn from other sources, or from personal observation. In Gorgias’ case, Pausanias also appears to reserve epigraphical information until he can personally verify it, and then incorporate it in its appropriate place in the narrative.210 This allows the exegete to present a concise, but full account about the famous sophist Gorgias, whose inscribed monument in Olympia serves as the basis and starting point.

---

210 This by no means is the only instance of such a case. See above Chapter 1, p. 19: while in the precinct of Asklepios in Epidaurus (2.27.3) Pausanias states that he read six *Sanationes* in the Doric dialect which describe healings of various persons and nothing else; when, however, Pausanias reaches the uninhabited city of Halike (2.36.1), he assumes that it once was inhabited, since the city is attested in the *Sanationes* which he read in the precinct of Asklepios in Epidaurus. It follows, therefore, that he read the *Sanationes* through carefully and noted down what information he thought might be of importance and possible future reference in his narrative, as the case of the abandoned city of Halike proves.
B. COPIES OF OLYMPIC INSCRIPTIONS FOUND OUTSIDE ELIS

In his *Eliaka* Pausanias mentions monuments that he saw set up in the Altis, but, unlike those discussed in the previous section, have not been found during the excavations there. As it turns out, however, similar or even identical dedications to those at Olympia were set up elsewhere, either in another sanctuary, or in the dedicator’s city. These are discussed in this section. For, although Pausanias’ information derives from the inscription at Olympia, nevertheless, the “copy” available from another site contains more or less the same information, and, therefore, provides evidence for Pausanias’ narrative which is based mainly on the inscriptions he read at Olympia.

49.

5.5.1: χρόνωι δὲ ὕστερον Ἀριστότιμος ὁ Δαμαρέτου τοῦ Ἐτύμονος τυραννίδα ἔσχεν ἐν Ἡλείαι, συμπαρασκευάζοντες αὐτῷ τὰ ἐς τὴν ἐπίθεσιν’ Ἀντιγόνου τοῦ Δημητρίου βασιλεύοντος ἐν Μακεδονία. τὸν δὲ Ἀριστότιμον μήνας τυραννήσαντα ἐξ καταλύσι- σιν ἐπαναστάτες Χήλων καὶ Ἐλλήνικος καὶ Λάμπις τε καὶ 5 Κύληλων, οὕτως δὲ καὶ αὐτοχειρία τὸν τύραννον ἀπέκτεινεν ὁ Κύληλων ἐπὶ Δίδο Σωτήρος βωμὸν καταφυγόντα ικέτην. τὰ μὲν δὴ ἐς πόλεμον τοιαύτα ὑπήρχεν Ἡλείους, ὡς περὶ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς παρόντι ἀπαριθμήσαι μετρίως.


Apparatus Criticus:

6 Κύλην mss. 7 Κύλεν all mss. 10 Κύλενα is Casaubon’s correction of the manuscripts (κύλενα Va Ms, Κύλωνα the rest) from Paus. 5.5.1. In Plut. Moralia 250F-253E (Τύνακες Τρεῖς 'Αρεταῖ: Μάκκα καὶ Μεγιστῆ) the same Κύλην is spelled with one lambda. Hitzig 1904,
vol. 2.2, 604-5: "da die v. 1. der Hss. nur auf ein λ hinweist und V.5,1 und bei Plutarch Κύλλων überlieferst ist, haben wir nicht zu ändern gewagt."

6, 7, 10 following the Delphic inscription below, Pomtow Syll. 4 423 note 1 corrects the mss.'s readings of the name with two lambdas, and Habicht 1984, 54-55, note 87 suggests that the form of the name "is slightly deformed in the author's manuscripts."

FD III.3, 191: a block of limestone found on the east side of the polygonal wall at Delphi (fig. 17). No measurements are given in FD.

Letter Height: ca. 0.01m.

FD in.3, 191: a block of limestone found on the east side of the polygonal wall at Delphi (fig. 17). No measurements are given in FD.

Letter Height: ca. 0.01m.

269-248 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 45


Commentary: The date of this inscription is based on Daux's discussion of the archons at Delphi.211 There were two archons named Kallikles (G20 and G26) of the same period, when the Aitolians were in control of Delphi, and this decree may refer to either one of the two attested archons.

As Habicht has shown convincingly, this inscription at Delphi corroborates Pausanias’ information on an incident of the history of Elis and corrects the spelling of the tyrannicide’s name from Kylon to Kyllon in Pausanias’ manuscripts. Plutarch, in his treatise on the Bravery of Women (250F-253E), tells in detail the story of Mikka, the

211 See also Habicht 55, note 87, and 54 note 85 with bibliography for the date of Krateros, brother of Antigonos. Krateros, as Plutarch says, was with an army at Olympia, a presence which falsely assured Aristotimos that Krateros would help in rescuing his regime in Elis.
daughter of a certain Philodemos, and Megisto, the wife of Timoleon, who suffered under the tyranny of Aristotimos. Plutarch mentions the same names, except that Chilon is replaced by Thrasyboulos, and he describes vividly the death of Aristotimos, his wife and his two daughters. The emphasis in Plutarch, however, is not on Kyllon who is a member of Aristotimos’ entourage, but on Hellanikos, an old citizen, who organized the resistance of the Eleians inside Elis and those exiled by Aristotimos to Aitolia. In fact, in Plutarch’s account Kyllon shares the credit with two other tyrannicides, Thrasyboulos and Lampis, and he is singled out only as the one who attacked first and struck one of Aristotimos’ followers (253B).

Yet, Pausanias emphasizes that Kyllon was the one who actually killed with his hands (αυτοκτονησα) the tyrant Aristotimos and as expected was honored accordingly. There is no question that the Aitolians were responsible for the Delphic decree honoring Kyllon. They were in control of the sanctuary and, according to Plutarch, the Aitolians also received the exiles from Elis, when Aristotimos forced them to leave. Moreover, the Aitolian Confederacy had also erected a statue in Olympia which Pausanias saw among those of the Olympic victors, honoring Kyllon the man who freed the Eleians from the tyranny of Aristotimos (6.14.11). This statue of Kyllon, although it has not been found in Olympia, was in all probability inscribed and may have been dedicated at the same time.

---

212 Plutarch Moralia 252D: ...τον συνηθεν της αυτης Κυλλος δομα πεσοτε δοκην ειναι, μισου δε και μετεχον της συναμμεσα τως περι των Ελληνικουν,... Similarly, in Justin’s Epitome of Pompeius Trogus’ Historiae Philippicae 26.1 only Hellanikos is mentioned: “princeps eorum Hellanicus, senex et liberis orbus, ut qui nec aetatis nec pigneris respectu timeret,...”

213 Plutarch Moralia 253B: πρατοσ μεν ουν ο Kyllon απασομενος το ξυφος πατει τυνα των ομενων ης Άριστοτιμου. Θρασυβούλου δε και Λαμπηδος εξ οναντας επιθερμων, έφτη μεν ο Άριστοτιμος εις το των Διως ιερων καταφυγων. έκει δ’ αποκτηναις αυτων και το σεμα προβαλοντες εις την άγοραν εκαλουν τους πολιτας επι την έλευθεραν. Interestingly enough, Plutarch has the same spelling as the manuscripts of Pausanias, and perhaps this may be an inadvertent influence by the other famous Kylon, the Athenian Alkmeonid, who was also involved in a coup d’etat.
or thereabouts that the Delphic decree was set up. Such a dedication could very well be
the reason for Pausanias’ narrative of the episode: on reading the inscription on the
statue’s base, i.e. that the Aitolian koinon honored Kyllon, Pausanias may have assumed
that the Aitolians honored Kyllon for his killing Aristotimos. This coupled with the
absence of any dedications in honor of the other members of the tyrannicides may have
led Pausanias to the conclusion that it must have been Kyllon who actually killed him,
therefore he singles him out as the tyrannicide.214

The reason for these honours to Kyllon by the Aitolians was no doubt their enmity
towards the Macedonians who, in particular Antigonos Gonatas, supported Aristotimos in
his attempt to take over Elis.215 Moreover, as Pausanias relates in the older history of
Elis (5.1.3-8), the Eleians or rather the Epeians and the Aitolians had a common ancestry,
which may have played a part in how state relations were formed during the Hellenistic
era, when the propaganda for a mythic past that ensured certain advantages was
flourishing (see also nos. 83 and 87).

50.

5.23.1: Παρεξιόντι δὲ παρὰ τὴν ἔσωδον Ζεὺς τε ἐστηκεν ἐπὶ γραμμα ἔχων οὐδὲν καὶ αὐθαίρης ἔσω 
πρὸς ἄρκτον ἐπιστρέφαντι ἀγαλμα ἐστὶ Διὸς· τούτῳ τέτραπται μὲν πρὸς ἀνί-
σχοντα ἴλιον, ἀνέθεσαν δὲ Ἐλλήνων δοῦν Πλαταιάσιν ἐμαχέσαν-
το ἐναντία Μαρσιώνιοι τε καὶ Μήδεις. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἐγγεγραμμέναι
κατὰ τοῦ βάθρου τὰ δεξιὰ αἱ μετασχοῦσαι πόλεις τοῦ ἔργου,
Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν πρῶτοι, μετὰ δὲ αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίοι, τρίτοι δὲ

214 This possibility for the discrepancy is mentioned by Stadler 1965, 87 and note 198. Phylarchos,
hower, the source of Plutarch, is given priority by Stadler, who also accepts the view that the Delphic
inscription is in honor of Kyllon’s son. The dates for the archon Kallikles, however, are uncertain and
there is no other corroborating evidence. See Habicht 1984, 54-55, notes 83-87, and also no. 82.

215 Some Eleian coins, bearing the abbreviation API for Aristotimos, have been thought to belong to
this Aristotimos’ new minting. See, however, Head 1967, 424-425, where coins of ca. 365-323 B.C.
bear the same abbreviation as those of ca. 312-191 B.C.
γεγραμμένοι καὶ τέταρτοι Κορίνθιοι τε καὶ Σικυώνιοι, πέμπτοι δὲ Αιγινήται, (2) μετὰ δὲ Αιγινήτας Μεγαρεῖς καὶ "Επιδαύριοι, Ἀρκάδων δὲ Τεγεώται τε καὶ "Ορχομένοι, ἔπὶ δὲ αὐτῶς ὁσοὶ φιλοδίνα καὶ Τροιζήνια καὶ "Ερμόδια οἰκουσιν, ἕκ δὲ χώρας τῆς Ἀργείας Τιρυνίων, Πλαταιές δὲ μόνοι Βουιτών, καὶ Ἀργείων οἱ Μυκήνας ἔχοντες, νησίωται δὲ Κεῖοι καὶ Μήλιοι, Ἀμβρακιώται δὲ ἐξ ἡπείρου τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος, Τήνιοι τε καὶ Λεπρεάται, Λεπρεάται μὲν τῶν ἐκ Τριφυλίας μόνοι, ἐκ δὲ Αἰγαλοῦ καὶ τῶν Κυκλάδων οὐ Τήνιοι μόνοι ἀλλὰ καὶ Νάξιοι καὶ Κύθνιοι, ἀπὸ δὲ Εὔβοιας Στυρείς, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ηλείοι καὶ Ποτιδαιάται καὶ Ἀνακτόριοι, τελευταίοι δὲ Χαλκιδεῖς οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν Εὐρύποι. (3) τούτων τῶν πόλεων τοσαίδε ἦσαν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἔρημοι: Μυκηναῖοι μὲν καὶ Τυρνοῖοι οὐ πολὺ τῶν Μηδικῶν ὑστερον ἐγένοντο ὑπὸ Ἀργείων ἀνάστατοι: Ἀμβρακιώτασι δὲ καὶ Ἀνακτόριοις ἀποίκους Κορινθιῶν ὄντας ἑπηγάγετο ὁ 'Ρωμαίων βασιλεὺς ἐς Νικόπελεως συνοικισμὸν πρὸς τῶν Ἀκτών: Ποτιδαιάτασι δὲ δίς μὲν ἐπέλαβεν ἀναστάτους ἐκ τῆς σφετέρας ὑπὸ Φιλίππου τε γενέσθαι τοῦ Ἀμυντοῦ καὶ πρότερον ἐτί ὑπὸ 'Αθηναίων, χρόνω δὲ ὑστερον Κάσσανδρος κατηγαγε μὲν Ποτιδαιάτας ἐπὶ τὰ οἰκεία, ὄνομα δὲ οὗ τὸ ἄρχαλ τῷ πόλει, Κασσάνδρεια δὲ ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰκιστοῦ. τὸ δὲ ἀγαλμα ἐν Ὁλυμπία τοῦ ἀνατεθὲν ὑπὸ τῶν Ὁλυμπίων ἐποίησεν "Αναξαγόρας Ἀιγινήτης· τούτων οἱ συγγράψαντες τὰ ἐς Πλαταιᾶς παριστάνει ἐν τοῖς λόγοις. 10.13.9: Ἐν κοινῷ ἄνεθεσαν ἀπὸ ἔργου τοῦ Πλαταιᾶς ὁ "Ελξηνες χρυσοῦ τρίποδα δράκοντι ἐπικείμενον χαλκί. ὅσον ὁσοῦ μὲν δὴ χαλκός ἢν τοῦ ἀναθήματος, ὑπὸ οὗ μέντοι κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ τὸν χρυσὸν οἱ φωκέων ὑπελίποντο ἡγεμόνες.

Apparatus Criticus:

29-30 τὰ ἐς Πλαταιᾶς all mss., but Scubard corrects it to τὰ ἐς πλάστας, thus suggesting that Pausanias is using a handbook on sculptors. If the the mss.' reading is retained Herodotus especially is to be understood among others.

Meiggs/Lewis 27 (19): the famous bronze “serpent column”, hollow inside and dedicated at Delphi after Plataia by all the Greek allies. Only the bottom part of it survives in the Hippodrome of Konstantinople (modern Atmaidan of Istanbul) where it was transferred by Constantine the Great.216 The text is inscribed on eleven of the coils of the three intertwined snakes whose heads held on top the golden tripod which, according to Pausanias, the Phokians melted down

——

216 This information is from IGA no. 70, where more about the history of the monument can be found.
during the Third Sacred War. Each coil, indicated below by an empty space, contains three names except for coils seven and ten which have four names inscribed. For the following measurements see also Amandry 1987, 110-111 and notes.

Height of surviving column: 5.55m. (total height of column ca. 6m.)

Width of the bottom: ca. 0.60m.; of the top: 0.41m.

Letter Height: 0.015–0.019m.

The text below is that of Meiggs/Lewis 27 (19).

479/8 ante

4  Ἀθανάτοι
  Κορύνθιοι
  Τεγεά[ται]
  Σικυόνιοι
  Αἰγινάται

10  Μεγαρὲς
    Ἐπιδαύριοι
    Ἐρχομένιοι
    Φλειάσιοι
    Τροεάνιοι

15  Ἐρμιονὲς
    Τιρύνθιοι
    Πλαταιὲς
    Θεσπιὲς
    Μυκανὲς

20  Κέιοι
    Μάλιοι
    Τένιοι
    Νάξιοι
    Ἐρετριὲς

\[*\]

217 According to Jeffery LSAG 100.
25 Χαλκίδες
Στυρές
Φαλεῖοι
Ποτειδαιται
Λευκάδιοι
30 Φανακτοριής
Κύθνιοι
Σιφνιοί
Αμπρακιδται
Λεψεαται.

The letters are clearly cut and according to Roehl (IGA 70):
Quas (sc. litteras) ita videtur exarasse aerarius, ut primum angulos et extremas partes litterarum punctis notaret, deinde puncta lineis non aequi profundis inter se coniungeret.
The script and dialect of the inscription is Phocian and not Lakonian because of the non-Lakonian shape of gamma and sigma, and the non-Lakonian forms of [ε]πολεύ[ε]ν and Φλειάθσον (Carpenter 1945, 455-456 and LSAG 102). The shapes of the letters of this inscription are (LSAG 99): α2, γ2, δ1, Φ2, ρ3, u1, χ2.

The Dotted Letters are not discussed in Meiggs/Lewis.

Restorations:
Line 1-3: Roehl, assuming that the inscription ran all around the coil, restored:
'Απόλλωνις θείοι στάσαντι
Pomtow in Syll.4 31, Domaszewski: Τό[δε τῶν]
πόλεμον [έ]—
pολ[έ]μεσον.
Meister: Τό[δε τῶν]
[Μήδιον] πόλεμον [έ]—
pολ[έ]μεσον.

Line 4: Λακεδαιμόνιοι Roehl; Λακεδαί[μονιοι] Pomtow in Syll.4 31;
Λακ[εδ]αιμονιοι Domaszewski.

Line 5: 'Αθηνάκτοι Roehl; 'Αθηνάκτοι Pomtow in Syll.4 31;
'Αθ[ε][ν]ακτοι Domaszewski.

Line 7: Τευγαταί Roehl; Τευγαταί Pomtow in Syll.4 31; Τευγαταί Domaszewski.

Line 8: Σκυκνίοι Roehl; Σκυκνίοι Pomtow in Syll.4 31, Domaszewski.

Line 22: “From squeezes made for us by Professor Bean, we are fairly confident that the intrusive name on coil 7 was Τέντων, cut later, as has been generally thought, and not Μυκανές, the odd name geographically” (Meiggs/Lewis 27 (19), page 59).

Line 32: “More surprisingly, we find that the four names on coil 10 are not to be explained, with von Domaszewski, by the later intrusion of Κύθνιοι and Σιφνιοί into a list of Corinthian dependencies, but simply by the later addition of Σιφνιοί, presumably placed here, rather than on coil 11, in order to group it with Κύθνιοι” (Meiggs/Lewis 27 (19), page 59).

Commentary: The date of this inscription is generally accepted as 479/8 B.C. or immediately thereafter. All ancient sources mentioning this monument are in agreement.218

Pausanias, once he has finished the description of the various buildings and altars inside and around the Altis, lays out briefly in a paragraph the way he has organized his material and the order which he is to follow for the exegesis of the remaining monuments (5.21.1). The first distinction he makes is between dedications to Zeus and statues of Olympic Victors. He then proceeds to qualify the first group even further and thus he creates two subcategories: Zeus statues paid for by the fines extracted from cheating athletes (see above nos. 20 and 21), and then statues dedicated to Zeus or other gods by states and individuals (ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄγαλμα τα ἐν θεοσκοι τα καὶ ὅπο ἄνθρωπ ἄνατεθέντα πετωτῶν 5.22.1; see also above nos 2-6) with which he ends Book 5. Near the entrance of the Bouleuterion there is a Zeus statue with no inscription on it and therefore Pausanias cannot provide any information about it. Turning to the north, however, he sees the bronze Zeus, dedicated by the Greeks who fought at Plataia against the Medes. An oblong base has been identified by Dörpfeld as the base of the bronze Zeus in the area between southeast of the Zeus temple and five meters north of the

218 Herodotus 9.81; 8.82; Thukydides 1.132.2-3; 3.57; [Demosthenes] in Neeram 97; Nepos Pausanias 1; Diodorus 11.33; Plutarch Moralia 873de (De malignitate Herodoti) and Themistokles 20.3; Pausanias 5.23.1; 10.13.9. For sources later than Pausanias see IGA 70, pp. 26-27.
southern embankment wall (to the west side of the modern entrance), but it has no inscription.\footnote{219}

Although the ancient sources referring to the column are ample, it is only Plutarch in his \textit{Themistokles} that provides the actual number of the states, thirty-one, inscribed (σιδάξας ὑπὸ τριάκοντα καὶ μία μόνας πόλεως εἶναι αἱ μετασχοῦσαι τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τούτων αἱ πλεῖστοι παντάπασιν μικρὰς 20.3), and Pausanias remains the only one who records all the states which he reads on the base at Olympia. The total number of states, which Pausanias reads on the right side of the base (κατὰ τοῦ βάθρου τὰ ἐξίσου 23.1), is twenty-seven. His account of the various cities comes in pretty much the order in which the states are inscribed on the serpent column. Some variations, however, do exist and they are probably due to the geographical position of the cities.\footnote{220} The cities inscribed in lines 4–21 of the inscription are in the same order in Pausanias' text, except for two: the Tegeatai who in the serpent column are fourth, but Pausanias or the inscription at Olympia itself, perhaps for geographical reasons, records them with the other Arkadian city, Orchomenos; and the omission of the Thespieis (line 18 of the inscription). Pausanias' definitive statement that of the Beotians only the city of Plataia is on the list led commentators to suggest that Pausanias has used a defective copy of the inscription. His narrative, however, does not leave any room for doubt that he is copying from the text “inscribed to the right side of the bathron,” and thus the city of Thespiai may not have been inscribed on the dedication at Olympia. A similar example is Pausanias' argument about the Achaians, whom he did not read among the states at

\footnote{219} Frazer ad loc. is sceptical about this identification, but see now Eckstein 1969, 23.

\footnote{220} Similar problems exist between Herodotus' list of the cities who fought and the serpent column (9.28-30, 77), for which see Frazer 1965, vol. 5, 299-307.
Olympia and, therefore, concludes they did not participate in the Plataian *ergon* (7.6.4).221

The cities in lines 22–34 of the serpent column are recorded by Pausanias in quite a different order, which perhaps suggests that the inscription at Olympia from that point on followed a different order. The texts run as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The serpent column</th>
<th>Pausanias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τένιοι</td>
<td>Αμπρακιώται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νάξιοι</td>
<td>Τένιοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ερετρίας</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαλκίδες</td>
<td>Λεπρεθαί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Στυρίς</td>
<td>Νάξιοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φάκειοι</td>
<td>Κύθνιοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ποσειδαϊται</td>
<td>Στυρίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λευκάδιοι</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φανακτοριες</td>
<td>Ηλειοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύθνιοι</td>
<td>Ποσειδαϊται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σίφνιοι</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αμπρακιώται</td>
<td>Ανακτόριοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λεπρεθαί</td>
<td>Χαλκίδες</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As all commentators have observed, there is no apparent justification for the omission of Eretria, Leukas and Siphnos, as there is none also for the omission of Thespiai, and, to quote the most recent of them (Meiggs/Lewis p. 59), the omission “may be due to the negligence of the traveller or of some copyist.”

Frazer, however, has shown long ago (vol. 5, 304-306) that there may be no discrepancy at all between the two texts, if it is not postulated that the lists were identical. In fact, there is no evidence to suggest that they official lists inscribed for an official purpose. Quite the contrary. There is indeed evidence indicating problems surrounding the creation of the serpent column: if Thukydides’ mention of the episode of the Spartan king Pausanias (1.132.2-3) is trustworthy (and there is no reason why it should not be),

221 Paus. 7.6.4: υστερήσαν δὲ (sc. oι 'Ακαιως) καὶ ἔργου τοῦ Πλατανίδος. δὴ δὲ γὰρ δὴ ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναθῆματι τοῖς ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ματὴν δὲν καὶ 'Ακαίως γεγράφθαι.
then originally there was no list planned to be inscribed, only the boastful epigram of the Spartan king which Pausanias alone ascribes to Simonides.\(^{222}\) In other words, the decision to inscribe a list of the participants seems to have come about because of the Spartan king’s action. Furthermore, the islands of Tenos and Siphnos were later additions to the serpent column, because they are inscribed by a different cutter. It is conceivable, therefore, that at Olympia the Siphnians were not included because they did not participate in the battle and for some reason were added later only to the Delphic monument (there is no mention in Herodotus’ list of the Keians, Melians, Tenians, Naxians, Kynthians, and Siphnians; all of them, however, participated in one way or another at Salamis and perhaps at Plataia, although not with a city contingent).

What is even more important is that the names inscribed on such a list would undoubtedly reflect the political aspirations of these cities, especially the host cities of Delphi and Olympia. One notable example is the Eleians who, although they did not participate, nevertheless are included by name. Undoubtedly their control over the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia would be reason enough for the other Greeks to include the Eleians on this “Panhellenic” dedication. Exactly such a premise lies behind von Domaszewski’s and ATL’s division of the cities into three groups of allied forces which were inscribed on each of the three intertwined serpents, the leaders of the groups being the Lakedaimonians, the Athenians and the Korinthians. Although this division is not correct for all the cities, nevertheless it is an indication of the way in which the cities were

\(^{222}\) Paus. 3.8.2 where he discusses the honors to Kynosia by the Lakedaimonians (see above no. 7) and adds the only other exception of an epigram for a Spartan king: ὁ τει γὰρ μὴ τῆς Ἐλληνικαὶ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα ἐποίησεν ὅσις δή, καὶ ἔτι πρότερον Παυσανίας τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν τριών ἱερῶν Σιμωνίδης τῷ ἀναβάτῳ ἐς Δελφοὺς, ἄλλο (ἐδὲ) γε παρὰ ἄνδρον ποιητοῦ Λακεδαιμονίων τοῖς βασιλεῖσσαν οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐς μνήμην.

The epigram is quoted by Thukydides in 1.132.2 (=IGM 84):

"Ἐλληνοὶ ἄρηγος ἄπει νικητῶν ἡλεήσα Μῆθεν
Παυσανίας δολῆς μνήμης ἀνέθησε τοῖς.

For the epigram of Pausanias transmitted by Athenaeus as inscribed on a tripod at Byzantion see IGM 100.
inscribed perhaps by the Delphians. Likewise, Pausanias’ different order may be an indication of the way the Eleians inscribed the cities. It is worth pointing out that Pausanias’ list of the states does not correspond to a tripartite division. It rather suggests first a descending order of importance and also a geographical grouping of the cities. It is noticeable for example that in the beginning of his list and until the Aiginetans Pausanias numbers the cities from one to five (5.23.1, lines 7-9), but then he starts grouping them according to geographical areas (5.23.2 lines 10ff.). Thus, the Tegeatai, who are fourth on the serpent column, in Pausanias are mentioned together with the other Arkadian city Orchomenos, which occupies the same place in both lists. Also, Pausanias lists soon after the Tenioi other islands from the Aegean and the Cyclades, namely the Naxians, Kythnians and the Styreis from Euboia.

Finally, Pausanias, after a brief mention of the cities that during his time were destroyed, adds, as is his custom, the name of the sculptor of the bronze Zeus, Anaxagoras from Aigina, whose signature he also read along with the list of cities. Fabricius in Frazer _ad_ 23.1 has inferred that there were two inscriptions cut on the base: the left front side of the base had the general statement summarized by Pausanias in 5.23.1 (ἀνέθεσαν δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἅσοι Πλαταϊῶν ἐμαχέσαντο ἐρώτικα Μαρὶσονίου τε καὶ Μῆθεν), which would thus perhaps suggest a different preamble from the one on the serpent column, and on the right there was inscribed the list. This hypothesis may be true, but the ἀπὸ της clause was certainly inscribed too. Whether the reading τὰ ἐς Πλαταίας or the correction to τὰ ἐς πλάστας is accepted, the only conclusion to be reached is that Pausanias did indeed read the inscription, since, as he states, Anaxagoras is not mentioned in any historical accounts (or handbooks on

---

223 Diodoros 11.33 transmits a different epigram than the one in Thukydides (above in note 222) as inscribed on the Delphic monument see _IGM_ 85:

Ἐλλάδος εὐρυχόρου σωτῆρες τόνθ’ ἀνέθηκαν
δουλούσινα στυγερῆς ἀνοικμένοι πόλις.
sculptors). Since the manuscripts do not suggest any lacunae in the passage recording the list, it is only fair to Pausanias to accept his account of twenty-seven states in the absence of strong evidence against it.

51.

5.27.9: βοῶν δὲ τῶν χαλκῶν ὁ μὲν Κορκυραῖων, ὁ δὲ ἀνάθημα Ἑρετριέων, τέχνη δὲ Ἑρετριέως ἐστὶν Φιλησίου (no. 15 above). καὶ ἄνθρωπος μὲν οἱ Κορκυραῖοι τὸν τε ἐν Ὠλυμπίαι καὶ ἄλλους βοῶν ἐσσὶ δελφοὺς ἀνέθεσαν, δηλώσει μοι τὰ ἐστὶν ψιλλᾶσα τοῦ λόγου, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Ὠλυμπίαι ἀφάντων ἀνασήματι συμβηκήσαι τοιόνυμεν ἦκουσα. (10) παῖς μικρὸς ὑπὸ τούτων καθήμενος τῶν βοῶν ἐς τὸ κάτω νενεκώσ ἐπελεύσει, ἀνασηκών δὲ ἑξαίφνης θησίαν κατασέγα τε αὐτὴν πρὸς τῶν χαλκῶν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τραματοῦ θησίαν ὠστερον ἀπεθανὼν οὐ πολλαῖς. Ἡλεῖοι μὲν δὲ τῶν βοῶν ἄρει ἀκμαίοι ἐνοχοὶ ἐβουλεύοντο ἑκκομίσας τὴν Ἀλτεως· ὁ δὲ σφάς ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς κατα- <λείπειν> τὸ ἀνάθημα καθάρσα ἤφρα ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ποιησαμένος, ὀπόσα Ἐλληνες ἐπὶ ἄκουσία φόνωι νομίζουσιν.

10.9.3: εἰσελθοῦτι δὲ ἐς τὸ τέμενος χαλκὸς ταῦρος τέχνη μὲν θεοπρόπου ἐστὶν Αλγινήτου, Κορκυραῖων δὲ ἀνάθημα. λέγεται δὲ ὡς ταῦρος ἐν τῷ Κορκύρα τοῖς καταλήπτοις τὰς ἄλλας βοῦς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς νομῆς κατερχόμενος ἐμφατε ἐπὶ θυσίαν ἐγυμνοῦν δὲ ἐπὶ θησίαν πάση τοῦ αὐτοῦ κἀτεινοῦ ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ὅ βουκόλος, καὶ εἶχεν ἱερὰν τῶν θύμων ἀτέκμαρτον τὴν γῆν πληθοῦς. (4) καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐν τῇ πόλει Κορκυραίως ἐποίησεν· οὶ δὲ —ἐλεῖν γὰρ τοὺς θύμων προαρχόμενοι τὴν ἄλλος ταλαιπωρίαν εἶχον— θεωροῦσιν ἀποστέλλουσιν εἰς Δελφοὺς· καὶ οὔτω Ποσειδώνι τοις θεοῖς, καὶ ἐπιτέλεσαν τῶν ταῦρον, καὶ αὐτήκα μετὰ τὴν θυσίαν αἴρουσιν τοὺς ιεροῦς, καὶ σφικτὶ τὸ ἀνάθημα ἐν Ὠλυμπίαι τοις ἐστὶν ἡ δεκάτη τῆς ἡγίασα.

Commentary: Vatin in 1981 (440-449) published an article in which he claimed to have made new readings on some blocks in the Delphic sanctuary, but subsequent attempts by others to verify his readings have failed (SEG XXXI, 124, nos. 546-556, 561). One of Vatin’s readings in particular had to do with Pausanias’ descriptions of the Korkyraian dedications of two bulls at Olympia and Delphi, and by implication with his methodology.
This is the main reason for the present brief note; there is something to be said on Pausanias' behalf.

Without inspection of the stone one might have been sympathetic with Vatin's readings, except for one: his claim to read "φθαρμον ας θεραν θυ[ν]νον - - -", and ἀνδεθεραν θυ[ν]νον 'Ἀπόλλωνας. In the present study, however, in which eighty-nine instances have been examined that are based, or related to the epigraphical evidence, there is none that can be offered as a parallel. The most that could have been inscribed (if ἀνεγεται were to refer to the inscription, which in this case is highly unlikely) would be ἰσκάτη (and perhaps ἐγρα), words innocent enough so as they could be associated with almost any story.

Two notable examples (Theogenes [no. 53 below], and Euthymos [no. 24 above]), which may offer an idea of Pausanias' methodology, strongly suggest that Pausanias did not take the aetiological stories which he includes in his narrative from the inscriptions he read, but his sources were either the local exegetes or hearsay or even some other work. These stories were after the fact creations, aetiological in nature, and Pausanias incorporates them in his narrative in order to provide a complete account. His distance from belief or disbelief in them is rather evident. Likewise, in the case of the Korkyraian bulls Pausanias reports the story, i.e. the Korkyraian exegesis of their dedications which he probably heard at Delphi and at Olympia. If the story about the catch of tunnies were even remotely supported by the inscription, Pausanias would never have passed up the opportunity to testify from αὐτοψία to the story's veracity.

52.

6.4.1: "Εχεται δὲ τοῦ Λυσάνδρου τῆς εἰκόνος...καὶ Σικυώνιος Σωστράτος παγκρατιαστῆς ἄνηρ, ἐπίκλησις δὲ ἤν Ἀκροχειριστῆς αὐτῷ· (παρά) λαμβανόμενος γάρ ἄκρων τοῦ ἀνταγωνισμένου τῶν
χειρών ἔκλα, καὶ οὐ πρῶτον ἄνει ἵ αὐτῶι ἀπαγορεύσαντος. (2) γεγόνασι δὲ αὐτῶι Νεμεῶι μὲν νίκαι καὶ ἵσεμίωι ἄναμεξ δυδέκα. Ὀλυμπίασι δὲ καὶ Πυθοῖ, τῇ μὲν δύο, τρεῖς δὲ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ. τὴν τετάρτην δὲ ὀλυμπιάδα ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκατόν —πρώτην γὰρ δὴ ἐνίκησεν ὁ Σώστρατος ταύτην— οὐκ ἀναγράφουσιν οὐ Ἡλεῖοι, διότι μὴ αὐτοὶ τὸν ἄγωνα ἄλλα Πισιάοι καὶ Ἀρκάδες ἔθεσαν ἀντ' αὐτῶν.

Apparatus Criticus:
2 Ἀκροχειριστῆς is a correction by Hitzig adopted by Rocha-Pereira of the mss. reading ἀκροχειριστῆς; Valckenaer reads Ἀκροχειριστῆς.

Bousquet 1961, 74-78: a base of bluish-black limestone, broken on the top, and found in a house of the village Kastri in 1880 by Haussoullier who read and published the inscription with a facsimile in BCH 6 (1882) 446-448 no. 76. On April 25, 1894 the French excavators recovered the right part of the base (the left part having been lost) during the demolition of the house of Kavatha opposite the Ephoria; it is now in the Museum at Delphi. The inscription was cut on the front side with the help of guidelines which are still visible.

Delphi Museum Inv. No. 1375 and 4958.
Height: 0.195m. Width: ca. 0.35m. (Haussoullier 0.75m.). Breadth: 0.605m.
Letter Height: ca. 0.011m. which is also the empty space between the lines.

paulo post 356 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 35

The letters are carefully laid out, but the lines which the cutter inscribed make the reading difficult in some places (Haussoullier 1882, 447). The letter style suggests the fourth century B.C.
There seem to be two identical inscriptions: the end of lines 1-2 is similar to that of lines 7-9, and so the first two lines seem to belong to a similar inscription which is separated from the following one (the three elegiac distichs of lines 4-9) by an empty space.

Remains of Dotted Letters (form the facsimile of Ebert 1972, 130 and the photograph of Bousquet 1961, 75 fig. 5. These letters, however, were read by Haussoullier):

Line 1: alpha—only the bottom tip of the right slanting stroke.
Line 2: alpha—only the bottom tip of the left slanting stroke.

Restorations (the underlined letters were read by Haussoullier who had also printed the following facsimile):

\[ \text{ANOY} \]
\[ \Delta \ldots \text{GAEKRPEISAM} \]

Both lines 2 and 9 end with the same letters, but Haussoullier restored line 9 (accepted by Moretti and Bousquet): \[ [\text{πα}]\upsilon\alpha\varsigma \ 6' \ \text{α}ν\tau\iota[\text{παλιως παν}]\tau\iota \ [\text{δ}]	ext{κρατεις} \ \text{αιμακει}. \]

Ebert noticed the similarity and on account of Haussoullier's reading of line 2 restored line 9:

\[ [\text{πα}]\upsilon\alpha\varsigma \ 6' \ \text{α}ν\tau\iota[\text{παλιως παν}]\lambda[\text{ε}ν\alpha]τ\iota \ [\text{δ}]	ext{κρατεις} \ \text{αιμακει}. \]

Gallavotti's restoration attempts to account for the manner in which Sostratos was fighting:

\[ [\text{τρ}]\upsilon\alpha\varsigma \ 6' \ \text{α}ν\tau\iota[\text{παλιων}] \ \text{δ}[\text{ρακ}][\text{τα}], \ [\text{δ}]	ext{κρατεις} \ \text{αιμακει}. \]

Line 8: \[ \epsilonπο[\rhoον \ πολλα]\text{ους} \text{ Gallavotti.} \]


Commentary: the date for the inscription is based on the career of Sostratos who according to Pausanias won his first Olympic victory in the 104th Olympiad (364 B.C.), the non-Olympiad according to the Eleians, because the Pisatans organized the Games. Since he won two more Olympic victories, i.e. in the 105th (360 B.C.) and 106th (356
B.C.) Olympiads (Moretti), the *terminus post quem* for the dedication of his statue at Delphi is 356 B.C., a date which agrees with the letter style as well.

Pausanias, as was the case for the statue of Athenaios from Ephesos, offers no specific clue as to where in the Altis this statue was situated, except that he saw it together with that of the Ephesian Athenaios (see no. 18 above), after that of the Lakedaimonian Lysander, and in the general area between the Heraion and the temple of Zeus.

Although Sostratos' dedication at Olympia has not been found, the inscribed base at Delphi supports Pausanias' narrative about him. The agreement in the details prompted Haussoullier's (1882, 447-448) suggestion that Pausanias undoubtedly saw and used an identical copy of the Delphic inscription at Olympia. More specifically, the athlete's name, his ethnic, the event in which he won, and especially the number of Sostratos' victories in the four Panhellenic Games (three Olympic, two Pythic, and a total of twelve at Nemea and Isthmos) suggests that Pausanias' text is a prose rendering of the three distichs (lines 4-9).

Moreover, Pausanias' explanation of Sostratos' epithet 'Ἀκροξειφριστής, which Pausanias borrowed from some other source (Suda s.v. Σωστρατος), is certainly referred to in the last line (9) of the inscription, whichever restoration is accepted. The adverb ἄμαξεν cannot be understood simply to equal ἄκοιντες and ἄπτοτες, i.e. without a contest at all, although that meaning is possible (Ebert 1972, 132). Rather, there was no apparent contest, because Sostratos with his special technique in the pankration, seizing and bending the fingers, rendered his opponent helpless and unable to move (πάσας, or τρώγας the suggestion of Gallavotti who rightly argues for a restoration which would imply Sostratos' specialty in the pankration); hence Sostratos' victories without a fight.

There are, however, omissions by Pausanias as well. He does not mention the name of Sostratos' father Sosistratos, and omits the detail that Sostratos won many more victories (line 8 of the inscription). Indeed, if line 8 is not rhetorical exaggeration and
does refer to victories in other games (Gallavotti 1979a, 27-28 has found a similar expression in another epigram), it cannot not be considered an omission, because Pausanias never records any athlete’s victories except those won in the four Panhellenic games. At any rate, the comparison of the two texts validates Pausanias’ narrative and vindicates the author’s careful observation of the epigraphical evidence at his disposal. The likelihood that at Olympia Pausanias consulted an inscription, identical to the Delphic one, becomes a certainty given the closeness of the two texts. For the exegesis of Sostratos’ athletic fame which he acquired through the invention of a new technique in the pankration, Pausanias also employed some other source. Thus, in his narrative both autopsy and literary sources complement each other.

53.

6.6.5: ἀνελομένωι δὲ οἱ πυγμῆς ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι νίκην τετάρτην πρὸς ταῖς ἑβδομήκοντα ὀλυμπιάδι οὐ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ὀλυμπιά- ἅδα ἐμελλὲ χωρῆσειν. Θεο>γένης γὰρ ὁ Θάσιος ὀλυμπιάδι ἐθέλων τῇ αὐτῇ πυγμής τε ἀνελέσθαι καὶ παγκρατίου νίκας ὑπερβάλε- το πυκτεώτων Ἐθύμων, οὐ μὴν οὔθε ο Θεο>γένης ἐπὶ τῷ παγ- κρατίῳ λαβεῖν ἐθυνθῇ τὸν κότυνον ἄτε προκατεργασθεῖσι τῇ μάχῃ πρὸς τὸν Ἐθύμων. (6) ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ ἐπιβάλλοντο οἱ ἐλλα- νοθίκαι τῷ θεο>γένει τάλαντον μὲν ἵρεαν ἐς τὸν θεὸν ζημίαν, τάλαντον δὲ βλάβης τῆς ἐς Ἐθύμων, ὅτι ἐπηρεῖα τῇ ἐς ἐκείνον ἐδόκει σφίσιν ἐπανελέσθαι τὸ ἀγώνισμα τῆς πυγμῆς τούτων ἔ- νεκα καταδικάζουσιν αὐτὸν ἐκτίσαι καὶ ἱδίας τῷ Ἐθύμῳ χρήμα- τα. ἐκτῇ δὲ ὀλυμπιάδι ἐπὶ ταῖς ἑβδομήκοντα τὸ μὲν τῷ θεῷ τοῦ ἀργυρίου γινόμενον ξέτισεν ο Θεο>γένης, καὶ ἀμειβόμενος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐσθήθησαν ἐπὶ τὴν πυγμῆν· καὶ ἐπὶ ἐκείνης τε αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς μετ' ἐκείνην ὀλυμπιάδος τὸν ἐπὶ πυγμή στέφανον ἄνει- λετο ὁ Ἐθύμως. ἵ δὲ οἱ ἀνδριάς τέχνη τῇ ἐςτὶ Πυθαγόρου καὶ θέας ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ἄξιος.

6.11.2: Τῶν δὲ βασιλέων τῶν εἰρημένων (sc. the Eleian dedications for Phillip, Alexander, Seleukos, and Antigonus) ἐστηκέν τοὺς πόρρω Θεο>γένης ὁ Τιμόξενους θάσιοι δὲ ο Τιμόξενος 20 παῖδα εἶναι Θεο>γένην φασίν, ἀλλὰ λεράθαι μὲν Ἰρακλής τὸν Τιμόξενην θασίω, τοῦ Θεο>γένους δὲ τῇ μητρὶ Ἰρακλέους
συγγενέσθαι φάσμα ἔσοις Τμο<Ξ>ένει. Ἔνατόν τε δὴ ἔτος εἶναι τοῖς παιδὶ καὶ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν διδασκάλων φασίν ἐς τὴν οἰκίαν ἐρχόμενον ἁγάλμα ὅτου δὴ θεῶν ἀνακείμενον ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ χαλ-κοῦν —χαίρειν γὰρ τοῖς ἁγάλματι αὐτῶν—, ἀναστάσαι τε δὴ τὸ ἁγάλμα καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἔτερον τῶν ὅμων ἀναθέμενον ἐνεγκείν παρ’ αὐτῶν. (3) ἔχοντων δὲ ὄργην ἐς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς πεποιημένωι τῶν πολιτῶν, ἀνήρ τις αὐτῶν δόκιμος καὶ ἕλικαι προήκειαν μὲν σφᾶς τοῦ παῖδα οὐκ ἔαί, ἔκεινον δὲ ἐκέλευσεν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὕτος κομίσαι τὸ ἁγάλμα ἐς τὴν ἁγοράν· ὡς δὲ ἡνεγκε, μέγα αὐτίκα ἢν κλέος τοῦ παιδὸς ἐπὶ ἴσχυν, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἀνὰ πᾶσαι ἐβεβήκτο τὴν Ἑλλάδα. (4) ὅσα μὲν δὴ ἔργων τῶν θεοτογένους ἐς τὸν ἁγάλμα ἤκει τὸν Ὀλυμπικόν, προεδήλωσεν ὁ λόγος ἡδη μοι τὰ δοκιμωτάτα ἐξ αὐτῶν (οτ. 6.6.5), Ἐβυθύμον τε ὡς κατεμαχέσατο τὸν πύκτην καὶ ὡς ὑπὸ 'Πλείων ἐπεβλήθη τοῖς θεοτογείς ἐμίλαι· τότε μὲν δὴ τοῦ παγκράτιου τὴν νίκην ἀνήρ ἐκ Μαντινείας Δρομεύδονα πρῶτος ἄν ἴσμεν ἀκονιτὶ λέγεται λαβεῖν· τὴν δὲ ὀλυμπιάδα τὴν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ παγκράτιοι ὁ θεοτογείς ἐκράτει. (5) γεγό-ναι δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ Πυθοῦ νῖκαι τρεῖς, αὕτη μὲν ἐπὶ πυγμὴν. Νε-μείων δὲ ἐννέα καὶ Ἰσθμίων δέκα παγκράτιου τα ἀναμίκτα καὶ πυγ-μῆς. ἐν θάλασσα τῇ θεσαλῶν πυγμής μὲν ἡ παγκράτιος παρῆκε τὴν στοιχῆν, ἐφρόντιζε δὲ ὅτις καὶ ἐπὶ δρόμων ἔμφανθαν ἐν Ἑλλῆσσι εἴη, καὶ τοὺς ἐσελάθωτας ἐς τὸν δόλῃς ἐκράτησαν· ἣν δὲ οἱ πρὸς Ἀχιλλέα ἔμοι δοκεῖν τὸ φιλοτίμημα, ἐν πατρίδι τοῦ ἐκλείστου τῶν καλουμένων ἡρῶν ἀνελέσθαι δρόμοι νίκην. τοὺς δὲ σύμπαντας στεφάνους κτριακοσίους τε ἔσχε καὶ χιλίους. (6) ὡς δὲ ἀπήλθεν εἰς ἀνθώπων, ἀνήρ τῶν τις ἀπηχθημένων εἰς αὐτῶν παρεγένετο ἀνὰ πᾶσαι νῦκτα ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοτογένους τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ ἐμαστίγου τῶν χαλκῶν ἀτε αὐτῶν θεοτογείς λυμαίνετομεν. καὶ τὸν μὲν ὁ ἀνθρώπιν ἐμεπωδός ὅρrese παίε, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου δὲ τοῦ ἀποθανόντος οἱ πάθες τῇ εἰκόνι ἐπεξήγεσαν φόνο. καὶ οἱ θάσιοι καταποντοῦσι τὴν εἰκόνα ἑτακολουθήσαντες γνώμῃ τῇ Ἐράκον-τος, δὲ Ἀθηναίοις θεσμοὺς γράφας φοικίος ὑπερώρισε καὶ τὰ ἀψίχα, εἴγε ἐμπεσόν τι ἐς αὐτῶν ἀποκτεῖνεν ἄνθρωπων. (7) ἀνὰ χρόνων δὲ, ὡς τοῖς θαυμάσιοι οὐδένα ἀπεδίδου καρπὸν τῇ γῇ, θεωροῦσιν ἀποστέλλουσαν ἐς δέλφους, καὶ αὐτοῖς ἔρχεσθαι ὁ θεὸς καταδέχε-σθαι τοὺς δεδωγμένους. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγωι τούτωι κατα- δεχομένους οὐδέν τῆς ἀκαρπίας παρεξήγοντο ἱερὰ· δεύτερα οὖν ἔπι τὴν Πυθίαν ἐρχονται, ἱεροτείς ὡς καὶ ποιήσασιν αὐτῶς τὰ χρη-σθέντα διαμένοι τὸ ἐκ θεῶν μήνιμα. (8) ἐνατάθα ἀπεκρίνατο σφισιν ἡ Πυθία:

θεοτογένης δ' ἡμιστοῦν ἀφήκατε τὸν μέγαν ὑμέων.
άπορούντων δὲ αὐτῶν ὑπολαίη μηχανή τοῦ θεογένους τὴν εἰκόνα ἀνασώσσεται, φασὶν ἀλλεῖας ἀναχθέντας ἐστὶν τὸ πέλαγος ἐπὶ ξυή—ων θῆραν περισσεῖν τῷ δικτύῳ τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ ἀνενεγκέιν αὐτὸς ἐστὶν γῆν. θάσιοι δὲ ἀναθέντες, ἐνθα καὶ έξ ἀρχής ἐκείνο, νομίζουσιν ἄτε θεῦθε θεύειν. (9) πολλαχοῦ δὲ καὶ ἔτερῳ ἐν τῇ "Ελληνικῇ οἶδα καὶ παρὰ βαρβάρους ἀναγγέλλει θεογένους καὶ νοσηματά τε αὐτὸν ἰώμενον καὶ ἕκοντα παρὰ ἐπιχυρών τιμᾶς. ὁ δὲ ἀνδριᾶς τοῦ θεογένους ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀλτεί, τέχνη τοῦ Αἰγινήτου Γλαυκίου.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

20 θεαγένης is the reading of the mss. β and Phral., but the Suda has θεογένης; which is also attested by the Delphic inscription, and, therefore, the name θεαγένης of Pausanias' mss. is corrected into θεογένης in all places. The Aldine edition reads θεοθεόντω 21 θεαγένης is the reading of all mss. and editors after Bekker; editors before Bekker and the mss. Ms read θεαγένης; La has θεαγένης 22 Editors before Schubart-Walz read θυμοσθένην; later editors and the mss. Vb La Pa and R above the line read θυμοσθένην; however, the mss. Ms Vb P Ag Lb V and β read: θυμοθεόν, which agrees with the patronymic in the Delphic inscription and, therefore, it is accepted in Pausanias' text 23 the mss. Vb La Pa and R above the line read θυμοσθένην; however, the mss. Vb P Ag Lb V and β read: θυμοθεόν, which agrees with the patronymic in the Delphic inscription and I have accordingly corrected Pausanias' text. Modern editors (Hitzig, Papachatzis, and Rocha-Pereira) accept the older readings (θεαγένης θυμοσθένους) without taking into consideration the Delphic inscription, although Pompow (Syll. 36) has suggested: "in codd. Pausaniae θεαγένης et θυμοσθένους corrigenda sunt" 47 all mss. and editors read τετρακοσίους, although the number in all probability is wrong, since Plutarch (Praec. reipubl. ger. 15.7) has δικαίους, and the Delphic inscription (lines 7-8): νεκαντρίς τε ἐκαστὸν καὶ χύλαι. Accordingly, I have corrected the text of Pausanias to τετρακοσίους, the number preserved in the epigram.224

Ebert 1972, 118-119 no. 37: a base of white limestone found at Delphi onto which the bronze statue of Theogenes was mounted. The inscription is cut on the front side of the base and is badly preserved. The base is now in the Delphi Museum (Inv. No. 3835).

Height: 0.35m. Width: 0.78m. Breadth: 0.63m.

Letter Height is not given by the editors.

---

224 Moretti 1953, 52 *(IAG 21)* notes: “tali numeri parrebbero incredibili ma possono anche essere accettati tenendo presente che ad ogni modo essi comprendono non solo le vittorie in gare panelleniche, ma anche in modesti o modestissimi agoni regionali.” But Ebert (1972, 123-124) rightly suggests: “Auch die sonst überlieferten Siegeszahlen … werden durch unser Epigramm korrigiert.”
The dialect of the inscription is the Ionic with two notable variations: in the epigram the name of Theogenes is not contracted θεόγενες (line 7), but in the prose catalogue of his victories it is θεογένης (line 9); similarly the Isthmian Games in the epigram appear with the sigma ισθμίαν (line 5), but in the prose catalogue the sigma is dropped 17εις (line 26).

The letter style is plain and characteristic letter shapes are (Ebert’s facsimile 1972, 119): the top horizontal of the epsilon extends to the right, while its middle stroke is shorter; the theta in the middle has a dot and not a horizontal stroke; the xi has a vertical in the middle of the three horizontals; the right vertical of pi is considerably shorter than the left; and the top and bottom strokes of the sigma are slanting up-and-downwards. This style suggests a fourth century B.C. date for the inscription.

The text of the inscription is divided into two sections: lines 1-9 is the epigram comprising of six elegiac distichs which the cutter separates with the three-dot punctuation (Ebert in his facsimile prints a three-dot punctuation in line 9 after ἀρσενικόν, but Hansen [CEG 2, 844] notes that there is also an empty space); and lines 9-40 list Theogenes’ victories in prose.

The Stoichedon style is followed by the cutter consistently except for lines 11 (παγκράτιον) and 14 (ἀκοντίον), where because of the space limit these two words are inscribed in smaller letters and not stoichedon.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of Ebert [1972, 119]):

Line 1: omicron—only the right part of a curving stroke (it could also be a theta); alpha—only the upper triangular part; second omicron—only the upper part of an arc; gamma—only a trace of the left vertical and part of the upper horizontal (it could also be a pi); epsilon—only the bottom horizontal and the bottom part of the vertical.

Line 2: epsilon—only the bottom horizontal and the bottom part of the vertical; omicron—only the upper part of a curving stroke; nu—only a trace of the right vertical and part of the middle slanting strokes; phi—only the tip of a vertical and the a trace of the upper right part of a curving stroke.

Line 4: alpha—only the middle part of the left slanting stroke and a trace of the left part of the crossing bar; kappa—only traces of the bottom part of a vertical and the two slanting strokes.
Line 9: sigma—only traces of the rightmost tips of three slanting strokes.
Line 10: omicron—only a trace of the left part of an arc.
Line 17: iota—only bottom tip of a vertical; theta—only a trace of the bottom right part of a curving stroke.
Line 18: iota—only the uppermost tip of a vertical; theta—only the uppermost part of a curving stroke; mu—only the uppermost corners of four slanting strokes; omicron—only the uppermost part of a curving stroke; iota—only the uppermost tip of a vertical; pi—only the upper part of the left vertical and the upper horizontal.

Restorations: only line 1 requires major restoration, but none has so far won general acceptance, because of the nature of the epigram, and therefore none is printed in the text (see Hansen CEG 2, 844).

Line 1: ο[λεγον τη]θρηστευμα θ[α]ς...καλ γ[ερ εφ ηλη]νννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννννν
ο[αποτε το]τον Ξφυσε θ[α]ς...καλ η[ολο γ'] Ξ[λη]ννννννννννννννννννννννννν

IG XII.8 suppl., 425: a stele of Thasian marble was found in Limenas. It is broken at the bottom.
Height: 0.13m. Width: 0.23m. Breadth: not given by Hiller.
Letter Height: not given by Hiller.

*aetas Romana*

[Θεογ]ένει
[ἐ]πιφανεί
eυχήν
Α. *folium* Λικίνι-
ος *folium* Πόπ-
[λίου (?) - - -].

The letters have small apices and NE are in ligature.

Martin 1940-41, 163-200: a cylindrical and hollow offertory-box (θησαυρος) of Thasian marble was found in the Agora at Thasos in 1939. On the top and bottom there are two mouldings under which two inscriptions are cut on the side symmetrically.
Height: 0.73m. Diameter: ca. 0.51m.
Inscribed surface: (1) Height 0.034m., Width 0.044m.

(2) Height 0.017m., Width 0.031m.
Letter Height: (1) 0.02m., (2) 0.023m.
saec. I ante

1. τοὺς θύοντας τῷ θεογένει·
   [θα]σ[ίω]ι ἀπάρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν θεό-
   σαυρὸν μὴ ἐλασσον ὄργολο· τῷ δὲ
   μὴ ἀπαρχαμένω καθότι προγέ-
   γραπταί ἐνθυμιστὸν εἶναι τῷ δὲ
   πεσούμενον χρῆμα ἐκάστου ἐνι-
   αυτοῦ δοθῆναι τῷ Ιερομνήμονι,
   τὸν δὲ φυλάσσειν ἐως ἀν συνά-
   χωσιν δραχμαὶ χίλιαν ὅταν δὲ
   τὸ προγεγραμμένον πλῆθος
   συναχθή, βουλεύσασθαι τὴν βου-
   λήν καὶ τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὴ ἀνάθημα
   ἢ κατασκεύασμα ἀναλωθῆ-
   σεται τῷ θεογένει.

2. Ἀγαθὴς Τύχης· τὸν
   βουλ[ό]μενον ἐπὶ ὅ-
   νήσει [αὐτοῦ] καὶ τέκνων
   καὶ γυν[αι]κὸς ἐπάρ-
   5 [χησθαί τῷ] θεογένει.

The restorations are from Sokolowski 1962, 132-133 no. 72 A and B.

P.Oxy. 222. Pomtow 1909, 252-256. Roussel 1940-41, 289-290. Launey 1941, 22-
Sokolowski 1962, 132-133 no. 72A, B. Fontenrose 1968, 73-104. Ebert 1972, 118-

Commentary: The date for the base at Delphi, 400–350 B.C., is arrived at from the
letter style alone, and obviously is much later than the dates for Theogenes’ multiple
victories which are tentatively dated between 487 and 471 B.C. According to Pausanias
Theogenes was victorious at Olympia in the 75th and 76th Olympiads (480 and 476
B.C.) in the boxing and the pankration respectively (see also P.Oxy. 222 and Moretti).

Pausanias, after his note on the athletic dedication of the Arkadian Tellon (no. 34
above), mentions briefly four statues erected by the Eleians in the Altis in honor of the
Makedonian kings: Phillip the son of Amyntas, Alexander, Seleukos (these three on horse
back), and Antigonos whose statue was on foot (6.11.1). Near them, Pausanias continues, is the athletic dedication of Theogenes, son of Timoxenos from Thasos (for the correct forms of these names see the Apparatus Criticus), which must have stood on the southern terrace, to the south of Zeus’ temple, near the south Altis wall. The extraordinary athletic achievements of Theogenes, to which Pausanias had briefly alluded in his discussion of Euthymos (6.6.5 no. 24 above), offer an opportunity to insert in his narrative an excursus about the career and fame of this athlete (6.11.2-9), just as he had done earlier with Euthymos and the Diagoridai (nos. 22 and 26-28 above). The information about Theogenes that Pausanias had at his disposal was no doubt considerably more than that about other Olympionikai. More importantly, it testified to Theogenes’ heroization on account of his athletic achievements, as was the case with Euthymos and the legendary Olympionikai, Pelops and Herakles.\textsuperscript{225} In that sense, Pausanias’ exegesis of Theogenes’ dedication in the Altis parallels his narrative on Euthymos. It is another example of his methodology, which combines both epigraphical and literary sources, and of his interest in expanding the picture of the honorees when evidence is available.

Theogenes’ offering at Olympia has not been found, although some identify IO 153 as Theogenes’ base and not that of the Rhodian Dowieus (no. 26 above). At Delphi, however, there has been recovered an inscribed base of Theogenes whose information is similar to that provided by Pausanias. The exegete’s account, therefore, concerning the athletic achievements of Theogenes, can be tested against the text of the Delphic inscription, since it seems that Pausanias employed information which was inscribed on a similar dedication at Olympia. This, of course, is an open question, since it can also be argued that Pausanias' details on Theogenes are derived from the Delphic inscription itself, or even from another, literary source. The inscriptions themselves are considerably

\textsuperscript{225} For further discussion on the athletes who became heroes see Fontenrose 1968, 73-104.
later than the time of Theogenes and are clearly historical retrospectives on the career of the athlete. Nevertheless, the fact remains that Pausanias’ narrative about Theogenes and the epigraphical information do not contradict, but corroborate each other.

Specifically, the name of the Thasian athlete which in the manuscripts of Pausanias is preserved slightly deformed can now be securely restored thanks to the Delphic dedication which preserves the name: his name was Theogenes and his father’s was Timoxenos. Furthermore, the athletic career of Theogenes as is summarized in the inscription does not contradict Pausanias’ narrative. Both Pausanias and the inscription are in agreement that the Thasian athlete was victorious twice in the Olympics in the boxing and then in the pankration (6.6.5-6 and 6.11.4, lines 2-3, 10-11). Of course the epigram could not mention Theogenes’ fine imposed by the Eleians in the 75th Olympiad (480 B.C.), which is reported by Pausanias (6.6.5-6 and 6.11.4) and on account of which he failed to win twice during the same Olympiad in the two most difficult events, the so-called “heavy.” The Hellanodikai, after Theogenes defeated Euthymos in the boxing event, but then failed to defeat his opponent in the pankration, became suspicious that the only reason Theogenes entered both events was so that Euthymos would not win in the boxing, and accordingly fined him. Thus, Pausanias reports that in the next Olympiad (the 76th, 476 B.C.) Theogenes paid one talent to Zeus, but not to Euthymos with whom he agreed instead not to enter in the boxing event which Euthymos won. Theogenes entered, however, and won the pankration, his second and last Olympic victory. The claim in the epigram that he was the only one who won both of these events at Olympia was of course true until the Theban athlete Kleitomachos repeated the same accomplishment, as Pausanias notes (6.15.3): ἄν ἐς Ὁλυμπίαι βεύτερος ὁ Κλειτόμαχος οὗτος μετὰ τὸν Θασιον θεογένην ἐπὶ παγκράτιον τε

226 Literary sources spell the name Theagenes, while the inscriptions read Theogenes (see also the Apparatus Criticus).
According to Pausanias (6.15.4), Kleitomachos was victorious in the 141st Olympiad (216 B.C.) in the pankration, and in the 142nd Olympiad (212 B.C.) in the boxing.

Similarly, the two texts are in agreement about the other victories of Theogenes in the major Panhellenic Games. Both Pausanias and the inscription record the same number of victories: three Pythie, all in boxing (6.11.5 and lines 3-5, 12-14), although Pausanias fails to mention that one of them was "without contest" (ἀκοντικόν line 4 and 14 of the inscription); nine at Nemea in boxing (6.11.5 and lines 7, 27-34, 36); and ten at Isthmos in boxing and pankration (6.11.5 and lines 5-7, 15-26). Moreover, Pausanias adds a detail which is not recorded in the inscribed list of Theogenes' victories, but is implied nonetheless. Theogenes ran at Phthia the dolichos race, because, Pausanias explains, he wanted to excel in an event for which Achilles was famous, and in the same city which honored the Homeric hero. The inscription does not record Theogenes' victory in dolichos at Phthia, but Theogenes' last victory in the inscribed catalogue is in the dolichos race in the Hekatomboia at Argos (lines 37-39). Therefore, the inscription indirectly attests to Pausanias' note that Theogenes tried also to compete in a running event, although his training was in boxing and pankration. Apparently, however, the Hekatomboia at Argos were more important than the games at Phthia, which are not included in the inscription. For Pausanias, by contrast, Theogenes' victory at Phthia, the city of Achilles, is more significant, because it explains and foretells Theogenes' heroization in Thasos by his fellow citizens, an event which Pausanias proceeds to narrate. The final comment on Theogenes' athletic career by Pausanias is the total number of the victories, 1400, which in the inscription is 1300 and in Plutarch (Moralia 15.7) 1200. The discrepancy among these three sources suggests that obviously there was a problem about the total number of Theogenes' victories, and, in light of the evidence, the epigraphical testimony should be the overriding one. Accordingly, and given Pausanias'
dependency on epigraphical information, the number in his text is corrected from 1400 to 1300 victories, as the epigram dictates.

But the inscription was not the only source that Pausanias utilized for his extended exposition on the Thasian athlete. In the first paragraph and immediately after mentioning his father's name (6.11.2), Timoxenos, Pausanias adds that the Thasians had a different story: Theogenes' father was actually Herakles and not Timoxenos who was his priest. Herakles impersonating Timoxenos slept with his wife and Theogenes was born. Furthermore, Pausanias adds another anecdote from the early years of the Thasian athlete, which foretells his athletic career to come: when he was nine years old, Theogenes, upon returning home from school through the Agora at Thasos, removed a statue which he liked very much, put it on one of his shoulders, and brought it home. The people were angered and wanted to kill the boy, but one of the elders persuaded them to let the boy simply return the statue back to its spot in the Agora. The strength of the young Theogenes was marvelled at and Theogenes became famous all over Greece (6.11.2-3). After this aetiological anecdote Pausanias discusses Theogenes' athletic career and adds more information to what he already has said when he was discussing Euthymos (6.11.4-5).

As was the case with Euthymos, Pausanias concludes his narrative on Theogenes with another anecdote which to him is significant in that it demonstrates the heroization of the athlete after his death (6.11.6-8): one of Theogenes' enemies at Thasos was whipping his bronze statue at the Thasian Agora, thinking that Theogenes himself was suffering, albeit dead. The statue took its revenge and somehow fell on this defiler, whereupon his sons accused the statue of murder according to Drako's law at Athens, which postulated that even non-human things could be prosecuted, and the Thasians threw it into the open sea. This incident, however, caused the wrath of Theogenes, who had apparently acquired heroic status, which was manifested by the sudden infertility of the land of
Thasos. The citizenry sent an embassy to Delphi to ask Apollo for help, and the Pythia replied that the Thasians had to allow those whom they had persecuted to return. This did not work, and so a second embassy was sent again to Delphi. This time the Pythia was more explicit, and Pausanias quotes her response: "you forgot Theogenes."\(^{227}\) The Thasians devised a way to retrieve Theogenes' statue from the sea, placed it in the same spot in the Agora from where they had removed it, and started sacrificing to Theogenes as if to a god.

This is obviously an aetiological story for Theogenes' heroization which, Pausanias notes, was not exclusive to the island of Thasos. In fact, Pausanias states that he saw in many Greek and barbarian cities statues of Theogenes being honored and sacrificed to, because Theogenes had healing power, just like Asklepios and the athlete Poulydamas.\(^{228}\) On that note Pausanias concludes his lengthy exposition on Theogenes and his achievements by returning in ring composition to Theogenes' Olympic dedication in the Altis which, he adds, is the work of the Aiginetan sculptor Glaukias.

But that is not all. The French excavations in the Agora of Thasos have discovered the Heroon of Theogenes and quite remarkably there have been found inscriptions which attest to Pausanias' narrative both about Theogenes' athletic career, and, more significantly, about the hero cult of Theogenes instituted on the island. The athletic inscriptions in honor of Theogenes are fragmentary, but corroborate both the Delphic inscription and Pausanias' information (Ebert 1972, 124-126). The three cultic inscriptions, however, are remarkable in their own right. The first is the standard votive offering to a deity, in this case Theogenes. The second is a decree according to which all

\(^{227}\) According to Dio Chrysostom (\textit{Orations} 31) Pythia’s reply was: 
\[ \text{θεαγένεισι ἔδειξατε ἐν ψευδότοι πεσόντος}
\[ \text{καθ' ὑπὸ τοῖν μυρίδεθλος ἀνήρ.} \]

\(^{228}\) Lukian (\textit{Deorum consilium} 12) notes that Theogenes' statue at Thasos and Poulydamas' statue at Olympia could cure fever.
those offering sacrifices had to pay a tax of one obol for Theogenes; the yearly sum of money was collected by the *hieromnemon* who kept until it grew to a thousand drachmas, which the demos and the boule of Thasos decided to spend on dedications or constructions in honor of Theogenes. The third is a brief cult invitation to anyone who desires to sacrifice to Theogenes for the benefit of himself, his children and his wife.

What is important for the present discussion is that this remarkable evidence not only corroborates Pausanias’ information about Theogenes, but it also supports the view that the exegete’s sources, whether literary or from his own observations, are reliable. Whether or not Pausanias visited the island of Thasos is not clear and not as important. Theogenes’ story and cult was, as Pausanias says, widespread, and so, his information may have come from a Heroon of Theogenes which he saw in some city in Greece or Asia Minor, or from a literary source (πολλάκια ἐδὲ καὶ ἐτέραθι· ἐν τε Ἔλλησιν ὁμα καὶ παρὰ βαρβάροις ἀγάλματα ἱερώμενα θεογένους καὶ νοσήματά τε αὐτῶν ἠμένον καὶ ἔχοντα παρὰ ἐπιχρωμέναις τιμάς 6.11.9). Thus, the dedication of Theogenes at Olympia and Pausanias’ interest in offering an exegesis for it are testimony yet again of the sound methodological approach of the exegete: Pausanias’ foremost sources are epigraphical and archaeological, i.e. his own αὐτοψία, which, wherever possible, is further embellished with information from the exegete’s travels, or from literary sources. In the case of the Thasian Theogenes all these elements are admirably brought together into a coherent whole explaining who Theogenes was and why so many stories were circulating about him. And this is the programmatic principle

---

229 Interpretations of this evidence vary and are briefly summarized by Young (1984, 151-152 note 49) whose criticism is to the point. There is no need to presume that Theogenes belonged to an aristocratic family. Having said that, it is also equally likely that after his many victories Theogenes may have gained political clout at Thasos. This would not be something new and it would certainly have influenced the institution of the hero-cult of Theogenes (see note 215 above). Plutarch’s (Moralia 811d-e) and Eusebius’ (Praeparatio Evangelica 5.34.9-13) remarks are suggestive.
which Pausanias has set forth in the beginning of book 6 for composing his *Eliaka*, namely an exegesis of the monuments in the Altis, athletic or otherwise.

54.

6.17.4: Κολοφώνιοι δὲ 'Ερμησιάναξ <Γονέως> καὶ Εικάσιος Λυκίνου τε ὤν καὶ τῆς 'Ερμησιάνακτος θυγατρός κατεπάλαισαν μὲν παῖδας ἀμφότεροι, 'Ερμησιάνακτι δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τοῦ Κολοφωνίων ὑπήρξεν ἀνατεθῆναι τὴν εἰκόνα.

Apparatus Criticus:
1 the mss. read: Ἀγονέου, but the inscription found in Klaros preserves the correct form of the name: 'Ερμησιάναξ Γονέως, for which Peek (1985, 155) notes: "das Ἀγονέου bei Pausanias ist zu Γονέως zu verbessern (ΠΣ konnte natürlich leicht verlesen werden; das falsche Alpha erklärt sich wohl daraus, dass der olympischen Statue der Akusativ 'Ερμησιάνακτα stand)."

Peek 1985, 155: an inscribed base, found near the altar of Apollo in Klaros of Asia Minor. Lines 2-4 of the epigram were first published by Robert who noted that it "célèbre la victoire olympique d’un lutteur, qui ne fut pas renversé" (1967, 23).

Peek has recently reexamined the stone and his text is printed below (no dimensions are given by either editor).

320–200 ante

NON-STOICH. ca. 35

τρῷ[τ]ρὸς ὅς· ἐξ ['Ασίας 'Ερμησιάναξ Γονέως παις ἀπτῶς εἶλε πάλης ἄθλου 'Ολυμπιάδι,
εἰκόνα δ' ἐστησεν Κολοφών πατρὶς, ἣν στεφανώσας ἀθανάτου χάριτος θυητὸς ἔως ἔτυχεν.

Robert notes that the epigram is inscribed "en très belles lettres du IIIe siècle a. C."

Commentary: This inscription is dated late fourth to third centuries B.C. on the basis of its letter style. Moretti had placed tentatively the victory of Hermesianax in 320 B.C. (115th Olympiad) before the discovery of his inscribed base at Klaros.

After the athletic dedication of the Tenedian Demokrates, which he mentions first in his second φοιτόρ (no. 74 below), Pausanias continues his exegesis of the offerings in the Altis. These were set up in the area from the Leonidaion northwards towards the Great Altar of Zeus, as one passes by in front of the west side and then in front of the north side of the temple of Zeus. Among them he saw two statues of Kolophonian athletes, both of whom were victorious in the boy's wrestling event: Hermesianax, the son of Goneus, whose dedication was offered by the κοίνων of the Kolophonians, and Eikasios, Hermesianax's grandson, the son of Lykinos and of Hermesianax's daughter.

The inscribed bases onto which these two statues were mounted have not been found in Olympia. In Apollo's precinct, however, at Klaros in Asia Minor there has been discovered a base inscribed with an epigram commemorating the victory of Hermesianax and bearing the same information as the narrative of Pausanias who undoubtedly read on the base in Olympia the same epigram. More specifically, in the first distich of the epigram there is mention of: the athlete Hermesianax, his patronymic Goneus, the event in which he won in Olympia, and that he was the first Olympionikes from Asia in the boy's wrestling; while in the second distich the dedicator, the city of Kolophon, the country of Hermesianax, is noted and also the usual comment on the importance of Hermesianax's victory for his city. The information which Pausanias offers in his narrative about this athlete from Kolophon is the same as that of the epigram. The fact that Pausanias does not explicitly say that Hermesianax was the first Olympionikes from Asia, on account of which his city Kolophon felt obligated to undertake the dedication, does not mean that Pausanias is not aware of it. In fact, a few lines earlier (6.17.2) Pausanias refers to another athletic offering in the Altis, that of Herodotos whose statue was dedicated by his
city, Klazomenai, because he was the first Klazomenian to become an Olympionikes. The closeness in the narrative of these two athletic offerings dedicated by the athletes’ cities may imply that he was first. In spite of the fact that the statue base of Hermesianax has not been found in Olympia, Pausanias’ narrative is supported by the dedication, similar or identical to the Olympic one, which the Kolophonians set up in the precinct of Apollo in Klaros, and his text also improved.

230 This is actually what Moretti (1957, 128 no. 475) understood as implied by Pausanias’ narrative: “Pausanias ne vide la statua in Olympia, eretta a cura dei suoi concittadini (probabilmente perché era il primo Colophonio che riuscisse vincitore in Olympia).”
C. INSCRIPTIONS THAT PAUSANIAS MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE SEEN IN ELIS

Part C (nos. 55–82) examines instances in Ἡλικηδέν A and B whose information is supported by inscriptions that have been found at Olympia. They are passages in which Pausanias discusses the mythistoric past of Olympia and the region of Elis, the buildings and the altars, the priesthods, the games, the cult personnel, and dedications. These are cases that cannot either prove or disprove the assumption that Pausanias read and quoted from these inscriptions. Since these texts were at Olympia, and therefore presumably at his disposal, he may very well have read all, some, or even none of them. Be that as it may, the fact remains that when both texts are confronted they complement and corroborate each other.

55.

5.2.3: τούτων (sc. δύο...Αλλωι λόγοι) δὲ ὁ μὲν Κύψελον τὸν τυραννησαντα Κορινθίων φησίν ἄγαλμα ἀναθεῖναι τῷ Διὶ χρυσοῦν ἐσ' Ὀλυμπίαν, προαποθανόντος δὲ τού Κυψέλου πρὶν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀναθήματι τὸ δύναμ᾽ ἐπιγράψαι τὸ αὐτοῦ, τοὺς Κορινθίους παρὰ Ἡλείων αἰτεῖν δοῦναι σφισιν ἐπιγράψαι δημοσίαι τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τῷ 5 ἀναθήματι, οὔ τιχόντας δὲ ὀργήν τε ἐς τούς Ἡλείους χρησθαι καὶ προειπεῖν σφίσιν Ἄισθεμών εἰργεσθαι.

5.16.1: Λείπεται δὲ τοῦ μετὰ τούτῳ ἡμῖν τῆς τε Ἡρας ὁ ναὸς καὶ ὁπόσα ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ναῷ πρέπουσα ἐς συγγραφῆν... 10

5.17.5 Λάρναξ δὲ κέδρου μὲν πεποίηται, ζώιδια δὲ ἐλέφαντος ἐπὶ αὐτῆς, τὰ δὲ χρυσοῦ, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἕξ αὐτῆς ἐστὶν εἰργασμένα τῆς κέδρου ἐς ταύτην τὴν λάρνακα Κύψελον τὸν Κορίνθου τυραννήσαντα ἀπέκρυψεν ἡ μῆτηρ, ἥνικα τεχθέντα ἀνευρεῖν αὐτὸν...
Caskey 1922, 65-68: a fluted golden bowl of 22.3 carats and 836.469 gram was purchased by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts from the Francis Bartlett Fund in April 6, 1912. It is a φιάλη μεσόμεσος which was reportedly found at Olympia. The metal work is “exquisite” and the twenty-five letters are not incised but are stamped into two consecutive flutes, just below the rim.


Height: ca. 0.075m. Diameter: ca. 0.15m. Thickness of the flutes: 0.002m.

Letter Height: 0.0025-0.006m.

The letters are elegantly inscribed and, according to Caskey (1922, 68), they “were executed by a skilled and practised hand” who used three chisels: “a tubular puncheon for the circles of the kappa and theta, and small, blunt chisels, one twice as long as the other, for the straight strokes.” (See also Casson 1935, 513-514 for the inscribing technique of early inscriptions on metal).

The style is the early Korinthian and the letter shapes are (LSAG 114 fig. 33): α2, ε2 and ε3, θ1 or θ2, ν1, λ1, ν1 (but its right part considerably shorter, almost one-third the height of the left vertical), ξ2, π1, σ1 (ζan LSAG 33 fig. 17), ν1, ψ1.

The orthography in this inscription shows the use of kappa instead of koppa, omission of the aspirate in Ἐρακλέας, and two different letter shapes for epsilon: the ionic eta (ε2), and the spurious or genuine diphthong epsilon iota (ε3).232

231 Caskey (1922, 65-66) reports: According to the vendor (who was not the finder) the bowl was discovered some five years ago at Olympia, east of the Altis, between the stadion and the river Alpheios, in the bank of one of the small torrents formed by winter rains, which wash down earth from the hill of Kronos. In mediaeval times the bed of the Alpheios ran through that region. Unfortunately there is little hope that this account of the provenance can ever be verified, and the authenticity of the bowl established on irrefragable external proof.

For a full description of the bowl and other parallel ones that have been found see Caskey 1922, 65-68; id. 1926, 50-51; Casson 1935, 510-517; and Smith 1944, 258.

232 For other similar Korinthian examples see Buck 1973, 293-294, and Jeffery, LSAG 118-130.

Commentary: The date of this inscribed bowl, 650–550 B.C., is the widest possible terminus post and ante quem for such an offering and is based primarily on the letter style of the inscription and the disputed dates for the Kypselidai at Korinth, which vary from the middle or late seventh century to early or middle of the sixth century B.C.

Pausanias in the beginning of his Eliaka offers an overview of the mythistoric past of Elis and the Olympic Games and, as is his custom, he narrates all three possibilities for the exclusion of Eleian athletes from the Isthmian Games (5.2.1-5). The second of these explanations had to do with an incident just after the death of the tyrant of Korinth Kypselos (5.2.3): Kypselos had sent to Olympia a golden statue as an offering to Zeus, but he died before the statue was inscribed with his name. The Korinthians asked the Eleians to inscribe that the statue was an offering to Zeus by the city of Korinth, but the Eleians refused and the Korinthians retaliated by banning them from the Isthmian Games. Pausanias records this explanation, because he heard the story, but he does not accept it as the real reason for the ban. For he cannot understand how the Eleians allowed the Korinthians to participate in the Olympics, but themselves were banned from

---

233 For bibliography on the Chest of Kypselos see also Chapter I, note 41.

234 The epigram on this statue is quoted in other authors and its two versions run as follows (IGM 53 and also Gallavotti’s discussion 1962, 291-294):

A. εἶ μὴ ἔγειρες αὐτῷ ὁμοσθέας, ἐξέλθεις εἴη Κυψέληδαν γενεά,
B. εἶ μὴ ἔγειρες παγχρύσεος εἴμι κολοσσός, ἐξέλθεις εἴη Κυψέληδαν γενεά,

whose first line Jeffery reads (LSAG 127 note 3):

εἶ μὴ ἔγειρες παγχρύσεος εἴμι κολοσσός.
the Isthmian competition. The incident started with the golden statue of Kypselos and its inscription, which Pausanias, judging from his silence, did not see in Olympia.

One of the dedications, however, which Pausanias saw housed inside the temple of Hera, was the *Larnax* of Kypselos which was made of cedar wood, while the sculptured figures on its panels were of ivory, gold and cedar (5.17.5): when Kypselos was born, his mother had hidden him in a *kypsele*, as the Korinthians call the chests, so that the Bakchidai would not find him. In this way the boy was saved, became tyrant of Korinth and leader of the ruling family. He was named Kypselos after the chest which was appropriately dedicated at Olympia by his descendants, the Kypselidai who were named after him. After this introductory note Pausanias proceeds with a detailed description of the *Larnax* which occupies a significant place in his entire work (5.17.6-19.10). The interests, however, of the exegete in this offering of Kypselos are not artistic, but center around the wealth of the mythistorical scenes that offer the exegesis of the dedication itself and constitute evidence for Korinth’s history.

Of course, neither of these Kypselid dedications has been found. The golden statue was apparently already lost by Pausanias’ time. The Boston golden bowl was dedicated by the Kypselids from the war they fought against the Akarnanian city of Herakleia, when Korinth was colonizing the western part of Greece. The Kypselids apparently favored gold more than any other metal, since the majority of their dedications were golden. More importantly, Pausanias’ introductory note on the *Larnax* implies that he is reading from the dedicatory inscription which was inscribed on it.\(^{235}\) This assumption is supported by the inscription on the bowl. Both texts are apparently employing the same form of the patronymic in the plural: τῆς μὲν δὴ σωτηρίας ἤνεκα τοῦ Κυψέλου τὸ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ

---

\(^{235}\) Smith (1944, 275 note 132), cautiously reserved, suggests: “In the light of the Boston bowl with its (after all) rather surprising use of the plural patronymic, it may now seem not impossible that Pausanias v, 17, 5 echoes an inscription.”
Whether Pausanias saw the bowl or not, his narrative on Kypselos and the Kypselids and their dedications is supported by the inscribed Boston bowl, even if the dedicatory formulae are too common to prove anything. The extravagance of their dedications, preferably gold, and the formula which Pausanias employs for the Larnax are, if not proof, at least corroborating evidence about the Kypselids. It is also another of the many examples of the kind of sources Pausanias employed for the composition of his work. His main source of information is primarily but not exclusively based on inscriptions. Therefore, in his introductory comment about the Kypselid Larnax Pausanias is certainly narrating his personal observations, the dedicatory inscription, and information he heard about the Kypselids from the exegetes at Olympia or when he visited Korinth.

56.

5.4.2: κρατήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Πυραύχου τὴν τε βασιλείαν ἔσχεν Ὄξυλος καὶ Ἐπειοῦς τοὺς ἄρχαλους τὰ μὲν ἄλλα εἰσαεν ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐτῶν μένευν, συνοίκους δὲ σφίσε τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς ἐπὶ ἀναδασμῷ τῆς χώρας ἐπεισήγαγε. καὶ Δίωι τε ἀπένειμε γέρα καὶ ἤρωι τοῖς τε ἄλλοις κατὰ τὰ ἄρχαλα ἐφύλαξε τὰς τιμὰς καὶ Αὐγέα τὰ ἐς τὸν ἐναγισμὸν ἑτὶ καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς αὐτῶι καθεστηκότα. (3) λέγεται δὲ ὅσα καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρώπους ἐκ τῶν κωμῶν, ὅσοι τοῦ τείχους οὗ πολὺ ἄφεσαν, κατελθεῖν ἐπεισεν ἐς τὴν πόλιν καὶ πληθεὶ τε οἰκοτόρων (καὶ) μειὼνα καὶ εὐδαιμονεστέραν ἐσ τὰ ἄλλα ἀπέφηντεν τῆν Ἡλιου. ἀφίκετο δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ ἐκ Δελφῶν χρησίμως, τὸν Πελοπίδην ἐπάγεσθαι συνοικιστήν. Ὅξυλος δὲ τὴν ζήτησιν ἐποιεῖτο σπουδὴ καὶ ἀναζητῶν εἴρεν Ἀγώριον τὸν Δαμασίον τοῦ Πενθέλου τοῦ Ὀρέστου, καὶ αὐτῶν τε ἐξ Ἐλίκης τῆς Ἀχαιῶν καὶ σὺν τῶν Ἀγωρίων μοῖραν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐπηγάγετο οὖ πολλὴν.

IO 456: a base of Pentelic marble with cymatia on top and bottom, found in December 26, 1879, built in a late wall, approximate fifty steps south of the ninth Zan (the
Zeus statue made out of fines imposed on athletes). The inscribed front surface has suffered some cracks, and the extreme right is broken away. The base is now in the Altis, in situ.


Height: 1.17m. Width: 0.555m. Breadth: 0.57m. (top)-0.48m. (middle).

Inscribed surface: Height: 0.655m. Width: 0.495m.

Letter Height: 0.028-0.035m.

157 post

\textnormal{\textsuperscript{5}} Ωξύλου τοῦ κτίσα[υ]-
tos tʰn póli[ν],
léreiavn genvom[é]-
vn tʰs Δήμη-
troś ép[i] tʰs òl[θ]

\textnormal{\textsuperscript{10}} Olumiptáphi[s]
n̄ πólis tw[ν] 'Η'-
leiwvn kai n̄ 'Ol[υμ]-
píkʰ wyn bouλʰ'

The lettering of the inscription is elegant and typical of the Roman Imperial period: all strokes end in triangular serifs, the middle bar of the alpha is broken, and the shapes of the epsilon, mu, sigma and omega are cut with curving strokes. The cutter also employs three times a punctuation mark: in line 2 before and after the letter M which is an abbreviation for Marcus, and at the very end of the text after bouλʰ.

**Dotted Letters:**

Line 10: alpha and delta—only the upper triangular part; omicron—only the upper part of a curving stroke.

**Restorations:** all the restored letters at the extreme right end of the text are printed in the facsimile of the IO editors, but they are not on the stone.

**Bibliography:** Frazer 1965, ad loc. Hitzig 1896-1910, ad loc. Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc.
Commentary: The date for the honorary inscription of Baibia Antonia, ca. A.D. 157, is inscribed: she became a priestess of Demeter in the 234th Olympiad, sometime after which the dedication in her honor was made.

In his mythistoric introduction of Elis Pausanias briefly recounts the central stages of Eleian history. One influential leader in that early period was the Aitolian Oxylos (5.3.5-4.2). Pausanias goes on to say that he was instrumental in bringing together the Eleians and Aitolians (συνοικούσ), and that he furthermore persuaded the villages around the walls of Elis to abandon them and move into Elis. Thanks to Oxylos’ synoikismos Elis grew in population and wealth, and it was subsequently established as the major city of the region.

This mythistorical past narrated by Pausanias has found a surprising, albeit late, confirmation. To honor Antonia Baibia, the priestess of Demeter Chamyn, the Eleians and the Olympic Boule passed a decree and dedicated her statue in the Altis (for her priestesship see no. 80 below). What is unexpectedly welcome in this inscription is what the Eleians wrote about her father (lines 2-6): Marcus Antonios Samippos is the descendant of Oxylos who, translating literally, “founded the city.” This brief genealogical note supports the narrative of Pausanias to the extent that in the second century A.D. a family could deliberately and no doubt for political reasons claim direct lineage with the legendary Oxylos. Albeit an Aitolian, his major accomplishment, which was remembered and exploited in the second century A.D., was the synoikismos of Elis, in the same way Theseus’ synoikismos of Athens was celebrated.

Indeed, Marcus Antonios Samippos’ family seems to have been one of the most important in Elis, which therefore explains why his daughter was chosen priestess of

---

236 This is not a rare phenomenon, and it is similar to the claim of the Olympic phaidyntai who maintained that they were descendants of Pheidias (no. 61 below).
Demeter Chamyne. In *IO* 85, a cult personnel list of the late first century A.D., there are three persons named Samippos: in line 2 a *theokolos* Samippos with no patronymic is understood by the *IO* editors to be the father; in line 6 Oxylos S[amippou] and in line 8 Samippos [Samippou], the *spondophoroi*, are restored as sons of Samippos the father of Antonia. Furthermore, in Athens there have been found two inscriptions which apparently mention ancestors of Marcus Antonios Samippos: *IG II²* 1072, dated 116/7 B.C., is a decree passed by the Athenian boule to honor and erect a statue on the Akropolis for Antonios Oxylos Eleios, son of Antonios Samippos, who died prematurely; while *IG II²* 3827, dated in the middle of the fourth century B.C., is a decree by the Boule of the Areopagos in honor of Samippos Molossou Eleios. With this latter member another Molossos Molossou, mentioned in a honorary decree by the Achaians (*IO* 415), may be related, and perhaps Arestos Molossou and Isidoros Molossou, mentioned in *IO* 62, may have been members of this family as well.

Of course, all this additional epigraphical evidence does not support the claim of Antonios Samippos in the second century A.D. that his family descended from the *synoikistes* of Elis, Oxylos. Whether this association of the Eleian family with the legendary leader was actual or superficial is debatable and besides the point for the present discussion. What is significant, however, is that at the time when Pausanias visited Olympia, Antonios Samippos' family held a prominent position in the Eleian affairs, which was among other things, justified by their claim to fame through association with the hero Oxylos. And Pausanias may have heard this or similar claims which linked the past with the present.
57.

5.4.7: 'Ἡλείοις δὲ μέτεστι μὲν πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Ἰλίῳ, μέτεστι δὲ καὶ ἔργων <τῶν> κατὰ τῶν Μήθων ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐφοδοῦν. ὑπερβάντων δὲ ἄσοι φόρεσιν ἑγέρνοντο κἀκεφαλοὶ πρὸς Πισαλόους τε καὶ Ἀρκάδας ὑπὲρ τὴς διαθέσεως τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ ἔν Ὀλυμπίαι, συνεσσώρων μὲν Λακεδαιμονίους ἄκουσίς ἐς τὴν Ἀθηναίων, συνεστηκαν δὲ μετὰ οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους Μαντινεύσιν ὀμοῦ καὶ Ἀργείοις, ἔπαγόμενοι καὶ τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἐς τὴν συμμαχίαν.

5.12.8: στῆλαι δὲ ἄλλαι ἐστῆκασι (sc. in the temple of Zeus) καὶ ἡ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους καὶ Ἀργείους τε καὶ Μαντινεόν ἔχουσα ὕρκων παρὰ Ἡλείων ἐς συμμαχίαν ἔτων ἐκατόν.

5.23.4: "Εστὶ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ Δίος τούτου (sc. the one dedicated by the Greeks who fought at Plataia) στῆλη χαλκῆ, Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων συνθήκας ἔχουσα εἰρήνης ἐς τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸν. ταῦτα ἐποίησαντο Ἀθηναίων παραπτησάμενοι τὸ δεύτερον Ἑβοιαν, ἐτεί τρίτω τῆς <τρίτης πρὸς τὰς ὄγδοθεκόντα> ὀλυμπιάδος, ἦν Κρίσσων ἱμεραῖοι ἑνίκα στάδιον. ἔστι δὲ ἐν ταῖς συνθήκαις καὶ τόδε εἰρήμενον, εἰρήνης μὲν τῆς Ἀθηναίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων τῆς Ἀργείων μὴ μετείναι πόλει, ἵδαι δὲ Ἀθηναίους καὶ Ἀργείους, ἡν ἐθέλωσιν, ἐπιτηθείς ἔχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους. αὕτα μὲν λέγουσι τοιαῦτα αἱ συνθήκαι.

10 9: a bronze tablet preserved intact and discovered in Olympia in 1813 by Gell who transported it to England, now in London in the British Museum. On top of the upper corners there are two nail-holes from which the tablet was hung on a wall probably of a temple in the Altis.

British Museum Catalogue Bronzes 264.

Height: 0.10m. Width: 0.19m.

Letter Height: 0.0025-0.006m.

c. 500 ante?

NON-STOICH. c. 30

ά φράτρα τὸρ Φαλείοις καὶ τοῖς 'Ερ-
Φαδίοις: συμμαχία κ' ἔα ἐκατόν Fέτεα:
ἀρχική δέ κα τοῦ: αἱ δὲ τὶ δειοὶ: αἴτε Fέποις αἴτε F-
ἀργον: συνέαν κ' ἀλάλους: τὰ τ' ἄλ<α> καὶ πὰ-
5 ρ πολέμο: αἱ δὲ μὰ συνέαν: τάλαντόν κ'
The lettering is careful and elegant, and the cutter employs the double-dot punctuation to highlight certain clauses of the rhetra. The omicrons are not inscribed with a curving stroke, but their circular space is all chiseled out.

The dialect is Eleian with notable characteristics the rhotacism, the use of the digamma, the simplification of double consonants, and \( \alpha \) for \( \epsilon \), \( \varepsilon \) for \( \epsilon \eta \) (see further Buck 1973, 159-160). The Eleian alphabet, which is related with the Lakanion and the Arkadian, is archaic, since the letter shapes are quite early (LSAG 206 fig. 40): \( \alpha \), \( \gamma \), \( \delta \), \( \epsilon \), \( \zeta \), \( \xi \), \( \eta \), \( \chi \), \( \lambda \), \( \mu \), \( \nu \), \( \pi \), \( \rho \), \( \sigma \), \( \tau \), \( \upsilon \), \( \phi \), \( \chi \).

**Dotted Letters:**

Line 1: of the rho only a trace of two slanting to the left strokes remains. Most editors (IO editors, Buck, Meiggs/Lewis, Jeffery, Cook) read it as a rho and thus understand the city to be Heraia in Arkadia, whereas other (Roehl, Dubois, Phaklaris) read an upsilon and understand the city to be Eua in Thyreatis.

**Restorations:**

Line 4: the alpha is omitted by the cutter and is accordingly added by all editors.

**Bibliography:** Frazer 1965, ad loc. Hitzig 1896-1910, ad loc. Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc., and 262 pl. 261.

**Commentary:** The date for this alliance between the Eleians and another city, ca. 500 B.C., is that of Jeffery and is based on a comparison of the letter style of this text to that of other inscriptions from Olympia, Arkadia and Lakanion, whose alphabets are related.

The city with which the Eleians made the alliance inscribed on the bronze tablet is still under debate, i.e. whether it is the Arkadian Heraia, near the border with Elis, or Eua, the largest village in Thyreatis. This region divided Lakanion and Argolis and for its control the Argives and the Lakedaimonians were constantly fighting.
In his exegesis of the monuments at Olympia Pausanias, who seldom and only indirectly refers to decrees, reads and records two epigraphical documents which, although not dedications *per se*, are nevertheless important enough for him to incorporate in his narrative. In the beginning of his mythistorical overview of Elis (5.4.7) Pausanias briefly states that Elis was not always in control of Olympia and the Games. In the early years the Eleians fought Pisa and the Arkadians over the Altis and the prestige of the Olympics (see also his summary account of the non-Olympiads in 6.22.2-4). After the Eleians secured control over the sanctuary, Pausanias continues, they allied themselves with Sparta and unwillingly participated in the invasion of Attika, but later, i.e. after the Peace of Nikias in 420 B.C., they made an alliance with Argos, Mantineia and Athens against the Lakedaimonians. Later on in book 5, while describing the dedications inside the pronaoi of the temple of Zeus, Pausanias reads a number of stelai and he singles out the one which recorded the alliance he had mentioned in his historical introduction of Elis.

The second treaty Pausanias records is the “thirty-year” alliance between Athens and Sparta, which was inscribed on a stele set up near the entrance to the Bouleuterion, in front of the Zeus statue that was dedicated by all the Greeks who fought at Plataia (no. 50 above). For this second document Pausanias provides a date: it was in the third year of the 83rd Olympiad when Krison from Himera was the stadionike (446/5 B.C.) and after the Athenians subjugated Euboia for a second time (in 445 B.C. under Perikles). He also adds what he thinks is an important clause of this alliance: Argos is not a party in it, but if Athens and Argos wished, they could sign a separate treaty.

For both of these documents there is the indispensable account of Thukydides and also a very fragmentary inscription from Athens (*IG* Ιβ 83 = Ιλ 86) which is a copy of the treaty of 420 B.C. Thukydides mentions briefly and dates more securely the “thirty-year” treaty between Athens and Sparta (1.115.1 and 2.2.1), but he quotes the “hundred-year” alliance of 420 B.C., which is thus the basis for the restoration of *IG* Ιβ 83. Moreover,
Thukydides’ narrative of the second treaty mentions a provision, absent from the fragmentary inscription IG I 383, but supporting Pausanias’ narrative, namely that copies of the text were to be set up in temples of the three Peloponnesian cities: more specifically, all the parties together were to set up a bronze stele at Olympia during the Games that happened to take place in that year (the 90th Olympiad in 420 B.C.; καταθέτων δὲ καὶ Ὀλυμπίασι στῆλην χάλκην κοινῇ Ὀλυμπίους τοὺς νῦν 5.47.11). A fragment of a copy of this alliance that Thukydides quotes has survived (IG I 383); Pausanias saw and mentions the original in his narrative of Elis ca. 500 years after it was passed.

At Olympia, neither of these treaties that Pausanias records has been discovered. The exegete does say, however, that he saw other treaties in the pronaos of the temple of Zeus (στῆλαι δὲ ἄλλας ἅγιας καὶ ἡ πρὸς... 5.12.8). He singles out only the one he is interested in, the 420 B.C. treaty, while he overlooks the others. The treaty between Elis and the Arkadian city Heraia (Pausanias 8.26.1-4), or the Thyreatide Eua (Pausanias 2.38.5-6) that has been found (IO 9), which may have been among the ones Pausanias saw, is similar in two respects to the alliance of 420 B.C., which Athens made with Argos, Mantineia and Elis: it is for a hundred years, and there is no mention of any gods as the guarantors of the treaty, unlike the Sybarite treaty where all the gods are “witnesses” and the treaty is to last “forever” (no. 77 below). The circumstances under which Elis and Heraia or Eua agreed on this treaty are not known, because evidence is lacking.237 The troubles, however, of the Eleians with the Pisatans and the Arkadians

237 In that respect Meiggs/Lewis’ (1989, 32) suggestion is well taken: “arguments as to whether it should predate or postdate 572, the traditional date at which the Eleians finally wrested from the Pisatans the control of Olympia and its festival (Paus. 6.22.2), now seem beside the point. The circumstances in which Elis made this alliance with Heraia of western Arcadia must remain unknown.”

Pausanias’ information (6.22.3), however, that Arkadians were involved in the feud over control of Olympia not only before the proposed date for IO 9 by Jeffery, but even as late as the fourth century B.C. (the 104th non-Olympiad in 364 B.C.), seems only to suggest that the treaty was not enforced for a
over control of Olympia and the Games had a long history. Eua in the Thyreatide was situated on the opposite, eastern part of the Peloponnese, whereas Heraia's location was at the eastern border of Elis with Arkadia. Therefore, it seems rather unlikely that the treaty was between Elis and Eua. More importantly, this document may be evidence for an Eleian attempt to come to a settlement over Olympia at least with one Arkadian city, very close to her borders. The conflict over Olympia, as Pausanias notes (5.4.7 and 6.22.2; also no. 81 below), between the Eleians and Arkadians was going on in intervals as late as 364 B.C. Pausanias’ information, therefore, that he read the inscribed stelai of two important treaties at Olympia is supported both by Thukydides and IG I3 83. IO 9 is indirect evidence for Pausanias’ claim of Arkadian involvement in the dispute with the Eleians over Olympia, and also for his statement that in the pronaos of Zeus’ temples there were inscribed stelai of treaties.

58.

5.13.2: θύουσι δὲ αὐτῷ (sc. to Pelops) καὶ νῦν ἔτι κατὰ ἔτος οἱ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἔχοντες· τὸ δὲ ἱερεῖον ἠστὶ κρίδος μέλας. ἀπὸ ταῦτας οὐ γίνεται τῷ μάντει μοῦρα τῆς θυσίας, τράχηλον δὲ μόνον δίδοσθαι τοῦ κρῖν η καθέστηκε τῷ ὁνομαζομένῳ ξυλεῖ. (3) ἔστι δὲ ὁ ξυλεῖς ἐκ τῶν οἰκετῶν τοῦ Δίος, ἔργον δὲ αὐτῷ πρόσκειται τά ἐς τὰς θυσίας εἶλα τεταγμένου λήμματος καὶ πόλει παρέχειν καὶ ἀνδρὶ ἰδιώτης· τὰ δὲ λεύκης μόνης ξύλα καὶ ἄλλου δένδρων ἐστὶν οὐδενός.

5.14.4: Φέρε δὴ, ἐποιησάμεθα γὰρ βωμοῦ τοῦ μεγίστου μνήμην (sc. Zeus’ Great Altar), ἐπέλθωμεν καὶ τὰ ἐς ἢπαντας ἐν ὀλυμπίαι τοὺς βωμοὺς· ἐπακολουθήσει δὲ ὁ λόγος μοι τῇ ἐς αὐτοὺς τάξει, καθ’ ἥμτινα 10 Ἡλείοι θύειν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν νομίζουσι.

5.15.10: Ἐκάστου δὲ ἢπαξ τοῦ μηνὸς θύουσιν ἐπὶ πάντων Ἡλείοι τῶν κατειλεγέμενων βωμῶν. θύουσι δὲ ἀρχαῖον τινα τρόπον· λιβανωτὸν γὰρ ὀμοῦ πυρὸς μεμαγμένοις μέλητι θυμιᾶσιν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν,

hundred years, if indeed, as Meiggs/Lewis point out, “a century’s alliance was regarded as practically unlimited.”
tis eisai de kal kléonas élaías ét' aútwn kai o'ýnwi chróntai stpou-

Apparatus Criticus:

1-2 all mss. and editors read o1 káta étos tás arxías exowntes; Hitzig in his

IO 64: Parian marble tile from the temple of Zeus, found on March 29, 1880 in the west

wall of the Altis, between the wall and the base of Kallikrates. It is made to look

like a stele with pediment and antefixes and its back is rough. In the center of the

pediment there is in corona a bust and to the left and right the two words of the

first line are inscribed. The stele is now exhibited in the Roman Hall of the New

Museum Λ(Θέα) 535.


The stele: Height: 0.605m. Width: 0.378m. (top) – 0.395m. (bottom)

Thickness: 0.04-0.06m. (except the extreme right which is

thicker 0.09m.).

The inscribed surface: Height: 0.415m. Width: 0.34m.

Letter Height: 0.015-0.004m. (from top to bottom the letters tend to become

smaller).

28-24 ante

Διός

ιερά.

Νετεκχήρου τοῦ πρὸ τῆς ρῆθ

ʼΟλυμπιάδος Ἡθοκόλοι.

Εὐθαμος Εὐθύμενος Κ

NON–STOICH. ca 25
5 Σόφων Λύκου Ν
'Αφροδεισίος Εὐπόρου Τ
σπουδοφόροι.
'Αντίόχος 'Αντίόχου
'Ηρακλείδης 'Ηρακλείδου
10 Λυκίδας Λυκίδα.
μάντεις.
Κάλλιτος 'Αντίο Κλωτίάδης Π
Παυσανίας Διογένους 'Ιαμίδης Ν
κλείδωθηκοί.
15 "Αρκέσως 'Αρισδιόου Τ Καλλίας Παυσανίου Υ
'Ιππίας Χάρωπος Φ Μοσχίων Δαμέα Δ
Παυσανίας Διογένους Ν
αὐλητής.
'Αρίσταρχος 'Αριστοκλέους ΜΕ
20 έξηγητής.
Πολυχάρης 'Αριστοκράτους Π
καθημεροθύτης.
Ζώπυρος 'Ολυμπίχου.
γράμματεύς.
25 'Ηρακλείδης 'Ηρακλείδου Π
οινοχός.
'Αλεξάς Σόφωνος Χ.
έπισπουδορχησταί.
'Επίκτητος 'Ηρακλείδου Χ. "Ιλαρος 'Αντίόχου Χ.
30 'Επίκτητος 'Αφροδεισίου Χ.
ξυλεύς.
Εὐθύμος Σωτίωνος ΜΕ.
στεγανόμοι καὶ μάγειροι.
'Αλεξάς Λύκου Χ.

The letters are well incised and are crowded towards the end of the text. Some of the strokes end in serifs and the sigma is lunar-shaped.

The overlined and underlined letters, as well as Δοῦ (Δ), Δαῦ (Δ), and ΜΕ, which are inscribed in ligatures, probably refer to the Eleian tribes.

Restorations:
Line 29: the IO editors read Δοῦ., although they think it is different on p. 838 (Index s.v. Phylēn) and the ligature suggests a combination of delta, alpha and upsilon.

Commentary: This inscription is chosen from among many others that register cult officials at Olympia because it is complete and lists most of the officials that can be found in the other inscriptions. For whatever reason these registers seem to have started during the first century B.C., and the present inscription is a list of the persons in office before the 189th Olympiad, i.e. before 24 B.C. and of course after 28 B.C. the 188th Olympiad.

Pausanias, after he has completed his description of the altars, concludes with a brief overview on how the Eleians sacrificed and the officials in charge of the procedure. The IO editors have discussed thoroughly all the information available for these offices in Pausanias and in the inscriptions (pp. 138-142) and found one anachronism in Pausanias. The office of auletes, mentioned by Pausanias, had been changed in the second century A.D. to spondaules (p. 140-141). They argued, therefore, that Pausanias probably took the names from some older written source. Frazer (p. 584), however, has suggested that Pausanias may have chosen the more common name auletes, instead of the special title spondaules. Furthermore, the meaning of the word spondaules (an auletes playing during libations) is clearly implied by Pausanias' text, since the mention of the auletes is clearly connected with the monthly sacrifices (μελετετι σε τοι τους θυσίας). Along these lines, Pausanias' mention of one theokolos in charge every month need not imply that the author is unaware of the number of the theokoloi (which the inscriptions suggest to have been three), but simply suggests that every month only one theokolos was in charge.

238 Most of these cult personnel registers are only partially preserved, except for one or two which are later than IO 64. They are IO 58-141 and date from 36 B.C. (the 186th Olympiad) to A.D. 265 (the 261st Olympiad). Three more have been found and have been published in V. Bericht, 171-175 by E. Kunze.

239 For the different ways the cult officials were grouped under Olympiads see the comments of the IO editors pp. 149-150.
The IO editors have also noted some interesting omissions of offices by Pausanias that are known through the inscriptions (pp. 138-142). In Pausanias there is no mention of a *kathemerothyes* (the Daily Sacrificer), but in his description of the altar of Zeus Pausanias says that the Eleians sacrifice to Zeus every day (Θύεται δὴ τῶν Διόν καὶ ἄνευ τῆς πανηγύρεως ὑπὸ τε ἱερωτὸν καὶ ἄνα πᾶσαν ἡμέραν ὑπὸ Ἡλείων 5.13.10). This passage may suggest the office of *kathemerothetes* who, as the text of Pausanias and also the inscriptions imply, performed the daily sacrifices which presumably were distinct from those performed by the priest of Zeus.

The other offices listed in IO 64 and omitted by Pausanias are the *κλεισθοκύνη*, the *ἐπισπονδορχηστας*, the *οίνοχος*, the *γραμματεύς*, and the *στέγανόμος καὶ μάγειρος*. More offices are known from other inscriptions: the *περιηγητὴς*, the *ἐπιμελητὴς*, the *ἀρχιτέκτον* and the *ιερός*.241

Obviously, most of these offices are not exclusively connected with sacrifices, except perhaps for the *oinochoos* and the *epispondorchestai*. What is even more striking is that the lists of the inscriptions do not record any of the priesthoods held in Olympia, whose duties certainly included sacrifices. Markedly absent for example is the priest of Zeus and the priestess of Demeter Chamyne, both attested by inscriptions, the priestess of Demeter by Pausanias as well.242 This has led the IO editors to the conclusion that the lists record cult officials who performed those sacrifices which the priests or priestesses did not.243

---

240 For this office see the discussion in Chapter I pp. 11-13 and notes 26-31.

241 There are also some variations for two offices: there are attested *ὑποσπονδορχηστας* (IO 80111: 12216) and *ὑποσπονδοφόρος* (IO 12113).

242 For the priest of Zeus IO 433; 435; 456; 4737; IO 4852 and no. 80 below (Paus. 6.20.9 and 6.21.1-2). The *phaidynes* of Zeus, no. 59 below, is also absent from the lists.

243 IO p. 138, where Aristotle’s distinction between sacrifices performed by priests and those performed by kings (or, one can assume, by non-priests) is also brought to bear (τῶν ἑυρωτῶν δὲ σαὶ μὴ ἱεράτικας *Politica* 1285b). Also IO pp. 138-139.
Although only a few of the priesthoods are known, it can be safely assumed that the number of altars inside and outside of the Altis would suggest, if not a corresponding, at least a considerable number of priests and priestesses serving the sanctuary.

In this respect, then, the conclusions of the *IO* editors need not contradict Pausanias' statement that these sacrifices were performed by the Eleians. Quite the contrary. The passage about the importance of the *xyleus* in a sacrifice is related in the discussion of the Pelopeion, the temenos dedicated to Pelops (5.13.1-7). There Pausanias says clearly that sacrifices are offered to Pelops every year by those who are in office (*κατὰ έτος οليكτὶς ἐκχοντες*, see also the Apparatus Criticus) and mentions the peculiar custom of offering the neck of the sacrificed ram to the *xyleus*, whereas the *mantis* received no portion of the animal (5.13.2).

This statement by Pausanias and the registers of the inscriptions support the view that in Olympia there were two groups of cult officials, related but distinct: one being the priests and priestesses, and the other the officials about whom Pausanias and the inscriptions speak. The latter group, elected or appointed by the city of Elis for the period between Olympiads, had perhaps the general supervision of the Altis which included among other duties the performance of sacrifices. The former group, of which very little is known, probably constituted the sacral hierarchy of the temenos with more specific sacral duties. Therefore, when Pausanias speaks of the sacrifices the Eleians offered every month, he speaks of the same cult officials recorded on the inscriptions. Given the fragmentary state of the evidence, there is no reason to exclude the possibility of Pausanias having checked on the spot the inscriptions which registered cult personnel. After all, Pausanias is mainly interested in the specific officials, who were in charge or were connected with the monthly sacrifices offered by the Eleians on the altars that he has just finished describing in the same order that the Eleians sacrificed on them (5.13.1—
15.9). And indeed, the more important of these cult officials are present both in Pausanias and the inscriptions.

59.

5.14.5: ... θύσουσι ..., ἔκτα 'Εργάνης· ταύτη τῇ 'Εργάνη καὶ οἱ ἄπογονοι του θείου, καλούμενοι δὲ φαίδρουνται, γέρας παρὰ Ἡλέων εἰληφότες του Δίως τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀπὸ τῶν προσιτανόντων καθαίρειν, οὕτω θύσουσιν ἑνταῦθα πρὶν ἦ λαμπρύνειν τὸ ἄγαλμα ἄρχονται.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

2 φαίδρουντας all mss., corrected from IO 466.

**IO 466:** a quadrangular base-block of grey Peloponnesian marble, found November 6, 1877, in front of the fourth column of the south side of the Heraion. The base is a simple block with no ornament on the top or bottom and its back is rough. The base is now in situ in the Altis, south of the Heraion.


Height: 0.75m. Width: 0.49-0.51m. Thickness: 0.405m.

Letter Height: 0.032m.

`paulo post 128 post`

*NON-STOICH. ca. 16*

The letters are elongated and elegantly cut and the strokes end in serifs. The cutter also uses ligatures at the end of line 5 in HN and at the end of line 6 the upsilon in inscribed within the omicron. At the end of line 8 in ἐαυτοὺς the omicron and sigma are half the size of the other letters. In lines 1, 3, 4, and 9 the signs < are interpuncts, although an interpunct at the end of lines 3 and 4 is not needed and probably it is inscribed as an ornamental filling of the line.
Commentary: The date of this inscription, after A.D. 128, is based on the only other inscriptions that mention the phaidyntes of Zeus at Olympia and are dated in Hadrianic times. They come from Athens. The function of the phaidyntes is usually associated with the Messenian Damophon (ca. 180-160 B.C., for which see the discussion below), because of Pausanias' brief note that he was invited by the Eleians to clean the statue of Zeus at Olympia.244

The editors of IO had already drawn attention to the Attic inscriptions which mention Eleian phaidyntai and are dated after the dedication of the Olympeion at Athens by Hadrian in A.D. 128.245 One of them is a seat at the theater of Dionysus, dated in Hadrianic times (IG II² 5064):

\[
\text{φαίδυντος} \\
\text{Δίδὺς ἐκ Πειγης.}
\]

The other inscription is a prytany decree of the Attalid tribe and dated post ca. A.D. 218 (Agora XV 480 = IG II² 1828):

\[
\text{ἀγαθῆ τῷχη} \\
[\text{ἐπὶ}] \text{ἀρχωνος φεδυν[τό]}- \\
[\text{θ}] \text{Δίδὺς ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ Τιθε[ρου]} \\
\text{Κλαυθεον Πατρόκλου [Λα]-}
\]

---

244 Pausanias mentions Damophon many times throughout his work (4.31.10; 7.23.6-7; 8.31.2, 6; 37.4). Donnay's discussion (1967, 546-551), which favors a late first early second century A.D. date for Damophon, is based on Lévy's (1967, 518-545) conclusions about the date of the Messenian Damophon, which is arrived at through a reappraisal of the archaeological finds and the numismatic and epigraphical evidence from Messene and Lykosoura. Lévy & Marcadé (1972, 986), however, have since changed the Hadrianic date for Damophon. For a complete and up-to-date discussion of Damophon's date see Habicht 1985, 47-57, where (p. 57) 180-160 B.C. is the latest commonly acceptable date for the sculptor.

245 There are also two inscriptions mentioning phaidyntai of Zeus Olympios at Athens, both dated after Hadrian's dedication of the Olympeion at Athens: IG II² 5072 (another seat reservation) and IG II² 4075 (a honorary decree of a woman from Eleusis mentioning together the agonothetes of Olympia and the phaidyntes).
Both of these inscriptions suggest the extraordinary honor paid to the *phaidyntes* of Zeus at Olympia. In the theater of Dionysos he is the only non-Athenian cult official to have a seat. The archon Patroklos, an Athenian from Lamptraia, was elected archon while already a *phedyntes*, at that time an honor second only to the archonship.

Since Robert (1888, 452-453), the origin of the office of the *phaidyntes* of Zeus at Olympia has been understood in light of another passage in Pausanias, where the Messenian sculptor Damophon is mentioned (4.31.6):

... δε (sc. Damophon) καὶ τὸν Δία ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι διεστηκότος ἕδη τοῦ ἐλέφαντος συνήρμοσεν ἐσ τὸ ἀκριβέστατον καὶ οἱ δεδομέναι τιμᾶ χάρα Ἰλεύων εἰσί.

This brief note of the honors paid to Damophon by the Eleians on account of his restoring the ivory of the Pheidian Zeus has led to the belief that this significant event prompted the institution of the *phaidyntes*. This official would be responsible for taking care of the statue, so that in the future such extraordinary measures would not have to be taken.

There is no independent evidence for the precise honors which the Eleians accorded Damophon, unless of course the office of the *phaidyntes* is to be understood as lying behind this sentence of Pausanias. He at least does not know that Damophon was responsible for the institution of this office, otherwise he certainly would have mentioned it. According to his information, Damophon's work was an important salvage operation of the statue's ivory, whereas the *phaidyntai's* γερας was merely the cleaning and polishing of the statue. Furthermore, in the passage on the *phaidyntai* it is clearly stated that they considered themselves "descendants" of Pheidias, i.e. their activity, at least as

---

246 This by no means implies excluding the possibility of an Athenian holding that office. In fact, if Donnay's argument is taken one step further, it appears from the admittedly scanty evidence that this office may have been Panhellenic.

247 The difference in the spelling may be an indication of a change in the pronunciation.
they claimed, started immediately after Pheidias. The office of *phaidyntes* is indeed attested in inscriptions, although unrelated to Zeus at Olympia, as early as Pheidias' time: there is epigraphical evidence which indicates that such an office was known in Athens and Eleusis, and, in fact, one of the inscriptions dates from the 5th century B.C. Nevertheless, both Pausanias and the epigraphic evidence, which so far as can be determined date from Hadrianic times, suggest that the *phaidyntes* at Olympia was entrusted probably with only an honorary overseeing and a symbolic cleaning and polishing of the Pheidian statue before the sacrifice to Ergane. A similar event was performed during the festival of the *Plynteria* at Athens, when the xoanon of Athena was washed and cleaned in Piraeus.

Apparently, the office of the *phaidyntes* was an honorary cult title, at least as Agora XV 480 implies and as is suggested by its absence from all the lists of the cult personnel at Olympia from 36 B.C. to A.D. 265. The inscription honoring Herakleitos is so far the only decree for a *phaidyntes* at Olympia. Similarly unique is Pausanias' testimony for the *phaidyntes* at Olympia: his is the only literary source explaining this office, which very probably was instituted (or revived) during Pausanias' time by Hadrian. Given the manuscript tradition of Pausanias, it is perfectly reasonable to correct the word to

---

248 In Athens: a ἡρακλείτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἑορτή is associated with the Eleusinian Mysteries hierarchy in IG i² 6130-1, dated before 460 B.C.; in IG ii² 1092 B29, dated post A.D. 131; in IG ii² 107816, dated ca. A.D. 220. But for the *phaidyntes* of Zeus at Olympia the only evidence is the inscriptions from Hadrian's time and Pausanias.

Hadrian's preference for the Hellenic culture, and Olympia in particular, may also be surmised from a fragmentary inscription found at Olympia (IO 57, cf. IG ii² 1094) which records the letter of Hadrian of A.D. 126 and the response of the Achaean Confederacy to it in relation to his proposals concerning the state of affairs in Greece.

249 IO 58-141, see also no. 58 above. The *phaidyntes* does not seem to be a distinctive cult official. Rather this office or title was only indirectly associated with the cult of Zeus. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that an Athenian archon was appointed a *phaidyntes*.

250 *Phaidyntes* is the form favored by the literary sources which, however, are later than Pausanias, except Pollux, a contemporary of his (see LSJ s.v. I and II).
\(\text{\(\text{\(\phi\alpha\iota\delta\upsilon\nu\tau\eta\varsigma\), i.e. without the rho, as it appears in all inscriptions and is correctly assumed by the IO editors to be the older form.}^{251}\) The lexicographical entries of the word may very well be a copyist's correction of Pausanias' text.}

Apart from the spelling of the word, Pausanias' description of the \textit{phaidyntai} is corroborated by the honorary decree of T. Flavius Herakleitos. He indicates that they were "descendants of Pheidias", true or supposed, and that they were granted by the Eleians the privilege (\textit{\(\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\)}) of cleaning the statue of Zeus. The first of these characteristics is present in the text of the inscription: T. Flavius Herakleitos is "associated" with the family of Pheidias (\textit{\(\alpha\nu\delta\ \phi\alpha\iota\sigma\epsilon\zeta\varsigma\)u line 5}), which need not imply direct lineage. The mere fact of granting the privilege of cleaning the statue of the Pheidian Zeus could no doubt be a claim of direct association with Pheidias, since the \textit{phaidyntes}' duty was to preserve his work, in effect to care for it as the master himself would have. After all, the sacrifice they offered to Ergane, the goddess of artists and craftsmen, should be an indication of the professional association of the \textit{phaidyntai}. The other point, i.e. the granting of the privilege to clean the statue of Zeus, is not explicitly stated, since the expression \textit{\(\tau\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\beta\epsilon\zeta\varsigma\)} (lines 8-9) is a standard formulaic clause employed in honorary decrees. It may only very generally suggest that T. Flavius Herakleitos' work as a \textit{phaidyntes} was appreciated by the Olympic Boule and the city of Elis.

60.

5.14.7: \textit{\(\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\) (sc. to\(\omicron\ 'H\phi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\)) \pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon\nu\ 'H\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \beta\omega\mu\omicron\ \epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\varsigma\iota\nu\ \Pi\alpha\r\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\tau\tau\tau\tau\iota\nu\), \pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\alpha\iota\alaccent\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ 'H\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\epsilon\o\omicron\varsigma\) (\(\tau\omicron\upsilon\omicron\)\)

\footnote{The \textit{IO} editors had concluded on the literary sources (IO 466, p. 556): "Demgegenüber kann die handschriftliche Überlieferung, die allerdings nur \(\phi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\upsilon\nu\eta\iota\nu\), \(\phi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\nu\nu\tau\eta\varsigma\) kennt, nicht den Ausschlag geben."}
Kunze 1967, 90-91 fig. 30, pl. 49.1 (= VIII. Bericht): a bronze shield was found in October 1960, in the north wall of the Stadion. The inscription is cut on the outer edge of the shield. Olympia Museum Inv. No. B 5233.

Diameter: 0.85-0.91m.

Letter Height is not given by the editor.

saec. VI–V ante

ιερὰ τὸ Ἑρακλεῖ.

Kunze argues that the lettering and the formula employed for this dedication as well as the psilosis suggest Arkadia as the place of origin for the shield. If that is correct, then the letters should conform to Jeffery’s drawings for the shapes of the Arkadian letters (LSAG 206 fig.40): the epsilon is like ε but with small tails at both ends, the lambda is Λ, but more closed, and the rho resembles ρ; the omega, however, is not rounded, but cut in a rhomboid shape.

Although Kunze is probably right that the text betrays “einen etwas rustikalen Aspekt,” the inscription does not have enough letters to justify any definite identification, at least for the time being.


Commentary: The date for this dedication, sixth to fifth centuries B.C., is necessarily very general, because there is no evidence which could support a more precise date.

252 See Lazzarini 1974, 259-260 nos. 592-594, and 319 no. 975: all these dedications employ the word “sacred” + the dative, and all are from Arkadia, except no. 594 which is the present inscription. Lazzarini accepts Kunze’s suggestion, but Dubois (1986) omits this inscription from his recent study of the Arkadian dialect.
(Kunze does not offer any date; in SEG, the middle of the fifth century is proposed with a question mark; and Lazzarini offers the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.).

In his exegesis of the monuments in the Altis Pausanias includes the most significant cults of gods and goddesses the Eleians honored. Herakles, the son of Alkmene and Zeus, or the Idaean, was one of the legendary founders of the Games (5.7.6-8.4) and the one who established Pelops' worship in the Altis (5.13.2-14.2). For his worship in the Altis Pausanias mentions only two altars, but, when he visits the Pisatan region across the river Erymanthos, on the hill of Sauros, he sees the tomb of Sauros and a deserted temple of Herakles. Moreover, Herakles and themes from his labors were depicted on Zeus' throne (5.11.4-8) and on the twelve metopes on each side of the temple of Zeus (5.10.9). Similar depictions of the hero's accomplishments were decorating the *Larnax* of Kypselos which Pausanias describes in great detail (5.17.9, 17.11, 18.4, 19.1 and 19.9). But, Pausanias also saw in Olympia a few statues of Herakles which he deemed important enough to include in his narrative.253 All this scattered information in the exegete's narrative of Olympia suggests that Herakles had a cult in the Altis, although what that was is not certain.

All this information in Pausanias about the Herakles statues and his altars can be now supported by the inscribed shield which has been found.254 Its inscription, that the shield was a sacred offering to Herakles, confirms Pausanias' citations of a number of statues erected in the image of the hero and in his honor. Tradition told the story that the Olympic

253 Pausanias mentions the following sculptures: two statues of the young Herakles, dedicated by Hippotion (no. 14 above), and by Anaxippos from Mende (5.25.7); a sculptural group of Herakles fighting an Amazon on horse back, offered by Euagoras from Zankle (5.25.11); a Herakles made by Onatas and offered by the Thasians (5.25.12); and three labors of Herakles dedicated by Herakleia Pontika (5.26.7).

254 IO 693 which is a bronze sheet depicting Herakles' struggle with a sea god, whose names are inscribed (τ' Ἑρακλῆς and ὡς ἄρχων) is similar to the statue representations of the hero, the metopes on Zeus' temple, and the *larnax* of Kypselos.
Games were refounded by Herakles and sanctioned by Zeus. He was the one who established the worship of his ancestor Pelops with sacrifices and he was famed for his labors which in a sense were victories in competition. The vast majority of military dedications found at Olympia are offerings to Zeus. This shield is in fact a unique example of booty dedicated to Herakles, who, therefore, was also worshipped in the Altis.

61.

5.15.1: ἔστι δὲ οἴκημα ἐκτὸς τῆς Ἀλτεως, καλεῖται δὲ ἐργαστήριον Φειδίου, καὶ ὁ Φειδίας καθ' ἔκαστον τοῦ ἀγάλματος ἐνταῦθα εἰργάζετο· ἔστιν οὖν βωμὸς ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἐν κοινῷ.

Mallwitz & Schiering 1964, 169 no. 1, 151 no. 9:255 a black-varnished, Athenian or Eleian clay vessel, with leather-brown and somewhat reddish tint, and with fluted surface was found in 1958 in level D of Annex T of Pheidias' Workshop. The cup’s handle and mouthpiece are missing and is restored here and there. The bottom side is varnished inside and outside. The cup is now on display in the Early Classical and Classical Gallery of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. Π 3653. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.077m. Diameter of the inscribed bottom: 0.063m.

Letter Height: 0.004-0.006m.

440-430 ante

Φειδίοι: εἷ-

μί.

---

255 The book is divided into two parts: in part one Mallwitz discusses the architecture (pp. 1-134); and in two Schiering examines the archaeological finds (pp. 135-277).
The letters are very elegantly cut for a graffito (see for example the other graffito found in the workshop of Pheidias and published in Mallwitz 1965, 149-157, plates 53-58). The name is separated from the verb with three dots.

**Bibliography:** Frazer 1965, ad loc. Hitzig 1896-1910, ad loc. Papachatzis 1974-81, ad loc.

**Commentary:** The date of the cup and its inscription is that of Mallwitz 1972, 263 and is based on its fluting and other ceramic finds of the same level that date between 440-430 B.C. 256

Pausanias in describing the altars within the Altis opens a parenthesis in order to comment on another altar dedicated to all gods in common, which is outside the Altis proper and inside Pheidias' Workshop, and then he continues his short digression with the description of the Leonidaion (see no. 62 below). The older excavations in the Byzantine church, into which Pheidias' Workshop was converted in the early 5th century A.D., did produce enough evidence for identification of the church with the Workshop, though not without objections. 257 The excavations of 1954-58 have provided proof beyond doubt that the Byzantine church (Building A) was indeed the Workshop of Pheidias, which was cleaned sometime after Pheidias' work was complete. The rubble removed was heaped up to the southeast of the Workshop and subsequently was covered by the construction of the Building G and later C. In this area over sixty clay moulds of various sizes for drapery were discovered, which were used for the statues of the Pheidian Zeus.

256 Schiering (Mallwitz & Schiering 1964, 273) suggests that Pheidias brought the cup with him from Athens during his 436 B.C. visit to Olympia, the date when Pantarkes, Pheidias' lover, won in the 86th Olympiad (436 B.C.) in the boys' wrestling.

257 See Frazer's (1965, vol. 3, 565-567) summary of the results and the objections raised by some archaeologists.
Among the rubble removed probably from Pheidias’ Workshop his cup with his signature was discovered. The idea that this graffito is of modern origin is now put to rest by Heilmeyer through a stereomicroscopic examination of the letters. It showed that the greyish-white layer around the second epsilon is also present in the crack; and also the direction of the break of the curving stroke of the omicron does not support the argument that the stroke is modern. Likewise, the traces of a white layer above the phi and mu are presumably plaster remains from the restoration the cup underwent after it was found, and not an indication that the letter strokes are modern.258

Moreover, this mug along with numerous other everyday utensils suggests that Pheidias stayed in Olympia for some time, working on the statue of Zeus.259 Thus, the topographical information provided by Pausanias has been proven by the excavations and their finds, i.e. that Pheidias κατὰ ἑκαστὸν τοῦ ἀγάλματος ἐνταῦθα εἰργάζετο.

5.15.2: ὅπισω δὲ ἀναστρέψαντι αἰθής ἐσ τὴν "Ἀλτίν ἐστὶν ἀπαντικρυ τοῦ Ἀεωνιδαίου —τὸ δὲ ἐκτὸς μὲν τοῦ περιβόλου τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὸ Λεωνιδαίον, τῶν δὲ ἐσόδων πεποίηται τῶν ἐσ τὴν "Ἀλτίν κατὰ τὴν

258 Heilmeyer 1981, 447-448:

See also his discussion of other Workshops in Olympia in Heilmeyer 1969, 1-28.

259 Mallwitz & Schiering 1964, 165ff. describe various ceramic objects of everyday usage, while on pp. 272-277 they discuss in detail the date of the archaeological finds and their relevance to the events surrounding Pheidias’ life.
IO 651: six broken fragments of rough shell-limestone from the Ionic epistyle of the Leonidaion were found in the winter of 1886-87, built into the west Byzantine wall, to the north of the South Wall. The fragments still preserve the ancient plaster which was used to conceal the different building materials used for the construction, and on which the letters were carved in relief. Fragments a+b+c join. Of the six fragments a b c d seem to belong to one inscription, while fragments e and f seem to belong to a second inscription which stood on another side of the building. There is no way of knowing whether the inscription was carved on all four sides of the epistyle, on its three sides, or on just the two, the east and west sides according to the IO editors (north and south sides according to Treu). The fragments are now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum. *Vidi, Phot.*

Height of frgs a, b, c, d: 0.49m.; frg. e: 0.49m.; frg. f: 0.48m.

Width of all four (a b c d): 2.23m. (a+b+c: 1.365m.; d: 0.71m.);
frg. e: 1.02m.; frg. f: 0.96m.

Thickness of frgs a, b, c, d: 0.65m.; frg. f, broken on the back: 0.55m.

Letter Height: 0.2-0.3m.

330–320 ante

**frs. abcd:**

[Λεωνίδης Λεώτου Νάξιος ἐποίησε καὶ ἄνεθηκε Δίῳ Ὀλυμπίῳ].

---

260 For the construction material (sandstone and rough shell-limestone) employed for different parts of the building see: Mallwitz 1972, 246-254.
The hypothesis that these two fragments belong to the same inscription is not certain. They may very well be from two different inscriptions. Therefore:

\[
\text{frs. ef: } \lambda [\text{εωνίδης} \text{ Λεώτου} \text{ Νάξιος} \ \text{ἐποίησε καὶ} \ \text{ἀνέθηκε} \ \text{Διὶ} \ ' \text{Ολυμπίωι}],
\]

OR

\[
\text{fr. e: } \lambda [\text{εωνίδης} \text{ Λεώτου} \text{ Νάξιος} \ \text{ἐποίησε καὶ} \ \text{ἀνέθηκε} \ \text{Διἰ} \ ' \text{Ολυμπίωι}],
\]

\[
\text{fr. f: } [\lambda \text{εωνίδης} \text{ Λεώτου} \text{ Νάξιος} \ \text{ἐποίησε καὶ} \ \text{ἀνέθηκε} \ \text{Διἰ} \ ' \text{Ολυμπίωι}].
\]

The letters are not elegant and their carving on the stucco appears at times crude (width: 0.006m). There is no trace of coloration on the stucco, as one might expect for easier reading.

**Remains of Dotted Letters:**

Fragments abed: first nu—only the bottom part of the right vertical and the left vertical strokes; second nu—only the right vertical stroke and a trace of the right slanting stroke; iota—only a faint trace of a vertical stroke at the right break of the stone.

Fragment f: xi—only the upper horizontal and a trace of the middle horizontal; iota—only the upper tip and a faint trace of the bottom part of a vertical.

**Restorations:**

The ending of the inscription is restored by the IO editors on the correct assumption that the building could be named Leonidaion only after its dedicator, who in this case is both the architect and the dedicator.


**Commentary:** The date of the inscription is that of Mallwitz 1972, 252 and is based on the architectural style of the Leonidaion, the largest building at Olympia.

Pausanias in describing the altars at Olympia opens a parenthesis in order to explain what the Leonidaion is. This was an appropriate place for a brief digression, since he had just described the Workshop of Pheidias in which there was an altar to all the gods in common (see no. 61 above). The mention of the Leonidaion seems to be a topographical reference for Pausanias, since the mere size of the building made it conspicuous, and therefore it would help the visitor to locate the Workshop of Pheidias and the processional entrance into the Altis. This is the reason why Pausanias is very specific about the
building's topography. It stood outside the Altis proper, opposite the processional entrance into the Altis, at its southwest corner. It was a dedication of the Eleian Leonidas (ἀνδρος μὲν τῶν ἀντιχωρ(ων)), and in Pausanias' time (κατ' ἐμε) it functioned as a hotel to accommodate the Roman governors.

The dedicatory inscription, however, refers to a different person, i.e. Leonidas, son of Leotes from Naxos, as architect and very probably the dedicator as well. He is the same Leonidas whom the city of Psophis in Arkadia honored for some reason with a dedication at Olympia, seen by Pausanias (6.16.5, see no. 44 above = IO 294). It is worth mentioning that in the latter instance too Pausanias does not mention the father of Leonidas from Naxos, Leotes. The text of the inscription seems to contradict Pausanias' report, and that has prompted two possible explanations by G. Treu: first that Pausanias may have been led astray because he did not see anything inscribed on the epistyle. The building underwent major reconstruction and modernisation during Hadrian's reign,\(^{261}\) when the Eleians might have on purpose stuccoed over the inscription. So, Pausanias, who presumably visited Olympia after this renovation, reports what the local exegete probably told him, i.e. that a building of such magnitude was the work of an Elean. Pausanias, however, does not offer any hint, as is usually his custom,\(^{262}\) that his reporting is not based on his own observation.

The second explanation suggested by Treu is that Pausanias may be misreading the inscription, the word ἸΛΞΙΟΣ being easily mistaken from a distance of over six meters for ΗΛΞΙΟΣ instead of ΝΑΞΙΟΣ. But this is very unlike him. As was pointed out earlier (no. 1 above), the fact that the inscription may have been inscribed high up, at a considerable distance, cannot actually be an excuse. Pausanias is not a casual

---

\(^{261}\) See also Mallwitz 1972, 252.

\(^{262}\) See above Chapter I.
periegete/visitor of the Altis. He claims that what he reports is what he himself has observed, or what the local officials told him. And so, it is rather improbable that, if he saw the inscription on the epistyle of the Leonidaion, he misread it because of the distance. In no other instance, among scores of examples, can he be convicted of a mistake of this kind.

Moreover, it seems clear that Pausanias is not reading the inscription which has been recovered, because he omits too much. If he did read it, then too many mistakes have to be explained away: e.g. he misreads the ethnic, he misses the patronymic, and more importantly he does not say anything about the architect. In other words the ἐποίησε clause is totally absent from his text, and an omission of this type is totally uncharacteristic of Pausanias. The name of the building Leonidaion was obviously not Pausanias’ invention, but tradition preserved the story that it was built and perhaps dedicated by a man named Leonidas. That he was an Eleian Pausanias was told probably by a local exegete, or he postulated himself. Related to IO 651 is IO 294 (no. 44 above), the statue of Leonidas set up by the Arkadian city of Psophis. Although Pausanias read and recorded correctly the information of IO 294, it appears very probably that he did not read at all IO 651 which was inscribed on the epistyle of the Leonidaion, but that he relied either on his own speculation or the explanation of the local exegetes. He had no way of knowing that the Leonidas of IO 294 and the Leonidas who dedicated the Leonidaion were most probably the same person. Accordingly his text in 5.15.2 preserves the local explanation about the man who built and/or dedicated the Leonidaion.

63.

5.15.6: ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς στοὰς ἤν οἱ Ἡλεῖοι καλοῦσιν Ἀγνάπτου, τὸν ἀρχιτέκτονα ἐποιημάζοντες τῷ οἰκοδομήματι, ἀπὸ ταύτης ἐπανιόντι ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ βωμὸς Ἀρτέμιδος.
Kunze 1963, 107, pl. 142b: in the excavations of the buildings to the south-southwest of the so-called House of Nero there has been uncovered the altar of Artemis, which dates from the first century A.D., but surrounding finds indicate that it existed since the fifth century B.C. It is of black limestone and well preserved, and on its side, which is covered by whitewash, there is painted with red paint the name of the goddess:

\[saec. \; I \; post\]

\[\text{Ἀρτέμις}^{[ος]}\].

The lettering is late, since the alpha has a middle broken bar, and the shape of the epsilon is lunate.


Commentary: Pausanias, among the altars on which the Eleians offered sacrifices every month, mentions six which were dedicated to Artemis (one of them common to Artemis and Alpheios). One of Artemis' altars in particular, which Pausanias saw to the right of the stoa of Agnaptos, its architect, has been found in the same area bearing the name of the goddess painted. The certainty of this identification arises not only from the inscription on the altar, but also from Pausanias' specific topographical reference of where he saw it.263

In this case, therefore, Pausanias, although he does not indicate that the altar was inscribed, may have read the inscription on its side, or the local exegetes may have given him the goddess' name. Either way his topographical accuracy about this altar of Artemis

\[263 \text{ See also Kunze's (1963, 107) remark: "Es muss sich um den Artemisaltar handeln, den Pausanias auf dem Rückweg vom Hippodrom zur Altis erwähnt (Paus. V 15, 6)."} \]
is confirmed beyond doubt not only by the discovery of the first century A.D. altar in the same area, but more importantly by its inscription.

64.

5.15.12: 'Ἡλεῖοι δὲ καὶ ἡρωσι καὶ γυναιξὶ σπένδουσιν ἡρώων, ὅσοι τε ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ 'Ἡλεῖαι καὶ ὅσοι παρὰ Αἰτωλοῖς τιμᾶς ἐχουσίν.

IO 662: a quadrangular small altar of clay and ashes was found in May 1880, inside the Heroon (so named after the painted inscriptions of the altar), around which ashes and charcoal were also found. The building is to the west of the Theokoleon and to the north of the Byzantine church. The altar is located in the circular interior, on its south side, where the circular wall meets the south wall of the square building. It was stuccoed at least ten times, and each time the word "hero" was repainted over in color. A branch or branches of wild olive(?) were also painted beneath the word in inscriptions b, c, d, f, g, h.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 890.

Height: 0.37-38m. Width: 0.37m. Thickness: 0.54m.

Letter Height is not given by the IO editors.

saec. III–I ante

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>ἡρωρ</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>ἡρωρ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ἡρωρ</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>ἡρως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ἡρωρ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ἡρω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ἡρωρ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ἡρων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ἡρωρ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>ἡρως</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lettering in all ten painted words suggests the late Hellenistic and Roman period, since the majority of the strokes end in triangular serifs.

The genitive singular was apparently the preferred form, since only once (l) the genitive plural is used, while h has the form Ἥρω (genitive singular according to the Attic second declension) which, however, seldom appears in the Hellenistic period.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of the IO editors):

b: eta—only the bottom part of the right vertical; rho—only the bottom part of a vertical; omicron—only the bottom left part of a curving stroke; rho—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
c: rho—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
d: eta—only the bottom part of the right vertical; omicron—only the bottom left part of a curving stroke; rho—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
e: eta—only the bottom tip of the left and the bottom part of the right verticals; rho—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
f: eta—only the bottom part of the right vertical; rho—only the bottom part of a vertical.


Commentary: The date for these painted inscriptions, third to first centuries B.C., is based exclusively on their letter style which of course is considerably later than the building wherein the altar was discovered. The Heroon, so named after the inscribed altar, is situated west of the Theokoleon and north of Pheidias’ Workshop; it is a construction of the classical period (fifth to fourth century, according to Mallwitz 1972, 266-8).

At the end of his enumeration of all the altars in the order in which the Eleians were sacrificing on them every month Pausanias includes a very general statement, that the Eleians also offered sacrifices to heroes and their wives, who were honored in Elis and Aitolia. So far, in his extensive narrative on the altars (5.13.8-14.12, see also nos. 60 and 62 above) Pausanias has not mentioned any altar dedicated to a hero or heroine, except of course Pelops for whom there was a temenos in the Altis, the Pelopeion (5.13.1-3), and Herakles the so-called Parastates (5.14.7). The information which Pausanias offers for each of the altars around the Altis is based no doubt on what the local
exegetes told him, and perhaps on the inscriptions the altars themselves may have had. In fact, for one of them Pausanias explicitly states that he is reading its inscription (5.14.5):

This passage together with the painted inscriptions on the present altar (see also no. 62 above) indicate that at least some of the altars were inscribed with the name or the epithet of the god or goddess to whom they were consecrated.

Certainly the passage in Pausanias about the Eleian sacrifices for heroes and the existence of IO 662 do not prove that Pausanias saw this small, inscribed altar in the Heroon. There is no evidence, however, for the identification of this altar with any one specific hero, except for the IO editors’ plausible suggestion that it may have been consecrated to Iamos, the head of the Iamidai who together with the Klyttidai were the two families of diviners in Elis (6.2.4-5; 17.6). The genitive singular in all but one inscriptions may be referring to one but also to many heroes to whom as a group this altar was consecrated anonymously. In that respect then, Pausanias’ brief comment about the Eleian sacrifices to heroes honored in Elis and Aitolia is indirectly corroborated and confirmed by IO 662, which is evidence that in the Altis, besides Pelops and Herakles, other heroes were also included in the monthly sacrifices of the Eleians.

65.

5.21.12: Χρήματι δὲ ὑπὸ Ἡλείων ἐτεροί τε ὑστερον καὶ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐξημιώθη πῦκτης ὀλυμπιάδι ἐπὶ ταῖς διακοσίαις ὑγθῇ τε καὶ δεκάτης. ὅνομα μὲν τοις ἐξημιωθέντι Ἀπολλώνιος, ἐπίκλησις δὲ ἦν Ἰάντης καὶ πως καὶ ἐπιχώριον τὸ ἐστὶ ἐπίκλησεις τοῖς Ἀλεξανδρεῦσιν ἐστιν. (13) οὕτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀδικεῖν ὑπὸ Ἡλείων 5 κατεγνώσθη πρῶτος Αἰγυπτῶν. κατεγνώσθη δὲ οὓς δούναι χρήματα ἡ λαβεῖν αὐτός, ἀλλὰ τοιόνθε ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἀγώνα ἐξυπρίσκαι.
ἀφίκετο οὐκ ἐσ τὸν εἰρημένον καὶ ρόν, καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ Ἡλεῖων
πειθομένων τῷ νόμῳ ἐλείπετο τοῦ ἀγώνος εἰργεσθαι: τὴν γὰρ
ὁ πρόφασιν, ὡς ἐν ταῖς Κυκλάσις ἡσσοῦ ὑπὸ ἀνέμου κατείχετο 10
ἐναντίων, Ἦρακλείδης γένος καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀλεξανδρεύς ἠλεγχεν ἀπάτην
οὐσάν· ὑστερῆσαι γὰρ χρήματα ἐκ τῶν ἀγώνων αὐτὸν
ἐκλέγοντα τῶν ἐν ἰσόκλεισι. (14) οὕτω δὴ τὸν τε Ἀπολλώνιον καὶ
eἴ ἤ τις ἄλλος ἤκεν οὐ κατὰ προσεξιαί (τῶν πυκτῶν), τούτους
μὲν οἱ Ἡλεῖοι τοῦ ἀγώνος ἀπελαύνοντο, τοὺς Ἦρακλείδης δὲ τὸν
στέφανον παρατάσσων ἀκοντίζοντο ἐνταῦθα ο Ἀπολλώνιος κατεσκευά-
σατό τε τοῖς ἰμάσιν ὡς ἐσ μάχην καὶ ἔσθημα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἦρακλεί-
δην ἦπτετο ἐπικειμένου τε Ἰ ὅ δή τὸν κότινον καὶ καταπεφυγότος
ἐς τοὺς ἡλιανοβίκας. τούτω μὲν δὴ ἐμελεί τὸ κούφον τοῦ νοῦ
βλάφος μέγα ἔσσεσθαι.

Apparatus Criticus:
14 Hitzig in his apparatus comments: τῶν πυκτῶν falsa additum videtur. Indeed it seems
rather unintelligible for such a law to apply exclusively to the boxing event, and these words
were probably added by some scribe who misread the passage because of the μὲν... δέ
particles. Pausanias begins his sentence with Apollonios and then he adds a general statement
καὶ ἔτι τις ἄλλος, which there is no reason to be limited to the boxers, since
Apollonios’ case simply sets an example of the violation of the law’s clause. The τούτους
μὲν clause then refers to its immediate antecedent, and if clause does not require the genitive,
but, if one must be, τῶν ἀθηροτῶν is a preferable correction. With the δέ clause Pausanias
returns to Herakleides, i.e. from the general statement to the particular case of Apollonios. Lines
24-26 of IO 56 suggest that this law was general, and so these two words are suppressed.

IO 56: seven fragments of Pentelic marble, which belonged to one slab were found: fr. a
on June 18, 1880, in the southeast Hall; fr. b and c on May 9, 1879, in the Krypt
of the Stadion; fr. d on May 17, 1878, in the northeast trench of the Krypt; fr. e
on April 23, 1879, to the north of the Echo Colonnade; fr. f on January 4, 1879,
to the south of the Temple of Zeus; and fr. g on April 20, 1876, in the cella of the
Temple of Zeus. All fragments are broken on all sides, except for fragment a
which belongs to the upper right part of the slab and preserves the right part of the
beginning of the inscription, the gable, and the right margin in some lines. All
fragments are well preserved except fr. c whose left part is badly weathered.
Fragments bc and de join. Fragment g is printed the way the IO editors
published it, following the text of the joined fragments de. It should be noted,
however, that this small fragment may not belong at the end of the text, but at the right part of it (e.g. see Merkelbach). The IO editors' facsimile and text of fragment e contains the extreme right part of lines 52–58. The fragments are now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos: fr. a 937; fr. b 645; fr. c 798; fr. d 415;
fr. e 614; fr. f 519; fr. g 58.

Vidi, Phot. all except fr. g.

Height: fr. a: 0.66m. (inscribed surface: 0.40m.); fr. bc: 0.35m.;
fr. de: 0.36m.; fr. f: 0.06m.; fr. g: 0.052m.

Width: fr. a: 0.26m. (inscribed surface: 0.18m.); fr. bc: 0.32m.;
fr. de: 0.31m.; fr. f: 0.12m.; fr. g: 0.052m.

Thickness of all fragments: 0.15m.

Letter Height: 0.006–0.016m. Letter Width maximum: 0.018m.

post 2 post

fragments abc

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{tois} ϑέλον τῶν Ἰτα-
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{καί}
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{Μοιτανός, ἕφρωντισσαν}
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{Αγαθῆς<ως} Τύχη, ἡ σύνκλη-
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{Ἀκτια τρις ἄν-
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{τοῖς μετέχουσι τῶν}
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{τοῦ ἁγῶνος καὶ τῆς}
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{πανηγύρεως τῶν Ἰταλικῶν καὶ Ἰρω-
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{τῶν πανηγύριν καὶ}
\end{verbatim}}\]

\[\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{Ἰα Νεαπολῖταις καὶ}
\end{verbatim}}\]
10 μὴ εξέστω δὲ νεώτερον μετέχειν τοῦ ἀγώνος τῶν Ἰταλικῶν ὑστομτῶν ἢ ἐπιτάκαι-
[8]θετή· καὶ μετεχέτωσαν ἀπὸ μὲν ταῦτης μέχρι τῆς εἰκοσιοῦ· ἐτῶν ἡλικίας παῖδων ἀθλήσεως], μετὰ δὲ ταῦτην ἁν-
[8]ρών. περὶ ἑπάθειλλων· ἄθλος διδόσθω τοῖς νικῶσι

15 τῷ ἀθληταίς [πρὸ] ἡμερῶν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ πανηγύρεως λ. ὥστε πᾶσι μὲν τοῖς ἀγωνιστικοῖς δοθήθηκαί πρὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν· λ. τῆς πανηγύρεως τ. ο. μ. ν ἐκάστης ἡμέ[ρας, ἀπὸ δὲ πεντεκαίδεκαῖς ἡμέρας τοῖς μὲν παισιν] δὲ. Ὁ γ· τοῖς δὲ ἀνδρά-

20 τὸς γαγόρευσιν ἔστω τοῦ στεφάνου [----------------------- δῶν δ' ἀν τῶν ἁθλητῶν ἔρμα [Η]
[8]ε]ρά γένεται, το...[ς ἀνατιθέτωσαν οἱ ἀγωνιστικοὶ τοὺς στεφάνους ἐν Νέα ὀλεὶ ἐν τοῖς γυμναστικῶν], καὶ ἐπιγραφ[έ]-[σ]θηκακαὶ ἀφ' ἢ κρίσεως ἔκαστος ἄνετε[θή]. δῶτε δ' ἀν θαληταί εἰς τ' Ἰταλικὰ ἀπογραφὲς βούλωνται ἐαυτοῦ ἀγωνιούν-
[8]συν, παραγεγραφθῶσαν εἰς Νέαν ὀπὸ πρὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν ὀκὺ ἔλαττον ἢ τριάκοντα τῆς πανηγύρεως, καὶ ἀπογραφέο-

25 [θ]ωςαν πρὸς τοὺς ἀγωνιστικοὺς θέτεται πατρὸθεν καὶ τάς πατρίδας καὶ δ' προαιροῦνται κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν ἀγωνισμα. οἱ
[8]δὲ ἀ[θ]ληταί καὶ ἐλεθέτωσαν καὶ πρὸς γυμναστικῶν [----------------------- ἐπάναγκες δὲ ἐστὶν ἕκαστῳ τῶν ἀθλητῶν ἀπο-
[γρ]άφεσθαι ὄνομα[στὶ ὡς ἀν χρήμα]τιζή· ἢ πα[τρόθεν ἢ ἀλλι-

20 ὁμολογοῦσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγωνιστικῶν δραχμάς δὲ μὴ ἀποτίνησι τὴν ζημίαν, μᾶστειγοῦσθαι. ἡ-
[ν] δὲ τις ὑστερ[ῆ]·[ζῆ· τῆς προθέσειςμας, ἐπαγγέλλεις τὴν αἰτίας τῆς ὑστερήσεως πρὸς τοὺς ἀγωνιστικοῖς ἔστωσαν δὲ

25 [νῦ]σος ὃς ἡ λησθείσαται· λ. ἡ ναυαγία. κατ]ηγορεῖ·τω δὲ [ὁ βουλόμενος εκ τού ἀλλώτρων· [νύσωθα τοῦ ἀγωνιστικοῦ ἀγωνιστικῶν
[γ]ε]σθαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγωνιστικῶν δραχμάς δὲ μὴ ἀποτίνησι την ζημίαν, μᾶστειγοῦσθαι. ἡ-
[ν] δὲ τις ὑστερ[ῆ]·[ζῆ· τῆς προθέσειςμας, ἐπαγγέλλεις τὴν αἰτίας τῆς ὑστερήσεως πρὸς τοὺς ἀγωνιστικοῖς ἔστωσαν δὲ
fragment f

Neapot[síth] η̣

άγιωνοθέται καὶ v[-

ζημιούσθω δ'σο[v

λαμβανέτω [I] εἰς δ[ψυχικά

fragments de

τ][as ᾿Ε]

μεν τῶν πο[λύθων]

μένων ἀγνηφαίρηται

καὶ ἑπὶ τὸν ἀγώνα α[-

κρίσεως ἐκ στάδιων ἀνδρῶν,

πενταχλὸς ἀνδρῶν, πάλη [-

πυνγή ἀνδρῶν, πανικρατίων παίδων,

διπλῆτης ἰππ[ικοῦ δὲ κέλης, συνωρία, τέθριππον

ο[ν καὶ ζημιῶν [καὶ] ἐποχὴ τῶν πρὸς ἄλληλους

[ἀγνωσμάτων]

τῆς πανηγύρεως γεινέσθωσαν ἐν Νέακλεοί πόλις(ει

[καὶ ἱμέρας] πο[ι][πήν ἀγέτωσαν εἰς τὸ Καισαρείου

καὶ ο[ι θεο[ι] τῆς πόλεως κατὰ τὸ σύνθε[ε]

ο[ν τῶν ἀγώνα τῶν] σκηνικῶν ἀγωνίσθαι μετὰ τῆς ἱδίας

ἐκατ[άμβης]

καὶ ο[ι μαστειγοφόροι καὶ ὁ ξυστάρχης, ἔτι] ο[ι

ἀγωνι[σθέται]
The letters are elegantly but inconsistently cut. There is a great fluctuation of height and width and the cutter tends to crowd the letters in the middle of the inscription. Almost all strokes end in triangular serifs. Characteristic letter-shapes: the alpha has a broken middle bar; the loop of the rho is cut almost in the middle of the vertical stroke which thus is extended above it (it is cut the same way as the phi, except that the left loop is missing); the horizontal stroke of the pi extends beyond the verticals the right of which is shorter; the sigma and epsilon are cut very wide.

The abbreviations of the inscription are not printed in the text, because they are easily recognizable: a delta with a vertical stroke extending from the bottom or cut from top to bottom $\delta p. = \delta p. (\chi\mu\alpha\varsigma)$, or similar; the lunar-shape mark $< = \gamma\mu\lambda\varsigma\nu$. All the numbers are overlined, except for those in lines 56, 58 and 59 which have a tick inscribed on the top and curving to their left side.

Remains of Dotted Letters: since the IO editors do not use dots for partially preserved letters, they print some of them in square brackets and others they read.

Line 2: sigma—only the upper right tip of a horizontal stroke.
Line 6: sigma—only the upper right tip and the right bottom part of two horizontal strokes; nu—only a left vertical and a very faint trace of a right slanting strokes.

Line 11: kappa—only the bottom part of a vertical stroke.

Line 12: rho—only the right part of a curving stroke; theta—only the bottom left part of a curving stroke; alpha—a faint trace of right slanting stroke; psi—only an upper right slanting stroke.

Line 13: omicron—only the upper right part of a curving stroke; iota—only the upper tip of a vertical stroke; nu—only the right vertical and a faint trace of part of the slanting strokes.

Line 14: eta—only the upper tips of two vertical strokes; tau—only the left tip of a horizontal stroke, after which there are very faint traces of letter shapes which do not suggest the restoration of the JO editors \([\text{\footnotesize E\&\text{\textcopyright}X}] \mu[\eta]\); of the epsilon the bottom left part of a horizontal and a vertical stroke.

Line 15: eta—only the right vertical and a trace of the left vertical strokes.

Line 16: nu—only part of the right vertical stroke; epsilon—only a faint trace of the upper right tip of a horizontal stroke; upsilon—only an upper left slanting stroke.

Line 17: rho—only the right part of a curving stroke; omicron—only the bottom left part of a curving stroke; tau—only a faint trace of the upper right part of a horizontal stroke; omega or omicron—only the upper part of a curving stroke.

Line 18: theta—only the right part of a curving stroke; kappa—only the upper left part of a vertical stroke; rho—only the right part of a curving stroke.

Line 19: epsilon—only the upper right tip of a horizontal stroke; second epsilon—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.

Line 20: epsilon—only a faint trace of the vertical and the upper and bottom horizontal strokes; iota—only the upper tip of a vertical stroke.

Line 21: nu—only the left vertical stroke.

Line 22: kappa—only the upper left slanting stroke.

Line 23: first alpha—only the upper part of a left and right slanting strokes; second alpha—only the middle part of a left and right slanting strokes.

Line 24: epsilon—only the upper right tip of a vertical and horizontal strokes.

Line 25: eta—only the right vertical stroke.

Line 26: first iota—only the upper half of a vertical stroke; second iota—only the upper third of a vertical.

Line 27: iota—only the upper half of a vertical.

Line 28: sigma—only the bottom right tip of a horizontal; rho—a very faint trace of a vertical and a curving stroke.

Line 29: pi—only part of the upper horizontal; lambda—only a right slanting stroke.

Line 30: kappa—only a very faint trace of a vertical; nu—only a very faint trace of a vertical.

Line 31: epsilon—only an upper horizontal and the upper tip of a vertical stroke.

Line 32: eta—only the upper tips of two vertical; sigma—only an upper horizontal; iota—only the upper tip of a vertical; epsilon—only the upper left corner of a vertical and a horizontal stroke.

Line 33: gamma—only the upper left corner of a vertical and horizontal, which can also be a pi.

Line 34: iota—only the bottom half of a vertical stroke, which it can also be a gamma, a tau, or a rho; epsilon—only the bottom left corner of a vertical and a horizontal.

Line 35: iota—only the bottom part of a vertical; omicron—only the bottom left part of curving stroke.

Line 36: omicron—only the left part of a curving stroke.

Line 37: iota—only the bottom part of a vertical.

Line 38: epsilon—only the upper right tip of a vertical and horizontal; sigma—only the right bottom part of horizontal and a trace of the upper right tip of a horizontal.

Line 39: kappa—only the upper left slanting stroke; tau—only the upper right part of a horizontal; epsilon—only a trace of a vertical.

Line 40: sigma—only the the upper right tip of a horizontal; tau—only the upper left part of a horizontal.

Line 41: kappa—only the upper horizontal.

Line 42: sigma—only the upper horizontal.
Line 53: lambda-only the upper tip of a stroke.
Line 54: alpha-only the right slanting stroke.
Line 55: upsilon-only the upper left slanting; nu-only a trace of the right vertical; pi-only the upper half of a vertical and a horizontal.
Line 57: tau-only part of the upper horizontal.
Line 59: nu-only the left vertical.
Line 60: mu-only the left slightly slanting stroke.

Restorations:
The nine lines which according to the IO editors' restorations are complete give the following letter spaces (two iotas are counted for one letter space, although at least in the beginning of the text it looks that even three iotas can be cut in one letter space): 82.5 for line 11; 80 for lines 13 and 14; 84.5 for lines 17, 18, and 19; 79.5 for line 20; and 84 for line 24. This letter space count points to a ca. 83, but, since all this is based on the accuracy of the restorations, the reader should be alerted, hence the question mark.

The cutter is not consistent in spelling either. The iota adscript for the dative case and the subjunctive sometimes is inscribed and others is not (in line 4 for example the iota adscript is missing from 'Αγαθής<ι>, but is inscribed in Τόχη). Therefore, wherever an iota is missing, it is added to the text in angle brackets. The IO editors print the iotas subscript.

All restorations are those of the IO editors.

Merkelbach using the facsimile of the IO editors places fr. 1 in between frs. bc and a and proposes the following restorations:

Line 1-2: [ένομα "- - - - - - τοὺς] ἀποτελοῦσι τόν 'Ιτα/[λυκὴν καὶ 'Ρωμαίων Σεβαστῶν ἐσολυμπῶν τῶν ἀγώνα καὶ τὴν πανηγυρίν, ὃν ἤνεγκαν πρεσβεύσαντες Αθλος [- -].

Line 5-6: καὶ Ἀκτη τυρίς ἄν/[Ερεν.

Line 11: [καὶ μετεχότεν]σα[ν ἀπὸ μὲν ἔπτακαθέκα μέχρι εἰκοσιν ἠτῶν παίδων κρίσεως,].


Lines 23-31:

[α]ν δὲ τις ὑπερ[ήζε τῆς προθέ]σμίας, ἔπα[γγειλάτω τὴν αὐτὰν τῆς ὑπερέχειας πρὸς τοὺς ἀγωνιστέσας. ἐξοσσαν δὲ]
[νόμος ἡ ληστα[ὰ] ἡ ναυγία. κα]τηγορίζει δὲ [ὁ βουλόμε- νος ἔξ]νοις ἡ Νεαπο[λίτης ἐν δικαστηρίῳ], καὶ δὲν ἀδικ[ί, καὶ]-
[γέ]σθαι τῷ ἄγι[νοσ ὑπὸ τῶν] ἀγωνισμῶν δὲν [δε]νὸντος δὲν ἀγ]ιονοθέται καὶ ν[- - - - - - - ἐ]-
[πι]κληρούσθαι[ν ὑπὸ . . . . . . . . . .]ουρ[ο[- - - καὶ δὲν ἀδικ[ί, ἡ]μιούσθαι δο[ὺν ἃν τοῖς δικασταῖς δοκὶ ἢν δὲ]
[κα]λεύθε καὶ ξύσι[ὸν δόν καὶ ο[έλλων. ὅρκον δὲ]
[μινύντων, οὐ]-
[τα]τ. δο[μί]νοι τὸν ἄν[α κα τὸν 'Από]λλον [καὶ - - - -]κέ[ν - - - - καὶ]
[το]ὺς ἄλλους [θεούς, ὃ μὴν γεγυμνα]κέ[ναι - - -].
Crowther, arguing for three categories, restores lines 10-15 as follows:

[desunt fere 20 lit.] μὴ ἀξιοσάν τοὺς ἀγάνους τῶν Ιταλικῶν Ἰσο[μετουργίαν ἓ ἐπιτακτικῇ-
[6]εκτήτῃ. [καὶ μετεχεῖται] εἰς ἀπὸ μὲν ἀποκαλύπτει αὐτὸν τῆς ἐκκοσαίν έτῶν ἥλικιας ἀγενεῦς κράτεσιν], μετὰ δὲ ταύτην ἁν-

μὲν τοῖς ἀγονιομένοις δοθῇ ναὶ πρὸ ἡμερῶν Λ᾽ τῆς
[πανηγύρεως [θραχ]μῆν] ἐκάστης ἡμέρας, πρὸ δὲ ἡμερῶν τα
τοῖς μὲν παισι καὶ ἀγενεῦς] δρ(αχμᾶς) β′ (ἱμίου), τοῖς
δὲ ἀνδρά-

σιν] τοια [δὲ κ]ατὰ τῆς ἱὸκαρος ἐπίταγμην στεφάνοις
tοῖς παισι καὶ ἀγενεῦς καὶ ἀνδράς σταχύνοις.

Line 11: the IO editors restore: [ἀπὸ μὲν ἀποκαλύπτει αὐτὸν τῆς ἐκκοσαίν έτῶν ἥλικιας πατέων ἀθλήσεως] which would give 87 letter spaces, significantly higher than the other restored lines. The way it is now restored: [ἀπὸ μὲν ταύτης μέχρι τῆς ἐκκοσαίν έτῶν ἥλικιας πατέων ἀθλήσεως] gives 82.5 letter spaces. In addition, the word ἐπιτακτικῆ ἑκτη, already mentioned in lines 10-11, need not be repeated, since in a similar case immediately after this restoration the text continues without repeating the age limit for the men's category; it simply says (end of line 11-beginning of 12): μετὰ δὲ ταύτην ἁν[6]ρῶν. A further complication with this restoration is especially the limit of ἐκκοσαίν έτῶν, for which there is no other evidence, and the problem of whether two or three categories were mentioned in the inscription (see the comments of Geer, Ebert, Frisch, and Crowther).

Line 12: the stone has: ΧΩΡΗΓΙΣΘΟ. 

Line 14: the IO editors restore: [πανη]γύρεως [θραχ]μῆν ἐκάστης. However, there is clearly visible the upper left tip of a horizontal stroke which cannot suggest a delta (it is also printed in the facsimile of the IO), and in addition there are clear traces, albeit faint, which do not suggest the shapes for the letters restored.

Line 16: the IO editors read: [ἐν]γάρυρεώς [ἐξ]ο[τα].

Line 17: the IO editors read: [ἰε]ρὰ γένηται, τ[ούτων ...], but their facsimile reads: ΙΕΝΗΤΑΙΤΟ ...ΔΙΟΙ.


Line 23: the IO editors read: [ε]/[γ]/[τ][σ][π].

Line 25: the stone has: ΗΓΟΡΠΤΟΤ. The IO editors read: [-] καλ ἐὰν, but their facsimile reads: ΙΚΑΙΕΑΝ.

Line 26: the IO editors read: [-]ε[-], but their facsimile reads: ΙΕΓ. 

Line 28: the IO editors read: [-] ζ κ[α']λ [-].

Line 36: the stone has: ΜΒΑΝΤΟΙΕΙΣΟ. 

Line 37: the IO editors read: [- -]μα[- -].

Line 51: the stone has: ΣΥΣΤΑΡΧΗΣΕΠΟΙΟΙΑΙΩΝ.

Lines 52-58: the extreme right part of fragment ε seems to have broken away and I could not find it. The following underlined letters, however, appear in the facsimile of IO and are not treated as lost, because I may have overlooked it in the Βοθησ. 

Line 52: Κατεγ[ε]ρα [- -].
Line 53: ἐπὶ θελων - - .
Line 54: κιθαριζε - - ηλην κτλ.
Line 56: κάρσις κα[μο<1>διν - - .
Line 57: πλάσματι ἐχουθ[νη<1>] - - .
Line 58: Γ. ἐχουθ[νη<1>] - - .
Line 59: ὑπερην]στῆλ, Geer, who is probably right, since the kitharoedes are already mentioned above in line 54; [ - - κιθαριζε]στῆλ, IO editors.
Line 60: [ - - ἐγνο]ς τοῦ διὰ Wissowa; [ - - κιθαριζε]στοῦ διὰ IO editors.
Lines 63-65: I could not find fragment g, but its letters are not treated as lost, because I may have overlooked it in the Αποθήκη.
Line 65: the IO facsimile has: ΙΑΠΙΚΙ, but the text reads: [ - - πο]λικ[δι - - ], (this has already been pointed out by Geer 1965, 217 note 52).


Commentary: The date for this inscription, after A.D. 2, is that of Geer who offers a complete discussion of all pertinent information about the date of the institution of the Sebasta at Naples.264

Pausanias in his elaborate exegesis of the particular group of Zeus statues (see also no. 12 above ), erected from the fines imposed by the Eleians on cheating athletes, mentions the reason why each statue was set up. The most common and often repeated “crime” of the athletes was bribery. It is not surprising that all briberies explained by Pausanias happened only during the so-called heavy events, wrestling, boxing, pankration, and pentathlon which were the most difficult and dangerous ones.

264 Geer 1965, 216-217 note 40 has corrected the apparent typographical error in the IO (p. 124) where the founding of the games is dated in the 195,2 Olympiad (= A.D. 2) which is printed instead as “2 vor Chr.”
One of the punishments, however, imposed by the Eleians stands out as different in that no bribery is involved. In the 218th Olympiad (A.D. 93) a Greek from Alexandria, the boxer Apollonios surnamed Rantes, became the first athlete from Egypt to be fined on account of lying about his delay in meeting the deadline of the games. For according to Pausanias' narrative the Eleians did not exclude him simply because he showed up late for registration, but because his excuse was exposed as false by another competitor, Herakleides from Alexandria, who was crowned then and there by the agonothetes without a contest in the boxing event. The law according to whose proviso Apollonios was excluded is not known from other sources than IO 56.

This inscription is a document which sets forth the rules to be followed for another major competition, the Sebasta at Naples. The IO editors have assumed correctly that the discovery of so long a document in Olympia suggests that the Sebasta were modeled after the Olympic Games, hence these games include in their full title the epithet ἡσσαλώπτες. Otherwise, there was no need nor any purpose for setting up such a detailed document in the sanctuary of Zeus. The probability of this argument is certainly assured by Pausanias' narrative concerning Apollonios from Alexandria. Lines 23-26 of the inscription describe the procedure to be followed in case some athlete appears late for registration: if the restoration for line 25 is correct, then the athlete could be allowed

---

265 The only other such fine involves a certain Sarapion from Alexandria who in the 201st Olympiad (A.D. 25), when he saw the competitors in the pankration, fled Olympia one day before the game was to take place, on account of which cowardice he was fined by the Eleians (5.21.18: τοῦτον ζημιωθέντα ἐπὶ δειλίαν μόνον τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων καὶ αὐτῶν μνημονεύσωσιν Ἀγυμπτέων).

266 As Papachatzis observes (309 note 1), this passage of Pausanias also suggests that before the official proclamation and coronation of the victors in the last day of the games, the agonothetes or the judges, presumably after each event and in case of a dispute like Apollonios', had the power of proclaiming and pre-crowning the victors who would then participate in the events of the final day.

267 For a full account of the information provided by IO 56 see Geer's discussion. For prize money and a refutation of the myth of ancient Greek amateur athletics see Young 1984, passim.
participation in the Games provided he could prove that he was ill, a victim of robbers, or in a shipwreck. Indeed, according to Pausanias' report, Apollonios' excuse to the officials was the high winds which inhibited sailing from the islands of the Kyklades to the Peloponnesian shore for fear of shipwreck. This explanation for his delay would probably have been accepted and Apollonios would have been permitted to enter the boxing competition, but unfortunately for him, his "fellow" athlete Herakleides challenged his alibi. Herakleides persuaded the officials that the Athens participat in order to win some extra money. The Hellanodikai, in turn, not only denied him participation in the boxing event, but they also fined Apollonios (probably the amount of the extra sum he picked from Asia Minor) and declared his fellow athlete Herakleides the winner in boxing.

Finally, the incident of Apollonios, dated by Pausanias in the 218th Olympiad (A.D. 93), and the inscription IO 56, dated sometime after A.D. 2 when the Games at Naples were instituted, belong to roughly the same period. Very probably the incident of Apollonios was unique and perhaps the only such violation in the history of the Olympics. For Pausanias is here explaining the Zanes, i.e. what rules the athletes violated and why they were fined. If there was a similar violation, earlier than Apollonios, Pausanias would have read the inscription on the Zeus' statue and would have mentioned it. But was this law in existence before Apollonios' case? Pausanias' text with the genitive ἄνα τὸν ποτάρον may imply that because of Apollonios and from that time on, all boxers arriving late are excluded if their excuse is not accepted, but such an exclusionary measure makes no sense. If, however, the text is corrected (the genitive suppressed, or corrected to τὸν ἅλημνῷ τὸν instead of τὸν ποτάρον), then the text would imply that the law was already in existence before Apollonios' time. There is no independent evidence to suggest the actual time for such a measure, but the explosion of
new Games instituted during the Roman period in Greece, Asia Minor and Italy, suggests a rather late date. This is understandable when the officials had to add criteria which would insure the schedule and time-frame of the games with their various events, especially when there were by now far greater numbers of athletes who wanted to participate in some or all of the games. At any rate, both the incident of Apollonios, reported by Pausanias, and IO 56 belong to the first century A.D. Even if the law was in existence much earlier (sometime before the institution of the Sebasta at Naples which include this regulation), there was no known fine based on it at Olympia until A.D. 93, when Apollonios’ case was presented before the Hellanodikai.

5.10.5: τοῦ δὲ ἐν Ὁλυμπίαι ναοῦ (sc. of Zeus) τῆς ὑπὲρ κιόνων περιθεούσης ζώνης κατὰ τὸ ἐκτὸς ἄσπιδες εἶσίν ἐπίχρυσοι μία καὶ εἴκοσι ἄριθμον, ἀνάθημα στρατηγοῦ Ῥωμαίων Μομίου κρατήσαντος Ἀχαϊῶν πολέμωι καὶ Κόρινθῶν τε ἐλόντος καὶ Κορινθίους τοὺς Δωριέας ποιήσαντος ἀναστάτους. 6

5.24.4: Ῥωμαίων δὲ οὔτε ἄνθρωπος ὀὕτε ὀπόσοι τῆς βουλῆς οὐδένα Μομίου πρότερον ἀνάθημα ἤσμεν ἐς ἱερὸν ἀναθέντα Ἐλληνικὸν, Μόμιος δὲ ἀπὸ λαφύρων ἀνέθηκε τῶν ἕξ Ἀχαιῶν Δία ἐς Ὁλυμπίαιν χαλκοῦν. οὗτος ἔστηκεν ἐν ἁριστερῷ τοῦ Δακεδαμονίων ἀναθη-ματος, παρὰ τὸν πρῶτον ταύτη τοῦ ναοῦ κένα. 5

5.24.8: ἔστι δὲ καὶ πρὸς ταῖς τείχει τῆς Ἀλτεως Ζεὺς ἐπὶ ἕλιου τετραμένου δυσμάς, ἐπίγραμμα οὐδέν παρεχόμενος· ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ οὗτος Μομίου τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἁχαϊῶν εἶναι πολέμου. 10

IO 278, 279: a pedestal of Pentelic marble found on April 7, 1879, in the east Byzantine wall, opposite the south end of the Bouleuterion. It is preserved intact and on its upper surface there are footprints which indicate that a bronze horse was mounted on the pedestal. The base bears two inscriptions on the two short sides (278 and 279), of which 279 is a later copy of 278. The base is now in the Altis, in situ.

Height: 0.293-0.297m. Width: 0.895m. Breadth: 2.25m.

Letter Height: 0.025-0.035m.

*IO 278*  
*post* 146 *post*  
NON-STOICH. ca. 21

Λεύκιος Μόμμιος Λευκίου υλός,  
στρατηγὸς ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων,  
Διὶ Ὄλυμπώι.

*IO 279*  
*medio saec. I ante*—*medio saec. I post*  
NON-STOICH. ca. 21

Λεύκιος Μόμμιος Λευκίου υλός,  
στρατηγὸς ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων,  
Διὶ Ὄλυμπώι.

*IO 280, 281:* eleven fragments of Pentelic marble of which the first four a+b and c+d join and comprise 280, while e+f+g+h+i+k+l join and comprise 281. They were found: a b in March 7, 1876, in front of the east side of Zeus' temple; c d in December 6, 1877, to the east of Zeus' temple; f in March 11, 1876, to the east of Zeus' temple; e g h in January 14 and March 11, 1878, in the east Byzantine wall; i in January 23, 1878, to the west side of Zeus' temple; k in November 6, 1878, opposite the east front of Zeus' temple; l in May 9, 1879. The fragments, which comprise the two inscriptions, seem to suggest that they were part of one pedestal, like the one of *IO 278* and 279: the lettering of 281 seems to be a copy of 280, and the text of all four inscriptions is identical. The fragments of both 280 and 281 are now in Ἀποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. a b 35, c d 265, f 39, e g h 314, i 312, k 448, l 643. *Vidi, Phot.*

280 a b Height: 0.12+0.18m. Width: 0.41m. Breadth: 0.25m.

281 Height: 0.24m. Width: 0.89m. Breadth: 0.225m.
The lettering of 278 and 280 is simple and agrees with a post 146 B.C. date, whereas the letter style of 279 and 281 is more elaborate, with strokes ending in triangular serifs and a broken middle bar of the alpha.

Remains of Dotted Letters:

280 Line 1: mu—only the bottom tip of a left slightly slanting stroke.
   Line 2: sigma—only the top slanting stroke; tau—only a top horizontal; rho—only the top part of a curving stroke; alpha—only the upper triangular part; eta—only the upper tips of two vertical strokes; upsilon—only the upper triangular part; pi—only the bottom left tip of a vertical.
   Line 3: mu—only the left slanting and the middle left strokes.

281 Line 1: upsilon—only the bottom tip of a vertical.


Commentary: The dates for these four inscriptions, after 146 B.C. and 50 B.C.—A.D. 50, are based on the assumption that Mummius’ original statues must have been dedicated after his success in 146 B.C. Therefore, IO 278 and 280 are dated after 146 B.C., while IO 279 and 281 are dated, based on the lettering, between the middle of the first century B.C. and the middle of the first century A.D.

At the end of book 5 in his section of the statues of Zeus, scattered in the Altis and dedicated by cities and private citizens, Pausanias includes two Zeus statues erected by Mummius. One of them, Pausanias states definitively, is Mummius’ offering from the spoils of the Achaeans. The exegete also adds that Mummius was the first Roman, so
far as he knew, who, as an individual or a senator, dedicated a statue of a god in a Greek sanctuary (5.24.4). From the same victorious war Mummius had also dedicated twenty-one shields which Pausanias saw hanging on the outside frieze of the temple of Zeus (5.10.5). For the other Zeus statue, since there is no inscription on its base, Pausanias reports what he was told probably by the local exegetes at Olympia (ἐξεγέρτο 5.24.8), that it too had been set up by Mummius.

None of these three dedications has been found during the excavations at Olympia. Of the four inscriptions that are mentioned above the first two (IO 278-279) are inscribed on a pedestal that supported a statue on horseback which therefore could not have been a Zeus. The last two (IO 280-281) survive in fragmentary form, but the material of the stone, the lettering and the text are similar to those of IO 278-279 (the only difference is in the layout of the text). This suggests that IO 280-281, similar to IO 278-279, was part of a second pedestal of a statue of Mummius on horseback. But Pausanias did not omit from his narrative only these two statues of Mummius. At Olympia there have been discovered two more inscribed pedestals: IO 319 refers to a statue of Mummius dedicated by the city of Elis on account of his δεινή and εὐδοκία towards the Eleians and the other Greeks. IO 320, which forms part of a long pedestal, supported a group of eleven statues (IO 320-324), i.e. the consul Mummius and the ten legates who were appointed by the Senate to assist him in the reorganisation of the province Achaea after 146 B.C. All these four statues that have been found at Olympia are omitted by Pausanias from his discussion of the offerings in the Altis. Surely, the exegete must have had a reason for

---

268 Mummius' consulship or proconsulship of Achaia is also mentioned in IO 56 (lines 53 and 64), but as a chronological reference in the border dispute between the Messenians and the Lakedaimonians, which was judged by Milesian ambassadors.
this discrimination, and a more careful examination of his text may provide a better understanding for his attitude toward the Roman general.

Mummius was involved in one of the most significant events in the history of the relations between Greeks and Romans. It took place in 146 B.C. when Mummius defeated the Achaean Confederacy, sacked and levelled Korinth, and freed the Greeks. This year for Pausanias marked the end of Greek history. In the beginning of book 2, the Korinthisaka, Pausanias briefly narrates the events of Corinth’s annihilation by Mummius and lays the blame squarely on the Achaean Confederacy and its leader Critolaus (2.1.2 and 2.2.2). It is not until his Achaiaka (7.16) that Pausanias narrates in more detail the final battle and the total destruction of Corinth. Although here too Pausanias finds fault with the strategy of the Achaean commanders Critolaus and Diaeus in the battlefield, nevertheless one cannot help but notice in his narrative a sense of disappointment in Mummius’ excessive behavior after the victory. Pausanias states that Mummius did not wait for the ten legates to arrive, whom the senate had appointed to assist him in the reorganization of the province: he killed all the males in the city; sold the women and children and the slaves too; and “the most admired monuments of piety and art he carried off; the less valuable he presented to Philopoemen, the general of Attalus, and in my time [i.e. Pausanias’] the spoils of Corinth were still to be seen at Pergamum.” Furthermore, Pausanias adds, after a few years much of what Mummius and the legates had decreed for the new province was annulled by the Romans because they pitied the Greeks. Such a statement does not constitute outright hatred or prejudice against the Romans, although Pausanias, one may argue, may have been justified if he did so. Pausanias’ personal negative opinion about Mummius is only implicit. Mummius’ excessive actions after the victory no doubt reminded Pausanias of another parallel which he had narrated in his Attika, that of Sulla’s destruction of Athens in 86 B.C. There, however, the city is not Corinth, but Athens, and therefore Pausanias is more straightforward: Sulla, he notes,
acted "with cruelty you would not expect from a Roman" (ἀγριότερα ἦς ἀνθρώπες ἔκδεσ ἦν ἀγράσπαθαι 'Ραμαιτοῦ 1.20.7). Be that as it may, it seems that Pausanias' statements in books 2 and 7 concerning Mummius do not display open partiality on his part, but constitute an attempt at a rather balanced approach.269

While visiting Olympia, however, Pausanias records two (or possibly three) dedications by Mummius: the shields on the outer frieze of Zeus' temple and one (or two) statues of Zeus. In his note of the certain statue of Zeus (5.24.4) Pausanias remarks that Mummius was the first Roman, so far as he knew (Ἱστομων), who, as an individual or a senator, dedicated (ἀνεπέμπε) a statue of a god in a Greek sanctuary. So far, this statement has been explained as a lapse by Pausanias, since there is evidence, which are discussed below, that Romans made dedications at Delos and Delphi, dating before 146 B.C. (Habicht 1985, 100 notes 16-17).270 This, of course, is true, if with the word

269 In his chapter "The Roman World of Pausanias" C. Habicht (1985, 117-140 and the bibliography there) has recently re-evaluated Pausanias' statements and has put forth a more balanced response to the problem, which coincides with the historical events that marked the relations of Greeks and Romans. He has argued that, as far as Pausanias is concerned,

the Romans, like the Persians, the Macedonians, the Gauls, and the Pontic king Mithridates, are foreigners who do not belong in Greece and ought not to rule there. They had not contributed to Greek culture, as expressed in religion, literature, art, and philosophy (p.122-3). ... The picture becomes a little brighter in Pausanias' own time, owing to the fact that the good emperors succeeded not only in reconciling the monarchy with the ideology of the republic, but also in reconciling the Greek world to its fate. ... Their philhellenism achieved a great deal, and this was acknowledged by the Greeks. Pausanias is no exception (p.123).

These comments seem to divide Pausanias' Roman world into two sections: the first, the Roman attitudes towards Greece during the Republic and Early Principate were viewed by Pausanias negatively, whereas in the Late Principate things changed for the better, and so, in response, did opinions of Greeks about the Roman rule in Greece. The latter may be supported by Pausanias' narrative in which statues of Roman Emperors are noted in the Altis: of Hadrian, Trajan (5.12.6) Augustus (5.12.7); of Roman Emperors in the Metroon (5.20.9), a building which was converted from a temple to the Mother of Gods into a temple to all Roman Emperors (Mallwitz 1972, 160-163). Statues of most Roman Emperors have been found at Olympia and are now in the Roman Hall of the New Museum.

Even so, Pausanias' negative opinion about the early Roman involvement in Greece does not necessarily imply that he was prejudiced when he mentioned events of that period (one exception is the Makedonians whom Pausanias blames for Greece's submission to Rome, but they are actually only a part and not all of Greece). Instead, it appears that Pausanias incorporates in his narrative what he thought was significant enough for his reader to know when he visited the same place, regardless of his strong personal views.
Pausanias means “any kind of dedication.” The word ἀνενηχα is employed by Pausanias for the first two dedications of Mummius. Yet, his assertion that Mummius was the first Roman to offer a dedication to a Greek sanctuary is not appended to the first dedication, the twenty-one gilded shields, but to the statue of Zeus. This implies that in this case the word ἀνενηχα does not denote “any kind of dedication,” as has generally been assumed, because in that case Pausanias would have made this statement when he recorded the shields. Instead ἀνενηχα here should be understood as referring to a specific kind of dedications in the Altis, with which Pausanias is occupied at the end of book 5, namely statues portraying mainly Zeus and other gods. More importantly, of the fourteen Zeus statues that Pausanias includes in his narrative only three are dedications offered by individuals: a Zeus by Kleolas from Phlius, another Zeus by Hippagoras, Phrynon and Ainesidemos from Leontinoi, all of them Greeks, and finally the Zeus by Mummius. The remaining eleven statues were offerings dedicated by Greek cities to commemorate military success. Obviously, the small number of individual dedications of statues of Zeus of which only one is by a non-Greek, Mummius', may imply that the Eleian Boule granted permission only in exceptional cases.

The uniqueness of Mummius’ setting up in the Altis a statue of Zeus is further corroborated by the evidence outside Pausanias, to which scholars have referred as contradicting the exegete’s statement about Mummius. The only other author who mentions dedications by Roman generals before Mummius is Plutarch. In his Sulla

---

270 Habicht (1985, 100) correctly points out that “this is Pausanias’ error, but a harmless error, and not so important as his willingness to make such observations.”

271 Kunze (1963, 107) reports that a small inscribed and reused offering of this Phrynon from Leontinoi has been discovered in the excavations where the altar of Artemis has been found. He does not give a text and the inscription has not been published since. Also IO 838, a fragmentary marble base which reads AIN[- - -], has been tentatively associated with this Ainesidemos.

(12.6) Plutarch relates the story of the dictator's demand to the Delphic authorities to send to him various offerings from the sanctuary. This, he notes, reminded the Amphiktyons of how differently previous Roman generals behaved towards Greek sanctuaries: Flamininus, Acilius, and Aemilius Paulus not only did not plunder the sanctuaries, but instead made additional gifts to them and increased their honor and dignity. This is too general a statement and is of no help concerning the kind of dedications that the three victorious Roman generals made at Delphi. Of these three, however, only Acilius' offering is not known.

In his *Flamininus* (12.5-7) Plutarch records that Flamininus was proud for liberating Greece, and so he dedicated silver shields, among them his own long one, and also a golden wreath to Apollo at Delphi. On both of them Flamininus inscribed epigrams which Plutarch quotes and which emphasize Titus', the descendant of Aeneas, magnificent gift to the Greeks, i.e. their liberty. The same offerings, a shield and crown, that the general made at Delos, as is recorded in the accounts of the Hieropoioi (*IDélos 442 B*85-86, 89, 178 = *ILS* 8765). In the same accounts there are also listed other Romans, who dedicated mainly wreaths, among them Scipio (*IDélos 442 B*100-102 = *ILS* 8765). Aemilius Paulus' dedication at Delphi has been found in front of the entrance to the temple of Apollo (*FD* III.4.36). It is a column which was set up originally by Perseus in order to commemorate his victory that never came. Paulus instead placed his own statue on top and inscribed that the offering was a dedication from the booty of the battle at Pydna.

This evidence does not conform to Pausanias' criteria for his statement about Mummius, and therefore it is not proof beyond doubt that Pausanias made an error. If anything, the evidence corroborates the exegete's observation. Apparently the Roman generals' offerings to Greek sanctuaries consisted primarily of booty taken from the battlefield (only shields are mentioned), wreaths, and self portraits. No statues protraying
a god. As Pausanias’ assertion claims, there is no evidence, so far at least, that any Roman before Mummius dedicated a statue of a god in a Greek sanctuary.

From his narrative of Olympia, therefore, Pausanias omits the four statues that have been found in the excavations, although he undoubtedly saw them in the Altis, because all four were self portraits of the victorious consul, whereas the dedications of Mummius he mentions were not. This discrimination is not accidental, and the omission of Mummius’ self portraits is deliberate and indicative of Pausanias’ attitude. It is not simply that in this part of his narrative of Elis Pausanias is reporting only those statues which are depictions of Zeus in the Altis. Had he wanted to mention Mummius’ statues, he would have done so. Apparently, the Eleian Boule honored the Roman conqueror and also the Senate’s embassy with statues in the precinct of Zeus, while Mummius set up two statues of himself, a common practice of the Roman conquerors. The reason for Pausanias’ deliberate omission of these four dedications of Mummius, which in a sense glorify the personal achievement of the Roman consul, cannot be anything else, but his negative opinion about Mummius.

And yet, this negative attitude does not lead him away from his main task, to provide an explanation of the stories and monuments he deems notable. Pausanias chooses to incorporate in his work only three of the many dedications of Mummius he saw in the Altis, because they were remarkable and extraordinary. The twenty-one gilded shields, were, after all, fitted on the outside of the frieze of the temple of Zeus! Likewise, Mummius was given permission to erect certainly one statue of Zeus commemorating his victory. His comment about the purported second Zeus of Mummius implies that the first Zeus had an inscription which, according to his wording, looks similar to the wording of IO 278-279 and 280-281, with the possible additional statement that the statue was paid for from the booty of the war. The uniqueness of this monument and the epigraphical evidence seem to suggest that Pausanias tried to be impartial, and his assertion that
Mummius was the first Roman to have offered such a dedication in a Greek sanctuary is not it appears on present evidence in error.

67.

5.25.5: Ἐστὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄκραν ἐν Σικελεῖα τὴν τετραμμένην ἐπὶ λείψῃ καὶ νότου, καλουμένην δὲ Πάχυνον, Μοτῆπα πόλις· οἰκοῦσι δὲ Λίβυες ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ Φοίνικες. τούτοις τοῖς ἐν Μοτῆπῃ βαρβάροις Ἀκραγαντῖνοι καταστάντες ἐς πόλεμον καὶ λείαν τε καὶ λάφυρα ἀπ’ αὐτῶν λαβόντες ἀνέθεσαν τοὺς παίδας ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν τοὺς 5 χαλκοὺς, προτείνοντάς τε τὰς δεξιὰς καὶ εἰκοσίμους εἰχομένους τῶν θεών. κεῖνα δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τείχους οὕτω τῆς Ἀλτεως· Καλάμι-δος δὲ εἶναι σφάς ἔργα ἐγὼ τε εἰκαζόν καὶ ἐς αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὰ αὑτὰ ἐξεν ὁ λόγος. (6) Σικελίαν δὲ ἐθνὴ τοσάδε οἰκεῖ, Σικανοὶ τε καὶ Σικελοὶ καὶ Φρύγες, οἱ μὲν ἐς Ἰταλίας διεβεβηκότες ἐς αὐτήν, 10 Φρύγες δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σκαμάνδρου ποταμοῦ καὶ χώρας τῆς Τρωιάδος· οἱ δὲ Φοίνικες καὶ Λίβυες στόλων ἀφίκοντο ἐς τὴν νῆσον κοινώι καὶ ἀποκοικισμένους ἔσοι. τοσάτα μὲν ἐν Σικελίαι ἐθνὴ βάρβαρα· Ἐλλήνων δὲ Δωριέως τε ἐχουσίν αὐτὴν καὶ ἰωνίων καὶ τοῦ Φωκικοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁττικοῦ γένους ἑκατέρου μοῖρα οὖ πολλή. 15

Kunze 1958, 38-40, 176, pl. 24-25 (= VI. Berichte, 1958): two bronze fragments of a shield were found in the southwest corner of the Stadion. The inscription is cut on the inner outer rim of the shield and it is now in the Bronze Collection of the New Museum. Olympia Museum Inv. No. B 2590.

Diameter: 0.85-0.88m. Letter Height: 0.025-0.03m.

460–440 ante

[ι]ηρὰ vacat Συρακοσίων καὶ Ἀκραγαντίων λάφυρα.

The script of the inscription is Ionic, and the letter shapes are (LSAG 262 fig. 43): α3, γ1, λ3, ν1 (with the right stroke vertical and not slanting), ρ1, σ2, υ4, φ2 (but the middle vertical extends on the top of the curving). The omega is inscribed as a lambda with two horizontals at the bottom left and right. (…A…).

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of Kunze 1958, pl. 25):
alpha—only the bottom part of two slanting strokes.
Restorations: the restoration is Kunze’s. Albeit hesitantly, Kunze prefers this reading instead of the alternative:

\[\text{"\text{ερε}, ναυάι \Sigmaυρικός\text{ο\text{ιο} \text{σκόπημα}}\text{οι (\text{διονήσιον}) Α\text{κραγαντίες} λά\text{φυς}α} (Cook and Lazzarini, however, omit the first word \[\text{ερε}\text{)}\] for two reasons: first it seems unlikely that the Syrakusans had adopted the Ionic script so early (middle of the fifth century B.C., see also SEG XV, 252); and second the preposition \text{από} with the word \text{λά\text{φυς}α} is “allenfalls möglich und entspräche dann sachlich unserem ersten Vorschlag. Aber das nachklappemde \text{λά\text{φυς}α will dabei nicht gefallen” (176).}

As is, the dedication of the shield may be a reference to the incident of 452/1 B.C., and, therefore, an offering by Duketios. If the dedicators are the Syrakusans, then the shield may be a reference to the battle at Himera in 445 B.C. between the Syrakusans and the Akragantines.


Commentary: The date for this inscription, middle of the fifth century B.C., is based on the letter style. Depending on how \text{Συρικός[ -]} is restored the shield may have been taken as booty from one of two known incidents: in the 460s and 450s the Sikeliote leader Duketios tried to ally all the Sikeliots against the Greek colonists and establish a Sikeliote power on Sicily. He was able to win a victory against a Syrakusan and Akragantine force near Motye in 452/1 B.C., which, however, did not have any permanent effect, since next year he appeared in Syrakuse as a suppliant and was sent in exile to Korinth. The shield, therefore, may have been sent to Olympia by Duketios as an offering for his victory over the Syrakusans and Akragantines near Motye (Kunze). If the Syrakusans are restored as the dedicators, then the shield may be a reference to the victory they won over the Akragantines in 445 B.C. at the river Himera (Diodorus XII.8.26, and Cook, Jeffery). There is also another possibility which will be discussed later, namely that the genitves indicate possession.

After his description of the various buildings, the altars, and the statues of Zeus in the Altis, Pausanias proceeds to other interesting dedications that were not representations
of Zeus (ὅποσα δὲ ἄλλακα καὶ οὐ μνημοείς ἔστι Διός, ἐπιμνησόμεθα καὶ τούτον 5.25.1). Among them Pausanias includes the Akragantine dedication of the bronze youths that were set up on the Altis wall with their right hands stretched in a stance of prayer. No signature of the sculptor was inscribed on these, but tradition had it that they were made by Kalamis. Their style and antiquity apparently convinced Pausanias as well. Kalamis’ activity coincided with the period during which Pausanias dates the victory of the Akragantines over Motye, i.e. the first half of the fifth century B.C., which is further corroborated by independent epigraphical evidence (for signatures of this sculptor see Marcadé). But Pausanias offers no hint as to where in the Altis the wall that served as the base of the statues is. According to his own description of the statues, however, he must be referring to the old Greek wall, which enclosed the Altis from the south, to the south of Zeus’ temple. For this spot in the Altis, as Papachatzis (1974-81, vol. 3, 318 notes 2 and 4) has suggested, is ideal for Pausanias’ comment about the way the Akragantine youths were portrayed, because from that spot in the Altis the statues would be appropriately facing the temple of Zeus to whom they were praying. This presumed position of the Akragantine youths is further corroborated by the find spot of Hippotion’s base (no. 14 above), which was, according to Pausanias, on, or near the Akragantine monument.

Moreover, Pausanias provides the reason which prompted the Akragantine dedication at Olympia: Akragas fought a war with the barbarian, i.e. Sikeliote, inhabitants of Motye and having captured spoils and booty from them the Akragantines dedicated the youths at Olympia (λέγειν τε καὶ λάφυρα ἀπ’ αὐτῶν λαμβάνεις ἀνέθεσαν τοὺς πάθεσις ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν τοὺς Χαλκοῦς 5.25.5). His geographical note, however, of where Motye was situated is wrong. It was not at Pachynon, the southernmost promontory, but near Lilybaion, at the westernmost cape. It has been suggested (Marcadé and Papachatzis), therefore, that Pausanias may inadvertently be confusing two Akragantine victories, both
dated in the middle of the fifth century B.C., over Motye and over Motyon, another village in the vicinity of Akragas. Finally, Pausanias ends his exegesis of the Akragantine dedication with a brief list of the inhabitants of Sicily (Σικελικάν ἦν τοσάδε οἰκεῖο), in order to elaborate on his earlier statement that Motye was inhabited by Libyans and Phoinicians (5.25.6). He lists first the barbarians (ἐθνη βαρβάρα) and where they came from to Sicily, and then he adds that of the Greek inhabitants of Sicily the majority are Dorians and Ionians, while Phocians (i.e. Aioliants) and the Athenians are also present on a smaller scale. This is only a footnote, as it were, on Sicilian geography and anthropology, not unlike Thukydides', who in the introduction to his narrative of the Sicilian expedition (6.1.1-5.3), first enumerates the barbarians on the island and then the Greek colonies (τοσάδε ἦν Ἠσαχα τὰ ἁμπαντα 6.2.1 = τοσάτα ἦν ἦλληνων καὶ βαρβάρων Σικελικάν ήκεί 6.6.1). This does not imply that Pausanias follows Thukydides' account, since fuller ones certainly existed. The way he narrates his brief note, however, may betray Thukydidean influence.

It is true that Pausanias does not explicitly state that he saw the spoils and booty of the Akragantines. Even so, his narrative may arguably imply that the exegete, in addition to the youths, also saw hanging from the Altis wall one or many inscribed spoils, i.e. shield, spear, helmet, greave and so on, taken from Motye. And to that extent, the discovery of the inscribed shield supports his narrative that he saw dedications of Akragas at Olympia. After all, Pausanias is not including in his narrative all the monuments that he saw in the Altis during his visit, but only those which to him were the most interesting and worthy to be incorporated in his Εἰλιάκα.

Notwithstanding this, the words that Pausanias uses recall those that are found on a dedicatory inscription. Therefore, they may illuminate the inscription on the shield that has been found in the Stadion at Olympia. The way Pausanias is using the word λαψυρα
(in λείαν τε καὶ λάφυρα ἀπ' αὐτῶν λαβόντες 5.25.5273) certainly warrants the hypothesis that the genitive of possession in the inscription need not refer to the defeated, as Kunze suggests, since Pausanias normally employs the preposition ἀπὸ in order to indicate from whom the spoils were taken. It may thus refer to the victors, i.e. the shield was dedicated by the victorious Syrakusans and Akragantines and not by the Sikeliote leader, Duketios. Moreover, the text of the inscription, with the word ἵππα in the beginning and λάφυρα at the end, lays strong emphasis on the objects themselves, since the word λάφυρα refers directly to ἵππα.274 Thus, the inscription, as it is restored with the two genitives, may be translated “these are the sacred spoils of the Syrakusans and the Akragantines”, i.e. dedicated to Zeus by them, and not taken from them.

68.

5.25.11: Ο ð πόρω τε τοῦ Ἀχαιῶν ἀναθήματος καὶ Ἡρακλῆς ἐστὶν ύπὲρ τοῦ ζωστήρας αὐτού τοῦ ἀμαζόνα εἵπεπον γυναῖκα· τούτον Εὐαγάρας μὲν γένος Ζαγκλαῖος ἀνέθηκεν, ἔποιήσε τε Κυθωνιάτης Ἀριστοκλῆς. ἐν δὲ τοῖς μάλιστα ἀρχαῖοι καταρθομήσασθαι καὶ τὸν Ἀριστοκλέα ἐστι· καὶ σαφῶς μὲν ἡλικίαν οὖκ ἔχοι τις ἀν εἰπέτι αὐτοῦ, δῆλα δὲ ὡς πρότερον ἐτι ἐγενέτο πρὶν ἤ τῇ Ζάγκλῃ τὸ ὅνωμα γενέσθαι τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν Μεσσήην.

273 See also Lazzarini 1976, 164-165, but she includes wrongly this inscription in the category of dedicatory expressions which employ: “Nominative (the dedicators) + ἀπὸ and genitive (the defeated)”, for which, however, she has to restore Συρακόσα[το] ἀνέθηκαν ἀπ' τ' Ἀκραγαντίων λάφυρα, although Kunze indicates that there is not so much space. From all the dedicatory inscriptions on spoils that Lazzarini has collected no category emerges in which this inscription may fit (pp. 163-168 and 316-323 nos. 956-1000).

274 Kunze puts a period after ἵππα, because there is a very long empty space before the word Συρακόσα[το]. Even with the period, however, it would be a novum to restore a nominative, because of the presence of the word λάφυρα. The only other example from Olympia, in which the word ἵππα is followed or preceded by another sentence, is a sixth century B.C. Eleian dedication of a bronze bowl which bears the inscription (Il. Bericht 104-105; SEG XI, 1204): τοῖς Ἡλέκτοις τοῦ Σίκειοι. ἵππα λάφυρα (the last two words inscribed by another cutter). In this example the two sentences have two different subjects, or the last two words may also be the object of the first sentence. See also Miltiades' dedications, no. 70 below, and Lazzarini 1976, 163-168 and 316-323 nos. 956-1000.
6.2.10: παρά δὲ Μεσσήνιος <Δαμίσκος>, δς δύο γεγονός ἦτα καὶ δέκα ἐνίκησεν ἐν Ὁλυμπίαιαι. θάυμα δὲ εὕπερ ἄλλο τι καὶ τόθε ἐποιησάμην· Μεσσήνιος γὰρ ἐκ Πελοποννήσου φεύγοντας ἐπέλυσεν ἡ περὶ 10 τῶν ἀγώνων τύχη τῶν Ὅλυμπικῶν. ὅτι γάρ μὴ λεοντῖκος καὶ Σύμμαχοι τῶν ἐπὶ πορθμαί Μεσσήνην, ἄλλος γε οὐδὲς Μεσσήνοις οὔτε Σικελίωτης οὔτε Μεσσήνης «Ακατόργα»· ἓναν τὸν Ακατάλληλον τοῦ Ὁλυμπιάδος ἄνεσται νῖκην· εἶναι δὲ οἱ Σικελίωται καὶ τοῦτος τῶν ἀρχαίων Ζαγκλαίων καὶ οὗ Μεσσήνων ψάλτῃ. (11) συγκατῆθει 15 μέντοι Μεσσήνωι· ὃς Πελοπόννησον καὶ ἡ περὶ τὸν ἀγώνα τύχη τῶν Ὅλυμπικῶν· ἐναυτοῦ γὰρ ὦτερον τοῦ οἰκισμοῦ τοῦ Μεσσήνης ἀγώνων Ὅλυμπιάς Ἡλεῖων ἐνίκα στάδιον παῖδας ὁ Δαμίσκος οὖτος, καὶ οἱ καὶ πενταθλὴσαντι ὦτερον ἐγένοντο ἐν Νεμέαι τε νέκαι καὶ ἱσθημοὶ. 20

4.23.5: Ὅς δὲ ἐς τὴν Κυλλήνην οἱ Μεσσήνοι συνελέχθησαν, τὸν μὲν παρόντα χειμώνα ἐδοξέαν αὐτοῦ χείμαζεν, καὶ τὴν ἀγράν σφίσαι καὶ χρήματα οἱ Ἡλεῖοι παρεῖχον· ἀμα δὲ τῷ ἦρᾳ ἐβουλεύσατο ποί ὁὶ σταλάται. γνώμα δὲ ἠςαν Γόργου μὲν Ζάκυνθων τὴν ὑπὲρ Κεφαληνίας καταλαβόντας καὶ νυστώτας ἀντὶ ἦπερτων γενομένους ναυσίν ἐς τὰ παραθαλάσσια τῆς Λακωνίκης ἐπιπλέοντας κακοῖς τὴν γῆν· Μάντικλος δὲ ἐκέλευε Μεσσήνης μὲν καὶ τοῦ λακεδαμονίων ἐχθέοι λαβεῖν λήψῃ, πλεύσατας δὲ ἐς Σαρδῶ κτήσασθαι μεγάλην τε νήσον καὶ εὐδαιμονίᾳ πρώτην. (6) ἐν τοσούτῳ δὲ Ἀναξίλας παρὰ τοὺς Μεσσήνως ἀπέστελλεν ἐς Ἰταλίαν καλῶν. ὁ δὲ Ἀναξίλας ἔτυράννης μὲν Ἡργίου, τέταρτος δὲ ἀπόγονος ἦν Ἀλκιδαμίδου· μετωπίσεις δὲ Ἀλκιδαμίδας ἐκ Μεσσήνης ἐς Ἡργίου μετὰ τὴν Ἀριστοδήμου τοῦ βασιλέως τελευτῆν καὶ Ἰππίμης τὴν ἄλωσιν. οὕτως οὖν ὁ Ἀναξίλας τοὺς Μεσσήνως μετετέμπησε· ἐλθοῦσι τε ἐλέγει εἰς Ζαγκλαία διάφοροι μὲν εἰσὶν αὐτῶι, χώραν δὲ εὐδαιμονία καὶ πόλιν ἐν καλῶι τῆς Σικελίας ἐχούσιν, ὃ δὲ φοίσιν ἠθέλεν ἐφ ἀναγκασθενείς ναυσίν δοῦναι. προσεμένων δὲ τὸν λόγον, οὕτως Ἀναξίλας διεβίβα- 30 σεν ἐς Σικελίαν αὐτοῦ· (7) Ζάγκλην δὲ τὸ μὲν εἴς ἀρχής κατέλαβον λμησταί, καὶ ἐν ἐρήμῳ τῇ γῇ τειχίσαντες ὄσον περὶ τὸν ὁμοίων ὀρμητρώι πρὸς τὰς καταδρομὰς καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἐπίπον ἑχρώντο. ἡγεμόνες δὲ ήςαν αὐτῶι Κραταμένης Σάμιος καὶ Περίνης ἐκ Χαλκίδων. Περιήρει δὲ ὦτερον καὶ Κραταμένες καὶ ἄλλους ἐπαγαγέσθαι τῶν Ἐλληνῶν ἐδοξὲν οἰκήτορας. (8) τότε δὲ τοὺς Ζαγκλαίων ὁ τε Ἀναξίλας 45 ναυσίν ἀνταναγομένους ἐνίκησε καὶ οἱ Μεσσήνοι μάχη πεζοῦ. Ζαγκλαίων δὲ κατὰ γῆν τε ὑπὸ Μεσσήνων καὶ ναυσίν ἄμα ἐκ θαλάσσης ὑπὸ Ἡργίων πολιορκοῦμεν, καὶ ἀλλοικομένους φύοις ἤδη τοῦ τείχους, ἐπὶ τε βμοὺς θεῶν καὶ πρὸς ἱερὰ καταφεύγο- 

50
ικετεύοντας Ζαγκλαίων ἀποκτείνειν καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς γυναιξὶν ὁμοῦ καὶ παιῶν ἀνδραποθίσασθαι. (9) Γόργος δὲ καὶ Μάντικλος παρημηκύνοντο Ἄναξίλαοι μὴ σφάς, ὑπὸ συγγενῶν ἀνδρῶν πεπονθότας ἀνόσια, ὁμοίως αὐτοὺς ἐς ἄνθρώπους Ἐλλήνας ἀναγκάζαι δρᾶσαι. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἦδη τοὺς ἦδη τοὺς Ζαγκλαίους ἀνίσταται ἀπὸ τῶν 55 βωμῶν καὶ ὄρκους δόντες καὶ αὐτὸλ παρ᾽ ἐκείνων λαβόντες ὄμων ἀμφότεροι κοινῆι. ὁνόμα δὲ τῇ πόλει μετέθεσαν Μεσσήνην ἀντὶ Ζάγκλης καλεῖσθαι. (10) ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ὀλυμπιάδος ἐπράξει τῆς ἐνάτης καὶ εἰκοστῆς, ἥν Χλωνις Δάκων τὸ δεύτερον ἐνίκα, Μηλιάδου παρ᾽ Ὀθηναίοις ἄρχοντος. Μάντικλος δὲ καὶ τὸ 60 λεπτὸν Μεσσήνιος τοῦ Ἰρακλέους ἐποίησε, καὶ ἔστων ἑκτὸς τείχους ὁ θεὸς Ἰδρυμένος, Ἰρακλῆς καλούμενος Μάντικλος, καθάπερ γε καὶ Ἄμμων ἐν Λιβύη καὶ ὁ ἐν Βαβυλώνι Βῆλος ὁ μὲν ἄπο ἄνδρος Αἰγυπτίου Βῆλος τοῦ Λιβύης δύνα ἔσχεν, Ἄμμων δὲ ἄπο τοῦ Ἰδρυμένου ποιμένος. Μεσσήνιοι μὲν οὖν τοῖς φεύγουσιν ἔγεγονε 65 πέρας τῆς ἀλης.

ΙΟ 24: a bronze tablet found in January 22, 1878 to the east of the Palaistra, in the area of the Philippeion. It is broken all around except at the top right, and the text is inscribed boustrophedon (the angle brackets > and < indicate the direction of the script from left to right and right to left respectively).

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 328.

Height: 0.155m. Width: 0.125m. Thickness: 0.001m.

Letter Height: 0.006-0.01m.

\textit{ante 494 ante}
The lettering is that of Euboia, since Zankle was a colony of Kymai. According to Jeffery (LSAG 79 fig. 27) the letter shapes are: α1, γ2, δ1, ε1 and ε2, θ3, θ1 and θ2, ι1 and ι2 (with the right slanting stroke the same height as the left), μ2, ν1 and ν2 and ν3, ρ3, ρ1. Jeffery further observes that "epsilon has little or no tail, eta is the open form h3, nu varies between ν1 and ν3; it is probably to be dated not long before the seizure of Zankle by the Samian refugees c. 493. The circular letters are made with a punch, occasionally twice over if the first attempt was badly centred" (LSAG 243).

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of the IO editors, Roehl, and Jeffery).

Line 1: three vertical strokes—only the bottom parts.
Line 5: lambda—only the right slanting stroke; beta—only a faint trace.
Line 6: epsilon—only a faint trace.
Line 7: epsilon—the middle and bottom horizontals are faintly preserved; kappa—only a faint trace.
Line 9: sigma—only a faint trace; mu—the left slanting stroke is clear, the rest is faint; alpha—only a faint trace.
Line 10: iota—only a faint trace. After the second sigma there is a trace of the upper tip of a vertical or slanting stroke which is too small to suggest a letter.
Line 11: there is trace of the upper tip of a right slanting stroke which is too small to suggest a letter.

Restorations for this fragmentary text are very difficult and those proposed by some editors are not in agreement with their own facsimiles.

Bannier (1926, 541-542) restores: 

Jeffery (LSAG 410 pl. 49 no. 5) restores:
Kunze 1938, 22, 69-70, 99 note 1, fig. 43, pl. 41-42 (= II. Bericht) and Kunze 1956, 37-8, pl. 54 no. 23, fig. 18, pl. 22-23 (= V. Bericht): a bronze greave and a bronze shield found ca. 150 meters apart in the excavation at the north wall of the Stadion, the greave in 1937 and the shield in 1956. The shield is now on display in the Geometric - Archaic Gallery of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. B 310 (greave), B 2651 (shield).

Height of the greave: 0.425m. Diameter of the shield: 0.84-0.87m.
Letter Height: 0.0m. (greave); 0.026-0.032m. (shield).

*ante* 494 *ante*

the greave: Δαυκλαξιο (‘Πεγγυς.

the shield: Δαυκλαίοι Ρεγενον.

The lettering is that of Euboia, since Zankle was a colony of Kymai. According to Jeffery (LSAG 79 fig. 27) the letter shapes in both inscriptions are: α1, γ3 (lunate), δ1, ε4 (but with shorter horizontals), λ1, ν2 and ν3, ρ3.

**Remains of Dotted Letters:**

alpha—only the top triangular shape; iota—only the top half of a vertical; omicron—only a trace of a bottom curving stroke; iota—only the top half of a vertical; epsilon—only the bottom horizontal and the bottom part of the left vertical; gamma—only the bottom part of a curving stroke; iota—only the bottom part of a vertical; nu—only the left and middle slanting strokes; omicron—only the bottom part of a curving stroke; nu—only the left and middle slanting strokes.

Kunze 1958, 103-105, 104 fig. 35 no. 2, pl. 40 and 48 (= VIII. Bericht): a fragmentary bronze greave and a late Archaic Korinthian type helmet were found: the greave in September 1960, in the north wall of the Stadion; the helmet in March 1938, in the Stadion’s south wall. The inscription on the helmet is cut on the left prognathide.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. B 5180 (greave); B 499 (helmet).

Height: the greave 0.033m.; the helmet 0.0106m.

Width of the helmet: 0.0154m.

Letter Height: in both the greave and the helmet 0.007-0.009m.
the greave Δι["ποι|ο] Μεσσένιοι Λοκ[ρόν].

the helmet [Δι' Ο]ποι Μεσσένιοι Λοκρόν].

Kunze 1958, 105-106, 104 fig. 35 no. 3, pl. 41-42 (= VIII. Bericht): two late archaic korinthian type helmets were found: one in 1958, in the bed of the Alpheios river (B 4165), and the other in April 1960, in the Stadion’s north wall, in an early classical stratum (B 4882). The inscriptions on both helmets are cut on their left prognathides.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. B 4165 and B 4882.

B 4165: Height: 0.025m.; Width: 0.023m.

B 4882: Height: 0.0118m.; Width: 0.0165m.

Letter Height: in both helmets 0.007-0.008m.

The letter style of the first two (greave and helmet) and the last two (helmets) inscriptions suggests (Kunze 1958, 105) that the same cutter inscribed both texts. The shapes of the letters are in the Euboian script, as in the previous Zanklaian inscriptions above (LSAG 79 fig. 27), but with notable exceptions the ε, μ and σ, which suggest a later date.


Commentary: The dates are generally based on two important events. In the year 493 B.C. Samian refugees occupied Zankle and accordingly no dedication to Olympian Zeus could be inscribed as being by the citizens of Zankle. Similarly, in 489 B.C., when exiled Messenians were invited by Anaxilas of Rhexion to Zankle, they changed the name
of the city to Messene and dedications to Olympian Zeus were henceforth by the citizens of Messene. This Rhegine occupation of Zankle lasted until 461 B.C., when the name Δανκλακευ appears again. The lettering, however, on all these inscriptions cannot be attributed to so late a period.

Whenever Pausanias is including a dedication by a Messenian athlete in his Eliaka, he feels compelled to add a comment about the Messenian plight. Thus, when he discusses the statue of Herakles dedicated by Euagoras from Zankle, Pausanias adds that by his ethnic alone one can surmise that the date of the dedication was made before Zankle's name was changed into Messene. Likewise, when he reaches the statue of the Messenian boy Damiskos, Pausanias deviates from his narrative in order to explain a historical coincidence which he calls, not unlike Herodotos, a marvel (θαυμα). There were no Messenian victors in the Olympic Games during the period of their exile in Naupaktos and Zankle/Messene, except for Leontiskos and Symmachos from the Sicilian Messene. When they were repatriated, however, in 368 B.C., miraculously Messenian athletes were once more victorious in the Olympic Games. The reason for such a change was not due to any miracle, but probably to the restraints, either financial or political, or both, that the Messenians faced as exiles concerning participation in the Games. Nevertheless, Pausanias notices this historical coincidence and, religious man that he is, calls it a θαυμα, i.e. something for which no apparent explanation can be given.

Moreover, in his narrative of the region of Messenia, the subject matter of book 4, Pausanias devotes much time and treats extensively Messenian history. There, the exegete's sources are primarily historical and more specifically based on the works of Rhianos and Myron (Pausanias 4.6.1).275 These two, however, are not the only

---

sources. The facts which Pausanias records about Zankle/Messene are well known from
and corroborated by the accounts of Herodotos and Thukydides, except for his dating the
migration of the exiles in 664 B.C., which is off by one and a half centuries
(4.23.10). Herodotos in his narrative of the disastrous Ionian revolt against the
Persians describes the fate of the Samians who were invited by Zankle to colonize Kale
Akte and who together with Milesian refugees accepted the invitation (6.22.2-23.1).
What happened when they arrived in Sicily is *mutatis mutandis* strikingly similar to
Pausanias' account of the Messenian plight (6.23.2-6):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{μαθὼν δὲ ταῦτα ὁ 'Ρηγίου τύραννος 'Αναξίλεως, τότε ἔων διάφορος τοῖς Ζαγκλαῖοισι, συμμείχας τοῖς Σαμίοισι ἀναπείθει ὡς χρείαν εἴη Καλῆν μὲν ἀκτῆν, ἐπ’ ἦν ἔπλεον, ἧν χαίρειν, τὴν δὲ Ζάγκλην σχείν, ἑοῦσαν ἔρημον ἀνδρῶν. πειθομένων δὲ τῶν Σαμίων καὶ σχόντων τὴν Ζάγκλην, ἑντάθαναι οἱ Ζαγκλαῖοι, ὡς ἐπύθουστο έχομένην τὴν πόλιν [ἐσωτηρίων], ἐβοήθεον αὐτῇ καὶ ἐπεκαλέστο τὸ Ἰπποκράτεα τὸν Γέλης τύραννον. ἣν γὰρ δὴ σφι ὡς σύμμαχος. ἐπείτε δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ὁ Ἰπποκράτης σὺν τῇ στρατιᾷ ἠκτε βοηθέων, Σκύθην μὲν τὸν μοῦναρχον τῶν Ζαγκλαῖων ὃς ἀποβαλόντα τὴν πόλιν ὁ Ἰπποκράτης πεθήσας καὶ τὸν ἅδελφον αὐτοῦ Πυθογενέα ἐσ ἵνα καὶ πόλιν ἀπέπεμψε, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς Ζαγκλαῖους κοινολογησάμενοι τοῖς Σαμίοισι καὶ ὄρκους δοῦσκαὶ δεξαμένον προέδρωκε. μισθὸς δὲ οἱ ἦν εἰρημένοι δὲ ὅπο τῶν Σαμίων, πάντων τῶν ἐπίπλων καὶ ἀνδραπόδων τα ἡμῖνα μεταλαβεῖν τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλι, τὰ δ’ ἐπὶ τῶν ἅγρων πάντα Ἰπποκράτεα λαγχάνειν. τοὺς μὲν δὴ πλεῦνας τῶν Ζαγκλαῖων αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ ἐξέχε δήσας, τοὺς δὲ κορυφαίους αὐτῶν τριήκοςίους ἐδώκει τοῖς Σαμίοισι κατασφάξαι. οὐ μέντοι οὐ γε ὡς Σάμιοι ἐποίησαν ταῦτα.\end{align*}
\]

---

276 See especially Papachatzis’ discussion of this passage (1974-1981, vol. 3, 6 note 2), and Beloch’s explanation that Pausanias must be confusing the date of Alkidamidas, the ancestor of Anaxilas, with that of Anaxilas.

277 Herodotos’ narrative continues with the fate of the leader of Zankle Skythes (6.24) and returns to the events in Ionia (6.25).
Herodotos’ narrative is centered around the Samian exiles and their being manipulated by Anaxilas, whereas Thukydides offers a fuller account (6.4.5-6):

Obviously, Pausanias’ comments about Anaxilas’ descent from Messene and the colonisation of Zankle by Krataimenes and Perieres are not different from Thukydides’ account. As for Herodotos’ narrative of the Samian incident, it seems that it is responsible for Pausanias’ account about the Messenian exiles. It is not only the similar expression found in both authors which suggests that (Pausanias 4.23.6: οὖν δὲ ἄρχατον πατρίδος ἀντωνόμασεν. Pausanias emphasizes that the Messenian exiles played an instrumental role in Zankle’s occupation by Anaxilas, just as the Samians did earlier. Furthermore, both exiled groups were invited by Anaxilas and were manipulated for his own political gains, but not for long. At the end in both incidents the victors treat the defeated Zanklaians with humanity and against the wishes of their allies, Hippokrates of Gela in Herodotos and Anaxilas of Rhegion in Pausanias. This comparison of the historical accounts of Herodotos, Thukydides and Pausanias suggests that Pausanias’ narrative about the Messenian exiles and their settlement in Zankle is perhaps modeled on Herodotos’ narrative about the Samian exiles, while
Thukydides, among others, provided the exegete with the details of the earlier history of Zankle.

In turning to the inscriptions found at Olympia, especially the spoils from conflicts, the inscribed helmets, shields, and greaves which were part of whole panoplies dedicated to Zeus, the historicity of Zankle’s name being changed to Messene is confirmed. As Pausanias himself surmised in the case of the Zanklaian Euagoras that his dedication must have been made before the city changed its name in 489 B.C., so too the spoils with the inscription “the Zanklaian from the Rhegines” is assumed to have been dedicated before that year, whereas those dedicated by Messenians would be after 489 B.C. The latter were apparently involved in a feud with the Lokroi and the Zanklaian colony Mylai, from which they emerged victorious. The Zanklaian, before becoming Messenians, had sent to Olympia spoils from a victory over Rhegion, with which they were in constant conflict. What is even more significant is the fragmentary text of the treaty against aggression between Zankle and another city found at Olympia (IO 24). The text is difficult to restore, but it provides evidence for the claims in both Herodotos and Pausanias, namely that the Samians and later the Messenians, after defeating the Zanklaian, came to terms with them against their patron tyrants. They also gave mutual oaths to the effect that they were to be living in Zankle together with no more fighting.

All this cannot prove or disprove whether Pausanias saw these military dedications of Zankle/Messene at Olympia. Pausanias’ narrative, however, is by no means exclusively based on a single source, whether literary or epigraphical. In this case his narrative, and by extension his sources, had a sound foundation, since it is corroborated by the inscribed spoils. Notwithstanding his confusion in dating the change of the name of Zankle into Messene, the way Pausanias is arguing for the date of Euagoras’ and Damiskos’ dedications is not only trustworthy, but seems to have retained its basic validity.
69.

6.8.1: Εύανορίδας δὲ Ἡλείων πάλης ἐν παισίν ὑπήρξεν ἐν τῇ Ὀλυμπίᾳ καὶ Νεμέων νύκτι, γενόμενος δὲ ἐλλανοθίκης ἔγραψε καὶ οὕτως τὰ ὄνόματα ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τῶν νευκηκότων.

IO 299: three joining fragments of a slab of grey limestone, found: the upper right fragment May 22, 1880, northwest of the Byzantine church, and the other two November 17 and 22, 1880, in the Palaistra. The fragments preserve the right upper corner of the slab and the back is rough. The first line is inscribed as a caption, while the rest of the text is assumed by the IO editors to have been inscribed in two columns of which only the right one survives. The fragments are now in Ἁποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 918 + 977. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.24m. Width: 0.45m. Thickness: 0.53m.
Letter Height: 0.025-0.03m.; (0.052m. in line 1).

c. 235 ante

NON-STOICH.

[Ε ὑ α ν ω ο] ρ Ἰ δ α ρ
[-----------------] ν Δαμέαν τὸ ν κατὰ
[-----------------] ν παίδωσιν πα[τέρα].

The letters are clearly and sharply cut. The letters of the first line are almost twice the height of those in lines two and three, and the strokes are quite thin and end in triangular serifs. Worth noting is also the rhotacism of line one.


Commentary: The date for this inscription, c. 235 B.C., was proposed by Moretti. It is primarily based on the information of Polybius (5.94) who mentions an Eleian Euanoridas as an ἀντιφανής ἀνήρ in the year 218 B.C. Moretti assumed Polybius’ Euanoridas to be the same as that mentioned by Pausanias, and accordingly suggested as
a tentative date for his victory in the boys’ wrestling event the 135th Olympiad (240 B.C.). The letter style of the inscription, where an Euanoridas is mentioned, is also in agreement with a third century date, and, therefore, an approximate date for IO 299 is the time after Euanoridas’ victory.

Pausanias, continuing after the statue of Pythokles (no. 30 above) his brief exposition of victory statues in the general area between the Heraion and the Pelopion and southwards, records three statues, none of which has been found. One of them is the dedication of the Eleian Euanoridas, who won an Olympic and Nemeian victory in the boys’ wrestling event. This same person, Pausanias adds, became later an *Hellanodikes* and he too inscribed the names of the Olympic victors in Olympia. Euanoridas is indeed the second Eleian who, Pausanias says, inscribed an Olympic Register in Olympia. The first person to do that was another Eleian, Paraballon, an Olympic victor in the diaulos, whom Pausanias mentions in connection with his son’s victory statue (his son Lastratidas was victorious in the boys’ wrestling event in Olympia, and the boys’ and ephebes’ wrestling event in Nemea 6.6.3):

\[\text{Παραβάλλοντι δὲ τῷ Λαστρατίδαι πατρὶ ὑπῆρξε μὲν διαύλου παρελθεῖν δρόμῳ, ὑπελέπτετο δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸὺς μετέπειτα φιλοτήματα, τῶν νικησάντων ὁλυμπιάσι τὰ ὀνόματα ἀναγράψας ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ τῷ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ.}\]

Paraballon and Euanoridas, both of them Olympic victors and one of them *Hellanodikes*,\(^\text{278}\) are the only two whom Pausanias knows that were in charge of the

---

\(^{278}\) Jacoby (FGrH IIIb Kommentar p. 225) assumes, perhaps correctly, that Paraballon was also an Hellanodikes, possibly because of Pausanias’ narrative on Euanoridas which implies that he inscribed the Olympic Register while holding the office of the Hellanodikes (γενόμενος δὲ ἐλλανοδίκης ἔγραψε καὶ οὖτος ... 6.8.1). Papachatzis (1974-1981, vol. 3, 342 note 6 and 338 note 7), on the other hand, thinks that Paraballon’s action to inscribe the names of the Olympic Victors was simply a “private initiative” (ὑπελέπτετο δὲ καὶ ἐς τοὺς μετέπειτα φιλοτήματα ... 6.6.3), which seems rather unlikely. Even if it was a private initiative, and by that I mean only the expenses needed for such an undertaking, inscribing so long a text on Olympic property (the Gymnasium) would certainly require permission from the Olympic authorities, as was the case for so many of the dedications.
process for inscribing Olympic Registers in Olympia, Paraballon more specifically in the Gymnasium.

Although Euanoridas' victory dedication has not been found, nevertheless, the three fragments of the present inscription (IO 299) have been found near and in the Palaistra; the text records an Euanoridas who was adopted by a certain Dameas. On chronological grounds the IO editors identified him with the same Euanoridas mentioned by Polybius (5.94) and Pausanias. The fragmentary text of the inscription offers no support for Pausanias' narrative, except for the name, but its find spot may offer some clue as to where the Olympic Register was inscribed.

The excavations at Olympia have shown that both the Gymnasium and the Palaistra were built towards the end of the third century B.C., a terminus post quem for Paraballon's inscription. Since Pausanias states that Paraballon was the first, it follows that Euanoridas' date would be later than Paraballon's. The new construction of these two buildings would no doubt have been a factor in Paraballon's idea for inscribing the names of the athletes and later on in Euanoridas' decision. Moretti (1957, 135 no. 536, 139 no. 570) dates the victories of these two athletes tentatively in the third century B.C. (Paraballon in the 125th Olympiad = 280 B.C., and Euanoridas in the 135th Olympiad = 240 B.C.). Since Euanoridas' fragmentary dedication (IO 299) was found in the Palaistra, a place with which he was associated from the years he was an athlete and where IO 299 may in fact have stood, it is very likely that his Olympic Register was inscribed there as well. After all, he was victorious in the wrestling event for which the Palaistra was the training ground, whereas Paraballon was victorious in the diaulos for

Jacoby's suggestion, however, that Paraballon and Euanoridas were active in the beginning of the fifth century until 472 B.C. and thus that they were predecessors of the Eleian Hippias who compiled an Olympic Register ignores the fact that the Gymnasium and the Palaistra in Olympia were Hellenistic constructions (Moretti 1957, 135 no. 536 and Mallwitz 1972, 278-289).

279 For other epigraphical cases of adoption in Olympia see: IO 59.9; 75.4; and 408.2.
which the athletes trained in the Gymnasium. Furthermore, the span of years separating these two athletes is not so great as to justify a supplement to Paraballon’s inscription by Euanoridas. Whether these Registers included all Olympic victors, or only those associated with the particular event of the two former athletes in the respective buildings in which they themselves trained must remain an open question.

70.

6.10.8: τὰ γὰρ Μιλτιάδου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου...ἀναθήματα... τὰ Μιλτιάδου δέ, ὅποια ἐσ’ Ὀλυμπιάν ἀνέθηκεν, ἐτέρωθι (δὴ) δηλώσω τοῦ λόγου. 6.19.6: κεῖνται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐνταῦθα (sc. treasury of Sikyonians) δέ μοι ἐπιμνήσθαι, ... καὶ εἰργασμένου ἑλέφαντος κέρας τὸ Ἀμαλθείας, ἀνάθημα Μιλτιάδου τοῦ Κλίμωνος, ὅτε <τὴν> ἀρχὴν ἔσχεν ἐν χερονήσῳ τῇ θρακίαι πρῶτος τῆς οἰκίας ταύτης: καὶ ἐπίγραμμα ἐπὶ τωὶ κέρατὶ ἐστιν ἄρχαίοις Ἀττικοῖς γράμμασι.

Ζηνὶ μ’ ἄγαλμ’ ἀνέθηκαν Ὀλυμπιάιω ἐκ χερονήσου τεῖχος ἐλόντες Ἀράτου: ἐπήρχε δὲ Μιλτιάδης σφίν.

Kunze 1956a, 69-74, pl. 34-35 (= V. Bericht): a late archaic Korinthian-type bronze helmet, found in the excavations of April 1940 in the southern wall of the Stadion. The helmet remained in the Apotheke with other finds discovered before and during the Second World War until the 1953/54 excavation period when the cleaning process of the bronzes began and the inscription on the helmet was uncovered. Only the bottom half of the helmet is preserved and the inscription is engraved on the border of the left prognathide which is broken away in the middle, from left to right all the way to the back of the helmet. The helmet is now on display together with the Assyrian (?) helmet below in the Early Classical and Classical Gallery of the New Museum.


Height: 0.187m. Width: 0.28m. Thickness: 0.0027-0.0075m.
Letter Height: ca. 0.007-0.009m.

c.a. 500-490 ante

Μιλτιάδες ᾨθέναιοι Μέδον λαβόντες.

The script and dialect of this inscription are Attic and the letter shapes are (LSAG 66 fig. 26): α4, ε2 or ε3, ζ2, λ2, ν2, ο1.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
alpha-only a trace of the upper corner tip which coincides with the break of the prognathide in this spot.
first epsilon-only the upper horizontal and a trace of the middle horizontal, which coincides with the brake of the prognathide, and the upper half of a vertical stroke.
second epsilon-only an upper horizontal and the upper part of a vertical stroke.

Restorations:
Kunze restores a triple dot punctuation in [i r]δv, because after the nu and before the omicron there is space for one-and-a-half to two letters.

Kunze 1961, 129-137, pl. 56-57 (= VII. Bericht): a Persian, perhaps Assyrian, bronze helmet, found October 20, 1960, in a well dug on the Kronion hill, approximately seventeen meters northeast of the eastern end of the supporting wall behind the treasuries. The helmet is preserved intact and the letters of the inscription are engraved all around the bottom border with strokes comprised of dots. The helmet is now on display together with Miltiades' helmet above in the Early Classical and Classical Gallery of the New Museum.

Height: 0.231m. Diameter: 0.205-0.207m. Thickness: 0.0015-0.0025m.
Letter Height: ca. 0.006-0.008m.

post 490 ante

Διε ᾨθέναιοι Μέδον λαβόντες.

The script and dialect of this inscription are Attic and the letter shapes are (LSAG 66 fig. 26): α3 or α4, β3, ε2, ε3 or ε4, ζ3, ν2, λ2, ν2, ο1.

Kunze 1955, 7-21: a bronze helmet, found in Olympia and in the early thirties transported to Athens. The helmet is not intact: the upper right part, the top, and the back half
of the right prognathide are broken away. The letters of the inscription are engraved on the remaining front half of the right prognathide in two lines with dotted strokes, in a direction from the back of the helmet to the front. The helmet is now in the National Museum (καλκέ Collection).


Height: 0.28m. Width of the left prognathide: 0.36m.; of the right: ca. 0.020m.
Thickness: 0.0027-0.0075m.
Letter Height: ca. 0.010-0.015m.

500–493 ante

'Αθεναῖοι
[τῷ] ν έγ Λέμυ[α].

The letters are spread out and seem to be inscribed in stoichedon style, except that the cutter after the fourth letter in line 2 realized that he needed more space and thus the gamma and lambda occupy one letter-space as perhaps did the nu and the restored omicron.

The script and dialect of this inscription are Attic and the letter shapes are (LSAG 66 fig. 26): α3 or α4, γ2, ε2, θ2, τ2, λ2, ν2.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: alpha—only the upper part of a right slanting stroke and a left slanting stroke.
Line 2: nu—only the bottom half of a the left vertical stroke.

Restorations:
This is Kunze's reading of the earlier editors': ΘΕΝΑΙΟΙ Ν ΕΑΝΕΜ: (SEG XI 1212b).
Line 2: [τῷ]ν Kunze, but the space for the omicron is broken away and no trace of a dot remains.


Commentary: The dates for these dedications cannot be determined with accuracy, except perhaps for the second which Kunze hesitantly dates in 490 B.C. or slightly after. There is no way to determine whether Miltiades offered his helmet to Zeus after the battle of Marathon (Pfohl), or before it (before 493 B.C., the year of his return to Athens),
when he was in charge of Chersonnesos, or when he recaptured Lemnos in the first
decade of the fifth century (Kunze). The lettering and the style of the helmets do not help
either date, and the fact that the ethnic Athenaios is missing is not strong proof for a date
before the battle of Marathon, while Miltiades was in Chersonnesos or in Lemnos
(Kunze). It may very well be that this dedication was made on account of his expedition
to Paros and during the time of his trial (489 B.C.), as testimony for the general’s
accomplishments for his city.

Pausanias, continuing his exegesis of the athletic dedications in the Altis, reaches the
chariots of the Epidamnian Kleosthenes (6.10.6-8), the Athenian Miltiades, and the
Lakedaimonian Euagoras (6.10.8). That Pausanias saw a chariot of Miltiades nearby
those of Kleosthenes and Euagoras seems very probable, but he does not say anything,
except that he will mention later the dedications Miltiades made at Olympia. Later on,
however, the only dedication of Miltiades he notes is the cornucopia in the Sikyonian
treasury, whose inscription he also quotes as evidence for his narrative.

How many dedications did Miltiades offer to Zeus at Olympia, i.e. Miltiades the son
of Kimon, for Pausanias is concerned only with this Miltiades. From his narrative it
seems that Pausanias saw two dedications: the chariot near those of Kleosthenes and
Euagoras, dedicated by Miltiades, the son of Kypselos and not the son of Kimon as
Pausanias implies. This is one of Pausanias’ verifiable mistakes, since there is no
evidence that Miltiades, the son of Kimon, ever participated in the Olympics. Miltiades
the son of Kypselos, according to Herodotos 6.36, won in the chariot race before he
sailed to Chersonnesos, which Moretti (1957, 71 no. 106) tentatively put in the 55th
Olympiad, 560/59 B.C. (this by no means is a fixed date). Which Miltiades is the
dedicator of the second dedication seen by Pausanias, the inscribed cornucopia in the
Sikyonian treasury, is not certain, but he thinks it was Miltiades the Marathon general.
The question about the cornucopia dedicator originates from Pausanias’ confusion of
Miltiades, the son of Kypselos (PA 10209 Miltiades I), the first member of the Philaidai family who became the leader of Chersonnesos, and the Marathonomachos Miltiades, the son of Kimon and nephew of Miltiades I (PA 10212 Miltiades II) who was also the leader of Chersonnesos. In all fairness to Pausanias it should be emphasized here that the same confusion made by Pausanias is also present in Pseudo-Andokides 4.33 and in Nepos Miltiades 2.

The two dedications that Pausanias mentions have not been found in Olympia. But apparently there were more dedications of, or related to Miltiades which to an extent justify Pausanias’ comment (6.10.8): τὰ Μιλτιάδου ἔτη, ὅποια ἐσ Ὀλυμπίαν ἀνέθηκεν, ἐπέραθε (6η) ηλύσω τοῦ λόγου. The three helmets described above, which Pausanias may, or may not, have seen in Olympia, are all dedications to Zeus offered by Athenians victorious in wars (Kunze 1955, 7-21). The inscriptions on the last two helmets refer specifically to two events in Athenian history: the famous Athenian victory at Marathon in 490 B.C., and the less well known recapture of Lemnos from the Persians. Miltiades was placed in charge of the cleruchy sent to Lemnos by the Athenians before 493 B.C., in order to consolidate their power on the island and in the north Aigaian (Kunze 1955, 19-20). Miltiades’ recapture of Lemnos is mentioned by Herodotos in his narrative of the general’s trial. He was accused by Xanthippos for his failure to punish the island of Paros. Miltiades’ friends claimed in his defense that he had accomplished two major achievements for Athens, the battle at Marathon and the recapture of Lemnos. As Kunze has shown convincingly, it is from this incident that the third helmet was probably dedicated in the decade before the battle of Marathon.

---

280 For the epigram on the cornucopia see IGM 54 and Friedländer 1987, 53-54 no. 52.

281 Herodotos 6.136.2: Μιλτιάδης δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν παρεῖν οὐκ ἀπελογεῖτο (ἡν γὰρ ἀδύνατος ἥτοι οἴκου ἐν μηδενῷ ἐν κλίνῃ ὑπεραπολογεῖσθαι οἱ φίλοι, τὰς μάχας τε τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένης πολλὰ
What the account of Pausanias and the three helmets that have been found in Olympia suggest is quite extraordinary: there were in Olympia dedications from all the campaigns in which Miltiades was involved. The cornucopia comes from his tyranny in Chersonnesos, the third helmet from the cleruchy established by him in Lemnos, and the second from the Athenian victory at Marathon. Moreover, he, or his son, may have dedicated his own helmet on account of any of the above accomplishments, or on account of all of them, if a date after Marathon is accepted. The absence of his ethnic and of his father's name is not very significant. It only indicates that it was a private dedication (Kunze). Nevertheless, the name Miltiades inscribed on a helmet would hardly need any special introduction, nor for that matter would a visitor to the Altis care when and for which victory it was dedicated. Be that as it may, the narrative of Pausanias, which implies that Miltiades had many dedications in Olympia, is supported by the finding of the three helmets, which together with Herodotos attest to the accomplishments of the Athenian general and trace his career, i.e. one dedication to Zeus for each major achievement.

71.

6.12.1: Ἑν δὲ ἄρμα τέ ἐστι χαλκοῦ καὶ ἀνήρ ἀναβεβηκὼς ἐπ' αὐτό, κέλτης δὲ ὑπ' ου τοῦ ἄρμα εἶς ἐκατέρωθεν ἐπτηκε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπηρετον καθέχονται παΐδες· ὑπομνήματα δὲ ἐπὶ νῦν οἱ λοιπον ὀλυμπικάς ἐστιν ἑρων τοῦ δεινομένου τουρανήσαντος Συρακοσίων μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφον Γέλωνα. τὰ δὲ ἀναθηματα σὺχ ἑρων ἀπέσπειλεν, 5 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἀποδίδει τοῦ θεοῦ δεινομένης ἐστίν ὁ ἑρων, ἐργα δὲ τοῦ μὲν ὀνάτα τοῦ Αλγυνήτου τοῦ ἄρμα, Καλάμιδος δὲ οἱ ὑπ' οὐ τοι αὐτῶν ἐίσιν οἱ παΐδες.

Herodotos states clearly that Miltiades' recapture of Lemnos happened while he was in Chersonnesos. See also Herodotos 5.26 and 6.136.3-140.2; How 1975, vol. 2, 10, 122-124 and HCT 1, 375 and notes 1-3. There is no reason to discredit Herodotos' information that it was Miltiades son of Kimon who recaptured the island.
8.42.7: τότε δὴ ὁ ἄνθρωπος (sc. ὁ Μίκωνος Αἰγινῆτης) ἀνευρὼν
γράφην ἢ μίμημα τοῦ ἀρχαίου ἔξογνο τὰ πλεῖω δὲ, ὡς λέγεται, καὶ
κατὰ ὀνειράτων δῦν ἐποίησε χαλκοῦν φιγαλεύσιν ἀγάλμα, γενεάς
μάλιστα ὑστερον τῆς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐλλάδα ἐπιστρατεύει τοῦ Μῆδου. (8)
μαρτυρεῖ δὲ μοι τῶι λόγῳ· κατὰ γὰρ τὴν Ἑρέμου διάβασιν ἐς τὴν
Εὐρώπην Συρακοσσών τε ἐτυράννει καὶ Σικελίας τῆς ἄλλης Γέλων ὁ
Δεινομένους· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐτελεύτησε Γέλων, ἐς Ἴηρων ἀδελφὸν Γέ- 15
λωνος περὶμήλθεν ἢ ἀρχὴ· Ἴηρωνος δὲ ἀποθανόντος πρὸς ἰον ἣ
τοι Ὀλυμπίαι Διὶ ἀναθεῖναι τὰ ἀναστήματα ἐκεῖ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπίπων
ταῖς νίκαις, οὕτω δεινομένης ὁ Ἴηρων ἀπέδωκεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ
πατρός. (9) Ὁ ὁπάτα καὶ ταῦτα ποιήματα, καὶ ἐπιγράμματα ἐν
'Ολυμπίαι, τὸ μὲν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀναστήματος ἐστὶν αὐτῶν· 20
Σὼν ποτε νυκήσας, Ζεύ 'Ολύμπω, σεμνὸν ἀγώνα
tεθρίππωσι μὲν ἀπαξ, μουνοκέλητι δὲ δίς,
δῶρα Ἴηρων τάδε σοι ἱεραίσκατο· παῖς δ' ἀνέθηκε
Δεινομένης πατρὸς μήμα Συρακοσσίου.
τὸ δὲ ἐτερον λέγει τῶν ἐπιγράμματων· 25
Γίος ← μὲ Μίκωνος Ὁνάτα ἐξετέλεσεν,
nάσωι ἐν Αἰγίναι δώρατα ναιετάνων.
ἡ δὲ ἡλικία τοῦ Ὁνάτα κατὰ τὸν Ἀθηναίου Ἡγίαν καὶ Ἀγελάδαν
συμβαίνει τὸν Ἀργείου.

IO 249: a bronze Etruscan helmet was discovered at Olympia in 1817 and it was presented
in 1823 by King George IV to the British Museum where it still is. The
inscription is cut on the upper part of the helmet, just as the inscription on the
second Etruscan helmet found in Olympia (below SEG XXXIII, 328).

British Museum Catalogue Bronzes 250.

paulo post 474 ante

 NON-STOICH. ca. 16

: Ἰλάρον ὁ Δεινομένεος
καὶ τοῦ Συρακόσαρι
τοῦ Δι Τυρ<φ>αν<ἐν> ἀπὸ Κύμας.

Daux's suggestion that in line 3 there is probably a mistake by the cutter who inscribed ΤΥΠΑΝ instead
of ΤΥΠΠΑΝΟΝ seems, in light of the two following inscriptions which have the same text inscribed, to
be correct (similarly Lazzarini 1976, 317 no. 964 and note 2). Therefore, the letters in angle brackets, left
out by mistake by the cutter, are supplied according to the text of the following inscriptions.
SEG XXIII, 253: a bronze Korinthian type helmet was discovered by chance in the bed of the river Alpheios in 1959 at Olympia, on whose left prognathide the inscription is cut all the way to the back. It is now on display together with the second Etruscan helmet of Hieron (below) in the Early Classical and Classical Gallery of the New Museum.


Height: *ca. 0.18m.*

Letter Height: *ca. 0.006m.*

*Paulo post 474 ante*  
*NON-STOICH. ca. 18*

SEG XXXIII, 328 (except for line 3 for which see SEG XXXIV, 332\(^{282}\)): a bronze Etruscan type helmet was discovered by chance in the bed of the river Kladeos at Olympia. The inscription is cut on the upper part of the helmet, just as on the one in the British Museum. The helmet is now on display together with Hieron’s Korinthian one in the Early Classical and Classical Gallery of the New Museum.


Height: *ca. 0.18m.*

Letter Height: *ca. 0.006m.*

*Paulo post 474 ante*  
*NON-STOICH. ca. 18*

---

\(^{282}\) In *SEG XXXIII*, 328 the editors print the text published by Y.A. Pikoulas in *HOROS* 1 (1983) 59, which in line 3 reads Τυρραννόν. Pikoulas caught the mistake, however, and informed the editors *per epistulas* (*SEG XXXIV*, 332) that the correct reading of line 3 is Τυρραννόν.
The letter style of all three inscriptions is elegant and the letters are carefully inscribed, except in line 3 of the first helmet. According to Jeffery the inscription displays "a more advanced type of lettering: ө5, ө3 and no ө (LSAG 266)" but ө2 does appear in the two helmets at Olympia. The shapes of the letters are (LSAG 262 fig. 43): ө3, ө2 and ө5, ө3, ө1 (closed), ө2 (but with the outer left and right slanting strokes of equal length), ө2 and ө3, ө1, ө2, ө2, ө2.

Gallavotti (1979b, 14) has renewed Boeckh’s suggestion (in Kaibel 1965, no. 745) that the third line is a paraeneme to which Kaibel adds "neque priores duo versus numerorum specie carere videntur". Accordingly Gallavotti reads the three lines as two prosodia and an enoplia (or an alcaic if Daux’s legitimate correction for line three is accepted):

Γάλλαβοττί (1979b, 14) has renewed Boeckh’s suggestion (in Kaibel 1965, no. 745) that the third line is a paraeneme to which Kaibel adds “neque priores duo versus numerorum specie carere videntur”. Accordingly Gallavotti reads the three lines as two prosodia and an enoplia (or an alcaic if Daux’s legitimate correction for line three is accepted):

'Ἱάρον ὁ Δεινομάκρος καὶ τοῖς Συρακοσίοις (υυ — υ — υυ — , — — υ — υυ —)
τῷ Δὶ Τυρραννᾷ ἵππο Κόμας
(—— — — — — — — — — — — — —)
See, however, Hansen (1975 no. 416) who suggests that the inscription is not metrical.

410 no. 7 pl. 51, 460 no. C.

Commentary: The date for all three helmets, a little after 474 B.C., is the same and is based on the inscription itself. While the Greeks in the mainland, the islands, and Asia Minor were preoccupied with the Persian invasion in the early fifth century B.C., the Greek colonies in Sicily and Southern Italy were facing a similar situation. The Carthaginians and the Etruscans launched a combined attack against them, but the Carthaginians were defeated decisively at Himera in 480 B.C. by Gelo and the allied forces of the Greek cities. A few years later, in 474 B.C., Hieron was invited to assist Kyme which was threatened by the Etruscans and with his victory stopped the Etruscan expansion to the South. From the spoils of that victory he sent the three helmets at Olympia as offerings to Zeus.

In his exegesis of the athletic dedications in the Altis and near the statue of the Thasian Theogenes (no. 53 above) Pausanias mentions the bronze chariot of Hieron, who became tyrant in Syrakuse after the death of his brother Gelo in 478 B.C. (no. 9 above). The exegete gives a physical description of the offering, mentions the dedicator and
concludes with artists: the offering was comprised of a man standing in the chariot and on each side there were also standing two racing horses mounted by boys; it was sent to Olympia by Hieron’s son Deinomenes to commemorate all of Hieron’s chariot victories (Moretti 1957, 90 no. 221, 92 no. 234, 93 no. 246); the chariot with the man was the work of the Aiginetan Onatas, while the race horses with the boys were the work of Kalamis. Pausanias derived all this information from his own observation in the Altis and very probably from the inscription which was cut on the base of the Deinomenid dedication, which has not been found.

Indeed, Pausanias does not explicitly state that his information is based on the inscription on the base of the monument. At least not in this passage of his *Eliaka*. When he is in Phigaleia, however, and dates the statue of Demeter made by Onatas one generation after Xerxes’ invasion in Greece, Pausanias feels compelled to justify his claim, probably because there was some argument about the date of the Aiginetan sculptor, or Demeter’s statue. There the exegete reveals that he in fact read the two epigrams on Hieron’s dedication at Olympia, which he did not mention in his *Eliaka*, but which he quotes in his *Arkadika*. He thus lets his readers judge for themselves his reasoning for dating Demeter’s statue and, therefore, Onatas’ career one generation after Xerxes’ invasion. More importantly, the two passages reveal a significant assumption on Pausanias’ part. He did not feel compelled, it seems, to let his readers know that his information for every dedication in Olympia was derived from the inscriptions on the monuments. Pausanias seems to be assuming that his readers already knew and understood that. Otherwise, there is no obvious explanation why he quotes the epigrams he has read at Olympia not in the appropriate place, in 6.12.1, but where there was a strong argument to be made, i.e. in dating Onatas’ statue of Demeter for the Phigaleians.

Even though this inscribed base has not been found at Olympia, nevertheless, there have been found the three helmets of Hieron, the son of Deinomenes, dedicated to Zeus
by him and the Syrakusans from the Etruscan spoils at Kyme. Pausanias does not mention these spoils. He may have seen them, but omitted them in his narrative, or the helmets may had been lost at the time of his visit. At any rate, if he saw them, they were not so elaborate that they had to be incorporated in his *Eliaka*. Whatever the case, the discovery of the three inscribed helmets of Hieron provide indirect evidence concerning Hieron’s presence at Olympia: Pausanias mentions his athletic offering, while the helmets attest to his military victory.

### 72.

**6.12.2:** Παρὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἰέρωνος τὸ ἄρμα ἀνὴρ ἦστιν ὁμώνυμός τε τῷ Δεινομένους καὶ ἐν Συρακούσαις καὶ οὕτως τυραννῆσας, Ἰέρων δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο ἵππον καὶ ἐπιτέφθη, ἤματι δὲ τὴν Ἐγαθοκλέους τοῦ προτέρου τυραννῆσαντος τελευτὴν Συρακούσαιοι οὕνεις ἀναπεφύγει τύραννος ὁ Ἰέρων οὕτως, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν εἴχεν ἔτει δευτέρω τῆς ἐκτης ὀλυμπιακοῦ πιαδός ἐπὶ ταῖς εἰκοσὶ καὶ ἔκατον, ἡν Κυρηναῖος στάδιον ἐνίκησεν Ἰδαῖοι. (3) οὕτως ὁ Ἰέρων εξενία πρὸς Πύρρον τὸν Ἁικιδίου καὶ ὁμοί τῇ ἕξεναι καὶ ἐπιγραμμάζαν ἐποιησάτο, Γέλωνι τῶν παιδῶν Νηρήδα τὴν Πύρρου. Ἐρμαῖοι δὲ περὶ Σικελίας ἐσ τὴν πρὸς Καρχηδονίου πόλεμον καταστάντων εἶχον μὲν οἱ Καρχηδονίοι τῆς νήσου πλέον ἤ ἡμῖν, Ἰέρων δὲ συνιόντων μὲν ἄρτι ἐσ τὸν πόλεμον ἐλέσθαι τὰ Καρχηδονίων ἱππεῖς, μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολὺ δυνάμει τε ἐξείναι νομίζων τὰ Ἐρμαῖοι ἕχουρώτερα καὶ βεβαιότερα ζῆν ἤσ φιλαί μετεβάλετο ὡς τούτους. (4) τοὺς δὲ οἱ βίους συνέργη γενέσαθι τὴν τελευτὴν ὑπὸ Δεινομένους, γένους μὲν Συρακούσιου, δυσμενέστατα 15 τα δὲ ἀνδρῶς ἐσ τυραννίδα ἔχοντος, δὲ καὶ ὅστερον τούτων Ἰπποκράτη τῷ ἀδελφῷ τῶν Ἐπικύδους ἦπ Ἐρρήσσου παρεληλυθότι ἄρτι ἐσ Συρακούσιας καὶ ἐσ τὸ πλήθος ποιεῖσαθι λόγους ἀρχομένων ἐπέδραμεν (τις) ὃς ἀποκετεύν ὁν Ἰπποκράτην τοῦ δὲ οἱ αὐτόσταντος, κρατήσαντες τῶν δορυφόρων ἀλλοι διαφθείρουσι 20 τῶν Δεινομένην. τοὺς ἀνδριάντας δὲ τοῦ Ἰέρωνος ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, ἥππου τοῦ ἕτερον, τὸν δὲ αὐτῶν πεζὸν, ἀνέθεσαν μὲν τοῦ Ἰέρωνος οἱ παῖδες, ἐποίησε δὲ Μίκους Νικηφάτου Συρακούσιος. **6.15.6** ἴσος δὲ μὲν Ἰέρωνος ἐκάνα τὸ δημόσιον, τρίτην δὲ ἀνέθεσαν οἱ τοῦ Ἰέρωνος παῖδες ἐθήλωσα δὲ ὀλίγωι τι πρότερον 25 ὡς ὁμώνυμος τε τῷ Δεινομένους ὁ Ἰέρων οὕτως καὶ Συρακούσιος εἶναι κατὰ ταύτα ἐκείνῳ τύραννος.
Apparatus Criticus:

23 μήκεως is the reading of the mss. Αγ and Ββ. Νικοκράτους is the reading of the editors Musurus (Aldina), Xylander-Sylburg, Kuhn, Facius, and the mss. Ms Va Vb Lb; Νικοκράτους is the reading in Am. Smin.; Νικοστράτου is the reading of the ms. R; Νικηράτου is the reading of all other editors and the mss. P Pd (in the margin it has also Νικοκράτους) Pd Ag L. Συρακοσίας is the reading of the editors Bekker, Dindorf, Schubar, and the mss. P Ag; Συρακόσιας is the reading of all other editors, and the mss. V Vb L Lb Pd Ms.

Eckstein 1958 (VI. Bericht), 205-209, pl. 129: a fragmentary base of fine-grained, yellowish sandstone, found in July 1954, in the excavations of the area between the Pelopeion and the west Altis wall, ca. fifteen meters east of the wall’s gate. It is broken on the left and the back sides and the inscribed surface is very worn. It is now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum (no Inventory No. is given by the editor). Vidi.

Height: 0.24m. Width: 0.59m. Breadth: 0.59m.

Letter Height: 0.02-0.03m. (in the signature 0.009-0.02m.).

263–215 ante

[βασιλέα Ἰέρωνα] Ἱεροκλέρσ νακαί?
[ἀνέθηκεν ἄ πόλις τῶν Ταυρο[α]- νακαί?
[μενιτῶν?] Διὶ Ὀλυμπίῳ. Νικρῶν Νικηράτου Συρακόσιας ἀγονο[εν].

The letter style of the inscription is plain and the letters are spaced out and wide. Except for the letters of the signature, the others are difficult to read because the surface of the stone is very worn and the strokes are cut quite thin.

The empty spaces at the end of lines 1 and 2 are followed by a question mark, because the stone is badly weathered and definite conclusion cannot be reached. However, since the restoration in line 1 seems to be correct, the same number of letters should be assumed for the beginning of lines 2 and 3 (see Restorations). Moreover, the signature of the sculptor is inscribed in smaller letters, but not below line 3, as Eckstein printed it (see Restorations; likewise Moretti who follows Eckstein’s text). The text of the inscription, therefore, has 4 lines.

Characteristic letter shapes are: the horizontals of the epsilon are cut slightly slanting upwards, and the bottom stroke is slightly shorter than the top, while its middle is half the size of the top and bottom strokes; the right vertical of the pi is shorter than the left while the top horizontal is slightly slanting upwards; and the top and bottom strokes of the sigma are slanting up- and downwards, while the middle triangle is quite open.

Remains of Dotted Letters:

Line 1: omicron—only the upper left part of a curving stroke; second omicron—a faint trace of a curving stroke.
Line 2: upsilon—the upper left and right slanting strokes are faint, but visible.
Line 3: alpha—only a faint trace of its shape and a trace of the middle bar; tau—the extreme right part of a top horizontal.

Restorations: for line 1 see also Syll.\(^4\) 429 which is dated in the middle of the third century B.C.

Eckstein
\[\text{[Βασιλέα Ἰέρους] Ἰεροκλέος}
\[\text{[ἀνέθηκε ἀ πόλις τῶν Ταύρῳ Ἀρέου ἈΤ ἈΩ]}\]
\[\text{Μικήνης Νικη[άΤ]οῦ Συράκοσιος ἐπόνοι[αν].}\]

Moretti
\[\text{[Βασιλέα Ἰέρους] Ἰεροκλέος}
\[\text{[ἀνέθηκε ἀ πόλις τῶν Ταύρῳ[μεντὶν]}
\[\text{ΔΙ [Ω]Ἀμπιτεῖν.}\]
\[\text{Μικήνης Νικη[άΤ]οῦ Συράκοσιος ἐπόνοι[αν].}\]


Commentary: The date for this dedication, 263–215 B.C., is that of Moretti (ISE 145-146 no. 58) who correctly points out that these years are only \textit{termini post} and \textit{ante quem}, since a definite date for the decree is not possible;\(^{283}\) in 263 B.C. Hieron II and the Romans made a peace treaty in which a number of cities were included, among them Tauromenion (Diodoros 23.4), while 215 B.C. is the year of Hieron’s death.

In his exposition of the athletic monuments in the Altis, Pausanias also includes private and state dedications. Among them he mentions the offerings of Hieron I (no. 71 above) and Hieron II, both of which were set up near the statue of the Thasian Theogenes (no. 53 above) and that of the Spartan king Areus (no. 73 below). In order to distinguish the two tyrants of Syrakuse, who had the same name, Hieron, but different patronymics, the one the son of Deinomenes; the other of Hierokles, Pausanias adds a brief historical

\(^{283}\) Eckstein (1958, 209) suggests a date between 250–230 B.C., while in SEG the inscription is dated 263–241 B.C., because in 241 B.C. Hieron and his family appear to have acquired the title \textit{εὐεργέτης} Polybius (7.8.6).
note about the career of Hieron II, perhaps because he was not as renowned as his predecessor. In this overview, which for the most part is corroborated by Polybius’ account, Pausanias starts with the date when Hieron became tyrant of Syrakuse after Agathokles. The date he provides, however, is wrong by five years, since the second year of the 126th Olympiad when Idaios from Kyrene was the stadionike is 275 B.C., while Hieron actually became tyrant in 270 B.C.\textsuperscript{284} A similar mistake is also found in Pausanias’ statement that Hieron II was assassinated by a Syrakusan Deinomenes who hated tyrants. In fact, Hieron lived a long life and died peacefully in 215 B.C. It was his grandson, Hieronymos, son of Gelo and Pyrrhos’ daughter Nereis, whom Deinomenes assassinated one year after he succeeded his grandfather Hieron (214 B.C.).

Even so, all the other information Pausanias includes in his narrative about Hieron II is correct, since it is confirmed by Polybius (7.2; 4.5; 8.9): Hieron’s relations with Pyrrhos, whose daughter became the wife of his son Gelon; the alliance first with Karthage and then with the Romans, when they defeated him in 263 B.C.; and the incident of Deinomenes, who attacked Hippokrates, the brother of Epikydes, as he was about to address the Syrakusans. Polybius supplies the details of this event: Hippokrates and his brother Epikydes were members of the embassy sent by Hannibal to Hieronymos to find out whether there was any possibility of signing a treaty. This overview of Hieron’s career is based not on epigraphical evidence, but on a historical source or sources that may have been responsible for the incorrect dating of Hieron’s ascension to power and the end of his life. This by no means explains in a satisfactory way Pausanias’ mistakes, but at least serves as an indication that the exegete’s text needs careful reading.

\textsuperscript{284} See further Franke’s (1958, 57-85) discussion of the numismatic and historical evidence for Hieron’s career.
For in his narrative Pausanias combines information from many and various sources that are not always clearly discernible.

At any rate, after the historical note on Hieron the exegete concludes his exegesis with the subject that prompted this deviation in his narrative of the athletic monuments in the Altis, namely the statues of Hieron II, son of Hierokles at Olympia: they were two statues of Hieron, one on horseback and one on foot, dedicated by his children, and they were made by the Syrakusan artist Mikon son of Nikeratos. Later on, and near the base of the Erythraian Epitherses (no. 40 above), Pausanias sees three more statues of this same Hieron: two of them were dedications by the city of Syrakuse and the third again by his children. There is no mention, however, of the artist of these additional statues, either because he was the same, i.e. Mikon, or because there was no signature inscribed.

None of these five dedications of Hieron has been found at Olympia, but there has been discovered an inscribed base in honor of Hieron, son of Hierokles, dedicated by the city of, in all probability, Tauromenion. On the base there is also inscribed the signature of the sculptor for whom, until its discovery, Pausanias was the only source. This dedication of Hieron is not included by Pausanias in his narrative of the monuments in the Altis. The wording of its inscription, however, and that of Pausanias is very close. More specifically, the inscribed signature provides the correct name of the sculptor is a case. In Pausanias' manuscripts his name of the is recorded both as Μίκων and Μύκων, while his father's name is preserved as Νικηπάτου (the preferred reading of the later editors of Pausanias), Νικωπατού, Νικωπάτους, and Νικοπράτου. Both readings can now be tested vis-à-vis the text of the inscription which preserves the actual names: the sculptor's name is Μίκων, whereas in Pausanias the iota is dropped, which is not an unparalleled
phenomenon. More importantly, the reading which the later editors of Pausanias preferred for Mikion's patronymic is actually proved to have been the correct one. It seems that this was the third honorary statue of Hieron commissioned from Mikion who, in addition to being from Syrakuse, may have been the tyrant's favorite sculptor. Thanks to the discovery, therefore, of the inscribed base of Hieron Pausanias' testimony about his dedications at Olympia receives partial support: for the dedicator, the honored person, and the sculptor Pausanias doubtless used the inscriptions on the bases of the statues, while for the historical note on Hieron's career he employed other sources.

73.

6.12.5: Μετὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἴερωνας τὰς εἰκόνας Ἀρεὺς ὁ Ἀκροτάτου Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεὺς ... ἔστηκεν ..., καὶ αὕτης ἀναβηφκώς ἐστὶν Ἀρεὺς ἱππον. ἀνάθημα δὲ ... Ἀρεὺς δὲ ἡλείων ἐστίν καὶ μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ πρότερα ... οὐτε τῶν Ἑραία ἁμημόνως ἔσχεν, ....

6.15.9: μετὰ δὲ τῶν Εὐτελίδαν Ἀρεὺς τε αὕτης ὁ Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεὺς ... ἀνάκειται ....

IO 308: two joining fragments of yellowish soft limestone, of which fragment b was found May 21, 1877, in the Heraion, in the west Byzantine wall of the cella (for fragment a the IO editors do not provide the date when, or the place where it was found). The fragments are broken on the left and the right sides and fragment b also on the bottom. Only fragment a preserves the original height and on its surface there is a trace for a column which indicates that the base was also reused.

---

285 Marcadé (1953, vol. 2, 76) notes the name Agoralios-Agorallos, although he cautions that Pausanias' Mikon and the inscription's Mikion may be two different sculptors.

286 This is not unusual for the second half of the third century B.C. and it goes back to Alexander the Great, who preferred Lysippos for his statues.
as support for a column of the Heraion as were the bases of IO 306 and 307. The fragments are now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. Nos. 198 (a) + 198a (b). Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.205m. Width: 0.565m. Thickness: 0.15-0.155m.

Letter Height: 0.02-0.038m.

ante sive post 265/4 ante NON-STOICH. ca. 32

[βασιλεύς] Πτολεμαῖος βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου
[᾽Αρέα ᾽Ακρο]τάτου Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλέα,
[εὔνοιας ἐ]νεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν [καὶ εἰς τοὺς]
[ξύμπαντας Ἐ]λαμνας, Δι [῾Ο]λυμπίῳ [ἀνέθηκεν].

The lettering of the inscription is careful and dense and the strokes are cut deep enough that their width ranges from 0.003m. to 0.006m., while at their end tips they are deeper so as to form triangular serifs. Except for the relatively small omicrons, all the other letters are big, tallest are especially the upsilons, the iotas, and the epsilons, whereas the widest (0.03-0.04m.) are the epsilons, mus, nus, and sigmas.

Characteristic letters are: the epsilon’s middle stroke is half that of its upper and bottom strokes; the middle slanting strokes of the kappa are cut considerably smaller and so the width of the letter is considerably smaller; and the upsilon resembles the tau in that its upper slanting strokes are not sharply cut, but they tend to curve outwards starting from almost the top of the vertical stroke.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: pi—only the bottom part of the right horizontal.
Line 4: delta—only the two slanting strokes; lambda—only a trace of the right slanting stroke; first–iota a trace of the upper part of a vertical; second iota–the middle part of a vertical stroke.

Restorations:
The IO editors read and restore as follows:

[βασιλεύς Π]τολεμαῖος Βασίλεως Πτολεμαίου
[᾽Αρέα ᾽Ακρο]τάτου Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλέα,
[εὔνοιας ἐ]νεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν [καὶ εἰς τοὺς]
[ξύμπαντας Ἐ]λαμνας, Δι [῾Ο]λυμπίῳ [ἀνέθηκεν].


Commentary: The date for the inscription, ca. 265/4 B.C., is derived from Pompeius Trogus 26 and Plutarch’s Agis 3.4 where Areus’ death is mentioned. Areus I, son of Akrotatos, was king of Sparta from 309 to 265/4 B.C., the year of the Chremonidean War in which he presumably fell while attempting to break through the Makedonian
garrison stationed near Korinth by Antigonus Gonatas. Areus, Ptolemy Philadelphos and apparently his son, and the Athenian brothers Chremonides and Glaukon were allied against Antigonus Gonatas who had attacked and captured Athens. They tried to resist and repel the Makedonians, but they failed, because, according to Pausanias (see note 287), the naval commander of Ptolemy Patroklos and Areus were not very enthusiastic about the campaign. Pausanias does not record the manner of Areus’ death, nor does his narrative imply that Areus attempted three times (in 267, 266, and 265/4 B.C.) to break through the Makedonian garrison.\(^\text{287}\) Accordingly, the statue of Areus in Olympia was

\(^{287}\) F.W. Walbank writes about Pausanias’ brief historical comment on Areus \((CAH 7.1, 238)\):

The Spartans made several attempts to force their way through; the account in Pausanias \((III.6.4-6)\) has been plausibly interpreted to imply three campaigns, in 267, 266 and 265, in the last of which Areus met his death.

What Pausanias reports, however, is quite different in 3.6.4-6:

'Αρέως δὲ ἐν Σπάρτῃ τοῦ Ἀκρωτήτου βασιλεύοντος Ἀντίγονος ὁ Δημητρίου πατέρας, τοιούτῳ καὶ καλοὶ ἀρπαγεῖν ἀρπάζεται. \(\text{This is not even remotely an indication that Areus supported wholeheartedly this campaign. In fact, Pausanias states that when the supplies of his army vanished Areus returned to Sparta and not that he fell on the battlefield near Korinth. See also Diodoros’ version of the events (20.29), and McCredie’s (1966, 107-113) discussion of these sources.}\)
probably dedicated while Areus was alive, or soon after his death.\textsuperscript{288} Who of the Ptolemies made the dedication is not certain: the \textit{communis opinio} is that it is Ptolemy II Philadelphos (285–246 B.C.). Oikonomides (1956, 218-227), however, has shown that another Ptolemy II\textsubscript{a} called Andromachos, son and co-regent from 267 to 259 B.C. of Philadelphos, was also active during the Chremonidean War and he may have been the dedicator of Areus' statue in Olympia (p. 221, and 224 note 3).

Among the athletic statues Pausanias also saw in the Altis the dedications of kings and tyrants of various cities, which offered him the opportunity for a historical exegesis. After a long discussion on the famous athlete Theogenes from Thasos (6.11.2-9, no. 52 above) Pausanias continues with the chariots and statues dedicated by the Syracusan tyrants Hieron, the son of Deinomenes (6.12.1), and Hieron, the son of Hierokles (6.12.2-4), which are followed by the statues of Areus and Aratos of Sikyon (6.12.5). In fact, Pausanias reports three statues of the Spartan king Areus in Olympia alone, but his narrative is vague. He first mentions two of them, which stood perhaps in front of the east side of Zeus' temple (6.12.5): one of them portraying Areus on horseback, and one of the two, Pausanias does specify which one, being an Eleian dedication. Later on (6.15.9), Pausanias notes another statue of Areus near that of the Lakedaimonian athlete Eutelidas which stood to the south long side of Zeus' temple. Of course, the discovery of the fragments of \textit{IO} 308 in the Heraion does not agree with Pausanias' topography of the three monuments, since the base had been removed for reuse as a stylobate in the Heraion.

Pausanias gives the dedicant of only one of these statues, i.e. the Eleians, which cannot be identified with \textit{IO} 308. That Pausanias saw such a dedication in Olympia is

\\textsuperscript{288} For posthumous honors see Oikonomides' (1956, 223-224) discussion of \textit{IO} 296, the dedication of Ptolemy for Glaukon, and especially Buraselis' (1984, 136-160) discussion of the decree passed by the \textit{koinon ton Hellenon} at Plataia for Glaukos.
more than certain, because an inscribed base, echoing his narrative, has been found in the Arkadian city of Orchomenos, in the pronaos of the temple of Artemis (Moretti, *ISE* vol. 1. no. 54):

\[\text{ἐρ[χομεν]υν[δο]ν ὤ [πόλις]}
\text{βα[σ]ιλεία Ἀρέα Ἀ[κροτάτω]}
\text{Λακεδαιμονί[αν ἑυρέει]-}
\text{σι[α]ς [τ]ὰς ἐν αὐτῶν καὶ]}
\text{βασι[λέ]α [Πτο]λε[μαῖον].}

Except for line 1 where of course the city of Elis would be inscribed, what follows is the standard formulaic language of a dedication, and resembles that of *IO* 308. The Orchomenian inscription also notes king Ptolemy, who must be identical with the dedicator of *IO* 308.

Pausanias, it is true, does not provide any details as to who were the dedicators of the other two statues of the Spartan king Areus. Nevertheless, he notes that he has mentioned Areus in his earlier narrative (καὶ μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ πρώτα διέω. . . οὐτε τῶν ἐσ Ἀρέα ἀμνηστῶν ἔξοχον 6.12.5, Pausanias’ reference to his *Lakonika* 3.6.2-6). This may imply that these two dedications at least were connected with his earlier narrative on Areus, and so, Pausanias could offer no other information from the inscriptions on the bases, except that one of them was an Eleian dedication and the other a portrait of Areus on horseback. In the earlier account on Areus in his *Lakonika* (3.6.2-6; see also note 280) Pausanias does not explicitly name Ptolemy, but there is no doubt about the Egyptian king: Patroklos, the commander of the Egyptian fleet, was dispatched by none other than Ptolemy to help Athens during the Chremonidean War. It is very probable, therefore, that one of the two statues of Areus (the one on horseback 6.12.5, and the one near that of Eutelidas 6.15.9) was the Ptolemaic dedication referred to on the

---

289 See also no. 47, where the dedication of another major player of the Chremonidean war is discussed, the Athenian athlete Glaukon, son of Eteokles and brother of Chremonides.
two fragments of IO 308. Given the fact that IO 308 was reused as a column base in the Heraion, the statue near Eutelidas is the more probable candidate. The size alone of a base for an equestrian dedication would exclude the possibility of its easily being reused as a base for a column.

6.17.1: Δημοκράτης Τενέδιος ..., Δημοκράτης δὲ ἀνδρῶν πάλης: ἀνδρι-άντας δὲ τοῦ μὲν Μιλήσιος Διονύσικλῆς,...ἔστιν ὁ ἐργασθένος.

IO 39: a bronze tablet found almost intact in January 21, 1876, to the south of the southwest corner of the temple of Zeus. The text of the inscription is framed by two Korinthian columns and on top by an aetoma with akroteria (only the left is actually preserved). The aetoma is decorated with a bunch of grapes in the middle, flanked by two double axes, which was perhaps the emblem of Tenedos. The original tablet is now in the National Archaeological Museum, while in the New Museum in Olympia there is a cast of it in the Gallery of the Olympic Games (EM 6462).

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 9. Vidi, Phot. (the cast)
Height: 0.55m. Width: 0.33m. Thickness: 0.013m.
Inscribed Surface: Height: 0.43m. Width: 0.195m.

290 A dedication, similar to IO 308 by a Ptolemy (according to Oikonomides 1956, 218-227 Ptolemy Andromachos) has also been discovered in Olympia for another prominent participant of the Chremonidean war, the Athenian Glaukon, the brother of Chremonides, who was also a victorious athlete and for whom see no. 47 above.

The close relations between the Lakedaimonians and the Ptolemies are attested by yet another inscription found at Olympia, IO 309:

bas[...]l[e]s π[πολεμα[to]s
basilea [κλεομένε]a
Lακεδαίμονών [Δί Ὠλυμπ[ω]];
Letter Height: 0.003-0.005m. (except line 1: 0.008m.)

230–180 ante

Θεόρ. Τύχα.

υπὸ ἐλλανοδικὰν τῶν περὶ Αἰσχύλου, ὦ θυίῳ. vacat

ὅπωρ, ἐπεὶ Δαμοκράτηρ Ἱγήτορος

5 Τενέδιορ πεπολιτευκῶρ παρ᾽ ἀμεν., αὐτὸρ τε καὶ ὁ πατάρ, καὶ ἐστεφανωμένωρ τὸν τε τῶν Ὁλυμπίων ἀγώνα καὶ ἄλλωρ καὶ πλεόνερ, ἑπαντικῶρ ἐν τάν ἴδιαν τάν τε τῷ πατρὸν θεαροδόκιν δια-

10 δέδεκται καὶ ὑποθέξεται τοῖρ θεαροῖρ. όμοιόρ δὲ καὶ τοῖρ λοιπόν τοῖρ παρ᾽ ἀμεν. τάν πάσαν χρείαν ἐκτενέωρ καὶ ἀπρο-

φασίστωρ παρέχεται, φανερὰν ποιέων τάν ἔχει εὔνοιαν ποτὶ τάν πόλιν, καθὼρ

15 πλεόνερ ἀπεμαρτύρεον τοῖρ πολιτῶν. ὅπωρ δὲ καὶ ἀ πόλερ καταξίαρ φαίνανταν χάριτερ ἀνταποδιδώσα τοῖρ αὐτάρ εὔεργέταιρ. ύπάρχην Δαμοκράτη πρό-

ξενον, καὶ εὐεργεταν δ᾽ ἡ

20 μεν τάρ πόλιον αὐτῶν καὶ γένορ, καὶ τάν λοιπὰ τίμια ἦμεν αὐτοὶ, ὅσα καὶ τοῖρ ἀλ-

λοιρ προξένοιρ καὶ εὔεργέταιρ ὑπάρχει παρὰ τάρ πόλιορ. ἦμεν δὲ καὶ ἀσφάλειαι καὶ πολέμω

καὶ εἰράναρ καὶ γάρ καὶ βουκίαρ ἕγκτησιν καὶ εἰναι

25 ατέλειαν καὶ προεδρίαν ἐν τῷ ἁρ Διονυσιακῷ ἄγωνοιρ, τάν τε θυσιάν καὶ τιμᾶν πασὰν μετέχην, καθὼρ καὶ τοῖ λοιποι θεαροδόκικοι καὶ εὔεργέται μετέχοντι. δόμεν δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ Δαμοκράτη τόν ταμίαν ἐξενιά τάν τάν

30 μέγιστα ἐκ τῶν νόμων. τό δὲ ψάφισμα τό γεγονόρ ἀπὸ τάρ βωλάρ γραφέν ἐγ χάλκω-

μο ἀνατεθαὶ ἐν τό ialον τῷ Δίορ τῷ Ὁλυμπίῳ. τάν δὲ ἐπιμέλειαι τάρ ἀναθέσιορ ποῃσσαί Aἰσχύναν τόν ἐπιμελητάν τάν ἔππων.

35 περὶ δὲ τά ἀποσταλάμεν τοῖρ Τενέδιορ τό γεγονόρ ψάφισμα ἐπιμέλειαι ποησάται. Νυκόδρομορ ὁ βωλογράφορ, ὅπωρ δοθαὶ τοῖρ θεαροῖρ τοῖρ ἐμ Μήλητον ἀποστελλομέ-

νοιρ ποτὶ τάν θυσίαν καὶ τόν ἀγώνα
The dialect of the decree is the Eleian, its chief and persistent characteristic even for so late a date the rhotacism, but with considerable influences by the Attic koine (see Buck 1973, 159-160).

The letters of the inscription are cut carefully and elegantly, but the spacing is not as consistent as is expected in a long decree. The strokes are slightly curved and some of them end in dot-like serifs. Characteristic letter shapes are: the left stroke of the alpha is considerably longer and curves more; the upper horizontal of the epsilon is longer while the middle is the shortest and is cut closer to the upper stroke; the horizontal of the pi is overextended to the left and the right, while the right vertical is shorter than the left and curves outwards; and the left slanting stroke of the upsilon is cut attached to the right slanting stroke and not to the vertical.

Line 13: the upper horizontal of the pi in ΠΑΠΕΧΕΤΑΙ overextends too much as if a ligature of pi and gamma (Π) was intended.

Line 19: the letters are slightly higher (0.006m.) and are spread out by approximately one empty space between them.

Line 26: in ΤΙΜΑΝ the tau and iota are in ligature (Τ), while the nu is in angle brackets, because the cutter forgot it and inscribed it in the interlinear space above, between alpha and pi in ΤΙΜΑΝΙΑΣΑΝ.


Commentary: The date for this decree, late third and beginning of the second century B.C., is by no means certain. Stylistic and dialectical considerations have suggested the first half of the third century B.C. (JO editors, pp. 79-80). In addition to style and dialect, however, signatures of the Milesian Dionysikles, whom Pausanias names as the sculptor, have been found in Miletos.291 These texts place his career in the last decades of the third and the beginning of the second century (Buck, and Moretti, who tentatively places Demokrates' victory in the 144th Olympiad, i.e. 204 B.C.). Even so, the only certainty is that Demokrates was already an Olympionikes when the decree was passed, since it refers to his victory.

291 IMilet 1.3, 151, 162, 163; 1.7, 246.
With the chariot of the Athenian Glaukon (above no. 47) Pausanias completes his first route (ἐφοδιασόμενος) in the Altis and proceeds next with an exegesis of the monuments which were set up in the area “to the right” from the Leonidaion towards the Great Altar of Zeus, i.e. walking north— and eastwards having on the righthand side first the west and then the north façade of the temple of Zeus. The first significant monument according to Pausanias is the dedication of Demokrates from the island of Tenedos who won in the men’s wrestling event and whose statue was the work of the Milesian sculptor Dionysikles.

This athletic monument of Demokrates has not been found in the Altis, but to the south of the southwest corner of the temple of Zeus, in which it was to be set up (lines 31-32), a decree in honor of this same Demokrates has been discovered, to which Pausanias does not refer, but its information (lines 6-8) supports the exegete’s narrative on Demokrates. It is a proxeny decree of the Eleians conferring on the Tenedian Demokrates all the standard privileges of a proxeny decree (lines 19-25) with the addition of some specifically Eleian honors (lines 25-30), while in the beginning (lines 4-18) Demokrates’ career is listed as justification for the decree. The decree states that Demokrates was victorious in the Olympics and in most of the other major games in Greece and presumably in Asia Minor too (lines 6-8). This brief statement supports Pausanias’ narrative, and it may be safely assumed that he saw and very probably read the inscription on the base of the athletic dedication of Demokrates in the Altis.

Demokrates was an important person for the Eleians, since, as the decree makes clear, after his retirement from athletics he assumed his father’s duties. His father

---

292 6.17.1: Ταύτα μὲν δὴ τὰ ἀξιολογώτατα ἀνθρώπων ποιομένων τὴν ἐφοδίων ἐν τῇ Ἀλετῷ κατὰ τὰ ἡμέρας εὐχημένα. εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Λεωνίδαιου πρός τὸν βωμὸν τὸν μέγαν ἀφικοσθαί τῇ δεξιᾷ θελήσεσι, τοσάδε ἔστιν σοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐς μνήμην. For the latest and most convincing understanding of Pausanias’ vague topography see especially Herrmann 1988, 132-136 and Chapter II.
Hegetor and later Demokrates himself were *thearodokoi*, *i.e.* they received foreign dignitaries and provided them with the necessities. In fact, at the end (lines 36-40) the decree instructs Nikodromos, the Secretary of the Boule (βαλεγράφος) to give it to the Eleian *theoroi* who were about to be sent to attend and participate in the Didymeia, the festival of the city of Didyma in Asia Minor, where they would meet with Demokrates and present him with the decree.

The Tenedian Demokrates, an *Olympionikes* in wrestling, became, after his athletic career was over, a *theoros* and a *thearodokos* in which capacity he undoubtedly revisited Olympia many times and cultivated relations with the Eleians just as his father had done before. Thus, he became an important asset for the Eleians, their *thearodokos* in Asia Minor, where he was to receive their embassies, and they, in turn, were to receive him in Elis and Olympia. Pausanias’ brief note of Demokrates’ athletic dedication in Olympia and especially of the sculptor, the Milesian Dionysikles, is the only hint for dating this decree. In turn, the proxeny decree attests to the information of Pausanias about the Olympic victory of Demokrates (lines 6-8) and it adds considerably more about this important athlete turned politician from Tenedos.

75.

6.19.1: "Εστι δὲ λίθου πωρίνου κρητίς ἐν τῇ Ἡραίου, κατὰ νῆτον δὲ αὐτῆς παρήκει τὸ Κρόνιον. ἐπὶ ταύτης τῆς κρητίδος ἐλευθερίας οἱ θησαυροί, καθά δὴ καὶ ἐν Δελφοῖς Ἔλληνων τινὲς ἐποίησαν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι θησαυροῖ. ἔστι δὲ θησαυρὸς ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ Σικυωνίων καλούμενος. Μύρωνς δὲ ἀνάθημα τυραννῆ—5 σαντος Σικυωνίων. (2) τοῦτον ὣικοδόμησαν ὁ Μύρων νικήσας ἄρματι τὴν πρίττην καὶ τριακοστῆν ὀλυμπιάδα. ἐν δὲ τῷ θησαυρῷ καὶ θαλάμου δύο ἐποίησε, τὸν μὲν Δώριον, τὸν δὲ ἐργασίας τῆς Ἰώνων. χαλκὸν μὲν δὴ αὐτοῦ ἑώρων εἰργασμένους. εἰ δὲ καὶ Ἀρτήσιος χαλκὸς λόγῳ τῶι Ἡλείωι ἔστιν, οὐκ 10 οἶδα.
IO 649: a block of brown sandstone, found December 18, 1880, to the north of the eight treasuries above the wall of the mount and near the treasuries terrace. It seems to have been on one of the antae of the ante-chamber of the westernmost Building I, the treasury of the Sikyonians. The block is broken on the bottom and thus only the upper half of the letters is preserved. It is now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.11m. Width: 0.56m. Breadth: 0.46m.

Letter Height: the maximum of the preserved height is 0.018m. (the IO editors assumption that the original height was ca. 0.04m. seems to be correct).

500–450 ante

Σεκυνιοτ.

Remains of Dotted Letters:

iota—only the upper tip of a vertical stroke.

IO 245: a bronze spear butt, found February 8, 1878, on the northeast corner of the Byzantine church. It is damaged by oxydation and some letters are difficult to read. It is now in the Bronze Collection of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 331.

Longitude: 0.267m. Letter Height is not given by the IO editors.

500–450 ante

Σεκυνιατ(ων)νακατ.

The alphabet of both inscriptions is Sikyonian, which was a version of the neighbouring Korinthian. The letter shapes in both inscriptions are similar and show according to Jefferies (*LSAG* 138 fig. 35): ε1 (freak epsilon Ε), ν2 (IO 245) but ν3 (IO 649), ο2, ν2, and also the four-bar sigma in IO 649, but the E-shaped in IO 245.

IO 245 is apparently an abbreviation, since the space after the iota is left uninscribed.

To these Sikyonian inscriptions there should also be added: IO 668 which contains sixteen blocks from the treasury of the Sikyonians, all inscribed in the same letter style and bearing the marks of the masons;
and IO 714 which is fragmentary and, therefore, its subject difficult to ascertain, but whose lettering is
similar to that of IO 245, 649, and 668, and perhaps a Sikyonian-related inscription.

12, 15 pl. 23; 403.

Commentary: The date for these inscriptions, first half of the fifth century B.C., is
obviously related directly with the date of the construction of the Sikyonian treasury.
Pausanias “dates” it in the years when Myron, the grandfather of Kleisthenes was tyrant
of Sikyon (648 B.C.). The excavation of the building, however, has shown that
architecturally the construction of the treasury cannot be so early, and also that there is no
indication of bronze-lined walls, and therefore the first half of the fifth century B.C. is the
period of its construction, a date with which the letter style of the inscriptions is also in
agreement (Mallwitz 1972, 163-168). In all probability, Pausanias assumed that those
who erected and dedicated the whole building were the same persons who were
mentioned in an epigram he read on the smaller of the two bronze chambers, i.e. Myron
and the demos of Sikyon (6.19.4).

Pausanias, after he finishes with the exegesis of the statues in his second round
(ξίφος ὁδός) in the Altis, reaches the Column of Oinomaos which was set up between the
Great Altar and the temple of Zeus (5.20.3), i.e. the general area from where he started
out his first round with a southward direction. Near Oinomaos’ Column Pausanias
mentions the last two athletic dedications, which were the first athletic statues of wood to
be set up in the Altis (6.18.7), after which he moves to the last special category of
dedications within the Altis, the treasuries.293

293 Frazer (1965, vol. 4, 57) correctly points out the fact that Pausanias calls these builiding dedications
to Zeus ἑπορευτός and not ναυσκότος as Polemo does, the periegete whom Pausanias was supposedly
copying for his account in Olympia.
Pausanias’ topographical information about these buildings is accurate, since they have been found where he saw them: built on a terrace at the foot of Mt. Kronion, which was reached by stairs.\textsuperscript{294} The identification, however, of most of these buildings is still an open question, because Pausanias enumerates ten treasuries whereas the excavations have revealed twelve, and also because conclusive evidence has not been found during the excavations, except for three or four of them. Indeed, as Mallwitz put it (1972, 164), “ohne Pausanias wären uns auch diese Fundamente weithin ein Rätsel geblieben”.

The Sikyonian treasury, the first building from west to east, the order in which Pausanias describes them, has been securely identified not only by its material, the architectural remains, and its style, but also by the inscriptions. In particular, \textit{IO} 649 which was found to the north of the treasuries was probably part of the \textit{antae} of one of the ante chambers of the treasury, while the spear butt with the abbreviated genitive plural form was no doubt one of the offerings the Sikyonians housed in their treasury (\textit{IO} 245).\textsuperscript{295} It is no surprise that Pausanias relied on similar epigraphical evidence to corroborate the local exegetes’ suggestion that the building was the “so-called Sikyonian”, although he reached the wrong conclusion about its date (6.17.4):

\begin{quote}
\textquoteleft\textquoteleft Ολυμπίαι δὲ ἐπιγράμματα ἐπὶ τῶν ἐλάσσονί ἐστὶ τῶν θαλάμων, ἐς μὲν τοῦ χαλκοῦ τὸν σταθμὸν, ὅτι πεντακόσια εἶ.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{294} Pausanias mentions the stairs in 5.21.2 where he gives the topography of the Zanes that were set up at the foot of this elevated terrace (see no. 12 above): \textquoteleft Ιόντι γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ στάθμον τῆν ὁδὸν τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Μητράου, ἔστιν δὲ ἀριστερὰς κατὰ τὸ πέρας τοῦ ἄρους τοῦ Κρονίου λίθου τε πρὸς αὐτῖ τῇ ὃραι κρηπίς καὶ ἀναβασμοὶ ἐν' αὐτῆς· πρὸς δὲ τῷ κρηπίδι ἀνάματα Δίδα ἀνάκεινται χαλκα (sc. the Zanes).

\textsuperscript{295} The treasuries were a kind of a museum within the precinct in which the city housed its votive offerings so that they would be protected. Pausanias notes, in addition to Myron’s chambers, that he also saw, presumably among many other, the following offerings all of which (except the discs) had inscriptions (6.19.4-6): three discs, the number used in the pentathlon; an inscribed shield dedicated by the Myonians of Lokroi in Phokis; the sword of Pelops with golden hilt; Miltiades’ elephantine cornucopia with an epigram inscribed (see also no. 69 above); a boxwood statue of Apollo with gilt head, which had apparently an inscription stating that it was the work of Patroklès son of Katillos from Kroton and a dedication of the Lokrians of Cape Zephyrion.
This, of course, is not proof beyond a doubt that Pausanias read these two inscriptions of the Sikyonian treasury (IO 649 and IO 245), or for that matter that he did not read them. It does prove, however, that Pausanias' first choice for evidence were the inscriptions, much the same way it is today. And it is not accidental that the securely identified treasuries are those for which, in addition to archaeological, corroborating epigraphical evidence exists.

6.19.7: Ἐφεξῆς δὲ ταῖς Σικυωνίων ἐστὶν ὁ Καρχηδονίων θησαυρὸς, Ποθαίου τέχνη καὶ Ἀντιφίλου τε καὶ Μεγακλέους· ἀναθήματα δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ Ζεὺς μεγέθει μέγας καὶ θωράκες λυνοὶ τρεῖς ἄριθμον, Γέλωνος δὲ ἀνάθημα καὶ Συρακουσίων φοίνικας ἤτοι τριήρεσιν ἡ καὶ πεζῇ μάχη κρατησάντων.

IO 661: a small fragment broken on all sides and of the same material (hard, white, freshwater limestone) as that with which the treasury of the Syrakusans, or according to Pausanias of the Karthagenians was built. It is now in Αποθήκη 10 of the New Museum. Vidi, Phot.

Height: 0.12m. Width: 0.21m. Breadth: 0.05m.
Letter Height: the preserved maximum height of the upsilon is 0.055m.

520–470 ante
Συρ[ακοσίων].

Remains of Dotted Letters:
sigma—only the bottom slanting stroke; rho—only the bottom half of a vertical stroke.

The letters are cut sharply and the strokes are thin, but it is not certain that the Syrakusan alphabet is Korinthian, or a form based on and developed from the Korinthian. The shapes of the three partially preserved letters are (LSAG 262 fig. 43): σ2 and ρ2. Jeffery, because of the shape of the sigma in this fragment, believes that it is “too uncertain for inclusion among the Syracusan inscriptions” (LSAG 265
note 3). But Syracusan inscriptions *ca.* 470s B.C. do have both σ1 and σ2. See for example the dedications of Gelon and Hieron (nos. 9 and 71 above).


Commentary: The date for this inscription, late six to early fifth century B.C., is based on Pausanias' narrative, which is not very clear, and on architectural, sculptural, and epigraphical considerations (i.e. the letter style). These seem to indicate a date not later than the end of the sixth century. His last statement that the offerings, among which the treasury itself may be understood, were dedicated by Gelon and the Syrakusans on account of the victory over the Phoinicians may suggest further that the treasury was erected to commemorate the victory of 480 B.C. at Himera. This does not follow, however, if Pausanias' last statement is interpreted strictly, in which case it refers only to the offerings inside the treasury and not to the construction of the treasury itself. It may have been finished by 480 B.C. in order to receive Gelon's offerings, hence the late sixth and early fifth century B.C. date.

Immediately after the treasury of the Sikyonians (no. 75 above) Pausanias mentions the treasury of the Karthaginians. Identification of this building is not certain because the archaeological evidence indicates that in the second century A.D., perhaps just before Pausanias' visit, a road was cut for easy access up the Kronion hill by demolishing the two buildings next to the Sikyonian treasury. Thus, some identify the Syrakusan treasury with the fourth one from the west, since Buildings II and III were torn down for the road and Pausanias did not see them.\[296\]

\[296\] See especially Herrmann 1972, 97-104 and 240 note 390.
Notwithstanding this difficulty, Pausanias’ narrative creates another problem: he calls it the Karthaginian treasury, while later he makes clear that the noteworthy offerings inside it were dedications by Gelon and the Syrakusans which no doubt were also inscribed: a huge statue of Zeus and three linen corselets. Given the enmity between Karthage and Syrakuse, it is very difficult to imagine such cooperation. As Frazer (1965, vol. 4, 60-61) has noted long ago, the commonly accepted view is that the treasury was named not after its founders, but after the many Karthaginian spoils it housed. And yet, from 146 B.C. onwards there was no Karthage, since it was annihilated by the Romans, in which case the Karthaginian treasury would naturally fall into other hands, very probably Syrakusan. Therefore, even if the communis opinio is rejected, in later times the treasury may have changed owners and presumably name, even if it still housed its older Karthaginian dedications. At any rate, the problem must remain unresolved.

As with the Sikyonian treasury, so too for the Karthaginian/Syrakusan Pausanias seems to be using again epigraphical evidence to support his narrative: the signature of the architects and sculptors may have given him the information that the treasury was the work of Pothaios, Antiphilos, and Megakles; and the possible dedicatory inscriptions on the noteworthy offerings it housed may lie behind his statement that they were dedicated by Gelon and the Syrakusans commemorating their victory over the Phoenikians, IO 661.

77.

6.19.9: ὀικοδόμησαν δὲ καὶ Συβαρίται θησαυρόν ἐχόμενον τοῦ Βυζαντίων: ὁπόσοι δὲ περὶ Ἱταλίας καὶ πόλεων ἔποιησαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ, Λουκίας φασὶ κειμένην Βραυντεσίου τε μεταξὺ καὶ Ἰβρούντος μεταβεβληκέναι τὸ ὄνομα, Σύβαρμον οὖσαν τὸ ἀρχαῖον: ὃ δὲ ὄρμος ταῖς ναυσὶ χειροποίητος καὶ Ἄδριανοῦ βασιλέως ἐστὶν 5 ἔργον.
Kunze 1961b, 207-210: a bronze tablet found March 19, 1960, to the north of the westernmost third part of the northern slope of the stadion. It is preserved in excellent condition and has two holes: one in the middle of the top side between lines 1 and 2 and another at the bottom in the empty space of line 8. The tablet is now in the Bronze Collection of the New Museum.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. B 4750.

Height: left side 0.089m., right side 0.086m.

Width: top 0.157m., bottom 0.152m. Thickness: 0.005m.

Letter Height: 0.006-0.01m.

The letters are carefully and elegantly inscribed and their script is the Achaean, since Sybaris was an Achaean colony (LSAG 248 fig. 42): α1 but with the middle bar slanting to the left, β2, δ1, ε3, λ1, ν12, π1, ζ1, τ2 but with the top stroke slanting to the left, υ2, χ3.


---

Commentary: The inscription is generally dated a little before 510 B.C., the year in which Sybaris ceased to exist after neighbouring Kroton destroyed it, and after which Sybaris was not able to recover. This date is further confirmed by the architectural remains of Sybaris' treasury in Olympia and the style of the inscription. Sybaris was founded by Achaeans and Megarians ca. 720 B.C. and became a major center, founding other colonies in Southern Italy, among them Poseidonia.

Immediately after the treasury of the Karthaginians (no. 76 above) Pausanias mentions the treasury of the Epidamnians and the Byzantines from which no epigraphical evidence has been found yet, and then that of Sybaris, in which he did not see apparently any offerings worth reporting. Instead, he quotes his geographical sources about the site in Southern Italy where Sybaris was founded which of course must be wrong, since Λωντὰ (modern Lecce) lies between Brindisi (Brundisium) and Otranto (Hydruntum) on the eastern shores of Kalabria, whereas Sybaris was above Thurioi in Lukania.298

The treasury of Sybaris is variously identified as Building V, VI, or VII from the west (see nos. 75-76 above and notes 293-295), and it was identified very probably by Pausanias in the same manner that the two earlier treasuries were: through inscribed offerings that were housed inside it, among them perhaps the Sybarite bronze tablet which was affixed on one of the walls inside the treasury, or even by some sign outside the building. This is the only epigraphical evidence preserved about this important city in Southern Italy, which was the head of an alliance during the sixth century B.C. In the text two gods are specifically mentioned, Zeus and Apollo as the guarantors of the treaty which was to last forever, which may suggest that the treaty was to be set up both at

298 For the topography of the area and Pausanias' brief note see further Zancani-Montuoro 1973, 597-608.
Olympia and at Delphi by way of consecration. The discovery of this unique document of the city of Sybaris at Olympia near the treasuries is the only testimony about the importance of this city in Magna Graecia’s politics and economy during the sixth century B.C. It is also an indirect confirmation of Pausanias’ narrative about the treasury of Sybaris in the Altis, whose building was undoubtedly the show of power par excellence.

78.

6.19.10: Πρὸς δὲ τῶι Συβαρίτῶι Λιβύωι ἐστὶ τῶι ἐν Κυρὴνῃ θησαυρὸς· κεῖται δὲ βασιλείς ἐν αὐτῶι Ρωμαιῶν.

IO 246: a small slab of hard white-yellowish limestone, found on April 14, 1880, to the north of the treasury of Gela (the easternmost of the treasuries). It is broken on the top and right sides and the four preserved letters still have their reddish coloring with which the incision on the stone was painted. It is now in Ἀποθήκη 10 of the New Museum.


Height: 0.24m. Width: 0.33m. Thickness: 0.09m.

Letter Height: 0.078m.

post 630-500 ante ?

Φυρα[ναίοι - - ανέθευν?] OR Φυρα[ναίων].

The letters are monumental and proportional: their width (0.025m.) is one third their height (0.078m.). The strokes are cut elegantly and are painted, and the shapes of the letters show according to Jeffery that Kyrene used the script of Doric Thera, its metropolis (LSAG 308 fig. 45 “Southern Aegean Islands [Doric]”): α4, ο3, ρ2, υ2.

Commentary: the date for this inscription is only tentative and suggests the period from the date Kyrene was founded by Thera in 630 B.C. to the end of the archaic era. The treasury of the Kyrenaians was probably built during this broad archaic period (perhaps the sixth century B.C., during the reign of Battos II, 574–554 B.C., or Arkesilas II, 554–544 B.C.), with which the lettering on the inscribed fragment seems also to be in agreement.

Immediately after the treasury of Sybaris (no. 77 above) Pausanias mentions the treasury of the Libyans from Kyrene, in which statues of the Roman Emperors were housed. Which of the buildings is the treasury of the Kyrenaians is not certain because of the lack of conclusive architectural and sculptural evidence, and it has been variously identified with Buildings VI, VII, or VIII. The fragment which has been found to the north of the Geloan treasury undoubtedly was part of a Kyrenaian dedication which was housed within their treasury together with the statues of the Romans Emperors which Pausanias notes. The fact that Pausanias does not enumerate any other offerings in this treasury may be explained by his programmatic statement that only the most notable offerings are going to be included in his exegesis of the Altis, which in this case are the statues of the Roman Emperors. The fragmentary slab, therefore, which preserves the beginning of the name of the Kyrenaians is proof enough that the treasury housed many offerings in addition to the Roman statues, which could attest who dedicated the treasury in Olympia. This is after all the methodology which Pausanias follows for the other treasuries and it agrees perfectly with his general way of explaining the monuments in the Altis.
6.19.12: Megareis δὲ οἱ πρὸς τὴν Ἀττικὴν θησαυρὸν τῇ ὅικοδομήσαντο καὶ ἀναθήματα ἀνέθεσαν ἐς τὸν θησαυρὸν κέδρου θῶιδα χρυσῶι διηνησμένα, τὴν πρὸς Ἀχέλωνον Ἡρακλέους μάχην. Ζεὺς δὲ ἔνταθα καὶ Ἡ δημάνειρα καὶ Ἀχέλωιος καὶ Ἡρακλῆς ἔστιν, ὁ ἄρης τε τῷ Ἀχέλωι βοηθῶν. εἰστήκει δὲ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγαλμα ἀτέ 5 σοῦ τῷ Ἡρακλεί σύμμαχος· αὐτὴ παρὰ τὰς Ἐσσερίδας ἀνάκειται νῦν τὰς ἐν τῷ Ἡραίῳ. (13) τοῦ θησαυροῦ δὲ ἐπέφερασται τῷ ἑτοίῳ ὁ γιγάντων καὶ θεῶν πόλεμος· ἀνάκειται δὲ καὶ ἀστίς ύπὲρ τοῦ ἑτοίου, τοὺς Μεγαρέας ἀπὸ Κορινθίων ἀναθείναι τὸν θησαυρὸν λέγοντα· ταύτην Μεγαρέσιν ἠγοῦμαι τὴν χιλιάδα Ἀθηναίων 10 ἄρχοντος γενέσθαι φόρμαντος, ἄρχοντος δὲ διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βίου παντός· ἐναυσιάν γὰρ οὐκ ἦσαν πιὸ τὸτε Ἀθηναῖοι αἱ ἀρχαι, οὐ μήν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ Ἡλεών ἀνεγράφοντός ἐπὶ τηνυκατα αἱ ολυμπιάδες. (14) λέγονται δὲ καὶ Ἀργείου μετασχεῖν πρὸς τοὺς Κορινθίους Μεγαρεῖς τοῦ ἔργου. τὸν δὲ ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι τθεσαυρὸν ἔτεσιν *** 15 ύστερον τῆς μάχης ἐποίησαν οἱ Μεγαρεῖς· τὰ δὲ ἀναθήματα ἐκ παλαιοῦ σφᾶς ἔχειν εἰκός, ἡ γε ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος Δόντας Διποίνου καὶ Σκύλλιδος μαθητής ἐποίησε.

Apparatus Criticus:
15 Clavier restored the lacuna: έτεσιν περνήκοντα, Schubart-Waltz: έτεσιν τ', but Hitzig following Robert "excidit sive numeros sive πολύ',s", or even τῆς. Likewise, a lacuna is indicated in Papachatzis and Rocha-Pereira. 17 Δόντας is the mss.' reading, accepted by Hitzig and Papachatzis. Rocha-Pereira accepts the correction of Schubart-Waltz Μέδων, on account of Pausanias' 5.17.2, where it is assumed the same sculptor must be referred to.

IO 653: two joining fragments of soft local shell-limestone, found built into the west Byzantine wall of the Altis, fr. a in November 20, 1878, and fr. b in January 8, 1880. The two pieces form the central block of the architrave of the Megarian treasury and are now restored together with the entablature, the pediment and its recovered sculptures and on display in the Archaic Gallery II of the New Museum.

Height: 0.62m. Width: 1.93m. Thickness: 0.32m.
Letter Height: 0.08m.
The letters are carved on the soft limestone and are almost quadrangular. Their style suggests the Hellenistic period. Characteristic letter shapes are: the middle stroke of the epsilon is very short, while the top and bottom horizontals are of equal length with the vertical; the mu's middle part is the same height as its verticals; the nu's left vertical is slanting to the left, while its right is cut shorter; and the omega is very nicely rounded and centered.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
alpha—a trace of its left slanting stroke and of the rho a trace of the upper right part of a curving stroke.


Commentary: The date for the inscription is only tentative, since it is based on the letter style which suggests the Hellenistic period. Of course, the treasury was long in existence before that period, since a great number of its architectural and sculptural parts have been found, which allow restoration and can be dated in the last quarter of the sixth or even the first decade of the fifth century B.C. (Mallwitz, Bol, Herrmann).

Pausanias, after the treasury of the Libyans from Kyrene (no. 78 above), mentions the treasuries of Selinous and Metapontion, and then the treasury of Megara which has been identified with Building XI, the second to the last from the west, the last being that of the city of Gela (Building XII). Apparently for Megara Pausanias had at his disposal more information, both epigraphical and literary, which he employed for his exegesis of this dedication. The same methodology which Pausanias follows for the other treasuries is evident again in his brief narrative on the Megarian treasury: the building housed a sculptural group of small statues of cedar wood which represented the battle between Acheloos and Herakles, the works of the Lakedaimonian Dontas or Medon and therefore of early date; on the pediment the battle of the giants with the gods was depicted; and above it there was an inscribed shield, perhaps like the one on top of the eastern pediment.
of the temple of Zeus (above no. 1), which stated that the treasury was a dedication of the Megarians from (the spoils of the war with) the Korinthians. The Hellenistic inscription on the middle block of the architrave was probably seen by Pausanias, but the other dedications and especially the shield on top of the pediment were more important for his narrative, because of their historical ramifications: the Megarian victory, Pausanias speculates (νυσύσ), was won in a time when the Athenian archonship was not yet an annual office (Phorbas was an archon for life); and when the Eleians were not keeping records of the Olympiads, i.e. before 776 B.C., or even earlier, since there is no evidence as to when the Eleians started entering the victors’ names onto an honor roll of papyrus or stone, which eventually led Hippias, the Eleian sophist, to work on and compile the List of Olympic victors. From the same sources (?) that mentioned the archon Phorbas Pausanias also notes that the Argives “are said” to have helped the Megarians against Korinth.

The Megarian treasury which has been identified by its remains and the inscription on the architrave and Pausanias’ narrative about it provides yet another example of the methodology of the exegete: a particular monument in the Altis required, if possible, an exegesis which for Pausanias meant identification, date, outward description, its sculptor or architect, and the overall significance if any of the monument. And to do this the inscriptions on the offerings were his starting point which he then employed to corroborate, or dispute, as the case might be, his other sources. For the treasury of

299 Recently Figueira (1985, 292) has offered a thorough discussion of this passage of Pausanias and its importance for Megarian chronology. His understanding and interpretation, however, of Pausanias’ narrative is misleading, because Pausanias dates events and persons in his own way: he always gives the Athenian archon and the stadionike in the Olympic Games of the time (see especially Chapter II note 64, where all the passages in Pausanias which include an archon and a stadionike are given). Moreover, Pausanias’ attempt for a date originates from the inscribed shield which he thinks is a reference to the spoils of the war with which the treasury was built. Accordingly he starts this account with ηυσύματι, so as to alert his reader that it is all his speculation from one, or more sources and not like the dedications he has just mentioned which depend on his eyewitness observation and therefore more trustworthy.
Megara Pausanias employed the epigraphical testimony available, but also other sources, the local guides, and the relevant literature, which supplemented and corroborated the information of the inscriptions he read.

80.

6.20.8: τὸ μὲν δὴ στάδιον γῆς χώμα ἐστι, πεποιηται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ καθέστα τοῖς τιθείσι τῶν ἀγώνα. ἦστι δὲ ἀπαντικρὶ τῶν ἐλλανοθικῶν βωμὸς λίθου λευκοῦ. (9) ἐπὶ τούτου καθεξομένη τοῦ βωμοῦ θεᾶται γυνὴ τὰ Ὅλυμπια, ξέρεια Δήμητρος Χαμύνης, τιμὴν ταύτην ἀλλη λαμβάνουσα παρὰ Ἡλεύων. παρθένους δὲ οὐκ εἴργουσι θεᾶ- 

6.21.1: Τὸ δὲ ἔτερον τοῦ ἱπποδρόμου μέρος οὐ χώμα γῆς ἐστιν, ὅρος δὲ οὐχ ψηλόν. ἔπὶ τοῖς πέρατοι τοῦ ὅρους ξερὸν πεποιηται Δήμητρι Χαμύνης· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀρχαῖοι τὸ ὄνομα ἠγίνηται, χανεῖν γὰρ τὴν γῆν ἐνταῦθα τῶν ἄρματον τοῦ "Αἰδοῦ καὶ αἰθής μῦσαι· οἱ δὲ Χάμυν- 

10 νὸν ἄνδρα Πισαῖδον Πανταλέοντι ἐναντιούμενον τῷ Ὄμφαλίωνος τυραννοῦντι ἐν Πίση τι καὶ ἀπόστασιν βουλεύοντι ἀπὸ Ἡλεύων, ἀποθανεῖν φασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πανταλέοντος καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χαμύνου τῆς οὐσίας τῆς Δήμητρις οἰκοδομηθῆναι τὸ ξερόν. (2) ἀγάλματα δὲ 

ἀντὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων Κόρην καὶ Δήμητρα λίθου τοῦ 15 Πεντελῆσιν Ἀθηναίοις ἀνέθηκεν Ἡρώδης.

IO 485: a base of coarse marble, found on October 21, 1876, to the north of the north Byzantine wall. The base is broken on all sides, except for part of the top side which is preserved. Olympia Museum Inv. No. 89.

Height: 1.47m. Width: 0.60-0.62m. Breadth: 0.40-0.50m.

Letter Height is not given by the editors.

cavailability. 7w a. 245-249 post NON-STOICH. ca. 15

[- - - - ]Πιλάαν $ 
[τῆς ἱ]ξέρειαν τῆς $ 
[Χ]άμυναιας $ν Φλάβ(ίος) $ 
'Ἀρχέλαος $τῆς γυναίκα.
The lettering of the inscription is, according to the IO editors, similar to IO 627, 628, i.e. the letters are highly ornate, and the cutter employs empty spaces and the sign ς which is inscribed in major stops or after abbreviations: all strokes end in triangular serifs; eta and nu of την in line 3 form a ligature; the epsilon is the lunar shape; and the left slanting stroke of the alphas and lambdas extends upwards above the left slanting stroke.

Remains of Dotted Letters (from the facsimile of the IO editors):
Line 1: vertical stroke--only its bottom part; the gamma is dotted because it can also be an tau.
Line 2: epsilon--only the right part of the bottom curving stroke.
Line 3: alpha--only the right slanting stroke.

IO 473: a base of coarse Parian(?) marble, found on March 13, 1879, built in a late wall in the Echo Collonade. Line 1 of the inscription is cut on the cymation. Another fragmentary base has been discovered at Olympia (IO 474) and it appears, since it preserves the bottom right part of the text, that it was a copy of this inscription.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. 570.
Height: 1.47m. Width and Breadth: 0.49m. (with the cymation 0.62m.). Letter Height: 0.04m..

c. 212/213 post 

'Αγαθη<ι> 
Τύχη<ι>. 
Κλαυδία > Τύχη
Τιμ(ερίου) > Κλαυδίου
Τερτύλλου καὶ

5 Αιμιλίας Φιλοξέ- 
νας θυγάτηρ Κλει-
τορία καὶ Ἡλεία ἱέρει-
α Δήμητρος καὶ 
ἀρχιέρεια διὰ βίου

10 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 
αὐτοκράτορος 
καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν 
'Αχαϊῶν καὶ 'Εστία
διὰ βίου τοῦ κοινοῦ 

15 τῶν Ἀρκάδων
ἐπὶ τῆς ἡς συμ 
ὁλυμπιάδος
ψηφίσματι β(ουλῆς).
The lettering of the inscription is elegant and typical of the Imperial period, i.e. all strokes end in triangular serifs, and the shapes of the epsilon, mu, sigma and omega are cut with curving strokes. The cutter also employs twice the angle bracket punctuation mark: in line 1 to separate the nomen and the cognomen, and in line 2 to mark the abbreviation. In line 16, however, instead of a punctuation mark before the number he leaves one space empty.

IO 456: see no. 56 above.

ca. 157 post

The lettering of the inscription is elegant and typical of the Imperial period, i.e. all strokes end in triangular serifs, a broken middle bar alpha, and the shapes of the epsilon, mu, sigma and omega are cut with curving strokes. The cutter also employs three times a punctuation mark: in line 2 before and after the letter M which is an abbreviation for Marcus, and at the very end of the text after $\beta\nu\upsilon\lambda'$. For the family of Antonia Baibia and the significance of her father's claim that he was a descendant of Oxylos see no. 56 above.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 10: alpha and delta—only the upper triangular parts; of the omicron only the upper part of a curving stroke.

Restorations: all the restored letters at the extreme right end of the text are printed in the facsimile of the IO editors, but they are not on the base.

IO 610: a bull of Pentelic marble, found on March 20, 1878, lying in the middle of the lower water fountain of the Exedra of Herodes Attikos. Only the bottom part of the bull's legs are missing, and the inscription is cut on its right side, i.e. the side which was facing the visitor, since the bull was standing eastwards. The bull is now on display in the Roman Hall of the New Museum $\Lambda(\Theta\nu\nu\omega)$ 164.
Olympia Museum Inv. No. 373. *Vidi, Phot.*

Height: 0.70m. Length: 1.60m.

Letter Height: 0.06m.

160 post

'Ρηγιλλα, λέρεια folium
Δήμητρος, τὸ ύσυρ
καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸ ύσυρ τῷ Διί.


Commentary: The date for IO 486, 245–249 A.D., is derived from another inscription in honor of Flavios Archelaos (IO 483), the husband of the priestess, which has also been found at Olympia and includes the date, the 257th Olympiad. Likewise, the dates for the honorary inscriptions of Klaudia Tyche and Baibia Antonia are based on the Olympiads which are given on the texts, the 247th and 234th respectively. Their dedications, therefore, can be dated approximately, for Klaudia ca. A.D. 212–213 and for Baibia ca. A.D. 157. Finally the dates for Regilla are well known, because of her own and her husband’s career. She died in A.D. 160/1 (Habicht 1985, 10-11 note 55) and, since Baibia was Demeter’s priestess in the 234th Olympiad (A.D. 157–160), Regilla must have been Demeter’s priestess in the 233rd Olympiad or earlier (A.D. 153). This is also the commonly accepted date for the construction of the Nymphaion by Herodes Attikos at Olympia, which Regilla mentions in her inscription on the bull.

Pausanias, after he has completed his exposition of the buildings and the dedications inside the Altis, moves out of the temenos and proceeds with other constructions. These too are relevant to his subject matter, because they pertain either to the Games or to the gods and goddesses of the Eleians, whose temples were on the surrounding hills. Thus,
once he is finished with the treasuries, Pausanias briefly mentions the altars and temples at the foot of and on the Kronion hill (6.20.1-6), and then he returns inside the Altis for a moment to note the Hippodameion near the Processional Entrance into the Stadion (6.20.7). The Hippodameion has not been found and it has been assumed that it was in the area in front of the Echo Colonnade to the south of the Zanes. This is, after all, the last building which Pausanias mentions as inside the Altis before entering the Stadion.

In the Stadion the exegete describes the altar of white stone of Demeter Chamyne which was situated opposite the seats of the Hellanodikai. This goddess had a priestess at Olympia who was the only married woman allowed to attend the Olympic Games, but she sat apart on the altar.\textsuperscript{300} This is an extraordinary privilege and it highlights the importance of Demeter and her cult at the site. Later on, and after he has described in some detail the Hippodrome (6.20.10-19), Pausanias sees a temple on a hill adjacent to the Hippodrome, where there is the temple of Demeter Chamyne. This time, and as is his custom, Pausanias tries to offer an exegesis for the goddess' epithet. He is told two aetiological stories, both of which he includes in his narrative with no comment, thus allowing his reader to pick and choose: some believe that the epithet is ancient and is derived from \textit{xskov} “to gape open”, because in this spot the earth opened up, swallowed the chariot of Hades and then closed again.\textsuperscript{301} Others tell the story that the epithet of Demeter is in memory of the Eleian Chamynos, with whose estate the temple was built. Chamynos was a Pisatan who opposed the tyrant of Pisa Pantaleon, the son of Omphalion, on his attempt to revolt from Elis, and so Pantaleon killed him. In this

\textsuperscript{300} For the restrictions during the Olympics see also no. 65 above.

\textsuperscript{301} The Eleians alone honored Hades according to Pausanias 6.25.2-3. Papakonstantinou (1982, 505-513) has published an unusual Korinthian sandstone capital from Kolyri in Elis. She identifies the seated male as Hades flanked by Kerberos and a seated female, Persephone, and relates it to the statement of Strabo (6.25.2) about Hades' worship in the area.
temple, Pausanias concludes his narrative, the old statues of Demeter and Kore were replaced by Herodes Attikos with new ones, made of Pentelic marble.

Pausanias' information about the site of the altar and the priesthood of Demeter Chamyne has been corroborated both archaeologically and epigraphically. In the same site where Pausanias states that he saw the altar of Demeter Chamyne, there has been discovered in pieces a construction of light color limestone which is believed to have been Demeter's altar and the seat of her priestess. Its measurements are approximately 1.57m. by 10.6m., and immediately below it there have been also found stone posts which, it is presumed, originally supported wooden benches. The altar is situated approximately in the middle and closer to the western half of the north slope of the Stadion and it is dated in the middle of the second century A.D., a date which, of course, does not exclude the possibility that there was an earlier altar there. This is the third phase of reconstruction that the Stadion underwent since its construction in late Classical times.

Apart from Demeter's altar, there have been found at Olympia four inscriptions honoring priestesses of Demeter. Two of them, Regilla and Baibia Antonia, were near contemporaries of Pausanias, while the other two are considerably later. Even though in only one of the inscriptions is there specific mention of Chamyne (IO 485) which is a dedication by the priestess' husband, it is assumed that the other three which speak of the priestess of Demeter are in fact referring to Demeter Chamyne. For this was a very important priesthood which the Eleians and the Olympic Boule granted every Olympiad to a married woman. That is why Klaudia Tyche, who also held other, equally significant priesthoods, lists first her service to Demeter Chamyne (see further Kaldis-Henderson 1979, 134-154).

The case of Regilla, however, the wife of Herodes Attikos, requires further discussion. The inscription on the bull of the Nymphaion, together with the previous inscriptions, supports Pausanias' information about the priestess of Demeter Chamyne.
Her priesthood is not mentioned by Pausanias, but it certainly explains the interest of Herodes Attikos in Demeter Chamyne, which Pausanias records (6.21.2). Regilla during her four-year term as the priestess of Demeter Chamyne apparently took an instrumental role in at least two major constructions at Olympia. She and/or Herodes Attikos put up the money for the elaborate water fountain in the Altis and also for the new statues of Pentelic marble of Demeter and Kore. In fact, the major force behind these projects may have been Regilla and not Herodesi, and it is very likely that the statues were replaced while she was in office.

Moreover, the much discussed omission by Pausanias of the splendid, if not extravagant dedication of the Nymphaion by Herodes and his wife at Olympia, is not highly significant, although it is certainly deliberate. The inscription on the bull states that the Nymphaion was dedicated by Regilla as priestess of Demeter. This then suggests that Pausanias must have seen the fountain, and probably drank from it. The Nymphaion, like the Baths and other buildings which served practical purposes, had very little interest for Pausanias when it came to his exegesis of the Altis. Seldom does he include contemporary buildings and dedications. He is an antiquarian in the true sense of the word. Only once does Pausanias mention briefly such a building, the Leonidaion (no. 62 above), but not because it was the local VIP hotel. Its size and in particular its location, at the southwest corner outside the Altis and approximately opposite the processional entrance into the Altis, made it ideal as a topographical reference point. The Nymphaion did not meet any of Pausanias' criteria—it was not old, nor was it an object of religious veneration; there was no significant aetiological story connected with it which explained an Eleian or Olympic custom. It was simply a building which solved the very practical,
indeed pressing, water problem in the Altis.302

By contrast, when the subject matter is the temple of Demeter Chamyne Pausanias mentions Herodes and takes note that he replaced the old statues with new ones. Pausanias’ main goal is to answer why this Demeter at Olympia is called Chamyne and, in relation to her, what is significant about her temple and therefore worthy of being incorporated in his narrative. As for the epithet of the goddess, Pausanias could not decide definitively and, like Herodotos, he offers to his readers what he found out. The second aition about Chamynos is self-explanatory mythopoesis. The first and older aitiological story, however, comes closer to the modern explanation that Χαμύνη is related to Χαμύς and highlights the aspect of the earth (Kaldis-Henderson 1979, 140-141). More importantly, this older explanatory myth seems to underline the relation between two divinities, unique in Elis. Not only is Chamyne not attested anywhere else, but also in the city of Elis the Eleians honored with a temenos and a temple the god Hades, alone of all known people (ἀνθρώπων δὲ ἂν θεμέν μόνοι τιμῶν Ἡλείαν Ἡλέων κατὰ αἰτίαν τὴν ... 6.25.2, and Kaldis-Henderson 1979, 140-143).

Pausanias’ narrative on Demeter Chamyne, therefore, is not unlike other examples where the exegete combines his own archaeological and epigraphical observations with local tradition and customs and other literary sources to create a coherent presentation. The four inscriptions of the priestesses of Chamyne and especially that of Regilla, and the excavated altar of the goddess on the north slope of the Stadion provide background for the exegete’s narrative and illuminate his comment about the actions of Herodes.

302 For earlier bibliography and the various solutions for this omission by Pausanias see Habicht 1985, 134-135 and note 74; the extravagance of the building was undoubtedly an affront to Pausanias’ taste for this solemn precinct of Zeus.
6.22.3: ὁγδόν δὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς τεσσαράκοντα ὀλυμπιαδί. Δαμοφῶν ὁ Πανταλέοντος ὑπόνοιαν μὲν τινα παρέσχεν Ἄλεοις νεώτερα ἐς αὐτοὺς βουλευέν, ἐσβαλόντας δὲ ἐς τὴν Πίσιαίαν σὺν ὀπλοῖς ἀπελθεῖν οἴκαδε ἀπράκτους ἔπεισε δεθῆσι τε καὶ ὅρκους. (4) Πύρρου δὲ τοῦ Πανταλέοντος μετὰ Δαμοφῶντα τὸν ἄδελφον βασιλεύσαν- τος Πίσιαίοι πόλεμον ἐκούσαν ἐπανείλλοντο Ἀλεοίς, συναπέστη- σαν δὲ σφίσιν ἀπὸ Ἄλεων Μακίστου καὶ Σκιλλοῦντοι, οὕτω μὲν ἐκ τῆς Τριφυλίας, τῶν δὲ ἅλλων περιοίκων καὶ Δυσπόντιον.

Trianti 1986, 166-167: a bronze plaque was found in the excavations of 1978 on the south side of the temple of Athena at Mazi. It has six nail holes which were cut before the text was inscribed.303 The plaque is at the New Museum at Olympia.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. M 1128.

Height: 0.0144m. Width: 0.0148m. Breadth: 0.0032-0.0044m.

Letter Height is not given.

399–369 ante

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-STOICH.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ξδοξε τοῦρ Τριφυλίοιρ. ὅσοι ἐν τοῖς πῖναι ἐνηγράφενται, Μακίστου ἡμείς. αἱ δὲ τιρ θυλαία τὰμ πολιτείαν, αἱ τε ἐκ τελέων ἀποστέλλοι δικαίων πο- λιτειομένοιρ καὶ κάτ τὸν συνόμον, ἀσεβήτω πῶτ τάρ Ἀ- θανάρ. Δαμιάχο δαμω- ργό, Κατάκώ, Ἀγησιδά- μω, Διῶς μυγός Λυσιάδας Ἀγίας Μενάκης Ἀγεμονεύσ Φιλιππος Συλεύς Ἀπελλίς Ἐταρίχος Προνόα Φίλουκος Χάροψ Δαμήνης Πυθίων vestigia incerta

---

303 The inscription has been published by A.-I. Trianti in her Dissertation *Ὁ γαμπτὸς Ἐλακομός τοῦ μαχ. στὸν Ἔλες τῆς Ἄλεος* (Thessalonike 1985) 26-33, 143-147, which I have not seen.
Commentary: The date for this citizenship decree, 399–369 B.C., is based on line 1, where the *koinon* of the Triphylian cities is mentioned; this defines the *terminus post quem*, as 399 B.C., the year when Triphylia became independent, and the *terminus ante quem* 369 B.C. when Triphylia became part of Arkadia.

Pausanias, after his exegesis of Olympia and before proceeding to Elis, the major city of the Eleian region, visits various cities around Olympia, among which is the site where Pisa once stood. The site, Pausanias notes (6.22.1), is now deserted and one can see only vineyards, a small building in which there is a bronze box with the bones of Pelops, and signs of an old temple for Artemis Kordaka (6.22.1). This, however, does not mean that there is no history about Pisa, which Pausanias narrates in his usual summary form. It mainly centers around the dispute and the ensuing struggle between Elis and Pisa over control of Olympia and the Games (6.22.2-3).

During one of these struggles between Pisa and Elis, not long after the 48th Olympiad (588 B.C.), Pyrrhos, the second son of Pantaleon, who became tyrant of Pisa after his brother Damophon, managed to persuade the Triphylian cities Makistos and Skillous and the Eleian Dyspontion to revolt against Elis. Pausanias does not explicitly

---

**304** 6.21.3-22.11: in the Pisatan territory towards the borders between Arkadia and Elis Pausanias visits the cities of Phrixa and Pisa, and a few temples scattered on the mountains. He then returns back to Eleian territory, proceeding north- and eastwards to Pylos, Herakleia, and Letrinoi (for which see no. 82 below), before he reaches Elis, the major city of the region. After Elis and before entering Achaia, Pausanias visits one last city with which he concludes his *Ellaka*, Kyllene, situated “facing Sicily”, i.e. on the westernmost promontory of the Peloponnese.

**305** Andrewes’ thesis (1982, 85) that a city Pisa never actually existed can be put to rest, since excavations around Olympia have unearthed a multitude of Mycenaean tombs, which indicate that the area was populated and the inhabitants’ burial customs were similar to those of other communities. In fact, on the banks of Alpheios and Kladeos there seems to have existed settlements from prehistoric times. See further Papachatzis 1974-1981, vol. 3, 383-386 and the notes.
say that the Eleians managed to put down this revolt and retain control of Olympia, since he introduces the whole narrative of the Pisatan attempts as failures (6.22.2). No doubt, the Pisatan attempts had the support of neighbouring Arkadian cities. The Arkadians eventually organised the games at the 104th Olympiad (364 B.C.), and, as a result, a battle was fought in the Altis. Ultimately, however, the Eleians succeeded in destroying all the cities in Triphylia, and by Pausanias’ time only Samikon and Lepreon were still standing, since these are the only two that the exegete visits and mentions.

The cities in Triphylia according to Herodotos (4.148) were six: Lepreos, Makistos, Phrix, Pyrgos, Epion, and Noudion, of which only Lepreos’ remains have survived (see Papachatzis 1974-1981, vol. 3, 206-210, 386-388 notes 1 and 2). This territory between Elis and Messenia was frequently disputed between Elis and Sparta, and Elis and Arkadia. Indeed when Pausanias visits Lepreos he indicates that the inhabitants do not consider themselves Eleians, but Arkadian. Certainly this claim of the Lepreatai provided the pretence for Arkadia’s intervention and attempt to control Olympia, albeit unsuccessfully. The citizenship decree discovered in the temple of Athena at Mazi is dated in the years when Agis invaded Elis from the south and also when the war between Elis and Arkadia broke out. It is the first epigraphical testimony for the Makistioi and Triphylioi, and Trianti has offered a compelling argument for the site of the city Makistos: the bronze plaque was found near the temple of Athena, around, or very near which Makistos must have stood. Although the granting of citizenship is not by necessity related to political and military instability, nevertheless this decree may be associated with

---

306 For this incident see also Pausanias 5.9.6; 6.4.2; 6.8.3; Xenophon (Hellenika 7.4.28-32); and Diodoros (15.78). It has also been suggested that Pausanias’ reporting of the story he heard from the exegete Aristarchos that they found on the roof of the Heraion the bones of a soldier from the battle between Eleians and Lakedaimonians is not correct. Since Xenophon and Diodoros in the above passages say that a battle in the Altis took place in the war between Arkadians and Eleians.

307 See also no. 29 above.
these events, since the cities in Triphylia were by definition hostile towards Elis. Pausanias does not mention any visit to the Triphylian Makistos in his *Eliaka*, because by his time there were no traces of it. At the very least, however, his reference in a historical note to this Triphylian city as one of the participants in the Arkadian coalition against Elis in the 360s suggests that Makistos was in existence at that time. And this much is corroborated by the citizenship decree found at Mazi, the ancient Makistos.

82.

6.22.8: Ἔδε ἐλθείν ἐσ Ἡλιν διὰ τοῦ πεδίου θελήσειας, σταδίους μὲν ἐκκόσι καὶ ἐκατὸν ἐσ λετρίνως ἐξεῖς, ὑδαθύκοντα δὲ ἐκ λετρίνων καὶ ἐκατὸν ἐπὶ Ἡλιν. τὸ μὲν δὴ ἔξ ἀρχὴς πόλισμα ἤν οἱ λετρίνου, καὶ λετρέυς ὁ Πέλοπος ἐγεγόνει σφίσιν οἰκιστῆς. ἔπ' ἐμοῦ δὲ οἰκήματά τε ἐλείπετο ὀλίγα....

Kunze 1964, 169, pl. 173ab: a bronze strainer was found in Olympia with an inscription, cut retrograde on its handle.

Olympia Museum Inv. No. B5917.

No measurements are given.

*saec. VI–medio V ante?* ἵστον τὸ Διὸς Λεθρίνων.

The letter style of this brief text is that of the Eleian alphabet (*LSAG* 206 fig. 40): 61, λ1, ρ2, σ2.


Commentary: The date for the dedication, 600–450 B.C. (Kunze and others), is obviously very general, since it is solely based on the lettering.
If Kunze is correct in reading in the last word of the inscription the city of Letrinoi, and there is no reason why not, then this is the first epigraphical attestation of the Eleian city Letrinoi. The dedication itself does not conform to Pausanias' criteria for the composition of his *Eliaka*. It is a simple bronze strainer with an inscription on its neck, which simply states that it is a sacred offering to Zeus. It is, otherwise, hardly noteworthy and consequently Pausanias makes no mention of having seen it at Olympia. Once he finishes with Olympia, Pausanias moves to other cities around the region, until he finally reaches the most important city of the region Elis, also named Elis (6.23.1ff.). Among these cities is Letrinoi which in his time had just a few buildings remaining of which he briefly mentions only the temple of Artemis. Given the many examples so far discussed, it is not at all inconceivable that the exegete may have read inscriptions in the temple of Artemis at Letrinoi. Since Pausanias is the only ancient author who claims to have visited this place to find out what it was, it is appropriate to acknowledge that this brief dedication by the Letrinaeans, found at Olympia, supports his narrative that he visited such a place.

308 See note 304 above.

309 Xenophon may have also visited the Letrinoi, since he mentions them in his *Hellenika* (3.2.25-30 and 4.2.16) as one of the cities that Agis invaded crossing from Messenia to Triphylia. For more on the topography of the area see Papachatzis 1974-1981, vol. 3, 392-393 note 3.
D. INSCRIPTIONS THAT PAUSANIAS MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE SEEN OUTSIDE ELIS

Instances in Ἡλλακτών A and B similar to those in Part C are discussed in this final section (nos. 83–89) of indirect epigraphical evidence. The inscriptions all come from outside of Elis, from places which in all probability Pausanias visited and was familiar with, and where again he may, or may not, have seen and read them. As with the previous group, so too here if Pausanias' narrative and the epigraphical texts are studied side by side, a better understanding of both results.

83.

5.1.3: τοὺς Ἡλείους Ἰσμεν ἐκ Καλυβώνος διαβεβηκότας καὶ Ἀἰτωλίας τῆς ἄλλης· τὰ δὲ ἔτι παλαιότερα ἐστὶν οὕτως τοιάδε εὑρίσκον. βασιλεύσαι πρῶτον ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ λέγουσιν Ἀεθλίον, παῖδα δὲ αὐτοῦ Διός τε εἶναι καὶ Πρωτογενείας τῆς Δευκαλίωνος, Ἀεθλίον δὲ Ἐνυμίων γενέσθαι. (4) τοῦτο τοῦ Ἐνυμίων Σελήνην φαίνεται, καὶ ως θυγατέρας αὐτῶι γένοιτο ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ πεντήκοντα. οἱ δὲ δὴ μᾶλλον τι εἰκότα λέγοντες Ἐνυμίων λαβοῦντι Ἀστεροδίαν γυναῖκα—οἱ δὲ τὴν Ἰτώνον τοῦ Ἀμφικτύωνος Χρομίαν, ἀλλοι δὲ ὑπερήππην τὴν Ἀρκάδον—, γενέσθαι δὴ, σὺν φαίνεται αὐτῶι Παϊόνα καὶ Ἐπειόν τε καὶ Ἀἰτωλόν καὶ θυγατέρα ἔπτε δὴ αὐτοῖς Ἐὑρυθύκαν. ἔστηκε δὲ καὶ ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι δρόμου τοῖς παισὶν ἀγώνα Ἐνυμίων ὑπὲρ τῆς ἄρχης, καὶ ἐνίκησε καὶ ἔσχε τὴν βασιλείαν Ἐπειόν· (5) καὶ Ἐπειόι πρῶτον τότε δὴ ἤρχετο ἡμῶν ὑμνώσοντας, τῶν δὲ ἄδελφῶν ὑπὸ τὸν μὲν καταμείναι φασιν αὐτοῦ, Παϊόνα δὲ ἀχθὸμενον τῆι ἡσσῇ φυγεῖν ἐστὶ πορρωτάτῳ, καὶ τὴν 15 ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀξιοῦ ποταμοῦ χώραν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ Παῖοναν ὄνομασθήσησιν. τὰ δὲ ἔτι τὴν Ἐνυμίων τελευτήν οὐ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ Ἰρακλείωτα τε οἱ πρὸς Μιλήτωι καὶ Ἡλείοι λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ Ἡλείοι μὲν ἀποφαί-
Robert 1978, 478: a marble block from the west exedra (no. I) at Delphi (see FD III.3, 144 and fig. 11 on page III 96). Robert prints the text of Pomtow-Klaffenbach, as does Moretti, and reserves his suggestions for different restorations for the notes.

Delphi Museum Inv. No. 56 = No. 1078 (numéroté deux fois, Daux in FD III.3, 144).

Height: 0.087m. Width of inscribed surface: 0.0515m.

Thickness: 0.41m.

Letter Height: 0.008m.

c. 260 ante

[Στραταγένατος τῶν Ἄρχασινως τὸ δεῦ]-
[τερ]ον ἔθοξε τοὺς Ἀττιλοῖς. ἔπειδη Ἠρ[ακ]λεῖται

NON-STOICH. ca. 42
Restorations: it should be emphasized that G. Daux in his edition of this inscription (FD III.3, 144) is very critical of Pomtow's readings, since on the left part of the stone he does not see any of the dotted letters. He comments: "lecture très difficile: la partie gauche est évanide" (FD III 111). Daux's left part of the text is only partially restored with the following "restitutions assurées" (FD III 111), which Robert also calls "exactement" (p. 478 note 5):

Line 1: Στραταγέσωντος των άτωλος.
Line 2: ξέδοξε τούς άτωλος.
Line 6-7: πολύς εξίμεν τούς Ἡρακλείωτας. Line 6: [Αϊτωλοῦς].
Line 13: [καὶ ταῦτα ποιῶν.

Line 6: Επαύξησαν Pomtow; ἑνεφάνιἀν Daux; ἑνέθεσαν Moretti; ἑνεφάνιὸν Robert.
Line 15: Ἠρώτι Daux; Ἠρώτι Pomtow, Klaffenbach, Moretti, Robert.

Dain 1933, 66-73 no. 60: a rectangular block of white-greyish marble, found in the spring of 1873 at Herakleia on Latmos (Kapi-Kéré) during the excavations by O. Rayat and A. Thomas. In October of the same year the inscription was donated to the Louvre by the barons G. and E. de Rothschild. The stone is broken on all sides except the left and is in the salle de Milet, puis galerie épigraphique of the Louvre.

Louvre Museum Inv. MNB 697. Cat. Marbres ant. no. 2814.

Height: 0.56m. Width: 0.31m. Thickness: 0.185m.

Letter Height: 0.07m.
The lettering is elegant and all strokes end in triangular serifs. The crossbar of the alpha is sharply broken.

Remains of Dotted Letters: Dain’s facsimile and Robert’s photograph make possible some minor suggestions on dotted letters. Robert does not print the whole text, but comments on certain lines.

Line 3: nu—the left vertical and part of a slanting to the right strokes.
Line 9: upsilon—only an upper left slanting to the right stroke.
Line 11: Dain dots the last upsilon in άυς, but only the upper right slanting to the left stroke is lost.
Line 14: Dain dots the last alpha in ταυ, but only the right slanting stroke is lost.
Line 15: lambda—only a left slanting stroke.
Line 22: omikron—only the left part of a curving stroke.
Line 23: Dain dots the upsilon in πάυς, but only the upper right slanting to the left stroke is lost.
Line 25: nu—the left vertical and part of a slanting to the right strokes.
Line 26: Dain dots the last sigma, but only the right half of the top and bottom vertical strokes is lost.
Line 29: nu—the left vertical stroke and part of one slanting to the right stroke.

Restorations: Dain prints by way of commentary the notes and suggestions of B. Haussoullier and U. von Willamowitz-Möllendorff who studied this inscription. The nature of the inscription is not known and their suggestions are very tentative, since restorations are simply impossible. I have kept the text of Dain, but added question marks to all restorations, even those of letters, in order to stress caution. Even the accents in some instances are by no means certain (see for example Page’s text).


Commentary: The date for the Aitolian decree is based on Pomtow’s computation for the second generalship of Arkison (259 or 255 B.C.). If this is correct, then the Ptolemy in line 9 is Philadelphos II (308-246 B.C.), who was twice involved in a war over Syria and Asia Minor with Antiochus II: the first Syrian War ca. 276-271 B.C., the Second Syrian War 260-253 B.C. This by no means excludes the possibility that the decree may refer to the events of the Third Syrian War (246-241 B.C.), fought by Ptolemy III Euergetes during which he acquired important towns in Asia Minor. The inscription from Herakleia on the Latmos is not dated by previous editors, but its lettering points to Hellenistic times.

310 Except Page 1962, no. 119 (1037): “aetas incerta.”
These two inscriptions support the narrative of Pausanias concerning the mythhistorical past of Elis where he records in passing the dispute between the Eleians and the Herakleians on the Latmos over Endymion's death. The mythhistorical connections of founders of cities were from the Hellenistic time onwards very much in vogue and sometimes, as is the case with Herakleia, played an important part in state relations. According to Pausanias' narrative, Endymion's children became leaders and gave their names to the people whom they governed. Thus, Aitolos left Elis and settled in the region around the river Acheloos (5.1.8), while Endymion retired to a cave on Mt. Latmos where he died, according to the Herakleians (5.1.5 where the text presents problems). This mythical connection between Aitolia and Herakleia reflects early Aitolian interests in this area of Asia Minor where an Aitolian establishment may have existed. The reliability of this account of Pausanias can be tested by the two inscriptions.

The Aitolian decree from Delphi does not mention explicitly which Herakleia is to be helped by the Aitolian intercession with the Ptolemies and many different cities had been proposed until Robert's discussion of this decree. He offered the necessary proof for the identification of Herakleia on Latmos, where, as the second inscription suggests, Endymion was honored as its founder (line 7). Moreover, the decree's mention of οὐγγένεα (line 4) between the two states and the characterization of the Herakleians as άντωκοι of Aitolia (lines 12-13) are in concert with the mythistoric account of Pausanias, without which these lines of the decree cannot be easily understood and explained. Pausanias' preservation of the Eleian mythistoric past makes possible not only the identification of Herakleia on the Latmos as the Herakleia of the Aitolian decree, but also provides the nucleus for establishing a connection between Herakleia and Aitolia. During the third century B.C. the Aitolians were competing with the Macedonians for influence
over Greek affairs, while small Herakleia fared well by utilizing its ties with Aitolia and exploiting Aitolian influence over the Ptolemies.\(^{311}\)

The inscription from Herakleia sheds further light on Pausanias' text. It is not clear what kind of a hymn this inscription is,\(^{312}\) but what is important here is that Endymion in line 7 is praised as the founder of the demos of the city of Herakleia, during a public ceremony or festival (τελετας 32, whatever this telete might have been).\(^{313}\) This suggests that Endymion held a special place of honor in the public life of the Herakleians on Latmos, a fact which helps in solving the textual problem in 5.1.5, where a crux is rightly assumed by Rocha-Pereira, the recent editor of Pausanias. The text of the hymn can rule out as unlikely the restoration ὁς θεός, since Endymion is praised as an ὄλκιστής (line 7) and not a god, and it clearly shows that Endymion was highly honored by the citizens of Herakleia alongside Athena. Therefore, since Pausanias employs thrice

\(^{311}\) See Robert 1978, 490 note 61 on the use and meaning of ἀπονεκτα.

\(^{312}\) Haussoulier thinks it is a partheneion (line 31ff.); Willamowitz believes part of it to be on marriage (line 34). Page's 1962, no. 119 (1037) brief statement deserves to be quoted:

carmen melicum arguunt dialectus numerique: aetas incerta. est ambitiosior hic poeta, dihyrambi antiquioris imitator; prisca recolit..., nova appetit....

nuptiale esse carmen coni. Haussoulier, quocon coniungi irae divinae depreciationem, fortasse anniversariam. sententiarum conexio plerumque obscura, versuum divisio incertissima.

Robert 1978, 488-489 suggests that it is a celebration for Athena whose temple was excavated near the agora (line 2).

\(^{313}\) It is Strabo (10.3.2) who records an epigram inscribed on a statue of Aitolos at Thermon dedicated by the Aitolians (IGM 164), where Aitolos the son of Endymion is praised as their founder:

Χάρης ὁλκιστήρα, παρ' Ἀλφείον ποτε δύνας ἡρεθείναι, σταθὼν γείτον' Ὀλυμπιάδος, ἐνδυμίωνος πατέρ' Ἀιτωλὸν τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν Ἀιτωλῷ, σφετέρας μηὶ' ἄρετῆς ἐσοφαίν.

Another similar epigram is recorded by Strabo (10.3.2) as being on a statue of Oxylos in the Agora of Elis (IGM 147):

<"Οξυλος>

Ἀιτωλός ποτε τόνδε λιπάν αὐτόχθονα δῆμον κτήσατο Κούρητιν γῆν δορὶ πολλὰ καμάρι. τῆς δ' αὐτῆς γενεάς δεκακοσιτάρως Ἀτύνονος νύς ὁς Ὀξυλος ἀρχαίην ἔκτισε τὴνδε πόλιν.

It is Strabo (10.3.2) who records an epigram inscribed on a statue of Aitolos at Thermon dedicated by the Aitolians (IGM 164), where Aitolos the son of Endymion is praised as their founder:

Χάρης ὁλκιστήρα, παρ' Ἀλφείον ποτε δύνας ἡρεθείναι, σταθὼν γείτον' Ὀλυμπιάδος, ἐνδυμίωνος πατέρ' Ἀιτωλὸν τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν Ἀιτωλῷ, σφετέρας μηὶ' ἄρετῆς ἐσοφαίν.

Another similar epigram is recorded by Strabo (10.3.2) as being on a statue of Oxylos in the Agora of Elis (IGM 147):

<"Οξυλος>

Ἀιτωλός ποτε τόνδε λιπάν αὐτόχθονα δῆμον κτήσατο Κούρητιν γῆν δορὶ πολλὰ καμάρι. τῆς δ' αὐτῆς γενεάς δεκακοσιτάρως Ἀτύνονος νύς ὁς Ὀξυλος ἀρχαίην ἔκτισε τὴνδε πόλιν.
elsewhere the expression τιμάοι (not τιμήν) νέμουσι to convey honors bestowed upon someone, 314 5.1.5 should read καὶ τιμάει αὐτῷ νέμουσι.

84.

5.8.9: τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς παισίν ἐς μὲν τῶν παλαιότερων οὐδεμιᾶν ἦκει μυὴμην, αὐτὸi δὲ ἀρέσαν σφῶς καταστήσαντο Ἡλειόη. ὁδόμου μὲν δὴ καὶ πάλης ἔτεθη παισίν ἂθλα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης καὶ τριακοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος, καὶ Ἰπποσθένθης Λακεδαιμόνιος πάλην, Πολυνείκης δὲ τὸν ὁδόμον ἐνύκησεν Ἡλειόη. πρώτη δὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς τεσσαράκοντα 5 ὀλυμπιάδι πύκται ἔσεκάλεσαν πάδας, καὶ περιήν τῶν ἐσελθόντων Συμαρίτης φιλίτας. (10) τῶν δὲ ὀπλιτῶν οἱ ὁδόμοι ἐδοκιμάσθη μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς πέμπτης ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ἐξηκοστῆς, μελέτης ἐμὸ δοκεῖν ἐνεκά τῆς ἐς τὰ πολεμικα: τοὺς δὲ δραμόντας ἄσπισι ὁμοῦ πρῶτος Δημάρατος ἐκράτησεν Ἡραεὺς. ὁδόμος δὲ δύο Ἴππων τελείων 10 συνωρίζει κληθείσα τριτῇ μὲν ὀλυμπιάδι ἔτεθεν πρὸς ταῖς ἐνενήκοντα, Εὐαγόρας δὲ ἐνύκησεν Ἡλειόη. ἐνατῆ δὲ ἱρεσίν ὀλυμπιάδι καὶ ἐνενηκοστῇ καὶ πώλων ἄρμασιν ἀγωνίζεσθαι. Λακεδαιμόνιος δὲ ἐν <εύρυβείδεσι> τῶν στέφανον τῶν πώλων ἔσχε τοῦ ἄρματος. (11) προσέθεσαν δὲ ύστερον καὶ συνωρίζα πάδων καὶ πάλων κέλητα: 15 ἐπὶ μὲν δὴ τῇ συνωρίζῃ Βελιστίχην ἐκ Μακεδονίας τῆς ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ γυναίκα, Τληπόλεμον δὲ Λύκιον ἀναγορευθήμα τί γέγονεν ἐπὶ τᾶς κέλητι, τούτον μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης καὶ τριακοστῆς τε καὶ ἐκατοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος, τῆς δὲ Βελιστίχης τὴν συνωρίδα ὀλυμπιάδοι πρὸ ταύτης τριτῆς. πέμπτη δὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς τεσσαράκοντα καὶ 20 ἐκατὸν ἄθλα ἔτεθεν παγκρατίου παισί, καὶ ἐνίκα Φαίδιμος Αἰολεὺς ἐκ πάλως Τρωιάδος.

5.9.1 Κατελυθὲ δὲ καὶ Ὀλυμπία καὶ ἀγωνίςματα, μεταβδέαν μηκέτι ἄγειν αὐτὰ Ἡλειόης, πέντε τῶν τε γὰρ παῖδων ἐπὶ τῆς ὁγδόνης ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ τριακοστῆς ἔτεθη, καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτῶι τῶν κότυνοι Εὐτελίδα Λακε- 25 δαμιουργὸν λαβόντος ὄυκετί ἄρεστα Ἡλειόης ἴν πεντάθλους ἐσέρχε- σθαι πάδας.

**Apparatus Criticus:**
10 Δημάρατος Ms, all editors before Bekker; δημάρατος β; Δημάρατος Schubart-Walz's correction from 6.10.4 and 8.26.2, followed by all later editors 315 14 συβαρίδης Ag,

314 1.17.1; 6.9.8; 9.35.2.

315 See also Ebert’s (1982, 7 note 4) comments. It should be pointed out that the reading in these passages is by no means certain. In 6.10.2 the name occurs three times and Siebelis following Amasacus reads: Δημάρατος, while the ms. read Δημάρατος, and Δαμάρατος. In 8.26.2 the ms. and Bekker
IG II² 2326: fragment of a Pentelic marble slab, found on November 20, 1866 on the southern slope of Lykabbetos, near the monastery of Asomaton, probably the region where once stood the Gymnasium of Kynosarges (Koehler, Kirchner). In this region it now has been suggested that the Lykeion Gymnasium stood. It is broken on all sides, except the left which is partially preserved and the back which is rough.


Height: 0.21m. Width: 0.17m. Breadth: 0.10m.

Letter Height: 0.003-0.005m.

384–268 ante

[---] NON-STOICH. ca. 18

read Δημάρτετος, all editors before Schubart-Walz Δημάρτας, Schubart-Walz followed by all later editors Δημάρτες. It seems that the forms Δαμάρτας (in Doric) and Δημάρτος (in Ionic) are the preferable ones.

316 For the proposed locations see Wycherley 1978, 226-231.
The letter cutting is careless, although in some places the fragment is badly weathered and the strokes very faint. The empty space left between letters is very inconsistent from line to line, the letters are sometimes cut above the imaginary horizontal line and some of them tend to lean either to the left or to the right. The cutter displays many peculiarities with individual letters: e.g. the omega is closed at the bottom by a long horizontal stroke; the slanting strokes of the kappa are sometimes cut ca. 0.002m. away from the vertical stroke.

Remains of Dotted Letters: there are some minor differences in dotted letters between this text and that of Ebert and Kirchner.

Line 5: first-sigma only the upper horizontal.
Line 6: kappa—only the vertical stroke.
Line 7: phi—the upper tip of a vertical stroke and a faint trace of the upper-right round stroke; lambda—the left slanting stroke and a faint trace of the right.
Line 8: first epsilon—very faint traces of the tips of three horizontal strokes; mu—the left slanting stroke and the bottom tip of a right slanting stroke; first kappa—only the bottom slanting stroke; second epsilon—only the upper part of a vertical stroke and a faint trace of the upper horizontal stroke; second kappa—only a vertical stroke.
Line 9: first tau—only an upper horizontal stroke; pi—only the left vertical stroke; lambda—only the right slanting stroke; second tau—only the left tip of an upper horizontal.
Line 10: tau—only the bottom part of a vertical; omikron—an upper right curving stroke; sigma—an upper left tip of a horizontal; alpha—the left slanting stroke and the bottom tip of a right slanting stroke; iota—a very faint trace of a vertical stroke.
Line 11: tau—the right tip of an upper horizontal stroke; epsilon—only a bottom left horizontal and vertical.
Line 12: epsilon—only a bottom horizontal stroke and a trace of a middle horizontal stroke; nu—only the upper tip of a vertical.
Line 13: alpha—only the bottom part of a right slanting stroke and a very faint trace of a left slanting stroke.
Line 14: tau—only the right part of an upper horizontal stroke; lambda—only the bottom part of a right slanting stroke and a very faint trace of a left slanting stroke.
Line 17: tau—only the right tip of an upper horizontal stroke; sigma—part of an upper horizontal.
Line 18: the sigma has a peculiar looking shape in that on its left part a vertical stroke, cut later, connects the top and bottom left tips of the horizontal strokes, thus giving the impression of an epsilon; kappa—only a vertical stroke.
Line 19: rho—only an upper curving stroke; kappa—only part of a bottom slanting stroke; tau—only an upper horizontal.
Line 21: lambda-shape letter—only a faint trace of a vertical stroke and a faint trace of the top of a stroke slanting to the right.

Restorations: the number ca. 18 letters per line does not apply for line 12 which appears to be too long (32 letters), although the restoration is rather certain.

Line 1-3: Kirchner, [όγδοη καὶ τριακοστῇ ἑτέθη] Moretti [παίδων πέντεθλον καὶ ἐνίκα] Ebert a [όγδοη καὶ τριακοστῇ ἑτέθη] b [(τὴν δὲ ἕξῆς πάλιν κατελύθη)] c [παίδων πέντεθλον, καὶ ἐνίκα].
Line 17-18: Kirchner: [ἂντὶ τὴν Ὀλυμπιάδος τῆς μὲν ἄλλης καὶ]
[ἐκοστῆς ὁδὲ νεωκῆς [κακῶν].
Ebert: [ὁς τὴν Ὀλυμπιάδος τῆς αὖθις]
[ἐνέρᾳ ὁδὲ νεωκῆς [κακῶν].
Line 19-21: Kirchner: [Εὐνέτε]παι καὶ ei[κο]στ[ἡν - - ]
[...ος Παντα[κ]λ[ης ᾿Αθηναίος - ]
[... ἐ]κευλον ἐν[ - - - ]
Moretti: [Εὐνέτε]παι καὶ ei[κο]στ[ἡν πάνταν]
[προῖκ[?]]ος Παντα[κ]λ[ής στά]-
Ebert: [Εὐνέτε]παι καὶ ei[κο]στ[ἡν Ἑλλήνων]
[προῖκ]ος Παντα[κ]λ[ής ᾿Αθηναίος στάθιον]
[καὶ δε]κουλον ἐν μ[υρὶ ἡμέραι].


Commentary: The date is based on the information recorded in the first part of the inscription which is a list of victors who won in contests which were introduced for the first time. This fragmentary list begins with the victory of Eutelidas, who won in 628 B.C. (38th Olympiad) in the boys' pentathlon, and ends with that of Eurybiades in the chariot race of foals in 384 B.C. (99th Olympiad), the terminus post quem. The terminus ante quem, 268 B.C. (128th Olympiad), is the next date when, according to Pausanias, another game was introduced for the first time, that of the race between pairs of foals in which Belistiche from Makedonia won. Ebert, in his excellent discussion of this inscription, argues for ca. 276 B.C., i.e. the 500th anniversary of the Olympic Games, as a possible date for its setting up.

This fragmentary Olympic Chronicle is divided into two sections: what remains of the first section seems to be a list of names of first time Olympic victors, i.e. the athletes that won the first time an event was introduced (lines 1-14). Comparison of Pausanias' text and that of the inscription reveals a complete correspondence, starting with Philytas’
victory in the boys' boxing (616 B.C., 41st Olympiad). Therefore, the beginning of
the inscription which is lost probably included some or all the games going back to the
first Olympiad in 776 B.C. when the dromos race was instituted and Koroibos from Elis
won. Therefore, the beginning of

The inscription as now preserved begins with the Lakedaimonian Eutelidas. Pausanias
discusses him in a different place, because he describes separately those games
which were introduced and later dropped from the Olympic program. He states that the
boys' pentathlon of 628 B.C. was the only time when that event took place. There were
also instituted the race of mule carts (apene) and the trotting race (kalpe) in 500 B.C.
(70th Olympiad) and 496 B.C. (71st Olympiad) respectively, both of which were
dropped in 444 B.C. (84th Olympiad). The reason for the omission of these two races
from the inscription remains a puzzle.

The second section begins with the Athenian Pantakles who won in both the stadion
and the diaulos races of 692 B.C., the 22nd Olympiad (lines 16ff.), if Moretti's and
Ebert's restorations are accepted. The fact that an Athenian opens the second preamble

317 Habicht (1985, 87-88 and notes 84-90) has also identified the Lykian Tlepolemos, who appears in no
other writer except in Pausanias' 5.8.11 where his Olympic victory in 245 B.C. is mentioned, with one
Tlepolemos, son of Artapates, that is found in inscriptions.

318 According to Pausanias' description, prior to 628 B.C. the following games were held: in 632 B.C.
(37th Olympiad) the boys' running and the boys' wrestling; in 648 B.C. (33rd Olympiad) men's
pankration and men's horse race; in 680 B.C. (25th Olympiad) men's full grown horse chariot race; in
688 B.C. (23rd Olympiad) men's boxing; in 708 B.C. (18th Olympiad) men's wrestling and pentathlon;
in 720 B.C. (15th Olympiad) men's dolichos race; in 724 B.C. (14th Olympiad) men's diaulos; and in
776 B.C. (1st Olympiad) men's running. There is no way to determine how far back the Attic
inscription went, but if it was a true Olympic Chronicle it should start of course in 776 B.C.

319 Ebert 1982, 6 note 2 discusses this problem and suggests that Pausanias' comment about the mule
cart race (ἀντήνη ή ής συνε τών ἀνευρήματι συνε οὐδέν ἀρχαίον οὐτε εὐπρόθετα αὐτής
προσθῇ, ἐπέφυτον τε 'Ηλείοτις ἐκ παιδίου καὶ ἀρχὴς γενεέσθαι σφαγόν ἐν
τῇ χαράς τῷ ἐπὶ ζώννι 5.9.2) can be an indication "daß die elische bzw. olympische Behörde selbst
die Aufnahme der Maultier- und Stutenwettbewerbe in die Olymphonikenverzeichnisse verhindert hat."
This of course does not explain the absence of these two games from the Attic inscription, only their
abolishment from the Olympic program, and the cutter may have used a copy of an Olympic Register
which did not include these two games for whatever reason and also did not divide the games into
categories of those still in the program and those that had been abolished.
has led to the conclusion that this second section is an Athenian list of some kind. Ebert, however, has argued that this second list is not an Athenian one, but rather a list of victors who won twice during one and the same Olympiad; hence he restores the beginning as: “in the men’s category the following won twice in one and the same Olympiad.” Furthermore, the Athenian Pantakles was already a victor in the 21st Olympiad (696 B.C.) in the stadion, and, if this were a list of Athenian victors for example, it should start from this victory of Pantakles, since he is the first Athenian known in the Olympic Register.\(^{320}\)

Although the fragmentary nature of the inscription limits absolute conclusions, nonetheless, at least as far as Pausanias’ text is concerned, the Olympionikai Register of the inscription and that of the exegete corroborate each other. Both texts list the institution of the events in a chronological order which coincides, except for the fact that Pausanias discusses separately the three events which were instituted and subsequently dropped out of the Olympic program. This, of course, may not imply a different Olympic Register,\(^ {321}\) but that Pausanias chose for narratological clarity to list separately the games still in the Olympic program and then those that were tried and failed to secure a permanent incorporation into the program. Moreover, two of the inscription’s names, Δημαρτως (line 10) and Ευπυπινος (line 15) can now be safely restored in Pausanias’ text. The first name has enough variations in the manuscripts to suggest minor corruption, whereas the second is probably a copyist’s error, perhaps influenced by Συβερτης a few lines earlier.\(^ {322}\)

\(^{320}\) See Moretti 1957, 63 no. 25 (Pantakles). Pantakles’ is the first entry of an Athenian victor in Africanus’ list of stadionikai preserved by Eusebius (see Rutgers 1980, 8).

\(^{321}\) The evidence for Olympic registers and their authors are gathered and commented upon by Jacoby in FGrH vol. IIIb, XVIII. Elis und Olympia Nos. 408-416 and Kommentar.
5.13.7: Πέλοπος δὲ καὶ Ταντάλου τῆς παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἐνοικήσεως σημεῖα ἔτι καὶ ἐστὶ τόδε λεύπται (sc. around Magnesia on the Sipylos), Ταντάλου μὲν λίμνη τε ἄπτ' αὐτοῦ καλομένη καὶ οὐκ ἄφαντός τάφος, Πέλοπος δὲ ἐν Σιτύλωι μὲν θρόνος ἐν κορυφῇ τοῦ ὄρους ἐστίν ὑπὲρ τῆς Πλαστήνης Μητρὸς τὸ ἱερόν, διαβάντι δὲ Ἑρμον ποταμὸν Ἀφρο- 5 δύτης ἀγαλμα ἐν Τήμνωι πεποιημένον ἐκ μυρσίνης τεθνυμα- ἀναθεῖναι δὲ Πέλοπα αὐτὸ παρειλήφαμεν μνήμην, προϋλασκόμενον τε τὴν θεὸν καὶ γενέσθαι οἱ τὸν γάμον τῆς ἱπποδαμείας αἰτούμενον.

**Apparatus Criticus:**

5 Πλαστήνης is the reading of all mss. (except L πλαστάνης and Vb πλάνης) and of most editors;323 Schubart reads Πλακτήνης from CIG II 3657: παρὰ τῇ μητρὶ τῇ Πλακτήνη (occurs twice), and μητρὶς τῆς ἀκ Πατάκες (once, cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Πλάκη); Siebelis reads Πλακτήνης; Porson Πλατζηνής; Goldhagen Μοστηνής; I capitalized μητρὶς, because the full name of the goddess seems to be Μήτηρ Θεῖν Πλαστήνη. See also Habicht 1985, 14 note 64.

Kontoleon-Foucart 1887, 300-301 no. 8 and Wolters 1887, 271: a marble stele with relief found approximately one hour to the east of Magnesia on the Sipylos,324 in an area where the archaic statue of the Mother of Gods and her temple stood, under the Koddinos rock. Kontoleon saw only a squeeze of the inscription made by Iohannes Kokkines, who transcribed the text and further told him that in the middle of the inscription there is an anaglyph of a bull’s head flanked on each side of the stele by a flower bouquet. Kontoleon records only the height and width of the stele.

Height: 0.45m. Width: 0.30m.

---

322 The name Συμπράπαγης is not attested in the Lakedaimonian Prosopography (Poralla 1985 s.v. and Bradford 1977 s.v.), and, therefore, it was probably not a proper name.

323 This epithet, however, of Rhea Kybele is not honored with an entry in LSI. In all probability it is connected with the verb πλάσω or πλάτω from which πλάστης comes also.

324 Frazer (1965, vol. 3, 554) probably by mistake describes it as a statuette. Kontoleon’s description clearly refers to a stele with relief (ἐπὶ στήλης... ἐν τῷ μέσῳ κεφαλῆς βοῶς ἐνθεῖν καὶ ἐνθεῖν, ἐς τὰ ἄκρα ἄνθοδεσμα).
post 200 ante?

Μητροσώρα Ἀπολλᾶ
Μητρὶ Πλαστήνη(ι)
εὐχήν.

Restorations: at the end of line two (2) the iota, it seems, was not inscribed. The facsimile printed in Wolters 1887, 271 reads ΠΛΑΣΤΗΝΗ.

Kontoleon 1887, 253 no. 17 and Wolters 1887, 271-272: a bronze statuette with an inscribed base, found during excavations at the temple of the Mother of the Gods in 1887. Kontoleon reports only its height.

Height of statuette alone: 0.50m.

aetas Romana?

Μητρὶ θεῶν Πλαστήνη(ι)
Καλβείσιος Ὄρφεὺς
ἀνέθηκεν.

Restorations: at the end of line one (1) the iota, it seems, was not inscribed. Kontoleon's facsimile reads ΠΛΑΣΤΗΝΗ.


Commentary: There is no way of pinpointing a date for these inscriptions, except that the word εὐχήν in the first and the name Καλβείσιος in the second inscription perhaps refer to Roman times, i.e. from the second century B.C. onwards.

What is important in these two inscriptions, however, is their contribution to Pausanias' text which, to quote Kontoleon, παρέσχε πράγματα εἰς τοὺς ἐκθέτας (Wolters 1887, 272). Pausanias, after his exposition of Zeus' temple, proceeds to the next building, the Pelopeion, which offers him the opportunity to embellish his narrative with other stories concerning the sacred places of Asia Minor connected with Pelops and Tantalos. In this passage very explicitly and straightforwardly Pausanias identifies as his
homeland the region around Mt. Sipylos, an area which he knows very well, as is evident throughout his *Ελλάδος περιήγησις.*\(^{325}\) The same Mother of Gods, without her epithet, Plastene, is also mentioned in connection with her temple which Pausanias saw in the Lakedaemonian city of Akriai (3.22.4):

\[\text{θεάς δὲ αὐτόθι (sc. in the city of Akriai) θῷας θεῶν ναὸς καὶ ἀγαλμα λήθου. παλαιότατον δὲ τοῦτο εἶναι φασιν οἱ τὰς Ἀκρίας ἔχοντες, ὅποσα τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης Πελοποννησίως ἱερά ἦστιν, ἔπει Μάγνησι γε, οἱ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν νέμονται τοῦ Σιπύλου, τούτους ἐπὶ Κοδδίνου πέτραι Μητρὸς ἥστι θεῶν ἄρχαιότατον ἀπάντων ἀγαλμα· ποιησαὶ δὲ οἱ Μάγνητες αὐτὸ Βροτέαν λέγουσι τὸν Ταντάλου.}

Two other passages in Pausanias' work attest to his personal familiarity and fondness for the region of Mt. Sipylos. In Book 1, while describing the cave above the theater and below the Akropolis at Athens in which he saw Apollo and Artemis killing the children of Niobe, he adds (1.21.3):

\[\text{ταύτην τὴν Νιόβην καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδὼν ἀνεκθὼν ἔστιν Σίπυλον ὄρος· ἢ δὲ πλησίον μὲν πέτρα καὶ κρημνὸς ἦστιν οὐδὲν παρόντι σχῆμα παρεχόμενος γυναικὸς οὔ τε ἄλλως οὔτε πενθοῦσης· εἰ δὲ γε πορρωτέρω γένοιτο, δεδακρυμένη δέξεις ὅραν καὶ κατηφή γυναῖκα.}

Niobe is mentioned again in Book 8, where Pausanias is very critical of the wondrous beliefs of the people of his time. In 8.2.2-4 Pausanias reports the Arkadian story that, when Lykaon sacrificed to Zeus Lykaios a baby in order to spill its blood on the altar, he was turned into a wolf. This, the story goes, became a tradition in Arkadia: anyone who sacrificed to Zeus Lykaios was turned into a wolf for a period of ten years and, if he abstained from human meat, he was restored to human form, otherwise he remained a

\(^{325}\) See Habicht 1985, 13-17 and notes for the importance of this region as Pausanias' place of origin.

\(^{326}\) The city of Akriai is believed to have been situated south of the modern village Kokinia or Kokkinio at the shore, southwest of modern Molaoi (see Papachatzis ad loc.).
wolf forever. Pausanias rejects this tradition and accuses the Arkadians of credulity.\(^{327}\) He accepts, however, the story about Lykaon, because it is an extremely ancient tradition and goes back to that old time when people were closer to gods and these things could happen (8.2.5):

\[
\text{oùtw pei̇θoito ànv tis kai Lukáda θηρίων kai tēn Tantálou Nióbēn ĝené̄soi kai lýthov. ... (7) ύσαητωs de kai Nióbēn lêgoun̄v èn Sipú̄λωi tūi òreí thērōs úræi klàīein.}
\]

All these passages are telling of Pausanias’ interest and favor for this region of Asia Minor. Moreover, W. M. Ramsay, who visited the area with Pausanias as his guide and studied its topography, wrote (Frazer 1965, 552):\(^{328}\)

One who reads over the passages in which Pausanias refers to Sipylos, Niobe, and Tantalus, cannot fail to be struck with the life-like and telling accuracy of his language; it is that of a loving eye-witness.

It is obvious, therefore, from the two instances in books five and three that Pausanias visited the sanctuary of the Mother of gods Plastene and knew firsthand the landscape of the region. And yet, some of his editors before 1887 assumed a corruption and offered various alternative solutions, in spite of the phenomenon, rare in Pausanias’ manuscript tradition, of almost unanimous manuscript agreement for the reading \(\text{πλαστήννης}\). The two inscriptions, dedicated to Plastene, that were found during excavations in a building

---

327 In 8.2.5-6 Pausanias scorns the fashionable trend of Hellenistic monarchs and Roman Emperors after Augustus of declaring themselves gods and his statement deserves to be quoted:

\[
\text{έπ’ έμου δὲ —κακία γαρ δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ηὔζετο καὶ γῆν τε ἐπενέμετο πᾶσιν καὶ πόλεις πάσαις— ούτε θεὸς ἐγίνετο οὔδεις ἔτι ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν δὴν λόγωι καὶ κολακεύαι πρὸς τὸ ὑπερῆκον, καὶ ἃδικοις τὸ μῆνιμα τὸ ἐκ τῶν θεῶν ὑψεῖ τε καὶ ἀπελθοῦσιν ἐνθένυκε ἀπόκειται. ἐν δὲ τῇ παντὶ αἰῶνι πολλὰ μὲν πάλαι συμβάντα, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐτὶ γινόμενα ἄπιστα εἰναι πεποιητάκαιν ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς οἱ τοὺς ἀληθεύομεν ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἐφεύμενα.}
\]

For this important statement see the discussion by Heer 1979, 62, 193-194, and especially by Veyne 1988, 99-100 and 95-102 (Chapter 8: “Pausanias Entrapped”).

328 For a thorough discussion of the topography of the region and the identifications proposed see Frazer 1965, 552-555.
which Kontoleon assumed to be her temple, 329 attest to Pausanias’ reading Πλαστήνης.
In addition the inscriptions provide the full name of the goddess which in Pausanias is
derived from the combination of the two passages: the first inscription is dedicated to
Μητρὶ Πλαστήνης; the second to Μητρὶ Θεόν Πλαστήνη. Similarly, Pausanias refers to
the goddess as Πλαστήνης Μητρός (with a capital letter, since Plastene is only her epithet
5.13.7) and Μητρός Θεόν (3.22.4), both of which undoubtedly refer to the same
goddess whose full name is Mother of the Gods, Plastene.

86.

5.15.4: ἐν δεξιᾷ δὲ τοῦ Δεσποάντος, πεποίηται δὲ καὶ Δεσποίναις (sc. βωμός)—τὰ δὲ ἐς τὴν θεὸν ἤμηνα οὐομένους Δεσποιναν διδάξει μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Ἀρκάδας—....
5.15.10: μόναι δὲ ταῖς Νύμφαις οὐ νομίζουσιν οὐν οὐδὲ ταῖς Δεσποίναις στένοντει οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμαῖς τοῖς κοινών πάντων θεῶν.
8.37.1: Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀκακησίου τέσσαρας σταδίους ἀπέχει τὸ λεόν τῆς Δεσποίνης. πρῶτα μὲν δὴ αὐτός Ἦλεμονις ναός ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ χαλκοῦν ἀγαλμα ἔχων διάδας· ποδῶν ἐξ ἐιναι μάλιστα αὐτῷ εἰκάζομεν. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἐς τὸν λεόν περιβολον τῆς Δεσποίνης ἐστὶν ἔσοδος. ἔντων δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ναόν στοά τῇ ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ καὶ ἐν τοῖς θυσίαις λίθου λευκοῦ τύποι πεποιημένοι, καὶ τοῖς μὲν εἰσὶν ἐπειργασμέναι Μοῦραι καὶ Ζεὺς ἐπίκλησιν Μοιραγέττης, δευτέρω δὲ Ἡρακλῆς τρίποδα Ἀπόλλωνα ἀφαροῦμενος· ὅποια δὲ ἐς αὐτοὺς ἐπυνανόμην γενέσθαι, δηλῶσι καὶ τοῦτο, ἴν ἐς τοῦ φωκικοῦ λόγου τὰ ἔχοντα ἐς Δελφοὺς ἄφικμεθα (see 10.13.8). (2) ἐν δὲ τῇ στοάὶ τῇ παρὰ τῇ Δεσποίνῃ μεταξὺ τῶν τύπων τῶν κατειλεγμένων πυνάκιν ἐστὶ γεγραμένον, ἔχον τὰ ἐς τὴν τελετήν· Νύμφαι δὲ εἰσὶ καὶ Πάνες ἐπὶ τοῖς <τρίτω> τύπῳ, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς τετάρτωι Πολύβιος ὁ Λυκόρτας καὶ οἱ ἐπίγραμμα ἐστὶν ἐξ αρχῆς τε μὴ ἄν σφαλήν τὴν Ἑλλάδα, εἴ Πολυβίω τὰ πάντα ἐπείθετο, καὶ ἁμαρ—

329 Wolters 1887, 272 has disputed this claim on the ground that the building’s foundations do not
support the idea of a temple, but rather that of a building within the sanctuary of Plastene. For additional
topographical identifications, based on Pausanias’ description of the Sipylos Mountain area see Frazer
1965, vol. 3, 552-555, who quotes these same inscriptions as well (554).
τούσης δὲ ἐκείνου βοήθειαν αὐτῇ γενέσθαι μόνου. πρὸ δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ Δήμητρι τῇ ἔστι βωμὸς καὶ ἔτερος Δεσπόινη, μετ’ αὐτὸν δὲ μεγάλης Μητρὸς. (3) θεῶν δὲ αὐτὰ τὰ ἁγάλματα, Δεσποίνα καὶ ἡ Δήμητρι τε καὶ οἱ θρόνοι εἰς ἕνι καθέζονται, καὶ τὸ ὑπόθημα τὸ ὑπὸ τοῖς ποσῖν ἐστὶν ἐνὸς ὀμοίως λίθου· καὶ οὔτε τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἔσθητι 25 οὔτε ὁπόσα εἰργασται περὶ τὸν θρόνον οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἔτερον λίθου προσεχεῖσι σιδήρωι καὶ κόλλη, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα ἐστὶν ἐς λίθος. οὕτος οὖν ἐσεκομίσθη σφόνιν ὁ λίθος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύσιν ὀνείρατος λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ἐξευρεῖν ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου τῆς γῆς ὀρύξαντες. τῶν δὲ ἁγαλμάτων ἐστὶν ἐκατέρους μέγεθος κατὰ τὸ Ἀθηναίων 30 ἁγαλμα μάλιστα τῆς Μητρὸς· Δαμοφώντος δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἔργα. (4) ἡ μὲν οὖν Δήμητρι δαίδα καὶ δεξιά, τὴν δὲ έτέραν χεῖρα ἐπιβέβηκεν ἐπὶ τὴν Δεσποίναν· ἡ δὲ Δεσποίνα σκηνῆρόν τε καὶ <τὴν> καλομενήν κήσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασιν ἔχει, τῆς δὲ ἔχεται τῇ δεξιά (κύστης). τοῦ θρόνου δὲ ἐκατέρωθεν Ἀρτεμις μὲν παρὰ 35 τὴν Δήμητρα ἐστήκει ἀμπελομένη δέρμα ελάφου καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρῶν φαρέτραν ἔχουσα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς χερσὶ τῆς μὲν λαμπάδα ἔχει, τῇ δὲ ἀκοντα δύο. παρὰ δὲ τῇ Ἀρτεμις κατάκειται κύων, οἷά ς θερέων· εἰς οὖν ἐπιτίθεται. (5) πρὸς δὲ τῆς Δεσποινῆς τῶν ἁγάλματων ἐστήκειν Ἀντωνός σχῆμα ὁπλισμένου παρεχόμενον· φασί δὲ οἱ περὶ 40 τὸ λεοντὸν τραφήμα τὴν Δεσποίναν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντωνοῦ, καὶ εἶναι τῶν Τιτάνων καλομένων καὶ τὸν Ἀντωνοῦ. Τιτάνας δὲ πρῶτος ἐστὶν ἐπιθύμησιν ἔσχαγεν Ὡμηρός, θεοὺς εἶναι φήσας ὑπὸ τῶν καλομένων Ταρτάρων, καὶ ἔστην ἐν Ὁρας δρκων τὰ ἐπὶ· παρὰ δὲ Ὁμήρου Ὀνομάκροις παραλαβών τῶν Τιτάνων τὸ ὅνομα Διονύσῳ τε συνεθέν- 45 κεν ὅργα καὶ εἶναι τοὺς Τιτάνας τῷ Διονύσῳ τῶν παθημάτων ἐποιήσαν αὐτουργοῦς. (6) τὰ μὲν δὴ ἐς τὸν Ἀντωνοῦ ὑπὸ Ἀρκάδων λέγεται· Δήμητρος δὲ Ἀρτεμις θυγατέρα εἶναι καὶ οὐ λητοῦς, ὄντα Ἀλυττίνων τὸν λόγον Λυχύλου ἐδίδαξεν Εὐφορίωνος τοὺς Ἐλλήνας. τὰ δὲ ἐς Κουρήτας—οὐδὲν γάρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγαλμάτων πε- 50 τοῦτον· καὶ τὰ ἐς Κορύβαντας ἐπειραγμένους ἐπὶ τοῦ βάρου— γένος δὲ οὖδε ἀλλοιον καὶ οὐ Κουρήτης—, τὰ ἐς τούτους παρῆκα στάμενοι. (7) τῶν δὲ ἡμέρων οἱ Ἀρκάδες δένδρων ἀπάντων πλὴν ροΐας ἐσκομίσουσιν ἐς τὸ λεοντὸν· ἐν δεξιᾷ δὲ ἐξείνθη ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ κάτωπρον ἡμομενένου ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς τοίχωι· τούτο ἦν τὶς 55 προσβλέψη τοῦ κάτωπρον, ἐστὶν μὲν ἤτοι παντάπασιν ἀμφότερος ἡ οὖδὲ δεῖται τῆς ἄρχη, τὰ δὲ ἁγάλματα τῶν θεῶν καὶ αὐτὰ καὶ τῶν θρόνων ἐστὶν ἐναργῆς θεάσασθαι. (8) παρὰ δὲ τὸν ναόν τῆς Δεσποινῆς ὀλύγον ἐπαναβάντι ἐν δεξιᾷ Μέγαρον ἐστὶ καλομένου, καὶ τελετὴν τὴν δρώσιν ἐνταῦθα καὶ τῇ Δεσποινῆ θύσαντι ἑρέτα 60 οἱ Ἀρκάδες πολλὰ τε καὶ ἄφονα. θύει μὲν δὴ αὐτῶν ἐκατόσο φιλεῖν τίς ἐπὶ τῶν ἔρεων δὲ οὖτε τὰς θάρυγγας ἀποτέμενε ὃποτ' ἐπὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις θυσίαις, κώλου δὲ ὃ τι ἀν τῆς, τούτο ἐκατόσο ἀπε-
koipc toû thûmatos. (9) taútìn màliosta theûn sêbousin oi 'Arapàdes tîn Déspoinan, ðugatéra dè aútìn Poseidównòs fasin eînai kai 65 és Êîmêptrós. épîkllhîsis ès toûs polîous èstîn aútêl Déspoina, katháper kai tîn ék Diôs Kôrên èpînovmáçousan, Îðiâi dè èstîn ãvôma Persefôní, kathà 'Omphros kai èti próteron Pâmphwos èpîôíousan. tîs Déspoinhîs èdè to ãvôma èdeisai ès toûs àtêlêstous gráfeîn. (10) ùper dè to kaloûmenon Mégardon èllos tîs 70 Déspoinhîs ieròn ðrîgkîwî rîhôw perieiçômenon, èn vàs dè aútou dêvôra kai ãllla kai èlôia kai prînîos ék plêôs màs pefûkasi. toûto uô gewrphoi sofías èstîn èrâgon. ùper dè to èllos kai 'Ippîon Poseidównòs, àte patrôs tîs Déspoinhîs, kai theûn ãlllan eîsî bwmôi. tûi televntaiw dè èpîgyramá èstî theoiès aútôn toûs pâsîn 75 èînai koîon. 

IG V.2, 514: a stele of limestone was found in 1889, in the field called sêla Òelàs, near Lykosoura. The stele is broken into four fragments which join and only its bottom is missing. It is now in Athens.


Height: 0.575m. Width: 0.48m. Breadth: 0.175m.

Letter Height: 0.01-0.015m. (except for line 1 which has 0.02-0.035).

saec. III–I ante

.getType(): "STOICH. 26-28"
The letters are nicely spaced and the ends of strokes are thicker so as to suggest a dot-like serif, although de Prott calls them "volgares". The dialect (for which see Dubois) and the Ionic letter style suggest the Hellenistic period.

Characteristic letter shapes: the alpha (except for line 1 where it has a broken middle bar and in some other instances a curved middle bar), delta and lambda have all strokes of equal length; the pi's verticals are of equal length, but the horizontal is extended to the left and right; the omicron and omega are considerably smaller, and the omega's left and right horizontals are short; and the phi's vertical is higher than the rest of the letters, while its rounded shape is inscribed in a rhomboid fashion.

Remains of Dotted Letters:
Line 1: pi—only half of the left and the right verticals.
Line 3: tau—only the left and right part of the upper horizontal.
Line 5: mu—only the left vertical and the middle left slanting strokes; eta—only the top of the left and the upper half of the right verticals; nu—only the left vertical and the middle left slanting strokes.
Line 7: eta—only a faint trace of the left vertical; delta—only the upper triangular.
Line 9: tau—only the bottom tip of a vertical stroke.
Line 10: mu—only a faint trace of the left vertical.
Line 13: eta—only the bottom tip of the left vertical.
Line 17: rho—only the upper curving stroke.
Line 18: sigma—only the bottom horizontal and the right part of the upper horizontal; upsilon—only the upper left slanting stroke.
Line 19: epsilon—only the upper horizontal and the upper part of the right vertical; upsilon—only the upper part of two slanting strokes.

Restorations:
Line 2: the erasure was due to the cutter's mistake who, Leonardos has suggested and later editors accepted, started inscribing μὴ παρέρητον ἔχοντας and when it was too late he simply erased the offending letters.
Line 12: as earlier the cutter apparently inscribed twice μὴ ἐσθανεῖ which he caught too late and so he simply erased the second one and left the space empty.

Commentary: The date for this inscription, third to first centuries B.C., is based exclusively on the letter style which, according to Hiller, suggests the second century B.C., but, according to de Prott, the third.

Among the many altars in the Altis on which the Eleians offered sacrifices every month Pausanias mentions the altar of the Despoinai, the goddesses about whom he promises to elaborate in his Arkadika. Later, when he discusses the kinds of sacrifices the Eleians made, he states that on the altar of the Despoinai, as well as that of the Nymphai and the one common to all the gods, the Eleians do not pour libations of wine. When he reaches the sanctuary of the Despoinai on the road from Megalopolis to Lykosoura, Pausanias, as he promised in his Eliaka, offers a full account about the sanctuary and its major dedications, which in large part has been confirmed by the excavations at the end of the last century. A significant detail is that some of the gods and goddesses, honored within the temenos of the Despoinai, correspond surprisingly with the altars Pausanias saw in the Altis (5.14.8; 15.3, 5-6). In particular, in both sanctuaries there are altars to Zeus Moiragetes, the Nymphai, and one common to all the gods, who perhaps were related to Despoina’s cult.

Pausanias’ narrative about this sanctuary is quite detailed, but considerably shorter than his narrative on Olympia. It is quoted in its entirety, not only because in miniature it shows his treatment of a sanctuary and is therefore worth comparing with his extensive treatment of Zeus’ sanctuary at Olympia, but also because Pausanias’ statements have been corroborated by the inscriptions that were found during the excavations. These inscriptions should properly be included in an epigraphical commentary on book 8; for the present purposes it will be sufficient to concentrate on only one, perhaps the most

---

330 See Habicht 1985, 47-48, and especially Papachatzis 1974-81, vol. 4, 331-341 and the notes. Parts of the statues that Pausanias saw have been found.
important, inscription. It is a very well preserved sacred law which Pausanias most probably read in the stoa, near the statue of Despoina (8.37.2): ἐν ἐς τῆς στοάς τῆς παρὰ τῆς Δεσποινῆς μεταξὺ τῶν τόπων τῶν κατελεγμένων πινάκιον ἐστὶ γεγραμμένον, ἔχουν τὰ ἐς τὴν τελετὴν (see also 8.37.8 for the sacrifices they offered which may have been inscribed as well). Jost (1985, 329-331) has argued that IG V.2.514 cannot be the πινάκιον of Pausanias, since the inscription does not refer to some specific rite, but to the sanctuary as a whole. The omission, however, from the inscription of a specific rite does not make the interdictions of the lex sacra irrelevant to the rites, the τελετὰ, of Despoina, especially in light of the scanty evidence. Moreover, the presence of the verb μὴ ἐσθαν in line 12 lends support to the view that the interdictions in this lex sacra were in force during the specific rites of Despoina. The text of the inscription may be divided into three sections: in the first (lines 2-13) there are instructions of what the initiates (line 12 μὴ ἐσθαν), pregnant or breast-feeding women excluded, entering the temenos should not wear. The second section (lines 13-17) is a list of the offerings for the sacrifice, among which significantly there is no wine. The stele is broken at the beginning of the third section (lines 17-19) which mandated what kind of sacrificial animals could be offered to Despoina, and then further instructions to the initiates would presumably have been inscribed.

This inscription reveals the significance of Despoina and her cult. Pausanias, of course, does not reveal the laws of initiation, but his comment that the Eleians do not pour libations on the altar of Despoina at Olympia receives confirmation. There is no mention

331 For other inscriptions of, or for Despoina see: IG V.2, 129, 131, 132, 515, 516, 520, 522, 524, 525, 535, 536, 538, 540, 541, 542, 546. Most of these are dedications to Despoina for whose rites see Durie 1984, 137-147; Loucas and Loucas-Durie 1985-86, 561-578; Loucas-Durie 1987-88, 401-419; id. 1989, 105-114; and Jost 1985, 323-331, and passim. 535 is the dedication by the brother of Polybios, Thearidas son of Lykortas for Thearidas son of Philopoimen. Pausanias mentions only the statue of Polybios, the son of Lykortas, perhaps because of his fame.
of wine among the offerings for the sacrifice and the libations in the inscription. At
Olympia Pausanias mentions only one altar dedicated to Despoina, the goddess who was
honored especially by the Arkadians from whom the Eleians learned about her.
Obviously, Despoina did not hold a significant place in Olympia. The lack of evidence
there for her cult is greatly compensated by the discovery of many inscriptions in the
appropriate place, her temple and sanctuary in Lykosoura, for which Pausanias' information is as valuable as it is trustworthy.

87.

5.15.7: ἐσελθόντων δὲ αὐθεὶς διὰ τῆς πομπικῆς ἐς τὴν "Ἀλτὶν εἰσίν ὅπη-
σεν τοῦ Ἡραίου ... καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος πέμπτος (sc. βωμὸς) θερμίου.
τὸν μὲν δὴ παρὰ Ἡλείοις θέρμιον καὶ αὐτῶι μοι παρίστατο εἰκά-
ζειν ὃς κατὰ Ἀθῆδα γλώσσαν εἶν θέσμοι.

IG IX.1, 69: three associated fragments of limestone were found in Thermon, of which c
is now lost. Fr. a is broken on the left and right sides, fr. b on the right, and fr. c
on the left. Frs. a and b are in the Museum at Thermon (Inv. Nos. 97+1).
Height: fr. a 0.68m., fr. b 0.69m. Width: fr. a 1.00m., fr. b 0.057m.
Breadth: fr. a 0.35m., fr. b 0.32m.
Letter Height: 0.025-0.04m.

170–160 ante
[τὸ] κοινὸν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν τὸν βω[μὸν] Ἀπόλλωνι θεο[μίοι,
στραταγέοντο[ς]
Πολυθαίτα
[Μο]λυκρέος, γραμματε[ύοντος] τῶν Αἰτωλῶν Στομίον [υ το]ῦ
Χαβρό<ς> <κ>α Μαχετ[υ]-
IG IX.1, 83: a bronze weight was found in the temple of Apollo at Thermon. It weighs 500 gr. and is now in the Numismatic Museum at Athens.

Height: 0.068m. Width: 0.073m. Breadth: 0.01m.

Letter Height: 0.006-0.01m. (except line 2, 0.02m.).

c. 200 ante

\[ \begin{align*} & \text{Ἀπόλλωνος} \\
& \text{Μ(νδ)} \\
& \text{Θερμίου.} \end{align*} \]


Commentary: The dates for these inscriptions are Klaffenbach’s.

Among the altars, on which the Eleians offered sacrifices every month, Pausanias includes also the one dedicated to Apollo Thermios which was behind the Heraion. Following his principle of offering an exegesis, whenever possible, Pausanias adds his own explanation: “it occurred to me that what the Eleians (pronounce as) Thermios, the Athenians (pronounce) it Thesmios (i.e. of the institutions).” Pausanias’ line of reasoning is based apparently on the rhotacism of the Eleian dialect which of course did not occur in the middle of a word (Buck 1973, 159-160). Albeit wrong, this is the only example in his Eliaka in which Pausanias argues about the meaning of a word on the basis of phonology.

But Pausanias did not visit Thermon, the centre of the Aitolian League, where the temple of Apollo has been excavated. It seems more than probable that Thermios

\[ \text{ IG IX.1, 83: a bronze weight was found in the temple of Apollo at Thermon. It weighs 500 gr. and is now in the Numismatic Museum at Athens.} \]

\[ \text{Height: 0.068m. Width: 0.073m. Breadth: 0.01m.} \]

\[ \text{Letter Height: 0.006-0.01m. (except line 2, 0.02m.)} \]

\[ \text{ca. 200 ante} \]

\[ \begin{align*} & \text{Ἀπόλλωνος} \\
& \text{Μ(νδ)} \\
& \text{Θερμίου.} \end{align*} \]


\[ \text{Commentary: The dates for these inscriptions are Klaffenbach’s.} \]

\[ \text{Among the altars, on which the Eleians offered sacrifices every month, Pausanias includes also the one dedicated to Apollo Thermios which was behind the Heraion. Following his principle of offering an exegesis, whenever possible, Pausanias adds his own explanation: “it occurred to me that what the Eleians (pronounce as) Thermios, the Athenians (pronounce) it Thesmios (i.e. of the institutions).” Pausanias’ line of reasoning is based apparently on the rhotacism of the Eleian dialect which of course did not occur in the middle of a word (Buck 1973, 159-160). Albeit wrong, this is the only example in his Eliaka in which Pausanias argues about the meaning of a word on the basis of phonology.} \]

\[ \text{But Pausanias did not visit Thermon, the centre of the Aitolian League, where the temple of Apollo has been excavated.} \]

---

\[ \text{332 There also have been found inscriptions which indirectly mention Apollo Thermios, since they include the clause for setting up the dedication in the temple of Apollo ἐν Θερμίου: IG IX.1.3A14-15, 47, 1788, 17932, 18832.} \]
Apollo was the god of Thermon, especially when the mythistoric connection of the Eleians and the Aitolians is brought to bear. As Antonetti (1990, 130) has recently noted, the existence of an altar in honor of Apollo Thermios at Olympia cannot be anything else, but an indication that relations between the Eleians and the Aitolians were not limited to the mythistoric past. During Pausanias’ visit at the sanctuary the fifth altar which the cult personnel attended every month was that of Apollo Thermios to whom they offered sacrifices in the same way as in the old days.

88.

6.13.3: Ἐ οικότα δὲ Χιόνιδι τὰ ἐς δόξαν καὶ ἀνὴρ Λύκιος παρέσχετο Ἐρμογένης Βάνθιος, ὃς τὸν κότινον ἐν τρισίν ὀλυμπιάδισιν ἀνέλετο δικτάκις ἐπίκλησιν τε ἐσχεν ἰππος ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων.

Balland 1984, 325-349, pl. 1-18: the French excavations of 1981-82 in the Letoon of the Lykian city of Xanthos have recovered three blocks along the Sacred Road to the southwest of the sanctuary. They were joined together and set up on an elevation, thus forming a monumental dedication which is reconstructed and its topography and architecture thoroughly discussed by C. Le Roy (pp. 325-338). On three of these blocks there are inscribed four decrees of nearly identical wording: the first from left to right (A) on Block A is by the boule and the city of Xanthos; perhaps another copy of it (A’) was inscribed on a block which has not been found, but the extreme right ending of three of its lines is preserved on the left margin of Block B; a third decree (B) is inscribed on Block B, whose beginning is lost, since it was inscribed on a superimposed block that has not been found, and,

333 For earlier arguments that the Thesmios Apollo is the Apollo on the pediment of Zeus’ temple at Olympia see Papachatzis 1974-1981, vol. 3, 273-274 note 3.
therefore, it is not certain whether it was a decree by Hermogenes’ city or by the Lykian League; and, finally, the decree by the Lykian League (C) is inscribed on Block C, and is preserved intact. Later excavations in 1984 have shown that there was no other decree inscribed on the monument (338 note 5).

Inv. Nos. A 6378; A' 6378 bis; B 6379; C 3680.

Inscribed surface of Block A (A): Height 0.80m. Width 1.06m.

Inscribed surface of Block B (A', B): Height 1.30m. Width 0.90m.

Inscribed surface of Block C (C): Height 0.80m. Width 0.75-0.80m.

Letter Height: A, A', and C 0.03m.; B 0.04m.

A

paulo post 90 post

NON-STOICH.

[Ξαυ][θ]ῶν ἡ βοηλὴ καὶ ὁ δίκημος ἕτειμησεν]
[Τ[ί][τ]ον Φλάουμον 'Ἀπολλωνίου Κυρείνα]
'Ερμογένης, Ξάνθιον καὶ Παταρία καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέα, ποιλεινόμενον δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐξοχωτάταισι τῆς 'Ασίας]
5 καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλεως πάσαις, παράδοξων καὶ ἀριστοτῶν Ἑλλήνων, τὸν δὲ βίον ξυστάρι-

χῆν τῶν ἐν Λυκίᾳ <ι> ἀγομένων ἀγώνων, [νεικήσαντα Καπε]-

τῶλεα ἐν 'Ῥώμης, 'Ολυμπίας ἡ, Ἰσθμία [Θ, Νέμεια Θ, Πυθία] έ, Ἀκτία δ, τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ[κ] ἀργῶν πενταετρί-

kόν γ, ἐν Νεαπόλει δ, ἐν Περγάμῳ καὶ τοῦν Ἀσίας έ],
έν Ἐφεσω <ι> Βαλβύλλης έ, ἐν [Σμύρνης] καὶ τοῦν Ἀσίας έ],
έν Ἀντιοχείᾳ <ι> καὶ τοῦν Συρίας Κιλικίας θ, θ, τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τροπαίου ἀριστον τῶν Ἑλλήνων],
τῆν ἐξ Ἀργοὺς ἀσπίδα έ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς]
10 ἀγώνας στάδια διάλυον ὁ πλεῖον [τας πρώτον]
ἀπ' αἰῶνος.

A'

paulo post 90 post

NON-STOICH.

[-----------------------------]-
[κοινῶν Ἀσίας Θ, ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ <ι> και τοῦν Συρίας
[Κιλικίας θ, τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τροπαίου
[ἀριστον τῶν Ἑλλήνων, τῆν ἐξ Ἀργοὺς ἀσπίδα έ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς]
[- -----------------] ἕτειμησεν]

B

[-----------------------------]
Τίτον φλάουσον ἀπολλωνίου γενέσιν, καὶ Παταρέα καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέα,
[politeutêmenon δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς]
[ἐξοχωτάταις τῆς Ἀσιᾶς καὶ τῆς]
[Ἐλλάδος πόλεσι πάσαις, παραδο-]
[ἐξονείκην καὶ ἄριστον Ἑλλήνων,]
[τὸν διὰ] βίου ἱεράτηρα συν ἐν]

10 Λυκίας ἀγομένων ἀγώνων, νεική-
σαντας Καπετώλεια ἐν Ῥώμῃ>,
'Ολύμπια ἦ, "Ἰσθμία ἦ, Νέμεια ἦ,
Pύθια ἦ, "Ἀκτία ἦ, τὸν ἐν Ἀλε-
ξανδρεῖα ἐρότον πενταετηρικὸν
γῆ, ἐν Νεαπόλει ἦ, ἐν Περγάμων<>
κοινὸν 'Ἀσίας ἦ, ἐν Ἐφέσων> Βαλ-
βίλλης ἦ, ἐν Σμύρνη> κοινὸν 'Ἀ-
σίας ἦ, ἐν 'Ἀντιοχεία<>
κοινὸν Συρί-
ας Κιλικίας Φοινείκης ἦ, τὸν ἀ-
πὸ τοῦ τροπαίου ἄριστου τῶν
Ἐλλήνων, τὴν ἐξ "Ἄργους ἀσπίδα
ἡ, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀγώνας στά-
δια διαίλουσ ὀπλείτας πρῶτον
ἀπ’ αἰώνοσ.

C

Λυκίων τὸ κοινὸν ἑτεύμησαν πάλιν
Τίτον φλάουσον ἀπολλωνίου γενέσιν,
Κυρείνα Ἐρμουγένην, Ἐάνθιον καὶ Παταρέα
καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέα, politeutêmenon δὲ
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐξοχωτάταις τῆς Ἀσιᾶς καὶ
τῆς Ἐλλάδος πόλεσι πάσαις, παραδο-
ξονείκην καὶ ἄριστον Ἑλλήνων,
τὸν διὰ βίου ἱεράτηρα συν ἐν
Λυκίας> ἀγομένων ἀγώνων, νεική-
σαντας Καπε-
tώλεια ἐν Ῥώμῃ>, Ὀλύμπια ἦ, "Ἰσθμία ἦ,
Νέμεια ἦ, Πύθια ἦ, "Ἀκτία ἦ, τὸν ἐν Ἀλε-
ξανδρεῖα<> ἐρότον πενταετηρικὸν γῆ, ἐν Νεαπόλει
ἄριστον Ἑλλήνων, τὴν ἐξ "Ἄργους ἀσπίδα
ἡ, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀγώνας στάδια διαίλουσ ὀπλείτας πρῶτον
ἀπ’ αἰώνοσ.
The letter style of all four inscriptions is that of the Imperial period, *i.e.* elegant, and the strokes end in apices. The cutter consistently does not inscribe the iota adscript in the dative case which Balland prints as a subscript, but here it is in angle brackets. The numbers which come after each game are all inscribed with an overline and sometimes half a space is left empty.

**Restorations:** all the restorations are those of Balland and are based on the last inscription which is preserved intact.


**Commentary:** The date for these decrees, a little after 91 A.D., is based on the fact that Hermogenes won twice in the Kapitolia in Rome. These games were instituted by Domitian in 86 A.D. and were celebrated once more in 90 A.D. These three decrees were inscribed therefore sometime after 90 A.D. Hermogenes' Olympic victories are recorded only by Pausanias, and by Iulius Africanus (Rutgers 1980, 90-91) where his victories in the stadion race are dated in the 215th and 217th Olympiad (81 and 89 A.D.). The year 91 A.D., it should be emphasized, is only a *terminus post quem* and it does not necessarily coincide with the end of Hermogenes' athletic career.

Pausanias, continuing his exposition of athletic statues, reaches the inscribed stele of the Lakedaimonian Chionis, which offers him the opportunity to correct some misconceptions about the claims this athlete makes in the inscription about his victories (6.13.2). Pausanias proceeds to a comparison between Chionis' achievements and those of other runners whom he knew to have won in the Olympic Games (6.13.3-4): the Lykian Hermogenes from Xanthos, Polites from Keramos in Karia, and the Rhodian runner Leonidas. These three athletes are mentioned by Pausanias parenthetically and only in order to dispel the boasts he read on the stele of Chionis, that he was an extraordinary runner. Pausanias' narrative, therefore, does not imply that he saw the statues of these athletes at Olympia, although they may have existed, and so,
Hermogenes' case is included in this Chapter. In fact, the next statue he sees near that of Chionis is the dedication of the boy boxer Douris from Samos (κληρονομε ὃς ὦ ὦ) πόρρω τῆς ἀν ολυμπιακής στήλης (καὶ ὦς) ἐποτηκε ὄ ο Σάμιος, κρατήσας πυγμη παιδας. 6.13.5).

Notwithstanding this, the inscriptions which have been found in Hermogenes' city indicate that Pausanias was familiar with the career of this athlete. In all probability the exegete visited Lykian Xanthos where he may have seen the monumental dedication of Hermogenes that has been found in the Letoon and read the inscriptions on the bases. Although Pausanias' comment is very brief, it is in agreement with the information of the inscriptions: Pausanias identifies him only with his name and his ethnic, as is his custom, whereas the inscriptions preserve his full name: Titus Flavius Hermogenes from Xanthos, who was granted citizenship also by Patara and Alexandreia. The only other detail Pausanias offers about him is his eight Olympic victories during three Olympiads which are recorded in the three decrees (A line 8, B line 12, and C line 10). Before the discovery of these inscriptions, the generally accepted view was that Hermogenes' victories were won in the stadion, diaulos and dolichos running events. This was based on the stadionikai list of Iulius Africanus (preserved by Eusebius, Rutgers 1980, 90-91), where Hermogenes is entered as a stadionike in A.D. 81 and 89. This in connection with Pausanias' comment that he won eight times in three Olympiads led to the conclusion that Hermogenes was victorious in all three running events in 81 and 89 (stadion, diaulos and

---

334 Papachatzis' (1974-81, vol. 3, 351) caption of chapter 13 implies that Pausanias saw the statues of these athletes in Olympia. Hyde (1980, 15), however, correctly does not number these statues, but appends them (111a, 111b, and 111c) to the statue of Chionis (no. 111), and alerts the reader (48): Chionis mentio periegetae ansam præbet ad enumerandos alios quoque Olympionicas, qui aut pluribus Olympiadibus continuos aut eadem Olympiade plura certamina vicerint: Hermogenem, Politem, Leonidam (111a-c). Quorum statuas, si quae fuerunt, cave credas iuxta Chionidem positas fuisses.

See also Herrmann 1988, 165-166.
dolichos), while he won only in the two (the diaulos and dolichos) in 85, since in the stadionike list another athlete is mentioned. This was generally right. Except for one detail, which the inscriptions now correct, namely that Hermogenes did not run in the dolichos, but the armed running event (ὦλεήτας A line 15, B line 23, and C line 18).

Surprisingly, however, there is no mention in the inscriptions of the epithet Hippos with which, Pausanias says, the Greeks nicknamed him. The extraordinary list of his victories, however, justifies the epithet, and it moreover corroborates Pausanias’ objection to Chionis’ claims about his accomplishments as a runner: Hermogenes, in addition to his eight Olympic victories, won also in the Kapitolia at Rome, nine times in the Isthmia, nine in the Nemea, five in the Pythia, four in the Aktia, three in the pentaeteritic of Alexandreia, four in the Sebasta at Naples, and so on. Furthermore, the inscriptions record that he was a paradoxonikes, i.e. a winner in more than one event during the same day, or games. This is only implied by Pausanias who states that Hermogenes was victorious in three Olympics eight times, and his reluctance to use this title may be parallel to his avoidance of the title periodonikes.335 Paradoxonikes originally meant the athlete who was victorious in the wrestling and pankration during the same Olympiad and refers to the victories of Herakles according to Pausanias (λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐστὶν Ἡρακλέα ὃς πάλης το ἰνέλοιτο καὶ παγκρατίου νίκας 5.8.4).336 Apparently, however, the title was eventually used for athletes who were victorious in more than one event in the same Olympiad. But Pausanias consistently avoids using both paradoxonikes and periodonikes, precisely because of the confusion that surrounded their definition.

---

335 See nos. 8 above [Ergoteles], especially note 119; 21 [Kallias]; 40 [Epitheses]; and 89 below.
336 Balland 1984, 343 and the bibliography in notes 28-32.
Be that as it may, the inscriptions that have been discovered in Xanthos, the city of Hermogenes, are only the third bit of evidence about this extraordinary athlete, the other two being Pausanias and the stadionike list of Africanus. The epigraphical evidence not only corroborates Pausanias' brief note about Hermogenes, but attests to his methodology as well. While providing an exegesis for the dedication of the Spartan runner Chionis at Olympia, whose inscription made excessive claims about his athletic accomplishments, Pausanias deems it appropriate to set the record straight. He relates other examples of runners with whose careers he is familiar and who equaled, if not surpassed, the accomplishments and the fame of Chionis. This information the exegete probably derived from sources outside of Olympia and only appended them in the appropriate place. And it is no accident that two of these athletes, active in the first century A.D., are from Asia Minor, the native land of Pausanias himself.

89.

6.14.2: τὸ δὲ ἐν Ὁλυμπίαι τοῦ Ῥοδίου παλαιστοῦ (sc. Nikasylos) τὸλμημα Ἀρτεμίδωρος γένος Τραγταλάνδος ὑπερεβάλετο κατὰ ἐμὴν δόξαν. Ἀρτεμίδωρι γὰρ ἀμοτείν μὲν Ὁλυμπίῶν συνεβή παγκρατιάζοντι ζοντι ἐν παισίν, αὐτὰ δὲ οὐ ἐγένετο τῆς διαμαρτίας τὸ ἄγαν νέον. (3) ὡς δὲ ἄφικε τὸ ἀγάνος καιρός ὑπὲρ Ὁλυμπίαιν ἰώνων ἄγουσιν, ὡς τοσοῦτο ἀρα αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς ρώμης ἐπηγίζετο ὡς κρατήσαι παγκρατιάζοντα ἐπὶ ἡμέρας τῆς αὐτῆς τούς τε ἔξ Ολυμπίαις ἀνταγωνιστᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς παισίν οὐς ἀγενείους καλοῦσι καὶ τρίτα δὴ ὁ τι άριστον ἢν τῶν ἄνδρῶν. γενέσθαι δὲ οὐ τὴν ἁμιλλαν πρὸς ἀγενείους τε καὶ ἀνδρᾶς τὴν μὲν ἐκ γυμναστοῦ παρακλήσεως φασί, 10 τὴν δὲ ἔξ ἄνδρος παγκρατιαστοῦ λοιδορίας. ἀνείλετο δὲ ἐν ἀνδράσιν ὁ Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ὁλυμπικὴν νίκην δευτέρα καὶ δεκάτην πρὸς διακοσίαις ὁλυμπιάδι.

Engelmann 1980, 87 no. 1124 (IEphesos): a base of white marble was found in 1897, in the atrium of the Constantian Baths at Ephesos. The text below is that of the editors.
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96–98 post

\[ \text{"Αρτέμις βι] ["Εφεσίων}
\[ \text{καὶ Αὐτοκράτορι Νέρωσις Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ}
\[ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ "Εφεσίῳν}

5 Τιμ. Κλ. 'Αρτεμίδωρος Καισαρεύς Τραλλιανός ὁ
kαὶ 'Αλεξάνδρευς καὶ
'Εφεσίως, παγκρατιαστής,

10 ραθοδοξοείκης, ἀρχιερεύς ξυστοῦ καὶ διὰ βίου

ξυστάρχης.


Commentary: The date for Artemidoros’ dedication, A.D. 96–98, is self evident, since Nerva is mentioned as the dedicatee. Apparently Artemidoros was alive during Nerva’s reign, some years after he had won in the men’s pankration at Olympia in the 212th Olympiad (A.D. 69) according to Pausanias, although there is no evidence that this was his last victory.

Continuing his exposition of athletic statues, Pausanias reaches the statue of the Aiginetan athlete Pherials, who was denied permission to enter the competition because of his young age (no. 38 above). This unique incident gives Pausanias the opportunity to add more examples of athletes who were believed to be too young and accordingly were denied participation in the Olympics. One of them was the Rhodian Nikasylos (6.14.1-2), and the other, who surpassed Nikasylos’ achievement, an athlete from Tralleis in Asia Minor, the place to which Pausanias refers at every opportunity. As earlier in the case of
Chionis and Hermogenes (no. 88 above), so too here Pausanias mentions Nikasylos and Artemidoros parenthetically in order to compare their athletic accomplishments and to conclude that Artemidoros surpassed all. Pausanias, therefore, does not make clear whether he saw the statue of Artemidoros at Olympia, although it may have existed there, and so, Artemidoros’ case is included in this section of Chapter IV. In fact, the next statue Pausanias sees near that of Nikasylos is the dedication of a small bronze horse by Krokon from Eretria (Νικασύλου ὄς τὸς εἰκόνας ὕππος τε οὗ μέγας ἔμεταν χαλκοῦ, ἄν Κρόκων Ἐρετρείdrops ἀνέθηκεν ἀνέλομενος κέλητι ὕππαι στέφανον 6.14.4).

Even so, Pausanias’ information about Artemidoros’ athletic achievement in the pankration is corroborated and confirmed by the inscribed base that has been found in Ephesos. It is a dedication by Artemidoros to the Ephesian Artemis, Nerva and the city of Ephesos. In addition to his full name (Tiberius Klaudius), his ethnic (from Kaisareia and Tralleis) and his honorary citizenships by Alexandria and Ephesos, Artemidoros also mentions his titles: periodonikes, paradoxonikes, his appointment as president of the athletic guild, and as president of the organizing committee of the Games (probably in Asia Minor) for life. Of all these details only the athlete’s “cognomen” Artemidoros, his true ethnic Trallianos, and two of his athletic titles are in Pausanias’ account.

The athletic titles, however, that Artemidoros inscribed on the base are mentioned by Pausanias in a more detailed way. More specifically, the titles περισσόνεικης and παραδόσονεικης (line 9-10), which Pausanias consistently avoids, are in fact explained by the exegete: when Artemidoros entered the pankration at Olympia, he failed

337 See above note 334 and the arguments whether a statue of Hermogenes existed in Olympia. Mutatis mutandis the same arguments apply in the case of Artemidoros.

338 See above note 335.
because he was too young. When, however, he competed against the same athletes in the Ionian Games held at Smyrna, he was able to participate in all three categories of boys, ephebes, and men in the same day, in the last two because he was challenged to enter, and he won all three of them. This achievement, indeed a *paradoxon*, is implied by the inscription's title ἐπηρευκός. The other title, which required victories in all four major Panhellenic games, is not mentioned by Pausanias, except for Artemidoros' Olympic victory in the men's pankration in the 212th Olympiad (A.D. 69).

The inscription found in Ephesos, therefore, and Pausanias' narrative about Artemidoros not only corroborate, but also complement each other nicely. The exegete may have derived the information from an inscribed base of Artemidoros in the Altis, since he was an Olympic victor, or from sources outside of Olympia and only appended it in the appropriate place of his narrative. While discussing the statues of Pherias and Nikasylos at Olympia Pausanias deems it appropriate to relate the career of another athlete who again "happened" to be from Asia Minor and whose athletic achievements, as Pausanias proudly claims, surpassed those of all others.
CONCLUSIONS

The second century A.D., during which Pausanias, travelled and composed his work, belongs to the Second Sophistic movement in literature, so-called because the majority of its representatives were Sophists by profession. Two main characteristics of this movement were antiquarianism, and the revival or slavish mimesis of the Attic style. Pausanias, however, stands out as an exception to the norm because of the nature of his work, and it is this "difference" that lies behind his exclusion from discussions of the period. Indeed, although Pausanias strives hard for variatio in his presentation because of the repetitive nature of the subject matter, style is not one of his strong points. But he is an antiquarian, more so than any other representative of the Second Sophistic, an antiquarian who sets out to compose what has come to be known as the "Ελλήνους περιήγησις. The title is not his own and it was made up, it is generally assumed, by the first copyists in Byzantine times. In fact, Pausanias never uses the word περιήγησις or any other related word throughout his work. When he refers to earlier or later books in his narrative, Pausanias uses the word λόγος, an obvious Herodotean influence. But to what extent can his work be recognized as a sample of periegetic literature, and furthermore why did he feel the need for this kind of a work in which inscriptions occupy a prominent role? After all, Pausanias spent most of his adult years collecting the information and writing this magnum opus vitae.

From Homer's Odyssey on, travel literature enjoyed a significant popularity:

339 See Chapter I notes 27 and 33 above.
Herodotus’ *Inquiries* and the Ionian Ἱθαίρηθεις or Περιήγησις, geographical treatises and guide books, even the ancient romances, all display a fondness for exotic descriptions of the world close to and around Greece. Closely related to travel literature were also different types of historical writing: genealogy or mythography, ethnography, horography, chronography, and of course history. Works of this kind were primarily attempts to preserve the “past” and so to arrive at a better understanding of peoples with whom the Greeks came into contact.

Especially by the Hellenistic period and onward, periegetic literature is well established, and the epigraphical evidence becomes a significant element in such works. No complete example has survived from that period, and the few fragments of pseudo-Dikaearchos and Polemo, whom Pausanias purportedly copied extensively in his work, can not be compared in any detail to Pausanias. Moreover, the titles that are known suggest that they did not have the scope of Pausanias’ work. Pausanias not only distances himself from the periegetes by not using the word, but he also extends the scope of the genre. He is not interested, as the periegetes seem to have been, in writing a dry and superficial description of the monuments. He strives to paint the total picture for a

---

340 For the nature of historical writing see Formara 1988, 1-46. Formara’s discussion is limited to what may be called historical writing proper, the *res gestae*, by virtue of which Pausanias’ case is excluded.

341 In her recent study, *The Witness and the Other World. Exotic European Travel Writing, 400–1600*, Mary B. Campbell has convincingly argued that the need for such stories of the “Other World” is elemental and innate in human nature (Campbell 1991, 2-3; the emphasis is mine):

> After we learn “to be” and “to have” in a new language, we learn “to go.” ... Before the Renaissance, overseas travel was rare enough among Europeans that travelers could indeed “lie with authority,” though they might not mean to. ... The travel book is a kind of witness: it is generically aimed at the truth. *Neither power nor talent gives a travel writer his or her authority, which comes only and crucially from experience.*

Her discussion focuses on the periegetic literature from 400 to 1600 A.D. and the stories it told about the “Other World.” In this way humans, she argues, develop an understanding of and a discourse with “different” peoples, with whom they come in contact. Although he shares much with these travelers of exotic places, Pausanias moves the focus of his travel to an already known place, Greece.

342 See especially Frazer’s (1965, vol. 1, xlii-xliv and lxxxii-xc) comments on the fragments of the two periegetes and Pausanias’ predecessors; and Habicht (1985, 1-5).
particular place and, to this end, he utilizes anything he judges valuable. He mixes comments on the geography, mythology, history of places with descriptions of the temples and noteworthy monuments, adds information about local beliefs and customs, indeed anything that he deems of interest to the reader. On the surface, this is a guide book. Yet, any reader of Pausanias certainly feels uncomfortable with this sobriquet, mainly because his work is much more than that.\(^{343}\)

Certainly, Pausanias' work may be better understood as a "history" in the broadest sense of the word. He thought of himself as a historian not of the res gestae alone (history proper occupies a significant part in his exposition), but of, if you will, the res humanae. Early in his work he states unequivocally his aim (1.26.4): ἐὰν ἔμε ἄφενται τοῦ λόγου πρόσω, πάντα ὄμολες ἐπεξεργάται τὰ Ἑλληνικά. Pausanias is neither interested in exotic places, nor does he limit his goals to a specific subject, as many of his predecessors did. His exotic place is Greece and so his travels are in a way introspective, i.e. he sets out in a quest to find and explain the Greeks' traditions and how these were manifested through the monuments at the sites he visited. He is very much preoccupied with "all things Greek," or to paraphrase, what to him, a Greek from Asia Minor, meant to be Greek in the second century A.D.

To accomplish this enormous task Pausanias employs as his basic, self-contained

---

\(^{343}\) See note 33 above. Although Habicht (1985, 3) accepts the title of the book, he does not believe that it is only guide book (1985, 1-27 and 140-164). In a similar vein P. Veyne (1988, 3 and note 12) has noted recently (emphasis is mine):

Pausanias is not a mind to be underestimated, and we do him an injustice when we accept the assessment of his Description of Greece as the Baedeker of ancient Greece. Pausanias is the equal of any of the great nineteenth-century German philologists or philosophers. To describe the monuments and narrate the history of the different countries of Greece, he combed the libraries, traveled a great deal, cultivated himself, and saw it all with his own eyes. His approaches collecting local oral legends with the zeal of a French provincial scholar of the days of Napoleon III. The precision of his descriptions and the breadth of his knowledge are astounding. He amazes us, too, by his visual accuracy (by examining sculpture and inquiring about dates, Pausanias learned to date statuary according to stylistic criteria). And, as we will see, Pausanias was obsessed by the problem of myth and wrestled with this enigma.
unit of composition, as did Herodotos in his earlier books, the *logos* which corresponds to a geographical territory. This is evident in the way that his exposition of Elis, books 5 and 6, forms a unit. Within the convenient framework of geography Pausanias offers at the beginning a mythological and historical overview of the region and then proceeds to his exposition. In his account of his visits to various cities in Elis Pausanias focuses primarily on the local tradition/s (λόγοι) and the monuments (ἀνεθηματα / ἡμιθηματα). These two subjects constitute the core of the work from book 1, and Pausanias develops his narrative around them by providing what he calls an explanation (ἐξηγήσεις) of both of them, since more often than not they are interrelated. In that respect, both the local stories and the dedications are treated equally by Pausanias. Both are testimonies of the local history and tradition and hence worthy of incorporation in the narrative. At the same time Pausanias could not include everything that he saw; he had to be selective. Accordingly, he carefully limits his discussion to the most relevant and representative monuments and stories that a site in Elis has to offer. His decision for this selection is motivated primarily by the renown and the oldness of the monuments which thus constitute the local tradition.

And yet, the formulation of a clearly defined methodology for books 5 and 6 is not something he could have prepared in advance. In no way could Pausanias have foreseen the difficulties ahead, let alone that most of these difficulties, as it turned out, were intrinsic to a particular city, site, or monument. Nor did he have the luxury of extensive revision and editing. Rather his methodology evolved gradually as particular problems that he encountered demanded. For books 5 and 6 in particular Pausanias presents a clear notion of what he is doing and a sharply focused approach to his subject. The main body of the narrative is occupied with the dedications and through them with the local *logoi* they told, which a visitor to Elis, and especially to Olympia may encounter. One important and convincing source for the description and explanation of these monuments
was the testimony of inscriptions which were engraved on the monuments.

Unlike most written texts and oral communication, inscriptions are vested with an authenticity, seldom questioned, and they literally tell the story of the monument directly, with no intermediary.\footnote{Veyne (1988, 3) summarizes the Greek attitude towards myths and history as follows: The Greeks have their own way of believing in their mythology or being skeptical of it, and their way only appears to resemble our own. They also have their way of writing history, which is not our way. The Greek way relies on an implicit presupposition of such a kind that the distinction between original and secondary sources, far from being ignored out of methodological weakness, is simply irrelevant. Pausanias provides an excellent example of this way, and we will refer to him often. Although Pausanias does not make a distinction between “original” and “secondary” sources, nevertheless he makes a distinction which is quite relevant: for him inscriptions are treated differently than say hearsay, or than a literary source.} For his composition of the 'H\x26\ae
a\x26\ae Pausanias employed a number of sources, among which were stories that he heard from the local guides or read in books. In order to accept as authentic and dependable any logos/mythos for a particular monument, Pausanias had to evaluate his sources which more often than not presented him with conflicting accounts. The “objectivity” of the inscriptions, when available, resolved conveniently contradictions, at least for Pausanias, and so their information took precedence in his narrative. In other words, inscriptions assisted him in “restoring etiological truth to myth”,\footnote{This is the title of Chapter 6 of Veyne’s (1988) book Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination. His general argumentation provides useful support for my thesis of epigraphical evidence and Pausanias, although he does not specifically discuss inscriptions in Pausanias.} by providing a more or less trustworthy text which he read himself (α\vup\vphi\vtau\vomicron\vomicron\vomicron) and upon which he could base rational arguments, and, therefore, dismiss το μυ\vomicron\vomicron\vomicron\vomicron. This aspect, the “semblance of truth” inherent in epigraphical testimonia, indeed appears to be the reason for Pausanias’ positive attitude towards inscriptions. Inscriptions are the foundation of his narrative; the other sources are brought into the discussion as needed in a complementary way.

That the epigraphical evidence played an essential part for the composition of Pausanias’ 'H\x26\ae
a\x26\ae is evident from the eighty-nine instances found in the two books

\footnote{Veyne (1988, 3) summarizes the Greek attitude towards myths and history as follows: The Greeks have their own way of believing in their mythology or being skeptical of it, and their way only appears to resemble our own. They also have their way of writing history, which is not our way. The Greek way relies on an implicit presupposition of such a kind that the distinction between original and secondary sources, far from being ignored out of methodological weakness, is simply irrelevant. Pausanias provides an excellent example of this way, and we will refer to him often. Although Pausanias does not make a distinction between “original” and “secondary” sources, nevertheless he makes a distinction which is quite relevant: for him inscriptions are treated differently than say hearsay, or than a literary source.}
(eleven cases of Direct Epigraphical Evidence and seventy-eight of Indirect Epigraphical Evidence). Only eleven instances, where Pausanias says that he is reading an inscription, can be compared with the actual inscriptions. An additional forty-three suggest that inscriptions have been employed. Moreover, thirty-five cases, where it is not assumed that Pausanias read inscriptions, are found to be corroborated by epigraphical evidence. The total is small, but the low ratio (89 or ca. 20%), of course, does not reflect negatively on Pausanias, since many of the inscriptions he claims he read, either may have been permanently lost for us, or may be discovered in the future.

Even so, these eighty-nine instances are indicative of Pausanias' methodology and aims. In the Direct Epigraphical Evidence (nos. 1–11) Pausanias quotes verbatim the epigrams (elegiac distichs) he read on the bases of state dedications (nos. 1–3) and, except for orthographic changes, Pausanias' version of the inscription is very close to the text on the stone. In the remaining cases (nos. 4–11) Pausanias conveys the information that the inscription offers him. Whether quoted or summarized the inscriptions are not treated by Pausanias uncritically. For him they are one of the many sources at his disposal. Personal visits to other places, his familiarity with other ancient writers, pertinent to the inscription, are brought in to elaborate, support, or disprove the claim of an inscription.

Likewise, in the Indirect Epigraphical Evidence (nos. 12–54) where it is assumed

\[346 \text{ See Chapter I notes 11-14, and Appendix D which includes the remaining passages of Direct and Indirect Epigraphical Evidence, for which Pausanias may have employed inscriptions, as the discussion in Chapter III and IV Parts A and B suggests.}

\[347 \text{ The total number is actually greater than eighty-nine; three more inscriptions that have been found in the excavations at Olympia and corroborate Pausanias' arrative have not yet been published. See Appendix D Direct Epigraphical Passages 6.10.4-5. Indirect Epigraphical Passages 5.22.7; 6.12.6. There are also nine more cases in which Pausanias may have employed epigraphical evidence: six of the inscriptions are so fragmentary that cannot support an association; the remaining three are identifications made by Gurlit and especially by Habicht. See note 317 above, and Appendix D Direct Epigraphical Passages 5.20-8-9; 27.11. Indirect Epigraphical Passages 5.12.5; 21.15; 22.7; 6.14.5-9; 14.12; 17.2.}]}
that Pausanias sees the monuments and reads their inscriptions, his information is
primarily derived from inscriptions. And this holds true even for the five cases (nos. 49-
54) whose inscriptions have been found outside of Olympia. Furthermore (nos. 54–88)
where there is no assumption that Pausanias bases his information on inscriptions, show
that almost every detail in Pausanias may be corroborated by the epigraphical record.

Pausanias’ remarkable interest in inscriptions and his use of them is basically
historical. Herodotos was clearly one of his models for his exposition. Pausanias
seldom discusses a monument solely for its artistic value, or the lettering for its artistry.
His arguments and additional information from other sources and from other places are
concerned with the date of, and the reason for a dedication, a religious belief and practice,
or a local custom. This exegesis of the site, as he calls it, depends very much on the
monument itself and on what is inscribed on its base, its logos. Even nowadays a visit to
a site or a museum would be worthless without a guide and the explanatory labels on its
objects. In that sense, Pausanias expects of his reader, while visiting Olympia, to follow
closely his narrative. His topographical notes appear to be confusing, but he does offer
the necessary hints and expects his reader to follow them carefully. This economy was
required at Olympia especially where the number of offerings, the temples with cult
statues and altars, and the athletic dedications was overwhelming.

Olympia was at his time like an outdoor museum. Pausanias had to choose only the
most famous dedications; these largely belonged to the Classical and Hellenistic periods.
His narrative focuses on the temples with their cult statues and altars, the offerings by city
states and famous individuals, and the dedications of the athletic statues which constituted
a national custom.\(^{348}\) However, he abandons his strict chronological criterion, his
antiquarianism, when he has a chance to comment on his favorite place, Asia Minor. In

\(^{348}\) See especially Veyne's (1988, 95-102) Chapter “Pausanias Entrapped.”
particular, he includes with obvious pride not only the accomplishments of athletes from Asia Minor that have surpassed those of earlier athletes (nos. 54, 88, 89), but also mythological and religious parallels (nos. 83, 85). Pausanias' narrative of the athletic dedications reveals that most of his information derived from the inscriptions, the representations of the statue, and the Olympic Register. His omission of the patronymic of an athlete or a sculptor does not reveal any pattern. Obviously, when he is dealing with an important and well-known person, the patronymic is not necessary, and in the Roman period the name and the ethnic usually offered enough information for identification. Moreover, his reporting in many instances is astonishingly careful and consequently, when his manuscripts present variant readings, the epigraphical texts become a crucial tool for improving his text (see Appendix E). For the history and exegesis of the site of Olympia and Elis, then, Pausanias relied on the monuments he saw and their inscriptions, on personal observations during his visits, and on literary sources, all of which told an Ἡλιακὸς λόγος.

These stories, however, were sometimes inconsistent and the sources for them contradictory. His task was enormous and the mass of material he had to deal with inevitably led to some mistakes. In a few instances Pausanias, like any other human being, is led astray or makes a misreading (for example nos. 20, 62, 70). But even when he errs, often neither his information nor his method of argumentation is at fault (for example 9, 41, 70), but rather the conclusions he arrives at. With "subtle style and clear mind (Veyne 1988, 98)" he tried his best to present a narrative of stories, void of internal contradictions. Where he could apply rational criticism to his sources, he did so; otherwise, he suspended judgment and simply reported the different accounts of his sources, letting his readers judge for themselves. The most significant and trustworthy evidence at his disposal for arriving at the truth, or a semblance of it, came from the inscriptions.
A representative of the Second Sophistic Pausanias does not attract much attention, or at least the attention accorded to other authors of that period. Anyone, however, who takes the time to read his difficult text and become acquainted with his narrative, would readily agree with Habicht’s sigh of relief (1985, 140): “Thank God his work has lasted rather than the mass of the sophists’ speeches!” His text is mainly used as an interpretative tool by those interested in the myths, cults, and excavations. Indeed, one cannot begin to imagine what the state of knowledge for Olympia and Elis would have been without Pausanias’ Ἡθαλοκότας A and B; or how many of the fragmentary inscriptions would (or could) have been restored without his authority. His testimony is highly reliable and he cannot be easily overlooked, unless strong and indisputable evidence is presented for doing so. The eighty-nine examples discussed above strongly suggest the notion that Pausanias, to a greater degree than any other author, relied on and trusted the inscriptions that he read in Elis for his composition. They also support the attribution of the epithet στηλοκότας to him, not so much because he quotes or summarizes inscriptions, but rather because he clearly recognized in the inscriptions a crucial source for his exegesis of Elis.
APPENDIX A

EPIGRAPHICAL REFERENCES IN PAUSANIAS’ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΗΓΗΣΕΣ

The two 223 epigraphical passages are defined as those in which Pausanias, through his language, suggests that he is using an inscription. The bold-face numbers in parenthesis refer to the discussion in the commentary of the passages of books 5 and 6.

In Book 1 there are in total sixty-one instances:

Nineteen are scattered: 2.4 two; 5.5; 13.2-3; 13.3; 14.5; 15.4; 18.3 three; 19.2; 26.2; 26.4; 30.1; 34.5; 36.3; 36.4; 37.2; 43.8. Thirty-nine are in Athens’ cemetery: 29.3-16. Three are on Marathon’s tomb: 32.3-4.

In Book 2 there are in total fourteen instances:

Eleven are scattered: 7.2; 9.8; 17.3; 27.2; 27.3 six; 27.4. Three are polyandria: 22.9; 24.7; 38.5.

In Book 3 there are four instances: 8.1; 14.1; 14.3; 18.7.

In Book 4 there are four instances: 1.5-6; 15.5; 22.7; 32.2.

In Book 5 there are in total fifty-one instances:

Thirty-eight are scattered: 2.5; 4.6; 10.2; 10.3; 10.4 (no. 1); 10.10; 12.8 three; 15.5; 15.11-12; 16.3; 20.6-7; 20.8-9 (Appendix D); 22.2 (no. 2); 23.1-3 (no. 50); 23.4-5 (no. 57); 23.7; 24.1-2; 24.2; 24.3 (no. 3); 24.4, 8 (no. 66); 24.7-8; 24.9,11; 25.4; 25.9; 25.10 two; 25.13; 26.1 (no. 4); 26.5 (no. 5); 26.6; 27.2; 27.7; 27.8 two (one of them is no. 6); 27.11; 27.12. Twelve are on the Zanes: 21.4-8 (no. 12). One is the Kypselos Larnax: 17.6-19.10 (no. 55).

415
In Book 6 there are in total forty-five instances:

Thirty-eight are on bases of Olympic Victors: 1.4; 1.6 (no. 7); 1.7 two; 2.6-7; 2.9; 3.1 two; 3.2-3; 3.7; 3.14 two; 4.6-7; 4.8 two; 4.11 (no. 8); 6.3; 7.9; 8.2; 9.4-5 (no. 9); 9.9; 10.4-5 two; 10.6-8; 12.7; 12.8; 13.2; 13.5; 13.7; 13.10-11; 14.9-10; 14.12 (no. 10); 15.2; 15.8; 16.4; 16.8 (no. 11); 17.4; 17.5-6.

Six are on the Treasuries: 19.4-5 two; 19.6; 19.8; 19.13; 19.15.

One is about the Athenian Kleoitas: 20.14.

In Book 7 there are six instances: 6.6; 17.6; 22.2; 23.7; 25.10; 27.5-6.

In Book 8 there are twenty-two instances: 5.3; 9.6; 9.9-10; 10.10; 11.6 (and 9.5); 11.8 two; 14.6; 15.1-2; 25.1; 26.4; 30.5; 30.8; 31.3; 37.2 two (one is no. 86); 37.10; 38.5; 40.1; 42.9 (no. 71); 42.10; 49.1.

In Book 9 there are seven instances: 11.1; 15.6; 16.1; 31.4; 38.4,10; 39.14; 40.10.

In Book 10 there are nine instances: 7.5-6; 10.1; 11.6; 12.6; 21.5-6; 24.1; 24.2; 25.1-31.12; 36.9.
APPENDIX B

EPIGRAPHICAL EXPRESSIONS IN PAUSANIAS'
ELYADOS PERIHEIES

Epigraphical expressions are a combination of words, apparently drawn from inscriptionsal usage that suggest that Pausanias is reading an inscription.

ἐπίγραμμα + γράφω, μηνύω, φημί, εἰμί, μαρτυρῶ, λέγω, σημαίνω, δηλώ, ἔχω, διδωμι, ἀναμμηνήσκω:

Book 1: 2.4; 13.2-3; 15.4; 19.2; 26.4; 37.2.
Book 2: 7.2; 9.8; 17.3; 27.2.
Book 3: 8.2.
Book 4: 1.7.
Book 5: 4.6; 10.2; 10.3; 10.4; 15.5; 17.6; 17.11; 18.1; 18.3; 18.4; 18.5; 19.2-3; 19.4; 19.5 two; 19.6; 19.10; 20.8-9; 21.4; 21.7; 21.8; 24.1-2; 24.7-8; 25.4; 25.10; 26.5 two; 27.2; 27.8 two; 27.11.
Book 6: 1.4; 1.6; 1.7; 2.9; 3.1 two; 3.2-3; 3.7; 3.14 two; 4.6; 4.8; 4.11; 7.9; 8.2; 9.4; 10.4-5 two; 12.7; 13.5; 13.7; 13.10-11; 14.12; 14.9-10; 15.2; 16.2; 16.4; 17.4; 17.6; 19.4; 19.6; 19.15; 20.14.
Book 7: 6.6; 22.2.
Book 8: 5.3; 9.6; 9.9; 11.8; 26.4; 37.2; 37.3; 37.10; 40.1; 42.10.
Book 9: 11.1.
Book 10: 7.6; 10.1; 11.6; 21.5; 36.9.

ἐπίγραμμα + ἐλεγεῖον: Book 5: 2.5; 21.4,6.
Book 6: 3.8; 5.1-6.1; 16.2.
Book 7: 7.6-7,13-14; 27.6.
Book 8: 49.1 = 52.6.
Book 9: 38.4,10.
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ἐλεγεῖον + γράφω, μηνύω, φημί, εἰμί, μαρτυρῶ, λέγω, σημαίνω, δηλῶ:

**Book 1:** 29.11; 43.8.
**Book 5:** 10.10; 20.6-7; 22.3; 23.7; 24.3; 24.11; 25.13; 27.12.
**Book 6:** 9.9; 10.7; 12.8.
**Book 8:** 30.5; 30.8; 38.5.

στήλη + γράφω, εἰμί, λέγω, σημαίνω, ἔχω:

**Book 1:** 29.4-5; 29.6; 29.7; 29.11; 29.12; 29.13; 32.3.
**Book 2:** 36.1.
**Book 3:** 14.1; 14.3; 18.7.
**Book 4:** 22.7.
**Book 5:** 12.8; 23.4-5; 24.3; 25.13.
**Book 6:** 13.2; 16.8 two.
**Book 8:** 11.6; 48.8.
**Book 9:** 16.1.
**Book 10:** 24.2.

στήλη + ἔπιγραμμα: **Book 2:** 27.4.

**Book 6:** 13.10-11; 14.9-10.
**Book 8:** 11.8.

στήλη + ἐλεγεῖον: **Book 1:** 29.11.

**Book 10:** 12.6.

Form of γράφω: **Book 1:** 2.4; 5.5; 13.3; 14.5; 18.3 two; 26.2; 34.5.
**Book 2:** 27.3; 36.1.
**Book 4:** 15.5.
**Book 5:** 15.11-12; 16.3; 17.11; 18.2; 18.4; 18.5; 19.4; 20.1; 23.1-2; 24.2; 25.9-10; 26.1; 27.7.
**Book 6:** 2.6-7; 6.3; 10.7; 15.8; 19.5; 19.8; 19.13.
**Book 7:** 6.4; 25.10.
**Book 8:** 10.10; 14.6; 15.2; 25.1; 37.2.
**Book 9:** 31.4; 39.14.
**Book 10:** 24.1.
πολυάνδριον + ποιῶ, εἰμί: Book 2: 22.9; 24.7; 38.5.

ιαμβεῖον + φησί: Book 7: 23.7.
This Appendix is a list of the metrical inscriptions that Pausanias himself identifies as such and that he quotes (easily identified by their IGM no. [Preger 1981]) or summarizes. It does not include the inscriptions which have been found and are metrical, but which Pausanias does not so identify. The bold-face numbers in parenthesis refer to the discussion in the commentary of the passages of Books 5 and 6.

**Pythokritos, the auletes:** Book 6: 14.9-10 (IGM 145).

**Iambic meter:** Book 7: 23.7.

**Echembrotos' lyric and melic meters:** Book 10: 7.5-6 (IGM 138).

**Elegiac distichs:**

Book 5: 2.5 (IGM 131); 20.6-7 (IGM 202); 21.4 (four on the Zanes); 21.6-7 (six on the Zanes); 22.3 (IGM 60, no. 2); 23.7 (IGM 62); 24.3 (IGM 57, no. 3); 24.11; 25.4; 25.13 (IGM 176); 27.2 (IGM 55); 27.12 (IGM 56).

Book 6: 10.7 (IGM 125); 12.8.

Book 8: 30.8; 38.5.

Book 9: 15.6 (IGM 161); 38.3-4 (IGM 19).

Book 10: 12.5-6; 27.4 (IGM 179).
Elegiac distichs as epigrammata:

Book 1: 13.2 (IGM 96).


Book 6: 3.14 two (IGM 146); 4.6 (IGM 130); 8.2 (IGM 61); 10.4-5 two (IGM 174); 13.10.11 (IGM 123); 17.6 (IGM 132); 20.14 (IGM 178).

Book 7: 17.6-7 (IGM 127).

Book 8: 5.3 (IGM 64); 42.9 (IGM 126); 42.10 (IGM 176); 52.6 (IGM 148).

Book 10: 21.5-6.

Hexameters as epigrammata:

Book 1: 37.2 (IGM 203).

Book 4: 1.8 (IGM 155).

Book 5: 10.2 (IGM 177); 18.2; 18.3; 19.2-3.

Book 6: 19.6 (IGM 54).

Book 9: 11.1.

Metrical Inscriptions quoted as such, but without indication of their meter by Pausanias:

Elegiac distichs: Book 1: 13.3 (IGM 97).

Book 4: 22.7 (IGM 63).

Book 5: 10.3 (IGM 106); 10.4 (IGM 59, no. 1); 25.10 two (IGM 175, 58).

Book 6: 3.14 (IGM 146).

Hexameters: Book 5: 18.3 (IGM 186); 18.4 two (IGM 186); 19.4 two; 19.5 two (IGM 186).

Book 8: 10.10 (IGM 272).

Book 10: 24.2.
APPENDIX D
REMAINING EPIGRAPHICAL REFERENCES IN PAUSANIAS’
’ΩΛΙΑΚΩΝ Α AND Β

In light of the discussion in Chapters III and IV, here are listed the remaining passages of Pausanias’ Books 5 and 6 where it is highly probable that Pausanias utilized inscriptions. There are twelve passages which are not included in the commentary for two reasons: nine of them, because they have been thus far only tentatively associated with fragmentary inscriptions; the remaining three which are supported by extant inscriptions, because the inscriptions have not yet been published.

Direct Epigraphical Passages: The IGM numbers (Preger 1977) indicate that the epigrams are quoted by Pausanias.

Book 5: there are thirty-seven remaining instances:

2.5 (and 6.16.2, IGM 131): the dedication by the Eleian pentathlete Timon.

4.6 (and 5.20.1): Iphitos, son of Haimon, and the disc onto which the Olympic truce was inscribed.

10.2 (IGM 177): a statue of Zeus by the Athenian Pheidias, son of Charmides.

10.3 (IGM 106): the inscription about the Naxian Euergos, son of Byzes.

10.10: a statue of Iphitos being crowned by Ekecheiria, the personification of the Olympic Truce.

15.5: the inscribed altar of Zeus Moiragetas.
15.11-12: an inscribed stele in Egypt, set up by Eleians at the site of Ammon, where they had gone to ask the oracle.

16.3: inscribed statues of women athletes, victorious in the Heraia. Among them Hippodameia, Dionysos, and Athena Narkaia.

17.6-19.10: the Kypselos Larnax counted as one (IGM 186, Friedländer 1987, 56-60 no. 54, and Chapter IV no. 55);

20.6-7 (IGM 202): the House and Pillar of Oinomaos inscribed.

20.8-9: Pausanias does not say who the Roman senator is, or in what event he was victorious.

Gurlitt (1890, 421 note 37) and more recently Habicht (1985, 178-180) have associated this passage of Pausanias with an inscribed base that has been found near the Palaistra at Olympia (IO 236). The date seems to be appropriate, and the association is possible. The text is dated by Habicht (1985, 180) “sometime in the 150s” and reads:

ΑΟΥΚΙΟΣ ΜΙΝΥΚΙΟΣ ΝΑΤΑΛΙΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΙΚΟΣ Ὀλυμπιάδι ἀκτῆς

ἀρματέ τελεῖ υευκήσας ἀνέ-

ηκέν τὸ ἄρματος οὐσίωσ.

ἀνθύπατος Αἰμώνες

21.4: six Zanes by the athlete Eupolos from Thessaly who cheated in boxing. Only four of them (the first, second, fifth and sixth) are inscribed with epigrams which Pausanias summarizes and pertain to Eupolos’ cheating.

21.6-7: six Zanes by the Athenian athlete Kallippos who cheated in the pentathlon. All six are inscribed with epigrams which Pausanias again summarizes and pertain to Kallippos’ cheating.

21.8: two inscribed Zanes by athletes who cheated in wrestling. Their epigrams are again summarized by Pausanias and pertain to cheating.

23.7 (IGM 62): dedication of a statue of Zeus by the citizens of Kleitor, the work of the Lakedaimonians Ariston and Telestas.

24.1-2: dedication of a statue of Zeus from the war <between the Phokaians and Thessaliacs>, the work of the Theban Askaros and the Sikyonian <Kleon or Kanachos>.

24.2: dedication of a statue of Zeus by the Psophidians on account of their success in a war.

24.7-8: dedication by the Cherronesians from Knidos of statues of Zeus, Pelops and Alpheios.

24.9-11: an inscribed pinakion, set up in front of the feet of the staue of Zeus Horkios in the Bouleuterion, whose text was intended to strike terror into the perjurers.
25.4: dedication by the Messenians in Sicily of bronze statues of the thirty-five members of a choral group of boys, their teacher and the flute player, that perished in the straits.

25.8-10 (IGM 175 and 58): eight statues of the participants in Hektor's challenge to single combat dedicated by the whole Achaean race. Three of them are inscribed.

25.12-13 (IGM 176): statue of Herakles dedicated by the Thasians, the work of the Aiginetan Mikon, son of Onatas.

26.6: a Nike statue, resembling the Athenian Apteros-Nike, dedicated by the Mantineans on account of some successful war, the work of Kalamis.

27.1-2 (IGM 55): dedication of Phormis from the Arkadian Mainalon who became a Syrakusan under Gelon, son of Deinomenes.

27.7: another dedication for Phormis by the Syrakusan Lykortas.

27.8: a statue of Hermes dedicated by the citizens of Pheneos, the work of Onatas and Kalliteles.

27.11: a bronze trophy dedicated by the Eleians from the Lakedaimonians, the work of the Sikyonian Daidalos.
A signature of this sculptor has been found at Olympia (IO 635): it is on the last Zan from west to east, before entering the Stadion.

27.12: a statue (which Pausanias at first takes it for a pentathlete) dedicated by the citizens of Mende in Thrace, on account of their forceful takeover of another city Sipte.

Book 6: there are thirty-eight remaining instances: most are athletic victory statues and the reader is advised to consult also Herrmann 1988, 151-176: “Liste I. Olympische Siegerstatuen nach Pausanias, VI 1-18.”

1.4: statue of the Eleian Kleogenes, son of Silenos, victorious in the horse race.

1.7: statue of the Lakedaimonian Anaxandros, victorious in the chariot race.

1.7: statue of the Lakedaimonian Polykles, victorious in the four-horse chariot.

2.6-7: statue of the Milesian Antipatros, son of Kleinopatros, victorious in the boys' boxing. The Syrakusans attempted to bribe the father into proclaiming his son a Syrakusan. Antipatros denied the offer and inscribed his ethnic Milesios and also that he was the first of the Ionians to dedicate a statue at Olympia.
2.9: a statue of a Samian boxer, dedicated by his paidotribes the Samian Mykon.

3.1 (and 10.7.8): a statue of a man dedicated by the Makedonian Ptolemy, son of Lagos.

3.1: statue of the Sikyonian Chaireas, son of Chairemon, victorious in the boys boxing, the work of Asterion, son of Aischylos.

3.2-3: statue of the Eleian Stomios, victorious in the pentathlon.

3.7: statue of the Eleian Bupolemos, victorious in the stadion at Olympia, and pentathlon in Nemea and Isthmia, the work of Daidalos the Sikyonian.

3.14, 15: two inscriptions on the statue of the Lakedaimonian Lysander, son of Aristokritos, dedicated by the Samians.

4.6-7 (and 7.6.5, IGM 130): victory statue of the wrestler Cheilon from Patras, the work of Lysippos.

4.8: a statue dedicated by the Eleians for a Molpion.

5.1-6.1: victory statue of the pankratiast Poulydamas from the Thessalian city of Skotousa, the work of Lysippos. The fragmentary base of his statue has been found with the depictions as described by Pausanias.

7.9: statue of Gnathon, son of Alkainetos, from Dipaia in Mainalon, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Megarian Kallikles.

8.2 (IGM 61): statue of the Arkadian Damarchos, son of Dinyttas, from Parrhasia, victorious in the men's boxing.

9.9 (and 14.13): statue of the Korkyraian Philon, victorious in the boys dromos and in boxing, the work of the Aiginetan Glaukias. The distich is composed by Simonides, son of Leoprepes.

10.4-5 (and 5.8.10 and 8.26.2, IGM 174): statue of the Arkadian Damaretos, from Heraia, victorious in hoplite dromos, the work of the Argives Eutelidas and Chrysosthemis.

Habicht (1985, 150 and notes 40-41) quotes from an unpublished bronze tablet, found at Olympia in 1980 (Inventory B.10471). It dates from ca. 500 B.C. and contains the greater right part of the two lines about the sculptors. Pausanias' quote of the epigram read at the end of the second line: τέχναν εἰδὼτες ἐκ προτέρων, which Schubart emended to ἐκ πατέρων. The epigram preserves the end of the line and confirms Schubart's emendation. Accordingly, Habicht concludes: Here it is Pausanias, not a copyist, who is to blame, since the remark "The epigram does not say by whom they were taught" makes it quite clear that Pausanias read and copied ἐκ προτέρων. It could be, however, that a few letters of the text were damaged and hard to read.
10.4-5 (8.26.2, IGM 174): statue of Theopompos, son of Damaretos above, from Heraia, victorious in pentathlon, the work of the Argives Eutelidas and Chrysothemis. See the preceding note.

10.6-8 (IGM 125): statue of Kleosthenes from Epidamnos, victorious in the chariot race, the work of Ageladas.

12.7: chariot of the Kyrenaian Theochrestos, from Libya, victorious in the chariot and (?) horse races in Isthmia.

12.7: chariot of the Kyrenaian Theochrestos, son of Theochrestos above, from Libya, victorious in the chariot and (?) horse races.

12.8 (and 8.27.5): statue of Hagestratos, son of Haimostratos, from the Arkadian Tritaia, victorious in boxing.

13.2: stele for the Lakedaimonian Chionis, victorious many times in running events, his statue, the work of the Athenian Myron.

13.5: statue of the Samian Douris, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of Hippias.

13.7: an inscribed statue of some athlete who was born in Argos (there is a lacuna in the text).

13.10-11 (IGM 123): horse-statue by the sons of Pheidolas, victorious in the boys' horse race.

14.9-10 (IGM 145): a relief of the Sikyonian auletes Pythokritos, son of Kallinikos, who fluted during the pentathlon at Olympia and won victories in the Pythia in flute playing.

15.2 (and 5.11.3 and 6.10.6; 4.5): statue of the Eleian Pantarkes dedicated by the Achaians, because he made peace between them and the Eleians.

15.8 (and 5.9.1): statue of the Spartan Eutelidas, victorious in the boys' wrestling and pentathlon.

16.4 (and 2.15.3): statue of the Eleian Aristeides, victorious in the hoplite dromos and elsewhere.

17.4: statue of the Arkadian Emaution? (Enation ?), victorious in the boys' stadion.

17.5-6 (IGM 132): statue of the Eleian Eperastos, son of Theogonos, victorious in the hoplite dromos, a mantis of the family of Klytidai.

19.4: in the treasury of the Sikyonians, the smaller chamber, there two (2) inscriptions saying that the bronze in the treasury weighed 500 talents and was a dedication of the Sikyonian demos and their tyrant Myron.
19.4-5 (and 10.38.1): in the Sikyonian treasury there are bronze weapons inscribed as offerings by the Myonians in Phokis.

19.8: in one of the treasuries (the text has a lacuna) there are statues made by Theokles, son of Hegylos, and his son.

19.13 (and 5.17.2, no. 79): an inscribed shield on the pediment of the Megarian treasury which mentions that the Megarians built it from the Korinthians.

19.15: an inscription in the Geloan Treasury stating that it and the statues in it is a dedication of the Geloans.

20.14 (and 6.10-19, IG 178): statue of the Athenian Kleoitas, son of Aristokles, seen at Athens, who discovered the starting device in the Hippodrome.

INDIRECT EPIGRAPHICAL PASSAGES

Book 5: there are thirty-eight remaining instances:

11.3 (and 10.6, 15.2): the Eleian Pantarkes, Pheidias' παραληπτής, victorious in boys wrestling and horse race.

12.5: inside the temple of Zeus, or in its the pronaos, there is the throne of Arimnestos, king of Etruria, who was the first barbarian to offer a dedication to the Olympian Zeus.

12.5 (no. 7): to the right of those entering the pronaos of the temple of Zeus bronze horses of Kyniska from an Olympic victory. 
IO 634, the signature of Apelles, son of Kallikles has been associated with this dedication of Kyniska.

12.6: the cities of the Achaean League a statue of Hadrian. 
A marble statue of Hadrian has been found.

12.6: all Greeks a statue of Trajan. 
A marble statue of Trajan has been found.

12.7: statue of Augustus, made of elektron.
A marble statue of Augustus has been found.

12.7: an ivory statue of the king of Bithynia Nikomedes.

17.1: in the Heraion a statue of Themis, the mother of the Horai, the work of the Lakedaimonian Dorykleides, student of Dipoinos and Skyllis.

17.1: in the Heraion statues of the Horoi, works of the Aiginetan Smilis.
17.2: in the Heraion five statues of the Hesperidai, the work of the Lakedaimonian Theokles, son of Hegylos, student of Dipoinos and Skyllis.

17.2: in the Heraion a statue of Athena, the work of the Lakedaimonian Medon, the brother of Dorykleides, student of Dipoinos and Skyllis.

17.3: in the Heraion a statue of Hermes carrying Dionysos, the work of Praxiteles. The famous Hermes of Praxiteles has been found, but its sculptor is disputed.

17.3-4 (two): in the Heraion a bronze Aphrodite, the work of the Sikyonian Kleon, and a naked child in front of her, the work of the Karchedonian Boethos.

17.4 (two): in the Heraion, transferred from the Philippeion, statues of Eurydike, Philip's mother and his wife Olympias.

20.1-2: in the Heraion an ivory table onto which the crowns of the Olympic victors are laid, the work of Kolotes from Herakleia or Paros, the student of Pasiteles.

20.9: in the Metroon, a building in the Doric order and of ancient name, there are statues of the Roman Emperors.

20.9-10: in the Philippeion, a building constructed by Philip after Chaironeia, there are statues of Philip, Alexander and Amyntas, works of Leochares.

21.15: two Zanes to the left and to the right of the entrance into the Stadium, paid for by the boxers Deidas and Sarapammon who competed in the same event in which Sarapammon was caught paying Deidas to take a fall. They were both from Egypt, the newly established county Arsinoites.

Both names have suffered in the manuscript tradition, but there has been found an inscription at Olympia (IO 228), mentioning a Markos son of Deidas, from Daphne in Antiocheia, victorious in the boys boxing in the 219th Olympiad (A.D. 97). Hitzig has accordingly corrected the reading of Pausanias' manuscripts.

21.16-17 (and 6.23.4): two Zanes in the Gymnasium of Elis, and in the Altis in front of the Colonnade which is called Poikile (because of old paintings on its walls) or Echo (because, if someone called out, his voice echoed seven times). Sosandros, son of Sosandros, from Smyrna, and the Eleian Polyktor, son of Damonikos, were caught cheating in the boys' wrestling. The fines were not paid by the boys, but by their fathers who made the deal: Damonikos was caught paying Sosandros, the father, so that his son would take the fall and Polyktor would by an Olympic victor.

22.1: statue of Zeus dedicated by the citizens of the Arkadian Kynaiitha.

22.1: Kleolas from Phleious dedicated a statue of Zeus as a boy.

22.5: statue of Zeus dedicated by the citizens of Metapontion, the work of the Aiginetan Aristonous.
22.6: statues of Zeus, Asopos and his daughters, Nemea, Aigina, Harpina, Korkyra and Thebe, dedicated by the Phleiasians.

22.7: three men from Leontinoi, Hippagoras, Phrynon and Ainesidemos (not the tyrant), individually and not with the city, dedicated a statue of Zeus.

Kunze (1963, 107) reports that a small inscribed and reused offering of this Phrynon from Leontinoi has been discovered in the excavations where the altar of Artemis has been found (no. 62 above). He does not give a text and the inscription has not been published since.

Also IO 838, a fragmentary marble base which reads ΑΙΝ[- -], has been tentatively associated with this Ainesidemos.

23.5 (and 6.10.5): statue of Zeus dedicated by the Megarians, the work of the brothers Psylax and Onaithos and their children.

23.6: statue of Zeus dedicated by the citizens of Hyblai.

24.1: statue of Zeus dedicated by the Korinthians, the work of some Mousos.

24.5: Gnathis from Thessaly dedicated the statues of Zeus and Ganymedes, the work of Aristokles, the student and son of Kleoitas.

24.6 (and 26.2-5 and no. 5): a beardless Zeus among the dedicatory statues of Mikythos.

24.6: a beardless Zeus dedicated by the Elaitai who descended from Mt. Kaikos and settled in Aeolis in Asia Minor.

25.1: a dedication by a Korinthian is actually Alexander, the son of Philip, in the appearance of Zeus.

25.7: a naked statue of Herakles in young age dedicated by Anaxippos from Mende. The statue has been by the Eleians from its original position, on the Hiera Hodos from Elis to Olympia, within the Altis, at the southwest corner, and its near the statue of Herakles of Hippotion (no. 14).

26.6: a statue of Athena dedicated by the Eleians, the work of Nikodamos from Mainalon.

27.9-10 (and 10.9.3): a bronze bull dedicated by the Korkyraeans, who also dedicated another one at Delphi (no. 51).

Book 6: there are 197 remaining instances, most of which are athletic victory statues; as before, the reader is advised to consult also Herrmann 1988, 151-176: “Liste I. Olympische Siegerstatuen nach Pausanias, VI 1-18.”
1.3: statue of the Eleian Symmachos, son of Aischylus, victorious in wrestling, the work of the Sikyonian Alypos, student of the Argive Naukydes.

1.3: statue of the Arkadian Neolaidas, son of Proxenos, from Pheneos, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Sikyonian Alypos, student of the Argive Naukydes.

1.3: statue of the Eleian Archedamos, son of Xenios, victorious in the boys' wrestling, the work of the Sikyonian Alypos, student of the Argive Naukydes.

1.4-5: statue of the Eleian Deinolochos, son of Pyrrhos, victorious in the boys' running, the work of the Sikyonian Kleon.

2.1: statue of <Xenarkes, son of Philandridas> (the text has a lacuna), the first Akarnanian from Stratos to be victorious in the pankration, the work of Lysippos.

2.1-2: statue of the Lakedaimonian Xenarkes, <son of Philandridas> (the text has a lacuna), victorious in an equestrian event at Olympia, but with victories in Delphi, Argos, and Korinth.

2.1-2: statue of the Lakedaimonian Lykinos, victorious in the full-grown horses race, which he ran with his foals, one of which was rejected for its category, the work of the Athenian Myron.

2.1-2: statue of the Lakedaimonian Arkesilaos, victorious in the horse race.

2.1-3: statue of the Lakedaimonian Lichas, son of Arkesilaos, victorious in the chariot race. He entered the Games under the name of the Theban demos, he was discovered and whipped, and, as Pausanias reports, this incident caused the invasion of Agis into the Altis.

2.4-5 (and 8.10.5): statue of the Eleian mantis Thrasyboulos, of the Iamidai family. See also Pindar *Ol.* 6.43-70.

2.6-7: statue of the Eleian Timosthenes, victorious in the boys' stadion, the work of the Sikyonian Eutychides, the student of Lysippos, who also made the statue of Tyche for the Syrians on the Orontes.

2.8 (and 12.6): statue of the Eleian Timon, victorious in the chariot race, the work of the Sikyonian Daidalos.

2.8: statue of the Eleian Aisypos (or Aigyptos, the manuscripts are not unanimous), son of Timon above, victorious in the horse race, the work of the Sikyonian Daidalos.

2.10-11: statue of the Messenian <Damiskos>, victorious in the boys' stadion when he was twelve years old, and also in the pentathlon at Nemea and Isthmia.
3.4: statue of the Eleian Labax, son of Euphron, from Lepreon, victorious in boxing.

3.4: statue of the Eleian Aristodemos, son of Thrasis, victorious in wrestling, and with victories in the Pythia and Nemea, the work of the Sikyonian Daidalos, son and student of Patrokles.

3.5: statue of the Eleian Hippos, son of Thrasis, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Sikyonian Damokritos.

3.6: statue of the Achaian Kratinos, from Aigeira, victorious in the boys' wrestling, the work of the Sikyonian Kantharos, son of Alexis and student of Eutychides.

3.8 (and 7.17.6-7, 13-14): statue by the Achaians for the Achaian Oibotas, son of Oinias, victorious in the stadion.

3.9: statue of the Eleian Antiochos, from Lepreon, victorious in the pankration, and also with victories in the Nemea and Isthmia, the work of Nikodamos.

3.9-10: statue with ancient halters of the Eleian Hysmon, victorious in the pentathlon, and also with a victory in the Nemea (the Eleians were not allowed participation in the Isthmia), the work of Kleon. See Ebert 1963.

3.11: statue of the Arkadian Nikostratos, son of Xenokleides, from Heraia, victorious in the boys' wrestling, the work of Pantias.

3.11-12: three (? the number of his Olympic victories?) statues of Dikon, son of Kallibrotos, who was victorious in the boys’ running as a Kauloniates, but later competed as a Syrakusan after he was paid to change his citizenship and won in the men’s running twice in the Olympia, five in Pythia, three in Isthmia, and four in the Nemea.


3.13: statue of Xenophon, son of Menephylos, from the Achaian Aigeion, victorious in the pankration, the work of Olympos.

3.13: statue of Pyrilampes, from Ephesos, victorious in the dolichos race, the work of the Messenian Pyrilampes.

3.15: bronze statue of Alkibiades dedicated by the Ionians in the Heraion at Samos.

3.15: statues of Lysander, Eteonikos, Pharax and other Lakedaimonians dedicated by the Ephesian in the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesos.

3.16: bronze statues of Konon and Timotheos dedicated by the Ionians in the Heraion at Samos.

3.16: bronze statues of Konon and Timotheos dedicated by the Ephesians in the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesos.
4.3 (and 2.10): statue of Leontiskos, from the Sikilian Messene, crowned twice by the Eleians and once by the Amphiktyones in wrestling, the work of Pythagoras from Rhegion.

4.5: statue of an ἀνδροσώμονος παῖς, the work of Pheidias.

4.5: statue of the Eleian Satyros, son of Lysianax from the Iamidai family, victorious in boxing, in Olympia twice, in Pythia twice and in the Nemea five times, the work of the Athenian Silanion.

4.5: statue of the Ephesian Amyntas, son of Hellanikos, victorious in the boys’ pankration, the work of the Athenian Polykles, student of Stadieus.

4.9: uninscribed statue which they say is Aristotle from Stageira in Thrace and a dedication by a student of his or a soldier who knew that Aristotle was influential with Antipater and before him Alexander.

4.9: statue of Sodamas, from Assos in the Troad, first from the Aioli anians to be victorious in the boys’ stadion.

4.9-10 (and 15.7 and 3.10.5): statue of Archidamos, son of Agesilaos, the Spartan king.

4.10: statue of Euanthes from Kyzikos, victorious in boxing, in Olympia in the men’s category, in Nemea and Isthmia in the boys’.

4.10: statue and chariot, mounted by a young girl, of the Makedonian Lampos, from Philippoi, victorious in the chariot race.

6.1: statue of the Arkadian Protolaos, son of Dialkes, from Mantinea, victorious in the boys’ boxing, the work of Pythagoras from Rhegion.

6.1: statue of the Arkadian Androстhenes, son of Lochaios, from Mainalon, victorious twice in the pankration, the work of Nikodamos from Mainalon.

6.2: statue of the Theban Agenor, son of Theopompos who was a proxenos of the Phokians, dedicated by the Phokian koinon, victorious in wrestling, the work of the Argive Polykleitos, student of Naukydes.

6.3 (and 8.1): statue of the Eleian Lastratidas, son of Paraballon, victorious in the boys’ wrestling, and also in Nemea in the boys’ and ephebes’ categories.

6.3 (and 8.1, no. 69): statue of the Eleian Paraballon, victorious in the diaulos race, and the one who wrote in the Gymnasium an Olympic victory list.

7.1: statue of Pytharchos, from Mantinea, victorious in the boys’ stadion.

7.2 (nos. 21, 26-28): statue of the Rhodian Peisirhodos, grandson of Diagoras, victorious in the boys’ boxing.

7.8 (no. 29): statue of the Eleian Alkainetos, son of Theantos, from Lepreon, victorious in the boys’ and men’s boxing.

7.8 (no. 29): statue of the Eleian Theantos, son of Alkainetos, from Lepreon, victorious in the boys’ boxing.

7.9: statue of the Eleian Lykinos, victorious in the boys’ boxing.

7.10: statue of Dromeus from Stymphalos, victorious in the dolichos race in Olympia twice, in Pythia twice, in Isthmia thrice and in Nemea five, the work of Pythagoras. He was the one who introduced meat in his athletic diet.

8.1: statue of Sostratos from the Achaian Pellene, victorious in the boys’ dromos, the sculptor is not mentioned.

8.1: statue of the Eleian Amertos, victorious in the boys’ wrestling, and in Pythia in the men’s wrestling, the work of the Argive Phradmon.

8.3: statue of Eubotas, from Kyrene was victorious in the dromos and at the same date dedicated his statue because of the prophecy he received from the oracle in Libya. He was also victorious in the Anolympiad of 364 B.C. in the chariot race.

8.4: statue of Timanthes, from Kleonai, victorious in the pankration, the work of the Athenian Myron.

8.4: statues of Baukis, from Troizen, victorious in wrestling, the work of Naukydes.

8.5: statues of the Arkadian Euthymenes, from Mainalon, victorious in the men’s and boys’ wrestling, his statue for the boys’ victory a work of Alypos.

8.5 (and 7.27.5): statue of Promachos, son of Dryon, from the Achaian Pellene, victorious in the pankration.

8.6: statue of Timasitheos from Delphi, victorious in the pankration, the work of the Argive Ageladas.

9.1: statue of Theognetos from Aigina, victorious in the boys’ wrestling, the work of the Aiginetan Ptolichos, son and student of Synoon. See Anth.Pal. 16.2.

9.2: a statue of an athlete who won in the kalpe (trotting race), the event that was dropped out of the Olympic program, and therefore his name was not inscribed.
9.2: statue of the Arkadian Alketos, son of Alkinoos, from Kleitor, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of Kleon.

9.3: statue of the Argive Aristeus, son of Cheimon, victorious in the dolichos, the work of Pantias, son and student of Sostratos, from Chios.

9.3: statues of the Argive Cheimon, victorious in wrestling, the work of Naukydes.

9.4: statue of the Eleian Philles, victorious in the boys' wrestling, the work of the Spartan Kratinos.

9.9: statue of the Arkadian Agametor, from Mantineia, victorious in the boys' boxing.

10.1-3: statue of Glaukon, son of Demylos, from Karystos (his family had come from Anthedon in Boiotia), victorious in boxing in Olympia, and twice in Pythia, and eight times each in Nemea and Isthmia, the work of the Aiginetan Glaukas. The statue was dedicated by Glaukos' son.

10.4: statue of the Eleian Philles, victorious in the boys' wrestling, the work of the Spartan Kratinos.

10.4-5 (and 5.8.10 and 8.26.2): statue of the Arkadian Theopompos, son of Theopompos the son of Damaretos, from Heraia, victorious in wrestling, the sculptor is not known.

10.5: statue of Ikkos, son of Nikolaides, from Taras, victorious in the pentathlon, and later one of the best trainers.

10.8: chariots of the Lakedaimonian Euagoras, who is mounted on them.

10.9: statue of the Arkadian Lykinos, from Heraia, victorious in the boys' dromos, the work of Kleon.

10.9: statue of the Arkadian Epikrados, from Mantineia, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Aiginetan Ptolichos.

10.9: statue of the Eleian Agiadas, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Aiginetan Serambos.

This passage was incorrectly associated with the fragmentary inscription IO 150.

11.1: four statues of Philip, son of Amyntas, on horse back, Alexander, son of Philip, on horse back, Seleukos, on horse back, and Antigonos, all four dedicated by the Eleians.

12.5 (and 2.82-9.5): statue of the Sikyonian Aratos, dedicated by the Korinthians. Aratos also won in a chariot race.

12.6: statue of the Eleian Kallon, son of Harmodios, victorious in the boys boxing, the work of Daippos.
E. B. French (*Archaeological Reports* 1989-90, 30) reports Dr. U. Zinn's new discovery during excavations in the area north of the Prytaneion at Olympia. He reported the discovery of a base of a votive statue inscribed with the signature of the Sikyonian Daippos, the student of Lysippos (the text is not published). Pausanias saw two statues by Daippos in the Altis, both for Eleian athletes: Kallon, mentioned in this passage, and Nikandros (below 16.5).

12.6: statue of the Eleian Hippomachos, son of Moschion, victorious in the boys' boxing, the sculptor is not known.

13.1: statue of Astylos, from Kroton, victorious in three consecutive Olympiads both in the stadion and diaulos, the work of Pythagoras from Rhegion. He proclaimed himself a Syrakusan as a favor to Hieron in the last two victories, on account of which the Krotoniates made his house a jail.

13.3-4: Polites', from the Karian city Keramos, victories in the same day in the stadion, diaulos and dolichos (paradoxonikes).

13.4: the runner Leonidas from Rhodes won twelve victories in four Olympiads.

13.6: statue of Dialloos, son of Pollis, from Smyrna, the first of the Ionians to be victorious in the boys' pankration.

13.6: statue of Thersilochos, from Korkyra, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Argive Polykleitos.

13.7: statue of Bykelos, the first Sikyonian to be victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Sikyonian Kanachos, the student of the Argive Polykleitos.

13.7: statue of Mnaseas, armed, surnamed Libys, from Kyrene, the work of Pythagoras from Rhegion.

13.8: statue of Tisandros, son of Kleokritos, from the Sikilian Naxos, victorious in boxing four times in Olympia and four in Pythia.

13.9: the horse of the Korinthian Pheidolas named Aura with which he was victorious in the race (see also above 6.13.9-10).

13.11: statue of the Eleian Agathinos, son of Thrasyboulos, dedicated by the Achaians of Pellene.

14.1-2: statue of the Rhodian Nikasylos who, being eighteen years old, was not allowed participation in the boys' category and so he entered in the men's wrestling and won. He also won in the Nemea and Isthmia, but he died in his twentieth year, before his return to Rhodes.

14.4: bronze horse dedicated by Krokon from Eretria, on account of his victory in the horse race.
14.4: statue of the Messenian Telestas, victorious in the boys’ boxing, the work of the Athenian Silanion.

14.5-9: statue of Milon, son of Diotimos, from Kroton, victorious in the wrestling six times in Olympia (one in the boys’ and five in the men’s categories), and seven times in the Pythia (one in the boys’ and six in the men’s categories), the work of Dameas from Kroton.

A round base with a fragmentary inscription (IO 264) has been identified as Milon’s votive statue base. The text is restored: 

[Mίλων Διότ]'] 

\textit{See also Anth.Pal. 16.24.}

14.9: statue of the king of Thesprotis Pyrrhos, son of Aiakides, dedicated by the Eleian Thrasyboulos.

14.11: statue of the Messenian Gorgos, son of Eukletos, victorious in the pentathlon, the work of Theron from Boiotia.

14.11: statue of the Messenian Damaretos, victorious in the boys’ boxing, the work of the Athenian Silanion.

14.11: statue of the Eleian Anauchidas, son of Philys, victorious in the boys’ wrestling, the sculptor is not known.

14.11: statue of Anochos, son of Adamatas, from Taras, victorious in the stadion and diaulos, the work of the Argive Ageladas.

14.12 (no. 10): statue of Xenodikos, from Kos, victorious in the boys’ boxing, the work of Pantias.

14.12: statue of Pythes, son of Andromachos, from Abdera, the work of Lysippos. It is dedicated by soldiers and so this Pythes may have been a competent leader of mercenaries, or involved with military affairs.

A discovery of a fragmentary inscription (IO 297) is a dedication by a select corps of Achaians for an Antandridas, son of Pythes. The association is of course tentative. The text runs:

'Αντανάκτους τοιούτου το \\
\\
\\
\\
\\


14.13 (and 3.11.6): statue of Hieronymos, from Andros, victorious in the pentathlon, the work of Stomios. He competed against the Eleian pentathlete Tisamenos who was later the \textit{mantis} at Plataia, in the battle against the Medes and Mardonios.

14.13: statue of Prokles, son of Lykastidas, from Andros, victorious in the boys’ wrestling, the work of Somis.

14.13: two statues of the Eleian Aischines for his two victories in the pentathlon.
15.1: statue of the Eleian Xenon, son of Kalliteles, from Lepreon in Triphylia, victorious in the boys' stadion, the work of the Messenian Pyrilampes.

15.1: statue of the Eleian Kleinomachos, the sculptor is not known.

15.2: statue of the Eleian Olidas by the Aitolian nation.

15.2: statue of the Eleian Charinos, victorious in diaulos and hoplite running.

15.2: statue of the Chian Ageles, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of Theomnestos from Sardeis.

15.3-5: statue of Kleptomachos, son of Hermokritos, from Thebes, victorious in Olympia in the same day in boxing and pankration, in Isthmia in wrestling, and in the same day in boxing and pankration, and in the Pythia three times in pankration. It was dedicated by his father, Hermokritos.

15.7: statue of the Eleian Timoptolis, son of Lampis, dedicated by the citizens of Pale, formerly Doulichia, the fourth part of Kephalenia.

15.9: statue of the Messenian Gorgos, the only one who has been victorious four times in the pentathlon, and once in diaulos and once in the hoplite dromos.

15.10: statues of Ptolemy, son of Lagos, and his sons.

15.10-11: two statues of the Eleian Kapros, son of Pythagoras, victorious in the same day in wrestling and pankration, and also in the Pythia in the boys boxing and in the same day in wrestling and boxing.

16.1: statue of the Eleian Pherenikos, victorious in the boys' wrestling.

16.1 (and 10.16.4): statue of Pleistainetos, son of Eurydamos, strategos of the Aitolians against the Gauls, dedicated by the city of Thessalian.

16.2 (and 11.1): statue of the Eleian Tydeus, for king Antigonos, father of Demetrios.

16.2 (and 11.1): statue of the Eleian Tydeus, for king Seleukos.


16.5: statue of the Eleian Menalkes, victorious in the pentathlon.

16.6: statue of the Lakedaimonian Polypeithes, son of Kalliteles, victorious in an equestrian event.

16.6: statue of the Lakedaimonian Kalliteles, the father of Polypeithes, victorious in wrestling.

16.6: statue of the Eleian Eualkides, victorious in the boys' boxing.
16.6: statue of the Lakedaimonian Seleadas, victorious in wrestling.

16.7: the city of Psophis statue for the Eleian Lampos, son of Aristokos, a private citizen (and their proxenos?).

16.7: the city of Psophis statue for the Eleian [— — —], son of Aristarchos, a private citizen (and their proxenos?).

16.8: statue of the Eleian Pyttalos, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of Sthennis from Olynthos. He was also a judge in the dispute over territory between the Eleians and the Arkadians.

16.8: statue of the Eleian Theodoros, victorious in the pentathlon.

16.8: statue of the Eleian Nelaidas, victorious in the stadion and the hoplite race.

16.9: statue of Ptolemy mounted on horse back.

16.9: statue of the Eleian Klearatos, victorious in the pentathlon.

17.1: statue of the Eleian Kriannios, victorious in the hoplite race, the work of the Makedonian Lysos.

17.2: statue of the Klaizomenian Herodotos by the city of Klaizomenai. He was the first Klaizomenian victorious in the boys' stadion.

17.2: statue of the Koan Philinos, son of Hegepolis, victorious in the dromos, dedicated by the city of Kos. He won five times in Olympia, four in Delphi, four in Nemea, and eleven in Isthmia (i.e. four times *periodonikes*).

17.3: statue of Ptolemy son of Lagos dedicated by the Makedonian Aristolaos. For an identification of Aristolaos see Habicht 1985, 87.

17.3: statue of the Milesian Boutas, son of Polyneikes, victorious in the boys' boxing.

17.3: statue of Kallikrates from Magnesia on the Lethaion, victorious twice in the hoplite race, the work of Lysippos.

17.4: statue of Elkasios, son of Lykins and the daughter of Hermesianax, by the Kolophonians, victorious in the boys' wrestling.

17.4: statue of the Arkadian Alexibios from Heraia, victorious in the pentathlon, the work of Akestor.

17.5: statue of the Eleian Theotimos, son of Moschion, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of the Sikyonian Daitondas. Theotimos fought with Alexander against Dareios.

17.5: statue of the Eleian Choirilos, victorious in the boys' boxing, the work of Sthennis from Olynthos.
17.5: statue(?) of the Eleian Archidamos, victorious in the four-horse chariot race.

17.7: statue of the Eleian Alexinikos, victorious in the boys’ wrestling, the work of the Sikyonian Kantharos.

18.1: statue of Kratisthenes from Kyrene, the son of Mnaseas, the Libyan victorious in the horse race, the work of Pythagoras from Rhegion.

18.2-6: statue of Anaximenes by the demos of Lampsakos. He was a historian and he wrote a complete history of Greece and histories of Philip and Alexander.

18.6: statue of the Kretan Sotadas, victorious in the dolichos in 384 B.C. (the 99th Olympiad); in the next (100th = 380 B.C.) he was paid and changed his ethnic to Ephesian.

18.7: the first athletic statue of cypress wood, dedicated at Olympia was that of the Aiginetan Praxidamas, victorious in boxing in the 59th Olympiad (544 B.C.). It is near the Pillar of Oinomaos.

18.7: the first athletic statue of fig wood, dedicated at Olympia was that of the Opuntian Rhexibios, victorious in the pankration in the 61st Olympiad (536 B.C.). It is near the Pillar of Oinomaos.

19.6: in the Sikyonian treasury: a statue of Apollo made of boxwood, dedication by the Epizephyrian Lokrians.

19.10: in the Selinountian treasury: a statue of Dionysos whose face hands and feet made out of ivory.

19.11: in the Metapontine treasury: a statue of Endymion made out of ivory except its drapery.

20.1: on top of the Kronion hill, at the spring equinox, the so-called Basilai sacrifice to Kronos in the Eleian month Elaphion.

20.2-5: in the area between the treasuries and the Kronion hill there is a temple of the Olympian Eileithyia where the local daimon Sosipolis is also honored. In front of the temple there is also an altar of Eileithyia.

20.6: on the hill to the west of Kladeos there is a tomb for the Arkadians who fell in the battle inside the Altis, in 364 B.C.

20.6: near the temple of Eileithyia there are ruins of a temple of Aphrodite Ourania.

20.7: inside the Altis, at the processional entrance, there is the Hippodameion where once a year women are allowed to enter and offer sacrifices to Hippodameia.

20.8: at the end of the Zanes there is the Krypte entrance to the Stadion. Pausanias’ description has been confirmed by the excavations.

21.1 (no. 80): temple of Demeter Chamyne with new statues of Pentelic marble dedicated by Herodes Attikos.


21.3: across Kladeos the tomb of Oinomaos and ruins where, it is said, his stables were.

21.3-4: across the river Erymanthos, at the Sauros ridge, there are ruins of the tomb of Sauros and a sanctuary of Herakles.

21.4: forty stades on from the Sauros ridge, on high ground beside the Alpheios, there is in ruins the temple of Asklepios Demainetes, so-called from its dedicator.

21.5: near the ruins of the temple of Asklepios Demainetes there is the temple of Dionysos Leukyanites (from the river Leukyanias that flows near by).

21.6-8: Pisa: ruins of the city of Phrixa, and a temple of Athena Kydonia, founded by the descendant of the Idaean Herakles, Klymenos who came from the Kretan city Kydonia. Sacrifices to this Athena offered also by Pelops.

21.8: Pisa: ruins of the city of Arpina.

21.9-11: Pisa: further from the ruins of Arpina the high mount is the tomb of the suitors of Hippodameia.

22.1: Pisa: a stade further from the suitors’ tomb there is the temple of Artemis Kordaka (from the dance that Pelops and his followers performed when he won); near the sanctuary there is a building with a bronze coffin with the bones of Pelops.

22.2-4 (no. 81): Pisa: nothing of the ancient city of Pisa remains; history of their struggle with Elis.

22.5-6: ruins of the Eleian city Pylos, eighty stades away from Elis.

22.7: fifty stades from Olympia the village Herakleia with therapeutic springs, and sanctuary nearby of the Ionidai (named after the Athenian Ion, son of Gargettos, who migrated here) nymphs: Kalliphaeia, Synallasis, Pegaia, and Iasis.

22.8-11 (no. 82): one hundred twenty stades from Elis is Letrinoi: temple of Artemis Alpheiaia or Elaphiaia.

23.1-3: in the city of Elis: old Gymnasion, called Xystos; Plethrion; altars of the Idaean Herakles Parastates, Eros, Anteros, Demeter and Kore; a cenotaph
for Achilles where on the appointed day the women perform rites for Achilles.

23.4: in the city of Elis: a smaller Gymnasion, called Tetragonon.

23.5: in the city of Elis: a third Gymnasion, called Maltho because of its soft ground; a bust of Herakles stands in a corner, and also relief of Eros and Anteros.

23.6: in the city of Elis: according to the Eleian nomophylax the statue of a boy at the entrance of Maltho was Sarapion from Alexandria, victorious in the boys' boxing in the 217th Olympiad (89 A.D.).

23.7: in the city of Elis: the Bouleuterion, called Lalichmion after its dedicator, where exhibitions of eloquence and recitations of written works were held.

23.8: in the city of Elis: the road from the Gymnasion to the Baths lies through the Σινιστη street (named after the silence of the spies that Oxylos had sent), and past the sanctuary of Artemis Philomeirax (named after its proximity to the Gymnasion).


24.2: in the city of Elis: Agora called Hippodromos, constructed in an older fashion, and not after the Ionian style.

24.4: in the city of Elis: Agora of Korkyra constructed with one/tenth of the spoils.

24.5: in the city of Elis: statue of Pyrrhon, son of Pistokrates, the sophist, whose tomb is outside the city, in Petra (an old demos of the city of Elis).

24.6: in the city of Elis: in the open part of the Agora there is the temple and statue of Apollo Akesios, i.e. what the Athenians call Alexikakos.

24.6: in the city of Elis: in the open part of the Agora there are stone statues of Helios with rays projecting from its head, and Selene with horns.

24.6-7: in the city of Elis: in the open part of the Agora there is a sanctuary of the Charites with their statues (their body wooden, their drapery gilded, their faces, hands and feet white marble); they hold one a rose, the middle a die, the third a sprig of myrtle, because all these were associated with the story of Aphrodite and Adonis. To their right there is also a statue of Eros standing on the same pedestal.

24.8: in the city of Elis: in the open part of the Agora there is a temple of Silenos. There are tombs of Silenoi in the land of the Hebrews and at Pergamon.

24.9: in the city of Elis: in the open part of the Agora there is a tomb which an old man said is Oxylos'.
24.10: in the city of Elis: in the open part of the Agora there is a building for the Hekkaideka women who weave the robe for Hera.

24.10: in the city of Elis: in the open part of the Agora there is an old temple with a colonnade all around it; its roof has fallen and has no statues; it is now consecrated to the Roman Emperors.

25.1: in the city of Elis: in the agora behind the Korkyraian Colonnade there is a temple of Aphrodite Ourania with one foot of her statue standing on a tortoise, made of gold and ivory, the work of Pheidias.

25.1: in the city of Elis: in the agora behind the Korkyraian Colonnade there is a temple of Aphrodite Pandemos with her statue sitting on a bronze he-goat, the work of Skopas.


Papakonstandinou (1982, 505-513) published an "strange" sandstone Corinthian capital with figures which she interprets as Hades flanked by Kerberos and Persephone (cf. Strabo 6.25.2).

25.4: in the city of Elis: temple of Tyche with statues of her and Sosipolis.

25.5: in the city of Elis: bronze statue of Poseidon, or Satrapes Korybas, which the Eleians brought from Samiko.

26.1-2: in the city of Elis: between the agora and the river Menios an old theater, and the temple of Dionysos with his statue made by Praxiteles. The festival of Thyia, celebrated in his honor, was held eight stades from the city.

26.3: on the Akropolis of Elis: temple of Athena and a golden and ivory statue, the work of Pheidias. On the helmet sits a cock, which may be the bird sacred to Athena Ergane.

26.4: in the city of Kyllene: temples of Asklepios and Aphrodite, and a statue of Hermes which is nothing but a phallus erectus.
APPENDIX E

CRITICAL NOTES ON PAUSANIAS' ἩΛΙΑΚΩΝ A AND B

This is a list of the passages in ἩΛΙΑΚΩΝ A and B that present textual problems which are resolved in light of the epigraphical evidence, since Pausanias was taking his information from the very same text (see also the introductory comments in Chapter III and the notes). The bold-face numbers refer to the discussion in Chapters III (1-11); Chapter IV A (12-48); IV B (49-54); IV C (55-82); IV D (83-89); and one to the discussion in Appendix D: Direct Epigraphical Evidence for Book 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'ἩΛΙΑΚΩΝ'</th>
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