

MOMENTARY IMMORTALITY

GREEK PRAISE POETRY AND THE RHETORIC OF THE EXTRAORDINARY

Thesis submitted for the D.Phil. in Classical Languages and Literature

Felix Johannes Meister

Wolfson College

71.554 Words

Momentary Immortality: Greek Praise Poetry and the Rhetoric of the Extraordinary

Felix Johannes Meister

Wolfson College

D.Phil. in Classical Languages and Literature

Hilary Term 2015

ABSTRACT

This thesis takes as its starting point current views on the relationship between man and god in Archaic and Classical Greek literature, according to which mortality and immortality are primarily temporal concepts and, therefore, mutually exclusive. This thesis aims to show that this mutual exclusivity between mortality and immortality is emphasised only in certain poetic genres, while others, namely those centred on extraordinary achievements or exceptional moments in the life of a mortal, can reduce the temporal notion of immortality and emphasise instead the happiness, success, and undisturbed existence that characterise divine life. Here, the paradox of *momentary immortality* emerges as something attainable to mortals in the poetic representation of certain occasions. The chapters of this thesis pursue such notions of momentary immortality in the wedding ceremony, as presented through wedding songs, in celebrations for athletic victory, as presented through the epinician, and at certain stages of the tragic plot. In the chapter on the wedding song, the discussion focuses on explicit comparisons between the beauty of bride and bridegroom and that of heroes or gods, and between their happiness and divine bliss. The chapter on the epinician analyses the parallelism between the achievement of victory and the exploits of mythical heroes, and argues for a parallelism between the victory celebration and immortalisation. Finally, the chapter on tragedy examines how characters are perceived as godlike because of their beauty, success, or power, and discusses how these perceptions are exploited by the tragedians for certain effects. By examining features of a rhetoric of praise, this thesis is not concerned with the beliefs or expectations of the author, the recipient of praise, or the surrounding milieu. It rather intends to elucidate how moments conceived of as extraordinary are communicated in poetry.

PREFACE

This thesis is the most recent manifestation of my interest in questions regarding the relationship between man and god in Greek literature, particularly in Archaic and Classical poetry. In 2010, I concluded my undergraduate degree at the University of Leipzig with a dissertation on notions of humanity and divinity in Simonides and Xenophanes. In 2011, at the University of Oxford, I submitted an M.St. dissertation that was dedicated to a formal comparison between Pindar's epinicians and hymns addressed to gods. Compared to these early attempts, the present study aims to be broader, not only in size, but also in scope and methodology, in the hope that this will do better justice to the diversity of the subject and of the texts considered.

In the course of writing this thesis, I have been privileged to receive the help of many distinguished scholars. To them I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude. Gregory Hutchinson, who supervised both my M.St. and my D.Phil. studies at Oxford, has provided me with the most comprehensive guidance and support. He gave generously of his knowledge, time, and patience, not only while I was in Oxford, but also after I moved to Germany for a position at the University of Cologne. Bruno Currie, who supervised the first year of my D.Phil., offered invaluable help in laying the foundations of this thesis. Felix Budelmann and Henrik Indergaard agreed to read an early draft of what is now the first chapter; their comments allowed me to reconsider and deepen the approaches pursued there. For my transfer of status, Scott Scullion and Armand D'Angour

read what would become the third chapter of this thesis, and their criticism prevented me from pursuing many a blind alley. Richard Rawles kindly sent me unpublished material, which supplied stimulating ideas for the third chapter. In Cologne, Jan-Felix Gaertner generously accommodated the completion of my thesis, both by keeping me free of administrative work, and by lending me his student assistant, Yannick Brandenburg, to whom I also extend my gratitude.

Many general considerations, as well as a great number of smaller points, have gained significantly from discussions with friends and colleagues, such as Henry Spelman, Christopher Metcalf, Enrico Prodi, and many others. My dear wife, Veronica, not only provided support and many stimulating conversations, but she has also read each draft of the chapters that make up this thesis, red pen in hand.

I would also like to thank the Faculty of Classics at Oxford and Wolfson College for generously funding my DPhil studies, and Wolfson and Exeter College for providing the most supportive and stimulating of environments.

The last word of thanks is owed to my parents for their love and support.

All this assistance and advice has been paramount in completing this thesis. Its shortcomings are all of my own making.

Cologne, Hilary term 2015,

F. J. M.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Pursuing Paradoxes	2
Momentary Immortality in Hellenistic and Imperial Times	7
Mortality and immortality in Archaic and Classical Times	15
 THE WEDDING SONG.....	24
Introduction	25
Wedding Ceremonies.....	27
Wedding Iconography.....	34
Hymenaeic Traditions and Conventions	46
Structural Topoi of the Wedding Song	48
Thematic Topoi of the Wedding Song.....	60
Immortals as Bridal Couples	69
Bridal Couples as Immortals?	77
Conclusion.....	81
 THE VICTORY ODE.....	85
Introduction	86
Myth and Immortality	87
<i>Gnōmē</i> and Mortality	93
Victory Sculpture	94

Ultimate Journeys and Apotheosis: Heracles.....	99
<i>Nemean</i> 1	102
<i>Isthmian</i> 4	106
<i>Nemean</i> 3	113
Ultimate Joy and the Hyperboreans: Perseus.....	119
Eternal Bliss, Eternal Punishment, and Heroisation: Pelops.....	126
Conclusion.....	131
 TRAGEDY	 136
Introduction	137
Tragic Illusions.....	141
Illusions Suffered.....	144
Illusions Induced.....	154
Supplication and Salvation.....	164
Ritual Perspectives.....	164
Supplication in Tragedy.....	169
Comic Entries	185
Conclusion.....	191
 CONCLUSION.....	 194
 Bibliography	 201

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ABV</i>	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters</i> (Oxford 1956).
<i>ABFH</i>	J. Boardman, <i>Athenian Black-Figure Vases: A Handbook</i> (London 1974).
Ahlberg	G. Ahlberg, <i>Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art</i> (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 32; Göteborg 1971).
<i>ARV</i> ²	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters</i> (2 nd ed.; Oxford 1963).
<i>ARFH</i>	J. Boardman, <i>Athenian Red-Figure Vases, The Archaic Period: A Handbook</i> (London 1975).
Boardman	J. Boardman, 'Painted funerary plaques and some remarks on <i>prothesis</i> ', <i>BSA</i> 1 (1955): 51–66.
<i>CA</i>	J. U. Powell (ed.), <i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> (Oxford 1925).
<i>CCSL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina</i> , 201 vols. (Turnhout 1953–).
<i>CEG</i>	P. A. Hansen (ed.), <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca</i> , 2 vols. (Berlin and New York 1983–89).
<i>CID</i>	<i>Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes</i> , 4 vols. (Paris 1977–2002).

- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, 20 vols. (Berlin 1862–1959).
- CLE* F. Buecheler (ed.), *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1895–97).
- FGE* D. L. Page (ed.), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Oxford 1981).
- FGrHist* F. Jacoby et al. (eds.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 18 vols. (Leiden 1923–).
- Fink F. Fink, *Hochzeitsszenen auf attischen schwarz- und rotfigurigen Vasen* (Vienna 1974).
- FLP* E. Courtney (ed.), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (2nd ed.; Oxford 2003).
- FPL* K. Büchner, rev. J. Blänsdorf (eds.), *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium* (4th ed.; Berlin 2010).
- FRP* A. S. Hollis (ed.), *Fragments of Roman Poetry* (Oxford 2007).
- GDI* A. Bauer and H. Collitz (eds.) *Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften*, 2 vols. (Göttingen 1989).
- GP* A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1968).
- GVI* W. Peek (ed.), *Griechische Versinschriften* (Berlin 1955).
- HE* A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1965).

- HWPh* J. Ritter, K. Gründer, G. Gabriel (eds.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, 13 vols. (Basel 1971–2007).
- ICr* M. Guarducci (ed.), *Inscriptiones Creticae*, 4 vols. (Rome 1935–50).
- IEG* M. L. West (ed.), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, 2 vols. (2nd ed.; Oxford 1971).
- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 15 vols. (Berlin 1825–).
- IGT* R. Koerner (ed.), *Inschriftliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis* (Cologne 1993).
- KG* R. Kühner, rev. B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II: *Satzlehre*, 2 vols. (3rd ed.; Hannover and Leipzig 1898).
- KS* R. Kühner, rev. C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, II: *Satzlehre*, 2 vols. (2nd ed.; Hannover 1877–79).
- LfgrE* B. Snell et al. (eds.), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, 4 vols. (Göttingen 1955–2010)
- LSAM* F. Sokolowski (ed.), *Les Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineur* (Paris 1955).
- LSCG* F. Sokolowski (ed.), *Les Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris 1969).
- LSCG Suppl.* F. Sokolowski (ed.), *Les Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément* (Paris 1962).

- LSJ H. G. Liddel and R. Scott, rev. H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1940), *Revised Supplement* (Oxford 1996).
- MW R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (eds.), *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum* (3rd ed.; Oxford 1970).
- OCP T. Honderich (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (2nd ed.; Oxford 2005).
- ODP S. Blackburn (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* (2nd ed.; Oxford 2008).
- OED J. Simpson and E. Weiner (eds.), *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 20 vols. (2nd ed.; Oxford 1989).
- OLD P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (2nd ed., Oxford 2012).
- Paralipomena* J. D. Beazley, (1971), *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters and to Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters (Second Edition)* (2nd ed.; Oxford 1989).
- PCG R. Kassel and C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. (Berlin and New York 1983–).
- PLF E. Lobel and D. L. Page (eds.), *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford 1955).
- PMG D. L. Page (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962).
- PMGF M. Davies (ed.), *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Oxford 1991).

- Prückner H. Prückner, *Die lokrischen Tonreliefs. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte* (Mainz 1968).
- SEG A Chaniotis, T. Corsten, R. S. Stroud, and R. A. Tybout (eds.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, 60 vols. (Leiden 1923–).
- SH H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin and New York 1983).
- SLG D. Page (ed.), *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* (Oxford 1974).
- SM B. Snell, rev. H. Maehler (eds.), *Pindarus*, 2 vols. (8th ed.; Leipzig 1987).
- TLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 11 vols. (Leipzig 1900–).
- TrGF B. Snell, S. Radt, and R. Kannicht (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 5 vols. (Göttingen 1971–2004).
- V E.-M. Voigt (ed.), *Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam 1971).
- VS H. Diels, rev. W. Kranz (eds.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3 vols. (6th ed.; Berlin 1950–52).
- Z-M Zancani-Montuoro, P., ‘Il rapitore del Kore nel mito Locrese’, *Rendiconti dell’ Accademia di archeologia ecc. di Napoli* 29 (1954): 79–86.
- Zschietzschmann W. Zschietzschmann, ‘Die Darstellung der Prothesis in der griechischen Kunst’, *MDAI* 53 (1928): 17–47.

INTRODUCTION

PURSUING PARADOXES

The particular notion of immortality pursued in this thesis could seem to be a contradiction in terms. Modern Western notions of immortality, as reflected in everyday usage and scholarly concepts, seem to be focused exclusively on a temporal quality. As a result of Christian theology and the philosophical discourses branching out from it, immortality is understood as a state of being exempt from death and, therefore, as a form of endless existence.¹ Consequently, a temporarily limited experience of something defined only by its infinity would not seem to be possible outside, say, Eleatic paradoxes.

In pre-Christian antiquity, however, notions of immortality appear to be more diverse. On the one hand, we find several forms of continued, even endless, existence following physical death. Some of these are desirable, like life in the Elysian Fields (e.g., *Od.* 4.560–5, Verg. *Aen.* 6.637–78), on the Isles of the Blessed (e.g., Hes. *Op.* 170, P. *O.* 2.78–9), or among the Hyperboreans (e.g., P. *P.* 10.31–46, B. 3.58–9). Others are downright appalling, like the eternal punishment of Tityus, Tantalus, Sisyphus, and Ixion (e.g., *Od.* 11.660–89, P. *O.* 1.55–64, P. 2.21–30, Verg. *Aen.* 6.562–627), or like the endless aging of Tithonus (e.g., *HH* 5.218–38).

¹ On the modern usage of ‘immortality’, cf. *OED* s.v. ‘immortality’, ‘The quality or condition of being immortal; exemption from death or annihilation; endless life or existence; eternity; perpetuity’, and s.v. ‘immortal’ A.1a, ‘Not mortal; not liable or subject to death; deathless, undying; living forever’; *ODP* s.v. ‘immortality’, ‘The condition of being exempt from death or destruction, of living forever.’ For a survey of the development of the term through theological and philosophical discourse, cf. *OCP* s.v. ‘immortality’, *HWP* s.v. ‘Unsterblichkeit’, and Pattison (2015) 1–8.

On the other hand, actual deathlessness appears to be inextricably connected with divinity. The term ἀθάνατος, which etymologically denotes something or someone not subject to death, is used, from its earliest attestations in epic onwards, to refer to the gods and the particular form of existence enjoyed by them.² In fact, the long first syllable of the term, where short *alpha privativum* would be expected, seems to present an attempt to accommodate in epic metre the phrase οἱ ἀθάνατοι as a fixed term.³ Conversely, terms that etymologically denote something or someone subject to death, like βροτός and θνητός, are used historically as synonyms for ‘human’ or ‘the humans’.⁴ The same observations can be made for the Latin terms *immortalis* and *mortalis*.⁵

Divinity, however, is characterised not only by the absence of death, but also by the absence of any restriction or disruption in that existence, as is indicated in Greek by a colourful variety of privative adjectives, apart from ἀθάνατος, that describe this form of life (e.g. ἀπήμων/ἀπήμαντος,⁶ ἄπονος,⁷

² On ἀθάνατος, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. ‘ἀθάνατος’, 196.7–10, ‘Die Bezeichnung ἀθάνατοι ist ursprünglich als das charakteristische Prädikat der Gruppe “Götter” im Gegensatz zu der Gruppe der “sterblichen Menschen (θνητοί, βροτοί)”, zu deren Teil der θάνατος gehört, entwickelt worden.’ As an adjective, it is a stock epithet of the gods, cf. *ibid.* 197.29–200.2; as a noun, οἱ ἀθάνατοι can function as a synonym for οἱ θεοί, cf. *ibid.* 200.3–204.62.

³ Cf. *Lfgre* s.v. ‘ἀθάνατος’, 194.60–7; the first syllable is exclusively lengthened, which is necessary only where the last syllable is long, as in ἀθάνατοι.

⁴ On βροτός, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. ‘βροτός’, 101.14–21 ‘β[ροτός] kennzeichnet den Menschen durch e[inen] wesentl[ichen] Mangel u[nd] entspr[icht] damit der ep[ischen] Auff[assung] vom Mängelwesen, das haupts[ächlich] im G[egensatz] zu den (unsterbl[ichen]) Göttern, kaum zu den Tieren, gesehen wird.’ On θνητός, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. ‘θνητός’, 1049.33–47 ‘characterizing humans . . . , generally opp[osed] to gods, who are ἀθάνατοι.’

⁵ For *immortalis* as an epithet for *deus*, cf. *TLL* s.v. ‘immortalis’, A.1a, 492.31–40, and *TLL* s.v. ‘deus’, 906.31–8; for *immortalis* as a noun, cf. *TLL* s.v. ‘immortalis’, 492.61–6. For *mortalis* as an adjective, meaning ‘human’, cf. *TLL* s.v. ‘mortalis’, 1510.3–34; for *mortales* as a noun, meaning ‘the humans’, cf. *ibid.* 1510.42–1511.6.

⁶ For ἀπήμων/ἀπήμαντος, cf. Hes. *Thg.* 955 (of the deified Heracles) ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἥματα πάντα, Aesch. *Ag.* 553–4 τίς δὲ πλὴν θεῶν | ἅπαντ’ ἀπήμων;

⁷ For ἄπονος, cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 100–3 (Iyr.) πᾶν ἄπονον δαιμονίων· | ἥμενος ὃν φρόνημά πως | αὐτόθεν ἐξέπραξεν ἐμ-|πας ἐδράνων ἄφ’ ἄγνων, Soph. *OC* 1585 (Chorus to the Messenger about Oedipus’ death) πῶς; ἄρα θεῖαι κάπονωι τάλας τύχη;

ἀκηδής,⁸ ἀγήραος⁹). A comprehensive account of divine life in these terms is found in Pindar's fr. 143 SM: κείνοι γάρ τ' ἄννοχοι καὶ ἀγήραοι | πόνων τ' ἄπειροι, βαρυβόαν | πορθμὸν πεφευγότες Ἀχέροντος.¹⁰ Pindar uses similar language to describe the immortal life of the semi-divine Hyperboreans in *Pythian* 10: νόχοι δ' οὔτε γῆρας οὐλόμενον κέκραται | ἱερᾷ γενεᾷ· πόνων δὲ καὶ μαχᾶν ἄτερ | οἰκέοισι φυγόντες | ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν (41–4). In Simonides *PMG* 523 (= 245 Poltera), the contrast with the life of the gods is implicit when freedom from suffering is denied to even the best of mortals: οὐδὲ γάρ οἱ πρότερόν ποτ' ἐπέλοντο, | θεῶν ἐξ ἀνάκτων υἱ(έ)ες ἡμίθεοι, | ἄπονον οὐδ' ἄφθιτον οὐδ' ἀκίνδυνον βίον | < > ἐς γῆρας ἐξίκοντο τελέσαντες.¹¹ Finally, for Solon according to Herodotus (Hdt. 1.32.6), true happiness is characterised as a state of being ἄπνηρος, ἄνουρος, and ἀπαθής (as well as εὐπαις and εὐειδής)—a state which can never be fully obtained by humans (cf. 1.32.8 τὰ πάντα μὲν νυν ταῦτα συλλαβεῖν ἄνθρωπον ἐόντα ἀδύνατον ἐστί).

Unhindered by harm, toil, worry, disease, age, or death, immortal life is perceived as a life of supreme, unsurpassable ease and happiness. Hence the gods

⁸ For ἀκηδής, cf. *Il.* 24.526 (the gods, αὐτοὶ δὲ τ' ἀκηδέες εἰσί), Hes. *Thg.* 61 (the Muses, ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἐχούσαις), 489 (young Zeus, ἐὸς υἱὸς ἀνίκητος καὶ ἀκηδής), *Op.* 112 (people of the golden age, ὥστε θεοὶ δ' ἔζων ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες), 170 (people living on the Isles of the Blessed, καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες).

⁹ For ἀγήραος, cf. the formula ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος, combined with either ἥματα πάντα or αἰεὶ, in *Il.* 8.539 (Hector on himself), 12.322–8 (Sarpedon to Glaucus), 17.444 (on Peleus' horses), *Od.* 5.136 = 7.257 = 23.336 (all three by Calypso on Odysseus), 5.218 (Odysseus addressing Calypso), 7.94 (on the dogs of Alcinous), Hes. *Thg.* 277 (on Medusa's sisters), 305 (on Echidna), 949 (Dionysus immortalising Ariadne), 955 (on the deified Heracles, see above n. 6), *HH* 2.242, 260 (Demeter, planning to immortalise Demophoon), 3.151 (about the Delians), 5.214 (Ganymede). Cf. also Janko (1994) 10, Currie (2005) 44 with n. 21, 277. On the thought of divine agelessness, cf. also Soph. *OC* 607–9 ὃ φίλτατ' Αἰγέως παῖ, μόνοις οὐ γίνεται | θεοῖσι γῆρας οὐδὲ καταθανεῖν ποτε, | τὰ δ' ἄλλα κυγχεῖ πάνθ' ὁ παγκρατὴς χρόνος.

¹⁰ Plutarch, quoting these lines, indicates that they are concerned with the gods, cf. *Superst.* 167^{e–f} ὁ Πίνδαρος θεοὺς φησί; cf. also *Amator.* 763^c, *Adv. Stoic.* 1075^a.

¹¹ On the implicit contrast with the gods, cf. Poltera (1997) §403 and (2008) 411–12. Note that Wilamowitz (1879) 170 reads ἀφθόνητον for ἄφθιτον, Poltera (2008) 412 ad loc. ἄφθονον.

are described as *ῥεῖα ζῶντες* in epic,¹² and called *μάκαρες*¹³ or *beati*¹⁴ throughout antiquity. A connection between immortality and bliss is also suggested by Epicurean philosophy, which considers imperishability and happiness the only two conditions for divinity, and locates this view in popular beliefs.¹⁵

Immortality can therefore be understood not only as eternal life, but also as the enjoyment of all the other qualities that constitute the life of the gods. In this way, concepts of momentary immortality do not necessarily present a contradiction, though individual formulations may still ring paradoxical and be

¹² For θεοὶ *ῥεῖα ζῶντες*, cf. *Il.* 6.138, *Od.* 4.805, 5.122. Cf. also Σ *Il.* 6.139 *ῥεῖα ζῶντες*: *ῥεῖα καὶ ἀπόνως ζῶντες*, Ael. Arist. *In Sarap.* 47, 19–21 καὶ ταῦτα δὴ οὕτω μεγαλοπρεπεῖς εἰσιν, ἀφ’ οὗ πᾶς ὁδε λόγος ὠρμήθη, ὥς εἰς ἐὺδαίμονες κατ’ αὐτὸν τὸν Ὅμηρον *ῥεῖα ζῶντες*.

¹³ On *μάκαρ*, its meaning, and its point of reference in the divine sphere, cf. De Heer (1969) 4–11, esp. 6, ‘To be *μάκαρ* is to be divine, to have a home secure against adversity, to be untroubled by wind and rain, to enjoy perpetual sunshine, to enjoy oneself all day long. This sums up the Homeric ideal of the easy life whose attainment was beyond human hope’, West (1978) 186–7 on Hes. *Op.* 141, and *ibid.* 193–4 on Hes. *Op.* 171 ‘*μάκαρες* unqualified in the poetic language almost always means “the gods”’. Cf. also Keyssner (1932) 50, 69, 133. See also below, nn. 219 and 328.

¹⁴ On *beatus* as an attribute of the gods, cf. *TLL* s.v. ‘*beo*’, 1913.25–47, *ibid.* s.v. ‘*deus*’, 905.52; on the combination of *immortalis* and *beatus*, cf. *TLL* s.v. ‘*beatus*’, 1920.35–40, esp. Cic. *Fin.* 2.88, *ND* 1.24, 45 (3x), 47, 49, 85, 86, 95, 96, 104, 105, 106, 114, 3.3; Aug. *Civ.* 7.1, 8.16, 17, 9.13, 14, 15, 10.3, 31, 11.11). The adjective *felix* can describe divine life in a similar way, cf. *TLL* s.v. ‘*felix*’, IIB, 439.16–48.

¹⁵ Cf. Epicurus *Men.* 123.2–7 Arrighetti πρῶτον μὲν τὸν θεὸν ζῶιον ἄφθαρτον καὶ μακάριον νομίζειν, ὥς ἡ κοινὴ τοῦ θεοῦ νόησις ὑπεγράφη, μηθὲν μῆτε τῆς ἀφθαρσίας ἀλλότριον μῆτε τῆς μακαριότητος ἀνοίκειον αὐτῷ πρόσαπτε. πᾶν δὲ τὸ φυλάττειν αὐτοῦ δυνάμενον τὴν μετὰ ἀφθαρσίας μακαριότητα περὶ αὐτὸν δόξαζε, *Hdt.* 75.8–12 Arrighetti καὶ μὴν ἐν τοῖς μετεώροις φορὰν καὶ τροπὴν καὶ ἐκλειψιν καὶ ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν καὶ τὰ κύστοιχα τοῦτοις μῆτε λειτουργοῦντός τινος νομίζειν δεῖ γίνεσθαι καὶ διατάττοντος ἢ διατάζοντος καὶ ἅμα τὴν πᾶσαν μακαριότητα ἔχοντος μετὰ ἀφθαρσίας, Lucr. 5.1175–82 *aeternamque dabant uitam, quia semper eorum | subpeditabatur facies et forma manebat, | et tamen omnino quod tantis uiribus auctos | non temere ulla ui conuinci posse putabant. | fortunisque ideo longe praestare putabant, | quod mortis timor haud quemquam uexaret eorum, | et simul in somnis quia multa et mira uidebant | efficere et nullum capere ipsos inde laborem*, Cic. *ND* 1.44–5 *quod quoniam fere constat inter omnis non philosophos solum sed etiam indoctos, fatemur constare illud etiam, hanc nos habere siue anticipationem, ut ante dixi, siue praenotionem deorum . . . hanc igitur habemus, ut deos beatos et immortales putemus*, Sen. *Ep.* 92.27 *Dis, inquit [sc. Epicurus], solis et uirtus et beata uita contigit, nobis umbra quaedam illorum bonorum et similitudo*, Sext. *Emp. Adv. Math.* 9.44–7 καὶ καθόλου καὶ πρὸς πάσας τὰς ἐκκειμένους δόξας ἐνέστι λέγειν, ὅτι οὐ κατὰ ψιλὸν μέγεθος ἀνθρωποειδοῦς ζῶιου νόησις θεοῦ λαμβάνουσιν ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλὰ σὺν τῷ μακάριον εἶναι καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ πλείστην δύναμιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ προφερόμενον . . . οὕτως ἄνθρωπον εὐδαίμονα νοήσαντες καὶ μακάριον καὶ συμπληρωμένον πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, εἴτα ταῦτα ἐπιτείναντες τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις ἄκρον ἐνοήσαμεν θεόν.

exploited for that effect. It would seem possible to describe moments of extraordinary happiness, ease, or success as limited versions of the state that the gods enjoy eternally. A human could thus be called ἀθάνατος or *immortalis* because he appears to be like the ἀθάνατοι or *immortales* in a certain moment, without any reference to death. The purpose of this thesis is to identify typical moments where this occurs.

If it is possible to describe human states and experiences in terms of immortality, a central question has to be exactly how the two relate to each other. Do formulations of momentary immortality create an analogy between the particular state enjoyed by a mortal momentarily and the general state enjoyed by the gods indefinitely, or an equation of one with the other? In the case of analogy, the two states would have to be understood as fundamentally distinct in terms of quality, and merely comparable by similarity. Here ‘momentary immortality’ would be a metaphor, with divine life as the source domain (vehicle) and the human moment as the target domain (tenor).¹⁶ In the case of equation, the human experience would be identical with the divine experience in terms of quality, and distinct merely in terms of quantity, i.e., duration. Here ‘momentary immortality’ would be a literal expression. These questions matter because the two possible usages of momentary immortality would seem to have a different impact on potential wider preconceptions about the relationship between mortality and immortality, and between human and divine. The metaphorical usage, though bold, might nevertheless appear acceptable, whereas the literal usage could easily

¹⁶ On analogy and metaphor, cf. Boys-Stones (2003) 2-5, Innes (2003); on tenor and vehicle, cf. Richards (1936) 96, Silk (1974) 9-15; on target and source domain, particularly in lyric poetry, cf. Hutchinson (2012), esp. 278.

seem to constitute an act of arrogance or impiety, and could even provoke divine intervention.

MOMENTARY IMMORTALITY IN HELLENISTIC AND IMPERIAL TIMES

Notions of momentary immortality, as outlined in the preceding paragraphs, are formulated in a particularly explicit and, for the present purposes, illuminating way in Greek and Latin literature from Hellenistic times onwards. Thanks to their explicitness, these formulations can serve as a first approach to the kinds of experiences that can be thought of as approximating to immortal life or equalling it.

Happiness, joy, and pleasure appear to be the dominant experiences underlying comparisons with immortal life. A general idea of a momentary taste of immortal bliss is conveyed in the colloquial phrase *immortaliter gaudere*, attested in a letter of Cicero to his brother (*QF* 3.1.9 *Quod scribis te a Caesare quotidie plus diligere, immortaliter gaudeo*). In his speech *Against Piso*, Cicero seems to use an elaboration of this phrase, with a stronger accent on temporality, to characterise his satisfaction on returning home from exile: *unus ille dies mihi quidem immortalitatis instar fuit quo in patriam redii* (*Pis.* 52).

A more particular context, found in a variety of poetic genres from comedy to elegy and epigram, is erotic and sensual pleasure. Love and sex seem to inspire several poetic topoi concerned with collapsing boundaries between mortal and immortal, like, for instance, comparisons between the beloved and a goddess,¹⁷ or rejections of immortality if it were to be spent without the beloved.¹⁸ Here, however, it may suffice to focus only on those passages where the experience of love and sex is described as a moment of immortality.

In New Comedy, it is a stock motif that the protagonist compares the happiness that he feels in certain situations to divine bliss.¹⁹ These situations tend

¹⁷ On comparisons between the beloved and deities, cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 217 (Pistoclerus about Bacchis) *ni nactus Venerem essem, hanc Iunonem dicerem*, *Curc.* 192 (Phaedromus about Planesium) *Tun meam Venerem uituperas?*, 196, *Poen.* 277–8 (Agorastocles about Adelphasium) *nam Venus non est Venus: | hanc equidem Venerem uenerabor me ut amet posthac propitia*, *Rud.* 420 (Sceparnio about Ampelisca) *Pro di immortales, Veneris effigia haec quidem est*; Cat. 68.71–2 (about Lesbia) *quo mea se molli candida diua pede | intulit*, Verg. *Ecl.* 3.68 (Damoetas about Galatea) *parta meae Veneri sunt munera*, Ov. *Am.* 11.47 *perque tuam faciem, magni mihi numinis instar*, *Met.* 4.320–1 (Salmacis to Hermaphroditus) *puer o dignissime credi | esse deus, seu tu deus es, potes esse Cupido*, 7.86–8 (Medea seeing Jason) *spectat et in uultu ueluti tum denique uiso | lumina fixa tenet nec se mortalia demens | ora uidere putat, nec se declinat ab illo*, *Her.* 13.159 (Laodamia to Protesilaus) *mea numina*; Rufinus *AP* 5.70 = 26 Page κάλλος ἔχεις Κύπριδος, Πειθοῦς τόμα, κόμα καὶ ἀκμήν | εἰαρινῶν Ὠρῶν, φθέγμα δὲ Καλλιόπης, | νοῦν καὶ σωφροσύνην Θέμιδος καὶ χεῖρας Ἀθήνης· | cὸν κοὶ δ' αἱ Χάριτες τέσσαρές εἰσι, Φίλη, *AP* 5.94.1–2 = 35.1–2 Page ὄμματ' ἔχεις Ἥρης, Μελίτη, τὰς χεῖρας Ἀθήνης, | τοὺς μαζοὺς Παφίης, τὰ σφυρὰ τῆς Θέτιδος. *Lucr.* 4.1170–91 criticises the folly of comparing a girl to Venus. Moreover, in Rufinus *AP* 5.73 = 27 Page and *AP* 5.75 = 29 Page the beloved is mistaken for Aphrodite. In Rufinus *AP* 5.35 = 11 Page, *AP* 5.36 = 12 Page, and *AP* 5.69 = 25 Page, it is asserted that the beloved would win the beauty contest against Athena and Hera in front of Paris; similarly, in Plaut. *Poen.* 1219–20, Agorastocles claims that he, even if he were Jupiter, would reject Juno and marry Adelphasium (*si sim Iuppiter, | iam hercle ego illam uxorem ducam*). Finally, in adesp. *AP* 5.95, Callimachus *AP* 5.146 = *Epigr.* 51 Pfeiffer, Meleager *AP* 5.148 = *HE* 47, *AP* 5.195 = *HE* 39, *AP* 5.196 = *HE* 40, adesp. *AP* 5.195b, the beloved is ranked among the Graces. In general, cf. Rohde (1876) 155–6, Kroll (1922) 229 on Cat. 68.70, Lieberg (1962) 9–13, Bömer (1976) 224 on Ov. *Met.* 7.87–8, Syndikus (1990) 2.274–5 on Cat. 68.70.

¹⁸ On rejections of immortality, cf. Tib. 2.3.31–2 *fabula nunc ille est, sed cui sua cura puella est, | fabula sit mauolt quam sine amore deus*, *CIL* 4.1928, tab. 22.7 = *CLE* 2.2, 937 *scribenti mi dictat Amor monstratque Cupido: | a] peream, sine te si deus esse uelim*, and the material collected in Kost (1971) 267–8 on Musaeus, *Hero and Leander* 80–1 (οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ κατ' Ὀλυμπον ἐφιμεῖρω θεὸς εἶναι | ἡμετέρεην παράκοιτιν ἔχων ἐνὶ δόμασιν Ἡρώ).

¹⁹ Cf. Webster (1953) 203 and Shipp (1960) 196 on Ter. *And.* 959–60 'It is a commonplace in comedy for the young men to claim to be (like) gods when it appears that they will marry their girls, or when blessed by the sight of them.' On the proverbial character of these and similar utterances, cf. Otto (1890) s.v. 'deus' 5, p. 109, and Häussler (1968) s.v. 'deus' 5, p. 153.

to be either the first entry of the beloved or, later in the plays, the realisation that marriage is possible after all. As for the first type of situation, one may recall Saturio's description of Toxilus as *Iuppiter terrestris* in *Persa* (100–1), or Phaedromus' reaction to seeing Planesium in Plautus' *Curculio*, where a brief *sum deus* is designed to evoke the complex image of immortal happiness (167–8 PH. *est lepida*. PA. *nimis lepida*. PH. *sum deus*. PA. *immo homo haud magni preti*. | PH. *quid uidisti aut quid uidebis magis dis aequiparabile?*). One may also think of Agorastocles' reaction to seeing Adelphasium in *Poenulus*, where, first, the pleasure of seeing the beloved is explicitly equated with immortal pleasures and,²⁰ second, the beloved is equated with Venus (275–8 *di immortales omnipotentes, quid est apud uos pulchrius?* | *quid habetis qui mage immortalis uos credam esse quam ego siem* | *qui haec tanta oculis bona concipio? nam Venus non est Venus:* | *hanc equidem Venerem uenerabor me ut amet posthac propitia*).²¹

As for the second type of situation, a passage in Terence's *Heauton Timoroumenos* is illuminating (693 *deorum uitam apti sumus*), where the reference is explicitly to the pleasures of divine life rather than its endlessness. One may also refer to the brief exclamations in Terence's *Hecyra* (843 *deus sum si hoc itast*) and in Plautus' *Mercator* (603–4 CH. *ubi ego sum? hicine an apud mortuos?* | EU. *neque apud mortuos neque hicine*. CH. *saluos sum, immortalitas* | *mihi data est: hic emit illam, pulchre os subleuit patri*), or to the penultimate

²⁰ Cf. the similar statement in Rufinus *AP* 5.94.3–4 = 35.3–4 Page εὐδαιμόνων ὁ βλέπων σε, τρισόλβιος ὅστις ἀκούει, | ἡμίθεος δ' ὁ φιλῶν, ἀθάνατος δ' ὁ γαμῶν.

²¹ On the comparison with Venus in 277–8, cf. Fraenkel (2007) 149 = (1960) 209 'In fact something quite extraneous enters here; the thought that a divinity is now present in human form conflicts very disturbingly with the earlier mood in which the overjoyed human feels no less immortal on earth than the gods do in heaven.'

scene of *Pseudolus*, when the hero describes his erotic ecstasy in terms of immortality (1257–74 *hic omnes uoluptates, in hoc omnes uenustates | sunt: deis proximum esse arbitror. | nam ubi amans complexust amantem, ubi ad labra labella adiungit*, etc.). Finally, in Terence’s *Andria*, Charinus describes, in the most illuminating fashion, his present happiness as a form of immortality (959–61 *ego deorum uitam propterea sempiternam esse arbitror | quod uoluptates eorum propriae sunt; nam mi immortalitas | partast, si nulla aegritudo huic gaudio intercesserit*).²² In all these passages, references to immortality are evidently not intended to deny that the protagonist or his beloved will die eventually, but rather to convey an extraordinary degree of happiness, which is, at most, enjoyed until death. The focus of this description is, however, on the particular moment.

The paradox potentially arising from notions of momentary immortality is explored, also in the context of love, in two Propertian poems, where the speaker describes the pleasures enjoyed during nights spent with Cynthia. In 2.14, the pleasures of one such night are presented, through a series of mythical exempla (1–8),²³ as a metaphorical *triumphus*. These pleasures are then summarised with the words *quanta ego praeterita collegi gaudia nocte: | immortalis ero si altera talis erit* (9–10). Here, *immortalis* explicitly refers to the pleasures (*gaudia*) experienced during one single night (*altera talis*, sc. *nox*).²⁴ The same thought

²² Donatus ad loc. (5.3.4) offers an interesting view on this passage: “*ego deorum uitam*” *non dixit quod sit, sed quod uerum putet et est δόγμα Ἐπικούρειον, quod a ceteris philosophis repudiatur, de otio deorum ac perenni uoluptate.*

²³ On these exempla, cf. Lyne (1980) 88–9; his concept of Propertius ‘believing’ in these exempla is valid only insofar as the speaker of the poem is portrayed as naive enough to overlook the sinister implications of all the stories referred to.

²⁴ Cf. Enk (1962) 205 ad loc., Fedeli (2005) 422 ad loc. ‘Il motivo dell’ immortalità legato a uno gioia straordinaria.’

appears in 2.15, in the context, not of a metaphorical *triumphus*, but of a metaphorical wedding.²⁵ After an explicit reference to the speaker's mortality (36 *huius ero uiuus, mortuus huius ero*), we find perhaps the most pronounced rendering of momentary immortality:²⁶ *si dabit haec multas, fiam immortalis in illis: | nocte una quiuus uel deus esse potest* (39–40).²⁷ Similar to these two instances in Propertius is one epigram in the *Anthologia Palatina*, attributed to Dioscorides (*AP* 5.55 = *HE* 5), in which the speaker recalls an experience with a certain Doris in the words: Δωρίδα τὴν ῥοδόπυγον ὑπὲρ λεχέων διατείναις | ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς ἀθάνατος γέγονα (1–2). Since the poem as a whole focuses exclusively on the moment spent with Doris, and particularly on its 'climax' (cf. 7–8), there is no reason to think that the speaker's experience of immortal bliss extends beyond that moment, even though the perfect γέγονα is ambiguous.²⁸

Apart from love, a second context in which a notion of momentary immortality is attested is military and warfare. In his biography of Alexander, Plutarch narrates an episode in the campaign against Darius when the Macedonian army, worn out and short of water supplies, regain morale after Alexander rejects

²⁵ On wedding imagery in Prop. 2.15, see below, n. 58.

²⁶ Cf. Richardson (1977) 255 '... the play is on the theme of what is eternal and what is transient, the night of love being the merest moment of time and yet granting immortality, and simply the climax of a love that cannot be limited in any way,' Fedeli (2005) 462 ad loc. 'Su *deus* per definire un uomo che si considera al culmine della felicità.'

²⁷ The passage is considered spurious by Jachmann (1951), Günther (1997) 141–42, and in Heyworth's edition; cf. also Heyworth (2007) 176 'This is an interpolator's embellishment, designed to make this passage match xiv 10.' Indeed, the anticlimax from 39 to 40—from many nights (*multas*) to a single night (*una nocte*)—seems hard to reconcile. Even more problematic is the apparent distinction between *immortalis* and *deus*, and attempts to explain it are unsatisfactory; cf., e.g., Richardson (1977) 257 (see below, n. 41).

²⁸ On resultative perfects in general, cf. KG §384.1–2. Elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry, forms of γέγονα refer to a person's permanent, inalterable qualities; cf. Call. fr. 493 Pfeiffer εἴ κε Προμηθεὺς | ἔπλασε καὶ πηλοῦ μὴ ᾽ξ ἑτέρου γέγονας, Apoll. Rhod. 2.1162 Κρηθεὺς γάρ ῥ' Ἀθάμας τε κασιγνήτοι γεγάσιν, 3.366 ἀθανάτων υἱέας τε καὶ υἰώνοι γεγάσιν, 731 ... οἱ δὲ μοι ἀδελφείοι γεγάσιν (all three in direct speech).

an offering of water and gives it to his soldiers instead (*Alex.* 42.6). Witnessing their leader's self-control and selflessness (ἀθυμήουσιν οὗτοι θεακάμενοι δὲ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ μεγαλοψυχίαν), the soldiers declare 'that they are neither weary nor thirsty, nor consider themselves mortal at all, as long as they have such a king' (οὔτε γὰρ κάμνειν οὔτε διψᾶν οὔθ' ὅλως θνητοὺς εἶναι νομίζειν αὐτούς, ἕως ἂν ἔχωσι βασιλέα τοιοῦτον). This passage presents a noteworthy view on what it means, for Plutarch or his source, to be more than mortal in a military context. As is indicated by οὔτε κάμνειν οὔτε διψᾶν, such a state is characterised by the absence of the needs and restraints of the human body. Moreover, if the phrase οὔθ' ὅλως θνητοὺς εἶναι provides not only a summary of the two preceding items, but widens the scope (ὅλως), other qualities may be associated with this state as well, like for instance extraordinary strength and courage and a certain safety from harm. While these attributions of superhuman or immortal life would appear conventional and intuitive enough, the temporal condition attached to them (ἕως ἂν ἔχωσι βασιλέα τοιοῦτον) is striking. It reflects the soldiers' knowledge that the immortal strength that they seem to experience is not perpetual, as it would be for actual immortals, but, as it emanates from Alexander's inspirational aura, depends on his existence, presence, and leadership. The statement does not deny that the soldiers, or Alexander, are ultimately subject to their mortality, but acknowledges that, for a certain period and in a certain respect, they seem to transcend this condition.

A third context is moral philosophy. Here a first notion of immortality is found in Epicurus' ethics, which is similar to the one attested by Plutarch in a

military context. On the basis of the theory that pleasure is derived from satisfying the needs of the body,²⁹ Epicurus states that someone who feels no hunger, thirst, or cold ‘will rival Zeus for happiness’ (Epicurus *SV* 33 Arrighetti *σαρκὸς φωνὴ τὸ μὴ πεινῆν, τὸ μὴ διψῆν, τὸ μὴ ῥίγοῦν· ταῦτα γὰρ ἔχων τις καὶ ἐλπίζων ἔξειν κἂν Διὶ ὑπὲρ εὐδαιμονίας μαχέσαιο*). Immortality here represents the ideal of happiness to which the philosopher aspires.³⁰ There is no intimation, here or elsewhere in Epicurean philosophy, that, if a mortal attained this ultimate state of happiness, he would transcend death. In fact, the necessity of dying, and strategies of acknowledging this necessity, are a constant theme in Epicurean philosophy.³¹ Hence the Epicurean notion of immortal happiness is also a temporal notion.

More evidence, also in the context of moral philosophy, is found in Seneca’s letter to Lucilius (*Ep.* 53). Seneca here meditates on the practical implications of a life dedicated to philosophy, and in particular on the relationship between the philosopher and the rest of humanity (11). He concludes that there will be a gulf between the two (*ingens interuallum inter te et ceteros fiet*)—a gulf so great that the philosopher will be closer to the gods than to ordinary mortals (*omnes mortales multo antecedes, non multo dii antecedent*). As Seneca points

²⁹ Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 1.37 *ut enim, cum cibo et potione fames sitisque depulsa est, ipsa detractatio molestiae consecutionem affert uoluptatis, sic omni re doloris amotio successionem efficit uoluptatis*, 55, 2.9–10, Σ Epicurus *RS* 29 = 149.1–8 Arrighetti φυσικὰς καὶ ἀναγκαίαις ἡγεῖται ὁ Ἐπίκουρος τὰς ἀληθύνους ἀπολυσούσας, ὡς ποτὸν ἐπὶ δίσκου· κτλ., Ath. 12.67.14–15, 546^f (= Epicurus fr. 409 Arrighetti) καὶ ὁ Ἐπίκουρος δὲ φησιν “ἀρχὴ καὶ ρίζα παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ ἡ τῆς γαστρὸς ἡδονή”, Plut. *Contra Ep. Beat.* 1089^d τὸ γὰρ εὐσταθὲς σαρκὸς κατάστημα καὶ τὸ περὶ ταύτης πιστὸν ἔλπιμα τὴν ἀκροτάτην χαρὰν καὶ βεβαιοτάτην ἔχειν τοῖς ἐπιλογίζεσθαι δυναμένοις.

³⁰ On the relationship between divine and human happiness in Epicurean philosophy, cf. Diog. Laert. 10.121 τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν διχῇ νοεῖσθαι, τὴν τε ἀκροτάτην οἷα ἐστὶ περὶ τὸν θεόν, ἐπίτασιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν· καὶ τὴν (κατὰ τὴν) προσθήκην καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν ἡδονῶν.

³¹ Cf. Epicurus *Men.* 124–7 Arrighetti, esp. 124.8–11 ὅθεν γινώσκῃς ὀρθῇ τοῦ μηδὲν εἶναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸν θάνατον ἀπολαυστὸν ποιεῖ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς θνητόν, οὐκ ἄπειρον προστιθεῖσα χρόνον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανασίας ἀφελομένη πόθον, *RS* 19–21 = 145.1–146.4 Arrighetti; Lucr. 3.830–911, 966–1023, 1087–94.

out, the quality that brings the philosopher close to immortality is *securitas* (12 *ecce res magna, habere imbecillitatem hominis, securitatem dei*); the word is employed here, following Classical usage, to denote freedom from worry and fear, an unshakable mental disposition.³² A prerequisite for the *uita beata*,³³ this kind of *securitas* is understood, here and elsewhere, to be a characteristic feature of immortal life.³⁴ Seneca then raises the question of whether the philosopher, since he is able to obtain so fundamental a prerogative of the gods, is in any way different from them (*quaeris quid inter te et illos interfuturum sit?*). His answer is brief, and focused exclusively on time: *diutius erunt*. This is to say that the ideal life awaiting the student of philosophy is no less than a temporally restricted version of the immortal life enjoyed by the gods. Seneca's notion of temporary immortality is, therefore, surprisingly literal.

The examples chosen here develop ideas of momentary immortality in different contexts and by focusing on different aspects of immortal life: in the context of love, immortality refers to an experience of sensual pleasure and erotic happiness; in a military and philosophical context, to a transcendence of physical restraints; and elsewhere in philosophical contexts, to a stable mental disposition

³² Cf. *OLD* s.v. 'securitas', IA; Sen. *Ep.* 53.11 *est aliquid quo sapiens antecedit deum: ille naturae beneficio non timet, suo sapiens*, and 105.7 *securitatis magna portio est nihil inique facere. confusam uitam et perturbatam inpotentes agunt; tantum metuunt, quantum nocent, nec ullo tempore uacant*. The post-Classical sense, 'absence from danger', 'safety', seems to be used in Sen. *Clem.* 1.19.5.

³³ On the relationship between *securitas* and *uita beata*, cf. Cic. *Fin.* 5.8.23 *Democriti securitas, quae est animi tamquam tranquillitas, quam appellauit εὐθυμία, eo separanda fuit ab hac disputatione, quia ista animi tranquillitas, ea ipsa est beata uita*, *Tusc.* 5.15.42 *securitatem nunc appello uacuitatem aegritudinis, in qua uita beata posita est*, *ND* 1.20.53 *beatam uitam in animi securitate et omnium uacatione munerum ponimus*, *Amic.* 45 *caput enim esse ad beate uiuendum securitatem*.

³⁴ Cf. Cic. *Amic.* 47 *o praeclaram sapientiam! solem enim e mundo tollere uidentur ei, qui amicitiam e uita tollunt, qua nihil a dis immortalibus melius habemus, nihil iucundius. quae est enim ista [sc. deorum] securitas?*

independent of external influences. While all the passages discussed so far range from the fourth century BC to the first century AD (and, depending on the dating of some epigrams in the *AP*, beyond), this thesis aims to pursue comparable notions of momentary immortality in the poetry of Archaic and Classical Greece: immortal pleasure and happiness in the traditions of wedding songs, transcendence of physical restraints in victory odes, and perceived stability and independence from external influences in tragedy.

MORTALITY AND IMMORTALITY IN ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL TIMES

There seems to be something distinctly Hellenistic about all the texts discussed in the previous section. The passages from Plautus and Terence, which Propertius seems to adapt,³⁵ are almost certainly modelled on plays of Menander.³⁶ Plutarch's narrative is situated in the fourth century. Epicurus was active in the fourth and third centuries. Seneca's philosophy generally elaborates traits of Hellenistic philosophy, especially Stoicism, and the particular concept of

³⁵ Cf. Enk (1962) 205, Fedeli (2005) 422, 462, Heyworth (2007) 176.

³⁶ Cf. Donatus on *Ter. And.* 959 *hanc sententiam totam Menandri de Eunucho transtulit*, Fraenkel (1960) 208–10 = (2007) 148–50, Webster (1953) 203. However, Shipp (1960) 196–7 on *Ter. And.* 959–60 is sceptical of Donatus' specific reference to *Eunuchus*.

securitas leading to *uita beata* recalls Epicurean doctrines about the relationship between εὐδαιμονία and ἀταραξία.³⁷

This connection between explicit formulations of momentary immortality and Hellenistic times is unlikely to be coincidental. After all, it is during the fourth and third centuries BC that individual humans receive cultic honours during their lifetime, on a broad scale, and, in some cases, by default. Monarchs of the Diadochi dynasties are worshipped as gods in centrally organised cults throughout their empires and receive, alongside successful generals, victorious athletes, and other eminent individuals, local cults from independent communities.³⁸ The extent to which such forms of cult have precursors in Archaic and Classical Greece is controversial,³⁹ but it is generally held that the boundaries between mortal and immortal, and between human and divine, are defined differently before and after Alexander.⁴⁰ Explicit formulations of momentary immortality in Hellenistic and Imperial literature could appear to be literary reflections of a more obscured perception of these boundaries from the fourth

³⁷ On the relationship between εὐδαιμονία and ἀταραξία, cf. Epicurus *Men.* 4 = 127–32 Arrighetti *passim*, *RS* 7–10 = 141.1–142.10 Arrighetti, 17–18 = 144.6–12 Arrighetti, 40 = 154.6–10 Arrighetti, *SV* 79, *Lucr.* 2.7–19, 5.1154–7, *Diog. Laert.* 10.136–7.

³⁸ Shipley (2000) 157–8 distinguishes between ‘civic’ and ‘royal’ ruler cults; on the former, cf. Habicht (1970) *passim*, Fears (1981) and (1988), Shipley (2000) 158–9; on the latter, cf. Habicht (1970) 160–71, 195–213. On cults for athletes, Cf. Currie (2005) 120–9. On the increasing number of hero cults in Hellenistic times, cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 205–6, Herrmann (1995) 195–7, R. Parker (1996) 276.

³⁹ Religious discontinuities between Classical and Hellenistic times, especially regarding religion, are stressed, e.g., by Bosworth (1988) 278, (1994) 871, Walbank (1992) 209–10, Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 199–216, Ekroth (2002) 17; continuities, e.g., by Price (1984) *passim*, Graf (1995), R. Parker (1996) 280, Mikalson (1998) 315–23, Shipley (2000) 153–63, Currie (2005) *passim*, esp. 9–10, 137–8, 158–9, 406–7. On pre-Hellenistic cults for living mortals in particular, cf. Habicht (1970) 3–16, Dover (1974) 81, Préaux (1978) 1.238–41, 257, Fredrickmeyer (1981), Sanders (1991) 257–87, Currie (2005) 89–119, 158–72.

⁴⁰ Cf., e.g., Farnell (1920) 152–4, (1921) 369, Nilsson (1925) 288.

century onwards.⁴¹ This may prompt the question of exactly how the boundaries between mortal and immortal are drawn in Archaic and Classical times, and whether or not notions of momentary immortality are conceivable during that period.

Our understanding of Archaic and Classical attitudes towards immortality still seems to contain problematic assumptions datable roughly to the first half of the twentieth century. These are represented, for example, by the studies of Rudolf Pfeiffer, Bruno Snell, Wolfgang Schadewaldt, and, above all, Hermann Fränkel. Applying to early Greek poetry Goethe's theory of the three 'natural forms of poetry' (epic, lyric, and drama),⁴² these studies argue for a historical succession of the three genres, with epic emerging as the preferred mode of poetic expression in the eighth century, lyric (considered broadly, including elegy and iambus) in the seventh and sixth centuries, and tragedy in the fifth century.⁴³ As a transitional period between the 'Dark Ages' and Classical Athens, the seventh and

⁴¹ Cf., e.g., Richardson (1977) 257 on Prop. 2.15.40 '[Propertius]' meaning here seems to be that on a night in the company of his mistress any man will seem to become a god for that moment, but if his mistress will grant many nights, then he will become one of the immortals. The distinction between "gods" and "immortals" is possible because of such institutions as divine monarchy in the East.'

⁴² Cf. J. W. v. Goethe, 'Naturformen der Dichtung', in *Noten und Abhandlungen zum besseren Verständnis des west-östlichen Divan*, ed., e.g., E. Trunz (7th ed., Hamburg 1967) 2.187–90, 'Es gibt nur drei echte Naturformen der Poesie: die klar erzählende, die enthusiastisch aufgeregte und die persönlich handelnde: Epos, Lyrik und Drama.'

⁴³ Cf., with explicit references to Goethe, Pfeiffer (1929) 137–8 and Schadewaldt (1989) 9–12 (from his 1959 and 1960 lectures). Cf. also Snell (1946) 56–7 'Wir nehmen als selbstverständlich an, daß es in den abendländischen Literaturen verschiedene Dichtungsarten nebeneinander gibt, das Epos, die Lyrik und das Drama. Bei den Griechen, die diese Dichtungsgattungen als Formen großer Poesie geschaffen haben und durch deren direkten Einfluß sie sich bei den europäischen Völkern entfaltet haben, blühten sie nicht neben-, sondern nacheinander: Als das Epos verklang, hob die Lyrik an, und als die Lyrik ihrem Ende entgegenging, entstand das Drama. Im Lande ihres Ursprungs waren also diese Dichtungsgattungen Leistung und Ausdruck einer bestimmten geschichtlichen Situation', and Bowra (1961) 9 'Such evidence as we have suggests that between the fall of the Mycenaean world and the seventh century the dominating art was the epic. It suited the temper of the time . . . But when this age passed into another more civilly minded, another means of expression was needed and was found in choral song', 14–15.

sixth centuries are understood as a time of social, political, and religious revolution and crisis, and lyric poetry as the voice of these processes.⁴⁴ With regards to religion in particular, there is supposed to be a profound sense of human weakness and divine strength.⁴⁵ Fränkel, who considers a tendency to think in polar opposites characteristic of Archaic literature,⁴⁶ detects one such dichotomy in the relationship between man and god. Accordingly, humans are perceived as having no knowledge, power, or means to influence their fate, whereas gods are omniscient, omnipotent, and generally unrestricted in their actions.⁴⁷ In his view, Archaic literature presents a gulf between mortal and immortal that is conceptually extreme, and so in practice insurmountable.⁴⁸ More recent scholarship on Archaic and Classical literature is critical of many of the propositions made by Fränkel and his contemporaries, but it often retains notions of a stark contrast between human and divine, between extreme frailty and omnipotence, and between vulnerability and self-determination.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Cf. esp. Schadewaldt (1989) 11–16.

⁴⁵ Cf. Snell (1928) 27, (1946) 59, 71–5, and Pfeiffer (1929) on human ἀμηχανία; Fränkel (1955b) 26–31 and Dickie (1976) on human nature as ἐφήμερος.

⁴⁶ Cf. Fränkel (1962) *passim*, esp. 59 ‘... eine Denkform, die im archaischen Zeitalter der Griechen, nach Homer, die herrschende sein wird: die polare Denkweise. Qualitäten können nicht anders konzipiert werden als gemeinsam mit ihrem Gegensatz’, 603 ‘Ein Widerspiel polarer (absoluter, oder schroffer, extremer) Gegensätze ist konstitutiv für das frühgriechische (und besonders für das archaische) Denken und Fühlen; Werte, und Qualitäten überhaupt, konnten nur gemeinsam mit ihrem Gegensatz konzipiert werden.’

⁴⁷ Cf. Fränkel (1962) 59–60 ‘Die enge Gebundenheit des menschlichen Daseins bedarf des Gegenbildes eines unbeschränkten, aber im übrigen menschenähnlichen, gottähnlichen Daseins’, 603 ‘Die ewigen, himmlischen, seligen und freien Götterpersonen sind unter anderem konzipiert als Gegenbilder des sterblichen, irdischen, unseligen, und gebundenen Menschentums.’

⁴⁸ Cf. Fränkel (1962) 128–9 on Hesiod, and 544–5 on Pindar. More nuanced is Pfeiffer (1929) 150 on Pindar ‘So gelangen die Auserlesenen nahe an die Trennungslinie, die Göttliches von Menschlichem scheidet. Die an Leib und Geist, an ἀρετή, vollkommenen Sieger in den panhellenischen Wettspielen erheben sich bis zu dieser äußersten Grenze: sie feiert Pindars Lied.’

⁴⁹ Cf. the, overall very balanced, discussion in M. Griffith (2009) 78 ‘Many Greek hymns and poetic prayers include narratives demonstrating the god’s wonderfully superior capabilities and entitlement, often to the point of exaggerating human feebleness and futility; the gulf separating human from divine is unbridgeable’, and 80–1.

The purpose of this thesis is not to argue that, in the historical reality of Greek communities in the seventh, sixth, and fifth centuries, the boundaries between mortality and immortality are as permeable as they appear to be from the fourth century onwards. The primary focus of this thesis is not historical realities, but their representations in poetic realities. In the latter we may find varied approaches to those boundaries, even when there are firm preconceptions about them in the former. In fact, there could, intuitively, seem to be a greater appeal for a poet to explore, redefine, or even cross the limits of mortality in an environment where transitions from mortality to immortality are not expected to happen, rather than in one where they occur frequently and regularly. This thesis aims to show that, at least for lyric poetry, one decisive factor for such variations is genre or, to be more precise, occasion, performance, and audience.

It should be noted that the ‘pessimistic’ world-view, supposedly characteristic of Archaic writing and thinking, and with it notions of a vast gulf between mortal and immortal, features, in a pronounced and exclusive manner, only in some genres of poetry. Apart from one famous passage in the *Odyssey*,⁵⁰ such views are primarily found in iambus and elegy. Archilochus, for instance, describes his own concerns as ἀμήχανα κήδη in *IEG* 128.1 and characterises the general vicissitude of human fortune in *IEG* 130 (τοῖς θεοῖς τ’ ἴειθεῖάπαντα· πολλάκις μὲν ἐκ κακῶν | ἄνδρας ὀρθοῦσιν μελαίνῃ κειμένους ἐπὶ χθονί, |

⁵⁰ *Od.* 18.129–37 (Odysseus to Amphinomus) τοῦνεκά τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μευ ἄκουσον· | οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποις, | πάντων ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἔπι πνέει τε καὶ ἔρπει. | οὐ μὲν γὰρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσασθαι ὀπίσσω, | ὅφρ’ ἀρετὴν παρέχῃσι θεοὶ καὶ γούνατ’ ὀρώσῃ· | ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ καὶ λυγρὰ θεοὶ μάκαρες τελέωσι, | καὶ τὰ φέρει ἀεκαζόμενος τετληότι θυμῷ· | τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων | οἷον ἐπ’ ἡμᾶρ ἄγῃσι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε. Cf. also Steiner (2010a) 175 ad loc.

πολλάκις δ' ἀνατρέπουσιν καὶ μάλ' εὖ βεβηκότας | ὑπτίους, κείνοισ δ' ἔπειτα
πολλὰ γίνεται κακά, | καὶ βίου χρήμη πλανᾶται καὶ νόου παρήγορος). Human
ignorance is the topic of *IEG* 131 (τοῖος ἀνθρώποισι θυμός, Γλαῦκε Λεπτίνεω πάϊ,
| γίνεται θνητοῖς, ὁποῖν Ζεὺς ἐφ' ἡμέρην ἄγῃ) and 132 (καὶ φρονέουσι τοῖ'
ὁποίοις ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργμασιν). Semonides characterises the human condition in a
very similar way in *IEG* 1 (esp. 1–5 ὦ παῖ, τέλος μὲν Ζεὺς ἔχει βαρύκτυπος |
πάντων ὅς' ἐστὶ καὶ τίθης ὅκη θέλει, | νοῦς δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν, ἀλλ'
ἐπήμεροι | ἃ δὴ βοτὰ ζοοῦσιν, οὐδὲν εἰδότες | ὅκως ἕκαστον ἐκτελευτῇσει θεός).
Finally, for Mimnermus, humans are as exposed to external forces as are leaves in
the wind (*IEG* 2, esp. 1–5 ἡμεῖς δ', οἷα τε φύλλα φύει πολυάνθεμος ὥρη | ἔαρος,
ὅτ' αἶψ' ἀνγῆς αὖξεται ἡελίου, | τοῖς ἵκελοι πήχυιον ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄνθεσιν ἤβης |
τερπόμεθα, πρὸς θεῶν εἰδότες οὔτε κακὸν | οὔτ' ἀγαθόν).

Outside iambus and elegy, in lyric poetry in a stricter sense, similar views
are found mainly in fragments of Simonides.⁵¹ In *PMG* 520 (= *SLG* S332, F21
Poltera), mortality and suffering are powerfully asserted as the main forces in
human life (ἀνθρώπων ὀλίγον μὲν | κάρτος, ἄπρακτοι δὲ μεληδόνες, | αἰῶνι δὲ
παύρῳ πόνος ἀμφὶ πόνῳ | ὁ δ' ἄφυκτος ἐπικρέμαται θάνατος. | κείνου γὰρ ἴσον
λάχον μέρος οἱ τ' ἀγαθοί | ὅστις τε κακός). According to *PMG* 523 (= F245
Poltera) not even the heroes of the past were exempt from these ills (see above, p.
4). In *PMG* 521 (= F244 Poltera), the swiftness of reversals of fortune is
compared to the flap of a fly's wing (ἄνθρωπος ἔων μὴ ποτε εἴπηις ὅ τι γίνεται
αὔριον | μηδ' ἄνδρα ἰδὼν ὄλβιον ὅσσον χρόνον ἔσσεται | ὥκεῖα γὰρ οὐδὲ

⁵¹ Cf. Bowra (1961) 324–6.

τανυπτέρυγος μυίας | οὕτως ἂ μεταστάσις). In *PMG* 527 (= F349 Poltera (spur.)), the role of the gods in these reversals is highlighted (οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνεπιδόκητον ἀνθρώποις κακόν· | ὀλίγωι χρόνῳ δὲ πάντα μεταρρίπτει θεός). Death is the inescapable end of a life of toil (*PMG* 522 = F258 Poltera πάντα γὰρ μίαν ἱκνεῖται δασπλήτα Χάρυβδιν, | αἱ μεγάλοι ἀρεταὶ καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος, *PMG* 524 = F22 Poltera ὁ δ' αὖ θάνατος κίχεν καὶ τὸν φυγόμαχον). Although these fragments seem to develop a perspective comparable to that of Archilochus, Semonides, and Mimnermus, it should be noted that some originate almost certainly from the book of *threnoi* in the Alexandrian edition of Simonides,⁵² while others can reasonably be assumed to originate from it too.⁵³ In a threnodic context, that is, in a context of lamenting the dead and consoling the bereaved, an emphasis on the toils of life and the inescapability of death is not necessarily a reflection of some sort of

⁵² Cf. Stob. 4.41.9 and 4.34.14, introducing the quotations of *PMG* 521 and 523 respectively with *Κιμωνίδου θρήνων*. On the book of *threnoi* in the Alexandrian edition of Simonides, cf. *Suda* σ 439 (4.361.10–14 Adler) καὶ γέγραπται αὐτῷ [sc. *Κιμωνίδῃ*] Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ ἢ Καμβύσου καὶ Δαρείου καὶ Ξέρξου ναυμαχία καὶ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίδῃ ναυμαχία δι' ἐλεγείας, ἢ δ' ἐν Καλαμῖνι μελικῶς· θρήνοι, ἐγκώμια, ἐπιγράμματα, παιᾶνες καὶ τραγωιδίαι καὶ ἄλλα, Σ *Ar. Vesp.* 1411 λέγει δ' ἴσως *Κιμωνίδην τὸν Λεοπρεποῦς* . . . θρήνοι, παιᾶνες, ἐγκώμια, ἐπιγράμματα, τραγωιδίαι καὶ ἄλλα, Σ *Theocr.* 16.36/37 (= *PMG* 529, F247 Poltera) καὶ *Κιμωνίδης ἐν θρήνοις*, Σ *Theocr.* 16.44 τὸν *Κιμωνίδην* φησί, παρόσον αὐτὸς τοῖς προειρημένοις ἐνδόξοις ἀνδράσι τῶν Θεσσαλῶν ἐπινικίους ἔγραψε καὶ θρήνους, *Harp.* T3 (p. 247 Keaney = *PMG* 530, F248 Poltera) Ταμύναι· Αἰσχίνης κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος (3.86.88) πόλις ἐστὶν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ Ἐρετρίῳ αἱ Ταμύναι, ἔνθα καὶ ἱερὸν Απόλλωνος, ὡς οἱ τε τὰ Εὐβοϊκὰ γράψαντες (*FGrHist* 427 F1) μαρτυροῦσι καὶ *Κιμωνίδης ἐν τῷ εἰς Λυσίμαχον τὸν Ἐρετρίᾳ θρήνῳ*. On Simonides being famous especially for his *threnoi*, cf. *Cat.* 38.7–8 *paulum quid lubet allocutionis | maestius lacrimis Simonideis*, *Hor. Carm.* 2.1.37–40 *sed ne relictis, Musa proci, iocis | Caeae retractes munera neniae: | mecum Dionaeo sub antro | quaere modos leuiore plectro* (with *Porph.* ad loc. *nenia lugubre carmen est, quod in mortuos canitur. Simonides autem ex C)ea insula lyricus poeta θρήνους optime scripsit. Inde Ceam neniā appellauit*), *Aristid. Or.* 11.75 (2.212.9–13 Keil = *PMG* 528, F246 Poltera) ποῖος ταῦτα *Κιμωνίδης* θρηνήσει;

⁵³ Page *PMG* (tentatively) and Campbell (1984) assign *PMG* 520–31 to the *threnoi*. Rutherford (1990) 202 and Poltera (2008) 329 consider the possibility that *PMG* 520 might be an epinician, since *POxy.* 32, 2623, which contains part of the fragment, preserves also epinicians. On the problems with this kind of argument, cf. D'Alessio (1997) 23–4. Cf. also Poltera (2008) 449 on uncertainties regarding the generic provenance of *PMG* 522, and *ibid.* 584–5 on those regarding the authorship of *PMG* 527.

cultural melancholy, but can also be conceived of as an attempt to meet the more immediate demands of the occasion, namely consolation.⁵⁴

Other occasions may pose different demands, and compositions performed on such occasions may define the distance between mortality and immortality in different terms. In a recent study on Greek humour, Stephen Halliwell argues that poetry performed at the symposium (or imagined to be performed at it) tends to present the symposium as an ideal space of harmony, joy, and festivity, where worries, or any negative thinking, are not allowed to enter.⁵⁵ As is clear from the passages quoted at the beginning of this chapter, worrying is a symptom of ignorance and weakness, characteristic of the human condition, and a life completely free of worry (ἀκηδής/*securus*) is a prerogative of the gods. Hence the symposium can be thought of as an occasion where the mortality of the participants is temporarily suspended, where mortals can indulge in what Halliwell describes as a ‘simulation’ of immortality.⁵⁶ Evidently, if sympotic poetry presents the human symposiasts as having a taste of immortal ease, the gulf between mortal and immortal is here treated as considerably less vast than it is in iambus, elegy, and *threnos*.

This thesis aims to pursue similar phenomena in the poetic representations of other occasions. Community celebrations—extraordinary occasions that engage

⁵⁴ This argument must not be stressed too much, as there is a risk of circularity: some fragments are assigned to the *threnoi* precisely for their negative perspective, cf. Rutherford (1990) 202 and, on similar problems in Pindar, Currie (2005) 34–5.

⁵⁵ Cf. Halliwell (2008) 104–7; on sympotic exclusion of pessimism, cf. already Burkert (1977) 363.

⁵⁶ Cf. Halliwell (2008) 104 ‘... the thematic place of laughter in *human* symposia is connected at least subliminally to a simulation of immortality: a simulation that, for the duration of the symposium, tacitly renders the participants god-like, suspended in the hoped-for perfection of the moment and able to float temporarily free of the downward drag of pessimism.’

with the population of a *polis* and lift them out of their everyday tedium—are in general likely to be presented as inspiring in their participants a positive, ‘immortal’, state of mind similar to that of the symposium. This must particularly be the case where celebrations are owed to the actions and achievements of individual members of a community, and where these individuals are singled out and glorified, as happens at wedding ceremonies and victory celebrations. This thesis aims to show that the songs conveying the praise on these two occasions can present the happiness felt by the bridal couple and the victorious athlete at these celebrations as moments of immortality. Tragedy, pursued in the third part of this thesis, provides a useful contrast to these positive notions of momentary immortality. On the one hand, tragic heroes are often perceived as godlike or divine for their happiness, power, or success and, when such perceptions are uttered, the permanence or transience of this state is not usually considered. On the other hand, with the ultimate downfall of the hero, any illusion of this state being permanent is shattered. In depicting fluctuations between exuberant happiness and extreme suffering, tragedy emphasises strongly the temporary nature of any experience approximating or equating to immortality.

THE WEDDING SONG

INTRODUCTION

The material presented in the introduction suggests that love and sex provide general experiences that can be presented as approximating to divine pleasure. In those cases where marriage is understood to be the ultimate goal of love, weddings can be presented as particular moments of extraordinary, immortal, happiness. This is evidently the case in New Comedy, where the protagonist's realisation that marriage with his beloved is possible defines the conventional climax of the plot. It is also suggested in Propertius 2.15, though in a spurious passage,⁵⁷ where a series of wedding images leads to the conclusion *si dabit haec multas, fiam immortalis in illis: | nocte una quiuis uel deus esse potest* (39–40).⁵⁸ Finally, in an epigram attributed to Rufinus, the various ways of enjoying a

⁵⁷ On the textual uncertainties concerning this passage, see above, n. 27.

⁵⁸ As for wedding images in Prop. 2.15, we should note that, first, the opening (1–2 *O me felicem! o nox mihi candida! et o tu | lectule deliciis facte beate meis*) contains a clear reference to an *epithalamium* by Ticia (*FPL* 1 = *FRP* 102 *felix lectule talibus | sole amoribus* < >), cf. Hollis (2007) 162. Second, in 27–8, the narrator compares his relationship with his mistress to the life-long *coniugium* of doves. Third, the sentence *huius ero uiuus, mortuus huius ero* (36) seems to adopt Roman wedding vows of the type *ubi tu Gaius, et ego Gaia*; on these vows, cf. Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 30 Διὰ τί νόμφην εἰσάγοντες λέγειν κελεύουσιν “ὅπου cὺ Γάιος, ἐγὼ Γαῖα”; κτλ., Cic. *Mur.* 27 *in omni denique iure ciuili aequitatem reliquerunt, uerba ipsa tenuerunt, ut, quia in alicuius libris exempli causa id nomen inuenerant, putarunt omnis mulieres quae coemptionem facerent “Gaias” uocari*, Quint. *Inst.* 1.7.28 *Quid? quae scribuntur aliter quam enuntiatur? nam et Gaius C littera significatur, quae inuersa mulierem declarat; quia tam Gaias esse uocitatas quam Gaios etiam ex nuptialibus sacris apparet*; cf. also [Val. Max.] *Praen.* 10.7. On the legal and contractual aspects of such vows, cf. Kunkel (1930) 2281–2, Hersch (2010) 187–90; similar poetic elaborations of wedding vows are found in Prop. 2.20.17 *me tibi ad extremas mansurum, uita, tenebras*, and Hor. *Epod.* 15.1–10 *nox erat et caelo fulgebat Luna sereno | inter minora sidera, | cum tu, magnorum numen laesura deorum, | in uerba iurabas mea, | artius atque hedera procera adstringitur illex | lentis adhaerens bracchiis, | dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion | turbaret hibernum mare | intonsosque agitare Apollinis aura capillos, | fore hunc amorem mutuum*. On marital metaphors in Propertius in general, cf. 2.6.41–2 *nos uxor numquam, numquam deducet amica: | semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris*, Lyne (1980) 79 ‘Propertius is fond of marriage terminology, particularly in his second book’, Miller (2013) 175. On the theme in Catullus’ elegiacs, Lyne (1980) 33–8, Syndikus (1990) 2.279, Miller (2013) 170; in Tibullus, cf. Miller (2013) 171–2.

certain Melite are ranked according to the degree of pleasure that they bestow on her partner (*AP* 5.94 = 35 Page ὅμματ' ἔχεις Ἥρης, Μελίτη, τὰς χεῖρας Ἀθήνης, | τοὺς μαζοὺς Παφίης, τὰ σφυρὰ τῆς Θέτιδος· | εὐδαίμων ὁ βλέπων σε, τρικόλβιος ὅστις ἀκούει, | ἡμίθεος δ' ὁ φιλῶν, ἀθάνατος δ' ὁ γαμῶν). Marriage with Melite is here presented as the ultimate stage, and it is compared to being immortal. This chapter aims to show that the conventional language and imagery of wedding songs ascribe to the bridal couple, in the moment of their wedding, a similarly supreme degree of bliss.

Accounts of the wedding song as a genre of ancient poetry, and particularly of lyric poetry, are confronted with a series of problems. On the one hand, only scanty fragments in Sappho and a handful of songs in drama have survived to represent a widespread tradition of lyric wedding songs in Archaic and Classical Greece.⁵⁹ On the other hand, if the scope is broadened so as to accommodate later poems, the result is a highly diverse corpus, comprising lyric songs and dactylic poems, composed by Greek and Roman authors for real, imagined, or enacted weddings, over a period that starts in the seventh century BC and extends far into the Roman Imperial period. In fact, limiting the scope would appear difficult and, to some extent, arbitrary, since hymenaeic traditions are pursued in Claudian's *epithalamia* and the Christian literature of the Western Roman Empire, and in the

⁵⁹ On these traditions, see below, p. 35. Alcman is praised as an expert in ὑμέναιοι by Leonidas of Tarentum, *AP* 7.19 = *HE* 57 (τὸν χαρίεντ' Ἀλκμᾶνα, τὸν ὑμνητῆρ' ὑμεναίων | κύκνον, τὸν Μουσῶν ἄξια μελψάμενον), and Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 47–63 attempts, rather unconvincingly, to interpret various papyrus fragments as wedding songs. *Epithalamia* are absent from the preserved lists of book titles of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides, but that does of course not exclude the possibility that these poets did write wedding songs.

conventions of Byzantium and modern-day Greece.⁶⁰ In pursuing the treatment of the bridal couple, these difficulties determine the structure of this chapter. In an attempt to balance out the scarcity of Archaic and Classical wedding songs, the first part of this chapter juxtaposes evidence for the wedding ceremony and evidence for the iconography of weddings on vases, and evaluates how notions of mortality and immortality are relevant in the treatment of the bridal couple there. The second part of this chapter discusses, *en bloc*, all the wedding songs and poems up to Lucian's *Symposium* (41.18–25) and an anonymous fourth-century papyrus.⁶¹ In order to address the *prima facie* diversity of this corpus, the discussions focus on the conventionality of these texts by surveying elements, both structural and thematic, that the majority seem to have in common. On the basis of this survey, the third and final part of this chapter assesses the ways in which immortality features in wedding songs and how it can affect the characterisation of the bridal couple.

WEDDING CEREMONIES

The wedding songs that we possess are all, in some way or other, rooted in the performative context of the wedding ceremony. Sapphic wedding songs were most likely performed at these ceremonies. Wedding songs in drama re-enact this

⁶⁰ On Claudian and Byzantine wedding songs, cf. Mangelsdorff (1913) 47–51; on Roman late-antique songs, cf. Horstmann (2004); on modern Greek wedding songs, cf. Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 110–32.

⁶¹ *PRyl.* 1.17, edd. Hunt (1911) no. 17, Page (1950) no. 139, Heitsch (1961) no. 25.

performance and its context.⁶² Recited poems, even those of a mythical subject matter, allude to their imagined performance by a chorus at the wedding.⁶³ In Catullus 61, the same context seems to be artificially contrived for the historical wedding of Manlius Torquatus and Iunia (or Vinia) Aurunculeia.⁶⁴ The performative context serves, in this way, as one unifying principle for the diverse body of texts that are considered here as wedding songs.

The treatment of the bridal couple at the wedding ceremony provides a first hint at a conventional perception of bride and bridegroom as transcending their normal status temporarily. This perception can still be studied at traditional Greek wedding ceremonies in modern times. The central elements of this ceremony, the crowns (στέφανα), create a strong sense of the bridal couple becoming royalty at their wedding. This happens regardless of the status of the bridal couple prior to their wedding, and has no effect on it thereafter. The bridal couple are elevated

⁶² Cf., however, the *caveat* in Krummen (1998), esp. 322 ‘Sicher ist, daß sie [sc. rituelle Handlungen] eine pragmatische Verankerung im kultisch-rituellen Leben des athenischen Alltags haben, jedoch so, daß sie diesen Alltag nicht unkittelbar abbilden, sondern jeweils sorgfältig an die inhaltlichen und dramatischen Erfordernisse der Stücke angepaßt werden.’

⁶³ Cf. [Hes.] fr. 211.6 MW καὶ τοῦτ’ ἔπος εἶπαν ἅπαντες, Theocr. 18.7–8 ἄειδον δ’ ἅμα πᾶσαι ἐν μέλος ἐγκροτέοιαι | ποσσὶ περιπλέκτοισι, ὑπὸ δ’ ἴαχε δῶμ’ ὕμεναίωι, Cat. 64.321 *talia diuino fuderunt carmine fata*, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.16–17 *te concinit iste | (pande fores!) te, Stella, chorus*. Cf. also the *epithalamium* of Dracontius, apparently composed in prison, *sed quia captiuo fas non est dicere carmen | nec reticere licet festiuo in tempore | ista canant pueri, quia carmine uera loquentur* (*Rom.* 7.25–7), and Ausonius’ *Cento Nuptialis* (68–9) *at chorus aequalis, pueri innuptaeque puellae, | uersibus incomptis ludunt et carmina dicunt*. On the last two, cf. Horstmann (2004) 325 ‘In einigen spätantiken Epithalamien wird eine mimetisch-dramatische Erzähltechnik angewandt, die auf Catull 61 zurückgeht. Sie suggeriert eine persönliche Anwesenheit des Autors bei den Hochzeitsfeierlichkeiten, der als Ich-Erzähler Teile der Zeremonie auffordernd oder kommentierend begleitet. Dies ist als literarisches Stilmittel anzusehen, das die Darstellung lebendiger halten soll, und läßt keinen Rückschluss auf eine tatsächlichen Anwesenheit des Verfassers bei der Eheschließung zu.’ An exception is the song in Luc. *Symp.* 41, introduced with παύσασθε, ἔφη· ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐπιθαλάμιον ἀναγνώσομαι. καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀνεγίνωσκεν.

⁶⁴ Cf. Forsyth (1986) 295 ‘Yet it shows no signs of having been composed for an actual performance; rather, it is a sophisticated and elegant fantasy in which the poet assumes the role of an imaginary master of ceremonies organizing the ritual involved.’ Cf. also Horstmann (2004) 77–8. On difficulties regarding the name of the bride, cf. Syndikus (1990) 2.1 n. 2. For a similar argument regarding Cat. 62, cf. Thomsen (2002).

only for the duration of the ceremony. The following section aims to assess whether a similar temporary elevation can be detected in the customs of Archaic and Classical wedding celebrations.

Generalising about ancient Greek wedding ceremonies is not without difficulties. However, while it is possible that wedding ceremonies varied, to some extent, across time and from one Greek community to another,⁶⁵ there appear to be certain objects and acts that feature prominently throughout Greek thinking about weddings, in literature as well as in vase painting, which is the subject of the following section (pp. 34–46). Among these objects and acts are wedding sacrifices (προτέλεια or προαύλια)⁶⁶ and the singing of paeans,⁶⁷ the wedding symposium,⁶⁸ and the procession to the house of the bridegroom at

⁶⁵ Sparta seems to have been particularly exceptional in its wedding rituals, cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 15.3–6.

⁶⁶ On wedding sacrifices generally, cf. Eur. *IA* 433–9, Men. *Sam.* 673–4, Plut. *Amat.* 771^d, Cat. 68.75–6 (Protesilaus) . . . *nondum cum sanguine sacro | hostia caelestis pacificasset eros*, Pollux 3.39, Hesych. s.v. ‘γάμων ἔθῃ’, Suda s.v. ‘προτέλεια’, Σ Ar. *Thesm.* 973, Serv. ad Verg. *Aen.* 3.136 *apud ueteres neque uxor duci neque ager arari sine sacrificiis peractis poterat*. Cf. Kroll (1922) 229–30 on Cat. 68.75, also Burkert (1983) 62–3, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 39 ‘ähnlich wie die Hochzeit hatten sie [sc. wedding sacrifices] religiösen Charakter’, Oakley and Sinos (1993) 11–12. For sacrifices in honour of Aphrodite, cf. Diod. 5.73.2, Paus. 2.34.12, 3.13.9. For sacrifices in honour of Artemis, cf. Nicomedes *AP* 6.318 Κύπριδι κουροτρόφωι φάμαλιν ῥέξαντες ἔφηβοι | χαίροντες νύμφας ἐκ θαλάμων ἄγομεν, Pollux 3.38, Xenophon of Ephesus 1.8.1, Plut. *Arist.* 20.6, *SEG* 9.72.84–5 = *LSCG* Suppl. 115 b.1–2. For sacrifices in honour of Hera (and Zeus), cf. Plut. *Mor.* 141^f, Pollux 3.38, Diod. 5.73.2, Σ Ar. *Thesm.* 973.

⁶⁷ On wedding paeans, cf. Sapph. fr. 44.31–4 V γύναικες δ’ ἐλέλυδον ὅσαι προγενέστερα[ι, | πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήρατον ἵαχον ὄρθιον | Πάον ὀνκαλέοντες ἐκάβολον εὐλύραν, | ὕμνην δ’ Ἔκτορα κ’ Ἀνδρομάχαν θεοεικέλο[ις, Ar. *Thesm.* 1034–6 (= Eur. *Andr.* *TrGF* 5.1, F122) γαμηλίωι μὲν οὐ ξὺν | παιῶνι, δεσμίωι δέ, | γοῶσθ’ ἐμ’, ὦ γυναῖκες, Aesch. *inc. fab.* *TrGF* 3, F350 (= Plat. *Rep.* 383^{a7}) τὰς ἐμὰς εὐπαιδίαις | νόσων τ’ ἀπείρους καὶ μακραίωνας βίου | ξύμπαντά τ’ εἰπὼν θεοφιλεῖς ἐμὰς τύχας | παιῶν ἐπηυφήμησεν εὐθυμῶν ἐμέ; cf. also Philippus *AP* 16.177.1–3 = *GP* 72.1–3 Κύπρι φιλομειδῆς, θαλαμηπόλε . . . κοῖ παιῶν φίλος ἦν καὶ ὁ χρυσοκόμης Ὑμέναιος, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.2–3 *cui, Paeon, noua plectra moues umeroque comanti | facundum suspendis ebur?* Cf. Deubner (1919) 391, Käppel (1992) 50–1, Rutherford (2001a) 56.

⁶⁸ On wedding symposia, cf. Ath. 5.1, 185^b10–11 ὡς νενόμισται ἄγειν συμπόσια περὶ τοὺς γάμους τῶν τε γαμηλίων θεῶν ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς οἰονεῖ μαρτυρίας, Luc. *Symp.* 47, Ter. *Andr.* 361–74.

dusk,⁶⁹ with torches held by the participants,⁷⁰ shouts of ὕμῃν (or variations of it),⁷¹ and a vehicle carrying the bridal couple.⁷²

These objects and acts suggest that wedding ceremonies are not, as might *prima facie* appear, located in a purely mortal sphere,⁷³ but exhibit a certain connection with ritual, especially with cultic ritual. In the *Odyssey*, the performance of wedding rites is described with the verb ἐκτελεῖν (sc. γάμον),⁷⁴ which puts it on a plain with other rites of passage, such as the funeral (cf. *Il.*

⁶⁹ Originally, ὕμναιος seems to have denoted only the wedding procession; as the most important part of the wedding, however, it came to represent the ceremony as a whole as well as all songs performed at it, cf. Swift (2010) 243.

⁷⁰ On torches, cf. Eur. *IA* 732 τίς δ' ἀνασχίσει φλόγα; ἐγὼ παρέξω φῶς ὃ νυμφίοις πρέπει, Σ Eur. *Phoen.* 344 ἔθος γάρ ἦν τὴν νύμφην ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ γαμοῦντος μετὰ λαμπάδων εἰσάγεσθαι, Σ Eur. *Troad.* 315 νόμιμον γάρ ἐστι τῇ μητρὶ δαιδουχεῖν ἐν τοῖς γάμοις τῶν θυγατέρων, Σ Apoll. Rhod. 4.808 ὅτι παλαιὸν τὰς μητέρας τῶν γαμοῦντων ἐν τοῖς γάμοις δαιδουχεῖν ἔθος ἦν. Cf. also Erinna *AP* 7.712.6 = *HE* 2.6.

⁷¹ Cf. [Oppian] *Cyneg.* 1.341 εἰς θάλαμον βαίνησιν ὕμῃν ὕμναιον ἀείδων, Nonn. *Dionys.* 16.290 αὐλὸς ἐπεσμαράγηεν ὕμῃν Ὑμέναιε λιγαίνων, 24.271 οὐ λιγὺς αὐλὸς ἔμελψεν ὕμῃν Ὑμέναιε λιγαίνων, Ov. *Her.* 14.27 *uulgu* 'hymen Hymenaeae' clamant. Cf. also Maas (1907), Mangelsdorff (1913) 4–5, Muth (1954) 7–8 'Wir können annehmen, daß der älteste literarisch bezeugte Hochzeitsgesang der Griechen ... nur aus ὕμῃν-Rufen, wohl auch in mannigfaltigen Erweiterungen, bestand.'

⁷² Lexicographers preserve a term, χαμαίπους, for the poor bride that cannot afford a cart for the wedding procession, cf. Pollux 3.40 ἐπὶ ζεύγους γὰρ τὰς νύμφας ὡς τὸ πολὺ μετήιεσαν· εἰ δὲ πεζῇ ἀφίκοιτο ἡ νύμφη, χαμαίπους ἐλέγετο, 2.195 ἡ χαμαίπους. ἐκάλουν δὲ οὕτω τὴν οὐκ ἐπὶ ζεύγους κομιζομένην νύμφην, and 10.33 οὐ μέντοι ἀγνοῶ ὅτι κλινὶς ἐκαλεῖτο τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης καταστορνύμενον, ὅταν μετίωσι τὰς νύμφας, ἐφ' οὗ κάθηται ἡ νύμφη μετὰ τοῦ παρόχου τε καὶ τοῦ νυμφίου. See also Hesych. s.v. 'κλινίς', Phot. s.v. 'ζεύγος ἡμιονικὸν ἢ βοεικόν', Suda s.v. 'ζεύγος ἡμιονικὸν ἢ βοεικόν', ζ 33.22–30. Vase evidence, and the differences between mule-carts and horse-chariots, are discussed in the following section.

⁷³ The wedding song as a lyric genre, and with it the wedding ceremony, are considered secular (εἰς ἀνθρώπους) in Hellenistic scholarship, cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 320^a1–9, p. 5.159 Henry, εἰς δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἐγκώμια, ἐπίνικον, σκόλια, ἐρωτικά, ἐπιθαλάμια, ὕμναιος, κύλλου, θρήνου, ἐπικήδεια. The same arrangement is implicitly applied in Pollux *Onom.* 4.52, pp. 1.216–17 Bethe; cf. also Färber (1936) 1.16–19 and the material in 2.12–22. Similarly, the wedding song is defined as ἐγκώμιον in Him. *Or.* 9.227–31 (ὦ καλὴ ὦ χαρίεσσα, πρέπει γὰρ σοὶ τὰ τῆς Λεσβίης ἐγκώμια) and Tzetzes ad Lyc. *Alex.*, pp. 4.9–15 Sheer (ἐπιθαλαμιογράφοι δὲ ποιηταί, ὅσοι πρὸς τοὺς νυμφίους ἐν γάμοις ἐγκώμια ἔγραφον). On problems regarding the classification of poems εἰς θεοὺς and εἰς ἀνθρώπους, cf. Harvey (1955) 159–60; on the wider problems regarding secular and profane rituals, cf. Yatrimanolakis and Roilos (2004) 26–8.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Od.* 4.6–7 (Menelaus' children) ἐν Τροίῃ γάρ πρῶτον ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσε | δωσέμεναι, τοῖσιν δὲ θεοὶ γάμον ἐξετέλειον, P. P. 9.66 (Apollo and Cyrene) τερπνὰν γάμου κραίνειν τελευτάν.

24.60 τελεῖν τάφον), and with cultic forms of worship.⁷⁵ By comparison, vehicles feature widely in a variety of forms of cultic worship, especially where cult images are transported or gods enacted,⁷⁶ while torches are a stock component of the nocturnal worship of Dionysus, Demeter, and other deities.⁷⁷ The cultic cry puts the wedding ceremony on a par with the performances of cultic songs such as paeans or iobakchoi.⁷⁸ Another connection between the wedding ceremony and cultic ritual is suggested by the deity Hymenaios who, perhaps from the fifth century onwards,⁷⁹ is invoked as a patron of weddings, which are presented as acts of worship performed in his honour.⁸⁰

Among the rituals that are similarly centred on mortal protagonists,⁸¹ the funeral ceremony reveals, in many of its conventional elements, a striking similarity with the wedding celebration: from the ritual washing to the wearing of

⁷⁵ On the semantics of τελετή/τελῶ, cf. Yatromanolakis and Roilos (2004) 5–6 and the literature recorded there.

⁷⁶ Cult processions are discussed in detail in the following section on wedding iconography.

⁷⁷ On torches in divine cults generally, cf. Mau (1909) 1953 and Gag   (1969) 158–9, and the puzzling statement in 161 ‘Der Gebrauch der [Fackel] bei der Hochzeit stammt wohl aus dem Cereskult.’ On torches in the Demeter cult at Eleusis, cf. Arnob. 5.24, Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.21.24; on torches in the cult of Iacchus at Eleusis, cf. Eur. *Ion* 1076; on torches in the cult of Dionysus, cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 145–6, *Ion* 716, Ar. *Nub.* 603–6, Burkert (1977) 109, K  ppel (1990) 251 n. 170, Krummen (1998) 316 n. 52. Ambiguities between the wedding ceremony and Dionysiac *mania*, exemplified in the use of torches, are exploited in Eur. *Troad.* 308–40, on which cf. Krummen (1998) 320 ‘Das ganze Lied ist denn auch gekennzeichnet durch ekstatische, bakchantische Thematik. Man braucht im Grunde “Hymenaios” nur durch “Iakchos”, den Ruf “  μ  ν durch “  ακχε zu ersetzen, dann wird es ganz deutlich.’

⁷⁸ On the similarities between the cultic cries at weddings and those in cult, cf. Rutherford (2001a) 56–7 and Swift (2010) 245 ‘generating a sense of ritual’. It is noteworthy that all genres listed in P. fr. 128c SM share these elements.

⁷⁹ The first reference that is not merely a cultic cry is P. fr. 128c.7–9 SM (= *Thren.* 3)    δ’   μ  ναιον,   ν γ  μοιαι χρο  ζόμενον | [Μο  ρα] c  μπρωτον λ  βεν, |   σχ  τοις   μνοιαι. On the deity Hymenaios and its relationship to the cultic cry, cf. Muth (1954) 8–22.

⁸⁰ Echos of weddings as offerings are found in Eur. *Troad.* 322–4 διδο  ς,      μ  ναιε, κο  , | διδο  ς,      κατα, φ  ος, | παρθ  νων   π   λ  κτροις |   ι νόμος   χει, and Theocr. 18.58   μ  ν      μ  ναιε, γ  μωι   π   τ  ιδε χαρείης. Cat. 61.1–75 appears as an adaptation, and substantial expansion, of these invocations. Cultic worship of Hymenaios outside of weddings is attested only for Argus, cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 273.2 and the discussion in Horstmann (2004) 195–8.

⁸¹ The victory procession, too, displays many similarities, which are pursued in the following section. Its performance within a given *polis* is located on a different scale of frequency and regularity, in comparison to funerals and weddings.

special garments and wreaths, the uttering of cultic cries and singing of choral songs, and the torch-lit procession alongside vehicles carrying the protagonists.⁸² In tragedy, as well as in funerary epigrams for unmarried or newly-wed girls, these similarities are explored in discourses evolving around the identification of marriage with death or of death with marriage.⁸³ However, what sets the funeral apart from the wedding ceremony is the decisive evidence for laws, passed by a number of communities from the seventh century onwards, which meticulously restrict the size of funeral ceremonies and the luxury displayed at them.⁸⁴ The majority of these laws reflect attempts to confine family funerals to the domestic sphere and reduce their engagement with the community to a minimum. In contrast, in fifth-century Athens, precisely those elements prohibited for family funerals are used in the state-controlled funerals of the casualties of the Persian

⁸² On the general outlook of Archaic and Classical funerals, cf. Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 142–61, (1985) 169–87, Engels (1999) 24–9. On the similarities between the two rituals, cf. Seaford (1987) 107, Rehm (1994) 29, Swift (2010) 251–4.

⁸³ Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 781–805, 806–16, esp. 813–16 οὐθ’ ὕμεναίων | ἔγκληρον, οὐτ’ ἐπὶ νυμ-|φείοις πώ μέ τις ὕμνος ὕ-|μνησεν, ἄλλ’ Ἀχέροντι νυμφεύσω, Eur. *Alc.* 922 νῦν δ’ ὕμεναίων γόος ἀντίπαλος, *Med.* 626 γαμεῖς τοιοῦτον ὥστε θρηγεῖσθαι γάμον, *HF* 481–4 νύμφας μὲν ὕμιν Κῆρας ἀντέδωκ’ ἔχειν, | ἐμοὶ δὲ δάκρυα λουτρά δυστήνῳ φέρειν. | πατὴρ δὲ πατρός ἐστι γάμους ὅδε, | Ἄιδην νομίζων πενθερόν, κῆδος πικρόν, *Troad.* 351–2 δάκρυά τ’ ἀνταλλάξατε | τοῖς τῆς μέλεσι, Τρωιάδες, γαμηλίοις, *IA* 460–1 τὴν δ’ αὖ τάλαιναν παρθένον—τί παρθένον; | Ἄιδης νιν, ὥς ἔοικε, νυμφεύει τάχα, Meleager *AP* 7.182 = *HE* 123, Parmenion *AP* 7.183 = *GP* 3, Antonius Thallus *AP* 7.188 = *GP* 3, Xenocritus of Rhodes *AP* 7.291, Agathias Scholasticus *AP* 7.568, Pallades of Alexandria *AP* 7.610, Antipater *AP* 7.711 = *GP* 56, Erinna *AP* 7.712 = *HE* 2; *GVI* 1.658 (Rome, 3/4th c. AD), 1162 (Lemnos, 2nd c. AD), 1238 (Leontopolis, 1st c. AD), 1551 (Teos, 2nd/1st c. BC), 1553 (Crete, 1st c. BC), 1989 (Pantikapaïos, 2nd/1st c. BC), and the material evaluated in Seaford (1987), (2004) 87–90, and Rehm (1994).

⁸⁴ For Athens, cf. the ‘Solonic’ legislation ([Dem.] 43.62 = Sol. fr. 466 Martina, 109 Ruschenbusch; 65–7 = Sol. fr. 467 Martina; Cic. *Leg.* 2.59 = Sol. fr. 468 Martina, 72b Ruschenbusch; 63–6 = fr. 469 Martina, 72a and 151 Ruschenbusch; Plut. *Sol.* 21.1, 5–7 = Sol. fr. 465c Martina) and the so-called *post-aliquanto* law (Cic. *Leg.* 2.64–6). For Mytilene, cf. Cic. *Leg.* 2.66.1. For Catana, cf. Stob. *Flor.* 4.2.24. For Locri, cf. Diod. 12.21.1–2 and Heraclides Lembus *Exc. Polit.* 60 Dilts = Arist. fr. 611.10 Rose. For Sparta, cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 27.1–4 = *Lac. Apophth.* 18. For Gortyn on Crete, cf. *ICr* 4.22, 46b, 76 = *LSAM* 315 n. 2, 4, 8 (450–400 BC). For Delphi, cf. *SEG* 36.520 = *CID* 1.9, *GDI* 2561, *LSCG* 77, *IGT* 46 (400–350 BC). For Iulis on Ceos cf. *LSCG* 97 = *IGT* 60 (500–450 BC). For Thasos, cf. *LSCG* Suppl. 64 (400–350 BC). For Gambreion near Pergamon, cf. *LSAM* 16 (3rd c. BC).

Wars.⁸⁵ Because of this discrepancy between ‘private’ and ‘public’ funerals, funerary legislation is interpreted as an attempt of the *polis* authorities, either to dissolve tensions between influential families, exacerbated and perhaps even escalating at lavish funeral processions,⁸⁶ or to appropriate the privilege of installing hero cults through funerals, hitherto wielded by aristocratic clans.⁸⁷

In the light of the apparent need to restrict the size of funerals, it seems remarkable that no comparable laws are known concerning the wedding ceremony,⁸⁸ which could, potentially, provide an equally suitable stage for the display of wealth, power, and support among the *polis* population.⁸⁹ Admittedly, it

⁸⁵ Cf. Thuc. 2.34, *IG* 1.523–5, Lys. 2.80, [Plat.] *Menex.* 249^b5–6, Arist. *AP* 58.1, [Dem.] 60.36. On the controversy as to whether the war dead were heroised, cf. Currie (2005) 112–14 with further literature.

⁸⁶ Cf. Alexiou (1974) 13–19, Garland (1989), Toher (1991) 174–5, Morris (1992) 35–50, and Engels (1998) 30–47.

⁸⁷ Cf. Humphreys (1980) 102 = (1983) 89 ‘The aim of the celebration of public festivals, and of the legislation restricting ostentation in private celebrations, was to reserve the right of conferring “heroic” honours on the dead to the polis’, Engels (1998) 86–7 ‘In kunstvoll komponierten *Threnoi* ließen zuvor Aristokraten bei aufwendigen Beerdigungen den Ruhm ihrer Vorfahren und des mythischen Stammvaters ihres Geschlechtes von professionellen Dichtern und Musikern feiern. Diese Sitte bedrohte aber den sozialen Frieden innerhalb der Bürgerschaft und die Gemeinschaft aller Politen. Denn solche auch in literarischer Form publizierte *Threnoi* konnten zusammen mit dem Totenkult in besonders auffälligen Gräbern und mit der Erinnerung an ein „heroisches“ prachtvollen Begräbnis zum Ausgangspunkt für zahlreiche neue private, aristokratisch kontrollierte Heroenkulte werden. Diese stellten aber eine Bedrohung für die religiöse Gemeinschaft aller Politen dar, vor der schon Aristoteles in den *Politika* [sc. Arist. *Pol.* 6.4.11, 1319^b24–5] warnte.’ Cf. also Toher (1991) 175. For other possible motives, cf. Cannon (1989) 437–58, who examines social interactions by means of anthropological comparison, and Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 33–49, 429–39, who regards them as a protection of the living from the power of the dead.

⁸⁸ There is a vague reference in Pollux 1.206 to a ‘Solonic’ law defining the household goods to be carried by the bride during the procession. In Plato’s *Laws*, marriage laws are among the most important responsibilities of the lawgiver, cf. 8, 841^{d–e} τὰ μέγιστα ἤδη νενομοθετηκώς περὶ γάμου ἅμα καὶ γενέσεις παίδων καὶ τρόφας.

⁸⁹ In the fourth and fifth centuries AD, Christian authors criticise the pagan wedding ceremony precisely for its display of *profana ambitio*, cf. Paulinus of Nola *Carm.* 25.231–4 *nulla per ornatas insultet turba plateas; | nemo solum foliis, limina fonde tegat, | nec sit Christicolam fanatica pompa per urbem: | nolo profana pios polluat ambitio*; cf. also Cyprian *Hab. Virg.* 21 and, in the east, Joh. Chrys. *In Acta Hom.* 62.3 and *In 1 Cor. Hom.* 12.6. On this criticism, cf. Horstmann (2004) 255 ‘Das Festhalten an einer Hochzeitszeremonie, die weite Kreise der Bevölkerung in das Geschehen miteinbezog, zeigt deutlich, daß sich das Selbstverständnis der Oberschicht trotz der Ausbreitung des Christentums in vielen Punkten noch nicht verändert hatte.’

would seem that the line between glorifying mortal men and worshipping immortal heroes is less easily blurred at a wedding than at a funeral, partly because the bridal couple are alive while being so glorified and will resume normal mortal lives after the ceremony. However, the impression remains that Greek communities seem willing to grant bridal couples honours that are, in cultic contexts, employed to worship gods and, in other rituals for mortals, perceived as problematic or even transgressive. In concluding our first approach to the treatment of the bridal couple in wedding poetry, we may note that the wedding ceremony itself, as the real, enacted, or imagined performative context of this poetry, conveys a strong spirit of exceptionality and reveals a high degree of elevation.

WEDDING ICONOGRAPHY

A second approach to the treatment of the bridal couple is offered by wedding iconography; this is preserved with particular richness on Athenian black-figure and red-figure vases. The shapes of most of these vases suggest that they functioned as gifts in the contexts of weddings.⁹⁰ Hence they appear to be rooted in the same context that is reflected in the songs. More than that, these vases serve the celebration of the wedding for which they were produced or acquired in a manner parallel to the wedding song. A similar relationship between song and

⁹⁰ Cf. Fink (1974) 187, 247. It is no objection that the majority of vases were found in tombs, since it is conceivable that precious wedding gifts would be buried with their owners.

commemorative object has significantly deepened our understanding of the pragmatics of the victory ode,⁹¹ and the same can be achieved for the wedding song. Lastly, wedding vases depict, like wedding songs, mortal, heroic, and divine weddings. By understanding the ways in which these vases distinguish between these three spheres, we might be able to gain a sharpened perspective on the wedding song.

We begin with a description of black-figure wedding iconography. In three instances, all of which depict the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, we see the bridal couple standing as they receive their divine guests on chariots.⁹² All other instances depict wedding processions with bride and bridegroom mounted on a horse-chariot and accompanied by mortal or divine figures.⁹³ Towards the end of

⁹¹ See below, p. 70, on victory sculpture.

⁹² See Kleitias, krater (570–60 BC), Florence 4209 = *ABV* 76.1, *Paralipomena* 29, Fink 5; Sophilos, dinos fr. (600–575 BC), Athens *Akropolis* 587 = *ABV* 39.15, *Paralipomena* 19.16, Fink 1; Sophilos, dinos fr. (600–550 BC), London *Erskine* = *ABV* 40.16, *Paralipomena* 19.16, Fink 2.

⁹³ See Group-E Painter, amphora (575–550 BC), London *BM* 160 = *ABV* 134.15, Fink 16; Group-E Painter, pan-Athen. amphora (575–550 BC), Tarquinia RC1061 = *ABV* 137.58, *Paralipomena* 56.58, Fink 17; Painter of the Vatican Mourners, amphora (560–550 BC), Canterbury 43.57 = *ABV* 140, *Paralipomena* 58, Fink 18; Painter of the Vatican Mourners, amphora (c. 550 BC), Basel = *ABV* 140, *Paralipomena* 58, Fink 19; London-Group Painter, amphora (c. 550 BC), London *BM* B174 = *ABV* 141.1, Fink 20; London-Group Painter, amphora (550–525 BC), Melbourne 1729.4 = *ABV* 141.4, *Paralipomena* 58.4, Fink 21; London-Group Painter, neck amphora (550–525 BC), Naples 2498 = *ABV* 141.5, Fink 22; Towry-Whyte Painter, amphora, Orvieto 315 = *ABV* 141.2, Fink 23; Towry-Whyte Painter, neck amphora (550–525 BC), Vatican 358 = *ABV* 142.7, *Paralipomena* 58, Fink 24; Taleides Painter, loutrophoros fr., Athens *Akropolis* = *ABV* 174.2, *Paralipomena* 73.2, Fink 26; Lysippides Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), Florence 3790 = *ABV* 260.30, *Paralipomena* 114, Fink 27; Lysippides Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), Oxford 1965.119 = *ABV* 261.35, *Paralipomena* 115, Fink 28; Lysippides Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), New York *MM* 14.105.10 = *ABV* 261.35, Fink 29; London-Group Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), London *BM* B339 = *ABV* 264.1, Fink 30; Antimenes Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), London *BM* B340 = *ABV* 267.9, Fink 31; Antimenes Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), Berlin 1891 = *ABV* 267.10, Fink 32; Antimenes Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), Civitavecchia 1319 = *ABV* 267.11, Fink 33; Antimenes Painter, amphora (550–525 BC), Paris *Hirsch* = *ABV* 274.132, Fink 34; painter in the manner of Antimenes Painter, hydria (530–525 BC), Toronto 296 = *ABV* 277.10, Fink 35; painter in the manner of Antimenes Painter, lebes (550–525 BC), Athens *NM* 19.363 (bis) = *ABV* 280, *Paralipomena* 122, Fink 36; painter in the manner of Antimenes Painter, amphora, Orvieto 578 = *ABV* 281.13, Fink 37; painter in the manner of Antimenes Painter, amphora (550–525 BC), Naples 2466 = *ABV* 281.14, Fink 38; painter in the manner of Antimenes Painter, calyx krater (550–525 BC), Brussels R310 = *ABV* 281.17, Fink 39; Painter of the Auge-Sirene Group, hydria, Basel

the black-figure style, this theme is merely varied when we see the groom mounting a chariot with the bride already on it.⁹⁴ A striking feature of these vases is their uniform representation of the bridal couple. In the vast majority of cases,

Schweizer = *ABV* 287.13, Fink 40; Painter of the Würzburg-Group, neck amphora (550–525 BC), Orvieto 1008 (=198) = *ABV* 288.22, Fink 41; Würzburg-199 Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), Florence 94.315 = *ABV* 289.29, Fink 42; Berlin-1686 Painter, amphora (550–525 BC), London *BM* B197 = *ABV* 296.1, Fink 43; Berlin Painter, amphora (550–525 BC), Munich 1375 (J392) = *ABV* 297.15, Fink 44; Louvre-F42 Painter, hydria (c. 530 BC), *Louvre* F42 = *ABV* 304.1, Fink 45; Munich-1410 Painter, amphora fr. (c. 530 BC), Brussels A2091 = *ABV* 311.3, Fink 46; Euphiletos Painter, neck amphora (550–525 BC), Berlin 1872 = *ABV* 322.15, Fink 47; Euphiletos Painter, neck amphora, London *BM* = *ABV* 323.16, Fink 48; Euphiletos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Munich 1697 (J44) = *ABV* 324.31, Fink 49; Euphiletos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Aberdeen 696 = *ABV* 324.32, Fink 50; Euphiletos Painter, hydria, San Simeon *Hearst* 9518 = *ABV* 324.33, Fink 51; Euphiletos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Munich 1699 (J649) = *ABV* 324.34, Fink 52; Euphiletos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Würzburg 312 = *ABV* 324.35, Fink 53; Long-Nose Painter, amphora (525–500 BC), Basel *Erlenmeyer* (priv.) = *ABV* 328.11, Fink 54; Perikles Painter, neck amphora (525–500 BC), Syracuse = *ABV* 328.4, Fink 55; painter in the manner of Madrid Painter, neck amphora (525–500 BC), Munich 1529 (J312) = *ABV* 330.1, Fink 56; painter in the manner of Madrid Painter, neck amphora (525–500 BC), Munich (J1196) = *ABV* 330.2, Fink 57; Priamos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Oxford 1965.108 = *ABV* 333.35, Fink 58; Priamos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Naples 112.847 = *ABV* 333.29, Fink 59; Rycroft Painter, amphora (525–500 BC), Lyon 1169 = *ABV* 335.5, Fink 60; Rycroft Painter, amphora fr. (525–500 BC), Athens *Agora* = *ABV* 336.7, Fink 61; Rycroft Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Copenhagen *Thorvaldsen* 74 = *ABV* 337.28, Fink 62; Rycroft Painter, hydria (c. 510 BC), Los Angeles *Silver* = *ABV* 337.28, Fink 63; painter in the manner of Rycroft Painter, amphora (525–500 BC), Copenhagen 113 = *ABV* 364.51, Fink 64; painter of the Leagros Group, hydria (525–500 BC), St Petersburg 2067 = *ABV* 364.59, Fink 66; painter of the Leagros Group, hydria (525–500 BC), Florence 94.322 = *ABV* 364.60, Fink 67; painter of the Leagros Group, amphora (c. 501 BC), Munich 1413 (J693) = *ABV* 366.85, Fink 69; painter of the Leagros Group, amphora (c. 510 BC), Munich 1406 (J592) = *ABV* 368.108, *Paralipomena* 171.1, Fink 70; painter of the Würzburg-346 Group, oinochoe (c. 510 BC), Philadelphia 4838 = *ABV* 421, Fink 71; painter of the Altenburg Group, oinochoe (c. 510 BC), New York *Popelka* = *ABV* 423, Fink 72; painter of the Vatican-G47 Group, oinochoe (c. 510 BC), Berlin 1923 = *ABV* 431.4, Fink 73; painter of the Vatican-G47 Group, oinochoe (c. 510 BC), Munich 1778 (J433) = *ABV* 431.5, Fink 74; painter of the Phanyllis Group A, lekythos (525–500 BC), Antwerp *Vleeshuis* 877 = *ABV* 463, *Paralipomena* 204, Fink 75; Oxford-245 Painter, lekythos (c. 510 BC), Oxford 245 = *ABV* 472, Fink 76; Edinburgh Painter, lekythos (c. 510 BC), Maplewood *Noble* = *ABV* 477, *Paralipomena* 217, Fink 77; painter of the Athens-581 Group, lekythos (c. 500 BC), Lincoln C2338 = *ABV* 492.79, Fink 78; unknown painter, neck amphora (c. 500 BC), New York *Gallatin* = *ABV* 489, *Paralipomena* 295, Fink 79; painter of the Villa Giulia-M482 Group, neck amphora (c. 500 BC), Tarquinia 645 = *ABV* 590.5, *Paralipomena* 295.5, Fink 80; painter in the manner of Red-Line Painter, amphora (c. 500 BC), Naples 2535 = *ABV* 607, Fink 81; unknown painter, amphora (c. 550 BC), Rome = Fink 82–4; unknown painter, hydria (c. 550 BC), *Louvre* F48 = Fink 85; unknown painter, hydria (575–550 BC), *Louvre* F10 = Fink 86; unknown painter, hydria (c. 550 BC), *Louvre* F44 = Fink 87. Cf. the summary in Fink (1974) 180.

⁹⁴ See Priamos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Oxford 1965.108 = *ABV* 333.35, Fink 58; Priamos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Naples 112.847 = *ABV* 333.29, Fink 59; Rycroft Painter, amphora (525–500 BC), Lyon 1169 = *ABV* 335.5, Fink 60; Rycroft Painter, hydria (c. 510 BC), Los Angeles *Silver* = *ABV* 337.28, Fink 63; painter in the manner of Rycroft Painter, amphora (525–500 BC), Copenhagen 113 = *ABV* 364.51, Fink 64; painter of the Villa Giulia-M482 Group, neck amphora (c. 500 BC), Tarquinia 645 = *ABV* 590.5, *Paralipomena* 295.5, Fink 80.

there is no iconographical attribution that would, for us, mark a couple as mortal, heroic, or divine. Instead we find that, in a few cases where the couple is identified as heroic through inscriptions, these figures lack the attributes that they usually display in vase painting.⁹⁵ A figure like Heracles, who is identified by his conventional attributes throughout the black-figure and red-figure styles, even in the secondary zones of many wedding vases,⁹⁶ is shown without these attributes and recognised only through inscriptions when depicted as a groom. As a result of this uniform iconography, some of these bridal couples are interpreted differently, by some as ordinary mortals, by others as Peleus and Thetis or even Zeus and Hera.⁹⁷

Similar phenomena can be observed on red-figure vases. Though these depict a greater variety of wedding scenes, the procession with horse-drawn

⁹⁵ See Menelaus and Helen: Sophilos, lebes (c. 570 BC), Smyrna = *ABV* 40.20, *Paralipomena* 18, Fink 3; Peleus and Thetis: painter in the manner of Lysippides Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), Florence 3790 = *ABV* 260.30, Fink 27; Heracles and Hebe: painter in the manner of Lysippides Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), New York *MM* 14.105.10 = *ABV* 261.37, Fink 29. On other, more dubious, cases, see Boardman (1952) 43 n. 219.

⁹⁶ See Guglielmi Painter, hydria (575–550 BC), Leiden xv.e26 (PC44) = *ABV* 105.132, Fink 11; painter of Group E, amphora (575–550 BC), London *BM* B1160 = *ABV* 134.15, Fink 16; Painter of the Vatican Mourners, amphora (560–550 BC), Canterbury 43.57 = *ABV* 140, Fink 18; painter in the manner of Lysippides Painter, hydria (550–525 BC), Florence 3790 = *ABV* 260.30, Fink 27; Antimenes Painter, hydria, Civitavecchia 13/9 = *ABV* 267.11, Fink 33; painter in the manner of Antimenes Painter, hydria (530–525 BC), Toronto 296 = *ABV* 277.10, Fink 35; painter of the Würzburg-199 Group, hydria (550–525 BC), Florence 94.315 = *ABV* 289.29, Fink 42; Berlin-1686 Painter, amphora (575–550 BC), London V197 = *ABV* 196.1, Fink 43; Euphiletos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Munich 1697 (J.44) = *ABV* 324.31, Fink 49; Pasikles Painter, neck amphora (525–500 BC), Syracuse = *ABV* 328.4, Fink 55; Priamos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Oxford 1965.108 = *ABV* 333.25, Fink 58; Priamos Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Naples 112.847 = *ABV* 333.29, Fink 59; Rycroft Painter, hydria (525–500 BC), Copenhagen *Thorvaldsen* 74 = *ABV* 337.28, Fink 62; Rycroft Painter, hydria (c. 510 BC), Los Angeles *Silver* = *ABV* 337.28, Fink 63; painter of the Leagros Group, hydria (525–500 BC), St Petersburg 2067 = *ABV* 364.59, Fink 66; painter of the Leagros Group, hydria fr. (525–500 BC), Florence 94.322 = *ABV* 364.60, Fink 67.

⁹⁷ See Peleus and Thetis perhaps on Edinburgh Painter, lekythos, Maplewood *Noble* = *ABV* 477, *Paralipomena* 217, Fink 77 (c. 510 BC). A mortal wedding or that of Zeus and Hera on Oxford-245 Painter, lekythos (c. 510 BC), Oxford 245 = *ABV* 472, *Paralipomena* 212.1, Fink 76. Divine or mortal weddings on Athens Lydos, chalix fr. (575–550 BC), *Agora* P14.326 = *ABV* 107.3, Fink 13; Berlin-1686 Painter, amphora (575–550 BC), London *BM* B197 = *ABV* 296.1, Fink 43.

chariots remains a dominant theme.⁹⁸ Again, the general iconography of the bridal couple does not allow us to identify them as mortal, heroic, or divine. Only in one case can we discern with certainty a heroic wedding, namely that of Admetus and Alcestis, but identification is only possible through inscriptions.⁹⁹ Even Dionysus, who features in most black-figure wedding processions with unmistakable iconography, is bare of his usual attributes and recognised only through inscriptions in a scene where he seems to be the groom.¹⁰⁰ In other cases, which lack specific attributes or inscriptions, the couples are variously interpreted either as mortal or as heroic and divine (Heracles and Hebe, Menelaus and Helen, Peleus and Thetis).¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ See Bologna-228 Painter, fr., Tübingen E86 + Amsterdam 2307, 2308 = *ARV*² 513.21, Fink 13; painter in the manner of Alkimachos Painter, loutrophoros, Athens *Akropolis* = *ARV*² 534.11, Fink 19; Florence Painter, lebes, Athens *NM* 1251 = *ARV*² 544.19, Fink 23; London-E494 Painter, loutrophoros fr., Athens *Akropolis* + New Jersey (priv.) = *ARV*² 1079.2, Fink 50; painter in the manner of Tarquinia-707 Painter, hydria, Würzburg 535 = *ARV*² 1112.3, Fink 66; Athens-1454 Painter, lebes or loutrophoros fr., Athens *Vlasto* = *ARV*² 1179, Fink 93; painter of the Oppenheimer Group, pyxis, Brussels A3547 = *ARV*² 1224, Fink 96. The *hymenaios* appears as a new type of *komos*-like procession scene where neither bride and groom nor chariots feature, cf. Bologna-228 Painter, loutrophoros fr., Athens *Akropolis* = *ARV*² 513.16, Fink 12; Pan Painter, loutrophoros hydria, Houston 37.10 = *ARV*² 544.79, Fink 25; Ariana Painter, loutrophoros, Basel *Borowski* = *ARV*² 1102.2, Fink 60; Wash Painter, loutrophoros, Athens *Akropolis* = *ARV*² 1127.19, Fink 82.

⁹⁹ See Methyse Painter, loutrophoros fr. (475–425 BC), Athens *Akropolis* = *ARV*² 632.1, Fink 29.

¹⁰⁰ See painter of the Polygnotos Group, fr., Tübingen 5439 = *ARV*² 1057.97, *Paralipomena* 445, Fink 49 (image in *Antike Kunst* 6 (1963) pl. 5.1). In some Dionysiac scenes it is doubtful whether they depict a wedding: painter of the Polygnotos Group, fr., Tarquinia RC4197 = *ARV*² 1057.96, *Paralipomena* 445, Fink 48 clearly features a satyr rather than Dionysus; Painter of the Otchët Group, lekanis, Eleusis 628 = *ARV*² 1498.10, Fink 151; painter in the manner of Otchët Group, lekanis, St Petersburg 1983 = *ARV*² 1499.2, *Paralipomena* 499, Fink 166 are too unspecific to be decisive.

¹⁰¹ See Heracles and Hebe perhaps on Persephone Painter, loutrophoros, Athens *Akropolis* = *ARV*² 1013.2, Fink 41; Menelaus and Helen perhaps on Providence Painter, lekythos, Boston 95.44 = *ARV*² 640.76, Fink 30; Peleus and Thetis perhaps on Berlin Painter, fr., Athens *Akropolis* 732 = *ARV*² 205.119, Fink 3; Makron, bowl fr., Boston o3.856 = *ARV*² 460.16, *Paralipomena* 377, Fink 8; Makron, bowl fr., *Louvre* C11.272 = *ARV*² 460.17, Fink 9; Makron, bowl fr., Florence PD278, 280–1 = *ARV*² 460.18, Fink 10; painter in the manner of Alkimachos Painter, loutrophoros, Athens *Akropolis* = *ARV*² 534.11, Fink 19; painter in the manner of Dinos Painter, krater fr., Athens = *ARV*² 1155.1, Fink 89; Athens-1454 Painter, lebes or loutrophoros fr., Athens *Vlasto* = *ARV*² 1179, Fink 93.

It could be thought that the presence of inscriptions is a necessary condition for identifying mythical scenes and that, consequently, all unlabelled wedding scenes are of a non-mythical nature.¹⁰² However, even the unlabelled scenes are not straightforwardly non-mythical nor are they likely to give an adequate impression of the wedding customs contemporary with the vases depicting them. The presence of Apollo, Dionysus, Hermes, and other deities in all these scenes does not in itself render them mythical, as their presence could have been perceived in elements of the wedding ceremony, particularly in the music performed.¹⁰³ What seems to elevate the unlabelled scenes, however, is the almost invariable presence of the horse-chariot.¹⁰⁴ For literary sources tend to refer to mule-carts (ἄμαξα, ζεῦγος, ἀπήνη) rather than horse-chariots (e.g., ἄρμα, δίφρος), and lexicographers in particular attest to the wide use of this kind of vehicle at wedding processions (see above, n. 72). These testimonies do not exclude the possibility that chariots were used at some weddings, but they challenge the uniform impression emerging from vase evidence.

That chariots would have been used on a particularly large scale becomes further unlikely when we consider other occasions where chariots feature in civic processions. Its most widely attested function is in cultic contexts. Cult images, for example, are carried in procession and when gods are ritually represented,

¹⁰² Cf. Fink (1974) 12, 183 and Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 40.

¹⁰³ Cf. Boardman (1952) 34.

¹⁰⁴ A bridal mule-cart followed by another mule-cart is depicted on Amasis Painter, lekythos, New York *MM* 56.11.1 = *ABV* 155, Fink 25, *ABFH* 77.

they ride a chariot.¹⁰⁵ The image of the chariot as the vehicle of gods is paralleled in literary descriptions of epiphany.¹⁰⁶ The story of Pisistratus' return to Athens, as related in Herodotus 1.60, can serve to illustrate the strong association of chariots with the divine sphere. Few civic occasions are known when living mortals feature on chariots. Before Hellenistic times, it is only in tragedy that kings travel on chariots, and here ideas of excess and orientalism are often found in the vicinity.¹⁰⁷ Apart from that, we only know of the Panhellenic victor being granted by some *poleis* a chariot procession on his return.¹⁰⁸ For the victory procession, a cultic element is suggested by some attested customs in which the victor seems to be perceived as having extraordinary, almost talismanic, powers of which the *polis* can avail itself.¹⁰⁹ It seems, then, that in the life of the *polis* the chariot holds a predominantly sacral function. Again, that does not exclude any possible use of chariots at wedding processions, but it underlines a certain discrepancy between vase iconography and other accounts of the wedding ceremony.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. the evidence collected in Rutherford (1992) 69–72 and Sinos (1993) 79–90 and 83–4. See also the remarks on P. *Pae.* 15 SM (= S4 Rutherford) in Rutherford (2001) 412–13 and Pavlou (2011) 67–8.

¹⁰⁶ Cf., e.g., Sapph. 1.88–9 V, *HH* 2.19.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. particularly the entries of the Persian Queen in Aesch. *Pers.* in 155–8 (cf. 607–8), of Agamemnon in *Ag.* 882 (cf. 906), and of Clytaemnestra in Eur. *El.* 998–1003. See also Taplin (1977) 303, and Hall (1989) 205 on the chariot as an 'Aeschylean danger sign'.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 69–70 with Σ, Ael. *VH* 12.58, Diod. 13.82.7 (for Acragas), Vitruv. 9 *Praef.* 1 (for Greece in general). References in Pindar are problematic as hardly any occurrence could not also be metaphorical; only *O.* 4.8–12 is agreed to be non-metaphorical, cf. Slater (1984) 244–5. On chariots at the victory procession, cf. Slater (1984) 244–7, Sinos (1993) 77–8, Kurke (1993) 131–3, Currie (2005) 139–40.

¹⁰⁹ Some *poleis* tore down parts of their city walls on the arrival of the victor, cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 2.5.2, Suet. *Nero* 25. In Sparta, the victor was placed next the king in battle; cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 2.5.2 and *Lyc.* 22.4. On talismanic powers, cf. Versnel (1970) 155–62, Kurke (1993) 133–7, Currie (2005) 140.

In seeking the reasons for this discrepancy, comparison with Archaic and Classical funerals, which exhibit a similar discrepancy, can be illuminating. On Athenian geometric vases and clay plaques, the *prothesis* is shown in open space with a host of male and female mourners,¹¹⁰ not infrequently surrounded by warrior and chariot processions.¹¹¹ *Ekphora* scenes involve the lavishly adorned corpse, laid out on a horse-chariot and sometimes accompanied by other chariots in the same scene.¹¹² Some vases depict, in the vicinity of such funeral scenes, processions of armed men¹¹³ and chariots,¹¹⁴ and chariot¹¹⁵ and boat races.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁰ Baldachins are stretched out above the bier on New York *MM* 14.130.15 = Ahlberg 22, Thorikos TC666 = Ahlberg 30, Oxford 1916.55 = Ahlberg 33, Sèvres = Ahlberg 3. Floral motifs are found on Athens *NM* 804 = Ahlberg 2, Sèvres = Ahlberg 3, *Louvre* A517 = Ahlberg 4, *Louvre* A552 = Ahlberg 16, Oxford 1916.55 = Ahlberg 33. Cf. the discussion in Ahlberg (1971) 165. For branches, leaves, and birds on clay plaques, see Brussels A5–7 = Zschietzschmann 30, Boardman 14; Dresden ZV814 = Zschietzschmann 32, Boardman 17; Athens *Kerameikos* 677 = Boardman 19; New York *MM* 54.11.15 = Boardman 23; Athens *Vlasto* 52 MVB + Amsterdam *Allard Pierson* 1366 = Zschietzschmann 33, Boardman 25; Berlin F1811–1826 = Zschietzschmann 27, Boardman 9; *Louvre* A1376 (formerly Brussels) = Zschietzschmann 31, Boardman 15. Cf. the discussion in Boardman (1955) 55–7.

¹¹¹ For warrior processions, see *Louvre* A522 = Ahlberg 5. For chariot processions, see *Louvre* A517 = Ahlberg 4, *Louvre* A547 = Ahlberg 13, Sydney 46.41 = Ahlberg 14, *Louvre* A541 = Ahlberg 15, *Louvre* 552 = Ahlberg 16, Athens *NM* 802 = Ahlberg 7, *Louvre* A522 = Ahlberg 5, Athens from Piraeus Street = Ahlberg 8, Halle *Robertinum* 58/58a.1–2 = Ahlberg 6, Amsterdam 2015 = Ahlberg 9, Athens *NM* = Ahlberg 19.

¹¹² On vases, see Bonn 16 = Ahlberg 55, New York *MM* 14.130.14 = Ahlberg 55, Athens *NM* 990 = Ahlberg 54. On clay plaques, see Berlin F1811–1826 = Zschietzschmann 27, Boardman 9; New York *MM* 54.11.15 = Boardman 23.

¹¹³ See New York *MM* 34.11 = Ahlberg 1, *Louvre* A517 + A522 = Ahlberg 16, *Louvre* A547 = Ahlberg 13, Sydney A552 = Ahlberg 14, Athens *NM* 802.18062 = Ahlberg 24, Oxford 1916.55, Halle *Robertinum* 58/58 A1–2 = Ahlberg 6, Sydney *Nicholson* 46.41; Athens *Brauron* = Ahlberg 35, Hamburg *Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe* 1966.89 = Ahlberg 43, Athens *Bernaki* 7675 = Ahlberg 46. For a discussion of the scenes, cf. Ahlberg (1971) 204–5.

¹¹⁴ For chariot processions, see *Louvre* A517 = Ahlberg 4, *Louvre* A522 = Ahlberg 5, Athens *NM* 802 = Ahlberg 7, Athens from Piraeus Street = Ahlberg 8, *Louvre* A545 = Ahlberg 11, *Louvre* A547 = Ahlberg 13, Sydney 46.41 = Ahlberg 14, *Louvre* A541 = Ahlberg 15, *Louvre* A552 = Ahlberg 16, New York *MM* 14.130.15 = Ahlberg 22. Cf. Ahlberg (1971) 194–6.

¹¹⁵ For chariot races, see *Louvre* A552 = Ahlberg 16, Athens *NM* 806 = Ahlberg 20, New York *MM* 14.130.15 = Ahlberg 22, New York *MM* 14.130.14 = Ahlberg 25, Oxford 1966.55 = Ahlberg 33, Athens *Brauron* = Ahlberg 35, Cleveland 1927.27.6 = Ahlberg 36, Baltimore *Walters* 48.2231 = Ahlberg 37, Athens (private collection) = Ahlberg 38, Athens *Agora* = Ahlberg 39, Athens *Stathatou* 222 = Ahlberg 40, Athens *Kerameikos* 1371 = Ahlberg 42; acrobatic games seem to be depicted on Essen *Folkwang* K969 = Ahlberg 41. Cf. Ahlberg (1971) 194–6.

¹¹⁶ For ships, see New York *MM* 34.11.2 = Ahlberg 1, *Louvre* A517 = Ahlberg 4, *Louvre* A522 = Ahlberg 5. Cf. Ahlberg (1971) 209.

Because such agonistic scenes are found in the majority of secondary zones of funerary vases and so form a part of the iconography of funerals, it is suggested that they represent funeral games.¹¹⁷ On the other hand, we know that many customs depicted in Athenian iconography were explicitly banned by the Athenian funerary legislation later ascribed to Solon, which was passed before many vases.¹¹⁸ These laws confine the *prothesis* to indoor space, limit the number of mourners, and simplify the decoration of the corpse; the vehicle used at the *ekphora* is always referred to as a mule-cart. Remarkably, many of these elements are only attested for fifth-century state-controlled cults of the casualties of the Persian Wars, a form of worship that comes close to, or is identical to, hero cult.¹¹⁹ In the light of this evidence, it seems unlikely that Athenian funerary vases offer accurate depictions of the customs of family funerals for which they were produced.

Like wedding vases, black-figure funerary vases and clay plaques are functionally rooted in contemporary ceremonial customs, but they reveal, more clearly than those, an attempt to elevate these customs. The resulting image is of a ceremony that resembles in many ways the ideal of the heroic funeral as it is preserved for us in the description of Patroclus' funeral in *Iliad* 23.¹²⁰ By displaying heroic funerals in the contexts of real-life funerals, these vases and

¹¹⁷ Cf. Ahlberg (1971) 209 '... the fact that the ship scenes are depicted on funeral vases and that they together with other secondary motifs, such as chariot scenes and warrior parades, constitute an integral part of the iconographic context, which is found in the *prothesis*.'

¹¹⁸ On the evidence, see above, n. 84. As for the dating of these laws, Engels (1998) 93–4 adduces the archaeological observation that from 560–30 BC luxury in funerary monuments increases significantly, arguably because it could no longer be spent on *prothesis* and *ekphora*.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Currie (2005) 113–14 on 'archaisms' in the cult of the Athenian war dead.

¹²⁰ Cf. the discussion in Ahlberg (1971) 165, 292–4. Scenes with ships recall the funerary games of *Aeneid* 5.

plaques seem to aim at bridging the gulf that separates historical present and mythical past, and so emphasise the timeless nature of communal ceremony. In doing so, they invite comparison, if not identification, of the figures depicted with the deceased and his family and friends.

A similar explanation can be developed for the discrepancy between wedding iconography and literary testimonies. No epic description of a wedding procession has come down to us, but when Sappho relates the heroic wedding of Hector and Andromache, all of Troy mounts their carts and chariots to partake in a magnificent celebration.¹²¹ It appears that wedding iconography, like funerary iconography, while being rooted in contemporary wedding customs, elevates these customs to the mythical and heroic sphere.¹²² One symbol of this elevation is the heroic chariot, which is unlikely to have been used widely in sixth- and fifth-century weddings, particularly in Athens.¹²³ This interpretation of wedding iconography suggests that a neat division of mythical and non-mythical scenes,

¹²¹ Cf. Sapph. fr. 44 V (13–14 ἐϋτρόχοις | ἄγον αἰμιόνοις, 17 ὑπαγον ὑπ’ ἄρ[ματα]). In Eur. *Hel.* 723–4, the Slave recalls how he carried torches next to Helen, τετραόροις | ἵπποις τροχάζων. Hofinger (1975) s.v. ‘ἀπήνη’ interprets [Hes.] *Scut.* 272 (εὐσκότρου ἐπ’ ἀπήνης) as chariot, though the passage seems ambiguous. Similarly, Dunbar (1995) 761–2 on Ar. *Av.* 1738–40 assumes that Zeus and Hera are seated on a chariot, though the text gives no clear indication.

¹²² Cf. Sinos (1993) 76–7.

¹²³ Cf. also Dunbar (1995) 752 ‘The relation of the chariot to actual 5th-c. weddings is uncertain: was it only used by richer citizens, or also borrowed or hired by the less rich for the important event, or did it survive only in art, as serving, along with the attendant deities often appearing in the pictures, to raise the marriage above the level of mundane reality?’; Oakley and Sinos (1993) 39 ‘If the usual vehicle for the wedding procession was the cart, then why do black-figure vases of the wedding normally depict the bride and groom riding in a chariot? The reason must be the symbolic value of the chariot, the normal vehicle of the gods’; M. Griffith (2006) 236 ‘Is it true that in many representations of the wedding procession, real or mythological, painted on vases (especially the wedding of Peleus and Thetis), the divine or heroic couples are shown in a horse-drawn chariot (as, e.g., in the François vase); but this seems to be an iconographical convention adopted to emphasize the exalted status of the pair, rather than a realistic representation of actual cultic practice.’

depending on the presence or absence of inscriptions, would be problematic, as all wedding vases establish a connection with the world of myth.

Comparison with funerary iconography also indicates that the categories of mortal, heroic, and divine might be out of place in considering the bridal couple. It is argued above that in Athenian black-figure and red-figure style they are a standardised motif, almost a template, which lacks obvious iconographical indicators of mortal, heroic, or divine statuses, and that these categories can only become known in the form of inscriptions. Ultimately, the iconography of the bridal couple overrides the usual iconographies of man, hero, and god and so allows a given spectator to see how the spheres of myth and reality are connected in the wedding ceremony.¹²⁴

Iconographical assimilation in contexts of weddings is not restricted to Athenian examples. We can observe a similar process on the Locrian *pinakes*, where we find, side by side, tablets that depict the abduction of Persephone by Hades, both identified through their distinct attributes, on a chariot with winged horses,¹²⁵ and tablets that depict abductions of girls by unspecified young men on chariots.¹²⁶ The latter series of plates is variously interpreted, but the most convincing approach considers them as dedications to the Locrian cult of Persephone offered in the context of weddings and depicting wedding processions rather than being a variation on the theme of Persephone's abduction.¹²⁷ However,

¹²⁴ Cf. Boardman (1952) 34, Sourvinou-Inwood (1972) 18, Sinos (1993) 77.

¹²⁵ See the examples under types 2/18, 19, 22, 24 in Z-M and 57–9, 84 in Prückner (1968) 121.

¹²⁶ See the examples under types 2/2–16, 20, 23, 28–30, 32 in Z-M and 60–83 in Prückner (1968) 121–2.

¹²⁷ Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1973) and (1978) 104–5. Z-M type 2/30, Prückner 83 (p. 122) shows the abduction of a girl by the youth with Hades standing nearby.

since the two series of scenes display many similar iconographical features, to the extent that we see winged horses in some supposed wedding scenes,¹²⁸ it is further argued that the iconography of the cultic scenes is assimilated into that of the wedding scenes. It seems that, for the Locrian cult of Persephone, the paradigmatic wedding is that of Hades and Persephone, as represented through the abduction, and that dedications made in the context of real-life weddings adapt this ideal. The result of this assimilation is a hybrid of mortal and divine iconographies, which, in effect, serves to highlight the similarities between the mortal couple offering the tablet and the divine couple receiving it. By repeating the ceremony that Hades and Persephone performed paradigmatically, the bridal couple enact, and to some extent become, Hades and Persephone.

Athenian black-figure and red-figure vases and Locrian *pinakes* are similar in that they open interpretative paths from the immediate context of their use to the world of myth. The present wedding is given meaning through its connection with the mythical paradigm and *vice versa*.¹²⁹ The connection between these two spheres is made in the representation of the bridal couple, whose iconography transcends the boundaries between human, heroic, and divine. In addition to the observations on the nature of the wedding ceremony, wedding iconography further conveys an impression of ambiguity regarding the boundaries between

¹²⁸ See Heidelberg Lo56 = Z-M 2/13, Prückner 71; Tübingen 2025–26 = Z-M 2/25, Prückner 85. Cf. remains of winged chariots on Heidelberg Lo 55, 49, 82 in Z-M 2/3, 11 and Prückner 69 and 79.

¹²⁹ On this aspect of community ritual in general, cf. Eliade (1954) 34–5, 76, Werner, Haggard, Altman, and Oxley (1988), Hubert (1999), R. Parker (1996) 273–4 and (2005) 377–8, Pavlou (2011) *passim*.

mortal and immortal. We will now try to evaluate whether or not similar phenomena are found in the wedding song.

HYMENAEIC TRADITIONS AND CONVENTIONS

It is argued above (p. 27) that virtually all extant wedding poetry envisages the wedding ceremony as its performative context, which provides a general unifying principle for these compositions. More particularly, the connection between poetry and ceremony also embeds these compositions in the broader tradition of wedding songs that is attested as early as Homer and said to abate as late as the first century BC.¹³⁰ If the Hellenistic classification of the lyric *epithalamium* reflects this tradition, the impression arises that songs accompanied the various stages of any wedding within this period.¹³¹ Consequently, most of the songs and

¹³⁰ *Il.* 18.490–508 and [Hes.] *Scut.* 273–80 are the earliest preserved descriptions of songs performed at a wedding. Philodemus informs us that νῦν δὲ σχεδὸν παντάπασι καταλελυμένων τῶν ἐπιθαλαμίων (*Mus.* 68.37). For Augustinus, *epithalamia* are a phenomenon of *scholastici*, cf. *In Psalm.* 44.3 (= *CCSL* 38.495) *solent dici ab scholasticis carminae quaedam uxores ducentibus et nubentibus, quae uocantur epithalamia; quidquid ibi cantatur, ad honorem cantatur sponsi et sponsae.*

¹³¹ On the stages of the wedding ceremony and their songs, cf. Mangelsdorff (1913) 1–13, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 33–41, Oakley and Sinos (2003) 23–38, Rehm (1994) 14–18, and Swift (2010) 242. Post-Alexandrian scholarship subcategorises the wedding songs according to these stages, cf. Σ Theocr. 18 *arg.* τῶν δὲ ἐπιθαλαμίων τινὰ μὲν αἰδεῖται ἐσπέρας, ἃ λέγεται κατακοιμητικά, ἅτινα ἕως μέσης νυκτὸς αἰδοῦσι· τινὰ δὲ ὄρθια, ἃ καὶ προκαγορεύεται διεγερτικά. αἰδοῦσι δὲ τὸν ἐπιθαλάμιον αἱ παρθένοι πρὸ τοῦ θαλάμου, and Ammon. 47 Valckenaer = Eustath. 1541.49 = *Et. Gud.* 119–23, 200–15 Sturz Γαμήλιος καὶ ἐπιθαλάμιος διαφέρει· ἐπιθαλάμιον μὲν γάρ ἐστιν τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ θαλαμῷ τῆς γαμουμένης γραφὲν ποίημα. ὁ δὲ γαμήλιος οὐ περιώριται χρόνῳ· τάττοιο δ' ἂν καὶ κατὰ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐν γάμῳ διδομένης. See also Färber (1936) 2.49–51. Archaic and Classical usage, however, uses terms as ὑμέναιος and γαμήλιος collectively for

poems discussed in the following paragraphs would have originated next to, or within, an active and widespread culture of wedding songs. Determining the precise relationship between this culture of songs, which is entirely lost to us, and the songs that are preserved as the works of specific authors is difficult. Sappho, for instance, by composing songs for actual weddings, would seem to be closer to that culture than, say, Theocritus. Differences between Sappho's songs and those *carmina popularia* could be located on scales of style (low to high, simple to elaborate) or quantity (short to long), or take the form of dichotomies of performance (one-off performance vs. reperformance) or authority (anonymous compositions vs. those associated with a poet). Yet, even where we would seem to be able to assign one of these values to a composition at a certain point in time, the possibility remains that the diachronic picture would reveal them as transient. Sappho, for example, could have reworked traditional material, which was then transmitted under her name, just as her songs could, at some later point, have entered a local tradition anonymously.¹³² The same is, *a priori*, conceivable for wedding songs in tragedy.¹³³

Pursuing these problems in detail would go beyond the scope of these pages. Nevertheless, what emerges from these considerations as a characteristic of

any song performed during the wedding ceremony, cf. Muth (1954) 23–43 and Swift (2010) 242–3.

¹³² Herodotus gives an instructive example of such processes of transformation, in the account of the Lycian Olen, who 'coming from Lycia, composed, among other things, the old hymns sung in Delos' (4.33.3 οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ὀλὴν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς παλαιούς ὕμνους ἐποίησε ἐκ Λυκίης ἐλθὼν τοὺς ἀειδομένους ἐν Δήλῳ); on this passage, cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.146–7.

¹³³ Songs in tragedy are naturally likely to draw on contemporary customs, as is argued in the case of ritual lament by, e.g., Easterling (1988) 98–9, Segal (1993), Seaford (1994a), Krummen (1998), Foley (2001), Alexiou (2002a), Sourvinou-Inwood (2003), Easterling (2004) 151–2. However, the assumption of Mangelsdorff (1913) 25, that Sappho and drama draw exclusively on their respective local wedding traditions, is too schematic. Sappho could have been known to and used by the dramatists, cf. Kugelmeier (1996) 11–27 and Swift (2010) 40.

the wedding song is its frequent and ubiquitous performance, at least at certain times in certain places. For the victory ode, the performance of which never amounted to a regular event even in the most successful *poleis*, the demands of the individual commission are a palpable element of almost all extant compositions. In contrast, the wedding song, for its regular performance, would appear to be significantly more standardised and conventionalised.¹³⁴ Certain expressions, themes, and images seem to be perceived as distinctly hymenaeic long before the generations of Theocritus and Catullus transformed them into generic markers. By analysing the treatment of the bridal couple through these conventions, first the structural and then the thematic ones, we would seem to be able, not only to compensate for the poor preservation of wedding songs, but also to do justice to the very nature of these songs.

STRUCTURAL TOPOI OF THE WEDDING SONG

A common formal feature of the extant wedding songs is the address of bride and bridegroom in the vocative. Where we have complete poems, such addresses tend to occur in either the first or last sections, thus serving to open or close the

¹³⁴ On the development of more personalised wedding songs after Statius, cf. Horstmann (2004) 18, 79 'Trotz der Namensnennung der Brautleute [sc. in Cat. 61] verzichtet Catull weitgehend darauf, persönliche Bezüge in das Epithalamium einzubauen. Erst Statius führte den persönlichen Zuschnitt auf ein konkretes Brautpaar in die lateinische Epithalamiendichtung ein.'

poem.¹³⁵ Personal names are found only in songs for mythical weddings. In other songs, the bride is addressed generically as νύμφη and *nupta*, the bridegroom as γάμβρε or νυμφίε and *marite*.¹³⁶ These generic addresses, used for mortals, heroes, and gods alike, already suggest an idealised perception of the bridal couple comparable to that of wedding iconography pursued above. Addresses are found either as bare vocatives,¹³⁷ or, more commonly, extended with attributes, of which κάλα and χαρίεσσα are conventional for the bride,¹³⁸ φίλος, τίμιος, ὄλβιος, and μάκαρ for the bridegroom.¹³⁹ Addresses are also extended with participle or relative clauses.¹⁴⁰ Moreover, initial vocative addresses are found repeated through polyptoton of second-person personal and possessive pronouns, and through second-person verbs. This seems to be the case in Sappho fr. 112 V (ὄλβιε γάμβρε, κοὶ μὲν γάμος ὥς ἄραο | ἐκτετέλεετ', ἔχηι δὲ πάρθενον ἂν ἄραο. | κοὶ χάριεν μὲν εἶδος, ὅππατα <δ' . . . > | μέλλιχ', ἔρος δ' ἐπ' ἱμέρτωι κέχυται προσώπωι | < > τετίμακ' ἔξοχά σ' Ἀφροδίτα). Following one source of this

¹³⁵ First sections: Sapph. fr. 112 V, quoted as the beginning; [Hes.] fr. 211.7 MW, Ar. *Pax* 1333, Av. 1725, Theocr. 18.9, *PRyl.* 17.1; last sections: Eur. *Phaeth. TrGF* 5.2, F781.27, Theocr. 18.49, Luc. *Symp.* 41.22.

¹³⁶ Proper names only in [Hes.] fr. 211.7 MW Αἰακίδη . . . Πηλεῦ, Theocr. 18.15 Μενέλαε, 41 Ἑλένα. The exception is Luc. *Symp.* 41.18–20.

¹³⁷ Sapph. fr. 113 V ὦ γάμβρε, Luc. *Symp.* 41.22 νυμφίε, *PRyl.* 17.1 νυμφίε; Cat. 61.181 *at marite*; Auson. *Cent. Nupt.* 73 *marite*.

¹³⁸ Sapph. fr. 108 V ὦ κάλα ὦ χαρίεσσα κόρα, Theocr. 18.38 ὦ κάλα ὦ χαρίεσσα κόρα (also used in Theocr. 11.30, by Polyphemus to Galatea, χαρίεσσα κόρα); see, however, *PRyl.* 17.3 νύμφα φίλη. *Noua nupta* occurs in Latin wedding poetry, cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 815, Cat. 61.95, 100, 110, 120 (refrain *prodeas noua nupta*), Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 25.81–2, 95–6, 103–4. Cf. also Auson. *Cent. Nupt.* 70 *gratissima coniunx*.

¹³⁹ Sapph. fr. 115.1 V ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, 116 V τίμιε γάμβρε, 112 V ὄλβιε γάμβρε; Theocr. 18.9 ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, 16 ὄλβιε γάμβρε; [Hes.] fr. 211.7 MW τρίς μάκαρ Αἰακίδη καὶ τετράκις ὄλβιε Πηλεῦ, Ar. *Pax* 1333 ὦ τρίς μάκαρ, Eur. *Phaeth. TrGF* 5.2, F781.27 ὦ μάκαρ, βασιλέως μείζον ἔτ' ὄλβιον. Cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 312–3 μακάριος ὁ γαμέτας· | μακαρία δ' ἐγώ.

¹⁴⁰ [Hes.] fr. 211.8–9 MW ὦ . . .] Ζεῦς | [ὥπαρ], 10–11 ὅς . . . εἰσαναβαίνων | [κραίνεις]; Ar. Av. 1725 ὦ μακαριστὸν σὺ γάμον . . . γήμας; Eur. *Phaeth. TrGF* 5.2, F781.28 ὅς θεῶι κηδεύεις, *Phoen.* 313–14 βασιλικοῖς λέκτροις | κατ' Ἄργος ἅ γαμουμένα; Luc. *Symp.* 41.19–20 δῖα Κλεανθίς . . . προῦχους.

fragment, Choricus' wedding speech for Zacharias,¹⁴¹ interpreters tend to assume in the first lacuna a shift from addressing the groom to addressing the bride. However, such a shift would be difficult to accommodate,¹⁴² and Catullus' interpretations of this song are exclusively addressed to the bridegroom.¹⁴³ Similar repeated addresses appear, with less uncertainty, in Euripides, Theocritus, and Plautus.¹⁴⁴

Related to opening addresses is the question directed at the bridegroom in Sappho's fr. 115 V (τίωι σ', ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, κάλως εικάδω), which is quoted by Hephaestion as the beginning of a poem. Concern on the part of the speaking voice with how his or her praise should be conducted appropriately (κάλως) is a common feature of praise poetry in general.¹⁴⁵ The fact that such questions also

¹⁴¹ Cf. Chor. *Zach.* 5.19, pp. 86–7 Förster-Richtsteig ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν νύμφην—ὁρᾶτε ὅπως κεκήληται τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ σύντονον βλέπει καὶ μᾶλλον ὑπέχει τὰ ὅτα—ἐγὼ οὖν τὴν νύμφην, ἵνα σοι πάλιν χαρίζωμαι, Καπρικῆ μελωιδία κοσμήσω· σοὶ χάριεν μὲν εἶδος καὶ ὄμματα μελιγρά, ἔρωσ δὲ καλῶι περικέχεται προσώποι καὶ σὲ τετίμηκεν ἐξόχως ἡ Ἀφροδίτη. Since it seems unlikely that the text used by Choricus contained an explicit change of addressee (see next note), his testimony offers merely an interpretation of the fragment. The same interpretation is made by, e.g., Fränkel (1962) 195 and M. Treu (1968) 88.

¹⁴² As for line three of the fragment, Wilamowitz (1900) 73 n. 2 suggests reading δ' ἐκτί, νύμφα, and Bowra (1934) 175 δ' ἐκτί νύμφας. However, as Lobel (1927) 37–9 and Voigt in app. crit. point out, the copula is hardly used in extant Lesbian poetry. The correspondence between μὲν (1) and δέ (3) (if the latter is supplied correctly, which is far from certain) does not necessarily indicate a change of addressee, cf. Denniston (1954) 369–70 and Tzamali (1996) 422 'Die parataktische korrelative Verbindung μὲν . . . δέ hat hier keine adversative Geltung, sondern bewirkt den Übergang zu etwas Neuem (in der Bedeutung von τε . . . καί).'

¹⁴³ Cf. Cat. 61.189–92 *at marite*, | *nihilo minus* | *pulcer es, neque te Venus* | *neglegit*; 195–8 *bona te Venus* | *iuuerit, quoniam palam* | *quod cupis cupis, et bonum* | *non abscondit amorem*; 64.329–30 *coniunx*, | *quae tibi flexanimo mentem perfundat amore*.

¹⁴⁴ Eur. *Phaeth.* TrGF 5.2, F781.18–24 πότνια, σοὶ τόδ' ἐγὼ νυμφεῖ' ἀεῖδω, | Κύπρι, θεῶν καλλίστα, | τῷ τε νεόζυγι σῶι | πῶλωι τὸν ἐν αἰθέρι κρύπτεις, | σῶν γάμων γένναν; Theocr. 18.16–18 ὄλβιε γάμβρ', ἀγαθός τις ἐπέταρεν ἐρχομένωι τοι | ἐς Σπάρταν ἄπερ ὄλλοι ἀριστεές, ὡς ἀνύσαιο· | μῶνος ἐν ἡμιθέοις Κρονίδαν Δία πενθερόν ἐξεῖς; Plaut. *Cas.* 816–22 *sospes iter incipe hoc, uti uiro tuo* | *semper sis superstes*, | *tuaque ut potior pollentia sit uincasque uirum uictrixque sis*, | *tua uox superet tuomque imperium*; *uir te uestiat*, [*tu*] *uirum despolies*.

¹⁴⁵ Cf., e.g., P. O. 2.1–2 and its echo in Theocr. 17. 9–13; Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.1–3, with Race (1990) 105; see also Aesch. *Ag.* 784 (chorus to Agamemnon) πῶς σε προσείπω, πῶς σε σεβίζω, 1490 πῶς σε δακρύω, Eur. *IA* 978 (Clytemnestra to Achilles) πῶς ἄν σ' ἐπαινέαιμι μὴ λίαν λόγοις, Ar. *Equ.* 460 (chorus to the Sausage Seller, after a quasi-hymnic address) πῶς ἄν σ' ἐπαινέαιμεν οὕτως ὥσπερ ἡδόμεθα. Hymnic parallels are discussed below, n. 196.

form the beginning of Claudian's first *Fescennina* (1–5 *princeps corrusco sidere pulchrior, | Parthis sagittas tendere doctor, | eques Gelonis imperiosior, | quae digna mentis laus erit arduae? | quae digna formae laus erit igneae?*) could indicate that they were a viable means of opening a wedding song.

Another opening feature is the thematic announcement, in other words, a statement either reflecting the intent of the speaking voice or prompting the chorus, with the proposed topic depending on a verb of singing. It is attested for Sappho in what Hellenistic editors considered the beginning of an *epithalamium* (103.2 V ἀεί]κατε τὰν εὐποδα νόμφαν), in Euripides' *Phaethon* (TrGF 5.2, F781.15 τὰν Διὸς οὐρανίαν <ἀ>εἶδομεν), and in Callimachus' hexametrical poem for Arsinoe (fr. 392 Pfeiffer Ἀρσινόης ὧ̣ ξεῖνε γάμον καταβάλλομ' αἰεῖδεν).

Finally, Muses and Graces are invoked to support the song performed.¹⁴⁶ One such invocation is found in one of the beginnings of Sapphic *epithalamia* preserved on *POxy.* 21, 2294 (= fr. 103.5 V δεῦτέ ν]υν ἄγναι Χάριτες Πιέριδε[c τε] Μοῖ[cαι) and perhaps also in another (103.1 V ἐννεπε[.]η). Similar invocations feature in other Sapphic fragments (fr. 53 V βροδοπάχεεc ἄγναι Χάριτες, δεῦτε Δίος κόραι, 127 V δεῦρο δηῦτε Μοῖcαι χρύσιον λίποιcαι, 128 V δεῦτέ νυν ἄβραι Χάριτες καλλίκομοί τε Μοῖcαι), but their context is debated. In fact, before the publication of *POxy.* 21, 2294 these were all thought to be part of hymns to gods.¹⁴⁷ Now, they are just as likely to originate from wedding songs. A reference

¹⁴⁶ Cf. M. Treu (1968) 169 'Die Epithalamien sind in hohem Maße traditionell, in ihnen mögen die Anfangsverse mit ihren Götteranrufungen und mit der Nennung des Liedthemas besonders viele typische Züge aufgewiesen haben', 199 '... zeigt, daß solche hymnische Anrufung der Chariten in Hochzeitsliedern ihren festen, traditionellen Platz gehabt hat', Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 83.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Wilamowitz (1913) 43 n. 1.

to the Muse is also made in the messenger speech that prompts the chorus to sing a *hymenaeus* for Peisetaerus and Basileia in Aristophanes' *Birds* (1718–19 ἀλλὰ χρὴ θεᾶς | Μούσης ἀνοίγειν ἱερὸν εὐφημον τόμα).

The end of the wedding song is most commonly achieved through (re-) addresses combined with the imperative χαῖρε or variations of it. In Sappho's fr. 116 V (χαῖρε νύμφα, χαῖρε τίμιε γάμβρε πόλλα) we lack a clear indication as to its original position in the song. Fr. 117 V (†χαίροις ἃ νύμφα† χαίρέτω δ' ὁ γάμβρος), however, is clearly marked as the end of a poem. In Theocritus (18.49 χαίροις, ὦ νύμφα· χαίροις εὐπένθερε γάμβρε) and Lucian (*Symp.* 41.22 νυμφίε, καὶ cὺ δὲ χαῖρε) similar phrases lead into the last sections of their poems. *PRyl.* 17.3 has the phrase νύμφα φίλη, μέγα χαῖρε διαμπερές in the middle of the poem, but the address of the bride continues until the end of the six-line poem. Catullus provides the Latin version of this feature at the very end of his wedding song (61.225–8 *at boni | coniuges, bene uiuite*).¹⁴⁸ Its predominant position at the end of these poems makes clear that here χαῖρε is not used as a salutation, as we find it used between Homeric heroes or in sympotic contexts, but as a farewell.¹⁴⁹ At the end of a song performed in honour of the person addressed, the verb χαίρειν, with its primary meaning 'to take pleasure in something',¹⁵⁰ might also denote the wish

¹⁴⁸ Cf. also [Claud.] *Epith. Laur.* 85–7 *uiuite felices quam longaeque carpite saecula; | uiuite concordēs, donec premat una senectus | donec uestra habeant narum uota nepotes.*

¹⁴⁹ On salutations between Homeric heroes, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. 'χαίρω', B2, esp. 1096.26–63; χαῖρε and χαίρετε are used seldom, and never in the *Iliad*, to bid farewell, cf. *ibid.* 1096.63–1097.6. On epigraphs, cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 180–216; on sympotic salutations, cf. *P. N.* 3.76 with Σ and Instone (1996) 168 ad loc. On χαῖρε at the end of wedding songs, cf. Kaibel (1892) 254 'Es wird nun sicher sein, dass die Anrede an das junge Paar nicht, wie Bergk meinte, am Anfange, sondern am Ende des Liedes seinen Platz hatte', Mangelsdorff (1913) 19 'Dieselbe Abschiedsformel findet sich bei Sappho zweimal, und wir werden nicht zweifeln, daß sie wirklich den Schluss des Epithalamions bildete.'

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *Lfgre* s.v. 'χαίρω', B1.

that the song may be received favourably. The conventional nature of re-addresses at the end of the wedding song is confirmed by late-antique *epithalamia*, which tend to conclude with an *allocutio sponsalis* (cf. Claud. 10.338–41, 25.130–8 Hall, [Claud.] *Epith. Laur.* 79–87, Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 25.191–8, Dracont. *Rom.* 7.116–17, Aus. *Cent. Nupt.* 70–9).

Comparisons appear as a conventional feature predominantly located between the opening and closure of a song.¹⁵¹ The importance of comparisons is indicated by Sappho's programmatic question in fr. 115.1 V (see above, p. 50), and the following likening of the groom to a sapling can be paralleled with other images drawn from the field of plants. In fr. 105a V, Sappho compares the bride to an apple, which according to Himerius she does also in other songs,¹⁵² and in fr. 105b V to a hyacinth flower. Eratosthenes (*CA* 28, 37) seems to compare the bride to grapes of wild vine and Theocritus (18.29–31) likens Helen to a cypress. Catullus develops the images of a myrtle in 61.21–5, of a hyacinth flower in 61.91–3, of an unspecified flower in 62.39–48, and of wild vine in 62.49–58. In Calvus' *epithalamium* (*FPL* 2 = *FRP* 29), the bride seems to be compared with an unknown flower to be cut by a nymph (*uaga candido | nympa quod secet ungui*).¹⁵³ In Claudian's *epithalamium* for Honorius and Maria, the bride is compared, first, to honey protected by bees and to a rose guarded by thorns (*Fesc.* 4.7–13) and, second, to a vine supported by a tree (*ibid.* 18–20 *tam iunctis manibus nectite uincula, | quam frondens hederā stringitur aesculus, | quam lento*

¹⁵¹ On comparisons, cf. Snell (1931) 72, Fränkel (1962) 195, Wills (1967) 178, Hague (1983) 132–4, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 94–7.

¹⁵² Cf. Him. *Or.* 9.185–6 *Саπφοῦς ἥν ἄρα μήλωι μὲν εἰκάσαι τὴν κόρην.*

¹⁵³ Cf. Hollis (2007) 72–3.

premitur palmite populus). The same images are adopted in Dracontius' *epithalamium* for Johannes and Vitula (*Rom.* 7.48–54 *sic puer Idalius permiscet mella uenenis, | sic rosa miscetur spinis, medicina cerastis | perficitur stimulisque fauos apis alme tuetur: | sic pia uirginitas non tollitur ante pudoris*, etc.). In Claudian's *epithalamium* for Palladius and Celerina, the bride's skin is compared to snow and lilies (25.125–6 Hall . . . *matura tumescit | uirginitas superatque niues ac lilia candor*), in Pseudo-Claudian's *epithalamium* for Laurentius and Florida to lilies and roses (32–3 *lilia ceu niteant rutilis commixta rosetis, | sic rubor et candor pingunt tibi, Florida, uultus*).

The second field that comparisons are drawn from is the sphere of heroes and gods.¹⁵⁴ Such comparisons are established in Sappho's poetry, even though it is often debatable to what genre a given fragment is affiliated. In fr. 23.4–5 V, there is a comparison with Helen; in fr. 96.21–2 V, with demigods in general (α[ι]μιθέαιι μórφαν | ἐπή[ρατ]ον ἐξίωοθ'); attributions as 'godlike' are found in fr. 68a.3–5 V (ἴσαν θεοίειν) and perhaps in 96.4–5 V (†θεασικελαν ἀριγνώτα†).¹⁵⁵ The bridegroom is compared to Ares in fr. 111.5–6 V,¹⁵⁶ and, according to Himerius, frequently to Achilles.¹⁵⁷ Sappho calls even the heroic couple of a mythological wedding 'godlike' (fr. 44.21 V ἵκελοι θεοί[ς, 34 ὕμνην δ' Ἑκτορα κ' Ἀνδρομάχαν θεο(ε)ικέλο[ις]). Catullus likens Aurunculeia to

¹⁵⁴ Pace Horstmann (2004) 46 'direkte Göttervergleiche in einem Epithalamium wurden hauptsächlich bei sozial sehr hochstehenden Persönlichkeiten angewendet.'

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Roloff (1970) 103–7 for reconstructions of the contexts of these lines.

¹⁵⁶ This comparison is understood by Kirk (1963) 51–2, Lloyd-Jones (1967) 168, Wills (1967) 180 n. 26 and (1970) 112, Killeen (1973) 198 and Kirkwood (1974) 264 n. 64 as an ithyphallic joke made about the bridegroom, but that seems unlikely, see below, n. 170

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Him. *Or.* 9.191 [sc. Καφοῦς ἦν] τὸν νυμφίον τε Ἀχιλλεῖ παρομοιωῶσαι καὶ ἐς ταῦτὸν ἀγαγεῖν τῷ ἥρωι τὸν νεανίσκον ταῖς πράξεσι.

Venus and Manlius to Paris in 61.16–20. In Seneca's *Medea* (82–9), Jason's beauty is said to be greater than that of Bacchus, Apollo, and Castor. In Statius' *epithalamium*, in a series of mythical comparisons (*Silv.* 1.2.38–45), Stella's successful wooing of Violentilla is likened to the labours of Heracles, Odysseus, Jason, and Pelops, and his union with his bride is said to exceed that of Paris and Helen and that of Eos and Tithonus. Later in the poem, the bride's beauty is said to outshine that of Rhea Silvia, Lavinia, and Claudia (*ibid.* 242–6). Lucian's Histaëus has the bridegroom surpass Achilles and Nireus (*Symp.* 41.23 κρέσσων Νιρῆος καὶ Θέτιδος παῖδός) and the bride Aphrodite and Helen (*ibid.* 41.21 κρέσσων τῆς Κυθήρης ἢδ' αὐτῆς Ἑλένης). The conventionality of such comparisons is further suggested by late-antique *epithalamia*. In Claudian, the bridegroom Honorius exceeds Castor, Achilles, Apollo, and Bacchus (*Fesc.* 1.6–9 *te Leda mallet quam dare Castorem, | praefert Achilli te proprio Thetis, | uictum fatetur Delos Apollinem, | cedit minorem Lydia Liberum*), and could have achieved what was refused to heroes such as Heracles (*ibid.* 30–7). In Ausonius' *Cento Nuptialis*, verses of the *Aeneid* are re-arranged in such a way that, first, the bride is compared to Helen, gods in general, and Venus (42–4 *ornatus Argiuae Helenae, qualisque uideri | caelicolis et quanta solet Venus aurea contra | talis erat species*) and, second, the bridegroom to an unspecified god (51 *os umerosque deo similis lumenque iuuentae*). By a similar technique, in Luxorius' epithalamic *cento* for Fridus, the bride is compared to the Nereids Doto and Galatea (*AL* 18.35–42).

Among comparisons with divinities, celestial bodies are a particularly well-attested source domain. In the messenger speech that introduces the wedding song in Aristophanes' *Birds* (1709–14), the gleam of the moon and stars is exceeded by Peisetaerus and Basileia. Theocritus compares Helen's radiance with that of dawn and spring (18.26–8). Stars and the sun serve as a measure for Medea's beauty in Seneca's *Medea* (95–101). If Sappho's fr. 96 V is indeed a *propemptikon* for the recently married Arignota,¹⁵⁸ we would here find another comparison between the bride and the moon in the context of a wedding (9–12 νῦν δὲ Λύδαισιν ἐμπρέπεται γυναί-|κεσσι, ὥς ποτ' ἀελίῳ | δύντος ἅ βροδοδάκτυλος Cελάνα, | πάντα περ(ρ)έχοις' ἄστρα. φάος δ' ἐπί-|χει θάλασσαν ἐπ' ἀλμύραν | ἴως καὶ πολυανθέμοις ἀρούραις).¹⁵⁹ In Claudian, the bridegroom is compared to an unspecified star (*Fesc.* 1.1 *corrusco sidere pulchrior*), and in Ausonius' *Cento Nuptialis*, to the morning star (52–4 *qualis, ubi oceani perfusus Lucifer unda | extulit os sacrum caelo, sic ore ferebat, | sic oculos cursuque amens ad limina tendit*).

Apart from comparisons, it seems likely that mythical narratives could have featured in the middle sections of more elaborate wedding songs so as to connect the present ceremony with paradigmatic weddings between heroes or gods.¹⁶⁰ One example of such narratives is found in the second half of the *hymenaeus* in Aristophanes *Birds* (1731–43), which is discussed in more detail below (pp. 73–

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 145, Swift (2006) 131.

¹⁵⁹ However, one should hesitate to declare, as Griffiths (1972) and Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 58–60 do, Alcman *PMG* 1 a wedding song purely because Agido is compared to the sun in 41–3.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Snell (1931) 73 n. 2, Merkelbach (1957) 7 'Braut und Bräutigam wiederholen nämlich jene Handlung, welche in der mythischen Zeit Zeus und Hera für alle Zeit begründet haben', 18, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 105 'Die mythische Hochzeitserzählung, eingebettet in ein Hochzeitslied, gehört zu den poetischen Prinzipien der archaischen Lyrik.'

76), and here the parallelism of the mythical wedding of Zeus and Hera with the one celebrated is evident (esp. 1735 ἐν τοιῷδ' ὕμενάϊωι). The much simpler wedding song at the end of *Peace* contains no reference to myth, which could suggest that narratives are a feature of relatively more elaborate compositions. Sappho's fr. 44 V, which relates the wedding of Hector and Andromache, is too controversial as to its generic provenance for the song to serve as an example of a narrative within a wedding song.¹⁶¹ Other Archaic or Classical examples have not survived. Some support for the conventionality of narratives can be found in later evidence, as, for example, in Dracontius' *epithalamium* composed in honour of the wedding of Johannes and Vitula (*Rom.* 6, early 6th century).¹⁶² This poem starts with an extended *praeteritio*, where the speaker refers to many acts unambiguously associated with weddings that he could perform if he were not in prison (1–24).¹⁶³ Among these acts are narratives of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, Apollo and Daphne, Bacchus and Ariadne, and Mars and Rhea Silvia.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Pace Snell (1931) 73 ad loc. 'Freilich werden hier die Gestalten der Sage als göttergleich bezeichnet, doch kann nicht bezweifelt werden, daß damit zugleich das Brautpaar verherrlicht werden soll, zu dessen Hochzeit Sappho von der mythischen Hochzeit erzählt. Denn die Hochzeit Hektors spiegelt im Mythos das irdische Ereignis'. See also Snell (1975) 57, Merkelbach (1957) 14–16 'Die Mythen der griechischen Lyriker beziehen sich sehr genau auf die gegenwärtige Situation eines jeden Liedes, sind nur Gegenbilder von höherer Realität', also 16–19, Schadewaldt (1951) 49 and Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 103–9. Kakridis (1966) questions the hymenaeic provenance of the fragment on the grounds that the wedding of Hector and Andromache was not very long-lasting; however, as Rösler (1975) points out, the same is true for Achilles, to whom the bridegroom is indubitably compared.

¹⁶² Note also that Christian *epithalamia* seem to adapt this tradition with references to biblical weddings, cf. Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 25.103–12 and Horstmann (2004) 162.

¹⁶³ Cf., e.g., Dracont. *Rom.* 6.6–9 *emerito referens generosas auspice laudes, | et Vitulae canerem taedas per uota Ioannis. | laurea sarta comis religans et tempora myrto | prodere gestirem haec quae nunc per uota geruntur.*

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Dracont. *Rom.* 6.16–24 *uulgarem quia tela gerit quibus auctor Achillis | arserit Aeacides nymphae radiatus amore; | spicula dixissem, quibus arsit Apollo desertus, | cum peteret Daphnen, Liber quibus arserat Indus, | candida Dictaeae cum cerneret ora puellae, | uel quibus, ipse furor, Mars est accensus amare, | Vesticolae niueos peteret cum uirginis artus, | ut daret aeternum Romana in saecula Quirinum | et post fata deos faceret super astra senatum.*

Moreover, prose wedding speeches, which seem to have developed from the tradition of wedding songs, are recommended to contain references to paradigmatic weddings of myth, such as the ones between Menelaus and Helen, Peleus and Thetis, or Admetus and Alcestis.¹⁶⁵ The fact that the same marital unions are also depicted on labelled Athenian vases (see above, nn. 92, 99, 101) could indicate that referring to these mythical weddings in the context of a wedding celebration was a common pattern also in wedding poetry.

A last formal feature of wedding songs to be discussed here is humour. Caution is required in juxtaposing Greek and Roman material with regards to humour, as forms of abuse in Roman wedding songs could depend on the distinctly Roman tradition of the Fescennine verses.¹⁶⁶ However, there is evidence suggesting a Greek counterpart to this Roman tradition.¹⁶⁷ In the description of a wedding in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield*, we find a group of youths, perhaps the chorus, described as laughing (283 γελῶντες). This could be interpreted as mockery of the bridal couple and, in this way, provide, depending on the dating of the poem, an early example of hymenaeic abuse.¹⁶⁸ Jokes of a lascivious kind are

¹⁶⁵ Cf. [Dionys.] *Ars Rhet.* 2.5, p. 264.7–13 UR ἤδη παραθετέον καὶ μνηστέον καὶ ἐνδόξων γάμων ἢ ἀρχαίων, καὶ ὅσα ἀπὸ τούτων ἀγαθὰ ἐγένετο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ὅση ἀποτροπὴ τῶν δυσχερῶν διὰ γάμου, οἷον ὅτι Μενέλεως ἀθάνατος ἐγένετο διὰ τὸν γάμον τῆς Ἑλένης καὶ ὁ Πηλεὺς διὰ τὸν τῆς Θέτιδος, καὶ ὁ Ἄδμητος διὰ τὴν Ἀλκίηστιν τὸν ἐκ τῆς εἰμαρμένης θάνατον διέφυγεν.

¹⁶⁶ On *fescennini uersus*, cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.145–6 *Fescennina per hunc inuecta licentia morem | uersibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit*, Liv. 7.2.7 *qui non, sicut ante, Fescennino uersu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant*, Sen. *Contr.* 3.21 *inter nuptiales Fescenninos in cruce generis nostri iocabantur*; cf. also Serv. in Verg. *Aen.* 7.695. In the wedding songs of Cat. 61.119–20 (*ne diu taceat | Fescennina iocatio*) and Sen. *Med.* 113–14 (*festa dicax fundat conuicia Fescenninus, | soluat turba iocos*) the dependancy on the Roman tradition is made explicit.

¹⁶⁷ On mockery in Greek wedding songs, cf. Mangelsdorff (1913) 7–9, R.D. Griffith (1989) 57, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 94.

¹⁶⁸ The line is deleted by West, but a possible insertion would seem to be old since the line is attested in *P.Soc.Ital.* 1087, dated to the second or third century AD, and in Σ Ar. *Av.* 1426. The verb παίζειν in lines 277 and 282 is probably no indication of mockery as the context (277 χοροὶ παίζοντες, 282 παίζοντες ὑπ' ὀρχηθμῶι) and the Homeric pretext (*Il.* 18.494 κοῦροι δ' ὀρχηστῆρες

employed in the wedding song at the end of Aristophanes' *Peace* (1337–40 τί δράκομεν αὐτήν; τρυγήκομεν αὐτήν, 1351–2 τοῦ μὲν μέγα καὶ παχύ, | τῆς δ' ἡδὺ τὸ κύκον). The absence of similar jokes in the more elaborate song of *Birds* could mean that this sort of humour would tend to feature more widely in simple compositions. It is certainly absent from Sappho's hymenaeic fragments,¹⁶⁹ though hyperbolic comparisons in fr. 110 and 111 V could be designed to amuse.¹⁷⁰ Finally, in Theocritus 18, the bridegroom is addressed with a whole catalogue of frivolous questions (9–15), which could suggest that, by the third century, when genre markers tend to be observed in a systematic and conservative manner, mockery of the bridegroom is perceived as a conventional feature of the *hymenaeus*.

ἐδίνεον) suggest the epic meaning 'to dance' (cf. *LfGrE* s.v. 'παίζω', 916.7–48, LSJ s.v. 'παίζω' II).

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Page (1955) 120 'There is no trace here [sc. in fr. 110a LP = 109 V] or elsewhere in Sappho of that ribaldry which was characteristic of the songs recited at this and other stages of Greek wedding-ceremonies', Bowra (1961) 216 'neither bawdy nor exalted, but playful. If the humour is a bit primitive, that is due to tradition, which expected jokes at this level', Marcovich (1969) 35 'Sapphos volkstümliche Epithalamien gehören nicht zum selben Genus wie die spätere obszöne epithalamische Poesie', (1972) 32 'In her epithalamian poetry Sappho is not indecent but strongly ritualistic'. However, these statements fail to consider the discourse on Sappho's different treatments of bride and bridegroom in [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 166–68, διὸ καὶ ἡ Καπρὼ περὶ μὲν κάλλους αἰδουσα καλλιπῆς ἐστὶ καὶ ἡδεῖα, καὶ περὶ ἐρώτων δὲ καὶ ἔαρὸς καὶ περὶ ἀλκυόνος, καὶ ἅπαν καλὸν ὄνομα ἐνύφανται αὐτῆς τῇ ποιήσει, τὰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ εἰργάσατο. Ἄλλως δὲ σκώπτει τὸν ἄγροικον νυμφίον καὶ τὸν θυρωρὸν τὸν ἐν τοῖς γάμοις, εὐτελέστατα καὶ ἐν πεζοῖς ὀνόμασι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν ποιητικοῖς, ὥστε αὐτῆς μᾶλλον ἐστὶ τὰ ποιήματα ταῦτα διαλέγεσθαι ἢ αἰδεῖν, οὐδ' ἂν ἀρμόσαι πρὸς τὸν χορὸν ἢ πρὸς τὴν λύραν, εἰ μὴ τις εἴη χορὸς διαλεκτικός. Μάλιστα δὲ διαφέρουσιν καὶ ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως· οὐ γὰρ ὅμοια προαίρεται ὁ εὐχάριτος καὶ ὁ γελωτοποιῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν εὐφραίνειν, ὁ δὲ γελασθῆναι. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπακολουθοῦντων δέ· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ γέλως, τοῖς δὲ ἔπαινος.

¹⁷⁰ However, Kirk (1963) goes too far in interpreting fr. 111 V as an ithyphallic symbol with the bridegroom's penis rising above his head. Kirk fails to make sense of the comparison with Ares, to which it is evidently connected, and to provide any parallels. The passage supplemented by Lloyd-Jones (1967), Tzetzes ad [Lycophr.] *Alex.* 1378, p. 2.381–2 Scheer, lacks any obvious ithyphallic nuances: even if an equation of μέγας and θαλερός were legitimate in this context, it would seem to denote primarily the capability to produce offspring rather than an oversized penis (θαλερός πόσις is a Homeric cliché, see Marcovich (1972) 30). Wills (1967) 180 n. 26 and (1970) 112 adds Ar. *Pax* 1351, but the image of the μέγα καὶ παχύ κύκον refers directly to the penis, not to the man. Killeen (1973) and Kirkwood (1974) 264 n. 64 follows Kirk's approach. Cf., *contra*, Marcovich (1963/4) 51–2 and (1969) 34–6 with Serbian parallels, (1972) 29–32, McKay (1967) 189, Renehan (1983) 20–3, R.D. Griffith (1989) 57, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 93–4.

THEMATIC TOPOI OF THE WEDDING SONG

One common theme of hymenaeic praise is beauty, significantly not only of the bride but also of the bridegroom. The physical qualities of the bride are conveyed above all in the epithets attributed to her. She is καλή and χαρίεσσα (both in Sapph. fr. 108 V and Theocr. 18.38; καλλίστα in Eur. *Phaeth. TrGF* 5.2, 781.21), ἰόκολπος (Sapph. fr. 30.5, 103.3, 103.4 V), εὖπους (Sapph. fr. 103.2, 103b.2 V), χρυσή (Theocr. 18.28), and ῥοδόχρως (Theocr. 18.31). Beauty also motivates the imagery developed around the bride.¹⁷¹ The apple of Sappho's fr. 105a V is γλυκύς, a synonym for ἡδύς, which refers to the tenderness of the bride.¹⁷² Moon and stars are used as images for her radiance (Sapph. fr. 96.6–8 V if attributed to a bride, Theocr. 18.26–9; Ar. *Av.* 1710–14 leads the elaborate image back to the bride with οἷος ἔρχεται | ἔχων γυναικὸς κάλλος). Helen is the most beautiful woman of all times,¹⁷³ and Aphrodite represents beauty in the divine sphere; comparisons with the two (Helen: e.g., Sapph. fr. 23.4–5 V, Luc. *Symp.* 41.21; Venus: e.g., Cat. 61.17–19; Aphrodite: e.g., Luc. *Symp.* 41.21) evidently aim at ascribing the same supreme beauty to the bride. The comparison with unspecified demigods in Sappho's fr. 96.21–2 V leaves no doubt that it is about beauty

¹⁷¹ Cf. Mangelsdorff (1913) 17–18, Roloff (1970) 103–7.

¹⁷² On the connection, cf. Call. *Hymn.* 6.28 ἐν δὲ καλὰ γλυκύμαλα. In Sapph. fr. 102 V it is used to address the mother of a bride (Γλύκη μαῖτερ). On the symbol of the apple, cf. Foster (1899), McCartney (1925), and Brazda (1977) 35, 42. The function of the image in the context of a concrete wedding is explored in Mangelsdorff (1913) 17, Fränkel (1962) 194, M. Treu (1968) 152–3, 223–4, and Harris (1986), and tentatively restored in R.D. Griffith (1989) 57–61 and Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 95–6, Mason (2004), Tomis (2005). Gomme (1957) 260 accepts the encomiastic intention of the comparison itself, but regards the following lines as 'a simple case of a simile carried beyond the immediate purpose of comparison, for its own sake.' Davison's interpretation in (1968) 78 of 'an old maid' is indeed not likely in a wedding song.

¹⁷³ Cf. Sapph. fr. 16.6–7 V ἃ γὰρ πόλυ περκεθέοισα | κάλλος ἀνθρώπων Ἑλένα; see also *Il.* 3.154–8.

(αἰμιθέαισι μórφαν | ἐπήρατον ἐξίωσθ’). Flower similes (Sapph. fr. 105b V, Cat. 61.21–5, 91–3) are more complex as they express the goal of female life as seen from two different perspectives: male and female.¹⁷⁴ Ultimately, however, both perspectives agree that the flower is a delicate object of beauty, and they only disagree on whether it should be cultivated or left untouched.

The imagery connected with the bridegroom expresses ideals of male beauty.¹⁷⁵ In Sappho’s fr. 111.5 V, height is presented as one of these ideals. Here the bridegroom is compared to Ares, and the following line makes clear that the comparison is about height (7 ἄνδρος μεγάλῳ πόλῳ μέδων). Ares is known as extraordinarily tall from the *Iliad* (e.g., 21.407), and the prompt to raise the chamber (lines 1–3) is only intelligible with regard to height.¹⁷⁶ Another ideal seems to be expressed through the image of the sapling (βράδινος ὄρπαξ) in Sappho’s fr. 115 V. The use of βράδινος in Anacreon (*PMG* 407.2 of the thighs of a grown man, *PMG* 456 of a race horse) suggests that the image in Sappho is not so much about the groom’s slender and fragile appearance, but about his long and

¹⁷⁴ On Sapph. fr. 105b V, cf. Page (1955) 121, Wills (1967) 180, and Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 96–7. For the present purpose it only matters that the fragment originates from a wedding song and that the comparison is about the bride. It is observed that the simile as whole would sound offensive if it referred to the sexual union of bridegroom and bride and so cannot be hymenaeic, cf. Gomme (1957) 260, Hague (1983) 135 n. 12. However, it might as well refer to the idea that marriage protects girls from rape, as expressed by the male chorus in Cat. 62.49–56, cf. Stigers (1977) 89. Thus the singing contest, as suggested by Davison (1968) 242–6, who rightly refers to Him. *Or.* 9.4, remains a possible context.

¹⁷⁵ Note that Men. *Rhet.* advises to praise κάλλος δὲ παρ’ ἀμφοῖν κατὰ ἀντεξέτασι πάντως (404.5–6).

¹⁷⁶ Cf., *contra*, Roloff (1970) 110 ‘Damit aber zielt Sapphos Vergleich nicht auf die Schönheit des Bräutigams (nicht die Größe als Bestandteil der Schönheit), sondern auf die Kraft (die Leibesgröße als Hinweis auf eine korrespondierende Stärke ist gemeint).’ He can only achieve this interpretation by degrading lines 1–4 to a meaningless trigger of tension (cf. *ibid.* 109 n. 8). Ar. *Plut.* 328, which he adduces as evidence, is essentially different.

muscular, athletic figure.¹⁷⁷ Achilles and Nireus are considered the two most beautiful Greeks before Troy,¹⁷⁸ and comparisons with them (Achilles: e.g., Sapph. *ap. Him. Or.* 9.191; Achilles and Nireus: e.g., Luc. *Symp.* 41.23) are likely to be aimed, not only at martial prowess, but also at appearance.¹⁷⁹ Comparisons with stars also refer to the bridegroom's beauty (as, explicitly, in Claud. *Fesc.* 1.1 *princeps corusco sidere pulchrior*).

The ideals of male and female beauty encountered in wedding poetry find a concise expression in the *hymenaeus* of Aristophanes' *Peace*, despite the superficial obscenity of the passage: τοῦ μὲν μέγα καὶ παχύ—τῆς δ' ἡδὺ τὸ κύκον (1351–2). By praising the bride for her grace, tenderness, and chastity, and the bridegroom for his strength and height,¹⁸⁰ the songs examined here seem to adapt ideals that are found already in epic poetry.¹⁸¹

A second topic is pre-eminence among fellow men or women.¹⁸² In Sappho (fr. 112.1 V), Theocritus (18.16), and the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr. 211.7

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Swift (2010) 246 'youthful vigour', with Homeric parallels. Cf., *contra*, Wills (1967) 181 n. 26 '... probably not so much a physical description as an expression of love for a treasured plant.'

¹⁷⁸ Cf., e.g., *Il.* 2.673–4 Νηρέυς, ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθεν | τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα (cf. 17.280, *Od.* 11.470, 551, 24.18). On Achilles, Cf. also Plat. *Symp.* 180^a Ἀχιλλέα... ὃς ἦν καλλίων οὐ μόνον Πατρόκλου ἀλλ' ἅμα καὶ τῶν ἡρώων ἀπάντων.

¹⁷⁹ Note, however, Himerius' perplexing remark (*Or.* 9.191) that comparisons with Achilles happen on the grounds of ταῖς πράξεσι.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Merkelbach (1957) 10 'Die Braut ist schön, der Bräutigam ist groß und stark.'

¹⁸¹ On the male ideal, cf. Homeric phrases such as καλός τε μέγας τε (*Il.* 21.108, *Od.* 1.301, 6.276 et al.) μέγας καὶ καλός (*Od.* 6.230, 8.20, 9.513, 10.395–6, 24.370), μέγεθος καὶ κάλλος (*Il.* 24.253, *Od.* 11.307); see also Hdt. 1.112.1, 3.3.1, 5.56.1, 7.12.1, 187.1, 9.25.1, 96.1, and the definitions in Arist. *EN* 1123^b6–8, *Poet.* 1450^b36–9, *Pol.* 1326^a33–4. Pfister (1924) 314–15 and Verdenius (1949) 295 give comprehensive collocations, to which we may add Archilochus *IEG* 114.1, where the speaker rejects, and thereby affirms as a general ideal, the 'tall and long-shanked general' (μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον).

¹⁸² The theme is present already in the description of Nausicaa in *Od.* 6.109, after a comparison with Artemis and her entourage, (ὥς ἢ γ' ἀμφιτόλοισι μετέπρεπε παρθένος ἀδμής). The focus on her status as unmarried girl (παρθένος ἀδμής) shows that here a hymenaeic topos is evoked. Similarly, in Odysseus' supplication a few lines down, he states that her future husband will stand out of all the other man (158–9 κείνός δ' αὖ περὶ κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων, | ὃς κέ σ' ἐέδνοισι βρίσας οἰκόνδ' ἀγάγηται).

MW), the bridegroom is addressed as ὄλβιος, a term that generally denotes the peak of human achievement.¹⁸³ In epic and elegiac poetry, ὄλβιος is centred around notions of wealth, prosperity, and power as bestowed by a deity.¹⁸⁴ The context of the three hymenaeic occurrences indicates that it is the achievement of the wedding that singles out the bridegrooms:¹⁸⁵ in Sappho, the bridegroom has secured the wedding ἄν ἄραο (2), and is honoured ἔξοχα by Aphrodite (5–6); in Theocritus, Menelaus is singled out of a group of ὅλλοι ἀριτέες and ἡμίθεοι as μῶν (17–18); in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue*, Peleus is distinguished from the masses of ἄλλων ἀλφειτάων . . . χθονὸς ὅσσοι καρπὸν ἔδουσι (fr. 211.6–7 MW). To be sure, the latter two bridegrooms are in an extraordinary position in that they marry a goddess (Peleus) or into divine lineage (Menelaus). However, the similarity with Sappho suggests that Theocritus and the poet of the *Catalogue* evoke a conventional topos of wedding poetry.

The convention of hailing the bridal couple as ὄλβιος is further paralleled by tragic passages where wedding ceremonies are recalled. In Euripides' *Alcestis*, Admetus remembers his wedding with the words cὺν θ' ὑμεναίοις ἔτειχον ἔσω, . . . τήν τε θανοῦσαν κάμ' ὀλβίζων (916–19). In *Andromache*, the chorus conjure up the memory of Peleus' wedding with μάτην δέ σ' ἐν γάμοις ὄλβισαν θεοί (1218). In *Helen*, the heroine remembers how her brothers blessed her at her wedding (639–41 ἄ γ' ὑπὸ λαμπάδων κόροι λεύκιπποι | ξυνομαίμονες ὄλβισαν

¹⁸³ Cf. De Heer (1969) 21 'To be ὄλβιος is the culmination of a human ambition, not of a divine one.'

¹⁸⁴ Cf., int. al., *Il.* 24.543, *Od.* 11.136, 17.354, 17.419–20, 18.138. ὄλβια are given by deities in *Od.* 7.148–50, 8.413, 13.41–2, 24.202, *HH* 3.466; similarly ὄλβος in *Il.* 16.595–6, *Od.* 3.205, 4.207, 6.188–9.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. De Heer (1969) 32–3.

ὤλβικαν οὐ μάταν | τὸ πρόοθεν), and the Servant, who proposes to ‘sing Helen’s *hymenaeus* once more’ (722), states how Helen rendered her house blessed on her wedding day (725 δῶμ’ ἔλειπεσ ὄλβιον, with a proleptic use of the adjective).

Apart from these instances, we find that in Sappho the bridegroom is attributed with the terms *πέροχος* (fr. 106 V) and *τίμιε* (fr. 116 V), both of which denote a state of being more honoured than others. In Euripides’ *Phaethon*, the hero is described as *μόνος . . . δι’ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν θνατός* (*TrGF* 5.2, F781.29–30). In Lucian, we recognise, behind a corrupt phrase, a similar means of distinguishing the bridegroom from his peers (*Symp.* 41.22 ἡκρατερῶν κράτιτε ἐφήβων†¹⁸⁶). In the *hymenaeus* of Ticidea, the theme is, unexpectedly, applied not to the bridegroom, but to the marriage bed, which is the sole witness to the love exercised on it (*FPL* 1 = *FRP* 102 *felix lectule talibus | sole amoribus*¹⁸⁷).

As for the bride, in Theocritus 18, Helen stands out of a group of two-hundred and forty girls, Sparta’s entire young female population, as unmatched in her beauty (22–5, esp. 25 τῶν οὐδ’ ἄτις ἄμωμος ἐπεὶ χ’ Ἑλένη παριωτῇ) and domestic virtues (32–7). Cleanthis in Lucian’s *Symposium* is described as *προῦχου* ἀλλάων πασάων παρθενικάων (41.20). In Seneca’s *Medea*, the heroine is said to outshine her female companions (93–4 *haec cum femineo constitit in choro | unius facies prae nitet omnibus*). The same idea underlies the comparison between Arignota and the sun in Sappho’s fr. 96 V (6–7 νῦν δὲ Λύδαισιν ἐμπρέπεται γυναῖ-|κεσσιν), which, as is said above (p. 56), may not a wedding

¹⁸⁶ καλῶν κράτ. ἐφ. Guyet : [κρατερῶν] κράτιτε τεῶν συνεφήβων Dindorf (1858) 3.216 : καλῶν κάρτιτε εὐφήβων Fritzsche (1860) 122 : καλῶν μέγ’ ἄριτέ γ’ ἐφήβων Macleod (1972) 1.159–60.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Hollis (2007) 162–63, who speaks of ‘μακαρισμός of the bed.’ Various nouns are supplied to go with *sole*, e.g., *conscie* by Housman (1972) 695, *testis* by Pighi (1974) 436, *arbiter* by Scivoletto (1974) 210.

song proper, but seems to connect to Arignota's marriage logically and thematically.

Finally, in Catullus 64, pre-eminence is attributed to the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, first, through a contrast between *nulla domus* and *tales amores* and, second, through one between *nullus amor* and *tali foedere* (334–5).

Related to the theme of pre-eminence is the thought that bride and bridegroom are ready subjects for song because they surpass ordinary mortals in certain qualities. Explicitly, this thought is only formulated in *PRyl*. 25.1 (coi Χάριτες γλυκεραι καὶ κῦδος ὀπηδεῖ). It appears too, however, in Himerius after a quotation of the first line of a Sapphic *hymenaeus* (*Or.* 1.18 ὦ καλή, ὦ χαρίεσσα κόρα (= Sapph. fr. 108 V), πρέπει γάρ σοι τὰ τῆς Λεσβίας ἐγκώμια. σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ῥοδόσφυροι Χάριτες χρυσῇ τ' Ἀφροδίτῃ συμπαίζουσιν). That Himerius' second sentence could still be written in the vein of a Sapphic model is suggested by the verb συμπαίζειν, which has a distinctly lyric flavour.¹⁸⁸

A third theme is conveyed in the term μάκαρ.¹⁸⁹ Its precise meaning and significance for the characterisation of the bridal couple is explored later in this chapter (pp. 79–80); here it may suffice to record its conventional occurrence in the wedding song. The bridegroom is addressed as μάκαρ in Euripides' *Phaethon* (*TrGF* 5.2, F781.27 ὦ μάκαρ, ὦ βασιλέως μείζων ἔτ' ὄλβον), Aristophanes' *Birds* (1725 ὦ μακαριστὸν σὺ γάμον γήμας), *Peace* (1334 ὦ τρις μάκαρ), and in the

¹⁸⁸ The verb is used for Dionysus in Anacr. *PMG* 357.1–4 ὦναξ, ὦι δαμάλης Ἔρως | καὶ Νύμφαι κυανόπιδες | πορφυρῇ τ' Ἀφροδίτῃ | συμπαίζουσιν, and Soph. *OT* 1105–9 (Iyr.) εἶθ' ὁ Βακχεῖος θεὸς | ναίων ἐπ' ἄκρων ὀρέων <ς> | εὖ-|ρημα δέξαιτ' ἔκ του | Νυμφᾶν Ἑλικωνίδων, αἷς | πλεῖστα συμπαίζει. In an erotic context, it occurs in Anacr. *PMG* 358.1–4 σφαίρῃ δηῖτέ με πορφυρῇ | βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἔρως | νήνι ποικιλοκαμβάλωι | συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Mangelsdorff (1913) 16, Wills (1967) 178–9, Hague (1983) 134–5, Swift (2006) 130.

pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr. 211.7 MW τῖς μάκαρ Αἰακίδῃ).¹⁹⁰ In Euripides' *Trojan Women*, Cassandra, in want of a chorus to sing her praise, applies the same address to herself and her 'bridegroom' (311–12 <ἰώ>, μακάριος ὁ γαμέτας· | μακαρία δ' ἐγὼ βασιλικοῖς λέκτροις | κατ' Ἄργος ἁ γαμουμένα).

Elsewhere, forms of μάκαρ (and μακάριος) are generally associated with wedding songs. In *Trojan Women*, Cassandra praises her μακαριώταται τύχαι (329–30) and requests μακάριαι ἀοιδαί from the chorus (338–9). In Aristophanes' *Birds*, the messenger addresses the chorus with the words ὦ τρισμακάριον πτηνὸν ὀρνίθων γένος, | δέχεσθε τὸν τύραννον ὀλβίοις δόμοις (1707–8). In turn, the chorus reply with περιπέτεσθε μάκαιρα μάκαρι σὺν τύχαι (1726). After the delivery of the song, Peisetaerus salutes his bride with ὦ μάκαιρα (1760). In a passage of *Iphigenia at Aulis* that is now considered spurious, the Messenger requests wedding songs for the heroine because this day is μακάριον in the life of a girl (439 φῶς γὰρ τόδ' ἦκει μακάριον τῇ παρθένῳ).

Finally, the term μάκαρ is associated with weddings also outside of wedding songs. In *Odyssey* 6, when Odysseus supplicates Nausicaa, he praises her parents and siblings as τῖς μάκαρες (154–5 τῖς μάκαρες μὲν κοί γε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ, | τῖς μάκαρες δὲ κασίγνητοι); however, μακάρτατος ἔσχατον ἄλλων will be her future husband, ὅς κέ σ' ἐέδνοις βρίσας οἴκονδ' ἀγάγηται (158–9). Revealing are also tragic passages where a wedding celebration and the songs performed for

¹⁹⁰ On this address, cf. Reitzenstein (1900) 80 'Nicht von der Hochzeit, sondern von der siegreichen Heimkehr von der Eroberung von Iolkos ist zunächst die Rede. Aber die Seligpreisung des Peleus knüpft dennoch hauptsächlich an seine Hochzeit und erinnert derartig an den Hymenaios, oder besser, an die Worte, welche dem Bräutigam zugerufen werden, wenn er die Braut endlich ins eigene Haus geführt hat, daß wir mit Sicherheit annehmen dürfen, Thetis betritt bei dieser Heimkehr zum ersten Mal das Haus des Gatten.'

the occasion are recalled or anticipated. In Euripides' *Medea*, the heroine instructs her children to deliver the dowry to the μακαρίαι νύμφηι (957). In *Suppliants*, Euadne recalls how, at her wedding, the city of Argos raised with their songs the εὐδαιμονία of herself and Capaneus (995–9). In *Heracles*, Amphitryon relates how the city of Thebes hailed Heracles and Megara at their wedding (10–12 ἦν πάντες ὕμεναίοισι Καδμεῖοι ποτε | λωτῶι συνηγάλαξαν ἡνίκ' εἰς ἐμοῦς | δόμους ὁ κλεινὸς Ἡρακλῆς νιν ἤγετο) and, later in the play, Megara herself recalls how she was called blessed because of her wedding with Heracles (491–2 ὄλλομαι δ' ἐγώ, | ἦ πρὶν μακαρία διὰ σ' ἐκλιζόμεν βροτοῖς). In *Trojan Women*, Hecuba, on being presented with her dead grandson Astyanax, resents the fact that he will not experience the bliss of his wedding (1170 μακάριος ἦσθ' ἄν, εἴ τι τῶνδε μακάριον). In *Helen*, when Theoclymenus makes arrangements for his wedding to Helen, he envisages μακαρίαις ὕμνωιδίαις, | ὕμναιος Ἑλένης κάμους ὡς ζηλωτὸς ἦι (1434–5). In *Phoenician Women*, Iocasta laments that she could not light the torches at Polynices' wedding, ὡς πρέπει ματέρει μακαρίαι (345). In *Orestes*, the hero states, in a spurious passage, that a good marriage can lead to a blessed life (602–4 μακάριος αἰών). Later on, he expects that Pylades, if he were to survive the plot, would enjoy a μακάριον λέχος in marriage with Electra (1208). In *Iphigenia at Aulis*, Clytemnestra is eager to mark the ἀρχὴν μακαρίων νυμφευμάτων (832) between Achilles and Iphigenia. Achilles in turn assumes that a god would bless him if this marriage should come to pass (1404–5 μακάριόν μέ τις θεῶν | ἔμελλε θήσκειν, εἰ τύχοιμι σὼν γάμων). In between, the chorus recall how the gods blessed the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (1076–9 μακάριον τότε

δαίμονες | τᾶς εὐπάτριδος γάμον | Νηρήιδων ἔθεσαν πρώτας | Πηλέως θ’
 ὑμεναίους). In a fragment of unknown provenance, we find the relationship
 between marriage and blessedness moulded into a *makarismos* (Eur. *inc. fab.*
TrGF 5.2, F1057 μακάριος ὅστις εὐτυχεῖ γάμον λαβὼν | ἐκθλής γυναικός).

In Roman wedding songs, *felix* corresponds to the Greek μάκαρ.¹⁹¹ In Seneca’s *Medea* it is applied to the bridegroom (105), in Catullus 64 to marriage (373 *felici foedere*) and to the wedding song (382 *felicia carmina*). Ticidea transposes the theme from the bridegroom to the bridal bed (*FPL* 1 = *FRP* 102; see above, p. 64). In Statius’ *epithalamium*, the bridal couple are attributed as *felices* (*Silv.* 1.2.236 *felices utrosque uocant*), and in Ausonius’ *Cento Nuptialis* the chorus wish for the bridal couple to be *felices* (70–1 *O digno coniuncta uiro, gratissima coniunx, | sis felix*, 77–8 *fortunati ambo . . . | uiuite felices*).¹⁹²

¹⁹¹ Note, however, that late-antique glossaries translate *felix* predominantly as εὐτυχής, cf. *TLL* s.v. ‘felix’, 435.20–1.

¹⁹² Cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 12.821 *conubiis felicibus*, Sen. *Tro.* 873 *felici thalamo*, Firm. *Math.* 6.23.5 *felix et prosperum matrimonium*. Other testimonies refer to a practice of shouting *feliciter* during the *domum reductio*, cf. Juv. 1.2.119, Σ Lucan. 2.371 ‘*auspex dicitur . . . eo quod ab eo nuptiae auspicentur et quod primus ‘feliciter’ dicat*’, Phaedr. 5.1 ‘*feliciter subclamant*’. For *felix* in erotic contexts, cf. also Cat. 68.155–6 *sitis felices et tu simul et tua uita, | et domus ipsa in qua lusimus et domina*, 100.8 *sis felix, Caeli, sis in amore potens*.

IMMORTALS AS BRIDAL COUPLES

Having thus laid out the structural and thematic elements that appear to constitute the majority of extant wedding songs, we can now examine the ways in which these songs treat mortal, heroic, and divine bridal couples.

One observation follows immediately from the formal characteristics of the wedding song. For it appears that many of the characteristics are also found in hymns. Defining the concepts of ‘hymn’ and ‘hymnic’, especially on formal grounds, has proved difficult ever since Dieterich and Norden initiated the task at the beginning of the last century.¹⁹³ Nevertheless, there seem to be certain expressions, syntactical structures, and rhetorical strategies that, especially in combination, are characteristic of appeals to heroes and gods and that can, in turn, be subject to comparison. For example, hymns predominantly open with direct addresses, thematic announcements, or Muse invocations.¹⁹⁴ All of these we also find in wedding songs. In hymns, as in wedding songs, addresses can be extended with epithets and participle or relative clauses, or be repeated in a series of anaphoric sentences.¹⁹⁵ Even the opening question of Sappho fr. 115 V (1 τίωις, ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, κάλως εἰκάδω) has a formal counterpart in hymnic openings of

¹⁹³ Cf. Dieterich (1910) 227 ‘Das erreichbare Ziel ist eine wissenschaftliche Formenlehre religiöser Liturgie’, Norden (1913) 144 ‘der Stil war im Altertum eine Großmacht und, richtig verhört, wird er auch Interpretationsfragen beantworten und religionsgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge beleuchten helfen.’

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.51–2.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Norden (1913) 166–76 (‘Partizipialstil und Relativstil der Prädikation’), Race (1982) 5–6. (1990) 85–6, Bremer (1981) 195, Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.52–6.

the kind πῶς τ' ἄρ' εἴς' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὖμνον ἐόντα.¹⁹⁶ The most common end of hymns is the re-address combined with the farewell χαῖρε,¹⁹⁷ and the same closural strategy can be found in wedding songs. The end of the wedding song in Lucian's *Symposium* (41.22–5 καὶ cὺ δὲ χαῖρε . . . ἄμμεν δὲ αὖθ' ὑμῖν τοῦτον θαλαμῆϊον ὕμνον | ξυνὸν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροισι πολλάκις αἰκόμεθα) is particularly close to the end of the majority of *Homeric Hymns* (καὶ cὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε . . . αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' αἰοιδῆς).¹⁹⁸ Middle sections seem to be flexible in both forms of praise,¹⁹⁹ but if, as seems likely, wedding songs conventionally involved a mythical narrative, they would have this feature in common with many hymns, where similar narratives root the present ritual performance in a foundational paradigm. Comparisons and mockery appear as the only formal elements that *hymenaei* do not share with hymns.²⁰⁰

By itself, this formal resemblance between *hymenaeus* and hymn must be of limited significance. It could be coincidental or merely point to the existence of a general form of praise, which would take similar shapes when directed at humans and when directed at heroes or gods. However, the formal resemblance does gain significance from another peculiarity of the wedding song, namely that it can be

¹⁹⁶ Cf. *HH* 3.19, Theocr. 22.25, Call. *Hymn.* 4.28–9, Aristid. 43.6. See also Norden (1913) 143–7, Race (1990) 86, Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.56.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Willi (2003) 29.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. *HH* 2.495, 3.545–6, 4.479–80, 5.292–3, 6.19–21, 9.7–9, 10.4–6, 18.10–12, 19.48–9, 25.6–7, 17.21–2, 28.17–18, 29.13–14, 30.17–19, 33.18–19. See also Race (1982) 9.

¹⁹⁹ The middle section is the weak point of the tripartite model of hymnography, cf. Ausfeld (1903) 514–15, Norden (1913) 149, Zielinski (1921) 83–5, Meyer (1933) 5, Bowra (1961) 200, Danielewicz (1974) 23–6, (1976), Bremer (1981) 194–6, Race (1990) 86, Furley (1995) 35 n. 31, Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.59.

²⁰⁰ In fact, we find an active refraining from comparing gods amongst each other in Call. *Ia.* 4.72 (= fr. 194 Pfeiffer) (in the contest between laurel and olive and their respective patron deities, Apollo and Athena) θεοὺς γὰρ οὐ διακρίνω, and Ov. *Fast.* 6.97–100 (in the contest between Juno and Hebe about the etymology of *Iunius*, with the poet judging) *at uos ignoscite, diuiae: | res est arbitrio non dirimenda meo. | ite pares a me. perierunt iudice formae | Pergama: plus laedunt, quam iuuat una, duae.*

addressed to heroes and gods. The preceding analysis of structural and thematic topoi allows us to conclude that almost all elements of the wedding song are addressed to the bridal couple and develop their praise. If we then consider, in the most general terms, wedding songs as songs of praise for bridal couples, and hymns as songs of praise for heroes and gods, we may further conclude that the purpose of *hymenaeus* and the purpose of hymn coincide when a heroic or divine wedding is celebrated. Therefore, the general formal resemblance of hymenaeic praise with hymnic praise is accompanied by the ability of the wedding song to fulfil a hymnic purpose. Three examples will help us understand how such wedding songs praise immortality within a structure designed to praise the bridal couple.

Theocritus 18 is a good place to start. Through its preface (1–8), final invocation to Hymenaios (58 Ὕμῆν ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμῳ ἐπὶ τῷδε χαρεῖη), and the genre markers that are carefully observed throughout, the poem is clearly identified as a wedding song. At its centre (39–48), however, we find an element that is traditionally at home in hymns rather than *hymenaei*: aetiology.²⁰¹ For although a Spartan tree-cult of Helen is not otherwise attested, this passage of the poem clearly serves to elucidate the origins of such a cult, be it real or invented by the author, in a manner parallel to passages in, say, Homeric or Callimachean hymns.²⁰² Remarkably, this hymnic element does not merely acknowledge

²⁰¹ On aetiology in hymns, cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.13, 18–20.

²⁰² Cf. Kaibel (1892) 255–9, Mangelsdorff (1913) 15, 18–19, Gow (1952) 348, Merkelbach (1957) 20 ‘Aber wie gehören beide Motivkomplexe, Baumkult und Epithalamios, zusammen? Warum erzählt Theokrit diese Episode aus der Heldensage?’ His interpretation is compromised by confusion between mythical wedding songs and real-life wedding songs involving a mythical narrative. See also West (1975) 5 ‘There is reason to believe that her wedding, which in the

Helen's immortality in the form of cultic worship, but initiates it.²⁰³ Yet the foundation of the cult is integrated into the imagined wedding ceremony and song in so far as the imagined chorus present the cultic tree as a wedding present to Helen. By these means, the wedding ceremony serves as the establishment of the heroic worship of the bride, and the *hymenaeus* as the first ritual performed in its service. Theocritus 18 thus shows with a lot of clarity to what extent the *hymenaeus* can assume a hymnic purpose.

A second example comes from Euripides' *Phaethon* (*TrGF* 5.2, F781). The song that the chorus deliver at Aphrodite's and Phaethon's wedding is externally marked as a *hymenaeus* (4–5 γαμηλίους | μολπάς, 14 Ὑμῆν Ὑμῆν, 18 κοὶ τάδ' ἐγὼ νομφεῖ' αἰίδω, 35 σεμνοῖσιν ὑμεναίοισιν). However, assimilated with this structure are elements that acknowledge Aphrodite's divine status. After the cultic cry, the song formally opens with a thematic announcement (15 τὰν Διὸς οὐρανίαν αἰίδομεν), as seems conventional in wedding songs (see above, p. 51; compare the exhortation in Sapph. fr. 113.2 V αἰί|κατε τὰν εὐποδα νόμφαν), but also in hymns. The diction of the announcement, and especially its genealogical focus, add to it a distinctly hymnic tone (cf. esp. *Hipp.* 59–60 τὰν Διὸς οὐρανίαν | Ἄρτεμιν).²⁰⁴ The announcement then triggers a series of asyndetic attributions, with a shift from third person to second person, as we find them in both wedding songs and hymns. In these attributions, Aphrodite's dual role as a bride in love

general tradition appears as a historical event, was a recurring festival at Sparta', and *ibid.* n. 5 'Theoc. 18.43–8 implies these acts by giving what is evidently meant as their aition, and the context of the poem indicates their connection with Helen's nuptials.'

²⁰³ Cf. Kaibel (1892) 255 'Die Mädchen versprechen der Helena ein dauerndes Gedenken, aber mit dem, was sie thun wollen, erweisen sie ihr nicht menschliche, sondern göttliche Ehren.'

²⁰⁴ On genealogy in hymns, cf. Bremer (1981) 195, Race (1990) 86, Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.56.

and as the divine patroness of love (16 ἐρώτων πότνια) is explored. This culminates in her description as γαμήλιον (17), which expresses at once her divine presiding over weddings in general and her involvement in this particular wedding.²⁰⁵ Finally, the praise of Aphrodite's beauty (19 θεῶν καλλίστα) conveys the generic praise of the bride in the *hymenaeus*, but also refers to the specific attribute that the goddess is given in hymns (e.g., *HH* 5.1–2 καλὴν Ἀφροδίτην | ἄικομαι). The ode of *Phaethon* can thus serve to illustrate how conventional structural and thematic elements of the *hymenaeus* can be adopted for a hymnic purpose.

The third and most complex example of this kind is found in the last scene of Aristophanes' *Birds*. Here the hymenaeic and the hymnic purposes are logically connected because the wedding with Basileia is the symbol of, and the reward for, Peisetaerus' victory over the Olympians and so motivates his apotheosis.²⁰⁶ Upon the arrival of the couple, therefore, the chorus are obliged simultaneously to celebrate Peisetaerus' wedding and to acknowledge his newly assumed divine status.

This double purpose already pervades the messenger speech in lines 1706–19. On the surface, this speech seems to adopt a model that is familiar from epiphany descriptions, typically consisting of firstly a command, secondly a reason for the command, and thirdly a confirmation of that reason, usually of an

²⁰⁵ On γαμήλιος as 'pertaining to the wedding', cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 805 (κοίτη), *Eum.* 835 (τέλος), *Choeph.* 487 (χοαί), *inc. fab. TrGF* 3, F242 (λέκτρα); Eur. *Med.* 673 (εὐνή). As an attribute of deities, cf. Ath. 5.2, 185^b11 (see above, n. 68); Pollux 1.24.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Prometheus' remark about Basileia in 1538–9, ταμיעύει τὸν κεραυνὸν τοῦ Διός | καὶ τᾶλλ' ἀπαξάπαντα.

epiphany reaction.²⁰⁷ Here we find the command in the form of the imperative δέχεσθε, which has, among its many usages, a strong religious tone and is common in descriptions of epiphanies.²⁰⁸ As indicated by γάρ, lines 1709–14 provide the reason for the command, namely that the god has arrived in all his divine splendour (προσέρχεται).²⁰⁹ Finally, in lines 1715–17, Peisetaerus' arrival is described as causing a palpable reaction in the environment (ὄσμή, καλὸν θέαμα), a phenomenon often encountered in epiphany scenes.²¹⁰ On the other hand, we find, interwoven with this structure, motifs that can, with some confidence, be identified as hymenaeic. The theme of blessedness appears twice in the address to the birds (1706–7), and the reference to the ὀλβίοις δόμοις recalls the hymenaeic thought that the bridal couple bestow happiness upon their houses.²¹¹ A second theme is the comparison of Peisetaerus to a star (1709–12), and of Basileia to the sun (1713), since, as is shown above (p. 56), comparisons to celestial bodies are found frequently in wedding poetry. Finally, we should note that the prompt for εὐφημία in 1719 aptly unites the hymnic and hymenaeic

²⁰⁷ On the following, cf. McKay (1967), esp. 192–3; he does not evaluate comic material though pp. 188–9 he discusses the possibility of door magic in *Equ.* 1326. On epiphany motifs in this speech, cf. Kleinknecht (1937b) 295–301, Horn (1970) 41, Dunbar (1996) 744.

²⁰⁸ On the reception of gods and heroes appearing in epiphany, cf. Pfister (1924) 312, Kleinknecht (1937b) 296, Dunbar (1995) 745 on 1708–9, and the evidence in Currie (2005) 181–3, who concludes 'In these cases where the figure "received" is a god (Poseidon, Athena, Dionysos, Asklepios) or a hero (Theseus), it is clear that their "reception" involves recognizing their divine status and their entitlement to cult. The implication of extending such a "reception" to a historical person is clear: they too were being cast as someone more than human and a fit object of veneration.' Dunbar (1996) 745 on 1708–9, sharing this view, further refers to Aesch. *Ag.* 521–6.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Dunbar (1995) 746 on 1709–12 'Both similes clearly apply to [Peisetaerus], underlining his fantastic apotheosis as the new Zeus.'

²¹⁰ Cf. McKay (1967) 193 'The arrival of a divinity is commonly accompanied by the reaction of nature.' On ὄσμή and divine epiphanies cf. also *HH* 2.277–8, 4.231, Aesch. *PV* 115 (Prometheus upon the appearance of the Oceanids), Eur. *Hipp.* 1391, and Van Leeuwen (1902) 256 on 1715. Wilamowitz (1928) 374–5 = (1962) 458–9 refers it to θυμιαμάτων, but cf. Dunbar (1995) 748 on 1715. On the visual quality of smell (καλὸν θέαμα), cf. the evidence *ibid.* and Sommerstein (1987) 309 on 1716.

²¹¹ See above, p. 63; cf., e.g., Eur. *Hel.* 725 δῶμ' ἔλειπεσ ὀλβιον.

intentions, since similar prompts are found, in Aristophanes and elsewhere, in the context of religious ceremonies,²¹² but also precede the wedding song in *Peace* (1316 εὐφημεῖν χρὴ καὶ τὴν νύμφην ἔξω τινὰ δεῦρο κομίζειν).²¹³

While the messenger speech relies on a hymnic structure and integrates hymenaeic elements into it, the choral ode itself is formally marked as *hymenaeus* (1728–9 ὕμεναίοις | καὶ νυμφιδίοις δέχεσθ' ὠδαῖς, 1735 ἐν τοιῷδ' ὕμεναίωι, and the refrain 1736–7 and 1741–2). Following this structure, the address that opens the song is hymenaeic in so far as it praises beauty and blessedness (1721–2 περιπέτεσθε μάκαρ μάκαρι σὺν τύχαι. | ὦ φεῦ φεῦ τῆς ὥρας, τοῦ κάλλους). However, when the chorus immediately measure the wedding by its benefit for the community (1725 ὦ μακαριστὸν σὺ γάμον τῇδε πόλει γήμας), they shift the focus to celebrating Peisetaerus' apotheosis within the same theme of blessedness. In the following strophe, a thematic announcement calls for a wedding song (1728–9 ὕμεναίοις | καὶ νυμφιδίοις . . . ὠδαῖς), but the verb is again δέχεσθαι, which, as is argued in the preceding paragraph, can serve to recognise a person's

²¹² Cf. *Ar. Av.* 958 (before the foundation sacrifices) εὐφημία ἔστω; *Thesm.* 39–40 εὐφημος πᾶς ἔστω λαός, | στόμα συγκλήσις, 295–6 εὐφημία ἔστω, εὐφημία ἔστω, εὐχεσθε τοῖν Θεομοφόροις κτλ.; *Nub.* 263 (preceding the prayer to Aer) εὐφημεῖν χρὴ τὸν πρεσβύτην καὶ τῆς εὐχῆς ἐπακούειν, 297 (amid the *parodos* of the divine Clouds) ἀλλ' εὐφήμει· μέγα γάρ τι θεῶν κινεῖται σμῆνος αἰοδαῖς; *Equ.* 1316–17 (before the 'epiphany' of Demos) εὐφημεῖν χρὴ καὶ στόμα κλείειν καὶ μαρτυριῶν ἀπέχεσθαι, | καὶ τὰ δικαστήρια συγκλείειν. See also Pulleyn (1997) 184 'Once εὐφημία is established, then one can utter prayers.' As 'abstention from certain forms of (ill-omened) speech' (*ibid.*), it is a suitable concept for comedy. Cf. also Willi (2003) 42 'Communication with the gods is potentially dangerous. To guarantee the absence of ill-omened interference, εὐφημία is proclaimed at the first stage of a communal prayer ceremony. In practical terms this was a call for abstention from articulated speech. εὐφημία is also established before other situations that demand religious concentration (e.g. a sacrifice or the performance of a hymn).'

²¹³ On this passage, cf. Sommerstein (1985) 139 on *Pax* 96 and Olson (1998) 86 on *Pax* 96–7.

divine status.²¹⁴ Significantly, the myth of the following two strophes parallels not only the performance of the wedding ceremony generally,²¹⁵ but also this particular kind of ode. For as the chorus point out (1735 ἐν τοιῷδ' ὕμεναίωι), the song performed by the Moirae at the wedding of Zeus and Hera would have involved a similar combination of praising their divinity and celebrating their wedding.

Birds thus provides a complex blend of hymenaeic and hymnic elements, incorporated into the general structure of a wedding song. Characteristically, Peisetaerus responds to the song thus delivered in a manner that reflects his dual role as god and husband. For although the chorus do not explicitly bid farewell, Peisetaerus seems to presuppose an implied χαῖρε when he says ἐχάρην ὕμνοις, ἐχάρην ὠίδαῖς, | ἄγαμαι δὲ λόγων (1742–3). In doing so, he anticipates an element that is customary at the end of wedding songs as well as hymns.²¹⁶

These three passages can offer an answer to the question set out above. For it appears from these texts that the hymnic purpose, in other words, the praise of immortality does not need to be interpolated into the hymenaeic structure, but is achieved by exploiting the formal elements that constitute this structure even where mortals are addressed. Theocritus' aetiological passage might reach the limits of what is possible in this regard, but it remains striking that it should be possible for the *hymenaeus* to serve as the enactment of cultic worship. If

²¹⁴ It is plausible that δέχεσθαι also featured in wedding songs, denoting the reception of the bridal couple by the community or at the bridegroom's house. In that case, there would be further ambiguity in the *Birds* passage. However, no other attestation has come down to us.

²¹⁵ Cf. Dunbar (1995) 756 on 1731–42 '... the mythological paradigm, comparing the present marriage to a famous marriage of gods or heroes.'

²¹⁶ On the hymnic aspect, cf. Dunbar (1995) 761 on 1743–7 '[Peisetaerus] is here acting the god, graciously "taking pleasure" in the worship offered.'

wedding songs praise the bridal couple in terms evocative of appeals to heroes and gods, this treatment must, above all, have an impact on the mortal bridal couple. The following paragraphs will try to assess this impact.

BRIDAL COUPLES AS IMMORTALS?

Attempts to assess the treatment of mortal bridal couples could be seen as difficult, given that unambiguous examples of this kind of wedding song are few and almost restricted to Sappho's ill-preserved fragments. However, as this chapter aims to show, all wedding songs, even the mythical ones, observe with great care a tradition that is ultimately rooted in a distinct performative context and song culture. It is for this reason that we might be entitled to draw, with due caution, conclusions from those elements that the above survey identifies as distinctly hymenaeic.

Following the observation that the *hymenaeus* can resemble hymns addressed to gods, in structure and purpose, it seems that two different arguments could be developed regarding the mortal bridal couple that would have received such a song. First, it could be thought that the wedding song, like the wedding vase, emphasises the shared nature of the wedding ceremony among mortals, heroes, and gods. To achieve that, it would create a dimension in which the differentiation between mortal, heroic, and divine is dissolved. Second, it could be

argued that the wedding song not merely dissolves these boundaries, as does wedding iconography, but that it elevates the mortal bridal couple into the higher spheres of mythical heroes and gods.

Indeed, it seems that the second argument finds stronger support in the extant hymenaeic fragments and complete songs. A first indicator of this are the comparisons of bridal couples with heroes and gods that we find in most of the longer pieces from Sappho to Lucian and the late-antique tradition of *epithalamia*. Evidently, these comparisons root the point of reference in the immortal sphere and measure the qualities of the mortal bridal couple against it. They reinforce the general boundaries between mortal and immortal, rather than obscuring them, separate the particular bridal couple, and approximate them to the latter sphere, if only in a certain respect. The effect of this approximation is not necessarily lessened by the observation that similar comparisons are commonplace in epic.²¹⁷ For epic narrators readily concede that the sphere inhabited by epic heroes is closer to that of the gods than to historical times.²¹⁸ What can be said of these heroes might still be extraordinary if applied to living mortals.

As is argued above, these comparisons are centred around concepts of beauty, both male and female. It appears that, from the conventionalised

²¹⁷ Cf. Roloff (1970) 103–4 on a ‘offenkundiger Anklang an die homerischen Formeln’ in Sappho.

²¹⁸ E.g., *Il.* 5.302–4 ὁ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ | Τυδείδης, μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ δύο γ’ ἄνδρε φέροιεν, | οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰς’, 12.381–3 οὐδέ κέ μιν ῥέα | χεῖρεσσ’ ἀμφοτέρησιν ἔχοι ἀνὴρ οὐδὲ μάλ’ ἠβῶν, | οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰς’, 447–9 τὸν δ’ οὐ κε δὴ δ’ ἄνδρε δῆμιον ἀρίστω | ῥῆϊδίως ἐπ’ ἄμαξαν ἀπ’ οὐδενος ὀχλίττειαν | {οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰς’ . . . } (449 del. West), 20.285–7 ὁ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ | Αἰνεΐας, μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ δύο γ’ ἄνδρε φέροιεν, | οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰς’. Cf. Roloff (1970) 106 ‘Diese beiden Stellen [sc. Sapph. fr. 96.21–82 V and 23.4–5 V] lassen deutlich werden, daß für Sappho der Bereich der Heroen als der ἡμίθεοι bzw. ἡμίθεαι trotz aller ursprünglicher Gemeinsamkeiten vom Menschen weg in die Nähe zum Göttlichen gerückt ist, und daß umgekehrt den Menschen ein Abstand minderer Vollkommenheit nicht nur vom Göttlichen, sondern ebenso vom Halbgöttlichen trennt . . .’, Currie (2005) 178–9 ‘The heroes of epic are “godlike men” *par excellence*.’

perspective of the wedding song, the beauty displayed by the bridal couple at their wedding day is such that it surpasses common mortal appearances and approximates to divine splendour.

A second indicator of the approximation of the bridal couple into immortal spheres is found in the conventional attribution of the bridal couple as *μάκαρ*. For, primarily, this term denotes the endless and untroubled existence enjoyed by the gods.²¹⁹ In epic, where it is a stock epithet of the gods, we find it commonly combined with the phrases *αἰὲν ἔόντες* (e.g., *Il.* 24.99)²²⁰ and *ῥεῖα ζῶντες* (*Il.* 6.138), and contrasted with the mortality of humans (*Il.* 1.339 *πρὸς τε θεῶν μακάρων πρὸς τε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων*).²²¹ As opposed to the related term *ὄλβιος*, *μάκαρ* has its point of reference not in the human experience, but in the divine. Hence, it is applied to humans only in a handful of epic cases, where a comparison with the life of the gods seems to be implicit,²²² whereas Solon explicitly denies the achievement of this state to mortals (*IEG* 14.1 *οὐδὲ μάκαρ οὐδεὶς πέλεται βροτός, ἀλλὰ πονηροὶ | πάντες ὅσους θνητοὺς ἡέλιος καθορᾷ*).²²³ Pindar, too, tends to attribute it only to gods and semi-divine people or heroised mortals.²²⁴ Only once, in *Pythian* 5, the term is used of living mortals (Arcesilas

²¹⁹ On *μάκαρ* and its implications, see above, n. 13.

²²⁰ Cf. also *Od.* 5.7, 8.306, 12.377, *HH* 4.249–50, 13.55 *μακάρεσσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι*.

²²¹ Cf. also *Il.* 5.339–42, 6.141–2, 21.463–6, where it is used in a contrast between divine consumption of nectar and the human consumption of food and wine.

²²² Cf. *Il.* 3.181–3, 11.67–9, 24.376–7, 543–6, *Od.* 1.217, 6.154–9, 11.483–6, 18.125–7. On these passages, cf. De Heer (1969) 6–11.

²²³ A similar conclusion is drawn by the chorus at the end of Soph. *OT*: *ὦ γενεαὶ βροτῶν, | ὡς ὑμᾶς ἴσα καὶ τὸ μη-δὲν ζώσας ἐναριθμῶ. | τίς γάρ, τίς ἀνὴρ πλέον | τᾶς εὐδαιμονίας φέρει | ἢ τοσοῦτον ὅσον δοκεῖν | καὶ δόξαντ' ἀποκλίνει; | τὸν δὲ τὸν τοι παράδειγμ' ἔχων, | τὸν δὲ δαίμονα, τὸν δὲ, ὦ | τλᾶμον Οἰδιπόδα, βροτῶν | οὐδὲν μακαρίζω* (1186–96).

²²⁴ On the use of *μάκαρ* in Pindar, cf. Currie (2005) 229–30.

in line 20 and his charioteer in line 46), and here considerations of hero cult might be relevant.²²⁵

This usage suggests that, in the wedding song, *μάκαρ* conveys the state of happiness that bride and bridegroom enjoy at their wedding, and that it does so through an implicit comparison of this state with the eternal bliss of the gods. The wedding song thus conventionally ascribes to the bridal couple an experience that other poetic genres hesitate, or refuse, to ascribe to mortals. It seems that, in the ideology of the wedding song, the bridal couple experience a moment of joy so extraordinary and awe-inspiring that it can be compared to nothing but the undisturbed existence of gods. That is to say, the bridal couple enjoy a moment of immortality. Of course, this moment only lasts for the duration of the wedding ceremony, and so the bridal couple will not become gods. Nevertheless, we find in the wedding ceremony, according to the ideology of the wedding song, a moment where humans temporarily leave behind mortal restrictions and approach the immortal sphere.

While these elements of wedding songs suggest a temporary approximation of the bridal couple to immortal spheres, and so convey sublime praise, elements of jest, mockery, and abuse, often directed at the bridal couple in the vicinity of or even within such praise, could appear to be disruptive. In Sappho's fr. 111 V, for example, the comparison of the bridegroom with Ares could be seen as light-hearted given the hyperbolic expressions surrounding it (esp. 7 ἄνδρὸς μεγάλῳ πόλῳ μέδων). However, this humorous tone does not necessarily lessen the

²²⁵ Cf. Currie (2005) 248–9.

impact of this and similar comparisons. As is shown above, traditions of κώπτειν at Greek weddings, and of *Fescennini uersus* at Roman weddings, are attested also outside of organised lyric compositions, which merely present poetic manifestations of this ritual practice. Laughter at weddings thus appears to be a form of ritual laughter, and in the context of sublime praise it is likely to serve, here as elsewhere, primarily apotropaic purposes. As is variously expressed in praise poetry, strong praise can risk inspiring arrogance and self-deception in its recipients, or of incurring divine jealousy and retribution. Hymenaeic humour can be interpreted as a means of checking such adverse responses to the elevated treatment that the bridal couple indubitably receive.²²⁶ The very need for such checking mechanisms can serve to indicate the high degree of elevation that the bridal couple receive at the wedding in general and in the wedding song in particular, and the potential dangers that lurk behind such treatment.

CONCLUSION

A fragment attributed to Antiphon the ‘Sophist’ (*VS* 87 B49) develops a perspective on marriage that can contrast, in an instructive manner, the perspectives found in wedding songs. For the author, the wedding marks the

²²⁶ On this function of humour and abuse at weddings, cf. M. Treu (1968) 224 on Sapph. fr. 105a V and R.D. Griffith (1989) 56–7 ‘Abuse may have checked hybris at weddings, but was subordinate to the over-all task of praise. It was also easily recognized as abuse.’

beginning of a new phase in life (αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα, αὕτη ἡ νύξ καινοῦ δαίμονος ἄρχει, καινοῦ πότμου), a phase that is chiefly concerned with increased worry (ἔνεστι πλησίον που καὶ τὸ λυπηρόν). He argues that, for a male individual to maintain his basic human needs, i.e., health, everyday sustenance, and good reputation (ὕπερ τε τῆς ὑγείας τοῦ σώματος ὑπερ τε τοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν βίου ἐς τὴν ξυλλογὴν ὑπερ τε δόξης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ εὐκλείας καὶ τοῦ εὖ ἀκούειν), can be difficult enough. In marriage, these worries are doubled, the wife being merely a second body for the husband to maintain (τί οὖν, εἴ γυνὴ γένοιτο cῶμα ἕτερον τοιοῦτον, ὃ γέ μοι οὕτως οὕτως ἐπιμελὲς εἶη;). Ultimately, this double maintenance can amount to a question of life and death (οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην ζῆν). The original context of this fragment is lost, but, in its general acknowledgment of the desire to marry, especially among the young (τί γὰρ ἥδιον ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς καταθυμίας; τί δὲ γλυκύτερον ἄλλως τε καὶ νέῳ;), it is conceivable as a piece of advice offered to someone (or anyone) intending to marry, and as an exhortation to consider the consequences.

This negative view on marriage can serve as a corrective to the positive views offered in wedding songs. Concerns similar to the ones advanced by Antiphon, widespread though they might have been in patriarchal societies, hardly find their way into songs associated with weddings. Only in Sappho's fr. 112 V (1–2 ὄλβιε γάμβρε, κοὶ μὲν γάμος ὥς ἄραο | ἐκτετέλεστ', ἔχῃς δὲ πᾶρθενον ἂν ἄραο) one such concern seems to be presupposed, namely that of marrying within one's station (compare Antiphon's εἰ γὰρ τύχοι μὴ ἐπιτηδεῖα γενομένη, τί χρὴ τῇ συμφορᾷ χρῆσθαι;), but this concern is refuted at the outset because of the

positive outcome of the wedding recognised in the song. For all other songs, Antiphon's fragment enables us to assume that they deliberately pass over such worries and focus instead on positive aspects of the wedding, such as the beauty displayed and the happiness enjoyed by the bridal couple.

That the praise of these qualities happens at the expense of financial or social concerns potentially lurking beneath wedding celebrations is suggested by two characteristics of this praise, which this chapter aims to elucidate. The first characteristic is the highly generic and conventionalised manner in which this praise is developed. For we never seem to find an acknowledgement of particular aspects of the beauty or the happiness of the particular bridal couple. Even in a poem like Catullus 61, which is preserved as a whole and directed to an identifiable couple, distinct traits of this couple appear not in the sections praising them, but in those mocking them (esp. 119–43). The second characteristic is the highly concentrated and intensified form that this praise commonly takes. In the wedding songs discussed here, the beauty and happiness of the bridal couple are presented as so great that they approximate to divine splendour and bliss, and this presentation is reflected throughout the formal and thematic design of these songs. These two characteristics appear interrelated because the approximation of the bridal couple to immortality emerges as a conventional perspective of wedding songs. As part of the poetics of hymenaeic praise, this perspective has no necessary bearing outside the poetic world within which it unfolds, although it is likely derived from the exceptional treatment that the bridal couple receive in the wedding ceremony, which is also reflected in wedding iconography.

Antiphon embeds the worries and risks involved in marriage in a discourse on the dynamics of toil and reward. Since all great goods come to man only as a result of struggle and suffering, a successful and reputable marriage, too, depends on much pain and hard work (αἱ γὰρ ἡδοναὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐμπορεύονται, ἀλλ' ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐταῖς λῦπαι καὶ πόνοι). As the paradigm for this relationship, Antiphon then refers to the victors at the Olympian, Pythian, and other games (ἐπεὶ καὶ ὀλυμπιονῖκαι καὶ πυθιονῖκαι καὶ οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀγῶνες καὶ σοφαὶ καὶ πᾶσαι ἡδοναὶ ἐκ μεγάλων λυπημάτων ἐθέλουσι παραγίνεσθαι· τιμαὶ γάρ, ἄθλα, δελέατα, ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκεν ἀνθρώποις, μεγάλων πόνων καὶ ἰδρώτων εἰς ἀνάγκας καθιστᾶσιν). This comparison between a successful marriage and athletic victory is striking and points to a deeper connection between the wedding ceremony and the victory celebration, and between the respective songs performed at these occasions. This connection is the subject of the following chapter.

THE VICTORY ODE

INTRODUCTION

When Horace characterises the victors at the Olympic Games, *quos curriculo puluerem Olympicum | collegisse iuuat metaque feruidis | euitata rotis palmaque nobilis | terrarum dominos euehit ad deos* (*Carm.* 1.1.3–7), he explicitly compares the aftermath of victory with immortality. Here, the focus is neither on potential forms of worship that the victor might receive for his achievement, nor on the conservation of his fame in song, but on the extraordinary state that he enjoys immediately after the victory. The same thought appears when Horace characterises specifically those athletes celebrated in Pindar’s epinicians, *quos Elea domum reducit | palma caelestis* (*Carm.* 4.2.17–18). Here, the image is a triumphant victory procession where the glory, vigour, and happiness that the victor exudes make him appear closer to the gods than to the ordinary mortals surrounding him.²²⁷

The thought that the aftermath of athletic victory means for the victor a moment of immortality is, in such explicitness, unparalleled in the odes of Pindar or Bacchylides. It is, however, not entirely absent. This chapter aims to show that, in some odes, immortality is a relevant background against which the achievement of and reward for victory is measured, and that this immortality is presented in these odes implicitly through mythical narratives. The focus of this

²²⁷ Cf. Richard Thomas (1983) 99–103 and (2011) 112–13 ad loc., who assumes a Callimachean model (e.g., *AP* 7.525.4 = *Epigr.* 21.4 Pfeiffer ὁ δ’ ἤειπεν κρέεσσα βακκανίης) reflected in Horace, as well as in Verg. *G.* 3.37–8 (*inuidia infelix Furiis amnemque seuerum | Cocyti metuet*) and Prop. 3.1.21–2 (*at mihi quod uiuo traxerit inuida turba | post obitum duplici faenore reddet Honos*). These passages, however, are all explicitly concerned with immortality in song. In Horace, the focus seems to be on moments of immortal happiness.

chapter is on mythical paradigms like Heracles, Perseus, and Pelops and their journeys into immortal realms, on the carefully constructed parallelism between these paradigms and the respective victor, and on the implications of such parallelism for the characterisation of the victor. Since the arguments developed in the following paragraphs are concerned with a feature of the metaphorical language of the epinician, they affect our understanding of the victor and the poet only as conventionalised *personae*, not as historical individuals with distinctive aspirations and predilections.²²⁸

MYTH AND IMMORTALITY

Questions regarding the purpose of a mythical narrative within the composition of the epinician are complicated and relate to the wider question of unity, which has vexed Pindaric scholarship at least since Hellenistic times.²²⁹ While it can never be excluded *per se* that narratives are related for their own sake, as a means of entertainment,²³⁰ scholarship has become increasingly aware of the variety of ways in which certain narratives can interact with other elements of an ode and

²²⁸ In this respect, this chapter differs significantly from the purpose of Currie (2005). Nevertheless, the questions pursued there provide an important background for the following paragraphs.

²²⁹ On problems of unity in ancient scholarship, cf. Drachmann (1891) 5–18, Most (1985) 12–25, Currie (2005) 331 with n. 196. On modern times, cf. Drachmann (1891) 18–44, Young (1970), Heath (1986), Krummen (1990) 10–30, Pfeijffer (1999) 12–18, Patten (2009) and Indergaard (2011b) 1–5.

²³⁰ On the ‘decorative’ function of myth, cf. Thummer (1968) 1.110–20, Patten (2009) 146–54.

contribute to an overall encomiastic programme.²³¹ Where mythical figures provide paradigms for characters of the *hic et nunc*, the narrative would function in a way similar to similes or metaphors, with a source domain, a target domain, and a more or less complex net of connections between the two.²³² Often, however, the precise nature of the target domain is obscure and more than one construal is reasonably possible, ranging from the victor to the poet to the victor's hometown etc. The extent of ambiguity that can arise by these means seems to depend in part on the size of the narrative. While shorter narratives provide straightforward paradigms for *laudandus* or *laudator*, often explicitly, longer narratives tend to create a variety of associations as they unfold.

In fact, most of the shorter and explicitly paradigmatic narratives seem to invite comparison primarily with the *laudandus*. In *Pythian* 1, for example, the story of Philoctetes is related because Hieron, like the hero, set out in a state of illness to aid his allies (50–1 τὰν Φιλοκτητάο δίκαν ἐφέπων | ἐστρατεύθη). In *Olympian* 10, the *laudator* wishes that Hagesidamus may offer gratitude to his trainer Ilos as Patroclus did to Achilles (17–19 Ἴλαι φερέτω χάριν | Ἀγησίδαμος ὥς | Ἀχιλεῖ Πάτροκλος).²³³ In *Pythian* 6, the *laudator* attributes Thrasyboulus with the same reverence towards gods and parents that Chiron once instructed Achilles to observe (19–27, esp. 19–22 ὀρθὰν ἄγειε ἐφημοσύναν | τὰ ποτ' ἐν οὔρεσι φαντὶ μεγαλοθενεῖ | Φιλύρας υἱὸν ὀρφανίζομένωι | Πηλεΐδα παραινεῖν). In the following lines, Antilochus is introduced as a second example of filial

²³¹ Cf., e.g., Köhnken (1971), Carey (1981) 10, Slater (1984) 250, Lloyd-Jones (1990) 64–5, Erbse (1999), esp. 30–2, and Indergaard (2011b) 2–3.

²³² On metaphors, see above, n. 16.

²³³ A similar, though less explicit, comparison is made in *O.* 9.76–9, 83–5 between Epharmostus and Lampromachus and Achilles and Patroclus.

devotion, and at the end of the narrative Thrasyboulus is presented as the present-day counterpart of that hero (43–5 τὰ μὲν παρίκει· | τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος | πατρώϊαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα). In *Olympian* 6, the *laudator* explicitly compares Hagesias with Amphiaraus, because both combine the art of divining with martial or athletic prowess (12–14, 16–17).²³⁴ Moreover, the central narrative of Iamus' life, related from birth to heroisation (28–71), is evidently designed in reference to the Iamid Hagesias (cf. 5).²³⁵

On the basis of these explicit comparisons between mythical heroes and *laudandi*, it is tempting to interpret also other narratives, which are more open to interpretation, with a view on the *laudandus*. Most longer narratives, especially in Pindar, are centred around a hero's cultural or martial exploits, around struggles and their resolution.²³⁶ In itself, this kind of plot could seem to provide an apt reflection of athletic training and competition. However, while this argument is frequently encountered in Pindaric scholarship, its implications are often neglected. For many narratives contain not only the struggles undertaken by the mythical hero, but also the reward received for them, and this reward is often a

²³⁴ Cf. Kirkwood (1980) 86 'Amphiaraus symbolizes Hagesias as warrior and prophet', Erbse (1999) 16–17.

²³⁵ Explicit comparisons are also found in *N.* 3.14–15 (Aristocleides and the Myrmidones) and *I.* 4.49–55 (Melissus and Heracles), which are both discussed in detail below.

²³⁶ Exceptions are, for example, the female protagonists of *Pythians* 3 (Coronis), 9 (Cyrene), and 11 (Clytemnestra), where the function of the narratives are debated. On the possible parallelism between Coronis and the *laudator* in *P.* 3.8–37, cf. Race (1989) 191, Finglass (2007) 42–4. On the parallelism between Telesicrates and Cyrene in *P.* 9.1–75, cf. Winnington-Ingram (1969), Woodbury (1972), Robbins (1978), Carson (1982), Kirkwood (1982) 216, Suárez de la Torre (1984), Köhnken (1984), Miller (1993) 26. On the problems of 'relevance' regarding the Clytemnestra narrative in *P.* 11.13–37, cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 263, Bowra (1936), (1964) 154, 294, 405, and (1965) 104, Finley (1955) 100–5, Burton (1962) 63, 71–3, Most (1985) 25, Finglass (2007) 41–7.

form of immortality.²³⁷ Thus, Pelops receives a hero cult after defeating Oenomaus in the chariot race in *Olympian* 1 (90–3). In *Olympian* 2, Semele and Ino-Leucothea are immortalised in return for their suffering (22–33, esp. 23 Κάδμοιο κούραις, ἔπαθον αἰ μεγάλα). Iamus becomes a hero in *Olympian* 6 (50–63). Tlaptolemus receives worship ὥσπερ θεῶι in *Olympian* 7 (76–80). Aristaeus will, according to Chiron’s prophecy, be immortalised by Gaia and the Horae in *Pythian* 9 (esp. 63). At the beginning of *Nemean* 10, Athena makes Diomedes a god (7), and Amphiaraus is turned into an oracular hero (8); with these two immortalisations at the beginning of the ode, and the choice offered to Polydeuces at the end (55–9, 80–90; see the following paragraph), immortalisation frames *Nemean* 10 as a whole. The most prominent apotheosis is that of Heracles, recounted or alluded to in *Olympian* 3 (36–8), *Nemean* 1 (69–72), 3 (22), and 10 (17–18), and *Isthmian* 4 (58–69). Moreover, epinician narratives refer to places at the edge of or beyond the known world, where mortals can be brought to enjoy immortal life. Thus, Peleus, Cadmus, and Achilles are said to live on the Isles of

²³⁷ In the world of myth, the boundaries between mortal and immortal are generally fluid. Heroes of narratives enjoy the company of gods, who assist them in their adventures, dine with them, attend their weddings, and even marry them: Tantalus invites the gods to dinner in exchange for the meals enjoyed on Olympus (ἀμοιβαῖα θεοῖσι δεῖπνα) in *O.* 1.36–9; Peleus marries Thetis and Cadmus Harmonia in *P.* 3.86–95, καὶ θεοὶ δαΐσαντο παρ’ ἀμφοτέροισι (93); the chorus of Muses sings at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis in *N.* 5.25–6 (αἱ δὲ πρῶτιστον μὲν ὕμνησαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν | Πηλέα θ’). Peleus is εὐδαιμόνων γαμβρὸς θεῶν in *I.* 6.25; Heracles marries Hebe and becomes γαμβρὸς Ἥρας in *I.* 4.76–8; a metaphorical γάμος takes place between Apollo and Cyrene in *P.* 9 (13 ξυνὸν ἀρμόζοισα [sc. Ἀφροδίτα, cf. 9] θεῶι τε γάμον μιχθέντα κούραι θ’ Ὑψέος ἐνρυβία, 51 ταυτῇ πόσις ἵκεο βᾶσσαν, 66 τερπνὰν γάμου κραίνειν τελευτάν). The line between mortal and immortal can also be crossed in the other direction: Ixion (*P.* 2.25–6) and Tantalus (*O.* 1.54–64) are expelled from Olympus and receive the opposite of immortal bliss, eternal punishment; Pelops, in turn, who was sent to earth as a result of his father’s transgression, regains immortality in the form of heroic worship (*P. O.* 1.90–9). In other cases, attempts to attain immortality fail unless a god vouchsafes them: Asclepius’ resurrection of a dead man results in death (*P.* 3.55–8), as does Belerophon’s ascent to Olympus (*I.* 7.44–7, *O.* 13.91), while Pegasus is accepted among the gods (*O.* 13.92). The choice offered to Polydeuces by Zeus in *N.* 10.55–9 and 80–90, either to live as a god on Olympus or to share his lot with his brother, illustrates well how flexible movements between the mortal and the divine spheres can be in the world of the myth.

the Blessed in *Olympian* 2 (78–9; cf. P. fr. 172.1 SM Πελέος ἀντιθέου, P. 3.88 ἀντιθέωι Κάδμωι), and Croesus is transferred to the Hyperboreans by Apollo in Bacchylides 3 (58–62 τότε Δαλογενῆς Ἀπόλλων | φέρων ἐς Ὑπερβορέους γέροντα | σὺν τανικφύροις κατέναςσε κούραις | δι’ εὐσέβειαν, ὅτι μέγιστα θνατῶν | ἐς ἀγαθέαν ἀνέπεμψε Πυθώ).

In cases where the exploits of a mythical hero provide an implicit or explicit parallelism with the training of the athlete, immortalisation as a reward for these exploits is likely to continue this parallelism. The end of *Olympian* 10 offers an instructive example of this effect of the narrative on the *hic et nunc*. There, the *laudator* compares the beauty that he observed in Hagesidamus at the moment of his victory (expressed through the aorist εἶδον in 100, and κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον in 102) with the beauty of Ganymede, which secured his immortalisation (103–5 ἰδέαι τε καλόν | ὥραι τε κεκραμένον ἅ ποτε | ἀναιδέα Γανυμήδει θάνατον ἄλκε σὺν Κυπρογενεῖ). This comparison creates the impression of an analogy between Ganymede’s immortal life on Olympus and the moment of Hagesidamus’ victory, which the ode preserves like a photograph.²³⁸ Whereas *Olympian* 10, thus interpreted, explores the momentary nature of victory, the end of *Nemean* 10 seems to focus on the ambivalent nature of the victor during that moment. There, Castor and Polydeuces, who are introduced as ‘good athletes’ (50–1 οὗ θαῦμα σφίσι | ἐγγενὲς ἔμμεν ἀθληταῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν), and whose struggles with Idas and

²³⁸ Cf. Nassen (1975) 239 ‘Since Hagesidamus shares the beauty of Ganymede, he will certainly escape a common end. Just as Ganymede was spared from meeting ruthless death . . . because Aphrodite blessed him . . . with a handsome appearance, so will the son of Arcestratos also be spared; for he has been favored with victory by the king of the gods for his athletic prowess and physical strength and will thus live for all eternity in Pindar’s immortal epinician song.’ Cf. also Wilamowitz (1922) 220, Hubbard (1985) 69, and Verdenius (1988a) 86 on 105, Hutchinson (2011) 115 with n. 7.

Lynceus are described in terms reminiscent of athletic competition generally and of wrestling particularly (61–72, esp. 61 λαιψηροῖς δὲ πόδεσσιν, 66 διώκων, 68 ἔμβalon, 69 οὐδ’ ἀνέχαccαν· ἐφορμαθεῖς δ’ ἄρ’ ἄκοντι θοῶι), are evidently designed as paradigms for the athlete. The result of this struggle is Castor’s death and Polydeuces’ subsequent decision, not to enjoy Olympian immortality forever by himself (83–5 εἰ μὲν θάνατόν τε φυγὼν καὶ γῆρας ἀπεχθόμενον | αὐτὸς Οὐλύμπον θέλει νάειν ἐμοῖ, σύν τ’ Ἀθαναίαι κελαινεγχεῖ τ’ Ἄρει | ἔστι σοι τούτων λάχος), but to share a combination of mortality and immortality with his brother (86–8 πάντων δὲ νοεῖς ἀποδάccασθαι ἵσον | ἡμῖν μὲν κε πνέοις γαίᾳς ὑπένερθεν ἔων, | ἡμῖν δ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐν χρυσεῖς δόμοισιν). Remarkably, the end of *Nemean* 10 does not return to the *hic et nunc*, but closes with the image of alternating life on Olympus and in the underworld.²³⁹ In doing so, the ode leaves unchecked any intimation, potentially arising from the parallelism between the Dioscuri and the athlete, about the *laudandus* experiencing a similar hybrid of mortality and immortality at the moment of his victory.²⁴⁰

This chapter aims to pursue a similar line of interpretation in a selection of odes, the narratives of which conclude in immortalisation, and which therefore invite comparison between the moment of victory and immortality.

²³⁹ Cf. Young (1993) 128–9 ‘He [sc. Pindar] almost always returns to comment on the victor’s present state, that part of the poem which Schadewaldt called the “zweite Siegerlob.” But here, I shall later suggest, the “zweite Siegerlob” is contained in the myth itself.’ The reference to Schadewaldt is to Schadewaldt (1928) 284.

²⁴⁰ On aspects of mortality and immortality in the myth of *Nemean* 10, and their effect on the characterisation of the *laudandus*, cf. Stern (1969), Carne-Ross (1985) 82–3, Young (1993), and Currie (2005) 217.

GNŌMĒ AND MORTALITY

While the suggestive force of myth is widely acknowledged, its impact on a given ode as a whole is often measured against the adjacent gnomic statements, which seem to contradict overtly what a myth can intimate. In most of these statements, the *laudator* recommends satisfaction with what has been reached and advises against yearning for more. The tension between contentment and aspiration takes the shape of metaphorical dichotomies, like near and far, familiar and strange, native and foreign, possible and impossible, or indeed mortal and immortal. Other images, like the Pillars of Heracles, the Hyperboreans, or ascent to Olympus, are employed for the same purpose.²⁴¹

A supposed contradiction between myth and *gnōmē* does not, in itself, rule out or even weaken the potential implications of a narrative. First, at least some epinicians appear to be designed as fundamentally polyphonic compositions where no voice would *a priori* seem to hold supremacy over the others.²⁴² A second and more important consideration concerns the function of *gnōmai*. As break-offs, they can serve a rhetorical purpose, leading from one section of the poem to another. In this capacity, many are as likely to relate to the *laudator* and the fiction of an improvised song on a ‘subjective’ level, as to the *laudandus* on

²⁴¹ Dichotomies: *O.* 1.113–14, 5.23–4, *P.* 3.19–23, 61–2, 8.76–8, 10.28–9, *N.* 9.46–7, 11.13–16, *I.* 2.39–42, 5.12–16, 6.10–13, 7.39–44; Pillars of Heracles: *O.* 3.43–5, *N.* 3.19–21, 4.69, *I.* 4.11–13; Hyperboreans and ascent to Olympus: *P.* 10.27–30. Cf. Thummer (1968) 1.67–81, Gianotti (1975) 129–30, Gerber (1982) 173–5 on *O.* 1.114, Hubbard (1985) 11–12, Race (1990) 191–5.

²⁴² On the supremacy of *gnōmai*, cf. Bowra (1964) 61, Kirkwood (1981), Instone (1993) 19–20. Cf., *contra*, Hubbard (1985) 7 ‘In Pindaric criticism, this critical bias has resulted from an overemphasis on individual gnomic statements.’ On epinicians and polyphony, cf. also A. M. Miller (1993), Hutchinson (2001) 436–7, Currie (2005) 80, (2013) 244; on polyphony and lyric generally, cf. Blevins (2008).

an ‘objective’ level.²⁴³ The image of the journey, which underlies all gnomic utterances, can refer both to the *laudandus*’ path of achievement and to the *laudator*’s path of song.²⁴⁴ Gnostic statements, we may conclude, can be as ambiguous and open to interpretation as mythical narratives.

Claims such as μή ματεύει θεὸς γενέσθαι (*O.* 5.24) or μή μάτενε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι (*I.* 5.14) are not affected by the considerations raised so far because they can only refer to the *laudandus*. However, these claims only provide a problem if we interpret a narrative about immortalisation as a promise of actual immortality for the victor.²⁴⁵ If, on the other hand, we consider immortality a metaphor for the victor’s experience, the content of these *gnōmai* is not challenged. The *laudandus* may be presented through myth as someone who enjoys a moment so extraordinary that he appears similar or identical to a god for that moment, but he does not become a god.²⁴⁶

VICTORY SCULPTURE

The arguments developed in the preceding paragraphs about the purpose of mythical narratives within the epinician in general, and about the suggestive force

²⁴³ Cf. Hubbard (1985) *passim*, Indergaard (2011b) 120–1. On objective and subjective, cf. Bundy (1962) 12–13.

²⁴⁴ Cf. Becker (1937) 50–68 on objective usage of the image of the path, *ibid.* 68–85 on subjective usage.

²⁴⁵ Cf. Currie (2005) 78–81.

²⁴⁶ Cf. similarly Young (1993) 126 ‘... these passages are not real warnings or rebukes. Rather, they are highly complimentary statements, something like beatitudes, that Pindarists recognize as elements of the *ne plus ultra* theme.’

of narratives about immortality in particular, find further support in sculpture, especially in civic monuments associated with athletic competition. For the questions asked here, this type of sculpture provides more immediate access because it is not addressed to a particular victor but seeks universal relevance. Also, in interpreting mythical depictions in sculpture, several of the voices that can complicate narratives in the epinician, like the *laudator*, the *laudandus*' family or social milieu etc., are absent. Instead, if mythical scenes in sculpture serve a paradigmatic purpose, they are more likely to reflect the path of the athlete than, say, of the sculptor.

That sculpture is a relevant background for epinician poetry is suggested not only by explicit remarks in Pindar's odes,²⁴⁷ but also by archaeological findings that reveal the extent to which Pindar engages in a dialogue with this art form. The Alcmeonid temple of Apollo at Delphi, for example, which shows on the east pediment Apollo with his chariot, is alluded to in *Pythian* 7 (9–11) to glorify the Alcmeonid Megacles.²⁴⁸ The Siphnian treasury at Delphi, depicting on the east frieze the battle of Achilles and Memnon over Antilochus' body with Nestor in the far right, seems to have influenced the mythical narrative of *Pythian* 6 (28–42).²⁴⁹ The new pediments of the temple of Aphaea in Aegina (c. 480 BC), which depict on the east frieze the first sack of Troy, on the west frieze the second, seem

²⁴⁷ Cf. *N.* 5.1–5, 4.79–85, *P.* 6.1–18, *I.* 2.45–6. On Pindar and sculpture generally, cf. Steiner (1993), (1998), (2001), Kurke (1993), O'Sullivan (2003), Rosalind Thomas (2007), and Smith (2007).

²⁴⁸ For a reconstruction of the pediment, cf. Lacoste (1920), La Coste-Messelière (1931) 33–67. For its influence on Pindar, cf. Steiner (1993) 166–7, Athanassaki (2011b) 245–54.

²⁴⁹ For a reconstruction of the frieze, cf. Brinkmann (1985), (1994) 139–53. For its influence on *P.* 6, cf. Shapiro (1988) and Athanassaki (2012a).

to provide a model for the narratives of the Aeginetan odes *Olympian* 8 (30–46),²⁵⁰ and *Isthmians* 5 (34–8) and 6 (26–35, 51–4).²⁵¹

Of primary importance for the questions asked here is the sculptural programme of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, built while Pindar was composing odes for Olympic victories (c. 470–50 BC). This monument shows on the east pediment Pelops and Oenomaus with their chariots, on the west pediment the battle between Lapiths and Centaurs, and on the metopes of *pronaos* (east) and *opisthodomos* (west) the twelve labours of Heracles, six on either side. The monument is the centre of the temple district of Olympia: in the *bouleuterion*, athletes would sacrifice and swear the oath of fair play before competing;²⁵² victors might have been crowned in the *pronaos*;²⁵³ votive offerings of victorious athletes surround the vicinity of the temple.²⁵⁴

The depiction of Heracles and Pelops at Olympia is sufficiently motivated in the role that both heroes played in the foundation of the games. There is, however, a strong possibility that the sculptures are also designed to invite comparison between the mythical figures and the athletes performing rites in the vicinity. The chariot race of Pelops and Oenomaus provides a paradigm for

²⁵⁰ For reconstructions of the friezes, cf. Ohly (1974) 47–66 and (1976). For its influence on *O.* 2, cf. Podlecki (1976) 405–8, Burnett (2005) 29–44, 219, 245–7, Santi (2006), Athanassaki (2011a) 281–6 and (2012) 139–42.

²⁵¹ Cf. Indergaard (2011a) 306–21.

²⁵² On athletes taking their vows at the *bouleuterion* of the temple, cf. Paus. 5.24.9 ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ πάντων ὁπόσα ἀγάλματα Διὸς μάλιστα ἐς ἐκπληξιν ἀδίκων ἀνδρῶν πεποιήται· ἐπὶ κλησὶς μὲν Ὀρκιὸς ἐστὶν αὐτῷ, ἔχει δὲ ἐν ἑκατέρῃ κεραυνὸν χειρὶ. παρὰ τούτῳ καθέστηκε τοῖς ἀθληταῖς καὶ πατράσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀδελφοῖς, ἔτι δὲ γυμνασταῖς ἐπὶ κάπρου κατόμνυσθαι τομίῳν, μηδὲν ἐς τὸν Ὀλυμπίῳν ἀγῶνα ἔσεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν κακοῦργημα.

²⁵³ Cf. Sinn (2000) 58, 69.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Barringer (2005) 212.

athletes competing in this particular discipline.²⁵⁵ A similar paradigm in the case of Heracles and of the Centauromachy is suggested by scenes where the heroes are engaged in poses typical of wrestling or boxing.²⁵⁶ More strikingly, Heracles and one of the Lapiths exhibit injuries characteristic of boxing (the ‘cauliflower ear’).²⁵⁷ Pausanias (6.5.5–6) even preserves an example of one athlete, a certain Polydamas, who identified himself and his career with Heracles and his labours.²⁵⁸

If a paradigmatic function can be assumed for these depictions, immortality is an implicit element of the parallelism. Heracles’ apotheosis is not shown on the metopes, but as the result of and reward for the labours depicted it is present in the background of the narrative.²⁵⁹ This impression is enhanced by the way in which the scenes progress linearly through the hero’s life, from a beardless youth in the first scenes to a bearded middle-aged man in the later scenes. Even without an explicit depiction, this progression points to the last stage of the hero’s life as a god on Olympus. The same can be observed in the case of Pelops. Apotheosis is no element of accounts of the hero’s life, but the worship that he received at

²⁵⁵ The paradigmatic function of Pelops is complicated by versions of the story where Pelops wins by manipulating or bribing Oenomaus’ charioteer Myrtilus, cf. Soph. *Oenom. TrGF* 4, F471–7, Eur. *Oenom. TrGF* 5.2, F571–7, Diod. 4.73, Apollod. *Epit.* 2.4–8. It would appear that the sculptural programme at Olympia chooses to ignore these compromising elements in the tradition of Pelops, as does Pindar in his account in *O.* 1.71–88.

²⁵⁶ See Heracles’ battle with the Cretan Bull: G. Treu (1897) pl. 45, fig. 4; the Keryneian Hind: G. Treu (1897) pl. 45, fig. 5; and the Hydra: G. Treu (1897) pl. 45, fig. 2. On Heracles, cf. Barringer (2005) 237. On the Lapiths, cf. Raschke (1988) 42–3, Barringer (2005) 234. On the iconographical assimilation of Heracles and athletes more generally, cf. Mackey (2002).

²⁵⁷ On Heracles’ injury on G. Treu (1897) pl. 45, fig. 1, cf. Raschke (1988) 33–4, Pimpinelli (1994) 353–4, Barringer (2005) 237; on the Lapith’s injury on G. Treu (1897) pl. 45, fig. Q, cf. Rehak (1998) 199, Barringer (2005) 234.

²⁵⁸ On the anecdote of Polydamas, a victor in the *pancratium*, cf. Paus. 6.5.5 ἐνταῦθα ὁ Πουλυδάμας λέοντα ἐν τῷ Ὀλύμπῳ, μέγα καὶ ἄλκιμον θηρίον, κατειργάσατο οὐδενὶ ἐσκευασμένῳ ὅπλῳ. προήχθη δὲ ἐς τὸ τόλμημα φιλοτιμία πρὸς τὰ Ἡρακλέους ἔργα, ὅτι καὶ Ἡρακλῆα ἔχει λόγος κρατῆσαι τοῦ ἐν Νεμέῃ λέοντος.

²⁵⁹ Cf. Barringer (2005) 237.

Olympia, in the Pelopeion just next to the temple of Zeus, seems to have been on a larger scale than cults for other heroes at other places.²⁶⁰ In fact, there is evidence that his cult statue was nearly as big as that of Zeus.²⁶¹ This lavish form of worship is relevant for understanding the function of the sculpture at the temple of Zeus because athletes would have made offerings also at the Pelopeion (Paus. 5.13.8).²⁶² If, therefore, athletes were encouraged to regard the depiction of Pelops on the east pediment of the temple of Zeus as a model for athletic competition, the form of immortality that the hero received some thirty metres north of that temple becomes part of this model.

For the victor, the kind of immortality that is expressed through the parallelism between himself and these two heroes is unlikely to convey any promise of cultic worship.²⁶³ Nor does it, in its general applicability to any victor, seem to be concerned with the preservation of fame of a particular victor, as can be done by epinicians and victory statues. Instead, as the sculptural narratives about immortalisation are placed at the very spot where victors seem to have been crowned (see above, n. 253), immortality is most likely to represent this particular moment. Similar to the Horatian verse quoted at the beginning of this chapter, immortality here seems to serve as an image for the vigour that secured the

²⁶⁰ On Pelops' cult at Olympia, cf. Herrmann (1980), Burkert (1983) 97–103.

²⁶¹ Cf. Paus. 5.13.1 ἡρώων δὲ τῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τοσοῦτον προτετιμημένους ἔστιν ὁ Πέλοψ ὑπὸ Ἥλειων ὅσον Ζεὺς θεῶν τῶν ἄλλων. On the dimensions of Pelops' statue at Olympia, cf. Tulunay (1998) 453 and Barringer (2005) 212.

²⁶² On sacrifices for Pelops, cf. implicitly Paus. 5.13.3 ἔστι δὲ ὁ ξυλευὺς ἐκ τῶν οικετῶν τοῦ Διός, ἔργον δὲ αὐτῷ πρόσκειται τὰ ἐς τὰς θυσίας ξύλα τεταγμένου λήμματος καὶ πόλεσι παρέχειν καὶ ἀνδρὶ ιδιώτη· τὰ δὲ λεύκης μόνης ξύλα καὶ ἄλλου δένδρου ἔστιν οὐδενός· ὅς δ' ἂν ἢ αὐτῶν Ἥλειων ἢ ξένων τοῦ θυομένου τῷ Πέλοπι ἱερείου φάγηι τῶν κρεῶν, οὐκ ἔστιν οἱ ἐσελθεῖν παρὰ τὸν Δία.

²⁶³ Cf. Barringer (2005) 237.

victory and for the fame and happiness that result from it, all of which are presented as so great that mortal standards are insufficient to measure it.

Thus interpreted, the sculpture at the temple of Zeus at Olympia functions in a way very similar to mythical narratives in the epinician.²⁶⁴ It unfolds stories about heroic exploits that ultimately result in immortalisation, and encourages comparison between these exploits and athletic training and competition. By extension, it also encourages comparison between the reward for heroic exploits, i.e., immortality, and the reward for athletic competition, i.e., victory. The latter parallelism characterises only the moment when the athlete appears as superhuman, and makes no claims about the longevity of this impression or about the victor's afterlife.

ULTIMATE JOURNEYS AND APOTHEOSIS:

HERACLES

The possible connections that Olympic victors could draw between themselves and the representations of Heracles at the temple of Zeus at Olympia shed an interesting light on the treatment of the same hero in Pindar. After all, he is not unlikely to have studied the sculptures on the most important monument at the

²⁶⁴ On a detailed comparison between Pindar and this sculpture, cf. Stewart (1983) and Barringer (2005) 237–9.

most prestigious game site. Heracles is the most prominent mythical figure in the Pindaric corpus, and the speaking voices of several odes, often exploring a Theban identity,²⁶⁵ express a personal connection with him.²⁶⁶ As with the sculptures at Olympia, the presence of Heracles in the epinician is superficially motivated through his role in founding the Olympian and Nemean Games, although the equally frequent references in *Pythian* and *Isthmian* odes point to a more profound motivation.²⁶⁷ Pindar's odes present Heracles as the archetypal culture hero who promoted civilisation by freeing the world of villains and beasts on land and at sea, defined the known world,²⁶⁸ and even measured time.²⁶⁹ His

²⁶⁵ On Pindaric *laudatores* presenting themselves as Theban, cf. Indergaard (2011b) 8–13 and Breman (2015) 56–65.

²⁶⁶ Cf. *P.* 9.87 κωφὸς ἀνὴρ τις, ὃς Ἡρακλεῖ στόμα μὴ περιβάλλει, *N.* 1.33–4 ἐγὼ δ' Ἡρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφόνως | ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετῶν μεγάλας.

²⁶⁷ Cf. *P.* 5.69–72, 9.87 (see above, n. 266), 10.1–3, 11.3–5; *I.* 5.35–7, 6.31–5, 7.6–7, fr. 29.4 SM.

²⁶⁸ Cf. *N.* 1.62–6 ὅσσους μὲν ἐν χέρσῳ κτανὼν, | ὅσσους δὲ πόντῳ θῆρας αἰδοδίκας· | καὶ τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ | ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ κτείνοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον | φᾶ ἐδαιώσκειν μόρον, 3.22–6 (the Pillars of Heracles) ἃς ἔθηκε ναυτίας ἐσχάτας | μάρτυρας κλυτὰς δάμασε δὲ θῆρας ἐν πελάγει | ὑπερόχους, ἰδία τ' ἐρευνάει τεναγέων | ῥοάς, ὅπαι πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος | καὶ γὰν φράδαζε, *I.* 4.73–5 γαίης τε πάσας | καὶ βαθύκρημον πολιᾶς ἁλὸς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ, | ναυτιλίας τε πορθμὸν ἡμερώσας, *O.* 10.26–38 ἐπεὶ Ποσειδάνιον | πέφνε Κτέατον ἀμύμονα | πέφνε δ' Εὐρυτον . . . On Heracles as a culture hero, cf. also Soph. *Trach.* 1012 πολλὰ μὲν ἐν πόντῳ, κατὰ τε δρία πάντα καθαίρων, Eur. *HF* 20 ἐξημερῶσαι γαῖαν, 225–6 ποντίων καθαρμάτων | χέρσου τ' ἀμοιβὰς ὧν ἐμόχθησεν χερί, 400–2 (colometry disputed) ποντίας θ' ἁλός | μυχοὺς εἰσέβαινε, θνα–|τοῖς γαλανείας τιθεῖς ἐρετμοῖς, 696–700 τὰς δ' εὐγενίας | πλεον ὑπερβάλλων (ἀρετῶν) | μοχθήσας τὸν ἄκυμον | θῆκεν βίον βροτοῖς | πέρας δειμάτα θηρῶν, 851–3 ἄβατον δὲ χώραν καὶ θάλασσαν ἀγρίαν | ἐξημερώσας θεῶν ἀνέστησεν μόνος | τιμὰς πιτνοῦσας ἀνοσίων ἀνδρῶν ὕπο, 1252 εὐεργέτης βροτοῖσι καὶ μέγας φίλος, 1309–10 τοὺς εὐεργέτας | Ἑλλάδος; Sen. *HF* 249–51 *orbe defenso caret*, | *sensere terrae pacis auctorem suae* | *abesse*, 271–2 *qui scelera terra quique persequitur mari* | *ac saeva iusta sceptrā confringit manu*, 441–6 *post tot ingentis uiri* | *memoranda facta postque pacatum manu* | *quodcumque Titan ortus et labens uidet*, | *post monstra tot perdomita, post Phlegram impio* | *sparsam cruore postque defensos deos* | *nondum liquet de patre?*, 831 *iusserat* [sc. Eurystheus] *mundi penetrare fundum*, 882–8 *Pax est Heraclea manu* | *Auroram inter et Hesperum*, | *et qua sol medium tenens* | *umbras corporibus negat*; | *quodcumque alluitur solum* | *longo Tethyos ambitu*, | *Alcidae domuit labor*. Cf. also the evidence in Brommer (1984) 60–3 and Jourdain-Annequin (1980/1).

²⁶⁹ Cf. *O.* 10, the central narrative of which presents the foundation of the Olympic Games by Heracles as the establishment of a chronological system; this establishment is reflected in the narratology of the ode: before the foundation, events are not arranged in chronological order, and after the establishment, they are arranged in a catalogue; cf. Nassen (1975), Kromer (1976), Hubbard (1985) 68–9, Theunissen (2002) 612–13, Nünlist (2007) 240. On the Olympic Games as a chronological system, cf. Hippias *VS* 89 B3 (τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους ἐξακριβῶσαι χαλεπὸν ἐστι, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ὀλυμπιονικῶν ἀναγομένους, ὧν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ὀψέ φασιν Ἰππίαν

life is shown as one of tireless toiling, and the reward for these toils is his acceptance as a god on Olympus. As opposed to Bacchylides 5 and Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*, which seem to decidedly omit the hero's apotheosis, in Pindar's odes there is not even a hint at Heracles' physical death at the hands of Deianeira. Instead, as in Hesiod's *Theogony*,²⁷⁰ the reward follows the toils directly.²⁷¹ Arguably, this can be seen as an attempt to facilitate the parallelism of Heracles' cultural exploits with the victor's athletic training, and of Heracles' apotheosis with the athlete's experience at the moment of victory, while smoothing out elements that would disturb the parallelism, such as Heracles' death.

ἐκδοῦναι τὸν Ἥλειον, ἀπ' οὐδενὸς ὀρμώμενον ἀναγκαίου πρὸς πίστιν), Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 T10, Eratosthenes *FGrHist* 241 F1a, and Censorinus *DN* 21 *et si origo mundi in hominum notitiam uenisset, inde exordium sumeremus; nunc uero id interuallum temporis tractabo, quod historicon Varro appellat. Hic enim tria discrimina temporum esse tradit: . . . tertium a prima Olympiade ad nos, quod dicitur historicon, quia res in eo gestae ueris historiis continetur.*

²⁷⁰ Cf. Hes. *Thg.* 950–5 Ἥβην δ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλιφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱός, | ἵς Ἡρακλῆος, τελέεας σπονόμεντας ἀέθλους, | παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἥρας χρυσοπεδύλου, | αἰδοίην θέτ' ἄκοιτιν ἐν Οὐλύμπω νιφόνετι· | ὄλβιος, ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσει | ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἡματα πάντα. Note the emphasis here on toils (τελέεας σπονόμεντας ἀέθλους, μέγα ἔργον ἀνύσσει).

²⁷¹ The same can be observed at the end of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, where Heracles appears as *deus ex machina* on top of the stage building; on the staging, cf. Schein (2013) 334–5 on 1409–17. Heracles refers to his immortality as a reward for his toils (1413–14 τὴν σὴν δ' ἤκω χάριν οὐρανίαν | ἔδρας προλίπων, 1418–20 καὶ πρῶτα μὲν σοὶ τὰς ἐμὰς λέξω τύχας, | ὅσους πονήσας καὶ διεξελθὼν πόνους | ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν ἔσχον, ὥς πάρεσθ' ὀρᾶν), but fails to state whether he had to die first. At the end of his speech, he seems to blur this question deliberately (1443–4 οὐ γὰρ ἠυξέβεια συνθνήσκει βροτοῖς | κἄν ζῶσι κἄν θάνωσιν, οὐκ ἀπόλλυται). The suggestion of Schein (2013) 335, that 'an Athenian audience would have been predisposed to consider [Heracles'] appearance *ex machina* ethically and dramatically appropriate, because of his legendary initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries and worship in Attica as a cult-hero who "wards off harm (Ἀλεξίκακος)" and in other cities as saviour (Σώτηρ)' seems far-fetched; Heracles' apotheosis is a well-established literary motif. For omission of Heracles' death, cf. also Cat. 68.113–16 (*Amphitryoniades*) *tempore quo certa Stymphalia monstra sagitta | perculit imperio deterioris eri, | pluribus ut caeli tereretur ianua diuis, | Hebe nec longa uirginitate foret.*

NEMEAN 1

A good first example to study such potential parallelism between Heracles and the victor is found in *Nemean 1*.²⁷² The narrative about Heracles, which unfolds in the last two of the four triads (35–72), is introduced as one about excellence (33–4 ἐγὼ δ' Ἡρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως | ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετῶν μεγάλαις, ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων λόγον), and, through this theme, is generally connected with Chromius' victory. Moreover, as the *gnōmē* preceding the narrative indicates (32–3 κοινὰ γὰρ ἔρχοντ' ἐλπίδες | πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν), a second, more particular topic concerns hopes and expectations,²⁷³ and indeed the first part of the narrative (35–59) relates Heracles' first adventure as a precursor of his future successes (esp. 56–7 ἐκνόμιον | λῆμά τε καὶ δύναμιν). This topic evidently serves as a point of comparison between Heracles and Chromius, in whom a similar relationship between prodigious origins and a career that lives up to the expectations arising from such origins is recognised earlier in the ode (8–9 ἀρχαὶ δὲ βέβληνται θεῶν | κείνου σὺν ἀνδρὸς δαιμονίαις ἀρεταῖς).²⁷⁴ The precise nature of Chromius' origins is beyond our grasp, but their vague formulation would seem to allow, if not encourage, a connection with the following account of the hero's origins.

²⁷² Cf. Radt (1966) 167, Braswell (1992) 56, Erbse (1999) 14–15 'Die Leistungen des Herakles sind ein idealisiertes Bild der Taten des sizilianischen Feldherrn', Nicholson (2001) 87, Currie (2005) 1–2, and Σ *N.* 1.49b ἐπαπορήσειεν ἄν τις διατί τοῦ Ἡρακλέους μνημονεύει· οὐ γὰρ εὐκαιρὸς δοκεῖ ἡ μνήμη νῦν Ἡρακλέους. καὶ φαμεν, ὅτι βουλόμενος δεῖξαι, ὥς οἱ διαφανεῖς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἀθάνατοι γίνονται τῇ μνήμῃ, διὰ τοῦτο μέμνεται Ἡρακλέους ἀρετῆς, ἐπιφέρων τοῖς τοῦ Χρομίου θαύμασιν. Cf., *contra*, Wilamowitz (1922) 256 'Da haben sich schon die alten Erklärer den Kopf zerbrochen, was die Heraklesgeschichte mit Chromios zu tun hätte. Da gibt's freilich keine Verbindung, aber Pindar sagt ja auch, daß ihn seine Neigung leitet'.

²⁷³ On the ambivalent connotations of ἐλπίδες at this point of the ode, and its gradual revelation as a positive term, cf. Bundy (1962) 87 and Theunissen (2002) 347–8.

²⁷⁴ Cf. Radt (1966) 167–8, W. Rose (1974), and the restrictions in Erbse (1999) 14–15.

In the second part of the narrative, when Tiresias is summoned to interpret the events and foretell Heracles' career (60–72), the parallelism between Chromius and Heracles is further explored and enriched by a parallelism between the *laudator* and the prophet.²⁷⁵ Pindar's choice to introduce a secondary narrator, who relates Heracles' career in prior narrative (a prophecy), rather than to continue in subsequent narrative through the mouth of the primary narrator, is noteworthy.²⁷⁶ On the one hand, by leaving the narratological point of reference in Heracles' childhood, this kind of narrative allows the poem to develop further the theme of prodigious origins. On the other hand, it allows Pindar to reflect in the activity of Tiresias the activity of the *laudator*, who, after all, relates the prophecy in reported speech. Like the prophet, the *laudator* recognises in his subject an extraordinary degree of excellence. The precise nature of the correspondence between Heracles' labours and Chromius' career must remain unclear, but, if the biographical data provided by the scholia is correct, it is tempting to see a connection between Heracles' fights on land and at sea (62–3 ὄσσους μὲν ἐν χέρσῳ κτανών | ὄσσους δὲ πόντῳ θήρασ ἀϊδροδίκας) and Chromius' naval and military campaigns,²⁷⁷ and between Heracles' marriage with Hebe (71–2

²⁷⁵ Cf. Indergaard (2011b) 81–2. The following interpretation does not exclude a further parallelism between the *laudator* and Amphitryon, who both *stand* in awe of extraordinary deeds (19–20 ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείας θύραις | ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου καλὰ μελπόμενος, 55–6 ἔστα δὲ θάμβει δυσφύρῳ | τερπνῶι τε μυχθεῖς); cf. Nicholson (2001) 87.

²⁷⁶ The terminology is that of de Jong and Nünlist (2007) xi–xiii. Nünlist (2007) does not consider *N.* 1, but states in 233 n. 2 that 'prior narrative seems to be confined to secondary narratives'. We cannot determine whether the role of Tiresias in this story is a Pindaric invention because no older account has survived; Tiresias does, for what it is worth, feature in the treatments in Theocr. 24.64–8, [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 2.4.8, and Plaut. *Amph.* 1128–9.

²⁷⁷ Cf. *N.* 9.34–43, esp. 34–5 Χρομίῳ κεν ὑπασπίζων παρὰ πεζοβόαις ἵπποις τε ναῶν τ' ἐν μάχαις ἔκρινας, and Σ *P.* 2.36^c Ἀναξίλα τοῦ Μεσσήνης καὶ Ῥηγίου τυράννου πολεμοῦντος Λοκροῖς Ἰέρων πέμψας Χρόμιον τὸν κηδεστὴν διηπείλησεν αὐτῷ.

δεξάμενον θαλερὰν Ἥβην ἄκοιτιν καὶ γάμον | δαΐσαντα παρ Δὶ Κρονίδαι) and Chromius' marriage with one of Hieron's sisters.²⁷⁸

However, there is a temporal difference between the prophet and the epinician *laudator*, as the former predicts future events, whereas the latter recounts events past and present. This temporal difference is important for understanding the account of Heracles' apotheosis at the end of the narrative and of the ode as a whole (69–72). In this account, the explicitness of καμάτων μεγάλων ποινά (70) invites comparison between Heracles' apotheosis and Chromius' reward for his victory at Nemea.²⁷⁹ As follows from the difference between *laudator* and prophet, this reward is not likely to refer to something that Chromius is to expect of the future, such as poetic or cultic immortality,²⁸⁰ but to something that he has experienced already or that he is experiencing during the performance of the ode. Noteworthy in this respect is the emphasis that the account of Heracles' life on Olympus places on feasting (71–2 γάμον | δαΐσαντα) and sympotic peace (69 ἐν εἰρήναι τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐν cχερῶι, 71 ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμοις). This emphasis seems to correlate with the imagined performative context

²⁷⁸ Cf. Σ N. 9.95^b (= Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F212) ἐπιτρόπους δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς μετ' ἐκεῖνον κατέστησεν Ἀριστόνουν καὶ Χρόμιον τοὺς κηδετάς· τούτοις γὰρ ὁ Γέλων δέδωκε τὰς ἀδελφάς, Σ P. 2.36^c Χρόμιον τὸν κηδετὴν (see above, n. 277). On the relationship between Hieron and Chromius, cf. also Σ N. 9 *inscr.* ὁ δὲ Χρόμιος οὗτος φίλος ἦν Ἰέρωνος, κατασταθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τῆς Αἴτνης ἐπίτροπος. See also Radt (1966) 196–8, (2002) 21 n. 51, W. Rose (1974) 169 with n. 72, Braswell (1992) 82. See, however, the *caveat* in Privitera (1972a) 48–50, and Erbse (1999) 14–15 '... daß es Pindar hier nicht um den Vergleich von Lebensläufen geht, sondern um die Verwandtschaft der Grundlagen, auf denen die Vorzüge beider Männer beruhen.'

²⁷⁹ So interprets already Σ N. 1.49^c ὡς οὖν οὗτος ἑπαθλον πόνων ἔλαβε τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν, οὕτω καὶ Ἡρακλῆς πολλὰ ταλαιπωρήσας ἑπαθλον ἔσχε τὴν ἀθανασία καὶ τὸν γάμον τῆς Ἥβης.

²⁸⁰ Cf. Currie (2005) 2 'There is an implied parallelism between Chromios and Herakles; one is left wondering about its exact extent, and about Chromios' future after his death.'

of the ode (compare 21–2 ἔνθα μοι ἀρμόδιον | δεῖπνον κεκόσμηται).²⁸¹ The victory symposium in Syracuse (or Aetna) and the wedding symposium on Olympus are presented as parallel activities.²⁸² This performative parallelism assumes a striking effect at the end of the ode, which does not lead back to the *hic et nunc* via a gnomic statement or a similar rhetorical device, as happens in all other odes except *Nemean* 10 (see above, n. 239), but leaves us with the tranquil image of Heracles' feasting on Olympus. The divine symposium, it seems, is so similar to its mortal counterpart that it evokes in itself the *hic et nunc*, as imagined by the *laudator*, in the minds of the original audience and the modern reader.²⁸³

While both feasts follow as the reward for the respective protagonist's exploits, *Nemean* 1 is careful to point out a temporal difference between them. Heracles' reward is explicitly said to last forever (69 τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον), which seems to imply that Chromius' reward is confined to the duration of this particular symposium. In terms of quality, however, the ode states no fundamental difference. The victory symposium held in his honour means for Chromius a taste of the everlasting bliss that Heracles enjoys on Olympus.

²⁸¹ This is not to say that the primary performative context of *Nemean* 1 was necessarily the symposium, as it is taken by Wilamowitz (1922) 254, Krummen (1990) 276, Carey (2007) 204, and Morrison (2007) 24–5. It seems more likely that the *laudator* entertains here, as elsewhere, the fiction of sympotic performance.

²⁸² Cf. Rose (1974) 169–70, Krummen (1990) 56–7, Indergaard (2011b) 90–1.

²⁸³ Cf. Clay (1999) and Indergaard (2011b) 92.

ISTHMIAN 4

While *Nemean* 1 presents Heracles' apotheosis as the result of his adventures generally, two other narratives, found in *Isthmian* 4 and *Nemean* 3, connect his immortalisation with the particular journey to the west and the erection of the pillars that antiquity was to name in his honour. The Pillars of Heracles are a prominent theme in the Pindaric corpus, denoting the geographical end of the mortal world, beyond which lies the immortal realm,²⁸⁴ to traverse that boundary would be dangerous if not deadly.²⁸⁵ As a metaphor, extending the image of the journey, the Pillars mark a point on a path from where there is no safe continuing, and so they can reflect either the *laudandus*' path of achievement or the *laudator*'s path of song.²⁸⁶ The world within the Pillars and the one beyond form a dichotomy that is evaluated in terms similar to those of the gnostic dichotomies between near and far, familiar and strange, or mortal and immortal.²⁸⁷ Here, however, the dichotomy is complicated by the fact that Heracles is, in all other accounts of the myth, a paradigm not merely for reaching the limit demarcated by

²⁸⁴ Atlantis is meant to be situated beyond the Pillars, cf. Hdt. 1.202.4 τὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἑλληνες ναυτίλλονται πᾶσα καὶ ἡ ἔξω Στηλέων θάλασσα ἡ Ἀτλαντὶς καλεομένη καὶ ἡ Ἐρυθρὴ μία ἐοῦσα τυγχάνει, Plat. *Crit.* 108^e τοῖς θ' ὑπὲρ Ἡρακλείας στήλας.

²⁸⁵ Cf. P. *I.* 4.29–31 ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν | οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἄπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις· | καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν, *N.* 3.19–21 εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' εἰκότα μορφᾷ | ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος, οὐκ ἔτι [οὐκέτι SM] πρόσω | ἀβάταν ἄλα κίωνων ὕπερ Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές, *O.* 3.43–4 νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἰκάνων ἄπτεται | οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν. τὸ πρόσω δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον | κάδοφοις, and *N.* 4.69–70 Γαδεῖρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν· ἀπότρεπε | αὐτίς Εὐρώπην ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός. See also fr. 256 SM (= Strab. 3.5.5) στήλας, ἃς Πίνδαρος καλεῖ πύλας Γαδειρίδας, εἰς ταύτας ὑστάτας ἀφίχθαι φάσκων τὸν Ἡρακλέα.

²⁸⁶ Cf. Indergaard (2011b) 119–22, 149, and above, n. 244. Cf., e.g., *N.* 4.69–70, where the reference to the Pillars of Heracles (Γαδεῖρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν) is subjective as it is followed by the *laudator*'s self-exhortation to return to a more suitable subject (ἀπότρεπε αὐτίς Εὐρώπην ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός).

²⁸⁷ On these dichotomies, see above, n. 241.

the Pillars, but also for transcending it on his way to adventures further into the western sea.²⁸⁸ Although Pindar seems to avoid mentioning this fact explicitly,²⁸⁹ his audiences would have been aware of this connection. As the following interpretations aim to show, the image of the Pillars of Heracles conveys advice not against any attempt to cross certain limitations, but for caution in doing so.

In *Isthmian* 4,²⁹⁰ the Pillars of Heracles appear twice, though once rather obliquely, and in the surrounding context of either appearance we find discourses on immortality. The first appears in the opening triad of the ode, which is dedicated to the praise of the victor's clan, the Cleonymidae: αἴκι (sc. ἀρεταῖκι) Κλεωνυμίδαι θάλλοντες αἰεὶ | cὺν θεῷ θνατὸν διέρχονται βιότου τέλος. ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλοιός οὔρος | πάντα ἀνθρώπους ἐπαῖσσων ἐλαύνει. | τοὶ μὲν ὧν Θήβαισι τιμᾶντες ἀρχᾶθεν λέγονται | πρόξενοί τ' ἀμφικτιόνων κελαδενναῖς τ' ὄρφανοὶ | ὕβριος· ὅσσα δ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἄηται | μαρτύρια φθιμένων ζωῶν τε φωτῶν | ἀπλέτου δόξας, ἐπέψαυσαν κατὰ πᾶν τέλος (22–9). For our purpose, three aspects of this praise appear noteworthy. First, the Cleonymidae are said to cross, with the

²⁸⁸ According to one tradition, Heracles crossed the Pillars on his way to fetch Geryon's cattle, cf. Hdt. 4.8.1–2 (Ἡρακλέα ἐλαύνοντα τὰς Γηρυόνας βόας ἀπικέσθαι ἐς γῆν ταύτην ἐοῦσαν ἐρήμην, ἦντινα νῦν Σκύθαι νέμονται· Γηρυόνα δὲ οἰκέειν ἔξω τοῦ Πόντου κατοικημένον τὴν Ἑλληνες λέγουσι Ἐρύθειαν νῆσον τὴν πρὸς Γηδεῖροις τοῖσι ἔξω Ἡρακλέων στηλέων ἐπὶ τῷ Ὀκεανῷ) and Diod. 14.18.2, 56.3. According to another, it happened on his way to the garden of the Hesperides, cf. Eur. *HF* 394–402 (ὑμνωιδούς τε κόρας | ἦλυθεν ἐσπέριον <τ'> ἐς αὐλάν | χρύσειον πετάλων ἀπὸ μηλοφόρων | χερὶ καρπὸν ἀμέρξων, | δράκοντα πυρρόνωτον, ὅς <cf'> | ἄπλατον ἀμφελικτὸς ἔλικ' ἐφρούρει, | κτανών· ποντίας θ' ἄλδς | μυχοὺς εἰσέβαινε, θνα–|τοῖς γαλανείας τιθεὶς ἐρετμοῖς), Sen. *HF* 235–8 (*penetrare iussus solis aestiui plagas | et adusta medius regna quae torret dies | utrimque montes soluit ac rupto obice | latam ruenti fecit Oceano uiam*), [Sen.] *HO* 1240 (*his fracta Calpe manibus emisit fretum?*), and Plin. *NH* 3.4 (*indigenae columnas eius dei uocant creduntque perfossas exclusa antea admisisse maria et rerum naturae mutasse faciem*). The latter version is supposed to be the background for Pindar's treatments by Wilamowitz (1922) 278 n. 4, Erbse (1969) 276, and Indergaard (2011b) 155–6.

²⁸⁹ Expressions as ἄς ἔθηκε ναντυλίας ἐσχάτας | μάρτυρας κλυτὰς (*N.* 3.22–3) and the paraphrase in Strabo (3.5.5 = P. fr. 256 SM εἰς ταύτας ὑστάτας ἀφίχθαι) seem almost decidedly ambiguous.

²⁹⁰ It will be assumed that *Isthmian* 3 and 4 are different poems, cf. the discussions in Barrett (1956) 249 n. 1 = (2007) 315 n. 3, Köhnken (1971) 87–94, Willcock (1995) 69–72. For the sake of convenience, the line numbers of SM are retained here.

help of a deity, the ‘mortal end of life’ (23 *cὺν θεῷ θνατὸν διέρχονται βίτου τέλος*).²⁹¹ The meaning of this sentence is obscure, but a notion of eternity and continued existence might additionally be expressed in *αἰεῖ*, which floats between this clause and the preceding participle phrase (*θάλλοντες*). Although relating the adverb to the participle phrase might be more natural (‘always blooming there’), construing it with what follows seems also viable (‘forever cross the mortal end of life’), in which case it would enhance the impression of eternal existence on the part of the Cleonymidae. Second, their hearth is called *μάκαιρα*, a term denoting godlike happiness,²⁹² which here contrasts with the misfortunes suffered in the past (34–35b *ἀλλ’ ἀμέραι γὰρ ἐν μιᾷ | τραχεῖα νιφὰς πολέμοιο τεσσάρων | ἀνδρῶν ἐρήμωσεν μάκαιραν ἐκτίαν*). Third, they have attained the ‘end’ in every respect (29 *ἐπέψαυσαν κατὰ πᾶν τέλος*). Elsewhere in Pindar, the *τέλος* of things rests with gods or godlike entities and is beyond human control (cf. 49–50 *ἔστιν δ’ ἀφάνεια τύχας καὶ μαρναμένων, πρὶν τέλος ἄκρον ἰκέσθαι*).²⁹³ Being able to see all their aspirations fulfilled, the Theban clan exercise a remarkable, almost divine, degree of autonomy. Together, these three aspects characterise a state of prosperity that would seem to separate the Cleonymidae from the ordinary human condition and to approximate them to the unrestricted bliss enjoyed by the gods.

²⁹¹ On the meaning of *διέρχεσθαι*, cf. LSJ s.v. ‘διέρχομαι’, I.1, 2, and Indergaard (2011b) 149 n. 498. This particular passage is granted an otherwise not attested meaning in LSJ *loc. cit.*, I.5 (‘pass through and reach, arrive at’).

²⁹² See below, n. 328, on P. *P.* 10.46 *ἀνδρῶν μακάρων ὅμιλον*, and *O.* 1.11 *μάκαιραν Ἰέρωνος ἐκτίαν*, which introduces a passage of sublime praise. Cf. Thummer (1969) 2.68 on 35b.

²⁹³ Cf., above all, *N.* 10.28–9 *Ζεῦ πάτερ . . . πᾶν δὲ τέλος ἐν τὶν ἔργων*, *O.* 10.16–17 *Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατὴρ δύναιτο θέμεν ἔργων τέλος*, *O.* 13.104–5 *ἐν θεῷ γε μὴν τέλος*, *P.* 9.44–5 (Phoebus) *κύριον ὃς πάντων τέλος οἶσθα καὶ πάσας κελεύθους*, 10.10–11 *Ἀπολλων, γλυκὺ δ’ ἀνθρώπων τέλος ἀρχὰ τε δαίμονος ὀρνύντος αὔξεται*, *N.* 7.57–8 *Μοῖρα τέλος ἔμπεδον ὥρεξε*. In *P.* 4.286, the *laudandus* is praised for *μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν*. See also Aesch. *Suppl.* 100–3 *πᾶν ἄπονον δαιμονίων | ἦμενος ὃν φρόνημά πως | αὐτόθεν ἐξέπραξεν ἔμπεδον | ἐδράνων ἐφ’ ἀγνῶν*, Xenoph. *VS* 21 B25 *ἀλλ’ ἀπάνευθε πόνοιο νόου φρενὶ πάντα κραδαίνει*.

In lines 29–30, the degree of this prosperity is further specified, now from a negative angle, via the image of the Pillars of Heracles, which is explicitly introduced as a metaphor of ultimate achievements (ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισι | οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἄπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις).²⁹⁴ Although the life of the Cleonymidae is described in strong terms, as a state of semi-divine prosperity and sovereignty, the *laudator* knows of an even greater form of existence located behind the Pillars. This existence can only be actual immortality. As this life is unattainable to the mortal clan, the *laudator* explicitly advises against seeking it (31 μηκέτι μακροτέραν πεῦδεν ἀρετάν). Denying actual immortality, he offers, as the ode progresses, an alternative form of immortality that is available to mortals, that is, the preservation of fame in song (58–60 τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾷεν ἔρπει, | εἴ τις εὔειπνι τι· καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν | ἐργμάτων ἀκτις καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεὶ), and he illustrates the effect of this kind of immortality through the examples of Ajax and Homer (53–7). Thus interpreted, the first half of *Isthmian* 4 contains a rejection of literal immortality, which is marked as unattainable by the image of the Pillars, and, as a redress, an offer of metaphorical immortality.²⁹⁵

The relationship between literal and metaphorical immortality, and the notion of their mutual exclusivity developed so far, is complicated in the second part of the ode with the introduction of Heracles as a paradigm for Melissus: οὐ γὰρ φύσιν Ὀαριωνεῖαν ἔλαχεν· | ἀλλ' ὄνοτος μὲν ιδέσθαι, | συμπεσεῖν δ' ἀκμῇ

²⁹⁴ Reading the metaphor on the subjective plain, as a self-exhortation of the *laudator*, is not impossible, cf. Indergaard (2011b) 149. However, the explicit references to excellence make the objective reading appear somewhat preferable. On the obscure οἴκοθεν, cf. Hubbard (1985) 12–13.

²⁹⁵ On metaphorical (exclusive) concepts of immortality, as opposed to literal (inclusive) forms, cf. Currie (2005) 71–8.

βαρύς. | καί τοί ποτ' Ἀνταίου δόμους | Θηβᾶν ἄπο Καδμεῖᾶν μορφὰν βραχύς, |
 ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτος, προσπαλαίων ἦλθ' ἀνὴρ | τὰν πυροφόρον Λιβύαν, κρανίοις
 ὄφρα ξένων | ναὸν Ποσειδάωνος ἐρέφοντα χέεθαι, | υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνας (67–73). In
 this passage, the parallelism between Heracles and the victor borders on an
 explicit comparison. The correspondence is carefully constructed between the city
 of origin (71 Θηβᾶν ἀπὸ Καδμεῖᾶν), the act of wrestling (62 παγκρατίου—71b
 προσπαλαίων), and the relative disproportion between height and valour on the
 champion's part (68–9 ἀλλ' ὄνοτός μὲν ἰδέσθαι, συμπεσεῖν δ' ἄκμῃ βαρύς—71–2
 μορφὰν βραχύς, ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτος).²⁹⁶ The effect of this parallelism is further
 enhanced by the fact that the identity of the mythical exemplum is, though
 gradually revealed, fully comprehended only in line 73, at the dramatic opening of
 the new triad with the words υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνας.²⁹⁷

With the equally dramatic opening of the next sentence, ὅς Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἔβα, the narrative seems to assume a life of its own, somewhat detached from its former purpose, but the parallelism with Melissus remains a relevant background, partly because it is syntactically connected via the relative: ὅς Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἔβα, γαίᾳς τε πάσᾳς | καὶ βαθύκρημνον πολιᾶς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ | ναυτιλίαςί τε πορθμὸν ἡμερώσας. | νῦν δὲ παρ' Αἰγίοχῳ κάλλιστον ὄλβον | ἀμφέπων ναίει, τετίμαται τε πρὸς ἀθανάτων φίλος, Ἦβαν τ' ὀπύει, | χρυσεὼν οἴκων ἄναξ καὶ γαμβρὸς Ἦρας (73–8). The narrative takes the form of ring composition, beginning and ending with Heracles' apotheosis, and supplying in the middle the exploits that secured

²⁹⁶ On the similarities between Melissus and Heracles, cf. also Krummen (1990) 57, Currie (2005) 76–7.

²⁹⁷ Cf. Thummer (1969) 2.76, Krummen (1990) 57 n. 38, Willcock (1995) 83–4 on 52–5.

him this reward.²⁹⁸ Through this stylistic device, Heracles' apotheosis is given emphasis and framed by the praise of Melissus' victory and the celebrations at Thebes (79–85). The latter description of Heracles' life on Olympus (76–8) deserves special attention as it depicts a scene of sympotic harmony and domestic peace (ναίει, χρυσέων οἴκων ἄναξ), of respect (τετίμαται), friendship (φίλος), kinship (Ἥβαν ὀπιύει, γαμβρὸς Ἥρακ), and the pursuit of the 'most beautiful happiness' (κάλλιστον ὄλβον ἀμφέπων), and so corresponds closely to the feast (δαῖτα) held in honour of Melissus' victory. As in *Nemean* 1, it seems, the eternal symposium on Olympus mirrors the victory symposium on earth,²⁹⁹ with either celebration following as the reward for the respective protagonist's achievements. Immortality here signifies the moment of undisturbed happiness, respite, and relief, celebrated among family members and friends, that the victor is able to enjoy in the aftermath of his victory. It is a moment of such joy as is not usually granted to mortals, but is characteristic of the eternal existence of the immortals.³⁰⁰

There is a noteworthy tension between this last triad of *Isthmian* 4 and the preceding three, especially with a view on concepts of immortality. As is argued at the beginning of this section, the first triad seems to discourage from seeking literal immortality; the end of the second and the beginning of the third develop

²⁹⁸ Cf. Krummen (1990) 92 'Als Kultivierungsaufgabe sind dann auch die *athla* gesehen (vgl. ἡμερῶσαι 75), die in der Formel "zu Land, im tiefen Meer und an den Ufern Sicherheit bringend", zusammengefasst sind. "Lohn" ist die Apotheose.'

²⁹⁹ Cf. Krummen (1990) 56–7 'das thebanische Opferfest wird so zur olympischen Tafelrunde, die Grenzen zwischen tafelnden Göttern und Menschen in der Göttergemeinschaft werden fließend . . . Was für Herakles der Olymp, ist für den Sieger Melissos das Herakles- und Siegesfest auf Erden.'

³⁰⁰ Comparison with the description of Olympian harmony in the first strophe and antistrophe of *Pythian* 1 (1–12) can be instructive.

instead a notion of metaphorical immortality. However, at the beginning of the fourth triad, the paradigm of Heracles, who is emphatically asserted to have attained literal immortality, contrasts openly with the cautionary remarks earlier in the ode. In addition, there is a possibility that this contrast is conveyed, on a more subtle level, in the particular image of the Pillars of Heracles, which features in the advice given to the Cleonymidae and which seems to feature also in the account of Heracles' apotheosis. For while the list of the deeds that were awarded with immortality purports to begin broadly, with the all-encompassing formula 'on land and at sea' (73–4 . . . γαίᾱς τε πάσας | καὶ βαθύκρημνον πολιᾶς ἁλός . . .),³⁰¹ it ends with the peculiar detail of identifying a shallow at sea (74–5 . . . ἐξευρὼν θέναρ | ναυτιλῖαις τε πορθμὸν ἡμερώσας). Since a similar task is part of the erection of the Pillars of Heracles in *Nemean* 3 (24–5 ἐρεύνασε τεναγέων ῥοάς; see below, pp. 113–118), it is conceivable, though debated, that πορθμός in *Isthmian* 4 refers to the particular Straits of Gibraltar.³⁰² If this is the case, we would here find a reference to the Pillars in the context of Heracles' apotheosis. Given that the Pillars signify, at the beginning of the ode, the boundaries between mortality and (literal) immortality, Heracles seems to offer a paradigm for the crossing of these limits and the reaching of immortality, and so subvert the denial to yearn for this ultimate state.

³⁰¹ For similar formulas in accounts of Heracles' cultural exploits, cf. *HH* 15.4, *N.* 1.62–3, 3.23–6, and Indergaard (2011b) 153.

³⁰² Thus interpret Bury (1892) 75 on *I.* 3.55, 56, Farnell (1932) 354–5 on *I.* 3/4.55–7, and Pfeijffer (1999) 294–6 on *N.* 3.23–5. Thummer (1969) 77 on *I.* 3/4.75 is more cautious. The decision seems to depend on whether we interpret γαίᾱς πάσας as genitive singular or accusative plural. The latter may not be attested elsewhere in Pindar, but 'the high-cliffed shallow of every land' seems, despite the remarks in Thummer (1969) 77 on *I.* 3/4.73–4, a highly unlikely phrase.

This subversion has an effect, above all, on the *laudandus*, for whom Heracles serves as a paradigm. Literal immortality is as unreachable for him as it is for his clan, the Cleonymidae. However, it seems that, through the paradigm of Heracles, the initial dualism of (unattainable) literal immortality and (attainable) metaphorical immortality is expanded by a third concept, i.e., momentary immortality. Whereas metaphorical immortality resembles literal immortality in terms of duration but not in terms of quality, the *laudandus*' experience seems to resemble it in terms of quality but not in terms of duration. Through his extraordinary achievement, the *laudandus* has gone beyond the Pillars of Heracles, and is now rewarded with a moment of the same divine bliss that Heracles enjoys eternally.

NEMEAN 3

A second ode in which the Pillars of Heracles appear in a suggestive manner is *Nemean* 3. Here, a first connection between the *laudandus* and the world of myth is established after the proemial invocation of the Muse, when the *laudator* measures the victor's achievement against the Aeginetan legacy and so overwrites, with their shared character, the temporal distance between Aristocleidas and the Myrmidones: Μυρμιδόνες ἵνα πρότεροι | ὤικησαν, ὧν παλαίφατον ἀγορὰν | οὐκ ἔλεγχεσσιν Ἀριστοκλείδας τεὰν | ἐμίανε κατ' αἴσαν ἐν

περιθνεῖ μαλαχθεῖς | παγκρατίου στόλῳ (13–18).³⁰³ This connection sets the tone for the brief narrative about Heracles, which is introduced via a *gnōmē* reflecting on the limits of success: εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' εὐκότα μορφᾷ | ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος, οὐκ ἔτι (οὐκέτι SM)³⁰⁴ πρόσω | ἄβάταν ἄλλα κίωνων ὕπερ Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές (19–21). Since this *gnōmē* is addressed directly to the *laudandus* (ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος), an objective interpretation of the *gnōmē*, and of the narrative that is so introduced, would seem possible if not preferable. Moreover, the *gnōmē* is cast in the form of a conditional period, the construal of which affects the meaning of the narrative. Three points deserve attention. First, the *protasis* serves an affirmative purpose rather than expressing a hypothetical or even unreal condition, thus conveying that Aristocleidas has indeed displayed ἀνορεῖν ὑπέρταται in his victory.³⁰⁵ Second, that Aristocleidas could go even further, and so cross the Pillars of Heracles, is not denied in the *apodosis*, but merely stated as ‘not easy’ (οὐκ εὐμαρές).³⁰⁶

³⁰³ Cf. also Carey (1980) 154.

³⁰⁴ On the reasons for reading οὐκ ἔτι instead of οὐκέτι, see below, n. 306.

³⁰⁵ Gildersleeve (1882) 440 lists *N.* 3.19 among the ‘logical condition’, characterised by him as ‘largely a mere *pro forma* condition. Occasionally generic, it almost always has in view a particular illustration of the principle involved’ (439). Cf. *KG* §572.1a ‘... als etwas Gewisses, Unbezweifeltes, Wirkliches, Nothwendiges ausgesprochen; alsdann steht der Indikativ’, and §573 ‘Ei wird mit dem Indikative aller Zeitformen verbunden, wenn der Redende die Bedingung als etwas Gewisses, Unbezweifeltes, Wirkliches mit Bestimmtheit ausspricht, ohne seine persönliche Ansicht über Wirklichkeit oder Verwirklichung des Gesagten anzudeuten.’ Cf. also Gildersleeve (1885) civ, Hummel (1993) 351–2, Instone (1993) 20 ‘“If, as is the case . . .”’, Pfeijffer (1999) 202.

³⁰⁶ On εὐμαρές meaning ‘easy’, cf. *P.* 3.115, *N.* 11.33. The interpretation preferred here relies on construing οὐκ with εὐμαρές, and ἔτι with πρόσω, which would seem natural; cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 287–9 on 20–1, who concludes ‘One would expect something like δύναντον . . . The postponement of εὐμαρές to the very end of the sentence adds to the ἀπροσδόκητον.’ Yet, it is inconceivable why the expression ‘not easy’ should form a litotes. Scholars who read in these lines an exclusive admonition usually construe οὐκέτι εὐμαρές, cf. Carey (1980) 154–5; however, the thought that it was ‘no longer easy to go beyond the Pillars of Heracles’ would, oddly, convey that it was at a certain moment in the past easier for the *laudandus* to cross the Pillars. *N.* 4.69 (Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς οὐ περατόν) cannot serve as a parallel because there the metaphor is subjective, not objective (cf. 69–70).

Third, Aristocleidas has, at any rate, reached the Pillars of Heracles and is confronted with the decision whether to stop or try to go further. The reference to the Pillars of Heracles can thus be read in a dual way, one stating a fact (that Aristocleidas has reached the Pillars of Heracles), and the other a possibility (that he could go beyond them).

The narrative, which, as said above, is likely to depend to some degree on the preceding *gnōmē*, can then serve to elucidate either the fact or the possibility: ἥρως θεὸς ἄς ἔθηκε ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας | μάρτυρας κλυτάς· δάμασε δὲ θῆρας ἐν πελάγεϊ | ὑπερόχους, ἰδίαί τ' ἐρεύνανε τεναγέων | ῥοάς, ὅπῃ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος, | καὶ γὰρ φράδασε (22–6). As for the fact that Aristocleidas has reached the Pillars, there is a noteworthy correspondence between the ἀνορέαι ὑπέρταται displayed by Aristocleidas (20) and the ναυτιλία ἐσχατα undertaken by Heracles (22). Underlying this correspondence seems to be an analogy between geography and athletic prowess. Just as Heracles measured the world (26 γὰρ φράδασε) and defined its limits, so did Aristocleidas measure human excellence and set the limits by which future success will be assessed.³⁰⁷ Along this reading, the Pillars of Heracles represent the standards of the mortal world, by which Aristocleidas' victory at Nemea appears truly extraordinary.

³⁰⁷ Cf. Erbse (1969) 277, Carey (1980) 155 n. 51, and Pfeijffer (1999) 301 on 26 'Heracles reached the end of the world and marked it as such by setting up the Pillars; thus, in defining and pointing out the boundaries of the world, he defined and pointed out the world itself.' As for the parallelism between Aristocleidas and Heracles generally, cf. Carey (1980) 154–8 and Instone (1993) 19, who highlight wrestling as a similarity; and Privitera (1977) 252, who sees a parallelism between Heracles' maritime adventures and the prowess of Aeginetan sailors; on the last interpretation, see however Instone (1993) 19.

As for the possibility, with the phrase ἥρωc θεός, placed emphatically at the beginning of the second triad,³⁰⁸ the narrative also contains a linguistic peculiarity that might indicate that Aristocleidas could go beyond these mortal limitations. It can be observed that in Pindar the term ἥρωc tends to assume religious connotations only outside of mythical narratives, while within it commonly refers to man as opposed to god, as it does in epic.³⁰⁹ Though here, within the narrative, there might be no need to dismiss any religious connotations all together,³¹⁰ the phrase ἥρωc θεός seems to be designed primarily to highlight the dual nature of Heracles, which combines aspects of mortality and immortality.³¹¹ However, the paradox of the ‘hero-god’ is unlikely to convey that Heracles is, at once, fundamentally mortal and immortal.³¹² Where mortality is considered a flaw and immortality perfection, coexistence of the two would seem impossible. Rather, the paradox seems to convey that Heracles changed from being mortal to being immortal. The phrase ἥρωc θεός would then refer, in the most concise way, to Heracles’ quasi-historical transition from ἥρωc to θεός, that is, to his

³⁰⁸ On the emphatic positioning of the phrase, cf. also Instone (1996) 159 on 22.

³⁰⁹ Cf. Carey (1981) 162, Currie (2005) 61–2.

³¹⁰ Cf. the balanced discussion in Indergaard (2011b) 125. Religious connotations are stressed by Σ 38a (διὰ τὸ δὲ αὐτὸν ἥρωα καὶ θεὸν εἶπε; λέγεται γὰρ ὅτι τῆς Ἑλλάδος προσελθούσης τῷ Απόλλωνι καὶ ἐρωτώσης, ὅπως δεῖ τιμᾶν τὸν Ἡρακλέα μετὰ τὴν ἀποθέωσιν, εἶπεν ὁ θεός· νῦν μὲν ὡς ἥρωα, τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ ὡς θεόν) and Instone (1996) 159 on 22. On ἥρωc and θεός as cult titles of Heracles, cf. West (1966a) 417 on Hes. *Thg.* 947–55.

³¹¹ Cf. Soph. *Phil.* 726 ἀνὴρ θεοῖς with Hermann’s conjecture ἀνὴρ θεός, and Indergaard (2011b) 125. Note that for Maas (1954) 199 the oxymoron is so harsh that he preferred to read ἥρωc θεός; against this conjecture, cf. Rutherford (2001a) 409–10.

³¹² Cf. Pfeiffer (1999) 289–92 on 22, linking the phrase with *Od.* 11.601–4 (τὸν δὲ μετ’ εἰκονόχα βῆν Ἡρακλεΐην, | εἰδὼλον· αὐτὸς δὲ μετ’ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι | τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃ καὶ ἔχει καλλίφυρον Ἥβην, | παῖδα Διὸς μέγαλοιο καὶ Ἥρης χρυσοπεδύλου), Hes. *Thg.* 950–5 (see above, n. 270), and sacrificial practice; cf. also Rutherford (2001a) 409–10, linking the passage with P. *Pae.* 15 SM = S3 Rutherford (esp. 36–7 ἡρώδης | θεαρίας), ‘... ἥρωc θεός, which concisely conveys the ambiguous status of Heracles between hero and god ...’

immortalisation.³¹³ The interpretative effort invested in this meaning may appear excessive, but, in the light of the alternatives, this reading emerges as the most attractive one.³¹⁴

Thus interpreted, *Nemean* 3 refers to Heracles' apotheosis in the context of the journey that led to the erection of the Pillars. Like *Isthmian* 4, however, *Nemean* 3 does not state explicitly that Heracles crossed the point demarcated by the Pillars,³¹⁵ nor does it explicitly link such crossing with immortality. Again, these connections need to be supplied by the audience and the modern reader to reconstruct a coherent narration behind Pindar's narrative. Consequently, this narration suggests that the crossing of the Pillars is possible and can be rewarded with great happiness. The double way in which the *gnōmē* and the narrative of *Nemean* 3 can be construed appears to be a careful negotiation between acknowledging the extraordinary nature of the victory achieved, and allowing for the possibility of other, even greater, achievements in the future.³¹⁶ It seems implied that, if the latter were to be reached, it would mean for Aristocleidas to leave behind the limitations set for mortality as they are defined, geographically, by the Pillars of Heracles. This does not mean that Aristocleidas would, upon

³¹³ Cf. also Instone (1993) 19, (1996) 159 on 22 'Heracles, exceptionally, was a great man who after "death" did become a god, and the striking juxtaposition "god-hero" conveys this exceptional duality.'

³¹⁴ Cf., *contra*, Currie (2005) 61 n. 12 'The non-religious use could be understood if the phrase were taken as "(once) a hero, (now) a god", but this seems less probable.'

³¹⁵ Again, the phrase ὅπῃ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νότου τέλος (25) seems almost decidedly ambiguous. Cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 278 n. 4 and Erbse (1969) 276 'Das Vordringen zu den Hesperiden könnte ja ohne weiteres als ein einmaliges Überschreiten dieser Grenze hingestellt werden (man denke an den Perseusmythos der 10. Pythie!). Aber das soll augenscheinlich nicht geschehen' (277); see also 278–9, 291; *pace* Carey (1980) 155 n. 51 'Heracles does not exceed the limits established by Pindar but merely reaches and defines them.'

³¹⁶ Cf. similarly, though by a different interpretation, Carey (1980) 157 'I would suggest that this myth is another example of the substitution of myth for direct praise. Though mythic in form, the tale of Heracles is technically part of the programme.'

winning at, say, Olympia, become a god as Heracles did. It merely locates his past and potential future victories on a scale that measures achievement at the lower end by mortal standards, at the very top by immortal standards.

The geographical imagery employed with the Pillars of Heracles is continued in the gnomic statements that cap the excursus on Heracles: θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπὰν | ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβει; | Αἰακῶι σε φημι γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν. | ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, ‘ἐκλὸν αἰνεῖν’, | οὐδ’ ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες. | οἴκοθεν μάτευε. ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον ἔλαχε | γλυκὺ τι γαρυμέν (26–32). These statements could appear to affect the preceding narrative about Heracles and the Pillars, as they engage in a discourse on appropriate and inappropriate desires, conveyed in dichotomies of distant and near, strange and familiar (26–7 ἀλλοδαπὰν ἄκραν, 30 ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες, 31 οἴκοθεν μάτευε). However, despite the similar imagery, this discourse does not, at least at face value, check the associations that the narrative evokes. The *laudator* prompts himself (26 θυμέ) to return to a subject more germane to the praise of an Aeginetan and so introduces the central narrative about the Aeacidae (32–64). This *gnōmē* is therefore primarily subjective and leaves any possible implication of the preceding narrative intact.³¹⁷

³¹⁷ Cf. Erbse (1969) 279, Hubbard (1985) 35. Additional objective connotations are stressed by Gianotti (1975) 31–2, 47.

ULTIMATE JOY AND THE HYPERBOREANS: PERSEUS

While *Nemean* 1 and 3 and *Isthmian* 4 present Heracles' immortalisation as the everlasting reward for his cultural exploits on earth, the ode that seems to be the oldest in the Pindaric corpus, *Pythian* 10, allows Perseus only a moment of immortal bliss among the Hyperboreans and so might reflect more closely the notion of momentary immortality in the case of the *laudandus*. Though the Hyperboreans feature infrequently in the extant epinicians, there is a strong impression that the life that they live is closer to the undisturbed and uninterrupted existence of the gods than to that of mortals. They are located outside the known world, providing the northern counterpart to the realm outside the Pillars of Heracles in the west, or to the Ethiopians in the south.³¹⁸ They are the favourite tribe of Apollo, who is elsewhere said to spend among them the winter months, when Dionysus rules in Delphi.³¹⁹ Finally, they are attributed eternal, or at least

³¹⁸ Cf. P. *O.* 3.31–2 πνοιᾷς ὀπιθεν Βορέα | ψυχροῦ. In P. *I.* 6.22–7, the Hyperboreans are juxtaposed with those who dwell at the source of the Nile, i.e., the Ethiopians (cf. also Aesch. *PV* 807–9), who in the Homeric Epics enjoy the presence of the gods at their festivities comparable to that of Apollo at the Hyperborean hecatombs (cf. *Il.* 1.423–4 ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας, 23.205–7, *Od.* 1.19–26, 5.282–7). The same juxtaposition appears in Hesiod fr. 150.14–21 MW and might be alluded to in Verg. *Aen.* 4.143–6; cf. also Soph. *OT* 227–8 (οἶμαι γὰρ οὐτ' ἂν Ἴκτρον οὔτε Φᾶσιν ἂν | νίψαι καθαρμοῖ τήνδε τὴν στέγαν).

³¹⁹ Cf. P. *O.* 3.16 δᾶμον Ὑπερβορέων Ἀπόλλωνος θεράποντα. Cf. the story about Apollo spending a whole year, rather than just the winter, among them, apparently related in Alc. 307c V. In P. *Pae.* 8 SM = B2 Rutherford, we find a reference to the second temple of Apollo in Delphi, the 'feathery one' (πτέρινον) that was carried from the Hyperboreans by the wind. Sophocles calls their land Φοῖβου παλαιὸν κῆπον (*inc. fab. TrGF* 4, 956.3). Hecataeus of Abdera (*FGrHist* 264 F7.2) seems to know a tradition according to which Apollo was born in the land of the Hyperboreans. Cf. also the stories in Hdt. 4.34–6 about pairs of Hyperborean women, Hyperoche and Laodice, and Arge and Opis, carrying Apollinian offerings around Greece, and the account about Abaris, the Hyperborean priest who carried Apollo's golden arrow through Greek cities. On these figures, cf. Sandin (2014).

unusually long, lives.³²⁰ Thus, when, in Bacchylides 3, Croesus is saved by Apollo from the pyre and brought to the Hyperboreans (56–66), the god seems to grant Croesus the blissful and deathless existence that is elsewhere said to be enjoyed by those living on the Isles of the Blessed.³²¹

The characterisation of the Hyperboreans in *Pythian* 10 follows precisely this image of the divine tribe.³²² Contrasted with the βροτὸν ἔθνος of line 28, they are called a ἱερὰ γενεά (42), which evokes their special relationship with Apollo, who is also said to take delight in their sacrifices (34–6).³²³ That they live eternal lives could be expressed in the present tense describing their activities (36 χαίρει, γελᾷ, 37 ἀποδαμεῖ, 39 δονέονται, 41 εἰλαπινάουσι, 43 οἰκέουσιν),³²⁴ as opposed to the aorist of the surrounding narrative about Perseus (31 ἐδαίκατο, 45 μόλεν, ἀγέιτο), and in the adverb ἔμπεδον (34), which here seems to mean ‘continually’.³²⁵ A certain indication of immortality is given in the sentence stating the absence from their lives of old age and disease, toil and war, in other words, all possible causes of death: νόκοι δ’ οὔτε γῆρας οὐλόμενον κέκραται | ἱερᾷ γενεᾷ· πόνων δὲ καὶ μαχῶν ἄτερ | οἰκέοισι φυγόντες | ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν

³²⁰ Strabo 15.1.57 reports that Simonides (*PMG* 570 = 288 Poltera) and Pindar (fr. 257 SM, identified—perhaps wrongly—by SM as a reference to *P.* 10.41–2) called the Hyperboreans χιλιετείς, ‘of a thousand years’. A later tradition has the Hyperboreans end their long and happy lives by jumping off a cliff, cf. Plin. 4.89–90, Mela 3.37, Solin. 16.4, Mart. Cap. 6.664, Clem. *Strom.* 131.

³²¹ On B. 3, cf. Jebb (1905) 460 on 59, Cairns (2010) 73–4, Currie (2011) 366 with n. 126. On the Isles of the Blessed, cf. the account in *P. O.* 2.70–80.

³²² Cf. Schroeder (1922) 94, 99, 108, Köhnken (1971) 159.

³²³ Cf. Apoll. Rhod. 4.614 Ὑπερβορέων ἱερὸν γένος. On the connotations of ἱερός, which usually means ‘consecrated to a god’, see Burkert (1985a) 269 and Currie (2005) 237.

³²⁴ The emphasis would have to be on the combination of aorist and present tense (on the aorist here, see below, n. 331), as the present could also denote cultural customs, as it does, for example, in Herodotus’ ethnographical description, cf. KG §382.1b.

³²⁵ Cf. LSJ s.v. ‘ἐμπεδος’, II.

(41–4). The precise meaning of Νέμεσις here is debated,³²⁶ but comparison with Pindar's fr. 143 SM (κεῖνοι γάρ τ' ἄνοχοι καὶ ἀγήραοι πόνων τ' ἄπειροι, βαρυβόαν πορθμὸν πεφευγότες Ἀχέροντος), which describes the lives of the gods,³²⁷ suggests that it simply means 'death'. The description of the Hyperboreans with the term μάκαρες (46), which usually denotes divine bliss and ease,³²⁸ aptly summarises their immortal lives, despite the additional qualification as ἄνδρες.

The precise reasons that led Perseus to the Hyperboreans are not made explicit in *Pythian* 10. There are, however, three aspects of this otherwise unparalleled account that can suggest an answer. First, his visit seems to be connected with slaying the Medusa and, perhaps, with petrifying the Seriphans.³²⁹ A participle phrase seems to state Perseus' bravery as the cause for his visit to the Hyperboreans (44–5 θραεῖαι δὲ πνέων καρδίαι | μόλεν Δανάας ποτὲ παῖς), and this bravery is likely to refer to his struggles with the Medusa and the Seriphans, which are in fact related in the immediately following sentence (46–8).³³⁰ Second, Athena is explicitly said to have showed Perseus the way to the remote region of the Hyperboreans (45 ἀγεῖτο δ' Ἀθήνα), as opposed to Heracles in *Olympian* 3, who found the way by accident (31 τὰν μεθέπων) and was merely welcomed by

³²⁶ Cf. Köhnken (1971) 163–8 and Kirkwood (1982) 242.

³²⁷ See above, p. 4.

³²⁸ On μάκαρ and its implications, see above, n. 13. On its nuances in Pindar, cf. Currie (2005) 229–30. Note that in Aesch. *Choeph.* 372–4 the chorus respond to Electra's wish that Agamemnon had never died with the words ταῦτα μὲν, ὦ παῖ, κρείσσονα χροκοῦ, | μεγάλης δὲ τύχης καὶ ὑπερβορέου | μείζονα φωνεῖς.

³²⁹ The exact chronology of events is controversial. Wilamowitz (1922) 469–70 and Köhnken (1971) 177–9 assume that Perseus slayed Medusa, petrified the Seriphans, and went to the Hyperboreans. Schroeder (1922) 95, Wüst (1967) 24, and Kirkwood (1982) 243 suggest that Perseus visited the Hyperboreans before petrifying the Seriphans.

³³⁰ Cf. Köhnken (1971) 179–80.

Artemis (26–7). Third, Perseus’ visit was only temporary, as the verbs expressing his visit are all in the aorist tense,³³¹ and twice qualified with the adverb ποτε (31 παρ’ οἷς ποτε Περσεὺς ἐδαίκατο, 45 μόλεν Δανάας ποτὲ παῖς).³³² Together, these three aspects create the impression that Perseus’ successes against the Medusa and the Seriphans were rewarded by Athena with a visit to the Hyperboreans and participation in their feasts in honour of Apollo.³³³

This reconstruction of the narration is important for understanding how the narrative relates to the wider context of the poem. The narrative is introduced via a gnomic reflection, which mentions the Hyperboreans in a metaphorical discourse about immortality: ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτ’ ἀμβατός αὐτῶι· | ὅσαις δὲ βροτὸν ἔθνος ἀγλαΐαις ἀπτόμεσθα, περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον | πλόον· ναυὶ δ’ οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὖροις | ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν (27–30). This discourse is explicitly about pleasure (28 ἀγλαΐαις), and in terms of pleasure it contrasts two forms of existence, first, life on Olympus (27 ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανός), which is ‘unreachable’ (οὐ ποτ’ ἀμβατός), and, second, the life among the Hyperboreans, which is found ‘neither on ship nor by foot’ (29 ναυὶ δ’ οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν). Since the image of the road underlies the descriptions of both forms of existence (esp. 30 θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν), the discourse seems primarily to reflect the *laudandus*’ path of achievement, which is said to have reached its furthest point (28–9 ἔσχατον | πλόον). In that case, the discourse would be an attempt to measure Hippocles’ victory and the pleasure following from it on a scale where Olympian

³³¹ On the aorist as the tense of momentary action in the past, cf. KG §386.1–2. On the contrast here with the present, see above, n. 324.

³³² Cf. Schroeder (1922) 95 ‘eine kleine Stärkung’, Erbse (1969) 291, Köhnken (1971) 175, 181 ‘einen kurzen “Urlaub” bei Apolls seliger Heerschar’, Willcock (1974) 195.

³³³ Cf. Schroeder (1922) 95, Wüst (1967) 24, Köhnken (1971) 177–80, Willcock (1974) 195.

immortality marks the absolute top while the Hyperborean form of existence is placed relatively below it. Whereas Hippocles is explicitly denied the attainment of Olympian bliss, it remains ambiguous whether he is meant to match the Hyperboreans. For the poem merely provides two conditions under which the journey into their region must fail, leaving open the question of whether there are other conditions under which it might be successful. Whatever the answer would be at this point of the ode, it seems that through the narrative, which recounts one hero's successful journey to the Hyperboreans, one such positive condition is found. For the narrative is summarised with the gnomic conclusion that, if a deity assists, nothing is implausible (48–50 ἐμοὶ δὲ θαυμάσαι | θεῶν τελεσάντων οὐδὲν ποτε φαίνεται | ἔμμεν ἄπιτον), and the correspondence between θαυμάσαι and θαυμαστάν (30) links this conclusion with the earlier *gnōmē*.³³⁴ The conclusion is evidently drawn from Athena's paradigmatic assistance in Perseus' journey, which the narrative emphasises. Thus, reaching the Hyperboreans, literally or metaphorically, is possible with a god's help.³³⁵ Remarkably, the term θεῶν τελεσάντων also recalls the initial address to Apollo (10–11, esp. δαίμονος ὀρνόντος), which recognises this god's assistance in Hippocles' victory (11 ὁ μὲν που τεοῖς τε μήδεσι τοῦτ' ἔπραξεν). The parallelism between Athena's assistance for Perseus and Apollo's assistance for Hippocles could then indicate that the experience enjoyed by Hippocles subsequent to his victory is a reward for his

³³⁴ Cf. Hubbard (1985) 23.

³³⁵ Cf. Köhnken (1971) 176, who, perhaps unnecessarily, thinks of an aerial journey made possible by Persues' winged sandals; but, when a deity is involved, one could think of other ways also. Cf. also Perón (1974) 70, Hubbard (1985) 19–20, Indergaard (2011b) 160–6. Cf., *contra*, Verdenius (1975) 201.

previous struggles, and that this experience is a metaphorical reaching of the Hyperboreans.³³⁶

The exact nature of this experience can further be specified by performative considerations. For what Perseus is primarily granted among the Hyperboreans is the participation in their lavish sacrificial banquets held in honour of Apollo (cf. 31 παρ' οἷς ποτε Περσεὺς ἐδαίκατο). In the description of these banquets, the emphasis on sympotic revelling (40 δάφναι τε χρυσέαι κόμας ἀναδύσαντες εἰλαπινάζουσιν εὐφρόνως) and on musical accompaniment (37–9 Μοῖσα δ' οὐκ ἀποδαμῇ | τρόποις ἐπὶ σφετέροισι· παντῶν δὲ χοροὶ παρθένων | λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν δονέονται) deserves attention as it seems to parallel the imagined celebrations in Thessaly described in the following triad, just as the descriptions of Heracles' life on Olympus parallel the victory celebrations in *Nemean* 1 and *Isthmian* 4 (see above, pp. 104 and 111).³³⁷ Here, too, we find choral songs (56–7 ὅπ' ἀμφὶ Πηνεῖδὸν γλυκεῖαν προχέοντων ἐμάν | τὸν Ἴπποκλέαν

³³⁶ Cf. Köhnken (1971) 174 'Pindars Darstellung der Hyperboreer in *Pyth.* 10 aber, ebenso wie die der Seligen in *O.* 2.69ff., zeigt, daß für einen Sterblichen der Zugang zur "Heerschar der Seligen" prinzipiell nicht ausgeschlossen ist, vorausgesetzt, ein Gott verhilft ihm dazu. . . . Nicht zufällig also hat Pindar seine Aussage über den "wunderbaren Weg" in die Gefilde der Hyperboreer . . . soviel vorsichtiger formuliert als das kategorische "Niemals!" über den Aufstieg in den ehernen Himmel', 183 'Wenn Athene den Perseus dorthin geführt hat, warum sollte dann nicht Apoll, der Gott der pythischen Festspiele (10) und der Schutzpatron der Hyperboreer (35), auch den Phrikias als Lohn für seine glänzenden Siege einen Besuch bei den Hyperboreern ermöglichen können?' Cf., *contra*, Wilamowitz (1922) 128 'Die dem Sterblichen unzugängliche Seligkeit, an der sich der Gott erfreuen kann, paßt auch zu dem Gedanken, in dem sie hier erscheint, als Gegensatz zu dem höchsten Menschenglück.' Cf. also Radt (1974) 119.

³³⁷ Cf., *int. al.*, P. *O.* 10.73–7. See Gildersleeve (1885) 350 'The land of the Hyperboreans is a glorified Thessaly', Krummen (1990) 256 *ad loc.* 'Der Sinn des Bildes ist klar. Es ist ein Bild der Glückseligkeit, für das die Hyperboreer stehen, repräsentiert durch das Symposium, wo man alles los ist, was bedrücken kann, Krankheit, Alter und Tod, wo Friede und Glück herrschen. Dadurch aber sind die Hyperboreer das ideale Spiegelbild des menschlichen Symposiums, wo reichlich Essen, Wein, Heiterkeit, Kränze im Haar, usw. die Illusion hyperboreischer Heiterkeit erwecken.' Cf. similarly Indergaard (2011b) 162 and, differently, Cairns (2010) 72 'In Pindar's earliest ode . . . the hero Perseus as an exceptional privilege is entertained in their world of perpetual festive cheer (a world which in its permanent felicity constitutes the perfection at which the transient bliss of the victory celebration can only approximate)'.

ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον σὺν αἰοδαῖς), groups of young women (59 παρθένοισι), an atmosphere of friendship (66 φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων ἄγοντα προφρονώς) and love (59–60 ἔρωτες), and, significantly, laurel wreaths (58 στεφάνων θαητόν). Moreover, the combination of instruments played at the Hyperborean hecatombs (39 λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν δονέονται) recalls the instrumentation in the description of victory celebrations in other odes (e.g., *O.* 10.93–4 . . . τὴν δ' ἀδυεπὴς τε λύρα | γλυκύς τ' αὐλὸς ἀναπάσσει χάριν;). If intended, this performative parallelism would indicate that the victory celebrations in Thessaly provide for Hippocles a form of respite similar to the one granted to Perseus among the Hyperboreans.

This is significant because, as is argued above, *Pythian* 10 attributes central aspects of immortality to the Hyperboreans, even though it distinguishes them from Olympian deities, and presents their eternal feasting as an ideal form of existence. Through the implicit parallelisms between Hippocles and Perseus, and between the Thessalian victory celebrations and the Hyperborean feasts, these aspects of immortality are, to some extent, imported into the characterisation of the *hic et nunc* of the ode. The impression that thus arises is that Hippocles is, like Perseus, granted a moment of divine bliss during the celebration of his victory as a reward for the struggles involved in it.³³⁸ Accordingly, the Hyperboreans, as an image, represent the victor's experience in terms similar to Heracles' apotheosis in other odes. However, what the paradigm of Perseus is able to highlight more accurately than that of Heracles is the temporal limitation of this experience.

³³⁸ Cf. Köhnken (1971) 155, 163–5. Cf., *contra*, Verdenius (1975) 201.

Perseus had to return to the mortal realm after enjoying Hyperborean bliss for a day or so, and so does Hippocles.³³⁹

ETERNAL BLISS, ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, AND HEROISATION: PELOPS

Olympian 1 is the last example discussed here because it presents concepts of immortality more differentiated than in any other epinician. It is among the densest, most famous and, thereby, most controversial Pindaric compositions, and the following interpretation attempts no more than to evaluate the concepts of immortality offered in this ode and their effects on the characterisation of the *laudandus*. Questions aimed at the expectations of the historical victor, certainly relevant in the case of Hieron, are purposely omitted so as to focus, as much as possible, on the literary connections.³⁴⁰

The first notion of immortality is encountered in the narrative about Tantalus, which is developed in lines 54–64 as an example of divine favour. The gods are said to have honoured him like no other man (54–5 εἰ δὲ δὴ τιν' ἄνδρα θνατὸν Ὀλύμπου σκοποῖ | ἐτίμασαν, ἣν Τάνταλος οὗτος) and, through the gift of

³³⁹ Cf. Köhnken (1971) 181 'Sein Glück [sc. Perseus'] ist im Gegensatz zu dem der Hyperboreer nicht von Dauer. Damit aber nähert er sich dem Athleten an, dessen Erfolg Pindars Gedicht feiert. . . . Auch sie erleben bei der Siegesfeier das höchste Glück, doch ist es für sie als Sterbliche, genau wie das des Perseus bei den Hyperboreern, zeitlich begrenzt.'

³⁴⁰ On Hieron's anticipation of heroic worship being reflected in *Olympian* 1, cf. Gerber (1982) xi–xv, Slater (1989) 466, Currie (2005) 75, 311.

nectar and ambrosia, to have made him immortal (63–4 νέκταρ ἀμβροσίαν τε . . . οἴσιν ἄφθιτον θέν νιν). Tantalus enjoyed the highest form of immortality available, the Olympian immortality. Like Heracles, he could have enjoyed this state indefinitely, but he was unable to sustain satisfaction even with so exceptional a life (55–6 ἀλλὰ γὰρ καταπέσσει | μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη). He transgressed (60–4), and was punished heavily (56–9). His life of eternal happiness was turned into its extreme opposite (59 ἐμπεδόμοχθον). In this respect, Tantalus' fate resembles that of Ixion, recounted in *Pythian* 2, who also enjoyed a blissful life among the gods (25–6 εὐμενέεσσι γὰρ παρὰ Κρονίδαις | γλυκὺν ἐλὼν βίον), but who, out of a similar form of greed (26 μακρὸν οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν ὄλβον), transgressed and suffers eternal punishment (30 ἐξαιρετον ἔλε μόχθον). Like the example of Ixion, the episode about Tantalus contains advice against unreasonable yearning for more (56–7 κόρωι δ' ἔλεν | ἅταν ὑπέροπλον), when the *status quo* is undoubtedly the highest attainable.

As opposed to *Pythian* 2, the negative example of Tantalus is here outweighed by the fate of his son Pelops, which forms the central part of the narrative (65–96).³⁴¹ Along with his father, he enjoyed supreme immortality, but, following his father's transgression, he was allotted the life of ordinary mortals (66 μετὰ τὸ ταχύποτμον αὖτις ἀνέρων ἔθνος). This life on earth, which at first might appear as a form of undeserved punishment, proves to be the testing ground for the hero's virtues. After a series of heroic feats (67–89), Pelops manages to

³⁴¹ One might wonder how the example of Ixion could feature as a paradigm for the *laudandus* and his achievements. In an ode written for Hieron, however, the role of the *laudandus* seems rather to be reflected in the εὐεργέτας (24), against whom Ixion transgresses. Ixion himself would then serve as a negative paradigm for the *laudator* or indeed for anyone enjoying the generosity of the *laudandus*.

regain a kind of immortality in the form of heroic worship at Olympia (93 τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων πολυξενωτάτωι παρὰ βωμῷ).³⁴² Precisely how this heroic immortality relates to the Olympian form of existence enjoyed by Pelops in his childhood is not made explicit in the ode, but we are evidently meant to regard it as the reward (98 μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν) for his achievements (99 ἀέθλων γ' ἔνεκεν).

There are several aspects of this narrative that suggest an implicit parallelism between Pelops and the *laudandus*.³⁴³ The general plot of the narrative, depicting a series of achievements followed by a reward, can be seen as a reflection of the athlete's career and victory. As in the east pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (see above, p. 97), Pelops' paradigmatic achievement is here the chariot race with Oenomaus (67–88), which seems a suitable reflection of Hieron's victory in the similar discipline of the horse race. Additionally, there is an unusually high number of verbal echoes between the initial account of Hieron's victory and the narrative, especially in the description of Pelops' cult.³⁴⁴ In an interesting way, this parallelism seems also to extend to the kind of immortality that Pelops attained at Olympia. For the sentence that leads from the

³⁴² Cf. also Σ *O.* 1.146^a αἱμακουρίαῖς· Βοιωτικὴ ἡ φωνή. Βοιωτοὶ γὰρ αἱμακουρίας τὰ τῶν νεκρῶν ἐναγίσματα λέγουσιν. ὁ δὲ νοῦς· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ παρόντος ὁ Πέλοψ ἐναγισμοῖς καὶ θυσίαις τελευτήσας τιμᾶται . . . On Pelops' cult in Olympia, cf. Paus. 5.13.1–3, Herrmann (1980), and Krummen (1990) 158–67. That such cults presuppose the death of their recipients is made clear in Soph. *OC* 621–2 ἴν' οὐμὸς εὐδὼν καὶ κεκρυμμένος νέκυς | ψυχρὸς ποτ' αὐτῶν θερμὸν αἶμα πίεται.

³⁴³ Cf. Young (1968) 123 on the 'paradigmatic relationship between Pelops' Olympic success and Hieron's victory', Cairns (1977) 129 'It is clear too that in Olympian 1 Pelops was intended to be identified closely with Hieron of Syracuse', Kirkwood (1982) 44. Hubbard (1985) 158 pursues the adherence or violation of *xenia* by Tantalus, Pelops, and Hieron. Cf., *contra*, Verdenius (1988) 1–4, who concludes that 'the myth serves to enhance the glory of Olympia and hence, indirectly, that of Hieron, but that from a literary point of view it forms a digression which does not have a specific connection with the praise of the victor.'

³⁴⁴ On these echoes, cf. Gerber (1982) 122, 142–3, 145, and Currie (2005) 75.

account of Pelops' heroisation back to Hieron's victory (97–9 ὁ νικῶν δὲ λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίον | ἔχει μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν | ἀέθλων γ' ἕνεκεν), oscillates between the two sections. In this generalising sentence, both Hieron and Pelops are subsumed under the concept of 'the victor' (ὁ νικῶν), and their respective rewards under the notion of 'honey-sweet tranquillity' (μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν). Immortality in the form of heroic worship and the life that follows athletic victory are presented as, in certain respects, equivalent, even if the phrase λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίον appears somewhat strained in the case of Pelops.³⁴⁵

The approximation of Pelops' heroisation and Hieron's victory is further suggested by a thematic parallelism between the myth and the *hic et nunc*. For all mythical examples of *Olympian 1* emphasise a connection between immortalisation, in whatever form, and divine favour. Tantalus received nectar and ambrosia because the gods honoured him more than any other mortal (54–5; see above, p. 126). Poseidon's love for Pelops is repeatedly stressed and offered as the reason for Pelops' being transferred to Olympus (25–6 τοῦ μεγαθενὲς ἐράσσατο Γαῖάοχος Ποσειδάν, 40–1 τοτ' Ἀγλαοτρίαιναν ἀρπάσαι, δαμέντα φρένας ἰμέρωι, χρυσέαισι τ' ἀν' ἵπποις | ὕπατον εὐρυτίμου ποτὶ δῶμα Διὸς μεταβᾶσαι, 86b τὸν μὲν ἀγάλλων θεός). Finally, in lines 43–5, Poseidon's affection for Pelops is compared to that of Zeus for Ganymede, which also resulted in immortalisation (ἔνθα δευτέρωι χρόνῳ | ἦλθε καὶ Γανυμήδης | Ζηνὶ

³⁴⁵ Note that the scholiast felt unease about the ambiguity of the sentence, cf. Σ^a ad loc. ἐξωθεν ἀκουστὸν τὸν Ὀλυμπιακὸν ἀγῶνα. Cf. Gerber (1982) 149–50 on 97, 98 'A comparison is suggested between Hieron and Pelops, since λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίον . . . ἔχει, with its rare use of temporal ἀμφί, makes us think of τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων (93). It is probable that εὐδίαν is intended to remind us of the sympotic εὐφροσύνη which is denied to Tantalus (58), granted to Pelops (90–2), and ascribed to Hieron.' Cf., *contra*, Verdenius (1988) 43 on 97–8.

τωῦτ' ἐπὶ χρέος).³⁴⁶ In the light of this relationship, lines 106–8 are significant; here the *laudator* recognises divine assistance in Hieron's victory (θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν τεαῖσι μήδεται | ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος, Ἴερων, | μερίμναισιν).³⁴⁷ There seems to be an implied parallelism between divine favour in the world of the myth and at the present occasion, which suggests that Hieron was granted this victory by an unnamed deity just as Tantalus, Pelops, and Ganymede were granted immortality by their divine patrons.³⁴⁸

The concluding gnomic statement of lines 113–14 (ἐπ' ἄλλοις δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι. τὸ δ' ἔσχατον | κορυφοῦται βασιλευσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον), with its dichotomy of the furthest (ἔσχατον) and the further (πόρσιον), is often understood to check hopes for immortality and to advocate mortal quietism.³⁴⁹ However, the *gnōmē* is preceded by the *laudator*'s wish to see Hieron succeed also in the more prestigious discipline of chariot race (108–11 εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχὺ λίποι, | ἔτι γλυκυτέραν κεν ἔλπομαι | σὺν ἄρματι θοῶι κλεῖττον ἐπίκουρον εὐρὺν ὁδὸν λόγων | παρ' εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν Κρόνιον). Combined with the statement that 'the highest is crowned by kings' (113–14 τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται | βασιλευσι), which seems to mean that Hieron holds a political dignity independent of further athletic success, this *gnōmē* seems to advance merely an acknowledgement of Hieron's present victory. At any rate, the statement does not seem to specify whether or not

³⁴⁶ Cf. *P. O.* 10.43 ὦραι . . . ἅ ποτε ἀναιδέα Γανυμήδει θάνατον ἄλκε σὺν Κυπρογενεῖ.

³⁴⁷ *Pace* Verdenius (1988) 2 'It is true that Pelops enjoys divine favour and that Pindar *wishes* [emphasis added] Hiero divine favour, but such a wish is a *topos* in his poetry.' Wishes for divine favour are usually expressed in the optative, cf. *P.* 1.56 (for Hieron, οὕτω δ' Ἴερωνι θεὸς ὀρθωτὴρ πέλοι), *O.* 4.12 (θεὸς εὐφρων εἴη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς), *P.* 10.20 (μὴ φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν μετατροπῆς ἐπικύρσαιεν), *P.* 5.117–18 (θεός τέ οἱ τὸ νῦν τε πρόφρων τελεῖ δύνασιν, | καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ὁμοῖα).

³⁴⁸ Cf. also Cairns (1977) 129–30, Gerber (1982) xiv–xv, Verdenius (1988) 47 on 106.

³⁴⁹ Cf. Verdenius (1988) 41 on 114 and, *contra*, Hubbard (1985) 11 with n. 2.

the *laudandus* has attained a moment of immortality in his victory. For as the example of Tantalus illustrates, it is possible, though not advisable, to ‘gaze further’ even when one is enjoying the highest form of existence.³⁵⁰ The parallelism between Pelops’ afterlife as a hero and the *laudandus*’ experience in the aftermath of his victory, which the end of *Olympian* 1 intimates, is not necessarily affected by this statement.

CONCLUSION

Returning, with these interpretations in mind, to Horace and the depiction that he offers of the epinician *laudandus*, we are now in a position to conclude that these depictions seem to represent, not merely the Roman poet’s creative imagination, but rather a viable path for construing a victory ode. The phrases *euehit ad deos* (*Carm.* 1.1.6) and *reducit caelestis* (*Carm.* 4.2.17–18) appear to be apt reflections of an epinician technique whereby the victor is juxtaposed, and thus implicitly compared, with a mythical hero, his athletic achievements with cultural and martial exploits, and his reward with certain forms of immortality. As is stressed throughout this chapter, this technique is suggestive rather than exclusive, because the parallelism is never made fully explicit (although *Isthmian* 4 comes very close to an explicit parallelism). In many odes, however, the world of the myth seems to

³⁵⁰ Cf. Gerber (1982) 173–5 on 114.

complement the *hic et nunc* in such a way that certain aspects of their narrative are tacitly imported into the present celebration and, consequently, affect the characterisation of the *laudandus*. Among these aspects we find notions of immortality, and the effect of a narrative about immortalisation on the presentation of the *hic et nunc* can best be demonstrated at the end of *Nemean* 1.

In the descriptions of immortal life, be it on Olympus or among the Hyperboreans, the focus on sympotic exuberance and similar forms of revelry is noteworthy and, in all cases discussed, lends itself to a comparison with the (imagined) celebrations surrounding the performance of the respective ode. The victory celebration, it appears, is the primary reward for the victorious athlete. As the example of *Olympian* 10 demonstrates, the epinician presents a conventionalised and idealised notion of these celebrations, a notion where the boundaries between mythical past and present occasion are blurred rather than enforced. In this ode, the narration of the establishment of the Olympic Games leads into a description of the first competitions (60–73), followed by the first celebration (73–7 ἐν δὲ ἔσπερον | ἔφλεξεν εὐώπιδος | κελάνας ἐρατὸν φάος. | αἰείδετο δὲ πᾶν τέμενος τερπναῖσι θαλίαις | τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἄμφι τρόπον), to which *Olympian* 10 immediately links itself and the celebration of Hagesidamus' victory (78–83 ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι καὶ νυν ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν | νίκας ἀγερῶχου κελαδηρόμεθα κτλ.). In this conventionalised notion of the victory celebration, it seems, the joy experienced by the victor is so great that it approximates to the bliss of the gods and of semi-divine beings at their eternal feasts.

In the metaphorical language of the epinician, victory seems to entail an experience that is, not necessarily identical, but certainly very similar to actual immortality. There may in fact be no other difference between the two than their duration, since categorical claims of the form *μὴ ματεύει θεὸς γενέσθαι* or *μὴ μάτευσ Ζεὺς γενέσθαι* (*O.* 5.24 and *I.* 5.14; see above, p. 94) can also be read so that, if the victor were able to prolong the present experience indefinitely, he would count as a god. The mere possibility of such prolongation is denied, but this denial does not necessarily involve the nature of the present moment.

The victory odes discussed here are similar to the wedding songs discussed previously in that they present a certain moment in their protagonist's life, and the emotions involved in this moment, as an experience of immortal bliss. There are, however, two important differences between the presentations in the two genres. First, while the use of imagery of immortality seems to be a generic feature of the tradition of wedding songs, the same use occurs, in a distinctive manner, only in a selection of victory odes. Second, while the wedding song expresses an affinity with immortality explicitly, e.g., through terms with specific connotations and direct comparisons with heroes and gods, the examples of victory odes examined here display a much higher degree of concealment and intimation. The two differences appear to be related as the victory ode, with its relatively few performances in a given *polis*, seems generally less conventionalised than the tradition of wedding songs, performed, in some form or other, frequently and ubiquitously. The victory procession, too, as one performative context for victory odes, has elements in common with the wedding ceremony, such as the vehicle,

special garments, and an appropriation of public space, but it would, for its exceptional occurrence, seem to have been significantly more widely witnessed and attended. The risks involved in likening a mortal to the gods too explicitly seem greater at the victory celebration than at the wedding celebration, where convention and cliché can serve to cushion precisely those effects of excessive praise that the epinician *laudator* is always worried about. Composed for Pan-Hellenic occasions, the epinician anticipates a wider audience and can reflect broader aspirations, engaging, for example, in the presentations of a tyrant in front of his *polis*, of a *polis* in front of another *polis*, or even of a *polis* in front of the Greek world as a whole. It seems unlikely that a wedding song, even where it is composed for marriages of political relevance, could have similar aspirations and expose the poet in a similar way if he overshoots his praise in the audience's perception. Echoes of these risks, and of the political motivations underlying them, are still found generations after Pindar, for example, when Nicias tries, in the assembly, to discredit Alcibiades' capacities as a general on grounds that he wastes his inheritance on breeding race horses for the Olympian track,³⁵¹ or when Aristotle is charged with ἀκέβεια for composing what the prosecution considers a paean for the mortal Hermias of Atarneus.³⁵² In questions as delicate as that concerning the relationship between victory and immortality, the ambiguity

³⁵¹ Cf. Thuc. 6.12 εἴ τί τις ἄρχειν ἄσμενος αἰρεθείς παραινέει ὑμῖν ἐκπλεῖν, τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον σκοπῶν, ἄλλως τε καὶ νεώτερος ὢν ἔτι ἐς τὸ ἄρχειν, ὅπως θαυμασθῇ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἵπποτροφίας, διὰ δὲ πολυτέλειαν καὶ ὠφελήθητι τι ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς, . . . Cf. Alcibiades' response in 6.16 οἱ γὰρ Ἕλληνες καὶ ὑπὲρ δύναμιν μείζω ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν ἐνόμικαν τῷ ἐμῷ διαπρεπεῖ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάζε θεωρίας, πρότερον ἐλπίζοντες αὐτὴν καταπεπολεμηῆσθαι, διότι ἄρματα μὲν ἐπτὰ καθῆκα, ὅσα οὐδεὶς πω ἰδιώτης πρότερον, ἐνίκησα δὲ καὶ δεῦτερος καὶ τέταρτος ἐγενόμην καὶ τᾶλλα ἀξίως τῆς νίκης παρεσκευασάμην.

³⁵² Cf. PMG 842. The case is recounted in Ath. 15.51–2, 696^a–7^b; and Didymus in Demosth. Phil. 4.10.32 (= PBerol. 9780, col. 6.22–43). On the context of the song, cf. Ford (2011), esp. 22–5.

employed in Pindar appears as a safeguard whereby the victor, on making the necessary connections, will find himself sufficiently praised, while potential detractors lack an unambiguous foundation for reproaching the song.

TRAGEDY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to show that in drama, especially in tragedy, characters can be ascribed aspects of immortality in ways comparable to the descriptions of the *laudandi* in wedding songs and victory odes. In pursuing within drama a feature that appears to be characteristic of encomiastic lyric, this chapter relies on recent studies in the relationship between the two kinds of poetry. The predominant mode of this relationship seems to operate not through allusions to specific authors or songs (found almost exclusively in comedy),³⁵³ or through the presence and acting of the chorus *per se*, but through the re-enactment of the performances and performative contexts that constitute lyric genres.³⁵⁴ Wedding songs in tragedy and comedy, discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, can provide an example. As far as we are able to judge, these songs are marked as wedding songs not through references to specific songs of, for instance, Sappho, but through adaptations of a certain perception of the bridal couple that appears to be conventional of wedding poetry.³⁵⁵ The same can be observed in the case of victory songs in tragedy and comedy, where we seem to find no detectable

³⁵³ Kugelmeier (1996) on the relationship between comedy and lyric, and Garner (1989) and Bagordo (2003) on the relationship between tragedy and lyric, are focussed entirely on specific quotations. See, however, Swift (2010) 27 ‘We rarely (if ever) in tragedy find something which could be an example of a piece from another genre incorporated wholesale into a play, and we rarely find a direct allusion to a particularly famous piece.’ Cf. similarly, for comedy, Carey (2013) 155–6.

³⁵⁴ For tragedy, cf. Rutherford (1995a) 118–21, Swift (2010), and Rodighiero (2012a) 7–17; for comedy, cf. Carey (2013).

³⁵⁵ Cf. Swift (2010) 26 ‘Yet the language with which tragic choruses express themselves often draws on the language of other genres and other types of choruses. This is not surprising: choral poetry forms a central part of Greek religious and cultural identity, and its *topoi* create a shared network of *mores* and normative assumptions about how one celebrates a wedding, relates to a god, and so on.’ On wedding songs in tragedy, cf. also Rodighiero (2012a) 95–101.

references to paradigmatic songs of Simonides, Pindar, or Bacchylides, but instead evocations of conventional epinician perspectives.³⁵⁶

This view of the relationship between lyric and drama also provides an approach to the *prima facie* difference of status existing between the protagonists of the two kinds of poetry. On the one hand, in the epinicians of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides, and probably in Sappho's non-mythical wedding songs, the figures celebrated are contemporary humans, who would remain mortal even when it is intimated that they temporarily leave behind their mortal limitations. Figures of tragedy, on the other hand, are located in the world of myth, and thus to some extent separated from the reality of contemporary audiences. One manifestation of this difference is the fact that many characters of tragedy retain significant powers or receive individual heroic worship after their death and that others are deified while still alive.³⁵⁷ Fifth-century Athenians did not, to our

³⁵⁶ For victory songs in drama, cf. Wilson (2007), Steiner (2010b), Swift (2010) 104–72, (2011), Carey (2012), Rodighiero (2012a) 73–9, and Rawles (2013).

³⁵⁷ Agamemnon's posthumous powers are evoked e.g. in Aesch. *Choe.* 139–51 (beginning with κατεύχομαι σοι, καὶ σὺ κλυθί μου, πάτερ), 152–63 (esp. 157–8 κλύε δέ μοι, céβας, κλύ', ὃ δέσποτ' ἐξ | ἀμαυρᾶς φρενός), throughout the main ode in 306–478, and in Soph. *El.* 453–4 (αἰτοῦ δὲ προσπίτνουσα γῆθεν εὐμενῇ | ἡμῖν ἀρωγὸν αὐτὸν εἰς ἐχθροὺς μολεῖν). Ajax' tomb will 'forever be remembered by mortals' in Soph. *Aj.* 1166–7 (βροτοῖς τὸν ἀείμνηστον | τάφον), on which cf. Garvie (1998) 231 ad loc. 'the most specific reference in the play to the hero-cult of Ajax', and Finglass (2011) 465–6 ad loc. for a more sceptical reading. Oedipus bargains with his posthumous powers in Soph. *OC* 92–3 (κέρδη μὲν οἰκήσαντα τοῖς δεδεγμένοις, | ἄτην δὲ τοῖς πέμψασιν οἱ μ' ἀπῆλασαν), 287–8 (ἦκω γὰρ ἱερὸς εὐσεβῆς τε καὶ φέρων | ὄνησιν ἄστοις τοῖς δ'), 457–60 (ἐὰν γὰρ ὕμεῖς, ὃ ξένοι, θέλητέ μου | σὺν ταῖςδε ταῖς σεμναῖσι δημόχοις θεαῖς | ἄλκην ποιεῖσθαι, τῆιδε μὲν πόλει μέγαν | σῶτηρ' ἀρεῖσθε, τοῖς δ' ἐμοῖς ἐχθροῖς πόνους), 787–8 (οὐκ ἔστι σοι ταῦτ', ἀλλὰ σοι τάδ' ἔστ', ἐκεῖ | χώρας ἀλάτωρ οὐμὸς ἐνναίων ἀεὶ); his tomb is described as 'sacred' in 1544–5 (ἱερὸν τύμβον); his death is reported as a miracle in 1656–65. On aspects of Heracles' apotheosis in *Trach.* and *Phil.*, see above, p. 75 with n. 271. Alcestis is to receive heroic worship from the chorus in Eur. *Alc.* 994–1005 (esp. 1003–5 νῦν δ' ἔστι μάκαιρα δαίμων· | χαῖρ', ὃ πότνι, εὖ δὲ δοίη). Medea anticipates a Corinthian festival being held in her honour at *Med.* 1381–3 (γῆτι δὲ τῆιδε Κικύφου | σεμνὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ τέλη προσάγομεν | τὸ λοιπὸν ἀντὶ τοῦδε δυσσεβοῦς φόνου). Eurystheus knows of a Delphic oracle according to which he will be worshipped in Athens in *Heracl.* 1030–44 (esp. 1032–3 καὶ σοὶ μὲν εὖνους καὶ πόλει σῶτήριος | μέτοικος αἰεὶ κείσομαι κατὰ χθονός). Artemis installs a cult in Troizen for Hippolytus in *Hipp.* 29–33 and 1423–30 (esp. 1423–5 σοὶ δ', ὃ ταλαίπωρ, ἀντὶ τῶνδε τῶν κακῶν | τιμὰς μεγίστας ἐν πόλει Τροζηνίαι | δῶσω).

knowledge, have any first-hand real-life experiences of apotheosis, and the Athenian public appears to have been careful to bestow forms of cultic worship only collectively on those who served what would be considered the common good, as, for instance, the War Dead of the Persian Wars.³⁵⁸ It seems evident, however, that the gulf between mythical heroes and contemporary audiences is in tragedy not as great as it is, for instance, in epic, and that the tragedians carefully construct parallels between the world of the myth and the world of the audience.³⁵⁹ A systematic parallelism of this kind is implemented in virtually all plays by the onstage performance of rituals and accompanying songs that are modelled on contemporary Athenian rituals, like supplication, weddings, victory

An Athenian cult for Iphigenia is anticipated by Athena in *IT* 1464–7 (οὗ καὶ τεθάνησι καθανοῦσα, καὶ πέπλων | ἄγαλμά μοι θήσουσιν εὐπῆνοιο ὑφάς, | ἄς ἂν γυναῖκες ἐν τόκοιο ψυχόραγεῖς | λίπας ἐν οἴκοις). Castor knows that Menelaus will live on the Isles of the Blessed in *Hel.* 1676–7 (καὶ τῷ πλανήτῃ Μενέλεω θεῶν πάρα | μακάρων κατοικεῖν νῆσόν ἐστι μόριμον). Similarly, Dionysus knows that Cadmus will live there in *Bacch.* 1338–9 (εἰ δ' Ἄρης Ἀρμονίαν τε ρύσεται | μακάρων τ' ἐς αἶαν δὲ καθιδρύσει βίον). Thetis deifies Peleus in Eur. *Andr.* 1253–62. Helen is deified by Castor in *Hel.* 1666–8, by Apollo in *Or.* 1683–90. Rhesus' mother deifies Rhesus in *Rhes.* 970–3. The theory, advanced most convincingly by Scullion (1999/2000), that many Euripidean *aitia* seem to be inventions, would seem to enhance in the audience a sense of distance from these immortalisations. The same happens, more obviously, at the end of Aristophanes' *Birds* with the apotheosis of Peisetaerus.

³⁵⁸ It is debated whether cults for these War Dead conform with the ordinary tendency of the dead or amount to heroic worship. The former is advocated, e.g., by Welwei (1991) 31, Flashar (1996) 73; the latter, e.g., by Loraux (1986) 33, Currie (2005) 89–119, esp. 112–19. See also above, p. 26 with n. 85.

³⁵⁹ Already Aristotle's concept of 'pity and fear' (cf., e.g., *Poet.* 1449^b27–8 [sc. ἔστιν οὖν τραγωιδία] δι' ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν, 1452^a1–3 ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ μόνον τελείας ἐστὶ πράξεως ἢ μίμησις ἀλλὰ καὶ φοβερῶν καὶ ἐλεινῶν) is based on identification with the action onstage, especially when one adduces his definitions of φόβος and ἔλεος in *Rh.* 2, 1382^a22–6 (οὐ γὰρ πάντα τὰ κακὰ φοβοῦνται . . . , ἀλλ' ὅσα λύπας μεγάλας ἢ φθορὰς δύνανται, καὶ ταῦτα ἐὰν μὴ πόρρω ἀλλὰ σύνεγγυς φαίνεται ὥστε μέλλειν. τὰ γὰρ πόρρω ἐφόδρα οὐ φοβοῦνται) and 1385^b16–19 (δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι ἀνάγκη τὸν μέλλοντα ἐλεήσειν ὑπάρχειν τοιοῦτον οἶον οἷεσθαι παθεῖν ἂν τι κακὸν ἢ αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ τινα, καὶ τοιοῦτο κακὸν οἶον εἶρηται ἐν τῷ ὄρωι ἢ ὅμοιον ἢ παραπλήσιον). See also his characterisation of the ideal tragic hero in *Poet.* 1452^b30–39. On general ambiguities in the presentation of time, space, and ideology, which help this identification, cf. Buxton (2013) 145–60. On anachronisms, cf. Easterling (1985), esp. 3 'This leads to the more general consideration that the heroic world was not at all a constraining medium for the tragedian who knew how to handle it'. On the presentation of Athens, cf. Swift (2010) 59 'There is less of a gap between heroic and contemporary worlds in the presentation of Athens, as the city's positive qualities mirror the audience's self-perception.'

celebrations, forms of lament, and burials.³⁶⁰ These utterances and songs tend not to reflect a character's heroic status or possible heroisation or deification at the end of the play,³⁶¹ but are such that they could, in principle, have been used by contemporary Athenians for their own rituals.

This chapter is concerned with conventionalised perceptions of power, wealth, and courage in the plays and the question how, and to what effect, immortality is used to measure these qualities. What follows pursues two forms of these perceptions at different stages of the plots of tragedy, first, a perception of the protagonist presented by other characters before his or her reversal of fortune, and, second, a perception of other characters presented by the protagonist at the climax of his or her downfall. The last part of this chapter examines the parody of these perceptions in comedy.

³⁶⁰ On the interplay of rituals in tragedy and those in real-life Athens, cf. Easterling (1988) 98–9 = (1993) 17, Krummen (1998), Henrichs (2000), Sourvinou-Inwood (2003). On ritual in tragedy more generally, cf. Easterling (1988), Jouanna (1992), Lloyd-Jones (1998). The tendency of tragedy to present ritual in a 'perverted' form does not conflict with this argument, cf. Zeitlin (1970) 351–70, Segal (1986) 35, Henrichs (2004).

³⁶¹ An exception is the choral lament for Alcestis, which promises worship, in Eur. *Alc.* 994–1005 ἐξεύξω κλικίαις ἄκοιτιν. | μηδὲ νεκρῶν ὡς φθιμένων χῶμα νομιζέσθω | τύμβος cāc ἀλόχου, θεοῖσι δ' ὁμοίως | τιμάσθω, cέβας ἐμπόρων. | καί τις δοχμίαν κέλευθον | ἐμβαίνων τόδ' ἐρεῖ· | Αὐτα ποτὲ πρῶταν' ἀνδρός, | νῦν δ' ἔστι μάκαιρα δαίμων· | χαῖρ', ὦ πότνι', εὖ δὲ δοίης. | τοιαῖ νιν προσεροῦσι φῆμαι.

TRAGIC ILLUSIONS

Apart from the differences of status between the protagonists of encomiastic lyric and tragedy, another difference that is relevant to the questions asked in this thesis concerns what might be described as narratological focus. On a broad distinction, it could be said that victory odes and wedding songs are focused on the particular moments of their respective celebrations and explore aspects of these moments from various angles. The present is the predominant time in these genres, whereas ‘the’ past, in its various forms, and ‘the’ future are among these angles. In the epinician, narratives, which introduce the mythical past as one temporal layer, usually do so in parallelism with the present occasion.³⁶² Accounts of the victor’s career, which are concerned with the more immediate past, depict the present victory as the climax of this career. Wishes and prayers for continued success in the future are often concerned with acknowledging what has been achieved. Hence, with its focus on one particular present moment, the epinician plot could be called ‘static’. Plots of drama, on the other hand, are ‘dynamic’ insofar as dramatic action involves developments of present moments.

While victory odes and wedding songs emphasise the happiness experienced by their protagonists in the very moment of celebration, tragedy—and to some extent comedy—presents human fortune in flux. In tragedy especially, the instability of human happiness is a fundamental truth; plots involve, by default, developments from happiness to suffering, from suffering to

³⁶² See above, pp. 87–93.

happiness, or both (as in *Heracles*).³⁶³ The epinician world, too, is aware of the vicissitudes of human fortune, but the achievement of victory is here presented as a momentary transcendence of this aspect of the human condition.³⁶⁴ In *Isthmian* 4, for example, a period of mourning and misfortune for the Theban Cleonymidae is said to end with Melissus' victory, just as spring succeeds the winter storms (16–30, esp. 18–19 νῦν δ' αὖ μετὰ χειμέριον ποικίλα μηνῶν ζόφον | χθὼν ὅτε φοινικέοισιν ἄνθησεν ρόδοις | δαιμόνων βουλαῖς). Similarly, concepts of suffering (πόνος, κάματος, and derivatives) occur frequently, but refer to the labour and pain involved in athletic training, which is relieved in and rewarded by the joy of victory.³⁶⁵ Tragedy, by contrast, so embraces suffering that depictions of

³⁶³ Cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1450^a16–20 ἡ γὰρ τραγωιδία μίμησις ἐστὶν οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ πράξεων καὶ βίου {καὶ εὐδαιμονία καὶ κακοδαιμονία ἐν πράξει ἐστὶν κτλ.} (del. Kassel), and his concept of 'reversal' (περιπέτεια) in 1452^a22–4 ἔστι δὲ περιπέτεια μὲν ἢ εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν πραττομένων μεταβολὴ καθάπερ εἴρηται, καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ὥσπερ λέγομεν κατὰ τὸ εἶκος ἢ ἀναγκαῖον. Aristotle favours reversals from happiness to suffering (cf. *Poet.* 1453^a13–15 . . . καὶ μεταβάλλειν οὐκ εἰς εὐτυχίαν ἐκ δυστυχίας ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἐξ εὐτυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν . . .). So does the hypothesis to Euripides' *Alceſtis*, considering its happy ending characteristic of either comedy or satyr play, cf. Σ Eur. *Alc. arg.* 23–7 (ed. Diggle (1984–94) 1.34) τὸ δὲ δρᾶμά ἐστι σατυρικώτερον, ὅτι εἰς χαρὰν καὶ ἡδονὴν κατατρέφει παρὰ τὸ τραγικόν. καὶ ἐκβάλλεται ὡς ἀνοίκεια τῆς τραγικῆς ποιήσεως ὅ τε Ὀρέτης καὶ ἡ Ἀλκίητις, ὡς ἐκ κυμοφοῦς μὲν ἀρχόμενα, εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν (δὲ) καὶ χαρὰν λήξαντα, (ἃ) ἐστὶ μᾶλλον κωμωιδίας ἐχόμενα. On the underlying assumptions, cf. Gregory (2011) and Silk (2013) 28–9.

³⁶⁴ Cf., e.g., *P.* 3.80–3, 8.88–97, *N.* 6.1–24, *I.* 7.40–4, 3.17–18, and the remarks in Fränkel (1955) 23–35 and (1962) 539–46.

³⁶⁵ Cf., e.g., *P.* *O.* 5.15–16 αἰεὶ δ' ἄμφ' ἀρεταῖσι πόνος δαπάνη τε μάρναται πρὸς ἔργον | κινδύνῳ κεκαλυμμένον· εὐ δὲ τυχόντες σοφοὶ καὶ πολῖταις ἔδοξαν ἔμμεν, 11.4–6 εἰ δὲ σὺν πόνῳ τις εὐ πράττει, μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι | ὑτέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων | τέλλεται καὶ πιστὸν ὄρκιον μεγάλας ἀρεταῖς (contrast *P.* 8.73–5 εἰ γάρ τις ἐσλὰ πέπαται μὴ σὺν μακρῷ πόνῳ, | πολλοῖς σοφὸς δοκεῖ πεδ' ἀφρόνων | βίον κορυσέμεν ὀρθοβούλοις μηχαναῖς), *P.* 5.46–9 μακάριος, ὃς ἔχεις | καὶ πεδὰ μέγαν κάματον | λόγων φερτάτων | μναμήϊ', *N.* 4.1–2 ἄριστος εὐφροσύνη πόνων κεκρυμένων | ἱατρός, 7.74 εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται, *I.* 1.41–5 εἰ δ' ἀρετῇ κατάκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν, | ἀμφοτέρων δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις, | χρή νιν εὐρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον | μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν | γνώμῃς, 5.22–5 εἰ δὲ τέτραπται | θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἂν καθαρὰν, | μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικὸς' αἰοῖδαι | κιννάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων, 6.10–13 εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνη τε χαρεῖς | καὶ πόνῳ πράττει θεοδμάτων ἀρετὰς | σὺν τῇ οἱ δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον, ἐσχατιαῖς ἤδη πρὸς ὄλβου | βάλλει' ἄγκυραν θεότιμος ἐών, 8.8 γλυκὺ τι δαμωσόμεθα καὶ μετὰ πόνον. Cf. also *O.* 2.33–4 ῥοαὶ δ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι | εὐθυμῖαν τε μέτα καὶ πόνων ἐς ἄνδρας ἔβαν, *P.* 5.54 πόνων δ' οὐ τις ἀπόκλαρός ἐστιν οὐτ' ἔσεται, *N.* 6.23–4 ἐπεὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἀεθλοφόροι πρὸς ἄκρον ἀρετὰς | ἦλθον, οἱ τε πόνων ἐγεύσαντο, *I.* 3.17b–18 καὶ ματρώθε Λαβδακίδαισιν σὺννομοι | πλοῦτου διέτειχον

happiness can, at certain stages of the plot, serve to foreshadow impending reversals.

This difference of focus affects the way that the imagery of immortality functions in drama. It has been argued in previous chapters that, in victory and wedding poetry, images of apotheosis, eternal bliss, and Olympian feasting convey the extraordinary degree of happiness that both athletic victors and bridal couples are able to enjoy at the moment of their celebrations. In tragedy, we find similar imagery in the form of comparisons between characters and gods, and this imagery conveys, as in the lyric genres, extraordinary happiness, social standing, and wealth.³⁶⁶ However, since the audience can expect these advantages to be overturned in the course of the play, this imagery has a more sinister effect on the stage than it does in lyric poetry. A reflection of this effect is found in the *parodos* of Aeschylus' *Choephoroi*, where the chorus contemplate the nature of justice: τὸ δ' εὐτυχεῖν, | τόδ' ἐν βροτοῖς θεός τε καὶ θεοῦ πλέον (59–60). As the rest of the antistrophe states, godlike fortune is never more than a temporary impression as Justice, Δίκη, in the form of reversals of fortune, might strike eventually (61–5). The specification ἐν βροτοῖς is therefore important as it indicates an element of illusion inherent in likening a character to a god on grounds of his fortune.³⁶⁷

τετραοριῶν πόνοις. On the rhetorical aspects of epinician πόνος, cf. Bundy (1962) 2.53–4 and Race (1990) 67 n. 27.

³⁶⁶ Pace Roloff (1970) 111 n. 10, who asserts that '[d]ie Perser des Aischylos sind die einzige Tragödie, in der von der Gottähnlichkeit eines Menschen die Rede ist.' This chapter discusses ten passages apart from *Persians* that advance a perception of a character as godlike.

³⁶⁷ In similar situations, simple datives can denote subjective perspectives; cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 711 (Queen to Darius) βίοντον εὐαίωνα Πέρσαις ὡς θεὸς διήγαγε, Ar. *Av.* 722–3 (Chorus to Peisetaerus and Euelpides) ἄρ' οὐ φανερώς ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν ἐσμεν μαντεῖος Ἀπόλλων; | ἦν οὖν ἡμᾶς νομίχτε θεοῦς, Emped. *VS* 31 B112.4–5 χαίρετ'· ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκέτι θνητός | πωλεῖμαι μετὰ πᾶσι τετιμένος, ὥσπερ ἔοικα, Verg. *Ec.* 1.6–8 *O Meliboe, deus nobis haec otia*

What follows aims to show that tragedy is primarily interested in exploring this illusion by depicting both characters suffering from that illusion and learning their lesson, and characters inspiring this illusion in other characters in order to destroy them.

ILLUSIONS SUFFERED

A good passage to start with is found in the second part of the prologue of Euripides' *Hippolytus*. After Hippolytus' prayer, the Servant enters in dialogue with his master with the striking sentence ἄναξ—θεοὺς γὰρ δεσπότης καλεῖν χρέων (88). The meaning of this sentence depends on whether δεσπότης is considered the direct object to καλεῖν and θεοὺς its predicate ('Lord, for one must address his masters as gods'), or *vice versa* ('Lord, for one must address (only) the gods as masters').³⁶⁸ The former construal, however, seems preferable given that both ἄναξ and δεσπότης can be addressed to mortals and immortals alike, and that, when addressed to mortals, ἄναξ seems to be used primarily for kings or princes, δεσπότης for masters by their slaves.³⁶⁹ Thus, if the sentence were to convey a restriction of one of these term to addresses to gods, and thereby a

fecit. | namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram | saepe tener nostris ab ouilibus imbuet agnis. Cf. also Currie (2005) 188–9.

³⁶⁸ On the former, cf. West (1965), (1966b), (1980) 10–11, and Kovacs (1980) 136–7; on the latter, cf., Barrett (1964) 176 ad loc., Glucker (1966), and Diggle (1967).

³⁶⁹ Thus concedes also Barrett (1964) 176 ad loc. 'ἄναξ is a deferential address (whether by slave or freeman) to a king or prince; δέσποτα . . . the humble address of a slave to his master. Both are used in addressing gods; with δέσποτα the worshipper proclaims his humility as that of slave master.' On ἄναξ addressed to gods, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. 'ἄναξ', 1a, 784.37–785.75; on ἄναξ as an address to kings and princes, cf. *ibid.*, 1b, 785.75–787.6. δεσπότης is not used in epic, perhaps for metrical reasons.

reason why this term is not addressed to Hippolytus, we would expect the two terms to be the other way round: δέσποτα—θεοὺς γὰρ ἄνακτας καλεῖν χρέων.³⁷⁰

Accordingly, the Servant addresses Hippolytus as a god, which, in the context of his cautious criticism (cf. the following sentence in 89 ἄρ' ἄν τί μου δέξαιο βουλευσάντος εὔ;), could serve as a means of appeasement, intended to mitigate what might be perceived by Hippolytus as impertinence or even transgression. Moreover, since the Servant's statement is cast as a general rule ('*All* servants must call their masters gods'), it seems to be targeted not at particular aspects of the relationship between him and Hippolytus, but at the slave-master dichotomy in general. We would then expect to find, underlying this statement, an analogy whereby a free master compares to an unfree slave as a god compares to man. The Servant, however, does not make this distinction explicit. It seems instead that, because he perceives his master's liberties from the opposite end of the social scale and feels his own distance from these liberties, he does not differentiate sharply between the privileges of a mortal sovereign and those of the gods. *Hippolytus* thus attests a perspective whereby a character, in the face of his own impotence, perceives another, more powerful character as godlike.

The Servant's statement not only contributes to the social typology of the slave, but, in opening the discourse about appropriate attitudes towards gods, also sets the tone for one of the central issues of the play. In the dialogue with the Servant, Hippolytus advances the view that one needs to worship only those

³⁷⁰ The line is structurally similar to *Hel.* 560 (Helen on meeting, but not yet recognising, Menelaus) ὦ θεοί· θεὸς γὰρ τὸ γινώσκειν φίλους. As in *Hipp.* 88, an initial statement, which seems unproblematic if not expected in the present circumstances, is followed by a surprising explanation. Here, too, θεός is the predicate to the subject (τὸ γινώσκειν φίλους).

deities that conform with one's character while others can be neglected (104 ἄλλοις ἄλλος θεῶν τε κἀνθρώπων μέλει).³⁷¹ While the question whether this view exhibits a degree of arrogance sufficient to justify Aphrodite's vengeance is debated,³⁷² an answer could be found in the way that Hippolytus responds to the Servant. The reaction of other figures of epic and drama to being addressed as gods suggests that it is expected of a moderate and pious character instantly to rebuke the transgression that potentially lurks in such treatment.³⁷³ Hippolytus, however does not rebuke the Servant. This failure to display modesty corresponds to a general impression of Hippolytus as having a heightened sense of himself. In his prayer to Artemis preceding the interaction with the Servant, Hippolytus characterises himself as an individual unlike other mortals, as a chosen intimate of Artemis who enjoys her company and protection (84–6 μόνῳ γάρ ἐστι τοῦτ' ἐμοὶ γέρας βροτῶν· | κοῖ καὶ ξύνειμι καὶ λόγοις ἀμείβομαι, | κλύων μὲν αὐδῆς, ὄμμα δ' οὐχ ὁρῶν τὸ δόν).³⁷⁴ However, this perception of Hippolytus as a quasi-divine individual is unmasked at the outset as arrogance and conceit by Aphrodite (11–

³⁷¹ Cf. the observations of Snell (1946) 121–2 on the allegorical nature of the deities in *Hippolytus*: 'Die Göttinnen Artemis und Aphrodite werden fast zu Symbolen, um psychologische Typen zu verdeutlichen; die Menschen aber gewinnen an innerem Eigenleben und geistiger Beweglichkeit, so daß man jetzt erst von Charakteren und Individuen in der Tragödie sprechen kann.' In fact, the prologue of *Hippolytus* exhibits similarities with Heracles' decision between the 'goddesses' *Kakia* and *Arete* in Prodicus' *Horae*, *VS* 84 B1–2. Cf., however, the restrictions put forward in Mills (2002) 51–2.

³⁷² A traditional interpretation sees in the prologue a display of Hippolytus' arrogance, designed to justify Aphrodite's vengeance; cf. e.g. Barrett (1964) 172–3 and Dimock (1977). On the problems of this interpretation, cf. Kovacs (1980) 133–7, who develops a more sympathetic approach.

³⁷³ Cf., e.g., Menelaus' response to Telemachus' praise in *Od.* 4.79–81 (τέκνα φίλ', ἣ τοι Ζηνὶ βροτῶν οὐκ ἄν τις ἐρίζοι· | ἀθάνατοι γὰρ τοῦ γε δόμοι καὶ κτήματ' ἔασι· | ἀνδρῶν δ' ἣ κέν τις μοι ἐρίσσεται, ἦε καὶ οὐκί, | κτήματι), and Agamemnon's response to Clytemnestra in Aesch. *Ag.* 925 (λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα, μὴ θεόν, céβειν ἐμέ; see below, p. 119).

³⁷⁴ Cf. also Mills (2002) 67 'This [sc. Hippolytus' statement in 104], combined with his belief that he is uniquely blessed in his "companionship more than mortal", indicates that he considers himself to be closer to the gods than to other men.'

19, esp. 17 *χλωρὰν δ' ἀν' ὕλην παρθένῳι ξυνὼν ἀεὶ*, 19 *μείζω βροτῖας προσπεσὼν ὁμιλίᾳς*), and overturned in the course of the play.

Apart from contributing to the characterisation of the hero, the perception of Hippolytus as more than mortal also provides an effective contrast to the figure of Aphrodite, who is portrayed in this play as decisively human. In the prologue, Aphrodite herself states that vengeance is a sentiment shared *also* by the gods (7 *ἔνεστι γὰρ δὴ καὶ θεῶν γένει τόδε*), and so explicitly compares her motives with the inferior sentiments of mortals. At the end of the play, Artemis repeatedly emphasises this aspect of Aphrodite's scheme by criticising her excessive and ungodly temper (1328 *πληροῦσα θυμόν*, 1400 *Κύπρις γὰρ ἡ πανοῦργος*, 1402 *τιμῆς ἐμέμφθη, σωφρονοῦντι δ' ἤχθετο*, 1417–18 *θεῶς ἄτιμοι Κύπριδος ἐκ προθυμίας | ὀργαί*). In succumbing to vengeance, Aphrodite overtly defies the postulate, uttered by the Servant just after addressing Hippolytus as a god, that gods ought to be wiser and more moderate than mortals (120 *σωφωτέρους γὰρ χρὴ βροτῶν εἶναι θεούς*).³⁷⁵ The prologue thus characterises the central conflict of the play as one between a supposedly godlike human and an all too human goddess, and the Servant's address to Hippolytus as *ἄναξ* contributes to this characterisation.

A second example is encountered in lines 590–607 of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*. Though we cannot put too much weight on a passage that may not be by

³⁷⁵ For similar postulates, cf. Cadmus' reaction to the Dionysus at the end of *Bacchae*: *ὀργὰς πρέπει θεοὺς οὐχ ὁμοιοῦσθαι βροτοῖς* (1348). Cf. also the criticism of the gods in Eur. *HF* 1345–6 *δεῖται γὰρ ὁ θεός, εἴπερ ἔστ' ὀρθῶς θεός, | οὐδενός· αἰοιδῶν οἶδε δύστηνοι λόγοι*, and Antiph. Soph. *VS* 87 B10 *διὰ τοῦτο οὐδενός δεῖται οὐδὲ προσδέχεται οὐδενός τι, ἀλλ' ἄπειρος καὶ ἀδέητος*. On the connection between Euripides and Antiphon, cf. Wilamowitz (1889) 277–8 on Eur. *HF* 1346.

Euripides,³⁷⁶ since editors and interpreters agree that these lines would have been performed at some point in the fourth century BC, it may cautiously be included in this discussion. The ode in question is likely to be intended for a secondary chorus,³⁷⁷ perhaps of Argive soldiers arriving in the entourage of Clytemnestra and Iphigenia.³⁷⁸ Evidently unaware of Agamemnon's intention to sacrifice Iphigenia, they hail the arrival of the queen and princess in strong, almost hymnic, terms. Striking in this respect is the repeated exclamation *ιὼ ιὼ* (590), which in drama, to which it is virtually restricted, conveys either grief or calls for divine assistance.³⁷⁹ Moreover, the emphasis on seeing (591–3 *τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως | ἴδεν*'

³⁷⁶ Dindorf (1840) 270 was the first to suspect the passage; cf. also Page (1934) 160, Barrett (1964) 368 n. 1 on Eur. *Hipp.* 1102–50, Taplin (1977) 77, Stockert (1992) 376–7 on 590–7, Diggle (1984–94) 3.381 in app. ('minus fidenter'). Lammers (1931) 103–4 defends the authenticity of the ode, and the edition of Günther (1988) 23 in app. follows him.

³⁷⁷ The reference to *ἄνακτα ἐμήν* (592) provides the main difficulty, and the solution offered by Firnhaber (1841) 138 on 586–7 ('Aber der Chor ist bereits durch die Aufforderung v. 538 in die Rechte des gewöhnlichen Chors der Tragödie getreten, welcher in der nächsten Verbindung zu der Hauptperson zu stehen pflegt.') is rather unconvincing. Bothe (1825) 2.603 in app., Hermann (1848) 7, Hartung (1848–53) 60 in app., Wecklein (1899) 26 in app., and Lammers (1931) 103–4 delete ἐμήν and assign the ode to the main chorus or a half chorus (cf., e.g., Hermann). Another problem is the chorus' apparent ignorance of Agamemnon's plan, and again the solutions offered seem forced; cf. Firnhaber (1841) 138 on 586–7 'Nur in Bezug auf die Pracht dieser Erscheinung kann der erste Ausruf geschehen, wozu die Lage der Ankommenden keinen Anlass gibt. Man darf denselben auch den Weibern zugute halten, die ob solchen Anblicks Alles Andere momentan vergessen', and Busche (1903) 41 on 590–7 'Der Chor darf bei der Annäherung Iphigeniens ihr bevorstehendes Geschick nicht erwähnen; er zieht es daher vor, die Gefühle, die etwa die Soldaten des Heeres beim Anblick der Königin und ihrer Tochter hegen mochten, auszudrücken und trägt so seinen Teil bei zu der tragischen Ironie, die die ganze folgende Partie durchzieht.' A secondary chorus is assumed by Murray (1902–13) ad loc. in app., Wilamowitz (1919) 52–3, Page (1934) 160, Stockert (1992) 376–7 on 590–7.

³⁷⁸ This is suggested by Ennius' reworking of the play, which seems to feature a soldier chorus. However, Skutsch (1953) 197–201 argues for Sophocles' *Iphigenia* as Ennius' actual model, pointing to a correspondence between *otio qui nescit uti | plus negoti habet quam quom est †in illis† negotium* [*in illis δ : in illo γ ; negotio ΠΧ : negotium in negotio* Skutsch loc. cit.] (Enn. fr. 109 Jocelyn, ll. 195–6) and *τίκτει γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐκθλὸν εἰκαῖα χολή* (Soph. *TrGF* 4, F308).

³⁷⁹ Cf. LSJ s.v. 'ιὼ'. The two notions are not always clearly distinguishable, as for instance in Eur. *Phoen.* 1290 *ιὼ μοι πόνων, ιὼ Ζεῦ, ιὼ γᾶ*. In the *pardodos* of Aesch. *Sept.* (78–181), which expresses grief (e.g., 78 *⟨ . . . ⟩ θρέομαι φοβερά μεγάλ' ἄχη*), *ιὼ* features twice to call for divine support: 87–8 *ιὼ ιὼ θεοὶ θεαὶ τε, ὁρόμενον | κακὸν ἀλεύατε*, and 96–7 *ιὼ μάκαρες εὐεδροὶ. | ἀκμάζει βρετῶν ἔχεσθαι*. In the latter passage, the invocation is followed by an explicit exhortation to stop grieving (98–9 *τί μέλ-λομεν ἀγάκτονοι*). Even less ambiguous is the *stasimon* in Soph. *Aj.* 693–718, where the chorus, blinded by false hope, use *ιὼ* in a context of joy, to invite Pan to dance (693–4 *ἔφριξ ἔρωτι, περιχαρὴς δ' ἀνεπτάμαν. | ιὼ ιὼ Πᾶν Πᾶν*; cf. also 706 *ἔλυεν*

Ἰφιγένειαν, ἄνασσαν ἐμήν, | τὴν Τυνδάρεω τε Κλυταιμήμετραν) and on arrival (595 ἐπὶ τ' εὐμήκεις ἤκουσι τύχας) may evoke descriptions of divine epiphanies.³⁸⁰ Furthermore, the entry on a horse-drawn carriage (πωλικὸς ὄχος/ὄχημα, cf. 599, 610, 616, 619–20, 623), reserved in drama for gods and royalty, may enhance the impression of an epiphany-like appearance.³⁸¹

In this suggestive context, the explicit comparison between these two royal women and the gods is particularly effective: θεοὶ γ' οἱ κρείττους οἱ τ' ὀλβοφόροι | τοῖς οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι θνητῶν (596–7). This sentence, too, has received various interpretations, but the most plausible rendering seems to be something like ‘The strong(er) and wealthy appear as gods to those less fortunate.’³⁸² Even if this

αἰνὸν ἄχος ἀπ' ὀμμάτων Ἄρης). *ἰώ* precedes a similar invocation in *Trach.* 205–24, when the chorus rejoice on learning of Heracles' return (222 *ἰὼ ἰὼ Παιάν*). At *OC* 1085–9 (*ἰὼ θεῶν πάνταρχε παντ-λόπτα Ζεῦ, πόροις | γὰρ τὰςδε δαμούχοις | χθένει 'πινικεῖωι τὸν εὖ-|αγρον τελειῶσαι λόχον*), *ἰώ* introduces a prayer for victory just after the chorus expressed their good hopes about a positive outcome for Antigone and Ismene (cf. 1074–9 *ἔρδουσιν ἢ μέλλουσιν; ὥς | προμνᾶται τί μοι | γνώμα τάχ' ἀνδῶσειν | τᾶν δεινὰ τλασᾶν, δεινὰ δ' εὖ-|ρουσᾶν πρὸς αὐθαίμων πάθῃ. | τελεῖ τελεῖ Ζεὺς τι κατ' ἡμᾶρ*). At *Phil.* 737, when Philoctetes' situation is improving momentarily (736 οὐ δῆτ' ἔγωγ', ἀλλ' ἄρτι κουφίζειν δοκῶ), most mss. read *ἰὼ θεοὶ* and Dawe (1984/5) 2.119 prints it; ms. Zg (= Flor. Laur. 32.2) reads *ὦ θεοὶ*, which is now preferred by Lloyd-Jones (1994) 326 in app. Note that Neoptolemus replies to Philoctetes' exclamation with *τί τοὺς θεοὺς ὧδ' ἀναστένων καλεῖς; ἰώ*, with a variety of reduplications, has a distinctly cultic dimension in the third episode of Eur. *Bacch.* Here, Dionysus uses *ἰώ* to call on the chorus (576–8 *ἰώ, | κλύετ' ἐμᾶς κλύετ' αὐδᾶς, | ἰὼ βάκχαι, ἰὼ βάκχαι, 580–1 ἰὼ ἰώ, πάλιν αὐδῶ, | ὁ Σεμέλας, ὁ Διὸς παῖς*), to which the chorus respond with *ἰὼ ἰὼ δέσποτα, δέσποτα, | μόλε νυν ἡμέτερον ἐς | θιάσον, ὦ Βρόμει Βρόμει*. A parody of such calls for divine assistance seems to be provided in the chorus' appeal to Lamachus in Ar. *Ach.* 566–8 (*ἰὼ Λάμαχ' ὦ βλέπων ἀτραπᾶς, | βοήθησον ὦ γοργολόφα φανεῖς, | ἰὼ Λάμαχ' ὦ φίλ' ὦ φυλέτα*), on which see below, p. 189. On *ἰώ* as a variation of the paeanic epiphthegma *ἰή*, cf. Käppel (1992) 225 with n. 79.

³⁸⁰ Cf. Call. *Hymn.* 2.1–7 (esp. 4 οὐχ ὁράαις; 7 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακρὴν) and the material collected in Pfister (1924) 311–12, 317–20. Cf. also McKay (1967) 192–4 on Cat. 61.76–8 (esp. 77 *virgo adest. viden ut . . .*).

³⁸¹ Cf. Taplin (1977) 303 and Currie (2005) 139–40, and above, pp. 31–32.

³⁸² Notably, Hermann (1831) 55–6 on 599 changes the transmitted sentence into θεοὶ τοὶ κρείττους, οἳ τ' ὀλβοφόροι | <τοῖς εὐδαίμοσι> | τοῖς τ' οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι θνητῶν ('the gods are stronger and give wealth to mortals, fortunate and unfortunate alike'). Similarly translates Firnhaber (1841) 138–9 on 592 'Es heißt aber "die Mächtigen, die Glücksspenden an die Unglücklichen sind die Götter.'" However, this kind of unrelated wisdom would be expected at the end of the play rather than here, before the reversal. More likely, οἱ κρείττους οἳ τ' ὀλβοφόροι is subject, θεοὶ its predicate, while the dative τοῖς οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι θνητῶν focalises to whom it appears to be so (on this function of the dative, cf. KG §423.18b). A related question concerns the

sense can be established, the precise meaning of this sentence remains remarkably ambiguous. At first sight, the comparison is made on a social plane, being centred on power (οἱ κρείττους) and wealth (οἷ τ' ὀλβοφόροι) as seen by those who lack these qualities (τοῖς οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι θνητῶν). Moreover, regardless of the nature and class of the chorus (soldiers, women, etc.), it seems clear that they identify themselves with those οὐκ εὐδαίμονες θνητῶν and perceive Clytemnestra and Iphigenia as κρείττους καὶ ὀλβοφόροι. Thus the comparison with the gods serves here, as in *Hippolytus*, to express how the socially inferior perceive the socially superior.

However, the dramatic irony is more intense in this play than in *Hippolytus*, since the terms ὀλβιος and εὐδαίμων can denote not only financial prosperity, but also a general state of good fortune as bestowed by the gods.³⁸³ Ancient audiences and modern readers are keenly aware of Agamemnon's scheme, and so we understand that the chorus' statement may be true in terms of finance, though that is proved irrelevant soon, but that it is cruelly mistaken in terms of fortune. When the plan to sacrifice Iphigenia is finally disclosed, Clytemnestra and Iphigenia are miserable to the extent that they could, in turn, address the same comparison to the chorus (cf. the lament in 1276–1335), who are personally spared such

translation of the otherwise unattested compound ὀλβοφόρος, either as 'bestowing wealth' (cf. ὀλβοδότης) or as 'possessing wealth' (cf. μισθοφόρος). Most commentators, and LSJ s.v. 'ὀλβοφόρος' prefer the former, though there appear to be no compelling reasons to exclude the latter. In terms of dramatic effect, it would actually be better suited.

³⁸³ The dialogue of Croesus and Solon in Hdt. 1.30–2 instructively illustrates this double meaning. For Croesus, his goods are μεγάλα τε καὶ ὀλβια (30.1), he who possesses them is ὀλβιώτατος (30.2, 3), and the state enjoyed through them is εὐδαιμονίη (32.1). For Solon, the same terms mean an absence of disease and suffering, and the presence of good offspring, in a lifetime as a whole (32.2–9, esp. 6 ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγα πλούσιος ἀνόλβιος δὲ δυοῖσι προέχει τοῦ εὐτυχέος μούνον etc.).

suffering.³⁸⁴ The chorus' initial admiration for the good fortune of the queen and princess now turns to pity for their bad fortune (1336–7 ἐγὼ μὲν οἰκτίρω σε συμφορᾶς κακῆς | τυχοῦσαν, οἷας μήποτ' ὄφελος τυχεῖν). Thus, as in *Hippolytus*, the initial impression of someone as godlike is unmasked as an illusion because a real goddess (here Artemis) intervenes.

Polyxena's speech in Euripides' *Hecuba* (342–78) provides an instructive third example. Polyxena uses a comparison with the gods similar to the statements in *Hippolytus* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*, but she does so in recollection of her own past: she was ἴκη θεοῖσι πλὴν τὸ καθθανεῖν μόνον (356). The remarks preceding this comparison indicate that it is again about social standing, wealth, and freedom: Polyxena was raised as Troy's royal princess (349–50 ἦι πατὴρ μὲν ἦν ἄναξ | Φρυγῶν ἀπάντων· τοῦτό μοι πρῶτον βίου); she would expect kings to compete for her hand (351–3 ἔπειτ' ἐθρέφθην ἐλπίδων καλῶν ὑπο | βασιλεῦσι νόμφη, ζῆλον οὐ μικρὸν γάμων | ἔχουσ', ὅτου δῶμ' ἐτίαν τ' ἀφίζομαι); she was the noblest of Troy's female population (354–5 δέσποινα δ' ἡ δύστηνος Ἰδαίαισιν ἦ | γυναιξί) and the most conspicuous of its maidens (355 παρθένοισι τ' ἀπόβλεπτος μέτα). In this example, to live a life like that of the gods encompasses all these privileges.

This thought is expressed more clearly in a similar context in *Trojan Women*. Addressing her dead grandson Astyanax, Hecuba depicts the future that would have awaited the prince of Troy if the city had not been sacked: ὦ φίλταθ', ὥς σοι θάνατος ἦλθε δυστυχίης. | εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἔθανες πρὸ πόλεως, ἦβης τυχὼν |

³⁸⁴ Note that this subtlety is lost entirely if we translate ὀλβοφόρος as 'bestowing wealth'.

γάμων τε καὶ τῆς ἰσοθέου τυραννίδος, | μακάριος ἦσθ' ἄν, εἴ τι τῶνδε μακάριον (1167–70). Hecuba lists the experiences that would have made Astyanax μακάριος,³⁸⁵ which here as elsewhere denotes a share in divine bliss.³⁸⁶ Among these, the ability to rule over others is singled out by the attribute ἰσόθεος, which makes the analogy with power and divine bliss more explicit.³⁸⁷ In *Hecuba*, Polyxena, with her youth, pre-eminence, and the prospect of a noble marriage, seems to have fulfilled the same conditions for being blessed in the female sphere, εἴ τι τῶνδε μακάριον.

Polyxena makes the comparison between her past and the life of the gods at the summit of her misery. As her death is decided by her captors, and she cannot even supplicate Odysseus to save her life (cf. 332–4), Polyxena's situation has reversed from that of a princess to that of a slave. This reversal is expressed dramatically in the contrast between ἴση θεοῖσι πλὴν τὸ κατθανεῖν μόνον and the following brief νῦν δ' εἰμὶ δούλη (357).³⁸⁸ Polyxena has reached the lowest point of the human social order, and so her past appears to her in similarly absolute terms. As in *Hippolytus*, Polyxena's comparison of her past life to that of the gods

³⁸⁵ The statement εἴ τι τῶνδε μακάριον seems to assert that each of these three experiences makes one μακάριος; on this function of εἴ, cf. KG §572–3 and the discussion of P. N. 3.19 above, n. 305. Cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 7.1–4 *Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix, | aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti; | et nunc seruat honos sedem tuus, ossaque nomen | Hesperia in magna, si qua est ea gloria, signat;* on this passage, cf. Fordyce (1977) 52–3 ‘The parenthesis is a pathetic reflection: “if glory by which the living set store means anything to the dead”.’

³⁸⁶ Pace De Heer (1969) 31 who, based purely on P. P. 5.20 and 46, assumes that ‘though both words are laudatory, μάκαρ must be so more strongly than μακάριος’.

³⁸⁷ Note that Plato's Socrates seems to have this passage in mind when he expells Euripides, and with him all tragedians, from the Republic for praising dictatorship (*Rep.* 8, 568^{a-b}).

³⁸⁸ The line appears to contain a reference to Soph. *Aj.* 485–9, spoken by Tecmessa in a situation similar to the one that Polyxena would have to face: ὦ δέσποτ' Αἴας, τῆς ἀναγκαίας τύχας | οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν μεῖζον ἀνθρώποις κακόν. | ἐγὼ δ' ἐλευθέρου μὲν ἐξέφυγν πατρός, | εἴπερ τινὸς σθένοντος ἐν πλούτῳ Φρυγῶν· | νῦν δ' εἰμὶ δούλη. Note that in epic, where forms of δούλος are rare, δούλη seems to bear connotations of a concubine, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. ‘δούλη’, 341.11–15, to which may be added *Il.* 3.408–9 (Helen to Venus) ἀλλ' αἰεὶ περὶ κείνον [sc. Paris] ὄϊζε καὶ ἐφύλασσε, | εἰς ὃ κέ σ' ἢ ἄλοχον ποιήσεται ἢ ὃ γε δούλην.

seems to be derived partly from its contrast with slavery, vulnerability, and impotence, and from the perspective that is engendered by this contrast. Here the contrast between the godlike privileges of the past and the present captivity contributes effectively to the play's wider interest in the dynamics of slavery and freedom as it is summarised, for example, by Hecuba in 864–7 (οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν ὅστις ἔστ' ἐλεύθερος· | ἢ χρημάτων γὰρ δοῦλός ἐστιν ἢ τύχης | ἢ πλῆθος αὐτὸν πόλεος ἢ νόμων γραφαὶ | εἴργουσι χρῆσθαι μὴ κατὰ γνώμην τρόποις).³⁸⁹

An element of illusion appears to be conveyed in the noteworthy restriction that Polyxena attaches to the comparison between her past life and that of the gods (πλὴν τὸ καθανεῖν μόνον). For while the turn of events confirms that Polyxena cannot escape death, it also reveals a second difference between her and the gods, namely, the stability of fortune. Divine life is, *per se*, characterised by the permanent and uninterrupted experience of the state that Polyxena was able to enjoy for some time in the past.³⁹⁰ Thus, from Polyxena's present perspective, we would expect a double restriction to the comparison, perhaps of the form 'except for dying, and for the inability to hold on to good fortune' (if that could be said in a poetic way).³⁹¹ It seems that, since Polyxena does not make this second restriction and emphasises instead the first as the only one (μόνον), she has somehow transported herself to her state of mind before her downfall. This is further suggested by the use of the simple future where an unreal connotation would appear necessary (353 ὅτου δῶμ' ἐτίαν τ' ἀφίξομαι), since attaining house

³⁸⁹ On slavery and freedom as central themes of *Hecuba*, cf. Daitz (1971), esp. 217, and Matthiessen (2010) 41–2.

³⁹⁰ See above, pp. 4–5.

³⁹¹ See above, n. 383, on Solon's view that no man should be considered to be, or to have been, happy before his death in Hdt. 1.30–2.

and hearth is no longer possible.³⁹² Polyxena seems to say not that her past life appears to her as godlike now, in retrospect, but that it did appear so while she was living it. Consequently, there would be a contrast between Polyxena's perspectives then and now, which is caused by her experience of her own change of fortune; the impression of her life as godlike is marked as an illusion, which the turn of events has dispelled.

ILLUSIONS INDUCED

The element of illusion, which is, to a varying degree, inherent in the three examples considered so far, is exploited in a more pronounced way in passages where characters liken other characters to gods in an attempt to manipulate them. Evidently, neither the Servant in *Hippolytus* nor the (secondary) chorus in *Iphigenia at Aulis* have ulterior motives when they compare their superiors to gods. From the point of view of those making these comparisons, they are harmless, if not decidedly laudatory, and a sense of foreboding is aroused only in the audience, thanks to their superior knowledge of the story. This is different in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and Euripides' *Electra*. The two passages in question lend themselves to comparison as they reveal striking similarities; the scene in

³⁹² Cf. Garzya (1955) 63, Biehl (1985) 259, and Matthiessen (2010) 301 ad loc. 'Polyxene versetzt sich jedoch in die Zeit zurück, als die Fülle der Möglichkeiten noch bestand.' Where the point of reference is the future, from the speaker's present point of view, we would expect future or aorist with ἄν, cf. KG §392.6, §573.1c, n. 3, and *Hec.* 1170 (Hecuba to the dead Astyanax; see above, p. 112) μακάριος ἦσθ' ἄν, εἴ τι τῶνδε μακάριον.

Agamemnon almost certainly serves as a model for the one in *Electra*.³⁹³ In both cases, a royal person arrives at a house on a chariot, is welcomed exuberantly, lured into the house, and murdered. Comparisons with gods feature in both passages and contribute decisively to the intentions of the murderers.

In Euripides' *Electra*, after Orestes manages to kill Aegisthus, Electra invites Clytemnestra into her house, where she and Orestes intend to kill her. Between lines 987 and 988, Clytemnestra enters the stage, and she does so magnificently, mounted on a chariot and followed by a retinue of luxuriously adorned slave girls, perhaps on a separate carriage.³⁹⁴ The chorus respond to this splendid appearance with an anapaestic address that resembles, in many ways, a hymn addressed to heroes or gods.³⁹⁵ Here, too, the extrametrical *ιὼ*, perhaps reduplicated,³⁹⁶ precedes the vocative.³⁹⁷ As in hymnic utterances, a series of asyndetic vocatives indicates the sphere of power (988 βασιλεια γύναι χθονὸς Ἀργείας), genealogy (989 παῖ Τυνδάρεω), and the relation to other deities (990–3 ξύγγονε κτλ.).³⁹⁸ The extended reference to the Dioscuri, paradigms *par excellence* for the dissolution of mortal and immortal boundaries, conveys further ambiguity as to the nature of the addressee, Clytemnestra. The imperative χαῖρε,

³⁹³ Cf. Cropp (1988) 166–7 on Eur. *El.* 988–97.

³⁹⁴ Lines 998–9 (ἐκβητ' ἀπήνης, Τρωιάδες, χειρὸς δ' ἐμῆς | λάβεσθ', ἵν' ἔξω τοῦδ' ὄχου κτήσω πόδα) could denote two different carriages, cf. Cropp (1988) 166–7 on 988–97. On the attire of Clytemnestra and the slave girls, cf. 315–18, 966, 1139–40.

³⁹⁵ Cf., *contra*, Cropp (1988) 166–7 on 988–97 'These conventions need not be confused with those of the religious cult-hymn.' The parallels that he cites, most of which are discussed in this chapter, do not support this claim.

³⁹⁶ A single *ιὼ* is preserved in ms. L (and deleted in Triclinius). Wilamowitz (1875) 69 inserts a second *ιὼ*, which is adapted in recent editions, e.g., in Diggle (1981–94) 2.98 in app., Donzelli (1995) 54 in app., Kovacs (1998) 260.

³⁹⁷ On *ιὼ* preceding invocations to gods, see above, n. 379.

³⁹⁸ On genealogy, see above, n. 204. On spheres of power, cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.55. On 'companion deities', cf. Fraenkel (1957) 198 n. 1 on Hor. *Carm.* 1.30, Horn (1970) 59 n. 94, Fraenkel (1975) 34 n. 13, Slater (1988) 59, Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.56.

concluding this section of praise, has of course strong hymnic force.³⁹⁹ While these lines address Clytemnestra as a goddess implicitly through formal indicators, the following sentence makes this intention explicit: *κεβίζω σ' ἵσα καὶ μάκαρα* | *πλούτου μεγάλης τ' εὐδαιμονίας* (994–5). Striking here is not only the direct comparison with a goddess (*ἵσα καὶ μάκαρα*), but also its combination with the verb *κεβίζειν*, which elsewhere denotes the worship of gods and heroes.⁴⁰⁰ Depending on the reading of line 997,⁴⁰¹ the thought of worshipping Clytemnestra might be continued in the following sentence with the verb *θεραπεύειν*.⁴⁰²

The chorus assume a surprisingly humble position towards Clytemnestra, presenting their relationship with her as one between worshipper and deity. In the ensuing *agon* with her mother, Electra assumes a similar position. The rhetoric of worship finds an echo in the qualification of Clytemnestra's hand as *μακαρία* (1006 *λάβωμαι μακαρίας τῆς σῆς χερός*), which refers us back to the comparison made by the chorus (*ἵσα καὶ μάκαρα*). In addition, we find Electra at pains to present her relationship with her mother as one between slave and master, notably against Clytemnestra's own will. Before offering to help Clytemnestra alight from the chariot, she inserts a parenthesis stating her servile position (1004–5 *οὔκουν ἐγώ—δοῦλη γὰρ . . .*). Clytemnestra, however, rejects Electra's self-presentation as a slave, pointing to the actual slaves that she has brought with her (1007 *δοῦλαι*

³⁹⁹ See above, nn. 197 and 198.

⁴⁰⁰ Cf. esp. *El.* 195–7 *οὔτοι στοναχαῖς | ἀλλ' εὐχαῖσι θεοὺς κεβί-|ζουσ' ἔξεις εὐαμερίαν, ὃ παῖ*), and *P. P.* 5.81, Aesch. *Eum.* 12, *Ag.* 258, 785, Soph. *OC* 1007, 1557, Eur. *El.* 196. See, however, *Med.* 155–7 *εἰ δὲ σὺ πόσις | καὶνὰ λέχη κεβί-|ζει*.

⁴⁰¹ The mss. read *καιρός*, ὃ βασιλεία, i.e., a pherecratean, which seems out of place in a neatly anapaestic environment. Nauck (1884–5) 1.lxxiv proposes *καιρός*. <χαῖρ>, ὃ βασιλεία, which meets with the approval of Denniston (1939) 173 on 996–7. Camper (1831) 565–6 on 990 reads *κ. παῖδος*, β., thus construing *τὰς σὰς* in 996 as genitives. See, however, L. Parker (1958) 58, who suggests *καιρός*, <πότνι> ὃ βασιλεία.

⁴⁰² Cf. esp. Eur. *Bacch.* 82, *Ion* 111, 183, *IT* 1105.

πάρειν αἶδε, with δοῦλαι placed emphatically at the beginning), and refusing to accept her servile assistance (μὴ κύ μοι πόνει).⁴⁰³ In turn, Electra highlights the similarities between herself and these slaves (1009–10 αἰχμάλωτον . . . ὥς αἶδε, again placed emphatically). Electra might blame her mother for reducing her to the status of a slave and do so in a sarcastic voice, and at the same time conveys her total dependence from Clytemnestra.

This treatment of Clytemnestra by the chorus and Electra is of course part of the scheme to kill her, in which the chorus are implicated (cf. 272–3 OR. αἶδ' οὖν φίλαι κοί τοῦδ' ἀκούουσιν λόγους; | EL. ὥστε κτέγειν γε τὰμὰ καὶ σ' ἔπη καλῶς). This is indicated especially by the irony that the chorus employ when they state wealth and good fortune as the reasons for worshipping Clytemnestra as a goddess (995 πλούτου μεγάλης τ' εὐδαιμονίας). Clytemnestra's fortune is precisely the target of the scheme whereas wealth is, before her arrival onstage, explicitly discarded as reliable protection from harm (938–40, Electra on the now dead Aegisthus, ὁ δ' ἡπάτα σε πλεῖστον οὐκ ἐγνωκότα, | ἡὔχεις τίς εἶναι τοῖσι χρήμασι χθένων· | τὰ δ' οὐδὲν εἰ μὴ βραχὺν ὁμιλῆσαι χρόνον). Similarly, it should be noted that the term θεραπεύεσθαι, beneath its basic sense 'to be worshipped', might here also have a medical connotation, 'to be treated', 'to be seen to'.⁴⁰⁴

While it seems evident that these remarks are intended to deceive, the aim of their deception remains to be elucidated. According to one interpretation, Electra and the chorus aim, by deliberately overshooting their praise, at provoking

⁴⁰³ Cf. Scullion (1999/2000) 224 on the presentation of Clytemnestra as someone who is 'sympathetically circumspect and human, and whose execution is therefore brutalizing.'

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. Denniston (1939) 173 on 995, 996–7 referring to a similar pun in *Bacch.* 932; *ibid.* 173 on 990, he also points to the irony in ἀγαθοῖν (of the Dioscuri) given that, in line 1064, Electra calls Clytemnestra and Helen 'unworthy of Castor' (Κάστωρός τ' οὐκ ἀξίω).

divine $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ to assist them in their attack.⁴⁰⁵ However, this may only account for the chorus' address, but not for the self-abasement displayed by Electra. We might also wonder whether their motives would not be too conspicuous for Clytemnestra, since, for the murder to succeed, she needs to enter the house without even a hint of suspicion. Yet Clytemnestra, far from being suspicious or even reasonably cautious, seems instead to gain in confidence from the chorus' address and her interaction with Electra. She instructs her slaves with grandeur and pride (998–1003) and replies to Electra with regal benevolence (1007). It seems that Clytemnestra readily embraces the role of the godlike queen and mistress offered to her by the chorus and Electra, and so steps directly into the psychological trap laid out before of her. By elevating Clytemnestra, the chorus and Electra lure her into a sense of control and safety, which in turn assists their attack. The comparison with the gods is of primary importance for this strategy as it encapsulates precisely these feelings. By using this comparison to deceive Clytemnestra, the chorus consciously apply the same illusion to which the Servant in *Hippolytus*, the chorus in *Iphigenia at Aulis*, and Polyxena in *Hecuba* are subjected.

Electra is interesting not only because it develops a negative notion of godlike power in the figure of Clytemnestra, but also because it presents a positive notion of this power as early as in the prologue, when Electra addresses her husband with the words $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \varsigma'\ \acute{\iota}\varsigma\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\eta}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota\ \phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\nu$ (67). This statement surprises because the Farmer is in fact not remarkable for anything

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. Denniston (1939) 172 on 988–97.

except for his noble treatment of Electra. However, since this treatment is translated into categories of hubris and moderation, the Farmer can be seen as a paradigm of moderation and self-knowledge (cf. the Farmer's statement 45–6 αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ ὀλβίων ἀνδρῶν τέκνα | λαβὼν ὑβρίζειν, οὐ κατάξιος γεγώς, and Electra's reason immediately following the comparison in 68 ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γὰρ οὐκ ἐνύβριτας κακοῖς). Like Clytemnestra, the Farmer holds power over Electra, but, unlike her, he does not abuse it or display any haughtiness because of it. The Farmer thus serves as a foil to Clytemnestra, and this relationship is established via the two different notions of being godlike.

In Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, the welcoming of the hero is in many respects similar to the welcoming of Clytemnestra in *Electra*. There are, however, crucial differences that render the interaction in *Agamemnon* more complex. Agamemnon probably enters the stage between lines 782 and 783,⁴⁰⁶ and he, like Clytemnestra in *Electra*, does so triumphantly. The degree of luxury displayed at his entry is uncertain and controversial,⁴⁰⁷ but at least one chariot is indicated in the text (905–6 νῦν δέ μοι, φίλον κάρα, | ἔκβαιν' ἀπήνης τῆςδε), which suggests a grand entry.⁴⁰⁸ However, as opposed to Clytemnestra's excessive display of wealth, here

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. the discussion in Taplin (1977) 302–4.

⁴⁰⁷ Following the hypothesis of the play (9–10 ed. West, Ἀγαμέμνων δ' ἐπὶ ἀπήνης ἔρχεται, εἶπετο δ' αὐτῷ ἐτέρα ἀπήνη ἔνθα ἦν τὰ λάφυρα καὶ ἡ Κασάνδρα), G. Murray (1940) 215 and others draw a lavish picture of Agamemnon's procession, including two chariots, spoils, and attendants; cf., however, Taplin (1977) 304–6. On attendants, cf. also Wilamowitz (1916) 171–2, arguing against their presence, and Ortkemper (1969) 21–6, emphasising strongly their potential significance. Raeburn and Thomas (2011) 148–9 are careful not to assign too much luxury to Agamemnon's return: 'The appearance of a wagon rather than a war-chariot could make Agamemnon seem less heroic; certainly, nothing suggests a spectacular crowd of returning troops, body-guards, or welcoming Argive citizens. After all, the conqueror has lost all but one ship from his fleet, and Aeschylus has every reason to emphasise his vulnerability in this scene.'

⁴⁰⁸ Cf. Steiner (2010) 23–4 on the similarities of this entry with victorious athletes returning to their cities.

a certain degree of luxury and celebration might be justified by Agamemnon's victory at Troy. The anapaestic address with which the chorus respond to Agamemnon's entry is also similar to that in *Electra*, though here it is more cautious since this chorus' reverence for their king is sincere. The chorus open with an elevated tripartite address circumscribing Agamemnon's reign (783 βασιλεῦ), exploit (Τροιάς π(τ)ολίπορθ'), and genealogy (784 Ἀτρέως γένεθλιον).⁴⁰⁹ As the chorus in *Electra*, they use the verb *ceβίζειν* to describe their relationship with Agamemnon, but they cast it in a question about appropriate forms of praise (785–6 πῶς *ce* προσείπω, πῶς *ce* *ceβίζω* | μήθ' ὑπέραρας μήθ' ὑποκάμψας καιρὸν χάριτος).⁴¹⁰

The chorus' address provides a contrast to the one made by Clytemnestra in lines 895–913. While it seems understood that the praise advanced by the chorus is developed within acceptable limits (cf. Agamemnon's full concurrence in 831–2), Clytemnestra clearly exceeds those limits (cf. his criticism in 916–17). She pours out no less than seven laudatory images of increasing intensity, each conveying protection and salvation (895–901 νῦν, ταῦτα πάντα τλαῖς', ἀπενθήτωι φρενὶ | λέγοιμι ἄν ἄνδρα τόνδε τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα, | *c*ωτῆρα ναὸς πρότονον, ὑψηλῆς *c*τέγης | *c*τῦλον ποδῆρη, μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρί, | γαῖαν φανεῖσαν ναυτίλοις παρ' ἐλπίδα | κάλλιστον ἡμᾶρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χεῖματος | ὁδοιπόροι διψῶντι

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. Steiner (2010) 24, who connects this address with the epinician custom of providing a 're-enactment of the original proclamation of the victory as the singers reiterate the announcement of the sacred herald at the games while the athlete stepped up to claim his prize. . . . The chorus opt for the simplest arrangement: Agamemnon's title, the exact type of triumph and his father's name occupy the start of the address.' On genealogy, see above, n. 204

⁴¹⁰ Note that a correction in ms. F reads the (Doric) future *ceβίξω*, which Fraenkel (1950) 2.358–9 ad loc. defends. Notably, what appears here as a laudatory question, paralleled in encomiastic poetry, re-emerges in 1489–90 as a form of lament (ἰὼ ἰὼ βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ | πῶς *ce* δακρύω). On similar laudatory questions, see above, nn. 145 and 196.

πηγαῖον ῥέος). Despite the excessive tone of this passage,⁴¹¹ of which she seems to be aware herself (903 τοιοῖδε τοί νιν ἀξιῶ προσφθέγμασιν), Clytemnestra attaches a reference to jealousy (904 φθόνος δ' ἀπέκτω), and so pretends to be concerned about the moderation that is in fact exercised by the chorus.⁴¹² Non-verbal expressions of her excess are the fabric, which she orders her attendants to roll out in lines 905–13, and possibly the gesture of prostration (*proskynesis*),⁴¹³ to which Agamemnon refers in lines 919–20.

The implications of these verbal and non-verbal gestures are found in Agamemnon's response. He deplores the length of Clytemnestra's speech (916–17), the prostration, and the red fabric because he associates them with softness, both female and barbarian (918–20),⁴¹⁴ and, significantly, because he finds them more appropriate for the worship of gods (922 θεοῖς τοι τοῖςδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεών). Treading on fabrics in particular is, for Agamemnon, associated with cult and, if done by a mortal, would constitute a dangerous act of transgression (923–4 οὐδαμῶς ἄνευ φόβου).⁴¹⁵ According to Agamemnon himself, Clytemnestra is

⁴¹¹ Cf. Raeburn and Thomas (2011) 161 on 896–901 'The central idea behind these laudatory images is that of the saviour or preserver.' Note that Dindorf (1832) 187 in app. deletes these lines; on textual uncertainties, cf. also Denniston and Page (1957) 147–8 on 899–902. Wilamowitz (1927), Kranz (1933) 102, Fraenkel (1950) 2.406–10 on 899–902, and Hall (1989) 206 point to the possibility of Near-Eastern models. Cf., however, Steiner (2010) 32–5, who shows a—not entirely convincing—connection with epinician imagery.

⁴¹² Cf. Denniston and Page (1957) 148 ad loc. 'to make sure that φθόνος is *not* absent is of course her principal objective here and in what follows', Sailor and Stroup (1999) 168–9 'after such a beginning, φθόνος δ' ἀπέκτω is more an invitation than a safeguard', Raeburn and Thomas (2011) 162 ad loc. 'blatantly hypocritical on Clytemnestra's lips.'

⁴¹³ It is uncertain whether Clytemnestra actually prostrates herself in front of Agamemnon, cf. Sommerstein (2008) 106 n. 192. Raeburn and Thomas (2011) 161 on 895 assume she does.

⁴¹⁴ Cf. Easterling (1973) 10–11. At 935–6, Priam is mentioned as a paradigmatic Eastern king, cf. Dover (1987) 155.

⁴¹⁵ The symbolic force of the fabric is variously interpreted, cf. the discussion in Taplin (1977) 308–16. For Lloyd-Jones (1952), the fabric refers back to 239 and the robe Iphigenia wore at her sacrifice; for Goheen (1955) 115–26, the purple-red colour foreshadows murder; Jenkins (1985) 116–18 roots the fabric in a general context of ambivalence associated with textiles and the female

trying to treat him as a god (925 λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα, μὴ θεόν, céβειν ἐμέ). Since she, like Electra and the chorus in *Electra*, plans to lure Agamemnon into the house in order to kill him, her excessive praise of Agamemnon can be interpreted as a strategy to deceive him so as to facilitate her attack. Consequently, Clytemnestra would try in these lines to lull Agamemnon into a sense of godlike power, control, and reverence, which is intended to diminish any suspicions that he might hold against her.⁴¹⁶

While the preceding paragraphs focus on the similarities between *Agamemnon* and *Electra*, the differences should not be overlooked. Euripides deploys a high degree of irony in portraying Clytemnestra as victim to the same scheme that she contrives for Agamemnon in Aeschylus' play. There is also a considerable difference in the way that the respective murderers act in the aftermath of their deeds. While Electra and Orestes succumb to feelings of guilt already in the following triadic exchange (1177–1236), Clytemnestra retains a sense of justification throughout the remainder of the play (esp. 1373 οὐκ ἐπαισχυνθήσομαι, 1380 καὶ τὰδ' οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι, 1404–6 ὁμοιον· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἀγαμέμνων, ἐμὸς | πόσις, νεκρὸς δέ, τῆςδε δεξιᾶς χερὸς | ἔργον, δικαίας τέκτονος. τὰδ' ὧδ' ἔχει, 1432 μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς Δίκην, 1443 ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην, 1527 ἄξια δράσας, ἄξια πάσχων). As regards the excessive praise of mortals, Aeschylus' play differs from Euripides' in the way that

world that produces them; for Dover (1987) 153–5, it denotes sacrifice; associations with oriental monarchies are emphasised by S. West (1992), Crane (1993) 122–3, and Raeburn and Thomas (2011) 162–3 on 905–11. Cf. also Goward (2005) 33–4.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. differently Raeburn and Thomas (2011) 162–3 on 905–11 'Clytemnestra is thus contriving a temptation which, if Agamemnon yields, will provoke the divine *phthonos* which will be, as it were, the final nail in his coffin, and also sanctify her vengeance.' On divine φθόνος, cf. also Fraenkel (1950) 2.411 on 904. Cf. differently Dover (1987) 158.

Agamemnon responds to Clytemnestra's adulations, and in the consequences arising from this response. Unlike Clytemnestra in *Electra*, Agamemnon emphatically rejects being treated as a god (925). Aware of his human nature, he perceives, not the imminent danger of being murdered by his wife, but some form of danger originating from an appropriation of divine privileges. This refusal brings about the following, highly effective interaction (931–43), which sees Clytemnestra at pains to persuade Agamemnon to accept the fabric and its implications. However, her insistence, and ultimate success, subverts the very image that she hopes to evoke. While the godlike treatment of Agamemnon was intended to inspire in him a sense of control, Clytemnestra now has to exercise control over Agamemnon in order to make him accept this sense of control. By forcing Agamemnon to accept an illusion of his own power, she leaves us in no doubt that it is she who is truly in control.⁴¹⁷ This paradoxical situation is expressed in the statement that ends the dialogue: *πιθοῦ· κρατεῖς μέντοι παρείς γ' ἐκὼν ἐμοί* (943).

⁴¹⁷ On the reversal of power, cf. Hall (1989) 205–7, Raeburn and Thomas (2011) 166 on 931–43 'In only thirteen economical and powerfully compelling lines, the conqueror Agamemnon is himself conquered by Clytemnestra' persuasion into doing what he has just refused as decadent, hubristic, and dangerous.'

SUPPLICATION AND SALVATION

While the preceding section considers situations where protagonists in tragedy are perceived as godlike by other characters, this section focuses on situations where other characters are perceived similarly by the protagonists. Tragic heroes and heroines assume a perspective from which other characters appear as godlike only at certain stages of the plot and only in a well-defined ritual context, namely, during supplication. The aim of this section is therefore to illustrate that, in the conventionalised perspectives that tragic suppliants assume in front of a human *supplicandus*, the boundaries between mortal and immortal can become obscure or irrelevant.

RITUAL PERSPECTIVES

A certain ambiguity, in the suppliant's perception, regarding differences between mortal and immortal seems to be at the heart of the ritual of Greek supplication. In its most basic outline, supplication appears as a relationship between two parties, with one party appealing to the other for a certain service.⁴¹⁸ On this basic view,

⁴¹⁸ On supplication as a ritual, cf. Gould (1973) *passim* and Lloyd-Jones (1998) 282 'Supplication is of course a ritual.' Gould's model, especially his thoughts on 'automated gestures' exercising 'ritualistic power', is criticised by those scholars who consider (epic) supplication as a speech act or a narrative exclusively; cf. Lynn-George (1988) 201, Goldhill (1991) 74, Crotty (1994) 104, and the overview in Naiden (2006) 8–18. Crotty (1994) 20 applies the concept of 'ceremony', developed by Redfield (1975) 163, to supplication. Mediation between the two approaches is advocated by Mercier (1998), Giordano (1999), and Götter (2000).

supplication appears related to prayer, where a similar relationship is attempted.⁴¹⁹

The proximity of supplication and prayer is manifest also in the lexical observation that forms of *λίσσασθαι/λιτή* can, in epic and drama, refer to appeals in supplication as well as prayer, next to tendencies elsewhere to distinguish between *εὔχεσθαι/εὔχος* and *ικετεύειν/ικεσία*.⁴²⁰ What seems to separate supplication from prayer are, to borrow mathematical terms, the variable and the constant values in this equation. At least in Archaic and Classical times, prayers are, by definition, addressed to heroes and gods, while the services appealed for can be derived from a wide range of human needs. By contrast, in supplication the service appealed for tends to be an act of mercy or protection, while the *supplicandus* is the character most capable of delivering this service, regardless of whether he or she is mortal, heroic, or divine. An overlap of supplication and prayer is therefore possible, namely when the *supplicandus* is heroic or divine, or when the object of prayer is mercy or protection. An instructive example of such overlap is found in Thetis' famous appeal to Zeus in *Iliad* 1.500–10, where supplicatory gestures (500–2 καὶ ῥα πάροιθ' αὐτοῖο κατέεζτο, καὶ λάβε γούνων | σκαῖῃ, δεξιτερῇ δ' ἄρ' ὑπ' ἀνθερεῶνος ἐλοῦσα | λισσομένη προσέειπε Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα) are combined with arguments characteristic of prayer (503–4

⁴¹⁹ The relationship between supplication and prayer is variously described. Crotty (1994) 95–8 sees the main difference in the argumentation of the suppliant: prayer is based on exchange, supplication on pity. Naiden (2006) 7 considers the difference in the absence and presence of the addressee in prayer and supplication respectively. As a result, both models deny the possibility of supplicating a deity, a view which is challenged below, p. 166. For Pulleyn (1997) 56–69, esp. 64, *ξενία*, *λιτή*, and *ικετεία* form three sections on a continuous scale from self-assertion to self-abasement. However, his connection of prayer and *ξενία*, and the separation of *λιτή* from these, is rather obscure; by contrast, Gould (1973) 91–4 connects supplication with *ξενία*.

⁴²⁰ Cf. *Lfgre* s.v. 'λίσσομαι', B, 1704.7–12; cf. also Gould (1973) 76 n. 12 and Clark (1998) 10. On the usage in fifth-century Athens, cf. Willi (2003) 23–5.

Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἴ ποτε δὴ σε μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ὄνησα | ἢ ἔπει ἢ ἔργωι, τόδε μοι κρήνηνον ἐέλδωρ).⁴²¹

Recent scholarship on supplication sometimes describes it as a ritual (or ceremony) conducted exclusively among humans. It thus reduces the significance of supplication at altars or temples, which is frequently attested as a historical phenomenon, and neglects supplication addressed directly at deities in narrative and dramatic poetry.⁴²² This view is problematic for several reasons.

First, deities can be supplicated. As the usage of supplicatory vocabulary indicates, this can happen by taking refuge at an altar or temple, or by appealing directly to a god.⁴²³ Moreover, there seems to be no conceptual difference between taking refuge at altars or temples and supplicating a deity appearing in epiphany, given that *asylia* at altars and temples can only be thought of as effective if it is understood as a supplication of the deity worshipped at them.

Second, the evidence available does not suggest a difference in effect between supplicating a deity and supplicating a mortal. When there is a choice involved, pragmatics seem to be the decisive factor. Thus, at *Odyssey* 22.333–7, Phemius is confronted with a decision between two equally viable gestures of begging for his life, either to supplicate the altar of Zeus or to supplicate Odysseus

⁴²¹ On the rhetorical aspects of prayer, especially the formula εἴ ποτε, cf. Bremer (1981) 196, Race (1982) 8–14, Pulleyn (1997) 16–38, Depew (2000) 61–3, Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.50–2.

⁴²² Cf. Crotty (1994) 98 ‘Indeed, supplication succeeds partly because it is a ceremony, ultimately, of the gods’ absence’, 104 ‘The suppliant’s speech and gestures are merely a means of persuasion: his words do not reach past the human realm’, and Naiden (2006) 7 (see below, n. 423). See also Pedrick (1982) 128 ‘supplication normally occurs between physical equals (man to man or god to god’ in the *Iliad*. This may be true for the poetic reality of the *Iliad*, but it need not extend beyond it; cf. Mercier (1998) 193–4.

⁴²³ Pace Naiden (2006) 7 ‘Supplication of a god is possible only if the god responds by an epiphany.’ This is admitted only to be dismissed for supposed real-life supplication. Cf., however, *Lys.* 2.39 (on the Greeks fighting at Salamis) ποῖαι δ’ οὐχ ἱκετεῖται θεῶν ἐγένοντο ἢ θυσίων ἀναμνήσεις . . . ;

(δίχα δὲ φρεσὶ μερμήριζεν, | ἥ ἐκδὺς μεγάροιο Διὸς μεγάλου ποτὶ βωμὸν | ἐρκεῖον ἔζοιτο τετυγμένον, ἔνθ' ἄρα πολλὰ | Λαέρτης Ὀδυσσεύς τε βοῶν ἐπὶ μηρί' ἔκηαν, | ἥ γούνων λίσσοιτο προκαΐζας Ὀδυσῆα). His choice for the latter is based merely on a guess at what might be more effective in the present case (338–9 ὧδε δέ οἱ φρονέοντι δοᾷκατο κέρδιον εἶναι, | γούνων ἄψασθαι Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος). He succeeds, but Leodes, who was confronted with the same choice before him, fails (22.310–29). Similarly, in Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*, Clytemnestra supplicates Achilles because she has 'no other altar to flee to than [his] knee' (911 οὐκ ἔχω βωμὸν καταφυγεῖν ἄλλον ἢ τὸ σὸν γόνυ). Here the two modes of supplication, at an altar and by clasping someone's knees, are regarded as the same. A third example of this kind can be found on a red-figure kalpis by the Kleophrades Painter,⁴²⁴ where we see Cassandra with one hand clasping a statue of Athena (the *palladion*), with the other reaching for Ajax' knees. Here the two kinds of supplication are combined into one supplicatory gesture.

Third, and most important, there are cases where there seems to be no formal difference between supplicating a deity and supplicating a mortal. In *Odyssey* 6.149–85, for instance, Odysseus finds himself shipwrecked and helpless. When Nausicaa appears, he does not know, or pretends not to know, whether he is addressing a mortal woman or a goddess (149 γουνοῦμαί σε, ἄνακκα· θεός νύ τις ἢ βροτός ἐσσι), and this uncertainty pervades his appeal.⁴²⁵

⁴²⁴ See Kleophrades Painter, hydria (kalpis type) (c. 480–75 BC), Naples *Museo Nazionale* 81699 = *ARV*² 189.74, *Paralipomena* 341, *ARFH* fig. 135, *Beazley Archive* 201724.

⁴²⁵ On the one hand, Odysseus addresses Nausicaa as γύναι in 168, and his wishes in 180–5 (οὐδὲ θεοὶ τόσα δοῖεν, ὅσα φρεσὶ σῆσι μενοινᾷς, | ἄνδρα τε καὶ οἶκον, καὶ ὁμοφροσύνην ὀπάσειαν | ἐσθλήν· οὐ μὲν γάρ τοῦ γε κρείττον καὶ ἄρειον, | ἥ ὅθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχρητον | ἀνὴρ ἠδὲ γυνή· πόλλ' ἄλγεα δυσμενέεσσι, | χάρματα δ' εὐμενέτησι· μάλιστα δέ τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοί.)

The difference between mortal and immortal affects the design of his initial address, which takes the form both of hymnic praise, in case she is a deity (150–2; esp. 150 εἰ μὲν τις θεός ἐστι, τοῖ σὺρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν), and of a blessing of her parents and future husband, in case she is mortal (153–7; esp. 153 εἰ δέ τις ἐστὶ βροτῶν, οἳ ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναιετάουσιν). The actual supplicatory appeal, however, remains the same in either case (esp. 178–9). It seems that for Odysseus, who is in dire need of help, it is to some extent irrelevant whether the person whom he addresses is mortal or divine if only she can provide this help. More striking is the case in *Odyssey* 13.258–67, where Odysseus supplicates Athena disguised as a young shepherd. Though Odysseus does not know that he is in fact addressing a goddess,⁴²⁶ he acknowledges that he appeals to the supposed young man ‘as though he were a god’ (260–1 κοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ γε | εὖχομαι ὥς τε θεῷ καὶ σευ φίλα γούναθ’ ἰκάνω). Here, it seems that the dynamics of elevation of the *supplicandus*, inherent in all supplicatory appeals, is intensified to the extent that Odysseus is ready to treat someone whom he considers mortal as a god.

seem to be located in the mortal sphere. On the other hand, lines 175–7 (ἀλλά, ἄναξ, ἔλαιοι· σὲ γὰρ κακὰ πολλὰ μογήσας | ἐς πρώτην ἰκόμην, τῶν δ’ ἄλλων οὐ τίνα οἶδα | ἀνθρώπων, οἳ τήνδε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἔχουσιν) are paralleled closely by Odysseus’ supplication of a river god in 5.445–50, esp. 448–50 (ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ νῦν | σὸν τε ῥέον κά τε γούναθ’ ἰκάνω πολλὰ μογήσας. | ἀλλ’ ἔλαιοι, ἄναξ· ἰκέτης δέ τοι εὖχομαι εἶναι).

⁴²⁶ It is of course possible that the primary narrator’s knowledge of the true nature of the *supplicanda* intervenes with Odysseus’ speech and affects his choice of words.

SUPPLICATION IN TRAGEDY

Humans usually resort to supplication in the face of danger. The circumstances, under which supplication is conducted, can explain why there is no formal differentiation between various kinds of *supplicandi*. This is particularly relevant in the case of tragedy, which depicts supplication in a rather distinct form, compared, for example, to epic. First, we should note that tragic supplication is reaction, not just to any kind of danger, but to life-threatening danger. In the dynamic tragic plot, which generally depicts movements from extreme happiness to extreme suffering and *vice versa*, supplication defines the rock bottom of a character's steep fall. For the suppliants, who are usually royal characters, the need to supplicate marks a total loss of self-determination, an inability to influence their fortune by their own means, and a submission of their freedom into the hands of someone else. Thus encapsulating a state of dependency, supplication is an effective dramatic device. Second, we should note that in tragedy the mortal *supplicandus* tends to be a morally unambiguous figure. On the epic battlefield, supplication is usually a bilateral relationship between a defeated soldier and his potential killer. There, the source of danger and its potential remedy are the same person, and so a rejection of supplication, occurring in fact more frequently than acceptance, can appear morally objectionable.⁴²⁷ In tragedy, on the other hand, supplication tends to be a triangular relationship between the suppliant, the

⁴²⁷ Cf. Pedrick (1982) 132 'The prevailing prospect for suppliants in the *Iliad* is gloomy. No warrior in the *Iliad* is ever stopped from rejecting an enemy's plea for his life by fear of Zeus', Mercier (1998) 196 'The *Iliad* often portrays a moral and religious obligation ignored.'

supplicandus, and an external source of danger.⁴²⁸ For the *supplicandus* to yield to supplication often means, not merely to refrain from killing the suppliant, but actively to intervene and risk his own and other people's lives.⁴²⁹ The tragic *supplicandus* therefore appears not infrequently as a shining figure who, in the suppliant's perception, comes to represent hopes for survival and salvation.⁴³⁰ Evidently, this heightened perception originates from extreme circumstances. The question here is whether this perception leaves room for sharp differentiations between mortal and immortal.

A good example to start with is found in the first episode of Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*. Here, after Oedipus' identity is revealed, Antigone supplicates the chorus of Attic elders in an attempt to gain their protection (237–57). She begins by addressing the *supplicandi* in a formal way (237 ὦ ξένοι, 242

⁴²⁸ Cf. Kopperschmidt (1967) 46–53 and (1971) 321–2. This is the rule for the so-called supplication plays, cf. Lattimore (1964) 46–7, Taplin (1977) 192–3, Heath (1987) 148, Burian (1997) 188, and Turner (2001) 27. A more complicated case is Medea's supplication of Creon in Eur. *Med.* 324. See also Turner (2001) *passim* for problems in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*.

⁴²⁹ For an exception, cf. Helen's supplication of Theonoe in Eur. *Hel.* 894–943.

⁴³⁰ Cf. the use of *σωτήρ* in Aesch. *Suppl.* 982 (Chorus to Pelasgus), Soph. *OT* 47–8 (Priest to Oedipus), 300–4 (Oedipus to Tiresias), *El.* 1354–5 (Electra to Orestes), Eur. *Heracl.* 640 (Iolaus to the messenger), *IT* 923 (Orestes to Iphigenia), and of *σώζειν* in Soph. *Phil.* 501 (Philoctetes to Neoptolemus), *OC* 276 (Oedipus to the Chorus), Eur. *Hel.* 900 (Helen to Theonoe), *Or.* 384 (Orestes to Menelaus), *Hel.* 894–902, *IA* 915–16. Light imagery is used in Eur. *Hec.* 841–3 (Andromache to Neoptolemus) ὦ δέσποτ', ὦ μέγιστον Ἑλληνιν φάος, | πιθοῦ, παράσχεε χεῖρα τῇ περὲς βύτιδι | τιμωρόν (841–3), *IA* 1063 (Chorus on Achilles, after he granted supplication). For light as a symbol of rescue, cf. also *Od.* 16.23 (Odysseus to Telemachus) = 17.41 (Penelope to Telemachus) ἦλθεε Τηλέμαχε, γλυκερὸν φάος, Soph. *El.* 1354 (Electra to Orestes) ὦ φίλτατον φῶς· ὦ μόνος σωτήρ δόμων, Eur. *Med.* 482 (Medea, about her rescue of Jason) κτείνας' ἀνέσχον κοί φάος σωτήριον, *HF* 531 (Amphitryon to Heracles) ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν, ὦ φάος μολὼν πατρί, | ἦκει, ἐσώθης εἰς ἀκμὴν ἐλθὼν φίλοις, Eur. *Bacch.* 608 (Chorus to Dionysus) ὦ φάος μέγιστον ἡμῖν εὐίου βακχεύματος. Cf. also Wilamowitz (1889) 157 on Eur. *HF* 563 and Fraenkel (1950) 2.266 on Aesch. *Ag.* 522. The *supplicandus* is addressed as a haven in Eur. *Andr.* 891–4 (Hermione to Orestes) ὦ ναυτίλοις χεῖματος λιμὴν φανεῖς | Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, πρὸς σε τῶνδε γουνάτων | οἰκτιρον ἡμᾶς ὧν ἐπισκοπεῖς τύχας, | πράσσοντας οὐκ εὖ. On maritime imagery, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 897 (Clytemnestra to Agamemnon) σωτήρα ναὸς πρότονον; the descriptions of deified Helen in Eur. *Or.* 1637 (ναυτίλοις σωτήριος) and of the Dioscuri in *El.* 992–3 (βροτῶν ἐν ἁλὸς ῥοθίοις | τιμὰς σωτήρας ἔχοντες) and 1348 (σώκοντε νεῶν πρόωιρας ἐνάλους) are similar, though not metaphorical.

ὦ ξένοι, οἰκτίραθ'),⁴³¹ and by trying to establish a relationship in the language of kinship (245–6 ὥς τις ἀφ' αἵματος | ὑμετέρου προφανεῖσα). While these features are conventional to supplicatory appeals,⁴³² Antigone makes a remarkable statement when she describes the extent to which she and Oedipus are at the Athenians' mercy: ἐν ὑμῖν ὥς θεῶι | κείμεθα τλάμονες (247–8). To understand this comparison, we should note that it is unlikely to contain an identification of the chorus as deities, or of their powers as divine. Rather, as the singular θεῶι suggests, the comparison seems to express an analogy whereby Antigone and Oedipus are exposed to the powers of the chorus as mortals are generally exposed to the powers of a god. Consequently, the phrase ὥς θεῶι means here, unlike elsewhere, not a treatment similar or identical to the worship of the gods,⁴³³ but a certain degree of power as perceived by the weak. Accordingly, the *supplicandus*' power approximates to divine sovereignty in the perception of the suppliant, but the question whether or not the two are in reality identical is left unanswered.

Thus understood, this particular comparison between the chorus and a god contributes effectively to the wider interest of *Oedipus at Colonus* in the

⁴³¹ Note, however, the dactylic metre, which puts this passage on a par with the agitated lament in *Phil.* 1170–1217 (astrophic, like here) and *El.* 121–50 (strophic). On the metrical design of the ode, cf. Jebb (1900) lxvii. On dactylic metres in Sophocles, cf. L. Parker (1997) 51 'Sophocles' most distinctive use of dactyls is in passages of lamentation, particularly in lyric dialogues (κομμοί)'.

⁴³² On the language of kinship in supplicatory appeals, cf. Burian (1974) 415. Cf. the arguments brought forward by Polynices when supplicating Oedipus in 1323–4 ἐγὼ δὲ κός, κεί μὴ κός, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κακοῦ | πότμου φυτευθεῖς, κός γέ τοι καλούμενος.

⁴³³ Other cases in drama are Aesch. *Supp.* 980–82 (discussed below, p. 173) and Eupolis *PCG* 5, 384.4–6 ἀλλ' ἦσαν ἡμῖν τῇ πόλει πρῶτον μὲν οἱ στρατηγοὶ | ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων οἰκῶν, πλούτῳ γένει τε πρῶτοι, | οἷς ὥς περὶ θεοῖσιν ἡνδρόμεθα, and the evidence collected in Currie (2005) 180–1, who concludes that '[t]hese dramatic passages seem to presuppose a cultural context where it was possible to pray to living persons in the fifth century BC'. However, it is debated whether phrases like ὥς θεῶι/ἄθανατῶν/ἡρώϊ εὔχεσθαι/θύειν etc. denote identical treatment of merely formal resemblance; on the former, cf., e.g., *Il.* 22.394, Currie (2005) 114–16 and 188–9; on the latter, cf. Taeger (1957) 60, Habicht (1970) 196, Shipley (2000) 156–9.

dynamics of vulnerability and power or, more precisely, of supplication and immortality. For while much of the structure of the play resembles that of suppliant plays, comparable to the plots of, for example, Aeschylus' *Suppliants* or Euripides' *Suppliants* and *Children of Heracles*,⁴³⁴ it differs from these plays in its second theme, namely, the heroisation of Oedipus.⁴³⁵ It is a fundamental paradox of *Oedipus at Colonus* that Oedipus arrives at Attica both as its suppliant and as its future guardian,⁴³⁶ and this paradox is explored, for example, in the shifting attribution of the power to save. Initially, Oedipus beseeches the chorus for rescue (275–6 ἀνθ' ὧν ἰκνοῦμαι πρὸς θεῶν ὑμᾶς, ξένοι, | ὥσπερ με κἀνεστήκαθ', ὧδε σώσατε). However, after Ismene conveys the Pythian oracle, which mentions his role as protector of Athens (389–90 καὶ τοῖς ἐκεῖ ζητητὸν ἀνθρώποις ποτὲ | θανόντ' ἔσσεσθαι ζῶντά τ' εὐδοίας χάριν), Oedipus seizes this information and bargains with it (459–60 τῇδε μὲν πόλει μέγαν | σωτήρ' ἀρεῖσθε, τοῖς δ' ἐμοῖς ἐχθροῖς πόνους). The chorus in turn accept the notion of Oedipus as their future saviour (462–3 ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆςδε γῆς | σωτήρα στυγερὸν τῷδ' ἐπεμβάλλεις λόγῳ) and coin, according to the manuscript reading,⁴³⁷ the striking paradox 'suppliant

⁴³⁴ On *OC* as a suppliant play, cf. Burian (1974).

⁴³⁵ On the specific form of immortality that Oedipus receives, cf. 393–4 OE. ὅτ' οὐκέτ' εἰμί, τηνικαῦτ' ἄρ' εἴμ' ἀνὴρ; | IS. νῦν γὰρ θεοὶ σ' ὀρθοῦσι, πρόσθε δ' ὄλλυσαν, 621–3 ἴν' οὐμὸς εὐδῶν καὶ κεκρυμμένος νέκυς | ψυχρὸς ποτ' αὐτῶν θερμὸν αἷμα πίεται, εἰ Ζεὺς ἔτι Ζεὺς χὼ Διὸς Φοῖβος καφής.

⁴³⁶ Cf. Kelly (2009) 75; on Oedipus as 'a man of polarised extremes', cf. *ibid.* 121–33.

⁴³⁷ Cf. Jebb (1900) 85 ad loc. 'leaving the hearer to think of that which Oedipus gives, and *also* of that which he receives', and similarly ambiguously Σ 486 de Marco . . . ἰκέτευσεν αὐτὰς δέχεσθαι καὶ τὸν ἰκέτην ἐπὶ σωτηρία. Following Bake and Hartung (1851) 68, most editors change into σωτηρίους, to go with Εὐμενίδας, cf. Pearson (1924) ad loc. in app., Dawe (1985) 2.164, Lloyd-Jones (1994) 468 and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990) 377. Colonna (1975–83) 3.105 and Rodighiero (1998) 84 preserve the mss. reading. Campbell (1879) 1.330 assigns the adjective σωτήριος an, otherwise unattested, passive meaning. More likely is an active meaning, on which cf. Kamerbeek (1984) 85 ad loc., Rodighiero (1998) 197 ad loc., Avezzù, Guidorizzi, and Cerri (2008) 68 and Kelly (2009) 75 n. 39.

saviour' (487 τὸν ἱκέτην σωτήριον). Oedipus thus moves from requiring salvation from the people of Attica to offering salvation to them.

Antigone's comparison between the chorus and a god introduces the relationship between supplication and immortal power that the play explores. When the comparison is made, Antigone and Oedipus depend on the protection of the Attic elders as though it were a divine power. However, when the time comes, the people of Attica will in turn depend on Oedipus' powers, which by then will in fact be immortal.

Aeschylus' *Suppliants* provides another good example for our purposes. After Pelasgus dismisses the Aegyptid herald, and thereby accepts the Danaids' supplication, Danaus responds with a statement that is, at first sight, similar to the one made by Antigone in *Oedipus at Colonus*: ὦ παῖδες, Ἀργείοισιν εὐχεσθαι χρεὼν | θύειν τε λείβειν θ', ὥς θεοῖς Ὀλυμπίοις, | σπονδάς, ἐπεὶ σωτήρες οὐ διχορρόπως (980–2). On closer inspection, however, the two statements appear to be rather different. As is argued above, Antigone's brief comparison conveys an analogy between the chorus' capacities and those of a god in relation to her and Oedipus' weakness. In the *Suppliants*, on the other hand, the specifications attached to the comparison (εὐχεσθαι, θύειν τε λείβειν θ', σπονδάς) imply a treatment offered to the Argives that is identical to the worship of gods and, consequently, a perception of the Argives as gods. The phrase ὥς θεοῖς conveys here not similarity but identity with the gods.⁴³⁸ This difference may in part be caused by the difference in purpose between the two scenes. Antigone's praise of

⁴³⁸ See above, n. 433.

the chorus' powers is part of a strategy to win over the *supplicandi*. Danaus' offer of divine worship is an expression of gratitude in return for the supplication granted.

The extraordinary treatment that Danaus offers to the Argives is prepared to some extent by two earlier passages where the Danaids address Pelasgus in a language that resembles prayers addressed to gods. The first is the chorus' agitated⁴³⁹ appeal to the king in lines 348–54 (Παλαίχθονος τέκος, κλῦθί μου | πρόφρωνι καρδίαι, Πελασγῶν ἄναξ | ἴδε με τὰν ἱκέτιν φυγάδα περίδρομον . . .). Here the vocative with the patronym in the genitive evokes a general form of hymnic openings, while the imperative κλῦθι⁴⁴⁰ and its extension with the term πρόφρων⁴⁴¹ recall very precisely terms of the hymnic register. The second passage is the chorus' immediate reaction to Pelasgus' yielding to their supplication in

⁴³⁹ Here, the dochmiac metre conveys a spirit of urgency. On the metrical design of this *Suppl.* 348–437, cf. Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 2.279–80; on the nature of dochmiacs, cf. L. Parker (1997) 67 'Of all Greek metres, dochmiac is the one that has the clearest expressive function. It is the metre of violent emotion: anger, grief, fear, even, in later tragedy, tumultuous joy . . . '

⁴⁴⁰ On κλῦειν in tragic prayers, cf. Aesch. *Choe.* 139, 157, 332 (all to Agamemnon), 399 (to Earth and the gods below), 802 (to unspecified deities), Soph. *El.* 1376 (to Apollo), Eur. *Phoen.* 605 (altars of Thebes' ancestral gods). For epic, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. 'κλῦειν', B.II, 1458.31–2, and the discussions in Pulleyn (1997) 134–6 and 146–8. Without discussing the *Suppliants* passage, Pulleyn concludes that in Homer (e.g., *Il.* 1.37, 451, 5.115, 10.278, 16.514, 23.770; *Od.* 2.262, 3.55, 4.762, 5.445, 6.324, 9.528) and later Greek literature, 'κλῦθι is, in fact, a *vox propria* for prayer' (p. 147). He further notes that the plural κλῦτε can be used for mortals 'in order to lend special weight to the speaker's words because of the religious associations of κλῦθι' (*ibid.*). Cf. also Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 2.280 on 348 'Elsewhere in Aeschylus . . . , as in all poets down to Sophocles, the sing. imperat. forms κλῦθι and κλῦε are exclusively addressed to gods or heroes; . . . it appears that down to at least c. 450 B.C. κλῦθι and κλῦε are traditionally limited to prayers addressed to heroes and gods.' The nature of the addressee in Anacr. *PMG* 418 (κλῦθί μοι γέροντος εὐέθειρα χρυσόπεπλε κοῦρα) is uncertain; the reference to the speaker's old age could suggest a human girl, her epithets a goddess.

⁴⁴¹ On πρόφρων in tragic prayers, cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 1 (Zeus), 216 (Apollo), *Choe.* 1063 (a god unspecified), Soph. *El.* 1380 (Apollo), Eur. *Alc.* 743 (Hermes); the theme of 'benevolent reception' is ubiquitous in prayers and πρόφρων is among its most prominent expressions, cf. *Lfgre* s.v. 'πρόφρων', 1–2, 1580.54–1582.3, Pulleyn (1997) 145, 219, and Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 2.280 on 349 'in view of the implications of κλῦθι (348n.) it is noteworthy that, except here and in 968, where the Danaids are petitioning Pelasgus, the word πρόφρων is always applied to relations between gods and men.'

lines 966–74, just before Danaus’ prompt to treat the Argives as gods (ἀλλ’ ἀντ’ ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθοῖσι βρύοις, | δῖε Πελασγῶν. | πέμψον δὲ πρόφρων δεῦρ’ ἡμέτερον | πατέρ’ εὐθαρσῇ Δαναόν, πρόνοον | καὶ βούλαρχον . . .). Besides the repeated occurrence of πρόφρων as an extension of the imperative, it is here the epic adjective δῖος and its highly unusual combination with the genitive plural Πελασγῶν that conveys a sense of extraordinary, if not godlike, power.⁴⁴²

In the context of these addresses to Pelasgus, we may include a series of ambiguous invocations towards the end of the play, which illustrate one of the effects of the insinuations of the chorus and Danaus. On hearing about the arrival of the Aegyptids from line 710 onwards, the Danaids succumb to terror and, in this state of mind, invoke unspecified father and ruler figures (811 ἔπιδε πάτερ, 885 πάτερ; 835 γαί’ ἄναξ, προτάccου, 908 ἄναξ). In the case of πάτερ, it is unclear whether the Danaids are referring to Danaus, who receives this title when on the stage (cf. 204, 480, 734, 738, 748, 756, 1015), but is now absent, or to Zeus (cf. 139, 592 πατήρ φνιουργὸς αὐτόχειρ ἄναξ, 902 ὦ πᾶ, Γᾶς παῖ, Ζεῦ).⁴⁴³ In the case of ἄναξ, we cannot be sure whether they are appealing to Pelasgus, who receives this and similar terms of address (cf. 328, 349, 616), but does not re-enter the stage before line 911, or again to Zeus (cf. 524 ἄναξ ἀνάκτων, 592, 1062).⁴⁴⁴ Since neither Danaus nor Pelasgus is onstage when the chorus invoke a father or a

⁴⁴² Cf. Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 3.265 on 967 ‘Though the notion of “godlike” in δῖε should not be pressed . . . the application of this word to a person does imply, outside epic . . . , that he is above the ordinary human level.’

⁴⁴³ Cf. Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 2.162, 216, arguing for Zeus. Yet βρέτεος in 885, which would speak in favour of the god, is Wilamowitz’ emendation.

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. Σ 835a ὦ Πελασγέ, πρὸ ἡμῶν προτάccου and Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 181–2 on 835 ‘However, the possibility cannot be absolutely excluded that the addressee of this exhortation is Zeus . . .’

ruler respectively, there is no reason to believe that contemporary audiences would have had a more reliable indicator as to the identity of the addressees than we do. Hence it is tempting to assume that this uncertainty is not so much an imprecision on Aeschylus' or the chorus' part, which needs to be resolved by the audience or the reader, but rather a systematic blending of all figures capable of rendering help to the Danaids: Danaus, Pelasgus, and Zeus, whom they implore as their personal guardian throughout the play (e.g., 1–4, 23–9, 86, 91–2, 138–40, 162, 209, 359–60, 385–6, 402–4, 524–37, 599, 627–9, 652, 671–3, 689–90, 902, 1052–3, 1057–8, 1062–7).

A similar situation can be observed in the second episode of Euripides' *Heracles*. Until line 347, Amphitryon, Megara, and Heracles' children are seen supplicating the onstage altar of Ζεὺς Ὀρωτήρ (cf. 47–8),⁴⁴⁵ who, since Heracles is assumed dead, is the only power that they can resort to. The situation of these suppliants is desperate from the outset (cf. 51–9), and becomes increasingly so as the play evolves and their death seems inescapable.⁴⁴⁶ At the dramatic height of this development, when the group leave the house in order to surrender themselves to their executioners, Amphitryon utters a last prayer to Zeus, begging for a miracle (498–502). When, almost immediately after this prayer, Heracles enters the stage (between 513 and 514), this miracle seems to come true, leaving Megara and Amphitryon stupefied and speechless (514–19). In the context of such agonising tension and its sudden unexpected relief, Megara makes a connection between Heracles and Zeus that deserves attention: δεῦρ', ὦ τέκν',

⁴⁴⁵ On the presence and position of the altar in *HF*, cf. Poe (1989) 127.

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. the account in Yunis (1988) 140–1.

ἐκκρίμνασθε πατρώων πέπλων, | ἵτ' ἐγκονεῖτε, μὴ μεθῆτ', ἐπεὶ Διὸς | σωτήρος
 ὑμῖν οὐδέν ἐσθ' ὅδ' ὕστερος (520–2). This statement is remarkable above all for
 its ambiguity. We should first note that the adjective ὕστερος, though its primary
 temporal meaning need not be lost altogether ('no later a saviour', see below),
 seems to convey here also a sense of quality.⁴⁴⁷ Heracles is no *less* a saviour than
 Zeus, i.e., in this moment he saves like Zeus.⁴⁴⁸ This sense, however, does not
 specify which of the three scenarios that are conceivable after Amphitryon's
 prayer to Zeus is here the case: does Heracles appear instead of Zeus (who ignores
 the prayer), or on behalf of Zeus (who so responds to the prayer), or as Zeus (who
 personally intervenes in the shape of Heracles)?

Megara is not required to make a precise distinction at this point. Changing
 suddenly from despair to relief (518 κηραίνουσ'), her consciousness might simply
 fuse the two saviour figures available, Zeus and Heracles, into a single figure, as
 the Danaids seem to do at the end of Aeschylus' *Suppliants*. This imprecision
 would be expected to abate in the ensuing interaction with Heracles, when his
 identity becomes manifest. We should, however, notice that the phrase Διὸς
 σωτήρος οὐδέν ὕστερος assumes an interesting connotation in the context of one
 of the wider themes of *Heracles*, namely, the criticism of Zeus' inactivity.
 Already in the first episode, in Amphitryon's interaction with Lycus, a hint of
 criticism of Zeus' sense of justice is heard in the unfulfilled condition εἰ Ζεὺς

⁴⁴⁷ On this meaning of ὕστερος, cf. LSJ s.v. 'ὕστερος', III, and Soph. *Phil.* 180–1 (the chorus about Philoctetes) οὗτος πρωτογόνων ἴσως | οἴκων οὐδενὸς ὕστερος, *Ant.* 746 (Creon about Haemon) ὃ μαιρὸν ἦθος καὶ γυναικὸς ὕστερον.

⁴⁴⁸ So translate, e.g., Barlow (1996) 148 on 521–2 'for he is as good at saving you as Zeus himself', and Kovacs (1998) 355 'since he is no less a rescuer than Zeus the saviour is'. After the mentioning of Διὸς σωτήρος, an implied σωτήρ seems to be the noun to go with ὕστερος.

δικαίας εἶχεν εἰς ἡμᾶς φρένας (212). This criticism is fully developed in the second episode, where Amphitryon explicitly rebukes Zeus for engaging in affairs with mortal women but neglecting their well-being, and that of the offspring born from these affairs (339–47, esp. 344–6 *cū δ' ἐκ μὲν εὐνὰς κρύφιος ἡπίκτω μολεῖν, | τᾶλλότριά λέκτρα δόντος οὐδενὸς λαβών, | cōίζειν δὲ τοὺς κοὺς οὐκ ἐπίσταται φίλους*). He goes so far as to state his own moral superiority over the highest of gods (341–2 ἀρετῇ τε νικῶ θνητὸς ὢν θεὸν μέγαν), and declaring Zeus either a fool or unjust (347 ἀμαθὴς τις εἴ θεὸς ἢ δίκαιος οὐκ ἔφους).⁴⁴⁹ The tone of aggressive criticism is continued in the second appeal to Zeus, shortly before the appearance of Heracles (498–502). This appeal is focused on aspects of time since, in Amphitryon's perception, this particular moment provides the last opportunity for Zeus to prove his responsibility (500 ὥς τάχ' οὐδὲν ἀρκέσεις).

When Megara says that Heracles is no *later* a saviour than Zeus, and so highlights the timeliness of Heracles' arrival, she seems to offer a response to Amphitryon's criticism.⁴⁵⁰ Zeus did not appear in time and any hope directed at him indeed proved to be futile (cf. the emphasis on μάτην in 339–40 and 501). Heracles, on the other hand, arrives in time and offers actual protection, and therefore he takes, from the suppliants' perspective, the place previously held by Zeus (contrast 346 *cōίζειν δὲ τοὺς κοὺς οὐκ ἐπίσταται φίλους*). This change of

⁴⁴⁹ On the structure of Amphitryon's speech, its inversion of the prayer form, and the underlying discourse of *φιλία* and reciprocity, cf. Yunis (1988) 142–3. For a similar sentiment, cf. *IT* 385–91 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ἔτεκεν ἄν ἡ Διὸς δάμαρ | Λητῷ τοσαύτην ἀμαθίαν. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν | τὰ Ταντάλου θεοῖσιν ἐστιάματα | ἄπιστα κρίνω, παιδὸς ἡσθῆναι βορᾷ, | τοὺς δ' ἐνθάδ', αὐτοὺς ὄντας ἀνθρωποκτόνους, | ἐκ τῆν θεὸν τὸ φαῦλον ἀναφέρειν δοκῶ | οὐδένα γὰρ οἶμαι δαιμόνων εἶναι κακόν.

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. Wilamowitz (1889) 152 on 522 'Der Altar des Zeus Soter hat sie nicht geschützt (48), und die Anrufung des Zeus war noch eben als nutzlos bezeichnet (501)', Barlow (1996) 148 on 521–2 'an extravagant claim to equate Heracles with Zeus the Saviour and one which overrides the doubts expressed about Zeus at 339ff. and 498ff.'

perspective is visually expressed when the children, who supplicate the altar of Zeus until line 347, now proceed to supplicate their father (520–1; cf. 624–5 ἀλλὰ θάρρος ἔχετε | καὶ νόματ' ὅσων μηκέτ' ἐξανίετε). This comparison, therefore, unlike the other instances discussed here, conveys no similarity of power between Heracles and Zeus, but Heracles' superiority over Zeus in terms of tangible effect and justice.⁴⁵¹

For the chorus, Heracles' epiphany-like appearance restores a sense of divine justice in the world (756–9 τίς ὁ θεὸς ἀνομία | χραίνων, θνατὸς ὢν, | οὐρανίων <ὸς> ἄφρονα μακάρων κατέβα-|λε λόγον ὡς ἄρ' οὐ χθένουσιν θεοί). After the hero's rampage, this sense is entirely lost again. At the end of the play, the preference of mortal justice over divine injustice, which Megara expresses on seeing Heracles, re-occurs when Heracles denies any knowledge of and relation with Zeus and chooses to be the son of Amphitryon: Ζεὺς δ', ὅστις ὁ Ζεὺς, πολέμιόν μ' ἐγείνατο | Ἴηραι—cὺ μέντοι μηδὲν ἀχθεσθῆς, γέρον· | πατέρα γὰρ ἀντὶ Ζηνὸς ἡγοῦμαι σ' ἐγώ (1263–5). The preference for mortal justice over immortal cruelty emerges as one conclusion of the play, and Heracles' 'replacement' of Zeus on his appearance provides an early image towards this conclusion.

⁴⁵¹ In this regard we should note that Seneca's adaptation of the play focuses entirely on Hercules' godlike powers and the dangers that could arise from them for the existing order of the world, cf. *HF* 39–40 (Juno) *indomita uirtus colitur et toto deus | narratur orbe*, 63–74, esp. 74 *quaerit ad superos uiam*, 89–90 *i nunc, superbe, caelitem sedes pete*, | *humana temne*, 121–2 *scelere perfecto licet | admittat illas genitor in caelum manus*, 194–5 *caeloque parem | tollat et astris*, 265–7 (Amphitryo) *caelo relicto uenit, haec quae caelites | recepit et quae fecit et—fas sit loqui— | fortasse faciet*, 423 (Megara) *inferna tetigit posset ut super assequi*, 437 *non est ad astra mollis e terris uia*, 438 (Lycus) *quo patre genitus caelitem sperat domos*, and Heracles' own speech in 955–73. On the portrayal of Hercules and his aspirations in this play, cf. Hutchinson (1993) 208–16.

The three passages discussed so far in this section concern suppliants' addresses to *supplicandi* where the distinction between human and divine is not strictly observed. In Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* we find, besides a further example of such addresses, also a *supplicandus*' response. In this play Clytemnestra, on learning about Agamemnon's intention to sacrifice Iphigenia, supplicates Achilles in lines 900–18 for his help and protection. Clytemnestra starts her appeal by elevating Achilles and reducing herself, as is typical of supplicatory appeals, but she does so in terms of mortality and immortality (900–1 οὐκ ἐπαιδεσθήσομαι ἄλλοις ἀλλὰ προσπεσεῖν τὸν γόνυ | θνητὸς ἐκ θεᾶς γεγάτο· τί γὰρ ἐγὼ σεμνύνομαι;). According to her argument, Achilles, being the son of a goddess,⁴⁵² is more than an ordinary mortal, more than herself, and therefore worthy of being entreated in this way. This thought resurfaces when Clytemnestra states that she 'has no other altar to flee to' than Achilles' knee (911 οὐκ ἔχω βωμὸν καταφυγεῖν ἄλλον ἢ τὸν γόνυ; see above, p. 167). For this statement does not merely reflect the general choice of a suppliant to kneel either at an altar or in front of a mortal, but it identifies the invocation of a divine power with that of Achilles. In Clytemnestra's present situation, and in her present perception, appealing to Achilles' authority seems as worthwhile as appealing to a divine authority, since it can, if he yields, bring rescue (915–16 ἦν δὲ τολμήσεις κύ μου | χεῖρ' ὑπερτεῖναι, σεώμεθ'· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ σεώμεθα).

Achilles' reply to Clytemnestra's supplication (919–74) is among the most corrupt passages of the play, and so it is included in this discussion with a high

⁴⁵² Note that Achilles' divine mother is repeatedly stressed by Clytemnestra (626 κόρης ἰοθέου γένους, 903 ὦ θεᾶς παῖ, 909 πρὸς μητέρα) and in the chorus' reaction to his approval (ἔλεξας, ὦ παῖ Πηλέως, σοῦ τ' ἄξια, | καὶ τῆς ἐναλίας δαίμονος, σεμνῆς θεοῦ).

degree of caution. At the end of his speech, Achilles seems to refer precisely to those elevating aspects of Clytemnestra's appeal: ἀλλ' ἡκύχαζε· θεὸς ἐγὼ πέφηνά κοι | μέγιστος, οὐκ ὄν· ἀλλ' ὅμως γενήσομαι (973–74). If the line is genuine,⁴⁵³ the use of πέφηνα would deserve attention as it seems to change connotations as the sentence unfolds before the audience. Initially, Achilles seems to use the verb φαίνεσθαι as a god appearing in epiphany would be expected to use it.⁴⁵⁴ With the addition of κοι, this 'epiphany' is marked as slightly more subjective,⁴⁵⁵ not because Achilles merely 'appears to be the highest of gods to Clytemnestra', but because he 'has proved himself' or 'shown himself' to be so to her.⁴⁵⁶ Only with the phrase οὐκ ὄν it becomes clear that Achilles does not in fact share the view that he is a god. However, though Achilles eventually denies being the highest god, he nonetheless acknowledges that, for Clytemnestra, the protection that he offers is comparable to divine salvation.

This interaction between Clytemnestra and Achilles marks the first low point in a reversal process that starts with the grand chariot-entry of Clytemnestra and Iphigenia in lines 590–7, which is discussed earlier in this chapter.

⁴⁵³ The passage is considered spurious by most editors since Markland (1822) 59. Ritchie (1978) 196 argues for the lines' genuineness on grounds that 'Achilles means simply that, although he is not a god, he will fulfil the role of saviour for Clytemnestra', and the editions of Diggle (1981–94) 3.394 and Günther (1988) 23 retain them. Cf. already Hermann (1831) 97 on 980 'Volebat poeta, nisi fallor, magnitudinem periculi indicare, si Agamemno, si universus exercitus, et diis quidem secundum Calchantis vaticinia auctoribus, sacrificium virginis expeterent.' However, it seems that any attempt to retain the first two sentences should find an emendation for the highly suspicious ἀλλ' ὅμως γενήσομαι; as, for example, Hermann's ingenious ἀλλὰ φῶς γενήσομαι (on φῶς in supplicatory utterances, see above, n. 430).

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. especially Eur. *Bacch.* 182 Διόνυσον ὃς πέφηνεν ἀνθρώποις θεός, and 42 φανέντα θνητοῖς δαίμον ὃν τίκτει Δί. On φαίνεσθαι in descriptions of divine epiphanies generally, cf. Pfister (1924) 279.20–280.24, and the parody in Ar. *Ach.* 566–67 with Horn (1970) 46–47, Olson (2002) 221 ad loc. and Given (2009) 118.

⁴⁵⁵ On datives to denote subjective impressions, see above, n. 367.

⁴⁵⁶ Pace England (1891) 98 on 973 'It is possible that the interpolator here used φαίνεσθαι in the sense of δοκεῖν. If not, it is hard to find any sense in the following verse.'

Clytemnestra, the proud queen who comes to Aulis to conduct the most prestigious of weddings, now finds herself at Achilles' knees begging for his help. Even the soldiers, who admire the splendour of queen and princess as they arrive, now seem to pose a threat to the women far from home and in need of support (913–14 ἀφῖγμαι δ', ὥσπερ εἰσορᾷς, γυνή | ναυτικὸν στρατεύμ' ἀναρχόν). This reversal is reflected effectively in the changing descriptions of characters as 'godlike'. Initially, Clytemnestra and Iphigenia appear as deities for their nobility (596 κρείττους) and the wealth that they display (ὀλβοφόροι). Now, however, as fate turns against Clytemnestra and Iphigenia, and nobility and wealth prove worthless, Clytemnestra herself appeals to Achilles as godlike for his strength and martial standing.

With these passages in mind we can now approach Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The opening of the play is itself a scene of supplication, with the Priest and a group of children beseeching an altar outside the palace (1–3). As Oedipus enters the stage, the Priest, representing the group, directs a supplicatory appeal to him. This appeal expresses sublime praise for the ruler by recounting the deeds through which Oedipus established himself as the saviour of Thebes (esp. 47–8 ὥς δὲ νῦν μὲν ἦδε γῆ | σωτῆρα κλήζει τῆς πάρος προθυμίας). This strategy, which aims at securing the favour of a higher power by remembering favours granted in the past, could recall the hymnic strategy of *hypomnesis* or prayers of the type *da quia dedisti*.⁴⁵⁷ The Priest, however, seemingly aware of possible ambiguities in his address, clarifies the nature of his appeal at the outset: θεοῖσι

⁴⁵⁷ On hymnic *hypomnesis*, cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.57–58; on prayers of the type *da quia dedisti*, cf. Bremer (1981) 196 and Pulleyn (1997) 16–38.

μέν νυν οὐκ ἰκούμενόν σ' ἐγὼ | οὐδ' οἶδε παῖδες ἐζόμεσθ' ἐφέεττοι, | ἀνδρῶν δὲ
 πρῶτον ἔν τε συμφοραῖς βίου | κρίνοντες ἔν τε δαιμόνων συναλλαγαῖς (31–4).

Indeed, the Priest stresses Oedipus' human nature again when a series of imperatives might recall hymnic requests: ἴθι', ὦ βροτῶν ἄρις, ἀνόρθωσον πόλιν, | ἴθι', εὐλαβήθηθι' (46–7). In its explicitness, this emphasis on Oedipus' mortality and refusal to liken him to the gods seems noteworthy. Oedipus delivered the city from danger in the past, and he seems able to do so now. Hence, in the light of all the passages discussed so far in this section, there might seem to be a double justification for comparing his saving powers to divine powers. It appears that the Priest, by expressly renouncing such a comparison, shows his awareness of this hypothetical justification. In doing so, he confirms for us *ex negativo* an aspect of the suppliant's perception that we see in the plays discussed above.

While it is evident that the Priest's remarks contribute significantly to the characterisation of Oedipus, their precise effect is evaluated differently. The refusal to liken Oedipus to the gods could serve either to defy Oedipus' own aspirations, and so portray an arrogant and hubristic ruler,⁴⁵⁸ or to conform to them, and so portray a moderate ruler who is conscious of his place in the world.⁴⁵⁹ The second reading seems more attractive because, at this stage of the

⁴⁵⁸ For a negative interpretation, cf. R. Griffith (1999) 77–8 'The priest's claim that he does not liken Oedipus to the gods (31) would be reassuring if we did not see Oedipus behaving like a god. Since we do so seen him, the priest's words take on the unintended ominous quality of a warning.'

⁴⁵⁹ For a positive interpretation, cf. Dawe (2006) 74 on 31 'It is important that we know at an early stage whether Oedipus is the kind of tyrant who might wish to be regarded as divine, or whether he keeps himself from such impiety', and Manuwald (2012) 67 on 31–34 'Er [sc. Oedipus] gilt hier also nicht als jemand, der sich hybrisch über menschliches Maß hinausheben will . . . Diese Einschätzung ist von Bedeutung für das Verständnis der späteren Aussagen des Chores über die "Hybris" (873ff.).'

play, there is no compelling reason for the Priest to question the integrity of Oedipus. The general relationship between knowledge and guilt, which the play explores, emerges more clearly if Oedipus is characterised at the outset as a flawless monarch and the least likely suspect for the murder of Laius.⁴⁶⁰ Moreover, it should be noted that, on Tiresias' arrival, Oedipus readily offers the prophet the same elevated treatment that he himself received from the Priest (300–3 ὦ πάντα νομῶν Τειρεσία, διδακτά τε | ἄρρητά τ' οὐράνιά τε καὶ χθονοστιβῆ, | πόλιν μὲν, εἰ καὶ μὴ βλέπεις, φρονεῖς δ' ὅμως | οἷαι νόσῳι κύνεστιν· . . .).⁴⁶¹ Oedipus even addresses Tiresias as Thebes' 'only guardian and saviour' (303–4 . . . ἧς δὲ προστάτην | σωτήρ τ', ὦναξ, μόνον ἐξευρίσκων), and so passes on, and augments, the title that he himself received earlier.⁴⁶² The audience is likely to consider this behaviour towards the blind prophet, which would also be appropriate towards a monarch or even a deity, as an act of piety and modesty.

If the audience is meant to see Oedipus as a just and moderate ruler, it is attractive to interpret the Priest's refusal to liken Oedipus to the gods as part of that image. It seems that the act of approximating a ruler to the gods, and its acceptance or rejection by the ruler, is here assessed in moral terms, within the dichotomy of modesty and hubris, which links this play with other passages

⁴⁶⁰ In fact, after the prologue, Oedipus' integrity is taken for granted at least until line 873; here, Blaydes (1859) 122 on 873 changed the ms. reading ὕβρις φυτεύει τύραννον into ὕρβιν φυτεύει τυραννίς, which would advance criticism of Oedipus' modesty. Dawe (2006) 14 and 147–8 ad loc. makes a convincing case in favour of this conjecture.

⁴⁶¹ Cf. Dawe (2006) 102 on 303–4 'Oedipus applies to Teiresias the same language that others had addressed to him, and which can be used unaltered to a god.'

⁴⁶² Note that *προστάτης* is used for an unspecified deity in 822 (Chorus, θεὸν οὐ λήξω ποτὲ *προστάταν* ἴσχω), and *Trach.* 209 (the whole passage is of interest; cf. 207–15 ἐν δὲ κοινὸς ἀρσένων | ἴτω κλαγγὰ τὸν εὐφάρετραν | Ἀπόλλω *πορστάταν*, | ὁμοῦ δὲ παιᾶνα παι-|ᾶν' ἀνάγει, ὃ παρθένοι, | βοᾶτε τὰν ὁμόσπορον | Ἄρτεμιν Ὀρτυγίαν, ἐλαφαβόλον, ἀμφίπυρον, | γείτονάς τε Νύμφας). Cf., however, *OC* 1278, where θεοῦ *προστάτης* denotes the suppliant of a deity.

discussed in the previous section. By catering to the monarch's self-representation, the Priest withholds the comparison with the gods because he anticipates that Oedipus might reject it, in words perhaps similar to those used by Agamemnon in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.⁴⁶³ While in *Iphigenia at Aulis* a case is encountered where the *supplicandus* supposes that the suppliant sees him as godlike, *Oedipus Tyrannus* provides an example where the suppliant anticipates the *supplicandus*' reaction to being so treated.

COMIC ENTRIES

Our understanding of how the tragic suppliant perceives the *supplicandus* can be deepened by examining also the parody of this perception in comedy. Although there is extensive parody of the plots of suppliant tragedies in a few known cases,⁴⁶⁴ supplicatory gestures themselves seem to feature rarely on the comic stage.⁴⁶⁵ However, a systematic parody of tragic supplication is found in comic helper figures. Promoting and often executing the 'big ideas' of the protagonists,⁴⁶⁶ these helper figures are appealed to as *ωτῆρες*, as are *supplicandi*

⁴⁶³ See above, n. 373 and p. 162.

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. Rau (1967) 40–2, Foley (1988) 34–6, and Olson (2002) lx–lxi on the parody of Euripides' *Telephus* in *Acharnians*; Bakola (2010) 150–8 on Cratinus' *Drapetides* (PCG 256).

⁴⁶⁵ For supplicatory gestures in comedy, cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 179 (Euripides to Agathon) *ἰκέτης ἀφίγμαι πρὸς σέ*, 224 (Mnesilochus threatening to take refuge at the temple of Demeter), Av. 120 (Hoopoe to Peisetaerus and Euelpides) *ταῦτ' οὖν ἰκέται νῶ πρὸς σέ δεῦρ' ἀφίγμεθα*, Eq. 30–1 (Nicias to Demosthenes) *κράτιστα τοίνυν τῶν παρόντων ἐστὶ νῶν, | θεῶν ἰόντε προσπεσεῖν τοῦ πρὸς βρέτας*.

⁴⁶⁶ On 'big ideas' and helper figures in the plots of comedy, cf. Arrowsmith (1973) 137, Sommerstein (1980) 11–12, Sifakis (1992) 129–32, Given (2009) *passim*.

in tragedy.⁴⁶⁷ In the plays of Aristophanes there is a noteworthy pattern in the way that these figures are summoned on to the stage, since the elaborate style of these invocations often suggests the arrival of a god or a quasi-divine force. While the introduction of such a character arouses expectations of a divine epiphany, these expectations are usually crushed with the laughable figure that appears after the introduction. This incongruity not only has comic potential, but also substantiates the notion that we have derived from tragedy about the suppliant's perception of the *supplicandus*.

The first case is found in *Acharnians*, when Dicaeopolis suddenly announces in front of the chorus that his defence requires the help of Euripides (393–5). The following invocation to Euripides, brief though it may be, contains many elements characteristic of Aristophanic religious register: Εὐριπίδη, Εὐριπίδιον, | ὑπάκουσον, εἴπερ πόποτ' ἀνθρώπων τινί· | Δικαιοπόλις καλεῖ σε Χολλήιδης, ἐγώ (404–6).⁴⁶⁸ Reduplicated vocatives are used, especially in drama, to invoke deities,⁴⁶⁹ though here the diminutive in the second vocative may be amusing. Moreover, the term ὑπάκουσον recalls the use of imperatives of the verb ὑπακούειν in prayers throughout Aristophanes' plays,⁴⁷⁰ and the phrase εἴπερ

⁴⁶⁷ On *σωτηρία* denoting the big idea, cf. Ar. *Eq.* 11–12, *Vesp.* 369, *Pax* 301, 595, *Av.* 878–9, *Lys.* 29–30, *Thesm.* 765, 965, *Ran.* 1435–6, *Eccl.* 202, 395–6, 400–2, 412–14, and perhaps *PCG* 3, 35.1 and 650c.1; see also Frey (1948), Dunbar (1995) 371–2 on *Av.* 544–5, and Given (2009) 109. On *σωτήρ* referring to helper figures, cf. *Eq.* 146–9 (Servant to the Sausage Seller), 457–60 (chorus to the Sausage Seller), *Nub.* 1161 (Strepsiades to his son), *Pax* 913–17 (chorus to Trygaeus), and *Av.* 543–5 (chorus to Peisetaerus).

⁴⁶⁸ On this passage, cf. Kleinknecht (1937) 79, Horn (1970) 46, 51, Olson (2002) 179 on 405–6 'A parody of a typical prayer-formula', and, more cautiously, Willi (2003) 28 n. 82 'perhaps a parody of prayer'.

⁴⁶⁹ On reduplicated vocatives in hymnic invocations, cf. Soph. *Aj.* 693 ἰὼ ἰὼ Πᾶν Πᾶν, Eur. *Bacch.* 582–4 ἰὼ ἰὼ δέσποτα, δέσποτα, | μόλε νυν ἡμέτερον ἐκ | θιάκων ὧ Βρόμιε Βρόμιε.

⁴⁷⁰ On ὑπακούειν in Aristophanes, cf. *Lys.* 878 (Cinesias to Myrrina), *Nub.* 274 (Socrates to the Clouds; cf. 360), *Pax* 785 (chorus to the Muse), See also Dover (1968) 134, Olson (2002) 179 on

πόποτ' unmistakably adopts the argument *da quia dedisti*, which is fundamental to prayers.⁴⁷¹ Finally, the formulation καλεῖ σε matches hymnic expressions designed to identify the worshipper.⁴⁷²

Dicaeopolis addresses Euripides in this elevated, prayer-like fashion because he hopes to win his support. The similarities between this appeal and supplicatory appeals in tragedy are made explicit later, when Dicaeopolis entreats Euripides by clasping his knees (414 ἀλλ' ἀντιβολῶ πρὸς τῶν γονάτων σ', Εὐριπίδη, cf. 431 τούτου δός, ἀντιβολῶ σέ, μοι τὰ σπάργανα) and asks for the suppliant costume that the character of Telephus wore in Euripides' production (esp. 429–30). Before that, however, Euripides' appearance on stage provides humour. Contrary to the expectations created by Dicaeopolis' invocation, it is not a divine or quasi-divine power that is revealed onstage, but a sluggish poet, dressed in rags (412–13 ἀτὰρ τί τὰ ῥάκι'; εἰς τραγωιδίας ἔχεις | ἐσθῆτ' ἐλείνῃ;), lying on a sofa (ἀναβαδὴν in 399, 410), pretending to be working (406 ἀλλ' οὐ σκολή), who can be persuaded to appear only if he is not required to move, making his entry by means of the *eccyclema* (407–8).⁴⁷³

Ach. 405–6, Willi (2003) 28 with n. 82. In Eur. *Alc.* 399, ὑπάκουσον is used in a supplicatory appeal.

⁴⁷¹ See above, n. 421, on *Iliad* 1.500–10, and n. 457, on Soph. *OT* 47–8. On εἴ ποτε and similar strategies in Aristophanes, cf. *Eq.* 591–4 (chorus to Athena), *Nub.* 356–7 (Strepsiades to the Clouds) with the comments in Dover (1968) 148 ad loc., and *Thesm.* 1157–8 (chorus to Athena).

⁴⁷² On καλεῖν in Aristophanes, cf. *Thesm.* 1145–6 (chorus to Athena) δῆμός τοί σε καλεῖ γυναῖ-|κων (cf. 1137 δεῦρο καλεῖν νόμος εἰς χορόν), *Lys.* 356–7 (chorus to Athena) καί σε καλῶ ξύμμαχον, ὦ | Τριτογένει', *Nub.* 564–5 (chorus to Zeus) Ζῆνα τύραννον εἰς χορόν | πρῶτα μέγαν κικλήσκω, and Willi (2003) 17 with n. 39.

⁴⁷³ Similar to this scene is the entry of Agathon in the opening scene of *Thesmophoriazousae*. The servant of Agathon, who appears to announce his master's arrival, does so in terms of a divine epiphany (39–48), cf. Kleinknecht (1937a) 151 n. 1, (1937b) 297, Horn (1970) 46–52, esp. 50, Kugelmeier (1996) 272, Sommerstein (1994) 160 on 39, Given (2009) 117. Yet what is rolled out on the *eccyclema* is not a deity, but a man, shaved and dressed as a woman (136–8, 141–45, cf. Agathon's defence 149–52, 191), reclining on a sofa (cf. 97), surrounded by toiletries (138–40), and singing a song in a feminine voice (192 γυναικόφωνος). The emergence of this hermaphrodite

The second case is found in the prologue of *Knights*, when the two slaves intercept the Sausage Seller on his way to the market with the words ὦ μακάριε | ἀλλαντοπῶλα, δεῦρο δεῦρ', ὦ φίλτατε, | ἀνάβαινε σῶτήρ τῇ πόλει καὶ νῶν φανείς (147–9). This address is laden with adaptations of songs of worship,⁴⁷⁴ starting with the description of the Sausage Seller as σῶτήρ, which indicates his function as a helper. The opening ὦ μακάριε seems to allude to addresses to gods generally,⁴⁷⁵ the repeated δεῦρο to cletic hymns and prayers,⁴⁷⁶ and the participle φανείς to epiphany hymns and descriptions.⁴⁷⁷ After the entry of a somewhat perplexed Sausage Seller, the Slave repeats his address in equally hyperbolic terms (157–9 ὦ μακάρι', ὦ πλούσιε, | ὦ νῦν μὲν οὐδεὶς, αὔριον δ' ὑπέρμεγας, | ὦ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ταγὲ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων), where the phrase τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ταγὲ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων might recall Aeschylus' description of Zeus as ταγὸς μακάρων (*PV* 96).⁴⁷⁸

As becomes clear later in *Knights*, this sublime invocation of the Sausage Seller, and his consequent treatment as a quasi-divine helper, is conditioned by

(136 ὁ γόνυτις), where a deity is invoked, of course caters for the humour of contemporary audiences.

⁴⁷⁴ On this passage, cf. Kleinknecht (1937a) 79 n. 1 'gebethaft-parodische Begrüßung und Seligpreisung des Wursthändlers'.

⁴⁷⁵ On μακάριος, see above, n. 386.

⁴⁷⁶ On δεῦρο in Aristophanes, cf. *Ach.* 665 (chorus to the Muse), *Eq.* 559 (chorus to Poseidon), 586 and 591 (chorus to Athena), *Lys.* 1263 and 1271 (Spartans to Artemis), *Thesm.* 319 (chorus to Zeus, Apollo, and Athena), 1137 (chorus to Athena), *Ran.* 395 (chorus to Iacchus), 1306 (Aeschylus to the Muse of Euripides), *Eccl.* 882 (Old Woman to the Muses), and Willi (2003) 17 with n. 38, 19 n. 50.

⁴⁷⁷ On φανείς, see above, n. 454, and cf. Kleinknecht (1937a) 79 n. 1 'Φαίνομαι ist ja der älteste und seit Homer für das sichtbare Kommen der Gottheit zu den Menschen gebräuchliche religiöse Begriff', Horn (1970) 46, 51, Given (2009) 121–2. Note that the terms σῶτήρ and φανείς reappears in the chorus' elevated address to the Sausage Seller in 457–60 (ὦ γεννικώτατον κρέας ψυχῇ τ' ἄριστε πάντων, | καὶ τῇ πόλει σῶτήρ φανείς ἡμῖν τε τοῖς πολίταις, | ὥς εἰ τὸν ἄνδρα ποικίλως τ' ἐπῆλθε ἐν λόγοισιν. | πῶς ἂν σ' ἐπαινέσαιμεν οὕτως ὥς περ ἡδόμεσθα;), on which see Kleinknecht (1937a) 79 n. 1.

⁴⁷⁸ Note, however, that ταγός denotes the holder of a military office in Aesch. *Pers.* 23, 324, 480, *Ag.* 110, Soph. *Ant.* 1057, Eur. *IA* 269.

the contrast with Paphlagon, the great opponent who is himself attributed with godlike powers.⁴⁷⁹ Indeed, the Sausage Seller manages eventually to defeat Paphlagon and so earns the appellation *σωτήρ*. At this early point in the play, however, when the Sausage Seller is called onstage, the elevated treatment that he receives seems entirely incompatible with his actual appearance. The Sausage Seller enters carrying a vending table (152 *τοῦλεόν*) and butcher's gear (155 *τὰ κκεύη*), and displays the most naive, if not ignorant, demeanour (160–1, 188–9), which leads to a rather different address on the Slave's part immediately after his hyperbolic invocation (162 *ὦ μῶρε*).

The last example chosen here comes again from *Acharnians*, when Lamachus is summoned by the semichorus. Lamachus does not act as a helper to the plan conceived by Dicaeopolis, but as its opponent. He is, however, invoked by the semichorus precisely as their helper after the debate following Dicaeopolis' proposal. The agitated ode⁴⁸⁰ that they address to him is replete with evocations of cult song: *ἰὼ Λάμαχ', ὦ βλέπων ἀτραπάς, | βοήθησον, ὦ γοργολόφα, φανείς, | ἰὼ Λάμαχ', ὦ φίλ', ὦ φυλέτα· | εἴτ' ἐστι ταξίαρχος ἢ στρατηγὸς ἢ | τειχομάχας ἀνὴρ, βοηθηκάτω | τις ἀνύκας· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔχομαι μέκος* (566–71).⁴⁸¹ As regards form, repeated asyndetic invocations, *ἰὼ* preceding the vocative,⁴⁸² and participle extensions (*βλέπων*, *φανείς*) recall hymnic openings; the imperative *βοήθησον*

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. Given (2009) 120–1.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. L. Parker (1997) 134 ad loc. 'Dochmiacs suggest a certain loss of control as the anger of the Acharnians takes on a new tone of exasperation and bewilderment. Their certainties are to be shaken in this scene and eventually demolished.' *Ibid.* 67, Parker concedes the possibility of paratragedy.

⁴⁸¹ On this passage, cf. Kleinknecht (1937a) 77–9, Dover (1968) 125 on *Nub.* 219 'an almost supernatural being', Rau (1967) 40–2, Horn (1970) 46–7, Olson (2002) 221 on 566–7, Given (2009) 118.

⁴⁸² On *ἰὼ* in appeals for divine assistance, see above, n. 379.

befits petitionary prayers; lines 569–70 (εἴτ’ . . . ἥ . . . ἥ), which offer a combination of several attributes in an attempt not to omit the one most pleasing to the addressee, adopt hymnic *aporia*;⁴⁸³ γάρ is employed to provide the reason for the repeated imperative as it is in hymns.⁴⁸⁴ As regards theme, βλέπων ἀτραπάς resembles epic descriptions of fierce monsters or berserk warriors;⁴⁸⁵ γοργολόφα is an epithet of Athena in *Knights* 1181,⁴⁸⁶ and φανείσ recalls again epiphany hymns and descriptions.

After this solemn song, Lamachus’ blustering entry onstage must appear ridiculous. He appears with a retinue of soldiers (575 λόχων), clad in full armour, carrying a Gorgon shield (582 τὴν μορμόνα), wearing an oversized helmet with a triple crest (575 τῶν λόφων, 586 τοὺς λόφους) and two large feathers (584–9 πτερόν, πτίλον), and responds to the semichorus’ invocation with a series of inflated questions (572–4 πόθεν βοῆς ἤκουσα πολεμιστηρίας; | ποῖ χρή βοηθεῖν; ποῖ κυδοιμὸν ἐμβαλεῖν; | τίς Γοργόν’ ἐξήγειρεν ἐκ τοῦ κάγματος;). Lamachus provides an absurdly exaggerated image of a soldier and, in the ensuing *agon*, Dicaeopolis mocks him precisely for this image.

It was noted in the previous section that in tragic supplication a tendency can be observed whereby the suppliant equates the mortal *supplicandus* with a divine being. It seems that, in the Aristophanic passages discussed here, we catch

⁴⁸³ On hymnic *aporia*, see above, nn. 145, 196, and 410; cf. Norden (1913) 146–7, Race (1990) 104, and Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.56.

⁴⁸⁴ On hymnic γάρ, cf. Race (1990) 86.

⁴⁸⁵ For similar expressions, cf. *Od.* 19.446 (a boar) πῦρ δ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσι δεδορκώς, Aesch. *Sept.* 53 λεόντων ὧς Ἄρη δεδορκότων, *PV* 356 (Typhon) ἐξ ὀμμάτων δ’ ἤστραπτε γοργωπὸν ἐέλας, and *Lfgre* s.v. ‘δέρκομαι’, 251.59–76; thematically closer is Soph. *Oenom. TrGF* 4, F477 τοίαν Πέλοψ ἴγγα θηρατηρίαν | ἔρωτος, ἀτραπὴν τιν’ ὀμμάτων, ἔχει. For another parody of this expression, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 254 (Dicaeopolis to his daughter) ἄγ’, ὦ θύγατερ, ὅπως τὸ κανοῦν καλὴ καλῶς | οἶσεις, βλέπουσα θυμβροφάγον.

⁴⁸⁶ Cf. Van Leeuwen (1901) 202 ad loc. and Anderson (1995) 26–7.

sight of the same tendency through the comic prism. The pompous and high-flown style of comic invocations, which unmistakably recalls the registers of prayers and hymns, is likely to be an exaggeration of tragic supplicatory appeals, where the *supplicandus* is addressed as though he were a god.⁴⁸⁷ The expectations, too, which these comic passages conjure up only to crush them, are expectations of tragedy, where grand addresses and grand entries go hand in hand.⁴⁸⁸ Comedy, in this way, seems to confirm a perspective from which mortals can appear as divine.

CONCLUSION

The interpretations offered in this chapter aim to show that, in a selection of plays, we seem to find conventionalised perspectives whereby human beings can, in certain moments, be approximated to the divine sphere. As can be demonstrated, these perspectives are voiced as a character's or the chorus' reaction to witnessing a splendid appearance; they can be a character's memory of a happier past; or they can serve as a means to win the favour of another character, to good or to bad effect. The qualities that here seem to elevate a human being temporarily are centred around notions of physical, economical, or social power, and, in the

⁴⁸⁷ On style as a means of paratragedy, cf. Rau (1967) 10–18, Horn (1970) 58 'Die Sprache der Komödie ist die Umgangssprache, der sermo cottidianus, und ihr Stil das γένος ἰσχνόν. Verstöße gegen dieses Gesetz wirken in der Komödienwirklichkeit komisch', though 'Gesetz' may seem too strong a term. Cf. also Landfester (1975) 336 and Kugelmeier (1996) 309.

⁴⁸⁸ Cf. Given (2009) 114–18.

female sphere, of beauty. Drama thus attests to perspectives comparable to the ones encountered in wedding and victory poetry. Drama also agrees with the two lyric genres in that some perspectives—namely those made in supplication—appear to be rooted in a ritual context that in itself seems to permit some blurring of the boundaries between mortal and immortal.

However, as opposed to epinicians and *hymenaei*, tragedy attaches a distinct notion of discomfort to comparisons between mortal protagonists and immortal beings. In the first section of this chapter, two cases are encountered where a present state of godlike power or beauty foreshadows imminent ruin (Eur. *Hipp.* 88, *IA* 590–607); one case where a past state of godlike bliss contrasts present misery (Eur. *Hec.* 342–78); and two cases where the praise of a character as godlike is part of a scheme to kill that character (Aesch. *Ag.* 895–913, Eur. *El.* 988–97). Here, comparisons between characters and gods convey a spirit of foreboding and almost anticipate the reversals of fortune that follow. A similar connection between these comparisons and suffering is found in supplication, which is usually conducted by characters at the low-points of their developments. Moreover, some *supplicandi* seem to perceive danger in being compared to the gods since, if the interpretations offered here are accepted, one *supplicandus* rejects such comparison (Achilles in *Iphigenia at Aulis*), while another is, because of his modesty, anticipated by the suppliant to reject it (Oedipus in *Oedipus Tyrannus*).

The end of the previous chapter brought us to consider, in abstract terms, the dangers of excessive praise about which the epinician *laudator* purports to be

concerned. The tragic plays selected here can serve to supply vivid depictions of the consequences of such praise, and of strategies of averting them. Approximations of characters to gods, and characters' attitudes towards such approximations, are decidedly more explicit in tragedy than in epinicians or *hymenaei*. Nowhere in epinician poetry do we find the *laudator* say to the *laudandus* 'you are like the gods save alone for dying' (Eur. *IA* 356), or 'I worship you like a blessed deity for your wealth and great fortune' (Eur. *El.* 994–5); nor does he say, conversely, 'we do not sit before you because you equal the gods, but because we consider you the best of mortals' (Soph. *OC* 31–4). Similarly, it is, hypothetically, unlikely that the *laudandus* would respond to a song with 'I tell you to treat me as a man, not as a god' (Aesch. *Ag.* 925). This explicitness is crucial. Epinicians may negotiate and, at times, even stretch the limits of what its audience would consider sufficiently moderate praise, but its proclaimed objective is to stay within these limits. In the plays discussed in this chapter, on the other hand, these lines need to be crossed, from a dramaturgical point of view, so as to motivate the downfall of the hero who is so praised.

CONCLUSION

In some way or other, all the Archaic and Classical poetry discussed here presupposes one global vision about the relationship between man and god: that mortals cannot become immortal. Although this vision is probably derived from widespread attitudes towards the gods from the seventh to the fifth centuries BC, this thesis is dedicated to poetic expressions of this vision. In the poetry composed during this time, it is reflected in a certain pressure to observe the boundaries between man and god. Pindar's *μὴ ματεύεσθαι θεὸς γενέσθαι* (*O.* 5.24, cf. *I.* 5.14) or *ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτ' ἀμβατὸς αὐτῶι* (*P.* 10.27), and perhaps Sappho's hymenaeic *ἵδμεν μ[έ]γαν εἰς Ὀλ[υμπόν | ἄ]νθρωπον* (fr. 27.12–13 V),⁴⁸⁹ can serve to illustrate this pressure. However, as this thesis aims to show, this pressure results not necessarily in rigidity and conservatism, but in creative explorations and negotiations of the precise nature of these boundaries.

Different genres, embedded in specific occasions and responding to particular objectives, explore these boundaries differently. Some, like iambus, elegy, and the lyric *threnos*, can downright deny mortals the possibility of approximating, even momentarily, to divinity. Other genres, especially those concerned with praise, appear less reluctant to allow for such possibilities. Wedding songs and victory odes conjure up a spirit of exuberant celebration and revelry, and derive from this spirit a perspective whereby their protagonists can appear as enjoying moments of divine joy and success. That such perspectives are conventional to the two encomiastic genres is suggested by the highly generic

⁴⁸⁹ For Sapph. fr. 27 V, a context of a wedding is indicated in line 9 (c) *τείχομεν γὰρ ἐς γάμον* . . .). The impact of lines 12–13 must not be overstated, as the reading reprinted here is in fact Hunt's rather creative combination of *POxy.* 10, 1231, fr. 53 (*ἵδμεν | ἄνθρωπον*) and 51 (*ἵδμεν | ἄνθρωπον*); cf. Grenfell and Hunt (1914) 38.

rendering of their protagonists, which is found in the wedding song and, to a smaller degree, in the victory ode. Like the *kouroi* set up for victorious athletes and the majority of bridal couples depicted on wedding vases, the songs seem to create a dimension where the expected differentiations between human, heroic, and divine can be blurred. The tragedians incorporate similarly exuberant mind-sets into the tragic world and exploit them for the development of the plot. Here too, references to immortality, which are made in response to extraordinary wealth, beauty, and power, are unspecific and appear to be part of a certain rhetoric.

Further comparison between the specific uses of this rhetoric of immortality in epinician, *hymenaeus*, and tragedy requires a careful distinction between individual formulations of this rhetoric and the wider objectives achieved by them, that is, between means and ends. As regards means, wedding songs and tragedy are similar in that both genres employ direct comparisons between protagonists and heroes or gods, whereas victory odes create parallels between victory and immortality less explicitly. As regards ends, however, wedding songs and tragedy seem to form an antithesis. Wedding songs, on the one hand, are immersed in the present moment and, apart from wishes for a happy life and offspring, deliberately oblivious to the future.⁴⁹⁰ Here, comparisons with heroes or gods serve no other purpose than the praise of the bridal couple. Tragedy, on the other hand, aims for universal claims. In the structures of the plays, impressions

⁴⁹⁰ Sapph. fr. 43.6 V mentions a certain κάματος φρένα[[c]], but the genre of the fragment is uncertain. The reference to night-time activity (8–9] ἀλλ' ἄγιν', ὦ φίλοι, |] ἄγχι γὰρ ἡμέρα) does not necessarily indicate a context of wedding, as it does, e.g., in Sapph. fr. 30.1–4 V (νόκτ[. . .] . [|] | πάρθενοι δ[| παννυχίδοι[c]αί | | cὰν ἀείδοις[t]ν φ[ιλότατα καὶ νύμ]φας ἰοκόλω).

of extraordinary privilege are given a frame in which they are juxtaposed with equally extraordinary suffering. Through this juxtaposition, this rhetoric of immortality inspires apprehension. Initially it may serve as a means of praise, as in wedding songs, but ultimately it is presented as an impression in need of correction. A false sense of security, as conveyed in a false sense of immortality, is unmasked as naive and dangerous. In this antithesis between wedding song and tragedy, the epinician takes a middle position. On the one hand, victory odes, like wedding songs, focus on the moment of celebration and make other temporal layers part of the characterisation of this *hic et nunc*. On the other hand, like tragedy, they display an undeniable effort to convey universal truths. The epinician *laudator* is presented as aware of the dangers that tragedy illustrates onstage, and therefore pursues a more cautious path. Immortality is a significant point of reference in the depictions of victory celebrations, but its effect is cushioned by vagueness and intimation.

A crucial element in achieving these various ends in the three genres is myth. Even short and specific references to myth will evoke wider narrative contexts. In this way, myth can lead away from the present moment and its demands and invite thinking about universal truths and making universal claims. Tragedy fully embraces this capacity of myth to allow for sudden reversals and to infer from them a universal truth. In the epinician, the use of myth is more complicated. Narratives can lead to encompassing gnomic conclusions, but they can also run the risk of distracting from the present occasion too much. Thus there are cases, like *Nemean* 3 (26–31) and *Pythian* 10 (51–9), where the *laudator*

breaks off a narrative suddenly and returns to a subject closer to the *laudandus*.⁴⁹¹

In this tension between acknowledging the present occasion and making claims of a more universal nature, narratives about toil and ultimate reward seem to offer a solution. They allow both seeing the victor and his achievement reflected in figures like Perseus, Pelops, and Heracles and their exploits, and inferring from them a universal truth. In the wedding song, it would appear to be more difficult to achieve a similar effect since myth offers hardly any example of a marriage that does not involve forms of prolonged suffering or killing. It is hard to conceive how couples like Clytemnestra and Agamemnon, Helen and Menelaus, or Andromache and Hector could provide paradigms for an optimistic bridal couple. Sappho's fr. 44 V relates the wedding of Andromache and Hector, but, as is argued above,⁴⁹² the context of its original performance is uncertain. Peleus and Thetis would offer perhaps the least portentous paradigm, and indeed they are frequently depicted (and labelled) on Athenian wedding vases. It may be for these difficulties that, though it is possible that more elaborate wedding songs contained some forms of mythical narratives, no example is attested, except for Aristophanes' *Birds*, and there it is characteristically the wedding of Zeus and Hera that parallels the wedding of the 'new Zeus' Peisetaerus. Instead of

⁴⁹¹ Cf. also P. O. 3.38–41 (after the narrative about Heracles' fetching olive trees from the Hyperboreans and establishing the Olympic Games: . . . ἐμὲ δ' ὦν παῖ θυμὸς ὀτρύνει φάμεν Ἑμμενίδασι | Θήρωνι τ' ἐλθεῖν κῶδος εὐίππων διδόντων Τυνδαριδᾶν, ὅτι πλείστασι βροτῶν | ξενίασι αὐτοὺς ἐποίχονται τραπέζαισι, | εὐσεβεῖ γινώμαι φυλάσσοντες μακάρων τελετάς). Rapid summaries of remaining aspects of a story are found in P. 4.247–8 (after narrating the story of Jason up to the sawing of the dragon's teeth: μακρὰ μοι νεῖσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν· ὥρα γὰρ συνάπτει· καὶ τίνα | οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχόν), and in I. 6.56–9 (after the narrative about the encounter between Heracles and Telamon: ἐμοὶ δὲ μακρὸν πάσας ἄν' ἀγῆσθαι ἀρετάς· | Φυλακίδαί γὰρ ἦλθον, ὧς Μοῖσα, ταμία | Πυθέαι τε κώμων Εὐθυμένει τε· τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον | εἰρήσεται που κἄν βραχίστοισι).

⁴⁹² See above, p. 56 with n. 161.

potentially ambiguous and potentially distracting narratives, we find in wedding songs direct comparisons between the bridal couple and heroes or gods for certain, often explicitly stated qualities: between the bride and Helen or Aphrodite for grace and beauty; between the bridegroom and Achilles or Ares for athletic appearance and strength. As the examples of Helen and Achilles suggest, this form of reference allows greater control over the evocative powers of myth. The present moment remains in focus, so much so that most songs are restricted from elevating this moment towards a universal truth.

The interpretations offered here focus on features of the poetic worlds of *hymenaeus*, epinician, and tragedy, and of the perspectives found conventionally in these worlds. The nature of our evidence does not permit decisive conclusions about how these perspectives relate to other perceptions of bridal couples, athletic victors, and other successful individuals outside of these worlds. However, there is a possibility that the poetry as we have it received inspiration from the spirit of the occasions for which it was composed. Wedding songs, for example, presuppose the context of the wedding ceremony, which appears to have involved a range of forms of shouting, jesting, and singing. Here, it is tempting to assume that certain perspectives, like that of the bridal couple as enjoying a moment of immortality, are characteristic of the occasion as a whole and merely reflected in the elaborate songs that have survived. The exceptional treatment that the bridal couple receive at these ceremonies, as well as the iconography of the bridal couple on Athenian vases, can be interpreted in favour of this possibility. A similar argument could be developed for the victory celebration, which also seems

to have involved forms of simple songs, centred around shouts of *τήνελλα*.⁴⁹³ However, it is important to highlight that, even if occasion, rather than just poetry, generates such perspectives of momentary immortality, this would not allow us to move into historical reality and identify the targets of this praise with historical individuals. Comparisons with Aphrodite and Ares, or parallelisms with Heracles and Pelops, even where they are made in the most basic way, are aimed at generic *personae*. They do not, to our knowledge, reflect the particular status enjoyed, or the particular hopes entertained, by historical individuals like Aristocleidas of Aegina, Hippocles of Thessaly, Hieron of Syracuse, or a particular bridal couple. In tragedy, a variety of perspectives, ranging from exuberant elevation to desperate lament, are applied to the same character, often in rapid succession. This seems to confirm that such perspectives are conventionalised responses to certain occasions, to which they are confined. Wedding ceremonies and victory celebrations, and the songs performed on these occasions, communicate the approximation of their protagonists to immortality, but these perspectives are limited to these occasions, just as the immortality that they refer to lasts but for a moment.

⁴⁹³ Cf. P. O. 9.1–4 τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος | φωνᾷεν Ὀλυμπίαι, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδῶς, | ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι | κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστωι σὺν ἑταίροις, with Σ ad loc. = Arch. IEG 324, and Σ^c N. 3.1; for *τήνελλα*, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1227–34 (DI. ὁρᾷτε τουτονὶ κενόν. *τήνελλα* καλλίνικος. | CH. *τήνελλα* δῆτ', εἵπερ καλεῖς γ', ὃ πρέσβυ, καλλίνικος. | DI. καὶ πρὸς γ' ἄκρατον ἐγγέας ἄμυστιν ἐξέελαψα. | CH. *τήνελλα* νυν, ὃ γεννάδα· χῶρει λαβὼν τὸν ἄσκόν. | DI. ἔπεσθέ νυν αἰδοντες· “ὃ *τήνελλα* καλλίνικος”. | CH. ἀλλ' ἐψόμεσθα σὴν χάριν | *τήνελλα* καλλίνικον αἰ-δοντες ἐπὶ καὶ τὸν ἄσκόν) with Σ ad loc., *Equ.* 276 (CH. ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὲν τόνδε νικᾷς τῇ βοῇ, *τήνελλος* εἶ) with Σ ad loc., and *An.* 1765 (CH. *τήνελλα* καλλίνικος, ὃ δαίμόνων ὑπέρτατε).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adami, F. (1900), *De poetis scaenicis Graecis hymnorum sacrorum imitatoribus* (Diss. Giessen).
- Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. (eds.) (2012), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge).
- Ahlberg, G. (1971), *Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art* (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 32; Göteborg).
- Alexiou, G. (1974), *The Ritual Lament in the Greek Tradition* (Cambridge).
- (2002a), *The Ritual Lament in the Greek Tradition*, 2nd ed. revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos (Lanham).
- (2002b), *After Antiquity: Greek Language, Myth, and Metaphor* (Ithaca, NY).
- (2004), 'Not by words alone: Ritual approaches to Greek literature', in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (eds.): 94–120.
- Anderson, C. A. (1995), *Athena's Epithets: Their Structural Significance in the Plays of Aristophanes* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- Appel, G. (1909), *De Romanorum Precationibus* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 7.2; Giessen).
- Arrowsmith, W. (1973), 'Aristophanes' *Birds*: The fantasy politics of Eros', *Arion* 1: 119–67.
- Athanassaki, L. (2004), 'Deixis, performance, and poetics in Pindar's First *Olympian Ode*', in Felson (ed.): 317–41.
- (2009), 'Narratology, deixis, and the performance of choral lyric: On Pindar's First *Pythian Ode*', in Grethlein and Rengakos (eds.): 241–73.

- (2011a), ‘Giving wings to the Aeginetan sculptures: The Panhellenic aspirations of Pindar’s Eighth *Olympian*’, in Fearn (ed.): 257–93.
- (2011b), ‘Songs, politics, and cultural memory: Pindar’s *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmeonid temple of Apollo’, in Athanassaki and Bowie (eds.): 235–68.
- (2012a), ‘Performance and re-performance: The Siphnian treasury evoked (Pindar’s *Pythian* 6, *Olympian* 2 and *Isthmian* 2)’, in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.): 134–57.
- (2012b), ‘Recreating the emotional experience of contest and victory celebrations: Spectators and celebrants in Pindar’s epinicians’, in Riu and Pòrtulas (eds.): 173–219.
- Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. L. (eds.) (2011), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (Oxford).
- Aubriot-Sévin, D. (1992), *Prière et conceptions religieuses en Grèce ancienne jusqu’à la fin du V^e siècle avant J.-C.* (Lyon).
- (1994), ‘Sur la valeur religieuse de quelques prières dans la tragédie grecque’, *Journal des Savants*: 3–18.
- Ausfeld, K. (1903), ‘De Graecorum precationibus quaestiones’, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 28: 503–47.
- Austin C. and Olson, S. D. (2004), *Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Avezzù, G. (ed.) (2003), *Il dramma sofocleo. Testo, lingua, interpretazione* (Drama: Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 13; Stuttgart).

- Avezzù, G., Guidorizzi, G., and Cerri, G. (2008), *Sofocle, Edipo a Colono* (Rome).
- Babin, M. (1978), *Epithalamia: Classical Traditions and Changing Responses* (Diss. Berkeley).
- Bagordo, A. (2003a), *Reminiszenzen früher Lyrik bei den attischen Tragikern. Beiträge zur Anspielungstechnik und poetischen Tradition* (Munich).
- (2003b), 'Sofocle e i lirici: Traduzione e allusione', in Avezzù (ed.): 5–15.
- Bailey, C. (ed.) (1936), *Greek Poetry and Life: Festschrift G. Murray* (Cambridge).
- Bakola, E. (2010), *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford).
- Bakola, E., Prauscello, L., and Telò, M. (eds.) (2013), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genre* (Cambridge).
- Barlow, S. A. (1996), *Euripides, Heracles: With Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Warminster).
- Barrett, W. S. (1956), 'Dactylo-epitrites in Bacchylides', *Hermes* 84: 248–53 = (2007): 314–21.
- (1964), *Euripides, Hippolytus: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- (2007), *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers*, ed. M. L. West (Oxford).
- Barringer, J. M. (2005), 'The temple of Zeus, heroes, and athletes', *Hesperia* 74: 211–41.

- Barron, J. P. (1984), 'Ibycus: *Gorgias* and other fragments', *BICS* 31: 13–24.
- Beazley, J. D. (1955), 'Hydria-fragments in Corinth', *Hesperia* 24: 305–19.
- Becker, O. (1937), *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Hermes Einzelschriften 4; Munich).
- Berman, D. W. (2015), *Myth, Literature, and the Creation of the Topography of Thebes* (Cambridge).
- Biehl, W. (1985), 'Interpretationsprobleme in Eurpides' *Hekabe*', *Hermes* 113: 257–66.
- (1989), *Euripides, Troades* (Heidelberg).
- Bierl, A. (2001), *Der Chor in der Alten Komödie. Ritual und Performativität (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Aristophanes' Thesomphoriazusen und der Phalloslieder fr. 851 PMG)*, (Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 126; Munich).
- (2009), *Ritual and Performativity: The Chorus in Old Comedy*, trans. A. Hollmann (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (2011), 'Alcman at the end of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*: ritual interchorality', in Athanassaki and Bowie (eds.): 415–36.
- Bierl, A., Lämmle, R., and Wesselmann, K. (eds.) (2007), *Literatur und Religion. Wege zu einer mythisch-rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen* (Berlin and New York).
- Billings, J., Budelmann, F., and Macintosh, F. (eds.) (2013), *Choruses, Ancient and Modern* (Oxford).

Bitto, G. (2011), 'Ein horazisches Skolion: Zu Horaz c. 1.19 und Pindar frg. 122', *Hermes* 139: 205–15.

——— (2012), *Lyrik als Philologie: Zur Rezeption hellenistischer Pindarkommentierung in den Oden des Horaz. Mit einer rhetorisch-literarkritischen Analyse der Pindarscholien* (Litora Classica 4; Rahden)

Blaydes, F. H. M. (1859), *Sophocles: With English Notes* (London).

Blech, M. (1982), *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (Berlin and New York).

Blevins, J. (ed.) (2008), *Dialogism and Lyric Self-Fashioning: Bakhtin and the Voices of a Genre* (Selinsgrove, Penn.).

Boardman, J. (1952), 'Pottery from Eretria', *BSA* 47: 1–48.

——— (1955), 'Painted funerary plaques and some remarks on prothesis', *BSA* 1: 51–66.

——— (1978), *Greek Sculpture: The Archaic Period* (London).

——— (1988), 'Sex differentiation in grave vases', *AION (archeol)* 9: 171–9.

Boedeker, D. (1998), 'The new Simonides and heroization at Plataea', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* (London): 231–49.

Bollansée, I. (2001), 'Aristotle and the death of Hermias of Atarneus', *Simblos* 3: 67–98.

Bömer, F. (1976), *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar*, vol. 3: *Buch 6–7* (Heidelberg).

Bosworth, A. B. (1988), *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge).

- (1994), 'Alexander the Great Part 2: Greece and the conquered territories', in *CAH* 6.846–75.
- (1995), *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph* (Oxford).
- Bothe, F. H. (1825/6), *Euripidis Dramata*, 2 vols. (Leipzig).
- Bowie, A. M. (1993), *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual, and Comedy* (Cambridge).
- (1997), 'Thinking with drinking: wine and the symposium in Aristophanes', *JHS* 117: 1–21.
- Bowie, E. (2012), 'Pindar and "patrons"', in Agócs, Carey, and Rawley (eds.): 83–92.
- Bowra, C. M. (1934), 'Varia lyrica', *Mnemosyne* 3: 175–80.
- (1936), 'Pindar, *Pythian IX*', *CQ* 30: 129–41.
- (1938), 'Aristotle's hymn to virtue', *CQ* 32: 192–9.
- (1961), *Greek Lyric Poetry: From Alcman to Simonides* (2nd ed.; Oxford).
- (1964), *Pindar* (Oxford).
- (1965), *Classical Greece* (New York).
- Boys-Stones, G. R. (ed.) (2003), *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions* (Oxford).
- Braswell, B. K. (1988), *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin).
- (1992), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Freiburg).
- (1998), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Berlin and New York).
- (2012), 'Reading Pindar in antiquity', *MH* 69: 12–28.
- Brazda, M. (1977), *Zur Bedeutung des Apfels in der antiken Literatur* (Bonn).

- Bremer, J. M. (1981), 'Greek hymns', in Versnel and van Straten (eds.): 193–215.
- (1998a), 'Greek cultic poetry: Some ideas behind a forthcoming edition', *Mnemosyne* 51: 513–24.
- (1998b), 'The reciprocity of giving and thanksgiving in Greek worship', in Gill and Seaford (eds.): 127–39.
- (2008), 'Traces of the hymn in the epinikion', *Mnemosyne* 61: 1–17.
- Bremmer, J. (1983), *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton, NJ).
- Brinkmann, V. (1985), 'Die aufgemalten Namensbeischriften an Nord- und Ostfries des Siphnierschatzhauses', *BCH* 109: 77–130.
- (1994), *Die Frieze des Siphnierschatzhauses* (Ennepetal).
- Brommer, F. (1984), *Herakles, vol. 2: Die unkanonischen Taten des Helden* (Darmstadt).
- Budelmann, F. (2000), *The Language of Sophocles: Communality, Communication, and Involvement* (Cambridge).
- (ed.) (2009), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge).
- (2012), 'Epinician and the symposion: a comparison with the *enkōmia*', in Agócs, Rawles, and Carey (eds.): 173–90.
- (2013), 'Greek festival choruses in and out of context', in Billings, Budelmann, and Macintosh (eds.): 81–98.
- Bundy, E. L. (1962), *Studia Pindarica* (University of California Publications in Classical Philology 18.1–2; Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Burian, P. (1971), *Suppliant Drama: Studies in the Form and Interpretation of Five Greek Tragedies* (Diss. Princeton).

- (1972), 'Supplication and hero cult in Sophocles' Ajax', *GRBS* 13: 151–6.
- (1974), 'Suppliant and saviour: *Oedipus at Colonus*', *Phoenix* 28: 408–29.
- (1997), 'Myth into *muthos*: The Shaping of the tragic plot', in Easterling (ed.): 178–208.
- Burkert, W. (1972), *Homo Necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Berlin and New York).
- (1977), *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart).
- (1979), *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Sather Classical Lectures 47; Berkeley).
- (1981), 'Glaube und Verhalten. Zeichengehalt und Wirkmacht von Opferritualen', in J. Rudhardt and O. Reverdin (eds.), *Le Sacrifice dans l'Antiquité* (Fond. Hardt 27; Geneva): 91–125.
- (1983), *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, transl. P. Bing (Berkeley).
- (1985a), *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. J. Raffan (Oxford).
- (1985b), 'Opferritual bei Sophokles: Pragmatik—Symbolik—Theater', *AU* 28: 5–20.
- (1992), *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near-Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, Mass).
- (1994), 'Griechische hymnoi', in: Burkert and Stolz (eds.): 9–17.

- (2003), *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2: *Orientalia*, edd. M. L. Gemelli-Marciano et al. (Hypomnemata Suppl. 2; Göttingen).
- Burkert, W. and Stolz, F. (eds.) (1994), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 131; Freiburg, Switzerland, and Göttingen).
- Burnett, A. P. (1983), *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London).
- (1985), *The Art of Bacchylides* (Cambridge, Mass., and London).
- (1989), 'Performing Pindar's Odes', *CP* 84: 283–93.
- (2005), *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford).
- Burton, R. W. B. (1962), *Pindar's Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford).
- Burton, D. (2011), 'Response and composition in archaic Greek poetry', *Antichthon* 45: 58–76.
- Bury, J. B. (1890), *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London and New York).
- (1892), *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London and New York).
- Burzacchini, G. (2009), 'Momenti della poesia d'amore nella Grecia antica', *AMAM (M)* 12: 231–58.
- Busche, K. (1903), *Euripides, Iphigenie in Aulis. Herausgegeben und erklärt* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Buxton, R. (2013), *Myths and Tragedies in their Ancient Greek Contexts* (Oxford).
- Cairns, F. (1977), 'Ἐπὶ in Pindar's first *Olympian* ode', *Hermes* 105: 129–32.

- (2010), *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes (3, 5, 9, 11, 13)* (Cambridge).
- (2012), *Roman Lyric: Collected Papers on Catullus and Horace* (Berlin and New York).
- Calame, C. (1995), 'Variations énonciatives : Relations avec les dieux et fonctions poétiques dans les Hymnes homériques', *MH* 52: 2–19.
- (2004), 'Choral forms in Aristophanic comedy: Musical mimesis and dramatic performance in Classical Athens', in P. Murrey and P. Wilson (eds.), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of 'Mousike' in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford): 157–84.
- (2005), 'Une poétique de la mémoire : Espace et temps chez Sappho', in A. Kolde, A. Lukinovich, A.-L. Rey (eds.), *κορυφαίω ἀνδρί : Mélanges offerts à André Hurst* (Geneva): 53–67.
- (2006), 'Una poética de la memoria: Espacio y tiempo en Safo', *Ordia Prima* 5: 19–35.
- (2007), 'Mythos, musische Leistung und Ritual am Beispiel der melischen Dichtung', in Bierl, Lämmle, and Wessermann (eds.): 179–210.
- (2009), *Poetic and Performative Memory in Ancient Greece: Heroic Reference and Ritual Gestures in Time and Space*, trans. H. Patton (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (2012a), 'La memoria poetica nei canti di Saffo: Performance musicale e creazione sociale', in Riu and Pòrtulas (eds.): 45–97.
- (2012b), 'La poésie de Sappho aux prises avec le genre : Polyphonie, pragmatique et rituel (à propos du fr. 58b)', *Eugesta* 2012: 1–23.

- Calder, W. M. and Stern, J. (eds.) (1970), *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (Darmstadt).
- Camper, P. (1831), *Euripidis Electra* (Leiden).
- Campbell, L. (1879), *Sophocles: Edited with English Notes and Translation*, 2 vols. (Oxford).
- Campbell, D. A. (1984), 'Stobaeus and early Greek lyric poetry', in Gerber (ed.): 51–7.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (1980), 'Peani, Ditirambi, Treni in Pind. fr. 128c S.-M.', *GIF* 32: 182.
- (1987), 'Schol. Eur. *Rh.* 895 e Pind. fr. 128c S.-M.', *RFIC* 115: 12–23.
- (1989), 'Un frammento lirico in Clemente Alessandrino e Teodoreto', in S. Calderone (ed.), *Polyanthema. Studi di letteratura Cristiana antica offerti a Salvatore Costanza* (Studi tardoantichi 7; Messina): 141–50.
- (1990), *Pindarus. Threnorum Fragmenta* (Rome).
- (2007), 'Elementi "corali" nella narrazione tragica e lirica', in Perusino and Colantino (eds.): 75–94.
- Cannon, A. (1989), 'The historical dimension in mortuary expressions of status and sentiment', *Current Anthropology* 30: 437–58.
- Carey, C. (1980), 'Three myths in Pindar: *N.* 4, *O.* 9, *N.* 3', *Eranos* 78: 143–62.
- (1981), *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8* (New York).
- (1989), 'The performance of the victory ode', *AJP* 110: 545–65.
- (1991), 'The victory ode in performance: The case for the chorus', *CP* 86: 192–200.

- (2007), 'Pindar, place and performance', in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.): 199–210.
- (2009), 'Genre, occasion and performance', in Budelmann (ed.): 21–38.
- (2012), 'The victory ode in the theatre', in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.): 17–37.
- (2013), 'Comedy and the civic chorus', in Bakola, Prauscello, and Telò (eds.): 155–74.
- Carne-Ross, D. S. (1985), *Pindar* (New Haven).
- Carson, A. (1982), 'Wedding at noon in Pindar's ninth *Pythian*', *GRBS* 23: 121–7.
- Chahoud, A. (2010), 'Idiom(s) and literariness in classical literary criticism', in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge): 42–68.
- Chaston, C. (2002), 'Three models of authority in the *Odyssey*', *CW* 96: 3–19.
- Cingano, E. (1990), 'L'opera di Ibico e di Stesicoro nella classificazione degli antichi e dei moderni', *AION (filol)* 12: 189–224.
- (2003), 'Entre skolion et enkomion: réflexions sur le "genre" et la performance de la lyrique chorale grecque', in Jouanna and Leclant (eds.): 17–45.
- Clairmont, C. W. (1983), *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial in Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.* (British Archaeological Reports 161; Oxford).
- Clark, M. (1998), 'Chryses' supplication: Speech act and mythological allusion', *ClAnt* 17: 5–24.
- Clay, J. S. (1999), 'Pindar's sympotic epinicia', *QUCC* 62: 25–34.

- (2006), *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (2nd ed.; London).
- Colonna, A. (1975–83), *Sophoclis Fabulae*, 3 vols. (Torino).
- Contiades-Tsitsoni, E. (1990), *Hymenaios und Epithalamion. Das Hochzeitslied in der frühgriechischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart).
- Crane, G. (1993), ‘The politics of consumption and generosity in the carpet scene of the Agamemnon’, *CP* 88: 117–36.
- Cropp, M. J. (1988), *Euripides, Electra: With Translation and Commentary* (Warminster).
- Cropp, M. J., Lee, K. H., and Sansone, D. (eds.) (1999/2000), *Euripides and the Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century* (ICS 24/25; Champaign, Illinois).
- Crotty, K. (1994), *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey* (Ithaca, NY).
- Culumovic, M. (2009), *Heroic Journeys: Geography and Landscape in Pindar’s Odes* (Diss. Harvard).
- Cummins, M. F. (2009/10), ‘Sicilian tyrants and their victorious brothers. 1: The Emmenids’, *CJ* 105: 321–39.
- (2010/11), ‘Sicilian tyrants and their victorious brothers. 2: The Deinomenids’, *CJ* 106: 1–20.
- Currie, B. (2004), ‘Reperformance scenarios for Pindar’s odes’, in Mackie (ed.): 49–70.
- (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).

- (2011), 'Epinician *choregia*: Funding a Pindaric chorus', in Athanassaki and Bowie (eds.): 268–310.
- (2012), 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in De Jong (ed.): 285–303.
- (2013), 'The Pindaric first person in flux', *CLAnt* 32: 243–82.
- Daitz, S. G. (1971), 'Concepts of freedom and slavery in Eur. *Hec.*', *Hermes* 99: 217–26.
- Dale, A. (2011), 'Sapphica', *HSPh* 106: 47–74.
- D'Alessio, G. B. D. (1994a), review of Käppel (1992), *CR* n.s. 108: 62–5.
- (1994b), 'First-person problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39: 117–40.
- (1997), '*Prosodia* and the classification of Pindaric papyrus fragments', *ZPE* 118: 23–60.
- (2000), review of Schröder (1999), *BMCR* 2000.01.24.
- (2004), 'Past future and present past: Temporal deixis in Greek archaic lyric', *Arethusa* 37: 267–94.
- Danielewicz, J. (1973), 'Hymni Homerici minores quanam arte conscripti sint', *SPhP* 1: 7–17.
- (1974), 'De elementis hymnicis in Sapphus Alcaei Anacreontisque carminibus obviis quaestiones selectae', *Eos* 62: 23–33.
- (1976), *The Morphology of the Ancient Hymn* (Uniw. Mickiewicza Ser. filol. Klas. 8; Poznań).
- (1990), 'Deixis in Greek choral lyric', *QUCC* 34: 7–17.
- Davidson, J. (2003), 'Olympia and the chariot race of Pelops', in Phillips and Pritchard (eds.): 101–22.

- Davison, J. A. (1968), *From Archilochus to Pindar* (London).
- Dawe, R. D. (1984/5), *Sophocles, Tragoediae* (Leipzig).
- (2006), *Sophocles, Oedipus Rex: Edited* (2nd ed.; Cambridge).
- Dawe, R. D., Diggle, J., and Easterling, P. E. (eds.) (1978), *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry. Festschrift D. L. Page* (Cambridge).
- Decker, W. (1995), *Der Sport in der griechischen Antike* (Munich).
- de Heer, C. (1969), Μάκαρ—εὐδαίμων—ὄλβιος—εὐτυχής: *A Study of the Semantic Field Denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek to the End of the Fifth Century* (Amsterdam).
- de Jong, I. J. F. (ed.) (2012), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative 3, Mnemosyne Suppl. 339; Leiden):
- de Jong, I. J. F. and Nünlist, R. (eds.) (2007), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative 2, Mnemosyne Suppl. 291; Leiden).
- Denniston, J. D. (1939), *Euripides, Electra: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- (1954), *The Greek Particles* (2nd ed.; Oxford).
- Denniston, J. D. and Page, D. L. (1957), *Aeschylus, Agamemnon: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Depew, M. (2000), 'Enacted and represented dedications: Genre and Greek hymn', in: Depew and Obbink (eds.): 59–79.
- Depew, M. and Obbink, D. D. (eds.) (2000), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, Mass.).

- Deubner, L. (1919), 'Paian', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 22: 385–406.
- Devlin, N. (1995), *The Hymn in Greek Literature: Studies in Form and Content* (Diss. Oxford).
- Dickie, M. (1976), 'On the meaning of ἐφήμερος', *ICS* 1: 7–14.
- Dietel, K. (1939), *Das Gleichnis in der frühen griechischen Lyrik* (Diss. Munich).
- Dieterich, A. (1910), *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (2nd ed.; Leipzig).
- Diggle, J. (1967), 'Euripides, *Hippolytus* 88–9', *CR* n.s. 17: 133–4.
- (1981–94), *Euripides Fabulae*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- Dimock, G. E. Jr. (1977), 'Euripides' *Hippolytus* or virtue rewarded', *YCS* 25: 239–58.
- Dindorf, W. (1832), *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (5th ed. 1870; Leipzig)
- (1840), *Euripides Tragoediae Superstites et Perditarum Fragmenta = Poetarum Scenicorum Graecorum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripides et Aristoiphanis Fabulae Superstites et Perditarum Fragmenta* 3 (London).
- (1858), *Luciani Samosatensis Opera*, 3 vols. (2nd ed.; Leipzig).
- Dodson-Robinson, E. (2010), 'Helen's "judgement of Paris" and Greek marriage ritual in Sappho 16', *Arethusa* 43: 1–20.
- Donzelli, G. B. (1995), *Euripides, Electra* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- Dornseiff, F. (1921), *Pindars Stil* (Berlin).
- Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (eds.) (1993), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics* (Cambridge).

——— (eds.) (2003), *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration* (Cambridge).

Dover, K. J. (1968), *Aristophanes: Clouds* (Oxford).

——— (1974), *Greek Popular Morality* (Berkeley).

——— (1977), 'The red fabric in the Agamemnon', *Dionisio* 48: 55–69 = (1987): 151–60.

——— (1987), *Collected Papers*, vol. 1: *Greek and the Greeks: Language, Poetry, Drama* (Oxford).

——— (1993), *Aristophanes: Frogs* (Oxford).

Drachmann, A. B. (1891), *Moderne Pindarfortolkning* (Copenhagen).

Dunbar, N. (1995), *Aristophanes, Birds: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).

Easterling, P. E. (1973), 'Presentations of character in Aeschylus', *G&R* 20: 3–19.

——— (1985), 'Anachronism in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 105: 1–10.

——— (1988), 'Tragedy and ritual: "Cry woe, woe, but may the good prevail"', *Mètis* 3: 87–109.

——— (1993), 'Tragedy and ritual', in R. Scodel (ed.), *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (Ann Arbor): 7–23.

——— (ed.) (1997), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).

——— (2004), 'Now and forever in Greek drama and ritual', in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (eds.): 149–60.

Eck, J. van (1978), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Commentary, and Appendices* (Diss. Utrecht).

- Eckermann, C. (2008), 'Pindar's κοινὸς λόγος and Pan-Hellenism in Olympia', *RhM* 151: 37–48.
- Ekroth, G. (2002), *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero Cults* (Kernos Suppl. 12; Liège).
- Eliade, M. (1949), *Le Mythe de l'Éternel Retour* (Paris).
- (1954), *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, trans. W. R. Trask (New York).
- Engels, J. (1998), *Funerum sepulcrorumque magnificentia. Begräbnis- und Grabluxusgesetze in der griechisch-römischen Welt mit einigen Ausblicken auf Einschränkungen des funeralen und sepulkralen Luxus im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit* (Hermes Einzelschriften 78; Stuttgart).
- England, E. B. (1891), *The Iphigenia at Aulis of Euripides: Edited with Introduction and Critical Explanatory Notes* (London).
- Enk, P. J. (1962), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber Secundus* (Leiden).
- Epstein, P. D. (1981), 'The marriage of Peisthetairos and Basileia in the Birds of Aristophanes', *Dionysius* 5: 6–28.
- Erbse, H. (1969), 'Pindars dritte Nemeische Ode', *Hermes* 97: 272–91 = (1979): 104–25.
- (1979), *Ausgewählte Schriften zur klassischen Philologie* (Berlin and New York).
- (1997), 'Sapphos Sperlinge', *Hermes* 125: 232–4.
- (1999), 'Über Pindars Umgang mit dem Mythos', *Hermes* 127: 13–32.
- Erdmann, W. (1934), *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland* (Munich).
- Fabbro, E. (1986), 'Considerazioni sul peana convivale', *QFC* 5: 23–35.

- Färber, H. (1936), *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, 2 vols. (Munich).
- Farnell, L. R. (1920), *Outline-History of Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- (1921), *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford).
- (1932), *The Works of Pindar* (London).
- Fearn, D. (ed.) (2011), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry* (Oxford).
- Fears, J. R. (1981), ‘Gottesgnadentum (Gottkönigtum)’, *RAC* 11: 1103–59.
- (1988), ‘Ruler Worship’, in M. Grant and R. Kitzinger (eds.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean*, vol. 2 (New York): 1009–25.
- Fedeli, P. (2005), *Properzio, Elegie libro II: Introduzione, testo e commento* (Cambridge).
- Felson, N. (ed.) (2004), *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric* (Arethusa 37).
- Fennel, C. M. (1899), *Pindar: The Nemean and the Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge).
- Ferrari, G. (2004), ‘The *anodos* of the bride’, in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (eds.): 210–26.
- Ferrari, F. (2007), *Una mitra per Kleis: Saffo e il suo pubblico* (Pisa).
- (2012), ‘Representations of cult in epinician poetry’, in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.): 158–72.
- Finglass, P. J. (2007), *Pindar, Pythian 11: Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- (2011), *Sophocles, Ajax: Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Cambridge).

- Finglass, P. J., Collard, C., and Richardson, N. J. (eds.) (2007), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford).
- Fink, F. (1974), *Hochzeitsszenen auf attischen schwarz- und rotfigurigen Vasen* (Vienna).
- Finley, M. I. (1955), 'Marriage, sale and gift in the Homeric world', *RIDA* 3: 167–94.
- Finley, J. H. (1955), *Pindar and Aeschylus* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Firnhaber, C. G. (1841), *Euripides, Iphigenia in Aulis. Mit deutschem Commentar* (Leipzig).
- Flashar, M. (1996), 'Die Sieger von Marathon—zwischen Mythisierung und Vorbildlichkeit', in M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke, and E. Heinrich, *Retrospektive. Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Munich): 63–85.
- Foley, H. P. (1988), 'Tragedy and politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *JHS* 108: 33–47.
- (2001), *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton).
- Ford, A. (2011), *Aristotle as Poet* (Oxford).
- Fordyce, C. J. (1977), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri vii–viii: With a Commentary* (Glasgow).
- Forsyth, P. Y. (1986), *The Poems of Catullus: A Teaching Text* (New York and London).

Foster, B. O. (1899), 'Notes on the symbolism of the apple in Classical Antiquity', *HSPH* 10: 39–55.

Fraenkel, E. (1922), *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin).

——— (1931), 'Der Zeushymnos im *Agamemnon* des Aischylos', *Philologus* 86: 1–17.

——— (1950), *Aeschylus, Agamemnon: Edited with a Commentary*, 3 vols. (Oxford).

——— (1957), *Horace* (Oxford).

——— (1960), *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, trans. F. Munari (Florence).

——— (1962), *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Rome).

——— (1975), 'Die Parabasenlieder', in: H. J. Newiger (ed.), *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie* (Wege der Forschung 265; Darmstadt): 30–55.

——— (2007), *Plautine Elements in Plautus*, trans. T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke (Oxford).

Fränkel, H. (1924), 'Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur', 1 and 2, *Göttinger gelehrte Nachrichten*: 63–127 = (1955a): 40–96.

——— (1927), 'Pindars Religion', *Die Antike* 3: 39–63.

——— (1946), 'Man's *ephemeros* nature according to Pindar and others', *TAPA* 77: 131–45.

——— (1955a), *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens. Literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Studien* (Munich).

——— (1955b), 'Εφήμερος als Kennwort für die menschliche Natur', in (1955a): 23–39.

- (1962), *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zur Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts* (5th ed. 2006; Munich).
- Fredricksmeier, E. A. (1981), 'On the background of the ruler cult', in H. J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honour of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki): 145–56.
- Freudenburg, K. (2006), 'Playing at lyric's boundaries: Dreaming forward in book two of Horace's *Sermones*', *Dictynna* 3: 137–74.
- Frey, V. (1948), 'Zur Komödie des Aristophanes', *MH* 5: 168–77.
- Freyburger, G. (1988), 'Supplication grecque et supplication romaine', *Latomus* 47: 501–25.
- Friis Johansen, H. and Whittle, W. (1980), *Aeschylus, The Suppliants: Edited*, 3 vols. (Copenhagen).
- Fritzsche, F. V. (1860), *Lucianus Samosatensis* (Rostock).
- Furley, W. D. (1993), 'Types of Greek hymns', *Eos* 81: 21–41
- (1995), 'Praise and persuasion in Greek hymns', *JHS* 115: 29–46.
- (2005), 'Hymn, I: The Greek hymnos', *DNP* 6: 616–20.
- Furley, W. D. and Bremer, J. M. (2001), *Greek Hymns: A Selection of Greek Religious Poetry from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols. (Tübingen).
- Gagé, J. (1969), 'Fackel (Kerze)', *RAC* 7: 154–217.
- Gallo, I. (1968), *Una Nuova Bibliografia di Pindaro (POxy. 2438): Introduzione, Testo Critico e Commentario* (Salerno).

- (1969), ‘Gli κόλμα di Pindaro: Nota critica al catalogo pindarico del papiro di Ossirinco XXVI 2438’, *QUCC* 8: 107–12.
- García, J. F. (2002), ‘Symbolic action in the Homeric Hymns: The theme of recognition’, *ClAnt* 21: 5–39.
- Garland, R. (1989), ‘The well-ordered corpse: An investigation into the motives behind funeral legislation’, *BICS* 36: 1–15.
- Garner, R. (1989), *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London).
- Garvie, A. F. (1998), *Sophocles, Ajax: Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Warminster).
- Garzya, A. (1955), *Euripide, Ecuba* (Rome).
- Gentili, B. (1985), *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica: Da Omero al v secolo* (Rome and Bari).
- (1988), *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*, trans. T. A. Cole (Baltimore).
- Gentili, B., Bernardini, P. A., Cingano, E., and Giannini, F. (1995), *Pindaro: Le Pitiche* (Verona).
- Gerber, D. E. (ed.) (1982), *Pindar’s Olympian One: A Commentary* (Phoenix Suppl. 15; Toronto).
- (1984), *Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico, Calif.).
- Gianotti, G. F. (1975), *Per una poetica Pindarica* (Torino).
- Gildersleeve, B. L. (1882), ‘Studies in Pindaric syntax’, *AJP* 3: 434–55.

- (1885), *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (London).
- Gill, N. P. and Seafood, R. (eds.) (1998), *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).
- Giordano, M. (1999), *La supplica: Rituale, istituzione sociale e tempo epico in Omero* (Naples).
- Giuliani, L. (2003), *Bild und Mythos. Geschichte der Bilderzählung in der griechischen Kunst* (Munich).
- Given, J. P. (2009), 'When gods don't appear: Divine absence and human agency in Aristophanes', *CW* 102: 107–27.
- Glucker, J. (1966), 'Euripides, *Hippolytus* 88', *CR* n.s. 16: 17.
- Gödde, S. (2000), *Das Drama der Hikese. Ritual und Rhetorik in Aischylos' Hiketiden* (Orbus Antiquus 35; Münster).
- Goheen, R. F. (1955), 'Aspects of dramatic symbolism: Three studies in the *Oresteia*', *AJP* 76: 113–37.
- Goldhill, S. (1990), 'Supplication and authorial comment in the *Iliad*: *Iliad* Z 61–2', *Hermes* 118: 373–7.
- (1991), *The Poet's Voice* (Cambridge).
- Gomme, A. W. (1957), 'Interpretations of some poems of Alkaios and Sappho', *JHS* 77: 255–66.
- Gould, J. (1973), 'Hiketia', *JHS* 93: 74–103.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1952), *Theocritus: Edited with a Translation and Commentary*, 2 vols. (Cambridge).
- Goward, B. (2005), *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (Bath).

- Graf, F. (1991), 'Prayer in magic and religious ritual', in C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera* (New York and Oxford): 188–213.
- (1995), 'Bemerkungen zur bürgerlichen Religiosität im Zeitalter des Hellenismus', in Wörrle and Zanker (eds.): 103–14.
- (ed.) (1998), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale. Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- Gregory, J. (2011), 'Genre and intertextuality: Sophocles' *Antigone* and Euripides' *Alcestis*', in J. Davidson, F. Muecke, and P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek Drama III: Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee* (BICS S87; London): 113–27.
- Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. (1914), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part X: Edited with Translations and Notes* (London).
- Grethlein, J. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2009), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 4; Berlin).
- Griessmair, E. (1966), *Das Motiv der Mors Immatura in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften* (Innsbruck).
- Griffin, J. (1980), *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
- (1990), 'Characterisation in Euripides: *Hippolytus* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*', in C. B. R. Pelling (ed.), *Characterisation and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford): 128–49.
- Griffith, M. (2006), 'Horsepower and donkeywork: Equids and the ancient Greek imagination', *CP* 101: 185–246.

- (2009), 'Greek lyric and the place of humans in the world', in Budelmann (ed.): 72–94.
- Griffith, R. D. (1989), 'In praise of the bride: Sappho fr. 105(A) L-P, Voigt', *TAPA* 119: 55–61.
- (1999), *The Theatre of Apollo: Divine Justice and Sophocles' Oedipus The King* (Montreal and Kingston).
- Griffiths, A. (1972), 'Alcman's *partheneion*: the morning after and the night before', *QUCC* 14: 7–30.
- Groningen, B. A. van (1960), *Pindare au Banquet. Les Fragments des scolies édités avec un commentaire critique et explicatif* (Leiden).
- Günther, H.-C. (1988), *Euripides, Iphigenia Aulidensis* (Leipzig).
- (1997), *Quaestiones Propertianae* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 169; Leiden).
- Habicht, C. (1970), *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte* (2nd ed.; Zetemata 14; Munich).
- Hague, J.-D. (1997), *Presenting the Divine: Stagecraft and Politics in Aristophanes' Birds* (Boston).
- Hague, R. H. (1983), 'Ancient Greek wedding song: the tradition of praise', *Journal of Folklore Research* 2/3: 131–41.
- Haldane, J. (1963), *The Greek Hymn with Special Reference to Athenian Drama* (Diss. London).
- Hall, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy* (Oxford).

- (2013), *Adventures with Iphigenia in Tauris: A Cultural History of Euripides' Black-Sea Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Halliwell, S. (2008), *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity* (Oxford).
- Hamilton, R. (1974), *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (Paris).
- (1994), *Choes and Anthesteria: Athenian Iconography and Ritual* (Ann Arbor).
- Harris, J. R. (1986), 'Sappho 105a and the Gaelic songs of Mary MacLeod: poetic representation vindicated', *CJ* 81: 112–8.
- Hartung, I. A. (1851), *Sophokles' Oedipus auf Kolonos. Griechisch mit metrischer Übersetzung und prüfenden und erklärenden Anmerkungen* (Leipzig).
- (1852), *Euripides' Iphigenia in Aulis. Griechisch mit metrischer Übersetzung und prüfenden und erklärenden Anmerkungen* (Leipzig).
- Harvey, A. E. (1955), 'The classification of Greek lyric poetry', *CQ* n.s. 5: 157–75.
- Häussler, R. (1968), *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer* (Darmstadt).
- (1974), 'λίvoς ante Λίvoν?', *RhM* 117: 1–14.
- (1976), 'Nachtrag zu λίvoς ante Λίvoν', *RhM* 119: 93.
- Heath, M. (1986), 'The origins of modern Pindaric criticism', *JHS* 106: 85–98.
- (1987), *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy* (Stanford).

- (1988), ‘Receiving the κῶμος: The context and performance of epinician’, *AJP* 109 (1988): 180–95.
- Heath, M. and Lefkowitz, M. (1991), ‘Epinician performance’, *CP* 86: 173–91.
- Heitsch, E. (1961), *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 1 (Göttingen).
- Henrichs, A. (1994/5), “‘Why should I dance?’ Choral self-referentiality in Greek tragedy’, *Arion* 3: 56–111.
- (2000), ‘Drama and Dromena: Bloodshed, violence, and sacrificial metaphor in Euripides’, *HSPH* 100: 173–88.
- (2004), “‘Let the good prevail’: Perversions of the ritual process in Greek tragedy’, in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (eds.): 189–98.
- Henry, W. B. (2005), *Pindar’s Nemeans, a Selection: Edition and Commentary* (Munich).
- (2007), ‘Pindaric accompaniments’, in Finglass, Collard, and Richardson (eds.): 126–31.
- Hermann, G. (1831), *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide* (Leipzig).
- (1847), *De interpolationibus Euripideae Iphigeniae in Aulide* 1 (Leipzig).
- (1848), *De interpolationibus Euripideae Iphigeniae in Aulide* 2 (Leipzig).
- Herrmann, H.-V. (1980), ‘Pelops in Olympia’, in ΣΤΗΛΗ: *Festschrift N. Kontoleon* (Athens): 59–74.
- (1995), ‘Τέρας θανόντων: Totenruhm und Totenehrung im städtischen Leben der hellenistischen Zeit’, in Wörle and Zanker (eds.): 189–97.

- Hersch, K. K. (2010), *The Roman Wedding: Ritual and Meaning in Antiquity* (Cambridge).
- Heyworth, S. (2007), *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius* (Oxford).
- Hofinger, M. (1975) *Lexicon Hesiodeum cum Indice Inverso* (Leiden).
- Hollis, A. S. (2007), *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c. 60 BC–AD 20* (Oxford).
- Holst-Warhaft, G. (1992), *Dangerous Voices: Womens' Laments and Greek Literature* (London).
- Horn, W. (1970), *Gebet und Gebetsparodie in den Komödien des Aristophanes* (Nürnberg).
- Hornblower, S. (1982), *Mausolus* (Oxford).
- (2009), 'Greek lyric and the politics and sociologies of archaic and classical Greek communities', in Budelmann (ed.): 39–57.
- Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C. (eds.) (2007), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford).
- Horstmann, S. (2004), *Das Epithalamium in der lateinischen Literatur der Spätantike* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 197; Munich and Leipzig).
- Housman, A. E. (1972), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, vol. 2, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge).
- Hubbard, T. K. (1985), *The Pindaric Mind: A Study in the Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 85; Leiden).
- (1986), 'The subject/object-relationship in Pindar's second *Pythian* and seventh *Nemean*', *QUCC* 22: 53–72.

- (1990), 'Envy and the invisible roar: Pindar, *Pythian* 11.30', *GRBS* 31: 341–51.
- (1991), *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (Ithaca, NY).
- (2004), 'The dissemination of epinician lyric: Pan-Hellenism, reperformance, written texts', in Mackie (ed.): 71–94.
- (2011), 'The dissemination of Pindar's non-epinician choral lyric', in Athanassaki and Bowie (eds.): 347–63.
- Hubert, H. (1999), *Essays on Time*, ed. R. Parkin (Oxford).
- Hummel, P. (1993), *La Syntaxe de Pindare* (Paris).
- Humphreys, S. C. (1980), 'Family tombs and tomb cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or traditionalism?', *JHS* 100: 96–126 = (1993): 79–134.
- (1993), *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies* (2nd ed.; Ann Arbor).
- Humphreys, S. C. and King, H. (eds.) (1981), *Mortality and Immortality: The Anthropology and Archaeology of Death* (London).
- Hunt, A. S. (1911), *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, vol. 1 (Manchester).
- Huntington, R. and Metcalf, P. (1979), *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (Cambridge).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1993), *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: A Critical Study* (Oxford).

- (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford).
- (2011), ‘Morality and time in fifth- and fourth-century Greek literature’, *Eikasmos* 22: 111–30.
- (2012), ‘Image and world in epinician poetry’, in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.): 277–302.
- Huxley, G. L. (1978), ‘Simonides and his world’, *PRIA* 78: 231–47.
- Imellizzeri, S. (1939), ‘La II Olimpica e i frammenti di ῥῆνοι di Pindaro’, *SIFC* 16: 105–10.
- Indergaard, H. M. (2011a), ‘Thebes, Aegina, and the temple of Aphaia: A reading of Pindar’s *Isthmian* 6’, in Fearn (ed.): 294–322.
- (2011b), *Pindar and the Mythology of Heracles* (Diss. Oxford).
- Innes, D. (2003), ‘Metaphor, simile, and allegory as ornaments of style’, in Boys-Stones (ed.): 7–27.
- Instone, S. (1993), ‘Problems in Pindar’s Third *Nemean*’, *Eranos* 91: 13–31.
- (1996), *Pindar, Selected Odes: Olympian One, Pythian Nine, Nemeans Two and Three, Isthmian One. Edited and Translated* (Warminster).
- (2002), review of Schröder (1999), *Gnomon* 74: 545–6.
- Ivanov, R. V. (2010), *Pindar’s Isthmians 3 and 4: Essays and Commentary* (Diss. Cornell; Ithaca, N. Y.).
- Jachmann, G. (1951), ‘Eine Studie zu Properz’, in *Festschrift Fritz Schultz*, vol. 2 (Weimar): 179–87.

- Janko, R. (1971), 'The structure of the Homeric Hymns: A study in genre', *Hermes* 109: 9–24.
- (1994), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 4: *Books 13–16* (Cambridge).
- Jaratt, S. C. (2002), 'Sappho's memory', *RSQ* 32: 11–43.
- Jay-Robert, G. (2002), 'Fonction des dieux chez Aristophane. Exemple de Zeus, d'Hermès et de Dionysos', *REA* 104: 11–24.
- Jebb, R. C. (1900), *Sophocles, the Plays and Fragments: With Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose*, Part 2: *Oedipus Coloneus* (3rd ed.; Cambridge).
- Jebb, R. C. (1905), *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments* (Cambridge).
- Jenkins, L. (1985), 'The ambiguity of Greek textiles', *Arethusa* 18: 109–32.
- Jouanna, J. (1992), 'Libations et sacrifices dans la tragédie grecque', *REG* 105: 406–34.
- Jouanna, J. and Leclant, J. (eds.) (2003), *La poésie grecque antique* (Cahiers de la Villa 'Kerylos' 14; Paris).
- Jourdain-Annequin, C. (1980/1), 'Héraclès héros culturel', *Atti del Centro Ricerche e Documentazione sull'Antichità Classica* 11: 8–29.
- Kaibel, G. (1892), 'Theokrits 'Ελένης ἐπιθαλάμιον', *Hermes* 27: 249–59.
- Kakridis, J. (1966), 'Zu Sappho 44 LP', *WS* 78: 21–6.
- Kambylis, A. (1964), 'Anredeformen bei Pindar', in A. Anastasiou, A. Kampyles, A. Skiadas (eds.), *Charis: Festschrift K. I. Vouveris* (Athens): 95–199.
- Kamerbeek, J. C. (1984), *The Plays of Sophocles*, Part vii: *The Oedipus Coloneus* (Leiden).

- Kantzios, I. (2005), 'Tyranny and the symposium of Anacreon', *CJ* 100: 227–45.
- Käppel, L. (1992), *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 37; Berlin and New York).
- Karadimitriou, A. K. (1975), 'Ο ικέτης στην αρχαία Ελλάδα', *Hellenica* 28: 29–48.
- Kassel, R. (1958), *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsollationsliteratur* (Munich).
- Kelly, A. (2009), *Sophocles: Oedipus at Colonus* (London).
- Keyssner, K. (1932), *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus* (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft 2; Diss. Würzburg).
- Kienzle, G. (1936), *Der Lobpreis von Städten in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (Diss. Basel).
- Killeen, J. F. (1973), 'Sappho fr. 111', *CQ* n.s. 23: 198.
- Kirk, G. S. (1963), 'A fragment of Sappho reinterpreted', *CQ* n.s. 13: 51–2.
- Kirkwood, G. M. (1974), *Early Greek Monody: The History of a Poetic Type* (Ithaca, NY, and London).
- (1981), 'Pythian 5.72–6, 9.90–2, and the voice of Pindar', *ICS* 6: 12–23.
- (1982), *Selection from Pindar* (Chicago).
- Kleinknecht, (1937a), *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* (Stuttgart).
- (1937b), 'Zur Parodie des Gottmenschentums bei Aristophanes', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 34: 294–313.

- (1939), 'Die Epiphanie des Demos in Aristophanes' *Rittern*', *Hermes* 74: 58–65.
- Klinz, A. (1933), *Ἱερὸς γάμος. Quaestiones selectae ad sacras nuptias Graecas et poeseos pertinentes* (Diss. Halle).
- Knoke, K. (1924), *De hymnis Graecorum tragicis* (Diss. Göttingen).
- Koerber, W. (1877), *De Graecorum hymenaeis et epithalamiis* (Diss. Bratislava).
- Köhnken, A. (1971), *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar. Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten* (Berlin and New York).
- (1984), 'Meilichos Orga. Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der neunten pythischen Ode Pindars', in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare. Huit exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens Hardt 31; Geneva): 72–110.
- Konstan, D. and Rutter, K. (eds.) (2003), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh).
- Kopff, E. C. (1975), review of Köhnken (1971), *CJ* 70: 71–4.
- Kopperschmidt, J. (1967), *Die Hikesie als dramatiache Form. Zur motivischen Interpretation des griechischen Dramas* (Diss. Tübingen).
- (1971), 'Hikesie als dramatische Form', in W. Jens (ed.), *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich): 321–46.
- Köstler, R. (1944a), 'Raub- und Kaufehe bei den Hellenen', *ZSS* 64: 206–32.
- (1944b), 'Ἑδνα: Ein Beitrag zum homerischen Ehe recht', *AAWW* 81: 6: 6–25.
- Koschaker, P. (1937), *Die Eheformen bei den Indogermanen* (Zeitschrift für ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht, Sonderheft 11; Berlin).

Kost, K. H. (1971), *Musaios: Hero und Leander: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Bonn).

Kovacs, D. (1980), 'Euripides *Hippolytus* 100 and the meaning of the prologue', *CP* 75: 130–7.

——— (1987), *The Heroic Muse: Studies in the Hippolytus and Hecuba of Euripides* (Baltimore).

——— (1998), *Euripides, Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles: Edited and Translated* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Kranz, W. (1933), *Stasimon. Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie* (Berlin).

Kroll, W. (1922), *C. Valerius Catullus. Herausgegeben und erklärt* (6th ed. 1980; Stuttgart).

Kromer, G. (1976), 'The value of time in Pindar's *Olympian* 10', *Hermes* 104: 420–36.

Krummen, E. (1990), *Pyrros Hymnon. Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition bei Pindar* (Berlin and New York).

——— (1998), 'Ritual und Katastrophe: Rituelle Handlung und Bildersprache bei Sophokles und Euripides', in Graf (ed.): 296–325.

——— (2014), *Cult, Myth, and Occasion in Pindar's Victory Odes: A Study of Isthmian 4, Pythian 5, Olympian 1, and Olympian 3*, trans. J. G. Howie (Arca 52; Prenton).

Kugelmeier, C. (1996), *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der Alten attischen Komödie* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).

- Kunkel, W. (1930), 'Matrimonium', *RE* 14: 2259–86.
- Kurke, L. (1993), 'The economy of *kudos*', in Dougherty and Kurke (eds.): 131–63.
- (1996), 'Pindar and the prostitutes, or reading ancient "pornography"', *Arion* 4: 49–75.
- (2000), 'The strangeness of "song culture": Archaic Greek poetry', in O. Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek and Roman World: A New Perspective* (Oxford): 58–87.
- (2005), 'Choral lyric as *ritualization*: Poetic sacrifice and poetic ego in Pindar's sixth *Paian*', *ClAnt* 24: 81–130.
- Kurtz, D. C., and Boardman, J. (1971), *Greek Burial Customs* (Ithaca, NY).
- (1985), *Thanatos. Tod und Jenseits bei den Griechen* (Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 23; Mainz a. R.).
- Kurz, G. (1974), 'Humor bei Pindar?', in U. Reinhardt and K. Sallmann (eds.), *Musa Iocosa. Festschrift A. Thierfelder* (Hildesheim): 3–25.
- La Coste-Messelière, P. de (1931), *Art archaïque : Sculptures des temples* (Fouilles des Delphes 4.3; Paris).
- Lacoste, H. (1920), *La terrasse du temple : Relevés et restaurations* (Fouilles des Delphes 2: Topographie et architecture; Paris)
- Lambin, G. (1993), 'L'origine du σκόλιον', *Eranos* 91: 32–7.
- Lammers, J. (1931), *Die Doppel- und Halbchöre in der antiken Tragödie* (Paderborn).
- Landfester, M. (1975), review of Horn (1970), *Gnomon* 47: 334–9.

- Latacz, J. (1985), 'Realität und Imagination. Eine neue Lyrik-Theorie und Sapphos κῆνος-Lied', *MH* 42: 67–94.
- Lattimore, R. (1964), *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy* (London).
- Lattke, M. (1991), *Hymnus. Materialien zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis antiquus 19; Freiburg, Switzerland, and Göttingen).
- Lattmann, C. (2010), *Das Gleiche im Verschiedenen. Metapher des Sports und Lob des Siegers in Pindars Epinikien* (Berlin and New York).
- Leeuwen, J. F. van (1901), *Aristophanis Acharnienses* (Leiden).
- (1902), *Aristophanis Aves* (Leiden).
- (1904), *Aristophanis Equites* (Leiden).
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1963), 'Τῷ καὶ ἐγώ: First person in Pindar', *HSPH* 67: 177–253.
- (1974), review of Köhnken (1971), *CW* 68: 117–18.
- (1988), 'Who sang Pindar's victory odes?', *AJP* 109: 1–11.
- Leidl, G. (2003), 'The harlot's art: Metaphor and literary criticism', in Boys-Stones (ed.): 31–54.
- LeVen, P. A. (2014), *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in Late-Classical Greek Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Leveque, P. (1982), 'Olbios et la félicité des initiés', in L. Hadermann-Misguich and G. Raepsaet (eds.), *Rayonnement Grec. Hommages à Charles Delvoye* (Brussels): 113–26.

Liapis, V. (1996), 'Double entendres in Attic skolia: The etymology of skolion', *Eranos* 94: 111–222.

Lieberg, G. (1962), *Puella divina. Die Gestalt der göttlichen Geliebten bei Catull im Zusammenhang der antiken Dichtung* (Amsterdam).

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1952), 'The robes of Iphigenia: Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 228–43', *CR* n.s. 2: 132–7 = (1990a): 300–4.

——— (1962), 'The guilt of Agamemnon', *CQ* n.s. 12: 187–99 = (1990a): 283–99.

——— (1967), 'Sappho fr. 111', *CQ* n.s. 17: 168.

——— (1985), 'Pindar and the after-life', *Entretiens Hardt* 32: 259–60 = (1990a): 80–105.

——— (1990a), *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).

——— (1990b), *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).

——— (1994), *Sophocles, Antigone, Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus: Edited and Translated* (Cambridge, Mass.).

——— (1998), 'Ritual and tragedy', in Graf (ed.): 271–96 = (2005): 141–62.

——— (2005), *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N.G. (1990), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford).

Lobel, E. (1927), Ἀλκαίου μέλη: *The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Alcaeus* (Oxford).

Lobel, E. and Tovar, A. (1961), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part 26* (Oxford).

Lobel, E., Lloyd-Jones, H., and Turner, E. G. (1961), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part 25* (Oxford).

——— (1967), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part 32* (Oxford).

Loraux, N. (1986), *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).

Lowe, N. J. (2007), 'Pindaric eidography', in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.): 167–76.

Luraghi, N. (2011), 'Hieron agonistes or the masks of the tyrant', in Urso (ed.): 27–47.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1980), *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace* (Oxford).

Lynn-George, M. (1988), *Epos: Word, Narrative and the Iliad* (Atlantic Highlands).

Maas, P. (1907), 'ὕμην ὕμην', *Philologus* 66: 590–6.

——— (1914), 'Hymenaios', *RE* 17: 313–14.

——— (1954), 'ἥρωος θεός', *MH* 11: 199.

Mackey, E. A. (2002), 'The hairstyle of Herakles', in A. J. Clark and J. Gaunt (eds.), *Essays in Honour of Dietrich von Bothmer* (Allard Pierson Series 14; Amsterdam): 203–10.

Mackie, H. (2003), *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise* (Ann Arbor).

Mackie, C. J. (ed.) (2004), *Oral Performance and its Context* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 248; Leiden).

- Macleod, C. W. (1972), *Luciani Opera*, 4 vols. (Oxford).
- (1974), ‘Two comparisons in Sappho’, *ZPE* 15: 217–20.
- Maehler, H. (2011), ‘Griechische Chorlyrik und die Symbole der Macht’, *WS* 124: 5–16.
- (2012), ‘Greek choral lyric poetry and the symbols of power’, in M. Castiglione and A. Poggio (eds.), *Arte-Potere: Forme artistiche, istituzioni, paradigmi interpretativi* (Milan): 185–93.
- Malkin, I. (1987), *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 3; Leiden).
- Mangelsdorff, E. A. (1913), *Das lyrische Hochzeitsgedicht bei den Griechen und Römern* (Diss. Giessen).
- Manuwald, B. (2012), *Sophokles, König Ödipus. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Berlin and Boston).
- Marcovich, M. (1963/4), ‘On Sappho fr. 111 L.-P.’, *Humanidades* 5–6 (Universitas Emeritensis, Venezuela): 223–7.
- (1969), ‘Bedeutung der Motive des Volksglaubens für die Textinterpretation’, *QUCC* 8: 22–36.
- (1972), ‘Sappho fr. 31: Anxiety attack or love declaration?’, *CQ* n.s. 22: 19–32.
- Markantonatos, A. and Zimmermann, B. (eds.) (2012), *Crisis on Stage: Tragedy and Comedy* (Berlin and New York).
- Markland, J. (1822), *Euripidis Supplices et Iphigenia in Aulide et in Tauris* (Leipzig).

- Mason, H. J. (2004), 'Sappho's apples', in M. Zimmerman, R. T. van der Paardt (eds.), *Metamorphic Reflections: Essays Presented to Ben Hijmans* (Leuven): 243–53.
- Matthiessen, J. (2010), *Euripides, Hekabe: Edition und Kommentar* (Berlin).
- Mau, A. (1909), 'Fackeln', *RE* 12: 1945–53.
- McCartney, E. S. (1925), 'How the apple became a token of love', *TAPA* 56: 70–81.
- McGibbon, D. (1964), 'Metempsychosis in Pindar', *Phronesis* 9: 5–11.
- McKay, K. J. (1967), 'Door magic and the epiphany hymn', *CQ* n.s. 17: 184–94.
- Meister, K. (1967), *Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor. Von den Anfängen bis zum Tod des Agathokles* (Munich).
- Mercier, C. E. (1998), review of Crotty (1994), *CP* 93: 192–6.
- Merkelbach, R. (1957), 'Sappho und ihr Kreis', *Philologus* 101: 1–29.
- Meuli, K. (1926), *Der griechische Agon. Kampf und Kampfspiel in Totenbrauch, Totentanz, Totenklage und Totenlob* (Basel; repr. Cologne 1968).
- Meyer, H. (1933), *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Diss. Cologne).
- Mikalson, J. D. (1998), *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 29; Berkeley).
- Miller, A. M. (1993), 'Pindaric mimesis: The associative mode', *CJ* 89: 21–53.
- Miller, P. A. (2013), 'The *puella*: Accept no substitutions!' in Thorsen (ed.): 166–79.
- Mills, S. (2002), *Euripides: Hippolytus* (London).

- Morelli, C. (1910), 'L'epitalamio nella tarda poesia latina', *SIFC* 18: 319–432.
- Morgan, K. A. (1993), 'Pindar the professional and the rhetoric of the κῶμος', *CP* 88: 1–15.
- (2014), *Pindar and the Construction of the Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford).
- Morris, I. (1987), *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State* (Cambridge).
- (1989), 'Attitudes towards death in Archaic Greece', *ClAnt* 8: 296–320.
- (1992), *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge).
- Morrison, A. D. (2007), *Performance and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (London).
- (2011), 'Aeginetan odes, reperformance, and Pindaric intertextuality', in Fearn (ed.): 227–53.
- Most, G. W. (1985), *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes* (Göttingen).
- (2003), 'Epinician envies', in Konstan and Rutter (eds.): 123–42.
- (2011), 'Power and truth in Archaic Greece—and after', in Urso (ed.): 13–26.
- Murray, G. (1902–13), *Euripidis Fabulae*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- (1940), *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Murray, O. (ed.) (1990a), *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford).

——— (1990b), ‘The affair of the mysteries: Democracy and the drinking group’
in (1990a): 149–61.

Muth, R. (1954), ‘*Hymenaios und Epithalamion*’, *WS* 67: 5–45.

——— (1993), review of Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990), *Gnomon* 65: 585–8.

Naiden, F. S. (2006), *Ancient Supplication* (Oxford).

Nassen, P. J. (1975), ‘A literary study of Pindar’s *Olympian* 10’, *TAPA* 105: 219–40.

Nauck, A. (1884–5), *Euripidis Tragoediae*, 3 vols. (3rd ed.; Leipzig).

Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2007), ‘Der Aufführungsrahmen von Epinikien. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag’, *Nikephoros* 20: 49–112.

Nicholson, N. (2000), ‘Pederastic poets and adult patrons in late Archaic lyric’, *CW* 93: 235–59.

——— (2001), ‘Victory without defeat? Carnival laughter and its appropriation in Pindar’s victory odes’, in P. Barta, P. A. Miller, C. Platter, and D. Shepherd (eds.), *Carnivalizing Difference: Bakhtin and the Other* (London): 79–98.

——— (2003), ‘Aristocratic victory memorials and the absent charioteer’, in Dougherty and Kirk (eds.): 101–28.

——— (2005), *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge).

——— (2011), ‘Pindar’s *Olympian* 4, Psauis and Camarina after the Deinomenids’, *CP* 106: 93–114.

Nikolaev, A. S. (2012), ‘Showing praise in Greek choral lyric and beyond’, *AJP* 133: 543–72.

- Nilsson, M. P. (1925), *A History of Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- Nisetich, F. J. (1975), 'Olympian 1.8–11: an epinician metaphor', *HSPH* 79: 55–68.
- (1988), 'Immortality in Acragas: Poetry and religion in Pindar's Second *Olympian Ode*', *CP* 83: 1–19.
- Norden, E. (1913), *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig).
- Norwood, G. (1945), *Pindar* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Nünlist, R. (2007), 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in De Jong and Nünlist (eds.): 233–51.
- Oakley, J. H. and Sinos, R. H. (1993), *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison).
- Ogilvie, R. M. (1969), *The Romans and Their Gods* (London).
- Ohly, D. (1974), *The Munich Glyptothek: Greek and Roman Sculpture* (Munich).
- (1976), *Die Aigineten. Die Marmorskulpturen des Tempels der Aphaia auf Aegina. Ein Katalog der Glyptothek München* (Munich).
- Olson, S. D. (1998), *Aristophanes, Peace: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- (2002), *Aristophanes, Acharnians: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Ortkemper, H. (1969), *Szenische Techniken des Euripides. Untersuchungen zur Gebärdensprache im antiken Theater* (Diss. Berlin).
- O'Sullivan, P. (2003), 'Victory statue, victory song: Pindar's agonistic poetics and its legacy', in Phillips and Pritchard (eds.): 75–100.

Otto, A. (1890), *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig).

Page, D. L. (1934), *Actor's Interpolations in Greek Tragedy: Studied with Special Reference to Euripides' Iphigenia in Aulis* (Oxford).

——— (1950), *Select Papyri*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.).

——— (1955), *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford).

Palmisciano, R. (2003), 'Mitologie, riti e forme del lament funebre tradizionale', *AION (filol)* 25: 87–112.

Pardini, A. (1993), 'P. Oxy. 2623 fr. 14 e Sim. PMG 520: Alcune Osservazioni', *ZPE* 95: 23–7.

Parker, L. P. E. (1958), 'Some observations on the incidence of word-end in anapaestic paroemiacs and its application to textual questions', *CQ* n.s. 8: 82–9.

——— (1997), *The Songs of Aristophanes* (Oxford).

Parker, R. (1983), *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford).

——— (1996), *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford).

——— (2005), *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).

Paschalis, M. (2002), *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry* (Rethymnon Classical Studies 1; Rethymnon, Crete).

Patten, G. (2009), *Pindar's Metaphors: A Study in Rhetoric and Meaning* (Oxford).

- Pattison, G. (2015), *Eternal God/Saving Time* (Oxford).
- Pavlou, M. (2011), 'Past and present in Pindar's religious poetry', in A. P. M. H. Lardinois, J. H. Blok, and M. G. M. van der Poel (eds.), *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy and Religion* (Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World 8, Mnemosyne Suppl. 332; Leiden and Boston): 59–78.
- Pavlovskis, Z. (1965), 'Statius and the Late Latin epithalamia', *CP* 60: 164–77.
- Paz de Hoz, M. (1998), 'Los himnos homéricos cortos y las plegarias culturales', *Emerita* 66: 49–66.
- Pearson, A. C. (1924), *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford).
- Pedrick, V. (1982), 'Supplication in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 112: 125–40.
- Pelliccia, H. (1987), 'Pindarus Homericus: *Pythian* 3.1–80', *HSPH* 91: 39–63.
- Pepino, I. (2004), 'Sapphus xlv, quod sit carmen nuptiale in via actum', *Latinitas* 52: 148–53.
- Perón, J. (1974), *Les images maritimes de Pindare* (Paris).
- Perusino, F. and Colantonio, M. (eds.) (2007), *Dalla lirica corale alla poesia drammatica: Forme e funzioni del canto corale nella tragedia e nella commedia greca* (Pisa).
- Petersmann, G. (1973), 'Die monodische Totenklage der *Ilias*', *RhM* 116: 3–16.
- Pfeiffer, R., (1929), 'Gottheit und Individuum in der frühgriechischen Lyrik', *Philologus* 84: 137–52.

- Pfeijffer, I. L. (1999), *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, & Pythian VIII* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 197; Leiden, Boston, and Cologne).
- Pfister, F. (1924), 'Epiphanie', *RE* Suppl. 4: 277–323.
- Pfisterer–Haas, S. (1989), *Darstellungen alter Frauen in der griechischen Kunst* (Frankfurt a. M., Bern, New York, and Paris).
- (1990), 'Ältere Frauen auf den attischen Grabdenkmälern', *MDAI (A)* 105: 179–96.
- Phillips, D. J. and Pritchard, D. (eds.) (2003), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient World* (Swansea).
- Pighi, G. B. (1974), *Il libro di Valerio Catullo e i frammenti dei 'poeti nuovi'* (Torino).
- Pimpinelli, M. A. (1994), 'Eracle ad Olimpia: La metope del tempio di Zeus', *Ostraka* 3: 349–416.
- Piotto, E. (2014), 'Olympia and Syracuse, the *polis* and Panhellas in the epinicians for Hieron', *CW* 108: 3–26.
- Podlecki, A. J. (1976), 'Athens and Aegina', *Historia* 25: 396–413.
- (1980), 'Festivals and flattery: The early Greek tyrants as patrons of poetry', *Athenaeum* 58: 371–95.
- Poe, J. P. (1989), 'The altar in the fifth-century theater', *CLAnt* 8: 116–39.
- Poltera, O. (1997), *Le langage de Simonide : Étude sur la tradition poétique et son renouvellement* (Bern).

- (2008), *Simonides lyricus. Testimonia und Fragmente* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 35; Basel).
- Pötscher, W. (1992), 'Die Hikesie des letzten *Ilias*-Gesanges', *WJA* 18: 5–16.
- (1994), 'Die Strukturen der Hikesie', *WS* 107: 51–75.
- Préaux, C. (1978), *Le Monde hellénistique : La Grèce et l'Orient de la mort d'Alexandre à la conquête romaine de la Grèce (323–146 av. J.-C.)*, vols. 1–2 (Paris).
- Price, S. R. F. (1984), *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge).
- (1987), 'From noble funerals to divine cult: The consecration of Roman emperors', in D. Cannadine and S. Price (eds.), *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge): 56–105.
- (1999), *Religions of the Ancient Greeks* (Berkeley).
- Privitera, G. A. (1972a), 'Eracle nella prima *Nemea*', *GIF* 3: 28–51.
- (1972b), 'Il peane sacro ad Apollo', *Cultura e Scuola* 41: 41–9 = in C. Calame (ed.), *Rito e Poesia Chorale in Grecia* (Bari 1977): 17–24.
- (1977), 'Eracle e gli Eacidi nella terza *Nemea*', *GIF* 8: 249–73.
- (1982), *Pindaro. Le Istmiche* (Milano).
- Prückner, H. (1968), *Die lokrischen Tonreliefs. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte* (Mainz).
- Pulley, S. (1997), *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- Pütz, B. (2003), *The Symposium and Komos in Aristophanes* (Tübingen).
- Rabel, R. T. (1988), 'Chryses and the opening of the *Iliad*', *AJP* 109: 473–81.

- Race, W. H. (1982), 'Aspects of rhetoric and form in Greek hymns', *GRBS* 23: 5–14.
- (1989), 'Elements of style in Pindar's break-offs', *AJP* 110: 189–209.
- (1990), *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta).
- (2004), 'Elements of plot and the formal presentation in Pindar's *Olympian* 12', *CJ* 99: 373–94.
- Radt, S. L. (1966), 'Pindars erste *Nemeische* Ode. Versuch einer Interpretation', *Mnemosyne* 19: 148–74.
- (1974), review of Köhnken (1971), *Gnomon* 46: 131–21.
- Raeburn, D. and Thomas, O. (2011), *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus: A Commentary for Students* (Oxford).
- Raschke, W. J. (1988), 'Images of victory: Some new considerations of victory monuments', in W. J. Raschke (ed.), *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity* (Wisconsin Studies in Classics; Madison): 38–54.
- Rau, P. (1967), *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (Zetemata 45; München).
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1967), 'Das Denkmal-Epigram', *Entretiens Hardt* 14: 3–26.
- Rawles, R. (2013), "'Aristophanes'" Simonides: Lyric models for praise and blame', in Bakola, Prauscello, and Telò (eds.): 175–201.
- Rayor, D. J. (2005), 'The power of memory in Erinna and Sappho', in E. Greene (ed.), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Norman, Okla.): 59–71.
- Redfield, J. M. (1975), *Nature and Culture in the Iliad and Odyssey* (Chicago).

- Rehak, P. (1998), 'Unfinished hair and the installation of the pedimental sculptures of the temple of Zeus at Olympia', in K. J. Hartswick and M. C. Sturgeon (eds.), Στέφανος: *Studies in Honor of Sismondo Ridgway* (Philadelphia): 193–208.
- Rehm, R. (1988), 'The staging of suppliant plays', *GRBS* 29: 263–307.
- (1994) *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton).
- Reiner, E. (1938), *Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 30; Stuttgart).
- Reitzenstein, R. (1893), *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen).
- (1900), 'Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis', *Hermes* 35: 73–105.
- Renahan, R. (1983), 'The early Greek poets: Some interpretations', *HSPH* 87: 1–29.
- Richards, I. A. (1936), *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (Oxford).
- Richardson, L. Jr. (1977), *Propertius: Elegies I–IV* (Norman, Oklahoma).
- Ritchie, W. (1978), 'Euripides, *Iphigenia at Aulis* 919–974', in Dawe, Diggle, and Easterling (eds.): 179–203.
- Riu, X. and Pòrtulas, J. (eds.) (2012), *Approaches to Archaic Greek Poetry* (Orione 5; Messina).
- Robbins, E. (1978), 'Cyrene and Cheiron: The myth of Pindar's ninth *Pythian*', *Phoenix* 32: 91–104.
- (1990), 'The gift of the gods: Pindar's third *Pythian*', *CQ* n.s. 40: 307–18.

Roberts, M. (1989), 'The use of myth in Latin epithalamia from Statius to Venantius Fortunatus', *TAPA* 119: 321–48.

Rodighiero, A. (1998), *Sofocle*, Edipo a Colono (Venice).

——— (2000), *La parola, la morte, l'eroe. Aspetti di poetica sofoclea* (Padua).

——— (2008), 'Confluenza di generi lirici, allusività epica e performance corale in Soph. *Trach.* 497–530', in G. Avezzi (ed.), *Didaskalia II. Nuovi studi sulla tradizione e l'interpretazione del dramma attico* (Verona): 293–369.

——— (2010), 'Coralì innodici dell *Antigone*: Forma e funzione', in A. M. Belardinelli and G. Greco (eds.), *Antigone e le Antigoni. Storia forme fortuna di un mito* (Florence): 159–81.

——— (2011), 'Ideologia e paesaggio nell' *Edipo a Colono* di Sofocle', in A. Beltrmetti (ed.), *La storia sulla scene. Quello che gli storici non hanno raccontato* (Rome): 241–58.

——— (2012a), *Generi lirico-coralì nella produzione drammatica di Sofocle* (Studien zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 12; Tübingen).

——— (2012b), 'The sense of place: *Oedipus at Colonus*, 'political' geography and the defence of a way of life', in Markantos and Zimmermann (eds.): 55–80.

——— (2012c), 'Le danze del coro in Soph. *Ai.* 699: νόσια vs. μύσια', *Eikasmos* 23: 115–34.

——— (2014), 'L'ultimo viaggio di Edipo', in D. Piovan and R. Brazzale (eds.), *Diario 2014* (Quaderni del Teatro Olimpico 35; Vicenza): 83–91.

Rodin, B. P. (2009), *Pindaric Epinikion and the Evolution of Poetic Genres in Archaic Greece* (Diss. Berkeley).

Rohde, E. (1876), *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig).

Roloff, D. (1970), *Gottähnlichkeit, Vergöttlichung und Erhöhung zu seligem Leben* (Berlin).

Rose, H. J. (1936), 'The Ancient grief: A study of Pindar, fragment 133 (Bergk), 127 (Bowra)', in Bailey (ed.): 79–96.

Rose, P. W. (1974), 'Pindar's first *Nemean*: Sportsman, poetry, paideia', *HSPH* 78: 145–75.

Rösler, W. (1975), 'Ein Gedicht und sein Publikum: Überlegungen zu Sappho Fr. 44 LP', *Hermes* 103: 275–85.

Rudolf, A. (2009), 'Die Transgression der Situation: Zur Text-Kontext-Relation als Konstituens der Literarizität sapphischer Lyrik', *Poetica* 41: 331–54.

Rutherford, I. C. (1990), 'Paeans by Simonides', *HSPH* 93: 169–209.

——— (1992), 'Two heroic prosodia: A study of Pindar, "paeans xiv–v"', *ZPE* 92: 59–72.

——— (1995a), 'Apollo in ivy: The tragic paeon', *Arion* 3: 112–35.

——— (1995b), 'Et hominum et deorum . . . laudes (?): A hypothesis about the organisations of Pindar's "Paian"-book', *ZPE* 107: 44–52.

——— (2001a), *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).

——— (2001b), review of Schröder (1999), *CR* n.s. 51: 377–8.

- Sailor, D. and Stroup, S. C. (1999), 'Φθόνοϛ δ' ἀπέστω: The translation of transgression in Aiskhylos' *Agamemnon*', *ClAnt* 18: 153–82.
- Samter, E. (1911), *Geburt, Hochzeit und Tod. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Volkskunde* (Berlin).
- Sanders, L. J. (1991), 'Dionysos I of Syracuse and the origins of the ruler cult in the Greek world', *Historia* 40: 275–87.
- Sandin, P. (2014), 'Famous Hyperboreans', *Nordlit* 33: 205–21.
- Santi, F. (2006), 'Gli Egineti, gli Eacidi e le figlie di Asopo', *Archeologia Classica* 57: 1–27.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1928), *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikions* (Halle).
- (1951), *Sappho. Welt und Dichtung. Dasein in der Liebe* (Potsdam).
- (1989), *Die frühgriechische Lyrik* (Tübinger Vorlesungen 3; Frankfurt a. M.).
- Schein, S. L. (2013), *Sophocles, Philoctetes: Edited* (Cambridge).
- Schlesinger, E. (1933), *Die griechische Asylie* (Diss. Giessen).
- Schlunk, R. (1976), 'The theme of suppliant-exile in the *Iliad*', *AJP* 97: 199–209.
- Schmidt, F. (1911), *De supplicum ad aram confugientium partibus scenicis* (Diss. Königsberg).
- Schmitt-Pantel, P. (1990), 'Sacrificial meal and symposium: Two models of civic institutions in the Archaic city?', in Murray (ed.): 14–33.
- Schroeder, O. (1922), *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Schröder, S. (1999), *Geschichte und Tradition der Gattung Paian. Eine kritische Untersuchung mit einem Ausblick auf Behandlung und Auffassung der*

- lyrischen Gattungen bei den alexandrinischen Philologen* (Stuttgart und Leipzig).
- Scivoletto, N. (1974), 'Ticida, *poeta novus*', in G. Puccioni (ed.), *Poesia Latina in frammenti: Miscellanea filologia* (Genova): 201–11.
- Scullion, S. (1999/2000), 'Tradition and Invention in Euripidean aitiology', in Cropp, Lee, and Sansone (eds.): 217–33.
- Seaford, R. (1987), 'The tragic wedding', *JHS* 107: 106–30.
- (1994), *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford).
- (2004), 'Tragedy, Ritual, and Money', in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (eds.): 71–93.
- Segal, C. (1986), *Interpreting Greek Tragedy: Myth, Poetry, Text* (Ithaca, NY).
- (1993), *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow: Art, Gender, and Communication in Alcestis, Hippolytus, and Hecuba* (Durham).
- Shapiro, K. (1988), 'Hymnon thesauros: Pindar's sixth *Pythian* ode and the treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi', *MH* 45: 1–5.
- (1991), 'The iconography of mourning in Athenian art', *AJA* 95: 629–56.
- Shipley, G. (2000), *The World after Alexander 323–30 BC* (London and New York).
- Shipp, G. P. (1960), *P. Terenti Afri Andria: With Introduction and Commentary* (2nd ed.; Melbourne).
- Sifakis, G. M. (1992), 'The structure of Aristophanic comedy', *JHS* 112: 123–42.

- Silk, M. S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery: With Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- (2003), 'Metaphor and metonymy: Aristotle, Jakobson, Ricœur, and others', in Boys-Stones (ed.): 115–50.
- (2013), 'The Greek dramatic genres: Theoretical perspectives', in Bakola, Prauscello, and Telò (eds.): 15–39.
- Sinn, U. (2000), *Olympia: Cult, Sport, and Ancient Festival*, trans. T. Thornton (Princeton).
- Sinos, R. H. (1993), 'Divine selection: Epiphany and politics in Archaic Greece', in Dougherty and Kurke (1993): 73–91.
- Skutsch, O. (1953), 'Der Ennianische Soldatenchor', *RhM* 96: 193–201.
- Slater, W. J. (1969a), *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin).
- (1969b), 'Futures in Pindar', *CQ* n.s. 19: 86–94.
- (1983), 'Lyric narrative: Structure and principle', *ClAnt* 2: 117–32.
- (1984), 'Nemean one: The victor's return in poetry and politics', in Gerber (ed.): 241–64.
- (1988), 'Pindar's *Pythian* 3: Structure and purpose', *QUCC* 29: 51–61.
- (1989), 'Pelops at Olympia', *GRBS* 30: 485–501.
- Smith, R. R. R. (2007), 'Pindar, athletes, and the early Greek statue habit', in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.): 83–139.
- Snell, B. (1928), *Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama* (Philologus Suppl. 20; Leipzig).
- (1931), 'Sapphos Gedicht φαίνεται μοι κῆνος', *Hermes* 66: 71–90.

- (1946), *Die Entdeckung des Geistes. Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen* (9th ed. 1975; Göttingen).
- Solmsen, F. (1968), 'Two Pindaric passages on the hereafter', *Hermes* 96: 110–21.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (1980), *Aristophanes, Acharnians: Edited with Translation and Notes* (Warminster).
- (1985), *Aristophanes, Peace: Edited with Translation and Notes* (Warminster).
- (1987), *Aristophanes, Birds: Edited with Translation and Notes* (Warminster).
- (1994), *Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae: Edited with Translation and Notes* (Warminster).
- (1996), *Aristophanes, Frogs: Edited with Translation and Notes* (Warminster).
- (2008), *Aeschylus, Oresteia: Edited and Translated* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1973), 'The young abductor of the Locrian pinakes', *BICS* 20: 12–21.
- (1978), 'Persephone and Aphrodite at Locri: A model for personality definitions in Greek religion', *JHS* 98: 101–21.
- (1995), *'Reading' Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period* (Oxford).
- (2003), *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (Oxford).

- Stamatopoulou, M. (2007), 'Thessalian aristocracy and society in the age of epinikian', in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.): 308–41.
- Starkie, W. J. M (1909), *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London).
- Stavrakopoulou, A. (2004), 'Wedding: Re-composing a ritual in shadow theatre performances', in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (2004): 297–306.
- Steiner, D. (1993), 'Pindar's *Oggeti parlanti*', *HSPh* 95: 159–80.
- (1998), 'Moving images: Fifth-century victory monuments and the athlete's allure', *ClAnt* 17: 123–49.
- (2001), *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought* (Princeton).
- (2010a), *Homer, Odyssey: Books xvii–xviii* (Cambridge).
- (2010b), 'The immeasures of praise: The epinician celebration of Agamemnon's return', *Hermes* 138: 22–37.
- Stern, J. (1969), 'The myth of Pindar's *Nemean* 10', *GRBS* 10: 125–32.
- (1978), 'Theocritus' *epithalamium* for Helen', *RBP* 56: 29–37.
- Stigers, E. S. (1977), 'Retreat from the male: Catullus 62 and Sappho's erotic flowers', *Ramus* 6: 83–103.
- Stockert, W. (1992), *Euripides, Iphigenie in Aulis*, vol. 2: *Detaillkommentar* (Wiener Studien Beiheft 16.2; Vienna).
- Stoneman, R. (1977), 'The "Theban" eagle', *CQ* n.s. 26: 188–97.
- Stupperich, R. (1982), *Staatsbegräbnis und Privatdenkmal im klassischen Athen* (Münster).

- Suárez de la Torre, E. (1984), 'El mito de Cirene y la victoria de Telesícrates', *EClás* 29: 199–208.
- Swift, L. (2006), 'Mixed choruses and wedding songs: A new interpretation of the third stasimon of the *Hippolytos*', *JHS* 126: 125–40.
- (2010), *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford).
- (2011), 'Epinician and tragic worlds: The case of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*', in Athanassaki and Bowie (eds.): 391–414.
- Syndikus, H. P. (1990), *Catull. Eine Interpretation*, 3 vols. (Darmstadt).
- Taege, F. (1957), *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart).
- Taplin, O. (1977), *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Teodorsson, S. T. (1987), 'The etymology of scolion', *Eranos* 87: 127–32.
- Theunissen, M. (2002), *Pindar. Menschenlos und Wende der Zeit* (2nd ed.; München).
- Thomas, Rosalind (2007), 'Fame, memorial, and choral poetry: The origins of epinician poetry', in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.): 141–66.
- (2012), 'Pindar's "difficulty" and the performance of epinician poetry: Some suggestions from ethnography', in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.): 224–45.
- Thomas, Richard I. (1983), 'Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman poetry', *CQ* n.s. 33: 92–13.

——— (2011), *Horace, Odes Book 4 and Carmen Saeculare: Edited* (Cambridge).

Thomsen, O. (1992), *Ritual and Desire: Catullus 61 and 62 and Other Ancient Documents on Wedding and Marriage* (Aarhus).

——— (2002), 'An introduction to the study of Catullus' wedding poems: The ritual drama of Catullus 62', *C&M* 53: 255–87.

Thornton, A. (1984), *Homer's Iliad: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication* (Hypomnemata 81; Göttingen).

Thorsen, T. S. (ed.) (2013), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy* (Cambridge).

Thummer, E. (1969), *Pindar. Die Isthmischen Gedichte*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg).

Thraede, K. (1994), 'Hymnus', *RAC* 16: 915–46.

Tichy, E. (1994), 'Indo-iranische Hymnen', in Burkert and Stolz (eds.): 79–96.

Toher, M. (1991), 'Greek funeral legislation and the two Spartan funerals', in M. A. Flower and M. Toher (eds.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (London): 159–75.

Trédé, M. (2003), 'Présence et image des poètes lyriques dans le théâtre d'Aristophane', in Jouanna and Leclant (eds.): 169–83.

Treu, G. (1897), *Olympia. Die Ergebnisse der von dem deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabungen*, vol. 3: *Die Bildwerke von Olympia in Stein und Thon* (Berlin).

Treu, M. (1968), *Sappho. Griechisch und Deutsch* (4th ed.; Munich).

- Tsantanoglou, K. (2008), 'The banquet of the gods and the picnic of the girls: Observations on Sappho fr. 2 V. (with an appendix on Ibycus *PMGF* 286)', *Eikasmos* 19: 45–69.
- Tsomis, G. (2005), 'Sappho, Longus und das Apfel-Gleichnis. Ein Beitrag zum pragmantischen Charakter des Sapphischen Fragments 105a V.', *Eranos* 103: 63–7.
- Tufts, V. (1978), *The Epithalamium in Europe and its Development in England* (Los Angeles).
- Tulunay, E. T. (1998), 'Pelops statt Apollon? Ein neuer Deutungsvorschlag für die mittlere Figur im Westgiebel des Zeustempels in Olympia', *IstMit* 48: 453–60.
- Turner, C. (2001), 'Perverted supplication and other inversions in Aeschylus' *Danaid* trilogy', *CJ* 97: 27–51.
- Tzamali, E. (1996), *Syntax und Stil bei Sappho* (Munich).
- Ucciardello, G. (2007), 'A single scribe in *P. Oxy.* IV 660 + *P. Oxy.* XXIII 2623 + *PSI* inv. 1907 (choral lyric Simonides?)', *ZPE* 160: 4–14.
- Urso, G. (ed.) (2011), *Dicere laudes: Elogio, comunicazione, creazione del consenso* (Pisa).
- Usener, H. (1896), *Götternamen. Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung* (Frankfurt a. M.).
- Valk, M. H. van der (1973), 'On the composition of the Attic *Skolia*', *Hermes* 102: 1–20.

- Vendruscolo, F. (1994), 'Pindaro, *Threnoi* fr. 129, 10–11 Snell-Maehler', *ZPE* 101: 16–18.
- Verdenius, W. J. (1949), 'κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος', *Mnemosyne* 2: 294–8.
- (1975), review of Köhnken (1971), *Mnemosyne* 28: 200–1.
- (1987), *Commentaries in Pindar 1* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 97; Leiden).
- (1988a), *Commentaries in Pindar 2* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 101; Leiden).
- (1988b), review of Hubbard (1985), *Mnemosyne* 41: 136–40.
- Versnel, H. S. (1970), *Triumphus: An inquiry into the Origin, Development, and Meaning of the Roman Triumph* (Leiden).
- (2011), *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (Religions in the Greco-Roman World 173; Leiden).
- Versnel, H. S. and van Straten, E. T. (eds.) (1981), *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 2; Leiden).
- Vetta, M. (1983), 'Un capitolo di storia di poesia simposiale (per l'esegesi di Aristofane *Vespe* 1222–1248)', in id. (ed.), *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica. Guida storica e critica* (Rome): 119–31.
- (1992), 'Il simposio: La monodia e il giambo', in G. Gambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. 1 (Rome): 177–218.
- (1996), 'Convivialità pubblica e poesia per simposio in Grecia', *QUCC* 54: 197–209.

- Vickers, M. (1997), *Pericles on Stage: Political Comedy in Aristophanes' Early Plays* (Austin, Texas).
- Vivante, P. (1990), 'Pindar *Pythian* XII', in A. Schachter (ed.), *Essays in the Topography, History and Culture of Boiotia* (Montreal): 125–7.
- (2005), 'The sculptural moment in Pindar', *Arion* 13: 1–20.
- Voigt, E. M. (1971), *Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam).
- Walbank, F. W. (1992), *The Hellenistic World* (3rd ed.; London).
- Wasdin, K. (2009), *The Reluctant Bride: Greek and Roman Wedding Poems* (Diss. Yale).
- Webster, T. B. L. (1953), *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester).
- (1975), 'Homeric Hymns and society', in C. Préaux, J. Bingen, G. Cambier, G. Nachtergaele (eds.), *Le monde grec : Pensée, littérature, histoire, documents. Festschrift Claire Préaux* (Brussels): 86–93.
- Wecklein, N. (1899), *Euripidis Iphigenia Aulidensis* (Leipzig).
- Welcker, F. G. (1816), *Sappho von einem herrschenden Vorurtheil befreit* (Göttingen) = (1845): 80–144.
- (1845), *Kleine Schriften*, ed. O. Lüders, vol. 2 (Bonn).
- Welwei, K.-W. (1991), 'Heroenkult und Gefallenenehrung im antiken Griechenland', in G. Binder and B. Effe (eds.), *Tod und Jenseits im Altertum* (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 6; Trier): 50–70.
- Werner, C. M., Haggard, L. M., Altman, I., and Oxley, D. (1988), 'Temporal qualities of rituals and celebrations: A comparison between Christmas Street

- and Zuni Shalako', in J. E. McGrath (ed.), *The Social Psychology of Time: New Perspectives* (Beverly Hills): 203–32.
- West, M. L. (1965), 'Euripides, *Hippolytus* 88', *CR* n.s. 15: 156.
- (1966a), *Hesiod, Theogony: Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary* (Oxford).
- (1966b), 'Euripides, *Hippolytus* 88 again', *CR* n.s. 16: 274–5.
- (1968), 'Two passages of Aristophanes', *CR* n.s. 18: 5–8.
- (1975), *Immortal Helen* (Inaug. lect. Bedford College; London).
- (1978), *Hesiod, Works and Days: Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary* (Oxford).
- (1980), 'Tragica IV', *BICS* 27: 9–22.
- (1987), *Euripides, Orestes: Edited with a Commentary* (Oxford).
- (2007), *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- West, S. R. (1992), 'Textile homage: A note on Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 895–974', in *Apodosis: Essays Presented to W. W. Cruickshank* (London): 111–18.
- (2004), 'Herodotus and lyric poetry', *LCláss* 8: 79–91.
- Whitfield, G. K. (1967), *The Restored Relation: The Supplication Theme in the Iliad* (Diss. Columbia).
- Whitman, C. J. (1965), *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (New York).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1875), *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin).
- (1879), 'Parerga', *Hermes* 14: 161–86 = (1962): 1–23.
- (1889), Euripides, *Herakles*, vol. 2: *Text und Kommentar* (Berlin).

- (1900), *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker* (Berlin).
- (1913), *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker* (Berlin).
- (1914), ‘Neue lesbische Lyrik (Oxyrhynchus-Papyri X)’, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 33: 225–47 = (1935): 384–414.
- (1916), *Aischylos. Interpretationen* (Berlin).
- (1919), ‘Lese Früchte’, *Hermes* 54: 46–74 = (1962): 284–313.
- (1922), *Pindaros* (Berlin).
- (1927a), *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (Berlin).
- (1927b), ‘Lese Früchte’, *Hermes* 62: 287–88 = (1962): 431–53.
- (1928), ‘Lese Früchte’, *Hermes* 63: 369–90 = (1962): 454–75.
- (1935), *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 1: *Klassische griechische Poesie*, ed. P. Maas (Berlin).
- (1962), *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2: *Lese Früchte und Verwandtes*, ed. K. Latte (Berlin).
- Willcock, M. M. (1974), review of Köhnken (1971), *CR* 24: 191–6.
- (1995), *Pindar. Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7* (Cambridge).
- Willi, A. (2003), *The Language of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek* (Oxford).
- Williams, G. (1958), ‘Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies’, *JRS* 48: 16–24.

- Williamson, M. (1990), *Some Problems of Literary Theory Considered With Particular Reference to the Interpretation of Pindar* (Diss. London).
- Wills, G. (1967), 'Sappho 31 and Catullus 51', *GRBS* 8: 167–97.
- (1970), 'Phoenix of Colophon's κορώνισμα', *CQ* n.s. 20: 112–18.
- Wilson, F. (1948), 'Pastoral and *epithalamium* in Latin literature', *Speculum* 23: 35–57.
- Wilson, P. (2007), 'Nike's cosmetics: Dramatic victory, the end of comedy, and beyond', in C. Craus, S. Goldhill, H. P. Foley, and J. Elsner (eds.), *Visualizing the Tragic: Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin* (Oxford): 257–87.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1969), 'Pindar's ninth *Pythian* ode', *BICS* 16: 9–15.
- Wise, J. (2008), 'Tragedy as "an augury of a happy life"', *Arethusa* 41: 381–410.
- Wolff, H. J. (1944), 'Marriage law and family organisation in ancient Athens', *Traditio* 2: 43–95.
- (1952), 'Die Grundlagen des griechischen Eherechts', *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 20: 1–29, 157–81.
- Woodbury, L. (1972), 'Apollo's first love: Pindar *Pyth.* 9.26ff.', *TAPA* 103: 561–73.
- (1982), 'Cyrene and the τελευτά of marriage in Pindar's ninth *Pythian* ode', *TAPA* 112: 245–59.
- (1985), 'Ibycus and Polycrates', *Phoenix* 39: 193–220.
- Wörrle, M. and Zanker, P. (eds.) (1995), *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Vestigia 47; Munich).

- Wülfing, P. (1981), 'Hymnos und Gebet. Zur Formengeschichte der älteren griechischen Hymnendichtung', *Stud. Class.* 20: 21–31.
- Wüst, E. (1967), *Pindar als geschichtsschreibender Dichter* (Diss. Tübingen).
- Yatromanolakis, D. (1999), 'Alexandrian Sappho Revisited', *HSPH* 99: 179–95.
- (2004), 'Ritual poetics in Archaic Lesbos: Contextualizing genre in Sappho', in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (eds.): 56–70.
- Yatromanolakis, D. and Roilos, P. (eds.) (2004), *Greek Ritual Poetics* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Young, D. C. (1968), *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 9; Leiden).
- (1970), 'Pindaric criticism', in Calder and Stern (eds.): 1–95.
- (1983), 'Pindar's *Pythians* 2 and 3: Inscriptional ποτέ and the "Poetic Epistle"', *HSPH* 87: 31–42.
- (1993), 'Something like the gods: A Pindaric theme and the myth of *Nemean* 10', *GRBS* 34: 123–32.
- Yunis, H. (1988), *A New Creed: Fundamental Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama* (Hypomnemata 91; Göttingen 1988).
- Zancani-Montuoro, P. (1954), 'Il rapitore del Kore nel mito Locrese', *Rendiconti Accademia Napoli* 29: 79–86.
- Zeitlin, F. I. (1970), *The Ritual World of Greek Tragedy* (Diss. Columbia, New York).
- Ziegler, K. (1905), *De precationum apud Graecos formis quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Breslau).

Zielinski, T. (1921), *Religia starzytnej Grecji* (Warsaw).

Zimmermann, B. (1985–87), *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatischen Technik der aristophanischen Komödien*, 3 vols. (Königstein and Frankfurt).

——— (1989), ‘Gattungsmischung, Manierismus, Archaismus. Tendenzen des griechischen Dramas und Dithyrambos am Ende des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.’, *Lexis* 3: 25–36.

Zschietzschmann, W. (1928), ‘Die Darstellung der Prothesis in der griechischen Kunst’, *MDAI (A)* 53: 17–47.

Zsolt, A. (2008), ‘Pindarus allegoricus: zur Deutung der 2. und 3. *Olympischen Ode*’, *AAntHung* 48: 305–38.

Zuntz, G. (2005), *Griechische philosophische Hymnen* (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 35; Tübingen).