

ZANES SPEAK:
OLYMPIC FINES IN HELLENIC INTELLECTUAL
AND POLITICAL CONTEXT

I

Just before the vaulted passage of the entrance to the stadion of Olympia, at the foot of the Hill of the Treasure-Houses, the bases of a separate series of now lost statues are still to see. Pausanias has seen these statues standing there during his visit of the site and begins with them his report on the images of Zeus dedicated in the supreme god's Olympic sanctuary (5. 21. 2 ff.). In the local dialect, those specific monuments were called Ζᾶνες (the plural of Ζάν = Ζεύς).¹ They had been made of bronze, and they seem to have represented the god in one of his usual postures, e.g. standing on his right foot while the left one takes a resting position, as we may conclude from the holes preserved in some of the surviving bases. The statues also bore epigrams, read and summarized by Pausanias, and they built groups of dedications resulting from violations of Olympic agonistic rules. Especially cases of bribing co-athletes to achieve a victory incurred fines, which were then not perfunctorily added to the treasury of the sanctuary but were invested in erecting these monuments. Their dedicative texts in combination with local memory as expressed by Olympic 'guides / interpreters' (ἐξηγηταί) preserved and perpetuated the data of infringements on the proper agonistic spirit which had met in these cases the due reaction from the Hellanodikai. As one of the relevant epigrams mentioned, Pausanias says, "Olympic victories were not to buy with money, a lesson to all Greeks (διδασκαλίαν πᾶσιν Ἑλλήσιν)". One can only highlight this demonstrative austerity which certainly deserves further thoughts.

First, as already noted, the economic use of the fines in question is instructive.² They were not regarded and utilized as a mere addition to

¹ Still basic on the Zanes, especially in archaeological respect: Herrmann 1974. Cf. also Golden 1998, 15–16; Kyle 2007, 131–132; Weiler 2014, 5–11.

² Cf. Golden 1998, 16: "It is striking... that the fines were used for dedications to the god" (without further comments).

the sanctuary's income to face various expenses or to increase the sacred capital through lending, but to create works of art. It is crucial to observe in this respect that these athletic frauds were classified by the organizers and the participants in the contests as a sort of ὕβρις, an insolent violation of sacred law, on which the constitution of the whole games was believed to be founded. Pausanias himself expresses this spirit in his relevant passages when he remarks (more than once) that those punished had committed this crime against the Olympic rules (5. 21. 2: ὑβρίσασιν ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα; cf. *ib.* 13). Thus these crimes were similar in moral essence with those committed i.a. by the barbarians who had once come to enslave Greece, and whose booty had been also used to produce famous works of art like the Delphian tripod, the dedicative monument of Plataia. The punishment had to be monumentalized to work as an everlasting admonition for the future. This is an idea we encounter also here in respect to athletic regulations and discipline under divine observance.

Another aspect of these monuments was the refined self-portrayal of the Eleian organizers as guarantors of this athletic order and impartiality. Pausanias mentions that this motif appeared also repeatedly in the epigrams completing the impression of the Zanes on all visitors: the Eleians deserved to be the Ἑλλανοδίκαι of the games as they were able to judge correctly among all Greeks. We also know of cases where the Eleian Hellanodikai had not behaved so, and the Olympic Council (apparently a variant of the Eleian one)³ had to punish in a sense its own functionaries.⁴ However, these cases are not reported to have caused the erection of any statues in the Zanes' row. Characteristically, a case of bribery by an Eleian father unduly caring for his son's victory seems to have been commemorated by a statue at the gymnasium of Elis, "entre nous", while the bribed father's similar monument was posted in front of the Stoa of Echo at Olympia, at a conspicuous place and not far from the Zanes (Paus. 5. 21. 16–17). Thus the latter exhibited Eleian austerity in its edition towards the other Greeks. The Eleians' image as trustees of interpoliad justice and impartiality in the service of the Panhellenic athletic ideal should suffer no self-imposed corrections at the same place.

³ Cf. esp. the analysis of the relevant evidence and the conclusions by Baitinger–Eder 2003.

⁴ Paus. 6. 3. 7: Leon of Ambrakia appeals at the Olympic Council against two of the three Hellanodikai who gave the victory to his antagonist, the Eleian Eupolemos; the victory remains officially with the latter, as the epigram on his honorific statue mentioned, but the two partial Hellanodikai are fined. Thus the once proclaimed result could not change but the partiality of the athletic judges could be also fined.

II

On another important aspect of the games the evidence of the Zanes has not been properly scrutinized so far. Who paid the fines? The natural answer is: the delinquents, that is, the deceitful sportsmen (or their parents, if the athletes were boys: Paus. *ib.*). Indeed, the first case of Zanes reported by Pausanias (5. 21. 3–4), presenting his material in chronological order – as the statues actually stood – corresponded to such a case of payment by the athletic transgressors themselves: the Thessalian boxer Eupolos had managed in 388 BC to bribe his antagonists recorded by name and origin (from Arkadia, Kyzikos and Halikarnassos) and so attain a paid victory. Both he and the bribed were fined for that and the affair and its moral precept was the reason for setting there six Zanes with concomitant epigrams (on four of them). It is interesting that one of the latter may have generalized the capacities necessary for an Olympic victory beyond the specific conditions of the game in question: “quick feet and strength of body” were the proper qualities to be appreciated at Olympia, not money. The virus might infect further sports, therefore the expression of the crime in more general terms was even more reasonable. However, it is clear that in this case the persons who broke the rules also had to face the bill for their acts, and were further inflicted with eternal bad name.

The next case of Zanes perpetuated the memory of an incident with a much more complicated sequel. In 332 BC the Athenian pentathlete Kallippos was discovered to have been proclaimed victor after extinguishing his antagonists’ fervour with corresponding sums of money. All involved were fined again but not all obeyed the decision of the Hellanodikai. We do not know the origin of the bribed nor how they reacted. Probably, they paid their fines and were later allowed to fall into relative oblivion. However, Kallippos not only did not pay himself but surprisingly his city appears to have intervened on his behalf to annul his punishment. No less an orator (and important statesman of the period) than Hypereides undertook a sort of judicial embassy to the Eleians, appeared before the Eleian Council and strove to annul the judgment.⁵ His effort seems to have been unsuccessful, at least finally. Thus reports Pausanias, on the basis of the corresponding (again six) Zanes and their epigrams. On the other hand, Hypereides’ *Vita* in Pseudo-Plutarch mentions that the great speaker won his case, possibly initially, when he appeared before the Eleian Council. We shall return to this point. Anyway, the judgment of the Hellanodikai in the end remained valid but Kallippos and Athens

⁵ Cf. Weiler 1991.

were obstinate. Whether the fined Athenian champion was able to pay or not, we cannot know. However, Pausanias further reports that Athens did not recognize and refused to pay the fine, apparently on the sportsman's behalf, and even preferred to abstain for some (unspecified) time from the Olympic Games because of this difference with the Eleians and Olympia. Furthermore, the situation would have not changed if Delphi and its oracle had not intervened and warned the Athenians not to ask for any oracle from Apollo as long as they had not solved their debt towards Olympia. Faced with this strict sacred solidarity and embargo, the Athenians gave in, paid, and the new group of Zanes were produced from that money. Eloquent epigrams alluding to the basic phases of the affair decorated the bases again.

One could first think that this final responsibility of Athens to pay the fine of a transgressive Athenian athlete was as exceptional as this whole affair looks like. However, Pausanias (5. 21. 8–9) reports a second example of such a connection between city and athlete in regard to a fine: it was demonstrated by the first of a further group of two statues concerning Rhodian wrestlers in the same “gallery of the Zanes”. For there was also a wrestler of that origin whose bribed victory had been fined again but the fine was paid by his city, as the epigram accompanying the first of these Zanes expressly mentioned. In regard to the second statue of this group, the epigram mentioned that its creation was owed to the fines imposed on the athletes involved without further specification. The local guides of Pausanias were ready here to supply the briber's name, Philostratos the Rhodian, and that of his opponent, Eudelos, and the year of the relevant Olympiad (the 178th, that is in 68 BC). Pausanias checked this against the official list of the Olympic winners kept at the seat of the games and found there the name of someone else as winner. However, it might be, as has been already correctly observed, that the fact of the bribery had been found out and punished in time by the Hellanodikai so that another wrestler was finally proclaimed as victor.⁶ In any case and for our present point, it is enough to retain that at least the first of these fines and the corresponding Zan had been paid, for whatever reason, not by the Rhodian athlete(s) responsible but by his / their polis community.⁷

The necessary conclusion on the basis of these remarks seems then to be that the connection between city and athlete was both of an ideological and of a specific material nature also in this respect. In other words, the polis acted as a sort of guarantor for its athletes if they incurred fines. The spirit

⁶ Cf. Herrmann 1974, 980 (with further lit.).

⁷ Maddoli–Saladino 1995, 315 have noted this without further comments.

of identification between athletes of wider Hellenic standing / aspirations and their cities, and the specific financial support of the first by the latter, for which we do have detailed evidence since the early Hellenistic age (e.g. in respect to training and traveling subsidies as testified by an Ephesian inscription of ca. 300 BC),⁸ gains in background. We should further realize even better that the athletes, although they participated as private individuals in the big contests, did not cease in fact to constitute a sort of highly specialized, competent *θεωρία* of their cities to those places. They did not represent simply themselves but also their cities, and this obviously had its important, and recognized, practical consequences.⁹

III

The political-ideological aspect of this representation, however, could also acquire important weight as we may now see trying to set the already examined “Kallippos affair” into its full contemporary context. For it was apparently not a simple thing for Athens of 332 BC to be stigmatized as having been represented at Olympia by an athlete expending money to pretend physical superiority.¹⁰ The psychological wound of Chaironeia must have still been very fresh and deep, and Athens was certainly interested in presenting to the Greek world the image of a city which, despite the indubitably prevailing power of Alexander’s Macedonia, had not lost its vigour and ability to fight on any field. The selection of Hypereides, one of the two most important representatives of the traditional anti-Macedonian camp in Athens, to plead against a fine symbolically denigrating Athenian strength cannot have been fortuitous.¹¹

Moreover, the address to which Hypereides had been sent must have been equally involved in related political concerns. For we know that the Eleians had repeatedly expressed signs of political recalcitrance from Macedonia in the years preceding that incident. From Diodoros (17. 3. 4–5) we have the information that the hosts of Olympia were among those

⁸ *I. Ephesos* 2005. Cf. Mann 2013.

⁹ This sort of underlying connection between city and athlete can then even better explain the irritated reactions of Greek cities towards citizen athletes who changed their allegiance and chose to represent other cities at the Panhellenic games: Kyle 2007, 131 collects and discusses examples.

¹⁰ Herrmann 1974, 979 remarks that “Athen... den Fall offenbar als ‘nationale’ Angelegenheit auffasste” without further analysis. Weiler 1991, 90 similarly tends to recognize the reasons for Hypereides’ choice simply in his rhetorical talent and patriotism.

¹¹ Cf. Weiler 1991, 90–92; Engels 1993, 195–196.

Greeks who became restive after Philip's death and during Alexander's royal beginnings, wishing to regain their autonomy. The same source mentions a little further (17. 8. 5) that the revolted Thebans dispatched an embassy also to the Eleians asking for help to face Alexander. We do not know whether the Eleians sent any help in the end, but the fact of the Thebans' plea to them is already significant. Arrian (*An.* 1. 10. 1) adds then that after the capture and destruction of Thebes by Alexander in 335 BC the Eleians had to recall their pro-Macedonian exiles, obviously and inevitably revising their recently declared anti-Macedonian policy. Very probably, this phase of Eleian *στάσις* is further testified by an inscription from Olympia dated approximately to the same period.¹² Here it is expressly foreseen that those banished from the city after a specific local year may return home, while their properties are not to be confiscated or otherwise liquidized and exported. There seem to be here limits to the enforced reconciliation between Eleian parties, while at least some of the exiles seem not decided to return yet. One gains an impression of how delicate the situation in Elis must have been after these new political conditions had been imposed from outside. Therefore, it is clear that Hypereides' embassy in Athenian and outwardly financial interest to Elis could reckon from the beginning on the very friendly feelings of a strong party there. It is equally understandable then that the talented orator would be perfectly able to point or allude in his speech in front of the Eleian Council on the "Kallippos affair" to the seductive "naked beauty" of Greek liberty (we recall how dexterous a defendant of Phryne he has also been!) versus Macedonian domination to win local feelings. One should then not underrate or simply reject the tradition in Ps.-Plutarch crediting his effort with success. He may have gained great applause in Elis with his words, even initially the impression of an actual change of the Eleian position on the matter. Nevertheless, the Eleians seem to have retained sobriety in the end and not attempted a revision that might have exposed them as partial *and* too close friends of the Athenians in a decidedly Macedonian age. After all, the Philippeion of Olympia, erected there under Philip and Alexander to highlight the Macedonian royal house's connection with the Panhellenic sanctuary and ideals, was clearly to see from the gallery of the Zanes. Zeus had acquired discreet royal supervisors in the aftermath of Chaeroneia. The verdict of the Hellanodikai, always valid, rested now indirectly also on the authority of the Hellenic League and its masters.

¹² Schwyzler, *DGE* no. 424, now re-edited (with German translation) by Siewert-Taeuber 2013, 37–38, no. 8. Still useful remarks on the content of this inscription: Seibert 1979, 149–151.

We should also reflect that the decisive intervention of Delphi which effected the final Athenian capitulation in this case does not need to have been simply an expression of firm collegiality between the two biggest Panhellenic sanctuaries, or of Apollo's filial respect to his father¹³ and the latter's central sanctuary in Greece. Equal weight, at least, should be ascribed to the current state of Amphictionic policies, under similar but discreet control of Macedonia since Philip's Sacred War.

Some further remarks may strengthen this impression of a Macedonian background to the "Kallippos affair". In the next Olympiad (328 BC) we find a Macedonian stadion race winner at Olympia, Kleiton. However, it is more intriguing that we find for the same year in the lists of Olympia victors the mention of a Demades, son of Demeas, which may be combined with an entry in *Suda*¹⁴ attributing to the homonymous Athenian orator a horse race victory at Olympia. Moretti has expressed doubts on this combination (not on the identity of this Demades),¹⁵ but the evidence at least exists. One may remark that it would have been a superbly clever move for the Eleians to have won as a participant and assured as a winner in the next Olympiad after the "Kallippos affair", while Athens officially abstained from the games,¹⁶ a man who was not only an Athenian but also the well-known head of the pro-Macedonian faction there, the politician who had attained to patch up the relations of the city of Pallas with Philip after Chaironeia. Whereas Hypereides had been finally unsuccessful, Demades may have been both welcome and successful in signalling the Eleians' own compromise with Macedonian power. After Alexander's death the Eleians presented again their old anti-Macedonian leanings.¹⁷ However, as long as Alexander lived, they must have understood that it was better for them to respect the rules of both the games and current policy.

It would be also useful to remember in this context another story exemplifying how laden with political meaning any athletic activity or rivalry between Athens and Macedonia in the same period could be. We know that Alexander had among his entourage in Asia the Athenian

¹³ Cf. Golden 1998, 16: "...Apollo at Delphi, a dutiful son of Zeus, declared that he would not deliver any oracle..."

¹⁴ *Suda* 415 s.v. Δημάδης.

¹⁵ Moretti 1957, 127. Kyle 1987, 166–167 accepts both the date and the identity of the victor (Demades the orator, 328 BC).

¹⁶ Weiler 1991, 91 remarks that the catalogue of the Olympia victors does not mention (otherwise) any Athenian for ca. twenty years after the "Kallippos affair".

¹⁷ Diod. 18. 11. 2: Elis in the coalition of the Lamian War against Antipatros.

pankratiast Dioxippos, an ex-Olympia winner.¹⁸ During the Indian phase of the expedition in 325 BC a match was organized to entertain the army where Dioxippos, dressed like Herakles, equipped with only a club, accepted to face the Macedonian Koragos, fully armed as a Macedonian edition of Ares.¹⁹ Poor Dioxippos was victorious but unlucky: his deserved victory did not fail to provoke the deep embitterment not only of the other Macedonians but also of Alexander himself. The pankratiast's feat was perceived as a dangerous disclosure of Athenian physical superiority over Macedonians as mirrored even in this specific athletic meeting. The Athenian champion was then treacherously accused of theft, and he was forced to commit suicide. One may then better understand that also in the "Kallippos affair" not mainly money but crucial fame was at stake. The athletic ground assumed symbolically under the circumstances of that age the importance of an ideological battlefield.

IV

Let me conclude with some final remarks. The reconstructed testimony of the Olympic Zanes proves finally very eloquent. It shows, once again, how 'mere', apparently not further significant data of economic administration like fines may be deeply connected with and contribute to the understanding of the moral values, the self-image and the political life of a society. Money and fame, and their typical stadium of exercise, that is politics, have never been separated, no more or less in ancient Greece than in our present world. The specific trait of the Greek world was, however, that once again art had an important part in that interplay, creating monuments and donating eternity even to human weaknesses and passions.

Kostas Buraselis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

kburasel@arch.uoa.gr

¹⁸ Sources on the "Dioxippos affair": Diod. 17. 100–101 (cf. esp. 101. 2: Dioxippos was κοινὴν πᾶσι τοῖς Ἑλλήσι παρεσχημένος εὐδοξίαν); Ael. *VH* 10. 22; Curt. 9. 7. 16–26 (cf. esp. 23: Alexander *celebratam Macedonum fortitudinem ad ludibrium recidisse querebatur*). Cf. Kyle 2007, 176; 240.

¹⁹ The connection of Ares with Macedonia versus Athens is brought out very clearly in the famous epigram for Demosthenes (Plut. *Dem.* 30): if the orator's strength of mind had equaled his physical one, "Ἀρης Μακεδόν would have never ruled over Greece. Dioxippos was going to ridicule a Macedonian image apparently conceded by the Athenians themselves.

Bibliography

- H. Baitinger, B. Eder, “Tesserae di voto ellenistiche da Elide e da Olimpia. Nuove ricerche sulle relazioni fra la città e il santuario”, *Geographia Antiqua* 12 (2003) 95–109.
- J. Engels, *Studien zur politischen Biographie des Hypereides. Athen in der Epoche der lykurgischen Reformen und des makedonischen Universalreiches* (Munich 21993).
- M. Golden, *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge 1998).
- H.-V. Herrmann, “Zanes”, *RE Suppl.* 14 (1974) 977–981.
- D. G. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden 1987).
- D. G. Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World* (Malden–Oxford 2007).
- G. Maddoli, V. Saladino (eds.), *Pausania. Guida della Grecia, Libro V. L’ Elide e Olimpia* (Milano 1995).
- C. Mann, “Der antike Sport und seine soziale Bedeutung“, in: W.-D. Heilmeyer et al. (eds.), *Mythos Olympia. Kult und Spiele* (Munich 2013) 243–245.
- L. Moretti, *Olympionikai. I vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*, Atti Lincei. Memorie, Classe di sc. morali..., VIII, VIII.2 (Roma 1957).
- J. Seibert, *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der griechischen Geschichte* (Darmstadt 1979).
- P. Siewert, H. Taeuber, *Neue Inschriften von Olympia. Die ab 1896 veröffentlichten Texte*, TYCHE-Sonderbd. 7 (Wien 2013).
- I. Weiler, “Korruption im antiken Sport”, in: K. Harter-Uibopuu, T. Kruse (eds.), *Sport und Recht in der Antike* (Wien 2014) 1–30.
- I. Weiler, “Korruption in der Olympischen Agonistik und die diplomatische Mission des Hypereides in Elis”, in: A. D. Rizakis (ed.), *Achaia und Elis in der Antike* (Athens 1991) 87–93.
- D. Whitehead, *Hypereides The Forensic Speeches: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford 2000).

Olympic Zanes, statues erected with the fines of athletic transgressions, apparently not further significant data of economic administration, are shown to be more deeply connected with and able to contribute to the understanding of the moral values, the self-image and the political life of ancient Greek society, in the first period of Macedonian control over the Greek cities.

В статье рассматриваются олимпийские Ζᾶνες (“Зевсы”), бронзовые статуи, обязанность посвящения которых в Олимпийское святилище налагалась на провинившихся атлетов в качестве штрафа. Автор демонстрирует, что, не имея серьезного экономического значения, статуи служат интересным свидетельством для изучения моральных ценностей и политической жизни раннеэллинистической эпохи.

CONSPECTUS

MICHAEL POZDNEV	
Das Geschenk eines Rhapsoden: Über eine Weihinschrift aus Dodona	5
TATIANA KOSTYLEVA	
And What Were <i>You</i> Like in Hades? Eur. <i>HF</i> 1410–1417	19
ELENA ERMOLAEVA	
On the “Undying Old Age” of Cleonicus (Matro fr. 7 O.–S.)	28
CARLO MARTINO LUCARINI	
Platone e gli Eleati (I)	36
SOFIA EGOROVA	
Poeta <i>Classicus</i> : Was Horace in the Fleet during the Battle of Actium? . . .	65
ALEXANDRA NOVIKOVA	
A Fox and a Weasel (Hor. <i>Epist.</i> 1. 7. 29–36)	78
ILSETRAUT HADOT	
Les attitudes diverses des néoplatoniciens au sujet de la théurgie	92
DARIA KONDAKOVA, NATALYA KUZNETSOVA	
<i>AP</i> IX, 484 (Palladas): Aiolos serviert Wind	123
<p>SYMBOLAE CHRISTIANO HABICHT NONAGENARIO OBLATAE, QUAE HYPERBOREI VOLUMINIS XXII FASCICULO II IN EIUS HONOREM EDITO ADICIUNTUR</p>	
KOSTAS BURASELIS	
Zanes Speak: Olympic Fines in Hellenic Intellectual and Political Context	133
ALEXANDER VERLINSKY	
Draco’s Constitution in the <i>Athenaion Politeia</i> 4: Is It an Interpolation or an Author’s Later Addition?	142
Key Words	174