

expect something more than the single *πῶς* question which follows it. At the very least, something which would explain the athetization of Heracles' scene has been left out.

The scholiastic comments on Heracles in TV at *Od.* 11.385 easily join the truncated list which *τοιιάδε* introduces in HT at 11.568. They continue to enumerate reasons for athetization in the form of a series of rhetorical questions beginning with *πῶς*. This conforms to a pattern in the Homeric scholia in which *πῶς* questions cluster around one another. A short example of this is also from the scholia on the *Nekuia*, HT at *Od.* 11.573, '*πῶς οὖν μήκιστοι οἱ προειρημένοι παῖδες Ἀλωῆος; ἢ πῶς ὁ κείμενος ἐξήλθεν; εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐξήλθε, πῶς ἑωρᾶτο;*' It is interesting to note that this addresses the text only five lines after the note we are looking at, and in quite similar fashion. Further such examples are in the scholium on the other Odyssean *Nekuia*, MV at 24.1, in which three *πῶς* questions are joined together to support the athetization of that part of the *Odyssey*. The Iliadic scholia partake of the pattern also, as can be seen in the scholium bT at 5.885–7.⁵ So moving the comments about Heracles from TV at *Od.* 11.385 to HT at 11.568 would not only make the plural *τοιιάδε* more intelligible, but also give the note a form found elsewhere in the scholia.

More importantly, the comments about Heracles in TV at 11.385 make the reference of HT at 11.568 to Heracles intelligible. The scholium's comments can now be understood as a general introduction to the athetization which begins at *Od.* 11.568 and continues until the end of Book 11. The note sums up the arguments for athetization, and so the reference to Heracles and the lists of reasons for athetization peculiar to his scene should come as no surprise at this point in the scholia.⁶ Such a change in the text is not insignificant. It dispels the impression otherwise created that the scholia suggest that the Heracles scene, like the descriptions of Minos and the damned, can be athetized simply because of a problem in the logic of the narrative. As such, it sets the Heracles scene apart as a separate, and much more complex, textual problem for the scholia than that provided by the descriptions of Minos and the damned.

Princeton University

EDWARD GUTTING
egutting@princeton.edu

⁵ H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (Berlin, 1969).

⁶ The scholia's other criticisms of the Heracles scene follow shortly after 11.568, at lines 11.601, 602, 604, 616.

THE SEER TISAMENOS AND THE KLYTIADAI

At the battle of Plataia, 'Ἕλλησι μὲν Τισαμενὸς Ἀντιόχου ἦν ὁ θυόμενος· οὗτος γὰρ δὴ εἶπετο τῷ στρατεύματι τούτῳ μάντις· τὸν ἔοντα Ἥλειον καὶ γένεος τοῦ Ἰαμιδέων Κλυτιάδην Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐποιήσαντο λεωσφέτερον (Herodotos 9.33.1).

The Klytiadai, like the Iamidai, were an extended family of seers. They claimed descent from Melampous, by way of Klytios, grandson of Amphiaraios and son of Alkmaion.¹ Scholarly opinion is divided as to whether the name *Κλυτιάδην* should be secluded from the text of Herodotos as an intrusive gloss, or left where it is: if the Klytiadai and Iamidai were separate *genē*, then Tisamenos must belong to either

¹ Pausanias 6.17.6, where the line is given as: Amathaon-Melampous-Mantios-Oïkles-Amphiaraios-Alkmaion-Klytios (by a daughter of Phegeus of Arkadia).

one or the other, but not to both.² On the other hand, it has been argued that the Klytiadai may have been a branch of the Iamidai, and so the text should be allowed to stand.³

Inscriptions from Olympia make it clear that Iamidai and Klytiadai were regarded as equals: the lists of cult personnel identify *μάντεις* as one or the other.⁴ These lists cover the period 36 B.C. to 265 A.D. Up to about 181 A.D. there were two prophets in each list, normally one Iamid and one Klytiad.⁵ Thereafter the number was usually four, either two of each or three Iamids and one Klytiad. Towards the very end of the series one of the prophets, previously identified as an Iamid, is called a Klytiad.⁶ Ludwig Weniger suggested that he might have been adopted by the Klytiadai because of a shortage of candidates. He went on to suggest that this was what happened to the Tisamenos son of Antiochos who functioned at Plataia.⁷

Aside from Herodotos 9.33.1, the earliest datable reference to the Klytiadai is in Cicero, *De divinatione* 1.41 (91), where he calls them '*Clutidae*'.⁸ This work was probably written in the first part of 44 B.C.⁹ Pausanias (6.17.5–6) refers to a statue of Eperastos son of Theognos, victor of the race in hoplite armour at Olympia, and quotes the last part of the accompanying epigram, in which Eperastos describes himself as a prophet of the *genos* of the Klytidai, descended from Melampous.¹⁰ It is impossible to date this poem, although it is thought to be Hellenistic. Both Cicero and the epigrammatist quoted by Pausanias call the *genos* Klytidai, whereas Herodotos and the inscriptions call it Klytiadai. It may be (as Weniger suggested)¹¹ that the *-a-* was dropped for metrical reasons, which would suggest that Cicero's source depended ultimately on the epigram.

Whether one keeps or excises *Κλυτιάδην* at Herodotos 9.33.1 seems therefore to be a matter of informed choice. However, epigraphical evidence suggests that Herodotos may have written a different name.

A stone found near Kriekouki (now called Erythrai) in the nineteenth century bears

² Thus [*Κλυτιάδην*] in the Oxford text, following Valckenaer, and in Stein's edition.

³ E.g. S. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la Divination dans l'Antiquité* 2 (Paris, 1879), 70 (who suggests that they may have started out as a branch of the Iamidai, and been elevated later); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Berlin, 1886), 180, n. 37 ('einen Zweig der Iamiden'); F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la Nature du Genos* 1 (Paris, 1976), 364–5; N. Luraghi, *Klio* 79 (1997), 72. See too Hepding, *RE* 9 (1916), 688 s.v. 'Iamidai'.

⁴ W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold (edd.), *Die Inschriften von Olympia = Olympia* 5 (Berlin, 1896), nos. 59–141; L. Weniger, 'Die Seher von Olympia', *ARW* 18 (1915), 53–115.

⁵ Except for two occasions, once when there were two Iamids and once when there were two Klytiads.

⁶ This is Βιβ[ούλλιος] Φαυστανεϊνανός, an Iamid in *IvO* 117 = Weniger no. XXVII (221 A.D.), 114 = XXIX (225 A.D.), 115 = XXX (229 A.D.), 116 = XXXI (233 A.D.), 113 = XXXII (undated), but a Klytiad in 121 = XXXV (245 A.D.) and 122 = XXXVI (265 A.D.). It is possible, given the length of time involved, that the Iamid and the Klytiad were two different people. A trace of the same name is visible in 118 = XXXIII (241 A.D.); in 120 = XXXIV (around the middle of the 250th Olympiad) the third of the four prophets is Βιβούλλιος Φαυστανεϊνανός Ἀλεξάνδρου (all four are listed thus, without reference to *genos*).

⁷ Weniger (n. 4), 64–5, cf. 72: 'Vermutlich war er geborener Iamide und von den Klytiaden adoptiert'.

⁸ 'Itemque Elis in Peloponneso familias duas certas habet, Iamidarum unam, alteram Clutidarum, haruspicinae nobilitate praestantes.'

⁹ A. S. Pease (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione Liber Primus* (Chicago, 1920), 13–15.

¹⁰ See D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981), 445–6, no. CXXXVII (with bibliography). Page dates it 'IV/III B.C.'.

¹¹ Weniger (n. 4), 59, n. 3.

an inscription in characters of the first part of the fifth century B.C.:¹²

[Δ]άματρο[s] τόδ' ἄγαλμα[.]
 [ἐ]νθάδε γ' [ἐ]ἰσοράοντι σέ[βας]
 [.]εἰσαμενος ρυδάδας καί[.]

The find-spot is in the vicinity of the sanctuary of Demeter where the decisive engagement between Spartans and Mardonios occurred,¹³ and the temptation to restore [Τ]εἰσαμενός in line 3 is almost impossible to resist. Most editors have done so. Dittenberger (IG) restored [h]εἰσαμενός because Tisamenos was son of Antiochos, not Kydas. Those who read [Τ]εἰσαμενός either take this to be a different Tisamenos (son of Kydes), or identify him with the seer from Elis, and take ρυδάδας as the name of the second of three dedicators.¹⁴

There is another possibility, namely that ρυδάδας identifies Teisamenos as the member of a family (there would then have been at most two dedicators), and that this was indeed the seer who worked for the Spartans at Plataia. The idea that ρυδάδας is a *gentilicium* is not new,¹⁵ but I do not think that it has occurred to anybody that Herodotos might really have written γένεος τοῦ Ἰαμιδέων Κυδάδην, that is, 'a member of the family of Kydadaí, of the *genos* of Iamidai'. The change to Κλυτιάδην would be attributable to later scholarly intervention at the time of the preparation of the major recension of the text, with a familiar name being put in place of an otherwise unattested one.¹⁶

Eliminating Κλυτιάδην from the text of Herodotos puts this *genos* into a different light. The Klytiadaí came to prominence later than the Iamidai,¹⁷ and the genealogy which Pausanias—and he alone—transmits gives every appearance of being a late concoction: it is simply tacked on to the genealogy of Amphiaraios given in *Odyssey* 15.241–8. It is not impossible that the Klytiadaí entered the picture at a relatively late date as part of a revival or reorganization of cult activity at Olympia. The sanctuary was sacked by Sulla, and the games of 80 B.C. transferred to Rome as part of his triumph. For a time thereafter the games were of local or regional rather than panhellenic interest: it was Augustus who fostered their revival.¹⁸ The lists of officials

¹² IG 7.1670. I give the text as in P. A. Hansen, *CEG* 1.176.328 and Addenda in *CEG* 2, which see for the bibliography. The original publication was by B. Haussoullier, *BCH* 2 (1878), 589, with a transcription in pl. 26. He restored [Τ]εἰσαμενός, but with no comment. In the following year, P. Foucart, *BCH* 3 (1879), 134–6, suggested some restorations, noting (136) that Tisamenos was the name of the seer, 'mais c'est peut-être une coïncidence fortuite'. W. Peek, *Hermes* 72 (1937), 233.2, produced an improved text on revision of the stone. He took ρυδάδας as a patronymic. W. K. Pritchett, *AJPh* 100 (1979), 145–52, republished the text after his own revision. He suggested that there were three dedicants, Teisamenos, Kydadas, and one other (= *SEG* 29.450).

¹³ See W. K. Pritchett, *AJA* 61 (1957), 10 and n. 15.

¹⁴ Hansen's objection to this is valid: we should expect either two καί's or none.

¹⁵ H. Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae* (Berlin, 1882), p. 47 no. 143: 'Nomen Κυδάδας Tisameno adiectum potest esse gentilicium.'

¹⁶ See e.g. Ph.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote. Introduction* (Paris, 1942), 186–7 (186: 'Manuscrits et papyri semblent dériver tous, pour ce qui concerne le fond du texte, d'une même recension, d'une même édition antique, qui, dès les premiers siècles de notre ère, devait être la plus répandue.'

¹⁷ Cf. F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la Nature du Genos* 1 (Paris, 1976), 362: 'Tout se passe comme si les Clytiades étaient de notoriété plus récente et de prétensions plus modestes que les Iamides'; and N. Luraghi, *Klio* 79 (1997), 71–2.

¹⁸ E. N. Gardner, *Olympia. Its History and Remains* (Oxford, 1925), 152–60; J. Hopp, in S. Lauffer (ed.), *Griechenland* (Munich, 1989), 485 s.v. 'Olympia'.

may reflect a fairly thorough overhaul and reorganization, calling upon, among others, the members of existing families of seers to staff that office thereafter.¹⁹

McGill University

A. SCHACHTER

¹⁹ I note—but will not pursue the matter—that the names Kydas and Klyt(i)os carry more or less the same message. I am grateful to Peter Hansen for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

PINDAR, PYTHIAN 2.56

τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχαι πότμου σοφίας ἄριστον.

The sentence has been much discussed,¹ but most of the explanations suggested may be discounted on grounds of word order² or Greek usage,³ and it is fairly clear that the meaning of Pindar's words is that to be wealthy σὺν τύχαι πότμου is 'the best (part) of wisdom'.⁴ It remains only to determine the force of τὸ πλουτεῖν . . . σὺν τύχαι πότμου. Eduard Fraenkel⁵ and others who take these words together have supposed that the phrase means 'wealth when it is granted by divine will and not gained unjustly',⁶ but good fortune is not plausibly said to be a constituent of

¹ A survey in C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York, 1981), 43–5. Recent discussions, with further bibliography: G. W. Most, *AFLS* 7 (1986), 47–71; Pascale Hummel, *La Syntaxe de Pindare* (Louvain and Paris, 1993), 111–14; E. Cingano in B. Gentili et al., *Pindaro, Le Pitiche* (Milan, 1995), 387f.; D. I. Iakov, *Hellenica* 47 (1997), 152f.

² I include the explanation τὸ εὐπορεῖν σοφίας [~ τὸ πλουτεῖν . . . σοφίας] σὺν εὐτυχίᾳ ἄριστόν ἐστι, proposed at sch. 101f, ii.48.16f. Dr., and that attributed to Aristarchus, εὐπομπότατός ἐστιν [~ πότμου . . . ἄριστον] ὁ πλουτῶν καὶ σοφίας ἅμα τυγχάνων [~ σὺν τύχαι . . . σοφίας] (ibid., ii.49.6f.).

³ This may be said of the view that the subject of the sentence is τὸ πλουτεῖν . . . σὺν τύχαι πότμου σοφίας, apparently implied by sch. 101e, ii.48.15f., τὸ δὲ ἐπιτυγχάνειν . . . πλούτου μετὰ σοφίας ἄριστόν ἐστιν: σὺν τύχαι πότμου is shown by O. 8.67 τύχαι . . . δαίμονος, P. 8.53 τύχαι θεῶν, N. 4.7 σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι, 5.48 Μενάνδρου σὺν τύχαι, 6.24 σὺν θεοῦ . . . τύχαι, to be a phrase complete in itself (so Carey [n. 1], 43f.), and even if it were granted that the words σὺν τύχαι πότμου σοφίας could be joined and understood in the required sense, there would remain the objection that σοφία is a permanent quality, not something that a man gets from time to time, as τύχαι would appear to imply.

⁴ The sense of this phrase is settled by Soph. *Ant.* 1347f. πολλῶν τὸ φρονεῖν εὐδαιμονίας / πρῶτον ὑπάρχει and Pl. *R.* 3.389de σωφροσύνης δὲ ὡς πλήθει οὐ τὰ τοιάδε μέγιστα, ἀρχόντων μὲν ὑπηκόους εἶναι, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἄρχοντας τῶν περὶ πότους καὶ ἀφροδίσια καὶ περὶ ἐδωδὰς ἡδονῶν; compared by Carey (n. 1), 44: it does not mean, for example, 'the best thing wisdom has to offer' (H. Lloyd-Jones, *JHS* 93 [1973], 122 = *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* [Oxford, 1990], 130) or 'bester Gegenstand der Dichtung' (E. Thummer, *RhM* 115 [1972], 298, n. 20, referring vaguely to 'verwandte Ausdrücke wie z. B. τὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας'; A. M. Miller, *TAPhA* 111 [1981], 142, strangely cites in support of Thummer's view *N.* 10.46 and *Thuc.* 1.142.9, the latter with a false reference). Most (n. 1), 52, n. 19, appears to suppose that the possibility of this construction is somehow called into question by the existence of the separate construction illustrated at Kühner–Gerth i.279f.; he denies the relevance of the Plato passage on the grounds that 'the superlative is supported by a demonstrative pronoun which it modifies', without explaining why the agreement of μέγιστα with τὰ τοιάδε is to be regarded as essentially different from that of πρῶτον with τὸ φρονεῖν or that of ἄριστον with τὸ πλουτεῖν.

⁵ Ap. W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*, *SKGG* 5.3 (Halle, 1928), 331 [73], n. 0.

⁶ So Lloyd-Jones (n. 4); cf. Carey (n. 1), 44.