

PINDAR'S SEVENTH PYTHIAN AND THE STATUS OF THE ALCMAEONIDS AS *OIKOS* OR *GENOS*

MATTHEW W. DICKIE

IN AN APPENDIX TO AN ARTICLE ON THE EUPATRIDES published in 1931 H. T. Wade-Gery argued that the Alcmaeonids were what Herodotus calls an *oikie*, i.e., a real family descended from a historical ancestor, and not a *genos* or clan.¹ His reasons for reaching this conclusion were that Herodotus (6.125.5) calls the Alcmaeonids an *oikie*, "a house," that the Alcmaeonids as a whole benefited from Croesus' generosity to Alcmaeon and from Megacles' marriage to the daughter of Cleisthenes of Sicyon (Hdt. 6.125-126.1), evidence that the Alcmaeonids were too small a group to be a *genos* or clan, and that all known Alcmaeonids are the descendants of that Alcmaeon who was Solon's contemporary.

In propounding this thesis, Wade-Gery was taking issue with what was at the time and is apparently even now the most commonly accepted view of the status of the Alcmaeonids, namely, that they are a *genos* or clan. A. Boeckh, in his great commentary on Pindar, in treating the Seventh Pythian, had argued that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* on the ground that the form of their name so indicated and because Harpocration (s.v.) said they were.² That the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* or clan seems to have been generally accepted thereafter. Toepffer, for example, assumes that they are.³

U. Kahrstedt accepted Wade-Gery's view of the matter and it has recently been re-asserted by J. K. Davies. A. Andrewes holds that the Alcmaeonids were a "house," though he raises the possibility that there may have been a *genos* or clan called Alcmaeonidae of which this *oikos* was a part.⁴ F. Bourriot concludes in his study of what a *genos* in Athens was that until the middle of the fourth century the Alcmaeonids were

¹Wade-Gery 82 f. (= EGH 106-108). The following works are cited by author's name: F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la nature du genos. Etudes d'histoire sociale athénienne—périodes archaïque et classique* (Diss. Lille 1977); G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* (Gotha 1895); B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885); F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949); W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969); J. Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie* (Berlin 1898); H. T. Wade-Gery, "Eupatrides, Archons, and Areopagus," CQ 25 (1931) 1-11, 72-89, reprinted in *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford 1958, hereafter EGH) 86-115; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).

²A. Boeckh, *Pindari Epinicionum interpretatio Latina cum commentario perpetuo, fragmenta et indices* (Leipzig 1821) 300.

³225 ff., cf. RE 2 (1894) 1556 ff.

⁴U. Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige* (Stuttgart and Berlin 1934) 268 n. 2.; J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1972) 369 ff.; A. Andrews, *The Greeks* (London 1967) 81.

thought to be an *oikos* but around the middle of that century the notion of what constituted a *genos* changed and the Alcmaeonids began to be called and thought of as a *genos*.⁵

I propose in this paper to re-examine the evidence that has led scholars either to reject or to ignore Wade-Gery's thesis and instead to adopt the view that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* or clan. On the positive side, I shall argue that because Herodotus uses the terms *oikie* and *oikos* with precision, there are good grounds for thinking that since he calls the Alcmaeonids an *oikie* (6.125.5), they are an *oikie*, i.e., a house or line. On the negative side, I shall try to show that there is no good evidence that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* or clan and that in consequence that version of Athenian history which has the clan of the Alcmaeonids expelled from Athens sometime after the suppression of the Cylonian conspiracy and again by Cleomenes of Sparta in 508/7 B.C. in the factional strife between Cleisthenes and Isagoras is ill-founded. Finally, I shall argue that there is another very good reason, in addition to those presented by Wade-Gery, for thinking that the Alcmaeonids are a house, namely, Pindar's calling them an *oikos* at v.6 of his Seventh Pythian.

The first criticism with which Wade-Gery's theory seems to have met was that of W. S. Ferguson.⁶ As evidence that Herodotus does not use the word *oikie* with precision he alleged that that author (6.35.1) called the Philaids, a group who he believed were acknowledged to be a *genos*, an *oikie*.⁷ He also asserted that Thucydides (1.126.11) and Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 1) refer to the Alcmaeonids as a *genos*. C. Hignett inclined to the view that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* or clan because Pausanias (2.18.9) speaks of a *genos* of the Alcmaeonids. But Wade-Gery had already anticipated such an objection by questioning the authority of Pausanias on this matter.⁸

P. J. Bicknell points out that Aristotle refers to the Alcmaeonids as a *genos* at *Ath. Pol.* 20.1.⁹ He infers from Herodotus' saying (6.125.1) that the Alcmaeonids were distinguished in their origins in Athens but that they really only became very distinguished with Alcmaeon that there

⁵Bourriot 553–560. Bourriot thinks that during the fourth century the Athenian conception of what a *genos* was changed. In the course of that century the Athenians began to apply the term to aristocratic families such as the Alcmaeonids. Earlier *genos* had been used only of royal families, families who were thought to have the power of divination, and priestly families such as the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes.

⁶"The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion," *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 43 n. 3.

⁷Diog. Laert. 10.1 says the philosopher Epicurus belonged to the *genos* of the Philaids. This is the evidence that there was a clan of that name. See Toepffer 278.

⁸C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) 63 n. 4, 316; Wade-Gery 83 (=EGH 107).

⁹P. J. Bicknell, *Studies in Athenian Politics and Genealogy* (Wiesbaden 1972 [*Historia Einzelschriften* 19]) 59.

must have been Alcmaeonids before Alcmaeon, i.e., Alcmaeon did not found the house. Bicknell believes that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos*, in which only one house, called Alcmaeonidae, was eminent.

I shall deal first with the way in which Herodotus uses the words *oikie* and *oikos*, since Ferguson's assertion that he calls the Philaids an *oikie* raises the question of how precise his usage is in this matter. There are twelve instances of *oikie* in Herodotus used of a group of people in addition to the passages in which the Alcmaeonids (6.125.5) and the Philaids, as Ferguson holds, are called an *oikie*.¹⁰ In none of these cases is there anything to suggest that anything other than a house or line is meant and in some cases it is clear that what is intended is a house or line. Thus the line of Lydian kings of whose number Croesus was is referred to as an *oikie* at 1.25.2. The two Spartan royal houses are also spoken of in this way (6.51, 65.1; 8.131.2; 9.10.3). Otanes, one of the seven conspirators against the false Smerdis, withdraws from the competition for the Persian kingship after securing an agreement that he himself and those born from him should be ruled by no one. This *oikie*, Herodotus says, alone of the Persians remains free to this day (3.83.2-3). In other words, Otanes' descendants constitute an *oikie*.

The word *oikos* used of a group of people occurs three times in Herodotus. In all of these instances Herodotus is speaking of a house or line. The daughter of Apries, Amasis' predecessor as king of Egypt, is said by Herodotus to be the only surviving member of the *oikos* when she was sent by Amasis to Cambyses (3.1.3); that is, she was the sole survivor of the line to which Apries belonged. Herodotus reports that the Egyptians maintain that Cambyses killed the sister whom he had married because she plucked a lettuce in his presence of its leaves and told him that he had plucked bare the *oikos* of Cyrus (3.32.3-4). She meant that the *oikos* established by Cyrus had been shorn of one of its members when Cambyses killed his brother Smerdis, who was, as was Cambyses, a son of Cyrus. Finally, there is an oracle at 6.86.γ.2 in which the destruction of all the *genee* and all the *oikos* of perjurers is predicted. This is the customary threat of extinction of the family and lineage of a wrongdoer. Herodotus then employs the terms *oikie* and *oikos* in much the same way as the English word "house" is used. There is also reason to infer a tendency on Herodotus' part to restrict the terms *oikie* and *oikos* to families of some distinction.

Herodotus at 6.35.1 does not, as Ferguson says he does, call the Philaids an *oikie*. The word Philaid does not in fact occur in his narrative. What he says is that Miltiades, the son of Cypselus, belonged to an *oikie* rich enough to support a four-horse chariot-team and that the beginnings of

¹⁰1.25.2, 99.2, 107.2; 2.172.2; 3.2.2, 83.3; 4.76.6; 5.66.1; 6.51, 65.1; 8.131.2; 9.10.3.

Miltiades' ancestry can be traced back to Aegina and Aeacus but that he was more recently Athenian. Philaeus, the son of Ajax, was the first Athenian in the *oikie*. In saying that Miltiades belonged to an *oikie* rich enough to support a four-horse chariot-team, Herodotus seems to be referring to the house to which Miltiades belonged. It is hard to imagine what could be meant by saying of a man that he belonged to a clan rich enough to support such a team. When Herodotus goes on to say that Philaeus was the first member of this *oikie* to be an Athenian, we may conclude that in using the word *oikie* again he is still talking of the family or house of Miltiades. Herodotus can be convicted of some imprecision, caused by compressing what he has to say into too brief a form, in saying that Philaeus was the first member of the *oikie* to be an Athenian, since Philaeus, strictly speaking, was not a member of the *oikie* at all. He may well have been the mythic ancestor of the *genos* or clan of which the *oikie* of Miltiades was a part. But Herodotus does not say that the Philaids, if that was the name of the clan, were an *oikie*. In sum then, what Herodotus means by *oikie*, when he uses that term to refer to a group of persons, is a "line" or "house." There is no evidence that he employs the word to refer to a *genos* or clan.

I now turn to the evidence adduced in support of the thesis that the Alcmaeonids are a *genos* or clan. Bicknell's contention that from Herodotus' saying at 6.125.1 that the Alcmaeonids were distinguished in their origins in Athens but only became really distinguished with Megacles it follows that the Alcmaeonids existed in Athens before Alcmaeon, i.e., that the Alcmaeonids are not a house whose founder was Alcmaeon, is mistaken. How else was Herodotus to refer to the ancestors of the house? We have seen that in speaking of the ancestry of Miltiades, Herodotus says that Philaeus was the first member of the *oikie* of Miltiades to be an Athenian. It does not follow from that that Herodotus thought that the *oikie* was already in existence in Philaeus' time. We would be equally wrong to conclude that from Herodotus' saying at 5.65.1-3 that the Peisistratids were in origin Pylians and Neileidae it follows that there were people called Peisistratids amongst the Pylians and the Neileidae who came to Athens. Similarly, we do not infer from someone's saying that the House of Windsor was originally German that there were German princes whose family name was Windsor. Thus what Herodotus says at 6.125.1 does not in any way show that there was a family, whether real or mythic, called the Alcmaeonids in existence before Alcmaeon.

It is widely assumed that the Alcmaeonids were already in existence at the time of the Cylonian conspiracy and participated in its suppression.¹¹

¹¹The following assume the existence of the Alcmaeonids at the time of the Cylonian conspiracy: Toepffer, *RE* 2 (1894) 1559, Busolt 2² 208, K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (Berlin 1926) 1² 302-309, F. E. Adcock, *CAH* (Cambridge 1926) 4 27 f., Jacoby 186-188, G. W. Williams, "The Curse of the Alkmaionidae. I," *Hermathena* 78 (1951) 32-49,

Thucydides 1.126.11 and Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 1 have been taken to show that the persons brought to trial for the murder of the Cylonian conspirators were Alcmaeonids and that the sentence passed at the end of the trial was that the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids was to be exiled from Athens for ever.¹² These are the passages in which Ferguson says the Alcmaeonids are referred to as a *genos*. I shall argue that the passages in question provide no support at all for this version of Athenian history, since in neither of them are the Alcmaeonids mentioned, much less called a *genos* or clan. I shall also show that our other ancient sources for the Cylonian conspiracy do not say or imply that those expelled from Athens for the murder of the Cylonians were the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids.

Finally, I shall turn to what Herodotus has to say about the curse that affected the Alcmaeonids. The question here is whether there is anything to suggest that the reason that the Alcmaeonids were accursed was that the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids had been pronounced accursed by the court that had tried those responsible for murdering the Cylonians. I shall pay particular attention to Herodotus' account of the expulsion of Cleisthenes and his supporters by the Spartan king, Cleomenes, because Jacoby has concluded from his analysis of the passage that the Accursed were the Alcmaeonids and the Alcmaeonids only, a conclusion that tends to support the view that the Curse was a curse on the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids (366 n. 77).

Thucydides describes the Cylonian conspiracy and its consequences to explain why the Spartans in 432 B.C. had sent envoys to Athens urging the Athenians to drive out the Curse (*agos*) (1.126.2). In his version the Cylonians seized the Acropolis. The Athenians responded by coming in full force from the countryside to besiege the Acropolis (1.126.7). The majority of them, wearied by the length of the siege, left and entrusted to the nine archons, who at that time, Thucydides says, conducted most of the state's business, the task of guarding the besieged and the authority to take whatever measures they thought fit (1.126.8). Hunger and thirst caused Cylon and his brother to run off. Those who were left behind, some of whom were dying of starvation, became suppliants at the altar on the

H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte*⁴ (Munich 1960) 117, F. Ghinatti, *I gruppi politici ateniesi fino alle guerre persiane* (Rome 1970) 36, W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth Century Athens* (Princeton 1971) 13 f., L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London 1976) 88, R. J. Hopper, *The Early Greeks* (London 1976) 185 f., R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek States 700–338 B.C.* (Berkeley—Los Angeles 1976) 99, 114 f.

¹²Among those who subscribe to the view that the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids was condemned to exile are: Toepffer (above, note 11) 1559, Jacoby 186, Ghinatti, Connor, Hopper, Sealey *loc. cit.*; Hignett, (above, note 8) 87, 105, says that only Megacles and those members of the clan responsible for the massacre were driven into exile. Jeffery (*loc. cit.*) suggests that because only one clan was banished all the archons may have been Alcmaeonids.

Acropolis. Those entrusted with guarding them, when they saw them dying in the holy places, raised them up promising to do them no harm, but took them away and killed them. Some they killed on the altars of the Awesome Goddesses (1.126.10 f.). Because of this deed they were called accursed and transgressors against the goddess as were also their descendants (ἐκείνοι τε ἐκαλοῦντο καὶ τὸ γένος τὸ ἀπ' ἐκείνων). The Athenians drove these accursed persons out and so also later did Cleomenes in a period of civil strife in Athens. In both cases, expulsion meant a driving out of the living and an uprooting and casting out of the bones of the dead (1.126.11 f.). It was this curse, Thucydides says, that the Spartans ordered the Athenians to drive out knowing that Pericles was affected by it on his mother's side (1.127.1).

Thucydides' version then is that it was the nine archons who were given the task of dealing with the Cylonians, that it was they who killed the conspirators, after the conspirators had become suppliants, and that because of that deed they and their descendants were called accursed and transgressors. Those (ἐκείνοι 1.126.11) called accursed and transgressors against the goddess are those of the Athenians entrusted with guarding the Cylonians (οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακὴν 1.126.11) who killed the Cylonians, after raising them from their suppliant position, who, in their turn, are identical with the nine archons to whom the Athenians entrusted the task of guarding the Cylonians (ἐπιτρέψαντες τοῖς ἐννέα ἄρχουσι τὴν τε φυλακὴν 1.126.8). The sentence that has been taken to show that the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids were the Accursed and that it was they who were expelled from Athens is ἐκείνοι τε ἐκαλοῦντο καὶ τὸ γένος τὸ ἀπ' ἐκείνων (1.126.11).¹³ Those referred to as ἐκείνοι are, as we have seen, the nine archons. The phrase τὸ γένος τὸ ἀπ' ἐκείνων does not mean "the *genos* or clan of them," but "their descendants."¹⁴ The preposition ἀπό here signifies descent from and not belonging to.¹⁵ Although I cannot cite an exact parallel to the phrase, it is no more than a transformation into

¹³Jacoby misunderstood Thucydides' account, apparently because of his conviction that τὸ γένος τὸ ἀπ' ἐκείνων (1.126.11) meant the *genos* or clan, the Alcmaeonids. In consequence, the sentence in which Thucydides says that the Athenians handed over the responsibility for the siege to the nine archons (1.126.8) is for him a break in the narrative, which is resumed by the account of the *genos*, i.e., the Alcmaeonids, raising up the suppliant Cylonians and then killing them (187 f.). A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1945) 1.427, because of the same misunderstanding thought that there was an inconsistency between Thucydides' narrative, which seemed to say that all nine archons were equally guilty, and Thucydides' statement that the *genos*, i.e., the Alcmaeonids, alone were exiled. Hopper, (above, note 11) 185 understands Thucydides to say that those entrusted with the siege who killed the Cylonians and the clan connected with them became tainted with blood guilt.

¹⁴Bourriot says that there is no doubt that "descendants" are what is meant here (346 n. 10).

¹⁵LSJ s.v. ἀπό III.1.

substantival form of the participial phrases *οἱ γινόμενοι ἀπό* and *οἱ γεγεννημένοι ἀπό* that occur with some frequency in Herodotus.¹⁶

What Thucydides says then is that those called accursed were the nine archons who suppressed the Cylonian conspiracy and their descendants. There is no mention of the Alcmaeonids at all. The fact that those directly responsible and their descendants should be singled out in this way for punishment is in accord with the widespread Greek practice of punishing a man and his descendants for certain crimes.

What Aristotle says at *Ath. Pol.* 1 is in essential agreement with Thucydides' account. We have only the end of Aristotle's description of the Cylonian affair at *Ath. Pol.* 1. There, we are told that the verdict, in what can only be the trial of those who had put down the conspiracy, was that there was pollution (*agos*) and that they themselves were expelled from their graves and their *genos* was exiled for ever (*αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἐξεβλήθησαν, τὸ δὲ γένος αὐτῶν ἔφυγεν ἀειφυγίαν*). The contrast is between those who actually were guilty and their descendants. Aristotle's *αὐτοὶ μὲν . . . τὸ δὲ γένος* is an example of the formula found in decrees containing imprecations or penalties that are to be imposed on the guilty and their descendants or decrees laying down the honours to be accorded a man and his descendants.¹⁷ It is clearly not evidence that the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids was expelled from Athens.

There is nothing in Plutarch's nor Pausanias' account of the suppression of the Cylonian affair to support the view that the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids was driven into exile. Plutarch relates the story of the Cylonian affair in his *Solon*. He says that Megacles the eponymous archon and his fellow-archons are reputed to have stoned to death some of the Cylonians outside the shrine of the goddess, to have slaughtered others at the altars, and to have spared only those who supplicated their wives (12.1). Because of this deed they were called accursed and became hated (12.2). Strife followed between the surviving Cylonians and Megacles and his party until Solon persuaded the so-called Accursed to submit to trial before a jury of three hundred nobles. Myron of Phlya acted as prosecutor. The accused were convicted, the living going into exile, while the corpses of those who had died were dug up and cast outside the boundaries of Attica (12.2-4). The Accursed for Plutarch are Megacles and his fellow-archons and it is they who are in his version brought to trial and condemned for the killing of the Cylonians.¹⁸

¹⁶J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge 1938) s.v. *γίνομαι*

¹⁷For examples of this expression, Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*³ index s.v. *γένος*.

¹⁸Jacoby maintains that Plutarch's narrative like Thucydides' lacks continuity (188). Williams (above, note 11) 36 thinks that Plutarch's saying that Megacles and his fellow archons were called accursed (*Solon* 12.1) is inaccurate because in the next sentence Plutarch says that the Cylonians who survived pursued their feud with the supporters of Megacles (12.2). But the two sentences are not incompatible.

In Pausanias' account, the Athenians granted the suppliants the right to depart unpunished, but later those holding office (*αὐτοὶ οἱ ἔχοντες τὰς ἀρχάς*) killed the suppliants. Those responsible for the killing and their descendants were thought to be accursed of the goddess (*καὶ αὐτοὶ τε <οἱ> ἀποκτείναντες ἐνομίσθησαν καὶ οἱ ἐξ ἐκείνων ἐναγείς τῆς θεοῦ* 7.25.3). Here too it is the magistrates and their descendants of whom the Accursed are composed.

The Accursed were then, according to Thucydides and Pausanias, the magistrates who had been responsible for the killings and their descendants. Thucydides says specifically that the magistrates were the nine archons. We may with some reason infer that Aristotle said the same thing. Plutarch, who used Aristotle here or at any rate used the same source, says that those brought to trial for the killing of the Cylonians were the nine archons. In theory then all the descendants of the nine archons should have been thought to be accursed. This is in some measure confirmed by Herodotus and Aristotle. What they have to say about the consequences of the Curse makes it clear enough that it was not confined to one *genos* or clan, the Alcmaeonids, but was something that affected a wider group.

Herodotus twice refers to the Curse and the Alcmaeonids. At 1.61.1 he says that Peisistratus married the daughter of Megacles but did not consummate the marriage in a normal fashion as he already had adolescent sons and because he did not wish his wife to bear children since the Alcmaeonids were said to be accursed. Peisistratus' second reason for not wishing to have children by the daughter of Megacles was then that the children would be said to be accursed. The children of this union would not have been Alcmaeonids. Hence it follows that the Curse affected not only Alcmaeonids but others, since it could be passed in both the male and female lines. That this is so is confirmed by the Spartan attempt in 432 B.C. to have Pericles expelled from Athens as accursed (Thuc. 1.127.1). Pericles himself was not an Alcmaeonid but his mother was.

The topic of the Curse recurs at Herodotus 5.70–72.1. There, Herodotus relates how the Spartan king, Cleomenes, answered Isagoras' appeal for help by attempting through a herald to expel Cleisthenes and many other Athenians from Athens. On the instructions of Isagoras, Cleomenes called these people accursed. For, Herodotus says, the Alcmaeonids and those of their faction were blamed for the following murder, a blame in which Isagoras and his friends did not share (5.70.2).

Herodotus now digresses to explain how the Accursed had got their name. Cylon, an Athenian who was an Olympic victor, had formed a conspiracy to make himself tyrant. To that end he tried to gain control of the Acropolis. He did not succeed and therefore sat as a suppliant at the statue (*sc.* of the goddess). The *prytaneis* of the naucraries, who at that

time, according to Herodotus, governed Athens, raised up the suppliants, after they had agreed to submit to any penalty but death. The Alcmaeonids, Herodotus says, are blamed for having murdered them (5.71).

After this digression, Herodotus resumes his narrative using the device of ring composition. He says again that Cleomenes sent a herald to Athens and sought to expel Cleisthenes and the Accursed. Cleisthenes alone withdrew at this stage. Cleomenes nonetheless appeared in Athens with a small force and proceeded to drive out as accursed seven hundred households (5.72.1).

In this passage Herodotus makes it quite clear that there were persons other than the Alcmaeonids who could be called accursed because they shared in the blame of having killed the Cylonians (5.70.2).¹⁹ He identifies them only as being of the same faction as the Alcmaeonids. It does not follow that because Herodotus says that the Alcmaeonids were blamed for having murdered the Cylonians (5.71.2), he means that persons answering to the name Alcmaeonid put down the Cylonian conspiracy, i.e., that there were persons who could properly be called Alcmaeonids in existence at the time of the Cylonian conspiracy. All that he need mean is that guilt attached to the Alcmaeonids because of a murder committed in the past in which a forebear of the family was alleged to have participated. That is supported by his earlier statement that the Alcmaeonids and the members of their faction were blamed for the killings, while Isagoras and his friends did not share in the blame (5.70.2), i.e., no guilt attached to any of the ancestors of Isagoras and his friends.

Herodotus does not say, as Jacoby apparently thought that he did, that Cleomenes first expelled Cleisthenes and the Alcmaeonids as the Accursed using a herald and then came to Athens in person and drove out seven hundred other households.²⁰ What Herodotus says is that Cleomenes sought to drive out Cleisthenes and many other Athenians with him on the ground that they were accursed. The imperfect ἐξέβαλλε at 5.70.2 and 72.1 is conative and does not imply completed action.²¹ That

¹⁹In Jacoby's view the Accursed for Herodotus are only the Alcmaeonids (366 n. 77). The impression that they might include persons other than Alcmaeonids derives from Herodotus' failure to distinguish sufficiently sharply in his narrative between the Accursed, who were the Alcmaeonids, and their supporters, who were not Alcmaeonids. What is said at Hdt. 5.71 makes it impossible, according to Jacoby, to take οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι καὶ οἱ συστασιῶται αὐτῶν εἶχον αἰτίην τοῦ φονοῦ (5.70.2) to mean that there were persons other than Alcmaeonids amongst the Accursed. But if the sentence in Hdt. 5.71 that Jacoby had in mind was φονεῦσαι δὲ αὐτοὺς αἰτίη ἔχει Ἀλκμεωνίδας, it does not follow from that sentence that *only* the Alcmaeonids were blamed for the massacre of the Cylonians and so were alone accursed.

²⁰"Herodotus in 5.72 makes a very clear distinction between the ἐναγέλis on the one hand and on the other the 700 families expelled by Kleomenes" (366 n. 77).

²¹See W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (London 1889) 11.

follows from Herodotus' saying that Cleisthenes *alone* withdrew when Cleomenes issued his order through the herald (5.72.1).²² So the persons whom Cleomenes in person drove out as accursed (ἀγῆλατεί 5.72.1) are exactly the same persons whom he had tried to drive out using a herald naming them accursed (ἐξέβαλλε . . . τοὺς ἐναγέας ἐπιλέγων 5.70.2), but whom he failed to get to leave Athens.²³ Not only does the run of sense demand this interpretation, but Herodotus himself, in saying that the seven hundred households expelled as accursed were those about whom Isagoras had instructed Cleomenes (τά οἱ ὑπέθετο ὁ Ἰσαγόρης 5.72.1), uses a sentence that picks up and repeats the intent of the phrase (ἐκ διδαχῆς τοῦ Ἰσαγόρεω 5.70.2) that he had already employed in explaining how Cleomenes knew whom to have his herald order to leave as accursed. Herodotus then leaves us in no doubt that the accursed whom Cleomenes tried to expel by having a herald order them to leave Athens were the same persons whom Cleomenes in person had to expel as accursed.

To sum up, what Herodotus says about the Curse and the Alcmaeonids and what we may infer from what he says is the following: 1) The Curse was passed on through both the male and female lines, from which it follows that persons other than Alcmaeonids might be treated as accursed (1.61.1). 2) Herodotus, in explaining who the Accursed were, says that there were persons other than Alcmaeonids who were blamed for the murder of the Cylonians (5.70.3). 3) Seven hundred households were banished from Athens as accursed by Cleomenes (5.72.1). Some of them were Alcmaeonids and some were not.

Aristotle's account of the struggle between Isagoras and Cleisthenes has little independent authority, since it is obviously not much more than a paraphrase and summary of Herodotus' version of the same events (*Ath. Pol.* 20.1–3). It is, however, useful as a confirmation of the interpretation that has been given above of Herodotus' account. Aristotle says that when Cleisthenes got the upper hand, Isagoras called upon his guest-friend Cleomenes for help and persuaded him to drive out the Curse, on the ground that the Alcmaeonids were thought to be of the number of the Accursed (διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἀλκμεινίδας δοκεῖν εἶναι τῶν ἐναγῶν 20.2). After Cleisthenes had departed, Cleomenes drove out as accursed seven hun-

²²Κλεισθένης μὲν αὐτὸς ὑπεξέσχε. αὐτός here means "alone." So also W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford 1912) 2.39. Cf. Kühner-Gerth, *Griechische Grammatik* (Hannover-Leipzig 1898) 2.2³ 652 n. 2 and LSJ s.v. αὐτός 1.3.

²³The verb ἀγῆλατέω, a compound of ἄγος and ἐλαύνω (P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* [Paris 1968] s.v. ἄγος), clearly means "drive out those affected by an ἄγος," i.e., ἐναγείς Cf. Soph. *OT* 402. Jacoby ignores this in saying that Herodotus in 5.72 makes a clear distinction between the Accursed and the seven hundred households (366 n. 77). Wade-Gery, "The Laws of Kleisthenes," *CQ* 27 (1933) 26 n. 3 (= *EGH* 150 n. 1) says, "Kleisthenes himself withdrew at once, the remainder waited till Kleomenes came and compelled them."

dred houses (20.3). The Alcmaeonids then, according to Aristotle, in 508/7 B.C. made up only part of the number of the Accursed. The expulsion of the Accursed took place in two stages. Cleisthenes withdrew before Cleomenes arrived. Cleomenes then drove out seven hundred households.

The evidence of Herodotus 5.70–72.1, Thucydides 1.126.2–12, Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 1, 20.1–3, Plutarch *Sol.* 12.2–4, and Pausanias 7.25.3 gives no grounds for thinking that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* or clan. The testimony of Thucydides, Aristotle, and Pausanias makes it quite clear that the Accursed were not the *genos* or clan of the Alcmaeonids but the nine archons responsible for the suppression of the Cylonian conspiracy and their descendants.²⁴ The Alcmaeonids were of the number of the Accursed, but that is to be accounted for by the fact that they were descendants of Megacles, the eponymous archon at the time of the conspiracy.

There is, however, some evidence at *Ath. Pol.* 20.1 and 28.2 that seems to tell in favour of the Alcmaeonids' being a *genos* or clan. At *Ath. Pol.* 20.1 Aristotle says that when the tyranny had been brought down, Isagoras, the son of Teisandros, and Cleisthenes who was of the *genos* of the Alcmaeonids (τοῦ γένους ὧν τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν) fought against each other, while at *Ath. Pol.* 28.2, where there is a list of the leaders of the *demos* and of the leaders of the well-born and rich, the same phrase is used to identify Cleisthenes. The form of expression, *genos* with a dependent collective genitive, according to Bourriot (347), is that used when *genos* is employed in its technical sense.²⁵ But the matter cannot be settled by appeal to linguistic usage. We do not have enough evidence to say with certainty that *genos* with a dependent collective genitive always means "*genos*" in a technical sense and not just "family." Securely dated examples of the word used in a technical sense do not occur until the second half of the fourth century.²⁶ The word is used frequently in Herodotus and Attic Greek of real families. Thus Herodotus says that the kingship of Lydia passed from the Heracleidae to the *genos* of Croesus, those called the Mermnadae (1.7.1).²⁷ The Mermnadae are the royal line that begins with Gyges and ends with Croesus. This line Herodotus later calls an *oikie* (1.25.2), in saying that Alyattes was the second member of this *oikie* to dedicate a silver krater at Delphi. The first was Gyges (Hdt. 1.14.3).

²⁴So also Busolt 2² 208 and Wade-Gery *loc. cit.*

²⁵Bourriot believes that for Aristotle the Alcmaeonids are a *genos*. The Curse, as an indelible mark of a religious nature, had had the effect of setting them apart and had contributed to their being thought of as a *genos* just as in the archaic period ability in divination and priestly privileges had marked certain families off as *gene* (553–560).

²⁶[Dem.] 59.117 seems to be the earliest. The speech is to be dated to between 343 and 340 B.C. See F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* (Leipzig 1893) 3.1³ 536.

²⁷For further examples of *genos* in this sense, cf. Hdt. 1.35.1; 5.39.2; 7.173.2, 208.1; 8.42.2.

Andocides in the *De Mysteriis* tells the jurors that if they condemn him to death, there will be no one left of his *genos* but it will be gone root and branch (146). He goes on to say in the next sentence that the *oikia* of Andocides and Leogoras has been no disgrace to the Athenians but it was a disgrace when Cleophon the lyre-maker lived in it when he (Andocides) was in exile. *Genos* here is then more or less synonymous with *oikia*, which in this passage means both the line and the house in which the line lives. In Aristotle's *Politics* *genos* is used twice of real family groups (1280b 34 and 40). Linguistic usage is then not much help in settling this matter.

There is one further factor to be considered in interpreting *Ath. Pol.* 20.1 and its doublet, 28.2. It is the dependence of *Ath. Pol.* 20.1–3 on Herodotus 5.66.1–2 and 69.2–73.1. The *Ath. Pol.* here is for the most part a paraphrase of Herodotus which consistently avoids Herodotus' actual words. At Herodotus 5.66.1 Cleisthenes is described as ἀνὴρ Ἀλκμεωνίδης. It may be that τοῦ γένους ὧν τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν is simply Aristotle's rendering of Herodotus. But in our present state of knowledge it is impossible to say what is meant by the phrase. It may be that by Aristotle's time the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* and that *Ath. Pol.* 20.1 and 28.2 reflect that state of affairs. If that is so, it is not proof that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos* or clan in the sixth and fifth centuries.

I have argued that Herodotus uses the term *oikie* with precision. I take it for granted that he knew what he was talking about in calling the Alcmaeonids an *oikie*. Wade-Gery was then justified in insisting that the Alcmaeonids were a house. Pindar is as punctilious in his use of kinship terms as Herodotus. In his epinician odes, in particular, he devotes a great deal of attention to praising the families and ancestors of those whose victories he has been commissioned to celebrate. His patrons will have expected accuracy in these matters. So when in the Seventh Pythian he calls the Alcmaeonids an *oikos*, we may take that to be good evidence that the Alcmaeonids were a house and not a clan.

The Seventh Pythian, a poem in honour of a victory won in 486 B.C. in the chariot-race by the Alcmaeonid Megacles, who had been ostracized earlier in that year (*Ath. Pol.* 22.5), begins as follows:²⁸

Κάλλιστον αἱ μεγαλόπολις Ἀθῶναι
 προοίμιον Ἀλκμανιδᾶν εὐρυσθενεῖ
 γενεῇ κρηπὶδ' αἰδᾶν ἵπποισι βαλέσθαι.
 ἐπεὶ τίνα πάτρην, τίνα οἶκον ναίων ὀνυμάξαι
 ἐπιφανέστερον
 Ἑλλάδι πυθέσθαι;

(1–7)

²⁸The two most important discussions of this poem are U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin 1893) 2 323–328 and R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962) 32–35.

"Athens, a mighty city, is the fairest proem to cast down as a foundation of song for horses for the powerful family of the Alcmaeonids. For dwelling in what fatherland or house will you name a fatherland or house that is more distinguished for Hellas to learn of?"

Pindar then calls the Alcmaeonids both a *genea* and an *oikos*. The significance of Pindar's referring to the Alcmaeonids in this way has only to my knowledge been noticed by M. H. E. Maier,²⁹ who pointed out in his work on the Athenian *gene* that v.5 f. were cause for doubt about the truth of Boeckh's assertion that the Alcmaeonids were a *genos*.³⁰ He wrote: "sed quamquam praeter Pausaniam (2.18.9) etiam Pindarus (*Pyth.* 7.2) eam γενεάν et πάτραν et Harpocraton (s.v.) γένος ἐπιφανές appellant, tamen dubium manet, fueritne una illorum CCCLX gentium, an *oikos* potius, quo nomine Pindarus (*Pyth.* 7.5) non minus utitur."

Maier then thought that Pindar in the Seventh Pythian called the Alcmaeonids, on the one hand, a *genea* and a *patra*, i.e., a clan, and, on the other, an *oikos*. If Pindar had in fact done this, there would be reason for perplexity. Pindar does use *patra* to mean "a clan" (Slater s.v.). But the word may also mean "fatherland" in Pindar and that is what it means here.³¹ What Pindar asks then is what fatherland is there that is more distinguished than Athens and what *oikos* that is more distinguished than the Alcmaeonids (so Gildersleeve 322).

Yet the difficulty remains that Pindar calls the Alcmaeonids both a *genea* and an *oikos*. But there is no contradiction, since Pindar uses *genea* indifferently to refer either to real families or to mythic families, *patrai* in his terminology. *Oikos*, on the other hand, is a term with a precise significance in Pindar and is never a synonym of *patra*. Therefore in calling

²⁹M. H. E. Maier, *De Gentilitate Attica* (Halle 1835) 38.

³⁰There is nothing, for example, in E. Wust's *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter* (Diss. Tübingen 1967) on this matter, although she devotes a whole chapter of her dissertation to the poem. She apparently takes the Alcmaeonids to be a clan, who, she says, make their first appearance in history in 640 B.C. with the archon Megacles' part in the Cylonian affair, as a result of which a guilt that was never forgotten was fastened to the Alcmaeonids (98). Bourriot, 378 f., notices that the Alcmaeonids are called a *genea* at *Pyth.* 7.2 but makes no mention of their being called an *oikos* in v. 5 f. He believes that it is not just chance that Pindar chooses to call them a *genea* and not a *genos*. Pindar's avoidance of *genos* is deliberate for that term, in Bourriot's view, would be used by Pindar only of such groups as the Iamidae who are marked off by their powers of divination (*Ol.* 6.71). Bourriot points out that *genea* is used by Pindar on a number of occasions to refer to the family of the victor (379 n. 72). But some of these families are not families in any real sense but *patrai*. The Blepsidae, who appear to be an Aeginetan *patra* and who do not seem to have any of the prophetic or priestly associations that Bourriot maintains are the criteria for a family's being called a *genos* in this period, are referred to as a *genos* at *Ol.* 8.83. We cannot really say whether Pindar's calling the Alcmaeonids a *genea* and not a *genos* has any significance.

³¹So Gildersleeve 322, Wilamowitz (above, note 28) 2.335, and Slater s.v. *πάτρα*.

the Alcmaeonids an *oikos*, Pindar means that they are a real family and not a *genos* or clan.

There are in Pindar three real families or houses who are referred to as *geneai*. The Sixth Pythian was composed in honour of the victory that Xenocrates, a brother of the tyrant of Acragas, Theron, had won in the chariot-race. Xenocrates was a member of the family known as the Emmenidae, whose founder was Emmenes or Emmenides.³² Pindar says that there is a treasury of song built up at Delphi for the blessed Emmenidae, Acragas, and Xenocrates (5-9). The elements will not disturb that treasury, i.e., song is immortal unlike man's physical monuments (10-14). Then addressing Thrasyboulus, the son of Xenocrates, Pindar declares that the façade of the treasure-house will announce as a theme for the talk of mortals a victory in which Thrasyboulus' father and his *genea* share (14-18), i.e., the treasure-house that is Pindar's song will bring glory to Xenocrates and the Emmenidae. The Emmenidae, a real family, are then called a *genea*.³³

The Third and Fourth Isthmians celebrate the victories of a Theban, Melissus.³⁴ He belonged to a family called the Cleonymidae, who, there is reason to think, were a real family and not a clan. In the Third Isthmian, Melissus is said by his victory not to have disgraced his inherited *arete* (11-14). As evidence of the *arete* that runs in Melissus' blood, Pindar calls attention to the ancient fame of Cleonymus in chariot-racing (15 f.). The Cleonymidae are said in the Fourth Isthmian to have flourished in *aretai*, to have been honoured in Thebes from the beginning, to have been guest-friends of those who dwelt around, and to have been devoid of *hybris* (4-9). They had reached the limits of manly excellence, but one day of war had deprived that blessed hearth of four men (9-18). But the victory hymn granted the *genea* has awakened ancient fame that had fallen asleep (19-23). The fact that the Cleonymidae have a *hestia*, "hearth," suggests very strongly that they were a real family. Pindar at *Pythian* 11.13 f. seems to be talking of a real family when he says that the victor, Thrasydaeus, caused his paternal hearth to be remembered by casting three victory wreathes upon it. The use of *histie* and *epistion* in Herodotus to

³²RE 10 (1905) s.v. Emmenidai 2499 f. For a genealogical table of the family, see T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford 1948) 484.

³³Gildersleeve, to judge from the paraphrase of the poem that he gives, takes *genea* to mean the Emmenidae (213). C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) 22, translates *genea* by "clan." He seems to mean the Emmenidae. Slater, s.v. γενεά, takes the word to mean "descendants." But in view of vv. 5-8, where the treasure-house of song is said to be built for Xenocrates and the Emmenidae, it seems preferable to take the *genea* that the poem will make famous to be the Emmenidae.

³⁴On the question whether *Isthm.* 3 and 4 are one poem or two, see E. Thummer, *Pindar, Die isthmischen Gedichte* (Heidelberg 1969) 2. 55-57.

mean "family" is relevant here.³⁵ So we may conclude that the Cleonymidae are a house founded by Cleonymus, a man who had had the wealth to take part in chariot-racing and who had enjoyed some success in that sport.³⁶

The third instance of *genea* used to refer to a real family is in the Fifth Isthmian. Towards the end of that poem Pindar exhorts the man who would do battle in athletic contests to learn of the *genea* of Cleonicus. He goes on to say that neither long toil nor expense comes to nought (54–58). Praise of the brothers Pytheas and Phylacides follows (59–61). They then are the *genea* of Cleonicus, whose example should provide encouragement to the aspiring athlete. Cleonicus is their paternal grandfather. In the Sixth Isthmian their father, Lampon, is called the son of Cleonicus (16).

Pindar also speaks of a *patra* as a *genea*. That by *patra*³⁷ Pindar means "clan" rather than "phratry" seems likely.³⁸ It is hard to believe that in recording the achievements of the kinship groups of the victor praised he should consistently have ignored the smaller and more exclusive group, the clan, in favour of the larger and less exclusive phratry. In the Sixth Nemean he says that the Bassidae are a *genea* of long-standing fame, who do not lack stories and songs celebrating their deeds (30–34). He goes on to name two victors, one of whom, Callias, he explicitly says was a member of this *patra* (34–44).³⁹ *Genea* then in Pindar is a term that may be applied either to real or mythic families.

The term *oikos* in Pindar, on the other hand, has a more limited application. It is used with the meaning "house" or "line." At the start of the Thirteenth Olympian the poet says that he will praise an *oikos* that has three Olympic victories to its credit (1 f.). We learn later that two of these three victories belong to the poem's recipient, Xenophon, and one

³⁵1.176.3; 6.86.8; 5.72.1, 73.1.

³⁶So also Wilamowitz 337. "Das Geschlecht das sich nach einem Kleonymos nannte, der kein mythische Ahn war, sondern im sechsten Jahrhundert gelebt hatte."

³⁷The following groups are explicitly called *patrai* by Pindar: Meidylidae (Aegina) *Pyth.* 8.38, Theandridae (Aegina) *Nem.* 4.77, Bassidae (Aegina) *Nem.* 6.35, Euxenidae (Aegina) *Nem.* 7.70, Psalychiadae (Aegina) *Isthm.* 6.63. The following groups may well be clans: Eratidae (Rhodes) *Ol.* 7.93, Blesiadae (Aegina) *Ol.* 8.75, Oligaethidae (Corinth) *Ol.* 13.97, Aegeidae (Thebes) *Pyth.* 5.75, *Isthm.* 7.15, Chariadae (Aegina) *Nem.* 8.46.

³⁸Cf. C. Écrivain, Daremberg-Saglio 2.2 (1896) s.v. *Gens*, *l'évos*. But Wade-Gery says (83 = *EGH* 108) that a *patra* was a phratry and that Dicaearchus (fr. 9 *FHG* 3) was wrong to equate *patra* with *genos*. It is unlikely that Dicaearchus was completely wrong on this point. To be informed on such a matter would hardly require the arcane expertise that Wade-Gery holds Dicaearchus lacked. A list of *patrai* from Camirus in Rhodes is so long that it is hard to believe that they are phratries and not the smaller *gene* or clans and that the entities under which groups of these *patrai* are subsumed are not phratries (*IG* 12.1.695).

³⁹For a discussion of the origin of the name of the *patra*, see Wilamowitz 399 n. 1.

is that of his father, Thessalus (29–36). No *oikos* in all of Hellas, Pindar says in the Sixth Nemean, has boxing proclaimed as the steward of more wreaths (24–26). Those who by their victories conferred this distinction on their *oikos* were the three victor sons of Hagesimachus (21–24), the eldest of whom, Praxidamus, was the paternal grandfather of the victor celebrated, Alcimedes (13–22).⁴⁰ In the three other instances in Pindar of *oikos* used of a group of persons “house” or “line” is the only plausible meaning.⁴¹

There is also some evidence that Pindar consciously and deliberately distinguished between the *oikos* or house of the victor and his *patra* or clan. In the Sixth Nemean he concludes his praise of the athletic successes of Alcimedes the victor and his kin by declaring that boxing has made no other *oikos* in all of Hellas steward of more wreaths (24–26). He then expresses the hope that what he says may hit the mark and calls on the Muse to guide his words (26–29). For songs and words, he says, tend the fair deeds of men who have departed this life and there is no paucity of such deeds in the case of the Bassidae (29–31). A member of this *patra*, Callias, he continues, has been victorious in boxing at Pythia, while Creontides had won at the Isthmus and Nemea (34–44). The break between the praise of Alcimedes and his immediate kin and that of the *patra*, the Bassidae, suggests that Pindar is praising what are for him distinct groups of people, the *oikos* and the *patra*. In the Sixth Isthmian the distinction between the *oikos* and the *patra* of the victor is explicit. Pindar, referring to Phylacides, his brother, Pytheas, and their maternal relative, Euthymenes, says that they water the *patra* of the Psalychiadae with the fairest dew of the *Charites* and dwell in a god-loved city, raising on high the *oikos* of Themistius (63–66).⁴² What this amounts to is praise of the *oikos*, *patra*, and city of the victor. It is clear that here the *oikos* and the *patra* are for Pindar separate entities.⁴³ In sum, we have grounds for thinking that Pindar consciously distinguishes between a man's *oikos* and

⁴⁰Alcimedes' relationship to the members of this *oikos* mentioned in vv. 15–22 and their relationship to each other is unclear. The matter is further complicated by the statement of a scholiast that Asclepiades said that the ode should be inscribed to Alcimedes, son of Theon, the Cretan (Drachmann, *Schol. Pind.* 3.101). If this is true, Alcimedes had presumably been adopted into this Aeginetan *oikos*. On the relationships, see H. Jurenka, *Philologus* 58 (1899) 355 f., and Wilamowitz 399.

⁴¹At *Pyth.* 4.148–151 Jason says that he is not grieved at Pelias' *oikos* being increased by the flocks, herds, and land that Pelias has taken from his parents, at *Isthm.* 6.63–65 Phylacides, Pytheas, and Euthymenes are said by their victories to water the *patra* of the Psalychiadae and to have raised high the *oikos* of Themistius, while at *Parth.* 1.16–20 the man whose *oikos* does not fail through lack of children lives free of painful toil.

⁴²On the difficulties presented by this passage, see Wilamowitz, “Pindar auf die Söhne Lampons,” *SBBerlin* 1909 820 f.

⁴³Wilamowitz says “Die *patra* der Psalychiaden, der Lampon angehört, war vornehm; die Familie, der *oikos*, nannte sich nach Themistios (*Isthm.* 6.65)” (169).

his *patra* or clan.⁴⁴ His making such a distinction presumably reflects the concern that his patron felt that the distinction should be marked. In other words, it made some difference to those who commissioned victory odes to have the accomplishments of their *oikos* and their *patra* enumerated separately.

Pindar then uses the term *oikos* with the meaning "house" or "line." There is a distinction for him between a man's *oikos* and his *patra* or clan, evidence that he does not use the term *oikos* loosely or casually. A certain punctiliousness on points of kinship is exactly what we would expect in someone in Pindar's position. One of his objectives in composing poems of praise will have been to satisfy the pride in family that his patron felt. Pindar's calling the Alcmaeonids an *oikos* confirms Wade-Gery's thesis that the Alcmaeonids were a house whose members were all descendants of that Alcmaeon whom Herodotus says visited Croesus and not a *genos* or clan. It is hard to see how the evidence of Pindar and Herodotus can be gainsaid. Both were in a position to be well informed on this matter. Pindar, in particular, could not afford to be mistaken on such a point.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, CHICAGO CIRCLE

⁴⁴In addition to the passages cited, there is *Ol.* 7.92 f., where there seems to be a distinction made between the seed of Callianax, a group who would appear to be the victor's *oikos*, and the Eratidae, whom Wilamowitz believes to be a *patra* in Ialysus (361 n. 2).