



# Olympia and the Classical Hellenic State City-Culture

*Thomas Heine Nielsen*

Historiske-filosofiske Meddelelser 96

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab  
*The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters*

DET KONGELIGE DANSKE VIDENSKABERNES SELSKAB  
udgiver følgende publikationsrækker:

THE ROYAL DANISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND LETTERS  
issues the following series of publications:

<i>Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser</i> , 8°	<i>Authorized Abbreviations</i> Hist.Fil.Medd.Dan.Vid.Selsk. (printed area 175 x 104 mm, 2700 units)
<i>Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter</i> , 4° (History, Philosophy, Philology, Archaeology, Art History)	Hist.Filos.Skr.Dan.Vid.Selsk. (printed area 2 columns, each 199 x 77 mm, 2100 units)
<i>Matematisk-fysiske Meddelelser</i> , 8° (Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology)	Mat.Fys.Medd.Dan.Vid.Selsk. (printed area 180 x 126 mm, 3360 units)
<i>Biologiske Skrifter</i> , 4° (Botany, Zoology, Palaeontology, General Biology)	Biol.Skr.Dan.Vid.Selsk. (printed area 2 columns, each 199 x 77 mm, 2100 units)
<i>Oversigt, Annual Report</i> , 8°	Overs.Dan.Vid.Selsk.

### General guidelines

The Academy invites original papers that contribute significantly to research carried on in Denmark. Foreign contributions are accepted from temporary residents in Denmark, participants in a joint project involving Danish researchers, or those in discussion with Danish contributors.

#### Instructions to authors

Manuscripts from contributors who are not members of the Academy will be refereed by two members of the Academy. Authors of papers accepted for publication will receive galley proofs and page proofs; these should be returned promptly to the editor. Corrections other than of printer's errors will be charged to the author(s) insofar as the costs exceed 15% of the cost of typesetting.

Authors receive a total of 50 free copies. An order form, quoting a special price for additional copies, will accompany the page proofs. Authors are invited to provide addresses of up to 20 journals to which review copies could profitably be sent.

Manuscripts can be returned, but only upon request made before publication of the paper. Original photos and artwork are returned upon request.

# Olympia and The Classical Hellenic City-State Culture

*By Thomas Heine Nielsen*

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 96

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab  
*The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters*

## *Abstract*

The present study considers the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia from the following two points of view: (1) How did interaction at the sanctuary contribute towards the drawing of an ethnic boundary between Hellenes and Barbarians and how was Hellenic athletic nudity construed in this context? (2) How did interaction at the sanctuary help the great multitude of Hellenic *poleis* to develop and maintain their identities as individual local communities? In this context particular emphasis is put on a consideration of the *polis* of Elis, the city-state which organised and staged the Olympic Games. The study argues that in the Classical period the sanctuary at Olympia was in fact one of the most important arenas in which the two most characteristic levels of Hellenic identity – the overall and shared Hellenic identity and the individual local *polis*-identity of each community – was negotiated, developed and maintained, and collects the evidence needed to substantiate these points.

Thomas Heine Nielsen  
University of Copenhagen  
Saxo Institute  
Department of Greek & Latin  
Njalsgade 80  
2300 Copenhagen S

*For Jim Roy*

# Contents

I. Introduction .....	5
II. Athletics as a Distinctively Hellenic Activity .....	12
III. The Ethnic Exclusiveness of the Olympics .....	18
IV. Hellenic Athletic Nudity .....	22
V. Elis and the administration of Olympia .....	29
VI. Hellenic Interaction at Olympia .....	55
VII. Conclusion .....	99
Abbreviations etc. ....	102
Bibliography .....	106
Index of Sources .....	120
General Index .....	121



# I. Introduction

In this study I shall attempt to illuminate one of the socio-political processes by which the great multitude<sup>1</sup> of the highly diverse Hellenic *poleis* came to constitute a unified city-state culture<sup>2</sup> as opposed to a random agglomeration of individual city-states.<sup>3</sup>

- 
1. Exactly how many Hellenic *poleis* existed at any point in time is impossible to say. The *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* by the Copenhagen Polis Centre (= Hansen & Nielsen 2004) includes descriptions of 1,035 communities which were certainly, probably, or possibly *poleis* throughout or at least for some time within the Archaic and Classical periods. They were not, however, all in existence at any one point in time since some *poleis* ceased to exist (e.g. Arisba (no. 768) on Lesbos (Hdt. 1.151.2; Strabo 13.1.21)) whereas new *poleis* were frequently founded throughout these periods, e.g. Megalopolis in Arkadia (no. 282; Diod. Sic. 15.72.4 and Paus. 8.27.1-8 with Nielsen 2002: 414-42); Messene in Messenia (no. 316; Paus. 4.27.9 with Roebuck 1941: 27-39; for the possibility that there was a perioikic settlement on the site prior to the foundation, see Luraghi 2002: 61); Rhodos (no. 1000; Diod. Sic. 13.75.1) on the homonymous island (for synoecised Rhodes, see Gabrielsen 2000); etc. For a brief discussion of this problem, see the section "The Number of *Poleis*" by Hansen in Hansen & Nielsen 2004: 53-54 in which it is suggested that in the year 400 there were at least 862 *poleis* in existence and that the total number of *poleis* in any given year never exceeded 1,000. (Serial numbers in parenthesis following the name of a *polis* indicate the number given to the *polis* in question in Hansen & Nielsen 2004; in cases where I cite no source or give no reference to scholarly literature for details relating to a particular *polis* and give merely the serial number, the relevant sources and references can be found in the inventory entry.) – The present study focuses on the Classical period, but late Archaic and very early Hellenistic evidence is discussed if it illuminates the question under scrutiny. I have provided translations of all Greek cited in the hope that the study will be of interest also to e.g. historians of athletics or historians of religion; if not my own, such translations are taken from standard translations such as Loeb though sometimes modified. In order to ease reading and use of the study further, a list of abbreviations etc. is included at 104-7.
  2. For the concept of "city-state culture", see Hansen 2000a. For descriptions of the known city-state cultures throughout world history, see the papers collected in Hansen 2000b and 2002.
  3. I do not claim that the process under consideration here, interaction at Olympia, was the *only* such process, but only that it was *one* such – though certainly one of the more important ones. On the contrary, the present study is rather the first of what I hope will be a series of studies discussing the socio-political processes by which the Hellenic *poleis* came to form and maintain a city-state culture. And, of course, I do not claim that the function discussed here was the *only* function of the sanctuary at Olympia.

Though they were similar in many crucial respects, the Hellenic *poleis* were also readily recognisable individual communities which differed enormously in terms of size,<sup>4</sup> geographical position,<sup>5</sup> constitution,<sup>6</sup> religious cults,<sup>7</sup> etc.

In addition to these more or less tangible differences there were more subtle nuances of difference in identity and consequently the Classical Hellenic world consisted, in the happy turn of phrase by Cartledge, of “more than a thousand separate and usually radically self-differentiated ‘cities’”, i.e. *poleis*.<sup>8</sup> One ob-

- 
4. Our sources often distinguish between ‘great and small *poleis*’, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31: τὰς δὲ ἄλλας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις καὶ μικρὰς καὶ μεγάλας κτλ. Of course, the criteria on which this distinction is based may vary, from the size of the citizen population to the size of the territory, from poverty to wealth, from army size to political influence etc. See Hansen 1997: 25-31; Nixon & Price 1990.
5. In Plato’s memorable phrase, the Hellenes lived on the shores of the Mediterranean and Black Seas “like ants and frogs about a marsh” (Jowett; *Phd.* 109b: ἡμᾶς οἰκεῖν τοὺς μέγρι Ἡρακλείων στηλῶν ἀπὸ Φάσιδος ἐν σμικρῷ τινι μορίῳ, ὥσπερ περὶ τέλμα μύρμηκας ἢ βατράχους περὶ τὴν θάλατταν οἰκοῦντας). The easternmost Greek *polis* included in Hansen & Nielsen 2004 is Phasis (no. 711) while the westernmost is Emporion (no. 2); to the north, there was Olbia (no. 690) and to the south Kyrene (no. 1028) and Naukratis (no. 1023). See Hansen 2000c: 141-43.
6. See e.g. Demand 1996 for the striking preservation of monarchy on Cyprus. The descriptions of individual *poleis* in Hansen & Nielsen 2004 include the available evidence on forms of constitution; the results as regards the fourth century may be briefly summarised as follows: 39 *poleis* are known to have been tyrannies (e.g.: Syracuse (no. 47), Sikyon (no. 228), and Eretria (no. 370)); 47 are known to have been oligarchies (e.g.: Korkyra (no. 123), Tegea (no. 297), and Korinthos (no. 227)); while 59 are known to have been democracies (e.g.: Lokroi (no. 59), Ambrakia (no. 113), and Mantinea (no. 281)); see further Hansen in Hansen & Nielsen 2004: 79-86. On early democracies, see also Robinson 1997; on oligarchy, see also Ostwald 2000.
7. For example, the pantheon of Megalopolis (no. 282) strongly reflects the fact that this *polis* was created by a *synoikismos* of a number of pre-existing communities some of whose cults were relocated to the new site while others had ‘doublet’ sanctuaries established there; see Nilsson 1951: 18-22. The prominence of Zeus Soter, on the other hand, must be interpreted i.a. as a reflection of the circumstance which allowed the foundation to be realised: the defeat of the Lakedaimonians by Epameinondas (Jost 1996: 104). In other words, the distinct configuration of the Megalopolitan pantheon is a product of the local history of the *polis* and thus unique.
8. See Cartledge in Bruit Zaidman & Schmitt Pantel 1992: xv.



vious way in which *poleis* produced this self-differentiation was by the choice of types for their coinages: “[W]hen the institution of coinage spread with extreme rapidity through the Greek world in the middle of the sixth century few cities were content to use coinage minted elsewhere. City-specific coins were struck whose types sometimes made direct or punning reference to the city that minted them: Athens came to mint coins with the head of Athena and Athena’s owl, the city of Phokaia made coins with a seal for which the Greek name was *phoke*.”<sup>9</sup> Coin types, in fact, often function as an “*emblème de la cité*” and may serve to emphasise “le particularisme qui caractérise l’organisation politique du monde grec.”<sup>10</sup>

Stereotypes,<sup>11</sup> of course, developed as well, both of ‘self’ and ‘other’. This is not always easy to demonstrate, but a good example of a positive stereotype of self would seem to be exemplified by the Mantineans (no. 281) who most probably considered themselves ‘real hoplites’.<sup>12</sup> And when Demosthenes states that at Sparta (no. 345) a man cannot praise the institutions of a foreign state, be it those of Athens or another *polis*,<sup>13</sup> or that the Thebans (no. 221) take pride in their raw manners and wickedness, he is obviously engaging in negative stereotyping.<sup>14</sup> A wonderful collection of *polis* stereotypes may be found in the third-century writer Herakleides Kretikos (GGM I 97-110), who concludes his tour of Boiotia with a list of the ἀκληρήματα<sup>15</sup> (mishaps) of nine of the *poleis* of the region: in Oropos (no. 214) dwells αἰσχροκέρδεια (sordid love of gain, LSJ), in Tanagra (no. 220) φθόνος (envy), φιλονεικία (contentiousness) is at home in Thespiai (no. 222), ὕβρις (wanton violence) in Thebes (no. 221),

9. Osborne 1998: 117. For a case-study of Mantinea (no. 281) from this point of view, see Lacroix 1967. – More than a hundred Hellenic *poleis* struck coins prior to 480; see Nielsen 2002: 221.

10. Lacroix 1975: 154. See below 38-9, 43-6 on the coinages of Elis and Pisa.

11. Eriksen 1993: 23: “... the concept of stereotyping refers to the creation and consistent application of standardised notions of the cultural distinctiveness of a group.”

12. Nielsen 2002: 114-15.

13. Dem. 20.106: ... οὐκ ἔξεστι παρὰ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις τὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπαινεῖν νόμιμα οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν δεινῶν.

14. Dem. 20.109: Θηβαῖοι φρονοῦσιν ἐπ’ ὀμότητι καὶ πονηρίᾳ.

15. Cf. Pfister 1951: 179.

πλεονεξία (greediness) in Anthedon (no. 200), and περιεργία (intermeddling with other folk's affairs) in Koroneia (no. 210), while Plataiai (no. 216) is the home of ἀλαζονεία (boastfulness), Onchestos<sup>16</sup> of πυρετός (fever),<sup>17</sup> and Haliartos (no. 206) of ἀναισθησία (mental obtuseness). No wonder that the fifth-century comedian Pherekrates advised: Ἦνπερ φρονῆς εὖ, φεῦγε τὴν Βοιωτίαν (fr. 160, Kock = KA 171).<sup>18</sup>

In other words, each *polis* developed and was ascribed a particular local identity. At the same time, however, the Hellenes as such constituted a distinct ethnic group – τὸ Ἑλληνικόν as Herodotos famously has the Athenians phrase it at 8.144.2 – to which Hellenes of all *poleis* belonged. τὸ Ἑλληνικόν is described as being ὁμαίμον and ὁμόγλωσσον, ‘of the same blood and of the same tongue’, and is juxtaposed with θεῶν ἰδρύματα κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι, ‘shared sanctuaries of gods and sacrifices’, and ἤθεα ὁμότροπα, ‘congenial customs’. As has often been pointed out, here are “all the usual markers of ethnic affinity”,<sup>19</sup> and the rather emphatic repetition of the prefix ὁμο- (‘same’) coupled with κοινά (‘shared’) is worth noting since it is certainly meant to highlight the “notion of common essence” of the Hellenes.<sup>20</sup> By ‘same blood’ is implied a myth of common origin for the Hellenes, the *sine qua non* for an ethnic group<sup>21</sup> and an obvious ideological construct.<sup>22</sup> By ‘same tongue’ is implied that the Hellenes all spoke a common language; in fact the linguistic situation in Classical Hellas was characterised by a multiplicity of linguistic forms.<sup>23</sup> However, by the fifth century the different dialects were all subsumed under the abstract notion ‘the Hellenic tongue’ (ἡ

16. Onchestos, though included as a *polis* in Hansen 1996: 93-94, has after reconsideration of the evidence been excluded from Hansen & Nielsen 2004. See Hansen 1995a: 29-30.

17. Pfister 1951: 183: “Gemeint ist die Malaria, die von den Sümpfen des Kopais-Sees herrührt, an dessen Südrand Onchestos, an der Strasse Koroneia-Theben, lag.”

18. “If you have any sense left, avoid Boiotia”.

19. Konstan 2001: 33.

20. Konstan 2001: 30.

21. Hall 1997: 25.

22. Cartledge 1993: 3 calls it “the fiction of genetic homogeneity”.

23. Hall 2002: 116.

Ἑλλάς γλώσσα),<sup>24</sup> which, accordingly, is also a sort of ideological construct.<sup>25</sup> As to ἰδρύματα κοινά, “[t]he great national centres of religion, with their cults, oracles, and festivals – Olympia, Delphi, Dodona (perhaps Delos), Eleusis – must be chiefly in the speaker’s (or writer’s) mind” (Macan *ad loc.*).<sup>26</sup> That the idea of ‘shared sanctuaries’ was well-developed in the Classical period is clear also from the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18-19). The text of the Peace, in fact, begins with a stipulation concerning the shared sanctuaries: περι μὲν τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν κοινῶν, θύειν καὶ ἰέναι καὶ μαντεύεσθαι καὶ θεωρεῖν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τὸν βουλόμενον καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἀδεῶς,<sup>27</sup> i.e. a guarantee of free access to the ‘shared sanctuaries’. That the sanctuaries referred to here were in fact e.g. Olympia is a safe

- 
24. See Morpurgo Davies 1987; see also Mickey 1981, who argues on the basis of pre-400 verse inscriptions that such inscriptions by the fifth century show an increased awareness of the peculiarities of the epichoric tongues *and tend to avoid them*, and concludes that the increasingly non-epichoric character of the language of these inscriptions “constitutes a concrete reality corresponding to the idea of the ‘Greek language’.” Hall 2002: 115 is sceptical about whether the notion of a common ‘Greek’ language existed in the Archaic period, but acknowledges that such a notion had developed by the fifth century: “In fact, it is not until the fifth century that we find a concrete expression of this concept [sc. of a singular Hellenic language] in the phrase *he Hellas glossa* (‘the Greek tongue’).” Hall refers to Hdt. 2.154.2 where it is reported that Psammetichos turned over Egyptian children to resident Hellenic mercenaries in order that they might learn ‘the Hellenic tongue’: καὶ δὴ καὶ παῖδας παρέβαλε αὐτοῖσι Αἰγυπτίους τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλώσσαν ἐκιδάσκεσθαι ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων ἐκμαθόντων τὴν γλώσσαν οἱ νῦν ἐρμηγέες ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ γεγόνασι. For the phrase (ἡ) Ἑλλάς γλώσσα, see also Hdt. 2.56.3; 2.137.5; 2.143.4; 2.144.2; 4.78.2; 4.110.1; 4.155.3; 4.192.3; 6.98.3; 8.135.3 (βαρβάρου γλώσσης ἀντὶ Ἑλλάδος); 9.16.2.
25. Cartledge 1993: 3 states that Herodotos “gloss[es] over important differences of dialect”, but the important point is that he can do so since a *notion* of a ‘Hellenic tongue’ existed.
26. Cf. Hansen 2000c: 144: “The common sanctuaries were partly the oracles consulted by all Greeks (Dodone, Delphi, Didyma, Lebadeia, Abai and Oropos), and partly the sanctuaries which arranged pan-Hellenic competitions in sport, music, drama and recitation (Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia and Nemea)”.
27. “Regarding the shared sanctuaries, there shall be a free passage by land and by sea to all who wish it, to sacrifice, travel, consult the oracle and attend the games, according to ancestral tradition” (Crawley (modified)).

inference from the treaty itself which stipulates that copies of the text were to be set up at Olympia, Delphi and Isthmia.<sup>28</sup> “Common customs can cover anything from the reading of the Homeric poems to the use of coins and the construction of peripteral temples.”<sup>29</sup> One custom which was considered distinctively Hellenic was athletics, or rather, as we shall see, the Hellenic way of athletics.

So in terms of identity, the Hellenic world was characterised by strong local identities as well as by a sense of shared Panhellenic identity. Since identity is not a fact of nature but a socially constructed phenomenon, a city-state culture such as the Hellenic must obviously have institutions through which identity, local as well as Panhellenic, is constructed and maintained, that is, confirmed and continuously reconfirmed. One way in which Hellenic identities were created and maintained in this sense was through intense interaction<sup>30</sup> and, in the case of Panhellenic identity, through opposition to *βάρβαροι*, and here the confrontation with the Persians is commonly acknowledged to have been of significant importance.<sup>31</sup> In the following, I shall investi-

---

28. Thuc. 5.18.10: *στήλας δὲ στήσαι Ολυμπίασι καὶ Πυθοῖ καὶ Ἴσθμοὶ καὶ Ἀθήνησι ἐν πόλει καὶ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ἐν Ἀμυκλαίῳ*. The absence of Nemea from the list is a little strange, but perhaps it is due to the fact that Nemea at this time may possibly have been controlled by Argos (cf. below n. 90), a *polis* which was not a party to this treaty, whereas Olympia, Isthmia and Delphi were all controlled by Spartan allies, who were prospective parties to the treaty (cf. 18.1: *Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι*). Alternatively there were no problems in gaining access to Nemea, or this sanctuary may have been of lesser importance than the three others, cf. Hornblower 1996: 483: “Of the four Panhellenic sanctuaries, Nemea is the only absentee; it is also the only one never mentioned by Th., though Nemea features at v. 58 ff. as a place. Nemea was the least prestigious of the four; it was the only one to receive no victory dedication after the Persian Wars.”

29. Hansen 2000c: 144.

30. Hansen 2000c: 143.

31. Hornblower 1991: 10: “Persia was something else for the Greeks: a point of reference. A common enemy did more than supply themes for the makers and manipulators of Greek public opinion; it gave the Greeks, if not a word for themselves (they already had that), an added awareness that they were Greeks, and that ‘Hellas’, their word for their country, was more than just a geographical expression.” Cartledge 1993: 39: “However, by the time of Aeschylus’ *Persians*, produced at the Athenian Great Dionysia festival of 472, the process of ‘othering’ and indeed inventing ‘the barbarian’ as a homoge-

gate the role played by the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia in the Classical period as a focus of Hellenic interaction as well as a venue for expressing the difference between Hellenes and Barbarians.

---

nized stereotype was well underway in Greece, in an early version of the specific form of derogatory stereotyping now known as 'orientalism'. The catalyst was the defeat of the Persian invasion of Greece in 480-479, upon the failure of which the Athenians grounded their anti-Persian empire." Hall 1997: 44: "It has long been recognised that the Persian War of 480-479 BC was a decisive moment in the formation of Greek self-identity: in the words of Simon Hornblower, 'Persia gave the Greeks their identity, or the means for recognizing it.' Even if few *poleis* actually mounted resistance against Xerxes' forces (only thirty-one are named on the 'Serpent Column', set up as a victory monument at Delphi), the looming presence of an external invader was a powerful vehicle in persuading formerly antagonistic cities to make common cause in defence. The invasion acted as a catalyst for the 'invention of the barbarian' that is, the creation of a derogatory and stereotypical 'other'." Konstan 2001: 33: "To some extent, a pan-Greek identity was undoubtedly a consequence of the Persian invasion."

## II. Athletics as a Distinctively Hellenic Activity

The Hellenes seem to have conceived of athletics, i.e. the *gymnikos agon*, as a distinctively Hellenic phenomenon, something which marked them off from the Barbarians.<sup>32</sup> In this they were not quite right<sup>33</sup> and Thucydides at 1.6.5 explicitly acknowledges that non-Hellenic peoples, especially of Asia Minor, engaged in boxing and wrestling competitions.<sup>34</sup> But even so, to conduct athletic competitions was *construed* as an essentially Hellenic activity and athletics were thus *considered* distinctively Hellenic. Plato, for instance, at *Symposium* 182b has Pausanias state that among 'the Barbarians' pederastic relationships, philosophy and *philogymnastia* ('fondness for gymnastics') are considered *aischron* ('bad').<sup>35</sup> It should follow *e contrario* that *philogymnastia* was not considered a bad thing among the Hellenes, and it is interesting to note that the reason given for Barbarian dislike of *philogymnastia* is their political constitutions: διὰ τυραννίδας ('because of their dictatorial governments'), from which it ought to follow that there is a connection between athletics and the Hellenic way of life.

Herodotos, too, offers a couple of examples of the way in which athletics are constructed as characteristically Hellenic. Particularly memorable is a small episode narrated after the tale of the Battle of Thermopylai. A group of Arkadian *automoloi*

---

32. Golden 1998: 4-5: "Athletic exercise and competition marked Greeks off from their neighbours, and the great Greek festivals of athletic and equestrian competition excluded non-Greek outsiders, *barbaroi*." Hansen 2000c: 144: "[T]o have competitions in sports was a distinguishing mark of Greek civilisation, something in which the Greeks differed from all their neighbours."

33. See Sansone 1988 for sport throughout human world history.

34. Thuc. 1.6.5: ἐπι δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις ἔστιν οἷς νῦν, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς Ἀσιανοῖς, πυγμῆς καὶ πάλης ἄθλα τίθεται, καὶ διεζωμένοι τοῦτο δρώσιν ("To this day among some of the Barbarians, especially in Asia, when prizes for boxing and wrestling are offered, belts are worn by the combatants" (Crawley)).

35. τοῖς γὰρ βαρβάροις διὰ τὰς τυραννίδας αἰσχρὸν τοῦτό τε καὶ ἢ γε φιλοσοφία καὶ ἡ φιλογυμναστία.

(‘deserters’) applied to King Xerxes for mercenary service. The Persians, according to Herodotos, took the opportunity to ask *περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ ποιέοιεν* (8.26.1: (“about the Hellenes, what they were doing”). The answer was that they were organizing the Olympics and would be watching an athletic *agon* and a hippic.<sup>36</sup> The Persians then inquired *περὶ ὅτεν ἀγωνίζονται*, “what they competed about”. Upon hearing that an olive wreath was given as prize, a noble Persian, Tritantaichmes, son of the wisest of warners, Artabanos, exclaimed: *Παπαί, Μαροδόνιε, κοίους ἐπ’ ἀνδρας ἡγαγες μαχησομένους ἡμέας, οἱ οὐ περὶ χρημάτων τὸν ἀγῶνα ποιεῦνται ἀλλὰ περὶ ἀρετῆς* (8.26.3).<sup>37</sup> As Konstan notes, “there is something odd in the way Herodotus expresses himself here. Macan, who had a remarkable eye for detail, commented: ‘*chremata* and *arete* are not quite co-ordinate in this passage; the slight inconsequentiality only sharpens the gnome.’ Macan adds that ‘*peri aretes = tou kalou heneka*.’ Macan means that the Greeks do not contend for (*peri*) virtue or excellence in the same sense in which others, according to Tritantaichmes, contend for wealth. Virtue, that is to say, is not a prize. Tritantaichmes is being a trifle careless when he substitutes the word ‘virtue’ for the olive wreath which is the object of the contests. But the deeper point is, I think, that the Greeks are not really contending over an olive wreath, either. In answer to Xerxes’ question, ‘for what’ (*peri hoteu*) do they compete, the Arcadian defectors answer simply that a wreath is ‘given’ (*didomenon*). Money, properly speaking, may be a goal; virtue is a quality that is manifested in the contest, not the object of it.”<sup>38</sup> So, what motivates Persians, according to Herodotos, is *chremata*, whereas Hellenes are committed to valour, and this is exemplified through Olympic athletic activities. “The great festival at Olympia and its athletic contests are taken as a symbol of the Greek temper”,<sup>39</sup> and it is worth noting that here as in the Pla-

36. Ολύμπια ἄγουσι καὶ θεωροῦσι ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικόν. Cf. Miller 1975: 228-29.

37. “Don’t tell us, Mardonius, that you’re leading us to battle against the kind of men who don’t compete for money but for glory” (Blanco).

38. Konstan 1987: 62.

39. Konstan 1987: 61.

tonic passage quoted above the contrast is explicitly with 'Barbarians'.<sup>40</sup>

Another extremely interesting passage is 2.91. Herodotos opens the chapter with the general statement: Ἑλληνικοῖσι δὲ νομαίοισι φεύγουσι χρᾶσθαι [sc. οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι].<sup>41</sup> However, the chapter in fact treats of an exception to that rule: in the Thebaid nome, near Νέη πόλις, is a major city called Chemmis; here is a sanctuary of Perseus. Herodotos adds:

ποιεῦσι δὲ τάδε Ἑλληνικὰ τῷ Περσείῃ· ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν τιθεῖσι διὰ πάσης ἀγωνίης ἔχοντα, παρέχοντες ἄεθλα κτήνεα καὶ χλαίνας καὶ δέρματα. εἰρομένου δέ μεο ... ὅ τι κεχωρίδαται Αἰγυπτίων τῶν ἄλλων ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν τιθέντες, ἔφασαν τὸν Περσέα ἐκ τῆς ἐωυτῶν πόλιος γεγονέναι· τὸν γὰρ Δαναὸν καὶ τὸν Λυγκέα ἔοντας Χεμμίτας ἐκπλῶσαι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων γενεηλογέοντες κατέβαινον ἐς τὸν Περσέα. ἀπικόμενον δὲ αὐτὸν ἐς Αἴγυπτον κατ' αἰτίην τὴν καὶ Ἑλλήνες λέγουσι, οἴσοντα ἐκ Λιβύης τὴν Γοργοῦς κεφαλὴν, ἔφασαν ἔλθειν καὶ παρὰ σφέας καὶ ἀναγνῶναι τοὺς συγγενέας πάντας· ἐκμεμαθηκότα δὲ μιν ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Αἴγυπτον τὸ τῆς Χέμμιος οὖνομα, πεπυσμένον παρὰ τῆς μητρός· ἀγῶνα δὲ οἱ γυμνικὸν αὐτοῦ κελεύσαντος ἐπιτελέειν.<sup>42</sup>

40. See Brown 1983: 28 on this passage: "This carefully contrived episode can only represent Herodotus' own view about the games." However, if Herodotos is here true to his principle of transmitting what he was told (2.123.1; 6.53.1; 7.152.3), then it may surely also represent the views of other contemporary Hellenes on the games.

41. "Egyptians avoid adopting Greek customs" (Blanco).

42. "[T]hese are the Greek customs which they practice in honor of Perseus: they have established gymnastic contests in every category, and award prizes of cattle, cloaks, and skins. When I asked ... why they set themselves apart from the rest of Egypt by organizing gymnastic contests, they said that Perseus had derived from their own city, because Danaus and Lynceus, who were Chemmites, had sailed to Greece. From these two, they trace a genealogy down to Perseus. When Perseus came to Egypt for the reason the Greeks themselves give – to carry the Gorgon's head out of Egypt – they say that he came among them and recognized all of his kin. He had been thoroughly familiar with the name of Chemmis when he came to Egypt, because he had learned it from his mother. It was he who commanded the Chemmites to hold the gymnastic contests" (Blanco).



The Chemmitans worship Perseus with a *Hellenic*<sup>43</sup> ritual: τὰδε Ἑλληνικά, which turns out to be athletic competitions. Taken as a straightforward report of facts there are problems with this passage: e.g. Neapolis is not securely located and neither is the sanctuary described. But as a reflection of the working of Herodotos' mind it is of great interest, and it must undoubtedly be correct that: "The νόμοι of Chemmis excited H.s interest because, unlike customs elsewhere in Egypt, they were very similar to those of the Gks."<sup>44</sup> And, the point of resemblance singled out with great emphasis for its 'Hellenic-ness' (τὰδε Ἑλληνικά) is athletic competitions. Interestingly, Herodotos claims to have inquired why the Chemmitans differed from the rest of the Egyptians *in having athletic competitions*, and even more interestingly he seems to have accepted as an explanation of this, as it seemed to him, curious fact that these competitions did in fact derive from the Hellenic world. They constitute, in other words, an Egyptian importation of a Hellenic cultural institution. Considering that Herodotos normally takes cultural exchange, and in particular of religious rituals, to be a one-way traffic *from* Egypt *to* the Hellenic world,<sup>45</sup> it should be significant that this passage in fact reverses the direction.<sup>46</sup> In other words, the passage reveals that Herodotos thought of athletic competitions as a distinctively Hellenic institution. Here, again, it is worth noting that this passage occurs in the middle of a discus-

---

43. Evjen 1992: 97.

44. Lloyd 1976: 367.

45. Cf. e.g. 2.4.2 (δυώδεκά τε θεῶν ἐπωνυμίας ... Ἑλληνας παρὰ σφέων ἀναλαβεῖν); 43.2 (οὐ παρ' Ἑλλήνων ἔλαβον τὸ οὖνομα Αἰγύπτιοι [τοῦ Ἡρακλέους], ἀλλ' Ἑλληνες μᾶλλον παρ' Αἰγυπτίων); 49.2 (ἐγὼ μὲν νῦν φημι Μελάμποδα γενόμενον ἄνδρα σοφὸν μαντικὴν τε ἐωυτῶ συστήσαι καὶ πυθόμενον ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἄλλα τε πολλὰ ἐσηγήσασθαι Ἑλλῆσι καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον, ὀλίγα αὐτῶν παραλλάξαντα); 50.1 (σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ πάντων τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν θεῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐλήλυθε ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα); 51.1 (ταῦτα μὲν νῦν καὶ ἄλλα πρὸς τούτοις, τὰ ἐγὼ φράσω, Ἑλληνες ἀπ' Αἰγυπτίων νενομίκασι); 57.1 (ἔστι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἰσῶν ἡ μαντικὴ ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἀπιγμένη); 58 (πανηγυρίας δὲ ἄρα καὶ πομπὰς καὶ προσαγωγὰς πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων Αἰγύπτιοί εἰσι οἱ ποιησάμενοι καὶ παρὰ τούτων Ἑλληνες μεμαθήκασι).

46. As pointed out by Brown 1983: 19-20: "It is interesting that Herodotus, who derives so many Greek customs from Egypt, here reverses the process".

sion of a non-Hellenic people: athletics is again used to distinguish Hellenes from Barbarians.

Finally, mention may be made of an episode narrated in Xenophon's *Anabasis* (4.8.25-28). When the (remnants of) The Ten Thousand had reached the city of Trapezous (no. 734) on the southern coast of the Black Sea they sacrificed in gratitude to Zeus Soter and Herakles (the god and the hero of the Olympic Games) as well as to the other gods. They then arranged an ἀγών γυμνικός (4.8.25, 'gymnastic competition'). The competitions included *stadion* for boys, *dolichos*, wrestling, boxing and *pankration*, apparently for men, as well as a horse race (4.8.27). Now, there are oddities about these competitions, among others the fact that αἰχμάλωτοι ('captives') were allowed to compete in the boys' *stadion*.<sup>47</sup> However, in other respects these are standard Hellenic competitions: the programme is not dissimilar to, e.g., the Olympic programme and at least for some of the events the competitors were divided into age classes. We ought to ask *why* the Hellenes arranged this *agon gymnikos*. Xenophon does not provide the answer, but surely Mark Golden must be right when he explains that "[t]here is more involved here than simply recreation. Trapezus is the first Greek city the '10,000' have reached on their long and dangerous trek, and they celebrate in prototypically Greek fashion", i.e. by conducting athletic competitions. We are reminded of the famous cry of the soldiers at 4.27.24, "Θάλαττα, θάλαττα" ("The sea, the sea!") and the tearful embraces which followed upon the sight of the sea.<sup>48</sup> Obviously, the sea is a sign that the soldiers are as good as home again, that Hellas is within reach, that troubles are over, as indicated a little later by Leon of Thourioi (no. 74) who stated bluntly that he was tired of marching, going on patrols and fighting – he wanted to sail the rest of the way and ἐκταθείς ὥσπερ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀφικέσθαι εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα (5.1.2).<sup>49</sup> In other words, having reached Hellenic civilisation after a strenuous march

47. See the commentary on the passage in Golden 1998: 1-5.

48. 4.7.25: ἐνταῦθα δὴ περιέβαλλον ἀλλήλους καὶ στρατηγούς καὶ λοχαγούς δακρύνοντες.

49. "Reach Hellas stretched out on my back, like Odysseus" (Brownson, Loeb (modified)).

through Barbarian territories the soldiers immediately engaged in a distinctively Hellenic activity – athletics.<sup>50</sup>

To conclude, the Hellenes constructed athletics as a distinctively Hellenic phenomenon and since Olympia was beyond comparison the most distinguished athletic arena in the Hellenic world,<sup>51</sup> we may reasonably assume that the games there contributed significantly to the continuous and repeated drawing of the boundary between Hellenes and Barbarians.

---

50. Note also that Alexander the Great staged numerous *agones gymnikoi* during his campaigns: see Miller 2004: 196-97.

51. For the preeminence of Olympia, see Golden 1998: 34-37 who notes that “[t]he Olympic games were ‘the most athletic of contests’” (34). See also Cairns 1991: 96 who notes that the Olympic games “were entirely in a league of their own”.

### III. The Ethnic Exclusiveness of the Olympics

In this connection, of course, the *ethnic exclusiveness* of the Olympic Games is of great importance. It is well known that the Olympic authorities admitted only Hellenes as competitors.<sup>52</sup> The source for this fact is Herodotos who refers to it in two passages. The first passage is the description in the second book of an Eleian embassy's voyage to Egypt in order to inquire whether the Egyptians could improve on the Eleian administration of the Olympics (2.160). The Eleians are here made to explain that the games were open to σφέων [sc. τῶν Ἡλείων] καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων ὁμοίως τῷ βουλομένῳ.<sup>53</sup> A contrast may very well be implied here but it is certainly not a marked contrast between Hellenes and non-Hellenes and the passage is rather reminiscent of 8.65.4 which explains who can become an initiate of the Eleusinian mysteries: αὐτῶν [sc. τῶν Ἀθηναίων] τε ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων μυεῖται.<sup>54</sup> In both cases, the point seems simply to be that a religious festival is open to citizens of *poleis* other than the one in charge of the sanctuary celebrating the festival, and this is expressed as 'X and the other Hellenes', probably because non-citizens at the festivals would regularly be other Hellenes. It was simply a way of saying 'all the Hellenes', which is not quite the same as saying 'only Hellenes and not Barbarians'.

However, at 5.22 Herodotos does engage in a discussion of Hellenic identity as *opposed* to Barbarian identity and adduces participation in the Olympics as proof of the notion that Alexander I of Macedon was a Hellene:

---

52. Crowther 1996: 38; Hall 2002: 154.

53. "All Hellenes, from Elis or elsewhere" (Godley, Loeb (modified)).

54. "Any Athenian or any Hellene who so desires can be initiated into the mysteries" (Blanco (modified)).

Ἕλληνας δὲ εἶναι τούτους τοὺς ἀπὸ Περδίκκεω γεγονότας, κατὰ περ αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, αὐτός τε οὕτω τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖσι ὀπισθε λόγοισι ἀποδέξω ὡς εἰσὶ Ἕλληνες,<sup>55</sup> πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέποντες ἀγῶνα Ἕλλήνων<sup>56</sup> οὕτω ἔγνωσαν εἶναι Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ ἀεθλεύειν ἐλομένου καὶ καταβάντος ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο οἱ ἀντιθευσόμενοι Ἑλλήνων ἔξεργόν μιν, φάμενοι οὐ βαρβάρων ἀγωνιστέων εἶναι τὸν ἀγῶνα ἀλλὰ Ἑλλήνων. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἀπέδεξε ὡς εἶη Ἀργεῖος, ἐκρίθη τε εἶναι Ἕλληνα καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον συνεξέπιπτε τῷ πρώτῳ.<sup>57</sup>

Clearly, in the fifth century Barbarians could not compete at Olympia and a competitor had to be able upon request to produce Hellenic credentials. The Olympic Games, then, contributed to the continuous drawing the boundary between Hellenes and Barbarians by being ethnically exclusive.

It should be noted that the incident of Alexander's Olympic participation dates to the earlier fifth century.<sup>58</sup> While there is no reason to doubt that the Olympic Games were *de facto* a purely Hellenic phenomenon in the Archaic period<sup>59</sup> it should neverthe-

55. This is a cross reference to 8.137.

56. Note that this is Hude's text; for Ἑλλήνων the variant reading Ἑλληνοδίκαι is adopted by e.g. Stein.

57. "Now, that these descendants of Perdikkas are Hellenes, as they themselves say, I myself chance to know and will prove it in the later part of my history [sc. at 8.137]; and further, the Hellenes who have the ordering of the contest at Olympia determined that it is so. For when Alexander chose to contend and entered the lists for that purpose, the Hellenes who were to run against him were for barring him from the race, saying that the contest should be for Hellenes and not for barbarians; but Alexander proving himself to be an Argive, he was judged to be a Hellenic; so he contended in the furlong race and ran a dead heat for the first place" (Godley, Loeb (modified)). On this passage, see Hall 2002: 154-56.

58. *OCD*<sup>3</sup> s.v. Alexander (1) tentatively suggests the date 476 (so Mikalson 2003: 112) for the games in which Alexander competed; Hammond 1979: 3 dates it "c. 500 B.C.". The date is, obviously, unknown but Alexander must have competed at a date when the Persians were perceived as a threat to mainland Hellas, and if the incident really occurred in 476, the first Games after the stunning victory of the allied Hellenes, the Hellenic opposition to Alexander is easily understood.

59. All known Archaic victors were Hellenes.

less be noted that we have no information about any Barbarian who *wanted* to compete in the Olympics prior to Alexander, whose ethnic identity could both be acknowledged and denied to be Hellenic. It is not impossible that it was in fact Alexander's wish to compete which put the question of the competitors' 'Hellenic-ness' or lack thereof explicitly on the agenda. It has very aptly been remarked that "Persia gave the Greeks their identity, or the means for recognizing it".<sup>60</sup> This, of course, is not to say that no kind of Hellenic identity existed prior to the confrontation with the Persians, but this confrontation will surely have sharpened the Hellenic awareness of their individuality, and considering that Alexander was a Persian subject and that he had fought on the Persian side during Xerxes' invasion, it should be clear that his 'Hellenic-ness' could reasonably be doubted and that his Olympic participation belongs to a period in which 'Hellenic-ness' and its definition must have been a hotly debated question – though in the end, his Persian affiliation and questionable Hellenic identity apparently mattered less to the Eleian *Hellano-dikai* than it did to his rival competitors.

It is, in other words, a reasonable assumption that the ethnic exclusiveness of the Olympics was a product of – or was intensified by – the Hellenes' confrontation with the Persians. A detail of official Olympic nomenclature may point in the same general direction. In the Classical period and beyond, the title of the officials appointed by Elis to conduct the Olympics was Ἑλληνοδίκαι, 'Judges of the Hellenes',<sup>61</sup> who among other things were probably responsible for judging the Hellenic credentials of potential competitors<sup>62</sup> – though they also presided over the actual competitions.<sup>63</sup> The earliest literary attestation of the term *Hellano-dikes* is in Pindar's *Third Olympic* (12) of 476. The earliest epigraphical attestation is in *IvO* 2.5, of ca. 475-450.<sup>64</sup> Now, a late sixth-century law from Olympia (ca. 525-500) refers to the official presiding over wrestling as ὁ δῖαιτατέρ (= ὁ δῖαιτητής).<sup>65</sup> As the edi-

60. Hornblower 1991: 11; cf. 10, quoted in n. 31 above.

61. Crowther 2003a: 65-68.

62. Hall 2002: 130.

63. Crowther 2003a: 66-68.

64. Ebert & Siewert 1999: 400; Hall 2002: 130.

65. See Ebert & Siewert 1999. The phrase in question occurs at ll. 1-2: [κολ]άδοι παῖον καὶ ὁ δῖαιτατέρ πλάν κατὰ κεφαλάν.

tors note, this law shows that the original title of the Olympic chief official(s) was *diaitetes* and not *Hellanodikes*.<sup>66</sup> It follows that the magistracy underwent a change of name between 525-500, the date of the law, and 476, the date of the victory celebrated in Pind. *Ol.* 3. This change of name ought to belong in the same general context as the Alexander incident, that is, the drawing of the boundary between Hellenes and Barbarians by means of the Olympics.

---

66. Ebert & Siewert 1999: 400. Accepted by Roy (forthcoming).

## IV. Hellenic Athletic Nudity

By Thucydides' day, Hellenic athletes competed in the nude,<sup>67</sup> whereas Barbarian athletes of Asia Minor conducted their boxing and wrestling competitions διεζωμένοι, "in loin-cloths", and athletic nudity was, Thucydides implies, one of the features by which Classical Hellenic culture could be distinguished from contemporary Barbarian culture.<sup>68</sup> Thucydides took athletic nudity to be a recent development<sup>69</sup> and in fact the Homeric

---

67. This is the obvious implication of Thuc. 1.6.5.

68. *Ibid.*: πολλά δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλα τις ἀποδείξειε τὸ παλαιὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ὁμοίωτροπα τῷ νῦν βαρβαρικῷ διαιτώμενον ("Indeed, one could point to a number of other instances where the manners of the ancient Hellenic world are very similar to the manners of foreigners today" (Warner)).

69. Thuc. 1.6.5: τὸ δὲ πάλαι καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὀλυμπικῷ ἀγῶνι διαζώματα ἔχοντες περὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα οἱ ἀθληταὶ ἠγωνίσαντο, καὶ οὐ πολλὰ ἔτη ἐπειδὴ πέπανται ("In ancient times even at the Olympic Games the athletes used to wear coverings for their loins, and indeed this practice was still in existence not very many years ago" (Warner)). In contrast, Pindar in *Isthm.* 1.23 seems to depict mythical heroes (Kastor and Iolaos) as running the *stadion* in the nude (ἐν τε γυμνοῖσι σταδίοις); unless this is simply to contrast the *stadion* with the *hoplitodromos* (ἐν τ' ἀσπίδοδούποισιν ὀπλίταις δρόμοις, *ibid.*; cf. Bury 1892 *ad loc.*), it may be that the poet is here deliberately bridging the divide between mythical past and historical present (cf. Hornblower 2004: 114 n. 93) by depicting his mythical heroes both as running in the nude and as competing in the *hoplitodromos* (cf. Farnell 1932: *ad loc.*), traditionally thought of as introduced, at least at Olympia, only in 520 (Paus. 3.14.3; 6.10.4), cf. Golden 1998: 27, 41; Miller 2004: 32; Spivey 2004: 115; Tyrrell 2004: 6; or that he simply "thought the practice of running naked to have begun very early" (Huxley 1975: 39). In addition, it may be noted that a fragment of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (MW fr. 74 = Schol. Hom. *Il.* 23.683b1 (Erbse)) may possibly indicate that this poem depicted a naked runner; the scholiast states: νεώτερος οὖν Ἡσίοδος γυμνὸν εἰσάγων Ἴππομένη ἀγωνίζομενον Ἀτάλαντη. Obviously, this is very indirect evidence and since the scholiast does not adduce the actual text he refers to, his inference from it cannot be verified. Crowther 2004: 136 comments: "Since the example is mythological, it cannot be used to prove the actual practice of nudity in athletics." West 1985: 135 comments: "It is doubtful whether any useful deduction [about the date of the *Catalogue*] can be made from the statement in F 74 that Hippomenes ran naked in the race with Atalante. It is an observation due to Aristarchus, who used it in support of his contention that Hesiod was later than Homer. For Homer represents certain competitors in the funeral games for Patroklos



poems depict heroic athletes as competing girdled. Thus, *Iliad* 23 has boxers (683 (ζῶμα)<sup>70</sup>; 685 (ζωσαμένω)) as well as wrestlers (710 (ζωσαμένω)) wear loin-cloths – interestingly, the very disciplines in which Thucydides has girdled Barbarians compete. On the assumption that Homer depicts earlier historical practice,<sup>71</sup> the presumption would have to be that the introduction of athletic nudity was a post-Homeric development.<sup>72</sup>

And in fact a number of sources explain the perceived introduction of athletic nudity and date it to, as we would say, historical times. Thucydides (1.6.4-5) attributes the introduction of the custom to the Spartans (no. 345) and dates it vaguely to a point in time “not many years ago”, which must surely mean post-Homeric and historical times. Plato seems to echo Thucydides when at *Republic* 5.452c he makes Sokrates state that “not long ago” (οὐ πολὺς χρόνος) the Hellenes, like the Barbarians of his own day, found nudity to be “improper” (αἰσχρά) and “ridiculous” (γελοῖα) and continues: “when first the Cretans and then the Lacedaemonians introduced the custom of stripping for exercise, the wits of that day might equally have ridiculed the innovation” (Jowett).<sup>73</sup> The date given is as vague as the Thucy-

---

(boxers and wrestlers, not runners) as wearing ζώματα, and athletic nudity was generally held to have been an innovation of the archaic period. It is supposed to have been adopted by Olympic runners after an accident that happened to Orsippos of Megara in 724 or 720. If we could take it as a historical fact that no one raced naked at Olympia or anywhere else before 720, it would be reasonable to argue that a poet could not have represented Hippomenes as racing naked until some considerable time later, when the practice was no longer felt to be a novelty. But the premise is obviously completely untrustworthy. Naked runners are already shown on Dipylon vases of the eighth century. In any case, as we have not got the wording of the passage that Aristarchus had in view, we cannot be sure that it said unambiguously that Hippomenes wore nothing. Most likely the poet used a phrase such as μαλακὸν δ' ἔκδυε χιτῶνα.”

70. Cf. Richardson 1993: *ad loc.*: “the ζῶμα is the girdle or loin-cloth, later called διάζωμα or περιζωμα, which early Greek athletes wore”.

71. An assumption which Pindar apparently did not hold, cf. note 69 above.

72. Archaeological evidence, it may be noted, conclusively demonstrates that Hellenic athletes had competed in the nude generations before the Classical period: McDonnell 1991: 184; Golden 1998: 66.

73. καὶ ὅτε ἤρχοντο τῶν γυμνασίων πρῶτοι μὲν Κρηῆτες, ἔπειτα Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἐξήν τοῖς τότε ἀστείους πάντα ταῦτα κωμῳδεῖν.

didean, and probably relies on the historian, but priority is given to 'the Cretans' for the innovation.

Dionysios of Halikarnassos, writing during the early principate, argues at *Ant. Rom.* 7.72.2-4 for the antiquity of Roman religious observances and cites as evidence for this assertion the fact that Roman athletes, of the republican era as well as of his own day, wore loin-cloths (τὸ μὲν ἄλλο σῶμα γυμνοί, τὸ δὲ περὶ τὴν αἰδῶ καλυπτόμενοι). This was, he goes on, also the original Hellenic way (ὡς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγένετο παρ' Ἑλλήσιν). However, the Spartans put an end to the Hellenic practice (ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἑλλάδι καταλέλυται Λακεδαιμονίων αὐτὸ καταλυσάντων) – he thus agrees with Thucydides on this point though he does not cite him. Dionysios does not explicitly date this Spartan innovation, but states – without reference to any authority – that the first runner to compete in the nude at Olympia was Akanthos (Moretti 1957: no. 17) of Sparta (no. 345) who did so in 720.<sup>74</sup> It would thus seem that he took this date to be the *terminus ante quem* for the Spartan custom. Before that date, he states, the Hellenes did not practice naked athletics, and he adduces as evidence for this fact the Homeric poems (*Il.* 23.685; *Od.* 18.66-69, 74f). Thus, the Romans did not pick up their practice from the Hellenes.

Pausanias (1.44.1) attributes the introduction of athletic nudity to Orsippos (Moretti 1957: no. 16) of Megara (no. 225). This man “won the foot-race at Olympia by running naked when all his competitors wore girdles according to ancient custom”.<sup>75</sup> It was, Pausanias thinks, purely his own invention. Pausanias does not himself date Orsippos' victory, but tradition dated it to 720.<sup>76</sup> An inscription from Megara itself (*IG VII 52*) – perhaps the source on

74. ὁ δὲ πρῶτος ἐπιχειρήσας ἀποδυθῆναι τὸ σῶμα καὶ γυμνὸς Ὀλυμπίασι δραμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς πεντεκαίδεκάτης Ὀλυμπιάδος Ἀκανθος ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος ἦν.

75. ὃς περιεζωσμένων ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι κατὰ δὴ παλαιὸν ἔθος τῶν ἀθλητῶν Ὀλύμπια ἐνῖκα στάδιον δραμῶν γυμνός.

76. Moretti 1957: no. 16. *Etym. Magn.* 242.55-243.3 makes Orsippos a Lakedaimonian and dates his victory to 652: ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς περιζώματα φορεῖν ἐν τοῖς αἰδοίοις, καὶ οὕτως ἀγωνίζεσθαι κατὰ δὲ τὴν τριακοστὴν δευτέραν Ὀλυμπιάδα, Ὀρσίππου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου ἀγωνιζομένου, λυθὲν τὸ περιζῶμα αἴτιον αὐτῷ νίκης ἐγένετο. ἐξ οὗ καὶ νόμος ἐτέθη γυμνοῦς τρέχειν.

which Pausanias drew<sup>77</sup> – confirms that what Pausanias relates corresponds to local tradition: *πρῶτος δ' Ἑλλάνων ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ἐστεφανώθη / γυμνός, ζωννυμένων τῶν πρὶν ἐνὶ σταδίῳ*.<sup>78</sup> The inscription is a late, presumably Hadrianic, reinscribing of an older text honouring Orsippos; the date of the original text is unknown, but it may be Classical or even late Archaic.<sup>79</sup> However, even on the most optimistic dating of the original, i.e. an ascription of the epigram to Simonides, we should heed Sweet's warning: "If Simonides wrote this, he wrote it two centuries after the alleged event. We must consider whether he was piously perpetuating an unsubstantiated legend."<sup>80</sup>

Still other sources, all late, attribute the introduction of athletic nudity to an accident which occurred in Athens during the archonship of Hippomenes, in the 14th or 15th Olympiad (724 or 720): a runner fell and was killed when his loin-cloth either slipped or otherwise interfered with his performance, and it was decreed that running should henceforward be in the nude.<sup>81</sup>

It is to be noted that these stories vary quite a bit as regards the date of the introduction of athletic nudity, the identity of the athlete considered the *protos heuretes*, so to speak, his *polis* of origin, and the site of the event which gave rise to the new custom. A fair inference from this state of affairs would seem to be that the ancient Hellenes themselves in fact did not really know the date

77. Geffcken 1916: no. 81: "Auch Pausan. I 44, 1 las das Ep."

78. "As the first of the Hellenes he was crowned at Olympia naked, earlier runners being girdled in the stadium."

79. Geffcken 1916: no. 81: "Die das Ep. überliefernde Inschrift spät, vielleicht bald nach Hadrian; das Gedicht selbst alt, wie die sprachliche Form zeigt; eine alte Inschrift also, die Boeckh dem Simonides zuschrieb, zerstört, spät erneuert."

80. Sweet 1985: 43.

81. The sources, all discussed by Sweet 1985, are: Isidore of Seville *Etym.* 18.17.2 (runner unidentified; Hippomenes gives permission to competitors to exercise naked; no date); Schol. in Hom. *Il.* 23.683 (Erbse) *b1* (in the 14th olympiad, at Athens during the archonship of Hippomenes, Orsippos tripped on his loin-cloth, fell, and was killed, which led to a decree making nudity mandatory, cf. Townley Schol. in Hom. *Il.* 23.683); *b2* (at Athens, during the archonship of Hippomenes, an unidentified runner fell and died because of the loin-cloth, which led to decree on nudity).

of or motive for the introduction of athletic nudity,<sup>82</sup> and it seems preferable to regard all these stories as a complex of aetiological<sup>83</sup> anecdotes designed to explain the difference between Classical conditions and earlier practice as depicted in Homer, rather than as historical narratives in the proper sense.<sup>84</sup>

Modern research, on its part, has not yet reached a consensus on the questions of the origins of athletic nudity.<sup>85</sup> However, in the present context, we can leave aside the question of *origins* and ask, instead, how the Hellenes of the Classical period themselves *thought of* athletic nudity, which was well-established by the Classical period.

That they were acutely aware of the custom is a safe inference from the material discussed above. As pointed out by Bonfante (1989, 547), "In Homer's poems, of around 800 B.C., nakedness implies shame, vulnerability, death, and dishonor."<sup>86</sup> Obviously, the passage from Plato's *Republic* quoted above (n. 73) shows an awareness of the fact that the evaluation of nudity prevalent in the Classical period was different from the one current in earlier times. In the Classical period, there was clearly no stigma attached to public male nudity. Thus, Herodotos makes the following comment when relating the story of the rise to power of Gyges – a story which revolves around the consequences of a *woman* being seen in the nude: *παρὰ τοῖσι γὰρ Λυδοῖσι, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι βαρβάροισι, καὶ ἄνδρα ὀφθῆναι γυμνὸν ἐς αἰσχύνην μεγάλην φέρει* (1.10.3).<sup>87</sup> This comment, of course, implies a contrast, i.e. a contrast with *Hellenic* males for whom, it can be established *e contrario*, it was not always highly indecent to be seen naked. Likewise, the Platonic passage (above

82. Sansone 1988: 109: "The effect of these various and divergent accounts is to prove to us that the ancient Greeks, who were always very fond of assigning names to the 'inventors' of otherwise unexplained customs, were themselves unaware of the reason for the practice."

83. Tyrrell 2004: 69: "The story of Orsippus is an etiology that explains the origin of athletic nudity."

84. Cf. Sweet 1985: 45; Thuiller 1988: 34-35.

85. For athletic nudity, see e.g. Arieti 1975; Crowther 1982; Mouratidis 1985; Sweet 1985; Sansone 1988: 107-15; Bonfante 1989; Thuillier 1988; McDonnell 1991; Golden 1998: 65-69; Miller 2000: 283-85; Spivey 2004: 121-24.

86. On Iliadic nakedness, see MacCary 1982: 152-62.

87. "You see, for the Lydians, as for practically all the other barbarians, it is a great shame for even a man to be seen naked" (Blanco).

n. 73) also ought to mean that in Plato's day Hellenic males could let themselves be seen in the nude without making fools of themselves. And both authors, of course, imply that in this Hellenic males of the Classical period differed significantly from the Barbarians. Xenophon narrates an incident which spells out this difference between Hellenes and Barbarians in terms of nudity: when, in 395/4, Agesilaos, king of Sparta, was waging war against the Persians in Asia Minor, he decided, in order to increase the strength of his troops by inculcating contempt of the enemy into them, to sell Barbarian prisoners of war *naked*; the sight of pale, soft and lazy adversaries, says Xenophon, made the soldiers conclude that the war would not differ from a war against women.<sup>88</sup>

Whereas neither Herodotos nor Xenophon refers to Olympia in connection with nudity, Plato at least does refer to athletics (τῶν γυμνασίων), but Thucydides in fact refers to Olympia when he says that Hellenic athletes of olden wore loin-cloths *even at the Olympic Games* (καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὀλυμπικῷ ἀγῶνι). It seems a fair inference that in Thucydides' day – or mind – Olympia was the most prominent arena for athletic nudity, probably simply because it was the most important of all athletic arenas. Although, as shown above, athletics were construed as distinctively Hellenic, Thucydides goes on to note that some Barbarians in fact both wrestle and box – but do so wearing loin-cloths and

---

88. *Hell.* 3.4.19 (cf. *Ages* 1.28): ἡγούμενος δὲ καὶ τὸ καταφρονεῖν τῶν πολεμίων ῥώμην τινὰ ἐμβαλεῖν πρὸς τὸ μάχεσθαι, προεῖπε τοῖς κήρυξι τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ληστῶν ἀλίσκομένους βαρβάρους γυμνοὺς πωλεῖν. ὄρωντες οὖν οἱ στρατιῶται λευκοὺς μὲν διὰ τὸ μηδέποτε ἐκδύεσθαι, μαλακοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀπόνους διὰ τὸ αἰεὶ ἐπ' ὄχημάτων εἶναι, ἐνόμισαν μηδὲν διοῖσιν τὸν πόλεμον ἢ εἰ γυναξί δεοὶ μάχεσθαι (*Ages.* substitutes πίνοντας for μαλακοὺς). Harris 1964: 65 comments on the passage(s): "The Greeks always regarded their own readiness to appear naked before their fellows as one of the traits which marked them out from the Barbarians. On one occasion Agesilaus of Sparta when at war with the Persians exhibited naked prisoners of war to his troops so that they might be encouraged by the contrast between the flabby whiteness of the Persians and their own bronzed bodies." Spivey 2004: 124 comments: "The lesson ... is clear. For all that nudity may be a sort of 'costume' in Greek ... art, and a 'habit' of Greek athletics, it is also a revelation. What you see is what you get. Sporting prowess and fighting spirit: both are made equally evident by a display of the male body without clothes."

not in the nude. So, to conclude, we may say that in the Classical period athletic nudity was a boundary marker between Hellenes and Barbarians and was particularly characteristic of Olympia. In other words, at Olympia the difference was quite visible.

## V. Elis and the Administration of Olympia

If we sum up at this point, it seems clear that in the Classical period the Hellenes took athletic competitions to be a uniquely Hellenic phenomenon and that in this period the Games at Olympia had, at least partially under the impact of the clash with the Persians, developed into a marker of Hellenic identity and that the traditional athletic nudity was re-interpreted as another boundary marker. Obviously, Olympia's function as boundary marker must have been all the more emphasised by the fact that this sanctuary was perhaps the most important Panhellenic sanctuary.

On this background the political administration of the sanctuary is somewhat remarkable, at least when compared to that of Delphi, its only rival in Panhellenic importance. The sanctuary at Delphi was, as is well-known, administered by the Amphictyony, an international organisation in which twelve *ethne* ('peoples') were represented: The Thessalians, the Boiotians, the Phokians, etc. These *ethne* were all composed of *poleis* and it was these *poleis* which took turns in sending *hiaromnamones* to the Amphictyonic Council. Accordingly, more than one hundred *poleis* were at least indirectly involved in the administration of Delphi.<sup>89</sup>

---

89. In the Classical period, the following *ethne* were represented in the Amphictyony: (1) Thessalians, (2) Phokians (including the *polis* of Delphi), (3a) metropolitan Dorians, (3b) Peloponnesian Dorians, (4) Ionians, (5) Boiotians, (6) Lokrians (Eastern and Western), (7) Perrhaibians, (8) Dolopians, (9) Phthiotic Achaians, (10) Magnesians, (11) Ainianes, (12) Malians/Oitaians (Lefèvre (1998) 21-90). The research carried out under the auspices of The Copenhagen Polis Centre has identified the following numbers of *poleis* belonging to these *ethne*: to the Thessalians: 25 (nos. 393-417 in Hansen & Nielsen (2004)); to the Phokians: 29 (nos. 169-197); to the metropolitan Dorians: 4 (nos. 389-392); to the Boiotians: 26 (nos. 198-223); to the Eastern Lokrians: 11 (nos. 378-388); to the Western Lokrians: 12 (nos. 157-168); to the Perrhaibians: 11 (nos. 459-469); to the Dolopians: 2 (nos. 418-419); to the Phthiotic Achaians: 12 (nos. 433-444); to the Magnesians: 14 (nos. 445-458); to the Ainianes: 5 (nos. 420-424); to the Oitaians and Malians: 8 (nos. 425-432). The Peloponnesian Dorian *poleis* known to have been represented in the Amphictyony are the following 5:

Olympia, on the other hand, was administered by a single *polis*, Elis (no. 251):<sup>90</sup> Olympia was, in fact, an extraurban sanctuary of Elis. However, Elis seems not always to have possessed control of Olympia but to have taken it over only in the mid-sixth century<sup>91</sup> when it had defeated the previous administrator, the Pisatans, in what tradition held to have been a long struggle for Olympia.<sup>92</sup> In the Classical period the legitimacy of Elis' administration was accordingly on occasion questioned and disputed. Thus, Xenophon records that when, in the early fourth

---

Argos (no. 347), Sikyon (no. 228), Korinthos (no. 227), Megara (no. 225), and Phleious (no. 355), cf. Lefèvre 1998: 55. In addition, Sparta (no. 345) was occasionally represented (cf. Lefèvre 1998: 53-54). The Ionians were represented by (a) Athens (no. 361) (which may just possibly on occasion have ceded its place to another Ionian *polis*, cf. Lefèvre 1998: 59-60), and (b) by representatives from Euboia, an island subdivided into some 14 *poleis* (nos. 364-377). Thus, the groups making up the Amphictyony comprised some 180 *poleis*. Now, obviously, some *poleis* were more important or more powerful than others, and it is notable that, e.g., a *polis* such as Opous (no. 386) seems to have monopolised the East Lokrian seat on the council (Nielsen 2000: 99 n. 58). Furthermore, not all of these 180 *poleis* existed contemporaneously or throughout the whole of the Classical period; thus, e.g. Thebai (no. 444) in Achaia Phthiotis was presumably created by *synoikismos* only in the fourth century, and Herakleia Trachinia (no. 430) was founded in 426; but still, the basic point, that the Delphic sanctuary was administered by a truly international organisation comprising a great number of *poleis*, will stand.

90. Crowther 2003a. Though Olympia was markedly dissimilar to Delphi in this respect, it was, of course, similar to Isthmia, run by Korinthos (no. 227) alone (cf. Thuc. 7.9.2 and especially Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.13 with Salmon 1984: 357-58). The Nemean sanctuary seems to have been administered throughout the Classical period by the minor *polis* of Kleonai (no. 351), and to have been taken over by Argos (no. 347) in the early Hellenistic period (Perlman 2000: 131-49), though it cannot be entirely excluded that Argos controlled the sanctuary already from the fifth century (see Miller 1982: 105 with n. 39); for the possibility that Korinthos took over control of Nemea for a period in the earlier fifth century, see Hornblower 2004: 264 with refs. For an early intervention at Olympia by Pheidon of Argos, see Hdt. 6.127.3: Φεΐδωνος ... ὑβρίσαντος μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων πάντων, ὃς ἐξαναστήσας τοὺς Ἡλείων ἀγωνοθέτας αὐτὸς τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε. For the reports in later sources on early conflicts between Elis and Pisa for the control over Olympia, see the brief remarks with refs. in Crowther 2003b.

91. Roy 1997: 289 with n. 51 and Crowther 2003a: 62.

92. *RE* XX.2 (1950) 1747-50 (Meyer).



century,<sup>93</sup> the Spartans had defeated the Eleians, in a war designed to break the political power of Elis,<sup>94</sup> they contemplated depriving the Eleians of their control of Olympia: τοῦ μέντοι προεστάναι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου ἱεροῦ, καίπερ οὐκ ἀρχαίου Ἡλείοις ὄντος, οὐκ ἀπήλασαν αὐτοὺς, νομίζοντες τοὺς ἀντιποιουμένους χωρίτας εἶναι καὶ οὐχ ἱκανοὺς προεστάναι (*Hell.* 3.2.31).<sup>95</sup> The way in which Xenophon here introduces the notion of an early non-Eleian Olympic administration, as a fact *despite which* (note the use of καίπερ) the Spartans abstained from depriving the Eleians of their prestigious privilege, seems to indicate that the notion was openly voiced during the Spartan deliberations and presumably also that Xenophon himself fully endorsed it.<sup>96</sup> And so the important fact emerges that there were actually in the early fourth century rival claimants (ἀντιποιοῦμενοι) to the administration of Olympia, but that the Spartans *even so* did not interfere with the administration.<sup>97</sup> As for the reason(s) why Sparta would contemplate substituting a new Olympic administration for the Eleian, this passage does not state any; however, at *Hell.* 3.2.21-23 Xenophon gives a reasonably detailed exposition of the Spartan motives in waging the Eleian war, an exposition which distinguishes between the ‘official *casus belli*’ and the reasons for the Spartan anger (cf. 3.2.21: πάλαι ὀργιζόμενοι τοῖς Ἡλείοις) against the Eleians. The official reason for the war was that Elis had refused a Spartan request that Elis grant *autonomia* (‘independence’) to its *perioi-*

93. Unz 1986.

94. Falkner 1996.

95. “[T]hey did not, however, dispossess them of the presidency of the shrine of Olympian Zeus, even though it did not belong to the Eleians in ancient times, for they thought that the rival claimants were country people and not competent to hold the presidency” (Brownson, Loeb).

96. I note this simply because it seems to me to somewhat weaken the idea that the notion of an early non-Eleian (i.e. Pisatan) administration was a fiction created only in the 360s when the Arkadian Confederacy had in fact deprived the Eleians of their Olympic administration and turned it over to the newly-founded Pisatan state (cf. Nielsen 2000: 118-19). For the idea of fiction, see Nafissi 2003 and Möller 2004.

97. So Hornblower 2000: 222 n. 24.

*koi*.<sup>98</sup> However, Xenophon's initial sketch of the Spartan motives singles out a different set of four interrelated motives: (1) The Eleians' treaty of *symmachia* ('military alliance') with Athens (no. 361), Argos (no. 347) and Mantinea (no. 281) in 420; (2) The Eleians' expulsion of Sparta from the Games of 420; (3) The whipping of the Spartan citizen Lichas by the Eleian authorities in 420; (4) The exclusion – at an unknown date, but obviously after (1-3) which are arranged chronologically, and possibly ca. 413<sup>99</sup> – from the sanctuary of the Spartan king Agis who had come in accordance with an oracle to offer sacrifice to Zeus.<sup>100</sup>

*Re* (1-3) The treaty mentioned in no. (1) (= *Staatsverträge* 193) was merely the last in a series of treaties by which the Eleians *de facto* defected from the Peloponnesian League after the Peace of Nikias.<sup>101</sup> The Eleians' motive was a determination to recover the *polis* of Lepreon (no. 306), a subordinate ally of Elis which had recently broken away, as the Eleians saw it, with Spartan assistance.<sup>102</sup> The resulting strong alliance in 418 had some initial success in adding Orchomenos (no. 286) in Arkadia to its numbers;<sup>103</sup> however, at the subsequent deliberations among the allies it was decided to move on to attack Tegea (no. 297) and the

98. Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23: ἐκ τούτων οὖν πάντων ὀργιζομένοις ἔδοξε τοῖς ἐφόροις καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ σωφρονίσει αὐτοὺς (sc. τοὺς Ἡλείους). πέμψαντες οὖν πρέσβεις εἰς Ἴλιον εἶπον ὅτι τοῖς τέλεσι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων δίκαιον δοκοῖη εἶναι ἀφιέναι αὐτοὺς τὰς περιοικίδας πόλεις αὐτονόμους. ἀποκρυναμένων δὲ τῶν Ἡλείων ὅτι οὐ ποιήσοιεν ταῦτα, ἐπιληΐδας γὰρ ἔχουεν τὰς πόλεις, φρουρὰν ἔφηναν οἱ ἔφοροι. On the *perioikoi* (= dependent allies) of Elis, see Roy 1997.

99. See Parke 1967a: 186-87.

100. Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21-22: Λακεδαιμόνιοι ... πάλα ὀργιζόμενοι τοῖς Ἡλείοις καὶ ὅτι (1) ἐποίησαντο συμμαχίαν πρὸς Αθηναίους καὶ Ἀργεῖους καὶ Μαντινέας, καὶ ὅτι (2) δίκην φάσκοντες καταδικάσθαι αὐτῶν ἐκώλυον καὶ τοῦ ἵππικου καὶ τοῦ γυμνικοῦ ἀγῶνος, καὶ οὐ μόνον ταῦτ' ἤρκει, ἀλλὰ καὶ (3) Λίχας παραδόντος Θηβαίοις τὸ ἄρμα, ἐπεὶ ἐκρηύττοντο νικῶντες, ὅτε εἰσῆλθε Λίχας στεφανώσων τὸν ἠνίοχον, μαστιγοῦντες αὐτὸν, ἄνδρα γέροντα, ἐξήλασαν· τούτων δ' ὕστερον καὶ (4) Ἄγιδος πεμφθέντος θῦσαι τῷ Δίῃ κατὰ μαντείαν τινα ἐκώλυον οἱ Ἡλείοι μὴ προσεῦχεσθαι νίκην πολέμου, λέγοντες ὡς καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον εἶη οὕτω νόμιμον, μὴ χρηστηριάζεσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐφ' Ἑλλήνων πολέμῳ. The summary at Diod. Sic. 14.17.4 contains only nos. 4 & 2, in that order.

101. Cf. Thuc. 5.31.2: alliances with Korinthos (no. 227) and Argos (no. 347).

102. See further Nielsen 2005: 60-74.

103. Thuc. 5.61.5.

Eleians, who had proposed to move on for Lepreon (no. 306), simply quitted the campaign – enraged, according to Thucydides.<sup>104</sup> Obviously, Eleian eyes were firmly fixed on Lepreon, even to the extent of compromising the cohesion of a powerful alliance which could have decisively broken Spartan power. It was, moreover, the conflict with Sparta over Lepreon which had previously developed into (2-3). In 420 the Eleians barred the Spartans from participating in the celebration of the Olympics (Thuc. 5.49.1); the reason was that the Spartans had, according to the Eleians, moved hoplites into Lepreon during the Olympic truce and had refused to pay a fine imposed on them by the Eleians under Olympic law. This whole episode has been studied by Roy 1998 who demonstrates in detail how on this occasion the Eleians attempted to exploit their administration of Olympia to support their claim to Lepreon and how, in fact, the very indictment of Sparta was based on the contentious assumption that Lepreon belonged to Elis.<sup>105</sup>

Of course, such an expulsion from Olympia was a serious blemish on Spartan prestige; it was, accordingly, feared that the Spartans would force their way into the sanctuary and so the site of Olympia was protected during the celebration of the Games by armed forces from Elis, Argos, Mantinea, and Athens.<sup>106</sup> This fear was increased by an incident which occurred during the Games. Since Sparta had been excluded from the Games, individual Spartans were not entitled to participate.<sup>107</sup> Accordingly, the Spartan aristocrat Lichas enlisted his hippic team not as Spartan, but as Theban<sup>108</sup> (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21, Paus. 6.2.2), thus cir-

104. Thuc. 5.62.1-2: μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἔχοντες ἡδὴ τὸν Ὀρχομενὸν ἐβουλεύοντο οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἐφ' ὅτι χρὴ πρῶτον ἰέναι τῶν λοιπῶν. καὶ Ἡλεῖοι μὲν ἐπὶ Λέπρεον ἐκέλευον, Μαντινῆς δὲ ἐπὶ Τεγέαν· καὶ προσέθεντο οἱ Ἀργεῖοι καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τοῖς Μαντινεῦσιν. καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἡλεῖοι ὀργισθέντες ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ Λέπρεον ἐψηφίσαντο ἀνεχώρησαν ἐπ' οἴκου.

105. On the Olympic truce, see also Lämmer 1975-76 and 1982-83. On other ways in which the Eleians exploited their administration of Olympia to control their dependencies, see Roy 1997: 295-97; Roy 1999 points out that it is not even possible to distinguish the personnel of the Olympian sanctuary from that of the *polis* of Elis.

106. Thuc. 5.50.3.

107. Nielsen 2002: 203 and 2005: 17 and Nielsen in Hansen & Nielsen 2004: 107.

108. Or perhaps as 'Boiotian': see note 293 below.

cumventing the ban. Now, Lichas' team was victorious and "when the Thebans were announced as winners" (*Hell.* 3.2.21: ἐπεὶ ἐκηρύττοντο νικῶντες), Lichas stepped forward to tie a garland on the head of the charioteer "wishing to make it plain that it was his chariot."<sup>109</sup> Had he succeeded in this, he would have publicly secured for himself and for the Spartan state the immense symbolical capital produced by the victory.<sup>110</sup> But he did not succeed. He was, on the contrary, whipped by the Eleian authorities and driven off the field.<sup>111</sup> In this way, the Eleians inflicted a new serious blow to Spartan pride and prestige, for athletes were clearly conceived of as representing their *poleis*.<sup>112</sup> In short, items (1-3) may be said to be intimately related to the Eleian administration of Olympia, which could be turned against Sparta as a presumably not ineffective weapon of propaganda.

*Re* (4) It is not entirely clear whether Xenophon is representing the Eleians as stating a general rule applicable to all Hellenes and all Hellenic sanctuaries or a peculiarly Olympic rule. If meant as a reference to a Panhellenically recognised rule, it is simply not

109. *Thuc.* 5.50.4: βουλόμενος δηλῶσαι ὅτι ἑαυτοῦ ἦν τὸ ἄρμα. Cf. Dillon 1997: 46: "Lichas, in what must be described as a provocative act deliberately intended to defy the Eleian prohibition, came out into the stadium, and crowned the charioteer, in order to indicate that the chariot was owned by him, Lichas, a Spartan." Cf. Wolicki 2002: 79.

110. That Lichas persisted in his attempt to gain for himself the fruits of 'his' victory is clear from *Paus.* 6.3.2 which shows that he was able – after Sparta's victorious war on Elis – to dedicate a monument in the Altis commemorating the victory. Cf. n. 293 below. Hornblower 2000 shows conclusively that the Eleian ban on Spartan Olympic participation was effective only for the 420 Games, but even so, it would seem, it took a delayed war of revenge to enable Lichas to gain the prestige of 'his' victory, and accordingly, even if Sparta and Elis must have reached some kind of understanding prior to the 416 Games, tensions clearly persisted.

111. *Thuc.* 5.50.4: ὑπὸ τῶν ῥαβδούχων πληγὰς ἔλαβεν; *Xen. Hell.* 3.2.21: μαστιγούντες αὐτόν, ἀνδρα γέροντα, ἐξήλασαν. Flogging, of course, was a standard punishment for offences during competitive games in Classical Hellas (cf. *Hdt.* 8.59-60) and so the Eleians here did not act in an excessively provocative way. On flogging, see Crowther & Frass 1998. At Olympia, the punishment of flogging is epigraphically attested as early as the later sixth century (Ebert & Siewert 1999).

112. Nielsen 2002: 207-10 and below 85ff.

true.<sup>113</sup> But even if a peculiarly Olympic rule is referred to,<sup>114</sup> it can hardly have been literally true in this form<sup>115</sup> or uniformly respected: at least it was not respected in the early 380s when king Agesipolis of Sparta consulted the Olympic oracle of Zeus on a question involving armed aggression against Argos (Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.2). But then the 380s was a time when the Eleians had bowed to the might of the Spartans,<sup>116</sup> whereas the case in question here obviously belongs to a date when the Eleians opposed the Spartans. And so it appears – again – that the Eleian administration of Olympia was often (usually?) conducted with an eye to contemporary political agendas. And it seems a safe inference that it was this mode of Eleian administration which annoyed the Spartans to such an extent that they contemplated putting an end to administration by Elis.

However, the Spartans did not in the end abolish Eleian administration. Why, since they had what must have seemed to them perfectly good reasons, did they abstain? They did so, according to Xenophon, “because they considered the rival claimants to be *choritai* and not capable of presiding over the sanctuary” (νομίζοντες τοὺς ἀντιπιοιούμενους χωρίτας εἶναι καὶ οὐχ ἰκανοὺς προεστάναι). Whatever the implications of the rare word *choritai* (literally ‘people of the country’ and very possibly in a pejorative sense), it seems evident that the Spartans did not find the rival claimants to be in possession of the administrative sophistication (οὐχ ἰκανοὺς προεστάναι) needed for the important job, and so they resolved to leave it in the hands of the Eleians – who must have had plenty of administrative experience.

However, in 364 the Eleians were in fact deprived of the administration, by the Arkadian Confederacy and its puppet

---

113. Krentz 2002: 35 and Schwartz 2004: 69, referring to: Hdt. 1.66: Spartan consultation of the Delphic oracle on a question involving armed aggression against Arkadia (question accepted); Thuc. 1.118.3: Spartan consultation of the Delphic oracle on a question involving armed aggression against Athens (question accepted).

114. The two Spartan consultations of the Olympic oracle discussed here are the only documented historical consultations of the oracle (Sinn 2000: 19).

115. See Sinn 2000: 15-22 for an argument that the Olympic oracle in fact specialised in warfare (accepted by Spivey 2004: 174-77).

116. As noted by Parke 1967a: 189 and 1967b: 112.

state the Pisatans (no. 262).<sup>117</sup> In 365, war broke out between Elis with allies and federated Arkadia with allies. During this war, Arkadian forces captured Olympia and installed a garrison on the Kronion hill (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.14). Olympia was thus no longer under Eleian control and Elis had lost a significant part of its southern territory. Olympia was *de facto* controlled by the Arkadians, who even made use of sacred money to finance the standing federal army (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.33). The Arkadians, of course, had no historical claim to the Olympic administration. But the inhabitants of Pisatis<sup>118</sup> – presumably the very *choritai* considered by Sparta in the early fourth century<sup>119</sup> – did have (or could be presented as having) such a historical claim. Pisatis had been an integrated part of the *polis* of Elis,<sup>120</sup> but it was now constituted (or reconstituted) as an individual state, evidently with Arkadian backing.<sup>121</sup> According to Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.28 the Pisatans now openly claimed to have been the original *prostatai* ('leaders') of the sanctuary (Πισάταις τοῖς πρώτοις φάσκουσι προστῆναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ), thus implying that they had been deprived of this privilege by Elis and that their restoration would only be just. Xenophon does not specify the basis of this Pisatan claim, but Diodorus Siculus (15.78.2) records that they based it on τισι μυθικαῖς καὶ παλαιαῖς ἀποδείξεσι, "sur des mythes et sur des faits du passé" (C. Vial in the Budé), but unfortunately without giving details. It may, however, not be impossible to identify at least one myth projected by the Pisatans to justify their claim.

*Etymologicum Magnum* 623.12-18 is a brief discussion of the origin of the toponym 'Olympia'; it ends by explicitly rejecting a tradition that the site was named after the mythological heroine Olympia, daughter of the Arkadians' eponymous hero Arkas and wife of Pisos.<sup>122</sup> A town by the name of Pisa presumably

117. On the Games in 364, see Ritter 2001; Crowther 2003; and Roy (forthcoming).

118. On Pisatis, see Roy 2002a.

119. Cf. Roy 2002a: 240.

120. See Roy in Hansen & Nielsen 2004: 489-91.

121. Nielsen 2002: 118-19.

122. *Etym. Magn.* 623.16-18: οὐ γὰρ δέχομαι τοὺς λέγοντας ὠνομάσθαι τὸν τόπον (i.e. Olympia) ἀπὸ Ὀλυμπίας τῆς Ἀρκάδος, ἣν ἔγημε Πίσος.

never existed though some post-Classical writers refer to one.<sup>123</sup> Obviously, Pisos is the eponymous hero of this supposed Pisa and thus of the Pisatans,<sup>124</sup> and Phlegon seems to assign to him a significant role in the very earliest celebrations of the Olympics.<sup>125</sup> He would clearly have been an ideal figure on which to base Pisatan claims to Olympia; and the unique detail that he was married to a daughter of the Arkadians' eponym and that it was she who gave the sanctuary its name – this detail would serve to establish or was intended to establish a mythical precedent for the close alliance between the Pisatans and the Arkadians of the 360s and so presumably legitimate Arkadian presence at Olympia. The tradition thus fits perfectly the historical situation in 365-364 when the Pisatans and the Arkadians presided over the celebration of the Olympics,<sup>126</sup> and it is, in fact, the common assumption that it originated in exactly this historical situation.<sup>127</sup> This assumption finds corroboration in the fact that the Arkadian Confederacy is known to have made use of precisely such genealogical mythology to support its claims in the case of Triphylia which was incorporated into Arkadia in the 360s though it had not previously been a part of this region.<sup>128</sup> In

123. Roy 2002: 233 with refs.

124. Cf. *RE* XX.2: 1736. Paus. 6.22.2: ... ἐνθα ἡ Πίσα ᾤκειτο. οἰκίστην μὲν δὴ γενέσθαι τῇ πόλει Πίσσον τὸν Περιήρους φασί, Schol. in Theocr. 4.29-30b: ποτὶ Πίσσαν· ἢ νῦν Ὀλυμπία, ἀπὸ Πίσσου τοῦ Αἰθαρώως. Though this Pisos is mentioned only in post-Classical sources, he may perhaps be a figure of considerable antiquity for according to Paus. 5.17.9 he was depicted on the chest of Kypselos at Olympia.

125. Phlegon (*FGrHist* 257) fr. 1(1): μετὰ Πείσον καὶ Πέλοπα, ἔτι δὲ Ἡρακλέα, τοὺς πρῶτους τὴν πανήγυριν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν Ὀλυμπίασιν ἐνστήσαμένους. The same fragment at 1(10) reports that it was a Pisatan who introduced the crown of wild olive as the Olympic prize (cf. Crowther 2003b).

126. Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.29: note the wording Ἀρκάδες ... αὐτοὶ σὺν Πισάταις διετίθεσαν τὴν πανήγυριν, leaving no doubt that Xenophon regarded the Pisatans as mere puppets of the Arkadians. The same appears from *Hell.* 7.4.35 where Xenophon reports that part of the Arkadian reasoning prior to their treaty with Elis in 363/62 was that they no longer desired the presidency of Olympia (τοῦ τε γὰρ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διὸς προεστάναι οὐδὲν προσδεῖσθαι ἐνόμιζον): not a word about the Pisatans here.

127. *RE* XVIII: 174 (Herter), XX.2: 1754 (Meyer); Roy 2000: 144; Ritter 2001: 92; Nielsen 2002: 118.

128. See Nielsen 1997: 145-46. See also Nielsen 2005: 77-81.

the early 360s, the Arkadian Confederacy dedicated at Delphi a sculptural group to commemorate its raidings in Lakonia (CEG 2 824). The sculptures represented the mythical ancestors of the Arkadians such as Arkas and Kallisto and the accompanying inscription is a proud statement of Arkadian ethnic identity. Among the sons of Arkas paraded on the monument is one attested here for the first time: Triphylos, celebrated in verse and depicted in stone. Genealogies, of course, were used to retroject into the past, and thus legitimise, present realities and so what Arkas' paternity of Triphylos tells us is that here the inclusion of Triphylos' descendants, the *Triphylioi*, into those of Arkas, the *Arkades*, is proclaimed to the Hellenic world at a central sanctuary.<sup>129</sup> The myth of Olympia, daughter of Arkas and wife of Pisos, is obviously of a very similar kind and designed to legitimate Arkadian presence at Olympia.

Though obviously a puppet of the Arkadian Confederacy, Pisa developed into a statelet on its own and presumably even concluded a series of military alliances with foreign powers.<sup>130</sup> But, of course, its heart was the sanctuary of Olympia. First, the types of its gold coins referred directly to the Olympic sanctuary by depicting the dedicatee divinity: Zeus and the thunderbolt.<sup>131</sup> Second and even more important is an act by the Pisatan state (Perlman 2000: O.1 with pl. 1):

Θεός. τύχα. πρό[ξ]ενοι  
 θεαροδόκοι Κλέανδρος  
 Σωκλής Πισατᾶν, αὐτοὶ  
 κα[ὶ γέ]νος Σεκυώνιοι.  
 ὑπὸ [Ἑλλα]νοδικᾶν· Ἀγιάδ-  
 ας, Φίλ[ων Λ]υκομήδεος,  
 Βαθυλ[-----]<sup>132</sup>  
*vacat*

129. On the working of genealogies, see Fowler 1998: esp. 5-6, 16-17.

130. See Nielsen 2002: 119 with refs. See also Stylianou 1998: 493.

131. On these rare coins, see Head 1911: 426; Gardiner 1925: Fig. 37.11; Seltman 1955: 167 with pl. xxxv. 9 & 11; Kraay 1976: 106 with pl. 18.333. See further below 43ff. on the coinage of Elis.

132. "God. Fortune. *Proxenoι, theorodokoi* of the Pisatans: Kleandros, Sokles, themselves an[d the]ir offspring, of Sikyon. Under the [Hella]nodikai Agiadas,



The inscription is dated by reference to a board of eponymous *Hellanodikai* (ὑπὸ [Ἑλλα]νοδικᾶν), the title used for more than a century by Elis to designate the chief officials of the Olympics (above 20-1). As E. Meyer remarked (*RE* XX.2: 1754): “Man sieht, wie die Olympien natürlich im Mittelpunkt der Organisation Pisas stehen.” That the inscription really belongs to the 360s is as certain as can be from the name of one of the Sikyonian honorands: a Kleandros of Sikyon<sup>133</sup> is known from Xenophon’s *Hellenika* where at 7.1.45 he is reported to have been elected *strategos* of Sikyon in 366. That the coins must belong to the same period is just as clear, since at no other point in the Classical period was a Pisatan state in existence.

The inscription provides the earliest secure attestation of the term *θεαροδόκος*, but a recently-published mid-fifth century inscription from Olympia – a grant of citizenship by Elis to two foreigners (*SEG* 51 532) – demonstrates that an institution very similar to (or identical with) the institution of *theorodokia*<sup>134</sup> known from the fourth century onwards was in existence and serving the Olympics already by 450.<sup>135</sup> Accordingly, whatever their titles, *theorodokos*-like officials serving the Eleian festival- and truce-announcers (*theoroi* or *spondophoroi*) must have been in place throughout the Hellenic world prior to the Arkado-Pisatan celebration of the 364 Olympics.<sup>136</sup> These, of course, will have been appointed by Elis. The Pisatans may well have wanted to replace (some of) these, and it is hard to improve upon the comment by Perlman 2000: 65-66: “The alacrity with which Pisa appointed her own *theorodokoi* within a year or so of the Eleian expulsion and the identity of one of the individuals appointed suggest the role which the holders of this title might play in

---

Phil[on son of L]ykomedes, Bathyl[- -]’. A *proxenos* was a citizen of *polis* X (here Sikyon) appointed by decree by *polis* Z (here Pisa) to look after the interests of *polis* Z in *polis* X and assist visitors or official delegations from Z in X. On *proxenia*, see more below 82-3. For *theorodokoi*, see 42 and 62-67.

133. Perlman 2000: prosopographic catalogue no. 178.

134. For the institution of *theorodokia*, see Perlman 1995 & 2000.

135. See Siewert 2002: 365-66 on the phrase τὰν θε<α>ρίαν δέκεσαι. Before the system of *theorodokia* was developed, Elis may have made use of the institution of *proxenia* to ease its *epangelia*: see Perlman 2000: 20 citing Wallace 1970.

136. So Crowther 2003b.

interstate diplomacy. One of the honorands, Kleandros, was numbered among the five generals who were chosen by the Argives and Arkadians in 366 B.C. to direct the anti-Spartan movement one result of which was Pisa's capture of Olympia in 365 B.C. The appointment of Kleandros shortly thereafter as *proxenos* and *theorodokos* clearly secured a powerful ally for Pisa at Sikyon.<sup>137</sup> The concern on the part of the Pisatans that individuals of their own choice, rather than those appointed by Elis, serve as *theorodokoi* for the Olympic Games was not merely *pro forma* but involved considerations of political and military policy." In other words, Pisa's replacement of at least some *theorodokoi* may reasonably be interpreted as a means by which the Arkado-Pisatan control of Olympia was strengthened.

So, the Olympics of 364 was administered by a Pisatan state created by the Arkadian Confederacy precisely in order to run the sanctuary for the Arkadians (cf. n. 126 above). The Eleians, however, did not sit idly by and watch as their enemies celebrated the festival of Zeus Olympios at "their very spiritual centre" (Crowther 2003b). According to Paus. 5.9.5, the Eleians had at the 103d Olympic festival (i.e. in 368) raised the number of *Hellandikai* from ten to twelve, drawing one from each *phyle* (= administrative unit) of the *polis*. However, already in 364 – "at the earliest opportunity" (Roy (forthcoming)) – the number of *Hellandikai* appointed by Elis was reduced to eight and Pausanias explicitly connects this reduction with the territorial losses suffered by the Eleians in the war with the Arkadians, the war which led to the Arkadian occupation of Olympia and the creation of the Pisatan state.<sup>138</sup> Clearly, as argued by Roy (forthcoming), this reduction is a reflection of the loss of Pisatis. Now, the Eleian acknowledgement of this loss and the appointment of the reduced board of *Hellandikai* must have taken place by late 365 or "at the very latest, by spring 364." It was thus, as pointed out by Roy (forthcoming), effected after less than one season of fighting the Arkadians, which is a little

137. And one obviously tolerable to the Arkadians (THN).

138. Paus. 5.9.6: πεισθέντες δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀρκάδων πολέμῳ μοῖραν τε ἀπέβαλον τῆς γῆς καὶ ὅσοι τῶν δήμων ἦσαν ἐν τῇ ἀποτιμηθείσῃ χώρᾳ, καὶ οὕτως ἐς ὀκτώ τε ἀριθμὸν φυλῶν ἐπὶ τῆς τετάρτης συνεστάλησαν Ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ἑκατοστῆς καὶ Ἑλλανοδίκαί σφίσιν ἴσοι ταῖς φυλαῖς ἤρέθησαν.

strange since the Eleians were vigorously committed to regaining their lost territory (i.e. Pisatis with Olympia). But the open acknowledgement of the loss of Pisatis seems almost reminiscent of admission of defeat. However, as persuasively argued by Roy (forthcoming), the reform of the hellanodikic board was probably an attempt to deny the validity of the Arkado-Pisatan administration.

The Eleians, then, must have carried out the reform knowing full well that the Arkadians intended to run the Games. But the hellanodikic board was probably appointed in the usual way (apart from the ideologically motivated reduction) in order for it to be on the ready should an opportunity arise for the Eleians to reconquer the sanctuary and celebrate the Games. In fact, on what was probably the second day of the Arkado-Pisatan celebration of the Olympics,<sup>139</sup> Eleian forces, supported by forces from the Achaian Confederacy, marched down the Olympic Road (ἡ Ὀλυμπιακὴ ὁδός) and attacked the sanctuary which was guarded not only by Arkadian troops but also by some 2000 Argive hoplites and 400 Athenian *hippeis*. Fierce fighting took place in the Altis itself, but even though Xenophon remarks on the extraordinary quality of the Eleian performance (*Hell.* 7.4.30), they had to retire the next day without having taken the site. It seems a reasonable inference that what the Eleians aimed for was not only to reconquer the site but also to stage the Games themselves under the direction of the reduced hellanodikic board. A somewhat similar incident had occurred earlier in the century at the Panhellenic site of Isthmia. During the Corinthian War, the *poleis* of Argos (no. 347) and Korinthos (no. 227) were in all probability temporarily merged into a single *polis* under the name of Argos (*Xen. Hell.* 4.4.6).<sup>140</sup> Thus, in 390, the Ἀργεῖοι, as Xenophon has it (*Hell.* 4.5.1), prepared to celebrate the Isthmian Games. They had proceeded as far the sacrifice to Poseidon, when a Lakedaimonian army, commanded by king Agesilaos and accompanied by Korinthian exiles, was reported to be on the

139. See Crowther 2003b. According to *Xen. Hell.* 7.4.29, the attack took place when the hippic competitions were over and when the *pentathlon* was being contested; Lee 2001: 35 concludes that from 468 BC and probably until very late in the first century AD, the *pentathlon* took place on the second day.

140. See Griffith 1950; Salmon 1984: 357-62; Whitby 1984.

march for the sanctuary. Panic-stricken, the Argives left the sanctuary for the city of Korinthos, while Agesilaos put up his quarters in the sanctuary, sacrificed to the god and “waited until the Korinthian exiles had conducted the sacrifice and the competition in honour of Poseidon”.<sup>141</sup> Clearly, these exiles saw themselves as the true representatives of Korinthos, the traditional hostess of the Isthmian Games. However, when the Lakedaimonian army had left, the Ἀργεῖοι resurfaced and conducted the Isthmia all over again, clearly also a political demonstration. As for the athletes, at least some of them participated in both celebrations of the Isthmian Games, for Xenophon closes his account of this extraordinary episode with this comment: “So in that year in some of the events various competitors were beaten twice and the same people were twice proclaimed winners” (Warner).

However, the Eleians did not succeed in staging their own Games in 364 since they were unable to force the Arkadians and allies out of the sanctuary. Obviously, the Eleians did not recognise the Pisatan administration as legitimate. But others must have done so. That the Arkadian Confederacy did is clear. That Sikyon (no. 228) did as well may be deduced from (a) the fact that two of its citizens – one of them a *strategos* of the city – accepted appointment as *theorodokoi* of the Pisatans, and from (b) the fact that a Sikyonian, Sostratos the son of Sosistratos (Moretti 1957: no. 420), is known to have been victorious in the *pankration* in 364 (Paus. 6.4.2): in order to compete in the Games, an athlete had i.a. to belong to a *polis* which had accepted and respected the Olympic Truce, i.e. which had received the Olympic *theoroi* sent by Pisa and granted their request (Nielsen 2002: 203).<sup>142</sup> That Argos (no. 347) also recognised Pisa’s administration seems a fair inference from the fact that 2000 Argive hoplites helped protect the sanctuary during the 364 Games (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.29). Athenian troops were likewise present during the Games (*ibid.*), in which Phokides of Athens won the *stadion* race (Moretti 1957: no. 419; Diod. Sic. 15.78.1). Now, as it happens, both Sostratos

141. *Hell.* 4.5.2: κατασκηνήσας δὲ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ αὐτὸς τε τῷ θεῷ ἔθυε καὶ περιέμενεν, ἕως οἱ φυγάδες τῶν Κορινθίων ἐποίησαν τῷ Ποσειδῶνι τὴν θυσίαν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα.

142. On other formal requirements, see Crowther 1996.

and Phokides belong to *poleis* closely politically allied to the Arkadians, and so it is not really surprising that these states recognised the Arkado-Pisatan presidency. All the more significant, then, is it that a competitor from Kyrene (no. 1028) in Libya is on record as well:<sup>143</sup> according to Paus. 6.8.3, Eubotas of Kyrene won the chariot-race in 364. Apparently, Pisa sent *theoroi* far and wide and even states outside the Arkadian alliance accepted Pisatan presidency. To some states it may not have mattered much who ran the Games – just as a number of athletes were apparently indifferent to such political matters at the occasion of the 390 Isthmian Games. But obviously, to Elis it mattered very much. Not surprisingly, then, when the Arkadians offered Elis peace and restoration of Olympia in 363,<sup>144</sup> the Eleians accepted (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.35).

What happened to the Arkadian puppet statelet of Pisa when Arkadia and Elis concluded peace is unknown, but presumably the area was reabsorbed into the Eleian state. However, the brief interlude of Pisatan presidency was not forgotten. Thus, the Eleians declared the year 364 non-olympic and deleted it from the official records (Diod. Sic. 15.78.3; Paus. 6.22.3). Furthermore, some highly interesting Eleian coins may belong to the time when Elis regained Olympia. The types of Eleian coins had always referred explicitly to Olympia.<sup>145</sup> The mint of Elis began production on the Aiginetan standard and in a variety of denominations in the late sixth century and created a coinage “conspicuous for its artistic quality” (Kraay 1976: 103). It is sometimes described as a ‘temple coinage’, but is rather a standard civic mint (Roy in Hansen & Nielsen 2004: 498) drawing its imagery from the sanctuary of Olympia, thus making a demonstration of the intimate relations between Elis and that sanctuary. Recurrent obverse types depict the eagle of Zeus,<sup>146</sup> or

143. Moretti 1957: no. 422 tentatively assigns a Sicilian victor to the 364 Olympics.

144. On the internal frictions in the Arkadian Confederacy which led to this offer of peace, see Nielsen 2002: 490-91.

145. Gardiner 1925: 104.

146. Head 1911: figs. 224-28 (fifth century); Seltman 1955: pl. xiii.9-12 (ca. 500-480), xxxv.1-2 (428-24); Kraay 1976: pl. 18.323-25, 27 (fifth century), 18.330 (ca. 380); Jenkins 1990: fig. 59 (510-500), fig. 116 (ca. 450-430). In this and the following notes the bracketed dates are those given in the publications cited.

its head,<sup>147</sup> a seated Zeus,<sup>148</sup> or his head,<sup>149</sup> while reverse types include the thunderbolt of Zeus,<sup>150</sup> a striding Zeus wielding the thunderbolt,<sup>151</sup> or a winged Nike in various poses, most memorably an advancing Nike with a wreath in her outstretched hand, surely the olive crown for the athletic victor.<sup>152</sup> Other obverse types show the head of Hera with Zeus-imagery for the reverse.<sup>153</sup> The regular legend is the city-ethnic of Elis abbreviated as  $\text{F}\Lambda\langle\text{ΛEION}\rangle$ ,<sup>154</sup> but the obverses depicting the striding Zeus with the thunderbolt are inscribed  $\text{O}\Lambda\text{Y}\text{N}\text{Π}\text{I}\text{I}\text{K}\text{O}\text{N}$  (spelt also with koppa, cf. Schwabacher 1962: 12 n. 19). Whatever the exact meaning of this legend,<sup>155</sup> it is surely a reference to Olympia.<sup>156</sup> In short, imagery and legends of the Eleian coinage link city and sanctuary intimately and closely together. Now, in the fourth century appear some remarkable Eleian issues, *Obv.* Lau-

147. Head 1911: fig. 229 (fifth century); Kraay 1976: pl.18.329 (ca. 400); Jenkins 1990: fig. 120 (ca. 420).

148. Gardiner 1925: Fig. 37.1; Kraay 1976: pl. 18.326 (ca. 430).

149. Head 1911: fig. 230 (ca. 421-400); Kraay 1976: pl. 328 (ca. 416); Jenkins 1990: fig. 119 (ca. 420).

150. Head 1911: figs. 224, 227 and 229 (ca. 471-421), figs. 230-31 (ca. 421-400); Seltman 1955: pl. xiii.9-10 (ca. 500), xxxv.2 (ca. 424); Kraay 1976: pl. 18.323 (ca. 470), 18.328-30 (416-380), 18.331 (ca. 400); Jenkins 1990: fig. 59 (510-500), fig. 117 (ca. 450-430).

151. Gardiner 1925: Fig. 37.2; Schwabacher 1962: p. 7.4-6, pl. 8.1-3; Kraay 1976: pl. 18.325 (ca. 450). This type may possibly be inspired by the colossal Zeus dedicated at Olympia by the Hellenic League after its victory at Plataiai in 479 (so Gauer 1968: 97).

152. Head 1911: figs. 225-26 (ca. 471-421); Seltman 1955: pl. xiii. 11-12 (ca. 480); Schwabacher 1962: pl. 7.2-3; Kraay 1976: pl. 18.324 (ca. 465); Jenkins 1990: fig. 61 (ca. 480-470), fig. 116 (ca. 450-430).

153. Seltman 1955: pl. xxxv.3-5 (ca. 420); Kraay 1976: pl. 18.331-32 (ca. 400-380); Jenkins 1990: fig. 121 (ca. 420).

154. Head 1911: 421; Seltman 1955: pl. xiii.9-12, xxxv.4-6; Kraay 1976: pl. 18.323-24, 328-31; Jenkins 1990: figs. 59, 61, 116, 118, 121.

155. Schwabacher 1962 argues that the type depicts a pre-Pheidian cult statue of Zeus housed in the great fifth-century temple of the god before the creation of Pheidias' chryselephantine image; as pointed out by Kraay 1976: 105: "In this case the legend ... might be a neuter singular describing the type with some such word as ἄγαλμα ('statue') understood", i.e. it would then mean: "This is the Olympic statue of Zeus' *vel sim.*"

156. Head 1911: 420; Roy in Hansen & Nielsen 2004: 498. For Athenian fourth-century bronze coins referring to the sanctuary of Eleusis in much the same way, see Martin 1995: 271-73.

reated head of Zeus/ἸΑΛΛΕΙΟΝ or ἸΑΛΛΕΙΩΝ, *Rev.* Female head/ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑ.<sup>157</sup> Taking the reverse type to be a depiction of the personification of the sanctuary, the two legends may be read to yield an emphatic statement of the point of view that ‘Olympia belongs to the Eleians’ and the unabbreviated city-ethnic will become quite demonstrative.<sup>158</sup> If it is meant to depict an eponymous nymph or heroine, the coins may be interpreted as an official Eleian appropriation of this figure, who appears here for the first time in Eleian monetary imagery. Such an appropriation will fit very well the situation of 363, when Elis had regained control of Olympia after the brief Arkado-Pisatan administration of the site which had probably (cf. above 36-7) given rise to the myth of Olympia, daughter of Arkas and wife of Pisos – a tradition whose veracity these coins may then be seen to deny. On the assumption that Eleian coins (as a ‘temple coinage’) was produced only on the occasion of the Olympics, these coins are commonly dated to 360, the first Olympics after the scandalous Games of 364; but there is no compelling reason not to regard the Eleian mint as a standard civic mint, and this will allow a date of 363.<sup>159</sup> If accepted, the coins may be seen as a jubilant political celebration, at the earliest opportunity, of the return of Olympia to Eleian control.<sup>160</sup>

Eleian coinage, then, by its imagery and legends makes a demonstration of the close connections between Elis and Olympia, and emphatically so in 363. Another way in which city

157. Hill 1906: no. 40; Head 1911: 422; Gardiner 1925: Fig. 37.7; Kraay 1976: 106 & pl. 18.334; Ritter 2001: Abb. 1.

158. Kraay 1976: 106; Ritter 2001: 91. Cf. Head 1911: 423. Still worth quoting is the comment by Hill 1906: 77: “Here, not for the first time, it is true, but contrary to the general rule, the ethnic of the Eleians appears in full. What is more, it is associated with the head of the chief god of the sanctuary. And the placing of the nymph Olympia, legibly labelled, on the reverse expresses the claim of the Eleians to dominate the festival-place of which she is the personification.” Cf. Gardiner 1925: 122.

159. So Ritter 2001: 91 n. 8.

160. Presumably, the return of Olympia to Eleian control was also celebrated by a monumental bronze sculpture of Zeus set up in the Altis by the Eleians, a sculpture which was, according to Paus. 5.24.4, the largest bronze Zeus in the Altis: ὁ δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἄλτει μέγιστον τῶν χαλκῶν ἐστὶν ἀγαλμάτων τοῦ Δίος, ἀνετέθη μὲν ὑπὸ αὐτῶν Ἠλείων ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς Ἀρκάδας πολέμου, μέγεθος δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι ποδῶν ἐστί.

and sanctuary were linked was by means of the procession from Elis to the sanctuary, which formed one of the preludes to the festival.<sup>161</sup> Processions, of course, were standard features of most religious festivals,<sup>162</sup> but they may on occasion take on important extra-religious significance. Two examples may suffice to demonstrate this. The first concerns the famous procession from Athens to Eleusis. During the Dekeleian War, the Athenians had been unable to send the procession to Eleusis by the traditional route of the Sacred Road due to the Peloponnesian occupation of Dekeleia: they accordingly went by sea, which made for a much less splendid 'procession' (Plut. *Alc.* 34.3); however, after his election to *hegemon autokrator*, Alkibiades led out the entire army and staged the procession on land.<sup>163</sup> By this act he both "made amends to the goddesses whose mysteries he had once mocked"<sup>164</sup> and gave a military demonstration, presumably directed both at the Spartans – with whom he had a prehistory of collaboration – and the Athenian army and populace, who according to Plutarch were greatly spirited by the event (*Alc.* 34.6).<sup>165</sup> Clearly, this "piece of display" (Rhodes 1985: 16) can only have been as effective as it apparently was if the staging of the procession was felt to be of great symbolical value to the Athenians in political and military terms.

The second example concerns the procession linking the city of Argos to the sanctuary of Hera some 10 km northeast of the city, the so-called 'Argive Heraion'. It has been persuasively argued by Hall 1995 that Argos (no. 347) did not in fact establish its control over the whole of the Argive plain until the 460s when it, assisted in at least one case by Arkadian Tegea (no. 297) (Strabo 8.6.19), destroyed Midea, Tiryns (no. 356) and Mykenai (no. 353).<sup>166</sup> This extension of Argos' territory coincides not only with the earliest literary source unequivocally connecting the *polis* of Argos and the Heraion, Pindar's 10th *Nemean Ode* of

161. Lee 2001: 28-29.

162. Burkert 1985: 99-101.

163. Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.20: ... πρότερον μὲν τὰ μυστήρια τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατὰ θάλατταν ἀγόντων διὰ τὸν πόλεμον, κατὰ γῆν ἐποίησεν ἐξαγαγῶν τοὺς στρατιώτας ἅπαντας.

164. Rhodes 1985: 16. Cf. Kagan 1987: 291.

165. Kagan 1987: 291-92.

166. Hall 1995: 589-90.



464,<sup>167</sup> but most probably also with the laying-out of a new 'Sacred Way' adorned with at least one monumental building and serving a procession from Argos to the sanctuary which symbolised "Argos's newly won control over the sanctuary and her new-found domination over the Plain."<sup>168</sup> The Sacred Road<sup>169</sup> followed by the Olympic procession ran through the Eleian plain and was approximately some 58 km long,<sup>170</sup> and it has been estimated that the procession lasted two days<sup>171</sup> and 'guesstimated' that perhaps several thousands participated.<sup>172</sup> Clearly, this extremely long procession would serve as a convenient periodical demonstration of Elis' ownership of Olympia and would have been particularly significant in times when Eleian supremacy at Olympia was in dispute as, e.g., around 400 when Sparta questioned Elis' mode of administration (above 31ff.). No Classical source explicitly refers to the procession or the 'Sacred Road', but the route followed by the Eleian and Achaian troops marching on Olympia in 364 is described by Xenophon as ἡ Ὀλυμπιακὴ ὁδός, which is presumably the Sacred Road. If so, the expedition may almost be seen as a very special and extraordinary instance of the procession and the very route taken by the troops must have added immensely to the feeling of purpose felt by at least the Eleian soldiers: to regain what was theirs.

Another way in which Elis may perhaps have linked itself unusually closely with the sanctuary at Olympia was by not differentiating very much between the sanctuary and the site of Elis town in terms of the political administration of the *polis*: Whereas the normal state of affairs was that a *polis* centralised its political administration in its main town (if there was more than one), Elis seems to have located its administration partly in Elis town and

167. Pind. *Nem.* 10.22-23: ἀγών τοι χάλκεος/ δᾶμον ὀτρύνει ποτὶ βουθυσίαν  
Ἥρας ἀέθλων τε κρίσιν.

168. Hall 1995: 612.

169. Paus. 5.25.7: τῆς ὁδοῦ ... ἣ ἄγει μὲν ἐξ Ἥλιδος ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν, καλεῖται δὲ  
Ἰερά.

170. Weiler 1997: 192-93; Lee 2001: 28 with refs.; Jacquemin 2002 *ad* 6.25.5. See  
also Swaddling 2004: 52 with a map of the Sacred Road.

171. Gardiner 1910: 202; Drees 1968: 45; Lee 2001: 28.

172. Miller 2004: 118.

partly in Olympia.<sup>173</sup> Not only were public inscriptions put up at both sites,<sup>174</sup> public civic buildings were also constructed at both sites. Diod. Sic. 11.54.1 reports an Eleian *synoikismos* of 471;<sup>175</sup> however, Elis town was certainly not *founded* by this *synoikismos*; rather, the town was *enlarged* by the *synoikismos*.<sup>176</sup> Admittedly, the archaeological evidence predating 471 is not abundant, but enough to show that already in the sixth century at least a couple of public buildings stood on the site of the agora,<sup>177</sup> where stoas and other buildings were constructed in the Classical period.<sup>178</sup> Obviously, this town was in the Archaic and Classical periods a centre of Eleian administration, and it was almost certainly in this town that the chief Eleian officials resided and to this town that the Spartans sent an embassy ca. 400 demanding that Elis grant *autonomia* to her *perioikoi*.<sup>179</sup>

173. Fully accepted by Crowther 2004: 56-57. See also Siewert 1994a: 27 and Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 86-89.

174. For a sixth-century (600-550) inscription, a law with stipulations on judicial procedures, from the site of Elis town, see Siewert 1994a; for Eleian acts of state published at Olympia, cf. *ibid.* nn. 43-45. See also Siewert 2001. For Eleian inscriptions at Olympia, see also Taeuber 1991.

175. Ἡλείοι μὲν πλείους καὶ μικρὰς πόλεις οἰκούντες εἰς μίαν συνωκίσθησαν τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Ἥλιον. Cf. Strabo 8.3.2; Ps.-Skylax 43; Leandrios (*FGrHist* 492) fr. 13.

176. On the *synoikismos*, see Hansen 1995b: 58-60 and Roy 2002b.

177. Eder & Mitsopoulos-Leon 1999: 25-36.

178. Tritsch 1932: 72-73; Coulton 1976: 237; Yalouris in *PECS* 498.

179. Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23: πέμψαντες οὖν πρέσβεις εἰς Ἥλιον εἶπον ... ἀποκρινάμενων δὲ τῶν Ἡλείων etc. It is the most reasonable reading to take Ἥλιος here to denote the town of Elis as a centre of the Eleian state (cf. Hall 2000: 79 on Λακεδαιμόνων); however, toponyms may sometimes denote the *state* (as opposed to the town: see Hansen in Hansen & Nielsen 2004: 56); Hdt. 8.73.2 may so use Ἥλιος, and if Xenophon uses it in this way here, the passage may possibly mean "sending ambassadors to the state of Elis", which would imply nothing about exactly *where* these ambassadors went, and Olympia could perhaps be their destination (though it should of course be noted that Xenophon often uses the toponym Ὀλυμπία to denote the sanctuary: *Hell.* 3.2.26; 4.1.40, 7.2; 7.4.14, 4.28; *Mem.* 3.12.1, 13.5; *Anab.* 5.3.7, 3.11). In fact, Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.25 seems to use the toponym to denote the Eleian state: φαίνουσι ... οἱ ἔφοροι φρουρὰν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἥλιον (cf. 3.2.29: τοὺς ἐξ Ἠλίδος φυγάδας). Of course, Ἥλιος often does denote the town (Hdt. 6.70.1-2: ἐπὶ ὁδία λαβὼν ἐπορεύετο εἰς Ἥλιον; Ps.-Skylax 43: Ἥλιος ἐν μεσογείᾳ), and that important political administration took place at Elis town is strongly suggested by the treaty reported by Thuc. 5.47: The treaty explicitly locates the superior

In using its main town as a seat of political administration, Elis was not an unusual *polis*. However, the fact that the sanctuary of Olympia was equipped with both a *bouleuterion* and a *prytaneion* is unusual, since such buildings are eminently characteristic of *poleis* as political communities<sup>180</sup> and regularly located in the main town of a *polis*.<sup>181</sup> The *bouleuterion* at Olympia is mentioned

---

organs of the Eleian state ἐν Ἡλιῶνι (47.9 where it is juxtaposed with such an obvious locative expression as Ἀθήνησι) whereas the Eleian copy of the text is to be published Ὀλυμπίασι, and the text thus explicitly distinguishes between two toponyms of which one, Ὀλυμπίασι, is certainly meant to denote a *place* (it is juxtaposed with obvious locative expressions as ἐν πόλει (= 'on the Akropolis'), ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἐν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐν τοῦ Διὸς τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ); the other, Ἡλις, should be locative as well, and this reading will establish the town of Elis as the seat of the major Eleian officials and thus as a or even *the* political centre of the Eleian state.

180. Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 31 (*prytaneia*) and 37 (*bouleuteria*) arguing that every *polis* must have had such buildings. On the symbolical significance of the *prytaneion*, see also Miller 1978: 13-14.
181. Most of the Archaic and Classical buildings of this kind whose locations are known or can be reasonably inferred were located in the main urban site of the *polis*. (I) *Bouleuteria*. (I) *Urban location*. (1) Akragas (no. 9); (2) Argos (no. 347); (3) Athens (no. 361; Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 42-43); (4) Hyampolis (no. 182); (5) Kalaureia (no. 360; Gneisz 1990: 324-25); (6) Olynthos (no. 588; Gneisz 1990: 341); (7) Orchomenos in Arkadia (no. 286; but see Winter 1987: 238-39 disputing the identification of the building as a *bouleuterion*); (8) Sikyon (no. 228; Gneisz 1990: 351-52). In addition to these, the following *bouleuteria* were probably Classical buildings of urban location: (9) Argyrion (no. 7; Diod. Sic. 16.83.3); (10) Megalopolis (no. 282; if the building mentioned by Paus. 8.30.9 was erected at the time of the building of the city). (II) *Sanctuary location*. (1) Delos (no. 478; Gneisz 1990: 315). To this should be added (2) Delphi (no. 177) but the actual building is unidentified. (III) *Unknown location*. (1) Samos (no. 864); Plut. *Mor.* 304B mentions a *bouleuterion* in reference to ca. 600, but it remains unidentified. – Thus, ten of twelve were located in an urban setting as opposed to a sanctuary setting, and obviously both Delos and Delphi are very special cases. – (2) *Prytaneia*. (I) *Urban location*. (1) Apellonia (no. 946); (2) Argos (no. 347; urban location inferred from Diod. Sic. 19.63.2); (3) Athens (no. 361); (4) Kolophon (no. 848; Miller 1978: 109-12); (5) Lato (no. 971; Miller 1978: 78-86); (6) Peparethos (no. 511; urban location inferred from the narrative at Thuc. 3.89.4); (7) Thasos (no. 526; building not identified, but urban location clear from SEG 42 785.43-44; cf. the plan in Duchêne 1992: 108). (II) *Sanctuary location*. (1) Delos (no. 478; Miller 1978: 67-78); (2) Delphi (no. 177; the actual building remains unidentified). (III) *Unknown location*. (1) SEG 13 397 of the fourth century attests a *prytaneion* of unknown location in an unknown community (Dodone?); (2) Halikarnassos (no. 886; Michel, *Recueil* 452.10-11); (3) Halos

by both Xenophon<sup>182</sup> and Pausanias.<sup>183</sup> The building complex has been identified:<sup>184</sup> Situated to the south of the temple of Zeus, it consisted of two apsidal halls connected on the east by an Ionic stoa and with a square building between them; it was constructed in several phases from the mid-sixth to the fourth century.<sup>185</sup> It is clear from Xenophon that this building complex served as a *bouleuterion* in the fourth century, and if it was originally constructed as a *bouleuterion*,<sup>186</sup> then a *boule* was present at Olympia from the second half of the sixth century. But which *boule*? A *boule* is well-attested for the *polis* of Elis itself.<sup>187</sup> Late inscriptions from Olympia mention an Ὀλυμπικὴ βουλή ('Olymp-

---

(no. 435; Hdt. 7.197); (4) Iasos (no. 891; Michel, *Recueil* 462.27-28); (5) Ioulis (no. 491; Michel, *Recueil* 401B.34); (6) Karthaia (no. 492; *IG* XII.5 1060.2); (7) Koresia (no. 493; Michel, *Recueil* 401.24-25); (8) Kyrene (no. 1028; *SEG* 9 1.44); (9) Kyzikos (no. 747; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 4.5-6); (10) Lipara (no. 34; Diod. Sic. 20.101.2); (11) Mytilene (no. 798; Ath. 425A); (12) Sigeion (no. 791; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 2); (13) Sikyon (no. 228; Hdt. 5.67); (14) Siphnos (no. 519; but Hdt. 3.57.4 does suggest that it was located on the agora); (15) Taras (no. 71; Ath. 700D); (16) Tenedos (no. 793; Pind. *Nem.* 11.1-3); (17) Thespiai (no. 222; *BCH* 60 (1936) 179.32). That so many *prytaneia* remain unidentified is probably due to the fact that such a building was usually modest and unpretentious and that a fixed architectural form did not evolve; cf. Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 36-37. – Again, most of the locatable buildings are found in urban centres, the exceptions again being Delphi and Delos; it should, however, be noted that in neither *polis* has the Archaic-Classical urban site proper been identified and so the relation between town and sanctuary is really unknown. Clearly, located at a distance of some 60 km from the main town of the *polis*, the Olympic *bouleuterion* and *prytaneion* were highly unusual.

182. *Hell.* 7.4.31.

183. 5.23.1; 24.1, 24.9.

184. Mallwitz 1972: 235-40 with Fig. 188; Gneisz 1990: 340-41 with Abb. 4.

185. Mallwitz 1972: 238-39; Gneisz 1990: 341.

186. For scepticism as to whether the *bouleuterion* and the *prytaneion* discussed below were originally constructed to fulfill the functions attested for the fourth century, see Coulton & Morgan 1997: 113; however, in the present context it does not matter much whether the buildings were built to purpose or later adapted (cf. Miller 1995: 144 n. 31) to fulfill the functions attested by Xenophon, since even in the later case both a *bouleuterion* and a *prytaneion* were unquestionably to be found in Classical Olympia, and so both Olympia and Elis town will be Eleian administrative centres in the Classical period.

187. *IvO* 3; *IvO* 7; Thuc. 5.47.9; Arist. *Pol.* 1306<sup>a</sup>13-19.

pic Council’);<sup>188</sup> and it seems a reasonable assumption that this council met in the *bouleuterion*. No Archaic or Classical source mentions the Ὀλυμπικὴ βουλή but Pausanias refers to it in two passages discussing events of the fourth century: (a) at 5.6.6 he attributes to Eleian ἐξηγηταί a story to the effect that Xenophon was tried before the *Olympike boule* for accepting land at Skillous (no. 311) from the Lakedaimonians (cf. *An.* 5.3.7), but acquitted. The historicity of this information is open to doubt,<sup>189</sup> and it is not obvious how the *Olympike boule* (which seems to have dealt with the day-to-day administration of the sanctuary<sup>190</sup>) could pass sentence in a case involving transfer of land in another *polis*; however, Skillous was a former perioikic dependency of Elis,<sup>191</sup> lost after the war with Sparta ca. 400 (above), and one that the Eleians were eager to regain (cf. *Xen. Hell.* 6.5.2); it is thus not entirely inconceivable that they would attempt to use their administration of Olympia to this end after Leuktra – just as in the fifth century they used their administration to further their aims in the struggle with Sparta over Lepreon (above 32-3) – and that the case against Xenophon was part of such an attempt. However, it is probably best not to use this passage as proof of the existence of an *Olympike boule* in the fourth century. (b) However, the second passage does seem to be evidence of a fourth-century *Olympike boule*. In 396, Eupolemos of Elis (Moretti 1957: no. 367) won the *stadion* race at Olympia;<sup>192</sup> according to Paus. 6.3.7, however, the otherwise unknown athlete Leon of Ambrakia (no. 113) who had competed in the race, had been declared the winner by one of the three *Hellanodikai* officiating at the event, and Leon proceeded to lodge a complaint against the

188. *IvO* 351 (aet. Rom.); *IvO* 355 (3<sup>rd</sup> cent. AD); *IvO* 356 (3<sup>rd</sup> cent. AD); *IvO* 357 (2<sup>nd</sup> cent. AD?); *IvO* 372 (14-19 AD); *IvO* 406 (early 1<sup>st</sup> cent. BC); *IvO* 407 (mid-1<sup>st</sup> cent. BC); *IvO* 427 (aet. Imp.); *IvO* 429 (50-100 AD); *IvO* 432 (95-105 AD); *IvO* 433 (95-105 AD); *IvO* 434 (95-105 AD); *IvO* 437 (96-98 AD); *IvO* 439 (2<sup>nd</sup> cent. BC); *IvO* 440 (100-150 AD); *IvO* 449 (aet. Hadr./aet. Ant.); *IvO* 452 (3<sup>rd</sup> cent. AD); *IvO* 454 (143 AD); etc. The council is also attested by an inscription found at Elis itself and dated to the late first/early second century AD (*ÖJh* 46 (1961-63) 77 no. 1).

189. Jacquemin 1999: *ad loc.*

190. Crowther 1997: 153.

191. Roy 1997: 283-85; Nielsen 2002: 609.

192. *Pap Oxy* 2381.2; *Diod. Sic.* 14.54.1 (naming him ‘Eupolis’); *Paus.* 8.45.4.

two others with the Ὀλυμπικὴ βουλή. There is no reason to question Pausanias' information here, and we may then conclude that the *Olympike boule* in fact existed in the early fourth century. But did it differ from the *boule* of the *polis* of Elis in the Classical period? There is no evidence on which to base an answer to this question. But it seems simplest to assume that the two councils were in fact one and the same<sup>193</sup> and that when it met at Elis it was the ordinary *boule* of the *polis*,<sup>194</sup> whereas when it relocated to Olympia during celebrations of Olympic festivals and took up residence in the *bouleuterion*, it was called Ὀλυμπικὴ βουλή<sup>195</sup> whether from the site or from the nature of its duties during the Games among which was apparently to act as court of appeal against the decisions of the *Hellanodikai*. Given the distance between Elis and Olympia it is readily understood why such an important magistracy as the *boule* would need facilities of its own at Olympia and so the construction of a *bouleuterion* there makes good sense. But this does not detract from the fact that it was unusual, and that the building complex and the magistracy officiating there would have served as a reminder to all visitors of Elis' special relations with Olympia.

An even more emphatic statement of these special relations must have been provided by the presence of an Eleian *prytaneion* at Olympia: a *prytaneion* was the physical expression of the existence of a *polis*, and on its hearth burned the eternal flame "which signified the life of the polis."<sup>196</sup> Xenophon refers to τὸ τῆς Ἑστίας ἱερόν and Paus. 5.15.8 calls it the *prytaneion* "of the Eleians" (cf. Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 88). The building has been identified and its earliest phase belongs to the early

193. So Crowther 1997: 153 with n. 13.

194. Note that Paus. 6.23.7 attests to the existence of a *bouleuterion* at Elis itself, though without indication of date.

195. So Jacquemin 2002: 290.

196. Miller 1978: 13; cf. Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 31. See Schol. in Pind. *Nem.* 11.1(1a): πευτανειὰ φησι λαχεῖν τὴν Ἑστίαν, παρόσον αἱ τῶν πόλεων Ἑστίαι ἐν τοῖς πρυτανείοις ἀφίδρυνται καὶ τὸ ἱερόν λεγόμενον πῦρ ἐπὶ τούτων ἀπόκειται. Pollux 1.7: ἐφ' ὧν δὲ θύομεν ἢ πῦρ ἀνακαίομεν, βωμός, θυμιατήριον, ἑστία· ἔνιοι γὰρ οὕτως ἄνομάκασιν. οὕτω δ' ἂν κυριώτατα καλοῖς τὴν ἐν πρυτανείῳ, ἐφ' ἧς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστο ἀνάπτεται.

fifth century.<sup>197</sup> Whereas Pausanias does mention a *bouleuterion* at Elis town (6.23.7) in addition to the one at Olympia, he does not mention a *prytaneion* there, and if this silence means that there was no *prytaneion* at Elis, the Olympic building must have functioned as the *prytaneion* of the *polis* as such (cf. “of the Eleians”), and the significance of its location at Olympia is clear: Here, at their “spiritual centre” (Crowther 2003b), the Eleians erected the building which signified the life of the *polis*. But even if it had a sister at Elis, its symbolical significance must have been great, and it, too, will have served to intimately link city and sanctuary.<sup>198</sup> According to Pausanias, the *prytaneion* was the place where the Eleians gave a banquet, presumably at the end of the Games, to the victors;<sup>199</sup> it is unknown whether Pausanias’ evidence is valid also for the Classical period, but if it is, the location of the banquet will again have brought home to the victors how inseparable Elis and Olympia were.

In conclusion, it may be said that Olympia was a vital component of the local identity of the *polis* of Elis and that the Eleians demonstrated this in a variety of ways: by the choice of themes for coin types, by the unusually long procession from city to sanctuary, by their willingness to use military force in the Altis in 364, and not least by turning the site of the sanctuary into a second centre of their *polis*-administration.<sup>200</sup>

197. Miller 1978: 86-91.

198. Also noted by Sinn 2000: 93

199. Paus. 5.15.12 on which see Lee 2001: 74-75.

200. Though, as demonstrated above, the Eleian administration of Olympia was occasionally challenged, on other occasions other Hellenes seem to have acknowledged it and made a point of catering to Eleian sensibility in regard to Olympia; thus, when the Hellenic League (on which see Brunt 1953-54 and Tronson 1991) after its victory over the Persians at Plataiai in 479, decided to make monumental thank-offerings to the gods, such dedications were made at e.g. both Delphi and Olympia (Hdt. 9.81.1). Now, on the Golden Tripod at Delphi, the Eleians were listed (as φαλείοι (Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* 27.9)) under the heading το[ῖδε τὸν] πόλεμον [ἐ]πολ[έ]μεον (*ibid.* 1) as participants in the glorious campaigns. In actual fact, however, the Eleian performance in the war had been rather poor: Elis sent no troops to Thermopylai (Hdt. 7.202); no ships to Artemision (Hdt. 8.1) or Salamis (Hdt. 8.43-48); it did send troops to Plataiai but they arrived too late for the battle, later even than the Mantineians who were likewise late (Hdt. 9.77). The only effective participation by Elis in the campaigns of 480-479 seems to

---

have been in the fortification of the Isthmos (Hdt. 8.72). However, the Mantineians who had sent troops to Thermopylai (Hdt. 7.202: 500 hoplites) and presumably also participated in the fortification of the Isthmos (Hdt. 8.72: Ἀρκάδες πάντες), did not like the Eleians receive recognition of their performance by being inscribed on the Golden Tripod at Delphi. Clearly, Elis could not have complained seriously had their name not been inscribed on this prestigious memorial. The reason why they were so inscribed was presumably the fact that the Hellenic League decided to commemorate its victory also at Olympia (Hdt. 81.1; cf. Gauer 1968: 96-98); it would, presumably, have been impossible to erect a memorial at Olympia which did not pay homage to the owner of the sanctuary, no matter how poor Eleian performance had been, and so the name of the Eleians were inscribed not only at Olympia (Paus. 5.23.2) but also at Delphi.



## VI. Hellenic Interaction at Olympia

The Olympic festivals and in particular their athletic competitions were surely among the most celebrated and prestigious regularly recurring events at all of the Hellenic world;<sup>201</sup> it is, accordingly, commonly assumed that they attracted a substantial number of visitors and spectators, presumably “the greatest crowds for any kind of festival in Greece” (Crowther 2004: 35)<sup>202</sup> and post-Classical sources in fact state as much.<sup>203</sup> However, ancient sources mostly refer to the number of visitors at Olympia in very general ways as when Pindar calls the ash altar of Zeus “visited by most foreigners” (πολυξενωτάτω παρὰ βωμῶ (Ol. 1.93): “by the altar that is thronged by many a visitant” (Sandys (Loeb))),<sup>204</sup> and only rarely do they quantify the size of the audience; admittedly, according to Diod. Sic. 18.8.6, 20,000 *phygades* (‘exiles’) were present at Olympia during the Games of 324, but this was obviously a very special occasion since an important political demonstration of vital interest to exiles was expected: the proclamation of Alexander’s *Exiles’ Decree*,<sup>205</sup> and accordingly this piece of information, even if historical, cannot be generalised. The best evidence on which to base an estimate of the order of size of the athletic audience anticipated at Olympia would seem to be the seating capacity of the stadium there. The seating capacity of stadium II of the late sixth century has been estimated at 24,000,<sup>206</sup> whereas the mid-fourth century stadium III could probably accommodate some 45,000 spectators.<sup>207</sup> It would seem, then, that spectator interest increased throughout

---

201. Golden 1998: 34-37.

202. So Weiler 1997: 191 who at 193 estimates the audiences at 40,000 – 50,000.

203. Crowther 2004: 35 n. 1, referring to Cic. *Tusc. disp.* 5.3.9, Luc. *Peregr.* 1 and Livy 27.35.3. As pointed out by Lewis 1996: 41 “There is a surprising gap in our evidence for the attendance and composition of the audience at the Olympic festival during the classical period.”

204. Cf. Paus. 6.3.14 quoting a late fifth-century epigram referring to Olympia as πολυθάητον τέμενος Διός, “the much-seen sanctuary of Zeus”.

205. See Lewis 1996: 71-73.

206. Romano 1993: 22.

207. E.g. Yalouris & Yalouris 1995: 15.

the Classical period. It is, of course, not possible simply to translate these seating capacities into crowd numbers: It is not impossible, for instance, that empty sections were to be found in the stadium when everyone was seated, or conversely, that the stadium could not in fact accommodate everyone who wanted to watch; and, not everyone who went to Olympia at festival times may have had sportive interests: A number of other reasons for going to Olympia can easily be conjectured (Crowther 2004: 47-49; Weiler 1997: 196ff). But as it is, ca. 45,000 seems a reasonable hypothesis for the order of size of the athletic audience in the later Classical period. There is not much with which this estimate can be compared. The Archaic-Classical stadium at Isthmia is estimated at a capacity of a mere 4,000,<sup>208</sup> and even the Hellenistic stadium at Isthmia is estimated at only 21,000<sup>209</sup> whereas the early Hellenistic stadium at Nemea has been estimated at ca. 30,000 (Miller 2001: 28); all three stadia, then, are dwarfed by those at Olympia, which should be significant especially in the light of the generally much greater accessibility<sup>210</sup> of the Isthmos and probably Nemea as well. Likewise, even the Archaic stadium II at Olympia could seat a much larger audience than the later theatres of major Hellenic *poleis*:

(1) at *Katane* (no. 30) the seating capacity of the Classical theatre was possibly 7,000; (2) the Hellenistic theatre at *Syracuse* (no. 47) is estimated at ca. 14,000-17,000; (3) the Classical-Hellenistic theatre at *Metapontion* (no. 61) is estimated at ca. 6,500; (4) the fourth-century theatre at *Stratos* (no. 138) accommodated ca. 8,000 spectators; (5) the fourth-century/Hellenistic theatre at *Delphi* is estimated at 5,000 (Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 53); (6) in the fourth century, the theatre at *Korinthos* (no. 227) provided room for some 14,000 spectators (Frederiksen 1997.II: table 7); (7) the seating capacity of the theatre at *Elis* (no. 251) town itself is estimated at 7,900 (Frederiksen 1997.II: table 7); (8) the capacity of the fourth century theatre at *Mantineia* (no. 281) is estimated at 4,200 (Frederiksen 1997.II: table 7); (9) the fourth-century theatre at *Megalopolis* (no. 282) is estimated at 20,000; (10)

208. Romano 1993: 28.

209. Romano 1993: 33.

210. Gebhard 1993: 166.

the fourth-century/Hellenistic theatre in the town of *Epidauros* (no. 348) is estimated at ca. 5,000-6,000; (11) the theatre of Dionysos at *Athens* (no. 361) seated some 14,000 spectators (Hansen & Fischer-Hansen 1994: 53); (12) the theatre at *Eretria* (no. 370), the earliest phases of which may date to the fourth century, seated some 8,000 spectators (Frederiksen 1997.II: table 7); (13) and finally, at *Lindos* (no. 997) the theatre, possibly fourth-century, is estimated at a mere 1,800-2,000.

The difference in size between such theatres and the Olympic stadia must be at least partly due to the fact that the former constructions were intended merely to facilitate the local needs of a single *polis*, whereas at Olympia visitors from practically all over the Hellenic world must have been expected, and in large numbers: it is hardly credible that accommodation for 45,000 spectators was needed if the Classical stadium was intended to serve only Eleians, a point well illustrated by the fact that the theatre at Elis town, though quite large, has an estimated capacity of only 7,900 spectators.<sup>211</sup> The anticipation of a large Panhellenic audience at Olympia squares nicely with the fact that the athletic competitions could be entered by ὁ βουλόμενος τῶν Ἑλλήνων (above 18-19). In conclusion, it does in fact seem a reasonable assumption from the evidence available that the Olympic festival attracted more visitors than any other event of the Hellenic world.

However, even if 45,000 is a substantial number by Classical Hellenic standards, the audience actually present at Olympia during the festival will have constituted only a tiny fraction of all Hellenes: A recent study by Hansen (2006: 1-34) argues that by the second half of the fourth century the Hellenic world had a population of at least 7.5 million, and probably as many as 10 million. Even so, our sources often refer to those present at Olympia as 'the Hellenes', as the following examples will show. Thus, in the Herodotean passage discussed above (12-14), the Persians, having asked the Arkadian *automoloi* περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ ποιόειεν ("about the Hellenes, what they were

211. Cf. Weiler 1997: 193: "Ein Massenzustrom zum olympischen Fest kann nicht damit erklärt werden, daß die Bevölkerung der umliegenden Gebiete das Hauptkontingent gestellt hätte."

doing”) receive the answer ὡς Ὀλύμπια ἄγουσι καὶ θεωροῦσι ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικόν (“that they are organizing the Olympics and would be watching an athletic competition and a hippic”: 8.26.2). Obviously, a question to the effect: “What are the Hellenes doing?”, is absurd. However, Herodotos introduces it in order to be able to point to the difference between Barbarians and Hellenes, and by introducing as the answer “The Hellenes are celebrating the Olympic festival”, he is clearly generalising from the Hellenes present at Olympia to *the Hellenes as such*. Another good example is offered by Thucydides, who at 5.49-50 reports how prior to the festival in 420, when the Eleians had fined the Spartans for breaking the *ekecheiria* (‘sacred truce’) and excluded them from the sanctuary, and the Spartans refused to pay the fine – how in this situation the Eleians offered the Spartans access to the sanctuary on condition that they climbed the altar of Zeus Olympios and swore “in front of the Hellenes” (ἐναντίον τῶν Ἑλλήνων) that they would pay at a later date. This the Spartans refused and made a sacrifice at home while “the other Hellenes” (οἱ ἄλλοι Ἑλληνες) celebrated the festival at Olympia. Finally, we may note how at Isoc. *De bigis* 16.32 Olympia is described as a place where “the Hellenes” (τοὺς Ἑλληνας) display their wealth, strength and education and how it is stated that financial resources invested in lavish participation at Olympia will be spent “on behalf of the city for the benefit of all of Hellas” (ὕπερ τῆς πόλεως εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα). The Hellenes assembled at Olympia, then, could be construed as no less than *the Hellenes as such*.<sup>212</sup>

212. Note also (1) that Gorgias begins his *Olympiakos* by addressing *the Hellenes*: ὦ ἄνδρες Ἑλληνες (fr. 7 DK); (2) that in the Lysianic *Olympikos* (33.2) we find the statement that Herakles established the Olympic Games διὰ εὐνοίαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος in the belief that the assembly there would generate mutual friendship “for the Hellenes” (τοῖς Ἑλλησι); (3) that at Pl. *Hr. mi.* 363C8 the festival at Olympia is described as ἡ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πανήγυρις; (4) that at Heracl. Lemb. *Excerpta Politiarum* 55 Anaxilas of Rhegion is said to have entertained ‘the Hellenes’ (τοὺς Ἑλληνας) after his Olympic victory of 480: This is presumably a reference to a banquet given at Olympia itself, cf. Moretti 1957: no. 298; cf. Plut. *Alc.* 11.1 for a public banquet given by Alkibiades of Athens at Olympia in 416 (ἔστιῶντι πολλούς; for other instances of such banquets, see Ath. 3E); that (5) Ar. *Plut.* 583-84 has Poverty say that Zeus assembles ‘all the Hellenes’ every fifth year at the Olympic

Construing the visitors at Olympia as ‘the Hellenes’ as such must have been eased considerably if in fact they originated from virtually all parts of the Hellenic world. However, our information about the origins of visitors relates mostly to famous individuals; thus, Herodotos at 1.59 reports the presence at Olympia of Hippokrates of Athens and Cheilon of Lakedaimon; Thuc. 5.49.4 attests the presence of the Spartan aristocrat Lichas, the son of Arkesilaos; Xenophon at *An.* 5.3.7 implies his own presence at Olympia, at a time when he was a citizen of Skillous (no. 311); and Demosthenes was at Olympia in 324 in his capacity as Athenian *architheoros* (“Leader of the Sacred Embassy”; Din. *Contra Dem.* 81).<sup>213</sup> But if we assume crowds of some 24,000-45,000 from the late Archaic through the Classical period they cannot have been made up exclusively of such personalities<sup>214</sup> and the most economical assumption is that visitors and *theoroi* did in fact come from many parts of the Hellenic world. So, at least, did the athletes known to have won at Olympia in the Classical period:

---

*agon:* εἰ γὰρ ἐπλούτει, πῶς ἂν ποιῶν τὸν Ὀλυμπικὸν αὐτὸς ἀγῶνα, / ἵνα τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἀπαντας αἰεὶ δι’ ἔτους πέμπτου ξυναγείρει; (6) that Schol. vet. vulg. in Pind. *Ol.* 7c reports how Diagoras and his sons during their lap of honour in the stadium at Olympia were congratulated ‘by the Hellenes’ (ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων); (7) that the spurious Andoc. 4 twice refers to Alkibiades’ display at Olympia in 416 as witnessed by ‘the Hellenes’ (τοῖς Ἑλλησι (27); τοὺς Ἑλληνας (30)); (8) that the fourth-century epigram celebrating Troilos of Elis, a double Olympic victor (Moretti 1957: nos. 412-13), who served as *Hellanodikas* while competing (Paus. 6.1.4), states: Ἑλλήνων ἦρχον τότε Ὀλυμπίαι ἠνίκα μοι Ζεὺς/ δῶκεν νικῆσαι κτλ. (CEG 2 828). See also n. 231 below. McGregor 1941: 270 describes the *kerygma* at Olympia by Kleisthenes of Sikyon as “made before all of Hellas”. Ebert 1972: no. 20.1 (mid-fifth century) describes an Olympic victor as having defeated ‘the Hellenes’ (Ἑλλανας νικῶν). Finally, the title of the Eleian officials conducting the Games: *Hellanodikai* (above 20f.) point in the same direction.

213. On such prominent visitors, see Weiler 1997: 200ff.

214. Note that at *Mem.* 3.13.5 Xenophon relates the encouragement given by Sokrates to “someone who feared the journey to Olympia” without giving his name (φοβουμένου δέ τινος τὴν εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ὁδόν); this man need not but may very well have been an ordinary visitor.

Table 1: Origins of *Olympionikai* 480-324<sup>215</sup>

<i>Polis</i> of origin	Region	Moretti no. & date	
(1) Aitna (8)	Sicily	cf. 221 =	476
(2) Akragas (9)	Sicily	220	476
(3) Himera (24)	Sicily	224	472
(4) Kamarina (28)	Sicily	280	456
(5) Syracuse (47)	Sicily	196	480
(6) Messana (51)	Sicily	271	456
(7) Kaulonia (55)	Italy	379	392
(8) Lokroi (59)	Italy	214	476
(9) Poseidonia (66)	Italy	235	468
(10) Rhegion (68)	Italy	208	480
(11) Taras (71)	Italy	212	476
(12) Terina (73)	Italy	376	392
(13) Thourioi (74)	Italy	322	432
(14) Epidamnos (79)	The Adriatic	232	472
(15) Ambrakia (113)	Akarnania	321	432
(16) Korkyra (123)	Akarnania	409	372
(17) Stratos (138)	Akarnania	416	368
(18) Thebes (221)	Boiotia	206	480
(19) Thespiiai (222)	Boiotia	302	448
(20) Megara (225)	Megaris	468	328
(21) Korinthos (227)	Korinthia	229	472
(22) Sikyon (228)	Sikyonia	370	396
(23) Aigion (231)	Achaia	400	380
(24) Patrai (239)	Achaia	461	332
(25) Pellene (240)	Achaia	263	460
(26) Elis (251)	Elis	284	452
(27) Dipaia (268)	Arkadia	314	440
(28) Heraia (274)	Arkadia	200	480
(29) Kleitor (276)	Arkadia	395	384
(30) Mantinea (281)	Arkadia	202	480
(31) Methydriion (283)	Arkadia	410	372
(32) Oresthasion (287)	Arkadia	231	472
(33) Pheneos (291)	Arkadia	380	392
(34) Phigaleia (292)	Arkadia	392	384
(35) Stymphalos (296)	Arkadia	199	480

215. The table lists only one victor from each *polis*.

<i>Polis of origin</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Moretti no. &amp; date</i>	
(36) Lepreon (306)	Triphylia	267	460
(37) Messene (318)	Messenia	417	368
(38) Sparta (345)	Lakedaimon	211	476
(39) Argos (347)	Argolis	204	480
(40) Epidauros (348)	Argolis	223	472
(41) Kleonai (351)	Argolis	273	456
(42) Tiryns (356)	Argolis	244	468
(43) Troizen (357)	Argolis	358	400
(44) Aigina (358)	Saronic Gulf	217	476
(45) Athens (361)	Attika	228	472
(46) Chalkis (365)	Euboia	459	332
(47) Opous (386)	East Lokris	239	468
(48) Larisa (401)	Thessalia	258	464
(49) Skotoussa (415)	Thessalia	348	408
(50) Kos Meropis (499)	The Aegean	340	420
(51) Melos (505)	The Aegean	–	ca. 332 (?)
(52) Thasos (526)	The Aegean	201	480
(53) Maroneia (?) (646)	Thrace	213	476
(54) Byzantion (?) (674)	Thrace	–	480-460
(55) Mytilene (798)	Lesbos	209	476
(56) Chios (840)	Ionia	203	480
(57) Ephesos (844)	Ionia	398	380
(58) Magnesia (852)	Ionia	329	424
(59) Miletos (854)	Ionia	225	472
(60) Samos (864)	Ionia	226	472
(61) Halikarnassos (886)	Karia	378	392
(62) Ialysos (995)	Rhodos	252	464
(63) Rhodos (1000)	Rhodos	469	324
(64) Barke (1025)	Libya	261	460
(65) Kyrene (1028)	Libya	257	464

Thus, competitors from 65 *poleis* from many parts of the Hellenic world are known to have won Olympic victories 480 – 324, and considering the state of the evidence this is an impressive number. It seems a fair inference that athletes will have brought along not only trainers and official *theoroi* of their *poleis* but presumably also ordinary spectators, perhaps even ‘supporters’.

Accordingly, what happened at Olympia could be assumed to

become known to all Hellenes. Thus, according to Herodotos, when Kleisthenes of Sikyon wanted to find “of all Hellenes the best” (6.126.1) as husband for his daughter, he used the victory ceremony of the 582 Olympics to issue a *kerygma* to the effect that any Hellene who considered himself worthy to be his son-in-law should come to Sikyon before a specified date to present himself as suitor;<sup>216</sup> this announcement, according to Herodotos, attracted suitors from Siris (no. 69) and Sybaris (no. 70) in South Italy, from Epidamnos (no. 79) on the Ionic Sea, from Aitolia, from the Peloponnese (Argos (no. 347); Elis (no. 252); Paion (no. 288); Trapezous (no. 303)), from Athens (no. 361), from Eretria (no. 370), from Thessalia (Krannon (no. 400)) and from Molossia; now, this may perhaps be a story of doubtful historicity, but even so it will be a testimony to a Classical standard assumption: that what was promulgated at Olympia spread quickly throughout the Hellenic world. Similarly, at 6.16.2, Thucydides has Alkibiades refer to his Olympic performance of 416 as known to ‘the Hellenes’ (οἱ Ἑλληνας).<sup>217</sup> Clearly, “all states of any consequence knew what went on at Olympia” (Hornblower 1994: 23)<sup>218</sup> and the same should apply to most states of no consequence at all.

Olympia may in fact be considered the centre in a Panhellenic network of communication. One concrete expression of this communicative network will most probably have been the system of *epangelia* and *theorodokia*. The *poleis* which organised major festivals will obviously have wanted their festivals to attract numerous visitors, and one way to achieve this end was to send out sacred envoys – *theoroi* – to visit all or most *poleis* of the Hellenic world and perform the *epangelia*, i.e. to announce the upcoming celebration, invite the individual *poleis* to attend by sending an official delegation, and receive official pledges that the sacred truce would be respected. *Poleis* promising to partici-

216. See Lewis 1996: 70.

217. Note also that at Arist. *Pol.* 1357<sup>a</sup>20 it is assumed that details of the Olympic Games are common knowledge.

218. Cf. the fourth-century epigram *IvO* 170.5-6 (= Ebert 1972: no. 49) which says that ‘Hellas sings his undying reputation, in remembrance of his horsemanship’ ([οὐ κλέος] Ἑλλάς/ ἄφθιτον ἀεΐδει[τ] μνωμένα ἵπποσύνας), thus clearly implying what Hornblower says.



pate pledged themselves to respect the sacred truce by performing a solemn sacrifice and undertook to send a financial gift to the sanctuary whose *epangelia* they met.<sup>219</sup> The sacred envoys were official representatives of the *polis* organising the festival – and thus in the case of the Olympics of Elis – and they obviously needed to establish contact with the political authorities of the *poleis* they visited. To ease such contacts organising *poleis* appointed in each (or most) *polis*-to-be-visited<sup>220</sup> a *theorodokos* ('receiver of sacred envoys'), who assisted the sacred envoys in establishing contact with the local authorities<sup>221</sup> and by providing lodging, transportation *etc.*<sup>222</sup> As stated above, Elis seems to have developed a system of *theorodokia* already in the fifth century, but unfortunately the evidence for it is very sparse. Apart from the inscription dating to the period of the Pisatan administration (on which see above 38ff.), it consists of a single mid-fifth century inscription (*SEG* 51 532 with Siewert 2002: 365-67), which attests to Eleian *theorodokoi* at Sparta (no. 345) and on Euboia (though without indication of which Euboian *polis* is meant). To this may be added a Hellenistic inscription of the late 3rd/early 2nd century (*IvO* 39) attesting Eleian *theorodokoi* at Tenedos (no. 793). It is, however, a reasonable assumption that an Eleian web of *theorodokoi* covered virtually all of Hellas in the Classical period. By way of comparison, we may briefly look at two fourth-century stelae from the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros (*IG* IV<sup>2</sup>.1 94-95 = Perlman 2000: E. 1-2). The stelae contain catalogues of Epidaurian *theorodokoi* in various places, and it seems a reasonable assumption that these *theorodokoi* were appointed in the 350s when Epidauros (no. 348) decided to rearrange the increasingly popular festival of Asklepios (Perlman 2000: 74). The text of each stele consists of an original catalogue of *theorodokoi* and addenda, which seem to have been inscribed by various masons still in the fourth century (Perlman 2000: 78-

219. Perlman 2000: 45-48.

220. Alternatively, the *polis* itself appointed from among its citizens the *theorodokos* (Perlman 2000: 60).

221. Perlman 2000: 57.

222. Perlman 2000: 48-49.

81). Excluding the addenda, the stelae attest Epidaurian *theorodokoi* in the following *poleis* in the 350s:<sup>223</sup>

**Table 2: *Poleis* with Epidaurian *theorodoki* listed in IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1 94-95**

<b>Polis</b>	<b>Inv. no.</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Entry</b>
(1) Syracuse	47	Sikelia	95.39
(2) Kroton	56	Italia	95.42
(3) Lokroi	59	Italia	95.41
(4) Taras	71	Italia	95.44
(5) Terina	73	Italia	95.45
(6) Thourioi	74	Italia	95.43
(7) Artichia	87	Epeiros	95.30
(8) Kassopa	100	Epeiros	95.25
(9) Pandosia	104	Epeiros	95.24
(10) Poionos	108	Epeiros	95.27
(11) Alyzeia	112	Akarnania	95.19
(12) Ambrakia	113	Akarnania	95.32
(13) Anaktorion	114	Akarnania	95.22
(14) Argos	115	Akarnania	95.33
(15) Astakos	116	Akarnania	95.14
(16) Echinon	118	Akarnania	95.17
(17) Euripos	119	Akarnania	95.15
(18) Hyporeiai	121	Akarnania	95.35
(19) Korkyra	123	Akarnania	95.28
(20) Koronta	124	Akarnania	95.12
(21) Leukas	126	Akarnania	95.20
(22) Limnaia	127	Akarnania	95.8
(23) Medion	129	Akarnania	95.13
(24) Oiniadai	130	Akarnania	95.9
(25) Palairos	131	Akarnania	95.21
(26) Phoitiai	134	Akarnania	95.11
(27) Stratos	138	Akarnania	95.10
(28) Thyrraeion	139	Akarnania	95.16
(29) Torybeia	140	Akarnania	95.18
(30) Akripos	144	Aitolia	95.34

223. I have based this list on Perlman 2000: E. 1-2. I list only the names of *poleis* which can be securely read or restored; the name of one entry cannot be confidently restored: 94a.9 (presumably a Boiotian *polis*).

<b>Polis</b>	<b>Inv. no.</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Entry</b>
(31) Kalydon	148	Aitolia	95.7
(32) Phylea	152	Aitolia	95.37
(33) Proschion	154	Aitolia	95.38
(34) Therminea	155	Aitolia	95.36
(35) Amphissa	158	West Lokris	95.4
(36) Naupaktos	165	West Lokris	95.6
(37) Oianthea	166	West Lokris	95.5
(38) Delphi	177	Phokis	95.3
(39) Koroneia	210	Boiotia	94a.7
(40) Orchomenos	213	Boiotia	94a.8
(41) Thebes	221	Boiotia	94a.4
(42) Thespiiai	222	Boiotia	94a.6
(43) Megara	225	Megarais	94a.2
(44) Korinthos	227	Korinthia	95.2
(45) Athens	364	Attika	94a.3
(46) Atrax	395	Thessalia	94b.3
(47) Gyrtos	397	Thessalia	94b.4
(48) Larisa	401	Thessalia	94b.5
(49) Pelinna	409	Thessalia	94b.1
(50) Pharkadon	412	Thessalia	94b.2
(51) Homolion	448	Magnesia	94b.6
(52) Thasos	526	Aegean	94b.31
(53) Methone	541	Makedonia	94b.8
(54) Pydna	544	Makedonia	94b.7
(55) Apollonia	545	Mygdonia	94b.15
(56) Arethousa	546	Mygdonia	94b.16
(57) Amphipolis	553	Bisaltia	94b.18
(58) Argilos	554	Bisaltia	94b.17
(59) Traïlos	555	Bisaltia	94b.20
(60) Aineia	557	Chalkidike	94b.10
(61) Akanthos	559	Chalkidike	94b.22
(62) Aphytis	563	Chalkidike	94b.24
(63) Dikaia	568	Chalkidike	94b.11
(64) Kalindoia	575	Chalkidike	94b.13
(65) Mende	584	Chalkidike	94b.26
(66) Olynthos	588	Chalkidike	94b.14
(67) Poteidaia	598	Chalkidike	94b.12
(68) Skione	609	Chalkidike	94b.25
(69) Stagiros	613	Chalkidike	94b.21

Polis	Inv. no.	Region	Entry
(70) Stolos	614	Chalkidike	94b.23
(71) Berge	628	Thrace	94b.19
(72) Datos	629	Thrace	94b.32
(73) Neapolis	634	Thrace	94b.27
(74) Abdera	640	Thrace	94b.28
(75) Ainos	641	Thrace	94b.30
(76) Maroneia	646	Thrace	94b.29

So, the two stelae – one of which is fragmentary – attest Epidaurian *theorodokoi* in 77 *poleis* in 19 different geographical regions in the 350s; but Epidauros presumably had *theorodokoi* in many other *poleis*: it seems unlikely that the two preserved stelae will have been the only ones to have been inscribed with such catalogues. But more importantly, the preserved stelae provide a fascinating glimpse of the care taken by Epidauros to have its festival announced far and wide. The *polis* of Datos (no. 629) in Thrace, for example, was founded only ca. 360, but even so it was visited by Epidaurian *theoroi* ca. 360/59 in what must have been the very earliest period of its existence. Also of interest in this respect are some of the entries for Akarnania and Aitolia. The unlocated Akarnanian community Hyporeiai (no. 121) is known from only two sources: apart from the Epidaurian catalogue of *theorodokoi* there is only *IG II<sup>2</sup> 7998*, a fourth-century sepulchral inscription from Peiraieus commemorating a Θεαρίδης Ἀκαρῶν Ὑπωρεά(της);<sup>224</sup> and, of the five Aitolian communities listed in the catalogue, three are known *exclusively* from this source: Akripos (no. 144), Phylea (no. 152), and Therminea (no. 155). What this suggests is that Epidauros announced its festival in even the most insignificant of communities and thus in fact aimed to cover as many communities as possible. The addenda on the stelae may also testify to such an aim. The original section on Italia at the end of *IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1 94* lists:

224. Cf. *SEG* 39 281 and 820.

Lokroi  
 Kroton  
 Thourioi (Φρασίδακ Φαύλλου)  
 Taras  
 Terina

At the top of the stele are a number of addenda on Italia, listing the following Italian *poleis*:

Rhegion (no. 68)  
 Metapontion (no. 61)  
 Thourioi (Δάμων)

So, the addenda not only register changes in personnel (cf. Thourioi) but also add new *poleis* to the number of *poleis* where the Epidaurian *theoroi* were able to draw on the assistance of local *theorodokoi*. This is even more pronounced in the case of Sicily: the original list of IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1 94 comprised only Syracuse, but the addenda add the following *poleis* to the list of cities with *theorodokoi*:

Leontinoi (no. 33)  
 Katane (no. 30)  
 Messana (no. 51)  
 Gela (no. 17)  
 Akragas (no. 9)

Obviously, a *polis* could send *theoroi* to announce its religious festivals at other *poleis* even without the presence there of permanent local representatives in the form of *theorodokoi*: Elis must have so announced the Olympics before the system of *theorodokia* was developed, probably in the mid-fifth century (above 39), and it is possible that the announcement of the Panhellenic Nemean Games was conducted without the assistance of *theorodokoi* until late in the fourth century.<sup>225</sup> Accordingly, an increase in the number of *theorodokoi* appointed by Epidauros does not *per se* correspond to an increase in the number of *poleis* where the *epangelia* was made. However, the presence of Datos

225. Perlman 2000: 150.

(no. 629) in the catalogue does suggest that Epidauros continuously increased the number of *poleis* visited by its *theoroi* and the aim was probably simply to announce the festival at as many *poleis* as was possible<sup>226</sup> as is also suggested by the fact that the catalogues include *poleis* of which next to nothing is known; at the very least, the lists and addenda testify to a continuous effort by Epidauros to increase the number of its local permanent representatives and strengthen its international presence by formalising and facilitating the *epangelia* which took place over large parts of the Hellenic world. It seems a reasonable assumption that Elis will have been at least as careful as Epidauros when announcing the prestigious festival of Olympian Zeus, and the presumption is that an Olympic network of *theorodokoi* covered virtually all of the Hellenic world. Now, as we saw above, when Pisa briefly took over control of Olympia in the 360s, it appointed Kleandros of Sikyon (no. 228) as its *theorodokos*, the Kleandros who is also known to have served as *strategos* of Sikyon (Perlman 2000: 265 s.v. no. 178); and Epidauros' *theorodokos* at Syracuse (no. 47) in 356-355 was Dion, son of Hipparinos, tyrant of the city in 357-354 (Perlman 2000: 257 s.v. no. 98). In fact, a large number of the men (and in some cases women) known to have been appointed *theorodokoi* by various festival organisers are known to have been individuals "active in areas of foreign affairs and state religion quite apart from their duties as *theorodokoi*" and they or relatives of theirs "participated in activities which required a degree of public involvement with the world beyond their home towns" (Perlman 2000: 41). In other words, they were among the leading citizens of their respective home *poleis*. In conclusion, we may assume that the business of Olympic *epangelia* gave rise to formalised relations between Elis and the leading citizens of most Hellenic *poleis*.

To sum up briefly at this point: Olympia was probably the most well-visited sanctuary of the Hellenic world in times of the Olympics, when thousands and thousands of participants in offi-

---

226. Note also that individual decrees add the following *poleis* to the list of *poleis* with Epidaurian *theorodokoi*: Argos (no. 347): SEG 26 445 of ca. 350; Astypalaia (no. 476): IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1 48 of ca. 350-275; Lampsakos (no. 748): IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1 51 of ca. 350-275; Kardia (no. 665): IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1 49 of ca. 323-309; an unidentified *polis* on Cyprus: IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1 53 of ca. 350-275.

cial delegations and ordinary spectators crowded the site; it was, moreover, a sanctuary of extremely high prestige and every *polis* of the Hellenic world probably knew what happened there. Accordingly, it was the perfect place to make a statement. It was, for instance, at Olympia that Alexander the Great had his *Exiles' Decree* read to the crowds in 324:

Ἀλέξανδρος γὰρ βραχεῖ χρόνῳ πρότερον τῆς τελευτῆς ἔκρινε κατάγειν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐν ταῖς Ἑλληνίσιν πόλεσι φυγάδας, ἅμα μὲν δόξης ἔνεκεν, ἅμα δὲ βουλόμενος ἔχειν ἐν ἐκάστῃ πόλει πολλοὺς ἰδίους ταῖς εὐνοίαις πρὸς τοὺς νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀποστάσεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων. διόπερ ὑπογύων ὄντων τῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἐξέπεμψεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα Νικάνορα τὸν Σταγειρίτην, δοὺς ἐπιστολὴν περὶ τῆς καθόδου· ταύτην δὲ προσέταξεν ἐν τῇ πανηγύρει διὰ τοῦ νικῆσαντος κήρυκος ἀναγνωσθῆναι τοῖς πλήθεσιν. τούτου δὲ ποιήσαντος τὸ προσταχθὲν λαβὼν ὁ κῆρυξ ἀνέγνω τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τήνδε· “Βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων φυγάσι. τοῦ μὲν φεύγειν ὑμᾶς οὐχ ἡμεῖς αἴτιοι γεγόναμεν, τοῦ δὲ κατελθεῖν εἰς τὰς ἰδίας πατρίδας ἡμεῖς ἐσόμεθα πλὴν τῶν ἐναγῶν. γεγράφαμεν δὲ Ἀντιπάτρῳ περὶ τούτων, ὅπως τὰς μὴ βουλομένας τῶν πόλεων κατάγειν ἀναγκάσῃ.” κηρυχθέντων δὲ τούτων μεγάλῳ κρότῳ ἐπεσήμηνε τὸ πλῆθος. ἀποδεξάμενοι γὰρ οἱ κατὰ τὴν πανήγυριν τὴν χάριν τοῦ βασιλέως διὰ τῆς χαρᾶς ἡμεῖβοντο τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τοῖς ἐπαίνοις. ἦσαν δ’ οἱ φυγάδες ἀπηνητικότες ἅπαντες ἐπὶ τὴν πανήγυριν, ὄντες πλείους τῶν δισμυρίων. οἱ μὲν οὖν πολλοὶ τὴν καθόδον τῶν φυγάδων ὡς ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ γινομένην ἀπεδέχοντο, κτλ. (Diod. Sic. 18.8.2-6).<sup>227</sup>

227. “A short time before his death, Alexander decided to restore all the exiles in the Greek cities, partly for the sake of gaining fame, and partly wishing to secure many devoted personal followers in each city to counter the revolutionary movements and seditions of the Greeks. Therefore, the Olympic games being at hand [in 324], he sent Nicanor of Stageira to Greece, giving him a decree about the restoration, which he ordered him to have proclaimed by the victorious herald to the crowds at the festival. Nicanor carried out his instructions, and the herald received and read the following message: ‘King Alexander to the exiles from the Greek cities. We have not been the cause of your exile, but, save for those of you who are under a curse, we shall be the cause of your return to your own native cities. We

Thus, according to Diodorus, Alexander's motive was double:<sup>228</sup> (a) to gain glory, and (b) to create for himself partisans in the Hellenic *poleis* who would put an end to resistance against his rule. To the latter end, Alexander's ruling was, in the words of Bosworth (1988: 224), "deliberately disruptive, aiming to increase the tensions in Greek city states while at the same time augmenting Alexander's own partisans in each community." As for glory, "[t]he popularity of the move was obvious enough" (Bosworth 1988: 222), and the reactions of the crowds gathered at Olympia reported by Diodorus will have made this immediately plain to the official delegations from the Hellenic *poleis*. Since the contents of Alexander's ruling was known before it was announced at Olympia,<sup>229</sup> the decision to have it announced there was presumably not based solely on a need to publish the contents, but also on a wish to produce a massive public demonstration of gratitude in recognition of his clemency and royal benefaction.<sup>230</sup> But the announcement communicated more than that. It was unprecedented at Olympia prior to 324, where individual states and rulers had not formerly been in a position to have their decisions announced in this way.<sup>231</sup> Thus, the very way in which the airing of the ruling was imposed upon Olym-

---

have written to Antipater about this to the end that if any cities are not willing to restore you, he may constrain them.' When the herald had announced this, the crowd showed its approval with loud applause; for those at the festival welcomed the favour of the king with cries of joy, and repaid his good deed with praises. All exiles had come together at the festival, being more than twenty thousand in number. Now, people in general welcomed the restoration of the exiles as a good thing, but ... *etc.*" (Geer, Loeb).

228. See Bosworth 1988: 222: "This information comes from Hieronymus and it is intrinsically credible."

229. Lewis 1996: 72.

230. Lewis 1996: 73.

231. Lewis 1996: 70-71. The decree of Byzantion included in Dem. 18.90-91 (which includes the passage: ἀποστείλαι δὲ καὶ θεαρίας ἐς τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι παναγύριος, Ἴσθμια καὶ Νέμεα καὶ Ὀλύμπια καὶ Πύθια, καὶ ἀνακαρῶσαι τὰς στεφάνους οἷς ἐστεφάνωνται ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ὑφ' ἡμέων, ὅπως ἐπιστέωνται οἱ Ἕλληνας τὰν τε Ἀθηναίων ἀρετὰν καὶ τὰν Βυζαντίων καὶ Περινθίων εὐχαριστίαν) is generally considered spurious; see Lewis 1996: 71 who adds: "It seems more likely that a later idea, that of 'all Greece' being addressed at the panegyris, has been anachronistically applied by a later commentator." But see n. 212 above.



pia, and the language of autocracy in which it was phrased (Bosworth 1988: 221), marked a change in Alexander's attitude to the *poleis* of the Hellenic world: Alexander acted here not as the first among equals in the Corinthian League (Lewis 1996: 72); he simply issued a unilateral declaration, treating the Hellenes "as his subjects, the recipients of direct commands" (Bosworth 1988: 221).

Proclamations in the manner of Alexander were, as noted, unprecedented at Olympia since no other power had ever been in a position to impose its will on the Hellenes by fiat. But statements could be made in an infinite number of other ways. Two modes, in particular, are illuminated by the surviving evidence: communal dedications and publication of public inscriptions at Olympia. A great number of weapons has been found during the excavations at Olympia, and most of them undoubtedly originally belonged to dedications of spoils taken from a defeated enemy; but unless they carry dedicatory inscriptions, it is of course impossible to assign such a dedication to a specific *polis*. Other kinds of gift to Zeus include sculptures and whole buildings. On the basis of the evidence assembled in Hansen & Nielsen 2004 (with a few additions), the following list can be compiled of *poleis* which made communal dedications at Olympia in the late Archaic and Classical periods:

**Table 3: *Poleis* making communal dedications at Olympia<sup>232</sup>**

<b>Polis</b>	<b>Inv. no.</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Date</b>
(1) Akragas	9	Sicily	Sculpture	C5e
(2) Gela	17	Sicily	Treasury	ca. 600
(3) Zankle	51	Sicily	Spoils	C6
(4) Messana	51	Sicily	Sculpture	C5m
(5) Hipponion	53	Italia	Spoils	525-500
(6) Kroton	56	Italia	Treasury?	Archaic
(7) Lokroi	59	Italia	Sculpture	Late Archaic
(8) Medma	60	Italia	Spoils	525-500
(9) Metapontion	61	Italia	Treasury	Archaic
(10) Rhegion	68	Italia	Spoils	C6-C5

232. The table lists only one dedication by each *polis*.

Polis	Inv. no.	Region	Type	Date
(11) Siris	69	Italia	Treasury?	Archaic
(12) Sybaris	70	Italia	Treasury	Archaic
(13) Taras	71	Italia	Spoils	ca. 440
(14) Apollonia	77	Adriatic	Sculpture	C5m
(15) Epidamnos	79	Adriatic	Treasury	ca. C6s
(16) Korkyra	123	Akarnania	Sculpture	ca. 480
(17) Myania	164	West Lokris	Spoils	Archaic?
(18) Naupaktos	165	West Lokris	Sculpture	ca. 420
(19) Koroneia	210	Boiotia	Spoils	C6l
(20) Orchomenos	213	Boiotia	Spoils	C6m
(21) Tanagra	220	Boiotia	Spoils	C6l
(22) Thebes	221	Boiotia	Spoils	C6s
(23) Megara	225	Megaris	Treasury	C6l-C5e
(24) Sikyon	228	Sikyonia	Treasury	C5f
(25) Alasyaion	245	Elis	Bronze vessel	C5l/C4e
(26) Amphidolia	247	Elis	Bronze vessel	C5/C4
(27) Elis	251	Elis	various	from C6
(28) Letrinoi	258	Elis	'Weinsieb'	C6s
(29) Kleitor	276	Arkadia	Sculpture	C6s
(30) Mantinea	281	Arkadia	Sculpture	C5
(31) Pheneos	291	Arkadia	Sculpture	C5f
(32) Psophis	294	Arkadia	Spoils	C6s
(33) Thelphousa	300	Arkadia	<i>Kerykeion</i>	C5e
(34) Skillous	311	Triphylia	Bronze vessel	C5l/C4e
(35) Sparta	345	Lakedaimon	Sculpture	C5e
(36) Argos	347	Argolis	Spoils	ca. 500-480
(37) Kleonai	351	Argolis	Spoils	late Archaic <sup>233</sup>
(38) Athens	361	Attika	Spoils	C5f
(39) Eretria	370	Euboia	Sculpture	C5e
(40) Thasos	526	Aegean	Sculpture	C5e
(41) Chersonesos	661	Thrace	Sculpture	Late Archaic <sup>234</sup>
(42) Byzantion	674	Propontis	Treasury	Archaic
(43) Lampsakos	748	Propontis	Sculpture	C4s?

233. SEG 32 383.G; cf. SEG 31 365.

234. Paus. 6.19.6 with Isaac 1986: 172-73.

Polis	Inv. no.	Region	Type	Date
(44) Samos	864	Ionia	Sculpture	C61
(45) Kyrene	1028	Libya	Treasury	Archaic <sup>235</sup>

Thus, at least 45 *poleis* from various parts of the Hellenic world are attested as having made communal dedications at Olympia, quite a substantial number considering the fragmentary nature of the evidence, and one which surely represents only a fraction of the *poleis* which originally made such dedications. Most of the dedications listed here were made by *poleis* of the Peloponnese itself such as Pheneos (no. 291), or by *poleis* of central Hellas such as Koroneia (no. 210), or by western colonies such as Apollonia (no. 77),<sup>236</sup> and only a few by *poleis* of, e.g., Asia Minor and none by *poleis* on the Black Sea area. Some undated dedications by communities in these areas may, of course, belong to the Archaic or Classical period: at 5.24.6 Pausanias records a sculptural dedication by Elaia (no. 807) in Aiolis, but without any indication of date;<sup>237</sup> and at 5.26.7, he records a dedication by Herakleia Pontike (no. 715), again without indication of date; however, Pausanias adds that the dedication was occasioned by a Herakleian raid on Mariandynian territory,<sup>238</sup> and since Herakleia – a colony founded ca. 550 – is known to have waged a number of early wars with the local population,<sup>239</sup> it seems a reasonable assumption that this dedication was prompted by one of these and thus may be dated to the second half of the sixth century. So, the *poleis* of these areas may also have been regular dedicators at Olympia, though the evidence does seem to suggest that Olympia attracted somewhat more dedications from central Hellas, the

235. See Rups 1986: 37-40.

236. For a discussion of the presence at Olympia in the Archaic period of the *poleis* of South Italy, see Giangulio 1993.

237. ἀγαλμὰ ἐστὶ Διὸς οὐκ ἔχον γένεια οὐδὲ αὐτό, Ἐλαϊτῶν δὲ ἀνάθημα, οἱ ... ἐν τῇ Αἰολίδι οἰκοῦσι.

238. πρὸς τούτοις Ἡρακλέους ἐστὶ τῶν ἔργων τὸ ἐς τὸν λέοντα τὸν ἐν Νεμέᾳ καὶ ὕδρα τε καὶ ἐς τὸν κύνα τοῦ Ἄϊδου καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ Ἐρμάνθῳ ποταμῷ κάπρον· ἐκόμισαν δὲ αὐτὰ ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν Ἡρακλεῶται Μαριανδυνῶν ὁμόρων βαρβάρων καταδραμόντες τὴν χώραν.

239. Just. *Epit.* 16.3.8.

Peloponnese and the western colonies, if the surviving sample is representative of the dedications originally made.

Seen from the Eleian (or Pisatan, as the case may be) point of view, such dedications (and setting up of inscriptions) by foreign polities very probably reflected to the greater glory of Zeus Olympios<sup>240</sup> and thus in fact to the greater glory of Elis itself. As for the foreign *poleis* we may also assume that among their motives was a desire to increase their prestige and the glory of their names, thus sharpening their 'profiles'.<sup>241</sup>

If a communal dedication is to add to the prestige of the dedicating community, this community must be clearly identified and so weapons taken from a routed enemy are often inscribed with the name of the dedicant and the defeated enemy "to rub home the message they were intended to convey" (Snodgrass 1986: 55), as the following few examples will demonstrate: (a) a Persian helmet of 490-480 inscribed Διὶ Ἀθηναῖοι Μέδων λαβόντες<sup>242</sup> (SEG 22 346; Kunze 1961); (b) a late Archaic left-leg greave inscribed Θεβαῖοι τῶν Ηυετίων<sup>243</sup> (SEG 24 300; Kunze 1973: 98-100); (c) a shield of ca. 500 inscribed Δανκλαῖοι Τεγίνων<sup>244</sup> (SEG 15 246; Kunze 1956: 37, 54 no. 23); (d) three bronze spear-butts of the 430s inscribed σκῦλα ἀπὸ Θουρίων Ταραντῖνοι ἀνέθεκαν Διὶ Ὀλυμπίοι δεκάταν<sup>245</sup> (Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* 57). Obviously, such dedications were thankofferings to Zeus, as the inscriptions of both (a) and (d) make clear; but just as obviously, "[t]here could be fewer clearer proofs of victory than the arms and armour taken from the dead comrades of the routed enemy by the triumphant conqueror" (Jackson 1991: 228); the intended audience, then, to whom these inscriptions were addressed, cannot have been the all-knowing divinity alone but must have been also the Hellenes of other *poleis* visiting Olympia (Jackson 1983: 23), and they must have been

240. Cf. Lewis 1996: 140.

241. Cf. Giangulio 1993: 111: "Tutt'atro che estraneo doveva esser poi l'elemento dell'affermazione del nome della città nel cuore di uno dei centri pulsanti della società internazionale."

242. "For Zeus, the Athenians, having captured [it] from the Medes".

243. "The Thebans, from the Hyettians".

244. "The Zanklaians, from the Rhegians".

245. "The Tarantines dedicated spoils from the Thourians to Olympian Zeus, a tithe".

intended as overt celebrations of the prowess of the armed forces of the victorious dedicant. Moreover, they will of course, as all dedications, have established the dedicant *polis* as an individual agent in the Hellenic city-state culture.

In the Archaic period, dedications of captured weaponry must have been very common: it has been thought a not seriously exaggerated estimate that e.g. some 100,000 helmets were dedicated at Olympia over the seventh and sixth centuries (Jackson 1991: 244). However, by the fifth century there is a marked decrease in such offerings and item (d) above is among the latest known (Jackson 1991: 246). But martial victory could be celebrated also in sculptural form. Thus, at 5.23.7 Pausanias records a sculpture dedicated by Arkadian Kleitor (no. 276) ca. 550-500.<sup>246</sup> Pausanias quotes verbatim the text of the accompanying epigram;<sup>247</sup> its two first verses read as follows:

Κλειτόριοι τόδ' ἄγαλμα θεῶν δεκάταν ἀνέθηκαν  
πολλᾶν ἐκ πολιῶν χερσὶ βιασσάμενοι.<sup>248</sup>

The sculpture – a figure of Zeus himself – apparently celebrates a whole string of victories by Kleitor and was presumably financed by booty. Similar dedications were made by other *poleis*, e.g. Mantinea (no. 281): Pausanias saw a wingless Nike dedicated by Mantinea (Paus. 5.26.6) and took it for granted that it celebrated a martial triumph though the epigram did not elaborate which one;<sup>249</sup> it was the work of the famous sculptor Kalamis and thus was presumably dedicated in the second quarter of the fifth century.<sup>250</sup>

246. For the date, see Richter 1931: 200 and Maddoli 1992: 260-62.

247. On the reliability of Pausanias' quotations of inscriptions, see Habicht 1985: esp. 71-77.

248. "The Kleitorians dedicated this image to the god, a tithe/ from many cities that they reduced by force" (Jones & Ormerod (Loeb)).

249. παρὰ δὲ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν πεποιήται Νίκη· ταύτην Μαντινεῖς ἀνέθεσαν, τὸν πόλεμον δὲ οὐ δηλοῦσιν ἐν τῷ ἐπιγράμματι· Κάλαμις δὲ οὐκ ἔχουσαν πτερὰ ποιῆσαι λέγεται ἀπομιμούμενος τὸ Ἀθήνησι τῆς Ἀπτέρου καλουμένης Ξόανον.

250. On Kalamis, see Pollitt 1990: 46-48. Ioakimidou 2000 perceptively points out that when Hellenic communities of the west, i.e. 'the west Greek colonies', made such sculptural dedications to commemorate martial victories, which was regularly won against non-Hellenic neighbours, the dedications often

With a slight change of emphasis, a community struggling for freedom might make a dedication at Olympia and in this way present itself in the image of well-established polities: thus, *IvO* 247, a spear butt inscribed Μεθάνιοι ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων<sup>251</sup> and thus squarely in the tradition discussed above, has been persuasively interpreted as a dedication by the 'Messenians', that is by rebellious Lakedaimonian helots, made during their bid for independence during the great helot revolt of the 460s.<sup>252</sup> Clearly, celebration of victory through dedication of spoils was also a demonstration of the existence of a community.

However, less warlike dedications could be used to further similar ends. At 5.27.8 Pausanias records a dedication by the *polis* of Pheneos (no. 291) in Arkadia; it was produced by Onatas of Aigina and thus probably antedates 460 (Pollitt 1990: 36-39). Pausanias does not relate the historical background of the dedication, but he does describe the sculpture: it depicted a helmeted Hermes carrying a ram under his arm and clad in *chiton* and *chlamys*, and not Zeus as did the sculpture dedicated by Kleitor. Olympia housed other gods than Zeus, and in fact the very next monument described by Pausanias is a private dedication of a Hermes with *kerykeion* by one Glaukies of Rhegion (5.27.8); the base of this dedication has survived: [Γλ]αυκίης ὁ Λυκκίδεω [τῶ]ι Ἐρμῆι Π[η]γίνοϛ (*IvO* 271.2-3 (420-410)). Though Pausanias does not note it, Glaukies' dedication was in honour of Hermes, and it seems a reasonable assumption that the one by Pheneos was likewise in honour of this god. Why would Pheneos hire a famous sculptor to produce a Hermes for dedication at Olympia? Since Pausanias is silent on this point, we are reduced to supposition; but Hermes is not unknown in Pheneos. In fact, poetic tradition places his birth on Mt Kyllene between Pheneos and Stymphalos (no. 296),<sup>253</sup> and Pheneos had a sanctuary of the god on the mountain – sacred to him – as well as in

---

exploited the opportunity to emphasise, in addition to the local identity of the *polis*, the *Hellenic* identity of the *polis*; at 73-76 she discusses the dedication of Apollonia (no. 77) at Olympia, which provides an eminently illustrative case of this phenomenon.

251. "The Messenians, from the Lakedaimonians".

252. See Bauslagh 1990.

253. *Hom. Hym. Herm.* 1-60 with Jost 1985: 441-44.

the city.<sup>254</sup> Hermes is the divinity most commonly depicted on the Classical coinage of Pheneos (Head 1911: 452), and, finally, the city is known to have conducted athletic competitions in his honour.<sup>255</sup> In other words, Hermes was the principal deity of the city. It thus seems reasonable to assume that the choice of dedicatee at Olympia was based on his position in the local pantheon of Pheneos and that one of the functions the sculpture was intended to fulfill was to emphasise the individuality of Pheneos.

As a final example of a sculptural dedication whose chief function was probably to create prestige for the dedicant, we may note that the *polis* of Lampsakos (no. 748) set up at Olympia a sculpture depicting one of its most famous sons, the historian and rhetorician Anaximenes (ca. 380-320).<sup>256</sup>

The most sumptuous kind of dedication made by cities at Olympia was without doubt the erection of a 'treasury', a small temple-like building.<sup>257</sup> These were situated on a northern terrace overlooking the Altis, and at least eight of the eleven buildings were erected by colonies (Sinn 2000: 25),<sup>258</sup> an important and striking testimony to the importance of Olympia to colonies for maintaining links with the 'homeland' and thus preserve a Hellenic identity.<sup>259</sup> The ritual or practical functions of these buildings are not fully understood, but they seem to have been used to store ritual artefacts<sup>260</sup> and presumably dedications as well (be-

254. On Hermes in Pheneos, see Jost 1985: 29-30, 33-35; see also Erath 1999: 242-46 and Tausend 1999: 357-62.

255. Paus. 8.14.10: θεῶν δὲ τιμῶσιν Ἑρμῆν Φενεᾶται μάλιστα καὶ ἀγῶνα ἄγουσιν Ἑρμαῖα; cf. Schol. in Pind. *Ol.* 7.153a.

256. Paus. 6.18.2 (without indication of date).

257. For the treasuries at Olympia, see Rups 1986: 13-81.

258. Treasuries are attested for or have been assumed for the following colonies: Gela (no. 17); Selinous (no. 47); Syracuse (no. 47); Kroton? (no. 56); Metapontion (no. 61); Siris? (no. 69); Sybaris (no. 70); Epidamnus (no. 79); Byzantion (no. 674); Kyrene (no. 1028).

259. On this subject, see further Giangiulio 1993 and Ioakimidou 2000.

260. Polemo fr. 22 (Preller): ναὸς Μεταποντίνων, ἐν ᾧ φιάλαι ἀργυραῖ ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα δύο, οἰνοχόαι ἀργυραῖ δύο, ἀποθυστάνιον ἀργυροῦν, φιάλαι τρεῖς ἐπίχουσοι. ναὸς Βυζαντίων, ἐν ᾧ Τρίτων κυπαρίσσινος ἔχων κρατάνιον ἀργυροῦν, Σειρήν ἀργυρᾶ, καρχήσια δύο ἀργυρᾶ, κύλιξ ἀργυρᾶ, οἰνοχόη χρυσῆ, κέρατα δύο (= Athenaios XI 479D). Cf. Rups 1986: 236-39.

low). But apart from that, they must have functioned much like the other dedications discussed here: as demonstrations of the identity and individuality of the dedicants, though they were of course much more monumental in their expression.<sup>261</sup> The treasury of Megara (no. 225) may serve as an example. Constructed in the late sixth/early fifth century, it measures 12.3 x 6.80 m, has two Doric columns in antis, a Doric entablature and a pediment adorned with a splendid sculptural group depicting the gigantomachy.<sup>262</sup> According to Paus. 6.19.13, the pediment was crowned by an acroterion in the form of an inscribed shield stating that the Megarians dedicated the treasury from spoils taken from Korinthos (no. 227),<sup>263</sup> in the way Kleitor dedicated its sculpture from spoils. Placed right over the pedimental group the text of the shield may perhaps have encouraged viewers to identify the victorious Megarians with the victors in the pedimental group below – the gods, that is – and to identify the defeated Korinthians with the losing giants who were depicted as hoplites, though the gigantomachy is of course a traditional motive for pedimental groups and quite appropriate on a building erected in honour of Zeus.<sup>264</sup> According to Pausanias, the treasury also housed various sculptural dedications by Megara. It was, in short, a monumental expression of the stature of the *polis* of Megara, or rather, of the way it preferred to present itself.

Polities other than Elis itself set up inscriptions at Olympia, and it seems to have been reasonably common to have copies of

---

261. See Rups 1986: 253-56, esp. 253: "We are tempted to suggest quite seriously that civic pride and competition were the main motives ... We thus come to the conclusion that, whatever the official reason for dedicating a treasury, and whatever its official uses, it also functioned to enhance the prestige of its dedicators." For an instructive example of the messages conveyed by a treasury, see the analysis of the treasury erected by Athens (no. 361) at Delphi in Jung 2006: 96-108.

262. Bol 1974.

263. ἀνάκειται δὲ καὶ ἀσπίς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀετοῦ, τοὺς Μεγαρέας ἀπὸ Κορινθίων ἀναθεῖναι τὸν Θησαυρὸν λέγουσα.

264. See Ridgway 1999: 163; cf. 162-66 for the gigantomachy in architectural sculpture as such, and 181 n. 44 for a list of 28 buildings employing the theme of the gigantomachy for their sculptural decoration, and erected by various *poleis* such as Akragas (no. 9); Selinous (no. 44); Korkyra (no. 123); Makiston (no. 307); Argos (no. 347); Athens (no. 361); Siphnos (no. 519); Ilion (no. 779); Ephesos (no. 844); and Priene (no. 861).



international treaties set up there, as the following examples suggest: (1) Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* 10 is a bronze plate of ca. 550-525 recording the conclusion of a treaty of *symmachia* between Sybaris (no. 70) with allies and the enigmatic *Serdaioi*; (2) Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* 17 is a bronze tablet of ca. 500 inscribed with the text of a treaty of *symmachia* between Elis (no. 251) and the Ewaioi (no. 253);<sup>265</sup> (3) *IvO* 10 is a bronze plate of ca. 475-450 recording the conclusion of 'friendship' (φιλία) for 50 years between the Anaitoi (no. 248) and the Metapioi (no. 260); (4) Pausanias at 5.23.4 records a bronze stele carrying the text of the Thirty-Years Peace between the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians concluded in 446/5;<sup>266</sup> (5) the text of the Peace of Nicias concluded between the Athenians and Lakedaimonians with allies in 421 contains a stipulation to the effect that steles – obviously inscribed with the text of the treaty – were to be set up at Olympia as well as in other important sanctuaries (Thuc. 5.18.10);<sup>267</sup> (6) the text of the treaty creating the quadruple alliance between Athens (no. 361), Argos (no. 347), Elis (no. 251), and Mantinea (no. 281) in 420 likewise stipulates that a bronze stele be set up at Olympia (Thuc. 5.47.11);<sup>268</sup> (7) *SEG* 29 405 of 365/4 is a fragment of a stele recording a treaty of *symmachia* between the Arkadian Confederacy, Pisa (no. 262) and Akroreia;<sup>269</sup> (8) *SEG* 29 405b is a fragment of a contemporary stele recording a treaty of *symmachia* between Pisa (no. 262), Messene (no. 318) and Sikyon (no. 228);<sup>270</sup> (9) and *SEG* 29 406 is possibly a fragment of a contemporary stele recording a treaty of *symmachia* between Pisa (no. 262) and Athens (no. 361).

As for the motives prompting the publication of such treaties at Olympia one is likely to have been to add the sanction of Zeus to the treaty;<sup>271</sup> in fact, Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* 10.5-6 itself places

265. On this inscription, see now Roy & Schofield 1999.

266. ἔστι δὲ πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς τούτου στήλη χαλκῆ, Λακεδαμονίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων συνθήκας ἔχουσα εἰρήνης ἕς τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸν.

267. στήλας δὲ στήσαι Ὀλυμπίᾳσι καὶ Πυθοῖ καὶ Ἴσθμοῖ καὶ Ἀθήνησιν ἐν πόλει καὶ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ἐν Ἀμυκλαίῳ.

268. καταθέντων δὲ καὶ Ὀλυμπίᾳσι στήλην χαλκὴν κοινῇ Ὀλυμπίοις τοῖς νυνί.

269. See Dušanić 1979 and Siewert *et al.* 1999.

270. See Dušanić 1979 and Siewert *et al.* 1999.

271. Lewis 1996: 141; see also Cole 1995: 306-9.

Zeus at the head of the list of divine protectors of the agreement. In addition, “we can detect an effort to reach a wider audience” (Lewis 1996: 141) and perhaps “[t]he desire to inform the world at large, so as to gain a guarantee against violation of the terms, is of the same kind as the desire to gain a religious sanction” (Lewis 1996: 142). But of course, as Lewis notes, the propaganda aspect of such inscriptions cannot be overlooked (1996: 142) since “[s]tates on occasion used the international festivals to make a point ... an announcement of new loyalties, or a show of strength” (*ibid.*). The Sybaris treaty (Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* 10) is an almost paradigmatic example of this. It is the only surviving public document of this great and fabled *polis* in Magna Graecia; in translation, the brief text reads as follows: “The Sybarites and their allies and the Serdaioi made an agreement for friendship faithful and without guile for ever. Guarantors: Zeus, Apollo, and the other gods and the city of Poseidonia” (from Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* 10). Though the wish to add divine sanction to the agreement is rather obvious in this instance, we should not overlook the image of Sybaris which is here presented to the Hellenic world. Sybaris was a great and powerful *polis*:<sup>272</sup> a colony reported to have been founded in the last quarter of the eighth century (Ps.-Skymnos 360; Euseb. *Chron.* 91b Helm) – a date confirmed by archaeological evidence – Sybaris had itself, prior to its catastrophic defeat at the hands of the Krotoniates in 510, founded the colonies of Laos (no. 58) and Poseidonia (no. 66); the urban centre of Sybaris was large and is estimated at some 500 ha with evidence of at least some city planning; remains from the area testify to the existence of an industrial area (a “vast *kerameikos*” (Fischer-Hansen 2000: 108)), to a major sixth-century temple and to a monumental rectangular building which probably served some public purpose. As the town was large, the population was presumably large as well, though the figures reported in late sources are obviously legendary: 100,000 *astoi* are reported by Ps.-Skymnos 341; 300,000 *politai* by Diodorus Siculus 10.23 & 12.9.2; 300,000 men under arms appear in Diodorus (10.23) and Strabo 6.1.13; and Timaios (*FGrHist* 566 fr.

---

272. References to scholarly literature for the following brief sketch of Sybaris may be found in Hansen & Nielsen 2004 s.v. Sybaris (no. 70) (by Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen & Ampolo).

50 *apud* Ath. 519C) reports 50,000 horse. However, the size of the urban area indicates a substantial population, some 27,300 being an absolute minimum for the total population of the city-state proper (in contradistinction to the population of the dominion).<sup>273</sup> In the earlier sixth century, Sybaris waged war in alliance with Kroton (no. 56) and Metapontion (no. 61), and by the middle of the sixth century at the latest it had created a territorial dominion, which may have been as large as ca. 3,000 km<sup>2</sup>. Sybaris was a truly hegemonic *polis*: according to the (undoubtedly inflated) report found in Strabo 6.1.13, the city ‘ruled over’ (ἐπιῆρξε) four *ethne* (‘peoples’) in the vicinity (τεττάρων ἐθνῶν τῶν πλησίον) and acquired (ἔσχε) 25 ‘subject cities’ (πόλεις ὑπηκόους). A far-flung international Sybarite network is indicated by Herodotos’ statement that an unusually close relationship existed between Sybaris and Miletos (no. 854) in far-away Asia Minor.<sup>274</sup> By any standard, Sybaris must have been among the leading *poleis* of the Hellenic world, a fact which it expressed by its construction of a treasury at Olympia – and by the present inscription: the inscription under consideration here provides us with the only clue we have of the way in which Sybaris ruled (at least some of) its dependencies. This clue is found in the expression οἱ Συβαρίται κ’ οἱ σύμμαχοι, “the Sybarites and the allies”. The formula “X and the allies” is the standard way in Greek to refer to a hegemonic league, i.e. a *symmachia* comprising several *poleis* and acknowledging one of these as the *hegemon* (= the “X” of the formula), i.e. the *polis* which directs the policy of the league and provides the commander(s) of the troops during campaigns etc. Thus, what we call ‘The Peloponnesian League’ is Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι in Greek<sup>275</sup> just as our ‘Delian League’ is Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι,<sup>276</sup> and other examples could be cited.<sup>277</sup> The inscription, then, presents Sybaris as (and reveals it as in fact being) the *hegemon* of a hegemonic league, or

273. Hansen 2006: 15-34.

274. 6.21.1: πόλεις γὰρ αὐταὶ [sc. Sybaris and Miletos] μάλιστα δὴ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ἀλλήλοισι ἐξενώθησαν, on which see How & Wells 1912.

275. E.g. Thuc. 1.108.1; 2.7.1; 2.66.1.

276. E.g. Thuc. 1.109.1; 3.90.3; 6.67.1. See further de Ste. Croix 1972: 102 and Siewert 1994b: 261.

277. See e.g. Nielsen 2002: 242 for the expression τοὶ φαλείοι καὶ ἡ συμμαχία.

in other words, Sybaris is here depicted in the way Sparta (no. 345) and Athens (no. 361) were depicted in their most powerful days. To broadcast this picture of itself was probably also one of the motives prompting Sybaris to put up the inscription at Olympia. It proudly proclaims to the Hellenic world that the 'Sybarite League' has secured for itself a new member the complete obscurity of which strongly suggests that what matters here is Sybaris and Sybaris only.<sup>278</sup> In short, the inscription is a statement of the power and greatness of Sybaris.

But not only bilateral or multilateral agreements were published at Olympia; individual *poleis* also set up acts of state in the sanctuary, as the following few examples demonstrate: (1) *IvO* 24 (cf. *SEG* 11 1180; 46 464) is a sixth century bronze plate inscribed with a decree of Zankle (no. 51); (2) *IvO* 22 is a fragmentary bronze plate of ca. 500 inscribed with a decree of Selinous (no. 44);<sup>279</sup> (3) *IvO* 11 is a bronze plate of the early fifth century inscribed with a decree of the *polis* of the Chaladrioi (no. 249); (4) *IvO* 30 is a bronze plate of the fifth century recording a grant of proxeny by the Arkadian *polis* of Alea (no. 265)<sup>280</sup> to an Athenian.

The decree by Arkadian Alea is not the only proxeny decree set up at Olympia by foreign *poleis* (cf. e.g. *IvO* 37 of the fourth century), but even so the practice does seem a little strange since the identity of a *proxenos* cannot have been of much significance to others than the *polis* that appointed him. The text of the decree itself seems, in fact, to acknowledge that an unusual procedure was followed here, since it includes the very decision to have it published at Olympia: γραψαι ἐν Ὀλυμπία ἔδοξεν (5-6).<sup>281</sup> Why was the decree published at Olympia? Again, we are reduced to supposition, but it is worth reflecting on the following: Alea was in all probability a member of the Peloponnesian League, as

278. Giangiulio 1993: 111: "L'interesse a tutto questo e l'iniziativa della pubblicazione non possono essere che attribuiti a Sibari."

279. Cf. *SEG* 29 403; *Nomima* I.17.

280. Cf. Nielsen 1996: 118.

281. "It was decided to inscribe [it] at Olympia". Cf. Michel, *Recueil* 197 = *IvO* 39 = Perlman 2002: O.2 of C31-C2e, a decree by Elis which contains a stipulation to the effect that it should be published at Olympia: τὸ δὲ ψάφισμα τὸ γεγονὸς ἀπὸ τῶν βωλᾶδων γραφὲν ἐν χάλκῳ ἀνατεθεῖται ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ Διὸς τῷ Ὀλυμπίῳ (31-2).

were all *poleis* of Arkadia (Nielsen 2002: 380). The league, of course, was a hegemonic league acknowledging Sparta as the *hegemon*. Membership will have meant that Alea did not in practice conduct an independent foreign policy but followed the Spartan lead. However, to grant proxeny *is* in a certain sense to conduct foreign policy<sup>282</sup> and it may seem remarkable to find a Spartan ally entering into proxeny relations with Athens in the fifth century. Now, IG I<sup>3</sup> 80 is a fully preserved *Athenian* decree of 421/0 which grants proxeny to Asteas of Alea. The man who proposed to appoint Asteas *proxenos* is one Thrasykles, almost certainly the same man as the Thrasykles known from Thuc. 5.19.2 and 24.1 to have been involved in the negotiations for the Peace of Nikias.<sup>283</sup> It is, accordingly, generally assumed that Asteas had assisted an Athenian embassy on its way to Sparta.<sup>284</sup> *IvO* 30 is dated to the fifth or perhaps early fourth century (*LGPN* II s.v. Δίφιλος 8); it may then very well be contemporary with IG I<sup>3</sup> 80 and if so, the exchange of *proxenia* between Alea and Athens may be said to represent a *rapprochement* between these two *poleis*. This was presumably possible for a Spartan ally because Sparta herself was eager to have peace concluded. In other words, the political circumstances gave Alea the opportunity of independent international political existence. To publish *IvO* 30 at Olympia may very well have been the city's way of demonstrably stating its existence as an individual agent in the Hellenic city-state culture.

In fact, Olympia can often be seen to (be used to) mark the separate existence of individual communities, as in the following two examples: It was shown above (32ff.) how Elis exploited its administration of Olympia in its struggle with Sparta for control over the city of Lepreon (no. 306) in Triphylia. However, Lepreon was lost to Elis in the war with Sparta (31ff.), and the city went on to found a Triphylian federation to protect itself against Elis (Nielsen 2002: 252-62), which never relinquished its claims on its former dependencies.<sup>285</sup> An athlete from Lepreon,

282. See e.g. Meiggs 1972: 215-19 and Fossey 1994: 35-36.

283. So both Gomme and Hornblower in their notes *ad* 19.2.

284. Walbank 1978: 279.

285. See Nielsen 2005 for a detailed discussion; the following section on Antiochos is based on Nielsen 2005.

the pancratiast Antiochos (Moretti 1957: no. 360), found a way to turn Elis' Olympic ploys against itself, as it were. Antiochos was active in politics and pursued a policy of opposition to Elis: in 367 he served as an ambassador for the Arkadian Confederacy (of which the Triphylians were then a member) on a mission to the king of Persia (Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.33, 38),<sup>286</sup> a mission which would settle i.a. the question of Triphylyia's standing. During the negotiations in Sousa the king supported Elis' claim to Triphylyia,<sup>287</sup> and this so affected Antiochos that he refused the king's gifts and poked fun at the Persians in his report to the federal assembly of the Arkadians back home (*ibid.*). It had almost certainly been anticipated by the Arkadian Confederacy that the "Triphylian question" would come to the fore, and it is thus highly likely that Antiochos had been chosen to represent the Arkadians because he was a citizen of Lepreon in Triphylyia and thus had the qualifications and personal commitment needed to present the Arkadian/Triphylian point of view. Or to quote Buckler 1980: 152, Antiochos "was himself a symbol and a declaration of Arkadian aims". Exactly how Antiochos had come to personalise Triphylian opposition to Elis we do not know, but it is just possible that we can identify another area of activity in which he expressed this opposition. In his account, Xenophon refers to Antiochos as *παγκρατιαστής* ('the pancratiast'), which indicates that Antiochos was a famous athlete. We do, in fact, know something about Antiochos' athletic achievements from a passage in Pausanias which mentions his athletic record in some detail. At 6.3.9 Pausanias comments as follows on Antiochos' victory statue in Olympia: "The statue of Antiochos was made by Nikodamos. A native of Lepreon, Antiochos won once at Olympia the *pankratation* for men, and the *pentathlon* twice at the Isthmian games and twice at the Nemean. For the Lepreatai are not afraid of the Isthmian Games as the Eleians themselves are." The last sentence

286. It has been generally recognised that Antiochos the athlete and Antiochos the ambassador must be one and the same man; Xenophon actually refers to his athletic reputation by calling him *Ἀντίοχος παγκρατιαστής*. See further Bölte 1948: 200, Dušanić 1970: 297, Roy 1971: 575 with n. 40, Roy 1997: 290, Buckler 1980: 152-53, Nielsen 1997: 153. On the conference in Sousa and its background, see Buckler 1980: 151-60.

287. This, obviously, is the implication of Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.38, see Buckler 1980: 152.

reflects the fact that Eleians did not compete at the Isthmian Games. Whatever the reason for this, it has been accepted by modern scholars as fact.<sup>288</sup> At 5.2.1-5 Pausanias discusses the reasons for the absence of Eleian athletes at the Isthmia. He gives three different reasons and explicitly rejects the two later ones, which implies acceptance of, or preference for, the first reason given: that Eleian absence was due to the killing by Herakles of the sons of Aktor, which had happened during a truce proclaimed for the celebration of the Isthmian Games, and which the Corinthians had refused to revenge by excluding the Argives (who protected Herakles) from the Isthmia. Pausanias ends his discussion by quoting verbatim an elegiac couplet from a dedication by an Eleian athlete at Olympia which refers to the same myth as the reason for Eleians' absence from the Isthmia.<sup>289</sup> We may then conclude that this myth was accepted as giving the reason why Eleians did not compete at the Isthmia.<sup>290</sup> The implication is that we are not dealing with a Corinthian ban on Eleian participation but with an Eleian boycott of the Isthmian Games.<sup>291</sup> Now, Pausanias is explicit that Antiochos won at the

288. See e.g. Crowther 1988: 307.

289. Moretti 1957: no. 601 suggests ca. 200 as the likely date of this 'inscription'.

290. The story is found also in a scholion in Pl. *Phd.* 89c = Pherekydes (*FGrHist* 3) fr. 79a-b.

291. An episode which comes close to an Athenian boycott of the Olympic Games is recorded by Paus. 5.21.5: in 332, Kallippos of Athens (Moretti 1957: no. 460) was victorious in the *pentathlon*, but was fined for bribing his opponents. This somehow became a matter for the Athenian *polis* and Hypereides was sent to have the fine revoked. (Note that Harpokration s.v. Ἑλληνοδίκαι cites the speech that Hypereides must have given in the case mentioned by Pausanias [ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Καλλίππου πρὸς Ἡλείου]; see also *Pap. Oxy.* 3360 in which the speech is listed in a catalogue of Hypereides' speeches as [πρῆς]βεντικός εἰς Ἥλιν ὑπὲρ Καλλίππου). This the Eleians refused and the Athenians in their turn refused to pay the fine Ὀλυμπίων εἰργόμενοι: if εἰργόμενοι is here understood as middle voice, then we have a clear case of boycott; if it is taken to be passive as it probably should, then the Athenians refused to pay knowing full well that that this meant exclusion from the Games and thus in effect boycotted the Games: I point this out merely to suggest that 'boycott' is not an unduly anachronistic concept in this connection. See also Weiler 1991: 90-91 who treats the episode as an Athenian boycott of the Olympics and points out that it may have lasted for 20 years. The conflict was eventually solved by the intervention of the Delphic oracle. See also Herrmann 1974: 979 and Habicht 1997: 19-20.

Isthmos; the Eleians, though, claimed that Lepreon was a part of Elis. The Eleian boycott of the Isthmian Games may have applied only to citizens of the *polis* of Elis, but the very reason why this has been suggested is the fact that our Antiochos competed at the Isthmia.<sup>292</sup> Even if it was originally so, the Eleians may have tried to extend the boycott to their dependants in their attempt to impose an Eleian identity on them (discussed fully in Nielsen 2005). In any case, the participation of a Lepreatan in the Isthmia would be a statement to the effect that Lepreon was independent of Elis, not a part of it. What we do not, however, know is whether Antiochos emphasised this aspect of his participation. His later political opposition to Elis suggests that this is not impossible, and it may be felt that the way in which Pausanias brings in Antiochos' *Isthmian* achievements in connection with his *Olympic* monument suggests that an accompanying inscription mentioned them. In that case Antiochos may well have made a subtle point of his participation at the Isthmia, a point against Elis, as it would be, to the effect that Lepreon was not a part of Elis but an individual community in its own right – and that at Olympia, the 'very spiritual centre' of the Eleian state.

Antiochos' point was, of course, a statement of his personal point of view, though it was probably shared by the majority of his compatriots. But sometimes the way the Games unfolded gave rise to what amounts to an expression of an if not Panhellenically held view, then at least Elis' view on delicate international matters. Athletes competed at Olympia not only as individuals but also as representatives of their home *poleis* (cf. n. 112 above). An athlete had to prove to the Eleian authorities that he belonged to a polity which had received the sacred envoys of Elis, met the request to respect the *ekecheiria* and in fact respected it, as is abundantly clear from the Games of 420: Elis excluded Sparta from participation in these Games because Sparta, according to the Eleian point of view, had violated the sacred truce (above 32-33). This ban on Spartan participation meant that no

---

292. So Crowther 1988: 307 n. 9: "The exclusion applies to the city, not the province, of Elis, for Antiochos of Lepreon won twice in the pentathlon at Isthmia"; and Crowther 1996: 40: "all Eleans were permanently excluded from the Isthmian games"; I am, however, here suggesting that we are dealing not with an 'exclusion' but with a boycott.



individual Spartan was entitled to compete in the Games. Accordingly, the Spartan aristocrat Lichas, son of Arkesilaos, had to enter his hippic team not as Spartan but as Theban.<sup>293</sup> Admittance of an athlete to the Games, then, was tantamount to Eleian recognition of his home *polis* as a legitimate Hellenic *polis*. Viewed from this perspective the Olympic Games of 368 are of great interest in the present context. 368 is a mere three years after the catastrophic Spartan defeat at Leuktra and one year after the foundation of the *polis* of Messene (no. 318) in former Spartan subject territory in 369 after the first Boiotian Peloponnesian expedition – and the Games of 368 were the first Games after these crucial events. For a long time the Spartans simply refused to recognise the existence of the new *polis* of Messene<sup>294</sup> and the status of Messene as a legitimate *polis* was one of the central diplomatic problems of the 360s,<sup>295</sup> and could still cause war in the 350s.<sup>296</sup> Messene and its right to exist or not must, we may safely assume, have been one of the most delicate matters of international politics in 368. In 368, the *stadion* race was won by Pythostratos of Athens (no. 361),<sup>297</sup> the victorious boxer *may* have been Aristion of Epidauros (no. 348);<sup>298</sup> an athlete from Stratos (no. 138) in Akarnania *presumably* took the crown in *pankration*;<sup>299</sup> and the chariot race *may* have been won by a female Spartan

293. Thuc. 5.50.4 says that Lichas' team – which was victorious – was announced as 'Boiotian' (Βοιωτῶν δημοσίου); however, Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21 says that Lichas had handed over the team to the *Thebans* (Λίχα παραδόντος Θηβαίοις τὸ ἄρμα) and Paus. 6.2.2 says that Lichas entered the team ἐπὶ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θηβαίων δήμου and adds that the Eleian victory records named the victor not as Lichas but as the Theban *demos*. So, Thucydides may be a little imprecise here (so HCT *ad loc.* suggesting that "Thucydides may have made a mistake in writing Βοιωτῶν").

294. See e.g. Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.27, 4.9. Cf. Cartledge & Spawforth 1989: 8. See also Cartledge 1987: 200-1, 257, 262, 325, 388 ("Sparta ... would never accept the autonomy of Messene"), 392 ("Agesilaos would still not permit Sparta's name to be put to a protocol that recognized the autonomy of Messene").

295. See Ryder 1965: 79-86, 134-35. See also Roebuck 1941: 41-48 and Sundwall 1993: 78-83.

296. Cartledge & Spawforth 1989: 9-10 with n. 25 (on 235) on the Spartan attack on Megalopolis in 351.

297. Diod. Sic. 15.71; Moretti 1957: no. 414. According to Africanus, Pythostratos was from Ephesos (no. 844).

298. Moretti 1957: no. 415.

299. Moretti 1957: no. 416.

horse owner, Euryleonis.<sup>300</sup> So, apart from the victor in the *stadion*, these victors are not securely tied to the 368 Games. But one more victor is on record, Damiskos, and his victory is explicitly dated to 368 by Paus. 6.2.10.<sup>301</sup> Damiskos won the boys' *stadion* race and was from – Messene. It will have been a historic moment for any citizens of Messene – as well as for other misolakedaimonians – present at Olympia when the herald announced Damiskos' victory: in such proclamations, the name of the victor was always accompanied by the name of the community he represented, i.e. it included his city-ethnic, in this case *Messenios*.<sup>302</sup> In this way, the proclamation of Damiskos' victory came to constitute, at the earliest opportunity possible and before a gathering ideologically construed as 'the Hellenes' as such (above 57-58), a demonstration of official Eleian recognition of the existence of Messene as a legitimate Hellenic *polis*.<sup>303</sup>

The identification of an athlete with his *polis* is visible in other ways as well. A victor enjoyed the right to have a commemorative monument erected in the Altis itself.<sup>304</sup> As the name of a victor's home *polis* was included in the victory proclamation, so it was standard to include that name in the inscriptions accompanying the commemorative sculpture,<sup>305</sup> e.g. in the form of the toponym, as in the epigram (Paus. 6.9.9) celebrating the early fifth-century athlete Philon of Korkyra (no. 123):

300. Moretti 1957: no. 418.

301. ἐνιαυτῷ γὰρ ὕστερον τοῦ οἰκισμοῦ τοῦ Μεσσηνίας ἀγόντων Ὀλύμπια Ἡλείων ἐνίκα στάδιον παιδας ὁ Δαμίσκος οὗτος. He is Moretti 1957: no. 417.

302. Nielsen 2002: 264 with n. 264; see also Lee 2001: 69-70, discussing Pind. *Ol.* 5.8; Plut. *Alc.* 11; and Schol. Vet in Pind. *Ol.* 5.16: ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἀγῶνι οἱ νικῶντες καὶ ἀπὸ πατέρων ἀνηγορεύοντο καὶ ἀπὸ προγόνων καὶ πόλεων. See also Ebert 1972: 10 n. 3 quoting Timotheos fr. 26 (Page): μακάριος ἦσθα, Τιμόθε', ὅτε κἄρυσ εἶπε· νικᾷ Τιμόθεος Μιλήσιος. Cf. Ebert 1972: 11 n. 2 and Nielsen 2002: 205 n. 267. See also Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21: ἐπεὶ ἐκηρύττοντο [sc. οἱ Θηβαῖοι] νικῶντες. A full discussion of the herald's victory proclamation is found in Wolicki 2002: 69-76.

303. Eleian recognition of Messene is, of course, also implied by the facts that Elis must have sent sacred envoys to Messene and that it allowed Damiskos to compete.

304. On such monuments, see Raschke 1987; Lattimore 1988; and Herrmann 1988.

305. Cf. Mann 2001: 57. See also Bravi 2001.

Πατρις μὲν Κόκυρα, Φίλων δ' ὄνομα· εἰμί δὲ Γλαύκου  
 υἱὸς καὶ νικῶ πῦξ δυ' ὀλυμπιάδας.<sup>306</sup>

Another way in which the name of the home *polis* of a victor could be proclaimed was by using the city-ethnic, as on the base of a statue seen by Pausanias (6.16.5) and recovered during the Olympia excavations: Ἀσάμων Ἰππάρχου Ἡλείος (Moretti 1957: no. 452; *BCH* 107 (1983) 767 with Fig. 43),<sup>307</sup> or in other ways,<sup>308</sup> as e.g. the phrase στεφανῶ δ' ἄστρῳ Συρακοσίων in the epigram (*AnthPal* 13.15) celebrating the early fourth-century athlete Dikon (Moretti 1957: no. 379 etc.), who was in fact originally a citizen of Kaulonia (no. 55) but probably was among the Kaulonians relocated to Syracuse by Dionysios I of Syracuse after he had besieged and sacked Kaulonia in 389 (Diod. Sic. 14.106ff.).<sup>309</sup> The phrase “and I am a crown to the city of the Syracusans”<sup>310</sup> of

306. “My fatherland is Korkyra, and my name is Philon; I am/ The son of Glaukos, and I won two Olympic victories for boxing” (Jones (Loeb)). See also e.g. *IvO* 149: ἀπ' εὐδόξοιο [Κ]υνίσκος Μαν[τ]ινέας (= Moretti 1957: no. 265); *AnthPal* 6.135: οὗτος Φειδόλα ἵππος ἀπ' εὐρυχόροιο Κορίνθου (= Moretti 1957: no. 147); *SEG* 48 547: [Πολυδάμας Ν]ικίου Θ[ε]σσαλός] ἐξ Σκοτο[ύ]σης (= Moretti 1957: no. 348) (on this monument, dated to 325-300, and so a posthumous celebration of Poulydamas whose Olympic victory is dated to 408, see Taeuber 1997, who argues that it was erected by the Thessalian confederacy which was developing him into a ‘Nationalheros’); Ebert 1972: no. 7: Κλεοσθένης ὁ Πόντιος ἐξ Ἐπιδάμνου (= Moretti 1957: no. 141); cf. *IvO* 170.
307. See also e.g. *IvO* 144: Εὐθυμος Λοκρὸς Ἀστυκλέος (= Moretti 1957: no. 191); *IvO* 146: Καλλίας Διδυμίου Ἀθηναῖος (Moretti 1957: no. 228); *IvO* 147-148: Τέλλων ... Δαήμενος ... Ἀρκὰς Ὀρεσθάσιος (= Moretti 1957: no. 231); *IvO* 161: [Ναρ]κίδας Φιγ[α]λεύς (= Moretti 1957: no. 392); *IvO* 162-163: Πυθοκλῆς Ἀλείος (= Moretti 1957: no. 284); *IvO* 165: Ἀριστίων Θεοφίλος Ἐπιδαύριος (= Moretti 1957: no. 415); *IvO* 167: Κριτόδαμος Λίχα Κλειτόριος (= Moretti 1957: no. 406); *IvO* 168: Ἀθηναῖος Ἀρπαλέου Ἐφέσιος (= Moretti 1957: no. 438); Simonid. fr. 188 (Bergk): Ἀριστόδαμος Θράσιδος Ἀλείος (= Moretti 1957: no. 383); Ebert 1972: no. 50: Χείλων Χείλωνος Πατρεὺς (= Moretti 1957: no. 461).
308. *IvO* 155 combines city-ethnic and toponym: Ἐλλάνικος Ἀλείος ἐκ Λεπρέου (= Moretti 1957: no. 331); on this inscription, see Nielsen 2005: 71-73.
309. See Robert 1967: 19; Finley 1979: 76-77; and Stylianou 1988 *ad* Diod. Sic. 15.14.1.
310. Cf. Ebert 1972: no. 12.4, celebrating the *Olympionikes* Theognetos of Aigina (= Moretti 1957: no. 217): ὡς πατέρων ἀγαθῶν ἐστεφάνωσε πόλιν; Ebert 1972: no. 39.1-2, celebrating the *Olympionikes* Sostratos of Sikyon (= Moretti 1957:

this epigram is a good illustration of the fact that by identifying his home *polis* an athlete shares the honour and prestige of his victory with his *polis*. As has been perceptively pointed out by Herrmann (1988: 119): “[N]icht nur der erfolgreiche Athlet wurde mit der Siegerstatue geehrt, sondern auch die Heimatpolis, für die er zum Agon angetreten war. Zwar war der sportliche Wettkampf, im gegensatz zu heute, immer Sache des Einzelnen – Mannschaftskämpfe hat es nie gegeben, auch keine zweiten und dritten Sieger – nur mit der Vaterstadt konnte der Ruhm geteilt werden. Mag die Inschrift der Siegerstatue noch so kurz sein – kaum je fehlt der Name der Heimatpolis. Die Verbundenheit des Einzelnen mit der Gemeinschaft, die ihn trägt, kommt darin zum Ausdruck: jeder agonale Sieg ist zugleich ein Sieg der Polis.” It is no surprise, therefore, to find that the commemorative monument was sometimes commissioned by the *polis* of the victorious athlete; the practice is reasonably well-attested for the post-Classical periods<sup>311</sup> but may have been in existence already in the Classical period, since two instances seem to belong to the very early Hellenistic period: (1) according to Paus. 6.17.4, the monument celebrating Hermesianax of Kolophon (Moretti 1957: no. 475) was erected by the city of Kolophon; Moretti dates the victory of Hermesianax to 320; (2) according to Paus. 6.13.11, the monument celebrating the Athenian victor Aristophon (Moretti 1957: no. 484) was erected by the Athenian *demos*,<sup>312</sup> Moretti dates Aristophon’s victory to 312. On

---

no. 420): [ΠΛ]είστοις δὴ Σικυῶνα πάτραν, [Σ]ωσιστράτου υἱέ, / Σώστρατε, καλλίστοις τ’ ἠγλαΐσας στεφάνοις. Cf. Ebert 1972: nos. 19 and 41. For the probability that this Sostratos – an extremely successful pankratiast with three Olympic victories to his credit – was depicted on the coins of Sikyon in the later fourth century, see Lacroix 1964: 19-29, accepted by Milavic 2001, who states (184): “For the people of Sikyon, a facsimile of a pankratiast on their coins constituted a unique symbol recognizable to the ancient Greeks as representing their famous citizen and, by extension, the city itself.” See also Broneer 1962: 260 for the suggestion that the laurel wreath found on the helmet of Athena on some fourth-century coins of Korinthos (no. 227) was added to commemorate “some outstanding victory by Corinthian competitors.” See also *I.Ephesos* 1415-16 (ca. 300).

311. See *IvO* 186 with Paus. 6.15.6; *IvO* 224; and Paus. 6.17.2.

312. ἀνέθηκε δὲ καὶ ὁ Αθηναίων δῆμος Ἀριστοφώντα Λυσίου. *IvO* 169 may be part of this monument.

occasion, a *polis* would even erect a monument many years after the victorious athlete was dead: according to Pausanias (6.13.2) there stood at Olympia a monument consisting of an inscribed stele and a sculpture by Myron, the famous sculptor, commemorating the Spartan athlete Chionis whose athletic career belongs to the mid-seventh century.<sup>313</sup> The erection of such a posthumous monument must have been prompted by a desire to cater to Spartan civic pride.<sup>314</sup>

Closely related to this is the erection of a honorific sculpture in the home town in honour of victorious athletes. According to Lycurg. *Leocr.* 51, this was common practice outside Athens;<sup>315</sup> obviously, this was a considerable honour<sup>316</sup> and a remarkable sign of the pride taken by *poleis* in the victories of its citizens. In fact, a few examples are known of honorific statues set up at home, though not all in the agora:

(1) Kroton (no. 56): according to Paus. 6.13.2, there stood in the sanctuary of Hera Lakinia a statue of the athlete Astylos (Moretti 1957: no. 178 etc.); this statue was, Pausanias relates, pulled down by the Krotoniates when Astylos competed – and worse, won – at Olympia as representative of Syracuse (no. 47). If what Pausanias reports is historical, the statue must have been dedi-

313. Moretti 1957: nos. 42-47.

314. See Mann 2001: 137-38: “Der Sprinter Chionis war im 7. Jahrhundert jeweils dreimal im Stadionlauf und im *diaulos* erfolgreich gewesen. Als der krotoniatische Kurzstreckenläufer Astylos zu Beginn des 5. Jahrhunderts siebenmal den olympischen Kranz errang – dreimal im Stadionlauf, dreimal im *diaulos* und einmal im Waffrenlauf – gaben die Spartaner auf Staatskosten bei Myron eine Siegerstatue in Auftrag und ließen diese in Olympia neben einer Inschriftsstele aufstellen, auf der neben einem Verzeichnis der Siege des Chionis ausdrücklich vermerkt war, daß zu seiner Zeit, im 7. Jahrhundert, der Waffrenlauf als eigene Disziplin noch nicht existiert habe. Diese Bemerkung ist nur als Bezugnahme auf Astylos verständlich und impliziert, daß Chionis, falls es den Waffrenlauf zu seiner Zeit schon gegeben hätte, mehr Siege errungen hätte als der Krotoniate.” Cf. Raschke 1987: 41 and Hodgkinson 1999: 165.

315. εὐρησεται δὲ παρὰ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἀθλητὰς ἀνακειμένους, παρ’ ὧμῖν δὲ στρατηγούς ἀγαθοὺς καὶ τοὺς τὸν τύραννον ἀποκτείναντας. On Athenian practices as regards commemorative athletic statuary in civic space, see Raubitschek 1939 and Seaman 2002.

316. Lycurgus goes on: καὶ τοιοῦτους μὲν ἄνδρας οὐδ’ ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὀλίγους εὐρεῖν ῥάδιον, τοὺς δὲ τοὺς στεφανίτας ἀγῶνας νενικηκότας εὐπετώσ πολλὰ ἄρθρον ἔστι γεγονότας ἰδεῖν.

cated during Astylos' lifetime, but it is not clear whether the monument was erected by himself or by the *polis* of Kroton. Nevertheless, the fact that the Krotoniates pulled down the monument when Astylos competed for a foreign community strongly suggests that even if the statue was in fact a private commemoration, it must have been a focus of civic pride and thus that Kroton identified itself with Astylos or rather the athlete with itself.

(2-3) Lokroi (no. 59): (2) according to Paus. 6.6.4-6 there stood at Olympia a sculpture commemorating Euthymos (Moretti 1957: no. 191 etc.); this sculpture was a work of Pythagoras, a famous sculptor of the early Classical period (Pollitt 1990: 43-44);<sup>317</sup> however, there was also a statue of Euthymos at Lokroi itself (Pliny *NH* 7.152); since Euthymos became the object of hero cult already in the fifth century,<sup>318</sup> the statue at Lokroi may perhaps be connected with the cult, but to judge from Plinius, the statue at Lokroi seems possibly to have preceded his heroisation, and so *may* be honorific;<sup>319</sup> *if* Lokroi had erected the monument at Olympia, it may also have commissioned the sculpture at home, but this would, it must be admitted, have been a most dubious case had it not been for: (3) At Lokroi stood also an *andrias* of the Olympic victor Euthykles (Callim. fr. 84-85, Pf.); his date is unknown, but Moretti 1957: no. 180 dates his victory to 488 and a fifth-century date accords well with the fact that he was heroised (Bohringer 1979: 11). However, it is clear from Callim. fr. 84 *Dieg.* I (Pf.) that his statue at Lokroi preceded his heroisation. That this statue was considered a symbol of the identification between athlete and *polis* is clear as well: When Euthykles was accused of taking bribes to the detriment of the city, it was publicly decided (κατεψηήφ[ισα]ν) to maltreat (αϊκίσασθαι) his statue which was probably itself a public commission.<sup>320</sup>

317. It has been suggested that this monument was erected by the *polis* of Lokroi; cf. *IvO* 144 with Ebert 1972: 70-71 and Lattimore 1988: 250-51.

318. Mylonas 1944: 285-86; Bohringer 1979; Currie 2002.

319. *Patria ei Locri in Italia; imaginem eius ibi et Olympiae alteram eodem die tactas fulmine Callimachum ut nihil aliud miratum video oraculumque iussisse sacrificari, quod et vivo factitatum et mortuo.*

320. Callim. fr. 85.9 (Pf.): εἰκόν]α σὴν αὐτὴ Λοκροῖς ἔθηκε [πόλι]ς. Cf. Kurke 1998: 152.

(4) Pellene (no. 240): according to Paus. 7.27.5, there stood in the *gymnasion* at Pellene a stone monument to Promachos (Moretti 1957: no. 355), explicitly said to have been dedicated by the city (as was a bronze sculpture at Olympia).<sup>321</sup> The date at which the city dedicated these monuments is unknown, but the fourth century seems not impossible.

(5) Phigaleia (no. 292): according to Paus. 8.40.1 there stood in the agora of Phigaleia a statue of the famous Phigaleian pancratiast Arrhachion (Moretti 1957: no. 95 etc.).<sup>322</sup> Pausanias' description of the stance of the sculpture leaves no doubt that what he depicts was an Archaic *kouros*,<sup>323</sup> so even if the erection of the monument was posthumous, it must have taken place within the period under consideration here. Since Arrhachion is not known to have been the object of cult, the sculpture was presumably an honorific monument and its location in the agora – if original – suggests that it was a public commission. In that case, it is the earliest example of this kind of sculpture.<sup>324</sup>

(6) Sparta (no. 345): according to Paus. 3.13.9, there stood at Sparta a presumably honorific statue of Hetoimokles (Moretti 1957: no. 82). There is no indication in Pausanias' text of when and by whom this monument was erected, but it fits well into other evidence for fifth-century commemoration by Sparta of "past Olympic success" (Hodkinson 1999: 165-67), which perhaps even included the establishment of a temple and cult for Hetoimokles' father Hipposthenes (Moretti 1957: no. 61 etc.).

(7) Argos (no. 347): according to Paus. 6.9.3 there was at Rome in the temple of Peace a sculpture of Cheimon (Moretti 1957: no.

321. ἐνταῦθα ἀνὴρ Πελληνέως ἔστηκε Πρόμαχος ὁ Δρύωνος, ἀνελόμενος παγκρατίου νίκας, τὴν μὲν Ὀλυμπίασι, τρεῖς δ' Ἰσθμίων καὶ Νεμέα δύο· καὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνας ποιήσαντες οἱ Πελληνεῖς τὴν μὲν ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν ἀνέθεσαν, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ, λίθου ταύτην καὶ οὐ χαλκοῦ.

322. Φιγαλεῦσι δὲ ἀνδριάς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς Ἀρραχίωνος τοῦ παγκρατιαστοῦ, τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀρχαῖος καὶ οὐχ ἤκιστα ἐπὶ τῷ σχήματι· οὐ διεστᾶσι μὲν πολὺ οἱ πόδες, καθεῖνται δὲ παρὰ πλευρᾶν αἱ χεῖρες ἄχρι τῶν γλουτῶν. πεποιήται μὲν δὴ ἡ εἰκὼν λίθου κτλ.

323. Lattimore 1988: 250, 254; Jost 1998 *ad loc.*

324. A fragmentary Archaic sculpture of the *kouros* type has been found at Phigaleia (Richter 1970: Figs. 144-46), but it is not to be identified with the sculpture depicted by Pausanias: Richter 1970: 77; Ridgway 1977: 47, 74 (suggesting that the sculpture represents Apollo), Morgan 1999: 410.

298, victory: 448) brought there from Argos, the home *polis* of Cheimon. The sculpture was a work of Naukydes, a sculptor of the high Classical period (Pollitt 1990: 79-80). Since another monument commemorating Cheimon – also a work by Naukydes – stood at Olympia (Paus. 6.9.3), the one brought from Argos to Rome was presumably originally also erected at Argos; it is, however, unknown whether it was commissioned by the *polis* of Argos.

(8) Thasos (no. 526): according to Dio Chrys. 31.95, an *andrias* of Theogenes, son of Timoxenos<sup>325</sup> (Moretti 1957: no. 201) stood at Thasos ἐν μέσῃ τῆ πόλει, “in the middle of the city”, i.e. in the agora (Pouilloux 1954: 64 n. 5, 75). From Paus. 6.11.6 it appears that it was a bronze sculpture and that its existence predated the cult of Theogenes (6.11.8; cf. Pouilloux 1954: 82, 104) and the passages in both Paus. and Dio Chrys. strongly suggest that the statue existed at least shortly after the death of the athlete (cf. Pouilloux 1954: 75; Lattimore 1988: 250). It was thus in all probability an honorific monument commemorating his athletic victories (Pouilloux 1954: 104) and its location in the agora suggests that it was a public commission.

Clearly, athletic victories by their citizens were cherished by *poleis* which considered such victories their own victories. Accordingly, other honours than honorific sculptures are known to have been bestowed on victorious athletes. Thus, Xenophanes, in his famous critique of athletic adulation, clearly knows of *proedria* (“the privilege ... of sitting in the front seats at games and festivals” (Bowra 1938: 283)) as a reward for victory granted by *poleis* (fr. 2.7, West: καί κε προεδρίην φανεράν ἐν ἀγῶσιν ἄροίτο) and *proedria* was very probably among the rewards that Athens (no. 361) bestowed on its victors.<sup>326</sup> Also referred to by Xenophanes is public entertainment (fr. 2.8-9: σῆτ' εἴη δημοσίων κτεάνων / ἐκ πόλεως; “the ... privilege ... of being fed at public expense” for life (Bowra 1938: 274)) and this privilege is again attested for Classical Athens in the form of entertainment in the *prytaneion*, the building symbolising the life of the *polis* (above

325. On the form of his name, see Pouilloux 1954: 63 n. 4.

326. Kyle 1987: 147. Cf. Bowra 1938: 273-74. For general references by Classical sources to the honours bestowed on Athenian *Olympionikai*, see Isoc. 16.49 and Dem. 20.141.



52) and thus probably the greatest honour the *polis* had to bestow.<sup>327</sup> As a final example of honorific gestures we may mention the honour shown Exainetos (Moretti 1957: nos. 341 & 346) by the *polis* of Akragas (no. 9) in 412: When this athlete returned home after his second triumph in the Olympic *stadion* race he was magnificently wellcomed, being escorted at his entrance by chariot into the city by a chariot procession of the Akragantines – “three hundred chariots each drawn by two white horses” – a clear testimony to the public importance attached to his victory.<sup>328</sup>

In addition to such honorific gestures, at least some *poleis* rewarded their victors with cash payments: Xenophanes (fr. 2., West) has a general reference to such payments: δῶρον ὃ οἱ κειμήλιον εἶη (9; “a gift which will be a treasure to him”); and known historical examples may include Sybaris (no. 70)<sup>329</sup> and Athens (no. 361): even if the historicity of the reports that Solon legislated a reduction of the payments to be made to victors<sup>330</sup> may perhaps be open to doubt, the recent discussion by Mann (2001: 68-81) accepts the historicity of the reform and thus of the existence of such awards at Athens. Such financial awards were also honorific (Mann 2001: 78) and intended to turn the victory of the individual citizen athlete into a victory of the community (Mann 2001: 79) and to sharpen the identity of the *polis* bestowing such honours (Mann 2001: 80).

Though we have no examples before the early Hellenistic period of *poleis* subsidising athletes prior to victory (Mann 2001: 78) we hear of other ways in which *poleis* employed public finances in attempts to secure victory. Thus we know that *poleis* at least occasionally entered public hippic teams at Olympia: (1)

327. IG I<sup>3</sup> 131 (ca. 440-432; on this decree, see Morrissey 1978 and Thompson 1979.); Pl. *Ap.* 36d.

328. Diod. Sic. 13.82.7: καὶ κατὰ τὴν προτέραν δὲ ταύτης Ὀλυμπιάδα, δευτέραν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐνετήκοντα, νικήσαντος Ἐξαινέτου Ἀκραγαντίνου, κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐφ’ ἄρματος· συνεπόμενον δ’ αὐτῷ χωρὶς τῶν ἄλλων συναρίδες τριακόσαι λευκῶν ἵππων. On the significance of chariot processions, see Sinos 1993: 75-78.

329. See Young 1983: 48, Young 1984: 131 and Mann 2001: 72, both commenting on CEG 394 of the first half of the sixth century. Cf. Pleket 1975: 80.

330. Plut. *Sol.* 23.3; Diog. Laert. 1.55.

According to Phlegon (*FGrHist* 257 fr. 6 *apud* Steph. Byz. 245.17),<sup>331</sup> a public team of Dyspontion (no. 250) was victorious in 672 (Moretti 1957: no. 39). There is a textual problem in Stephanus (cf. Meineke's app. crit. *ad loc.*), and the early date to which this victory is assigned may cast doubt on its historicity; but two similar public teams are attested for the fifth century: (2) *Pap Oxy* 222.6 under 480 lists the victorious race horse as [Ἀργ]είων δημόσιος κέλης ('the public race horse of the Argives'); and (3) under 476 at 222.31 the victorious chariot is listed as [Ἀργ]είων δημόσιον τέθριππον ('the public chariot of the Argives'). Apparently, the quality of the public horses of Argos was well-known; for among the seven chariots entered by Alkibiades of Athens in the 416 Games was one which had been bought from the *polis* of Argos,<sup>332</sup> and it may even have been this one which was victorious.<sup>333</sup> So, the *polis* of Argos still possessed public horses in the late fifth century and it is worthy of note that Isoc. 16.34 compares Alkibiades' performance in 416 not with that of other individuals, but with that of "even the greatest of *poleis*",<sup>334</sup> which should indicate that public entrances were not an unknown phenomenon in the early fourth century, the probable date of the speech. Finally, the Lichas incident of 420 (above 34-4, 87 n. 293) provides a fourth example of a public hippic entrance, since Lichas' team was entered in the name of Thebes (no. 221).

Another way in which a *polis* could secure victory by financial means was to buy a victory from a victorious athlete, as Ephesos (no. 844) did in 384 when it paid the victor Sotades (Moretti 1957:

331. Ηλείων ἐκ Δυσποντίου τέθριππον. On this fragment, see Nielsen 2005: 65-66.

332. Isocr. 16.1 (πριάμενος παρὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ἀργείων); Plut. *Alc.* 13.2 (ἄρμα δημόσιον Ἀργείως).

333. This would seem to be the implication of Diod. Sic. 13.74.3: Διομήδους γὰρ τινος τῶν φίλων συμπέψαντος αὐτῷ τέθριππον εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν, ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης κατὰ τὴν ἀπογραφὴν τὴν εἰωθυῖαν γίνεσθαι τοὺς ἵππους ἰδίου ἀπεγράψατο, καὶ νικήσας τὸ τέθριππον τὴν τ' ἐκ τῆς νίκης δόξαν αὐτὸς ἀπηνέγκατο καὶ τοὺς ἵππους οὐκ ἀπέδωκε τῷ πιστεύσαντι.

334. ζεύγη γὰρ καθήκε τσαυτα μὲν τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὅσοις οὐδ' αἰ μέγιστα τῶν πόλεων ἠγωνίσαντο.

no. 398) of an unknown Kretan *polis* to accept Ephesian citizenship.<sup>335</sup>

What all this implies is, of course, that the athletic success of its citizens reflected back on the *polis*, and that the Olympic Games were not only competitions among individual athletes but also competitions among the *poleis* that they represented. Consequently, *poleis* were greatly distressed if their athletes were 'dishonoured' by the Eleian authorities in charge of the Games: According to Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21, a contributory reason for the Spartan war on Elis in the late fifth/early fourth century were the whiplashes meted out to Lichas in 420 (above 34), and in the later fourth century the Athenians boycotted the Games because the Eleians had fined an Athenian athlete, Kallippos (Moretti 1957: no. 460), and were unwilling to revoke the fine despite official Athenian pressure on them to do so (above n. 291). Nor were athletes spared if they seemed disloyal to their home *polis*: Sotades, who sold himself off to Ephesos in 384, was punished with exile.<sup>336</sup>

As a final example of the close identification between athlete and *polis* mention may be made of Isoc. 16.33 where the logographer has Alkibiades Junior say of his famous father that "although in natural gifts and in strength of body he was inferior to none, he disdained the gymnastic contests, for he knew that some of the athletes were of low birth, inhabitants of petty states, and of mean education" (Loeb).<sup>337</sup> It may well be true that there is a good deal of rhetorical distortion in the views here ascribed

335. Paus. 6.18.6: Σωπιάδης δὲ ἐπὶ δολίχου νίκαις ὀλυμπιάδι μὲν ἐνάτη καὶ ἐνενηκοστῇ Κρής, καθάπερ γε καὶ ἦν, ἀνερχήθη, τῇ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ δὲ λαβῶν χρήματα παρὰ τοῦ Ἐφεσίων κοινού Ἐφεσίους ἐσεποίησεν αὐτόν. For a failed attempt by Dionysios I of Syracuse to induce a victorious Milesian athlete to have himself proclaimed as a Syracusan, see Paus. 6.2.6. Note also *I.Ephesos* 1415 (C41-C3e), a decree conferring Ephesian citizenship on a metic, who had let himself be proclaimed an Ephesian ([ἀνα]γγελεῖς Ἐφέσιος ἐστεφάνωκε τὴν πόλιν (7)) at the victory ceremony after a Nemean victory in boys' boxing.

336. Paus. 6.18.6.

337. οὐδενὸς ἀφύεστερος οὐδ' ἄρρωστότερος τῷ σώματι γενόμενος τοὺς μὲν γυμνικούς ἀγῶνας ὑπερεῖδεν, εἰδῶς ἐνίους τῶν ἀθλητῶν καὶ κακῶς γεγονότας καὶ μικρὰς πόλεις οἰκοῦντας καὶ ταπεινῶς πεπαιδευμένους κτλ.

to Alkibiades,<sup>338</sup> but it is obviously based on the idea that the (lack of) prestige of a given *polis* reflects back on its athletes<sup>339</sup> – whose successes again reflected back on the *polis*.

There can be no doubt, then, that athletes competed as representatives of their *poleis*, that they were identified with their *poleis* and that *poleis* were identified with their athletes. The conclusion to be drawn from this discussion of Hellenic interaction at Olympia is that Olympia and the Olympic Games in the Classical period was one of the institutions, i.e. provided one of the socio-political arenas in which the great multitude of Hellenic *poleis* competed with each other through their dedications and their athletes and in this way ideologically constructed and sharpened their own peculiar local identity and existence.

---

338. Pritchard 2003: 327-28.

339. Young 1984: 101.

## VII. Conclusion

What I have attempted to argue and illustrate in this study is, to sum up by way of conclusion, the following: Olympia was an institution of crucial importance to the Hellenic city-state culture. It was an institution which helped create and maintain a degree of *similarity* in the enormous diversity produced by the existence of more than a thousand highly individual and radically self-differentiated *poleis*; and it was an institution which contributed to the formation and maintenance of *diversity* within the similarity which it itself promoted. In other words, at Olympia was confirmed and continuously reconfirmed the overall Hellenic identity in which all Hellenic *poleis* shared *and* the local identities of the individual *poleis* by which they were marked out as individual and unique each in their own way.

*Similarity* was produced by Olympia by providing one of the means by which the Hellenes continuously (re)drew the boundary between themselves and 'the Barbarians', thus creating and reconfirming the Hellenic identity. Three points are of importance here. First, athletics were in the Classical Hellenic view a uniquely and characteristically Hellenic phenomenon and, notably, when Herodotos came across Hellenic style athletics in Egypt he accepted as an explanation of his curious finding that the Egyptians in question had in fact imported their athletics *from Hellas*. The importance of Olympia here lies in the simple fact that it was the most prominent of all Hellenic athletic arenas. Second, the Olympic Games were *ethnically exclusive*, since only Hellenes were admitted to the competitions. It seems a not unreasonable assumption that this ethnic exclusiveness developed as a consequence of or was intensified by the Hellenic conflicts with the Persians, and the occasion which prompted the explicit formulation of the exclusive principle may have been the discussions caused by the participation of Alexander I of Macedon, a Persian ally whose Hellenic credentials could be (and were) contested. Third, athletics made vividly visible the difference between Hellenes and Barbarians, since Hellenes competed in the nude whereas the Barbarians who did practice athletics did *not* so compete. In brief, Olympia was the most

distinguished and most well-visited arena for the specifically Hellenic phenomenon of (nude) athletics and in this way it constituted an institution which contributed to the drawing of the boundary between the Hellenic world and the Barbarians.

Internal *diversity*, on the other hand, was also created and maintained at Olympia, where the innumerable *poleis* emphasised their individuality by competition through their dedications and their athletes. One *polis* was exceptionally intimately related to Olympia, the administrator of the sanctuary: Elis; in fact, Eleian identity was so closely connected with Olympia that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between *polis* and sanctuary. It seems that Elis in fact attempted actively to blur that distinction by treating the sanctuary as a second administrative centre of the *polis*, thus turning Elis into an unusual bicentral *polis*. But practically all Hellenic *poleis* exploited Olympia as a forum in which to sharpen and emphasise their individual identities. Counting merely from the evidence discussed in this study – which has been collected not with the ambition of completeness but primarily in order to illustrate – at least 102 *poleis*<sup>340</sup> from practically most parts of the Hellenic world can be

---

340. (1) Aitna (no. 8); (2) Akragas (no. 9); (3) Gela (no. 17); (4) Himera (no. 24); (5) Kamarina (no. 28); (6) Selinous (no. 44); (7) Syracuse (no. 47); (8) Zankle/Messana (no. 51); (9) Hipponion (no. 53); (10) Kaulonia (no. 55); (11) Kroton (no. 56); (12) Lokroi (no. 59); (13) Medma (no. 60); (14) Metapontion (no. 61); (15) Poseidonia (no. 66); (16) Rhegion (no. 68); (17) Siris (no. 69); (18) Sybaris (no. 70); (19) Taras (no. 71); (20) Terina (no. 73); (21) Thourioi (no. 74); (22) Apollonia (no. 77); (23) Epidamnos (no. 79); (24) Ambrakia (no. 113); (25) Korkyra (no. 123); (26) Stratos (no. 138); (27) Myania (no. 164); (28) Naupaktos (no. 165); (29) Koroneia (no. 210); (30) Orchomenos (no. 213); (31) Tanagra (no. 220); (32) Thebes (no. 221); (33) Thespiiai (no. 222); (34) Megara (no. 225); (35) Korinthos (no. 227); (36) Sikyon (no. 228); (37) Aigion (no. 231); (38) Patrai (no. 239); (39) Pellene (no. 240); (40) Alasyaion (no. 245); (41) Amphidolia (no. 247); (42) Anaitoi (no. 248); (43) Chaladrioi (no. 249); (44) Dyspontion (no. 250); (45) Elis (no. 251); (46) Ewaoioi (no. 253); (47) Letrinoi (no. 258); (48) Metapioi (no. 260); (49) Pisatai (no. 262); (50) Alea (no. 265); (51) Dipaia (no. 268); (52) Heraia (no. 274); (53) Kleitor (no. 276); (54) Mantinea (no. 281); (55) Methydrion (no. 283); (56) Oresthasion (no. 287); (57) Paion (no. 288); (58) Pheneos (no. 291); (59) Phigaleia (no. 292); (60) Psophis (no. 294); (61) Stymphalos (no. 296); (62) Thelphousa (no. 300); (63) Trapezous (no. 303); (64) Lepreon (no. 306); (65) Skillous (no. 311); (66) Messene (no. 318); (67) Sparta (no. 345); (68) Argos (no. 347); (69) Epidauros (no. 348); (70) Kleonai (no. 351); (71) Tiryns (no. 356); (72) Troizen (no. 357); (73) Aigina

shown to have had relations with Olympia, and in view of the fragmentary state of the evidence this is a significant number: it is, after all, some 10% of all *poleis* included in Hansen & Nielsen 2004.

The Olympic competitions were conceived of not merely as competitions between individual athletes but as competitions between *poleis* which eagerly exploited this opportunity to add to their prestige. In other words, Olympia generated an extremely intense and extensive interaction among the Hellenic *poleis*, which were thus enabled to emphasise their individuality. Olympia was a well-suited scene for this interaction since it was, at least during the festivals, the best-visited sanctuary in all of Hellas where enormous numbers of official delegates, athletes and spectators assembled; and the visitors to Olympia were ideologically construed as 'the Hellenes' as such. So what the crowds at Olympia witnessed was one of the socio-political processes by which the Hellenes demonstrated that they were not only Hellenes but also Mantineans, Kyrenaian, Lepreatans and even Myanians.<sup>341</sup>

---

(no. 358); (74) Athens (no. 361); (75) Chalkis (no. 365); (76) Eretria (no. 370); (77) Opous (no. 386); (78) Krannon (no. 400); (79) Larisa (no. 401); (80) Skoutoussa (no. 415); (81) Kos Meropis (no. 499); (82) Melos (no. 505); (83) Thasos (no. 526); (84) Maroneia (no. 646); (85) Chersonesos (no. 661); (86) Byzantion (no. 674); (87) Herakleia (no. 715); (88) Lampsakos (no. 748); (89) Tenedos (no. 793); (90) Mytilene (no. 798); (91) Elaia (no. 807); (92) Chios (no. 840); (93) Ephesos (no. 844); (94) Kolophon (no. 848); (95) Magnesia (no. 852); (96) Miletos (no. 854); (97) Samos (no. 864); (98) Halikarnassos (no. 886); (99) Ialysos (no. 995); (100) Rhodos (no. 1000); (101) Barke (no. 1025); (102) Kyrene (no. 1028).

341. I would like to thank not only the anonymous referee of the Royal Academy but also my friends and colleagues Drs David Bloch and Adam Schwartz as well as Prof. Mark Golden, Prof. Ted Buttrey and Prof. Stephen G. Miller who all kindly read drafts of this study, made incisive comments and saved me from numerous errors.







# Abbreviations etc.

## Ancient authors and their works

- Andoc. = Andokides  
*AnthPal* = *Anthologia Palatina*  
Ar. = Aristophanes  
    *Plut.* = *Ploutos*  
Arist. = Aristotle  
    *Pol.* = *Politica*  
Ath. = Athenaios  
Callim. = Kallimachos  
Cic. = Cicero  
    *Tusc. disp.* = *Tusculanae disputationes*  
Dem. = Demosthenes  
Din. = Deinarchos  
Dio Chrys. = Dion Chrysostomos  
Diod. Sic. = Diodorus Siculus  
Diog. Laert. = Diogenes Laertios  
Dion. Hal. = Dionysios of Halikarnassos  
    *Ant. Rom.* = *Antiquitates Romanae*  
*Etym. Magn.* = *Etymologicum Magnum*  
Euseb. = Eusebios  
    *Chron.* = *Chronica*  
Heracl. Lemb. = Herakleides Lembos  
Hdt. = Herodotos  
Hom. = Homer  
    *Il.* = *Iliad*  
    *Od.* = *Odyssey*  
*Hom. Hym. Herm.* = The Homeric Hymn to Hermes  
Isidore of Seville  
    *Etym.* = *Etymologiae*  
Isoc. = Isokrates  
Just. = Justinus  
    *Epit.* = *Epitome (of Trogus)*  
Luc. = Lucian  
    *Peregr.* = *De morte peregrini*  
Lycurg. = Lykourgos  
    *Leocr.* = *Contra Leocratem*

Paus. = Pausanias

Pind. = Pindar

*Isthm.* = *Isthmian ode*

*Nem.* = *Nemean ode*

*Ol.* = *Olympic ode*

Pl. = Plato

*Ap.* = *Apologia Socratis*

*Hp. mi.* = *Hippias Minor*

*Phaed.* = *Phaedrus*

*Phd.* = *Phaedo*

Pliny

*NH* = *Naturalis historia*

Plut. = Plutarch

*Alc.* = *Alcibiades*

*Sol.* = *Solon*

Simonid. = Simonides

Steph. Byz. = Stephanus Byzantius

Theocr. = Theokritos

Thuc. = Thoukydides

Xen. = Xenophon

*Ages.* = *Agesilaos*

*An.* = *Anabasis*

*Hell.* = *Hellenika*

*Mem.* = *Memorabilia*

### Other abbreviations etc.

*BCH* = *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*.

Budé = Collection des universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.

C = century, and, e.g.: C5e: early fifth century; C5m: middle of the fifth century; C5l: late fifth century; C5f: first half of fifth century; C5s: second half of fifth century.

*CEG* = *Carmina epigraphica Graeca*, ed. P.A. Hansen, 2 vols. (Berlin & New York 1983-89).

*DK* = *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*<sup>6</sup>, eds. H. Diels & W. Kranz (Berlin 1952).

*FGrHist* = *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby (Leiden 1923-).

fr. = fragment.

- HCT = A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, & K.J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 5 vols. (Oxford 1945-81).
- IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin 1873 -).
- GGM = *Geographi Graeci Minores*, ed. C. Müller, 2 vols. (Paris 1855-61).
- I.Ephesos = *Die Inschriften von Ephesos I-VII*, eds. H. Wankel, R. Merkelbach *et al.* (IGSK Band 11-17, Bonn 1979-81).
- IvO = *Inschriften von Olympia*, eds. W. Dittenberger & K. Purgold (Berlin 1896).
- KA = *Poetae Comici Graeci*, eds. R. Kassel & A. Austin, 8 vols. (Berlin & New York 1983-2001).
- Kock = *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*, ed. T. Kock, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1880-88).
- LGPN = *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*.
- Loeb = Loeb Classical Library.
- LSJ = Liddell & Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*<sup>9</sup>, rev. H. Stuart Jones (1925-40).
- Meiggs & Lewis, GHI = R. Meiggs & D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1988).
- Michel, *Recueil* = C. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques* (Brussels 1897-1900).
- MW = *Hesiodi fragmenta selecta*, eds. R. Merkelbach & M.L. West in F. Solmsen (ed.), *Hesiodi Theogonia. Opera et Dies. Scutum* (Oxford 1970).
- Nomima = *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec I-II*, eds. H. van Effenterre & F. Ruzé. Collection de l'école française de Rome 188 (Rome 1994-95).
- Obv. = obverse.
- OCD<sup>3</sup> = *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, eds. S. Hornblower & A. Spawforth (Oxford 1996).
- ÖJh = *Jahreshefte der Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien*.
- Pap Oxy = *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (1898 -).
- PECS = *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, eds. R. Stillwell *et al.* (Princeton 1976).
- RE = *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, eds. A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, & W. Kroll (1893-1978).
- Rev. = reverse.
- Schol. = scholion.
- SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.
- Staatsverträge = *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums II*, ed. H. Bengtson (Munich 1962).

*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*<sup>3</sup>, ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig 1915-24).

West = M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1992).

# Bibliography

- Arieti, J.A. 1975. "Nudity in Greek Athletics," *The Classical World* 68: 431-36.
- Bauslaugh, R.A. 1990. "Messenian Dialect and Dedications by 'Methanionoi'," *Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 59: 661-68.
- Bohringer, F. 1979. "Cultes d'athlètes en Grèce classique; propos politiques, discours mythiques," *Revue des études anciennes* 81: 5-18.
- Bol, P.C. 1974, "Die Giebelskulpturen des Schatzhauses von Megara," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 89: 64-75.
- Bölte, F. 1948. "Triphylia," *RE* VII: 186-201.
- Bonfante, L. 1989. "Nudity as a Costume in Classical Art," *American Journal of Archaeology* 93: 543-70.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1988. *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge).
- Bowra, C.M. 1938. "Xenophanes and the Olympic Games," *American Journal of Philology* 59: 257-79.
- Bravi, L. 2001. "L'epigramma simonideo per il pugile Casmilo di Rodi (XXXI Page)," *Nikephoros* 14: 11-19.
- Broneer, O. 1962. "The Isthmian Victory Crown," *American Journal of Archaeology* 66: 259-63.
- Brown, T.S. 1983. "Herodotus' View on Athletics," *The Ancient World* 7: 17-29.
- Bruit Zaidman, L. & Schmitt Pantel, P. 1992. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*. Translated by P. Cartledge (Cambridge).
- Brunt, P.A. 1953-54. "The Hellenic League against Persia," *Historia* 2: 135-63.
- Buckler, J. 1980. *The Theban Hegemony 371-362 BC* (Cambridge Massachusetts and London).
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Bury, J.B. 1892. *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London).
- Cairns, F. 1991. "Some Reflections of the Ranking of the Major Games in Fifth Century B.C. Epinician Poetry," in A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Achaia und Elis in der Antike. Meletemata* 13 (Athens) 95-98.
- Cartledge, P. 1987. *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta* (London).
- Cartledge, P. 1993. *The Greeks. A Portrait of Self and Other* (Oxford & New York).

- Cartledge, P. & Spawforth, A. 1989. *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta. A Tale of Two Cities* (London & New York).
- Cole, S.G. 1995. "Civic Cult and Civic Identity," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 72 (Copenhagen) 292-325.
- Coulton, J.J. 1976. *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa* (Oxford).
- Crowther, N.B. 1982. "Athletic Dress and Nudity in Greek Athletics," *Eranos. Acta philologica suecana* 80: 163-68.
- Crowther, N.B. 1988. "Elis and the Games," *L'Antiquité classique* 57: 301-10.
- Crowther, N.B. 1996. "Athlete and State: Qualifying for the Olympic Games in Ancient Greece," *Journal of Sport History* 23.1: 34-43.
- Crowther, N.B. 1997. "'Sed quis custodiet ip̄os custodes?' The Impartiality of the Olympic Judges and the Case of Leon of Ambracia," *Nikephoros* 10: 149-60.
- Crowther, N.B. 2003a. "Elis and Olympia: City, Sanctuary and Politics," in D. Phillips & D. Pritchard (eds.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea) 61-73.
- Crowther, N.B. 2003b. "Power and Politics at the Ancient Olympic Games: Pisa and the Games of 364 B.C.," *Stadion. Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Sport und der Körperkultur* 29: 1-10.
- Crowther, N.B. 2004. *Athletika. Studies on the Olympic Games and Greek Athletics*. Nikephoros Beihefte 11 (Hildesheim).
- Crowther, N.B. & Frass, M. 1998. "Flogging as a Punishment in the Ancient Games," *Nikephoros* 11: 51-82.
- Currie, B. 2002. "Euthydemos of Locri: A Case Study in Heroization in the Classical Period," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 122: 24-44.
- de Ste. Croix, G.E.M. 1972. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London).
- Demand, N.H. 1996. "Poleis on Cyprus and Oriental Despotism," in M.H. Hansen & K. Raaflaub (eds.), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 3. *Historia Einzelschriften* 108 (Stuttgart) 7-15.
- Dillon, M. 1997. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* (London).
- Drees, L. 1968. *Olympia. Gods, Artists and Athletes* (London).
- Duchêne, H. 1992. *La stèle du port*. Fouille du port 1. *Recherches sur une nouvelle inscription thasienne*. Études thasiennes XIV (Paris).
- Dušanić, S. 1970. *The Arcadian League of the Fourth Century* (Belgrade).

- Dušanić, S. 1979. "Arkadika," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 94: 117-35.
- Ebert, J. 1972. *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse 63 (Berlin).
- Ebert, J. & Siewert, P. 1999. "Eine archaische Bronzeurkunde aus Olympia mit Vorschriften für Ringkämpfer und Kampfrichter," *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 11: 391-412.
- Eder, B. & Mitsopoulos-Leon, V. 1999. "Zur Geschichte der Stadt Elis vor dem Synoikismos von 471 v. Chr.," *Jahreshefte der Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien, Beiblatt* 68: 1-40.
- Erath, G. 1999. "Heiligtümer und Kulte Nordostarkadiens. Der archäologische Befund," in K. Tausend (ed.), *Pheneos und Lousoi. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Topographie Nordostarkadiens* (Frankfurt am Main) 238-46.
- Eriksen, T.H. 1993. *Ethnicity & Nationalism. Anthropological Perspectives* (London).
- Evjen, H.D. 1992. "The Origins and Functions of Formal Athletic competition in the Ancient World," in W. Coulson & H. Kyrieleis (eds.), *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympic Games* (Athens) 95-104.
- Falkner, C. 1996. "Sparta and the Elean War, ca. 401/400 B.C.: Revenge or Imperialism?," *Phoenix. The Classical Association of Canada* 50: 17-25.
- Farnell, L.R. 1932. *The Works of Pindar. Critical Commentary* (London).
- Finley, M.I. 1979. *Ancient Sicily*, rev. ed. (London).
- Fischer-Hansen, T. 2000. "Ergasteria in the Western Greek World," in P. Flensted-Jensen et al. (eds.), *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000* (Copenhagen) 91-120.
- Fossey, J.M. 1994. "Boiotian Decrees of Proxenia," in J.M. Fossey (ed.), *Boiotia Antiqua IV* (Amsterdam) 35-59.
- Fowler, R.L. 1998. "Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the Creation of the Hellenes," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 44: 1-19.
- Frederiksen, R. 1997. *Det græske teater i tiden indtil ca. 300 – en analyse af arkitektur og funktion*. MA Thesis, University of Copenhagen.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2000. "The Synoikized Polis of Rhodes," in P. Flensted-Jensen et al. (eds.), *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000* (Copenhagen) 177-205.



- Gardiner, E.N. 1910. *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London).
- Gardiner, E.N. 1925. *Olympia. Its History and Remains* (Oxford).
- Gauer, W. 1968. *Weihgeschenke aus den Perserkriegen* (Tübingen).
- Gebhard, E.R. "The Evolution of a Pan-Hellenic Sanctuary: From Archaeology towards History at Isthmia," in N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches* (London & New York) 154-77.
- Geffcken, J. 1916. *Griechische Epigramme* (Heidelberg).
- Giangiulio, M. 1993. "Le città di Magna Grecia e Olimpia in età arcaica. Aspetti della documentazione e della problematica storica," in A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *I grandi santuari della Grecia e l'Occidente* (Trento) 93-118.
- Gneisz, D. 1990. *Das antike Rathaus. Das griechische Bouleuterion und die frühromische Curia* (Vienna).
- Golden, M. 1998. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- Griffith, G.T. 1950. "The Union of Corinth and Argos (392-386 B.C.)," *Historia* 1: 236-56.
- Habicht, C. 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley).
- Habicht, C. 1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, transl. by D.L. Schneider (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London).
- Hall, J.M. 1995. "How 'Argive' Was the 'Argive' Heraion? The Political and Cultic Geography of the Argive Plain, 900-400 B.C.," *American Journal of Archaeology* 99: 577-613.
- Hall, J.M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge).
- Hall, J.M. 2000. "Sparta, Lakedaimon and the Nature of Perioikic Dependency," in P. Flensted-Jensen (ed.), *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 5. *Historia Einzelschriften* 138 (Stuttgart) 73-89.
- Hall, J.M. 2002. *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago & London).
- Hammond, N.G.L. & Griffith, G.T. 1979. *A History of Macedonia. II. 550-336 B.C.* (Oxford).
- Hansen, M.H. 1995a. "Boiotian *Poleis* – A Test Case," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 72 (Copenhagen) 13-63.
- Hansen, M.H. 1995b. "Kome. A Study in How the Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements which were Not *Poleis*," in M.H. Hansen & K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. *Historia Einzelschriften* 95 (Stuttgart) 45-81.

- Hansen, M.H. 1996. "An Inventory of Boiotian Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 3. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 74 (Copenhagen) 73-116.
- Hansen, M.H. 1997. "The Polis as an Urban Centre. The Literary and Epigraphical Evidence," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 4. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 75 (Copenhagen) 9-86.
- Hansen, M.H. 2000a. "The Concepts of City-State and City-State Culture," in Hansen (2000b) 11-34.
- Hansen, M.H. (ed.). 2000b. *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures. An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 21 (Copenhagen).
- Hansen, M.H. 2000c. "The Hellenic Polis," in Hansen (2000b) 141-87.
- Hansen, M.H. (ed.). 2002. *A Comparative Study of Six City-State Cultures. An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 27 (Copenhagen).
- Hansen, M.H. 2006. *The Shotgun Method. The Demography of the Ancient Greek City-State Culture* (Columbia & London).
- Hansen, M.H. & Fischer-Hansen, T. 1994. "Monumental Political Architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis. Evidence and Historical Significance," in D. Whitehead (ed.), *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius. Sources for the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 1. *Historia Einzelschriften* 87 (Stuttgart) 23-90.
- Hansen, M.H. & Nielsen, T.H. (eds.). 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford).
- Harris, H.A. 1964. *Greek Athletes and Greek Athletics* (London).
- Head, B.V. 1911. *Historia Numorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics*<sup>2</sup>, repr. by Spink & Son Ltd., London 1963.
- Herrmann, H.-V. 1974. "Zanes," *RE Suppl.* XIV: 977-81.
- Herrmann, H.-V. 1988. "Die Siegerstatuen von Olympia," *Nikephoros* 1: 119-83.
- Hill, G.F. 1906. *Historical Greek Coins* (London).

- Hodkinson, S. 1999. "An Agonistic Culture? Athletic Competition in Archaic and Classical Spartan Society," in S. Hodkinson & A. Powell (eds.), *Sparta. New Perspectives* (London) 147-87.
- Hornblower, S. 1991. *The Greek World 479-323 BC<sup>2</sup>* (London & New York).
- Hornblower, S. 1994. "Introduction," in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 1-72.
- Hornblower, S. 1996. *A Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. II: Books IV-V.24* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. 2000. "Thucydides, Xenophon, and Lichas: Were the Spartans Excluded from the Olympic Games from 420 to 400 B.C.?" *Phoenix* 54: 212-25.
- Hornblower, S. 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar. Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry* (Oxford).
- Huxley, G. 1975. *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast).
- How, W.W. & Wells, J. 1912. *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Hyde, W.W. 1911. "Greek Literary Notices of Olympic Victor Monuments outside Olympia," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 43: 53-67.
- Ioakimidou, C. 2000. "Auch wir sind Griechen! Statuenreihen westgriechischer Kolonisten in Delphi und Olympia," *Nikephoros* 13: 63-94.
- Isaac, B. 1986. *The Greek Settlements in Thrace until the Macedonian Conquest* (Leiden).
- Jackson, A.H. 1983. "Some Deliberate Damage to Archaic Helmets Dedicated at Olympia," *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 8.2: 22-27.
- Jackson, A.H. 1991. "Hoplites and the Gods: The Dedication of Captured Arms and Armour," in V.D. Hansen (ed.), *Hoplites. The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London & New York) 228-49.
- Jacquemin, A. 1999. "Commentaire," in M. Casevitz & J. Pouilloux, *Pausanias. Description de la Grèce. Tome V. Livre V. L'Elide (I)* (Paris) 83-264.
- Jacquemin, A. 2002. "Commentaire," in M. Casevitz & J. Pouilloux, *Pausanias. Description de la Grèce. Tome VI. Livre VI. L'Elide (II)* (Paris) 83-311.
- Jenkins, G.K. 1990. *Ancient Greek Coins<sup>2</sup>* (London).
- Jost, M. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* (Paris).
- Jost, M. 1996. "Les cultes dans une ville nouvelle d'Arcadie au I<sup>ve</sup> siècle: Megalopolis," in P. Carlier (ed.), *Le I<sup>ve</sup> siècle av. J.C. Approches historiographiques* (Paris) 103-9.
- Jost, M. 1998. "Commentaire," in M. Casevitz & J. Marcadé, *Pausanias. Description de la Grèce. Livre VIII: L'Arcadie* (Paris) 161-293.

- Jung, M. 2006. *Marathon und Plataiai. Zwei Perserschlachten als "lieux de mémoire" im antiken Griechenland* (Göttingen).
- Kagan, D. 1987. *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca & London).
- Konstan, D. 1987. "Persians, Greeks and Empire," *Arethusa* 20.1-2: 59-73.
- Konstan, D. 2001. "To Hellenikon ethnos," in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Washington) 29-50.
- Kraay, C.M. 1976. *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London).
- Krentz, P. 2002. "Fighting by the Rules: The Invention of the Hoplite Agon," *Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 71: 23-39.
- Kunze, E. 1956. "Schildbeschläge," *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 5: 35-74.
- Kunze, E. 1961. "Ein Bronzehelm aus der Perserbeute," *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 7: 129-37.
- Kunze, E. 1973. "Waffenweihungen," *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 8: 83-110.
- Kurke, L. 1998. "The Economy of Kudos," in C. Dougherty & L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics* (Oxford) 131-63.
- Kyle, D.G. 1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden).
- Lacroix, L. 1964. "Quelques aspects de la numismatique sicyonienne," *Revue Belge de Numismatique et de Sigillographie* 110: 5-52.
- Lacroix, L. 1967. "Les monnaies de Mantinée et les traditions arcadiennes," *BACadRoyBelg* 53: 303-11.
- Lacroix, L. 1975. "Les types des monnaies grecques," in J.-M. Dentzer et al. (eds.), *Numismatique antique. Problèmes et méthodes. Études d'archéologie classique IV. Annales de l'est, publiées par l'université de Nancy II. Mémoire no. 44* (Nancy-Louvain) 153-63.
- Lämmer, M. 1975-76. "The Nature and Function of the Olympic Truce in Ancient Greece," *History of Physical Education and Sport* 3: 37-52.
- Lämmer, M. 1982-83. "Der sogenannte Olympische Friede in der griechischen Antike," *Stadion. Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Sport und der Körperkultur* 8-9: 47-83.
- Lattimore, S. 1988. "The Nature of Early Greek Victor Statues," in S.J. Bandy (ed.), *Coroebus Triumphs. The Alliance of Sport and the Arts* (San Diego) 245-56.
- Lee, H.M. 2001. *The Program and Schedule of the Ancient Olympic Games. Nikephoros Beihefte* 6 (Hildesheim).
- Lefèvre, F. 1998. *L'amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions* (Athens & Paris).

- Lewis, S. 1996. *News and Society in the Greek Polis* (London).
- Lloyd, A.B. 1976. *Herodotus. Book II. Commentary 1-98* (Amsterdam).
- Luraghi, N. 2002. "Becoming Messenian," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 122: 45-69.
- Macan, R.W. 1908. *Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth, & Ninth Books I-II* (London).
- MacCary, W.T. 1982. *Childlike Achilles. Ontogeny and Phylogeny in the Iliad* (New York).
- Maddoli, G. 1992. "L'epigramma dei Clitori a Olimpia (Paus. V 23, 7)," *La parola del passato* 47: 256-62.
- Mallwitz, A. 1972. *Olympia und seine Bauten* (Munich).
- Mann, C. 2001. *Athlet und Polis im archaischen und frühklassischen Griechenland. Hypomnemata* 138 (Göttingen).
- Martin, T.R. 1995. "Coins, Mints, and the Polis," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 72 (Copenhagen) 257-91.
- McDonnell, M. 1991. "The Introduction of Athletic Nudity: Thucydides, Plato, and the Vases," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111: 182-93.
- McGregor, M.F. 1941. "Cleisthenes of Sikyon and the Panhellenic Festivals," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 72: 266-87.
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford).
- Mickey, K. 1981. "Dialect Consciousness and Literary Language: An Example from Ancient Greece," *Transactions of the American Philological Society* (1981) 35-66.
- Mikalson, J.D. 2003. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars* (Capel Hill & London).
- Milavic, A.F. 2001. "Pankration and Greek Coins," *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 18: 179-92.
- Miller, S.G. 1975. "The Date of Olympic Festivals," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 90: 215-31.
- Miller, S.G. 1978. *The Prytaneion. Its Function and Architectural Form* (Berkeley & London).
- Miller, S.G. 1982. "Kleonai, the Nemean Games, and the Lamian War," in *Hesperia Suppl. XX. Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography Presented to Homer A. Thompson* (Princeton) 100-8.
- Miller, S.G. 1995. "Old Metroon and Old Bouleuterion in the Classical Agora at Athens," in M.H. Hansen & K.A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. Historia Einzelschriften* 95 (Stuttgart) 133-56.

- Miller, S.G. 2000. "Naked Democracy," in P. Flensted-Jensen *et al.* (eds.), *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen* (Copenhagen) 277-96.
- Miller, S.G. 2004. *Ancient Greek Athletics* (New Haven & London).
- Möller, A. 2004. "Elis, Olympia und das Jahr 580 v. Chr. Zur Frage der Eroberung der Pisatis," in R. Rollinger & C. Ulf (eds.), *Griechische Archaik. Interne Entwicklungen – externe Impulse* (Berlin) 249-70.
- Moretti, L. 1957. *Olympionikai, i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*. Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Memorie, Ser. 8, vol. 8, fasc. 2 (Rome).
- Morgan, C. 1999. "Cultural Subzones in Early Iron Age and Archaic Arkadia?," in T.H. Nielsen & J. Roy (eds.), *Defining Ancient Arkadia*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 78 (Copenhagen) 382-456.
- Morgan, C.M. & Coulton, J.J. 1997. "The Polis as a Physical Entity," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 4. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 75 (København) 87-144.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1987. "The Greek Notion of Dialect," *Verbum. Revue de linguistique* 10: 7-27.
- Morrissey, E.J. 1978. "Victors in the Prytaneion Decree (IG I<sup>2</sup> 77)," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 19: 121-25.
- Mouratidis, J. 1985. "The Origin of Nudity in Greek Athletics," *Journal of Sport History* 12: 213-32.
- Mylonas, G.E. 1944. "Athletic Honors in the Fifth Century," *The Classical Journal* 39: 278-89.
- Nafissi, M. 2003. "Elei e Pisati. Geografia, storia, e istituzioni politiche della regione Olimpia," *Geographia Antiqua* 12: 23-55.
- Nielsen, T.H. 1996. "Arkadia. City-Ethnics and Tribalism," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 3. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 74 (Copenhagen) 117-63.
- Nielsen, T.H. 1997. "Triphylia. An Experiment in Ethnic Construction and Political Organisation," in T.H. Nielsen (ed.), *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 4. *Historia Einzelschriften* 117 (Stuttgart) 129-62.
- Nielsen, T.H. 2000. "Epiknemidian, Hypoknemidian, and Opountian Lokrians. Reflections on the Political Organisation of East Lokris in

- the Classical Period," in P. Flensted-Jensen (ed.), *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 5. *Historia Einzelschriften* 138 (Stuttgart) 90-120.
- Nielsen, T.H. 2002. *Arkadia and Its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. *Hypomnemata* 140 (Göttingen).
- Nielsen, T.H. 2005. "A Polis as a Part of a Larger Identity Group. Glimpses from the History of Lepreon," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 56: 57-89.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1951. *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund).
- Nixon, L. & Price, S. 1990. "The Size and Resources of Greek Cities," in O. Murray & S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford) 137-70.
- Osborne, R. 1998. *Archaic and Classical Greek Art* (Oxford & New York).
- Ostwald, M. 2000. Oligarchia. *The Development of a Constitutional Form in Ancient Greece*. *Historia Einzelschriften* 144 (Stuttgart).
- Parke, H.W. 1967a. *The Oracles of Zeus: Dodona, Olympia, Ammon* (Oxford).
- Parke, H.W. 1967b. *Greek Oracles* (London).
- Perlman, P. 1995. "Θεωροδοκοῦντες ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν. Panhellenic *Epangelia* and Political Status," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 72 (Copenhagen) 113-64.
- Perlman, P. 2000. *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*. *Hypomnemata* 121 (Göttingen).
- Pfister, F. 1951. *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides* (Vienna).
- Pleket, H.W. 1975. "Games, Prizes, Athletes and Ideology. Some Aspects of the History of Sport in the Greco-Roman World," *Arena* 1: 49-89.
- Pollitt, J.J. 1990. *The Art of Ancient Greece. Sources and Documents* (Cambridge).
- Pouilloux, J. 1954. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos. De la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C. Études thasiennes III* (Paris).
- Pritchard, D. 2003. "Athletics, Education and Participation in Classical Athens," in D. Phillips & D. Pritchard (eds.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea) 293-349.
- Raschke, W.J. 1987. "Images of Victory," in W.J. Raschke (ed.), *The Archaeology of the Olympics. The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity* (Madison) 38-54.

- Raubitschek, A.E. 1939. "Leagros," *Hesperia* 8: 155-64.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1985. 'What Alcibiades Did or What Happened to Him'. Inaugural Lecture (University of Durham).
- Richardson, N. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Volume VI: Books 21-24 (Cambridge).
- Richter, G.M.A. 1931. "Greek Bronzes Recently Acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art," *American Journal of Archaeology* 35: 189-201.
- Richter, G.M.A. 1970. *Kouroi. Archaic Greek Youths. A Study of the Development of the Kouros Type in Greek Sculpture* (London & New York).
- Ridgway, B.S. 1977. *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture* (Princeton).
- Ridgway, B.S. 1999. *Prayers in Stone. Greek Architectural Sculpture (ca. 600 – 100 B.C.E)* (Berkeley & London).
- Ritter, S. 2001. "Münzbilder im Kontext: Zeus und Olympia auf elischen Stateren des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.," in R. von den Hoff & S. Schmidt (eds.), *Konstruktionen von Wirklichkeiten. Bilder im Griechenland des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Stuttgart) 89-105.
- Robert, L. 1967. "Sur des inscriptions d'Éphèse: fêtes, athlètes, empereurs, épigrammes," *Revue de Philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 93: 7-84.
- Robinson, E.W. 1997. *The First Democracies. Early Popular Government Outside Athens. Historia Einzelschriften 107* (Stuttgart).
- Roebuck, C.A. 1941. *A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C.* (Chicago).
- Romano, D.G. 1993. *Athletics and Mathematics in Archaic Corinth: The Origins of the Greek Stadion* (Philadelphia).
- Roy, J. 1971. "Arcadia and Boeotia in Peloponnesian Affairs 370-362 B.C.," *Historia* 20: 569-99.
- Roy, J. 1997. "The *Perioikoi* of Elis," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 4, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 75 (København) 282-320.
- Roy, J. 1998. "Thucydides 5.49.1-50.4: The Quarrel between Elis and Sparta in 420 BC, and Elis' Exploitation of Olympia," *Klio* 80: 360-68.
- Roy, J. 1999. "Cités d'Elide," in J. Renard (ed.), *Le Péloponnèse. Archéologie et histoire* (Rennes) 151-76.
- Roy, J. 2000. "The Frontier between Arkadia and Elis in Classical Antiquity," in P. Flensted-Jensen et al. (eds.), *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000* (Copenhagen) 133-56.



- Roy, J. 2002a. "The Pattern of Settlement in Pisatis. The 'Eight Poleis'," in T.H. Nielsen (ed.), *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6. *Historia Einzelschriften* 162 (Stuttgart) 229-47.
- Roy, J. Forthcoming, "Pausanias 5.9.6: The Number of Hellanodikai at Elis in 364 B.C."
- Roy, J. & Schofield, D. 1999. "IvO 9. A New Approach," *Horos* 13: 155-65.
- Rups, M. 1986. *Thesaurus. A Study of the Treasury Building as Found in Greek Sanctuaries*. Diss. The Johns Hopkins University.
- Ryder, T.T.B. 1965. *Koine Eirene. General Peace and Local Independence in Ancient Greece* (London).
- Salmon, J.B. 1984. *Wealthy Corinth. A History of the City to 338 BC* (Oxford).
- Sansone, D. 1988. *Greek Athletics and the Genesis of Sport* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London).
- Schwabacher, W. 1962, "Olympischer Blitzschwinger," *Antike Kunst* 5: 9-16.
- Schwartz, A. 2004. *Hoplitkriegsførelse i arkaisk og klassisk tid* (Copenhagen).
- Seaman, K. 2002. "Athletes and Agora-phobia? Commemorative Athletic Sculpture in Classical Athens," *Nikephoros* 15: 99-115.
- Seltman, C. 1955. *Greek Coins*<sup>2</sup> (London).
- Siewert, P. 1994a. "Eine archaische Rechtsaufzeichnung aus der antiken Stadt Elis," in G. Thür (ed.), *Symposion 1993. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Graz-Andritz, 12.-16. September 1993), Akten der Gesellschaft für Griechische und Hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte* 10 (Vienna) 17-32.
- Siewert, P. 1994b. "Symmachien in neuen Inschriften von Olympia. Zu den sogenannten Periöken der Eleer," in L.A. Foresti et al. (eds.), *Federazioni e federalismo nell' Europa antica* 1 (Milan) 257-64.
- Siewert, P. 2001. "Zwei Rechtsaufzeichnungen der Stadt Elis," in V. Mitsopoulos-Leon (ed.), *Forschungen in der Peloponnes. Akten des Symposions anlässlich der Feier „100 Jahre Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Athen“*, *Athen* 5. 3. – 7. 3. 1998. Sonderschriften des ÖAI 38 (Athens) 245-52.
- Siewert, P. 2002. "Die wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Bronze-Urkunden aus Olympia," in H. Kyrieleis (ed.), *Olympia 1875-2000. 125 Jahre Deutsche Ausgrabungen*. Internationales Symposium, Berlin 9.-11. November 2000 (Mainz am Rhein) 359-70.
- Siewert, P. et al. 1999. "Die Symmachien Pisas mit den Arkadern. Akroreia, Messenien und Sikyon. Eine neues Fragment der ‚Arkadis-

- chen Büdnisstele' von 365 v.Chr.," *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 11: 413-20.
- Sinn, U. 2000. *Olympia: Cult, Sport, and Ancient Festival*. Transl. by T. Thornton (Princeton).
- Sinos, R.H. 1998. "Divine Selection. Epiphany and Politics in Archaic Greece," in C. Dougherty & L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics* (Oxford) 73-91.
- Snodgrass, A.M. 1986. "Interaction by Design. The Greek City State," in C. Renfrew & J.F. Cherry (eds.), *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change* (Cambridge) 47-58.
- Spivey, N. 2004. *The Ancient Olympics* (Oxford).
- Stylianou, P.J. 1998. *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15* (Oxford).
- Sundwall, G.A. 1993. *The Liberation of Messenia and the Foundation of Messene*. MA Thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Swaddling, J. 2004. *The Ancient Olympic Games*<sup>3</sup> (London).
- Sweet, W.E. 1985. "Protection of the Genitals in Greek Athletics," *The Ancient World* 11: 43-52.
- Taeuber, H. 1991. "Elische Inschriften in Olympia," in A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Achaia und Elis in der Antike. Akten des 1. internationalen Symposiums Athen, 19.-21. Mai 1989. Meletemata* 13 (Athens) 111-13.
- Taeuber, H. 1997. "Ein Inschriftenfragment der Pulydamas-Basis von Olympia," *Nikephoros* 10: 235-43.
- Tausend, K. 1999. "Heiligtümer und Kulte Nordostarkadiens," in K. Tausend (ed.), *Pheneos und Lousoi. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und topographie Nordostarkadiens* (Frankfurt am Main) 343-62.
- Thompson, W.E. 1979. "More on the Prytaneion Decree," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20: 325-29.
- Thuillier, J.-P. 1988. "La nudité athlétique," *Nikephoros* 1: 29-48.
- Tritsch, F. 1932. "Die Agora von Elis und die altgriechische Agora," *Jahreshefte der Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 27: 64-105.
- Tronson, A. 1991. "The Hellenic League of 480 B.C. – Fact or Ideological Fiction?," *Acta Classica* 34: 93-110.
- Tyrrell, W.B. 2004. *The Smell of Sweat. Greek Athletics, Olympics, and Culture* (Wauconda, Illinois).
- Unz, R.K. 1986. "The Chronology of the Elean War," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 27: 29-42.
- Yalouris, A. & Yalouris, N. 1995. *Olympia. The Museum and the Sanctuary* (Athens).

- Young, D.C. 1983. "Professionalism in Archaic and Classical Greek Athletics," *The Ancient World* 7: 45-51.
- Young, D.C. 1984. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics* (Chicago).
- Walbank, M.B. 1978. *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Toronto).
- Wallace, M.B. 1970. "Early Greek Proxeny," *Phoenix. The Classical Association of Canada* 24: 189-208.
- Weiler, I. 1991. "Korruption in der olympischen Agonistik und die diplomatische Mission des Hypereides in Elis," in A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Achaia und Elis in der Antike, Meletemata* 13 (Athens) 87-93.
- Weiler, I. 1997. "Olympia – jenseits der Agonistik: Kultur und Spektakel," *Nikephoros* 10: 191-213.
- West, M.L. 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford).
- Withby, M. 1984. "The Union of Corinth and Argos: A Reconsideration," *Historia* 33: 295-308.
- Winter, F.E. 1987. "Arkadian Notes I: Identification of the Agora Buildings at Orchomenos and Mantinea," *Echos du monde classique. Classical Views* 31: 235-46.
- Wolicki, A. 2002. "The Heralds and the Games in Archaic and Classical Greece," *Nikephoros* 15: 69-97.

# Index of sources

## I. Literary texts

- Andocides**  
4.27: 59n212  
4.30: 59n212  
20.106: 7n13  
20.109: 7n14  
20.141: 94n326
- Anthologia Palatina***  
6.135: 89n306  
13.15: 89
- Aristophanes**  
*Plutus*  
583-84: 58n212
- Aristoteles**  
*Politica*  
1306a13-19: 50n187  
1357a20: 62n217
- Athenaeus**  
3E: 58n212  
425A: 50n181  
479D: 77n260  
519C: 81  
700D: 50n181
- Callimachus (Pfeiffer)**  
fr. 84 *Dieg.* I: 92  
fr. 84-85: 92  
fr. 85.9: 92n320
- Cicero**  
*Tusculanae disputationes*  
5.3.9: 55n203
- Demosthenes**  
18.90-91: 70n231
- Dinarchus**  
1.81: 59
- Dio Chrysostomus**  
31.95: 94
- Diodorus Siculus**  
10.23: 80bis  
11.54.1: 48  
12.9.2: 80  
13.74.3: 96n333  
13.75.1: 5n1  
13.82.7: 95n328  
14.17.4: 32n100  
14.54.1: 51n192  
14.106ff.: 89  
15.14.1: 89n309  
15.71: 87n297  
15.72.4: 5n1  
15.78.1: 42  
15.78.2: 36  
15.78.3: 43  
16.83.3: 49n181  
18.8.2-6: 69  
18.8.6: 55  
19.63.2: 49n181  
20.101.2: 50n181
- Diogenes Laertios**  
1.55: 95n330

<b>Dionysius of Halicarnassus</b>	2.137.5: 9n24
<i>Antiquitates Romanae</i>	2.143.4: 9n24
7.72.2-4: 24	2.144.2: 9n24
	2.154.2: 9n24
<b><i>Etymologicum Magnum</i></b>	2.160: 18
242.55-243.3: 24	3.57.4: 50n181
623.12-18: 36, 36n122	4.78.2: 9n24
	4.110.1: 9n24
<b>Eusebius</b>	4.155.3: 9n24
<i>Chronica</i> (Helm)	4.192.3: 9n24
91b: 80	5.22: 18
	5.67: 50n181
<b>Gorgias (DK)</b>	6.21.1: 81n274
fr. 7: 58n212	6.53.1: 14n40
	6.70.1-2: 48n179
<b>Harpocratio</b>	6.98.3: 9n24
Ἑλληνοδίκαι: 85n291	6.126.1: 62
	6.127.3: 30n90
<b>Heraclides Creticus (GGM)</b>	7.152.3: 14n40
25: 7-8	7.197: 50n182
	7.202: 53n200, 54n200
<b>Heraclides Lembus</b>	8.1: 53n200
<i>Excerpta politiarum</i>	8.26.1: 13
55: 58n212	8.26.2: 58
	8.26.3: 13
<b>Herodotus</b>	8.43-48: 53n200
1.10.3: 26	8.59-60: 34n111
1.59: 59	8.65.4: 18
1.66: 35n113	8.72: 54n200
1.151.2: 5n1	8.73.2: 48n179
2.4.2: 15n45	8.81.1: 54n200
2.43.2: 15n45	8.135.3: 9n24
2.49.2: 15n45	8.137: 19n55, 19n57
2.50.1: 15n45	8.144.2: 8
2.51.1: 15n45	9.16.2: 9n24
2.56.3: 9n24	9.77: 53n200
2.57.1: 15n45	9.81.1: 53n200
2.58: 15n45	
2.91: 14	<b>Hesiodus</b>
2.123.1: 14n40	fr. 74 (MW): 22n69

**Homeric Hymn to Hermes**

1-60: 76

**Homerus***Ilias*

23.683: 23

23.685: 23, 24

23.710: 23

*Odyssea*

18.66-69: 24

18.74-5: 24

**Isidorus***Etymologiae*

18.17.2: 25n81

**Isocrates**

16.1: 96n332

16.32: 58

16.33: 97

16.34: 96

16.49: 94n326

**Justinus***Epitome of Trogus*

16.3.8: 73n239

**Leandrios (FGrHist 492)**

fr. 13: 48n175

**Livius**

27.35.3: 55n203

**Lucianus***De morte peregrini*

1: 55n203

**Lycurgus**

1.51: 91, 91n316

**Lysias**

33.2: 58n212

**Pausanias**

1.44.1: 24, 25n77

3.13.9: 93

3.14.3: 22n69

4.27.9: 5n1

5.2.1-5: 85

5.6.6: 51

5.9.5: 40

5.9.6: 40n138

5.15.8: 52

5.15.12: 53n199

5.17.9: 37n124

5.21.5: 85n291

5.23.1: 50n183

5.23.2: 54n200

5.23.4: 79

5.23.7: 75

5.24.1: 50n183

5.24.4: 45n160

5.24.6: 73

5.24.9: 50n183

5.25.7: 47n169

5.26.6: 75

5.26.7: 73

5.27.8: 76

6.1.4: 59n212

6.2.2: 33, 87n293

6.2.6: 97n335

6.3.2: 34n110

6.3.7: 51

6.3.9: 84

6.3.14: 55n204

6.4.2: 42

6.6.4-6: 92

6.8.3: 43

6.9.3: 93, 94

6.9.9: 88

6.10.4: 22n69

6.11.6: 94

6.11.8: 94

6.13.2: 91bis

6.13.11: 90

6.15.6: 90n311

6.16.5: 89

6.17.2: 90n311

6.17.4: 90

6.18.2: 77n256

6.18.6: 97n335, 97n336

6.19.6: 72n234

6.19.13: 78

6.22.2: 37n124

6.22.3: 43

6.23.7: 52n194, 53

7.27.5: 93

8.14.10: 77n255

8.27.1-8: 5n1

8.30.9: 49n181

8.40.1: 93

8.45.4: 51n192

### **Pherecrates Comicus**

fr. 160 (Kock): 8

fr. 171 (KA): 8

### **Pherecydes (FGrHist 3)**

fr. 79a-b: 85n290

### **Phlegon (FGrHist 257)**

fr. 1(1): 37n125

fr. 1(10): 37n125

fr. 6: 96

### **Pindarus**

*Isthm.* 1.23: 22n69

*Nem.* 10: 46

*Nem.* 10.22-23: 47n167

*Nem.* 11.1-3: 50n181

*Ol.* 1.93: 55

*Ol.* 3: 21

*Ol.* 3.12: 20

*Ol.* 5.8: 88n302

### **Plato**

*Apologia*

36d: 95n327

*Hippias minor*

363c8: 58n212

*Phaedo*

89c: 85n290

109b: 6n5

*Respublica*

5.452c: 23

*Symposium*

182b: 12

### **Plinius**

*Naturalis historia*

7.152: 93

### **Plutarchus**

*Alcibiades*

11.1: 58n212

13.2: 96n332

34.3: 46

*Solon*

23.3: 95n330

*Moralia*

304B: 49n181

### **Polemo (Preller)**

fr. 22: 77n260

- Pollux**  
1.7: 52n196
- Ps.-Skylax**  
43: 48n175, 48n179
- Ps.-Skymnos**  
341: 80  
360: 80
- Scholia**  
*in Homerum*  
*Il.* 23.683 (Townley): 25n81  
*Il.* 23.683b1 (Erbse): 22n69, 25n81  
*Il.* 23.683b2 (Erbse): 25n81  
  
*in Pindarum*  
*Nem.* 11.1(1a): 52n196  
*Ol.* 5.16: 88n302  
*Ol.* 7c: 59n212  
*Ol.* 7.153a: 77n255  
  
*in Theocritum*  
4.29-30b: 37n124
- Simonides (Bergk)**  
fr. 188: 89n307
- Stephanus Byzantius**  
245.17: 96
- Strabo**  
6.1.13: 80, 81  
8.3.2: 48n175  
8.6.19: 46  
13.1.21: 5n1
- Thucydides**  
1.6.4-5: 23  
1.6.5: 12, 12n34, 22n67, 22n68, 22n69
- 1.108.1: 81n275  
1.109.1: 81n276  
1.118.3: 35n113  
2.7.1: 81n275  
2.66.1: 81n275  
3.89.4: 49n181  
3.90.3: 81n276  
5.18.1: 10n28  
5.18.10: 10n28, 79  
5.18-19: 9  
5.19.2: 83  
5.24.1: 83  
5.31.2: 32n101  
5.47: 48n179  
5.47.9: 49n179, 50n187  
5.47.11: 79  
5.49.1: 33  
5.49.4: 59  
5.49-50: 58  
5.50.3: 33n106  
5.50.4: 34n109, 34n111, 87n293  
5.58: 10n28  
5.61.5: 32n103  
5.62.1-2: 33n104  
6.16.2: 62  
6.67.1: 81n276  
7.9.2: 30n90
- Timaeus (FGrHist 566)**  
fr. 50: 81
- Timotheus (Page)**  
fr. 26: 88n302
- Xenophanes (West)**  
fr. 2.7: 94  
fr. 2.8-9: 94  
fr. 2.9: 95



**Xenophon***Agesilaus*

1.28: 27n88

*Anabasis*

4.7.25: 16n48

4.8.25: 16

4.8.25-28: 16

4.8.27: 16

5.1.2: 16

5.3.7: 48n179, 51, 59

5.3.11: 48n179

*Hellenika*

1.4.20: 46n163

3.2.21: 31, 33, 34, 34n111, 87n293,  
97

3.2.21-22: 32n100, 88n302

3.2.21-23: 31

3.2.23: 32n98, 48n179

3.2.25: 48n179

3.2.26: 48n179

3.2.29: 48n179

3.2.31: 31

3.4.19: 27n88

4.1.40: 48n179

4.4.6: 41

4.5.1: 41

4.5.2: 42n141

4.5.13: 30n90

4.7.2: 35, 48n179

4.7.4: 48n179

5.1.31: 6n4

6.5.2: 51

7.1.27: 87n294

7.1.33: 84

7.1.38: 84, 84n287

7.1.45: 39

7.4.9: 87n294

7.4.14: 36, 48n179

7.4.28: 36

7.4.29: 37n126, 41n139, 42

7.4.30: 41

7.4.31: 50n181

7.4.33: 36

7.4.35: 37n126, 43

*Memorabilia*

3.12.1: 48n179

3.13.5: 48n179, 59n214

**II. Inscriptions, papyri etc.***BCH*

60 (1936) 179.32: 50n181

107 (1983) 767: 89

*CEG*

394: 95n329

*CEG 2*

824: 38

828: 59n212

*Ebert, Epigramme*

7: 89n306

12.4: 89n310

19: 90n310

20.1: 59n212

39.1-2: 89n310

41: 90n310

49: 62n218	94b.11: 65
50: 89n307	94b.12: 65
	94b.13: 65
<b>Ebert &amp; Siewert, <i>Bronzeurkunden</i></b>	94b.14: 65
1-2: 20n65	94b.15: 65
	94b.16: 65
<b><i>I.Ephesos</i></b>	94b.17: 65
1415: 97n335	94b.18: 65
1415.7: 97n335	94b.19: 66
1415-16: 90n310	94b.20: 65
	94b.21: 65
<b><i>IG I<sup>3</sup></i></b>	94b.22: 65
80: 83bis	94b.23: 66
131: 95n327	94b.24: 65
	94b.25: 65
<b><i>IG II<sup>2</sup></i></b>	94b.26: 65
7998: 66	94b.27: 66
	94b.28: 66
<b><i>IG IV<sup>2</sup>.1</i></b>	94b.29: 66
48: 68n226	94b.30: 66
49: 68n226	94b.31: 65
51: 68n226	94b.32: 66
53: 68n226	94-95: 63
94: 66, 67	95.2: 65
94a.2: 65	95.3: 65
94a.3: 65	95.4: 65
94a.4: 65	95.5: 65
94a.6: 65	95.6: 65
94a.7: 65	95.7: 65
94a.8: 65	95.8: 64
94a.9: 64n223	95.9: 64
94b.1: 65	95.10: 64
94b.2: 65	95.11: 64
94b.3: 65	95.12: 64
94b.4: 65	95.13: 64
94b.5: 65	95.14: 64
94b.6: 65	95.15: 64
94b.7: 65	95.16: 64
94b.8: 65	95.17: 64
94b.10: 65	95.18: 64

95.19: 64	39.31-32: 82n281
95.20: 64	144: 89n307, 92n317
95.21: 64	146: 89n307
95.22: 64	147-148: 89n307
95.24: 64	149: 89n306
95.25: 64	155: 89n308
95.27: 64	161: 89n307
95.28: 64	162-163: 89n307
95.30: 64	165: 89n307
95.32: 64	167: 89n307
95.33: 64	168: 89n307
95.34: 64	169: 90n312
95.35: 64	170: 89n306
95.36: 65	170.5-6: 62n218
95.37: 65	186: 90n311
95.38: 65	224: 90n311
95.39: 64	247: 76
95.41: 64	271.2-3: 76
95.42: 64	351: 51n188
95.43: 64	355: 51n188
95.44: 64	356: 51n188
95.45: 64	357: 51n188
	372: 51n188
<b>IG VII</b>	406: 51n188
52: 24	407: 51n188
	427: 51n188
<b>IG XII.5</b>	429: 51n188
1060.2: 50n181	432: 51n188
	433: 51n188
<b>IvO</b>	434: 51n188
2.5: 20	437: 51n188
3: 50n187	439: 51n188
7: 50n187	440: 51n188
11: 82	449: 51n188
22: 82	452: 51n188
24: 82	454: 51n188
30: 82, 83ter	
30.5-6: 82	<b>Meiggs &amp; Lewis, GHI</b>
37: 82	10: 79bis, 80bis
39: 63	10.5-6: 79

17: 79

27.1: 53n200

27.9: 53n200

57: 74

**Michel, Recueil**

197.31-32: 82n281

401.24-25: 50n181

401B.34: 50n181

452.10-11: 49n181

462.27-28: 50n181

**Nomima I**

17: 82n279

**ÖJh**

46 (1961-63) 77.1: 51

**PapOxy**

222.6: 96

222.31: 96

2381.2: 51n192

3360: 85n291

**Perlman, Therodokia**

E. 1-2: 63, 64n223

O.1: 38

O.2.31-32: 82n281

**SEG**

9 1.44: 50n181

11 1180: 82

13 397: 49n181

15 246: 74

22 346: 74

24 300: 74

26 445: 68n226

29 403: 82n279

29 405: 79

29 405b: 79

29 406: 79

31 365: 72n233

32 383: 72n233

39 281: 66n224

39 820: 66n224

42 785.43-44: 49n181

46 464: 82

48 547: 89n306

51 532: 39, 63

**Staatsverträge**

193: 32

**Syll.<sup>3</sup>**

2: 50n181

4.5-6: 50n181

# General Index

- Abai 9n26  
Abdera 66  
Achaia Phthiotis 29n89, 30n89  
Agesilaos of Sparta 27, 41, 42  
Agesipolis of Sparta 35  
Agis of Sparta 32  
Aigina 61  
Aigion 60  
Aineia 65  
Ainis 29n89  
Ainos 66  
Aiolis 73  
Aischylos, *Persai* of 10n31  
Aitna 60  
Aitolia 62, 66  
Akanthos 65  
Akanthos of Sparta 24  
Akarnania 66  
Akragas 49n181, 60, 67, 71,  
78n264, 95  
Akripos 64, 66  
Akroreia 79  
Aktor, sons of 85  
Alasyaion 72  
Alea, projects its image at  
Olympia 82-83  
Alexander I of Macedon 18-20, 99  
Alexander the Great 17n50, 55, 69,  
70, 71  
Alkibiades of Athens 46, 58n212,  
59n212, 62, 96, 97, 98  
Altis 41, 45n160, 53, 77, 88  
Alyzeia 64  
Ambrakia 6n6, 60, 64  
Amphidolia 72  
Amphipolis 65  
Amphissa 65  
Anaitoi 79  
Anaktorion 64  
Anaxilas of Rhegion 58n212  
Anaximenes of Lampsakos 77  
Anthedon 8  
Antiochos of Lepreon 84-86  
Apellonia 49n181  
Aphytis 65  
Apollo 80  
Apollonia (Adriatic) 72, 73  
dedication by at Olympia  
76n250  
Apollonia (Mygdonia) 65  
*architheoros* 59  
Arethousa 65  
Argilos 65  
Argos 10n28, 30n89, 30n90, 32,  
32n101, 33, 35, 40, 41, 42, 46,  
49n181, 61, 62, 68n226, 72,  
78n264, 79, 85, 93, 94, 96  
Heraion at 46-47  
Argos Amphilochikon 64  
Argyrion 49n181  
Arisba 5n1  
Aristarchos 22n69  
Aristion of Epidauros 87  
Aristophon of Athens 90  
Arkadia 5n1, 35n113, 40, 41, 42,  
43, 43n144, 79, 83, 84  
and the Olympic Games of 364  
35-43  
and Triphylyia 37-38  
federal army of 36

- Arkas 36, 37, 38, 45  
 Arrhachion of Phigaleia 93  
 Artabanos 13  
 Artemision 53n200  
 Artichia 64  
 Asamon of Elis 89  
 Asia Minor 10, 22, 27, 73, 81  
 Asklepios 63  
 Astakos 64  
 Asteas of Alea 83  
 Astylos of Kroton 91-92  
 Astypalaia 68n226  
 Atalante 22n69  
 Athena 7  
 Athens 7, 25, 25n81, 30n89, 32, 33,  
 35n113, 41, 42, 46, 49n181, 57,  
 59, 61, 62, 65, 72, 74, 78n261,  
 78n264, 79, 82, 83, 90, 94, 95  
   boycotts Olympic Games  
   85n291, 97  
   coinage of 44n156  
   Sacred Road at 46  
 athletes 42, 43, 59-61  
   adulation of 94  
   as representatives of their *poleis*  
   34, 86, 87-95, 97, 98  
   subsidised by *poleis* 95  
 athletics 10  
   as a distinctively Hellenic activ-  
   ity 12-17, 99  
   Herodotos on 12-16  
   Plato on 12  
 Atrax 65  
*autonomia* 31, 48  
  
 Barke 61  
 Berge 66  
 Black Sea 73  
 Boiotia 7, 29, 29n89  
 Bonfante, L. 26  
  
 Bosworth, A.B. 70, 70n228, 71  
*bouleuterion* 49, 49n180, 49n181,  
   50, 50n181, 51, 52, 53  
 Bowra, C.M. 94  
 Brown, T.S. 14n40, 15n46  
 Buckler, J. 84  
 Byzantion 61, 72, 77n258  
  
 Cairns, F. 17n51  
 Cartledge, P. 6, 8, 9n25, 10n31,  
   87n294  
 Chaladrioi 82  
 Chalkis 61  
 Cheilon of Sparta 59  
 Cheimon of Argos 93-94  
 Chemmis 14-15  
 Chersonesos 72  
 Chionis of Sparta 91  
 Chios 61  
*choritai* 35, 36  
 city-ethnics 89, 89n307, 89n308  
 city-state culture 5, 10, 75, 99  
 coinage 7, 7n9, 10  
   of Elis 43-45, 53  
   of Korinthos 90n310  
   of Pheneos 77  
   of Pisa 38, 38n131  
   of Sikyon 90n310  
 colonies 77; *see also* western  
   colonies  
 constitution, forms of 6n6  
 Corinthian League 71  
 Crete 23, 24  
 Crowther, N. 22n69, 40, 53, 55,  
   86n292  
 Cyprus 6n6, 68n226  
  
 Damiskos of Messene 88, 88n303  
 Datos 66*bis*, 67  
 dedications at Olympia 71-78

- of buildings 71, 77-78
- of sculpture 71, 75-77
- of weapons 71, 74-75, 76
- Dekeleian War 46
- Delian League 81
- Delos 9, 49n181, 50n181
- Delphi 9, 9n26, 9n27, 10, 10n28, 11n31, 29, 29n89, 30n90, 38, 49n181, 50n181, 53n200, 54n200, 56, 65, 78
  - Amphictyony 29-30
  - oracle 35n113, 85n291
  - Serpent column at 11n31, 53n200, 54n200
- democracy 6n6
- Demosthenes 7, 59
- Diagoras of Rhodes 59n212
- Didyma 9n26
- Dikaia 65
- Dikon of Kaulonia 89
- Diodorus Siculus 36, 55, 70
- Dion of Syracuse 68
- Dionysios of Halikarnassos, and athletic nudity 24
- Dionysios I of Syracuse 89, 97n335
- Dipaia 60
- Dodona 9, 9n26, 49n181
- dolichos* 16
- Dolopia 29n89
- Dorians 29n89
- Dyspontion 96
  
- East Lokris 29n89, 30n89
- Echinos 64
- Egypt 14-15, 18, 99
- Elaia 73
- Eleusis 9, 18, 44n156, 46
- Elis 60, 62, 67, 68, 72, 74, 83, 84, 86, 88n303, 100
  - agora at 48
  - and Olympia 29-54
  - and Pisa 30n90
  - and Serpent column at Delphi 53-54n200
  - and the Isthmian Games 84-86
  - attacks Olympia in 364 41
  - boule* of 50
  - civic buildings of 48-54
  - coinage of 43-45, 53
  - dedication in Altis 45n160
  - Hellanolikai* at 40-41
  - inscriptions of 48, 48n174, 79, 82n281
  - name of 96-97n179
  - procession from to Olympia 46-47, 53
  - Sacred Road at 47
  - synoikismos* of 48, 48n176
  - takes over Olympia 30
  - theatre at 56, 57
  - theorodokoi* of 39, 63, 68
  - war with Arkadia 36ff., 40-41
  - war with Sparta 30-35, 97
- Emporion 6n5
- Epameinondas 6n7
- epangelia* 39, 62, 63, 68
- Ephesos 61, 78n264, 87n297, 96, 97, 97n335
- Epidamnos 60, 62, 72, 77n258
- Epidauros 57, 61
  - theorodokoi* of 63-68
- Eretria 6n6, 57, 62, 72
- Eriksen, T.H. 7n11
- Euboia 30n89, 63
- Eubotas of Kyrene 43
- Eupolemos of Elis 51
- Euripos 64
- Euryleonis of Sparta 88
- Euthykles of Lokroi 92

- Euthymos of Lokroi 92  
 Ewaioi 79  
 Exainetos of Akragas 95
- Fischer-Hansen, T. 80  
 flogging, *see* whipping
- Geffcken, J. 25n79  
 Gela 67, 71, 77n258  
 genealogy 38  
 Giangiulio, M. 74n241, 82n278  
 gigantomachy 78, 78n264  
 Glaukies of Rhegion 76  
 Golden, M. 12n32, 16, 17n51  
 Gorgias 58n212  
*gymnasion* 93  
 Gyrtion 65
- Haliartos 8  
 Halikarnassos 49n181, 61  
 Hall, J.M. 9n24, 11n31, 46, 47  
 Halos 49n181  
 Hansen, M.H. 9n26, 12n32  
*Hellandikai* 19n56, 20-21, 39, 40, 41, 51, 52, 59n212  
 Hellenes  
   common customs of 10  
   common language of 8  
   interact at Olympia 55-98, 100  
   myth of origin of 8  
   number of 57  
   opposition to *barbaroi* 10, 12-17, 18-21, 58, 99, 100  
   represented by Olympic audience 57-58, 88, 101  
   shared sanctuaries of 9  
 Hellenic League against Persia  
   44n151, 53-54n200  
 helots 76  
 Hera 44  
   Lakinia 91  
 Heraia 60  
 Herakleia Pontike 73  
 Herakleia Trachinia 30n89  
 Herakleides Kretikos, stereotypes  
   in 7-8  
 Herakles 58n212, 85  
 Hermes 76-77  
 Hermesianax of Kolophon 90  
 Herodotos 81, 99  
   and nudity 26  
   and the ethnic exclusiveness of  
   the Olympics 18-20  
   on athletics and Hellenic identity  
   12-16, 99  
   on Hellenic identity 8-10  
   on Olympic audience 57-58, 62  
 Herrmann, H.-V. 90  
 Hesiod 22n69  
 Hetoimokles of Sparta 93  
 Hill, G.F. 45n158  
 Himera 60  
 Hippokrates of Athens 59  
 Hippomenes 22n69, 23n69, 25,  
   25n81  
 Hipponion 71  
 Hodgkinson, S. 93  
 Homer 10, 22-23, 24, 26  
 Homolion 65  
 hoplites 78  
 Hornblower, S. 10n31, 20, 62  
 Huxley, G. 22n69  
 Hyampolis 49n181  
 Hyettos 74  
 Hypereides 85n291  
 Hyporeiai 64, 66
- Ialysos 61  
 Iasos 50n181  
 identity 6



- Ilion 78n264  
 inscriptions set up at Olympia 78-83  
 Ioakimidou, C. 75n250  
 Iolaos 22n69  
 Ionians 29n89, 30n89  
 Ioulis 50n181  
 Isthmia 9n26, 10, 10n28, 30n90, 41-42, 56, 84  
 Isthmos 54n200, 56  
  
 Jackson, A.H. 74  
  
 Kalamis 75, 75n250  
 Kalaureia 49n181  
 Kalindoia 65  
 Kallippos of Athens 85n291, 97  
 Kallisto 38  
 Kalydon 65  
 Kamarina 60  
 Kardia 68n226  
 Karthaia 50n181  
 Kassopa 64  
 Kastor 22n69  
 Katane 56, 67  
 Kaulonia 60, 89  
 Kleandros of Sikyon 39, 40, 68  
 Kleisthenes of Sikyon 62  
 Kleitor 60, 72, 78  
     dedication by at Olympia 75, 76  
 Kleonai 30n90, 61, 72  
 Kolophon 49n181, 90  
 Konstan, D. 11n31, 13  
 Koresia 50n181  
 Korinthos 6n6, 30n89, 30n90, 32n101, 41, 42, 56, 60, 65, 78, 85  
 Korkyra 6n6, 60, 64, 72, 78n264  
 Koroneia 8, 65, 72, 73  
 Koronta 64  
 Kos Meropis 61  
  
 Kraay, C.M. 44n155  
 Krannon 62  
 Kroton 64, 67, 71, 77n258, 80, 81, 91, 92  
 Kypselos, chest of 37n124  
 Kyrene 6n5, 43, 50n181, 61, 73, 77n258  
 Kyzikos 50n181  
  
 Lacroix, L. 7  
 Lampsakos 68n226, 72  
     dedication by at Olympia 77  
 Laos 80  
 Larisa 61, 65  
 Lato 49n181  
 Lebadeia 9n26  
 Leon of Ambrakia 51  
 Leon of Thurioi 16  
 Leontinoi 67  
 Lepreon 32, 33, 51, 61, 83-86  
 Lesbos 5n1  
 Letrinoi 72  
 Leukas 64  
 Leuktra 51, 87  
 Lewis, S. 55n203, 70n231, 80  
 Lichas of Sparta 32, 33, 34, 59, 87, 87n293, 96, 97  
     dedication in Altis 34n110  
 Limnaia 64  
 Lindos 57  
 Lipara 50n181  
 loin-cloths 22, 23, 27  
 Lokroi Epizephyrioi 6n6, 60, 64, 67, 71, 91, 91n317  
 Lysias 58n212  
  
 Macan, R.W. 13  
 Magna Graecia 80  
 Magnesia 29n89  
 Magnesia on the Maiander 61

- Makiston 78n264  
 Malis 29n89  
 Mann, C. 91n314  
 Mantinea 6n6, 7n9, 32, 33, 53n200, 54n200, 56, 60, 72, 79  
     dedication by at Olympia 75  
     stereotype of self 7  
 Maroneia 61, 66  
 McGregor, M.F. 59n212  
 Medion 64  
 Medma 71  
 Megalopolis 5n1, 49n181, 56  
     pantheon of 6n7  
     Zeus Soter at 6n7  
 Megara 30n89, 60, 65, 72  
     treasury of at Olympia 78  
 Melos 61  
 Mende 65  
 Messana 60, 67, 71  
 Messene 5n1, 61, 79, 87  
 Messenia 5n1  
 Messenians, dedication by at  
     Olympia 76  
 Metapioi 79  
 Metapontion 56, 67, 71, 77n258, 81  
 Methone 65  
 Methydrion 60  
 Meyer, E. 39  
 Mickey, K. 9n24  
 Midea 46  
 Milavic, A.F. 90n310  
 Miletos 61, 81, 97n335  
 Miller, S.G. 52  
 Molossia 62  
 Mt Kyllene 76-77  
 Myania 72  
 Mykenai 46  
 Myron 91  
 Mytilene 50n181, 61  
 Naukratis 6n5  
 Naukydes 94  
 Naupaktos 65, 72  
 Neapolis (Egypt) 14  
 Neapolis (Thrace) 66  
 Nemea 9n26, 10n28, 30n90, 56, 67, 97n335  
 Nike 44, 75  
 Nikias, Peace of 9, 32, 79, 83  
 Nikodamos 84  
 nudity 22-28, 99  
 Odysseus 16n49  
 Oianthea 65  
 Oiniadai 64  
 Oitaia 29n89  
 Olbia 6n5  
 oligarchy 6n6  
 Olympia *passim*  
 Olympia, the heroine 36-38, 45  
 Olympic Council 50-52  
 Olympic Games  
     audience at 55-61, 101  
     boycotted by Athens 85n291, 97  
     ethnic exclusiveness of 18-21  
     of 420 32, 33, 34n110, 58, 86-87  
     of 368 87-88  
     of 364 35-43, 45  
     of 324 55, 59, 69-71  
 Olympic Law 33  
 Olympic oracle 35, 35n114, 35n115  
 Olympic Road 41, 47  
 Olympic Stadium 55-57  
 Olympic Truce 33, 33n105, 42, 58, 86  
 Olympic victory 59-61  
     banquet 53  
     proclamation of by herald 88

- prestige of 34, 90  
 rewards for 94-95  
 Olynthos 49n181, 65  
 Onatas of Aigina 76  
 Onchestos 8, 8n16  
 Opous 30n89, 61  
 Orchomenos (Arkadia) 32, 49n181  
 Orchomenos (Boiotia) 65, 72  
 Oresthasion 60  
 Oropos 7, 9n26  
 Orsippos of Megara 23n69, 24, 25, 25n81  
 Osborne, R. 7  
  
 Paion 62  
 Palairos 64  
 Pandosia 64  
*pankration* 16, 87  
 Patrai 60  
 Patroklos, funeral games for 22n69  
 Pausanias 40, 50, 53, 55n204, 73, 76, 78, 86, 91  
   and athletic nudity 24-25  
   on the Olympic Council 51-52  
 Peiraieus 66  
 Pelinna 65  
 Pellene 60, 93  
 Peloponnese 62, 73, 74  
 Peloponnesian League 32, 81, 82-83  
*pentathlon* 41n139, 85n291  
 Peparethos 49n181  
*perioikoi* 31, 48, 51  
 Perlman, P. 39-40, 68  
 Perrhaibia 29n89  
 Perseus 14-15  
 Persia 10, 13, 19, 20, 27, 29, 57-58, 84  
 Pfister, F. 8n17  
  
 Pharkadon 65  
 Phasis 6n5  
 Pheidias of Athens 44n155  
 Pheidon of Argos 30n90  
 Pheneos 60, 72, 73  
   coinage of 77  
   dedication by at Olympia 76-77  
   pantheon of 77  
 Pherekrates, on Boiotia 8  
 Phigaleia 60, 93  
*philogymnastia* 12  
 Philon of Korkyra 88-89  
 Phlegon, on Pisos 37  
 Phleious 30n89  
 Phoitiiai 64  
 Phokaia 7  
 Phokides of Athens 42, 43  
 Phokis 29, 29n89  
 Phylea 65, 66  
 Pindar 46, 55  
   and athletic nudity 22n69  
 Pisa 30, 30n90, 31n96, 36, 36n118, 37n126, 38, 41, 42, 43, 68, 74, 79  
   acts of state by 38  
   and the Olympic Games of 364 35-43  
   coinage of 38, 38n131  
   *Hellanodikai* of 39  
   *theorodokoi* of 39-40  
   town of 36-37  
 Pisos 36-37, 37n124, 45  
 Plataiai 8, 44n151  
 Plato  
   and athletic nudity 23, 26, 27  
   on *philogymnastia* 12  
 Plutarch 46  
 Poionos 64  
*polis/poleis* 47, 49, 51, 52, 62, 63, 63n220, 66, 68, 70, 73, 74, 87, 88, 90, 91, 95

- and Pylian Amphictyony 29-30  
 identified with their athletes 34,  
 86, 87-95, 97, 98  
 individuality of 6, 100  
 number of 5n1  
 number of attested at Olympia  
 100n340  
 securing of athletic victory by  
 95-96  
 self-differentiation of 7  
 subsidising of athletes by 95
- Poseidon 41, 42  
 Poseidonia 60, 80  
 Poteidaia 65  
 Poulydamos of Skotoussa 89n306  
 Priene 78n264  
 processions 46-47, 53  
 Promachos of Pellene 93  
 Proschion 65  
*protos heurètes* 25  
*proxenoi/proxenia* 39-40, 39n132,  
 39n135, 40, 82-83  
*prytaneion* 49, 49n180, 49n181,  
 50n181, 52, 53, 94  
 eternal flame in 52, 52n196
- Psophis 72  
 Pydna 65  
 Pythagoras of Samos 92  
 Pythostratos of Athens 87, 87n297
- Rhegion 60, 67, 71, 74  
 Rhodes, P. 46  
 Rhodos 5n1, 61  
 Richardson, N. 23n70  
 Rome 94  
 Roy, J. 33, 40, 41  
 Rups, M. 78n261
- sacred truce 62; *see also* Olympic  
 Truce
- Salamis 53n200  
 Samos 49n181, 61, 73  
 Sansone, D. 26n82  
 sculpture, commemorative 88-94  
 Selinous 77n258, 78n264, 82  
 Serdaioi 79  
 Sigeion 50n181  
 Sikyon 6n6, 30n89, 39, 40, 42,  
 49n181, 50n181, 60, 62, 68, 72,  
 79  
 Simonides 25  
 Siphnos 50n181, 78n264  
 Siris 62, 72, 77n258  
 Skillous 51, 59, 72  
 Skione 65  
 Skotoussa 61  
 Snodgrass, A.M. 74  
 Solon of Athens 95  
 Sostratos of Sikyon 42, 89n310  
 Sotades of Crete 96, 97  
 Sparta 7, 23, 30n89, 33, 34, 34n110,  
 35, 46, 47, 51, 58, 61, 63, 72, 79,  
 82, 83, 86, 93  
 war with Elis 30-35, 97
- spondophoroi* 39  
*stadion* 16, 42, 87, 88, 95  
 Stagiros 65  
 stereotypes 7  
 Stolos 66  
 Stratos 56, 60, 64, 87  
 Stymphalos 60, 76  
 Sweet, W.E. 25  
 Sybaris 62, 72, 77n258, 79, 95  
 projects its image at Olympia  
 80-82
- symmachia* 81-82  
*synoikismos* 6n7, 48  
 Syracuse 6n6, 56, 60, 64, 67, 68,  
 77n258, 89, 91

- Tanagra 7, 72  
 Taras 50n181, 60, 64, 67, 72, 74  
 Tegea 6n6, 32, 46  
 temples 10, 93  
 Tenedos 50n181, 63  
 Terina 60, 64, 67  
 Thasos 49n181, 61, 65, 72, 94  
 Thearides Akarnan Hyporeates 66  
 theatres 56-57  
 Thebes (Achaia Phthiotis) 30n89  
 Thebes (Boiotia) 7, 33, 34, 60, 65, 72, 74, 96  
 Thelphousa 72  
 Theogenes of Thasos 94  
 Theognetos of Aigina 89n310  
*theorodokoi/theorodokia* 39, 39n134, 39n135, 40, 42, 62-68  
*theoroi* 39, 42, 59, 61, 62  
 Therminea 65, 66  
 Thermopylai 12, 53n200, 54n200  
 Thespias 7, 50n181, 60, 65  
 Thessalia 29, 29n89, 62, 89  
 Thourioi 60, 64, 67, 74  
 Thrasykles of Athens 83  
 Thucydides 62  
   and athletic nudity 23, 27  
   on Olympic audience 58  
 Thyreion 64  
 Tiryns 46, 61  
 toponyms 88-89n306, 89n308  
 Torybeia 64  
 Trailos 65  
 Trapezous (Arkadia) 62  
 Trapezous (Black Sea) 16  
 treasuries 77-78  
 Triphylia 37-38, 83-86  
 Triphylos 38  
 Tritantaichmes 13  
 Troilos of Elis 59n212  
 Troizen 61  
 tyranny 6n6  
 Tyrrell, W.B. 26n83  
 Weiler, I. 57n211  
 West, M.L. 22n69  
 West Lokris 29n89  
 western colonies 73-74, 75, 77  
 whipping 32, 34, 34n111  
 Zankle 71, 74, 82  
 Zeus 11, 35, 38, 55, 58n212, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80  
   Olympios 40, 50, 58, 68, 71, 74  
   on Eleian coins 43-45  
   pre-Pheidian cult statue of 44n155  
   Soter 6n7  
 Xenophanes 94-95  
 Xenophon 41, 42, 47, 48, 50, 50n181, 59, 59n214, 84  
   *Anabasis* of 16  
   and nudity 27  
   on Eleio-Spartan war 30-35  
   on Pisa 36  
   trial before Olympic Council 51  
 Xerxes 13, 20



## **Manuscript**

*General.* – Manuscripts and illustrations must comply with the details given below. The original manuscript and illustrations plus one clear copy of both should be sent to the editor of the series. Manuscripts on digital media are accepted; contact the editor in advance, giving technical specifications.

A manuscript should not contain less than 48 printed pages. This also applies to the *Mat.fys.Medd.* where contributions to the history of science are welcome.

*Language.* – Manuscripts in Danish, English, German and French are accepted; in special cases other languages too. Linguistic revision may be made a condition of final acceptance.

*Title.* – Titles should be kept as short as possible, preferring words useful for indexing and information retrieval.

*Abstract, Summary.* – An abstract in English is required. It should be of 10-15 lines, outline main features, stress novel information and conclusions, and end with the author's name, title, and institutional and/or private postal address. – Papers in Danish must be provided with a summary in another language as agreed between author and editor.

*Manuscript.* – Page 1 should contain title, author's name and the name of the Academy. Page 2: Abstract, author's name and address. Page 3: Table of contents if necessary. Consult a *recent* issue of the series for general layout. Indicate the position of illustrations and tables. A printout must accompany manuscripts submitted electronically.

*Figures.* – All illustrations submitted must be marked with the author's name. It is important that the illustrations are of the highest possible quality. Foldout figures and tables should be avoided.

*References.* – In general, the editor expects all references to be formally consistent and in accordance with accepted practice within the particular field of research. Bibliographical references should be given in a way that avoids ambiguity.

## **Correspondence**

Manuscripts are to be sent to

The Editor  
Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab  
H.C. Andersens Boulevard 35  
DK-1553 Copenhagen V, Denmark  
Tel: +45 33 43 53 00 Fax: +45 33 43 53 01  
E-mail: [kdvs@royalacademy.dk](mailto:kdvs@royalacademy.dk).  
[www.royalacademy.dk](http://www.royalacademy.dk)

Questions concerning subscription to the series should be directed to the Academy

**Editor** Flemming Lundgreen-Nielsen

© 2007. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the copyright owner.

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab  
*The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters*

Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter

		DKK
28	P.J. Riis, Ingolf Thuesen, John Lund & Thomas Riis: <i>Topographical Studies in the Āabla Plain</i> . 2004. 192 pp. Ill.	260.-
29	Vagn Fabritius Buchwald: <i>Iron and steel in ancient times</i> . 2005. 372 pp. Ill.	360.-
30:1	<i>Danish Sources for the History of Ghana 1657-1754</i> . Vol. 1: 1657-1735. Edited by Ole Justesen. 2005. 500 pp.	300.-
30:2	<i>Danish Sources for the History of Ghana 1657-1754</i> . Vol. 2: 1735-1754. Edited by Ole Justesen. 2005. 558 pp.	300.-

Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser

90	Sune Dalgård: <i>Kanslere og Kancellier – især »tyske« – i Danmark og Holsten hen imod Enevælden</i> . 2005. 238 pp. Ill.	240.-
91	<i>The Imaginary Polis</i> . Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 7. Symposium, January 7-10, 2004. Edited by Mogens Herman Hansen. 2005. 444 pp.	300.-
92	C. Barker Jørgensen: <i>Daniel Frederik Eschricht (1798-1863)</i> <i>Peter Wilhelm Lund (1801-1880): Danish pioneers in experimental physiology – Historians, philosophers and practitioners on Claude Bernard's Introduction à l'étude de la médecine expérimentale</i> . 2005. 44 pp.	48.-
93	Mogens Herman Hansen: <i>The Tradition of Greek Democracy</i> . 2005. 75 pp.	80.-
94	Mogens Herman Hansen: <i>Studies in the Population of Aigina, Athens, and Eretria</i> . 2006. 96 pp.	80.-
95	Sune Dalgård: <i>Lidt om Vibeke Kruse</i> . 2006. 69 pp. Ill.	100.-
96	Thomas Heine Nielsen: <i>Olympia and the Classical Hellenic City-State Culture</i> . 2007. 139 pp. Ill.	120.-

Priser ekskl. moms / Prices excl. VAT



Printed in Denmark by Special-Trykkeriet Viborg a-s  
ISSN 0106-0481 – ISBN 978-87-7304-309-7