

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Cultural Imaginary of Manteia: Seercraft, Travel, and Charisma in Ancient Greece

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8x63d2wg>

Author

Foster, Margaret Cecelia

Publication Date

2010

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

The Cultural Imaginary of *Manteia*: Seercraft, Travel, and Charisma in Ancient Greece

By

Margaret Cecelia Foster

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Classics

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Leslie Kurke, Chair

Professor Mark Griffith

Professor Donald Mastrorarde

Professor Emily Mackil

Spring 2010

Abstract

The Cultural Imaginary of *Manteia*: Seercraft, Travel, and Charisma in Ancient Greece

by

Margaret Cecelia Foster

Doctor of Philosophy in Classics

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Leslie Kurke, Chair

This dissertation considers four different members of the Melampodid and Iamid clans in order to elucidate Greek cultural fantasies about seers and seercraft. I explore why the seer is cast as a navigator, a military commander, an oikist (founder of a city), and a figure of charismatic authority. Moving beyond viewing seers merely as specialists in divination, I consider the other qualities Greeks attributed to seers and the range of ventures in which Greeks envisioned their seers participating. Each chapter concentrates on a particular seer in order to investigate a discrete facet of the Greek cultural imaginary of *manteia* (prophetic power).

Chapter 1 examines the relationship between Odysseus and the Melampodid seer Theoklymenos. The seer and the hero operate as a coherent pair within the framework of colonization. The *Odyssey* casts Odysseus' return home as a re-colonization of Ithaka and Odysseus himself as the oikist of this "colony." Theoklymenos emerges not only as a seer but also as a skillful navigator for the oikist. He thus exemplifies the homology that the ethnographer Mary Helms observes in pre-industrial societies between figures skilled at negotiating the horizontal axis of long-distance travel (e.g., navigators and traders) and those who mediate the vertical axis of communication with the supernatural (e.g., prophets). Adept at traversing both axes, Theoklymenos aids Odysseus in effecting the metaphorical re-foundation of Ithaka.

In Chapter 2, I turn to Herodotus' characterization of the Iamid Teisamenos as a "leader of wars" (9.33) and seek to uncover a cultural tendency to regard certain military seers as conduits of talismanic power (*kudos*). Talismanic potency accounts for the several references to seers commanding armies and winning battles. Beyond their technical ability to interpret divinatory sacrifices, seers could be a crucial presence on campaign because their *kudos* was perceived to guarantee victory for the army that enlisted them. Once we recognize that seers could be viewed as bearers of *kudos*, we can examine how they converge and intersect with other talismanic figures similarly characterized in the context of warfare. For instance, the three versions of the conflict between Kroton and Sybaris reported in different sources diverge only in crediting an athlete, an oikist, and a

seer as the cause of victory (Diod. Sic. 12.9 and Hdt. 5.44-45). These three competing tales reveal a shared template: a talismanic figure brings victory to Kroton.

I begin Chapter 3 by observing that scholars often emphasize the parallels between military campaigns and colonial expeditions of the sixth and fifth centuries BCE. Yet whereas seers regularly feature in accounts of archaic and classical Greek warfare, they rarely appear in colonial narratives of the same period. Furthermore, I discern that although the seer himself goes missing from most foundation tales, the functions the seer typically performs do not. I argue that the characterization of the oikist in colonial narrative as a figure who is singled out by and acts on behalf of Apollo, the god of divination, usurps the religious authority enjoyed elsewhere by the seer. In the second half of the chapter, I explore the idea of the seer's elision from colonial narrative by reading Bacchylides' *Ode* 11 as a specific example of this phenomenon. I demonstrate that in his rendition of the myth of the Proitids Bacchylides intentionally omits the seer Melampous and at the same time casts Proitos' arrival in Tiryns as a foundation and Proitos himself as its oikist.

Chapter 4 takes up a noteworthy exception to the seer's erasure from colonial discourse. In *Olympian* 6, Pindar praises the *laudandus* Hagesias as an Iamid seer, an athletic victor, and a co-oikist of Syracuse. The poet thereby joins together three *kudos*-bearing categories to fashion an individual of tremendous talismanic authority. Further, by identifying Hagesias as a co-oikist, Pindar uncovers what is typically occluded in foundation tales, namely the seer's participation in colonization. This final chapter accounts for the dual and often paradoxical nature of Hagesias by placing it in its cultural context. Hagesias is a talismanic figure subordinated to Hieron, a seer who is also a co-oikist, and an athletic victor linked to both the Peloponnese and Sicily who leads a victory revel "from home to home" (*O.* 6.99). I argue that these qualities make Hagesias a useful participant in Hieron's colonial program: his hybridity embodies Hieron's specific colonial fantasies for the recently founded Aitna while his two homes make him a less threatening figure for Syracuse, since he never fully belongs in any one location. In this way, Pindar distinguishes Hagesias from other seers, such as Teisamenos or the mythical Melampous, who are perceived as dangerous for the city and its political leaders, and he offers an alternative vision of a seer who is welcomed by Syracuse and credited with its foundation.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1. Sailing to Sicily: Theoklymenos and Odysseus in the <i>Odyssey</i>	9
Chapter 2. Beyond Entrails and Omens: Herodotus' Teisamenos and the Talismanic <i>Mantis</i> at War	32
Chapter 3. Suppressing the Seer in Colonial Narrative: The Disappearance of Melampous in Bacchylides' <i>Ode 11</i>	58
Chapter 4. Exposing the Seer in Colonial Narrative: Hagesias as <i>Sunoikistêr</i> in Pindar's <i>Olympian 6</i>	77
Conclusion	98
Bibliography	101

Introduction

εἰ δ' εἴ-
η μὲν Ὀλυμπιονίκας
βωμῶ τε μαντείῳ ταμίας Διὸς ἐν Πίσᾳ,
συνοικιστῆρ τε τᾶν κλεινᾶν Συρακοσ-
σᾶν, τίνα κεν φύγοι ὕμνον
κεῖνος ἀνήρ, ἐπικύρσαις
ἀφθόνων ἀστῶν ἐν ἡμερταῖς ἀοιδαῖς;
(Pi. O. 6.4-7)

If he should be an Olympic victor and a steward of the mantic altar of Zeus in Pisa, and a co-founder of famous Syracuse, what hymn could that man escape, if he should meet with ungrudging townsmen amidst lovely songs?

This study considers four different members of the Melampodid and Iamid clans in order to elucidate Greek cultural fantasies about seers and seercraft. The project arose out of the observation that current scholarship persists in treating seers primarily as specialists in divination when, in fact, seers were engaged in many other types of activities during the Archaic and Classical periods.¹ Moving beyond viewing seers merely as religious experts, I consider the other qualities Greeks attributed to seers and the range of ventures in which Greeks envisioned their seers participating. I explore why the seer is cast as a navigator, a military commander, an oikist (founder of a city), and a figure of charismatic authority. Each chapter concentrates on a particular seer in order to investigate a discrete facet of the Greek cultural imaginary of *manteia* (prophetic power).

I use “cultural imaginary” as the theoretical framework for my examination of Greek seers and turn to the cultural studies theorist Graham Dawson for a definition of the term: “those vast networks of interlinking discursive themes, images, motifs and narrative forms that are publicly available within a culture at any one time, and articulate its psychic and social dimensions.”² In our case, then, the term “cultural imaginary” will serve here to mean how the Greeks conceived of their seers “in fantasy,”³ both the ways in which they idealized seers as well as their negative conceptions of them as extraordinarily dangerous figures. As a result, my interests diverge from those evident in Michael Flower’s recent 2008 book, *The Seer in Ancient Greece*, with its detailed consideration of the *realia* of the *mantis* (seer). To my mind, a more complete understanding of the seer requires supplementing Flower’s positivist approach with an examination of the imaginary formation of seers. For, as Nicole Loraux reminds us, we cannot understand a society by scrutinizing its empirical experiences alone; we must

¹ E.g., Flower 2008, Johnston 2008.

² Dawson 1994.48.

³ Loraux 1986.328 translator’s note.

also confront the reality of its fantasies.⁴

A good place to start an investigation of just how surprising and un-“seer-like” seers can be is with the *Odyssey*’s Melampodid seer Theoklymenos. Chapter 1, “Sailing to Sicily: Theoklymenos and Odysseus in the *Odyssey*,” considers the relationship between the seer and the eponymous hero. Theoklymenos proved to be an unsettling character for previous scholars. His arrival in the poem seemed jarring, his interpretation of an omen mistaken, his ecstatic vision of the suitors’ death strange. The narrative ellipses and inconsistencies that crowd around the seer were, for Denys Page, not the product of a poet “who has gone far in his profession.”⁵ Theoklymenos’ presence would be more satisfyingly plausible, Page wrote, if he reflected another instantiation of the poem in which he was in fact “Odysseus himself in disguise.”⁶ In the first part of the chapter, I take what is essentially a passing remark by Page and consider seriously the implications of Theoklymenos as Odysseus’ mantic alter ego. I reveal how Theoklymenos and Odysseus prompt some of the same motifs and diction from the poet and, generally speaking, follow the same itineraries on Ithaka in the latter half of the epic. For instance, Theoklymenos’ elaborate introduction into the poem in which his actual name is withheld for thirty-two lines echoes the well-known delay of Odysseus’ name in the poem to the *Odyssey*. Theoklymenos is in certain fundamental ways the doublet of Odysseus.

But of what use is it to Odysseus to be shadowed by an imitative seer at the moment of his return to Ithaka? In the second part of the chapter, I demonstrate that Theoklymenos and Odysseus can be understood as a coherent pair, and that this pair operates within the framework of colonization. To do so, I first expand on Carol Dougherty’s analysis of the *Odyssey* as a colonial text.⁷ The *Odyssey* figures the eponymous hero’s return home as a (re)colonization of Ithaka and casts Odysseus himself as the oikist of this “colony.” Next, I discuss how the *Odyssey* depicts Theoklymenos not only as a seer but also as an expert navigator for the oikist Odysseus. Theoklymenos thus exemplifies the homology that the ethnographer Mary Helms observes in pre-industrial societies between figures skilled at negotiating the horizontal axis of long-distance travel (e.g., navigators and traders) and those who mediate the vertical axis of communication with the supernatural (e.g., prophets).⁸ Finally, I turn to an insult delivered by Penelope’s suitors which joins Odysseus and Theoklymenos together: the suitors suggest to Telemachos that he rid himself of his guest-friends, a disguised Odysseus and Theoklymenos, by putting them on a ship and sending them to Sicily (*Od.* 20.379-83). By uncovering the ways in which the insult overlaps with Greek colonial traditions, I show that the suitors’ slight has been formulated so as to blur distinctions between this suggested expulsion and a colonial expedition. Further, we can think of the insult itself as a kind of distillation of the dynamics of Theoklymenos and Odysseus’ relationship in the rest of the poem. Theoklymenos, adept at traveling both the horizontal and vertical axes of distance, accompanies Odysseus in effecting a foundation, whether it be a potential one in Sicily or the metaphorical (re)foundation of Ithaka.

⁴ See, e.g., Loraux 1986.5, 328.

⁵ Page 1955.85

⁶ Page 1955.88.

⁷ Dougherty 2001.

⁸ Helms 1993.

In Chapter 2, “Beyond Entrails and Omens: Herodotus’ Teisamenos and the Talismanic *Mantis* at War,” I seek to uncover a Greek tendency to regard certain military seers as conduits of talismanic power (*kudos*). The title of my dissertation refers to this talismanic power as “charisma,” but a clearer and more culturally specific definition of this quality is needed. I apply to seers the concept of *kudos* developed by Emile Benveniste. For Benveniste, *kudos* in the Homeric poems “acts as a *talisman of supremacy*”:

[T]he bestowal of *kûdos* by the god procures an instantaneous and irresistible advantage, rather like a magic power, and the god grants it now to one and now to another at his good will and always in order to give the advantage at a decisive moment of combat or some competitive activity.⁹

Leslie Kurke has shown that the same valuation of *kudos* endures in later Greek culture in the areas of warfare and athletic competitions. In particular, athletes who win victory at the “crown” games are the major inheritors of this notion of “talismanic potency.”¹⁰ Crown victors frequently appear in descriptions of battle, but, as Kurke has emphasized, a crown victor is not enlisted for his physical might or his military experience alone. Rather, his participation reflects a polis’ attempt to co-opt his *kudos*, bestowed at the moment of his athletic victory, for its own success in battle.¹¹

In like manner, I argue that the perceived importance of seers in warfare extends beyond their ability to attend to the customary rites of interpreting omens and conducting sacrifices for an army on campaign. In addition to their technical expertise in *mantikê* (divination), particular seers could be considered figures of extraordinary talismanic power. Military *manteis* reputed to be talismanic were seen as vital to campaigns because their *kudos* was imagined to guarantee victory for the army that enlisted them.

Herodotus’ characterization of the Iamid Teisamenos is an important example of this phenomenon. In Book 9 of the *Histories*, Herodotus relates how the Spartans recruited the seer Teisamenos “to be a leader of wars together with the Heraklid kings” (9.33). The striking phrase, “a leader of wars,” drove earlier scholars to the point of emendation: why would the xenophobic Spartans want a foreign seer to be their commander? In fact, the resonance of this phrase affirms that, in the eyes of the Spartans, Teisamenos is a talismanic figure. The convergence of leading armies and having talismanic potency is a collocation accorded to a number of athletic victors and cult-heroes. In these instances, the position of leading armies is dependent on the perception that the figure possesses an outsized portion of divine approval. Therefore, to be called a “leader of war” is to be acknowledged as a bearer of *kudos*. It is Teisamenos’ charismatic capability that opens up a space for him on the same level as the Spartan kings and accounts for his partnership with them.

Teisamenos, however, is not the only seer endowed with *kudos*. We can see the same signposts of talismanic potency, namely, leading armies and the related concept of winning wars, in the case of other seers as well. The seers *par excellence* of epic and tragedy, Kalchas (*Il.* 1.71-2) and Teiresias (Eur. *Phoen.* 852-57), respectively, belong to

⁹ Benveniste 1973.348.

¹⁰ Kurke 1993.132-33.

¹¹ Kurke 1993 *passim*.

this category, but there are other, lesser-known examples as well. These include the seer Agias who destroyed all but ten ships in the Athenian navy (Paus. 3.11.5) and the seer Kleoboulos, who “assisted in conquering at sea Cheilon, the navarch of the Lakedaimonians” (Aeschin. 2.78). An epigram inscribed on an extant grave stele for this same Kleoboulos concludes in the following way: “the people of great-hearted Erectheus crowned [him] having been the best throughout Greece to win *kudos*” (SEG 16.193).

Once we recognize that seers could be viewed as bearers of *kudos*, we can examine how they converge and intersect with other discrete categories of talismanic figures similarly characterized. I examine three types of interaction between seers and other talismans. First, I look at the different ways in which *kudos* can appear in duplicate: the Greeks hoarded *kudos* by doubling up on talismanic figures and, in addition, believed that an individual’s talismanic power could be manifested in more than one pursuit (e.g., athletics and seercraft). Second, I investigate two different cases of talismans being pitted against each other by their opposing armies. Third, I consider how three distinct talismanic figures perform an identical function in competing accounts of the same conflict. For this final section, I propose a solution for an unexplained discrepancy between three versions of the late-sixth century BCE war between Kroton and Sybaris that are reported in different sources and that diverge only in crediting an athlete, an oikist, and a seer as the cause of victory (Diod. Sic. 12.9 and Hdt. 5.44-45). Rather than privileging one account over the others, as previous scholars have done, I propose to read the versions together as a structural set and in this way consider more closely the basis for the “mix-up” between the athlete, the oikist, and the seer. I argue that what we are seeing are actually different multiforms of a common template: the Krotoniates defeated the Sybarites with the aid of a talismanic figure.

Chapter 3, “Suppressing the Seer in Colonial Narrative: The Disappearance of Melampous in Bacchylides’ *Ode* 11,” begins by observing that scholars often emphasize the parallels between military campaigns and colonial expeditions of the sixth and fifth centuries BCE. Yet whereas seers regularly feature in accounts of archaic and classical Greek warfare, they rarely appear in colonial narratives of the same period. Furthermore, I discern that although the seer himself goes missing from most foundation tales, the functions the seer typically performs do not. Instead, we find the oikist exhibiting a particular form of religious authority that is attributed to the seer in other contexts. The language in which Irad Malkin defines the role of the oikist is instructive:

Apollo’s address [at Delphi] endowed [the oikist] with a kind of religious aura which enabled him to make decisions about religion concerning, for example, the locations of sacred precincts, particular cults, and so on. In religious terms, the relationship of the oikist to the colonist was like Apollo’s relationship to him: an *exegetes*, an expounder of the god’s will.¹²

We might say that Malkin’s reference to a “religious aura” is one way of articulating the perception of the oikist as a figure who, not unlike the seer, possesses a superabundance of divine favor from Apollo. In fact, Malkin’s description of the oikist sounds strikingly similar to that of a seer (most notably as “an expounder of the god’s will”). I argue that the characterization of the oikist in colonial narrative as a figure who is singled out by

¹² Malkin 1989.135.

and acts on behalf of Apollo, the god of divination, usurps the place and function occupied elsewhere by the seer.

That colonial narrative remains invested in the seer's particular form of religious authority but attributes it instead to the oikist suggests a purposeful (if unconscious) effort to occlude the seer. I contend that one reason for the seer's disappearance from foundation tales is the Greek propensity to regard him as potentially dangerous to a polis' rulers and to the political stability of the polis itself. If the seer is indeed perceived as a destabilizing presence and as someone who prompts contestations over power (and *kudos*) when he remains in a polis for too long, we can perhaps begin to see why seers are not accorded a space within colonial narrative. Colonial tales commemorate the oikist's creation of a new polis. As a perceived menace to a polis' leaders, the seer does not belong in a context that celebrates the oikist's successful foundation of a notionally stable community and political order.

In the second half of the chapter, I explore the idea of the seer's elision from colonial narrative by reading Bacchylides' *Ode* 11 as a specific example of this phenomenon. The ode features the myth of the daughters of Proitos but the version Bacchylides presents contains a glaring omission: the seer Melampous, who appears in nearly all other variants within a rich mythographic tradition as the primary figure credited with purifying the maidens, is completely missing from *Ode* 11. Because Bacchylides' story in other respects resembles the usual tale—his Proitids follow the standard narrative arc from their transgression against Hera to their madness to their purified reintegration—I conclude that Bacchylides was familiar with Melampous' connection to the Proitids and that the absence of the seer from the myth was a calculated excision. We should understand Melampous' absence in relation to a second innovation in the epinikion. As I demonstrate, Bacchylides' particular rendering of Proitos' departure from Argos to Tiryns casts Tiryns as a foundation and Proitos himself as its oikist. Taking this alteration together with the omission of the seer, we can say that Bacchylides celebrates the successful foundation of Tiryns by freeing it from Melampous who, in the traditional conclusion to the myth, usurps most of Proitos' kingdom for himself and his brother. But Bacchylides does more than just secure Proitos' hegemony within the ode. By having the king supplicate Artemis to cure his daughters, Bacchylides also replaces Melampous with Proitos as the figure who negotiates with the gods for the maidens' recovery. In so doing, Proitos, the oikist of Tiryns, retains (politically) and absorbs (religiously) the functions left vacant by the missing seer in *Ode* 11. Thus *Ode* 11 is an individual instance of the cultural tendency I explore more generally in the first part of the chapter. Seers are elided from colonial narrative not only for political reasons (because they can threaten the stability of a polis and its oikist) but also on religious grounds insofar as the oikist himself becomes a religious authority and the primary mediator between a polis and the divine.

My final chapter, "Exposing the Seer in Colonial Narrative: Hagesias as *Sunoikistês* in Pindar's *Olympian* 6," takes up a noteworthy exception to the seer's erasure from colonial discourse. In *Olympian* 6, Pindar praises the *laudandus* Hagesias as an Iamid seer, an athletic victor, and a co-oikist of Syracuse. We can relate this description of Hagesias to the phenomenon explored in Chapter 2: the athlete Milo, the seer Kallias, and the oikist Dorieus are substituted for one another in competing accounts of the battle of Kroton and Sybaris. Pindar, however, does not give us three separate

figures with comparable claims to *kudos*. He joins together these *kudos*-bearing categories of athlete, seer, and oikist to fashion an individual of tremendous talismanic authority. By identifying Hagesias a co-oikist, Pindar uncovers what is typically occluded in foundation tales, that is, the seer's participation in colonization. Yet while Pindar praises Hagesias as a person who possesses *kudos*, he is simultaneously careful to assert Hagesias' secondary status vis-à-vis the tyrant Hieron whom the seer serves.

I explore how Pindar constructs Hagesias' subordination to Hieron primarily through intertextual readings of *Olympian* 6 with *Olympian* 1 and *Nemean* 1. For example, taking the myth of Iamos in *Olympian* 6 together with the myth of Pelops in *Olympian* 1, I demonstrate that while both Iamos and Pelops supplicate Poseidon with requests for kingship, the god grants this privilege only to Pelops and ignores Iamos' appeal. Instead, Iamos is given the gift of *mantikê* by his father Apollo and is told to found an oracle on Zeus' altar at Olympia. In Iamos' disregarded attempt to attain political power and his subsequent stewardship at Olympia, which itself functions as a paradigmatic foundation in both odes, Pindar assures his audience that Hagesias too is not after kingship but is willing to be seer (and *only* a seer) to Hieron at Syracuse.

I also consider how Hagesias' idiosyncratic ties to both Syracuse and the Peloponnese make him a uniquely desirable figure for the particular demands of the Deinomenid colonial agenda. In *Olympian* 6, Pindar repeatedly stresses Hagesias' lineage, tracing the Iamid clan back to Arkadia and Sparta and praising the seer's maternal family in Stymphalos. I argue that Hagesias' genealogy offers Syracuse a sense of Greek identity rooted in the mainland, and thus a kind of Greek legitimacy that the Deinomenids themselves, whose pedigree was of a local, Sicilian nature, were unable to provide. What is more, as someone who is at once from the Peloponnese and called a *sunoikistêr* of Syracuse, Hagesias re-enacts the original foundation of the city. This reenactment takes the following form: Pindar's description of Hagesias' victory *kômos* from Stymphalos to Syracuse reproduces the course of the notional first colonial expedition from the Greek mainland to Sicily. Finally, the collocation of Hagesias' Peloponnesian origins and his presence in Syracuse fits well with what we know of Hieron's specific colonial fantasies for the recently founded Aitna. According to Diodorus Siculus (11.49.1), Hieron desired a Dorian polis composed of Peloponnesians and Syracusans in equal number. The hybridity of Hagesias, a Syracusan who is also from Olympia, is the individual articulation of the tyrant's ambitious synoikism.

In short, this final chapter accounts for Hagesias' dual and often paradoxical nature by placing it in its cultural context. Hagesias is a talismanic figure who is simultaneously subordinate to Hieron, a seer who is also a *sunoikistêr*, and an athletic victor linked to both the Peloponnese and Sicily who leads a *kômos* from "home to home" (*O.* 6.99). I argue that these qualities make Hagesias a useful participant in Hieron's colonial program: he embodies Hieron's vision for Aitna, yet at the same time his two homes make him a less threatening figure for Syracuse, since he never fully belongs in any one location. In this way, Pindar distinguishes Hagesias from other seers, such as Teisamenos or the mythical Melampous, who are perceived as dangerous for the city and its political leaders and offers an alternative vision of a seer who is welcomed by Syracuse and credited with its foundation.

It remains to note one final point of method. Literary representations of Greek colonization are an important component of my project, and it is necessary to clarify my

approach to this subject here. Perhaps even more so than other areas of Greek culture, there is a considerable divide between the way in which the Greeks remembered the foundations of their cities (i.e., accounts of colonization in the literary tradition) and what archaeological excavations at these same settlements reveal. To capture this discrepancy, one can juxtapose Carol Dougherty's definition of colonial narrative with a widely influential argument made by Robin Osborne on early Greek settlements of the eighth and seventh centuries BCE.

Drawing on a variety of sources, from Homer to Plutarch and Pausanias, Dougherty compiles the following "composite typology" of the archaic colonial narrative. A crisis in a polis generates a Delphic consultation. At Delphi, Apollo imposes a colonial foundation as the solution to the crisis and selects an oikist to lead the expedition. Resolution of the original crisis is then achieved by establishing a new, independent polis.¹³ In contrast to the picture this narrative pattern provides, the archeological record does not indicate that there were "big bang" moments in which archaic colonies were founded suddenly and *ex novo* by an organized expedition sent out from a mother city.¹⁴ Rather, as Osborne has argued, early Greek settlements seem to have grown gradually over time and were much more heterogeneous and untidy enterprises than the "single-oikist traditions" let on.¹⁵ I set Dougherty and Osborne side by side here, although they have very different objectives, because both scholars are important for my own work. On the one hand, I use and build on Dougherty's definition of colonial narrative throughout my dissertation. Yet Osborne's insights remind us that we should be attentive to what foundation tales are also not telling us, and, what is more, that there is *much* they are not telling us.¹⁶ Greek seers, who likely did accompany groups

¹³ Dougherty 1993.8. I follow Dougherty's definition of colonial narrative, although I hope to re-evaluate the sources she uses to formulate this definition at a later point. Like Dougherty, I refer to specific examples of colonial narrative as foundation or colonial tales. Further, I follow Dougherty in considering *ktisis* poetry a literary *topos* (as opposed to a genre) that provides "geographical detail and aetiological focus to a variety of poetic contexts and thus is performed on more than one occasion" (Dougherty 1994.35). The instances of *ktisis* poetry I will explore are found within the genres of epic (the *Odyssey* in Chapter 1) and epinikian poetry (Bacchylides' *Ode* 11 in Chapter 3).

¹⁴ Osborne 1998.

¹⁵ Osborne 1998.264-65. I take the phrase "single-oikist traditions" from Hornblower 2004.185. In his 1998 article, Osborne forcefully campaigns against using the term "colony" for Greek settlements of the eighth and seventh centuries since these sites were not established in the manner of later, classical colonies (which were often the product of more formal, organized expeditions from a mother city). Osborne also argues against the term colony because of the "strong 'statist' overtones" it has to our modern, Western ears (1998.251). Osborne's argument, however, has been so influential that, paradoxically, it seems to have liberated the word and its derivatives from many of the misconceptions he argued it promoted. I will sometimes use the term "colony" and its derivatives even when discussing archaic Greek settlements. Moreover, in terms of the word's anachronistic connotations, I agree with Kowalzig (2007.267. n.3) who writes, "Thanks to Osborne (1998) much attention has been drawn to the conceptual differences between Greek colonization in the Mediterranean and the colonial movement of modern European states, and the term should by now be free of any culturally specific baggage."

¹⁶ So as not to give the impression that I believe that the literary tradition is completely divorced from the archaeological one, I quote Gianguilio's (2001.119-20) important observation: "It becomes apparent...that foundation legends do not derive from the simple need to preserve a record of the past. Cultural memory does not 'reflect' historical reality, even if it expresses a form of historical self-awareness. It is inevitably affected by the constraints and actualities of the present, and it reveals the concerns of the society whose identity it asserts. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to rule out on a priori grounds the notion that cultural memory also employs historical material. To emphasize the active and constructive nature of foundation

of settlers just as they did military campaigns, are figures who by and large do not find their way into colonial narrative. Part of my project over these coming chapters is to think about why this happens, why seers were not imagined as participating in the colonial process, and what this tells us more generally about Greek conceptions of the relationship between the oikist, the seer, and the city in archaic and early classical Greece.

tales means not putting the part played by historical memory completely aside.” In fact, when Osborne (1998) postulates that “charismatic individuals” led private (that is, non-state sponsored) expeditions to found settlements in the Archaic period, his descriptions of these individuals make them sound like the *kudos*-bearing oikists of colonial narrative.

Chapter 1

Sailing to Sicily: Theoklymenos and Odysseus in the *Odyssey*

Part 1. The Palimpsest of Theoklymenos

Theoklymenos has chafed against the sensibilities of previous scholars of the *Odyssey*. The narrative ellipses and inconsistencies that cluster around the seer were, for Denys Page, “not the work of a man who has gone far in his profession.”¹ His arrival in the poem seems abrupt, his interpretation of an omen incorrect, his ecstatic vision of the suitors’ destruction eerie.² As a result, Theoklymenos became the object of Analytic attempts at unraveling the filaments of interpolation.³ Representative of this approach is Erich Bethe, who saw Theoklymenos as the perfect illustration of the work of a redactor skilled at introducing self-contained elements into the poem without disturbing the surrounding story.⁴ But later scholars, responding to Theoklymenos’ relegation to a second-rate character, reclaimed the seer and argued for his relevance to the unfolding of the second half of the *Odyssey*. Bernard Fenik in particular attempted to defend each of Theoklymenos’ appearances over the course of Books 15 to 20 as “genuine” examples of Odyssean style.⁵ Others focused on Theoklymenos’ prophecy (*Od.* 20.351-57), especially Daniel Levine, who has examined the way in which the vision pulls together a number of crucial motifs in the moments before Odysseus’ revenge.⁶

Yet while Page’s view that Theoklymenos’ role is “wonderfully unimportant” has since been unanimously denounced, I do not think that more recent Homerists have sufficiently considered why the Analysts so thoroughly condemned the seer. In their defense of the thematic significance of Theoklymenos and his prophetic pronouncements, Fenik and his supporters have tended to ignore the lacunose strangeness that surrounds him: Theoklymenos’ speeches may be stylistically sound, but nothing in the plot seems to hinge on their content. And why does a seer suddenly appear for the completion of Odysseus’ *nostos*? The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that, although Theoklymenos is wonderfully *important* to the *Odyssey*, this is not so in the way in which these episodes are typically studied. That is to say, ironically, I do not think Theoklymenos’ mantic abilities tell us very much about him. Progress can be made in understanding Theoklymenos’ presence in the poem, however, by exploring his relation to Odysseus.

¹ Page 1955.85

² Such are the complaints leveled against Theoklymenos by Page, Kirk, and others. See Fenik (1974.233-34) for a list of all of Theoklymenos’ supposed infractions (which Fenik methodically if not entirely satisfactorily defends). On Theoklymenos’ interpretation of the omen (*Od.* 15.531-34), Kirk (1962.241) writes, “Now Homeric omens normally have some detectable relation to the interpretation offered for them; this one has none, and the interpretation is in addition both weak and vague.”

³ E.g., Wilamowitz 1927.148-50, Merkelbach 1951.69. Bolling (1998.214) notes that Aristarchus athetized Theoklymenos’ address to Penelope at *Odyssey* 17.147-65.

⁴ Bethe 1922.40.

⁵ Fenik 1974.233-44. See also Beye 1966.168, Thornton 1970.58-62, Erbse 1972.42-54, Hansen 1972.3447, Race 1993.98-9, and de Jong 2001.372-73.

⁶ Levine 1983. See also Amory 1963.109-12, Austin 1975.246, 250, and Broggiato 2003.

Paradoxically, Page is the most helpful starting point for this undertaking. In *The Homeric Odyssey*, Page concludes his discussion of Theoklymenos by positing that the seer must have belonged to another instantiation of the story in which he played a more satisfyingly plausible and coherent role. Theoklymenos' presence would be more relevant if, in this alternate version, he were in fact "Odysseus himself in disguise."⁷ In a different approach to the poem, this suggestion was seconded by Albert Lord, who also saw the seer as a possible doublet for Odysseus, his existence a relic of a variant in which Telemachos met his father not within Eumaios' hut but at Pylos.⁸ In this way, both Page and Lord discerned what might be thought of as a palimpsest of a Theoklymenos-as-Odysseus. While any attempt to uncover some lost variant of the *Odyssey* runs the risk of rapidly descending into pure speculation, we need not wholly abandon the implications of this suggestion. Rather, by keeping our focus trained on the epic as it has come down to us, I want to consider how the *Odyssey* continues to think about these two figures in tandem. We need not forget the possibility of an alternate version featuring Theoklymenos as Odysseus, but simultaneously, I hope to show that Theoklymenos and Odysseus even as distinct and separate characters generate some of the same salient motifs and patterns within Homer's text. What Page has done is to illuminate a muted but manifest alignment that is still being played out between them in our *Odyssey*.

The following section explores this alignment more fully and demonstrates that a homology between a seer of allegedly little consequence and the epic's eponymous hero does indeed reverberate through the latter half of the *Odyssey*. Establishing that this is the case will allow us to turn, in the second part of this chapter, towards considering not only how but why Homer's Theoklymenos and Odysseus converge.

§ *Theoklymenos and Odysseus: Parallels*

A number of thematic and dictional repetitions between Theoklymenos and Odysseus have been noticed by scholars, but have never been compiled. I have attempted to do that here and have listed these parallels in roughly sequential order as they occur in Books 13 to 20 (i.e., from the time Odysseus returns to Ithaka to Theoklymenos' exit from the poem): (1) Theoklymenos enters the *Odyssey* on the run for murder (*Od.* 15.223-25). In like manner, Odysseus claims to the first person he meets on Ithaka, a disguised Athena, that he is a fugitive homicide from Crete (*Od.* 13.256-86).⁹ (2) Telemachos' initial encounter with the seer at Pylos has been seen as an "anticipatory doublet" of his reunion with Odysseus at the home of Eumaios (*Od.* 15. 256-78 and 16.42-48, respectively).¹⁰ (3) As part of these two encounters, Theoklymenos and Odysseus both cast themselves as suppliants of Telemachos, who is consequently and suddenly placed in the position of host to these unforeseen *xeinoi*.¹¹ (4) Both

⁷ Page 1955.88.

⁸ Lord 2000 (1960).174. For Lord (2001.174), "[These two versions] have been put together in oral tradition as we have it in this song of Homer's. The result is duplication often with one element in the duplication being vestigial or partial, and hence an apparent postponement and suspense, or an inconsistency."

⁹ For a discussion of this Cretan lie, see below.

¹⁰ Higbie 1995.73. As mentioned above, this idea was first suggested by Lord 2001.174.

¹¹ As Fenik (1974.238) noticed. Eumaios tells Telemachos that the stranger who has come to his farmstead "ικέτης δέ τοι εὔχεται εἶναι" (Declares that he is your suppliant [*Od.* 16.67]). Theoklymenos also presents

Theoklymenos and Odysseus are steered towards the house of someone still loyal to Odysseus' family: during his meeting with Athena in Book 13, Odysseus is told to go first to Eumaios before venturing home to Penelope (*Od.* 13.404-6). One effect of Telemachos' abrupt rerouting of Theoklymenos away from the clutches of the suitor Eurymachos (where Telemachos originally proposes to send him) to his companion Peiraios is that it draws attention to the analogous placement of the seer and Odysseus with trusted allies (*Od.* 15.512-43). (5) Their respective departures from these locations with Peiraios and Eumaios and their subsequent arrivals at the palace of Odysseus frame the events of Book 17.¹² (6) When Theoklymenos and Odysseus find themselves in the presence of Penelope, each takes the opportunity to inform her of Odysseus' impending return.¹³ (7) Carolyn Higbie has shown that while the suitors address Penelope as if she were unwed or widowed by referring to her as the daughter of Ikarios (e.g., *Od.* 16.435), it is only the disguised Odysseus and Theoklymenos who call the queen by her "perhaps more appropriate" title: ὦ γύναι αἰδοίη Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος (chaste wife of Odysseus, son of Laertes [*Od.* 17.152 [Theoklymenos] = *Od.* 19.165 = 262 = 336 = 583 [Odysseus]]).¹⁴ (8) Moreover, although Theoklymenos and Odysseus swear that Odysseus' return is imminent, they are met with the verbatim skepticism of Penelope who replies to both that she will bestow upon them many gifts if only what they say is true (*Od.* 17.163-65 [to Theoklymenos] = *Od.* 19.309-11 [to Odysseus]).¹⁵ (9) Lastly, Theoklymenos and Odysseus both become the targets of the suitors' abuse in Book 20 and thus help to showcase their blind depravity as they feast in Odysseus' hall for a final time. The suitors' insults provoke Theoklymenos' exit, but only after he has delivered his vision of their impending destruction, a prophetic draft of the actual slaughter upon which Odysseus is about to embark.¹⁶

Thus in a general way – and with greater detail necessarily given to the epic's main character – the itineraries of hero and seer on Ithaka duplicate one another as the plot slides back and forth between them, staggering their comparable narrative arcs. Even more closely aligned are their interactions with Penelope, in so far as their conversations with the queen prompt some of the same diction from the poet.

himself as a suppliant to Telemachos (“ἀλλά με νηὸς ἔφεσσαι, ἐπεὶ σε φυγῶν ἰκέτευσσα” [But place me aboard your ship, since I supplicated you as a fugitive [*Od.* 15.277]]).

¹² These arrivals roughly book-end Book 17: Theoklymenos reaches the palace at *Odyssey* 17.84, Odysseus at 17.336. There is also a similarity between Eumaios escorting Odysseus here in Book 17 and Peiraios escorting Theoklymenos in Book 15 when they first disembark on Ithaka (*Od.* 15.542-43). In both cases, Telemachos orders a friend to accompany his guest into the city. On this particular parallel Lord (2001.170) writes, “These two scenes look like multiforms of the same them.”

¹³ Theoklymenos tells Penelope that Odysseus is already on Ithaka (*Od.* 17.157-59); the disguised Odysseus tells her that Odysseus will return “at this very *lykabas*” (*Od.* 19.306). On the exact meaning of *lykabas* (often translated as “month” or “year”), see Austin 1975.244-47.

¹⁴ Higbie 1995.130. On this issue, Higbie (1995.130) writes, “Although I would not want to push this point too far, as married women can be identified by their father's name, the consistency of usage for Penelope may be a subtle reminder of others' desires and views.” Whatever the implications of the address, the fact remains that it is only Theoklymenos and Odysseus who refer to Penelope as the wife of Odysseus.

¹⁵ The oaths that Theoklymenos and Odysseus swear are also very similar (compare *Od.* 17.155-56 to *Od.* 19.303-4). Furthermore, Theoklymenos' version of this oath is identical to an oath Odysseus swears to Eumaios at *Od.* 14.158-9.

¹⁶ Theoklymenos' prophecy occurs at *Odyssey* 20.351-57. Amory (1963.112-13) argues that Theoklymenos' prophecy is part of what inspires Penelope to initiate the contest of the bow.

But before considering why Odysseus is shadowed by a seer as he carries out the completion of his *nostos*, I wish to examine a further correspondence between the two characters which scholars have yet to notice. The parallel concerns Theoklymenos' entrance in *Odyssey* 15.

§ *Delaying Identities*

As Telemachos sacrifices to Athena before departing from Pylos, he is suddenly approached by a stranger: “σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἤλυθεν ἀνὴρ / τηλεδαπός, φεύγων ἐξ Ἄργεος ἄνδρα κατακτάς, / μάντις.” (A man came near him from a far-off country, fleeing from Argos for killing a man, and he was a *mantis* [*Od.* 15.223-25]). Yet no sooner does this fugitive *mantis* come upon Telemachos than the meeting is suspended temporarily while Homer embarks on a thirty-two line circuit through the preceding generations of the seer's family. Beginning with the progenitor of this mantic clan, Homer recounts the myths of Melampous and his escape from Pylos, of Amphiaraos and his death in Thebes, and of the seer Polyphoides who immigrated to Hyperesia out of anger towards his father.¹⁷ Along the way, the poet catalogues other descendants of Melampous including Amphiaraos' sons Alkmaion and Amphilochos (*Od.* 15.248). But it is not until the ring-composition at last arches back to the present that the poet finally reveals the current Melampodid to be Theoklymenos: τοῦ μὲν ἄρ' υἱὸς ἐπῆλθε, Θεοκλύμενος δ' ὄνομα ἦεν, / ὅς τότε Τηλεμάχου πέλας ἴστατο. (It was [Polyphoides'] son, Theoklymenos was his name, who then approached and stood near Telemachos [*Od.* 15.256-57]).

Page has described Theoklymenos' entrance into the poem as “by far the longest and most elaborate preparation of its kind in the *Odyssey*.”¹⁸ It is true that the arrivals of most Homeric characters into the narrative are not accompanied by such lengthy excursions into their family histories. Nevertheless, it is also the case that, in terms of its genre, Theoklymenos' introduction is a genealogy and but one of several equally expansive examples of this form in Homer, including those of Glaukos (*Il.* 6.145-211) and Aeneas (*Il.* 20.213-41).¹⁹ What is particularly noteworthy about this introduction, however, is not so much its length or degree of specificity (although these are indeed significant), but the fact that Homer initially does not make it clear to the audience of the poem whose genealogy this actually is. Despite plotting the seer's entire pedigree, the poet strangely suspends the revelation of Theoklymenos' own name until the final line of the ring-composition directs the spotlight once again on the setting at Pylos.

As far as I am able to tell, this delayed identification of the seer makes the account of Theoklymenos' origins unique among Homeric genealogies. And because in Homeric epic it is often the name of a character that triggers the genealogy, its absence at the outset here is all the more striking. By contrast, Athena's description to Odysseus of Arete's royal lineage serves as a representative example of this convention:

¹⁷ Theoklymenos' own imminent escape from Pylos thus echoes Melampous' escape from Pylos recorded in the genealogy. According to Homer, Amphiaraos died at Thebes, in contrast to other versions of the myth in which Amphiaraos is swallowed alive by the earth (e.g., *Pi. N.* 9.24-27).

¹⁸ Page 1955.83.

¹⁹ For the genre of genealogy, see Martin 1989.85-86.

δέσποιναν μὲν πρῶτα κιχήσσαι ἐν μεγάροισιν·
Ἄρητη δ' ὄνομ' ἐστὶν ἐπώνυμον, ἐκ δὲ τοκῆων
τῶν αὐτῶν, οἳ περ τέκον Ἀλκίνοον βασιλῆα.
Ναυσίθοον μὲν πρῶτα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων
γείνατο καὶ Περίβοια, γυναικῶν εἶδος ἀρίστη,
ὀπλοτάτη θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος Εὐρυμέδοντος,
ὅς ποθ' ὑπερθύμοισι Γιγάντεσσιν βασίλευεν...
(*Od.* 7.53-59)

First you will come upon the mistress in her halls. Arete is her given name and she is from the same forbearers who bore king Alkinoos. Poseidon the earth-shaker begot Nausithoos with Periboia, most outstanding of women in appearance, the youngest daughter of great-hearted Eurymedon, who, once upon a time, used to rule over the bold Giants.

It is Arete's proper name that activates her history. The naming of Polyphemos also precedes the story of the Cyclops' birth and the identification of his parents:

ἀλλὰ Ποσειδάων γαιήοχος ἀσκελὲς αἰὲν
Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται, ὃν ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάωσεν,
ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον, ὅου κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον
πᾶσιν Κυκλώπεσσι· Θόωσα δέ μιν τέκε νύμφη,
Φόρκυνος θυγάτηρ, ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο μέδοντος,
ἐν σπέεσι γλαφυροῖσι Ποσειδάωνι μιγεῖσα.
(*Od.* 1.68-73)

But earth-embracing Poseidon is ever unrelentless in his anger because of the Cyclops, whose eye [Odysseus] blinded, god-like Polyphemos, whose might is greatest among all the Cyclopes. Thoosa the nymph bore him, daughter of Phorkys, ruler of the barren sea, having lain with Poseidon in hollow caves.

Similarly, in the so-called obituaries of Iliadic heroes killed in battle, the dead warrior's name typically opens up into an excursus on his ancestry.²⁰

Not all genealogies, of course, begin in this way. As Leonard Muellner has observed, characters reciting their own lineages never state their names but only those of their forebears.²¹ Yet prior to a character's performance, the narrator-text always identifies who it is who will speak; in other words, the name of the hero presenting his genealogy is always known to the audience even while the speaker himself does not offer it.²² Genealogies aside, Egbert Bakker has demonstrated that Homer goes to great lengths to mark out with dictional cues which character is in focus at any given time.²³ It is thus

²⁰ See Stoevesandt (2005.128) for a useful list of the obituaries for dead warriors in *Iliad* (she counts nineteen of them).

²¹ Muellner 1976.74 n.9. Muellner attributes this feature to "etiquette."

²² E.g., Glaukos is named at *Iliad* 6.119 before beginning his genealogy at *Iliad* 6.145.

²³ Bakker 1997.54-85.

exceedingly unusual for Homer to withhold the identity of a character, no matter what the “genre.”²⁴

Although exceptional among genealogies, the deferment of Theoklymenos’ name is not without precedent. In fact, it is a well-known feature of another introduction in the poem: the proem to the *Odyssey*. It is as if what we have just observed in the entrance of Theoklymenos mimics the notorious delay of Odysseus’ own name in the opening of the whole epic.

To understand this congruence, it is necessary to look briefly at the proem itself. Jenny Strauss Clay’s statement that “In the *Odyssey*, . . . the hero as he is first introduced is anonymous” is one articulation of an observation at least as old as Eustathius.²⁵ The postponement of Odysseus’ name for a full twenty-one lines at the beginning of his epic clearly stands in contrast to Achilles’ forceful claim on *Iliad* 1.1.²⁶ Yet the opening periphrasis *andra polutropon* says as much about Odysseus as the proper name whose place it has hijacked. As Simon Goldhill writes,

Andra . . . announces the concealment and revealing of the name that plays a crucial role in the *kleos* of Odysseus’ return. Yet, as Pucci also notes, the name is displaced by an adjective, *polutropon*, that itself expresses the very quality of deceptive wiliness that is seen most strikingly in Odysseus’ constant disguises, which, precisely, withhold the proper name. *Polutropon*, in other words, both marks Odysseus’ capability to manipulate language’s power to conceal and reveal, and, at the same time, *enacts* such a revealing and a concealing.²⁷

Goldhill compares the resulting configuration of the proem to “a *griphos*, a riddle, and enigma, where a series of expressions (of which *polutropon* is the first) successively qualifies the term *andra* as the name ‘Odysseus’ is approached.”²⁸

Enlisting Goldhill’s observations on the proem, I want to suggest that the presentation of Theoklymenos is also organized, both thematically and formally, as a *griphos*. Like the proem, the introduction of Theoklymenos “enacts” the Odyssean motif of concealing and revealing names. By deferring Theoklymenos’ proper name until the end of the genealogy, Homer presents an anonymous seer whose identity must be puzzled out (at least notionally) by an audience removed from its customary position of omniscience. And it is because the seer’s introduction implicates the poem’s audience, as opposed to just its characters, in the riddle that Theoklymenos’ introduction aligns itself specifically with the proem and not only generally with other examples of this important motif of the *Odyssey*.

The proem, I would suggest, is even slyly evoked in Theoklymenos’ own entrance: *σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦλυθεν ἀνὴρ / τηλεδαπός, φεύγων ἐξ Ἄργεος ἀνδρα κατακτάς, / μάντις*. (A man came near him from a far-off country, fleeing from Argos

²⁴ On the importance of naming in Homer in general, see Higbie 1995. For naming in the *Odyssey*, see Goldhill 1991.24-36 (with bibliography).

²⁵ Clay 1983.26. Cf. Eustathius 1381.20-25.

²⁶ Clay 1983.26. Cf. de Jong 2001.7: “The suppression of Odysseus’ name is a common Odyssean motif. . . . By inserting this motif into his proem, the narrator signals his story’s preoccupation with (the concealing of) names.”

²⁷ Goldhill 1991.4.

²⁸ Goldhill 1991.4.

for killing a man, and he was a *mantis* [*Od.* 15.223-25]). Like the *Odyssey's* opening and ambiguous *andra*, Theoklymenos is at first only an *aner*. In fact, “*mantis*” has been delayed to achieve this effect, waiting two lines away in clarifying apposition at the end of the clause, over the line break. And here, too, in keeping with its allusion to *Odyssey* 1.1, this *aner*, although qualified by *mantis*, refuses to reveal its proper name for a full thirty-two lines.²⁹

Finally, when the audience is at last rewarded with Theoklymenos’ name, I wonder if it is not a deliberate pun that further recalls Odysseus and the thematic importance of concealed identity. The revelation of “Theoklymenos” (etmologized as *theos* + *kleos*) puns on a moment which is itself the revelation of a name after a prolonged delay, that is, Odysseus’ famous characterization of his own identity among the Phaiakians:

εἴμ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
 ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καὶ μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.
 (*Od.* 9.19-20)

I am Odysseus the son of Laertes, who troubles all mankind with my contrivances, and **my kleos reaches heaven**.

Although Theoklymenos’ name is eventually revealed to the audience, the characters themselves never learn it and he remains a *xeinos*, even to his host Telemachos, until his departure in Book 20.³⁰ I wonder, then, to what extent the delay of Theoklymenos’ name in his opening genealogy is as programmatic for the seer as the postponement of Odysseus’ name in the proem is for the hero. This possibility suggests that the structure of Theoklymenos’ introduction does not merely serve the purpose of imitating Odysseus’ proem but rather points to a more profound quality shared by the seer and hero.³¹ It is to these deeper cultural connections between Odysseus and Theoklymenos that I now turn in the second part of the chapter.

Part 2. Theoklymenos, Odysseus, and Colonial Contexts

As the preceding section has shown, Theoklymenos and Odysseus not only generate the same motifs and diction but also follow complementary courses on Ithaka as

²⁹ Furthermore, I would hesitantly suggest that the second line of Theoklymenos’ introduction is also organized in a way similar to that of the proem. In the proem, the *polutropos aner* is “driven far astray after he had sacked the sacred citadel of Troy” (*Od.* 1.2). In like manner, in the second line of Theoklymenos’ description, the seer “[came] from afar fleeing from Argos because he killed a man” (*Od.* 15.224). There are then, generally speaking, the same ingredients in the same order: involuntary travel (much wandering vs. fleeing from afar) brought on by bloodshed (the sacking of Troy vs. murder) located in a specific city (Troy vs. Argos). I’m not claiming that the two lines directly refer to one another but rather that the poet generates the same language for each. It is also tempting to view the opening of Theoklymenos’ “proem” as having the ability to spin off into another epic (e.g., a *Melampodeia?*).

³⁰ This point is made by Benardete 1997.119 (*contra* Higbie 1995). There is no evidence in the text for her claim that Telemachos knows Theoklymenos’ name.

³¹ That it, Odysseus is not the only figure in the poem with the ability to withhold his identity. I am interested in how the delaying of identity is connected to travel for both.

they interact with the same characters in quick succession.³² If not literally the doublet of Odysseus, Theoklymenos is in certain fundamental ways his figurative one. But why? Of what “use” is it to Odysseus to be shadowed by a seer at the moment of his return to Ithaka? In the second section of this chapter, I hope to demonstrate that Theoklymenos and Odysseus can be understood as a coherent pair, and that this pair is one that operates within the framework of colonization in the *Odyssey*. As part of this undertaking, I will concentrate not on Theoklymenos’ prophetic abilities, as other scholars have done, but on his movements to and from Ithaka vis-à-vis Odysseus’ own activities. For I believe that it is only through studying Theoklymenos’ entrances and exits in the poem that we can really begin to think about how the Greeks conceived of the relationship between oikists and seers and, in turn, what this relationship reveals about the alliance of *mantikê* and travel in Greek culture.

Theoklymenos and Odysseus chart comparable itineraries on Ithaka, but their paths never actually intersect. Even in Book 20, where they simultaneously occupy the same space and both sit among the feasting suitors in Odysseus’ hall, the hero and seer still do not acknowledge one another’s presence. It is during this episode in particular that it is difficult not to see the two as different renderings of a disguised Odysseus that were never fully synthesized in our version of the poem.³³ Yet, although scholars never discuss it in this way, there is a small fracture in Book 20 in the narrative partition which divides them, and for a moment the segregated stories of Theoklymenos and Odysseus fleetingly collide. This fracture takes the form of an insult that is bandied about among the suitors, and it is within the space of this insult that seer and hero finally meet.

At the end of Book 20, the suitors are driven mad by Athena, and Theoklymenos foresees their impending annihilation (*Od.* 20.351-357). When his prophecy goes unheeded and is met only with ridicule, Theoklymenos takes himself away from Odysseus’ *oikos* and out of the poem. After his departure, the suitors turn to mock Telemachos by laughing at his guests (Τηλέμαχον ἐρέθιζον, ἐπὶ ξείνοις γελῶντες [*Od.* 20.374]). Their collective criticism of Telemachos, which Homer does not attribute to any one suitor but imputes to all, takes the following form:

“Τηλέμαχ’, οὗ τις σεῖο κακοξεινώτερος ἄλλος,
οἶον μὲν τινα τοῦτον ἔχεις ἐπίμαστον ἀλήτην,
σίτου καὶ οἴνου κεχρημένον, οὐδέ τι ἔργων
ἔμπαιον οὐδέ βίης, ἀλλ’ αὐτῶς ἄχθος ἀρούρης·
ἄλλος δ’ αὐτέ τις οὔτος ἀνέστη μαντεύεσθαι.
ἀλλ’ εἴ μοί τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη·
τοὺς ξείνους ἐν νηὶ πολυκλήιδι βαλόντες
ἐς Σικελοὺς πέμψωμεν, ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι.”
ὥς ἔφασαν μνηστῆρες·

(*Od.* 20.376-83)

“Telemachos, no one is more unlucky in his guest-friends
than you. Like this wanderer you have whom someone has

³² That is, Telemachos, Penelope, and the suitors, although not in the same order.

³³ This contributes to the feeling among some scholars that Theoklymenos does not quite fit in the poem. Benardete (1997.120), who discusses this episode and Theoklymenos’ prophecy in Book 20, has written that Theoklymenos “belongs to another story.”

brought in, longing for food and wine, who is not skilled at anything, and who is not even strong, but is just a burden on the land. And, again, this other one stood up and began to utter a prophecy. But if you should take my advice, it would be very profitable: Let's throw the guest-friends in a many-oarlocked ship and send them to the Sikels, where it (i.e., such a sale) would fetch you a worthy price."³⁴

Thus spoke the suitors.

The suitors tauntingly recommend that Telemachos, since no one is more *kakoxeinoteros* than he, send his guest-friends to the Sikels. Because Theoklymenos exits before the insult is delivered, this fantasized departure of the seer is the last reference to him in the poem.³⁵ The final image of Theoklymenos with which the audience is left, then, is not of the seer walking out on the suitors but rather of his being sent aboard a ship and sailing with Odysseus to Sicily.

That the *Odyssey* explicitly draws Odysseus and Theoklymenos together in this way merits our attention, especially since the poem has carefully avoided any sort of collision between them thus far. More than the sarcastic suggestion that Telemachos' guests be sold into slavery, for the present project I am interested in the components of the insult that explain the intended purpose for their journey.³⁶ That is to say, I want to consider the significance of Theoklymenos being joined together with Odysseus in travel as well as the direction of the journey itself. I suggest that the suitors' insult is implicated in the "themes and issues of colonial discourse" that are at work in the poem.³⁷ As I hope to show, this imagined scenario of the suitors can be thought of as a sort a distillation of the current of colonization that operates in and through the pairing of Theoklymenos with Odysseus in the rest of the *Odyssey*. Teasing out the various components of the insult will thus allow us to progress towards a better understanding of Theoklymenos' seemingly confounding appearance on Ithaka and how it relates to the completion of Odysseus' *nostos*.

§ *The Odyssey as Colonial Text*

But before I can claim that colonial themes shape the suitors' insult, I must first turn to Carol Dougherty's work on how the *Odyssey* itself can be read as a colonial text. While other scholars have discussed the epic in relation to Greek colonization, I will primarily draw on Dougherty's analysis since I have found her interpretations to be the most directly pertinent to the study at hand.

Dougherty proposes that, in addition to taking an ethnographic approach to the *Odyssey*, we see the poem itself "as an ethnographic text, the product of a culture, late eighth-century BCE Greece, that was trying to construct a reading of the worlds and

³⁴ This last clause is directly quoted from Stanford ad loc. The passage is problematic because it is not clear who or what is the subject of ἄλφοι.

³⁵ Russo 1992 ad loc.: "Theoklymenos, recently departed, is vividly evoked as if present..." Even after his departure, Theoklymenos' presence continues to be felt by the suitors.

³⁶ For a discussion of the reference to slavery in the insult, see Crielaard 1995.232-33.

³⁷ Quotation from Dougherty 2001.169.

peoples of its own mythic past in order to make sense of a tumultuous and volatile present.”³⁸ As Dougherty asserts, a major contributor to the “tremendous flux and upheaval” of this period, and thus a major theme explored in the poem, is the colonization movement of early archaic Greece.³⁹ Thus Dougherty investigates the poem’s construal of Odysseus’ travels as its way of exploring how the Greeks were envisioning the dangers as well as the profit of colonial or settlement ventures in the “New World.” For example, she observes that by exploiting the “prominent motifs and strategies of colonial discourse” Homer figures both the hypo-civilized Cyclopes and the hyper-civilized Phaiakians as (extreme versions of) indigenous inhabitants awaiting Greeks exploring distant lands.⁴⁰ The diametrically-opposed receptions of Odysseus by Polyphemos and Alkinoös (cannibalism vs. the offer of marriage and assimilation) can be read as ethnographic formulations and mystifications of the “best and worst case scenarios” of colonial contact with non-Greeks.⁴¹

Dougherty is not the first to have noticed an awareness of colonization in the *Odyssey*, but, generally speaking, earlier discussions on this issue have mainly centered around the poem’s descriptions of the foundation of Scheria and the island off the coast of the Cyclopes.⁴² In contrast, Dougherty’s important contribution is her consideration of how the challenges of colonization manifest themselves also in the poem’s construction of Odysseus’ return. For Dougherty, Odysseus’ experience with the exotic places encountered in his adventures is brought to bear directly on his reunion with Penelope and the restoration of his power on Ithaka. That is, Odysseus’ homecoming is orchestrated as a kind of “re-foundation” of Ithaka, and this re-foundation functions as a culmination to and application of the colonial crash-course the hero has undergone in the preceding episodes of the epic.⁴³ Further, since it is Odysseus who effects this re-foundation, Dougherty is right to emphasize that Odysseus necessarily performs the role of Ithaka’s oikist. Because Odysseus-as-oikist will be crucial for my own interpretation, it is worth reviewing some of the key components of Dougherty’s argument in order to understand more fully how Odysseus undertakes the metaphorical colonization of Ithaka.

Dougherty has convincingly tracked the ways in which certain elements from Odysseus’ earlier travels resurface on Ithaka. She exposes, for example, how the imagery of Book 9 appears again in the second half of the poem to align the gluttonous suitors with the Cyclopes. As the poem transforms the suitors into savages, Odysseus becomes increasingly justified in conquering them in order to gain control of the territory.⁴⁴ Penelope, in turn, is cast as the native queen whom Odysseus must win to become king of

³⁸ Dougherty 2001. 9.

³⁹ Dougherty 2001.112.

⁴⁰ Dougherty 2001.162

⁴¹ Dougherty 2001.122-42.

⁴² Other scholars who see the *Odyssey* engaged with the colonization movement include Dench 1995.36-38; Finley 1978.61-63; Crielaard 1995.236-39; Rose 1992.134-40; Vidal-Naquet 1986.26; Clay 1980.

⁴³ Dougherty 2001.169. Dougherty clarifies her statement: “By this I don’t mean to say that Odysseus literally re-founds Ithaka; rather, the themes and issues of colonial discourse articulate the terms of his return to represent it as a kind of re-foundation” (Dougherty 2001.169). Redfield (1983.222) too calls Odysseus the “refounder” of his house.

⁴⁴ Dougherty (2001.167) writes, “Cannibals function rhetorically as a marker of the violence of colonial settlement. Once the *Odyssey* assimilates the suitors’ greed to the cannibal behavior of Polyphemus, it projects this colonial framework onto the slaughter of the suitors at Ithaca. By doing so, it recasts the problematic violence of Odysseus’ revenge as a positive act of foundation.”

Ithaka. Their reunion is laden with allusions to the temptingly marriageable Nausikaa in Book 6 and that former enticement for Odysseus to settle on Scheria forever.⁴⁵ Importantly, Dougherty demonstrates that these challenges to Odysseus' return (i.e., marrying into the royal family, subduing the local population) not only recall earlier episodes of the poem but are recurring features of foundation legends outside of Homer as well.⁴⁶

Odysseus' mounting claim on "colonizing" Ithaka is also registered at the level of the island's landscape over the course of the second half of the poem. Initially characterized by Athena as a site of raw possibility in Book 13 (see below), Ithaka metamorphoses and becomes, in the verbal parallels drawn between Laertes' orchard and Scheria in Book 24, a place that teems with cultivated and civilized prosperity. Dougherty, however, is careful to call attention to the distinction the poem marks between the Golden Age gardens of the Phaiakians and those of Laertes; the latter are clearly the result of agricultural skill and toil, the work of humans. Viewed through the lens of the 8th century, in other words, Ithaka is transformed from a land awaiting colonization in Book 13 to a model of a thriving colony in Book 24. And, according to Dougherty, it is Odysseus in the role of oikist who, back from his travels in the New World, metaphorically lifts Ithaka from the heroic past and introduces it to the Archaic present.⁴⁷

I wish to conclude this overview of Dougherty's work by building on her interpretation of Odysseus as (re)founder of Ithaka. For I think that, more than Dougherty herself allows, Odysseus is not only cast as an oikist but also willingly and explicitly plays this role upon his arrival home.

§ *Odysseus as Oikist*

In Book 13, Athena suspends Odysseus' recognition of Ithaka and it becomes instead, in the hero's eyes, yet another unknown land. Odysseus' disorientation amid his disguised surroundings resonates with the imagery of his previous travels. His reaction (ὦ μοι ἐγὼ, τέων αὔτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἰκάνω; [*Od.* 13.200]) to the unfamiliar environment repeats verbatim his outburst on Scheria (*Od.* 6.119-21).⁴⁸ The narrator-text, moreover, is complicit in the goddess' ruse: at the beginning of this episode, Ithaka's harbor and the cave of the Nymphs are described as if the poet were introducing his audience to a new place (*Od.* 13.96-112). This ethnographic bent of Book 13 is fully

⁴⁵ Dougherty 2001.167-69.

⁴⁶ On marriage see Dougherty 2001.31 (especially n. 32 with reference to Dougherty 1993.61-80). On violence see Dougherty 2001.137 (especially n. 53 with reference to Dougherty 1993.40-41).

⁴⁷ Dougherty 2001.162, 169-72. Dougherty (2001.174) believes that the archaic audience would have seen in Odysseus a role model for oikists: "[I]n his return to his native Ithaca, the wily and much-traveled Odysseus comes to represent important aspects of the colonial founder familiar to his archaic Greek audience." Other scholars have more generally noted that Odysseus' qualities are of the sort required for this age of exploration. See, e.g., Rose (1992.120): "Odysseus' heroic characteristics, his psychological profile, and his cultural role evoke the energetic and aggressive elements in the late eighth-century Greek society – elements that were the force behind the extraordinary burst of colonization into the western Mediterranean, northern Aegean, and Black seas." See also Redfield 1983.221-22.

⁴⁸ Odysseus' reaction is also similar to the one he delivers in the land of the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.174-76).

realized when Athena, appearing as a young shepherd, catalogues for the bewildered Odysseus the island's natural resources:

Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
“νήπιός εἰς, ὦ ξεῖν', ἢ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας,
εἰ δὴ τήνδε τε γαῖαν ἀνείρεαι. οὐδέ τι λίην
οὔτω νώνυμός ἐστιν· ἴσασι δέ μιν μάλα πολλοί,
ἡμὲν ὅσοι ναίουσι πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε,
ἡδ' ὅσοι μετόπισθε ποτὶ ζόφον ἠερόεντα.
ἦ τοι μὲν τρηχεῖα καὶ οὐχ ἰππήλατός ἐστιν
οὐδὲ λίην λυπρὴ, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' εὐρεῖα τέτυκται.
ἐν μὲν γάρ οἱ σῖτος ἀθέσφατος, ἐν δέ τε οἶνος
γίνεται· αἰεὶ δ' ὄμβρος ἔχει τεθαλυῖά τ' ἔερση.
αἰγίβοτος δ' ἀγαθὴ καὶ βούβοτος· ἔστι μὲν ὕλη
παντοίη, ἐν δ' ἄρδμοι ἐπηετανοὶ παρέασι.

(*Od.* 13.242-47)

The grey-eyed goddess Athena addressed him in turn:

“You are a fool, stranger, or else you have come from far away, if you inquire about this land. For it is not so very obscure (as you suggest), but many people know it, both as many as dwell towards the dawn and the sun as well as those who dwell where the day ends towards the dusky gloom. To be sure, it is rugged and is not good for driving horses, but neither is it very poor, even though it is not spacious. For it has an unlimited amount of food and there is wine there too, and there is always rain and copious dew. It is also good for browsing goats and grazing cattle, and there are all kinds of timber and water-places in abundance.”

As Dougherty has noticed, many of Ithaka's traits listed in the goddess' description, such as its wine, goats, and plentiful rain, coincide with those applied to the land of the Cyclopes and its neighboring island, locations which were themselves evaluated in the poem as though they were potential sites for Greeks to occupy.⁴⁹ In uncovering these correspondences, Dougherty has usefully demonstrated that Athena mischievously depicts Ithaka as if it, too, were another place suitable for founding a viable settlement.

Although Dougherty's own argument for this episode stops here, I would push it slightly further to refine our view of both Athena's address and Odysseus' subsequent reply to it. I suggest that in her topographical overview of Ithaka, Athena does not merely employ colonial imagery - rather, the goddess actually departs from the genre of epic and formulates her speech as *ktisis* poetry. The detailed appraisal of Ithaka's physical features which Athena offers here is in fact a formal feature of this *topos*. What is more, as was noted above, Athena's exposition of Ithaka directly parallels the description of the

⁴⁹ Dougherty 2001.163-64. See also De Jong (2001.325-26) who notes the unusual length and detail of this particular description of Ithaka.

Cyclopes' land (*Od.* 9.116-24), a description that elsewhere Dougherty has classified as a typological component of foundation tales.⁵⁰

Regardless of its (sub)genre, however, Athena's speech is also a *dolos*, and waiting at the end of her description is the true identity of this strange new land:

“τῶ τοι, ξεῖν’, Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἐς Τροίην ὄνομ’ ἵκει,
τὴν περ τηλοῦ φασὶν Ἀχαιΐδος ἔμμεναι αἴης.”
(*Od.* 13.248-49)

“Accordingly, stranger, the name of Ithaka reaches even to Troy,
which they say is very far from Achaian land.”

Athena's surprise finish, as Clay has argued, is meant to catch Odysseus off guard and, in doing so, lure him into prematurely disclosing his identity. But in place of openly rejoicing at his good fortune, Odysseus famously and carefully holds back before the stranger (οὐδ' ὅ γ' ἀληθέα εἶπε, πάλιν δ' ὅ γε λάξετο μῦθον, / αἰὲν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόον πολυκερδέα νωμῶν [*Od.* 13.254-55]).⁵¹ Refusing to buckle under temptation, Odysseus “recounts” instead his murder of Idomeneus' son, Orsilochos, for attempting to seize his Trojan spoils and his consequent exile from Crete (*Od.* 13.256-86). The standard reading of this Cretan tale maintains that the details of Odysseus' lie not only offer an explanation to the young shepherd as to why Odysseus has been found alone amid the gifts of the Phaiakians, but also contain a veiled threat: in describing his ambush of Orsilochos, the Cretan Odysseus makes it clear to the spear-carrying youth that he is capable of defending himself against another who might attempt to seize his possessions.⁵² Yet without dismissing this interpretation, I do not think it fully accounts for Odysseus' particular choice of casting himself as a fugitive-homicide. I suggest instead that Odysseus' volleying *dolos* counters Athena specifically by taking over from the goddess her excursion into *ktisis* poetry. He does so by implying, in his concocted persona, that he is a figure capable of laying claim to the colonial landscape she has just evaluated. For, in the narrative trajectory of foundation tales, it is the murderer-in-exile who frequently comes to assume the role of oikist. Examples of this traditional plotline proliferate in Greek literature. Archias, the founder of Syracuse, was forced to leave Corinth for killing the king's son in Plutarch's version of the legend (*Plut. Mor.* 772e-773b). Strabo records that Orestes founded a city, Argos Oresticum, during his wanderings after exacting revenge on Clytemnestra (*Strab.* 7.7.8). Aeolos killed his stepmother, left his native city of Metapontion, and founded Lipara (*Diod.* 4.67.4-6).⁵³ But it is not necessary to go so far afield. The Homeric poems also show an awareness of this pattern. *Iliad* 2.661-69 narrates Tlepolemos' flight from his homeland (Tiryns, although it is not named here) for murdering his father's uncle Licymnios and concludes with his settlement of Rhodes.

⁵⁰ See Dougherty 1993.21. Other examples of descriptions of sites that Dougherty categorizes as examples of *ktisis* poetry are Plato *Laws* 704 and Archilochus *Frr.* 17 and 18 T.

⁵¹ On this passage Clay 1993.196 n.19 notes, “These two lines intervene between the ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα and the actual speech which normally follows immediately. This interruption of the normal formulaic sequence vividly illustrates Odysseus' suppression of his immediate impulse.”

⁵² See the discussions of this scene by Clay (1993.195-98) and de Jong 2001.326-29.

⁵³ For more examples see Dougherty 1993.45-60.

The prominence of the oikist as fugitive-homicide within colonial stories motivates Odysseus' decision to portray himself as exiled from his homeland for murder. Athena presents Ithaka as a new land, and Odysseus answers by suggesting that he, as a murderer in exile, fits the mold of this land's oikist. In taking up the colonial narrative initiated by the disguised Athena, Odysseus casts himself as the potential oikist of the country she has just detailed. As a result, Odysseus' response also contains an undercurrent of intimidation against the young shepherd who has discovered him alone and surrounded by treasure. Within the narrative scenario of foundation tales, a stranger in a foreign land is not a victim but an invading aggressor. Thus, by replying in the generic register of *ktisis* poetry, Odysseus reorganizes the situation to his own advantage and re-imagines the potentially dangerous native shepherd as the local population that he, as conquering oikist, will subdue.

The intersecting motifs of oikist and fugitive homicide continue well beyond this initial episode. I would like to pursue this intersection a bit further since it will enhance our understanding of Odysseus' characterization at the end of the poem. Additionally, because Theoklymenos himself is a fugitive homicide, this survey also implicates the seer in its conclusions, an idea which I will address in the conclusion to this chapter.

Odysseus' Cretan tale in Book 13 is followed by two other references to fugitive homicides. As we have seen, Theoklymenos is characterized by Homer as a murderer-in-exile, a designation reiterated in the seer's own self-description (*Od.* 15.223-25 and 15.271-78, respectively). In the following book, Eumaios, recounting a visit from an Aitolian stranger, remembers his anonymous guest as "one who had murdered a man and having wandered over much of the earth had come to his house" (*Od.* 14.379-85). As Irad Malkin has observed, taken together, these three instantiations⁵⁴ of "the theme of murder and consequent exile" form a crescendo as the narrative approaches the climax of the epic.⁵⁵ For exile, following Odysseus' slaughtering of the suitors, is in fact a "realistic option" at the end of the poem, a consequence of his revenge that Odysseus himself seems to anticipate.⁵⁶ His acknowledgment of this looming repercussion appears, for example, in Book 23 where Odysseus offers Telemachos the following assessment of their situation:

“καὶ γὰρ τίς θ' ἓνα φῶτα κατακτείνας ἐνὶ δήμῳ,
 ᾧ μὴ πολλοὶ ἔωσιν ἀσσητῆρες ὀπίσω,
 φεύγει πηούς τε προλιπῶν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν·
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἔρμα πόλης ἀπέκταμεν, οἳ μέγ' ἄριστοι
 κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκῃ· τὰ δέ σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα.”
 (*Od.* 23.118-22)

“For in fact whoever has killed one man in a community for whom there are not many supporters left behind, he goes into exile and leaves behind his kinsmen and fatherland. But we have killed the mainstays of the city who were far and away the best youths in Ithaka. These things I exhort you to ponder.”

⁵⁴ That is, the Cretan Odysseus in Book 13, the Aitolian of Book 14 and Theoklymenos in Book 15.

⁵⁵ Malkin 1998.124 n.17.

⁵⁶ Quotation from Malkin 1998. 124.

The possibility of Odysseus being driven from Ithaka for destroying its adult elite male population is of course ultimately circumvented in the *Odyssey*. Yet Odysseus' expulsion is a popular feature of traditions outside the *Odyssey*.⁵⁷ In fact, Malkin notes that, "The exile of Odysseus, whether voluntary or compulsory, is common to most post-Ithaca stories."⁵⁸ Perhaps the clearest instance of Odysseus as fugitive homicide is found in a fragment of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Ithakans*:

τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ μετὰ τὴν μνηστηροφονίαν οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι τῶν τεθνηκότων ἐπανάστησαν, μεταπεμφθεὶς δ' ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων διαιτητῆς Νεοπτόλεμος ἐδικαίωσε τὸν μὲν Ὀδυσσεῖα μεταναστῆναι καὶ φεύγειν ἐκ τῆς Κεφαλληνίας καὶ Ζακύνθου καὶ Ἰθάκης ἐφ' αἵματι, τοὺς δὲ τῶν μνηστήρων ἐταίρους καὶ οἰκείους ἀποφέρειν ποινὴν Ὀδυσσεῖ τῶν εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἀδικημάτων καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν εἰς Ἰταλίαν μετέστη, τὴν δὲ ποινὴν τῷ υἱῷ καθιερώσας ἀποφέρειν ἐκέλευσε τοὺς Ἰθακησίους.⁵⁹
(Aristotle *Constitution of the Ithakans* fr. 507 Rose)⁵⁹

After the slaughtering of the suitors, the friends of the dead men rose up against Odysseus. Neoptolemos was sent for by both sides as an arbitrator, and his judgment was, on the one hand, for Odysseus to leave the country and to be banished for homicide from Kephallenia and Zakynthos and Ithaka, and, on the other hand, for the companions and relatives of the suitors to pay an annual recompense for their injustices against his house. Therefore, Odysseus himself withdrew to Italy, but having established the recompense as sacred, he ordered the Ithakans to pay it to his son.

What many of these alternate traditions also reveal is that Odysseus is not idle in his exile. Instead, he makes use of his time fathering royal lines and founding cities. Thus Odysseus is credited with settling, among other places, the city of Bouneima in Thesprotia and Crotona in Etruria, and, according to Hellanikos, even accompanied Aeneas when he founded Rome.⁶⁰ These diverse post-*Odyssey* accounts demonstrate that the part of oikist was a familiar role played by Odysseus in Greek culture. Seeing Odysseus as a founder of cities beyond the *Odyssey* allows for such a characterization to appear less strange within it: if Odysseus can slip easily into this role in other traditions, we should perhaps be amenable to viewing him in this capacity in the *Odyssey* as well. Moreover, because the motif of the fugitive homicide tends to cluster around potential oikists, and because this motif permeates the end of the epic, it is not surprising to find it

⁵⁷ Malkin (1998) thoroughly explores these stories.

⁵⁸ Malkin 1998.123. By "post-Ithaca" and "post-*Odyssey*" Malkin (1998.190) means "not composed later but concerning what happened to Odysseus after his return to Ithaca."

⁵⁹ Fr. 507 Rose = Halliday 1975 (1929) on Plut. *QG* 14.

⁶⁰ Thesprotia: schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 800, schol. *Od.* 11.121, Steph. Byz. s.v. Βούνειμα; Etruria: *FGrH* 115 F 354 = schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 806; Rome: Dion. Hal. 1.72.2 = *FGrH* 4 F 84, Damastes *FGrH* 5 F 3. For Odysseus as progenitor see, e.g., Apollod. *Epit.* 7.40; (and Eust. p.1796 51) where Apollodorus reports that Odysseus immigrated to Aitolia and married the daughter of Thoas, a Calydonian king. He never returns to Ithaka but dies there having fathered a son, Leontophonos. Many other heroes of the Trojan War went on to found cities as well (see Malkin 1998 *passim*). I do not mean to privilege Odysseus here as if he were the only oikist figure among the *Nostoi*.

being paired there with representations of Odysseus as the founder of Ithaka. The *Odyssey* does stand in contrast to other stories of Odysseus and to other colonial narratives, however, insofar as the expected progression (in which exile precedes foundation) has been folded in on itself; Odysseus in reclaiming his house and power from the suitors is both fugitive homicide and oikist simultaneously.⁶¹

With the help of Dougherty, then, we have seen that the *Odyssey* understands many of the challenges of Odysseus' homecoming through the framework of colonization. In particular, Odysseus himself, in numerous ways, is characterized as the founder of his native land. But, at the same time, we must not forget that as he is being portrayed as an oikist, Odysseus is also being closely aligned with a seer – as the first portion of this chapter revealed, Odysseus and Theoklymenos generate many of the same motifs from the poet. Turning now to the final part of the chapter, I join the two preceding sections together to explore the notion that the mirroring, doubling presence of Theoklymenos in the poem can be explained by his involvement in and even facilitation of the refoundation of Ithaka that Odysseus' return constitutes.

§ *Traveling to Sicily*

Let us return to the insult of the suitors in Book 20. The suitors recommend that Telemachos send his *xenoi* on a ship to the Sikels:

ἀλλ' εἴ μοί τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη·
τοὺς ξείνους ἐν νηϊ πολυκλήιδι βαλόντες
ἐς Σικελούς πέμψωμεν, ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι.”
ὥς ἔφασαν μνηστῆρες·

(*Od.* 20.379-83)

But if you should take my advice, it would be very profitable: Let's throw the guest-friends in a many-oarlocked ship and send them to the Sikels, where it (i.e., such a sale) would fetch you a worthy price.

Thus spoke the suitors.

It is necessary to reiterate here, first, that this is the one example in the *Odyssey* where Theoklymenos and Odysseus are acknowledged as existing in the same poem and, second, that in this one coincident moment, they are envisioned as traveling together to Sicily.⁶² The destination is intriguing since we can be fairly certain that to mention Sicily

⁶¹ For the progression from murderer-in-exile to oikist, see Dougherty 1993.45-60. Also, it should be remembered that even the *Odyssey* itself accepts that its hero must depart from home again, a position that surfaces in Teiresias' instructions to Odysseus to travel to a place so far inland that the oar he carries will be thought to be a winnowing fan and to make sacrifices to Poseidon there (*Od.* 11.119-37). According to Malkin (1998.122), this prophecy “implies an awareness of post-*Odyssey* stories” although I would stress that to the extent that the poem imagines a sequel to itself, it converts Odysseus' expected exile into a sacred pilgrimage/theoria.

⁶² Odysseus' implication in the insult seems especially marked given that the events of the episode leading up to the insult (i.e., the seer's prophecy and the suitors' dismissive reaction to it) have only concerned Theoklymenos. Odysseus has been co-opted into the insult and his sudden presence there when he hadn't been previously involved in the narrative makes his entry into the spotlight all the more jarring and, I will

in Homer necessarily implies an awareness of Greek colonies there. As Jan Paul Crielaard has observed, “Greek links with Sicily became substantial only after the foundation of a number of colonies, of which Naxos (734 BC) was the earliest.”⁶³ According to the archaeological record, “[e]vidence for pre-colonial contacts with Sicily is rather rare” before the eighth century BCE.⁶⁴ In the *Odyssey*, then, travel to Sicily cannot be entirely disassociated from the colonial implications or possibilities of journeys made in this westward direction. Odysseus and Theoklymenos are to be sent to the same place to which Greek colonists also sail.⁶⁵

What is more, outside of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus *does* go west. The *Constitution of the Ithakans*, for example, claims that Odysseus went to Italy after killing the suitors (αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν εἰς Ἴταλίαν μετέστη [Fr. 507 Rose]; see above for entire quotation). Other traditions, including the *Theogony*, credit Odysseus with fathering various *ethne* across the Italian peninsula.⁶⁶ An intriguing passage from Theopompus, furthermore, suggests to Malkin that Odysseus actually enjoyed a founder’s cult in Cortona (referred to here as Gortynaia):⁶⁷

Θεόπομπός φησιν ὅτι παραγενόμενος ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ τὰ περὶ
τὴν Πηνελόπην ἐγνωκῶς ἀπῆρεν εἰς Τυρσηνίαν καὶ ἐλθὼν ὠίκησε
τὴν Γορτυναίαν, ἔνθα καὶ τελευτᾷ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν μεγάλως τιμώμενος.
(FGrH 115 F 354 = schol. Lycoph. Alex. 806)

Theopompos says that Odysseus, having arrived (home) and having realized the affairs concerning Penelope, sailed away to Tyrsenia and went and settled Gortynaia, and reached the end of his life being honored greatly by them.

If the suitors’ insult is a signpost for an existing association between Odysseus and Italy/Sicily beyond the poem, it is interesting that these alternate stories it gestures towards concern Odysseus specifically as a founder of cities and progenitor of Italic peoples.⁶⁸

argue, necessary in order for the particular construction of the insult to work. He’s dragged in because it makes better cultural sense to have them as a pair.

⁶³ Crielaard 1995.232.

⁶⁴ Crielaard 1995.232.

⁶⁵ In Book 24, a re-disguised Odysseus burdens his father with a tale of his attempt to reach Sicily from Abydas. The scholia offer the Greek colony Metapontion as the historical identity of Abydas; Malkin thinks that, even if it is not Metapontion, Abydas must be another colony in southern Italy. It is interesting that once he has “re-founded” Ithaka by killing the suitors and remarrying Penelope, Odysseus sheds his Cretan persona in the lies he tells and presents himself instead as a Greek colonist.

⁶⁶ In the *Theogony*, Agrios and Latinos (both eponymous heroes of Italic peoples) are the sons of Odysseus and Circe (Hes. *Theog.* 1011-13). As Malkin (1998.194) points out, this passage immediately follows a reference to Aeneas, suggesting another connection between the two heroes. Odysseus and Aeneas are also connected by Hellanikos in the foundation of Rome [see above]. According to the historian Xenagoras (2nd c. BCE), Odysseus fathers by Circe Rhomos, Anteias, and Ardeias (who give their names to the cities of Rome, Antium and Ardea) (Xenagoras FGrH 240 F 29). That Hesiod is a source here proves that these traditions of Odysseus as the progenitor of Italic peoples are not all late.

⁶⁷ Malkin 1998.174.

⁶⁸ On the issue of alternate versions in general, Malkin (1998.35) writes, “The *Odyssey* also indicates awareness of its own alternatives: its sequels or alternative returns are either alluded to or expressly

In Book 20, however, Theoklymenos and Odysseus are to be sold into slavery, not to found a colony. But I think the suitors' insult has been formulated such that distinctions between the terms of their expulsion and a colonial expedition become blurred. The scenario imagined by the suitors intersects with colonial narratives not only in the destination intended for the hero and seer but also in the theme of forced exile that attends those same accounts. The Greeks remembered colonization as something they were compelled to embark upon when a calamity, political or natural, left them with no other alternative. In her study of the "plot" of archaic colonization," Dougherty has determined that a crisis within the mother city is a common impetus for founding a colony:

The subtext of much colonial discourse in the archaic period is the reluctance to leave home. While modern historians and archaeologists still debate the various motives that prompted such a large-scale colonial movement, the Greeks themselves tell us many times and in many ways that they were forced to leave home to search for a new place to live; they are unwilling colonists, driven from home by a myriad of catastrophic disasters.⁶⁹

The story pattern of the fugitive-homicide-turned-oikist, which Tleptolemos reveals is as old as Homer (see above *Il.* 2.661-9), fits this picture of colonists as "unwilling exiles in desperate search of a new place to live."⁷⁰ But we can also think of Herodotus' account of Battos and the expedition he led to found Cyrene. When Battos' initially unsuccessful colonists attempted to return to Thera, they were pelted with stones from the shore by the citizens who had remained behind.⁷¹ The formulation of Theoklymenos' and Odysseus' punishment as an expulsion is not unlike the unwilling departure of colonists evicted from their motherland as the result of some crisis.

Commentators often link the insult in Book 20 to a threat delivered by Antinoös. Antinoös taunts Iros as the beggar nervously prepares for his boxing match with Odysseus:

“αἶ κέν σ’ οὔτος νικήσῃ κρείσσων τε γένηται,
πέμπω σ’ ἤπειρόνδε, βαλὼν ἐν νηὶ μελαίνῃ,
εἰς Ἐχέτον βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων,
ὅς κ’ ἀπὸ ῥίνα τάμησι καὶ οὔατα νηλεῖ χαλκῶ
μήδεά τ’ ἐξερύσας δῶη κυσὶν ὦμα δάσασθαι.”
(*Od.* 18.84-7)⁷²

“If this man beats you and proves himself the stronger,
I will send you towards the mainland, having thrown you

attested. By "allusion" I mean not specific verse allusions – a contested question among Homerists – but the more basic plot elements.”

⁶⁹ Dougherty 1993.16.

⁷⁰ Dougherty 1993.18.

⁷¹ *Hdt.* 4.156; Similarly, Plutarch recounts a story of Eretrians who driven out of Corcyra and were subsequently repelled with slings when they tried to return (*Plut. QG* II 293a-b).

⁷² This seemingly outlandish torture is actually precisely what Telemachos and the herdsmen inflict on Melanthios at *Od.* 22.473-76.

on a black ship, to King Echetos, a scourge for all men,
who will cut off your nose and ears with pitiless bronze and, tearing
off your genitals, give them raw to the dogs to divide among
themselves.”

In a similar passage, Antinoös warns Odysseus that he will be sent to Echetos if he dares to touch Odysseus’ bow (*Od.* 21.307-9). But such cross-referencing between the insult and Antinoös’ warnings obscures the different directional cues embedded in these punishments. The baneful King Echetos is reached by sailing back ἤπειρόνδε (“towards the mainland”).⁷³ Moreover, the suitor’s scare tactics target Odysseus and Iros individually: One travels to King Echetos alone. The examples stand in contrast, then, to the insult of the suitors in Book 20. It is only the pair, Theoklymenos and Odysseus, who are sent west. Put another way, it is only seer and the “oikist” who activate the colonial motif of traveling out from Greece to Sicily.

In teasing out the various elements of the insult, I do not wish to give the impression that I treat all travel west as colonial in purpose, or, for that matter, that I view all exiles as budding oikists.⁷⁴ Yet given the *Odyssey*’s interest in colonization elsewhere in the poem and what we know of the post-Odyssean adventures of Odysseus in Italy, I think the collocation of sailing to Sicily and expulsion in this particular context permits us to make a case for the colonial resonance of the insult.

§ *Theoklymenos On Board*

I have discussed the ways in which Odysseus fits into the image formulated by the suitors, but how can Theoklymenos’ presence aboard the ship be explained? To answer this question, it will be helpful to examine Theoklymenos’ own arrival into the epic. Just as Theoklymenos exits the poem (figuratively) traveling with Odysseus, so too he enters the *Odyssey* accompanying Telemachos. In Book 15, as Telemachos sacrifices to Athena before departing from Pylos, he is suddenly approached by the seer who appeals to Odysseus’ son:

τὸν δ’ αὖτε προσέειπε Θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής·
“οὐτῶ τοι καὶ ἐγὼν ἐκ πατρίδος, ἄνδρα κατακτὰς
ἔμφυλον· πολλοὶ δὲ κασίγνητοὶ τε ἔται τε
Ἄργος ἀν’ ἱππόβοτον, μέγα δὲ κρατέουσιν Ἀχαιῶν·
τῶν ὑπαλευάμενος θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν
φεύγω, ἐπεὶ νύ μοι αἴσα κατ’ ἀνθρώπους ἀλάλησθαι.
ἀλλὰ με νηὸς ἔφεσσαι, ἐπεὶ σε φυγῶν ἰκέτευσα,
μή με κατακτείνωσι· διωκόμεναι γὰρ οἴω.”

(*Od.* 15.271-78)

Then godlike Theoklymenos addressed him:

⁷³ I agree with Malkin that the “mainland” here must refer to mainland Greece. Malkin (1998.153) provides examples of the numerous comings and goings between the mainland and Ithaka.

⁷⁴ There are, for example, a number of fugitive-homicides in the *Iliad* who are not oikists, such as Medon (*Il.* 13.695-96), Lycophron (*Il.* 15.431-32), and Patroklos (*Il.* 23.85-90).

“I too am out of my fatherland, having killed a man from my own tribe. And he has many brothers and kinsmen in horse-grazing Argos and they wield great power over the Achaians. Escaping death and black doom from these men I flee, since it is my fate to wander among men. But place me upon your ship, since I supplicate you as a fugitive, in order that they not kill me. For I think they are chasing me.”

Theoklymenos beseeches Telemachos to aid him in fleeing his pursuers, and Telemachos grants the seer passage aboard his ship. Although it is Telemachos who ostensibly rescues the seer, I think we should also consider seriously the implications of the timing of Theoklymenos’ sudden entrance into the poem.⁷⁵ As if in order to accompany him, Theoklymenos materializes at the very moment at which Telemachos is about to sail back to Ithaka. The voyage for which Theoklymenos appears is a perilous one: off the coast of Ithaka, the suitors are on the lookout, hoping to intercept Telemachos’ ship and murder him. In fact, the suitors are amazed when Telemachos manages to slip past their ambush and return safely home. Antinoös details the near-impossibility of Telemachos’ feat:

ὦ πόποι, ὡς τόνδ’ ἄνδρα θεοὶ κακότητος ἔλυσαν.
ἦματα μὲν σκοποὶ ἴζον ἐπ’ ἄκριας ἠνεμοέσσας
αἰὲν ἐπασσύτεροι· ἅμα δ’ ἠελίῳ καταδύντι
οὔ ποτ’ ἐπ’ ἠπείρου νύκτ’ ἄσαμεν, ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ πόντῳ
νηὶ θεῆ πλείοντες ἐμίνομεν Ἡῶ διαν,
Τηλέμαχον λοχῶντες, ἵνα φθείσωμεν ἐλόντες
αὐτόν· τὸν δ’ ἄρα τεῖος ἀπήγαγεν οἴκαδε δαίμων.
(*Od.* 16.364-70)

Ah! How the gods rescued that man from destruction. During the day we sat as lookouts upon windy hilltops always in shifts. And with the setting sun not once did we spend the night on land, but sailing the sea in a swift ship we were watching for divine Dawn, lying in wait for Telemachos, in order that we might anticipate and seize him. But meanwhile a *daimon* led him home.

Antinoös’ own conclusion (τὸν δ’ ἄρα τεῖος ἀπήγαγεν οἴκαδε δαίμων) allows us to treat the idea that Telemachos is *helped* home as a valid one. The suitor’s conviction that Telemachos must have been assisted in his escape makes us suspect that Theoklymenos’ position aboard the ship is more than one of a dependent suppliant. Our suspicion is increased further by an inevitable comparison: Theoklymenos in effect replaces the one

⁷⁵ The abruptness of Theoklymenos’ entrance into the poem bothered Page and Kirk, among others, greatly. Kirk (1962.240) granted Theoklymenos the distinction of being the “only character in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* – with the exception of Phoinix – whom one feels to have arrived there almost by mistake.”

figure, now absent, who had clearly played the role of escort on the outbound leg of Telemachos' journey, namely, Athena.⁷⁶

What the Telemachos episode, and Antinoös' inference from it, suggests is that Theoklymenos' skill does not only encompass connecting to the realm of the divine (through his ability to interpret omens and deliver prophecies) but also seemingly involves reaching locations in the landscape that are difficult for others to access (in his ability to travel past the suitors). This apparent duality of Theoklymenos' expertise, which seems to be simultaneously mantic and navigational in nature, corresponds well to an insight in the work of the ethnographer Mary Helms. In her comprehensive survey of pre-industrial cultures, Helms makes the following assertion that "[I]n traditional cosmologies geographical distance and space/time are accorded political and ideological qualities virtually identical to those associated with vertical (heavens-underworld) distance and space/time."⁷⁷ From this observed concordance between the vertical and horizontal axes, Helms' study also reveals a homology between figures who are adept at long-distance travel (e.g., sailors and traders) and those who mediate supernatural distance (e.g., shamans and other religious experts).⁷⁸ Such a correspondence of qualities, I think, is manifested in the character of Theoklymenos and is made especially clear in his sea voyage from Pylos to Ithaka with Telemachos. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize that, as with other Greek seers who will be discussed in Chapter 2 and who also conform to Helms' model, Theoklymenos is not the only beneficiary of his metanastic authority. Rather, just as Greek seers are enlisted by others for their special rapport with the gods, so too are they tapped for their ability to access places that are *physically* remote or challenging.⁷⁹ When Theoklymenos travels with Telemachos, it is not as a suppliant or even as a companion but as a guide. The Telemachos episode, then, presents new implications for the suitors' insult and the relationship of Odysseus and

⁷⁶ Page found fault with Theoklymenos' apparent rudeness in the way the seer approaches Telemachos and demands that he identify himself (*Od.* 15.260-64). Theoklymenos' questioning stands in contrast to other episodes in which it is the newly-arrived stranger who is the one interrogated about his origins (E.g., Nestor questions Telemachos (*Od.* 3.69-74); Penelope questions Odysseus (*Od.* 19.104-5)). Of Theoklymenos in this episode Page (1955.86) writes, "Great is the descent from the moderately sublime; all the more offensive since ancient custom would frown upon a suppliant who began his prayer by asking the name and address of his protector; it is for Telemachos to ask Theoklymenos, not vice versa." In the seer's defense, Fenik (1974.235) attributes the fugitive's questioning to the urgency of his situation. But the perceived "rudeness" of Theoklymenos that vexed Page stemmed from his assumption that Telemachos plays host to a suppliant Theoklymenos. If, however, it is actually Theoklymenos who safely leads Telemachos back to Ithaka, then this apparent "breach of etiquette" disappears (quotation from Fenik 1974.233). We might even say that Homer is actually signaling that Theoklymenos is really the one in charge by putting in his mouth a formula traditionally reserved for hosts.

⁷⁷ Helms 1993.44.

⁷⁸ See also, e.g., Helms 1988.80-81: "[G]eographical distance can again be seen to offer political-ideological challenges not unlike those posed by other dimensions of dangerous and powerful supernatural distance. Consequently, experts in the control and exploitation of geographical distance may be equated with experts who control and exploit other forms of distance as political-religious elites." While Helms in general tends to be more concerned with long-distance travelers who are accorded the qualities of religious experts, I would focus here on the reverse but equally true phenomenon – that Theoklymenos is a skillful long distance traveler as well a seer.

⁷⁹ This tendency of being enlisted by others for long-distance travel is I think a characteristic of seers in particular and is something that perhaps distinguishes them from other types of *sophoi* who are skilled travelers as well but whose travels are more solitary in nature (e.g., Solon's *theoria*).

Theoklymenos within it. With Theoklymenos aboard, Odysseus' journey to Sicily (and the colonial objective to which that journey alludes) is likely to be a successful one.

§ *Conclusions*

Over the course of the last section I have continually revisited the suitors' insult in Book 20 as a way of framing the discussion. By sending Theoklymenos and Odysseus west to Sicily, the suitors' threat subsumes the pair within the theme of colonization at work in the poem. But in addition to and perhaps the *reason for* the colonial direction of Theoklymenos and Odysseus' trip is the colonial nature of the pair themselves. That is, it is not just the characters of Theoklymenos and Odysseus who finally cross paths in the insult but, based on the motifs and qualities that have been accorded these characters leading up to this moment, it would perhaps be better to say that it is Theoklymenos as seer-navigator and Odysseus as oikist who are placed together aboard the ship.⁸⁰

I want to be clear that I am not making any claim about how the suitors themselves conceive of the relationship between Theoklymenos and Odysseus. But I would say that this coalescence of elements in their threat does tell us something about the *Odyssey's* conceptualization of seer and oikist as a meaningful alliance and one that makes sense within the larger framework of colonial discourse. In Chapters 3 and 4, I will explore other pairings of seers and oikists in the late Archaic and Classical periods and consider some of the issues at stake in this connection. For now, however, it is important simply to note that in one of the earliest Greek texts this convergence is already taking place. Furthermore, I have focused on the insult not only to draw attention to the pairing of oikist and seer that occurs there, but also because I think the insult itself functions as a kind of crystallization of the dynamics of Theoklymenos' and Odysseus' relationship in the rest of the poem. It is as if Theoklymenos' appearance in the suitors' imagined scenario repeats in miniature the seer's accompanying presence in the poem in general. For in both instances Theoklymenos, skilled in traveling both the horizontal and vertical axes of distance, can be thought of as helping Odysseus to effect a foundation – whether it be a potential one off in Sicily or (metaphorically) the re-foundation of Ithaka.

Even so, however, I do not think this satisfactorily explains the full extent of the doubling of Theoklymenos and Odysseus explored in Part 1. Such insistent overlapping, especially in their parallel introductions into the poem, seems to arise instead from the *Odyssey's* attentiveness to the fact that the boundaries between the pairing of seer and oikist are collapsible and porous. I will examine this idea in Chapter 4 by looking more closely at the seer Hagesias in Pindar's *Olympian 6*. But as a means of leading into that discussion I will end this chapter by briefly acknowledging some of the ways in which Theoklymenos and Odysseus themselves are representative of the potential permeability between these two types of figures.

First, the intricate genealogy that announces Theoklymenos' entrance in Book 15 mentions the preceding members of his family in some detail. According to the

⁸⁰ The presence of a seer on a journey does not mean, of course, that that journey is a colonial expedition. Seers, for example, are often represented in Greek literature as accompanying armies on campaigns of a non-colonial nature. But I think we can begin to see why they would be enlisted for one and that this reason does not lie in their mantic abilities alone, or rather, their mantic abilities are indistinguishable from their equally precious skill as long-distance travelers.

genealogy, stasis and subsequent exile follow the clan as persistently as their inherited prophetic abilities. Generation after generation, the seers are forced out of their native cities and settle somewhere new. Bookending the list of the nine Melampodids are the stories of Melampous himself and Theoklymenos' father, Polyphides, both of whom flee from their homes before going to live among other people (Melampus came to rule over Argos [*Od.* 15.239-40] and Polyphides settled in Hypersia where he prophesied for all men [*Od.* 15.254-55]).⁸¹ In addition to these ancestors, Amphiaraos' two sons, Alkmaion and Amphilochos are mentioned (*Od.* 15.248). Their names, I would argue, signpost their own colonial legends that lie beyond the scope of the *Odyssey*. According to Thucydides, Alkmaion, wandering throughout Greece for years after killing his mother (i.e., another fugitive homicide), was eventually directed by an oracle to settle Akarnania.⁸² Amphilochos also appears in Thucydides where he is said to have founded Argos Amphilochikon. In another tradition, Strabo credits Amphilochos with founding the city and oracle of Mallos in Asia Minor together with the seer Mopsos.⁸³ This pattern within the genealogy, then, invokes a whole family of seers who double as oikists, settling and founding cities throughout the Greek world (although Melampous doesn't found Argos, he does rule over it). Being introduced with such a pedigree leaves open the possibility that Theoklymenos, on the run from his own native land for murder, will leave the *Odyssey* only to found a city himself.

Second, out of the many post-Ithaka traditions that refer to Odysseus establishing cities and fathering royal lines, the following fragment presents a different kind of foundation:

Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶν ἐν Ἰθακησίων πολιτείᾳ Εὐρυ-
τᾶνας ἔθνος εἶναι τῆς Αἰτωλίας ὀνομασθὲν ἀπὸ Εὐρύτωνος,
παρ' οἷς εἶναι μαντεῖον Ὀδυσσεύως.

(Aristotle *Constitution of the Ithakans* fr. 508 Rose)

Aristotle says in the *Constitution of the Ithakans* that the Eurytanes are an ethnos in Aitolia, named after Euryton and that among these people there was an oracle of Odysseus.

I close with the image of Odysseus' *manteion* because I think it captures perfectly what I have sought to explore in this chapter, namely, the coherent convergence of the oikist and the seer, a pair so in counterpoint to each other that Denys Page was, in his own way, right to suggest that sometimes these two figures can become one.

⁸¹ This portion of the myth of Melampus can be contrasted to the one told in Book 11.288-97. There, the focus was on Pero whereas here the story is one of exile and re-settlement – fitting in a genealogy with other similar stories.

⁸² Thuc. 2.102.5-6.

⁸³ Thuc. 2.68; Strabo 14.5.16. Notice that Mallos is founded by a pair (both of whom are simultaneously seers and oikists).

Chapter 2

Beyond Entrails and Omens: Herodotus' Teisamenos and the Talismanic *Mantis* at War

Scholars repeatedly stress the parallels between military campaigns and colonial expeditions of the sixth and fifth centuries BCE.¹ Yet, whereas seers regularly feature in accounts of archaic and classical Greek warfare, they rarely appear in colonial narratives of the same period.² What explains the elision of seers from foundation tales? Furthermore, what does this elision tell us about the way the Greeks thought about their *manteis* and their relationship to these two forms of travel? This chapter and the next address this paradox.

We must first set aside the view that military seers were only specialists in divination.³ The customary acts of performing sacrifices and interpreting omens by themselves do not reveal why seers so often go missing from representations of colonial travel for which these skills were presumably still required.⁴ In this chapter, I argue instead that, in addition to their technical expertise in *mantikê*, particular seers could be considered figures of extraordinary talismanic power (*kudos*). Military *manteis* reputed as talismanic were believed to be vital to campaigns because their *kudos* was imagined to guarantee victory for the army that enlisted them. As we will find in Chapter 3, however, there were repercussions for a seer who wielded talismanic power, and this very capacity counted against him in his relationship with the oikist off the battlefield.

Chapter 2 falls into two main parts. In Part 1, I turn to Herodotus' characterization of the Iamid seer Teisamenos as a "leader of wars" (9.33) to uncover this cultural tendency to regard certain military seers as conduits of *kudos*. Talismanic potency elucidates the several references to seers commanding armies and winning wars. Moreover, an inscription in honor of a certain Kleoboulos reveals the seer as a bearer of *kudos*. In Part 2, I integrate seers into a larger cultural nexus of talismanic figures. Once we recognize that seers could be viewed as having *kudos*, we can examine how they converge and intersect with other talismanic figures similarly characterized, such as

¹ See Malkin 1987.103: "[T]here is not a great difference, after all, between the oikist as a leader of a colonial, or a military, expedition"; Dougherty 1993.187: "[F]ounding a colony can be as dangerous and violent as war... each means a dangerous confrontation with hostile peoples and requires a large demonstration of force."; Currie 2005.151 (citing Kurke 1993.136-37 and Hodkinson 1999.170): "Analogous to the important role played by athletes in warfare is their appointment as leaders of colonizing ventures." On using the term "colony," see my Introduction. I also include here Tandy's (1997.75) justification: "'Colony' is the term I will employ in discussing Greek activity in the west. There are at least two reasons, however, why 'expansion' may be a better term. First, increasing population density generated more people, so that colonization, if not caused by increasing population, at least accommodated it. Second, colonizing activities were, in some cases, expansions of labor bases and capital bases. 'Colony,' however, is the word students of these western settlements use, and it is too late to change the terminology." I also note here that I am interested in the difference between the *representations*, and not the *realia*, of military and colonial expeditions. Although I agree with Hornblower's (2004.185) statement that "'single-oikist' traditions are likely to be over-simple," I ask why the Greeks chose to have a single oikist in their foundation tales and what this narrative decision tells us about the perceived role of seers in colonization.

² For a definition of colonial narrative, see my Introduction.

³ For a concise summary of this standard view of seers, see Flower and Marincola 2002.164.

⁴ On the seer's sacrificial duties on campaign including the important battle-line sacrifice (*sphagia*), see especially Jameson 1991.

athletic victors and heroes. Demonstrating that seers are interchangeable in the context of warfare with other *kudos*-bearing individuals also anticipates Chapter 3: these other figures continue to appear in colonial narrative, and this makes the seer's erasure from foundation tales all the more conspicuous.

I deploy for seers the concept of *kudos* developed by Emile Benveniste and Leslie Kurke.⁵ Benveniste offers an initial definition of *kudos* in the Homeric poems:

The gift of *kûdos* ensures the triumph of the man who receives it: in combat the holder of *kûdos* is invariably victorious. Here we see the fundamental character of *kûdos*: it acts as a *talisman of supremacy*. We use the term talisman advisedly, for the bestowal of *kûdos* by the god procures an instantaneous and irresistible advantage, rather like a magic power, and the god grants it now to one and now to another at his good will and always in order to give the advantage at a decisive moment of combat or some competitive activity.⁶

Kurke shows that Benveniste's Homeric *kudos* and its attendant formula, *kudos aresthai* "to win *kudos*," endures in later Greek culture in the areas of warfare and athletic competitions. In particular, in addition to war dead, athletes who win victory at the "crown" games of the *periodos* are the major inheritors of this notion of "talismanic potency" in the Archaic and early Classical periods.⁷ Crown victors frequently appear in descriptions of battle but, as Kurke emphasizes, a crown victor is not enlisted for his physical might or his military experience alone. Rather, his participation reflects a polis' attempt to co-opt his *kudos*, bestowed at the moment of his athletic victory, for its own success in battle.⁸ Diodorus Siculus' account of the late sixth-century war between Kroton and Sybaris emphatically demonstrates this that is the case. According to Diodorus, the Krotoniates, despite being the underdogs, defeat the Sybarites:

...Μίλωνος τοῦ ἀθλητοῦ ἡγουμένου καὶ διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς τοῦ σώματος ῥώμης πρώτου τρεψαμένου τοὺς καθ' αὐτὸν τεταγμένους. ὁ γὰρ ἀνὴρ οὗτος, ἑξάκις Ὀλύμπια νενικηκῶς καὶ τὴν ἀλκὴν ἀκόλουθον ἔχων τῇ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα φύσει, λέγεται πρὸς τὴν μάχην ἀπαντῆσαι κατεστεφανωμένους μὲν τοῖς Ὀλυμπικοῖς στεφάνοις, διεσκευασμένους δὲ εἰς Ἡρακλέους σκευὴν λεοντῆ καὶ ῥοπάλω· αἴτιον δὲ γενόμενον τῆς νίκης θαυμασθῆναι παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις.

(Diod. Sic. 12.9.5-6)

...with Milo the athlete leading and, due to the superiority of his bodily strength, the first to put to flight those marshaled against him. For this man, who had won an Olympic victory six times and had courage to match his physical nature, is said to have come into battle decked with his Olympic crowns and dressed in Herakles' gear with lion skin and club. And [they say] that he was an object of wonder in the eyes of his fellow citizens as being the reason of their victory.

⁵ Benveniste 1973.346-56 and Kurke 1993.

⁶ Benveniste 1973.348.

⁷ Kurke 1993.132-33.

⁸ Kurke 1993 *passim*.

As Kurke writes,

No rationalistic explanation can do justice to this passage – Milo goes into battle wearing his six Olympic crowns and single-handedly turns the enemy. This account is intended to be a θαῦμα (a marvel), as Diodorus’ last sentence signals. We must conclude that the Olympic victor in his Olympic crowns was believed to have magical potency on the battlefield.⁹

I add that this episode reveals that the presence of the phenomenon of *kudos* does not rely exclusively on the presence of the word “*kudos*.” Milo explicitly enjoys talismanic power even though the actual word itself does not appear in Diodorus’ passage. With this concept of *kudos* in mind, I now turn to seers as talismanic figures. I begin with Teisamenos and the battle of Plataia in Book 9 of Herodotus’ *Histories*.

Part 1. Seers and *Kudos*

§ *Teisamenos at Plataia*

On the eve of the battle of Plataia, the Greeks and Persians stand eyeing each other across the Asopus, stalled by the same omen: on both sides, the signs are propitious for remaining in place but unfavorable towards an offensive attack. As if to pass the time during this stalemate and also to capture its length, Herodotus delivers protracted *logoi* about the two *manteis* overseeing these crucial sacrifices, balancing them, like the two sides of the river and their waiting armies, with a *men/de* construction.¹⁰ The historian first turns to the *mantis* who accompanies the Greek army:

Ἐλλησι μὲν Τεισαμενὸς Ἀντιόχου ἦν ὁ θυόμενος· οὗτος γὰρ δὴ εἶπετο τῷ στρατεύματι τούτῳ μάντις· τὸν ἐόντα Ἥλειον καὶ γένεος τοῦ Ἰαμιδέων Κλυτιάδην Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐποιήσαντο λεωσφέτερον.¹¹

(Hdt. 9.33.1)

For the Greeks it was Teisamenos son of Antiochos who was sacrificing. For he was accompanying this campaign as a *mantis*. He was an Elean and a Klytiad of the clan of the Iamidai and the Lakedaimonians made him a fellow-citizen.

Herodotus simultaneously and succinctly joins Teisamenos to two different poleis, Elis and Sparta, as well as two different mantic clans, the Iamidai and the Klytiadai. The following *logos* slowly unwinds this dense coil of identity as it takes a circuitous route

⁹ Kurke 1993.195. See also Kurke’s discussion of Plutarch’s *Life of Lykourgos* (22.4) (1993.133). For earlier examples of this phenomenon as well, see especially Kurke 1993.136-37.

¹⁰ On the length of these two digressions, see, e.g., Flower and Marincola 2002.164: “The space allotted to both incidents may be thought disproportionate, but the Greeks (and H[erodotus]) took religious matters seriously...”

¹¹ I plan to explore the meaning of the *hapax* λεωσφέτερον in a future project.

through the events that led to Teisamenos' presence at Plataia (9.33-35). Consulting the oracle at Delphi about offspring, Teisamenos receives instead the unsolicited news that he will win the five greatest contests. Misinterpreting the Pythia as referring to the five events of the pentathlon, Teisamenos begins to train as an athlete and nearly wins at Olympia. Enter the Spartans who, having correctly understood the oracular pronouncement to signify not athletic competitions but "contests of Ares," approach Teisamenos and attempt to make him a "leader of their wars" together with the Heraklid kings (μισθῶ ἐπειρῶντο πείσαντες Τεισαμενὸν ποιέεσθαι ἅμα Ἡρακλειδέων τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι ἡγεμόνα τῶν πολέμων "They were attempting to persuade Teisamenos through payment to be made a leader of wars together with the Heraklid kings" [9.33.3]). Teisamenos declines the proffered *misthos* and insists upon being made a citizen with full privileges. Offended by this unheard-of proposal, the Spartans depart, only to return, terrified by the looming threat of Persia. Teisamenos counters with a still higher price – that his brother, Hegias, also be made a Spartan citizen. By behaving in this way, Herodotus informs us, Teisamenos was imitating the mythical seer Melampus who demanded a share of the kingdom of Argos for both himself and his brother, Bias. Like the Argives before them, the Spartans agree to the seer's terms and Teisamenos and Hegias become the first and only foreigners ever to be made citizens of Sparta.¹²

In evaluating this episode, we might first note that Herodotus casts the Spartans as desperate for Teisamenos. No other seer will do. Although they are indignant at Teisamenos' bold demand for citizenship, they do not resort to hiring another seer. That option does not appear to exist. Teisamenos alone must possess something that makes the Spartans so frantic to have him on their side. Herodotus' presentation of events does not seem to suggest that the Spartans seek Teisamenos' expertise in divination. In fact, the historian's decision to open the *logos* with the seer botching his own oracle has the effect of undercutting any assumed mantic credentials we might have initially accorded him.¹³ As Michael Flower perceives, the "internal logic" of the story implies that Teisamenos had not performed as a professional seer before Plataia. If he had, he might have known that he was meant to be a military *mantis* and not an athlete. Instead, Flower writes, "We are...expected to imagine something that might seem unlikely on the face of it – that the Spartans hired someone who had no previous experience in his craft and was completely untested."¹⁴ What this opening encounter does indicate, however, is that Teisamenos possesses the conspicuous endorsement of Apollo. It is this divine approval that makes him completely irresistible for Sparta. After all, once the Spartans are in possession of him, they are guaranteed victory. In other words, what Apollo has imparted to Teisamenos is talismanic power.

The Spartans reveal that they understand the import of Apollo's conferral of favor when they seek to enlist Teisamenos as "a leader of wars together with the Heraklid kings" (Τεισαμενὸν ποιέεσθαι ἅμα Ἡρακλειδέων τοῖσι βασιλεῦσι ἡγεμόνα τῶν πολέμων [9.33.3]). The striking phrase drove earlier scholars to the point of emendation:

¹² Taita (2001) shows that this award of Spartan citizenship may not have been as unique as Herodotus claims it is.

¹³ Of Teisamenos' misinterpretation Flower (2008b.198) writes, "Herodotus does not explain here how an Iamid could be so stupid or Lacedaemonians so uncharacteristically intelligent."

¹⁴ Flower 2008b.199.

why would the xenophobic Spartans want a foreign seer to be their commander?¹⁵ In fact, the resonance of this phrase reaffirms that, in the eyes of the Spartans, Teisamenos is a talismanic figure.¹⁶ For, as I argue in the following section, to be called a “leader of war” is to be acknowledged as a bearer of *kudos*. Teisamenos’ kудic capability opens up a space for him on the same level as the Spartan kings and accounts for his partnership with them. What is more, that Teisamenos is aligned with the Heraklid rulers in this way is consistent with the kings’ own claim to military hegemony. Like that of Teisamenos, the Spartan kings’ roles as commanders of the army do not stem from any martial expertise they might possess but derive from their own talismanic authority.¹⁷

§ *Talismanic leaders of war*

The convergence of leading armies and having talismanic potency in Book 9 of the *Histories* is not an isolated incident tailored to the singular character of Teisamenos. In the period of the late sixth to early fifth centuries BCE, a number of athletic victors and cult-heroes fit this description.¹⁸ Particularly in accounts of the Persian Wars, i.e., concurrently with Teisamenos’ *floruit*, authors emphasize the athletic history of *stratēgoi* and also refer to epiphanic heroes who appear on the front lines of battle and steer their city’s army into the fray.¹⁹

Here I will touch on only those athletes who specifically perform the role of military commander, whether it be of a single ship or of an entire army, so as to provide the most vivid parallels to Teisamenos. It is important to remember that the placement of crown victors as commanders cannot be explained solely on the grounds that their physical prowess, exhibited in athletic contests, is simply redirected toward warfare.²⁰ Rather, as I discussed in the introduction, Kurke demonstrates that a crown victor is not enlisted for his brute force alone but rather as a polis’ attempt to appropriate his *kudos* for its own success in battle. Similarly, as Bruno Currie shows, cult-heroes are also viewed as contributing their *mana* for the benefit of their city.²¹

¹⁵ For example, How and Wells (ad 9.33.3) write of ἡγεμόνα τῶν πολέμων, “This cannot mean that the seer was to share the actual command in war, for in comparison with this the grant of citizenship would be nothing. It seems to refer to the position of the kings as priests, since they offered sacrifice before all important undertakings (Xen. *Rep. Lac.* 13). Teisamenos was to act with them in this.”

¹⁶ Kurke (1993.135-36) has discussed Teisamenos as a figure of *kudos* in reference to his athletic activity. I look at Teisamenos as an athlete below.

¹⁷ On the talismanic power of the Spartan kings, see Cartledge 1987.109-10 and Carlier 1984 *passim*.

¹⁸ On why athletes appear as talismanic in the archaic and early classical periods, see Kurke 1993.149-55. But there are other examples of talismanic figures: Homeric heroes (Benveniste 1973.1346-56; Currie 2005.178-80, 186-87) and Spartan kings (Cartledge 1987.109-10).

¹⁹ On the class issue (i.e., that only aristocrats could afford to be both athletes and generals), see Kurke 1993.153-55. Of military epiphanies, Pritchett (1979.17) asserts, “...the weight of the ancient testimonia supports the theory that actual physical participation by heroes in the hour of battle was sought by the Greeks themselves.” For epiphanies, see Versnel 1987; Harrison 2000.82-92; Hornblower 2001.135-47 with further bibliography.

²⁰ Moreover, that the epiphanies of heroes are described in terms similar to these athletes should be reason alone to dismiss any insistence that a crown victor’s value lies strictly in his physical presence. The victors discussed in this chapter, however, are but a few of the many Greeks whose past feats as athletes are part of the present praise they receive as warriors. As Currie (2005.150) remarks, “It is striking how often literary sources find it worth mentioning the athletic credentials of persons who distinguished themselves in battle.”

²¹ Currie terms these heroes “saving heroes.” See, e.g., Currie 2005.212.

Eurybates, for example, leads a company of volunteers from Argos to Aegina to assist the island against the Athenians in the early fifth century: ἤγε δὲ αὐτοὺς στρατηγὸς [ἄνῆρ ᾧ οὖνομα] Εὐρυβάτης, (ἄνῆρ) πεντάεθλον ἐπασκήσας (“The general Eurybates who had practiced the pentathlon led them” [6.92]).²² Since the nineteenth century, commentators have preferred to insert an ἄνῆρ into the second half of the clause, but the emendation dilutes the starkness of a simpler image: a general who participated in the pentathlon.²³ As Pausanias’ version of this same event reveals, Eurybates did not merely enter the pentathlon: he also won it at Nemea (1.29.5).

To the crown victor Eurybates can be added Eualkides, an Eretrian general at the time of the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 5.102). From among the many “men of renown” routed and killed by the Persians at Ephesus, Eualkides is the only one whom Herodotus chooses to identify.²⁴ The historian records that Eualkides, in addition to being a *strategos*, had won “στεφανηφόρους ἀγῶνας” (“contests in which the prize was a crown” [5.102.3]). Two athletes from Kroton also fall under the rubric of victor-turned-military commander. The first, to whom we will return below, is Philippos son of Boutakides, “an Olympic victor and the most beautiful man of his time” (5.47). Philippos contributed a trireme at his own expense to the oikist Dorieus’ colonial venture and fought together with him in the fatal confrontation against the Phoenicians and the Egestaeans over the settlement’s site, presumably leading the force with which he had manned his ship.²⁵ The second Krotoniate is a certain Phayllos, a three-time Pythian victor, who, according to Herodotus, was alone among the western Greeks to lend his support at Salamis. Like Philippos, Phayllos could only offer one ship: Τῶν δὲ ἐκτὸς τούτων οἰκημένων Κροτωνιῆται μοῦνοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐβοήθησαν τῇ Ἑλλάδι κινδυνεύουση νηὶ μιῇ, τῆς ἦρχε ἄνῆρ τρις πυθιονίκης Φάυλλος· (“Of those who lived outside of [Greece], the Krotoniates were the only ones who offered assistance to Greece when she was in danger with one ship, which Phayllos a three-time victor at the Pythian games commanded” [8.47]). As Kurke writes, “We might think one ship is very paltry aid, but the parallel of a *single* crown victor fighting beside the Spartan king should give us pause. Perhaps the substantive aid was not the ship, but the man it carried, a talisman potent with three Pythian victories.”²⁶ The arrangement of the anecdote itself reaffirms this conclusion. By delaying Phayllos’ athletic record until the end of the sentence, Herodotus presents the sole ship as syntactically overtaken by his three victories.

The Phayllos passage brings us as well to the consideration of cult-heroes as leaders of war.²⁷ In his narration of the battle of Salamis, Herodotus states that in the run-

²² I reproduce here Macan’s text. Macan brackets ἄνῆρ ᾧ οὖνομα because the words are absent in two of the major MSS (PR). Vannicelli 2005.267 suggests that Herodotus closely links Eurybates’ performances as a pentathlete and as a military general: Herodotus states that Eurybates won three duels before being killed in the fourth. Vannicelli points out that the pentathlon was also best of three. Eurybates’ performance in the battle thus reflects his performance as an athlete.

²³ Stein inserts the ἄνῆρ by analogy with 9.75 (where Eualkides is referred to as a “ἄνδρα πεντάεθλον”) and 9.105 (where Ermolukos is a “ἄνῆρ παγκράτιον ἐπασκήσας”). See Stein 1908 ad loc.

²⁴ Herodotus presumably knows the names of these other men as well, but chooses to reveal only that of Eualkides. Cf. his similar decision vis-à-vis the seer Megistias (Hdt. 7.228).

²⁵ Hdt. 5.46.1. Philippos probably also played a role in Kroton’s war against Sybaris, at least in one tradition (see Hdt. 5.42-48 [the Dorieus episode] and below).

²⁶ Kurke 1993.137. Emphasis in original.

²⁷ For a full list of military epiphanies, see Pritchett 1979.11-46. Pritchett counts a total of forty-nine.

up to the confrontation the Greeks resolved to call upon the Aiakidai to be their allies; thereupon a ship was sent to Aegina to retrieve the heroes (8.64). After the battle was won, the Aiginetans claimed that the ship carrying the Aiakidai was the first to engage the Persian fleet (8.84). In other words, the Aiakidai, according to Aiginetan tradition, led the rest of the fleet into battle. Kurke suggests that there is a “precise analogy between the one ship bearing the Aiginetan heroes and that which carried the crown victor [Phayllos] – both contribute their talismanic power, their *mana*, to the fighting force.”²⁸ The Aiakidai are not the only heroes found leading the charge during the Persian Wars. In his *Life of Theseus* (35.3), Plutarch records that during the battle of Marathon, many believed they saw Theseus in arms charging out ahead of them towards the enemy (Plut. *Thes.* 35.3).²⁹ For their part, the Abderites pray to their eponymous hero to advance their army in Pindar *Paeon 2*: Ἀβδ[η]ρηε, καὶ στ[ρατὸν] ἱπποχάρμαν / σᾶ βίᾳ πολέ[μ]ῳ τελευ/ταί[ω] προβι[β]άζοις (“Abderos, and may you lead forward the army that delights in horses with your might for the final war” [104-6]). At the end of the fifth century and of the Peloponnesian War, the Dioskouroi, “gods who are after all rather prone to epiphany,”³⁰ appear at Aigospotamoî. Some reportedly saw the twins in the form of stars gleaming upon the tillers of Lysander’s ship as he sailed out against the enemy (Plut. *Lys.* 12.1).³¹ Insofar as they appear on the flagship of the fleet, these sons of Zeus perform a role akin to that of the Aiakidai at Salamis. Finally, at the battle of the river Sagra between the (Epizephyrian) Lokrians and the Krotoniates, the Krotoniate general Leonymos is said to have positioned himself opposite the place in the Lokrian front line where Aias was standing (Konon *FGrH* 26F1.xviii; Paus. 3.19.12). Despite being vastly outnumbered, the Lokrians prevailed.³² In Diodorus’ account of the same conflict, the historian relates another tradition in which the Lokrians were also accompanied by the Dioskouroi, whom the Spartans had lent to them for assistance (Diod. 8.32).³³

On numerous occasions, then, crown victors and epiphanic heroes lead armies, either performing the role of military commander (e.g. Eurybates) or physically standing in the front lines of battle and launching the attack (e.g., Theseus for the Athenians at Marathon). This position is not dependent on technical military experience but rather on the perception that these figures possess an outsized portion of divine approval or are themselves divine. Because one of the salient characteristics of *kudos* is that it guarantees victory,³⁴ talismanic individuals appear in accounts of extraordinary upsets for which explanations based on sheer physical skill seem insufficient.³⁵ Furthermore, precisely because these figures are consistently connected to unexpected achievements, they are

²⁸ Kurke 1993.137.

²⁹ In his description of the figures and events associated with the battle of Marathon on the Stoa Poikile, Pausanias (1.15.3) says that he saw a representation of Theseus rising out of the ground. This suggests that the story was already current in the fifth century BCE.

³⁰ Hornblower 2001.143.

³¹ This epiphany is also commemorated in an epigram from Delphi (ML 95).

³² By Justin’s reckoning, there were fifteen hundred Lokrians to the Krotoniates’ one hundred and twenty thousand (Justin 20.2-3); Strabo 261 offers slightly less dramatic, although still incredibly disproportionate, figures. See Dunbabin 1948.358.

³³ According to Diodorus 8.32, the Dioskouroi left Sparta together with Lokrian envoys who had arranged for a couch (*klinê*) to be placed aboard their ship especially for the heroes on their journey back to Lokris.

³⁴ Recall Benveniste’s (1973.348) definition: “The gift of *kûdos* ensures the triumph of the man who receives it: in combat the holder of *kûdos* is invariably victorious.”

³⁵ See Hornblower 2001 on this perception of the Persian Wars, especially in their immediate aftermath.

often credited with winning or at least with helping to win the battles in which they participate. Recall that the presence of the Aiakidai and the Pythian victor Phayllos at Salamis can be thought of as two different ways of helping to explain the Greeks' remarkable upset of the Persian fleet (Hdt. 8.64 and 8.47, respectively) and that Milo the athlete is said to be the cause (*aition*) of the outnumbered Krotoniates' victory (Diod. Sic. 12.9.6).

We can return to Teisamenos' characterization in Book 9 of the *Histories*. First, given the examples of *kudos*-bearing figures commanding armies, I argue that Herodotus uses the phrase “*hêgemôn* of wars” as a signpost for talismanic potency. The Spartans believe that Apollo has granted Teisamenos *kudos*. Accordingly, they make him a leader of war and thereby place him in a position reserved for other talismanic figures. Second, like these athletes and heroes, Teisamenos also receives credit for winning the battles in which he takes part (9.33.2; 9.35.1), a further demonstration of perceived talismanic power.

§ *Teisamenos as Athlete*

Teisamenos' own characterization as a potential crown victor amplifies his talismanic status even as his *kudos* is ultimately directed towards winning battles as a *mantis* and not as an athlete. The interplay between *mantis* and athlete encapsulated in the portrayal of Teisamenos can best be seen by comparing the two sentences that frame his *logos*. After introducing Teisamenos as the Spartans' seer, Herodotus provides the following explanation:

Τεισαμενῶ γὰρ μαντευομένῳ ἐν Δελφοῖσι περὶ γόνου ἀνεῖλε ἡ Πυθίη
ἀγῶνας τοὺς μεγίστους ἀναιρήσεσθαι πέντε.

(Hdt. 9.33.2)

For when Teisamenos was consulting the oracle at Delphi about offspring the Pythia gave the response that he would win the five greatest contests.

At first glance, the opening participial phrase appears to continue the topic of the preceding sentence (οὗτος γὰρ δὴ εἶπετο τῷ στρατεύματι τούτῳ μάντις· [“For this man was accompanying this army as a *mantis*”] [9.33.1]) and we read “Τεισαμενῶ γὰρ μαντευομένῳ” as “when Teisamenos was acting as a *mantis*.” But straightaway we find ourselves within the sentence at Delphi in a session with the Pythia. We must quickly double back and retranslate “μαντεύομαι” using its alternate definition, “to consult an oracle.” In this way, wordplay pushes Teisamenos the seer aside, a gesture made all the more emphatic by our original misreading. In his place, Teisamenos the athlete begins to emerge as the Pythia utters a prophecy composed in the language of athletic competition (i.e., ἀγῶνας τοὺς μεγίστους ἀναιρήσεσθαι πέντε).³⁶ By the sentence's end, we along

³⁶ This sentence, in fact, contains a number of puns, as others have noticed (e.g., Flower and Marincola 2002 ad loc.). In addition to “μαντεύομαι,” there is the wordplay of “ἀναιρέω” whose two meanings are both present in the sentence (that is, both its active sense of “to give an oracular response” and its sense in the middle voice of “to win”). Moreover, there is the Pythia's response concerning “ἀγῶνας” when what Teisamenos had asked her was “γόνου”; to Macan's ears, this sounded like a “bad pun” (Macan 1908 ad

with Teisamenos believe that the Pythia refers to the crown games, until the Spartans approach the pentathlon-practicing seer and apprise him, and us, of the oracle's true meaning. We can compare this initial sentence of Teisamenos' story with the one that concludes it:

Συγχωρησάντων δὲ καὶ ταῦτα τῶν Σπαρτιητέων, οὕτω δὴ πέντε σφι
μαντευόμενος ἄγωνας τοὺς μεγίστους Τεισαμενὸς ὁ Ἡλεῖος, γενόμενος
Σπαρτιήτης, συγκαταίρει.

(Hdt. 9.35.1)

When the Spartans granted him also these things, that is how acting as a *mantis* for them Teisamenos the Elean, having become a Spartan, helped them to win the five greatest contests.

Although the same words resurface (Τεισαμενὸς, μαντευόμενος, πέντε ἄγωνας τοὺς μεγίστους, (συγκατ)αίρει), the opacity and oracular punning are gone. As signaled by the explanatory “οὕτω δὴ,” the sentence has “righted” itself. In this iteration, Teisamenos *qua mantis* has returned, which the relevant translation of “μαντευόμενος” now confirms, and his mantic capabilities replace athletic ones. This substitution is reflected in the change of word order as well: in contrast to the arrangement of the first sentence, “μαντευόμενος” is here ensconced within the phrase “πέντε ἄγωνας τοὺς μεγίστους” as if to attach further, on the level of syntax, Teisamenos' five victorious “contests” to his performance as a seer.

Both statements assert Teisamenos' guaranteed victories, but whereas the riddle of the first sentence suggests that this success will come in the athletic arena, the second links it to Teisamenos' role as a military *mantis*.³⁷ Put another way, the *kudos* of the seer comes to displace the *kudos* of the potential crown victor. And yet, Teisamenos never fully sheds his athletic reputation. As R. W. Macan has noted of the second statement at 9.35.1, “[I]t marks the solemnity of the occasion with a quasi-heraldic flourish” that recalls the herald's victory announcement for athletes. Kurke adds, “Herodotus' diction in this context bears striking similarities to the official victory announcement at the games.”³⁸ Even at his greatest moment as a seer, then, Teisamenos is made to sound like an athlete.

We will return to the figuration of Teisamenos as both an athlete and a seer below. Here it is sufficient to note that, as seen in the examples of athletic victors above, Teisamenos fits within the cultural pattern of associating talismanic “leaders of war” with

loc). Notice that for both of these puns (i.e., ἀνεῖλε/ἀναίρησεσθαι and γόνου/ἄγωνας) the wordplay concludes with the sense of the word most strongly associated with athletic competition and, further, that this occurs at the expense of the words' association with the language of oracles and divination. Thus, in the case of “ἀναίρω,” the definition “to consult an oracle” is replaced by the meaning “to win (athletic competitions or wars).” Likewise, because asking about offspring is a question commonly found in oracular consultation (see Flower and Marincola 2002.167), the Delphic connotations of this word (γόνου) are displaced by a pun on the athletic connotations of “ἄγωνας.” I point to these other puns as additional evidence that Teisamenos and divination are displaced by the language of athletic games and crown victors as the sentence develops.

³⁷ This convergence also works because of the parallels between athletics and warfare.

³⁸ Kurke 1993.136. On the form victory announcements can take, see Kurke 1993.142-44.

the crown games. At the same time, however, Teisamenos is not just a would-be crown victor, he is also and fundamentally a seer. I turn now to look at how Teisamenos' classification as a "leader of war," that is, as a *kudos*-bearing figure, accords with his more successful profession as a *mantis*.

§ *The kudos of seers*

Teisamenos is not the only seer endowed with *kudos*. We can see the same signposts of talismanic potency, namely, leading armies and winning wars, in the case of other seers as well. In the *Iliad*, Kalchas "led the ships of the Achaeans into Ilium through his seercraft, which Phoebus Apollo gave him" (νήεσσ' ἠγήσατ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον εἴσω ἦν διὰ μαντοσύνην, τήν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων [Il. 1.71-2]).³⁹ Tellias of Elis is known to Herodotus as the seer who once hatched (σοφίζεται) a particularly creative stratagem on behalf of Phokis when the city was besieged by the Thessalians (8.27).⁴⁰ Whitening with chalk the bodies and weapons of six hundred Phokians, Tellias sent them on a night attack against the enemy and instructed his men to kill whoever was not painted like themselves. The Phokians inflicted heavy losses on the surprised Thessalians terrified by the sight of ghostly, whitened men in their midst.⁴¹ Pausanias also mentions Tellias, explaining the seer's relation to the Phokians in greater detail:

στρατηγοὶ δὲ ἦσαν σφίσι Ῥοῖός τε Ἀμβροσσεύς καὶ Ὑαμπολίτης Δαΐφάντης, οὗτος μὲν δὴ ἐπὶ τῇ ἵππῳ, δυνάμεως δὲ τῆς πεζῆς ὁ Ἀμβροσσεύς. ὁ δὲ χῶραν <έν> τοῖς ἄρχουσι ἐχῶν τὴν μεγίστην μάντις ἦν <Τελλίας> ὁ Ἥλειος, καὶ ἐς τὸν Τελλίαν τοῖς Φωκεῦσι τῆς σωτηρίας ἀπέκριντο αἱ ἐλπίδες.

(Paus. 10.1.8-9)

Their commanders were Rhoios of Ambrossos and and Daiphantes of Hyampolis, the former for the calvary and the latter for the infantry. But the man who held the greatest place among the leaders was Tellias the Elean and in this Tellias the Phokians had placed their hopes of salvation.

Tellias is not only a *mantis* but also the most important of the Phokian *stratēgoi*. Later in Book 10, Pausanias once again mentions Tellias while describing a statue the Phokians dedicated at Delphi. Here Tellias is depicted as actually leading the Phokians against the Thessalians (Φωκέων καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀνάθημα, ὅτε σφίσι ἐπὶ τοὺς Θεσσαλοὺς Τελλίας ἠγήσατο Ἥλειος "This is a dedication from the Phokians when Tellias the Elean led them against the Thessalians" [10.13.7]).⁴² Fittingly, Tellias has a more famous

³⁹ As Flower and Marincola 2002.169 observe, "This notion of 'leading' may go back to the Near East since the Babylonian seer was likewise said to 'go in front of the army' (West 1997.349)."

⁴⁰ For a detailed discussion of this episode, see McInerney 1998 Chapt. 6.

⁴¹ Cf. the seer Theaenetus who, together with the general Eupompides, devised a plan of escape for the Plataians in 428/7 BCE (Thuc. 3.20.1).

⁴² Cf. Aristomenes' seer Theoklos, as well as Theoklos' son, Mantiklos, both of whom played an important role in the Second Messenian War (Paus. 4.14-24). During the Spartans' siege of the Messenian stronghold, Eira, Pausanias records, "πρῶτοι δὲ ἦσθοντο ἔνδον τῶν πολεμίων ὄντων καὶ ἐβοήθουν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς πρῶτοι Γόργος τε ὁ Ἀριστομένους καὶ Ἀριστομένης αὐτὸς Θεόκλος τε ὁ μάντις καὶ Μάντικλος ὁ Θεόκλου..." ("The first to perceive that the enemy were inside and the first to lend assistance against them

relative, the Persians' seer at Plataia and another member of the Telliadai clan, Hegesistratos, who bears the revealing name of "Leader of the Army."⁴³ Megistias, the Spartans' seer at Thermopylae, while not called a *hêgemôn* himself, is linked to the term in his epitaph. Herodotus records the inscription and attributes it to Simonides:

Μνημα τόδε κλεινοῖο Μεγιστία, ὃν ποτε Μῆδοι
Σπερχειὸν ποταμὸν κτείναν ἀμειψάμενοι,
μάντιος, ὃς τότε Κῆρας ἐπερχομένης σάφα εἰδῶς
οὐκ ἔτλη Σπάρτης ἡγεμόνα προλιπεῖν.
(Hdt. 7.228.3)

This is the memorial of glorious Megistias whom once the Medes killed having crossed the river Spercheios, a seer, who, although at that time he knew clearly that the Kerae were approaching, did not suffer to abandon the *hêgemôn* of Sparta.

As we might expect, the inscription honors the seer's ability to perceive the future (i.e., to foresee his own approaching death). Yet, as the second couplet continues, we realize that Megistias' skill as a diviner is subordinate to a greater achievement: that the seer did not abandon his Spartan *hêgemôn*. The ringing conclusion of the dedication is Megistias' abiding connection to the king of Sparta. Moreover, as John Dillery has observed,

[O]nly Leonidas and Megistias are named in memorial epitaphs of the battle, both by Simonides, even though Herodotus knows the names of the other men who distinguished themselves there (Hdt. 7.226-7)...While Megistias was...an outsider, he is put on the same level as Leonidas, one of the most famous kings of Sparta.⁴⁴

Dillery's observation that Megistias is "put on the same level as Leonidas" should remind us of Teisamenos' position as "a leader of wars together with the Heraklid kings." Pietro Vannicelli suggests that the Spartans' negotiations with and eventual hiring of Teisamenos occurred after the death of Megistias at Thermopylae, not before the entire expedition of Xerxes as others have argued.⁴⁵ Vannicelli's dating implies that Teisamenos is the replacement seer for Megistias; if Teisamenos is indeed filling the mantic shoes of Megistias, then there is a real possibility that we are meant to think of Megistias as a "leader of wars" for Sparta as well.

Having seen particular seers cast as leaders of war, we can move on to trace how, just as Teisamenos is twice said to win battles, other seers are also regarded as the cause of victory in war. In Euripides' *Phoinissai*, Teiresias proclaims,

were Gorgos son of Aristomenes, Aristomenes himself, Theoklos the mantis and Mantiklos the son of Theoklos..." [4.21.2]). Here again, there is no mention of the seers practicing divination. Rather, what is emphasized is their roles as commanders and leaders. On Theoklos, Pritchett (1979.56) writes, "On the Messenian side the seer Theoklos played a role second only to that of Aristomenes and died after fighting valiantly (4.21.11)."

⁴³ On Hegesistratos, see below.

⁴⁴ Dillery 2005.205.

⁴⁵ Vannicelli 2005.261.

κόπῳ παρῆμαι γοῦν Ἐρεχθιδῶν ἀπο
δεῦρ' ἐκκομισθεὶς τῆς πάροιθεν ἡμέρας·
κάκεϊ γὰρ ἦν τις πόλεμος Εὐμόλπου δορός,
οὗ καλλινίκους Κεκροπίδας ἔθηκ' ἐγώ·
καὶ τόνδε χρυσοῦν στέφανον, ὡς ὄραϊς, ἔχω
λαβῶν ἀπαρχὰς πολεμίων σκυλευμάτων.
(*Phoin.* 852-57)

Yes, I am weary, having traveled here from the land of the Erechthidae yesterday. For there was a war there too of the armed forces of Eumolpos over whom I made the sons of Kekrops victorious. And as you see, I wear this golden crown having received it from the first fruits of the enemy spoils.

Other Iamidai in addition to Teisamenos delivered success in battle. In one version of the conflict between Kroton and Sybaris, for example, the Krotoniates claim that Kallias of Elis, an Iamid *mantis*, was the only foreigner to come to their assistance (Hdt. 5.44-45).⁴⁶ The outnumbered Krotoniates managed to defeat the favored, more powerful Sybarites, and Kallias was generously rewarded for his assistance with extensive lands still held by the seer's descendants in Herodotus' day. Kallias was perceived as instrumental to Kroton's achievement.

Pausanias attributes the remarkable destruction of the Athenian navy at Aigospotamoi to a seer:

τοῦτον τὸν Ἄγιαν μαντευσάμενόν φασι Λυσάνδρῳ τὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐλεῖν
ναυτικὸν περὶ Αἰγὸς ποταμοῦς πλὴν τριήρων δέκα·
(Paus. 3.11.5)

They say that this Agias, having provided his services as a seer to Lysander on this occasion, captured the Athenian navy at Aigospotamoi except for ten triremes.

A later reference by Pausanias bolsters the surprising anecdote of Agias' performance at Aigospotamoi. Pausanias reports that Lysander included a statue of Agias on the so-called Navarchs monument that he erected at Delphi from Athenian spoils (10.9.7).⁴⁷ My final example is one that recalls Teisamenos' own biography. An early fourth-century stele bears a decree of the Athenian ekklesia announcing that the seer Sthorys of Thasos will be granted both Athenian citizenship and the privilege of dining in the Prytaneum

⁴⁶ For a fuller discussion of this episode, see below.

⁴⁷ The statue group included a number of gods as well as Lysander himself being crowned by Poseidon, and Hermon, the helmsman of Lysander's flagship. Additionally, Pausanias writes of a bronze statue of Agias which he saw in the agora at Sparta (3.11.5). This Agias was, in fact, the grandson of Teisamenos (see Flower 2008b.205). On the hereditary nature of *mantikē*, see Flower 2008a.27, 37. Teisamenos' great-grandson or great-nephew (also named Teisamenos) seems to have played an important role in the conspiracy of Cinadon in Sparta in 397 BCE (Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.11). The original Teisamenos' successful bid for Spartan citizenship thus appears to have been a privilege that remained in his family for generations.

(*JG* II² 17 + *SEG* 15.84 + *SEG* 16.42 = Osborne *Naturalization* D8). What the lacunose decree also seems to state is that the Athenians awarded Sthorys these rights for his service in a naval battle: *περὶ τῆς ναυμαχίας* (lines 26-27).

To the extent that scholars have discussed the references to seers as military commanders and victors, they have tended to understand the significance of these attributes vis-à-vis the seer as a specialist in divination. Most recently, for example, Flower has explained Teisamenos as a “leader of wars” with the help of Homer’s description of Kalchas. Because Herodotus does not portray Teisamenos as having “any active role in the actual battle, either in marshalling troops or in the fighting” his role must be akin to that of the *Iliad*’s seer (νήεσσ’ ἠγήσατ’ Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον εἶσω ἦν διὰ μαντοσύνην, τὴν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων· “He led the ships of the Achaeans into Ilium through his seercraft, which Phoebus Apollo gave him” [*Iliad* 1.71-72]). Flower concludes, “Like Calchas, then, Tisamenus *leads* the army and practices the art of divination as Apollo’s gift.”⁴⁸ Although I agree with this statement insofar as Teisamenos, like Kalchas, is present as the army’s *mantis*, nevertheless, such a conclusion fails to account for why, if their capacity to lead has strictly to do with *mantikê*, only some seers are cast as military commanders or credited with winning wars. The examples we have seen above seem reserved for exceptional cases. That is to say, Flower’s explanation that Teisamenos and Kalchas lead through divination cannot account for what exactly makes Teisamenos and Kalchas so extraordinary and what sets them apart from the many other “regular” seers also practicing *mantikê* on campaign.

Yet, the above discussion reveals that, like crown victors and heroes, Teisamenos and his fellow *manteis* are depicted as leading armies and winning battles. What is more, because athletes and heroes exhibit these attributes as a direct result of their talismanic nature, we can make a similar assertion about seers: seers can gain the standing of commanders and victors in consequence of their own perceived talismanic properties. In addition to the “ordinary” seers who already claim a connection to the gods by virtue of their *mantikê technê*, there are other *manteis* whose relationship to the divine is deemed so markedly superior and concentrated as to transform the seers into talismans themselves.⁴⁹ It is not coincidental that we should find Kalchas and Teiresias, the seers *par excellence* of epic and tragedy, respectively, who were unequivocally viewed as possessing a copious share of divine favor, cast in this way. To return to a lesser-known example, without Agias being regarded as a carrier of *kudos*, it is difficult to see how he could have been credited with capturing nearly all the ships of the Athenian navy at Aigospotamoi.

§ *A dedication for Kleoboulos*

Having seen that seers can wield *kudos*, we are now prepared to consider two dedicatory inscriptions in which this capability becomes the salient component of a seer’s identity.

In the fourth century, Aeschines praises his uncle for defeating Sparta in a sea battle:

⁴⁸ Flower 2008b.203. Emphasis in original.

⁴⁹ Although the correspondence is not exact, we can think of this hierarchical difference between seers and “super” seers as being akin to the distinction between athletes and Olympic victors.

καὶ ὁ τῆς μητρὸς τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀδελφός, θεῖος δὲ ἡμέτερος, Κλεόβουλος ὁ
Γλαύκου τοῦ Ἀχαρνέως υἱός, μετὰ Δημαινέτου τοῦ Βουζύγου
συγκατεναυμάχησε Χείλωνα τὸν Λακεδαιμονίων ναύαρχον·
(*De falsa legatione* 78).⁵⁰

And the brother of my mother, my uncle, Kleoboulos, the son of Glaukos of
Acharnai together with Demainetos of the clan of the Bouzygai assisted in
conquering at sea Cheilon the navarch of the Lakedaimonians.

We might assume that Aeschines' uncle was simply an admiral of the Athenian fleet if it
were not for the following inscription on a grave stele dated to the second quarter of the
fourth century BCE and discovered at Menidi, ancient Acharnai (*SEG* 16.193). The first
part of the inscription appears at the top of the stele above a relief of an eagle clutching a
serpent in its talons:

Κλεόβουλος Ἀχα[ρνεύς]
μάντις.

An epigram in hexameters is inscribed below the eagle and serpent:

Γλαύκο παῖ Κλεόβουλε θανόντα σε γαῖα καλ[ύπτει]
ἀμφότερον μάντιν τε ἀγαθὸν καὶ δορὶ μα[χητήν],
ὄν ποτ' Ἐρεχθέως μεγαλήτορος ἐστεφά[νωσε]
δῆμος ἀριστεύσαντα καθ' Ἑλλάδα κῦδος ἀρ[έσθαι].⁵¹

Son of Glaukos, Kleoboulos, having died the earth covers you
both a mantis and a good fighter with the spear,
whom once the people of great-hearted Erectheus crowned
having been the best throughout Greece to win *kudos*.

As the patronymic and demotic reveal, we are dealing with the same Kleoboulos, the
uncle of Aeschines, who was reportedly responsible for a naval victory. The second line
of the epigram has a pedigree extending back through Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*
and Pindar to the *Thebaid* and paraphrases Adrastus' estimation of Amphiaros at Pindar
Olympian 6.17 as “ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δορὶ μάρνασθαι” (“both a mantis
and good at fighting with the spear”).⁵² But it is the final two lines that demand our
attention here. The epigram contains two especially prominent tokens of a figure
endowed with talismanic power. First, the image of the *demos* crowning Kleoboulos
signals his *kudos*: Kurke discerns a “persistent connection between *kudos* and crowns” in

⁵⁰ For the possible battle to which Aeschines refers (and the orator's likely exaggeration of the significance of this event), see Harris 1995.23-24.

⁵¹ This is the text printed in *SEG*. For a slightly different version of the third line, see Papademetriou 1957. Daux (1958) brackets both ἐστεφά[νωσε] and κῦδος ἀρ[έσθαι] in their entirety; most subsequent scholars follow his text.

⁵² Papademetriou (1957.160) first observed this connection between the inscription and Pindar. For the connections to Aeschylus and the *Thebaid*, see Flower 2008a 96-97.

agonistic inscriptions and epinikion for athletic victors.⁵³ Second, as Benveniste notes, Homer uses the formula *kudos aresthai* to designate a warrior who has talismanic power. For instance, Hektor proclaims, “The son of Kronos gave to me to win *kudos* (κῦδος ἀρέσθ’) beside the ships and to pen the Achaeans by the sea” (*Il.* 18.293-94).⁵⁴ The attribution of talismanic power to Kleoboulos is thus overdetermined in this inscription.

In light of this chapter’s demonstration that seers have talismanic potency, I conclude Part 1 with a suggested reading of a contested inscription, *IG VII.1670 = SEG XVI.304 = CEG 328*. The inscription appears on a fragment of a marble base found below Mt. Kithairon in Boiotia. Approximately twenty-five meters away lie the probable remains of the sanctuary of Demeter beside which the final engagement between the Greeks and Persians at the battle of Plataia took place (*Hdt.* 9.62). Following W. Kendrick Pritchett, Michael Flower and John Marincola believe that the dedication originally stood in this nearby sanctuary and date the inscription to the early fifth-century from its letter-forms.⁵⁵ I reproduce Flower and Marincola’s text:

[Δ]άματρο[ς] τόδ’ ἄγαλμα [~~~~~ x]

[ἐ]νθάδε γ’ [ἐ]ἰσοράοντι σε[~~~~~ x]

[Τ]εισαμενὸς Φυδάδας καὶ [~~~~~ x]

This is the statue of Demeter...

Here for one looking upon...

Teisamenos of the family Kudadai and...

The provenance and date of the dedication increase the likelihood that this inscription refers to the very Teisamenos who became a “leader of wars” and claimed his first victory at Plataia in Herodotus’ *Histories*.⁵⁶ I follow Albert Schachter’s suggestion that Φυδάδας refers to a particular family of seers, and I draw attention to the hitherto unnoticed fact that Φυδάδας seems to have a connection with *kudos*.⁵⁷ This reading suggests that Teisamenos and his family actively sought to advertise their reputed ability

⁵³ Kurke 1993.131.

⁵⁴ For additional examples of Homeric heroes winning *kudos*, see Benveniste 1973.351-53.

⁵⁵ Flower and Marincola 2002.320.

⁵⁶ Peek (1937.233) thought he could see a trace of a tau at the beginning of the third line, but Pritchett (1979.146) was not able to discern it. For a commentary on this inscription as well as a bibliography, see Flower and Marincola 2002.320-22.

⁵⁷ Schachter 2000. Scholars disagree over the meaning of Φυδάδας, and it is variously taken as a separate proper name (i.e., Teisamenos, Kydadas, and...), a patronymic (i.e., Teisamenos, son of Kydas, and...), or as the name of a family (i.e., Teisamenos of the family of the Kydadae [of the Iamidai clan] and...) (See Flower and Marincola 2002.231-32). Regardless of whether the name is a proper name, a patronymic, or a family name, all three translations of Φυδάδας provide further evidence of a general link between seers and *kudos*. “Son of Kydas,” however, does contradict Herodotus’ assertion that Teisamenos was the son of Antiochos (9.33.1). N.B.: I realize that the upsilon scans as short. I want to pursue further, however, the possibility that seers are associated both with κύδος (reproach, abuse) and κῦδος and the possibility of a folk etymology linking these two words. κύδος might reflect the destructive aspect perceived in seers and their reputation for causing harm – a topic I will explore in Chapters 3 and 4. For now, this reading remains a mere suggestion but is something I plan to study more thoroughly.

to guarantee victory by going so far as to bear a name with associations of “*kudos*.”⁵⁸ Herodotus was right to insist on Teisamenos’ talismanic potency.

Part 2. Intersections and Interchange Within a Nexus of *Kudos*

In Part 1, we uncovered a cultural tendency to regard Greek seers as having *kudos*. In Part 2, I explore how these seers overlap and converge with other discrete categories of *kudos*-wielding individuals. By viewing seers as part of a larger nexus of talismanic figures, we can begin to make sense of a number of instances in the context of warfare in which the presence and role of seers initially seem incongruous or illogical. I examine three types of interaction between seers and other talismans. First, I look at the different ways in which *kudos* can appear in duplicate: the Greeks hoarded *kudos* by doubling up on talismanic figures, and they also held that an individual’s talismanic power could be manifested in more than one pursuit. Second, I investigate two different cases of talismans being pitted against each other by their opposing armies. Third, I consider how three distinct talismanic figures perform an identical function in three competing accounts of the same conflict.

§ *Doubling kudos*

At the battle of Aigospotamoi, Pausanias credits Agias with capturing all but ten ships of the Athenian navy (3.11.5), whereas Plutarch records that the Dioskouroi were seen upon Lysander’s ship (*Lys.* 12.1). These seemingly disparate accounts are actually two different riffs on the same impulse to attribute Sparta’s remarkable defeat of the Athenian navy at least in part to talismanic agency. Both Agias and the Dioskouroi are represented on the Navarchs monument at Delphi that Lysander dedicated after the battle (Paus. 10.9.7). Thus we can read this monument as the sculptural equivalent to the way in which Herodotus preserves two separate traditions of the presence of talismanic figures at Salamis, one which features the three-time Pythian victor Phayllos and another, Aiginetan variant that highlights the Aiakidai.⁵⁹

Another form of talismanic doubling occurs when a single individual exhibits his *kudos* in more than one way. Consider, for example, two Hellenistic dedications that Pausanias saw at Olympia.⁶⁰ The first is a statue of a member of the Iamidai clan of seers by the name of Satyros:

Σάτυρος δὲ Ἡλεῖος Λυσιάνακτος πατρός, γένους δὲ τοῦ Ἰαμιδῶν, ἐν Νεμέᾳ
πεντάκις ἐνίκησε πυκτεύων καὶ Πυθοῖ τε δὶς καὶ δὶς ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ·

⁵⁸ We can compare this strategy to other military seers, such as Hegesistratos, “Leader of the Army” (Hdt. 9.37), or Hagesias, “Leader” (Pi. O. 6.12) whose names declare their capability.

⁵⁹ Similarly, as we saw above, Pausanias and Diodorus relate two different accounts of the battle of Sagra. Pausanias preserves the tradition that Aias fought in the front lines of the Lokrians (3.19.12) while Diodorus emphasizes the role of the Dioskouroi (8.32). What both reports agree on, however, is that the Lokrians were helped by the presence of talismanically potent heroes.

⁶⁰ For the dating of these statues, see Pritchett 1979.55. For a different interpretation of the statues (that they functioned as advertisements for potential clients interested in the seers’ services), see Flower 2008b.196-97.

(Paus. 6.4.5)⁶¹

Elean Satyros, son of Lysianax, of the clan of Iamidai at Nemea won five times for boxing and at Pytho twice and at Olympia twice.

The second statue celebrates a certain Eperastos:

δύο δὲ αὖθις ἐξ Ἡλιδος, Ἀρχίδαμος τεθρίππῳ νενικηκῶς καὶ Ἐπέραστος ἔστιν
ὁ Θεογόνου ὄπλου νίκην ἀνηρημένος· εἶναι δὲ καὶ μάντις ὁ Ἐπέραστος τοῦ
Κλυτιδῶν γένους φησὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος τῇ τελευτῇ,
τῶν δ' ἱερογλώσσων Κλυτιδᾶν γένος εὐχομαι
εἶναι
μάντις, ἀπ' ἰσοθέων αἶμα Μελαμποδιδᾶν.

(Paus. 6.17.5-6)

There are two, in turn, from Elis, Archedamos who was victorious with the four-horse chariot and Eperastos, son of Theogonos, who captured victory in the race in armor; this Eperastos says that he is also a mantis from the clan of the Klytidai at the end of his inscription:

Of the family of the prophetic-tongued Klytidai I boast
that I am
a mantis, from the blood of the godlike Melampodidai.

Although Pausanias describes both men as seers, and even quotes the statue's inscription that identifies Eperastos as a Klytiad,⁶² he also makes clear that the statues have been dedicated in honor of the seers' athletic, not mantic, talents. In addition to these two seers one notes the *laudandus* of Pindar *Olympian* 6, Hagesias, a victor in the mule race who is additionally given the title of "steward of the mantic altar of Zeus in Pisa" (*O.* 6.5).⁶³ Thus, the talismanic potency that these individuals possess does not restrict itself to their roles as *manteis* but is responsible for their status as crown victors as well. These intersections between the discrete categories of seer and athlete are generated by *kudos*.

In Part 1 of this chapter, I discussed the intratextual connections between the opening and closing sentences of Teisamenos' *logos*, and how Herodotus' wordplay and punning at those moments simultaneously characterize Teisamenos as an athlete and as a seer. We are now in a position to argue that this interchange occurs because Teisamenos' *logos* capitalizes on a nexus of talismanic figures. Teisamenos' *kudos* is manifest in both his *athlêtikê technê* and *mantikê technê* and Herodotus manipulates this correspondence as he portrays Teisamenos now as a potential crown victor, now as a seer. Moreover, this analysis provides a response to Rosaria Munson's remark that "Tisamenus' job description forgets to limit Tisamenus' new assignment to the field of religion."⁶⁴ The

⁶¹ Although Satyros is not explicitly called a *mantis* by Pausanias, I agree with Kett (1966.67) that the fact that Satyros belongs to the mantic clan of the Iamidai makes it reasonable to assume that he was one.

⁶² The clan of the Klytiadai was considered an offshoot of the Melampodidai, as Eperastos' inscription also asserts. Klytiadai is written here in the dedication as Klytiadai, possibly in order to fit the meter (see Flower 2008b.196).

⁶³ I explore the figure of Hagesias in Chapter 4.

⁶⁴ Munson 2001.62.

biography of Teisamenos devotes so much space to the non-divinatory concern of practicing the pentathlon because the common denominator between Teisamenos' involvement in both athletics and *mantikê* is *kudos*.

§ *Pitting talisman against talisman*

Pausanias reports an episode in which a seer vies with another talismanic figure. After Aristomenes' successful rout of the Spartan army during the Second Messenian War, the Messenian leader continued to hound the fleeing Spartan soldiers, accompanied by his *mantis*, Theoklos.⁶⁵ In the middle of their pursuit, Theoklos urged Aristomenes to come to a halt: "And here beside a wild pear tree growing somewhere on the plain Theoklos the seer did not allow Aristomenes to run past: for he said that the Dioskouroi were sitting on the wild pear tree" (Paus. 4.16.5). Theoklos, who is the only one able to see the heroes, does not challenge the Dioskouroi's blockade but neither does he let Aristomenes come to harm. In this scene, the action stalls in a kind of standoff between the participating talismans of each side.

Recruiting a talisman to set against the talisman of an enemy provides a new perspective on the relationship between Teisamenos and Hegesistratos, the seer serving the Persians at Plataia. I want to spend some time demonstrating how Herodotus meticulously details the points of correspondence between the two seers of this decisive battle. I suggest that Herodotus does so in order both to underscore Hegesistratos' own talismanic nature as well as to imply that the Persians hire him specifically to counteract Teisamenos' individual *kudos*.

After Herodotus completes Teisamenos' *logos*, he crosses to the Persian side of the Asopos, to Mardonios, and to his *mantis* Hegesistratos. Here at last we find the answering *de*, the counterbalance to the *men* that introduced Teisamenos three chapters earlier:

Μαρδονίῳ δὲ προθυμειομένῳ μάχης ἄρχειν οὐκ ἐπιτήδεα ἐγίνετο τὰ ἰρά,
ἀμυνομένῳ δὲ καὶ τούτῳ καλά. καὶ γὰρ οὗτος Ἑλληνικοῖσι ἱροῖσι ἐχρᾶτο,
μάντιν ἔχων Ἡγησίστρατον, ἄνδρα Ἡλεῖόν τε καὶ τῶν Τελλιαδέων ἐόντα
λογιμώτατον...

(Hdt. 9.37.1)

But for Mardonios who was eager (to attack) the omens were not favorable to begin battle, but were also [i.e., like those of the Greek side] propitious if he should be defending himself. For in fact he was also using Greek sacrifices, because he had as a *mantis* Hegesistratos, an Elean man and the most well-known of the Telliadai...

Herodotus' estimation of Hegesistratos as the *logimôtaton* of the Telliadai⁶⁶ is soon explained by the historian's assertion that the seer performed a deed beyond description (ἔργον ἐργάσατο μέζον λόγου [9.37.2, where *logos* echoes the *logimôtaton* of the

⁶⁵ In a later episode, the Olympic victor Phanas of Messenia also accompanies Aristomenes (Paus. 4.17.9).

⁶⁶ The Telliadai are usually classed as one of the four main clans of seers but little is known of them. The seer Tellias appears at Hdt. 8.27, and Philostratus refers to the clan at *vita Apollonii* 5.25.

preceding sentence]) (9.37-38.1). The Spartans had imprisoned this Hegesistratos “in the belief that they had suffered many shocking things at his hands” (ὡς πεπονθότες πολλά τε καὶ ἀνάρσια ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ). Fearing for his life, Hegesistratos somehow got hold of a knife and sliced off just enough of his foot to free it from the prison stock. This audacious act of disfigurement is followed in Herodotus’ narration by a series of intrepid stunts: giving his guards the slip, digging through a wall, and hiding in the woods, Hegesistratos finally limped his way to Tegea, a distance of some thirty miles.⁶⁷ Discovering an abandoned appendage, his astonished captors searched in vain for Hegesistratos. Meanwhile, the seer, recovered from his wound, constructed a wooden prosthetic and, as good as new, applied himself to being “openly hostile towards Sparta” (ἐκ τῆς ἰθέης Λακεδαιμονίοισι πολέμιος [9.37.4]). Hegesistratos was eventually seized by the Spartans and put to death, but Herodotus backtracks from this later event in order to conclude the *logos* with Hegesistratos’ role at Plataia. According to Herodotus, the seer was motivated to medize out of his hatred of the Spartans and his love of profit (κατὰ τε τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ κατὰ τὸ κέρδος. [9.38.1]).

At first glance, Hegesistratos’ tale of escape is not only strange but also seems to have little in common with Teisamenos’ story of athletic competition and Spartan citizenship. Nevertheless, juxtapositions and verbal parallels abound between the two seers so that Teisamenos and Hegesistratos ask to be paired for reasons beyond their linking *men/de* construction.⁶⁸

Both seers perform a kind of intricate duet with Sparta in their respective accounts, although the Sparta that assumes the leading role is markedly different in each. The Spartans shrewdly provide Teisamenos with the correct interpretation to his own oracle, whereas they play the fool to Hegesistratos and his disappearing act. The Spartans hunt down and assassinate Hegesistratos, but they uniquely make Teisamenos and his brother citizens. The language used to describe the seers is also similar. Both seers, for example, are characterized as being exceptional. Teisamenos and his brother Hegias are the only ones out of all mankind to become Spartan citizens (μοῦνοι δὲ δὴ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐγένοντο οὗτοι Σπαρτιήτησι πολιῆται [9.35.1]). Hegesistratos is the most distinguished of the Telliadai clan (τῶν Τελλιαδέων ἐόντα λογμώτατον [9.37.1]), and his singular escape from the Spartan prison is the “bravest deed of all we know” (ἀνδρηιότατον ἔργον πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν [9.37.2]). Moreover, the two figures are both rendered in ways that refer to or conjure the epic past.⁶⁹ Herodotus likens Teisamenos to the mythical seer Melampous, and Hegesistratos’ self-inflicted amputation is “described in the language of heroic accomplishment.”⁷⁰

Appropriately, as if by some sort of onomastic reversal, the names of Teisamenos and Hegesistratos each evoke an attribute more salient in the other. That is, the Greeks’ seer enlisted to be a “leader of wars” is named “Avenger” (Teisamenos) while “Leader of Armies” (Hegesistratos) medizes out of his hatred for Sparta, an act which looks a lot

⁶⁷ According to Flower and Marincola (2002.177), the trip would have also been “mostly uphill”!

⁶⁸ Dillery (2005.208) writes, “But even more than the formal connection, they are united by a common theme: the independent diviner who advances his private interests while serving a non-native power.”

⁶⁹ Dillery 2005.208.

⁷⁰ Dillery 2005.208.

like vengeance.⁷¹ One effect of these “swapped” names is that it draws the two seers into closer alignment. It is hard not to think about Teisamenos as a “leader of wars” without simultaneously thinking “Hegesistratos.”

A further way in which Herodotus establishes Teisamenos and Hegesistratos as an oppositional pair is by gauging their contradictory reactions to the notion of being hired for a wage by their respective armies. *Misthos* appears in both *logoi* but is evaluated differently by each seer.⁷² Teisamenos refuses to be persuaded by pay (μισθῶ ἐπειρῶντο πείσσαντες) and demands that the Spartans make him a citizen, giving him a share of everything (9.33.3-4).⁷³ By rejecting the proffered wage, Teisamenos simultaneously rejects the status of a foreign seer-for-hire such a transaction implies. The seer, in his request for citizenship, aspires instead to take part in Spartan society and to have access to alliances of, for example, kinship and marriage, that that civic interconnectivity implies.⁷⁴ In his demands for such forms of compensation, Teisamenos advocates an embedded economy.⁷⁵ Herodotus’ subsequent comparison of Teisamenos to Melampous, who exacted a share of the kingdom of Argos for curing its women of madness, is therefore apt. Scholars have been troubled by the fact that Herodotus aligns Teisamenos’ request for citizenship with Melampous’ demand for the throne.⁷⁶ For how can someone who (just) wants to be citizen be compared to one who becomes king? Yet, the mythical and historical *manteis* essentially desire the same thing, the assurance of complete inclusion within a given polis.⁷⁷ Both Teisamenos and Melampous insist on more

⁷¹ Teisamenos and Hegesistratos are both “speaking names.” See Harrison 2000.263 n. 48 and Immerwahr 1966.294-95 (on Teisamenos and Hegesistratos’ names specifically). But, as far as I have been able to find, no one else has discussed the fact that their names evoke each other. There is also another Hegesistratos in Book 9 whose name is the focal point of an anecdote (it is taken as a sign of good omen to set sail before the battle of Mykale).

⁷² The word is thus a good example of Simon Hornblower’s (2007.170) maxim about interpreting Herodotus, namely that “negative presentations...are always worth watching.”

⁷³ Flower and Marincola (2002.168) liken “persuading by pay” to being “functionally equivalent to ‘bribing.’” Whether he is being bribed or not, however, I think what Teisamenos disdains is the idea of being hired for money in the first place. Furthermore, I do not see any evidence in the text to support Dillery’s (2005.208) claim that Teisamenos “at least initially” worked for a *misthos*.

⁷⁴ Slightly differently, Dillery 2005.208-209. Dillery thinks that Teisamenos is at first hired for a wage even as he becomes part of the community.

⁷⁵ To use Polanyi’s term (1968.84, 120). But there *is* something suspiciously disjointed and incongruous about the Spartans’ initial attempt to make Teisamenos “a leader together with the Heraklid kings” *for a misthos*. On the one hand, there are the Heraklid kings, awarded this irrevocable position *kata genos*, and on the other, their attempt to simply hire Teisamenos. It does seem like the Spartans are trying to “get away” with something in their effort to pair a position which is sacred and hereditary and permanent (Heraklid kingship) with a simple payment for services rendered.

⁷⁶ For a good summary of the scholarship on this point, see Vannicelli 2005.270-76.

⁷⁷ Melampous, too, rejects the Argives’ initial attempt to hire him (ἐμισθοῦντο) and counters with his own idea of a proper *misthos*: half of their kingdom (Hdt. 9.34.). The fact that both Teisamenos and Melampous insist on bringing their brothers along with them adds to their desire to strike up networks of kinship within their new poleis. Interestingly, Teisamenos’ plan seems to have worked beyond Herodotus narrative since his descendants remained active as Spartan seers for at least several generations (see Flower 2008b.205). There is also reason to believe that Teisamenos and his family were settled in the Spartan village of Pitana, which Herodotus says that he visited himself. I will examine this possibility more closely in the discussion of Pindar *Olympian* 6, but see Flower 2008b.201-202.

enduring forms of compensation, citizenship and kingship, respectively, than money provides.⁷⁸

By contrast, Herodotus concludes Hegesistratos' *logos* with the following characterization:

Τότε δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσωπῷ Μαρδονίῳ μεμισθωμένος οὐκ ὀλίγου ἐθύετό τε καὶ
προεθυμέετο κατὰ τε τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ κατὰ τὸ κέρδος.
(Hdt. 9.38.1)

At that time, on the banks of the Asopos, having been hired for not a small price by Mardonios, he was sacrificing and was eager both on account of his hatred for the Lakedaimonians and on account of profit.

Whereas Teisamenos imagines that he will be compensated by gaining access to forms of interaction that perpetuate a community, Hegesistratos, whose tale comes to a (incriminating) halt upon the word *kerdos*, participates in a disembedded economy.⁷⁹ Hegesistratos not only allows himself to be hired for a handsome price but welcomes the opportunity.

We must account for these scrupulously orchestrated similarities and differences between Teisamenos and Hegesistratos. Although Hegesistratos clearly functions as a foil to Teisamenos,⁸⁰ this opposition is more than simply a literary device. Herodotus' entire digression into the biographies of Teisamenos and Hegesistratos begins with the following statement: ὡς δὲ ἄρα πάντες οἱ ἐτετάχατο κατὰ [τε] ἔθνεα καὶ κατὰ τέλεα, ἐνθαῦτα τῇ δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ ἐθύοντο καὶ ἀμφοτέροι (“When they had all been drawn up by nation and by unit, thereupon on the second day both sides were sacrificing” [Hdt. 9.33.1]). Flower and Marincola observe in their commentary that,

the καί here is emphatic, but there is no reason to suppose (with Macan 664) that one would not have expected the Persians to sacrifice; though their gods were not those of the Greeks, they did sacrifice (1.131-132); what was odd, and what is delayed by Herodotus until it is most appropriate (37.1), is that the Persians were using a *Greek* seer. The Magi, who always preside at a Persian sacrifice (1.132.3), presumably returned with Xerxes to Persia.⁸¹

Regardless of where the Magi actually are, what is noteworthy is that Herodotus emphatically announces that both sides were sacrificing with Greek seers and, further, that this stands in blatant contradiction to Herodotus' earlier statement that the Magi are always present at a Persian sacrifice (1.132.3). More striking still is Mardonios' subsequent behavior. Although he at first abides by the omens Hegesistratos delivers, the Persian commander eventually rejects the portents outright: τὰ τε σφάγια τὰ

⁷⁸ I discuss in Chapter 3 the significance of this request and *why* a seer becoming a permanent fixture within society is a terrifying prospect for both cities (both Argos and Sparta only acquiesce out of utter desperation).

⁷⁹ Again to use Polanyi's term (1968.81-82).

⁸⁰ E.g., Flower and Marincola 2002.175: “Teisamenus' opposite number needs to be a worthy opponent so as to emphasize that this was a serious conflict.”

⁸¹ Flower and Marincola 2002.165. Emphasis in original.

Ἠγησιστράτου ἔαν χαίρειν μηδὲ βιάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ νόμῳ τῶ Περσέων χρεωμένους συμβάλλειν (“With respect to the sacrifices of Hegesistratos, [Mardonios said] to disregard them and not to force them, but rather to give battle using the custom of the Persians” [9.41.4]). In short, Mardonios hires a Greek seer when the Magi could do the job but ultimately ignores Hegesistratos’ predictions. I contend, therefore, that Mardonios is not interested in divination as much as he is interested in Hegesistratos himself. The Persians, I suggest, recruit Hegesistratos in order to set him in opposition to Teisamenos as a competing talismanic figure and to counteract Teisamenos’ talismanic potency with that of another. Like Teisamenos, Hegesistratos seems to enjoy at least temporarily an outsized portion of supernatural assistance and favor. That, at any rate, is one of the conclusions to be drawn from his *logos*, because Hegesistratos’ biography and the nature of his daring escape from Sparta signal a privileged connection to the gods. Hegesistratos *somehow* (κῶς) gets a hold of a knife in prison; he escapes the notice of his guards; he miraculously recovers from a severed foot despite a thirty-mile nocturnal trek to Tegea (9.37.2-3). In Herodotus’ presentation, which resists the clarity of a logical explanation, these achievements appear superhuman, as if Hegesistratos were in some way under the guidance and protection of the divine.⁸² Furthermore, in Book 2, Herodotus offers the same assessment of the Egyptians’ labyrinth as he does of Hegesistratos’ *logos*, that it is “beyond description” (compare λόγου μέζω [2.148.1] and μέζον λόγου [9.37.2]). During his description of the labyrinth, Herodotus also remarks that its rooms were “beyond the work of humans” (τὰ δὲ ἄνω μέζονα ἀνθρωπῶν ἔργων [2.148.6]). That Herodotus uses both “beyond description” and “beyond the work of humans” to refer to the labyrinth suggests that we can make a similar connection between Hegesistratos’ story being beyond description and being beyond human, i.e., divine. In short, I propose that we equate the divine assistance and favor Hegesistratos seems to receive in his *logos* to *kudos*.

Hegesistratos and Teisamenos are meticulously pitted against one other. This extensive juxtaposition indicates that both *manteis* are present at Plataia not only in order to perform customary rites, but also as carefully opposed talismanic seers who are part of an arsenal of *kudos* both armies will roll out against the enemy. Indeed, Herodotus’ focus on the talismanic nature rather than the *mantikē* of the seers is reflected in the composition of their *logoi*, both of which have little to do with divination. In fact, reading large swaths of the two accounts, one would be at a loss to uncover Teisamenos and Hegesistratos’ ostensible professions. Instead, we hear of Teisamenos’ pentathlon and citizenship and Hegesistratos’ severed foot and flight from Sparta.

§ *Interchanges at the crossroads of kudos: the seer, the athlete, and the oikist*

I come then to my final point concerning seers and their place within a nexus of *kudos*-bearing figures. I conclude with a particularly striking example that reveals the extent to which talismanic individuals can intersect and combine.

Herodotus provides two accounts of the late sixth-century war between Kroton and Sybaris (5.44-45). Diodorus Siculus offers a third (12.9). In each version, Sybaris is the aggressor and Kroton the victor, and each version singles out an individual whose

⁸² Cf. Priam’s ability to travel to the Greek encampment right up to Achilles’ hut under the guidance of Hermes in *Iliad* 24.

participation in the battle was crucial for Kroton. Yet, that individual differs in each account. In Herodotus, the Sybarites claim that the Spartan oikist Dorieus interrupted his colonial expedition to Sicilian Eryx to come to the aid of Kroton, whereas the Krotoniates assert that the only foreigner to support them was the Iamid *mantis* Kallias of Elis. In Diodorus Siculus, the athlete Milo, decked in all six of his Olympic crowns, led the outnumbered Krotoniates. Thus, an oikist, a seer, and a crown victor fill the same role in three different renditions of the story. The absence of Milo from the Herodotean variations cannot be explained by the historian's ignorance of this figure since Herodotus refers to Milo elsewhere in his work (3.37).⁸³ Likewise, Diodorus Siculus knows of Dorieus' colonizing attempt but makes no mention of this earlier stage in his journey (4.23).

All three figures are viewed as the reason for the remarkable upset of Sybaris in their respective versions. In the case of Milo, Diodorus records that the Krotoniates considered the wrestler responsible for their victory (ἀτίον δὲ γινόμενον τῆς νίκης θαυμασθῆναι παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις [12.9.6]). Dorieus and Kallias are thought of in the same way. Herodotus states that as proof of the veracity of their side of the story, the Sybarites point to a precinct and temple beside the river Krathis that they say Dorieus founded in honor of Athena Krathis after he had helped to capture (συνελόντα) their city (5.45.1). Conversely, the Krotoniates cite as evidence of their own competing claim the vast amounts of land in Kroton given to Kallias and upon which the seer's descendants continued to live in Herodotus' day (5.45.2). Kallias' reward of land and Dorieus' dedication suggest that both outsiders were a, if not the, deciding factor in Sybaris' unlikely defeat.

To my knowledge, no one has attempted to explain the discrepancy between these three accounts or to offer a reason as to why they differ only in the person who is credited with Kroton's victory. Rather than privileging one account over the others, as previous scholars have done, I propose to read the versions together as a structural set and in this way consider more closely the basis for the "mix-up" between Milo, Dorieus, and Kallias. What we are seeing here are actually different modulations on a common template: the Krotoniates defeated the Sybarites with the aid of a talismanic figure.

We have met Milo and his six crowns before. He is the figure *par excellence* for the talismanic potency of athletic victors.⁸⁴ Dorieus' significance in this context is a bit more complicated, and the talismanic nature of oikists is a subject that will be discussed in Chapter 3. For now, however, I note briefly several of the ways in which Herodotus assembles Dorieus' character in order to evoke a figure endowed with *kudos*. In part, Dorieus derives his talismanic power by proxy: accompanying the oikist on his expedition is Philippos son of Boutakides of Kroton (Hdt. 5.47). This Philippos is another paradigmatic example of a *kudos*-bearing athlete. Not only is he an Olympic victor but he also receives hero-cult upon his death, worshipped by the Egestaeans on account of his beauty.⁸⁵ As Kurke has written of this passage, "It appears that...[Philippos'] beauty, *on*

⁸³ At 3.37, Herodotus tells the story of Democedes of Kroton. Democedes sends a message to Darius informing him of his betrothal to the daughter of Milo, "for Darius thought very highly of Milo the wrestler."

⁸⁴ See again Kurke 1993.195 quoted above.

⁸⁵ Hdt. 5.47. On Philippos of Kroton, see Hornblower 2007.177-78. On the heroization of athletes in general, see Currie 2005.120-57. There may be a further association between Philippos and Dorieus involving the connections both have to Eryx. Dorieus stakes his claim on the territory of Eryx (where he

top of his Olympic victory stands as a sign of extraordinary divine favor and power.”⁸⁶ Furthermore, according to Simon Hornblower, Dorieus himself recalls an athlete insofar as Herodotus describes him as “τῶν ἡλικῶν πάντων πρῶτος” (“first in his age group”) and as possessing “ἀνδραγαθίη” (“bravery”) (5.42.1). For Hornblower, “this puts us in mind of the victor-oikists whom Leslie Kurke has well discussed.”⁸⁷ Finally, as a would-be Spartan king, who leaves town when that title goes to his half-brother, Kleomenes, and as a colonial founder who is twice given a band of settlers by Sparta to lead on an expedition, Dorieus seems to have been perceived, at least in some Lacedaemonian circles, as vested with his own talismanic authority.⁸⁸

Kallias belongs among those seers, examined in the first part of this chapter, who are credited with winning wars. He thus also comes with his own *kudos*. Kallias is briefly described at 5.44.2:

Ταῦτα μὲν νυν Συβαριῖται λέγουσι ποιῆσαι Δωριέα τε καὶ τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ, Κροτωνιῆται δὲ οὐδένα σφίσι φασὶ ξεῖνον προσεπιλαβέσθαι τοῦ πρὸς Συβαρίτας πολέμου εἰ μὴ Καλλίην τῶν Ἰαμιδέων μάντιν Ἥλειον μῦνον, καὶ τοῦτον τρόπῳ τοιῶδε· παρὰ Τήλυος τοῦ Συβαριτέων τυράννου ἀποδράντα ἀπικέσθαι παρὰ σφέας, ἐπεὶτε οἱ τὰ ἱρὰ οὐ προεχώρει χρηστὰ θυομένῳ ἐπὶ Κρότωνα.

(Hdt. 5.44.2)

Now these are the things the Sybarites say Dorieus and the men with him did, but the Krotoniates hold that no foreigner took a hand in the war against the Sybarites except for Kallias alone, an Elean *mantis* of the Iamid clan, and that this man took part in the following way: he came to them having run away from Telys, the tyrant of the Sybarites, since the omens were not turning out favorably when he was sacrificing against Kroton.

This passage reveals little about the Iamid except that he went over to Kroton after giving the Sybarites and their tyrant Telys the slip. Perhaps because it is so fleeting, Kallias’ maneuver also slips by unnoted in the major commentaries and has likewise not received much attention from scholars other than to document it as another reference to a seer plying his trade abroad.⁸⁹ But Flower, one of the few who have looked closely at Kallias, rightly recognizes the strangeness of this anecdote when he writes, “[H]ow did [Callias] end up serving the Crotoniates when he had been hired by the tyrant of Sybaris? I cannot

attempts to found his colony of Herakleia) by citing the myth that Herakles had bequeathed this land in Sicily to his descendants (i.e., the Heraklids) after he had defeated Eryx in a boxing match. Philippos has the unusual patronymic “Boutakides.” As Ciaceri (1911.49) points out, this patronymic may be connected to the genealogy of Eryx who, in some versions of the myth, is said to have been the son of Aphrodite and Boutes. Ciaceri makes the further compelling observation that Philippos’ reputation as being the most beautiful man in his day and being worshipped for his beauty makes sense if in fact there is a connection in his lineage to Aphrodite. Thus both Philippos and Dorieus are even more closely allied with each other through their mutual connection to the mythical Eryx and his territory in the far west of Sicily.

⁸⁶ Kurke 1993.151. Emphasis in original. Cf. Polydamas, an Olympic pankratorist, described by Pausanias as the “tallest among men except for those called heroes” (Paus. 6.5.1).

⁸⁷ Hornblower 2004.304.

⁸⁸ See Cartledge 1987.109-10 and Carlier 1984 *passim* for the talismanic authority of the Spartan kings.

⁸⁹ E.g., Hornblower 2007.177; Dillery 2005.192; Kett no.41.

think of a single seer who changed sides in the middle of a conflict and one imagines that there was some unofficial code of conduct which dictated against such high-handed acts.”⁹⁰ Flower absolves Kallias of the “especially awkward and embarrassing” position of switching sides by postulating the following scenario: Kallias must have repeatedly attempted to produce favorable omens for Telys (as the imperfect προεχώρει captures) but his efforts only continued to reveal that the gods had already decided the issue in Kroton’s favor. The seer “thus represented himself as having fully discharged his duties to his original employer; the will of the gods was clear, and there was no need to perish in a doomed cause.”⁹¹ Yet here Flower explains Kallias’ anomalous behavior of switching sides by postulating more anomalous behavior, because a similar claim of uniqueness could be made for what Flower speculates to be Kallias’ motive in fleeing (i.e., “there was no need to perish in a doomed cause”). That is to say, other seers do not abandon their armies. In fact the opposite is true: it is far more characteristic of seers to perish in a doomed cause.⁹²

Instead of trying to grasp the seer’s motive,⁹³ I return to Flower’s initial insight: that he “cannot think of a single seer who changed sides in the middle of a conflict.” The remark should give us pause. *No other seer acts like this*. How then can Kallias’ deviant performance be explained? I suggest that within an incredibly compressed narrative, Kallias’ behavior recalls the figure in whose episode he is found, namely, Dorieus. For, as Herodotus presents them, both seer and oikist act outside the norms prescribed for their roles in Greek culture. Shortly after introducing Kallias, Herodotus draws attention to Dorieus’ own unusual conduct. Before the oikist’s first, disastrous attempt at founding a settlement in Libya, Dorieus departed from Sparta “having neither consulted the oracle at Delphi as to what land he was to found nor having done any of the customary things” (οὔτε τῶ ἐν Δελφοῖσι χρηστηρίῳ χρησάμενος ἐς ἦντινα γῆν κτίσων ἦν, οὔτε ποιήσας οὐδὲν τῶν νομιζομένων [5.42.2]).⁹⁴ Seers do not abandon their armies, nor do oikists neglect to consult an oracle before commencing an expedition.⁹⁵

Herodotus not only makes Dorieus and Kallias compatible by calling attention to the transgressive actions of both men but also, in doing so, allows for Dorieus and Kallias to be switched out for each other more easily in the two competing versions of the same

⁹⁰ Flower 2008b.195.

⁹¹ Flower 2008b.195.

⁹² Perhaps no other seer demonstrates this better than Megistias who, two books later on in the *Histories* at 7.221, will refuse to forsake the Spartans at Thermopylae. There, Megistias also “reads their doom in the sacrifices” but, unlike Kallias, chooses to die alongside the army. Megistias himself, with his foreknowledge of the army’s destruction and his willingness nevertheless to remain, replicates the performance of Amphiaraus, the archetypal military seer who knowingly accompanied Adrastos and the rest of the Seven to their deaths in Thebes. Cf. the remark by Dillery 2005.204: “Of course the diviner who knowingly goes to his death is very familiar, beginning with the mythical Amphiaraus (note also Idmon, A.R. 1.140, 443).”

⁹³ Flower also brings up the possibilities that the Krotoniates proffered a higher wage or that Kallias simply guessed that the Sybarites would be defeated (2008b.195).

⁹⁴ Dorieus’ behavior in his second colonial attempt (to found Herakleia in Sicily) is hardly better. Harrison (2000.155), followed by Hornblower (2007.169), has argued that although he consults Delphi this time, Dorieus wasted the Pythia’s positive reply (that he would seize the land he was sent against [5.43]) by getting side-tracked and coming to the aid of Kroton. In other words, he uses up the oracle’s sanction on the wrong location.

⁹⁵ For the interesting implications of Dorieus’ deviant behavior and its significance vis-à-vis some of the larger thematic concerns of the *Histories*, see Hornblower 2007.

story. That Herodotus places both variations side by side with an “unadjudicated ambiguity” as to which is correct further adds to this compatibility.⁹⁶ In fact, we can refine the template slightly when looking exclusively at Herodotus’ two renditions of the battle and observe that the Herodotean template might look something like “the Krotoniates defeated the Sybarites with the aid of a talismanic rogue.”⁹⁷

Let us bring Diodorus Siculus back into the picture. Milo, Dorieus and Kallias are all transposable with one another within the framework of *kudos*. To tell of the battle between Kroton and Sybaris using a crown victor, an oikist or a seer ultimately makes no difference in terms of the *kudos* that accompanies each of these distinct individuals.

The Greeks envisioned the importance of seers in battle to extend beyond their ability to attend to the customary rites of an army on campaign. Teisamenos and other mantic “leaders of war” were enlisted for their talismanic power as much as for their ability to interpret omens and conduct sacrifices. Talismanic potency accounts for the several references to seers commanding armies and winning battles. Because seers could be viewed as bearers of *kudos*, we can examine how they converge and intersect with other talismanic figures, namely athletic victors, heroes, and oikists. In Chapter 4, we will turn to Hagesias, the *laudandus* in Pindar’s *Olympian 6* and discuss how three talismanic categories – crown victor, seer, and oikist – all converge on the same individual to create a figure of overwhelming talismanic potency. But Hagesias is unusual. More frequently, as we will see now in Chapter 3, the seer is eclipsed as a talismanic figure in colonial narrative and in his place the oikist, a competing recipient of Apollo’s divine favor, claims the spotlight instead.

⁹⁶ Quotation from Hornblower 2004. 305.

⁹⁷ “Rogue” is Hornblower’s (2004.305) word for Kallias and Dorieus.

Chapter 3

Suppressing the Seer in Colonial Narrative: The Disappearance of Melampous in Bacchylides' *Ode* 11

In this chapter, I draw attention to the absence of seers from colonial narrative.¹ I posit two reasons for this absence. First, the oikist co-opts the religious authority of the seer by means of his own privileged relationship with Apollo. Second, because the seer can be seen as a politically destabilizing force that is dangerous for the polis, he does not belong in accounts that celebrate a polis' successful foundation. I then turn to look at a specific example of the seer's interactions with colonial narrative in the genre of epinikion. In Bacchylides' *Ode* 11, I argue that the poet intentionally excises the seer Melampous from the mythic portion of the ode at the same time as he turns the myth into a foundation tale of Tiryns.

Part 1. The Case of the Missing *Mantis*

Given the prominence of seers in descriptions of Greek warfare and the parallels scholars often draw between warfare and colonization,² we would expect to find seers in accounts of the latter as well. And indeed we do find some evidence of their participation. Let us first look at three examples of seers implicated in the foundation of colonies.

First, according to Pausanias, during the Second Messenian War, the people of Pylos and Mothone approached the Messenian leader Aristomenes and asked him to lead a colonial expedition for them. Aristomenes declined and gave them instead his son Gorgos and the son of his own seer, himself a *mantis*, the aptly named Mantiklos, as leaders of the mission. Gorgos and Mantiklos proceed to command a force against the city of Zankle in Sicily and re-found it as Messene (Paus. 4.23.1-9). In a second example, the Athenian seer Lampon is consistently linked to the mid-fifth century foundation of Thurii. A scholion to Aristophanes' *Birds*, a comedy which is itself about colonization, records the following entry:

ἐξέπεμψαν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν κτίσιν αὐτῶν Ἀθηναῖοι δέκα ἄνδρας, ὧν καὶ Λάμπων ἦν ὁ μάντις ἐξηγητῆς ἐσόμενος τῆς κτίσεως τῆς πόλεως.
(Schol. Ar. *Av.* 521)

And the Athenians sent out ten men for its founding, among whom was also Lampon the *mantis* to be an exegete of the founding of the city.

Plutarch, in turn, even identifies Lampon as Thurii's oikist:

...Λάμπωνα δὲ Θουρίων οἰκιστὴν ἐξέπεμψεν.

¹ For a definition of colonial narrative and the problematic term "colony" and its derivatives, see my Introduction.

² See my Chapter 2 n. 1.

(Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 812d:)

... and he [Perikles] sent out Lampon as an oikist of Thurii.

Finally, in the *Anabasis*, Xenophon describes how, arriving at the shores of the Black Sea, he was seized with a desire to found a city and settle his army there:

καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐθύετο πρὶν τιμὴν εἰπεῖν τῶν στρατιωτῶν Σιλανὸν
παρακαλέσας τὸν Κύρου μάντιν γενόμενον τὸν Ἀμπρακιώτην.

(Xen. *An.* 5.6.16-17)

And with a view to these things, he [Xenophon] was sacrificing before telling any of the soldiers, having sent for Silanos the Ambraciot who had been the *mantis* of Cyrus.

These three references might give the impression that seers are stock figures in depictions of colonization, just as they are in portrayals of warfare. In fact, the opposite is true. Most foundation tales do not record the presence of a seer. It is telling that in her book on colonial discourse, the *Poetics of Colonization*, Carol Dougherty never once mentions the seer in connection to the oikist.³ But what accounts for the absence of seers from so many foundation tales when, as we have just seen, it seems to have been the norm for seers to be involved in the colonial process? To answer this, we must consider briefly how the Greeks tended to represent colonization.⁴ As outlined by Dougherty, many foundation tales adhere to a basic narrative pattern: a crisis in the mother city triggers a Delphic consultation. At Delphi, Apollo prescribes a colonial foundation as the solution to the crisis and singles out an oikist to lead the expedition. Resolution is then achieved by establishing a new, independent polis.⁵

These formulaic stories are also known for being terribly lacunose, preferring to describe in detail certain components of the expedition and passing over others in silence. For example, emphasis is often placed on the first two stages of the narrative, the crisis and the Delphic consultation, while depictions of the third stage, the actual foundation of the new city, are exceedingly rare.⁶ For this reason, we might assume that the absence of seers from many colonial tales can be attributed to a similar narrative elision – seers and seercraft simply did not “make the cut” of what the Greeks chose to remember about their colonial experience. Yet we cannot resort fully to this conclusion. For, although the seer

³ Dougherty 1993.

⁴ Here I must stress that, like Dougherty, I am more interested in how the Greek represented the colonial process to themselves as opposed to uncovering “what actually happened,” although one cannot view these two concerns as completely unrelated. Giangiulio’s (2001.119-20) observations on colonial narratives are once again helpful to keep in mind here: “It becomes apparent...that foundation legends do not derive from the simple need to preserve a record of the past. Cultural memory does not ‘reflect’ historical reality, even if it expresses a form of historical self-awareness. It is inevitably affected by the constraints and actualities of the present, and it reveals the concerns of the society whose identity it asserts. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to rule out on a priori grounds the notion that cultural memory also employs historical material. To emphasize the active and constructive nature of foundation tales means not putting the part played by historical memory completely aside.”

⁵ See Dougherty 1993.3-80.

⁶ Dougherty 1993.21.

himself goes missing from foundation tales, the functions the seer typically performs do not. Instead, what we find is the oikist exhibiting a particular form of religious authority and enacting its attendant responsibilities that are elsewhere reserved for the seer.

I define the seer's "particular form of religious authority" in the following general terms. In literary representations of the Archaic and Classical periods, seers are regularly depicted as possessing the ability to discern the will of the gods as a result of their perceived connection to the god of *mantikê*, Apollo.⁷ Furthermore, seers are often portrayed as being enlisted to lead others safely across geographical distance. To cite one famous example, it is only after Kalchas perceives why the Greek army is stalled at Aulis and what must be done to allow them to depart that the Achaeans are able to continue on their journey to Troy.⁸ More generally, Herodotus, Xenophon, and other ancient authors continually credit seers as the ones who, through the interpretation of signs from the gods, steer the course of armies on campaign, selecting the sites for encampment, the direction of their marching, and the locations for battle.⁹

And it is this same collocation of abilities, namely, the ability to decipher the will of the gods and to harness this ability in guiding others safely in travel, that is performed by the oikist in colonial narrative. In these stories, it is the oikist who lays claim to Apollo's divine favor from the moment he is selected by the god to lead the expedition. Personally chosen by Delphi, the oikist becomes the god's interpreter in a manner not unlike a seer. This connection between the oikist and Apollo is clearly demonstrated in the foundation oracle, a common motif of colonial narrative, which often contains directions to the divinely sanctioned location the oikist is to settle.¹⁰ Diodorus Siculus records the following tradition concerning Kroton's oikist Myskellos of Rhype. Here the Pythia simultaneously stresses Apollo's love for Myskellos as well as the route he is to take:

ἡ δὲ Πυθία ἀνεῖλεν οὕτως·
Μύσκελλε βραχύνωτε, φιλεῖ σ' ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων,
καὶ γενεὰν δώσει· τόδε δὲ πρότερόν σε κελεύει,
οἰκῆσαί σε Κρότωνα μέγαν καλαῖς ἐν ἀρούραις.
(Diod. Sic. 8.17.1)¹¹

The Pythia answered thus: Short-backed Myskellos, far-darting Apollo loves you and will give you offspring. But this thing he commands for you first, to settle in mighty Kroton among the beautiful ploughlands.

⁷ There are of course many exceptions to this general definition. But this characterization does consistently apply to those seers who claim membership in one of the four mantic clans, including those in the Melampodidai and Iamidai families who are the focus of this chapter. For a useful survey of who gets to be a seer, see Flower 2008a.22-71.

⁸ See, e.g., Aesch. *Ag.* 184-249. See also my discussion in Chapter 1 of Theoklymenos and Telemachos' voyage back to Ithaka.

⁹ See, e.g., Hdt. 9.36 (Teisamenos advises the Greek army not to cross the Asopos); Xen. *An.* 4.3.17 (The army's seers determine that the troops are safe to move across a river). See also Jameson 1991 and Parker 2004.

¹⁰ Parke and Wormell 1956 vol. 2 still remains the most comprehensive collection of foundation oracles. See also Parke and Wormell 1956 vol. 1. 49-81.

¹¹ Cf. Strab. 6.1.12 = Antiochus *FGrH* 555 F10.

The oikist's interpretative skill is especially required when oracular directions embedded in a foundation oracle take the form of a riddle. In these instances, it falls to the oikist to construe the riddle's correct meaning and thus the correct site for the colony. In another passage from Diodorus Siculus, the Pythia rejects a certain Phalathus' request to settle Siconia and instead enigmatically replies:

Σατύριον φράζου σὺ Τάραντός τ' ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ
καὶ λιμένα σκαιὸν καὶ ὄπου τράγος ἀλμυρὸν οἶδμα
ἀμφαγαπᾶ τέγγων ἄκρον πολιοῖο γενείου·
ἔνθα Τάραντα ποιοῦ ἐπὶ Σατυρίου βεβῶτα.
(Diod. Sic. 8.21.3)

Heed Satyrion and the shining water of Taras and a harbor on the left and (the place) where a goat warmly greets the salty swell of the sea, moistening the tip of his grey beard. There erect Tarantum, mounted upon Satyrion.

Phalathus subsequently discovers the correct location for Tarantum when he realizes that τράγος does not literally refer to a goat but is rather meant to be metaphor for a wild fig tree dipping its branches into a stream.¹²

As Irad Malkin writes of foundation oracles in general,

[T]he oikist is supplied with the religious authority to pinpoint the spot of settlement within the area given to him to colonize. To the colonists, then, their oikist would appear to be translating the god's own command into the physical terms of the site.¹³

Malkin also underscores the religious nature of the oikist's role during the later stage of foundation:

Apollo's address [at Delphi] endowed him [the oikist] with a kind of religious aura which enabled him to make decisions about religion concerning, for example, the locations of sacred precincts, particular cults, and so on. In religious terms, the relationship of the oikist to the colonist was like Apollo's relationship to him: an *exegetes*, an expounder of the god's will.¹⁴

Notice that the language Malkin uses to characterize the oikist (as someone who "translat[es] the god's own command" and is "an expounder of the god's will") sounds much like the language used to describe seers (although Malkin himself never makes this connection). Additionally, Malkin's reference to the "religious aura" that the oikist attains at Delphi is one way of articulating the perception that the oikist is someone who, again like the seer, possesses a superabundance of Apollo's divine favor.¹⁵

¹² For foundation oracles containing riddles, including this one, see Dougherty 1993.44-60.

¹³ Malkin 1987.51. Similarly, Gianguilio (2001.117) observes that the founders of Kyrene and Kroton are "represented as if they were the human agents of Apollo."

¹⁴ Malkin 1987.135.

¹⁵ It is necessary to mention here that Malkin is also interested in the presence of seers on colonial expeditions. In his chapter on divination and foundation, Malkin (1987.92-113) sets out to ascertain

To sum up this section thus far: Given that seers do appear in some accounts of founding cities, we are justified in questioning the reason for their absence in so many others. Moreover, in acknowledging their absence, we also observe that the role seers typically perform remains. What has changed is that this religious role of leading others across geographical distance by means of divining the will of the gods, specifically Apollo, is now enjoyed by the oikist. Put another way, we might say that in foundation tales, the oikist has co-opted the function of the seer and in doing so has eclipsed the seer himself from these very stories. That colonial narrative is still interested in the seer's particular form of religious authority but assigns it instead to the oikist suggests a purposeful (if unconscious) effort to exclude or occlude the seer. Let us turn now to think about why this happens and consider some of the reasons seers seem to be elided from colonial discourse.

One answer is simply that the absence of the seer allows the oikist to be the center of attention within the foundation legend. This makes sense for a number of reasons. First, the emphasis on the oikist in every facet of the colonial enterprise is in keeping with the tendency of Greek aetiologies to attribute innovations and cultural institutions to the accomplishments of individuals rather than groups of people or to the gradual evolution of these innovations and institutions over time. Thus the Greeks, to quote James McGlew, were inclined to “construct the rudiments of the new city's history from the personal quest and achievements of its founder.”¹⁶ Second, colonial narrative's celebration of the oikist can be linked to its performance context. As Dougherty has convincingly argued, one of the main occasions for the performance of *ktisis* poetry was likely to have been during annual festivities a city held for the cult of its founder.¹⁷ Finally, I do not think we can underestimate the role Delphi plays in colonial discourse. The subject of Delphi and colonization is too massive a subject to be broached here except to note how conspicuously the site features in accounts of the colonial process.¹⁸ The ability for a newly-founded city to align itself with Delphi and to claim that its origins were the direct result of Apollo's own initiative was clearly a desirable

whether the seer accompanied the oikist on colonial expeditions in the Archaic period. He concludes that “[t]he mantis' presence was not a necessary condition for a foundation of a colony” (112). Malkin states that this is in part because “the further one goes back in time the more concentration is found: the Archaic aristocracy certainly controlled political, military and religious matters. The archaic oikists belonged to this *milieu*; hence we may suppose that the function of divination was not yet necessarily separated, as far as the act of foundation was concerned” (111). Malkin does, however, believe that it is likely that the seer did accompany archaic colonial expeditions as a member of the oikist's retinue in a capacity similar to his role on military campaigns (112). Further, he thinks the seer accompanied colonial expeditions of the Classical period for which there is slightly more evidence (112). Thus, for Malkin, the seer was in attendance but not crucial for the foundation of a city. I agree with Malkin that seers did accompany oikists in the Archaic period just as they accompanied military commanders. But, again, part of my objective in this chapter is to determine *why* seers are not given the same degree of narrative attention as they are in accounts of warfare. In addition, I diverge from Malkin in viewing the religious authority of the seer as being in competition with the religious authority of the oikist.

¹⁶ McGlew 1993.158.

¹⁷ Dougherty 1994. *Ktisis* poetry was also likely performed at other public festivals. For example, both Krummen (1990.108-11) and Calame (2003.85) view the Karneia at Kyrene as a foundation festival. See also Gianguilio 2001.119.

¹⁸ See, e.g., Parke and Wormell 1956 vol. 1. 49-81; Dougherty 1993.18-21.

declaration for many a colonial polis.¹⁹ But the sanctuary's prominence also obviates the need for a seer in so far as Delphi speaks directly to the oikist. If the salient pair in warfare is the *mantis* and the military commander, then its counterpart in colonial narrative is Delphi and the oikist.

The seer, however, is not simply an inert cipher in his persistent elision from colonial discourse. Rather, in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of this cultural phenomenon, we need to consider what it is about the seer himself that could make his presence within this context not just dispensable but even undesirable. I contend that one reason for the seer's disappearance from foundation tales is the Greek propensity to regard the seer as potentially dangerous to a polis' rulers and to the political stability of the polis itself.

We have already seen this characterization of seers in the figures who were the focus of Chapters 1 and 2, namely, Theoklymenos and Teisamenos. In the *Odyssey*, Homer provides the seer Theoklymenos with an elaborate genealogy that charts the preceding members of his family in detail (*Od.* 15.225-56). In the genealogy, stasis and subsequent exile attend the clan as readily as their inherited prophetic abilities, as seers of each generation are forced out of their native cities and settle somewhere new. The list of the nine Melampodids includes the story of Theoklymenos' father, Polyphides, who, out of anger at his own father, left home for Hypersia where he prophesied for all men (*Od.* 15.254-55). Theoklymenos himself, it will be remembered, was also forced to flee Argos for killing a man (*Od.* 15.224).²⁰

In the *Histories*, Herodotus alludes to the possibility of a power struggle between Teisamenos and the Spartan kings in Book 9.33-35. When the Spartans initially approach Teisamenos and offer to make him a "leader of wars together with the Heraklid kings" (9.33), Teisamenos insists that he must first be made a full citizen of Sparta with all the attendant privileges. Offended by this unheard-of proposal, the Spartans depart, only to return, terrified by the looming threat of Persia. Teisamenos then counters with a still higher price – that his brother, Hagias, also be made a Spartan citizen. By behaving in this way, Herodotus informs us, Teisamenos was imitating Melampous' own demand for portions of Argos for himself and his brother. Like the Argives before them, the Spartans eventually agree to the seer's terms out of desperation and Teisamenos and Hagias become citizens of Sparta. I think part of the Spartans' extreme trepidation in granting the seer's request derives not only from Spartan xenophobia but also from an underlying anxiety that Teisamenos, like Melampous (and this is precisely why Herodotus juxtaposes the two seers here), will not be satisfied with being merely a "leader of wars" and will also want a share of the Spartan leadership within the polis itself.²¹ Furthermore, while Teisamenos is placed on the same level as the Spartan kings, at least on the battlefield, his opponent, the seer Hegesistratos, "declares a personal war upon the same polis, as though a state himself."²²

¹⁹ Giangiulio 2001.117-18

²⁰ See Chapter 1. As I argue there, a number of Theoklymenos' relatives also act as oikists.

²¹ This is perhaps why it is significant that Teisamenos' brother, Hagias, is also made a citizen: the two brothers are viewed as a threat to the two kings of Sparta.

²² Dillery 2005.209. Dillery (2005.209) goes on to state that "The seer contests with the polis for supreme authority." Recall that, according to Herodotus, Hegesistratos was motivated to medize out of his hatred of the Spartans and his love of profit (κατά τε τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ κατὰ τὸ κέρδος. [9.38.1]).

The contrast that arises from, on the one hand, the rapport between a seer and his military commander on campaign and, on the other, the tensions between a seer and a polis' rulers within the city is neatly encapsulated in the different ways in which Pindar depicts the relationship of Amphiaraos and Adrastos in *Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 9, respectively. In *Olympian* 6, after Amphiaraos has disappeared under the earth, Adrastos laments:

“Ποθέω στρατιᾶς ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς
ἀμφοτέρων μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ
δουρὶ μάρνασθαι.”

(*O.*6.16-17)

“I yearn for the eye of my army, good both as a mantis and at fighting with the spear.”

Conversely, in *Nemean* 9, Amphiaraos forces the king out of his own city of Argos and temporarily assumes the throne himself while Adrastos escapes to Sicyon:

φεῦγε γὰρ Ἀμφιαρῆ
ποτε θρασυμήδεα καὶ δεινὰν στάσιν
πατρίων οἴκων ἀπό τ' Ἄργεος· ἀρχοὶ
δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἔσαν Ταλαοῦ παῖδες, βιασθέντες λύα.

(*N.* 9.13-14)

For once he [Adrastos] fled bold-counseling Amphiaraos and terrible stasis, (fleeing) from his ancestral home and Argos. And the sons of Talaos were rulers no longer, having been overcome by discord.

If the seer is indeed perceived as a destabilizing presence within the polis and as one who prompts contestations over power when he remains in a single location for too long, we can perhaps begin to see why seers are not accorded a space within colonial narrative. Colonial tales commemorate the oikist's creation of a new polis. As a menace to a polis' leaders, the seer does not belong in a context that celebrates the oikist's successful foundation of a notionally stable community and political order.²³

I want to explore this idea further by looking at a specific example in epinikian poetry of the relationship between the seer and colonization, Bacchylides' *Ode* 11. Because epinikian is a genre that, as a rule, seeks to mitigate tension between the individual and the polis and that, simultaneously, frequently treats the theme of colonization, it offers itself as a productive laboratory in which to observe how representations of seers and the foundation of cities are handled in relation to one another.²⁴ As I will demonstrate, Bacchylides' solution to the seer in *Ode* 11 is to suppress him completely. To anticipate Chapter 4, however, this tactic of Bacchylides differs greatly from the approach taken up by Pindar in *Olympian* 6. In that ode, as we

²³ Dillery (2005.208-09) also discusses how the seers around the time of the Persian Wars especially “demonstrate how a tension exists between the *polis*-framework and the individual specialist from outside.”

²⁴ For the ways in which epinikian seeks to assuage points of conflict between elite individuals and the polis, see Kurke 1991. For discussions of colonial narrative within epinikian, see Dougherty 1993.

will see, Pindar argues against the occlusion of the seer Hagesias by presenting to his audience a figure who not only participates in colonization but is also beloved by his city.

Part 2. Bacchylides' *Ode 11*

§ *Eliding the Seer in Bacchylides' Ode 11*

Bacchylides' *Ode 11* celebrates a certain Alexidamos of Metapontion, victor in the boys' wrestling event at the Pythian games. Its date is unknown but it is thought to have been performed in Metapontion at a festival for Artemis, whose cult figures prominently in the ode.²⁵ After praising Alexadamos for his victory and implicating Artemis in the youth's present success, the ode enters into an extended aetiological myth from which it never fully resurfaces.²⁶ It is precisely Bacchylides' rendering of this mythic portion of the ode, which features not only the foundation of Artemis' Metapontine cult but also the madness of the daughters of Proitos and Proitos' own foundation of Tiryns, that I wish to discuss here.

The myth of *Ode 11* takes the shape of an elaborate, double ring composition in which the outer ring recounts the madness of the Proitids before spiraling into an inner, chronologically earlier account of the quarrel between the brothers Akrisios and Proitos of Argos. If we flatten out these interlocking narrative loops into a linear sequence, the myth of *Ode 11* runs as follows. The brothers' quarrel is introduced *in medias res*, at the point when it has already spun out of control and is in the process of tearing down the population with stasis (64-68).²⁷ In response, the people of Argos collectively beseech their leaders to divide their land before succumbing to grievous necessity (69-72). Their plea is successful and the younger brother Proitos departs and settles nearby Tiryns, whose walls the Cyclops come and build for the city's new inhabitants (77-81). Misfortune strikes again in the tenth year after the foundation of Tiryns when Proitos' daughters insult Hera within the goddess' *temenos* by unfavorably comparing her wealth (i.e., the wealth of her temple) to that of their father (47-52). An enraged and vengeful Hera places "backturning thinking" (παλίντροπον νόημα, 57) in their breasts and, as if "back-turning" were a directional cue, the maidens head for the hills, leaving Tiryns behind (53-58).²⁸ The daughters wander for thirteen months until Proitos, after momentarily losing his own mind and attempting suicide, prays to Artemis to lead his daughters out of their madness (85-88; 104-05). Artemis accomplishes this request and the maidens, their sanity restored, establish a *temenos*, altar, and choruses of women for the goddess at Lousoi (106-12). The myth concludes with this altar at Lousoi as the hook: Artemis followed the Achaians from this Arkadian precinct to Metapontion where she now also dwells beside the river Kasas (113-23).

²⁵ Cairns 2005.48. See also Kowalzig 2007.268.

²⁶ As Cairns (2005.36) writes, the ode "is unusual in that the final section (113-26) does not return explicitly to praise the victor, but rather constitutes a pendant to the ode's central myth."

²⁷ Bacchylides is suspiciously reticent about the cause of the dispute but other authors such as Pindar (fr. 284) and Apollodoros (2.4.1) provide a much fuller explanation as to the quarrel, namely that Proitos was accused of raping his niece, Danaë. On the more detailed versions of the quarrel, see Seaford 1988.132-33.

²⁸ On the spatial connotations of παλίντροπον here, see Seaford 1988.119.

This is the tale Bacchylides offers to the Metapontian youth Alexidamos, a tale of wandering wits and physical migration punctuated by the architecture of altars and Cyclopean masonry. That the madness of the maidens was deemed a subject suitable for an epinikian ode honoring an athletic victory in wrestling inevitably startled earlier scholars. The curious choice of myth, in addition to the fact that Bacchylides refers to Alexidamos' former defeat at Olympia (22-36) (seemingly an epinikian gaffe if there ever was one), inspired Anne Pippin Burnett to write that "we are apt to find the whole song somewhat insane."²⁹

But scholars, including Burnett herself, have worked out much of the eleventh ode's inscrutability.³⁰ The ode has come to be discussed, for instance, as a reflection of girls' maturation rites: the Proitids' movements within the myth trace an initiatory arc which begins from their rejection of Hera (the goddess of marriage) and culminates in their institution of women's choruses at Lousoi which signal thereby their readiness for marriage and reintegration into society.³¹ Taking another approach, Carol Dougherty and Douglas Cairns both explore the ways in which Tiryns and Proitos operate as paradigms for the colonial city of Metapontion and its victor.³² Most recently, Barbara Kowalzig has shown that *Ode* 11 participates in the contested concept of Achaian identity in early to mid-fifth century southern Italy, charting how Bacchylides implicates Artemis' cult at Metapontion in this negotiation.³³

And yet, there remains another exceedingly strange feature about the epinikian ode that has never been sufficiently resolved, although it is frequently observed. Bacchylides' version of this myth contains a glaring omission: the seer Melampous, who is a central figure in almost all other versions of the myth, is completely missing from *Ode* 11. In order to appreciate this absence, we must first examine other instantiations of the Proitid mythographic tradition.

§ *The Mythographic Tradition of Melampous*

The tradition is a rich one and encompasses a number of variants, which differ in the form the maidens' transgression takes as well as their subsequent punishment.³⁴ The early fifth-century Argive genealogist, Akousilaos, for example, held that Hera's anger was due not to the maidens' declaration of their father's superior wealth but rather to their

²⁹ Burnett 1985.107. Garner (1992.523) amusingly captures this earlier stage of scholarship on the ode: "There was a time when the detractors of Bacchylides singled out his eleventh ode as inept even by Bacchylidean standards: it was like the unfortunate tenor who was so stupid that even the other tenors noticed."

³⁰ For Bacchylides' mention of Alexidamos' past defeat, see especially Carey 1980.229-40, Garner 1992, MacFarlane 1998, Maehler 2004.

³¹ On the initiatory aspects of the ode, see Burnett 1985.100-13 (who carefully plots the ode's thematic oscillations between nature and culture); Seaford 1988; Dowden 1989; Suarez de la Torre 1992.3-6; Cairns 2005.47-48. Kowalzig (2007.274) is right to point out that while this initiatory element is certainly an important component to the ode, "Bacchylides' myth-telling is highly complex and cannot be reduced to a single local or ritual context."

³² Dougherty 1993.129-35 and Cairns 2005. Both Dougherty and Cairns' arguments will be discussed below.

³³ Kowalzig 2007.267-327.

³⁴ Dowden (1989.71-95) provides the fullest presentation of the different versions within this tradition but see also Cairns 2005. On Melampous in general, see Gantz 1993.185-88.

What is more, Melampous appears in the Proitid myth as early as Hesiod³⁹ and seems also to have been included in the versions offered by two of Bacchylides' contemporaries, Akousilaos and Pherekydes of Athens. Akousilaos is likely to have mentioned Melampous if his interest in the Proitids indeed lay in their genealogy since two of the daughters conventionally go on to marry the seer and his brother Bias.⁴⁰ Pherekydes' account, in turn, preserved in the scholia to the *Odyssey*, bears a striking resemblance to *Ode* 11, with the significant exception that the genealogist prominently features Melampous:

Μελάμπους ὁ Ἄμυθάωνος παῖς, πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα διὰ τῆς μαντικῆς τεράστια ἐποίει, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ αὐτῶ καὶ οὗτος ἐνδοξότατος ἄθλος ἐγένετο. Τῶν γὰρ Προίτου θυγατέρων, τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἀργείων, Λυσίππης καὶ Ἴφιανάσσης, διὰ τὴν ἀκμαιοτήτος ἀνεπιλογιστίαν ἀμαρτουσῶν εἰς Ἥραν παραγενόμεναι γὰρ εἰς τὸν τῆς θεοῦ νεῶν, ἔσκωπτον αὐτὸν, λέγουσαι πλουσιώτερον μᾶλλον εἶναι τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς οἶκον. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μάντις ὢν παραγενόμενος ὁ Μελάμπους, ὑπέσχετο πάσας θεραπεύειν, εἰ λάβοι κατὰξιον τῆς θεραπείας μισθόν. Ἦδη γὰρ ἡ νόσος δεκαετῆς, καὶ ὀδύνην φέρουσα οὐ μόνον αὐταῖς ταῖς κόραις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς γεγεννηκόσιν. Ἐπαγγειλαμένου δὲ τοῦ Προίτου τῶ Μελάμποδι καὶ μέρος τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ μίαν τῶν θυγατέρων ἦν ἂν θέλοι εἰς γάμον δώσειν, ἰάσατο τὴν νόσον ὁ Μελάμπους, διὰ τε ἰκεσιῶν καὶ θυσιῶν τὴν Ἥραν μελιξάμενος, καὶ λαμβάνει πρὸς γάμον Ἴφιάνασσαν, ἔδνον αὐτὴν τῶν ἰατρειῶν καρπωσάμενος. Ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Φερεκύδη.

(*FGrHist* 3 F 114 = Schol. MV on *Od.* 15.225)

Melampous, the son of Amythaon, did many other wondrous things through his seercraft, and not the least glorious of his labors was the following. For the daughters of Proitos, the king of the Argives, Lysippe and Iphianassa, on account of the thoughtlessness characteristic of youth transgressed against Hera. For when they came to the goddess' temple, they scoffed at it, saying that their father's house was richer. And on account of this Melampous, a seer who had newly arrived, promised to threaten them all, if he should get a wage worthy of his treatment. For at this point the sickness had lasted for ten years and had brought pain not only to the girls themselves but also to their parents. And after Proitos promised to Melampous both a portion of his kingdom and to give him one of his daughters, whomever he might wish, to marry, Melampous cured them of their

³⁹ Hesiod fr. 131 M-W = Probus on Virgil's *Eclogue* 6.48. The passage is: Hesiodus docet ex Proeto et Stheneboea natas [lacuna unius lineae] has, quod Iunonis contempserant numen, insania exterritas, quae crederent se boves factas, patriam Argos reliquisse, postea a Melampode Amythaonis filio sanatas ita uti [lacuna].” Cf. Hesiod fr. 37 M-W where both Melampous and Proitos are again mentioned and where Merkelbach (1967 ad loc.), Burkert (1983.170 n.12) and Vian (1965.29) all restore “Proitids.” Dowden (1985.95) defends the assertion that Probus' entire entry is taken from Hesiod, concluding, “Our passage is carefully written in indirect speech throughout and it would be out of character if Probus was not, as he purports to be, summarizing Hesiod throughout.” Also included in the scholia on *Eclogues* 6.48 is an account of Servius Auctus who offers an even more detailed account of the Proitids and Melampous, although he does not cite Hesiod as his source. But the family of scholia (to which both Probus and Servius belong) are all so similar with respect to this line that Dowden contends that Servius is also using Hesiod.

⁴⁰ Cairns 2005. 41.

sickness, propitiating Hera through prayers of supplication and sacrifices, and he married Iphianassa, reaping her as a reward for the treatments. And that is the story related by Pherekydes.

Because the fragment of Pherekydes is so similar to *Ode* 11 in many other respects, it has been argued that the scholiast who claims to be summarizing the genealogist was in fact primarily citing Bacchylides.⁴¹ This assertion, however, simply underscores the peculiarity of Bacchylides' omission of Melampous, for it suggests that the scholiast felt Bacchylides' version to be incomplete without the seer. In procuring this vital detail from Pherekydes, the scholiast also ended up in the process crediting the entire passage to him.

In like manner, Melampous consistently receives credit for securing the psychological and physical return of the women of Argos. And both myths share the same conclusion, namely that the seer was awarded with a generous swath of Argos for his trouble.⁴²

Melampous' prominence within the tradition can also be seen in the number of renderings of the myth that focus on the Proitids' purification rather than on the grounds for their impiety. A fourth-century inscription from Sikyon, for instance, purports to mark the site where Melampous hid his healing *pharmaka* after restoring the maidens' sanity:

Ἐνθάδε ὑπὲρ Προΐτου παίδων ἔκρυψε Μελάμπους
βλαψίφρονος μανίας φάρμακα λυσίνοσα,
ἢ τ' ἔθανεν παίδων, ὅτε δεῦρ' ἔμολον διὰ μῆνιν
Ἥρας, Ἴφινόην ἤδ' ἀγορὰ κατέχει.
(SEG 15.195)

Here for the daughters of Proitos Melampous concealed his sickness-dissolving drugs for the mind-damaging madness, and this agora covers Iphinoe, one of the daughters, who died when they came here on account of the wrath of Hera.

Other variations offer other explanations as to how Melampous cured the Proitids. Stephanus of Byzantium (*s.v.* Λουσοί) and Strabo (8.3.19) have the seer wash the maidens in a river⁴³ while, more dramatically, Apollodoros has Melampous and a band of ephebes pursue them out of the mountains and down into Sicyon “with loud howling and some divinely inspired khoreia.”⁴⁴ But regardless of technique, Melampous is consistently credited with the achievement itself and is an abiding presence in their release from madness.

The Proitids are of course still cured in *Ode* 11, but it is Artemis who receives credit. Yet, Bacchylides' exclusion of Melampous cannot necessarily be explained by his desire to implicate Artemis in the Proitids' recovery. For, as other versions of the myth reveal, there was space within the tradition for Melampous even when the goddess herself was present. Pausanias joins the two figures in the following way:

⁴¹ First proposed by Robert 1917.

⁴² Hdt. 9.34.

⁴³ The Lousos river in Arkadia and the Anigros river in Elis, respectively. While these authors are late, this method of purification may go back to Hesiod (see Kowalzig 2007.282 and below).

⁴⁴ Trans. Kowalzig 2007.282.

τὰς δ' οὖν θυγατέρας τοῦ Προΐτου κατήγαγεν ὁ Μελάμπους ἐς τοὺς
Λουσοὺς καὶ ἠκέσατο τῆς μανίας ἐν Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῶ· καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου τὴν
Ἄρτεμιν ταύτην Ἡμερασίαν καλοῦσιν οἱ Κλειτόριοι.

(Paus. 8.18.8)

Melampous led the daughters of Proitos to Lousoi and cured them of their madness in the temple of Artemis. And from that time on the Kleitorians call this Artemis “Hemeria.”

Like Bacchylides, Pausanias has located the site of the Proitids’ purification at Lousoi and applies the same cult-title with which Bacchylides himself equips the goddess, (i.e., Pausanias’ “Hemerasia” is thought to be a textual corruption of “Hemera” [Bacch. 11.39]).⁴⁵ To compare Pausanias and Bacchylides, it is only the seer who is once again missing from *Ode* 11. Similarly, Stephanus of Byzantium catalogues Lousoi as “Λουσοί, πόλις Ἀρκαδίας, ὅπου Μελάμπους ἔλουσε τὰς Προΐτου θυγατέρας καὶ ἔπαυσε τῆς μανίας” (“Lousoi, a city of Arkadia, where Melampous washed the daughters of Proitos and stopped their madness” [s.v. Λουσοί]). And, although the grammarian does not specifically mention Artemis, she is surely not far off since Lousoi was known primarily as the site of her sanctuary throughout antiquity.⁴⁶ Hesychius records that Melampous founded a temple to the goddess after the purification (s.v. ἀκρουχεῖ). Finally, a South Italian vase painting of the fourth century captures a scene in which Melampous heals the maidens before a temple as Artemis’ cult-statue looks on.⁴⁷ In the myth of the Proitids, then, Melampous and Artemis need not be mutually exclusive but can work in tandem.

As the above discussion reveals, Melampous is a, if not the, salient component in the myth of the daughters of Proitos. But before we can attempt to explain the seer’s elision from *Ode* 11, it is necessary to consider several inferences that can be made about the discrepancies between Bacchylides’ epinikian ode and the rest of the mythographic tradition.⁴⁸ First, we can be fairly certain that Bacchylides is not making use of an earlier, more succinct instantiation of the myth that did not yet contain the seer since Melampous’ role in the story dates back at least to Hesiod.⁴⁹ Nor does the poet seem to be drawing from a competing epichoric version that eschewed a Melampous-centered perspective: Melampous is so pervasive elsewhere that there is little evidence to suggest such a competing variant and, what is more, Bacchylides appears to adhere to the established template for the tale in other respects (i.e., his Proitids undergo the standard sequence beginning with the transgression against Hera to their madness to their purified reintegration). We must conclude, therefore, that Bacchylides was familiar with Melampous’ connection to the Proitids and that the absence of the seer from the myth is a calculated exclusion. To this assertion, I would add one more “incriminating” piece of evidence that Bacchylides intentionally suppressed the seer. In fr. 22 + fr. 4, Bacchylides

⁴⁵ See Cairns 2005.42 n. 47. Hemera as a cult-title for Artemis is attested elsewhere for Lousoi: *IG* V.2 398, 400 and 403; *Call. h.* 3.236. See Jost 1985.47-48, 419-20.

⁴⁶ For an extensive discussion of the site of Lousoi and its significance for Achaian identity, see Kowalzig 2007.267-327.

⁴⁷ Lucanian Nestoris, 390-370 BCE. Naples, Mus. Naz. 82125 (H 1760). See *LIMC* 7 no. 445.

⁴⁸ Here I follow Cairns 2005.43 closely.

⁴⁹ See n. 39 above.

not only mentions Melampous but also refers to him as coming from Argos (50-51), a signpost for the very story of the Proitids that the poet suppresses here.

As Burnett and others have observed, by eliminating Melampous, Bacchylides also eliminates the price that Proitos must pay for the seer's services and thus prevents the partition of the kingdom of Argos within this particular unfolding of the tale. Furthermore, Burnett has noticed that Bacchylides short-circuits the myth's conclusion by freezing the story at the moment when the daughters are cured but before they are married off to the seer and his brother (or, theoretically, to new partners of the poet's invention). In this way, Bacchylides circumvents not only the disastrous dismantling of Proitos' domain but also the exogamous dissolution of his dynasty.⁵⁰ Of Bacchylides' choice of ending, Burnett writes that "...Proetus can take his daughters back to Tiryns that has lost none of its power, and with the story cut at the moment of salvation, he seems to continue there as an example of god-favored kingliness."⁵¹

Both Burnett and Cairns rightly argue that Melampous is suppressed and Proitos' power is preserved because this manipulation of the myth allows for Tiryns to become a proper paradigm for Metapontion.⁵² With Melampous gone, Tiryns is a peaceful and successful polis whose king is no longer threatened and which enjoys, like the Metapontines generations later, the divine favor of Artemis. Thus it is the importance placed on the city in the myth and Tiryns and Proitos' significance as positive examples for Metapontion and its victor, Alexidamos, that explains Melampous' absence. Although I agree with these conclusions, I also think we cannot overestimate the strangeness of what Bacchylides has done in adjusting the myth in this particular way. That is to say, I think we must question why, if Bacchylides' intent with the myth was to present a paradigmatic vision of a city and its steadfast king, he chose a story that traditionally emphasized the opposite and was initially so ill-suited as a model for the polis and victor he wished to praise.

I think we can refine the arguments of Burnett and Cairns by considering why Bacchylides' modification to the myth had to occur at all. For I suspect that part of the point of Bacchylides' reworking of the Proitids may be just how conspicuous this revision is. I will return to this assertion shortly but, in order to do so, we must understand this innovative and purposeful omission of Melampous in relation to another significant alteration to the myth.⁵³

⁵⁰ Proitos is so devastated by the collapse of his kingdom and his daughters' marriage to foreigners that he names his son, born after these events, Megapenthes (Eust. ad Hom. P.1480.4).

⁵¹ Burnett 1985.109.

⁵² Burnett 1985.109 and Cairns 2005 45-46.

⁵³ It is important to note here that Seaford (1988) also argues for the omission of Melampous in Bacchylides *Ode* 11 but attributes it to a different reason, namely, the suppression of Dionysiac elements in the ode. For Seaford's argument to work, the amalgamation of the Proitid/Hera myth and the Women of Argos/Dionysos myth needs to have already taken place. This may be possible, although it is not clear when in the fifth century this integration happens (and it may not have happened until after Herodotus [see Kowalzig 2007.277]). As Kowalzig (2007.277) writes of the two types of myth, "Until well into the fifth century, however, the two groups and the language tying them to their deities remain distinct...[W]hen scrutinized in detail, the Proitids have little in common with Dionysiac maenadism to start with, a further indication that the girls acquired Dionysiac language once the two legends mixed in a fifth-century context."

§ *Bacchylides' Ode 11 as Foundation Tale*

The second innovation is that Bacchylides transforms the story of the daughters of Proitos into *ktisis* poetry. At the center of the epinikion, the people of Argos negotiate a reconciliation between Proitos and his brother Akrisios by advising that Proitos settle Tiryns:

λίσσοντο δὲ παῖδας Ἄβαν-
τος γὰν πολὺκριθον λαχόντας

Τίρυνθα τὸν ὀπλότερον
κτίζειν, πρὶν ἐς ἀργαλέαν πεσεῖν ἀνάγκαν·
Ζεὺς τ' ἔθελεν Κρονίδας
τιμῶν Δαναοῦ γενεὰν
καὶ διωξίπποιο Λυγκέος
παῦσαι στυγερῶν ἀχέων.
τεῖχος δὲ Κύκλωπες κάμον
ἐλθόντες ὑπερφίαλοι κλεινᾶ π[όλ]ει
κάλλιστον, ἴν' ἀντίθει
ναῖον κλυτὸν ἵππόβοτον
Ἄργος ἥρωες περικλειτοὶ λιπόντ[ες].
(11.69-81)

They beseeched the children of Abas, having inherited the barley-rich land,⁵⁴ for the younger one (Proitos) to settle Tiryns before they fell into grievous necessity. And Zeus the son of Kronos, honoring the race of Danaos and horse-driving Lynkeus, was willing to put an end to their hateful distress. The overweening Cyclopes came and built the most beautiful wall for the famous city where the god-like ones were dwelling, the far-famed heroes, having left renowned horse-rearing Argos.

By using the verb κτίζω, Bacchylides portrays Proitos' migration to Tiryns as a foundation. Several lines later, the poet bolsters this characterization with the arrival of the Cyclopes to ring the settlement with walls.⁵⁵ By the end of the stanza, a new city has been built, fortified, and settled by the king and his heroic companions who accompany him from Argos. Describing Proitos' move in these terms, however, marks a departure from the way in which the event is portrayed in other sources.

Apollodoros (2.2.1) says that Proitos seized Tiryns (καταλαμβάνει Τίρυνθα), which suggests that he viewed the city as already standing, since it was able to be captured. Similarly, Strabo (8.6.11) records that Proitos resolved to use Tiryns as a "headquarters" (Τῇ μὲν οὖν Τίρυνθι ὀρμητηρίῳ χρήσασθαι δοκεῖ Προῖτος) and led an army from Lycia, the home of his father-in-law, to take it. This, too, implies that Tiryns existed before Proitos assumed power. Pausanias (2.25.8), surveying the ruins in which Tiryns lay in his day, mentions that the city was named after the hero Tiryns the son of

⁵⁴ Maehler (2004. 150 ad loc.) argues that λαχόντας refers to the brothers' inheritance.

⁵⁵ The wall (τεῖχος ...κάλλιστον, [77-79]) syntactically rings the city (MacFarlane 1998.48). On κτίζω see Casevitz 1985.

Argus, who was, presumably, the city's eponymous founder.⁵⁶ Even if we are meant to understand Bacchylides' Tiryns as already inhabited before it was acquired by Proitos and his men, the point remains that the poet has chosen to cast the ruler's occupation of the polis in terms of a foundation and that the decision to do so stands in contrast to the way in which other authors chose to represent it.

The colonial resonance of Proitos' move to Tiryns is matched by another description during the mythic portion of the ode. At line 41, Bacchylides says that the king “β]ωμὸν κατένασσε” at Lousoi, a striking choice of words since the verb “καταναίω” is typically used of settling people in a particular location, not of dedicating altars.⁵⁷ In addition, A. Turyn proposed the metrically-sound emendation “κτίσαν / σταθμασάμενοι” for the textual corruption at lines 119-20. Lines 118-20 would thus read as: ἄλσος δέ τοι ἱμερόεν / Κάσαν παρ' εὐδρον κτίσαν / σταθμασάμενοι (“And they founded a lovely grove, measuring it out beside the fair-watered Kasas” [118-20]).⁵⁸ If this is correct, it would be both another instance of the verb κτίζω in the poem as well as another example of a word for founding cities applied to the establishment of a sacred precinct. The colonial language applied to Artemis' altar and grove is also in keeping with the very structure of the mythic portion of the ode. As Cairns writes, “In their chronological (but not narrative) progress the poem's myths present a long journey from the leaving of Argos (60, 81) to the arrival at Metapontum (113-20), a journey which entails a series of foundations of cults and cities.”⁵⁹

Dougherty also finds some of the motifs of colonial discourse at work in *Ode* 11. As she notices, the quarrel between Proitos and Akrisios that triggers Proitos' departure to Tiryns parallels other instances in which civic strife in the mother city serves as the impetus for a colonial expedition.⁶⁰ Since Dougherty is interested in the ways in which colonization can be represented as “civic purification,” she also examines the relationship between the healing of the Proitids and the founding of Tiryns. Drawing on Burnett's demonstration of how Bacchylides balances these two parts of the myth and “embeds” one within the other, Dougherty argues that these same parts can be conflated so that “they become different ways to tell the same story. The outer tale helps us to read the inner one; it describes the founding of a city as a purificatory act.”⁶¹ I am hesitant to go so far as to view the Proitids' purification and the foundation of Tiryns as so conflated that the settlement itself becomes a “purificatory act.” Rather, I agree with Cairns that what seems to have happened is that the motif of purification has migrated from its expected position in the narrative arc of foundation tales (where it often appears as the curative conclusion to the initial crisis) to a later time (“in the tenth year,” 59) in the history of the city.⁶² Still, the fact that the motif is present at all is further evidence that Bacchylides is thinking in colonial terms in a number of ways throughout the epinikian ode. Furthermore, I will show below that the maidens' purification and the foundation of

⁵⁶ Hall (2000.88) considers this Tiryns to be the founder of Tiryns.

⁵⁷ In fact, this is the only instance in which the verb is used in this manner (Maehler 2004 ad loc.).

⁵⁸ Cf. Pindar *Olympian* 10.45: (Herakles) ἐν Πίσει...σταθμᾶτο ζάθεον ἄλσος. See Maehler 2004.155 ad loc.

⁵⁹ Cairns 2005.38.

⁶⁰ Dougherty 1993.131 comparing this story to the foundation myths of Kyrene and Elea.

⁶¹ Dougherty 1993.132.

⁶² Cairns 2005.39 n.27.

Tiryns are joined together but that it is through the way in which Proitos himself is characterized as an oikist.

In this section, we have seen that Bacchylides figures Proitos' settlement of Tiryns as the foundation of a new city. Nor is the vocabulary of colonial discourse limited to this particular moment in the ode since it reappears in the unusual way in which Bacchylides chooses to describe the dedication of Artemis' altar (β]ωμὸν κατένασσε, 41) and possibly her Metapontine grove (ἄλσος δέ τοι ἱμερόεν / Κάσαν παρ' εὐδρον κτίσαν, 118-19). In addition, Bacchylides makes use of motifs which are conventional components of *ktisis* poetry, namely those of stasis in the mother city (i.e., the quarrel between Proitos and Akrisios at Argos) and purification. Thus, in *Ode 11*, a myth ostensibly about the madness of the Proitids comes to take on the qualities of a foundation tale.

On the one hand, that Tiryns is characterized as a colony and that the rest of the mythic portion of the ode exhibits colonial overtones makes sense insofar as Tiryns functions as a paradigm for Metapontion. Tiryns, with its mighty Cyclopean walls and its Zeus-honored leaders (Ζεὺς τ' ἔθελεν Κρονίδας / τιμῶν Δαναοῦ γενεάν, 73-74) becomes a positive forerunner for Metapontion, itself referred to as a *theotimon astu* (12) and a polis aware of its status as colony, even if it could not quite remember by whom it was settled or exactly when it was founded.⁶³ Yet, we must also denaturalize Bacchylides' decision to give the story of Proitos and his daughters a colonial inflection, especially when, as far as we can tell, other versions did not treat it in this way. Additionally, in calling into question why Bacchylides constructed a foundation-myth out of the Proitid one, we must relate this decision to the other innovation to the tale we explored above, namely, the omission of the seer Melampous. For I contend that these two alterations to the myth, namely, portraying Tiryns as a new foundation and eliminating the seer Melampous, are intentionally and inextricably connected. Bacchylides has not just taken any myth to transform it into a foundation tale. The myth he has chosen is one that is conspicuously and famously about a seer.

As I argued at the beginning of this chapter, stories about seers and about the foundation of cities tend to be mutually exclusive. Here, as if before our eyes, a story of one is blatantly replaced by a story about the other. That is, in the process of turning this myth into a foundation tale, Bacchylides simultaneously excises Melampous. And, given how central Melampous is to the myth elsewhere and therefore how marked his absence must have been in the ode, I wonder if this was not part of the point – the seer's absence not only made the city's foundation within the myth appear more stable (since its king's power was no longer in jeopardy) but it also made the myth itself appear more “colonial” (and thus more fitting as a model for the colony of Metapontion).

The metamorphosis into *ktisis* poetry of the Proitid myth can be gauged by the characterization of Proitos himself who, if Tiryns is cast as a foundation, must necessarily be considered its oikist.⁶⁴ As I argued above, seers are elided from colonial discourse not only for political reasons (because they can threaten the stability of a polis and its oikist)

⁶³ Kowalzig 2007.298-301. Bacchylides aligns the two cities still further by underscoring their mutual connection to Artemis and assembling a shared Achaian heritage for them.

⁶⁴ If Tiryns is a paradigm for Metapontion, then Proitos is a paradigm for the *laudandus* Alexidamos. The oikist as paradigm for the athletic victor is found elsewhere in the genre of epinician (e.g., Battos and Arkesilas in *Pythians* 4 and 5; in *Pythian* 1, Hieron is both the oikist and the victor).

but on religious grounds as well insofar as the oikist himself becomes the exegete of Apollo. This is precisely what happens in *Ode* 11 and I close this section by examining more closely how Proitos-as-oikist achieves this double erasure of Melampous.

Bacchylides celebrates the successful foundation of Tiryns by freeing it from the looming threat of a seer who swindles Proitos out of most of his kingdom. But, Bacchylides goes further than securing Proitos' political hegemony. He also replaces Melampous with Proitos as the figure who negotiates with the gods for the maidens' recovery.

While his daughters head for the hills, Proitos travels to Lousoi:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ
 Λοῦσον ποτὶ καλλιρόαν πατὴρ ἴκανε,
 ἔνθεν χροῖα νιψάμενος φοι-
 νικοκ[ραδέμνο]ιο Λατοῦς
 κίκλη[σκε θύγατρ]α βοῶπι
 χεῖρας ἀντείνων πρὸς αὐγὰς
 ἰππώκεος ἀελίου,
 τέκνα δυστάνοιο Λύσσης
 πάρφρονος ἐξαγαγεῖν·
 “Θύσω δέ τοι εἴκοσι βοῦς
 ἄζυγας φοινικότριχας.”
 Τοῦ δ' ἔκλυ' ἀριστοπάτρα
 θηροσκόπος εὐχομένου· πιθοῦσα δ' Ἥραν
 παῦσεν καλυκοστεφάνους κού-
 ρας μανιᾶν ἀθέων·

(11.95-109)

But when their father came to the beautifully-flowing Lousos, having washed his skin there he called upon the ox-eyed daughter of Leto of the crimson headdress, extending his hands towards the rays of the charioteer sun, [calling upon her] to deliver his children from their mind-altering terrible madness. “I will sacrifice to you twenty red-haired oxen not yet yoked.” And the daughter of the noblest father heard him praying. And, having persuaded Hera, she stopped the godless frenzy for the bud-wreathed girls.

At Lousoi, Proitos calls upon Artemis and orchestrates a transaction of promised sacrifices in return for his daughters' purification. In doing so, Proitos performs the role of mediator, initiating and arranging a god-sent resolution for the maidens' predicament. Here I am not suggesting that Proitos acts in the same capacity in which Melampous does in other instantiations of the myth. In contrast to the seer, who is credited with healing the maidens either by *pharmaka* or other means, Proitos does not cure his daughters himself. Yet Proitos' ability to contact the gods effectively and the divine favor he can subsequently lay claim to as Artemis heeds his request, obviates the need for Melampous' presence in the first place.

Proitos supplants the necessity for Melampous' expertise. But, what is more, Proitos does so in a conspicuous way since he remains the focus of the story even after the mythic portion circles away from the settlement of Tiryns. Burnett perceives that,

although the third strophe returns to the subject of the Proitids' madness, the daughters themselves fade from the narrative, and "...it is Proetus who bathes at Lousoi (97), instead of the afflicted ones; it is he who makes a prayer, he who promises sacrifice; the song makes his actions the only ones that we can perceive."⁶⁵

The transference of religious authority (and narrative attention) from seer to oikist is neatly encapsulated in the image of the king bathing in the river Lousos: ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ / Λοῦσον ποτὶ καλλιρόαν πατὴρ ἴκανε, / ἔνθεν χροῖα νιψάμενος... ("But when their father came to the beautifully-flowing Lousos, there having washed his skin..." [95-97]). Curative bathing in a river is in fact one of the remedies with which Melampous is said to have healed the Proitids. This antidote is connected to certain variations of the myth in which Hera's punishment took the form of a skin disease. Although explicit references to Melampous and purifying river baths are late, Kowalzig believes that this specific restorative treatment is likely to be as early as Hesiod who, as we saw above, speaks of Hera as afflicting the maidens with *alphos*.⁶⁶ *Ode* 11, however, contains none of the conditions for this particular form of purification. The goddess' revenge is psychological, not physical, torture and it is Proitos, not his daughters, who washes off his skin. Yet Kowalzig rightly sees that Proitos' bathing must be understood as an allusion to this other rendition of the myth. As Kowalzig writes:

Despite the absence of a full immersion rite in the ode, a puzzling trace of literal cleansing is still there: when the Proitids' father Proitos bathes himself in the 'stream at Lousos,' he suspiciously washes his skin (χροῖα νιψάμενος, 1.97) in a wording too close to Hesiod's not to recall the Proitidean skin-disease.⁶⁷ The purificatory bath only makes sense as long as there is a skin-disease to be washed off, but it has no place in the *nosos* the Proitids incur here.⁶⁸

By placing Proitos in the Lousos river, Bacchylides blatantly cites this alternate, Melampous-centered account. But he cites it to diverge from it. In other words, it seems that we are being reminded of Melampous washing away the Proitids' *alphos* precisely in order to recognize that this is not at all what is happening here and to see instead that it is Proitos who, by supplicating Artemis himself, will bring about his daughters' purification.

Thus, it is my contention that in *Ode* 11, Bacchylides transforms a traditional myth about the seer Melampous into a foundation tale. In the process, we can see that the seer has been written out not only of the political components of the myth (Proitos' kingdom is saved from destruction) but out of the religious ones as well. At the same time, Proitos, the oikist of Tiryns, retains (politically) or absorbs (religiously) the functions left vacant by the missing seer.

⁶⁵ Burnett 1985.111.

⁶⁶ Kowalzig 2007.282. Strabo 8.3.19: Some say the reason why the river Anigros in Elis has a terrible smell and inedible fish is due "to the fact that Melampous used these cleansing waters for the purification of the Proitids. The bathing-water from here cures leprosy, elephantiasis, and scabies" (tr. Jones).

⁶⁷ See Hesiod fr. 133 M-W quoted above.

⁶⁸ Kowalzig 2007.282-83.

Chapter 4

Exposing the Seer in Colonial Narrative: Hagesias as *Sunoikistêr* in Pindar's *Olympian* 6

In my final chapter, I wish to pursue a striking exception to the seer's erasure from colonial discourse, a phenomenon I explored in Chapter 3. In *Olympian* 6 composed for Hagesias' victory at Olympia in 472 or 468 BCE,¹ Pindar portrays the *laudandus* as an athlete, a seer, and a co-oikist of Syracuse:

εἰ δ' εἴ-
η μὲν Ὀλυμπιονίκας,
βωμῶ τε μαντείῳ ταμίης Διὸς ἐν Πίσᾳ,
σunoικιστήρ τε τᾶν κλειᾶν Συρακοσ-
σᾶν, τίνα κεν φύγοι ὕμνον
κεῖνος ἀνὴρ, ἐπικύρσαις
ἀφθόνων ἀστῶν ἐν ἡμερταῖς ἀοιδαῖς;
(*O.* 6.4-7)

If he should be an Olympic victor, and a steward of the mantic altar of Zeus in Pisa, and a co-oikist of famous Syracuse, what hymn could that man escape, if he should meet with ungrudging townsmen amidst lovely songs?

This is an extraordinary moment. For the sake of comparison, we can relate the description of Hagesias to the way in which the athlete Milo, the seer Kallias, and the oikist Dorieus replace one another in competing versions of the same story of the battle of Kroton and Sybaris.² But here, instead of three discrete figures with comparable claims to *kudos*, Pindar has combined these *kudos*-bearing categories of athlete, seer, and oikist to create a single individual of overwhelming talismanic authority. While Pindar's odes often "insist on an athlete-oikist connection"³ and while we have seen that athletes and seers can overlap and combine elsewhere (most notably in the figure of Teisamenos in Chapter 2), Hagesias uniquely joins these two separate relationships to produce a third, the seer who is not only a crowned victor but also a co-oikist. In honoring Hagesias in this way, Pindar also introduces what is typically missing from foundation myths, including colonial narratives within epinikian poetry: the seer's participation in colonization.⁴ Such a bold assemblage of qualities, however, requires a certain degree of delicacy, and Pindar simultaneously works hard within the ode to diffuse any threat that portraying the seer in this way might cause to the actual ruler of Syracuse, Hieron. It is precisely this careful balancing-act of praising the seer as a figure who can be

¹ On the date of the ode, see Farnell 1932.40 and see also below.

² See Chapter 2.

³ Hornblower 2004.27. The athlete-oikist connection has been treated extensively by Dougherty (1993), who also refers to both the athlete and the oikist as figures who possess *kudos* (see especially pp. 96-97). The image of the *kudos*-bearing athlete-oikist is perfectly encapsulated in a line from *Pythian* 1 in which Pindar, praising Hieron for his victory in the chariot race, says that the "κλεινὸς οἰκιστὴρ ἐκύδανε πόλιν" ("the renowned oikist bestowed *kudos* on his city" [31]).

⁴ See Chapter 3 for the suppression of the seer in colonial discourse.

incorporated into the city and into Hieron's colonial program while not infringing on Hieron's own status as tyrant that I want to explore in *Olympian* 6.⁵

Before we can delve into the ramifications of implicating a seer in a foundation, we must first briefly look at the word *sunokistêr* itself. Taken in this context, the term is nonsensical, since the traditional foundation date of Syracuse is placed some three centuries earlier in 733 BCE. Attempts to explain its meaning date back to the scholia on *Olympian* 6 which contain the following entries:

συνοικιστήρ τε: ὅτι οἱ πρόγονοι αὐτοῦ σὺν Ἀρ-
χία παρεγένοντο ἐν Συρακούσαις οἱ Ἰαμίδαι, ἀφ' ὧν εἰκὸς
παραλαβεῖν τινας.

(Schol. 8a)

Because his ancestors, the Iamidai, from whom it is likely to take some [seers?], came to Syracuse with Archias.

συνοικιστήρ τε: τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἀληθῶς· οὐ γὰρ
οὔτος συνῶκισε τὰς Συρακούσας. ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐγκώμιον εἴ-
ληφεν· ἀπὸ γὰρ ἐκείνων ὁ Ἀγησίας τῶν συνοικισάντων.

(Schol. 8b)

This is not true. For this man did not co-found Syracuse. But he [Pindar] has taken it with a view towards praise. For Hagesias is a descendant of those who did co-found (it).

It is not clear whether the scholiasts were privy to information about this title outside of the ode itself and some scholars treat their statements as mere guesswork.⁶ Simon Hornblower, however, is among those who are less skeptical:

It may be that the scholiasts are right that Pindar's choice of the word *συνοικιστήρ* hints at a real colonial tradition about the role of the Iamidai alongside Archias, who was too famous to be displaced as oikist of Syracuse altogether... On this view the compliment consists, not of granting Hagesias a fictitious title of oikist, but of transferring the ancestral role of the Iamids as co-founders of Syracuse to Hagesias the Iamid of Pindar's own time.⁷

In contrast, Irad Malkin argues that the term *sunokistêr* refers to Hagesias' own activities in early fifth-century Syracuse and to the seer's involvement, as a *mantis* for the

⁵ Of course, the reason we find the seer being granted such status and being cast as a figure worthy of praise (in contrast to so many negative representations of seers elsewhere) is because Hagesias is the patron of the ode. But I would contend that the fact that he is being characterized in this *particular* way (that is, not only as an athlete [which is expected]) but also as an oikist), deserves our attention.

⁶ e.g., Malkin 1987.95. See also Luraghi 1997.76.

⁷ Hornblower 2004.185. Farnell (1932.41) also argues that *sunokistêr* is a hereditary title. Hutchinson (2001.378-79) admits that the meaning of the term is unclear but thinks a hereditary title might be possible (comparing it to how the Corinthians remained known as the "founders" of Coreyra (Thuc. 1.25.1)).

Deinomenids, in their colonial enterprises.⁸ Malkin suggests that Gelon’s restoration in 485 BCE of the Gamoroi (Syracuse’s ruling class whose oligarchy had previously been removed from power) and his expansion of the city by means of a synoikism were considered, at least by Gelon, as a (re)foundation.⁹ As Malkin also emphasizes, since both Gelon and Hieron were fixated on “the terminology and honours associated with oikists,” this characterization of Syracuse and Hagesias would not be out of place in the cultural and political climate during Deinomenid rule.¹⁰

I think Malkin makes a convincing case that the appellation *sunokistêr* is consistent with the colonial obsessions of Gelon and, especially, Hieron. Yet I am not completely willing to forego Hornblower’s (and the scholiasts’) explanation that the term may be meant to evoke the tradition of Archias’ initial expedition. In fact, I think that the slippery quality of *sunokistêr* here, which defies attempts to locate it securely in either the shadowy past of Syracuse’s original foundation or in the historical, fifth-century present may be part of the point. Pindar, who tends to blur the lines between the present and mythological past in other ways, may be deploying a similar tactic here by playing with the possibility that Iamids accompanied Archias while simultaneously implicating Hagesias himself in the colonial agendas of Gelon and Hieron.¹¹

Finally, it is also worth observing that oftentimes Pindar seems to merge Syracuse and Aitna themselves in such a way that it is difficult to separate them out into two discrete poleis. In *Pythian* 3, for example, Pindar unites the two through the figure of Hieron:

καί κεν ἐν ναυσὶν μόλον Ἴονίαν τάμνων θάλασσαν
Ἀρέθοισαν ἐπὶ κράναν παρ’ Αἰτναῖον ξένον,
ὃς Συρακόσσαισι νέμει βασιλεύς...

(P. 3.68-70)

I also would have come having cleaved the Ionian sea in a ship to the spring of

⁸ Malkin 1987. 93-97. Schol. 165 says that Hagesias was Hieron’s friend and *mantis*.

⁹ Malkin (1987.96-97), citing contemporary parallels. Hornblower (2004.184) also cites several parallels including the following: The Spartan Brasidas commandeered the title and honors of oikist from the Athenian oikist of Amphipolis, Hagnon, in the fifth century and was honored ὡς οἰκιστῆ (Thuc. 5.11.1); in the fourth century, Euphron was to be honored as *archêgetês* of Sikyon (Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.12) and Timoleon of Corinth was honored as the second oikist of Syracuse (Diod. 16.90, Plut. *Timol.* 39). Conversely, Luraghi (1997.77) thinks that even the historiographical tradition that was favorable to Gelon did not view the tyrant’s project as a new foundation. Further, because they did not treat Gelon’s “foundation” as such, ancient commentators knew only of the foundation of Archias and so conjectured that Hagesias’ ancestors must have accompanied him. For the synoikism of Syracuse, see Dunbabin 1948.416.

¹⁰ Malkin 1987.97. Diodorus Siculus, for example, attributes the following motive to Hieron: τοῦτο δ’ ἐπραξε σπεύδων ἅμα μὲν ἔχειν βοήθειαν... ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς γενομένης μυριάνδρου πόλεως τιμὰς ἔχειν ἥρωικὰς (Diod. XI.49.2). In *Pythian* 1, Hieron is also called κλεινὸς οἰκιστῆρ (31) (cf. Pindar fr. 105a) while Aristophanes refers to him as κτιστῶρ Αἴτνας (*Birds* 926). Similarly, Gelon is said to have received τιμαὶ ἥρωικαί upon his death in 478 BCE (Diod. XI.38.5).

¹¹ For example, Athanassaki (2003) has demonstrated that one of Pindar’s strategies within the colonial narratives of his epinikian odes is to join the present with the past in order to “mask the disruption” of current political activity. She discusses the colonial narratives of *Pythians* 1, 4, 5 as well as *Olympians* 1 and 7 (but not *Olympian* 6). It is interesting to consider the implications of the idea that the Iamids accompanying Archias would have been a believable concept for the fifth-century audience, whether or not they really did accompany an early expedition to the site.

Arethousa and to my Aitnaian host who as a king holds sway over Syracuse...

Similarly, in *Nemean 1* discussed below, Pindar joins Aitna to Syracuse by having a hymn issue forth from Ortygia in honor of Zeus Aitnaios (*N.* 1.1-6). That Pindar does this is perhaps not surprising since Hieron was tyrant of Syracuse when he founded Aitna in 476 BCE. But I also think that this tendency to fuse the two locations allows us to consider the possibility that in identifying Hagesias as the *sunokistēr* of Syracuse Pindar was also thinking about the foundation of Aitna.¹²

Whatever foundation of Syracuse *sunokistēr* refers to, for my purposes what matters more is that a seer is being aligned with colonization at all. Thus, I cannot agree with Nino Luraghi that the term may be nothing more than a way to amplify the fact, “itself not very significant,” that Hagesias had received citizenship from Gelon in the course of the synoikism of Syracuse.¹³ Rather, as we will see below, it is precisely because the cultural capital of the title is so considerable that Pindar must go to such great lengths to assure his audience, especially Hieron, that applying it to a seer is not also dangerous.

There are several significant ways in which Pindar assures his audience that Hagesias is neither a threat to Hieron nor to the citizens of Syracuse. In Chapter 2 we observed how the seer is frequently represented in warfare as acting in tandem with his military commander. In *Olympian 6*, Pindar transposes this productive relationship of the battlefield onto the city and contends that the seer can also be represented as valuable for Syracuse. This grafting of the role of the military seer onto the colonial one happens in the ode itself in the way in which Pindar compares Hagesias to Amphiaraios:¹⁴

Ἀγησία, τὴν δ' αἶνος ἑτοῖμος, ὃν ἐνδίκας
ἀπὸ γλώσσας Ἄδραστος μάντιν Οἰκλεί-
δαν ποτ' ἐς Ἀμφιάρηον
φθέγγεατ', ἐπεὶ κατὰ γαῖ' αὐ-
τόν τε νιν καὶ φαιδίμας ἵππους ἔμαρψεν.
ἑπτὰ δ' ἔπειτα πυρᾶν νε-
κροῖς τελεσθεισᾶν Ταλαϊόνιδας
εἶπεν ἐν Θήβαισι τοιοῦτόν τι ἔπος·
“Ποθέω στρατιᾶς ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς
ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ
δοῦρι μάρνασθαι.” τὸ καὶ
ἀνδρὶ κώμου δεσπότη πάρεστι Συρακοσίῳ.
(*O.* 6. 12-17)

Hagesias, the praise is ready for you which Adrastus once justly proclaimed aloud in reference to the mantis Amphiaraios, son of Oikles, when the earth swallowed him and his gleaming horses up. Afterwards, when seven pyres of the dead were consumed, the son of Talaos spoke such a word as this at Thebes: I yearn for the

¹² This possibility is supported by the appearance of Hieron and Zeus Aitnaios in conjunction with Syracuse later in the ode (92-98).

¹³ Luraghi 1997.83. As we saw in Chapter 2 with the seer Teisamenos and his brother Agias, even granting (mere) citizenship to a seer is not necessarily an insignificant matter.

¹⁴ Nicholson 2005.86. For a different view, see Luraghi 1997.84.

eye of my army, good both as a mantis and at fighting with the spear.” This is also true for the Syracusan man who is master of the revel band.

Here in the shift from mythical past to epinikian present, Pindar applies the relationship between a military *mantis* and his commander in war to that of Hagesias and Hieron within the city.¹⁵ In addition, by calling him “the Syracusan man” (17) and imagining the seer as leading a *kómos* back to a welcoming Syracuse and Ortygia (17; 92-98),¹⁶ Pindar further joins Hagesias to its citizens. This is a very different image from Melampous’ dismantling of Proitos’ kingdom, Amphiaraios’ expulsion of Adrastos from Argos in *Nemean* 9, or the Spartans’ fear of making Teisamenos a citizen. In contrast, Pindar creates a space for the seer within Syracuse and among its citizens, advising them that they should not feel envy towards such a man but rather should take part in the festivities of his return to them (τίνα κεν φύγοι ὕμνον / κεῖνος ἀνὴρ, ἐπικύρσαις / ἀφθόνων ἄστῶν ἐν ἱμερταῖς ἀοιδαῖς; [“what hymn could that man escape, if he should meet with ungrudging townsmen amidst lovely songs?” [5-7]).¹⁷

Another way in which Pindar alleviates the potential apprehension of the audience towards Hagesias concerns the very nature of Hagesias’ athletic victory and the poet’s treatment of it within the ode. Hagesias did not win at Olympia for wrestling or running or sponsoring chariots but was crown victor in the slightly more unusual mule-cart race. Mule-cart racing did not enjoy a long history at Olympia and was perceived as the “poor relation” to chariot racing with horses.¹⁸ An anecdote preserved in Aristotle, although probably apocryphal, captures well the event’s less-prestigious reputation. According to Aristotle, the poet Simonides when asked to compose an ode in honor of the tyrant Anaxilas’ mule-cart victory, scoffed at the idea, finding the subject of mules beneath him. Simonides eventually granted Anaxilas’ request, but in the ode would only acknowledge the mules responsible for the victory through a periphrasis, calling them “the daughters of storm-footed horses.”¹⁹ (As Aristotle goes on to remind us, however, mules are the daughters of asses, too.)

Unlike Simonides, Pindar does not intentionally obfuscate the second-class status of Hagesias’ victory but rather draws attention to it. In fact, Pindar dedicates the ode’s second strophe to Hagesias’ mules, calling upon the driver, Phintis, “to yoke the powerful mules” (22) and praising them as “beyond all other (mules)”²⁰ who “won crowns at Olympia” (25-26). The motive for Hagesias’ choice of event (and Pindar’s attention to it), however, becomes clear once we understand it in relation to Hieron’s own athletic ventures at Olympia. The date of Hagesias’ victory is either 472 or 468 BCE and at both those Olympiads Hieron himself won in the more exalted equestrian competitions of the horse race (in 472) and the four-horse chariot race (in 468). As Nicholson writes on the timing of these respective victories, “Hagesias’ entry into the mule-cart race was a public

¹⁵ Hagesias was Hieron’s mantis at the battle of Himera (get reference).

¹⁶ Notice that the seer gets to be a *despotês* here, but it is only the *despotês* of a *kómos*.

¹⁷ I cannot think of another example in Greek literature of citizens actually welcoming a seer into their city.

¹⁸ Nicholson 2003.82.

¹⁹ Sim. 515 (Arist. *Rh.* 3.2.1405b).

²⁰ I cannot agree with Farnell’s suggestion that “ἐξ ἄλλῶν” (25) might refer instead to the following word, “ὁδόν,” and not to mules (i.e., “they know this path of all other paths”) (1932.43).

declaration that, although he sought glory in the games, he was happy to play, as it were, the mule to Hieron's horse."²¹

Yet it is important to recognize that this strategy of drawing attention to the mules as a way to highlight Hagesias' inferiority to Hieron is not consistent throughout the ode. Oftentimes, as Nicholson has shown, Pindar aligns Hagesias with horses instead, as when he speaks of the seer Amphiaraos and his steeds (13-14) and portrays the Iamidai as experts in chariot racing (71-6).²² This oscillation between horses and mules within the ode is comparable to the way in which Pindar can praise Hagesias himself as powerful and elsewhere downplay his importance in relation to Hieron's own pre-eminence. The mythic portion of the ode in particular exhibits this oscillatory sensibility of praising Hagesias while making his status secondary. What is more, the myth does so in a way that addresses specifically the colonial concerns of the ode.

§ *The Myth of Iamos*

The myth of *Olympian* 6 narrates the story of Iamos, the progenitor of Hagesias' mantic clan. Surprisingly, this genealogical excursus is our only independent source for the legend: in contrast to representations of the archetypal seers Melampous, Amphiaraos, Mopsos, and Teiresias who appear with relative frequency in Archaic and early Classical literature and material culture, the events of Iamos' biography can only be traced as far back as this ode.²³ Furthermore, in his characterization of the seer, Pindar seems to be recycling components of the myth of Melampous and attributing them to Iamos instead.²⁴ Given these two factors, as Michael Flower concludes, "It is possible that Pindar, in celebrating the ancestry of Hagesias, needed to make up most, perhaps virtually all, of the myth. He is simultaneously establishing a mythological basis for the prominence of the Iamidai and reflecting their new status in the larger Greek world."²⁵ If Pindar is indeed fashioning, or mostly fashioning, a mythological past for the Iamidai in

²¹ Nicholson 2005.83. Hagesias was not the first to use this tactic but was preceded by Anaxilas of Rhegium who minted coins portraying his victory in the mule-cart race as a way of accepting his subservience to Gelon (see Nicholson 2003.83).

²² Nicholson 2005.87.

²³ Flower 2008b.200. Pausanias, for example, links Pindar to the myth "as if he were the only source" (*Ibid.* n. 42): οἱ δ' Ἰαμίδαοι καλούμενοι μάντιες γεγόνασιν ἀπὸ Ἰάμου· τὸν δὲ εἶναι παῖδα Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ λαβεῖν μαντικήν φησιν ἐν ἄσματι Πίνδαρος (6.2.5). There are also no known artistic representations of the seer, although some scholars have wondered whether the old man on the East Pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia is not Iamos. This supposition, however, is based solely on *Olympian* 6 (see *LIMC* 5.1:614-15).

²⁴ As Flower (2008b. 201 n. 44) has noticed, both Melampous and Iamos are given the gift of *mantikē* after they come upon or pray to Apollo in the Alpheios river (compare Apollod. 1.9.11 for Melampous with *O.* 6.57-63). Snakes also figure prominently in both stories: Hesiod (fr. 261 M-W) says that snakes licked Melampous' ears and, in doing so, gave him the ability to understand the language of birds, while Pindar has snakes feed the infant Iamos honey at *Olympian* 6.45-47. Snakes are also connected to Teiresias, albeit in a different way (while watching snakes mate, his sex changed from male to female and back again). There may be another connection to Melampous in Pindar's narration of Iamos' genealogy, which is told through his female ancestors as if it were a miniature *Catalogue of Women*. In this respect it also seems to evoke Melampous, who figures prominently in the *Catalogue*. Finally, snakes also connect the infant Iamos to the infant Herakles in *Nemean* 1, on which see below.

²⁵ Flower 2008b.201 (Flower is arguing here that the Iamidai only really come into prominence in the fifth century after Teisamenos' victory at Plataia).

Olympian 6, it is especially important to pay attention to the way in which the poet goes about devising this myth vis-à-vis his characterization of Hagesias in the rest of the ode and thus the way in which Iamos operates as a paradigm for his descendant.

Pindar emphasizes the divine ancestry of Iamos by beginning his account of the seer two generations earlier: Pitana, the eponymous nymph of the Spartan village, bore a daughter by Poseidon, Euadne (29-30).²⁶ Euadne was entrusted to the Arcadian king of Phaisana, Aipyros, but was no safer than her mother from male gods. Seduced by Apollo, she gave birth to Iamos, a “godly-minded boy” (31-41). Iamos is thus twice descended from the gods and can claim both Apollo as father and Poseidon as his grandfather. And this is exactly what he does as soon as he comes of age:

τερ-
 πνᾶς δ' ἐπεὶ χρυσοστεφάνοιο λάβεν
 καρπὸν Ἥβας, Ἄλφεῶ μέσσω καταβαῖς
 ἐκάλεσσε Ποσειδᾶν' εὐρυβίαν,
 ὄν πρόγονον, καὶ τοξοφόρον Δά-
 λου θεοδμάτας σκοπόν,
 αἰτέων λαοτρόφον τιμάν τιν' ἑᾶ κεφαλᾶ,
 νυκτὸς ὑπαίθριος. ἀντεφθέγξατο δ' ἀρτιεπῆς
 πατρία ὄσσα, μετάλλασέν τέ νιν.
 (O. 6.58-62)

And when he took the fruit of golden-crowned Hebe, descending into the middle of the Alpheios, he called upon wide-ruling Poseidon, his ancestor, and the bow-wielding watcher of god-built Delos, and in the open air of night asked for some honor of rearing a people for himself. And the clear-speaking prophetic voice of his father replied and sought him out.

Iamos' lineage and his acknowledgment of it in this culminating scene at the river are idiosyncratic in at least two respects. First, as Flower writes, “This type of double descent from the gods is unparalleled in Greek myth.”²⁷ Second, while Iamos invokes both his immortal father and grandfather, it is only Apollo who responds. Poseidon remains silent and unresponsive to Iamos' prayer and is never mentioned again, except in a periphrastic address by the poet at the very end of the ode (103-05).²⁸ How can we explain these two peculiarities of the myth, particularly Poseidon's reticence?

²⁶ This connection to the Spartan village of Pitana has led scholars, beginning with Wilamowitz (1886.162-85) and followed by Parke (1967.176-77), to infer that Pitana must have been the village to which the Iamid Teisamenos (Hdt. 9.33) belonged. Flower (2008b.201) suggests that Pindar is here “providing a mythological legitimization for their [the Iamidai's] membership [in the village].” Hornblower (2004.184 n. 213) has noticed that Hagesias' own name recalls that of Teisamenos' brother, Hegies (Doric Hagias) at Hdt. 9.33.5.

²⁷ Flower 2008b.201.

²⁸ I owe this point to Leslie Kurke.

The phrase “αἰτέων λαοτρόφον τιμάν” at line 60 suggests that what Iamos is after as he wades into the Alpheios is kingship.²⁹ And yet, when Apollo answers his son, the god grants him something else entirely:

“Ὀρσο, τέκνον,
δεῦρο πάγκοινον ἐς χώ-
ραν ἴμεν φάμας ὀπισθεν.’
ἴκοντο δ’ ὑψηλοῖο πέ-
τραν ἀλίβατον Κρονίου
ἔνθα οἱ ὤπασε θησαυρὸν δίδυμον
μαντοσύνας, τόκα μὲν φωνὰν ἀκούειν
ψευδέων ἄγνωτον, εὔτ’ ἂν
δὲ θρασυμάχανος ἔλθῶν
Ἡρακλῆης, σεμνὸν θάλος Ἀλκαϊδᾶν, πατρί
ἐορτάν τε κτίση πλειστόμβροτον τε-
θμόν τε μέγιστον ἀέθλων,
Ζηνὸς ἐπ’ ἀκροτάτῳ βω-
μῷ τὸτ’ αὖ χρηστήριον θέσθαι κέλευσεν.
(O. 6. 62-70)

“Rise up and go, child, following my voice here to the land that is open to all.”
And they came to the steep rock of Kronos’ high hill where he bestowed on him a double treasury of prophecy, at this time to hear the voice ignorant of falsehoods and whenever Herakles bold-in-resource, the august offspring of the Alkaidai, came and founded for his father a festival crowded with people and the greatest of contests, then it was that he commanded him to establish for himself an oracle on the highest altar of Zeus.

In place of “the honor of rearing a people,” Apollo offers Iamos seercraft and orders him to establish an oracle of Zeus at Olympia. Discerning the interstices between what Iamos seeks, what Apollo grants, and what the absent Poseidon implicitly refuses, is crucial for understanding *Olympian* 6. I contend that, at this moment, Pindar first raises the specter of Iamos as king only to withdraw this possibility and call attention to Apollo’s very different gift of *mantikē*.

§ Reading *Olympian* 1 with *Olympian* 6

This reading and its implications gain greater traction when we see the story of Iamos as engaged in a dialogue with the mythic portion of *Olympian* 1.³⁰ Whether *Olympian* 6 was composed in 472 or 468, it follows *Olympian* 1’s traditional

²⁹ λαοτρόφον τιμάν is glossed by Farnell, for example, as “the honour of rearing a people” (1932.45). Slater 1969 ad loc. translates λαοτρόφον as “consisting in care of the people.” I am reminded by this unusual word (it appears in Pindar only here and at *Olympian*. 5.4) of the hapax λεωσφέτερον applied to the seer Teisamenos by Herodotus (9.33.1). The adjective λαοτρόφον is sufficiently vague that it does not necessarily have to refer to kingship but it certainly does not seem that Iamos is requesting seercraft either.

³⁰ Suggested in a Pindar seminar at Berkeley (Spring 2006) by G. B. D’Alessio.

performance date of 476 and we can therefore speak of Hagesias' ode as possessing an intertextual awareness of Hieron's.³¹ A still greater synchronicity between the two odes potentially exists if we accept Eveline Krummen's date of 472 for *Olympian* 1.³² For Krummen's date opens up the intriguing possibility that both odes were performed in the same year and perhaps even at the same celebration (if we take 472 as the date of Hagesias' victory as well), further encouraging us to read *Olympians* 1 and 6 together.

Olympian 1 also contains an invocation to Poseidon. Here Pelops, Poseidon's beloved, appeals to the god to aid him in winning Oinomaos' deadly chariot race and the hand of Hippodameia:

πρὸς εὐάνθεμον δ' ὅτε φυάν
λάχλαι νιν μέλαν γένειον ἔρεφον,
έτοῖμον ἀνεφρόντισεν γάμον
Πισάτα παρὰ πατρός εὐδοξον Ἴπποδάμειαν
σχεθέμεν. ἐγγύς {δ'} ἐλθῶν πολιᾶς ἀλὸς οἴος ἐν ὄρφνᾳ
ἄπυεν βαρύκτυπον
Εὐτρίαιναν· ὁ δ' αὐτῶ
παρ ποδὶ σχεδὸν φάνη.
τῶ μὲν εἶπε· 'Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας
ἄγ' εἴ τι, Ποσειδάον, ἐς χάριν
τέλλεται, πέδασον ἔγχος Οἰνομάου χάλκεον,
ἐμὲ δ' ἐπὶ ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἀρμάτων
ἐς Ἄλιον, κράτει δὲ πέλασον.
ἐπεὶ τρεῖς τε καὶ δέκ' ἀνδρας ὀλέσαις
μναστῆρας ἀναβάλλεται γάμον
θυγατρός...
...ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
μὲν οὔτος ἄεθλος
ὑποκείσεται· τὴ δὲ πρᾶξι φιλαν δίδοι.'
ὥς ἐννεπεν· οὐδ' ἀκράντοις ἐφάπατο
ἔπεσι. τὸν μὲν ἀγάλλων θεός
ἔδωκεν δίφρον τε χρύσειον πτεροῖ-
σὶν τ' ἀκάμαντας ἵππους.

(*O.* 1.67-87)

And towards the blooming age of youth when soft hair began to cover his chin and make it dark, he took thought of a ready marriage, how to take renowned Hippodameia from her father, the Pisan. And going alone to the gray sea at night he called aloud to the loud-thundering Trident-Bearer. And he appeared to him right by his feet. He said to him, "Come on! If the lovely gifts of Kypris, Poseidon, end in any way in gratitude, shackle the bronze spear of Oinomaos and convey me upon the swiftest of chariots to Elis and bring me power. Since, having killing thirteen suitors, he is putting off the marriage of his daughter... But for me

³¹ The 476 date for *Olympian* 1 is accepted by most Pindarists and is supported by *P. Oxy.* 222 which lists a victory for Hieron in the horse-race for that year (See Morrison 2007.57 n.117).

³² Krummen 1990.160ff argues for this date for the ode, when Hieron also won the horse-race at Olympia, based on the parallels between the myth of Pelops and Oinomaos in *Olympian* 1 and the eastern pedimental sculptures of the temple of Zeus which depict the same episode and which are also dated to 472.

that contest will be appointed, and you grant lovely achievement.” Thus he spoke, nor did he apply himself to unfulfilled words. The god honored him and gave him a golden chariot and horses with tireless wings.

The setting is strikingly similar to Iamos at the Alpheios. In both scenes, the suppliant, upon reaching manhood, approaches or descends into the water alone at night to make his prayer.³³ But unlike Iamos’ request, Pelops’ appeal is heard by Poseidon, who provides him straightaway with a golden chariot and winged, tireless horses. As Nagy has written, “It is with this chariot-team that Pelops wins his race against Oinomaos and the hand of Hippodameia, thereby inaugurating a kingship that serves as a foundation for the royal Peloponnesian dynasties of Argos, Sparta, and Messene.”³⁴ If we compare this scene to its counterpart in *Olympian* 6, we can say that Poseidon offers Pelops a means of acquiring kingship while, in ignoring Iamos, he denies the seer-to-be access to this same privilege. In fact, Apollo gives Iamos seercraft *in place of* kingship.

After their nocturnal invocations, both Pelops and Iamos travel to Olympia where parallels between *Olympians* 1 and 6 continue to surface in the analogous significance the site plays in each myth.

Lucia Athanassaki’s work on the characterization of the Panhellenic sanctuary in *Olympian* 1 proves to be a fruitful starting point. In *Olympian* 1, Pindar famously identifies Olympia as “the *apoikia* of Lydian Pelops” (24).³⁵ As Athanassaki has argued, the poet designates Pelops as Olympia’s “*heros ktistes*” here in order to evoke Hieron’s own colonial enterprise and the foundation of Aitna in 476 BCE.³⁶ By focusing on Olympia as a mythological model of a colony, Pindar glosses over Hieron’s actual and reportedly brutal colonial agenda back in Sicily and presents the act of foundation as a peaceful and divinely-sanctioned event.³⁷

Athanassaki also offers a new interpretation of Pelops’ abduction by Poseidon (*O.* 1.40-45) that raises the interesting prospect of additional colonial overtones within the mythic portion of the ode.³⁸ She suggests that Pindar’s account of the god’s homoerotic love of Pelops, which the poet conspicuously privileges within the epinikion over the competing myth of cannibalism, takes as its template “Syracusan/Corinthian colonial lore.”³⁹ According to Plutarch, the Bacchiad Archias of Corinth fell in love with the youth Akteon and tried to kidnap him from the house of his father Melissos. In the brawl that ensued as Archias, Melissos, and their respective allies tried to take hold of the youth, Akteon was dismembered and killed. Melissos demanded retribution, and when the Corinthians ignored his pleas, he approached the temple of Poseidon during the Isthmian

³³ Kirkwood 1982.90 also notes that this scene at *Olympian* 6.57-63 is “strongly reminiscent” of *Olympian* 1.71-87 (See also Carey 1993.106-07). The sea is obviously a more appropriate body of water at which to address Poseidon; Iamos’ appeal to him in the Alpheios is somewhat strange until we realize that the river flows to Olympia.

³⁴ Nagy 1986.84.

³⁵ See Nagy 1990.293-313 on the portrayal of the Peloponnesians as the settlement of a foreigner.

³⁶ Athanassaki 2005.121.

³⁷ For a description of Hieron’s colonial program that emphasizes its violent nature, see Diodorus Siculus 11.49; see also Asheri 1992. Athanassaki argues that this is Pindar’s strategy in a number of other odes as well (e.g., *Pythians* 1, 4, 5, and 9 and *Olympian* 7) (2005 *passim*).

³⁸ Athanassaki 2003.122.

³⁹ Athanassaki 2003.121. For a different reading of the significance and incorporation of the competing myths within the ode, see Nagy 1986.

games, cursed the Bacchiads and, calling upon the gods, jumped to his death on the rocks below. As a result, a plague broke out in Corinth and Archias was ordered by Apollo to go into exile. Thereupon, sailing west to Sicily, Archias founded Syracuse.⁴⁰

Athanassaki herself does not pursue this connection beyond simply referring to Plutarch's version nor does she elaborate on the parallels between Pelops and Archias. Yet even if we concede that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between Pelops and Archias, a striking degree of thematic convergence between the stories themselves remains. Both myths, for instance, tell the tale of an abduction (or, in the case of Archias, an attempted abduction) brought on by a homoerotic desire for a youth. Both implicate Poseidon and feature the exile of the myth's central figure. The expulsion to a foreign land, in turn, results in a foundation (Archias is exiled from Corinth to Syracuse, Pelops from Lydia to the Peloponnese via Olympos).⁴¹ Even the theme of dismemberment is present in each: it is the cause of Akteon's death as well as of Pelops' ivory shoulder (*O.* 1.27).⁴² Finally, perhaps this shared collocation of abducted youths and foundation tales between Olympia and Syracuse can further explain why the Syracusans chose the particular akroterion they did for their treasury at Olympia. The treasury, which was just being completed when Hieron won the chariot race in 476 (a possible date for *Olympian* 1) and whose construction was probably supervised by the tyrant himself, was crowned with a terracotta sculpture depicting Zeus' abduction of Ganymede.⁴³

While we can never know whether Pindar was actually acquainted with this foundation myth of Syracuse, Athanassaki's suggestion remains an attractive one. As she herself concludes, "The myth of Pelops may simultaneously evoke the foundation of Aitna and Syracuse in light of Pelops' founding activity *in illo tempore*, thus legitimating Hieron's rights not only to Aitna, but to Syracuse as well."⁴⁴ Keeping Pindar's designation of Olympia as an *apoikia* and this suggestive Syracusan colonial resonance in mind, I return to *Olympian* 6 and Iamos' own arrival at the sanctuary.

Apollo escorts Iamos to the site with the promise that he will receive a "twofold treasury of prophesy," the ability both to hear the "voice ignorant of falsehoods" and, when Herakles comes to found the Olympic games, to establish for himself an oracle on the highest altar of Zeus (64-70).⁴⁵ Just as Pelops and Olympia have been shown to function as models for Hieron and Aitna/Syracuse, so too Iamos' activities at the Panhellenic sanctuary appear to perform a paradigmatic role for how we are to meant to view Hagesias and Syracuse. For in *Olympian* 6, Pindar portrays Olympia as a co-foundation: Iamos is instructed by Apollo to establish an oracle only when Herakles founds (κτίσῃ [69]) the festival and games. As a result, Olympia, the *apoikia* of Pelops, becomes a site where a seer does not pose a threat to, but rather can successfully join in, an Apollo-favored foundation. Further, in Iamos' (implicitly) rejected bid for kingship and his subsequent willingness to assume the position of steward of the oracle (and *only*

⁴⁰ Plut. *Mor.* 772e-773b.

⁴¹ On the expulsion of Pelops from Olympos, see Nagy 1986.

⁴² For the story of Pelops' dismemberment and ivory shoulder, see Nagy 1986.

⁴³ Neer 2010.4-7. What is more, Zeus and Ganymede also appear in *Olympian* 1 as well.

⁴⁴ Athanassaki 2003.122. That *Olympian* 1 may be concerned with Syracuse and not only Aitna suggests another point of contact between the ode and *Olympian* 6.

⁴⁵ Apollo leading Iamos to Olympia also has interesting implications for Delphi vs. the seer vis-à-vis colonization. Here not only is Iamos secondary to Pelops the oikist but he is subordinate to Apollo, i.e., Delphi.

that position), Pindar seems to assure us that Hagesias too is not after political power and is amenable to occupying a secondary position to Hieron.⁴⁶

Thus in the mythic portion of *Olympian 6*, as in Hagesias' own choice of the mule-cart race, Pindar creates a means for Hagesias to register his subordination to Hieron. Pindar grants the seer authority as a *sunoikistēr* but also figures him as someone who works in partnership with the tyrant and does not threaten his supremacy.

§ Reading *Olympian 6* with *Nemean 1*

When we read *Olympians 1* and *6* together, we find that the two odes form a dialogue on the nature of the relationship between kingship and seercraft. Since both odes also emphasize the foundation of Olympia (the *apoikia* of Pelops), we can further say that these two odes think in particular about how this relationship plays out in a colonial context. But *Olympian 1* is not the only ode with which *Olympian 6* seems to be in dialogue. *Olympian 6* also contains many points of contact with *Nemean 1*, perhaps even more than it does with Hieron's famous epinikion. I will first review some of the correlations between *Olympian 6* and *Nemean 1* before considering the implications of this further intertextual alignment. We will find that, as with *Olympian 1*, the two odes converge on the site of Olympia and its role as a paradigmatic foundation.

Nemean 1 commemorates the chariot victory of a certain Chromios, a military commander for Syracuse under both Gelon and Hieron and, later in his long career, the *epitropos* of Aitna.⁴⁷ After an opening invocation to Ortygia (1-7), the ode moves on to praise the whole island of Sicily (8-18) and then Chromios himself (19-30). Following a gnomic statement of how all men wish for a respite from adversity and renown for their achievements (31-33), *Nemean 1* enters into its myth, where (unusually) it remains until the end of the ode (33-72). For the myth, Pindar takes as his subject the "biography" of Herakles and recounts the circumstances surrounding the hero's birth before turning, through a prophecy of Teiresias, to his famous labors and apotheosis.

The date of *Nemean 1* is contested, as is the related issue of whether it was written before or after Pindar's other epinikion for Chromios, *Nemean 9*. But since Zeus is given the epithet "Aitnaios" (6) and the inscriptions of two MSS refer to Chromios "of Aitna," it has been generally and convincingly argued to postdate 476 BCE.⁴⁸ In terms of *Nemean 1*'s relation to *Olympian 6*, it will be remembered that the latter ode was composed for Hagesias' mule-cart victory in either 472 or 468 BCE. This makes it at least possible that Hagesias' ode is later than that of Chromios. As we will see below, this

⁴⁶ Like Herakles, Hieron himself was said to have founded games at Aitna.

⁴⁷ According to Schol. *N.* 9. inscr.: ὁ δὲ Χρόμιος οὗτος φίλος ἦν Ἰέρωνος, κατασταθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τῆς Αἴτνης ἐπίτροπος· ὄθεν καὶ Αἴτναϊός ἐκηρύχθη. We know of Chromios only from these two odes and their scholia.

⁴⁸ I say "convincingly" because Zeus Aitnaios was the patron god of the city of Aitna (appearing on its coins and in vase paintings representing Aitna's foundation [see Dougherty 1993.85-88] and I therefore think it unlikely that the reference to Zeus Aitnaios in *Nemean 1* could predate Aitna's foundation. Braswell (1992.25-27) notes that the first Nemean games after the foundation of Aitna were those of 475, although he suggests a date of 469 or 467 for *Nemean 1* (based on his preference of c. 470 for the earlier [in his view] *Nemean 9*). Braswell's dating is followed by Morrison 2007.24. Both Carey (1981.104) and Luraghi (1994.339-40) argue for an earlier performance date, Carey for 476 and Luraghi for 477. Luraghi explains Zeus Aitnaios as possibly referring not to the foundation of the city but to a previous eruption of the volcano.

order for the relative dating of the two epinikia seems to be confirmed by the way in which *Olympian* 6 appears to be alluding to *Nemean* 1 and not vice versa.

The points of correspondence between *Nemean* 1 and *Olympian* 6 are both thematic and dictional in nature.⁴⁹ Perhaps the most unexpected parallels occur in the way in which Pindar recounts the birth and infancy of Herakles and Iamos, two figures who ostensibly have little in common. In *Nemean* 1, Herakles springs from his mother's womb:

ὡς, ἐπεὶ σπλάγχων ὑπο ματέρος αὐ-
τίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διός
ὠδῖνα φεύγων διδύμῳ
σὺν κασιγνήτῳ μόλεν
(*N.* 1.35-36)

How, when from out of the womb of his mother suddenly into the wondrous daylight the child of Zeus came fleeing the birth pains with his twin brother.

Iamos makes a similar entrance:

ἦλθεν δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχων ὑπ' ὦ-
δίεσσ' ἐραταῖς Ἴαμος
ἐς φάος αὐτίκα.
(*O.* 6. 43-44)

And he came from out of the womb from lovely birth pains – Iamos! – suddenly into the light.

In addition to exhibiting the vocabulary one might expect in such a scene (σπλάγχων ὑπο [*N.* 1.35] and ὑπὸ σπλάγχων [*O.* 6.43]; ὠδῖνα [*N.* 1.36] and ὠδίεσσ' [*O.* 6.43]), we also find that both Herakles and Iamos appear suddenly (αὐτίκα [*N.* 1.35, *O.* 6.44]), that both are identified at the end of the line (παῖς Διός [*N.* 1.35] and Ἴαμος [*O.* 6. 43]), and that both are said to come into the light. The possibility that the similarities between these scenes can be attributed to their simply being generic descriptions of a birth, however, is undermined by the shared sequence of events that follow.⁵⁰ In each ode, divinely-sent snakes soon appear to the infant (*N.* 1.40; 44-45 and *O.* 6. 45-46),⁵¹ a seer materializes (Teiresias enters at *N.* 1.60-61; Iamos' future profession is announced at *O.* 6.50-51), and Hebe is obtained (literally as a wife for Herakles [*N.* 1. 71], metaphorically for Iamos [*O.* 6.57-58]). What is more, the order is the same in each: birth, snakes, seer, and Hebe.⁵²

⁴⁹ Here I follow closely Morrison (2007.76-79) who outlines these parallels. Morrison is interested in the connections between the two odes in terms of what their similarities can tell us about the odes' premiere performances and primary audiences.

⁵⁰ Morrison 2007.76.

⁵¹ The snakes are bad for Herakles but good for Iamos (Iamos also connects here with Melampous and other seers [e.g., Teiresias] who are also associated with snakes [cf. n. 24 above]).

⁵² This is noticed by Morrison 2007.76-77. See Morrison (2007.77 n. 217) for even more verbal parallels.

But the points of contact between Herakles in *Nemean 1* and Iamos in *Olympian 6* unite completely when, at the very end of Iamos' own myth, Herakles himself appears:

εὖτ' ἄν
 δὲ θρασυμάχανος ἐλθῶν
 Ἡρακλῆης, σεμνὸν θάλος Ἀλκαϊδᾶν, πατρί
 ἑορτάν τε κτίση πλειστόμβροτον τε-
 θμόν τε μέγιστον ἀέθλων,
 Ζηνὸς ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ βω-
 μῶ τότ' αὖ χρηστήριον θέσθαι κέλευσεν.
 (O. 6. 66-70)

And whenever it was that Herakles bold-in-resource, the august offspring of the Alkaidai, came and founded for his father a festival crowded with people and the greatest of contests, then it was that he commanded him to place an oracle on the highest altar of Zeus.

Iamos is enjoined by Apollo to found the altar of Zeus at Olympia at the time when Herakles comes to found its games and festival. The place where the independent stories of Iamos and Herakles actually convene, that is, where the relationship between the two figures moves from being intertextual to intratextual, is the place in *Olympian 6* in which the story of Iamos describes a co-foundation. And at this moment, it is hard not to think of Chromios in relation to Hagesias. In doing so, we might compare Chromios' position as *epitropos* of Aitna to Hagesias' role as *sunoikistēr* of Syracuse: Chromios and Hagesias intersect both in their subordination to Hieron and, more specifically, in their subordination to him within his colonial program.⁵³ Creating a joint foundation of Herakles and Iamos at Olympia in *Olympian 6* is one way for Pindar to acknowledge this.⁵⁴

Let us turn to one final parallel between the two odes. The island of Ortygia, the "old quarter" of Syracuse,⁵⁵ also figures prominently in each ode. *Nemean 1* begins with an address to the island:

Ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ,
 κλεινᾶν Συρακοσσᾶν θάλος Ὀρτυγία,
 δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος,
 Δάλου κασιγνήτα, σέθεν ἀδυεπῆς
 ὕμνος ὀρμάται θέμεν
 αἶνον ἀελλοπόδων
 μέγαν ἵππων, Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου χάριν·
 ἄρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου Νεμέα
 τ' ἔργασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος.

⁵³ See also Slater 1984 for the ways in which Chromios' subordination to Hieron is articulated in *Nemean 1*.

⁵⁴ It also seems to confirm that *Olympian 6* postdates *Nemean 1*. Cf. Morrison (2007.78-79), who thinks that the obscure myth of Iamos is much more likely to mirror (and so postdate) the famous one of Herakles than vice versa.

⁵⁵ At least according to Thucydides, who says that it was the first part of the city to be settled (Thuc. 6.3.2).

(N. 1.1-7)

Hallowed breathing place of Alpheios, Ortygia, offshoot of famous Syracuse, couch of Artemis, sister of Delos, from you a sweetly-worded hymn is issuing forth to place mighty praise upon storm-footed horses for the sake of Zeus Aitnaios. The chariot of Chromios and Nemea spur me to yoke a song of praise for victorious deeds.

Nemean 1 opens by invoking Ortygia ostensibly because Chromios was from Syracuse and the ode was performed there.⁵⁶ But let us look more closely at the way in which Ortygia is described, since it will be relevant for thinking about how the ode intersects with *Olympian* 6.

By identifying Ortygia as “the hallowed breathing place of Alpheios,” Pindar gestures toward the myth of Arethousa and Alpheios. Pausanias (5.7.2-4) provides the fullest version of the tale of the hunter Alpheios who fell in love with the huntress Arethousa. Arethousa, the story goes, rejected Alpheios and fled from the Greek mainland to the island of Ortygia where she was turned into a spring. In response, Alpheios changed into a river and, flowing under the sea from Greece, emerged from the spring of Arethousa, mixing his water with her own. This myth, which appears as early as Ibykos (*PMG* 323), is also found in the foundation oracle delivered to Archias, the oikist of Syracuse:

ὄς Ἀρχίαν τὸν Κορίνθιον ἐς τὸν Συρακουσῶν ἀποστέλλων οἰκισμὸν καὶ
τάδε εἶπε τὰ ἔπη·
Ὀρτυγίη τις κεῖται ἐν ἠεροειδέι πόντῳ,
Θρινακίης καθύπερθεν, ἴν' Ἀλφειοῦ στόμα βλύζει
μισγόμενον πηγαῖσιν ἐυρρείτης Ἀρεθούσης.
(Paus. 5.7.3)

[It was the god at Delphi] who, when he was sending Archias the Corinthian off to the founding of Syracuse also uttered the following oracle: An island, Ortygia, lies in the misty ocean above Thrinacia where the mouth of the Alpheios bubbles forth mixing with the springs of fair-flowing Arethousa.

While the Pythia’s characterization of Arethousa as the “mouth of the Alpheios” intriguingly recalls Pindar’s comparable description of the spring as the “breathing place of the Alpheios” (*N.* 1.1), we do not know if Pindar was in fact familiar with the foundation oracle.⁵⁷ But if we cannot be certain as to whether the reference to the myth in *Nemean* 1 was meant to recall the tradition concerning the original migration of settlers to Syracuse⁵⁸ (although this is an exciting possibility), how else might we think about its

⁵⁶ Braswell 1992.29; Morrison 2007.71-79.

⁵⁷ On attempts to date this oracle, see Braswell 1992.33-34. Braswell thinks that it is more likely that whoever composed the oracle had Pindar in mind rather than vice versa.

⁵⁸ As Dougherty (1993.69) has observed, “[T]he Greek river’s transoceanic travel from the Peloponnesus to Sicily prefigures the colonists’ own westward movement from Corinth.” Dougherty (1993.69) is also interested in how “the intermingling of the two streams becomes an emblem for Greek and native interaction.”

prominent placement in the ode's opening strophe? We can begin by recognizing that the co-mingling waters of Alpheios and Arethousa are not merely tied to Syracuse's colonial past but that this image is also a productive one for the city's fifth-century present. For, as *Nemean 1*'s first line implies, the Alpheios *continues* to tether Syracuse to Olympia and to the rest of the Peloponnese beyond. That is to say, Arethousa and Alpheios remain pertinent to Pindar's audience because they symbolize Syracuse's unbroken tie to the Greek mainland by means of the trans-Adriatic river which (supposedly) still flowed to Sicily. We must not underestimate the relevance of this image in the production of Syracusan identity: the fact that the Syracusans chose to place the image of Arethousa on their coins during this period exemplifies the story's significance in the articulation of their civic identity.⁵⁹

Yet, in addition to being a valuable image for Syracuse more generally, I would contend that the Alpheios and the spring of Arethousa were especially productive for Hieron's colonial program in particular. As we will explore in greater detail below, part of Hieron's fantasy for the foundation of Aitna was to have the city settled by five thousand Dorians from the Peloponnese and another five thousand from Syracuse itself.⁶⁰ The Alpheios, a river which originates deep within Arkadia before crossing the Adriatic, reaching Ortygia, and mixing with Arethousa, would be a fitting metaphor for the synoikism of Peloponnesians and Syracusans Hieron was hoping to engineer at Aitna. That we should indeed be connecting this myth to Hieron's vision for Aitna (where, it will be remembered, Chromios was reportedly *epitropos*) in *Nemean 1* is supported by the reference to Zeus Aitnaios in the same strophe: Pindar declares that from Ortygia a sweet-voiced hymn issues forth for the sake of Zeus Aitnaios (Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου χάριν [6]). Zeus Aitnaios was the patron deity of the city of Aitna and appeared on coins contemporary with *Nemean 1* and in vase paintings representing its foundation.⁶¹ By having Ortygia as the mouth of the Alpheios sing in honor of Zeus Aitnaios, Pindar draws Aitna within the ambit of a (foundation) tale about Syracuse and, in so doing, seems to suggest that this myth of mingling Peloponnesian and Ortygian waters is a fitting image for Hieron's newly-founded city as well.⁶²

Olympian 6 also features Ortygia and Zeus Aitnaios in quick succession:

εἶπον δὲ μεμνᾶσθαι Συρα-
 κοσσᾶν τε καὶ Ὀρτυγίας·
 τὰν ἱέρων καθαρῶ σκάπτῳ διέπων,
 ἄρτια μηδόμενος, φοινικόπεζαν
 ἀμφέπει Δάματρα λευκίπ-
 που τε θυγατρὸς ἑορτάν
 καὶ Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου κράτος. ἀδύλογοι δέ νιν
 λύραι μολπαί τε γινώσκοντι. μὴ θράσ-
 σοι χρόνος ὄλβον ἐφέρπων,

⁵⁹ For these coins, see Kraay 1976.210 and pl. 47 no. 800.

⁶⁰ Diod. Sic. 11.49.1.

⁶¹ Dougherty 1993.85-88. For the coins, see Kraay 1976. 212; 317 and see pl. 49, nos. 837, 838.

⁶² Assuming, as I think we should, that *Nemean 1* was composed after 476 BCE. This Pindaric sleight of hand in which Ortygia sings in honor of Zeus Aitnaios is yet another example of how the poet blurs the line between these two locations (that is, Syracuse proper and Hieron's Aitna) and their foundations.

σὺν δὲ φιλοφροσύναις εὐ-
ηράτοις Ἀγησία δέξαιτο κῶμον
(*O.* 6.92-98)

Tell them to make mention of Syracuse and Ortygia which Hieron administers with a pure scepter, contriving fitting counsels, and attends to red-footed Demeter and the festival of her daughter of the white horses and to mighty Zeus Aitnaios. Sweetly speaking lyres and songs know her (Ortygia).⁶³ May time which steals up not shatter her happiness but may she receive with lovely acts of friendliness the revel band of Hagesias.

In a number of ways, this antistrophe forms the reverse of the opening of *Nemean* 1. *Nemean* 1 begins in Ortygia before the path of song moves away to the rest of Sicily and then on to the Greek mainland (through its myth) while *Olympian* 6 features a *kōmos* being led back to Ortygia from Stymphalos and Olympia. In addition, *Olympian* 6's "sweetly speaking (ἀδύλογοι) lyres and songs" (96-97) which know Ortygia recall *Nemean* 1's "sweetly-worded hymn" (ἀδυεπῆς ὕμνος) (4-5) which issues forth from Ortygia. The Alpheios is not mentioned in connection to Ortygia here but, as explored in our discussion of *Olympian* 1, the river has already played a significant role earlier in the ode.⁶⁴ What is mentioned in connection to Ortygia, however, is Zeus Aitnaios. In fact, *Olympian* 6 is the only other ode to name Aitna's patron deity in this way.⁶⁵ And in this case, Hieron is present to link the two locations together himself by ruling Syracuse and Ortygia (92-93) and simultaneously being devoted to Zeus Aitnaios (95-96).⁶⁶

To sum up this section, there are a significant number of parallels between *Nemean* 1 and *Olympian* 6. The most explicit of these occur at moments which in some way allude to Hieron's colonial program (e.g., Herakles and Iamos making a joint foundation at Olympia; Zeus Aitnaios). In the parallels Pindar draws between his two patrons, Hagesias and Chromios, the poet places the seer on par with a military commander and does so not in the context of warfare, as was explored in Chapter 2, but, more unusually, in a colonial setting. I would like to continue thinking about this balancing act by looking now in greater detail at Hagesias' own idiosyncratic ties to the Peloponnese and their significance for a seer involved in the Deinomenid colonial agenda.

§ Mapping Hagesias' Lineage

Before looking at Hagesias' connections to the Peloponnese, however, let us first briefly review the significance Olympia held for Syracuse at the time of the composition of *Olympian* 6. It is well known that colonial cities of the Archaic and Classical periods expended vast amounts of resources on the sanctuaries of the Greek mainland and none

⁶³ I follow Friis Johansen's convincing argument that "viv" refers to Ortygia, not to Hieron (Friis Johansen 1973).

⁶⁴ And as we will see below, it is as if Hagesias himself performs the same sort of symbolic function of a link to the Peloponnese that the Alpheios in *Nemean* 1 represents.

⁶⁵ Although the later *Olympian* 4 does refer to Zeus as Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς Αἴτναν ἔχεις (6).

⁶⁶ Cf. *Pythian* 3.68-70 (quoted above) where Hieron as "Aitnaios xenos" again links Syracuse to Aitna.

more so than those of Sicily and southern Italy.⁶⁷ Instead of establishing Panhellenic or even regional, Pansikeliotite ritual centers of their own, the western Greek elite kept their focus trained on the homeland arenas of Delphi and Olympia, where their involvement in the games and the accompanying apparatus of commemoration, including erecting victory monuments and commissioning epinikia, frequently outshone their mainland competitors.⁶⁸ As Catherine Morgan has argued, one of the reasons for this attention was that by investing in these sites a polis in Magna Grecia “would have had the advantage of maintaining general links with the source of [the] colony's Greek identity, while avoiding the kind of close connection with the mother city which might compromise its independence.”⁶⁹ Moreover, for colonies, including wealthy Syracuse, desiring to display and so declare their Greek identity, Olympia, above all, was the venue to do so since only “Hellenes” were permitted to compete in those games.⁷⁰ In fact, so strong was the pull of Olympia on Magna Grecia that Hanna Philipp can characterize the sanctuary up to the end of the fifth century as “Das ‘Panionion der Westgriechen,’ das ihnen gemeinsamen Zentrum.”⁷¹

Given the importance of Olympia for Syracuse at the time of the performance of Olympian 6, Hagesias’ ability to claim the title of steward of the sanctuary’s altar undoubtedly brought with it significant cultural capital, especially in terms of Syracuse’s own sense of its Greek identity. It is interesting, then, in light of this relationship between Syracuse and Olympia that Pindar describes Apollo’s gift to Iamos as a “twofold treasury of prophecy” (θησαυρὸν δίδυμον / μαντοσύνας [65-66]).⁷² In his work on the treasuries of Delphi and Olympia, Richard Neer has demonstrated that these treasuries were regarded as “a little bit of the polis in the heart of a Panhellenic sanctuary.”⁷³ The metaphor of a *thésauros* is anachronistic for Iamos at this moment in the myth before the foundation of the games (and so the existence of treasuries there). But it is an appropriate

⁶⁷ For a recent discussion, see Antonaccio 2007.

⁶⁸ Roughly a third of all victory statues as well as *epinikia* can be tied to western colonies (Antonaccio 2007.276). See also Bell (1995.15) for Sicilian tyrants and their investment in the games of the *periodos* as a way of “enhancing and dramatizing their authority.” Malkin (1986) has argued that the altar of Apollo Archegetes at Naxos was considered a Pansikeliotite sanctuary where all Sicilian Greeks sacrificed before departing on *theōriai* and other voyages. Yet as Antonaccio (2007.272-73) has observed in response to this assertion, “[E]ven if all Sikeliote *theōroi* did sacrifice at the altar of Apollo the Founder, this specialized and restricted function does not compare with those of the sanctuaries at Olympia and Delphi... [T]he identities of the *Sikeliōtai*, either as a group or as individual communities... do not find expression at a shared sanctuary in Sicily, but back in the homeland.”

⁶⁹ Morgan 1993.20.

⁷⁰ See Antonaccio for non-Greek/Italian interest in Olympia (and Delphi) opening up a way for later colonial interest in these sites. Cf. Neer 2007.

⁷¹ Philipp 1994.88. Philipp notes, however, in making this characterization of Olympia as a primarily Peloponnesian-West Greek sanctuary, that Olympia was still not as restricted as the East Greek Panionion to which she compares it (Philipp 1994. 88, 91). Philipp’s argument for this characterization is based on an examination of victor lists, patrons of *epinikia*, dedications of statues, and descriptions by Pausanias. Although the amount of extant material is scanty, Philipp does show not only that western Greeks participated at the Olympic festival from its earliest stages but also that they seem to make up a sizable percentage of the overall participants in the games (until the end of the fifth century).

⁷² For the importance of the image of the *thésauros* in Pindar’s poetics, see Kurke 1991.156-58, 189-90 and Steiner 1993.

⁷³ Neer 2003.129. In fact, treasuries were another way in which western colonies were conspicuous at the mainland Panhellenic sanctuaries. Of the eleven treasuries at Olympia, half come from Magna Grecia.

image for Hagesias. That Pindar concretizes the Iamid stewardship as a treasury can perhaps help us think about Hagesias' presence in Syracuse. If we consider the seer's metaphorical *thēsauros* as performing the same symbolic work in Sicily that Neer argues treasuries achieved at Panhellenic sanctuaries, Hagesias, as steward of the altar of Zeus is, as it were, a physical "piece" of Olympia housed at Syracuse.⁷⁴

Indeed, the kind of Greek legitimacy that Hagesias can offer the Deinomenids is shored up in the ode by more than just his link to Olympia. As Pindar's lengthy excursion into Hagesias' genealogy makes clear, the seer has roots on the mainland that stretch far beyond the Panhellenic sanctuary. Pindar not only traces the Iamid clan back to Arkadian Phaisana and Sparta in the mythic portion of the ode but also dedicates an epode to the seer's Stymphalian pedigree on his mother's side (77-81). Hagesias thus lends Hieron's colonial enterprise a much more comprehensive pan-Peloponnesian origin than even his role as mantic *tamias* at Olympia can provide.

Hagesias' Peloponnesian patina has a number of other implications regarding the Deinomenids' colonial program that it will be fruitful to explore here. Teasing these out will again expose the careful give-and-take Pindar must navigate between the patron of the ode and Hagesias' own patron, Hieron. First, the significance of the seer's Peloponnesian connections emerges as all the more considerable once we acknowledge that they were something Hieron himself was unable to furnish. For the Deinomenids' own "aristocratic credentials" could not compete with those of Hagesias, at least as Pindar represents them in *Olympian* 6.⁷⁵ While Hagesias enjoys a double-descent from two Olympian gods as well as membership in a major Peloponnesian mantic clan, Hieron's lineage was of a more dubious and local nature. According to Herodotus, before becoming tyrants, the Deinomenids were priests of Demeter and Persephone, an office which, like their political one, they held only in Sicily.⁷⁶ The audience of *Olympian* 6 is reminded of this hereditary priesthood towards the end of the ode when Pindar describes Hieron as one who "is devoted to / red-footed Demeter and the festival of her daughter with the white horses" (94-95 [quoted above]).

I agree with Nicholson that this disparity both in pedigree and in priesthood/stewardship puts a strain on the hierarchy between Hagesias and Hieron. We can point to it as another example within the ode of how Pindar grants Hagesias, as his patron, a status that seems to impinge upon and even threaten that of Hieron.⁷⁷ Yet, at the same time, because Hagesias is so geographically diffused, with one foot in the Peloponnese and the other in Sicily, he perhaps, paradoxically, poses less of a threat to the Deinomenid regime than he would if he were solely a citizen of Syracuse.

⁷⁴ We can perhaps say, then, that there is a reciprocal relationship between Hagesias as a "treasury" in Syracuse and the contemporary or near-contemporary construction of the Syracusan treasury at Olympia. The metaphorical hall that is being built at the beginning of the ode (which is "constructed" out of Hagesias' talismanic titles of athletic victor, seer, and oikist) would thus a fitting image for Hagesias-as-treasure house.

⁷⁵ The quotation is from Nicholson 2005.94. I write "at least as Pindar represents them" because, as discussed above, Pindar remains our only independent source for the myth of Iamos.

⁷⁶ Hdt. 7.153. See also Schol. *O.* 6.158 c (Didymus; Philist. *FGrHist* 556 F 49, Tim. 566 F 96), Bowra 1964.117. Herodotus paints an unfavorable and shadowy portrait of the Deinomenids' progenitor, Telines stating that he does not know where Telines acquired the holy instruments of the goddesses or whether they were his own invention and, further, that Telines himself was "soft and effeminate."

⁷⁷ Nicholson 2005.94.

Hagesias' Peloponnesian roots are significant for Syracuse beyond their being deemed more legitimately "Greek" than those of Hieron. It is as if, as someone who comes from the Peloponnese and is also called a *sunoikistêr* of Syracuse, Hagesias is re-enacting the original foundation of the city. In doing so, he aligns Hieron's new foundation with Syracuse's initial one. This reënactment is played out within the ode itself, insofar as the *kômos* Hagesias is said to be leading from Stymphalos to Syracuse recreates the path of the notional first journey from the Greek mainland to Sicily:⁷⁸

σὺν δὲ φιλοφροσύναις εὐ-
 ηράτοις Ἀγησία δέξαιτο κῶμον
 οἴκοθεν οἴκαδ' ἀπὸ Στυμ-
 φαλίων τειχέων ποτινισόμενον,
 ματέρ' εὐμήλοιο λείποντ' Ἀρκαδίας.
 (O. 6.98-100)

But may she receive with lovely acts of friendliness the revel band of Hagesias coming home from home, leaving the walls of Stymphalos, the mother of fine-flocked Arkadia.

The choice of Stymphalos as the starting location of the *kômos* is unusual, for while there are certainly other epinikian *kômoi* in Pindar, they begin from the more expected point of departure, namely, the site of the athletic victory.⁷⁹ In contrast, the *kômos* at the end of *Olympian* 6 is envisioned as leaving a polis in the Peloponnese instead of the expected Olympia. As a result, Hagesias, in guiding his revel "from home to home," from mainland Stymphalos to colonial Syracuse, moves in the direction of a western migration, as if his (imagined) *kômos* were simultaneously meant to recall a colonial expedition. The colonial overtones of the epode are perhaps reinforced by the image that the *kômos* is "leaving the mother of fine-flocked Arkadia" (100). G.O. Hutchinson writes that "the basis for this aggrandization is not apparent."⁸⁰ But although the phrase simply means that Stymphalos is the mother of Arkadia, "leaving the mother" is simultaneously a colonial image and as such momentarily turns Hagesias' band of revelers into a group of settlers.⁸¹

Finally, that Hagesias is "traveling" in the ode from a Dorian polis in the Peloponnese to Syracuse is especially relevant in the colonial climate of Hieron's tyranny. The collocation of Hagesias' Peloponnesian origins and his title as *sunoikistêr* fits well with what we know of Hieron's Dorian fantasies for the recently-founded Aitna. In describing this foundation, Diodorus Siculus states that Hieron had very specific ideas as to who was to live in his city:

Ἰέρων δὲ τοὺς τε Ναξίους καὶ τοὺς Καταναίους

⁷⁸ Cf. Slater 1984 on Chromios' progress from old Greece to his reception at Syracuse.

⁷⁹ See, e.g., *Nemean* 9.1. Morrison (2007.72) also observes that the "starting-point [of the *kômos*] is usually the place of victory."

⁸⁰ Hutchinson 2001.421.

⁸¹ For another example of the image of the mother (city) in a colonial context in Pindar, see *Paian* 2.28-30. In addition, mentioning Arkadia suggests once again the Alpheios, which rises in Arkadia and has made the migration to Sicily.

ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ἀναστήσας, ἰδίους οἰκήτορας ἀπέ-
στειλεν, ἐκ μὲν Πελοποννήσου πεντακισχιλίου
ἀθροίσας, ἐκ δὲ Συρακουσῶν ἄλλους τοσούτους
προσθείς· καὶ τὴν μὲν Κατάνην μετωνόμασεν Αἴτ-
νην...

(Diod. Sic. 11.49.1)

Hieron removed the Naxians and Katanians from their cities and dispatched to there his own personal settlers, having collected five thousand from the Peloponnese and having added just as many others from Syracuse. And he changed the name of Katana to Aitna...

According to Diodorus, Hieron desired a Dorian polis comprised of Peloponnesians and Syracusans in equal number. The hybridity of Hagesias, a Syracusan man (ἄνδρῖ Συρακοσίῳ [18]) who is also from Stymphaelos and Olympia, is thus the individual articulation or embodiment of that ambitious synoikism. As such, the representation of Hagesias offers another example of how Pindar obscures the disruption of Hieron's project of "mass-deportation and resettlement" recounted by Diodorus⁸² and presents his audience instead with the image of Hagesias triumphantly leading a revel to Ortygia. In so doing, Pindar also offers a vision of a seer which can peacefully return to a city who welcomes him "with lovely acts of friendliness" (98).

To conclude, part of what enables Hagesias to be incorporated into the city and credited with its foundation is the fact that Syracuse is not his only home. He is simultaneously a steward of Zeus' altar at Olympia and a co-founder of Syracuse; his mother's family is from Stymphalos (77-81), while his Iamid ancestors derive from Sparta (Pitana) and Arkadian Phaisana. This oscillation between stability ("home") and itinerancy bookends *Olympian* 6. The poem begins with the building of a hall but ends on a ship with two anchors.⁸³ In this final moment at the end of the ode, the poet prays that the "lordly ruler of the sea" (δέσποτα ποντόμεδον [103]) grant a safe voyage for Hagesias' returning *kômos*, as if it is only as a traveler between two homes, without the desire to rule either that a seer, with the aid of the poet, can hope for Poseidon to hear his prayer.

⁸² The quotation is from Asheri 1992.150. For other examples of how Pindar obscures the actual violence of Hieron's colonial program, see Athanassaki 2003.

⁸³ Although scholars disagree on the symbolism of the two anchors, I take them to represent Hagesias' two homes. See Hutchinson 2001.422 and Goldhill 1991.164. Goldhill (1991.145-66) carefully charts the abundance of double images in the ode.

Conclusion

After discussing the Athenians' decision not to winter in Akarnania during the third year of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides provides the following digression amidst a description of the region's topography:¹

λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἀλκμέωνι τῷ Ἀμφιάρεω, ὅτε δὴ ἀλᾶσθαι αὐτὸν μετὰ τὸν φόνον τῆς μητρός, τὸν Ἀπόλλω ταύτην τὴν γῆν χρῆσαι οἰκεῖν, ὑπειπόντα οὐκ εἶναι λύσειν τῶν δειμάτων πρὶν ἂν εὐρῶν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ κατοικήσῃται ἥτις ὅτε ἔκτεινε τὴν μητέρα μήπω ὑπὸ ἡλίου ἐωρᾶτο μηδὲ γῆ ἦν, ὡς τῆς γε ἄλλης αὐτῷ μεμιασμένης. ὁ δ' ἀπορῶν, ὡς φασι, μόλις κατενόησε τὴν πρόσχωσιν ταύτην τοῦ Ἀχελῷου, καὶ ἐδόκει αὐτῷ ἰκανὴ ἂν κεχῶσθαι δίαίτα τῷ σώματι ἀφ' οὔπερ κτείνας τὴν μητέρα οὐκ ὀλίγον χρόνον ἐπλανᾶτο. καὶ κατοικισθεὶς ἐς τοὺς περὶ Οἰνιαδάς τόπους ἐδυνάστευσέ τε καὶ ἀπὸ Ἀκαρνᾶνος παιδὸς ἑαυτοῦ τῆς χώρας τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἐγκατέλιπεν. τὰ μὲν περὶ Ἀλκμέωνα τοιαῦτα λεγόμενα παρελάβομεν.

(Thuc. 2.102.5-6)

And it is said also that by way of his oracle Apollo told Alkmaion, son of Amphiaraos, when he was wandering after the murder of his mother, to dwell in this place, adding that there would be no release from his terrors until he found and settled in that place which, when he killed his mother, had not yet been seen by the sun and was not even land, on the grounds that the rest of the earth was polluted for him. And he being at a loss, as they tell it, at last noticed this deposit of the Achelous, and it seemed to him that a place sufficiently able to provide for life would have been thrown up from the time he had killed his mother and engaged in his lengthy wanderings. And settling in the district around Oiniadai, he held power and he named the country after his own son Akarnan. We received stories of this sort about Alkmaion.

Examining this passage will allow me to point to some potential areas for future research into the cultural imaginary of *manteia*.

For Dougherty, this story is an exemplary foundation tale since it contains two prominent motifs of colonial narrative: the motif of the murderer-in-exile who becomes an oikist and the motif of the oracular riddle featuring an “impossible landscape” (in this case, the challenge of finding “that place which, when he killed his mother, had not yet been seen by the sun”).² Whereas Dougherty and others have focused on Alkmaion's

¹ This account of how Alkmaion came to settle Akarnania has garnered attention for just how un-Thucydidean it sounds. The passage is atypical not only for its mythological subject matter but also for the historian's use of poetic language, including the phrase λύσειν τῶν δειμάτων and the culminating and “powerfully-positioned” μεμιασμένης, a word which appears only here in Thucydides (Hornblower 2004.106-07). According to Hornblower (2004.106), both nouns in the phrase λύσειν τῶν δειμάτων are poetic. δεῖμα is only found one other time in Thucydides (7.80), and Hornblower compares the expression to Pindar's λύσις πενθέων (N. 10.76-7).

² In these foundation oracles, the oikist must decipher the real meaning of a nonsensical description of a landscape in order to discover the correct location for his colony. See Dougherty 1993.45-60.

status as an oikist, in keeping with my goals throughout this project, I draw attention to the fact that Alkmaion is simultaneously a Melampodid seer.³ To be sure, it is understandable that scholars do not discuss Alkmaion as a seer because there is nothing mantic about his behavior or his experiences in Thucydides' account: Alkmaion does not appear to have a relationship with Apollo that is substantively different from or more privileged than that enjoyed by other oikists whom Delphi provides with similarly cryptic foundation oracles.

One solution to Alkmaion's un-seer-like characterization would be to draw on my conclusions from Chapter 3: Alkmaion's behavior is another instance in which the function of the oikist eclipses that of the seer even when, as here, the oikist and the seer are one and the same individual.⁴ But the myth also gestures towards another cultural phenomenon as well, namely the competition in colonial contexts between seers and the oracle at Delphi.

Delphi's injunction to Alkmaion to find "that place which, when he killed his mother, had not yet been seen by the sun" would seem at first blush to describe a place underground. And I find it difficult not to think of this initially as the meaning of the oracle given that Alkmaion's father, who is named in the passage, is none other than Amphiaraos. Amphiaraos, as numerous ancient sources relate, was swallowed up by the earth before the walls of Thebes, and the site of his mythical engulfment was marked by the seer's *manteion*.⁵ It would seem, then, that Delphi commands Alkmaion to descend below the earth and to establish an oracle of his own. Such an interpretation is, of course, incorrect. The Pythia intends for Alkmaion to settle the alluvial deposits of the Achelous river, which had silted up in the time since he had murdered his mother. Put another way, the proper solution is for the seer to become an oikist and to found a city, not another oracle.⁶ We might read this myth, then, as a contestation over oracular authority in which the possibility of a *manteion* of Alkmaion is raised only to be dismissed as a false interpretation of the Delphic oracle. Instead, Alkmaion becomes the oikist of a Delphi-sanctioned site and founds Akarnania, thereby deferring to the oracular preëminence of Delphi.

Exploring the competition between Delphi and independent seers, particularly in colonial contexts, is a promising subject for future study. Moreover, I suspect that there is a diachronic dimension to this competition. We can already perhaps begin to observe this diachronic difference regarding Delphi's involvement in colonization vis-à-vis seers when we compare Homer's colonial narrative to that of Pindar. In the early archaic world of the *Odyssey* in which Greeks were founding settlements overseas but the Delphic oracle had not yet risen to prominence, Theoklymenos and Odysseus-as-oikist can form a coherent pair within the framework of colonization. Yet Delphi figures prominently in the colonial narratives of Pindar: in *Olympian* 7 Pindar diverges from the Homeric version of the myth of Tlepolemos and his colonization of Rhodes (*Iliad* 2.661-69) by

³ For Alkmaion's inheritance of his father Amphiaraos' prophetic power, see Pi. *P.* 8.60

⁴ Alkmaion would then actually be a counter-example to Hagesias in Chapter 4 whose qualities as a seer and as an oikist are allowed to co-exist in *Olympian* 6.

⁵ See, e.g., Pi. *O.* 6.14, Aesch. *Sept.* 587-89, Hdt. 8.134.2, Soph. *El.* 837-41.

⁶ That Alkmaion could potentially found an oracle is, I think, a real possibility since there is another myth in which his own brother, Amphilochos, founds the oracle of Mallos together with Mopsos in Anatolia (Plut. *Mor.* 434d).

inserting Delphi into his account of the same tale; one can also look to the foundation tales of Battos and the Delphic oracle embedded in *Pythians* 4 and 5.

Thucydides' digression suggests one other topic worthy of consideration. The historian's source for this story is unknown, but the myth of Alkmaion was the subject of tragedies by both Sophocles and Euripides. Amphiaraos, too, was a popular figure in fifth-century Athens, appearing in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* and Euripides' *Phoinissai*. He also had a prominent sanctuary at Oropos. Uncovering the ways in which Greek fantasies about their seers develop and transform over the course of the fifth century is yet another direction in which one might continue the investigation of the cultural imaginary of *manteia*.

Bibliography

- Amory, A. 1963. "The Reunion of Odysseus and Penelope." In *Essays on the Odyssey*, ed. C. Taylor, 100-21. Bloomington, IN.
- Antonaccio, C.M. 1999. "Colonization and the Origins of Greek Hero Cult." In *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*, ed. R. Hägg, 109-21. Stockholm.
- 2001. "Colonization and Acculturation." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, ed. I. Malkin, 113-57. Cambridge, MA.
- 2007. "Elite Mobility in the West." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, eds. S. Hornblower and C. Morgan, 265-85. Oxford.
- Asheri, D. 1992. "Sicily, 478-431 B.C." In *Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd ed. Vol. 5: 147-70.
- , ed. 2006. *Erodoto: Le Storie. Libro IX: La battaglia di Platea*. Rome.
- Athanassaki, L. 2003. "Transformations of Colonial Disruption into Narrative Continuity in Pindar's Epinician Odes." *HSCP* 101: 93-128.
- Austin, J. N. H. 1972. "Name Magic in the *Odyssey*." *ClAnt* 2: 45-63.
- 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey*. Berkeley and London.
- Bakker, E. 1997. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca.
- Bell, M. 1995. "The Motya Charioteer and Pindar's *Isthmian* 2." *MAAR* 40: 1-42.
- Benardete, S. 1997. *The Bow and the Lyre: a Platonic Reading of the Odyssey*. Lanham, MD.
- Benveniste, E. 1973. *Indo-European Language and Society*. Trans. E. Palmer. London.
- Bethe, E. 1922. *Homer II*. Leipzig.
- Beye, C. 1966. *The Iliad, the Odyssey and the Epic Tradition*. New York.
- Bolling, G.M. 1925. *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*. Oxford.
- Bowra, C.M. 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.
- Braswell, B.K. 1992. *A Commentary on Nemean One*. Fribourg.
- 1998. *A Commentary on Nemean Nine*. Berlin and New York.
- Broggiato, M. 2003. "Interpretazioni antiche e moderne della visione di Teoclimeno nell'*Odissea* (Od. 20. 351-357)." In *Rhusmos. Studi di poesia, metrica e musica greca offerti dagli allievi a Luigi Enrico Rossi per i suoi settant'anni. Seminari Romani di Cultura Classica, Quaderni 6*, ed. R. Nicolai, 63-72. Rome.
- Burkert, 1972. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Trans. P. Bing. Berkeley.
- Burnett, A.P. 1985. *The Art of Bacchylides*. Cambridge, MA.
- Cairns, D. 2005. "Myth and Polis in Bacchylides' Eleventh Ode." *JHS* 125: 35-48.
- Calame, C. 2003. *Myth and History in Ancient Greece. The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*. Trans. D.W. Berman. Princeton and Oxford.
- Carey, C. 1981. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*. New York.
- 1993. "Pindar's Ninth Nemean Ode." In *Tria Lustra*, ed. L. Ayres, 85-103. New Brunswick.
- Carlier, P. 1984. *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*. Strasbourg.

- Cartledge, P. 1987. *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*. Baltimore.
- Casevitz, M. 1985. *Le Vocabulaire de la Colonization en Grec Ancien: Étude Lexicologique: Les Familles de κτιζω et de οικέω – οικίζω*. Paris.
- Ciaceri, E. 1911. *Culti e miti nella storia dell'antica Sicilia*. Catania.
- Clay, J.S. 1980. "Goat Island: OD. 9.116-141." *CP* 74: 262-64.
- . 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Crielaard, J.-P. 1995. "Homer, History, and Archaeology." In *Homeric Questions*, ed. J.-P. Crielaard, 201-88. Amsterdam.
- Currie, B. 2005. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford.
- Daux, G. 1958. "Notes de lecture: Le devin Cléoboulos." *BCH* 82: 364-66.
- Dawson, G. 1994. *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire, and the Imagining of Masculinities*. London and New York.
- Dench, E. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines*. Oxford.
- Detienne, M., and J.-P. Vernant. 1978. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Dillery, J. 2005. "Chresmologues and Manteis: Independent Diviners and the Problem of Authority." In *Mantikê*, eds. S. I. Johnston and P. T. Struck, 167-231. Leiden.
- Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization*. Oxford.
- . 1994. "Archaic Greek foundation poetry: Questions of genre and occasion." *JHS* 114: 35-46.
- . 2001. *The Raft of Odysseus*. Oxford.
- Dowden, K. 1989. *Death and the Maiden*. London and New York.
- Drachmann, A.B., ed. 1903. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. Vol. 1. *Scholia in Olympionicas*. Leipzig.
- . 1910. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. Vol. 2. *Scholia in Pythonicas*. Leipzig.
- . 1926. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. Vol. 3. *Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas-Epimetrum-Indices*. Leipzig.
- Dunbabin, T.J. 1948. *The Western Greeks. The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 B.C.* Oxford.
- Erbse, H. 1972. *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 13. Berlin.
- Farnell, L. 1932. *The Works of Pindar*. Vol. 2. *Critical Commentary*. London.
- Fenik, B. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*. Hermes Einzelschriften 30. Wiesbaden.
- Finley, J. 1978. *Homer's Odyssey*. Cambridge, MA.
- Flower, M. A. 2008a. *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- . 2008b. "The Iamidae: A Mantic Family and Its Public Image." In *Practitioners of the Divine: Greek Priests and Religious Officials from Homer to Heliodorus*, eds. B. Dignas and K. Trampedach, 187-206. Cambridge, MA.
- Flower, M. A. and J. Marincola, eds. 2002. *Herodotus, Histories, Book IX*. Cambridge.
- Friis Johansen, H. 1973. "Agesias, Hieron, and Pindar's Sixth Olympian Ode." In *Classica et Mediaevalia. Francisco Blatt septuagenario dedicata*, eds. O.S. Due, A. Friis Johansen, and B. Dalsgaard Larsen, 1-9. Copenhagen.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Vol. 1. Baltimore.

- Garner, R. 1992. "Countless Deeds of Valour: Bacchylides 11." *CQ* 42:523-25.
 ----- 1992. "Mules, Mysteries, and Song in Pindar's *Olympia* 6." *CA* 11.1: 45-67.
- Geertz, C. 1993 (1983). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. London.
- Giangiulio, M. 1989. *Ricerche su Crotona Arcaica*. Pisa.
 ----- 2001. "Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene." In *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. N. Luraghi, 116-37. Oxford.
- Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Griffith, M. 2006. "Horsepower and Donkeywork: Equids and the Ancient Greek Imagination." *CP* 101.3: 185-246.
 ----- 2006. "Horsepower and Donkeywork: Equids and the Ancient Greek Imagination." *CP* 101.4: 307-358.
- Hall, J. 2000 (1997). *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.
 ----- 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago and London.
- Halliday, W.R. 1975 (1928). *The Greek questions of Plutarch*. New York: Arno Press.
- Hansen, W. 1975. *The Conference Sequence: Patterned Narration and Narrative Inconsistency in the Odyssey*. University of California Publications in Classical Studies. Vol. 8. Berkeley.
- Harris, E. M. 1995. *Aeschines and Athenian Politics*. Oxford.
- Harrison, T. 2000. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*. Oxford.
- Helms, M. 1988. *Ulysses' Sail: An Ethnographic Odyssey of Power, Knowledge, and Geographical Distance*. Princeton.
 ----- 1993. *Craft and the Kingly Ideal: Art, Trade, and Power*. Austin.
- Heubeck, A., S. West, and J.B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- Heubeck, A., and A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 2. Oxford.
- Higbie, C. 1995. *Heroic Names, Homeric Identities*. New York and London.
- Hodkinson, S. 1999. "An Agonistic Culture? Athletic Competition in Archaic and Classical Spartan Society." In *Sparta: New Perspectives*, eds. S. Hodkinson and A. Powell, 147-87. London.
- Hornblower, S. 2001. "Epic and Epiphanies: Herodotus and the "New" Simonides." In *The New Simonides: Context of Praise and Desire*, eds. D. Boedeker and D. Sider, 135-47. Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford.
 ----- 2007. "The Dorieus episode and the Ionian Revolt (5.42-8)." In *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories*, eds. E. Greenwood and E. Irwin, 168-78. Cambridge.
- How, W. W. and J. Wells. 2002 (1912). *A Commentary on Herodotus*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Hutchinson, G.O. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*. Oxford.
- Jameson, M. H. 1991. "Sacrifice before Battle." In *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, ed. V. D. Hanson, 197-228. London.
- Johnston, S. I. 2008. *Ancient Greek Divination*. Malden, MA and Oxford.

- Jong, I. J. F. de. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- Jost, M. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*. Paris.
- . 1992. "La Légende de Mélampus en Argolide et dans le Péloponnèse." In *Polydipsion Argos* (BCH Suppl. 22), ed. M. Piérart, 173-84. Paris.
- Katz, M.A. 1991. *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Kearns, E. 1982. "The Return of Odysseus: a Homeric Theoxeny." *CQ* 32: 2-8.
- Kett, P. 1966. *Prosopographie der historischen griechischen Manteis bis auf die Zeit Alexanders des Großen*. Erlangen.
- Kirk, G. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.
- Kirkwood, G. 1982. *Selections from Pindar*. Chico, Calif.
- Köhnken, A. 1974. "Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops story in *Olympian* 1." *CQ* 24: 199-206.
- Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods. Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford.
- Kraay, C.M. 1976. *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*. Berkeley.
- Krummen, E. 1990. *Pyrros Hymnon*. Berlin and New York.
- Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.
- . 1993. "The Economy of Kudos." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, eds. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, 131-63. Cambridge.
- Löffler, I. 1963. *Die Melampodie*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Lonis, R. 1979. *Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique*. Paris.
- Loroux, N. 1986. *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Trans. A. Sheridan. Cambridge, MA and London.
- Lord, A.B. 2001 (1960). *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
- Luraghi, N. 1994. *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia*. Florence.
- . 1997. "Un mantis eleo nella Siracusa di Ierone: Agesia di Siracusa, Iamide di Stinfalo." *Klio* 79: 69-86.
- Macan, R. W. 1908. *Herodotus: The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books*. 2 vols. London.
- . 1973 (1895). *Herodotus: The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books*. New York.
- MacFarlane, K. 1998. "Bacchylides absolvens: the defeat of Alexidamus in Bacchylides 11." In *Celebratio. Thirtieth Anniversary Essays at Trent University*, eds. J.P. Bews, I.C. Storey, and M.R. Boyne, 42-49. Peterborough, Ontario.
- Maehler, H. 2004. *Bacchylides: A Selection*. Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge.
- Malkin, I. 1986. "Apollo Archegetes and Sicily." *ASNP*, NS 3, 17.4: 959-72.
- . 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden.
- . 1989. "Delphoi and the Founding of Social Order in Archaic Greece." *Métis* 4: 129-53.
- . 1994. *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*. Cambridge.
- . 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley.
- Martin, R. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca.
- . 1997. "Similes and Performance." In *Written Voices, Spoken Signs*, ed. E. Bakker and A. Kahane, 138-66. Cambridge, MA.
- McGlew, J.F. 1993. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca and London.
- McInerney, J. 1999. *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*.

- Austin.
- Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.
- Merkelbach, R. 1951. *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee.* Munich.
- Merkelbach, R. and M.L. West. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodica.* Oxford.
- Morgan, C. 1993. "The Origins of Pan-Hellenism." In *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, eds. N. Marinatos and R. Hägg, 18-44. London and New York.
- Morrison, A.D. 2007. *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes.* BICS Supplement 95. London.
- Muellner, L. 1976. *The Meaning of Homeric EYXOMAI Through Its Formulas.* Innsbruck.
- Munson, R. V. 2001. *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus.* Ann Arbor.
- Murnaghan, S. 1987. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey.* Princeton.
- Nagy, G. 1986. "Pindar's *Olympian* 1 and the Aetiology of the Olympic Games." *TAPA* 116: 71-88.
- 1990. *Pindar's Homer. The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past.* Baltimore and London.
- Neer, R. 2003. "Framing the Gift: The Siphnian Treasury at Delphi and the Politics of Architectural Sculpture." In *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, eds. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, 129-49. Cambridge.
- 2007. "Delphi, Olympia, and the Art of Politics." In *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*, ed. H.A. Shapiro. Cambridge. 225-65.
- 2010. "Pindar and the Monuments." Unpublished lectured delivered at the Classical Arts Society, Chicago, March 2010.
- Nicholson, N. 2005. *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece.* Cambridge.
- Osborne, M. J. 1981, 1982. *Naturalization in Athens.* 2 vols. Brussels.
- Osborne, R. 1998. "Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West." In *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, eds. N. Fisher and H. van Wees, 251-69. London and Swansea.
- Page, D. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey.* Oxford.
- Papademetriou, J. 1957. "Ὁ θεῖος τοῦ Αἰσχίνου Κλεοβούλος ὁ Μαντις." *Platon* 9: 154-62.
- Parke, H.W. 1967. *The Oracles of Zeus.* Oxford.
- Parke, H.W. and D.E.W. Wormell. 1956. *The Delphic Oracle.* 2 vols. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2004. "One Man's Piety: The Religious Dimension of the *Anabasis*." In *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand*, ed. R.L. Fox, 131-53. New Haven.
- Peek, W. 1937. "Verbesserungen zu Boiotischen Epigrammen." *Hermes* 72: 232-39.
- Philipp, H.K. 1994. "Olympia, die Peloponnes und die Westgriechen." *JDAI* 109: 77-92.
- Polanyi, K. 1968. *Primitive, Archaic, and Modern Economies: Essays of Karl Polanyi*, ed. G. Dalton. Garden City, NY.
- Pritchett, W. K. 1979. *The Greek State at War.* Vol. 3. Berkeley.
- 1979. "Plataiai." *AJP* 100: 145-52.

- Race, W. 1993. "First Appearances in the *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 123: 79-107.
- Redfield, J. 1983. "The Economic Man." In *Approaches to Homer*, ed. C.A. Rubino and C. Shelmerdine, 218-47. Austin.
- Richer, N. 1999. "Le recherche des appuis surnaturels topiques par les Spartiates en guerre." In *Le Péloponnèse: Archéologie et Histoire. Actes de la rencontre internationale de Lorient (12-15 mai 1998)*, ed. J. Renard, 135-48. Rennes.
- Robert, C. 1917. "ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Φερκύδῃ." *Hermes* 52:308-13.
- Rose, P. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth*. Ithaca.
- Rose, V. 1966 (1886). *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Russo, J., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 3. Oxford.
- Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.
- Schachter, A. 2000. "The Seer Tisamenos and the Klytiadai." *CQ* 50.292-95.
- Seaford, R. 1988. "The eleventh ode of Bacchylides: Hera, Artemis, and the absence of Dionysus." *JHS* 108: 118-136.
- Segal, C.P. 1998. *Aglaia*. Lanthan, MD.
- Sineux, P. 2007. *Amphiaraos: guerrier, devin et guérisseur*. Paris.
- Slater, W.J. 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.
- . 1984. "Nemean One: The Victor's Return in Poetry and Politics." In *Greek poetry and philosophy. Studies in honour of Leonard Woodbury*, ed. D.E. Gerber, 241-64. Chico, CA.
- Steiner, D. 1993. "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti.'" *HSCP* 95: 159-80.
- Stern, J. 1970. "The myth of Pindar's *Olympian* 6." *AJP* 91: 332-40.
- Stoevestandt, M. 2005. *Feinde - Gegner - Opfer. Zur Darstellung der Trojaner in den Kampfszenen der Ilias*. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Band 30. Basel.
- Suarez de la Torre, E. 1992. "Les Pouvoirs des devins et les récits mythiques. L'Exemple de Mélémpous." *LEC* 60:3-21.
- Taita, J. 2001. "Indovini Stranieri al Servizio dello Stato Spartano: Un' "epoikia" elea a Sparta in una nuova iscrizione da Olimpia." *Dike* 4: 39-85.
- Tandy, D.W. 1997. *Warriors into Traders: The Power of the Market in Early Greece*. Berkeley.
- Thornton, A. 1970. *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey*. London.
- Vannicelli, P. 2005. "Da Platea a Tanagra: Tisameno, Sparta e il Peloponneso durante la Pentecontaetia." In *Erodoto e il 'modello erodoteo': Formazione e trasmissione delle tradizioni storiche in Grecia*, ed. M. Giangiulio, 257-76. Trento.
- Versnel, H. S. 1970. *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. Leiden.
- . 1987. "What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God? Some Reflections on Greco-Roman Epiphany." In *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religion*, ed. D. van der Plas, 42-55. Leiden.
- Vian, F. 1965. "Mélémpous et les Proitides." *REA* 67: 25-30.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. 1986. "Land and Sacrifice in the *Odyssey*." In *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World*, ed. P. Vidal-Naquet, 15-38. Trans. A. Szegedy-Maszak. Baltimore.

- West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1927. *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*. Berlin.