A COMMENTARY ON PINDAR'S EMMENID ODES:

*O.*2, *O.*3, *P.*6, *I.*2

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Oxford

Trinity Term 2015

Daniel Mahendra Jan Sicka

Magdalen College

99,771 words

ABSTRACT

A Commentary on Pindar's Emmenid Odes:
***O*.2, *O*.3, *P*.6, *I*.2**

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Oxford
Trinity Term 2015
Daniel Mahendra Jan Sicka
Magdalen College

The thesis is a commentary on four Pindaric odes for the Emmenid dynasty of Acragas: *Olympian* 2, *Olympian* 3, *Pythian* 6, *Isthmian* 2. The main introduction sets out the Emmenid odes' historical context, and the commentary's approach to them in relation to Pindaric scholarship. There follows a synopsis of the textual readings adopted, indicating divergences from Snell-Maehler. The four main chapters are arranged in chronological order, with each one treating a single ode: lemmatized commentary follows an introductory section that contains a translation, metrical scheme, notes on date and performance/reperformance context, structural analysis, and interpretation. A conclusion draws out the broader patterns that emerge from the study of all four odes, especially the techniques Pindar employs to address the encomiastic needs of his honorands, and to bind the poems together.

The commentaries on individual odes aim both to explore the nuances of particular words and phrases, and to advance critical understanding of the poem as a whole. They address a wide spectrum of linguistic, textual, metrical, and stylistic questions, in combination with socio-political and historical issues, bringing to bear a range of evidence and applying recent scholarly insights to established cruces. The translations do not seek to achieve the most natural English style, but to render as far as possible the Greek's emphasis, and to reflect the interpretative decisions argued for in the lemmata.

The study's larger aim is to explore the manner in which Pindar's odes for the Emmenids developed in light of the family's shifting personal, competitive, and political fortunes, over the course of two decades that saw their acquisition, possession, and loss of tyrannical power. The corpus as a whole is shown to constitute a series of intertextually-connected reperformative artifacts that together create a poetic monument to the Emmenids.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note on Citations 4

Introduction 5

Synopsis of Readings 10

Chapter 1: *Pythian* 6 11

Chapter 2: *Olympian* 2 101

Chapter 3: *Olympian* 3 259

Chapter 4: *Isthmian* 2 336

Conclusion 411

Abbreviations 424

Bibliography 426

NOTE ON CITATIONS

The text of Pindar used is that of Snell-Maehler. Most of the Greek texts cited are drawn from the *TLG*, with the exception of the following authors: Terpander (Gostoli); Stesichorus (Davies & Finglass); Bacchylides (Campbell). Other occasional deviations are noted when they occur. For the convenience of the reader in looking up the commentary's citations in the *TLG*, I include line-references and mark line-breaks for prose texts as well as for verse as they appear in that database; no further significance is intended.

INTRODUCTION

This section sets out the Emmenid odes' historical context, and the dissertation's approach to them in relation to Pindaric scholarship. To minimize repetition, issues specific to individual odes are dealt with in their respective chapters, and the broader patterns emerging from the study of the odes as a whole are collected in the **Conclusion**.

(1) The Emmenids and their Odes in Context

The four odes that form the subject of this study were composed for chariot-victories won by the Emmenids [1] of Acragas, one of the great tyrant epicracies of early 5th-century Sicily. Their dynasty was relatively short-lived: Theron seized power c.489 [2], and ruled until his death in 472 [3], but his son and successor Thrasydaeus pursued a disastrous domestic and foreign policy that led to his exile and execution in 471 [4]. On the dates accepted by this study, ***O*.2** and ***O*.3** were composed for Theron in 476, and ***P*.6** and ***I*.2** for his brother Xenocrates in 490/89 and 470, respectively [5]. The odes are thus unique in punctuating the rise, glory, and fall of a tyrant house, and represent Pindar's longest attested engagement with a single family.

[1] Ἐμμενίδαι is the family name used at ***P*.6.5** and ***O*.3.38**: the scholia derive it either from an Emmenes who overthrew Phalaris, or from an Emmenides whose father Telemachus did (Miller (1970) 53-67). This tyrannicide ancestor is part of a series of self-aggrandizing genealogical constructs propagated by the Emmenids, whose violent accession to power and immigrant background in Sicily required legitimation. In addition to the tyrannicide, the historical claims included involvement in Acragas' foundation (cf. Buongiovanni (1985) 493-99; Caserta (1995); (2000) 5-42; Lapini & Luraghi (1996) 213-20; Cardete del Olmo (2008) 9-26; Adornato (2011) 17-29; ***O*.2.8-11**, **9**, **93**), whilst on the mythic side, descent from Cadmus, the Labdacids, and the Argive royal house was asserted (see ***O*.2.45**, **46**).

[2] Asheri (1988) 767-68.

[3] D.S.11.53.

[4] For the history of their rule, see Asheri (1988) 766-75; (1992) 149-54; Luraghi (1994) 231-72.

[5] See the introductions to individual odes.

The major Sicilian poleis, all but Leontini located on the coast and easily accessible to one another by sea, formed a close-knit unit ideal for the rapid transmission of cultural innovations: the Emmenids were part of a wave of tyrannies that swept every major Sicilian polis in the two decades following 505 [6]. Their closest counterparts were the Geloan and Syracusan Deinomenids, with whom they were connected by a web of dynastic marriages [7]. During Theron's tyranny, their political relationship fluctuated from a military alliance at Himera in 480 [8] to a narrowly-avoided outbreak of hostilities in 476 [9]. The dynasties also competed with one another agonistically, investing heavily in the winning of equestrian victories at Panhellenic Games: counting only family members, the Emmenids accumulated 4, the Deinomenids as many as 10 [10]. It is remarkable that whereas the first Deinomenid victory, that of Gelon in 488 at Olympia, seems to have been calculated to consolidate Gelon's accession to the tyranny of Gela in 491, Xenocrates' 490 Pythian win precedes, and perhaps facilitates, Theron's tyranny in Acragas, demonstrating that the Emmenids had the resources and will to compete in chariot-racing even as a private family [11]. It has been suggested that the dynasties had an understanding that they would not compete directly against one another in the Games [12]. However, it is unlikely that Hieron, who seems to have restricted his associates Hagesias and Chromios respectively to competition in mule-cart races and the less prestigious Nemean and Sicyonian Games, would have willingly conceded the greatest Panhellenic accolade to his main Sicilian rival in the 476 Olympics.

The dynasties' celebration of their victories was equally assiduous. Like the Emmenids, Gelon's successor Hieron systematically commemorated his victories with epinicia, with

[6] Ober (2015) 176.
[7] Illustrated in *BNP* s.v. 'Deinomenids'.
[8] Hdt.7.165; D.S.11.20.5.
[9] D.S.11.48.
[10] Morgan (2015) 70-71.
[11] See ***P.6.Date***.
[12] Bell (1995) 18.

the same victory often celebrated by two poems by the same or different poets [13]. However, unlike the Deinomenids, the Emmenids eschewed physical victory-dedications altogether, which suggests either that they assigned particular value to performative celebration, or were unwilling to invest in monumental dedications [14]. Thus both families participated in a Panhellenic system of competition and commemoration, within which they were themselves only part of an extensive Western Greek tradition [15].

(2) A Treasury of Songs? Approaching the Emmenid Odes

Given the historical conditions adumbrated above, the Emmenid odes present a special opportunity to explore both diachronically and synchronically how Pindar approached the challenge of composing for different members of a single family over an extended period of time, as on the one hand their needs evolved with their personal, agonistic, and political circumstances, but on the other a core of continuity was maintained through the familial matrix.

A key thesis of this study is that although Pindar could not have known in advance the total number of his compositions for the family, from ***P.6*** onwards [16] he designs them to interlock allusively while maintaining their specific identity. Our understanding of how such a process might work has been enhanced by recent scholarship, which constructs a theoretical framework that grounds epinician intertextuality in contemporary Greek social structures.

---

[13] Neumann-Hartmann (2009) 284-85, 296-97.
[14] For differences between the Emmenid and Deinomenid odes in respect of the self-image they project, see **Conclusion (1)**.
[15] Hornblower (2004) 186-201.
[16] See ***P.6.52-53***.

The first part of the framework is the theory of regular oral reperformance, whether at symposia or other venues [17]. Within the same social setting for which they were originally produced, such reperformances reactivate the symbolic capital of an *oikos* [18], and, on a practical level, facilitate comparison between new and existing odes. Second, the circulation of written texts would likewise assist comparison, but also promote Panhellenic distribution [19]. Andrew Morrison [20] usefully classifies these levels of performance as 'primary' (i.e. the premiere); 'secondary' (reperformance close in space/time/milieu to the premiere); 'tertiary' (more distant reperformances/textual receptions). His complementary theory, that the audiences of odes composed for victors from similar geographical areas and/or social positions would overlap, is both attractive and a powerful hermeneutic tool. This framework counters several practical criticisms of the use of intertextuality (in the sense of intentional and specific allusion) to analyse texts: e.g. that a potential allusion is an intrinsic feature of language, and thus not intentional; that the author's knowledge of the source text cannot be assumed; that the audience would not have the knowledge/ability to recognize it [21]. Pindar's *expectation* that more than one type of audience would receive the ode, and/or that it would be performed in more than one context, gave him an incentive to exploit the opportunities that prospect offered. It can also potentially explain the ambiguities and inconsistencies of a given ode, if we assume flexibility was built into the text. The outcome of this intertextual investigation is summarized in the **Conclusion**.

[17] Herington (1985); Morgan (1993) 1-15; Loscalzo (2003) 85-119; Currie (2004) 49-69; Carey (2007) 199-200. See ***P*.6.5-6** for the argument that no (extant) epinician was conceived exclusively for one-off performance at the victory-site.
[18] Morrison (2012) 114. Cf. *N*.4.13-16; ***I*.2.44-46**.
[19] Hubbard (2004) 71-93.
[20] Morrison (2007); (2011a) 227-53; (2011b) 311-35; (2012) 111-33.
[21] Of course, no practical consideration can counter the poststructuralist position that meaning resides in reading practices, not the author's intention/text (Fowler (1997) 24-25).

The history of Pindaric scholarship has been memorably described as 'a chain of religious wars about method' [22]. This dissertation's overall approach is therefore holistic, reflecting the balance in particular of Formalism and (New) Historicism that has evolved over the last century of Pindaric studies [23]. In ideal cases, it may be possible to explicate what from the former perspective are ostensible anomalies through the lens of the latter [24], or indeed vice-versa.

In addition to intertextuality and performance/reperformance as mentioned above, this commentary focuses on a number of established and emergent areas of interest in research on epinician and Greek lyric in general. These include: *Selbstdarstellung* [25]; the construction of landscape as a source of symbolic capital; metapoetics; architectural and epigraphic literacy; comparison with NE/IE parallels; generic *Kreuzung*; stylistic enactment; engagement with epic, including awareness of the operation of its formulae and narratology; intrafamilial, intra-polis, and inter-polis dynamics; name-encoding; the politics of Panhellenic sites; mystery religion; synergy between metre and sense; reconfiguration of traditional myth; personification; break-off formulae; the relationships between contemporary poets; cultic interactions; the mechanics of patronage. I have particular sympathy with the view of Pindar taken by Michael Silk [26], who underscores the need to avoid reductive readings, and instead to recognize that much of the dynamism of Pindar's language comes from its ability to defamiliarize, connote, encode, to persuade as powerfully through style and implication as through direct argument. The genius of Pindar is to unite the functional effectiveness of a rhetorical technician with the sublime vision of a master spirit.

---

[22] Pfeijffer 1.
[23] Usefully summarized by Pfeijffer 1-12; Boeke (2007) 1-9; Xanthou (2011) 187-202.
[24] As for instance in the Emmenid victory-catalogue at ***I*.2.12-32**.
[25] See **Conclusion (1)**.
[26] Silk 177-97; (2012) 347-64.

SYNOPSIS OF READINGS

	Sicka	*Snell-Maehler*
O.2		
60	**Ἀνάγκᾳ**	**ἀνάγκᾳ**
63	**χαράσσοντες**	**ταράσσοντες**
75	**βουλαῖς**	**βουλαῖς·**
82	**κίονα**	**κιονα**
	Θανάτῳ	**θανάτῳ**
87	**γαρύετον**	**γαρυέτων**
97	**θέλων**	**θέλον**
	τε θέμεν	**τιθέμεν**
I.2		
10	**<στάθμας>**	<⏑–>
12	**ἀγνῶτ'**	**ἄγνωτ'**
19	**τόθι·**	**τόθι**

CHAPTER 1: *PYTHIAN* 6

TRANSLATION

A′ Listen! For it is quick-glancing Aphrodite's
furrow – or the Graces' –
that we are turning up again, as to the navel of the loud-roaring
Earth, strewn with shrines, we proceed;
5 where, for a Pythian victory, in the name of the blessed Emmenids,
and of Acragas the river-city, and especially of Xenocrates,
there stands ready-built a treasure-house
of songs, in the gold-laden
Apollonian valley;

B′ one which neither the winter's rain – which comes as an invader
from a loud-roaring cloud,
an implacable army – nor the wind shall drive into the depths
of the sea with their torrent-load of silt,
battered as it goes. But in pure light, its facade

shall a chariot-victory, shared by your father, Thrasybulus, and your family,

one to be made famous

through the words of men,

won in the folds of Crisa, proclaim.

Γ′ My boy, as you take her with your right hand, you uphold

that precept,

those words which they say once upon a time in the mountains

Philyra's son imparted to the mighty, temporarily-orphaned

son of Peleus, as instruction: above all gods, to give the son of Cronus,

the deep-voiced lord of lightning's flashes and bolts,

his reverence;

and of such honour never

to deprive his parents during the fated span of life.

Δ′ In the past, Antilochus too proved to be a man of might,

by manifesting this precept,

he who died for his father, when he stood up to the man-destroying

marshal of the Aethiopians,

Memnon. For Nestor's chariot had become ensnarled with a horse

rent by Paris' arrows; meanwhile that man [27] was wielding

his mighty spear.

35 And the Messenian elder's

whirling mind cried out: 'My son!'

E′ And then indeed no word that falls to earth did he cast forth: right there,

standing firm, did that godlike man

purchase his father's rescue with his own death,

40 and was esteemed amongst the younger-born

of the men of old, for accomplishing that colossal feat,

as the supreme example of virtue towards parents.

Those things are past;

but of those alive today, it is Thrasybulus

45 who has come closest to the standard of respect for fathers,

F′ while approaching his uncle in all forms of splendour.

It is with intelligence that he employs his wealth,

[27] Memnon.

culling the pleasures of a youth neither unjust nor insolent,

and wisdom too, in the grottoes of the Pierians.

And to you, Earthshaker, lord of the horses' lists,

with a mind that has greatly pleased you, Poseidon, does he keep close.

And his sweetness of spirit,

when it comes to mixing with his fellow-drinkers,

the bees' crannied labour surpasses.

METRICAL SCHEME

s1	⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – |	ia hi
s2	⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ‖ H	tl¨
s3	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏓ –⏑– ‖ B	gl ∧ia
s4	⏑ ⏑ – –⏑–⏑–⏑⏑– ‖ H	∧d gl¨
s5	– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – –⏑–⏑–⏑⏑– |	dod gl¨
s6	⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – –⏓⏑– ‖ H	gl ia
s7	⏑ – ⏑ – – |	ia –
s8	– – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – ‖ H	hag¨
s9	⏑ – – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ – ‖‖	ia∧ 2ia

The verse-division adopted is that of Turyn.

DATE

Σ.*P*.6.*Inscr*. and Σ.*I*.2.*Inscr*.a date Xenocrates' victory to the 24th Pythiad, i.e. 490 [28]. The date range for ***P.6***'s composition is much wider, from 490 to 476, when both this Pythian victory and a subsequent Isthmian are mentioned at ***O*.2.49-51**. Knowledge of the

[28] For 582 as the 1st Pythiad's date, see Finglass (on *P*.11) 19-27.

Isthmian victory's date would provide a *terminus ante quem* for ***P.6***, since P. would certainly have included it in ***P.6*** had it already occurred, but this too occupies a wide range between 488 and 476 [29]. *Pace* van den Groenendaal (2006) 217-19, it seems impossible that ***P.6*** could have post-dated the tyranny as ***I.2*** does: ***I.2*** references almost all earlier Emmenid compositions both explicitly and allusively [30], whereas ***P.6*** alludes only to fr.124ab [31]; the deliberate omission of Xenocrates' pre-476 Isthmian victory would be inexplicable, as would postponing by two decades commemoration of the family's first Panhellenic victory, esp. given its immediate political utility.

Therefore, the main choice is between a date just before, or just after, the tyranny began. The latter implies the inauguration/consolidation of the new regime [32]. The use of epinician poetry to legitimize rulers was part of its appeal to autocrats [33], and the same applied to Panhellenic victories themselves: Gelon's 488 Olympic chariot-victory, which followed his 491 accession, presumably served that purpose. However, there are reasons to regard ***P.6***'s political function as preparatory instead. Panhellenic victories could aid the acquisition of tyranny as well as its consolidation [34], and the fact that Xenocrates' victory predated the tyranny, and that by only a short while, implies that it was part of a conscious, and successful, effort to obtain it. ***P.6***'s political positioning aligns it with that same effort [35]. Moreover, Theron's prominence at **46**, although remarkable, is not as overt as that of a ruling tyrant in an ode for a close associate: *O.*6 for Hagesias names Hieron, his poleis Syracuse and Aetna, and his priesthood of Demeter and Kore (92-96); here, Theron is unnamed, and praised indirectly as an object of emulation within the family

[29] See ***I.2.Date***.
[30] See ***I.2.1-11***.
[31] See **52-53**. Intertexts between ***P.6*** and ***I.2*** are adaptations of the former by the latter.
[32] Carey *ap.*Morrison (2007) 41n.3.
[33] Cf. Currie (2005) 254-56 on *P.*4 and *P.*5.
[34] See **1-18**.
[35] See ***P.6.Interpretation***.

('capo della casata' [36]). Although Emmenid *Selbstdarstellung* is less concerned with power than the Deinomenids' [37], the ode's overall impression is of a family on the cusp of tyranny, rather than in possession of it: contrast Theron's explicit characterization as Acragas' bulwark (***O*.2.6**) with the poetic 'inscription' of Acragas' name on the song-treasury here [38], which only *implies* wielding the power of a state.

Potential topical references: **8** (addition of a Doric portico to the Olympic Geloan Treasury c.491); **12** (Battle of Marathon 490, which led to the commissioning of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi); **35** (Anaxilas of Rhegium renaming Zancle as Messene c.489). A date of late 490/early 489 is thus proposed.

PERFORMANCE

***P*.6** opens by enacting one performance-context, a Delphic procession (**1-4**), and ends implying another, a symposium (**52-54**). This pattern of multiple competing performance-contexts [39] is a recurrent epinician feature [40] that facilitates flexible performance/reperformance by eliding the difference between them [41]. That flexibility, fundamental to epinician's reusability and thus much of its utility to the victor [42], necessarily complicates modern attempts to fix historical *Realien*. In ***P*.6** in particular,

[36] Luraghi (1994) 241.
[37] Morgan (2015) 414.
[38] See **1-18**; **5-6**.
[39] Cf. *O*.6.98-100; *O*.7.1-6, 93-94; *O*.8.1-18, 25-30, 51; *N*.9.1-3, 48-53.
[40] 'Overloading' (Nagy (1994) 19).
[41] Morgan (1993) 12; Carey (2007) 199; Agócs (2012) 205-6; Athanassaki (2012) 134-57.
[42] See ***I*.2.43-46**; also **5-6** on epinician victory-data envisaging performance away from the victory-site.

these contexts seem to be specified more for their ideological value than as performance signposts [43]; my view is set out below.

1-4 has been taken as evidence for a Delphic processional premiere [44]. There is no practical difficulty with processional performance, which could be employed for prosodia and paeans [45], although even the former included vicarious (i.e. static) processions [46]. Similarly, ***P.6***'s monostrophic metre, and lack of 1st-person singular forms [47], might facilitate processional rendition [48], or simply evoke it. However, the locale is intrinsically unlikely: external evidence is lacking, and the logistics of organizing composition, choreography, and performance within the festival's remaining days after the victory are difficult [49]. This difficulty could be only partially alleviated if the rendition were monodic [50], or sympotic [51], rather than choral. The topographical deixis at **1-18** is arguably more relevant to recreating Delphi for a distant audience than a present one [52]. The Emmenids in particular made no known Panhellenic dedications, and those from Acragas at Delphi c.500-450 were minimal [53], which suggests their focus was on domestic reception, an impression supported by ***P.6***'s political positioning [54]. If performance at Delphi ever occurred, it would have been a reperformance during subsequent Games [55]. An Acragantine premiere is preferable.

---

[43] See **1-18**; **52-54**.
[44] Boeckh on **1-18** (*necesse est carmen ibi cantari*); Wilamowitz (1922) 139; Gelzer (1985) 98-99; Salviat (2007a) 11; cf. Neumann-Hartmann (2009) 61-124.
[45] Rutherford (2001) 63-64, 105-6.
[46] Rutherford (2003) 719.
[47] Burton (1962) 15, 24.
[48] Rutherford (2001) 176.
[49] Eckerman (2011) 1-8; (2012) 338-60.
[50] Gentili.
[51] Boeckh.
[52] Rutherford (2001) 177-78.
[53] Scott (2010) 91.
[54] See ***P.6*.Interpretation**.
[55] Loscalzo (2003) 116-18; cf. Currie (2004) 63; Hubbard (2004) 71.

The location/context of such an Acragantine premiere was probably an Emmenid private house, where ***I*.2.30-32** implies epinician *komoi* were frequent. It is noteworthy that both **52-54** and ***I*.2.30-32** allude to fr.124ab, an explicitly sympotic encomium for Thrasybulus. I take their intertextuality to indicate that the epinicia and encomia shared a locus (the house), and that their audiences overlapped. However, internal evidence suggests the epinician's performance addressed a wider audience, implying a large-scale, semi-public affair [56]: the view of wealth taken by **47** is markedly less elitist than the encomium's, and the ode's political message seems intended for a broader Acragantine public.

Since **52-54** strictly describes sympotic *behaviour* rather than performance, in line with P.'s other lexical references to symposia in epinician [57], this may mark Thrasybulus' habitual symposia as reperformance-contexts. ***P*.6** self-consciously envisages reperformance by thematizing both repetition [58] and the ode's future transmission of fame [59]. *V.s.* on reperformance at the Games-site.

See **1-4** on the ode's opening and close articulated as *komos* transitioning into symposium.

STRUCTURE

The stanzaic structure plays an important role in articulating the ode. Strophes 1-3 are end-stopped, 4 and 5 run over, but the former marks a narrative inflexion point and could

[56] Which could still be termed a 'symposium': Clay (1999) 26-27.
[57] Of which only *N*.9.48 occurs in the context of the current performance, but is still only gnomic; cf. Budelmann (2012) 173-90.
[58] See **3 ἀναπολίζομεν**; **ἐριβρόμου**.
[59] **18 ἀπαγγελεῖ**.

equally be punctuated with a high point. For progressive loosening of the correlation between stanza-end and content, cf. *O*.6 (49ff.); *O*.7 (25ff.). One might theorize that the opening image of the ode as an edifice here and in *O*.6 encouraged an unusually-tight structure. Henry 24 compares *N*.4, another monostrophic ode with stanzas in a multiple of 3, for the possibility of pseudo-triadic composition, which could have led to the Antilochus-myth opening Strophe 4. However, that feature seems coincidental here. It is better to regard the effect of the monostrophic scheme, which divides stanzas into identical building-blocks, as highlighting correspondences both in successive stanzas and non-consecutive ones to a greater degree than an equivalent triadic pattern.

Strophes 1-2 form a pair: 1 evokes a Delphic landscape as the site of both a procession (**1-4**) and the ode's physical manifestation as a treasury (**5-9**); 2 describes the song-treasury's durability in storms (**10-14**), and its communicative properties in sunlight (**14-18**). Responsions are marked: **6** ~ **15** (in the repeated naming-elements, Thrasybulus replaces Acragas as if via epigraphic erasure) [60]; **9** ~ **18** (locatives); **4 χθονὸς** ~ **13 ἁλὸς**. Aural effects: **3 ἐριβρόμου** [61], **10 χειμέριος ὄμβρος**, **11 ἐριβρόμου**.

The myths generate a larger structure. Myth 1 (Chiron's education of Achilles through precepts) occupies Strophe 3, with Myth 2 (Antilochus sacrificing himself to rescue Nestor from Memnon) occupying 4 and 5. Thrasybulus' connection to Myth 1 is clarified by the first two verses of Strophe 3 (**19-20**: he adheres to Chiron's precepts), and to Myth 2 by the final two verses of Strophe 5 (**44-45**: he is the modern exemplar of respect for parents), which are themselves in responsion with the precept to honour parents (**26-27**). Myth 2 is linked to Myth 1 by the first two verses of Strophe 4 (**28-29**), which indicate Antilochus observed the precept concerning devotion to parents in the last two verses of Strophe 3

[60] See **5-6**.
[61] Responsion with anagrammatism: **30 ἐναρίμβροτον**.

(**26-27**); **29 νόημα τοῦτο φέρων** also responds with **20 ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν** of Thrasybulus' observance of the precepts. The almost-exact responsion **21-23 μεγαλοσθενεῖ ... Πηλεΐδᾳ ~ 30-32 ἐναρίμβροτον ... Μέμνονα** adverts to the duel of Achilles and Memnon over Antilochus' body as depicted on the Siphnian Treasury [62]. The myths are thus linked with one another and with Thrasybulus, and the precepts with Achilles, Antilochus, and Thrasybulus. The narrative sequence of Myth 2 closely parallels *Il*.8.80-117 [63].

Strophe 6 is a self-contained virtue-catalogue for Thrasybulus, introduced as his emulation of Theron (**46**). Two correspondences link back to the precepts and Antilochus (**47 νόῳ ... ἄγει ~ 20 ἄγεις**, **29 νόημα**: responsion underlined). The ode concludes with an image of Thrasybulus' sympotic behaviour surpassing a honey-comb's sweetness (**52-54**) that by ring-composition both contrasts the opening procession (**1-4**) as a potential performance-context, and complements the song-treasury (**5-9**) as a model of an intricate poetic structure.

INTERPRETATION

Pace Wilamowitz [64], and despite the difficulties of defining the genre in general [65], ***P.6*** fulfils the function of an epinician, both in the technical sense of recording the data of the Acragantine Xenocrates' Pythian chariot-victory [66], and more broadly by furthering the interests of the victor and his family. However, the extraordinary requirements of the latter motivate an extraordinary strategy. The Emmenids had obtained a Panhellenic victory as a

[62] See **28-45**.
[63] See **28-45**.
[64] Wilamowitz (1922) 139.
[65] Currie (2005) 21-24.
[66] See **5-6**.

stepping-stone to achieving the tyranny of their polis [67]; we might speculate that Theron competed simultaneously, but was unsuccessful. The result was that the agonistic triumph was obtained by the less politically-significant brother, whereas it was Theron, as head of the family, who was intended to become tyrant. Therefore, the ode shares Xenocrates' prestige with his family to an remarkable extent [68], while marginalizing him outside the victory-data (**6**). The linchpin of this technique is Xenocrates' son Thrasybulus, whose naming and prominence are virtually unparalleled in epinician [69]. Thrasybulus is the focal point of the praise in Myths 1 and 2, where his analogues are Achilles and Antilochus; although the fact that Thrasybulus is praised for filial piety might appear to reflect well on Xenocrates, his analogues are respectively absent (Peleus) and helpless (Nestor). The misleading impression given is that Thrasybulus is the real honorand responsible for the victory, perhaps as charioteer, but its purpose is to detach Xenocrates from his victory's prestige [70], which is then channelled towards Theron: Thrasybulus emerges as a conduit for Theron's praise, since the former's concluding virtue-catalogue is explicitly cast as emulation of the latter [71]. The validity of this reading is supported by Theron's appropriation of Xenocrates' prestige in ***O*.2** [72], and the reversal of this process in ***I*.2** after Theron's death [73].

Beyond intrafamilial politics, the figure of Thrasybulus as an idealized, conservatively-educated and respectful young aristocrat counters any public concern regarding Emmenid ambitions [74], although some symbolic and allusive reference is made to them [75]. Evocation

[67] See **1-18**.
[68] See **5**.
[69] See **15**.
[70] See **28-42**.
[71] See **46**.
[72] See ***O*.2.48-51**.
[73] See ***I*.2.19-28**.
[74] See **47-54**.
[75] See **1-18**; **23-27**; **46**.

of Delphi grants both the family and the city the prestige of coming into direct contact with the centre of the world [76].

COMMENTARY

Strophe 1

1-18 Strophes 1 and 2 evoke a procession along the Delphic Sacred Way (**1-4**), where a treasury of song has been constructed in the name of the Emmenids, Acragas, and Xenocrates, to honour his Pythian victory (**5-9**). This song-treasury is impervious to the elements (**10-14**), and able to spread the fame of Xenocrates and the Emmenids' chariot-victory (**14-18**).

This passage manipulates Delphi's topography and cultural symbolism to create an imaginary landscape that enables the poet to achieve several interrelated objectives: these may be categorized as (1) performative; (2) ideological.

(1) Wherever the ode had its premiere (see ***P.*6.Performance**), the text inscribes performance in such a way as to 'vicariously transport' (term: Felson (1999) 1-31) both performers and audience to Delphi. This brings the ode vividly to life, and heightens engagement with its message through a simulation of lived experience and shared participation. Eckerman (2014) 21-35 identifies the human body as the conduit for this process, which involves stimulating multiple senses at once.

The auditory sense is activated by the imperative **1 Ἀκούσατ'**, which coincides with the start of the song and music, effectively creating its own audience. **3 ἐριβρόμου** evokes

[76] See **1-18**.

Delphi's earthquakes and storms, and is stylistically enacted (as a word signifying resonance) by its respective anagrammatism and repetition at **10 χειμέριος ὄμβρος**, **11 ἐριβρόμου**; it may also metapoetically signify the ode's musical character (see **2-3**) and its performers' footsteps (cf. fr.52f.18 ποδὶ κροτέο[ντι γᾶν θο]ῷ, likewise at Delphi). **18 ἀπαγγελεῖ** re-enacts the victory-proclamation, now repeated **16 λόγοισι θνατῶν**. The outstanding visual image is **7-8 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς**: the point of stressing the facade's conspicuousness (**14**) is to highlight allusion to the Siphnian Treasury's East Frieze, visible to anyone proceeding along the Sacred Way, which inspires both the narrative of Antilochus' death at Memnon's hands in Myth 2, and the inclusion of Antilochus' avenger Achilles in Myth 1 (see **21-27**; **28-42**). The sense of touch, together with motion, is produced by a putative procession (**4 προσοιχόμενοι**), which as a ritual action unites its participants in the consciousness of common purpose (Clear (2012) 36-37), esp. given the 1st-person plural forms, and the remarkable omission of the 1st-person singular from the ode (elsewhere only *N*.2; *I*.3). The procession's characterization as ploughing the field of Aphrodite and/or the Graces, en route to the Earth's navel, which is often personified in this context, extends the focus on corporeality to the landscape over which the procession travels, endowing the victory-celebration with a sexual dimension (as argued on **1-4**). The joyous emotions generated thereby alternate with excitement and fear at the storm (esp. if **12 στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος** signals contemporary military threats), before a state of tranquillity returns (**14-18**).

(2) The ideological dimension involves harnessing the landscape's symbolic capital (cf. ***O*.3.Interpretation**). The rationale in part mirrors the reasons why the Emmenids chose to compete at Delphi. For colonials, Panhellenic competition asserted Greek identity; although the core/periphery dichotomy has been challenged (Malkin (2011)), the foregrounding of Delphi's global centrality (**3-4 ὀμφαλὸν ... χθονὸς**) validates it here (cf.

Athanassaki (2009a) Ch.2). Since Panhellenic sites were loci for the display of power and prestige amongst all Greek elites, this initial victory was the Emmenids' first step in building an international profile, and bolstering their domestic prestige. For the ode to support this goal, a sufficient method would have been to identify key Delphic landmarks and reference Xenocrates' victory in relation to them. P. does so (**3 ὀμφαλὸν**; **6 Ξενοκράτει**; **9 Ἀπολλωνίᾳ ... νάπᾳ**; **17 ἅρματι νίκαν**), but the choice of the treasury-image and its treatment bespeaks a greater ambition on the part of both poet and honorand.

The correlation, sometimes virtually causation, between Panhellenic victories and tyranny (Morgan (2015) 70), a status the family achieved within two years, suggests that assisting that goal was the victory's primary purpose, and thus the ode's too. The ode's overt political positioning seems calculated to communicate Emmenid prestige whilst *avoiding* the impression of tyrannical aspirations by representing family members as models of conservative aristocratic virtue: see **46**. Nonetheless, some passages imply such aspirations subtextually (see **23-27**; **24**; **46 ἀγλαΐαν ἅπασαν**), with the most overt occurring here. Strophes 1 and 2 contain two sets of names that share in the song-treasury and the victory it proclaims, respectively, at **5-6** and **15**. At **5-6**, the datives after the perfect passive **9 τετείχισται** can be datives of agent, rather than merely of interest, i.e. the song-treasury was constructed *by* the Emmenids, and Acragas, and Xenocrates. When victory-data coincides with monument-imagery in epinician, the names produce a poetic 'inscription', such as would appear on the physical object (see **5-6**). Since treasuries were superlatively prestigious and expensive Panhellenic dedications made only by states and tyrants (see **8**), this implies Emmenid political ambition of that magnitude. However, whereas *P*.7.10-12 assigns construction of the Alcmaeonid-built Temple to the Athenians in order to ingratiate the family with their hostile polis, here the second set of names at **15** continues to include Xenocrates and the Emmenids, but replaces **6 Ἀκράγαντι** with **15**

Θρασύβουλε in exact responsion, thus subtly excluding the polis as if via an epigraphic erasure (see **5-6**). See **8** on contemporary instances of physical treasuries employed in commemorating tyrants' Panhellenic victories. The Emmenids would conceive their power in architectural terms: see ***O*.2.6 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος** of Theron.

The imagery also reinforces the poet's authority by conveying epinician's ability to incorporate and trump multiple alternative forms of celebration/commemoration. The original one-off victory-proclamation (see **18**) is crystallized in the ode and becomes a repeatable event. A poetic treasury offers a treasury's prestige to those who do not possess the means or authority to construct a real one. It has many real advantages, including indestructibility (**10-14**), performability (**1-4**; **16**), and especially flexibility: it can be 'reinscribed' within the same text (*v.s.*), its myth adapts to circumstances as no monumental frieze can (**28-42**), it can convey more complex ideology, esp. that inappropriate in Panhellenic sites (**5-6**; **15**), and be easily performed/reperformed in multiple locales.

1-4 The exact meaning of 'turning up again the furrow of quick-glancing Aphrodite *or* the Graces' (**1-3 ἑλικώπιδος ... ἀναπολίζομεν**) is unclear. The peculiarity is accentuated by the syntax: whereas one might expect the literal action of procession to the *omphalos* (**3-4 ὀμφαλὸν ... προσοιχόμενοι**) to occupy the main clause, and its metaphorical characterization a subordinate clause, the opposite is the case here.

That **1-3** is metaphorical is clear: neither Aphrodite nor the Graces has a sufficient cultic/geographical bond with Delphi to call the Sacred Way their terrain, and ploughing (**2-3 ἄρουραν ... ἀναπολίζομεν**) is a frequent metaphor for poetry. The metaphor's nature depends in part on whether **2 ἢ** is a weak or strong disjunctive. The weak use (i.e. of complementary alternatives) is typical in P. of solitary **ἢ** (Slater s.v.2.a), and Aphrodite and the Graces elsewhere share associations (see **2 Χαρίτων**) relevant to ***P*.6**: song/dance

(**7**); eroticism (*v.i.*); welcoming/accompanying the poet to Delphi (**1-9**; cf. fr.52f.3-4); the symposium (**52-54**). On the other hand, fr.52f.3-4 Χαρίτεσ- | σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ demonstrates P. could unite the theonyms unambiguously when desired, although the issue is complicated by possible intertextuality: see **3**. The ploughing-metaphor also interacts differently with each theonym (*v.i.*).

In a self-conscious opening, the disjunction has been seen as programmatic. Since P.'s Aphrodite relates to *eros* (see **1 Ἀφροδίτας**), and his Graces to epinician celebration (see **2 Χαρίτων**), it may imply metapoetic hesitation between those genres (Nisetich (1980) 195). Generic indeterminacy is characteristic of epinician (Currie (2005) 24), which employs elements of other genres and media to enrich its programme or define itself by contrast, esp. in proems: **5-18** (monuments); **21-27** (didactic); **28-42** (epic); ***O*.3.1-4** (cult hymn); *O*.9.1-4 (Archilochus); *N*.2.1-3 (epic); *N*.5.1-2 (statuary); ***I*.2.1-5** (παίδειοι ὕμνοι). Whether or not **1-4** is intertextual with fr.52f.3-4 (*v.s.*), evocation of a Delphic procession cannot help but recall the paeanic genre.

Many interpret Aphrodite as symbolizing *eros* here, whether reflecting the historical poet's desire for Thrasybulus (Wilamowitz (1922) 136-39; cf. fr.123 with Athen.13.601D), or conventional eroticized praise derived from παίδειοι ὕμνοι (Welcker (1834) 222-24, 227, 237; von der Mühll (1964) 168-72; cf. Ibyc.S288.1-2 Χαρίτων ... Κύπρις; fr.123.6 Ἀφροδί-τας, 14 Χάρις; ***I*.2.3**). However, this interpretation is hindered by the absence of corroborating features such as beauty-praise or love-declarations, which marginalizes the ode's erotic dimension. Kurke (1990) 88-103 explains this marginalization by interpreting the erotic items as secondary facets of the ode's primary generic admixture, the pedagogic elements derived from didactic genres (**21-27**): the combination represents the traditional overlap between elite *paideia* and *eros* (94).

Nicholson (2000) 245-46 claims the laudator gains authority, and distance from commercialism, via a pederastic persona (see ***I*.2.1-11**).

However, Kurke's argument is impaired by sharing the uncritical assumption of almost all scholars that Aphrodite connotes homoeroticism here: although the ploughing metaphor with the Graces signifies *poetic production*, all parallels with Aphrodite signify *procreation*, therefore heterosexuality (see **1-2**; **2-3**). To see pederastic *eros* here requires us to believe P. catachrestically employed the one metaphor that definitively excludes it. I suggest that the nostalgic references to pederastic poetics at ***I*.2.1-5** (which have their own local function) have led scholars to retrospectively detect them here.

The metaphor should be interpreted in reference to the immediate context. Rutherford (2001) 307 argues that at fr.52f.3-4 the theonyms generate an atmosphere of 'sexuality and celebration ... as if the χορός of young men ... is a κῶμος arriving at Delphi', comparing *h.l.* The sequence from **1-2 Ἀφροδίτας | ἄρουραν** to **3-4 ὀμφαλὸν ... χθονὸς** superimposes the procession's route over a metaphorical female body; Delphi is similarly conceptualized at *P*.4.74 ὀμφαλὸν ... ματέρος, A.*Eum*.2-6 πρωτόμαντιν Γαῖαν ... Χθονὸς, since Earth possessed the site before Apollo. At ***O*.3.23-26**, **33-34**, Heracles' planting of the olive at Olympia is represented as male domination of the female. The victory-procession is invigorated with the sense of a sexual triumph.

This concept has structural significance for the ode, if the processional *komos* at its opening metapoetically becomes a symposium at its close (a transition which to some degree inherently symbolizes a shift from inclusivity to exclusivity). Although within a sympotic group the sequence was symposium > *komos* (Węcowski (2014) 28-29), external komasts could join an ongoing symposium (Pl.*Symp*.212c-13b, 223b), and *N*.9 displays a similar *komos* > symposium transition between 1-3 and 48-53. At Pany.fr.20.1-3 West, the

Graces and Aphrodite are among the first divinities toasted at a symposium, together with Dionysus ἐρίβρομος (cf. **3 ἐριβρόμου**).

1 Ἀκούσατ': although the imperative is a favourite Pindaric opening, elsewhere it almost always occurs with a specified addressee, usually a divinity/personification (*O.*1.5; *O.*4.9; *O.*5.3; *O.*8.10; *O.*12.2; *O.*14.5 κλῦτ'; *P.*8.5; *P.*11.3; *P.*12.5; *N.*3.3; *N.*5.3; *N.*7.2 ἄκουσον; *N.*9.3; *N.*10.2; *N.*11.3). Apart from *h.l.*, the exceptions are *O.*9.6 ἐπίνειμαι (Σ.*O.*9.11a.1 τῷ χορῷ ἢ ἑαυτῷ) and *O.*10.1 ἀνάγνωτέ, both demanding participation in the performance.

Here, the unaddressed command to listen, forming a one-word sentence, creates an immediate, inclusive audience: cf. Call.*Iamb.*1.1 Ἀκούσαθ' Ἰππώνακτος; Ar.*Ach.*1000 ἀκούετε λεώ (prefacing public proclamations). The 1st-plural indicative **3 ἀναπολίζομεν** defines an implicitly contrasting group of singers/performers (E.*Supp.*670 ἀκούσαθ'· ἡμεῖς ἥκομεν; E.*IT.*578 ἀκούσατ'· ἐς γὰρ δή τιν' ἥκομεν λόγον), but of course the audience may still have imagined themselves as participants in the procession.

The call to attention is fictive (***O.*2.1-2**), since performance is underway: if stilling a hubbub were a regular necessity, so too would be the call. Instead, it (1) marks inception; (2) programmatically highlights 'listening' to various elements of the ode: (a) acoustic effects: repetition and anagrammatism (see **3**); (b) metaliterary effects: potential generic ambiguities/intertexts (**1-4**; **19-27**); (c) the ἀγγελία (**18**); (d) Chiron's advice (**19-27**); (e) Nestor's cry for help (**36**). Although ritual summoning to εὐφημία could occur during processions (Ar.*Ach.*237-38), that seems less relevant here.

ἦ γὰρ: affirmative (Denniston 284; fr.70d.40) with causal force; cf. explanatory **γὰρ** following opening imperative (*O.*10.3; *O.*12.3; *O.*14.5; *N.*3.3). **ἦ** introducing the theme after a call to attention: B.5.8-10 ἄθρησον νόῳ· | ἦ σὺν Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζώνοις ὑφά- | νας ὕμνον.

ἑλικώπιδος: of Aphrodite only here. Elsewhere primarily (*Il.*1.98; *h.Hom.*33.1; Hes.*Th.*298, 307, 998; Hes.fr.43a.19; Hes.fr.75.15; Hes.fr.180.13; Sapph.44.5; S.*OT*.1108), but not exclusively (Achaeans: 6x *Il.*; Alc.fr.283.16), of nubile female beauty. Cf. ἑλικοβλέφαρος/–γλεφάρος of Aphrodite at *h.Hom.*6.19; Hes.*Th.*16; Hes.fr.11.1; fr.123.6.

ἑλικ– divided ancient opinion: (1) 'dark-' (Call.fr.299.1); (2) 'rolling-'/'round-' < ἕλιξ: see Braswell on *P.*4.172(b). Kölligan (2007) 121-24 sees a cosmological explanation (the sun's eye rolling across the sky) for its application to Aphrodite, who adopts features of the PIE dawn-goddess Uṣas.

1-2 Ἀφροδίτας | ἄρουραν: some parallels reference specific locations: Paus.1.19.2.9 Ἀφροδίτης <τῆς> ἐν [τοῖς] Κήποις (Aphrodite's sanctuary in the Gardens by the Ilissus); *P.*5.24 κᾶ-πον Ἀφροδίτας (τέμενος of Aphrodite in Cyrene: Currie (2005) 227n.8); A.*Supp*.554-55 Ἀφροδί-τας πολύπυρον αἶαν (Phoenicia; Palestine).

But here the phrase is metaphorical: Aphrodite possessed no Delphic connection sufficient to call the Sacred Way her plough-land. Remaining parallels all concern heterosexual activity: Emped.fr.66.6 σχιστοὺς λειμῶνας ... Ἀφροδίτης; Anacr.fr.346.7-8 ἀρ]ούρας | ἵ]να Κύπρις (Heirman (2012) 92-95); Nonn.*Dion*.14.197-99 Ζεὺς ... ὑπόειξε γάμων ἄψαυστον ἐάσσας ... Ἀφροδίτην· | ἀντὶ δὲ Κυπριδίων λεχέων ἔσπειρεν ἀρούρῃ (pun: Zeus resorting to a literal ἄρουρα instead of the metaphorical); at A.fr.44.1-7, she claims responsibility for the generative cycle of rain impregnating the earth. Cf. **2-3**.

1 Ἀφροδίτας: in P., primarily of sex/desire (heterosexual: *O.*6.35; *P.*4.216; *P.*9.9; *N.*8.1, 7; fr.122.5, 18; homosexual: *O.*1.75; *O.*10.105; ***I.2.4***; fr.123.6); also linked to individuals (*P.*4.88: Ares; *P.*2.17: Cinyras), places (*O.*7.14: Rhodes; *P.*5.24 κᾶ-πον Ἀφροδίτας: Cyrene), or both (fr.52f.4: Graces at Delphi).

For her significance here, see **1-4**. She lacked Acragantine or Delphic cult (Budin (2003) Ch.4), but her Paphos cult-centre was assigned the same geographic centrality as Delphi (Hesych.s.v. γῆς ὀμφαλός: ἡ Πάφος καὶ Δελφοί); cf. **3-4 ὀμφαλὸν ... χθονὸς**.

Schneider (2000) 67 observes that as mother of Harmonia (Hes.*Th*.933-37), she is an Emmenid ancestress: cf. ***O*.2.3-7**.

2 ἄρουραν ... Χαρίτων: poetry-as-cultivation metaphor: *O*.9.26-27 Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον; Ar.*Av*.1100-1 Χαρί- | των τε κηπεύματα (Dunbar: possible sexual *double-entendre*); also Pl.*Ion*.534b.1 Μουσῶν κήπων; Ar.*Ra*.1300 λειμῶνα Μουσῶν. See **1-4**.

2-3 ἄρουραν ... ἀναπολίζομεν: *pace* Gerber on *N*.6.32-34, the poetry-as-ploughing metaphor is not unique to P.: Prat.fr.710 *PMG*; Prat.fr.712a.4 *PMG* νεῶν ἄρουραν αἰόλιζε τῷ μέλει; *N*.10.26; Call.*Hymn*.3.170-82; *R.V*.8.20.19.1-2 'with newest song sing out ... even as a plougher to his steers'; Steiner (1986) 44; Vanbremeersch (1987) 73-95; Campagner (1993) 41-56.

Ploughing as human procreation: **1-2**; to Braswell on *P*.4.255(b), add A.*Eum*.658-9; Men.*Sam*.727; du Bois (1988) 65-78; in other cultures: Chevalier & Gheerbrant (1996) 762-63.

The metaphor is appropriate to procession along the sinuous Sacred Way. Nonetheless, it is surprising in a Delphic context, since the Crisaean plain's sacred land, on which equestrian events were held (**10-14**), was probably off-limits to farming in the 5th century, and its cultivation was a *casus belli* in the Third Sacred War (Howe (2003) 129-46).

It tempting to see a broader metaliterary reference to metre and music, in particular contemporary debate on the Aeolian mode (see Prauscello (2012) 58-82). West (1992) 342 notes that Pratinas' characterization of its use as turning over a fallow field, i.e. exploiting an underused resource, 'tends to confirm Lasus' originality in adopting it'. The repetition

implied by **3 ἀναπολίζομεν** may indicate that the mode is P.'s usual practice (6 of his 9 odes from 498-480 are aeolic/iambic-aeolic: *O.*14; ***P.6***; *P.*7; *P.*10; *N.*2; *N.*7), probably under Lasus' influence (Eustath.*Proleg.Pind.*iii.296.19 Dr; *Vit.Pind.Thom.*i.4.14 Dr; fr.191). This may be underlined by **3 ἐριβρόμου** (cf. Las.fr.1.3 Αἰολίδ' ἃμ βαρύβρομον ἁρμονίαν), with attention drawn to acoustic details by **1 Ἀκούσατ'**.

Eckerman (2014) 27 compares the *karpaia* dance, which involved mimesis of ploughing.

2 ἢ: see **1-4**.

Χαρίτων: see MacLachlan (1993) 87-123; Breitenberger (2007) 105-15.

Of the active ('giving pleasure') and passive ('showing pleasure') senses of χάρις (Pfeijffer on *N.*5.54), the epinician Graces embody the former by assisting the celebration in various ways: aiding/accompanying the poet (*O.*9.27; *P.*9.3, 89a; *N.*4.7; *N.*9.54; *I.*5.21; *I.*8.16a; B.5.9; B.9.1; B.10.39; also fr.52g.10; fr.52m.7; B.19.6); receiving/accompanying the κῶμος (*O.*4.9; *N.*5.54); celebrating the victor (*P.*5.45; *N.*6.37), his family (*I.*6.63), his polis (*P.*8.21; *N.*10.1). Sometimes the distinction between celebrating and *bestowing* success is unclear (*P.*8.21; *N.*10.38; B.1.151), but the latter's only explicit instance is ***O.2.50*** (Xenocrates' Pythian and Isthmian victories), which alludes to *h.l.*, but does not guarantee the Graces are victory-givers here.

The Graces join Aphrodite as attendants (*Il.*5.338; *Od.*8.362-66; *Od.*18.193-94; *h.Hom.*5.61-62; *Cypr.*fr.5.1-7; Nonn.*Dion.*310-11); fellow-singers on Mt. Ida (*Cypr.*fr.6.1-6); associates in homo- (fr.123.6-15; Ibyc.S288.1-4) and hetero-eroticism (Hes.fr.196.4-6; Sapph.fr.194; Ar.*Ach.*988-89; Ar.*Eccl.*973-74); dancers to Apollo's lyre (*h.Hom.*3.194-95); welcomers/companions of the poet at Delphi (fr.52f.3-4). See **1-4** on Pany.fr.20.1-3 West.

Links to Apollo and/or Delphi: *h.Hom*.27.13-15; *P*.9.3; *N*.6.37; fr.52c.1-2 (with Rutherford (2001) 277); ***O*.2.49-50**; fr.52f.3. Iconography: Breitenberger (2007) 108, 112, on cultic links with Apollo at Thermon, Thera, Thasos, Delos; these were, however, 'the exception rather than the rule' (112).

3 ἀναπολίζομεν: *hapax* for ἀναπολέω; ἀναπολήσομεν (Schmid) is unnecessary: see Liberman.

The prefix **ἀνα–** connotes repetition (since the simplex verb already means 'dig up, plough'): *N*.7.104; S.*Ph*.1238; Pl.*Phileb*.34b.11; Pl.*Phileb*.60a.1; Pl.*Leg*.723.e.1-2. Repetition is stylistically enacted by (1) a recurring sequence of 5 identical tautometric vowels/diphthongs with identical word-breaks (⏑–⏑ – ⏑) opening **1-2**: **1 Ἀκούσατ'· ἦ γὰρ ~ 2 ἄρουραν ἢ Χαρ–**; (2) the monostrophic stanza-form (see ***P*.6.Structure**); (3) **3 ἐριβρόμου ~ 11 ἐριβρόμου ~ 10 χειμέριος ὄμβρος**.

In what sense is the ode going over the same (Delphic) ground? Wilamowitz (1908) 345 argues ***P*.6** alludes to *Paean* 6, which he dates to the same year (490) on the basis of that allusion: fr.52f.3-4 Χαρίτεσ-| σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ ~ **1-2 Ἀφροδίτας ... ἢ Χαρίτων**; fr.52f.14-15 ἄλσος Ἀ- | πόλλωνος ~ **9 Ἀπολλωνία ... νάπᾳ**; fr.52f.17 χθονὸς ὀμφαλὸν ~ **3-4 ὀμφαλὸν ... χθονὸς**. However, the intertexts are not definitive, and *Paean* 6 cannot be dated (Rutherford (2001) 331). Moreover, **ἀνα–** need not imply a *second* action, only a repeated one. However, if reference to a second composition is sought, *P*.12 for Midas of Acragas (490) provides a contemporary Pythian victory-ode with potentially-overlapping Acragantine audiences. All 3 of the above poems name the Graces (**2**; *P*.12.26; fr.52f.3).

Another possibility would be a Simonidean ode for the same occasion as ***P*.6** (Sim.fr.513). But ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει need only mean Simonides, as part of his praise-strategy (ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν), relates (κατατάσσει)

Xenocrates' earlier Pythian victory in an ode which concerned his later Isthmian – a normal epinician practice, observed by P. at ***I*.2.18**. A Simonidean '***P*.6**' probably never existed. Cf. Molyneux (1992) 233-34; Ferreira (2013) 170-72.

Morrison (2007) 81-82 suggests the thematization of repetition anticipated the ode's reperformance: see ***P*.6.Performance**.

***P*.6** and *N*.2 are the only Pindaric odes with no 1st-person singular forms (*I*.3 has no 1st-persons at all).

3-4 ὀμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου | χθονὸς: periphrases for Delphi as the Earth's navel: Braswell on *P*.4.74(a); Pfeijffer on *P*.8.58-59; Rutherford (2001) 393-95. The ὀμφαλός was (1) the conical stone within Apollo's Temple marking the Earth's centre; (2) metaphorically: (a) the Temple; (b) Delphi. The corresponding Vedic metaphor references a religious site (West (2007) 344-45).

Some sources identify Dionysus' Delphic tomb with the ὀμφαλός (Fontenrose (1959) 376-77; *contra* Rohde (1925) 110n.32), perhaps motivating the Dionysiac epithet **3 ἐριβρόμου**. Dionysus was embedded in Delphic religion, possessing the site while Apollo wintered with the Hyperboreans (see ***O*.3.16**): cf. Burkert (1985) 224-25; an Attic red-figure calyx in the Hermitage (late 5th-century) depicts Dionysus and Apollo clasping hands above the ὀμφαλός (Leningrad St.1807).

B.4.4 π[αρ' ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς corresponds closely: with verse-initial 5 Πυ[θ]ιόνικος (~ **5 Πυθιόνικος**), and 7-8 ἀ[να- | ξιφόρ]μιγγος (~ ***O*.2.1 Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες**), it suggests B. repurposed the openings of two Emmenid equestrian victory-odes for Hieron, who by 470 had surpassed the Emmenids politically, though not yet agonistically. See ***O*.2.86-88**.

Colonial victors seeking connection to the Greek world's centre: **1-18**.

3 ἐριβρόμου: outside P. (*h.Hom.*7.56; *h.Hom.*26.1; Anacr.fr.20.1; Pany.fr.20.2 West), only of Dionysus before Hellenistic times (cf. his cult-title Βρόμιος). In P., of lions (*O.*11.20); the sea (fr.dub.351); rain-clouds (**11**). If **ἐριβρόμου** evokes Dionysus (**3-4**), see **1-4** on the intertext with Pany.fr.20.1-4 West.

The epithet suits Delphi's location above one of the main antithetic active faults of the Gulf of Corinth Rift (Piccardi (2000) 651-54); an earthquake centred on Helice would destroy the Temple in 373: cf. **50 Ἐλέλιχθον**.

Musical significance: **2-3**.

Anagrammatism with the metrically-overlapping **30 ἐναρίμβροτον** (similarly **11 ἐριβρόμου ~ 10 χειμέριος ὄμβρος**) stylistically enacts reverberation.

4 χθονὸς: in Delphic myth, Earth was the first possessor of Delphi (A.*Eum.*2, 6 Χθονὸς; Paus.10.5.5), in some versions as consort of Poseidon (see **50-51**). Evoking the Delphic landscape's history heightens its symbolic value further, esp. if the processioners' feet are in direct contact with that history.

ἐς νάιον: Hermann for unmetrical MSS ἐς ναὸν. Gentili prints ναΐὸν (as substantive equivalent to ναός), which is semantically closest to the paradosis. But a substantive (1) is not Pindaric: all 7 of his other complete ὀμφαλός–periphrases (*P.*4.74; *P.*8.59; *P.*11.10; *N.*7.33; fr.52f.17, 120; fr.75.3 (Athenian agora)) give ὀμφαλός an epithet (fr.215b.12 ...]..ν εὐκάρπ[ου χθον]ὸς ὀ[μ]φαλόν has space); (2) requires **3-4 ὀμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου | χθονὸς** to be in awkward apposition to either ναΐὸν or **2 ἄρουραν**.

An adjective is preferable. **νάιον**, unattested in classical Greek (but cf. Myc. *na-wi-jo*) can be compared with Athena's Delphic title Προναία, and rendered 'supplied with ναοί', rather than 'enshrined' (Race): **8 θησαυρὸς** activates the polyvalent use of the term ναός

to mean a treasury as well as a temple (Neer (2001) 274); Neer (2004) 88 reads *P.*7.5/6 οἶκον ναίων as a pun.

However, the suspicion remains that the paradosis is an intrusive gloss displacing the original text (Mommsen; Liberman), in which case conjectures need not resemble it: see Gerber (1976) 81-82. But Hermann's emendation suits the context and is preferable in the absence of definite indications.

προσοιχόμενοι: *hapax*. The possibility of (1) imperfective as well as (2) perfective force means a processional as well as a static performance (fictive or not) is possible (*pace* Gentili): (1) is preferable insofar as ploughing implies *motion*, and **28-42** implies sight of the Siphnian Treasury's pediments along the Sacred Way. On 'vicarious processions', see ***P.*6.Performance**.

5-18 The ode is grounded in the landscape where its victory was won, via the image of a 'treasure-house of songs', constructed in Delphi for/by the Emmenids, Acragas, and Xenocrates (**5-9**). It will withstand the elements (**10-14**), and proclaim the victory shared by Xenocrates, Thrasybulus (implicitly), and the Emmenids (**14-18**). As here, P. often uses construction to metapoetically mark openings: ***O.*3.3**; *O.*6.1-4; *P.*7.1-3; *P.*4.138 (speech); *N.*2.4; *N.*5.1-2; fr.194.

Lyric poets' attitudes to physical monuments in relation to their poems have been variously evaluated.

Some texts (Sim.fr.531; Sim.fr.581; *N.*5.1-3; ***I.*2.45-46**) have been read as polemics seeking to bolster their own status by denigrating monuments' immobility or impermanence (Svenbro (1976) 187-212; Ford (2002) 98; O'Sullivan (2003) 79-83; Smith (2007) 92). Poets' interests were naturally served by inducing patrons to favour their commemorative medium rather than the competition's, and validating the choices of patrons who did so. Moreover, the laudator is agonistic in general, parading other genres

and media to define his own poetics (see **1-4**). Finally, poetry had many real advantages over monuments: see **1-18**.

However, P.'s engagement with monumental architecture, epigraphy, and sculpture (Steiner (1993) 159-80; Day (2013) 217-30) is better explained as *co-opting* the advantages physical media possessed over poetry to creating a commemoration more effective than either in isolation. Therefore, **10-14** asserts the superior durability of the **7-8 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς** over its physical counterpart, but **14-18** borrows a real monument's visual presence, sculptural imagery, epigraphic communication, and topographical fixity to underpin the ode. Fearn (2013) 241-44 rightly argues that at *N*.5.1-5 the superficial criticism of statues as static is undercut by the nautical imagery that grants the statues mobility, thus *exalting* the famous statuary and maritime commerce of P.'s Aeginetan patrons instead of disparaging them.

See **nn.** on **4**; **5-6**; **7-8**; **9**; **10-14**; **15-18**; **28-42**; **33**; **54**.

5-8 Πυθιόνικος ... ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς: here, as in all epinician parallels (*P*.8.5; B.4.5; B.11.13-14; also *P*.9.1 Πυθιονίκαν), **5 Πυθιόνικος** is linked to song as a reward for victory. ***O*.3.3 Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον ὀρθώσαις** makes a similar link, similarly monumentalizes the victory-song, and similarly exemplifies –νικος signalling openings.

5-6 Πυθιόνικος ... ὀλβίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαις | ποταμίᾳ τ' Ἀκράγαντι καὶ μὰν Ξενοκράτει: **Ξενοκράτει** lacks an epithet, but is marked as the tricolon's cap by **καὶ μὰν**.

Epinician typically concentrates victory-data in a 'naming-complex'. 4 elements (victor; polis; victory-site; event) occur somewhere in every Pindaric epinician, except *P*.2 (victory-site); *O*.14 (event). Optional elements include: father (*pace* Steiner (1986) 21; Nash (1990) 15); family. Variations in content and arrangement are meaningful here. (1) Naming the family spreads the victory's prestige across several members (see **5 Ἐμμενίδαις**). (2) Delaying the event until **17** highlights an architectural allusion. (3)

Despite the father-son theme, ***P.6*** is the only Emmenid ode not to name the victor's father Aenesidamus; when he is named, it is as Theron's father alone (***O.2.46***; ***O.3.9***), or Theron and Xenocrates' together (***I.2.28***: after both are probably deceased), reflecting Theron's superior position as elder brother, and (later) tyrant: see **46 πάτρῳ**; ***I.2.28-29***. (4) The exceptional naming of the victor's son (**15**; **44**; elsewhere only in ***I.2*** and *P.*1) has numerous potential causes (**28-42**), but is probably due to the ode's political positioning (**46**).

Epinician's presentation of victory-data reflects two related social practices: (1) the victory-proclamation (ἀγγελία) delivered by the Games' herald (Hubbard (2004) 77; Finglass on S.*El.*693; Wells (2009) 77-83), the original source of victory-data; (2) epigraphic victory-memorials, which, like epinician, are a secondary medium for the achievement's preservation and dissemination.

(1) Reconstruction of the *aggelia* is necessarily hampered by reliance on textual sources, some of which are closer to the original proclamation than others. Day (2010) 202 notes that a full *aggelia* comprised 4 items: (a) victor; (b) polis; (c) event; (d) victor's father. The victory-list *P.Oxy.*222 (which includes Theron's 476 victory) includes (a)-(c) (cf. *P.*1.32-33). The discrepancy with epinician, which never omits the victory-site, implies *prima facie* that no extant ode was designed *exclusively* for performance at the victory-site, since such an ode would have no need to mention it: an audience, present or future, that is unconnected to the victory-site is always envisaged.

ἀγγελία-language in epinician: *O.*4.5; *O.*5.8; *O.*6.90; *O.*7.21; *O.*8.82; *O.*9.25; *O.*13.100; *O.*14.21; *P.*1.32; *P.*2.4; *P.*4.278-79; **18**; *P.*9.2; *P.*10.9; *N.*4.74; *N.*5.3; *N.*6.57b; ***I.2.23***; *I.*4.25; B.2.3; B.10.29; B.13.231.

(2) Details given in epigraphic records generally increase from the 6th century (e.g. Ebert no.4: victor; polis; victory-site; event; father) to the 5th (e.g. charioteer/trainer; previous victories; family victories: Ebert 18-20).

Monument-language in epinician: ***O*.3.1-3**; *O*.5.8; *O*.6.91; *O*.7.21; *O*.10.1-3; *O*.11.11-14; *P*.3.113; *P*.5.49; **8**, **14**; *P*.7.1-4; *P*.8.29; *N*.1.8-9; *N*.2.4; *N*.3.4; *N*.4.79-81; *N*.5.1-2; *N*.8.15-16, 46-48; *I*.1.14-16, 45-46; ***I*.2.45-46**; *I*.6.1-3, 69; *I*.8.61-62 (memorial); B.5.4; B.10.11; Steiner (1993) 159-80; Thomas (2007) 158-59; Day (2010) 198-228; Day (2013) 217-30.

Epinician can replicate the orality of (1) through performance, and the textuality of (2) through its status as a written artifact. This is expressed dramatically through the fusion of ἀγγελία-language and monument-language at **14-18 <u>πρόσωπον</u> ... <u>ἀπαγγελεῖ</u>**; also *O*.5.8; *O*.6.90-91; *O*.7.21; *N*.4.74-81; *N*.5.1-3. Strikingly, all these ἀγγελία-monument fusions occur in passages containing victory-data, providing the best examples of Pindaric 'over-commemoration' across oral and written media: *O*.5.2-8; *O*.6.90-100; *O*.7.13-21; **14-18**; *N*.4.73-81; *N*.5.1-5.

Considering the monument-language separately from the ἀγγελία-language also produces striking phenomena. Steiner (1993) 169-70 argues that the juxtaposition of monument-language and victory-data here (**5-9**; **14-18**) causes the latter to be 'inscribed' on the metaphorical monument. This juxtaposition occurs in almost all cases of monument-language cited above, indicating 'poetic inscription' is regular Pindaric practice: ***O*.3.1-4**; *O*.5.2-8; *O*.6.91-100; *O*.7.13-21; *O*.10.1-3; *O*.11.11-14; *P*.7.1-4; *N*.1.6-9; *N*.2.3-5; *N*.3.2-4; *N*.4.73-81; *N*.5.1-5; *N*.8.15-16, 46-48; *I*.1.14-16; *I*.6.1-7; *I*.8.61-65 (memorial); B.10.9-20. I argue below that **5-9** and **14-18** adapt several real-life epigraphic practices to epinician.

5-9: θησαυροί were regularly inscribed, with the text determining their 'ownership' and ideological positioning. Here, the perfect passive **9 τετείχισται** permits the names to be read as datives of *agent*, implying that Xenocrates, the Emmenids, and Acragas had constructed and dedicated it themselves: since only states and tyrants had the resources to do so, this intimates Emmenid political ambitions. The inclusion of the polis here communalizes a private achievement, as did Delphic and Olympic θησαυροί (Neer (2001) 287): the tyrant Myron similarly constructed the Olympic Sicyonian Treasury (c.648) as a monument to his Olympic chariot-victory, but dedicated it not only from himself but from the *demos* that kept him in power (Paus.6.19.4). Cf. ML.29: war-spoils dedicated at Olympia (474) by 'Hieron, son of Deinomenes, and the Syracusans'. Since a treasury's *contents* were not only stored, but nationalized (Neer (2001) 284: 'diverting elite display in the interest of the polis'), even the family's epinicians (see **7 ὕμνων**) become in a sense the polis' property.

14-18: as a counterbalance, however, a second 'inscription' re-writes the first. At **15 πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾶ**, the tricolon's first and last terms are reversed, and the central dative denoting Acragas is replaced by a vocative addressing Xenocrates' son Thrasybulus: personal and familial glory is shared with the polis at **5-6**, then hoarded at **15**. Acragas is similarly displaced by the Emmenids in ***O*.3**, where 'gods – polis – victor' (***O*.3.1-3 Τυνδαρίδαις ... Ἀκράγαντα ... Θήρωνος**) becomes 'family – victor – gods' (***O*.3.38-39 Ἐμμενίδαις ... Θήρωνί ... Τυνδαριδᾶν**). Although, strictly speaking, the 2nd 'inscription' refers to ownership of the victory (**17 νίκαν**), the reference to the treasury's facade (**14 πρόσωπον**) proclaiming the victory (i.e. via an inscription) renders it compatible with **5-6**.

I submit that the perfect metrical responsion of **6 Ἀκράγαντι ~ 15 Θρασύβουλε** permits the latter to function like an epigraphic erasure, such as occurred in the

inscriptions of Panhellenic monuments when their ownership was contested: cf. the oldest Delphic treasury, dedicated by the tyrant Cypselus of Corinth and rededicated by the Corinthians post-Periander (Plu.*De.Pyth.Or.*13); the Deinomenid statue-base for a Pythian chariot-victory (Base 3517; cf. Adornato (2008) 29-55; Morgan (2015) 75-80); Pausanias' Delphic tripod (Th.1.132.2.8-9). Whereas those cases involve the suppression of inscriptions made by deposed/discredited rulers or leaders, here an elite family asserts itself at the *demos*' expense. Exploiting the ode's metrical conventions to alter its 'inscriptions' makes it a true treasury of song.

Acragas' elision at **15** may reflect the Emmenids' self-conception as a 'ruling family' even before their tyranny (see **46**), exemplifying epinician's greater latitude for self-aggrandizement relative to Panhellenic inscriptions, where overt references to tyranny might be ill-received: cf. Harrell (2002) 439-64 on the Deinomenids' eschewal in Panhellenic inscriptions of the royal titles paraded in epinician.

The Athens-Alcmaeonids relationship in *P.*7 provides parallels. On the one hand, attributing the family's rebuilding of the Temple to 10 Ἐρεχθέος ἀστῶν conciliates the polis (Athanassaki (2011) 235-68); on the other, the polis is implicitly criticized for envying aristocratic success (18-19) – an independent attitude comparable to that of the Alcmaeonid dedication c.540 to Apollo Ptoeus in Boeotia (*CEG.*302), which mentions Athens *only as the place of victory* (cf. Fearn (2007) 150n.169). Neer (2004) 85-88 argues the Athenian Treasury (to the foundations of which *P.*7.3/4 κρηπῖδ' ἀοιδᾶν may allude; see **7-8 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς**) was itself a polis strategem to rebrand the Temple as an Athenian dedication.

5 Πυθιόνικος: like Ὀλυμπιόνικος, crystallizing a Panhellenic victor's achievement in a single word; reworked chiastically at **17-18 νίκαν | Κρισαίαις**.

ἔνθ': relative introducing victories at Panhellenic sites: *P.*9.73; *N.*4.76; *I.*4.69.

ὀλβίοισιν: reflecting Emmenid self-representation as (1) 'wealthy' (*O.*13.4; fr.120.1) chariot-racers and (metaphorical) treasury-builders; (2) 'fortunate' (a) in winning victories (*P.*9.4; B.3.8); (b) in relation to initiation/eschatology (***O.*2.22 <u>ὄλβον</u>**). De Heer (1969) 15: 'ὄλβιος ... [denotes] the possession of highly-prized goods ... which render a man's life complete or single him out as being above the ordinary'. Cf. B.14B.2-3 <u>Ἀγαθοκλεαδᾶν</u> ἅτ' <u>ἀφνε[ῶν]</u> ... μέγαν <u>ὄλβον</u> ἀέξεις.

Ἐμμενίδαις: see **Introduction (1)**.

The family receives exceptional emphasis here. Elsewhere, P. names (1) 8 *gene*/*oikoi*: Emmenids (*h.l.*; ***O.*3.38**); Iamidae (*O.*6.71); Eratidae (*O.*7.93); Oligaethidae (*O.*13.97); Alcmaeonidae (*P.*7.2); Aleuadae (*P.*10.5); Timodemidae (*N.*2.18); Cleonymidae (*I.*4.4)); (2) 7 *patrae*: Blepsiadae (*O.*8.75); Meidylidae (*P.*8.38); Theandridae (*N.*4.73); Bassidae (*N.*6.31); Euxenidae (*N.*7.70); Charidae (*N.*8.46); Psalychidae (*I.*6.63). Of these, only the Alcmaeonidae (see **5-6**) and Aleuadae are named early in their ode and before the victor's name, as here (cf. fr.14B.1). ***O.*3.38** exhibits the regular pattern; however, although the victor has already been named once at ***O.*3.3**, when he is named again in the secondary cluster of ***O.*3.38**, the Emmenids are named first, as here. B. rarely names contemporary families: fr.14B.1 (Agathocleadae); B.10.17 (Attic tribe: Oeneidae).

This emphasis is programmatic: the victor Xenocrates is named 1x (**6**), but his son Thrasybulus 2x (**15**; **44**), with unnamed references to the family (**15**) and his brother Theron (**46**); 2 further references to Xenocrates (**15**; **45**) describe him *only as 'Thrasybulus' father*, i.e. a state to which epinician normally relegates the victor's father, not the victor himself. As in *P.*7 (see **5-6**), this promotes the family over the individual, probably because the victory and its ode were intended to support Theron's attempt at the tyranny, with Thrasybulus perhaps groomed for a responsible role (see **46**). The glorification of the

family is typical of victory-commemoration (Kurke (1991) 13-82; Boeke (2007) 77-81), but here the victor is extraordinarily eclipsed by his *oikos*.

Onomastic pun: **42 ἔμμεν** (in the context of familial piety); cf. **31 ἀναμείναις**, **32 Μέμνονα**, **38 μένων**.

6 ποταμίᾳ τ' Ἀκράγαντι: Acragas' name, found in every Emmenid ode (cf. ***O*.2.6**, **91**; ***O*.3.2**; ***I*.2.17**), derived from its river (Th.6.4.4), a procedure common to other Sicilian cities (Syracuse; Gela; Himera; Selinus; Phoenicus; Eryce; Halycus; Thermon; Camarina (Douris.fr.46)); cf. ***O*.2.9**. **ποταμίᾳ** thus implies Acragas' colonial marginality. Simultaneously, however, the term activates Acragas' association with its river-god, a combination of topography and numinosity that matches Delphi's characterization here, and thus aligns Acragas with the Panhellenic centre.

Acragantine dedication at Delphi of a statue of a boy with the river's name inscribed: Ael.*Var.Hist*.2.33. That the river symbolized the city is underscored by the depiction of freshwater crabs on its contemporary coinage: Rutter (2000) 74-76.

καὶ μὰν: 'and especially', emphasizing the last in a series (*P*.1.63; Denniston 352); but see **5 Ἐμμενίδαις**.

Ξενοκράτει: see **Introduction (1)**; ***I*.2.14**, **36**.

7 ἑτοῖμος: *O*.6.12 αἶνος ἑτοῖμος (song likewise 'standing ready' for a victor in an opening where a poetic edifice is constructed).

Of a θησαυρὸς at X.*Cyr*.8.2.18.3, signifying 'ready' money available for withdrawal: cf. the songs' availability for reperformance here (**7-8**).

7-8 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς: ode as both treasure-chamber and the treasure deposited within: cf. Timoth.fr.791.232-33 θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἴ- | ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμευτόν. Song-as-monument metaphors: **5-6**.

The metaphor was literalized when the epic poetess Aristomache of Erythrae (3rd/2nd-century BC), victorious in the Isthmian Games, dedicated a golden book of her poems in the Delphic Sicyonian Treasury (Polemo.Perieg.fr.27 Preller).

7 ὕμνων: for Gentili, the genitive plural indicates the treasury's *material*, i.e. the present ode. But the genitive is also objective, of what is *stored*, namely songs (i.e. future epinicia) deposited in the treasury as 'dedications': see ***I*.2.45 τούσδ' ὕμνους**. In citing that passage as a parallel, Gentili misses the point that ***I*.2** is *itself* such a dedication, with **τούσδ' ὕμνους** looking back at the Emmenid corpus, esp. ***P*.6**, as songs for Xenocrates that should be reperformed; the link is strengthened through sculptural metaphor (***I*.2.45-46**) recalling that of architecture here. This unification of the corpus is reinforced by the word's occurrence in Strophe 1 of every Emmenid ode (cf. ***O*.2.1**; ***O*.3.3**; ***I*.2.3**). Dedication of epinicia: Σ.*O*.7.*Inscr*. (cf. **5-6** on *O*.7.13-21 as one of 6 Pindaric passages to fuse *aggelia*- and monument-language with victory-data); **7-8**.

8 θησαυρὸς: employed literally of the Cnidian Treasury *c*.575-550; cf. *P*.11.5-6 (Theban Ismenium). Metaphorically: Hes.*Op*.719-20; Thgn.1.409-10; *O*.6.65-66; Timoth.fr.791.232-33. *O*.6.65-66, as here, employs the metaphor in evocation of physical Panhellenic treasuries (Morgan (2015) 402-3). Neer (2001) 279 (cf. 273-88) defines as 'strong-houses for storing dedications and goods and sacred things, typically distyle-in-antis and difficult of access, dedicated by a community outside its own territory, and specifically associated with that community and its citizens'. Construction encompassed numerous motivations: (1) military victories; (2) agonistic victories; (3) displaying wealth; (4) expressing piety; (5) obeying Apollo; (6) strengthening colonies' links with the mainland; (7) counteracting elite Panhellenic expenditure on dedications via a 'nationalizing' treasury.

Here, to (2), (3) (see **5 ὀλβίοισιν**), (4), (6), add a category (8) of consolidating political prestige in the home polis. Since only states and tyrants 'owned' a Panhellenic treasury, 'inscribing' the Emmenids' names upon the *thesauros* asserted their political ambition. Apart from the Sicyonian Treasury dedicated by the tyrant Myron for his Olympic chariot-victory (see **5-6**), there was contemporary precedent: a Doric portico, added to the Olympic Geloan Treasury c.491, has been argued by Dyer (1905) 297-98 (cf. Scott (2010) 167; *contra* Gardiner (1925) 222) to celebrate the Olympic chariot-victory of Pantares of Gela c.512-500 (see Ebert no.5). Pantares' son Cleander became tyrant c.505. When Gelon seized power c.491, he may have commissioned a new Olympic Syracusan Treasury (Morgan (2015) 30-31). The Panhellenic displays and power struggles of their chief Sicilian rivals were object lessons for the Emmenids as they stood on the cusp of their own tyranny (see **46**).

Between c.520-334, Delphic treasuries increased from approximately 5 to 30 (Neer (2001) 290); see Partida (2000). The Athenian Treasury was topical: **12**.

Any Emmenid ambitions for Panhellenic dedications implied by the imagery never materialized, and may have been pure spin; contrast Deinomenid dedications (Scott (2010) 88-91). They preferred monumental construction at Acragas, perhaps regarding it as surer support for their rule: D.S.11.25.3-4; D.S.13.81-84; ***O*.2.6-7**; ***O*.3.43-44**; van Compernolle (1989) 44-70; (1992); Luraghi (1994) 239-72; Urquhart (2010) Ch.5.

Allusions to the Siphnian Treasury: **28-42**.

πολυχρύσῳ: often of Delphi and Apollo: *P*.4.53 with Braswell. The epithet naturally adjoins **8 θησαυρὸς**, since the immense Delphic wealth it expresses, esp. of gold (*Il*.9.404-5; E.*Andr*.1092-93 θεοῦ | χρυσοῦ γέμοντα γύαλα, θησαυροὺς βροτῶν) is exactly the sort of riches a treasury contained.

As a formulaic epithet of Aphrodite (*h.Hom*.5.1, 9; 8x Hes.), it underlines her presence (**1 Ἀφροδίτας**) in Apollo's domain.

Gold in openings: ***I*.2.1**.

9 Ἀπολλωνίᾳ: elsewhere only *P*.5.23, 90; E.*Or*.1388. Theonymics in –ιος: ***O*.2.12**.

Apollo, as Delphic god, is named in every *Pythian* except *P*.12. *Thesauroi* were also dedicated to him (Athenian: ML 19; Cnidian: *FD*.III.1.289): cf. **5-6**. **5 Πυθιόνικος** may pun on Apollo's battle with Python over Delphi. His godhood imbues Delphi with its sacred character, and he bestows the Pythian victory on Xenocrates (***I*.2.18**).

His naming mirrors **1 Ἀφροδίτας** at the stanza's opposite 'corner', a phenomenon often found with figures in complementary relationships: *O*.6.50 πατρός..., 56 ...μάτηρ; *N*.4.49 ... Ἀχιλεύς, 56 Πηλεὺς...). **9 Ἀπολλωνίᾳ ... νάπᾳ** is geographical, **1-2 Ἀφροδίτας | ἄρουραν** figurative, but the contrast is bridged by **8 πολυχρύσῳ**.

Ἀπολλωνίᾳ ... νάπᾳ: *thesauroi* occupied Delphi's Sacred Way, not its valley, but νάπος/νάπα-periphrases for Games-sites are common (Delphi: *P*.5.38-39; Paus.10.6.1.7; Nemea: *I*.3.11-12; Isthmus: *I*.8.63; E.*HF*.958; E.*Ion*.176), and the unspecific expression produces a 'zoomed-out' overview of the site. Metrical structure reinforces topography: **18 Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς** concludes Strophe 2 in the corresponding verse; cf. B.4.4 παρ' [ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς ~ 14 ἐν ἀγχιάλοισι Κ[ί]ρρας μυχοῖς (responsion).

τετείχισται: intricate sentence-structure, with the verb appearing after 46 syllables, stylistically enacts the *thesauros*' construction. The perfect need not imply earlier odes (see **3**), but may be performative/instantaneous: fr.194.1-3 κεκρότηται χρυσέα κρηπὶς ἱεραῖσιν ἀοιδαῖς ... τειχίζωμεν ... κόσμον αὐδάεντα λόγων is comparable to **7-8 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς**, although there only the foundation is fixed, whereas the statue is built with the song.

Strophe 2

10-18 The song-treasury will (1) withstand the elements during storms (**10-14**); (2) proclaim the victory from its facade in fine weather (**14-18**). P. both disparages monuments' fragility, and co-opts their conspicuousness, in order respectively to highlight the durability, and enhance the visual dimension, of his own literary construct.

10-14 Delphic topography is exploited further. The Temple site was c.600m above sea level. To the E, torrents flowed down the Pleistos gorge, running SW through the Crisaean plain to the port of Cirrha and the Gulf of Corinth. Since the hippodrome was on the Crisaean plain (**18 Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς**; Paus.10.37.4; *CID*.1.10.35-46), the victory-monument's hypothetical ruin draws the audience back down to the victory-site, reversing in Strophe 2 the ascent to the Temple that began Strophe 1 (**1-4**). Although the Pleistos gorge bypassed the Temple complex, a secondary gorge to its N could have channelled rainwater towards it. Cf. Partida (2000) 293: 'torrential waterflow and soil erosion shifted several buildings' between the SW corner of the complex (where the Boeotian, Potidaean, West Greek, Athenian, Cypriot, and Corinthian Treasuries clustered) and the Temple. Of course, no torrent could carry a treasury to the sea, and the hyperbole is designed to valorize the song-treasury still further (Eckerman (2014) 30), but the image is based on real-world phenomena.

Fearn (2013) 231-50 rightly argues for a complementary attitude to monuments and poetry amongst poets (see **5-18**), esp. where criticizing the former harmed their patron's interests, as in Sim.fr.531.4-5, which parallels **10-12**: ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' εὐρὼς | οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος. But since the Emmenids never dedicated a Panhellenic monument (see **8**), reinforcing their choice of commemoration was appropriate. The motif of the superiority of texts to monuments has Egyptian precedent

c.1300 BC: West (1997) 535; cf. H.*O*.3.30.1-5 with Nisbet & Rudd; also Hamilton (2003) 262-65 (Goethe). Stressing the ode's indestructibility has particular significance for epinician because it anticipates limitless future *reperformance*: see **18 ἀπαγγελεῖ**.

There are epic models for the torrent-imagery, but there it is soldiers that are compared to rain/flood: *Il*.11.492-96 ὡς δ' ὁπότε πλήθων ποταμὸς πεδίονδὲ κάτεισι | χειμάρρους κατ' ὄρεσφιν ὀπαζόμενος Διὸς ὄμβρῳ ... πολλὸν δέ τ' ἀφυσγετὸν εἰς ἅλα βάλλει (Ajax compared to a rain-fed torrent rushing destructively from the mountains, carrying material down to the sea); *Il*.4.452; *Il*.5.87-92; *Il*.13.138-39; *Il*.16.389-92; A.*Pers*.412; E.*IT*.1437; also *I*.5.49-50 (rain/hail); *I*.7.27 (hail). The epic image occurs in Sumerian sources c.2000 BC, but so do exact parallels for *h.l.* of *a storm or flood as an army* (Tsumura (2005) 184-87).

Accumulated epithets (**10-12 χειμέριος ... ἐπακτὸς ... ἐριβρόμου ... ἀμείλιχος ... παμφόρῳ**) stylistically enact the build-up of rain and silt.

This produces extraordinary sigmatism, reinforced by homoeoteleuton (**10-13 χειμέριος ὄμβρος, ἐπακτὸς ... νεφέλας | στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος, οὔτ' ἄνεμος ἐς μυχούς | ἁλὸς ἄξοισι**), mimicking the roaring waters (*P*.1.23-24: π–/φ– alliteration of Etna's lava meeting the sea). P. generally avoids sigmatism (Clayman (1987) 69-84). Midas of Acragas' 490 Pythian victory with an auletic 'polycephalous nomos' imitated a snake's hissing: Σ.*P*.12.15b, 39a-b; West (1992) 214.

10-12: οὔτε ... οὔτ': imperviousness is often expressed through negation of what is expected: Sim.fr.531.4-5; also *Od*.4.566 οὐ νιφετός, οὔτ' ἂρ χειμὼν πολὺς οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος (Elysium); *Od*.6.43-45 οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρῳ | δεύεται ... ἀννέφελος (Olympus).

The unbalanced members (24 syllables vs. 3) highlight **12 ἄνεμος**, perhaps alluding to the Second Temple's destruction by the wind (see **12**; **54**).

10 χειμέριος ὄμβρος: Hes.*Scut*.478 ὄμβρῳ χειμερίῳ: by Apollo's command, the river Anaurus obliterates Cycnus' tomb as punishment for despoiling Delphic hecatombs, thus leaving Cycnus' *kleos* to poetry alone. Here, Apollo's favour (**9 Ἀπολλωνίᾳ**) guarantees the *permanence* of the Emmenids' Delphic monument, despite it being only *poetic*.

P.5.10 χειμέριον ὄμβρον, 120-21 ἀνέμων | χειμερία connote political unrest; cf. **12 στρατὸς**.

10-12 ἐπακτὸς ... στρατὸς: 'foreign' (*O*.10.89). Invading armies: A.*Sept*.583, 1019 στράτευμ' ἐπακτὸν; S.*Tr*.259 στρατὸν ... ἐπακτὸν.

ἐλθών ... στρατὸς: *I*.9.3 ἐλθὼν στρατός (army).

11 ἐριβρόμου: see **3**. Repetition of an epithet denoting reverberation is mimetic: cf. the anagrammatic **10 χειμέριος ὄμβρος** (also Ar.*Nub*.284 βαρύβρομον ~ 288 νέφος ὄμβριον). Its application to earthquakes and storm-clouds reflects the Greek tendency to confuse the noise generated by both: Dunbar on Ar.*Av*.1744-47, 1750-51.

11-12 νεφέλας | στρατὸς: *I*.7.27-28 νεφέλᾳ χάλα-ζαν αἵματος πρὸ φίλας πάτρας ἀμύνεται, | †λοιγὸν ἀμύνων† ἐναντίῳ στρατῷ.

12 στρατὸς: 'army'. The metaphor reverses the epic simile of army as rain/flood (see **10-14**). When taken together with the military/political connotations of **10 χειμέριος ὄμβρος**, **10 ἐπακτὸς**, plus **31 στράταρχον** of a non-Greek general, contemporary military allusion is possible. Marathon would be topical, esp. dated to 12 August (Olson & Doescher & Olson (2004) 34-41) over 12 September (Boeckh (1855) 64-73), since the Pythian Games took place in August-September; cf. *I*.5.49 (rain as metaphor for bloodshed at Salamis); *I*.7.27-28. If the Athenian Treasury, a thank-offering for Marathon (Paus.10.11.5; Neer (2004) 67), was vowed soon after the victory, it could have motivated both this image and that of the *thesauros* (see **8**).

ἀμείλιχος: 'implacable' (*Il*.9.158, 572; *P*.8.8): appropriate for an army.

ἄνεμος: possible allusion to the Second Temple's destruction by the wind: fr.52i.64 ἄνεμος; Sourvinou-Inwood (1979) 232; cf. **54**.

12-13 μυχούς | ἁλὸς: E.*HF*.400 ἁλὸς μυχοὺς; Lycophr.*Alex*.1244-45.

13 ἁλὸς: tautometric with **4 χθονὸς**: the procession up the Sacred Way to the Earth's centre is reversed in a downward rush to the sea.

ἄξοισι: future of authoritative prediction: *P*.9.54-63; **12 ἀπαγγελεῖ**.

παμφόρῳ: in verse only A.*Pers*.618; Theodorid.7.479.3-4. The distinction between active ('carrying all with it': LSJ; Slater) and passive ('borne along en masse') is slight here.

χεράδει: elsewhere only *Il*.21.319 (see Richardson); Sapph.fr.145; Alc.fr.344.1-2; fr.327; A.R.1123. Here 'silt' rather than gravel/shingle.

14 τυπτόμενον: enjambement and onomatopoeia enact the treasury's battered descent.

14-18 The facade's ability to proclaim the victory in fine weather (**14-18 πρόσωπον ... ἀπαγγελεῖ**) balances its imperviousness to rain-storms (**10-14**).

Victory-data, derived from the ἀγγελία, is proclaimed via an ἀγγελία-metaphor by the facade of a metaphorical monument on which that victory-data is 'inscribed' (see **5-6**: **15** modifies those lines, **17** includes the event-data omitted from them). This complex crystallization of the unrepeatable victory-proclamation in an endlessly-reperformable medium that evokes both the original proclamation and its monumental preservation encapsulates the commemorative power of the **ὕμνων θησαυρὸς**.

Whereas in performative terms the means by which **14 πρόσωπον** 'proclaims' (**18 ἀπαγγελεῖ**) the victory is through the performance itself, the internal logic of the metaphor suggests it does so via the monument's *readers*: **14 φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ** underscores the inscription's legibility; **16 λόγοισι θνατῶν** evokes readers vocalizing it –

as epigraphic text was normally activated (Svenbro (1988) 45). A further dimension is added to the monument's oralization.

14 φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ: light (fr.108b.2-5 φάος ... σέλας καθαρόν) allows the facade to be seen and its inscription read: *O*.6.3-4 πρόσωπον ... τηλαυγές. That ἐν φάει (fr.inc.203.3) and ἐν καθαρῷ (*O*.10.45: Olympic Altis) can mean 'in the open' emphasizes the *thesauros*' spatial dominance over the landscape. Metaphorically, light assists the victory-celebration at *P*.9.89a-90 Χαρίτων ... καθαρὸν φέγγος. Light as Pindaric valorizing concept: ***O*.2.56**.

Cf. the Temple's gleaming facades: E.*Ion*.187-89 Λοξίαι ... διδύμων προσώ- | πων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς.

πρόσωπον: subject (*pace* Σ*P*.6.13d), and to be rendered 'facade' (*O*.6.3; E.*Ion*.188): understanding 'face of a messenger' (Farnell) misses the point of the fused imagery (see **14-18**). Moreover, **5-14** guides expectations towards monumental imagery: the personification (**18 ἀπαγγελεῖ**, delayed 42 syllables after its subject to stanza-end) is a surprise, mirroring the monumentalization of **5-8 Πυθιόνικος ... θησαυρὸς**.

15 For the 'reinscription' in responsion with **6**, see **5-6**. Correspondences of sound and word-shape reinforce their parallelism: **15 πατρὶ τεῷ ~ 6 ποταμίᾳ**; **15 Θρασύβουλε ~ 6 Ἀκράγαντι**; **15 κοινάν ~ 6 καὶ μὰν**; **15 τε γενεᾷ ~ 6 Ξενοκράτει**.

πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε: the juxtaposition anticipates the myths' filial themes, but is surprising: the only other epinician odes to name the victor's son are ***I*.2** and *P*.1 (58: Hieron's son Deinomenes), and in contrast to **6**, Xenocrates is here mentioned only in terms of his relation to his son, a pattern that recurs at **44-45 Θρασύβουλος | πατρώαν**; in P., **τεῷ** of contemporary humans is always accompanied by vocatives addressed to the *victor* (except *N*.8.44: deceased father). Thrasybulus is the only Emmenid addressed in any of the family's odes (see ***I*.2.1**). The vocative here responds exactly with **6 Ἀκράγαντι**,

replacing the city in the corresponding lists of those sharing the victory, albeit by implication, not grammar: see **5-6**. By contrast, only here in the Emmenid odes is the victor's father not named: see ***I*.2.28-29**.

This line thus begins Thrasybulus' dominance of the remainder of the ode: although the myths stress respect *for* fathers, both are connected to the present through praise for Thrasybulus' embodiment of that quality (**19-20**; **44-45**). In both myths, the father is either absent (**22**) or helpless (**32-36**), and Xenocrates reappears only in relation to Thrasybulus (*v.s.*). The only diversion from his praise is that his concluding virtue-catalogue is characterized as emulation of his uncle Theron (see **46**). For discussion of what real-life factors might underlie this prominence, see **28-42**.

Θρασύβουλε: omission of ῷ is atypical in P. (Kambylis (1964) 110-17, 183-88 believes ῷ indicates emotion; *contra* Hummel 67-69; Dickey (1996) 199-206), and all other vocatives addressed to Thrasybulus include it (***I*.2.1**, **31**; fr.124.ab.1): **τεῷ** effectively replicates it here.

Whereas here and at **19 τοι** direct address strikes a tone both intimate and didactic, in keeping with Myth 1, the *Er-Stil* of his second naming at **44** matches the epic-style narrative of Myth 2, and the following virtue-catalogue (**47-54**).

Thrasybulus has an onomastic connection to Antilochus (cf. **44**), whose brother Thrasymedes (likewise 'bold-counselling') lent Nestor his shield at Troy (*Il.*14.9-11).

Thrasybulus' prominence: *v.s.*

κοινάν τε γενεᾷ: κοινάν often signifies sharing within the family (esp. of glory): ***O*.2.50**; *O.*7.21, 92; *P.*4.154; *P.*5.102; *I.*7.24; cf. A.*Sept.*1069-70 γενεᾶι | κοινὸν. Here, its dependent datives match those of **5-6**. With Acragas' elision here, contrast *I.*6.69 ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἐῷ προσάγων.

16 λόγοισι θνατῶν: λόγοισι is instrumental with either (1) **17 εὔδοξον** (taken proleptically: 'to be famous in men's speech'; cf. B.7.8-10 ᾧ δὲ σὺ πρεσβύ[τατο]ν νείμῃς γέρας | νίκας, ἐπ' ἀνθρ[ώπ]οισιν εὔδοξος κέκλη- | ται) or (2) **18 ἀπαγγελεῖ** ('announce through the words of men'). Both convey oralization of the **ὕμνων θησαυρὸς**, whether through reading the 'inscription' aloud, performing the ode, or by word of mouth: see **14-18**. Popular repute can be as important as song: *O.*11.4-5 ὕμνοι | ὑστέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων τέλλεται; *N.*6.30 ἀοιδαὶ καὶ λόγοι τὰ καλά σφιν ἔργ' ἐκόμισαν; *P.*3.112 ἀνθρώπων φάτῑς.

17 Delaying the event to this position (see **5-6**) throws it, as it were, into high relief: Eckerman (2011) 1-8 detects allusion to the monumental chariot-sculpture of Apollo on the Temple's East Pediment, the transfer of which to the **ὕμνων θησαυρὸς** enhances it visually. Cf. Apollo's prominence (**9 Ἀπολλωνίᾳ ~ 18 Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ**), and allusions to both the Siphnian Treasury sculptures (**28-42**) and the Temple's construction (**18**).

The diction is reflected in victory-dedications: *v.i.*

εὔδοξον: valorizing in P., B., Sim., esp. in agonistic contexts (victor: *P.*12.5; *N.*7.8; ***I.*2.34** (applied to the Emmenids due to their victories); B.7.9; B.14.22; Games: *O.*14.13; *I.*3.1; κῶμος: *I.*8.1), but of the victory only here and at Sim.fr.213.4 (Nike). In victory-dedications: Ebert 21.1 (polis).

εὔδοξον ἅρματι: *I.*3.16 δόξαν παλαιὰν ἅρμασιν.

εὔδοξον ... νίκαν: *P.*12.5-6 εὐδόξῳ Μίδᾳ ... νικάσαντα; B.7.8-10; B.14.22 εὔδοξον ἱππόνικ[ον υἱόν]. Opposite: E.*Andr.*777 νίκαν ... κακόδοξον.

ἅρματι νίκαν: *P.*1.32-33 καλλινίκου | ἅρμασι; *P.*11.46 ἅρμασι καλλίνικοι; ***I.*2.13**; X.*Ag.*9.72 ἅρματι μὲν νικήσας; Posidipp.*Epig.*78.5-6 ἅ]ρ[μ]ατι ... νίκην; Posidipp.*Epig.*88.6 νίκαν ἅρματι; Ebert no.81.2 ἅρματι νεικήσαντα.

17-18 ἅρματι νίκαν ... ἀπαγγελεῖ: *I.*4.25 ἅρμα καρύξαισα νικᾶν.

νίκαν | Κρισαίαις: reprising **5 Πυθιόνικος** chiastically.

18 Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς: ***I.*2.18 ἐν Κρίσα**.

Since the hippodrome was on the Crisaean plain, and the *thesauros* on the Sacred Way, the locative phrase modifies **17 νίκαν** rather than **18 ἀπαγγελεῖ**. This releases the song-treasury from the constraints of a fixed locale.

At *h.Hom.*3.257-74, Telphusa directs Apollo to build his Temple at Crisa (269 ἐν Κρίσῃ ποίησαι ὑπὸ πτυχὶ Παρνησοῖο), which is undisturbed by chariots and horses (270-71 οὔθ' ἅρματα καλὰ δονήσεται, οὔτε τοι ἵππων | ὠκυπόδων κτύπος). Richardson interprets these as traffic, but cf. ἅρματα καλὰ (*Il.*23.533), ἵππων ὠκυπόδων (*Il.*23.304, 504; fr.94b.44), of horse-racing: since the *Hymn* dates from the early 6th century (Richardson 13-15), 257-74 may reflect anachronistic awareness of the Pythian chariot-races established in 582 (Paus.10.7.6). Allusion to 269 here supports the theory that the Temple's sculpture is evoked: see **17**.

Κρισαίαις: *h.Hom.*3.446; *P.*5.37; S.*El.*730. On Crisa, see Richardson on *h.Hom.*3.269.

ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς: *N.*2.21 ἐν ἐσλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς (Olympia); Philodam.*Pae.In.Dion.*23 [Παρν]ασσοῦ πτύχας (Delphi).

ἀπαγγελεῖ: Strophe 2's final word fuses the *thesauros*' monumental function with *aggelia*-language (see **14-18**). Although the *aggelia* it evokes is past, the tense is not simply encomiastic/performative (*pace* Bundy 21-22), but looks forward to the ode's reperformance and reactivation of the speech act (see ***I.*2.43-46**).

In victory-epigrams, the original ἀγγελία is reported (Ebert no.37.7-8 ἄϋσεν | κήρυξ; no.55.3 ἐκαρύχθη; no.68.2 καρύχθην), and also *re-enacted* (Ebert no.51.1-2 [ἀγγέλλ]ω νίκημ Μεσσ[ηνίου, ὃς στεφανωθεὶς] [Πίσηι κη]ρύχθη παῖς στ[άδιον, Σοφίου];

no.72.2 ἀγγέλλω; no.76B.1 κηρύσσομαι): in these cases, a *real* monument inscribed with the ἀγγελία self-consciously reperforms it.

Strophe 3

19-20 Transition to Myth 1. The referent of **19 νιν**, and the metaphor's nature, are controversial.

νιν: (1) anaphora of (a) **14 πρόσωπον** (Heyne); (b) **15 πατρὶ** (Schroeder); (c) **15 γενεᾷ**; (d) **17 νίκαν** (Wilamowitz (1922) 138n.2; Bell (1995) 9); (2) cataphora of **20 ἐφημοσύναν** (Σ.*P*.6.19b).

Although (1)(b) suits the filial precepts (**23-25; 26-27**; cf. fr.146.2 δεξιὰν κατὰ χεῖρα πατρός), (2) is preferable, since the imagery suggests Thrasybulus is leading 'Precept' in marriage (Nicholson (2005) 57-58; **19**; **20**).

The image of rounding a turning-post (Carey (1975) 289-90, adducing *Il*.23.334-37, 465-66) would cohere with the *Il*.23 intertexts at **28-42**; since wedding-scenes sometimes involved a chariot (cf. **19**), the images may overlap. But that of a victor adjusting his wreath with his right hand (Bell (1995) 9) is forced.

19 σύ τοι: τοι '[establishes] close rapport between the mind of the speaker and the mind of another person' (Denniston 537). Instances addressing Hieron (*P*.1.87; *P*.3.85; fr.126) may be categorized as 'familiar address to rulers', and those to Thrasybulus (*h.l.*; ***I*.2.46**) and Pytheas (*N*.5.48) as 'tutelary address to youths', while that to Arcesilas (*P*.5.6 σύ τοί) overlaps. The laudator adapts his tone (marked as programmatic by stanza-initial position) in anticipation of the didactic ὑποθῆκαι of Myth 1 (**21-27**).

σχεθών νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός: a groom leads his bride home with his right hand ('χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ'): Sourvinou-Inwood (1987) 139-40; Iambl.*Vit.Pythag*.18.84 λῆψις διὰ δεξιᾶς; *P*.9.122-23 παρθένον κεδνὰν χερὶ χειρὸς ἑλών | ἄγεν.

ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός: recurring exactly only at Theocr.*Id*.18.25.18 ('on your right-hand-side'). P.'s apparent model is ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ χειρὸς (*Od*.5.277; *h.Hom*.4.153, 418, 499); cf. *Il*.7.238 ἐπὶ δεξιά.

Węcowski (2014) 85-124 identifies **ἐπὶ δεξιὰ** as a fundamental principle regulating the symposium: this connotation may be activated here by Thrasybulus' sympotic excellence (**52-54**).

χειρός: P. regularly puns on Chiron's (**22**) name: Robbins (1993) 12-15.

ὀρθὰν: the groom often raises the bride's hand in the wedding-procession: E.*Alc*.917; vase-paintings: Oakley & Sinos (1993) figs.85, 94, 97, 106. On an Attic red-figure *loutrophoros* (Berlin F.2372), he lifts her upright into a chariot. The moral sense (***O*.2.75**) naturally applies to the observance of precepts.

20 ἄγεις: *vox propria* for leading a bride: *P*.5.27-28 ἄγων ... θυγατέρα Πρόφασιν (similarly metaphorical); *P*.9.123; fr.30.4. Cf. **47 ἄγει**.

ἐφημοσύναν: except here (general precepts), of instructions for a *single occasion*: *Il*.17.697 (Antilochus instructed to inform Achilles of Patroclus' death: cf. **23**; **28-42**); *Od*.12.226; *Od*.16.340; *h.Hom*.5.213; S.*Ph*.1144; A.R.1.32-34 (Jason instructed by Chiron to accept Orpheus: cf. **22**).

21-27 Myth 1. The precept Thrasybulus upholds (**19-20**) is defined as Chiron's instructions to the young Achilles to honour Zeus, and his parents.

The sources for Chiron educating Achilles go back to *Il*.11.831-32; cf. Hes.fr.204.87-89; Robbins (1993) 7-20. Σ.*P*.6.22 quotes the opening of the Hesiodic Χείρωνος

Ὑποθῆκαι (Hes.fr.283.1-3), with Σ.*P*.6.16 implying P. alludes to it: see **23-27**. The poem's core was Chiron addressing Achilles (Paus.9.31.5) with advice and traditional wisdom. On its reconstruction, and relationship to a wider paideutic genre, see Friedländer (1913) 571-72, 577-78, 600-3; Schwartz (1960) 228-44; Kurke (1990) 90-94, 104-107; D'Alessio (2005) 231-32; Hunter (2014) 76-85.

In P., Chiron is primarily an educator, whose curriculum varies according to the ode's priorities: healing (*P*.3.1-67; *N*.3.55); filial piety (*P*.4.102-19; *h.l.*); love (*P*.9.29-66); combat preparation (*N*.3.43-63). Exceptions involve services to Peleus, his former ward (X.*Cyn*.1.8.4-5): *N*.4.60; *I*.8.41. Although fr.inc.177e refers to Χίρωνος ἐντολαί, he dictates specific precepts only here: P. incorporates the genre (cf. **1-4**) to (1) assist the laudator; (2) serve Emmenid interests; (3) anticipate Myth 2.

(1) As the exemplary educator, Chiron can be channelled by the laudator to enhance his authority in addressing a youth (Halliwell (2008) 64: the 'friendly preceptor'). Although this is a genuine phenomenon, the laudator's need for authority can be exaggerated, esp. since the generic difference between epinician and didactic means he is expressly praising Thrasybulus for *already obeying* (**19-20**) these precepts. For example, Nicholson (2000) 242-46 emphasizes didactic's pederastic overtones, arguing that P.'s desire to project a pederast-poet's unmercenary character led him to address Thrasybulus instead of Xenocrates, and to employ the Chiron-figure here. However, the ode's homoerotic element has been overstated (see **1-4**), and didactic is primary here; it cannot be assumed that P. radically redirected the ode towards the victor's son purely to be able to insert a pederastic dynamic.

(2) The myth's characters have significant correspondences with the Emmenids. Thrasybulus parallels Achilles in following the precepts (**19-20**), and is flattered by comparison to the *Iliad*'s greatest hero. As well as matching the laudator (*v.s.*), Chiron

parallels *Theron*, since Achilles' biological father Peleus (~ Xenocrates) is pointedly absent (**22-23 ὀρφανιζομένῳ | Πηλεΐδᾳ**): this Emmenid dynamic becomes explicit at **44-46**, where Thrasybulus reverences Xenocrates, but *emulates* Theron (see **46**). Xenocrates is marginalized (see **5**) in spite of the overt filial themes (patronymics: **23**; honouring parents: **26-27**). Thrasybulus' ultra-conservative aristocratic education plays a political role in reassuring aristocratic audience-members of Emmenid soundness: **47-54**.

(3) Myth 1 serves as a *Vormythos* (Carey (1980) 143-44) to Myth 2, establishing Chiron's teachings in preparation for Antilochus' exemplification of them.

Why is Antilochus, likewise Chiron's pupil (X.*Cyn*.1.2.6; X.*Cyn*.1.14.2-4), not the tutee here, but instead follows (**28-29**) precepts delivered to *Achilles*? *N*.3.43-63 provides a model that could have united Myths 1 and 2: Chiron's training of Achilles is explicitly (59 ὄφρα) linked to his Trojan career, which culminated in his Memnon-duel (61-63). The answers seem to be (a) Achilles was Chiron's most famous pupil; (b) this version associates Thrasybulus both with Antilochus and the hero who avenged him ('slayer-slain' motif: see **21-23 μεγαλοσθενεῖ ... Πηλεΐδᾳ**; **30**; ***O*.2.83**); Athanassaki (2012) 142-43 considers Achilles displaced to Myth 1 by P.'s divergence from the Achilles-Memnon battle on the Siphnian Treasury East Frieze in Myth 2 (**28-42**).

21 τά: Schmid for unmetrical τάν: since **23-25**, **26-27** are distinct precepts, **ἐφημοσύναν** is a collective noun equivalent to a plural (*P*.4.51; *I*.1.26-28). Myth-introducing relative: ***O*.2.81**.

ποτ': with the myth-introducing relative (*v.s.*), often emphasizing the *first* transition to myth: ***O*.3.13**.

ἐν οὔρεσι: Mt. Pelion in Thessaly (*Il*.16.143-44; *P*.3.4): cf. Hes.*Th*.1001-2 <u>οὔρεσιν</u> ἔτρεφε Χείρων | <u>Φιλλυρίδης</u> (Medeus). Heroic education often involves separation from society.

φαντὶ: *O.*7.54; *P.*1.52; *P.*2.21; *P.*4.88, 287; *P.*7.19; *I.*8.46a. Anonymous φασί occurs occasionally in Homeric narrative (*Il.*2.783; *Od.*6.42), but the Muse trumps tradition as the source of poetic authority (*Il.*2.484-86). In P., the Muse no longer supplies facts about the past, but assists the composition abstractly: see ***O.*3.4**. Tradition, primarily anonymous, but occasionally from named sources (Homer: *P.*4.277; *N.*7.21; *I.*4.37; fr.52h.11; Hesiod: *I.*6.67; Archilochus: *O.*9.1; *P.*2.55; Terpander: fr.125; Polymnastus: fr.188.2), replaces it (Scodel (2001) 109-38). Mackie (2003) 67-76 sees the difference in terms of the epinician genre's prioritization of the present over the past, which adds lustre to the present but is subordinate to it.

Even when evidently relying on specific texts, as here on the Χείρωνος Ὑποθῆκαι (see **23-27**), P.'s preference is to leave any sources he references anonymous: ***O.*2.28** (*Od.*5.333-35); *O.*6.17 (*Thebais*); *P.*3.80-82 (*Il.*24.527-28), 112-15 (*Iliad*); ***I.*2.9-11** (Alcaeus); cf. West (2011) 50-68. *N.*3.52-53 makes a similarly-anonymous attribution concerning the narrative of Chiron's education of Jason, Asclepius, and Achilles: λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων | ἔπος ἔχω.

This enables P. to (1) boost his authority by implying his account has popular acceptance; (2) advertise his knowledge of poetic tradition; (3) mask innovations behind the veil of traditional authority; (4) make any ramifications for the addressee more tactful by distancing the laudator from them; (5) endow his version with perpetual currency in future reperformances through the eternal present of φασί-statements (Pavlou (2012) 109).

A specific reason why P. avoids naming Hesiod here appears from comparison with *I.*6.67, where Hesiod's naming accompanies a textual allusion (66-67 μελέταν | ἔργοις ὀπάζων ~ Hes.*Op.*412 μελέτη δέ τοι ἔργον ὀφέλλει); here, P. appears to diverge from the Hesiodic original substantially (see **23-27**).

Unusually, both the fact that a statement was made (**21-23 φαντὶ ... παραινεῖν**), and its content (**25-27 σέβεσθαι ... ἀμείρειν**), are indirect: cf. *P*.2.21-24 Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ... λέγειν ... τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς ἀμοιβαῖς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι. The effect is distancing but also timeless, stressing the precepts' universal applicability, including to Thrasybulus in the present.

21-23 μεγαλοσθενεῖ ... Πηλεΐδᾳ: in almost-exact responsion with **ἐναρίμβροτον ... Μέμνονα**: the epithet, proleptic of Achilles' future might, anticipates his Memnon-duel (see **21-27**).

22 Φιλύρας υἱὸν: Chiron is often associated with his mother Philyra: Hes.*Th*.1002 (West: 'matronymics are only used of people fathered by gods, nearly always Zeus'); *P*.3.1; *P*.4.103; *P*.9.30; *N*.3.43; B.27.34; A.R.1.554. Her presence emphasizes Achilles' need for surrogate affection while separated from his mother (**22 ὀρφανιζομένῳ**): as an Oceanid, she was kourotrophic (West on Hes.*Th*.347). The matronymic varies the patronymics **23 Πηλεΐδᾳ ... Κρονίδαν**, and together they anticipate the parental-respect precept (**26-27**). Pun on Chiron's name: **19**.

ὀρφανιζομένῳ: oxymoronic: 'temporarily-orphaned'. This implies the version in which Thetis abandons Achilles shortly after his birth (Apollod.3.13.6; Friis Johansen (1939) 181-205). Chiron bonds with him *in loco parentis* (Stat.*Achill*.2.102 *pater*; Ov.*Fast*.5.407, 412).

23 Πηλεΐδᾳ: Achilles' epic patronymic; all dative epic instances (9x *Il*.) are likewise verse-initial.

παραινεῖν: 'παραινέσεις' was probably the 5th-century term for ὑποθῆκαι: *I*.6.68 παραινεῖ; Kurke (1990) 91.

The present infinitive represents the imperfect of direct speech, conveying didactic repetition.

23-27 Precepts 1 (**23-25**) and 2 (**26-27**).

Despite the scholia's implication (see **21-27**) that P. imitates Hes.fr.283.1-3, it is impossible to tell whether he does so while reworking the original, or closely emulates a lost passage. If the former, the modification is considerable. The single precept Hes.fr.283.1-3 contains (2-3 πρῶτον μὲν, ὅταν δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι, | ἔρδειν ἱερὰ καλὰ θεοῖς αἰειγενέτῃσιν) involves sacrificing to unspecified gods, in specific circumstances; Precept 1 involves honouring Zeus specifically, under all circumstances. 2 πρῶτον μὲν (~ **23 μὲν**) implies a second precept followed, but it probably concerned the same circumstances as the first.

Injunctions to honour 'gods and parents' in combination are common in moralizing discourse (A.*Eum*.151-52; Gorg.fr.6.27-29; Pl.*Symp*.188c.2-6; Pl.*Resp*.386a.1-4; X.*Mem*.4.4.19-22; Men.*Sentent*.230), as are those to individually honour Zeus (**23-25**) or parents (**25-27**), but 'Zeus and parents' is difficult to parallel (S.*El*.1081-97; Aphareus.*Epig*.1.1-2). The combination may thus be slightly original, but the overall effect is self-consciously conservative, in line with Thrasybulus' characterization for political purposes: **46**; **47-54**.

Simultaneously, however, the Emmenids' political ambitions are connoted (cf. **1-18**) by an allusion to Zeus' overthrow of Cronus in Hesiod's *Theogony*: see **24 στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε**. This activates the inherent irony in the juxtaposition of Precept 1 ('honour the *son of Cronus*': **23 Κρονίδαν**) with Precept 2 ('never *deprive your parents* of this honour').

Discomfort with the incongruity between Zeus' reputation for justice and his violent overthrow of his father becomes a topos from the 6th century onwards: Sext.Emp.*Adv.Math*.1.289 on Xenophan.fr.12; A.*Eum*.640-41; E.*HF*.1317-18; Ar.*Nub*.902-6; Pl.*Euthyph*.5e-6a. Pl.*Resp*.377e-78e insists Zeus' violence to Cronus, and other theomachic narratives, must be suppressed to avoid internecine strife in the polis.

23-25 Precept 1: honour Zeus above all.

Zeus, the mightiest Olympian, often receives the first/greatest honour: *Il*.3.298; *Il*.19.258; Sol.fr.31.1; A.*Nu*.563-65; X.*Cyr*.3.3.21.2-3. Proems often begin with him: Hes.*Op*.1-10; *h.Hom*.23; Alcm.fr.29.1-2; Terp.fr.3.1-2 Gostoli; Arat.1.1-18; cf. *Od*.8.499; *N*.2.1-3; *N*.5.25.

That the precept is not conspicuously exemplified by Achilles, Antilochus, or Thrasybulus suggests an alternative purpose: **23-27**.

μάλιστα ... θεῶν σέβεσθαι: often of personal devotion, as here (E.*Med*.395-96 ἣν ἐγὼ σέβω | μάλιστα πάντων (Hecate)), but also a topos of ethnographical prose, with local motivations for the deities selected: Hdt.2.29.25; Hdt.5.7.3 σέβονται Ἑρμέην μάλιστα θεῶν; Hdt.1.90.7-8; Arist.fr.var.8.44.594.10; Hecat.fr.7.10-11; Nymphodor.17.6; Timae.fr.85.10-11; D.S.4.64.4.3; App.*Mith*.323.1-2; Luc.*VH*.2.33.13-14; Paus.4.31.7.3-4.

Therefore, although Precept 1 denotes Zeus' immutable primacy in worship, its phrasing connotes variability.

23 μάλιστα: ~ **45 μάλιστα** (Thrasybulus' filial devotion).

Κρονίδαν: epic patronymic (***I*.2.23**). Here, it (1) suits the filial theme; (2) highlights Zeus' overthrow of his father and its violation of Precept 2 (see **23-27**); (3) plays on Chiron's status as son of Cronus (*P*.3.4; *P*.4.115; *N*.3.47) and half-brother of Zeus (cf. **22 Φιλύρας υἱὸν**): Chiron's injunction to honour Zeus with a term that applies equally to himself (a) is

amusingly self-serving; (b) forms a flattering analogy for the Emmenids, with Achilles' respect towards the half-brothers Chiron and Zeus mirroring that of Thrasybulus towards the brothers Xenocrates and Theron, although this is probably a secondary set of correspondences: see **23-27**.

24 βαρύοπα: a *hapax* ('deep-voiced') comparable to other βαρύ– compounds marking Zeus' association with thunder (Hes.*Th*.388 βαρυκτύπῳ; *O*.8.44 βαρυγδούπου; *I*.8.22 βαρυσφαράγῳ E.*Ph*.182 Διὸς βαρύβρομοι βρονταὶ; S.*Ant*.1117 βαρυβρεμέτα), complementing **στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε**. Cf. **11 ἐριβρόμου**.

στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε: respectively (1) lightning–flashes; (2) lightning–bolts. Both occur individually as attributes of Zeus ((1): *Il*.1.609; *O*.9.6; *N*.9.19; (2): *Il*.14.417; ***O*.2.26**), but together before Roman times only at Hes.*Th*.140-41, 504-5, 690-91 (ἀστεροπῇ), 699 κεραυνοῦ τε στεροπῆς τε, 707, 845-46, 854; Ar.*Av*.1746-47 (ἀστεροπὰς); A.R.1.510-11. All 7 Hesiodic instances (with 140-41, compare 504-6) occur in contexts of Zeus' acquisition of power from Cronus, or defence of it against the Titans/Typhoeus. Aristophanes' usage guarantees this interpretation: Peisetaerus, having won universal tyranny (1708) in Zeus' place, weds Zeus' personified *Basileia* and wields his weapons: Ar.*Av*.1746-47 Διὸς ἀστεροπὰς | δεινόν τ' ἀργῆτα κεραυνόν. A.R.1.510-11 adapts Hes.*Th*.140-41, but links the weapons' acquisition directly to Zeus' overthrow of Cronus. Political implications: **23-27**.

πρύτανιν: 'lord': metaphorical (A.fr.236), but with political overtones (*P*.2.58: Hieron): *v.s.*

25-27 θεῶν σέβεσθαι ... τιμᾶς ... γονέων: X.*Mem*.4.4.20.1-2 ἀνθρώποις πρῶτον νομίζεται θεοὺς σέβειν ... καὶ γονέας τιμᾶν: see **23-27**.

26-27 ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς | ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον: Precept 2: never deprive parents of honour during their lifetime. It is only marginally relevant to Achilles:

his mother is immortal, and he will not return to nurture his aged father (*Il.*18.330-31; *Il.*19.334-37). Antilochus is its ancient exemplar (**28-42**), and Thrasybulus its modern (**44-46**).

The precept is conventional in its content, in distinguishing between *sebas* for gods and *time* for parents (cf. **25-27**), and in ranking parents second after gods (Balla (2003) 6-40). **26 ταύτας** thus probably implies 'honour parents *first amongst humans* [as you honour Zeus first amongst gods]', rather than that parents should receive honour equal to the gods (as is occasionally enjoined: S.*OC*.1377; E.fr.852.1 τεκόντας ἐν βίῳ σέβει).

The positive version is a stereotypical commandment (Exodus 20:12; **23-27**). The negative formulation here (1) reflects the fact that its violation was a fundamental sin (West on Hes.*Op*.331-32); (2) balances the positive formulation of Precept 1; (3) sharpens the incongruity with Precept 1, since Zeus drove his father Cronus from his honour: cf. Hes.*Th*.489-491 ἐὸς υἱὸς ... ἔμελλε βίῃ καὶ χερσὶ δαμάσσας | τιμῆς ἐξελάαν (Cronus' ignorance that the stone he swallowed was not Zeus). Hes.*Th*.498-500 records Zeus set up the stone at Pytho as a memorial to mankind; this is likely a forerunner of the ὀμφαλός (cf. **3-4**), and Paus.10.24.6 attests contemporary Delphians anointing it with oil daily: Zeus' overthrow of Cronus thus has a physical monument in the Delphic landscape (cf. **1-18**). Political implications: **23-27**.

τιμᾶς | γονέων: [Pythag.].*carm.aur*.4 γονεῖς τίμα; E.fr.853 τιμᾶν ... γονῆς; X.*Mem*.4.4.20.2; Isoc.1.16.3 γονεῖς τίμα.

27 ἀμείρειν: *hapax* for epic ἀμέρδειν. Deprivation of honour: *h.Hom*.2.311-12 τιμὴν ... ἤμερσεν.

γονέων: although the ode emphasizes father-son relationships (excepting **22**), the plural reflects traditional commandments (**26-27**), and in a patriarchal society would prioritize

the father in any case. Poetic plural despite a particular parent being meant: Finglass on S.*El*.146.

βίον πεπρωμένον: the expectation that children repay their parents' nurture in old age until death (E.*Med*.1033-34, with Mastronarde; cf. E.fr.852.1 τεκόντας ἐν βίῳ σέβει; Pl.*Leg*.717b.5-6 γονέων ... τιμαὶ ζώντων). Violated: Hes.*Op*.185 γηράσκοντας ἀτιμήσουσι τοκῆας (Iron Race).

Since children's obligations to parents sometimes continue beyond their parents' deaths (Plat.*Symp*.188c.5-6; ***I*.2.43-46**; Balla (2003) 37), the phrase appears to be a limitation. Instead, however, I suggest it is ambiguous between the lives of parents and those of children: this anticipates Antilochus' self-sacrifice for his father, as does the association of **πεπρωμένον** with fated death in battle (*Il*.3.309; *Il*.16.441; *Il*.22.179).

Strophe 4

28-42 The *Odyssey* (*Od*.4.187-88) and *Aethiopis* (*Aethiop*.Arg.2c) record that Antilochus was slain by Memnon. However, *h.l.* is the first attestation that Antilochus died to save his father Nestor, followed by X.*Cyn*.1.14 (subsequent attestations: Welcker (1882) 174n.5).

Although the *Aethiopis* is not extant, the *Nestorbedrängnis* (*Il*.8.80-117), a parallel narrative in which Nestor is rescued from Hector by Diomedes, stands in an evident, but controversial, relationship to it: Cook (2009) 133-38. Pindaric reliance on the *Aethiopis* is usually assumed here (West on *Aethiop*.Arg.2c). However, Kelly (2006) 13-25 argues that P. recasts *Il*.8 and *Il*.23 extensively, to two ends: (1) artistic: co-opting Homeric authority while subverting Homer's text; (2) encomiastic: his Antilochus improves upon the flawed

version of *Il*.23 through recombination with the Diomedes of *Il*.8 in order to provide a superior exemplar for Thrasybulus.

I note that thematic intertexts are not restricted to the myth, but include extra-mythic passages relating to the Emmenids: (a) Nestor lost his chariot-race (*Il*.23.638-42), Xenocrates won (**6**); (b) Antilochus drove his father's horses (*Il*.23.402), P. gives the (misleading) impression that Thrasybulus drove his father's chariot (*v.i.*); (c) Zeus and Poseidon taught Antilochus horsemanship (*Il*.23.306-8), Thrasybulus is devoted to Zeus (**23-25**) and Poseidon *Hippios* (**50-51**).

The (A) structural, (B) linguistic parallels below modify and expand Kelly (2006) 17-18:

(A) *Il.*8	***P.*6**
	4. *Prologue: Antilochus' attitude* (**νόημα**) (**29**)
	0. *Summary: Antilochus died saving Nestor from Memnon* (**30-32**)
1a. Nestor stranded (80-81)	***1a.*** Nestor stranded (**32**)
2. Paris' arrow strikes horse (81-86)	***2.*** Paris' arrow strikes horse (**33**)
1b. Nestor tries to release trace-horse (87-88)	
3. Hector approaches (88-90)	***3.*** Memnon approaches (**33-34**)
4. Diomedes notices (νόησε) (91)	
5. Diomedes calls to Odysseus (92-97)	***5.*** Nestor calls to Antilochus (**35-36**)
6. Odysseus does not respond (97-98)	***6.*** Antilochus responds (**37**)
7. Diomedes fights his way to Nestor (99)	
8. Diomedes offers escape to Nestor (100-111)	***8.*** Antilochus makes his stand before Nestor (**37-38**)
9. Survival of Nestor and Diomedes (111ff.)	***9.*** Survival of Nestor, death of Antilochus (**39**)
	10. *Epilogue: Antilochus' posthumous reputation* (**40-42**)

P. follows *Il.*8.80-117 closely; divergences embed the episode in the ode's moral and chronological framework. Kelly (2006) 18 rightly observes that **4.** is not omitted, but transferred to the myth's *incipit* to provide a link back to Precept 2, and therefore a moral prism through which to interpret the myth that its model lacks. The omission of **1b.** avoids the narrative interruption of a miniature ring back to **1a.** One may add that P. instead creates two larger rings: ***0.*** and ***9.*** summarize the battle; ***4.*** and ***10.*** serve as prologue and epilogue respectively. ***10.*** is unnecessary in Homer, since Diomedes survives, and the

Iliadic episode is not intended as an exemplar for its poet's present. **7.**, although logically essential, since Antilochus must first reach his father in order to make his stand, drops out to make Nestor's cry and Antilochus' stand virtually simultaneous. The suppression of human motion in P.'s narrative (only 2 inanimates move: **33-34** (spear); **37** (word); note **31 ἀναμείναις**; **32 ἐπέδα**; **38 μένων**) assimilates it to the monumental sculpture with which it engages (*v.i.*).

(B) ***P.6***	*Il.8*	*Il.23*
28 Ἀντίλοχος βιατὰς	103 βίη λέλυται	576 Ἀντίλοχον ... βιησάμενος
		578 βίῃ
29 νόημα	91 νόησε	612 Ἀντιλόχοιο Νοήμονι
31 ἀναμείναις	78 μίμνειν (79, 80, 96)	419 Ἀντίλοχος μενεχάρμης
32 | Μέμνονα.	90 | Ἕκτορα.	
Νεστόρειον ... ἵππος	113 Νεστορέας ... ἵππους	
	192 ἀσπίδα Νεστορέην	
ἅρμ' ἐπέδα		585 ἅρμα πεδῆσαι
33 βελέων	85 βέλος	
35 γέροντος	87 γέρων (90, 96, 100, 102)	
	103 γῆρας	
36 βόασε	92 ἐβόησεν	
	91 βοὴν ἀγαθὸς	
38 μένων	78 μίμνειν (79, 80, 96)	419 Ἀντίλοχος μενεχάρμης
39 θανάτοιο	70 θανάτοιο	
κομιδὰν πατρός	186 κομιδὴν	411 κομιδὴ παρὰ Νέστορι
40-41 γενεᾷ | ὁπλοτέροισιν	[2.707 ὁπλότερος γενεῇ]	
	[9.58 ὁπλότατος γενεῇφιν]	

The myth is also iconographically allusive. Potential depictions of the Antilochus-Memnon duel itself are limited (*LIMC* s.v.Antilochos.I.no.26; cf. nos.7, 25, 27-32). However, Shapiro (1988) 1-5 adduces the right side of the Siphnian Treasury's East

Frieze, reconstructed by Brinkmann (1985) 109-21 as Achilles and Memnon's battle over Antilochus' corpse, with Nestor raising his arm towards Antilochus in grief. P. keeps the image of Nestor crying out to his son, but rewinds the narrative to the moment of Nestor's peril, making it a cry for help instead: this emphasizes the narrative's drama and heroism as well as its sad result. Therefore, the metaphorical **7-8 ὕμνων θησαυρὸς**, which self-referentially describes the ode, also references a physical Delphic monument, the sculpted imagery of which influences the ode's myth: cf. **17**; **33**. Athanassaki (2012) 134-57 traces the reworking of the East Frieze at ***O*.2.78-83**, and the reprise of sculptural metaphor at ***I*.2.45-46**; cf. ***O*.3.3**, **43-44**.

The correspondences between myth and non-myth are in part pellucid: moral education made Antilochus the ancient model of filial virtue, as it makes Thrasybulus the contemporary paradigm (**28-29**; **44-45**). But the incongruity between the single, specific, spectacular, military feat epitomizing Antilochus' virtue, and the multiple, generalized, unspectacular, social/moral qualities comprising Thrasybulus' (**19-20**; **47-54**), has drawn scholarly criticism, esp. from Wilamowitz (1922) 136-39.

These criticisms may be addressed by arguing that incongruity in comparisons between heroes and laudandi is inherent to epinician, and particularly appropriate to ***P*.6**. Thus at *P*.11.15-37, Orestes' avenging of his father through murder parallels Thrasydaeus' honouring of his father through victory (14-15), without concern for discrepancies in scale or detail (Finglass 43-47); explicit correspondences are in keeping with the paideutic genre (Kurke (1990) 95-98); Myth 1 keeps the correspondences between Achilles' and Thrasybulus' educations proportionate but the narrative unexciting, and so now Myth 2 introduces exciting narrative which necessarily distorts the correspondences; it is not Antilochus' *deed* that is the point of comparison, but the moral education that inspired it, which both Antilochus (**28-29**) and Thrasybulus (**19-20**) have received. Thrasybulus'

social/moral virtues (**47-54**) are the modern successors to Antilochus' heroism, but do not preclude it: when deeds are demanded of Thrasybulus, he will perform them as Antilochus did.

Nonetheless, that specific deeds in myth correspond only to general behaviour in reality is particularly peculiar here because Thrasybulus has *not* won the victory (the key achievement that justifies grandiose comparisons in other odes), and yet is far more prominent than the victor, with several elements (Myth 1, Myth 2, **45 ἔβα**, and **47-54**) implying that he must have done *something* to merit it.

This extraordinary treatment suggests two opposing possibilities: Thrasybulus' deeds are great, but details are suppressed to avoid embarrassing senior Emmenids, or they were minor, and they remain unspecified to allow the audience to imagine they were much greater than the reality. Given Thrasybulus' youth, and P.'s lack of hesitation elsewhere in listing specific deeds, the latter is probable.

An explanation emerges upon examination of the enduring misconception (already in Σ*P*.6.15; cf. van Groningen (1958) 344) that Thrasybulus drove Xenocrates' chariot. This is unlikely: P. explicitly highlights occasions where the victor (*I*.1.14-17) or his kinsman (*P*.5.43-53) was the charioteer, and ***I*.2.19-28** reveals that the charioteer in Xenocrates' Panathenaic victory, and Theron's Olympic, was Nicomachus. Instead, P. creates the overwhelming *impression* that Thrasybulus drove, in order to detach Xenocrates from his victory, and allow Theron to appropriate its prestige via Thrasybulus' emulation of him (**46**): the same strategy operates in reverse in ***I*.2** with Nicomachus' displacement of Theron from his Olympic victory (see ***I*.2.19-28**). Xenocrates' marginalization: **5**; **15**; **21-27**; **46**.

Any contribution by Thrasybulus to the victory was probably economic (see **47**): some possibilities are set out below.

(1) Financing the chariot-team, but having the victory announced as his father's rather than his own (cf. Hdt.6.103). This sacrifice of his own *kleos* for his father's would cohere with Myth 2, and with **15-18** (address to Thrasybulus in a section describing the proclamation of a victory shared by his father and family).

(2) Commissioning the epinician (see **49**).

(3) Organizing *symposia* for the victory-celebrations (see **52-54**); allusion to the sympotic fr.124ab.3 offers support.

28-29 Transition from Myth 1 to Myth 2, linked by Antilochus' adherence (**29**) to Precept 2 (**26-27**). Antilochus' adherence mirrors Thrasybulus', which introduced Myth 1: **20 ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν ~ 29 νόημα τοῦτο φέρων** (responsion).

ἔγεντο ... φέρων: not 'bore' (Race): verbal periphrasis (Björck (1940); Aerts (1965)) is dubious before Sophocles/Herodotus (Henry on *N*.10.17f.), and feeble here. Instead, take emphatically-placed **ἔγεντο** as copula, and **βιατὰς** as complement: 'Antilochus *proved to be* (cf. Alcm.fr.1.89) a mighty man, *by manifesting* this precept'. That a moral education produces a man of power as well as ethics (1) flatters Thrasybulus; (2) enables a warrior who *fell* in battle to be an unequivocally-glorious paradigm.

Ἀντίλοχος: Nestor's eldest son, but the youngest of the Greeks at Troy (*Il*.15.569): precepts such as **26-27** were fresh in his ears, as they are in the audience's. The Iliadic hero disregards Nestor's advice in the chariot-race and gains an improper advantage. When he prudently forfeits, however, Menelaus permits him to keep his prize: *Il*.23.612 Ἀντιλόχοιο Νοήμονι δῶκεν ~ **28-29 Ἀντίλοχος ... νόημα**. Here, Antilochus' wisdom and filial piety become irreproachable.

His brother Thrasymedes links him onomastically to Thrasybulus: **15**.

28-30 Ἀντίλοχος ... πατρός: that Antilochus is named, but his father is defined by their relationship, matches the Thrasybulus-Xenocrates pattern: **15 πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε**; **44-45 Θρασύβουλος | πατρώαν**. See **5**.

29 βιατὰς: signifying heroic force: Alcm.fr.1.4 (dead Hippocoontid); *O*.9.75 (Patroclus); *P*.1.10 (Ares), 42; *P*.4.236 (Jason); fr.52f.84 (Achilles).

νόημα τοῦτο: Precept 2 (**26-27**). Contrast epic τοῦτο νόημα (*Il*.7.456; *Od*.2.363; *Od*.15.326), always of an idea rejected by the speaker.

νόημα: 47 νόῳ (responsion).

φέρων: 'manifest': *P*.4.102 διδασκαλίαν Χίρωνος οἴσειν.

30-32 Summary: Antilochus died saving Nestor from Memnon: **ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός ... ἀναμείναις** ~ **37-39 μένων ... πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός**. Polysyllables underscore Memnon's threatening presence.

30 ὃς: the relative introduces Myth 2, like Myth 1 (responsion: **29 τά**). Cf. ***O*.2.81-83 ὃς ... Αἰθίοπα** (Achilles slaying Memnon), which fulfils the IE hero-definition (relative clause + 'kill' + opponent: Watkins (1995) 303, 309-11) that is here *inverted* (*v.i.*).

ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός: the verb occurs *hapax*: cf. X.*Cyn*.1.14.2-3 Ἀντίλοχος ... πατρὸς ὑπεραποθανὼν. Sons saving fathers: Stith-Thompson R.154.2, H.1162.2; Harrison on V.*A*.10.789-832.

ἐναρίμβροτον: elsewhere only *I*.8.53 μάχας ἐναριμβρότου (Achilles' warfare, checked by Memnon and Hector until he destroyed them). Watkins (1995) 368-69 suggests *Il*.13.338-39 ἐναιρέμεν ... μάχῃ φθισίμβροτος as the source, with the coinages **ὑπερέφθιτο ... ἐναρίμβροτον** redistributing the Homeric elements between Antilochus and Memnon to produce the IE 'slayer-slain' theme (implicit in *Aethiop*.Arg.2c-d; cf. *N*.6.52 ἐνάριξεν (Achilles slaying Memnon)). At ***O*.2.83**, Achilles takes metapoetic 'revenge' for

Antilochus' death here. Intratextually: **ἐναρίμβροτον** responds exactly with **21 μεγαλοσθενεῖ** (Achilles), and **32 Μέμνονα** almost exactly with **23 Πηλεΐδᾳ**.

31 ἀναμείναις: 'awaited' > 'faced in battle'. Cf. *Il*.8.78, 79, 80, 96; *Il*.23.419 Ἀντίλοχος μενεχάρμης; **32 Μέμνονα**; **38 μένων**.

στράταρχον: elsewhere until Roman times only *I*.5.40 (Memnon); fr.70.d.43 (Polydectes).

See **12 στρατὸς** for contemporary Greek-barbarian conflict.

31-32 στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων | Μέμνονα: Memnon as leader of the Aethiopians: *I*.5.40-41 στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων ἄφοβον | Μέμνονα (slain by Achilles: see **30**); also Hes.*Th*.984-85 Μέμνονα ... Αἰθιόπων βασιλῆα; *N*.3.62-63 Αἰθιόπεσσι ... κοίρανος ... Μέμνων; *N*.6.49-50; Call.*Aet*.fr.110.52; Q.S.2.31-32, 101. *Aethiop*.Arg.2a omits them. Ctes.*FGH*.688.F.1b.22 demythologizes.

31 Αἰθιόπων: in P., only in connection with Memnon: 4x of his leadership of them (see **31-32**); 1x of Memnon himself (***O*.2.83**).

The Homeric Aethiopians occupy a utopia at the Earth's Eastern/Western extremities (*Od*.1.22-26); only *Od*.4.481-85 locates them along the Red Sea trade-route. Linear B tablets from Pylos (Nestor's home: **35**) indicate familiarity (Myc. *ai-ti-jo-qo*), as do Minoan and Pylian frescoes of black men (Snowden (1970) 102). Controversy in antiquity over their Asiatic or African origin: Snowden (1970) 101-29; Burgess (2001) 158-160; Harder on Call.*Aet*.fr.110.52. In Greek poetry and art Memnon is their leader, though not black himself, as he becomes in Hellenistic/Latin poetry.

Although in the *Aethiopis* Memnon defends Troy, here the Aethiopians are characterized as *attackers*: see **12 στρατὸς**. Theron and Gelon's Himera victory (480) is often thought to have begun the 'othering' of the Carthaginians as hostile barbarians, promulgated by the Sicilian tyrants (*P*.1.70-80; Prag (2010) 51-60): *h.l.* may be an early

example, advertising Emmenid attentiveness to external threats. Such tactics had political salience, since many early tyrannies originated in war-leadership, such as those of Pheidon; Pittacus; Theagenes; Peisistratus (Hdt.1.59.4; *Ath.Pol.*22.3); Miltiades (Hdt. 6.34.1).

32 Μέμνονα: enjambement: *Il.*8.90 Ἕκτορα. Separation from **ἐναρίμβροτον** and a play on **31 ἀναμείναις** (cf. verse-initial **38 μένων**) replicates the suspense of his onslaught. Cf. *N.*3.43-63: Achilles waits with Chiron (43 μένων: 1st verse of strophe) until he can travel to Troy and defeat Memnon (63 Μέμνων: last verse of epode).

If the 4 forms of μένω at *Il.*8.78, 79, 80, 96 also originally played on Memnon's name, this might suggest the *Nestorbedrängnis* adapted an earlier Memnon-narrative: Mühlestein (1987) 47-54.

Etymology < μέδω: von Kamptz (1982) 81, 163. For the Egyptian pharoahs Ammenemes II and Amenhotep III, see Griffith (1998) 212-34, who observes the coincidence between μένω and the Egyptian root *mn* 'to be firm, remain'.

In all 5 other Pindaric occurrences (***O.*2.83**; *N.*3.63; *N.*6.50; *I.*5.41; *I.*8.54), he is Achilles' victim. The 2 Emmenid instances reflect the Siphnian Treasury's East Frieze (**28-42**). The 4 Aeginetan instances appropriate the Aeacids, who appeared on the West Frieze of the Aeginetan Aphaea Temple, which may have included Achilles and Memnon (Burnett (2005) 38): if so, P.'s predilection for Memnon emerges from his engagement with monumental sculpture. Greek-barbarian conflict provides a parallel motivation: *I.*8 and *I.*5 reference the 2nd Persian War; **12** and **31** may allude to Marathon, ***O.*2.81-83** to Himera.

Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἅρμ' ἐπέδα: cf. *Il.*8.113 Νεστορέας ... ἵππους. **Νεστόρειον ... ἅρμ'** enveloping **ἵππος** stylistically enacts the entanglement. Ironically, Nestor was a renowned horseman (ἱππότα Νέστωρ: 22x *Il.*; 10x *Od.*), who advises Antilochus how to win his

chariot-race without crashing at the turning-post (*Il.*23.301-50). However, since the turning-post plays no part in that race, Frame (2009) 131-36 theorizes Nestor's advice reflects his own crash in Amarynceus' funeral-games (*Il.*23.638-42). Nestor, helpless in his chariot, is an unflattering analogue for Xenocrates, implying he required Thrasybulus' aid (**28-42**).

P. suppresses Nestor's charioteer (*Il.*8.104): cf. Nicholson (2005) 32-33; contrast ***I.*2.19-28**.

Νεστόρειον: anthroponymic/theonymic adjectives: ***O.*2.12**. Juxtaposition with **Μέμνονα** stylistically enacts physical imperilment.

Of Nestor's epic characterization, his age (**35**), paternal relationship with Antilochus (**30**; **36**; **39**), and faded martial prowess are relevant here.

ἅρμ' ἐπέδα: *Il.*23.585 ἅρμα πεδῆσαι (Antilochus' improper tactics against Menelaus, for which he apologizes: see **28**).

ἐπέδα: Gerber on *O.*1.76 compares *defixiones* involving chariot-races.

33 Πάριος ἐκ βελέων δαϊχθείς: *Il.*8.81-82 ἵππος ... βάλεν ἰῷ ... Ἀλέξανδρος. Paris never misses his target (Fenik (1968) 20-21), but archery is unheroic (Hainsworth on *Il.*11.385-95) relative to Antilochus' spearman valour. Since Paris shoots Achilles after Memnon's death (*Aethiop.*Arg.3a; cf. fr.52f.78-86), he fits the 'slayer-slain' pattern here: **30**.

Πάριος: in Homer, 19x vs. 45x Ἀλέξανδρος. De Jong (1987b) 124-28 argues Πάρις is the local name, used in Trojan speech/focalization, and Ἀλέξανδρος the international, used by non-Trojans, or Trojans addressing Greeks (*contra* Lloyd (1989)). A treaty c.1280BC attests Alaksandu (~ Ἀλέξανδρος) of Wilusa (~Ἴλιον) as the vassal of the Hittite king Muwattalli II: see Latacz (2004) 117-18.

Here, it varies *Il*.8.82. But word-play on the homonymic, isotonic epithet Πάριος = 'Parian' is attractive, since the Temple and Siphnian Treasury, to which **17** and **28-42** allude, were faced in Parian marble: **32-33 ἵππος ... Πάριος** momentarily frames the scene in stone, like the equestrian sculpture on the Temple's East Pediment (see **17**). Cf. *N*.4.81 Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν.

ἐκ βελέων: 8x *Il*., invariably of either the escape of a living warrior (*Il*.11.163; *Il*.14.130; *Il*.16.122), or the rescue of a corpse (*Il*.4.465; *Il*.16.668, 678; *Il*.18.152, 232), from missile-range. The instrumental use here is ironic, since the missile-strike puts Nestor in need of escape, and will lead to a battle over Antilochus' corpse. Cf. *Il*.8.85 βέλος.

δαϊχθείς: epic: 'rend': cf. E.*IT*.871-72 ἐξ ἐμᾶν | δαϊχθεὶς χερῶν. Weapons associated with the verb are always bronze spears elsewhere: Paris' arrow is assimilated to a more heroic weapon (*v.s.*).

33-34 ἔφεπεν ... ἔγχος: 'wielded'; cf. Forssman (2006) 112. This modifies the epic 'press with the spear': *Il*.15.742 ἔφεπ' ἔγχεϊ (Ajax); *Il*.20.493-94 σὺν ἔγχεϊ ... κτεινομένους ἐφέπων (Achilles); *Il*.21.542-43 ἔφεπ' ἔγχεϊ, λύσσα δέ οἱ κῆρ ... ἔχε κρατερή (Achilles).

34 κραταιὸν ἔγχος: semi-personification: Gerber on *N*.6.52-53 ἀκμᾷ | ἔγχεος ζακότοιο (Achilles' means of slaying Memnon).

κραταιὸν: *N*.4.25 (Telamon); B.18.18-19 (Theseus). In epic, mostly of μοῖρα, connoting the ostensible inevitability of Nestor's doom here. 4 Iliadic instances of μοῖρα κραταιή (*Il*.16.853; *Il*.19.410; *Il*.21.110; *Il*.24.132) occur in prophecies of the slayer's death. Slayer-slain motif: **30**.

35-36 Whereas at *Il*.8.92-96 Diomedes calls Odysseus to assist Nestor, here Nestor calls Antilochus. Making Nestor's cry (**36 βόασε παῖδα ὅν**) stanza-final creates momentary

suspense before its resolution in Strophe 5, freezing the image as on the Siphnian Treasury (**28-42**); responsion with **26-27** (Precept 2) anticipates Antilochus' response.

35 Μεσσανίου: antiquity posited 3 locations for Nestor's Pylos (Σ.*P*.6.35c): (1) Messenia; (2) Triphylia; (3) Elis. (1) is confirmed as the Bronze Age city's location by Linear B tablets bearing the place-name *Pu-ro* from Ano Englianos. Although the *Odyssey* does not contradict this, Iliadic geography places Pylos further north: see Kirk on *Il*.2.591-94; Heubeck & West & Hainsworth on *Od*.3.4ff.; Shaw (2003) 138; Frame (2009) 657-68.

P. prefers (1) here and at *P*.5.70 ζαθέᾳ Πύλῳ (= Messene in the Heraclids' tripartite Peloponnese). Possible topical reference: Anaxilas of Rhegium renamed Zancle as Messene c.489, either to promote his Messenian ancestry (Th.6.4.6), or due to an influx of Peloponnesian Messenian refugees (Strab.6.2.3; Paus.4.24.6-9). Validating Messene's ancient connection with Nestor would flatter a local tyrant.

γέροντος: typical of Iliadic Nestor, as the oldest Greek at Troy. Superabundant in the *Nestorbedrängnis* (*Il*.8.87, 90 (the corresponding moment), 96, 100, 102; also 103 γῆρας), it encapsulates Nestor's battlefield vulnerability. Priam and Peleus' age accentuates the pathos of losing their sons: *Il*.22.60-62, 74-76; *Il*.24.486-543.

36 δονηθεῖσα φρὴν: 'set awhirl': Braswell on *P*.4.219(c). Cf. *N*.6.56-57 δονεῖν | θυμόν; B.1.178-79; B.fr.12.2-3.

As an emotional centre (Darcus (1979) 159-73), the **φρὴν** is often perturbed by fear: *Il*.15.627 τρομέουσι ... φρένα; *P*.9.32 φόβῳ ... κεχείμανται φρένες; A.*Pers*.115.

βόασε: formerly the earliest attestation with a personal direct object, but see now *P.Oxy*.4708.22 Ἡρακλέης δ' ἤντησ[ε] βοῶν ταλ[α]κάρδιον [υἱόν. Cf. *P.Oxy*.1792.41.3; Hummel 79-80; E.*Med*.206.

Diomedes' call to Odysseus (*Il.*8.92 ἐβόησεν; also 91 βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης) becomes Nestor's to Antilochus.

φρὴν can, consonant with its physical sense ('diaphragm'), possess a voice: Terp.fr.2 Gostoli ἀειδέτω φρήν; *N.*4.6-8; A.*Supp.*775 εὐγλώσσωι φρενί. The personification nonetheless strikingly expresses Nestor's instinctive call for his son's aid in despair.

παῖδα ὅν: representing the *ipsissima verba* ('O, my son!'): Fraenkel on A.*Ag.*48.

Cf. ὃν παῖδα (*Il.*9.481; *Od.*16.17) of a father welcoming his son home: ironic contrast deepens the scene's pathos.

Strophe 5

37 χαμαιπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριψεν: contrast *Il.*8.97 Ὣς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἐσάκουσε. Epic result-formulae express by litotes the success of a speech (οὐδ' ἀπίθησε: 23x *Il.*, 2x *Od.*) or projectile-throw (*Il.*4.498 ὃ δ' οὐχ ἅλιον βέλος ἦκεν): here, both are relevant, because Nestor's cry is heeded by Antilochus, but also fatal to him. The image also reprises Paris' arrow-strike (**33**).

Words as projectiles: *Il.*18.324 ἔπος ἔκβαλον; *Od.*4.503; ***O.*2.83**, **89-90**; *O.*9.12 οὗτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψεαι; *P.*2.81; fr.318 ῥεῖφθαι ἔπος; Hdt.1.153.9; Hdt.6.69.25 ἀπέρριψε τὸ ἔπος; Pl.*Euthyphr.*14d.5-6 οὐ χαμαὶ πεσεῖται ὅτι ἂν | εἴπῃς. Durante (1958) 3-14 sees this metaphor in the Homeric formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα.

χαμαιπετὲς: 'that fall to earth, i.e. miss'. Not before P.: *v.s.* Elsewhere locative: A.*Ag*.920 χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα; A.*Ch*.963-64; E.*Or*.1490-91b; E.*Cyc*.386-87; E.*Tro*.506-8; Pl.*Symp*.203d.1-2. Cf. Visa-Ondarçuhu (2002) 167-76.

Uncompounded Iliadic equivalents are always of the wounding (*Il*.13.530 χαμαὶ βόμβησε πεσοῦσα; *Il*.14.418; *Il*.16.803) or slaying (*Il*.4.482 ἐν κονίῃσι χαμαὶ πέσεν; *Il*.5.583 (by Antilochus), 578, 617; *Il*.16.741) of a warrior, except *Il*.22.448 (Andromache dropping her shuttle at Hector's death): here it intimates Antilochus' death (*v.s.*). Cf. *Od*.18.397; Hes.*Scut*.365; *P*.8.93 πίτνει χαμαί; *N*.4.39-41 χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν.

δ' ἄρ': epic (Denniston 33: 'a lively feeling of interest'). In Pindaric epinician, always in mythic narrative (*O*.10.43; *P*.3.27, 57; *P*.4.121; *P*.11.34; *N*.1.48; *N*.9.21; *N*.10.69), except *N*.8.32 (transition from myth). Here, as at *O*.10.43, *N*.9.21, it resumes the narrative after a stanzaic boundary, giving the result of Nestor's cry.

ἔπος: epic: 'complete utterance' (*O*.6.16).

37-38 αὐτοῦ | μένων δ': with Heyne, punctuating before **37 αὐτοῦ**, which is a locative adverb rather than a genitive pronoun (*pace* Σ.*P*.6.37b; Gentili). The epic phrase's inseparability explains postponed **38 δ'** (cf. B.5.36 εὖ ἔρδων δὲ; B.14.18 [ε]ὖ ἔρδοντα δὲ): *Il*.13.564; *Il*.22.5; *Od*.5.362 αὐτοῦ μενέω; *Od*.11.152, 628; *Od*.16.132.

Contrastive intertexts: *Il*.22.5 Ἕκτορα δ' αὐτοῦ μεῖναι ὀλοιὴ μοῖρα πέδησεν (~ **32 ἐπέδα**): Hector doomed to fight Achilles to the death before Troy, *in spite of* his parents' pleas (37-89); *Il*.13.564 αὐτοῦ μεῖν': Poseidon saving Antilochus from a spear-thrust.

αὐτοῦ: only here in P.

38 θεῖος ἀνήρ: θεῖος of a human only here in P. Often of Homeric heroes, but not Antilochus: *Il*.2.335 (Odysseus); *Il*.15.25 (Heracles); *Il*.19.279 (Achilles). Currie (2005) 158-200, esp. 172-78 (without discussing *h.l.*), traces **θεῖος ἀνήρ** as the characterization of

a person of superhuman qualities, current from early 5th-century Sparta onwards, arguing it carries the religious connotation of anticipating the heroization of exceptional individuals, including victors. If so, ***P.*6** anticipates the ***O.*2** eschatology (esp. ***O.*2.78-83**: Achilles' immortalization), applying it explicitly to Antilochus, and by analogy to Thrasybulus. Cf. **42 ὕπατος**.

At *Od.*24.76-79, Antilochus' bones are buried in an amphora near that of Achilles and Patroclus; Strab.13.1.32 attests his hero-cult.

39 πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός: Slater s.v. κομιδά renders **θανάτοιο** as genitive of separation ('rescue of his father from death'); cf. *P.*3.56 ἐκ θανάτου κομίσαι. But the genitive of price (Hummel 120) retains the mercantile metaphor's point, namely the *cost* of Antilochus' sacrifice.

The idiom is more common with 'life' (Heraclit.fr.85.2 ψυχῆς ὠνεῖται; Isoc.*Archid.*109.3-4 ψυχῆς ... πρίασθαι ... εὔκλειαν), but cf. Men.fr.306.2 θανάτου ... ὤνιον; also Caes.*BG.*7.19.4 *morte ... constare victoriam*; Vell.Pat.2.64.4; Quint.9.3.71 *emit morte immortalitatem*.

πρίατο: the commercial metaphor may imply Thrasybulus contributed financially to Xenocrates' victory/celebration (**28-42**; **47 νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει**).

39-40 μὲν ... τε: emphasizing continuity between actions. Here, the combination abbreviates the narrative, as at *P.*4.249-50 κτεῖνε μὲν ... κλέψεν τε (cf. 247-48) and *O.*7.69-70 βλάστε μὲν ... ἔχει τέ (cf. 68-69).

39 θανάτοιο: this substantive's epic genitive occurs only here in P. (against 5x θανάτου): cf. *Il.*8.70 θανάτοιο.

κομιδὰν πατρός: ‘rescue’ is post-Homeric (Hdt.9.73.4-5 Ἑλένης | κομιδὴν). The Homeric context creates ambiguity with the epic sense ‘nurture’: at *Il*.8.186 κομιδὴν ἀποτίνετον, Hector’s horses are asked to repay their provisioning, just as here Antilochus repays his θρεπτήρια to Nestor (see **27**). The idea is implicit in Antilochus’ exhortation to his father’s horses at *Il*.23.411 κομιδὴ παρὰ Νέστορι.

40-42 Antilochus’ reputation for filial piety: X.*Cyn*.1.14.2-4 Ἀντίλοχος ... πατρὸς ὑπεραποθανὼν (~ **28-30 Ἀντίλοχος ... ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός**) τοσαύτης ἔτυχεν εὐκλείας, | ὥστε μόνος φιλοπάτωρ (~ **42 ὕπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν**) παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀναγορευθῆναι.

40 ἐδόκησέν: ‘gained the reputation’: *O*.13.56.

τῶν πάλαι: ~ **44 τῶν νῦν**.

40-41 τῶν πάλαι γενεᾷ | ὁπλοτέροισιν: ‘to the younger-born of the men of old’: the phrase’s awkwardness highlights the epic intertexts, esp. with *Il*.9.58 ὁπλότατος γενεῇφιν (Nestor comparing Diomedes to his youngest son Peisistratus, who at *Od*.4.186-89, 199-202, recalls Antilochus’ excellence, and his death at Memnon’s hand). Both remaining instances of the phrase denote younger brothers who remained home while the elder, and better (ἀρείων), went to war at Troy: *Il*.2.707 ὁπλότερος γενεῇ (Podarces, younger brother of Protesilaus); *Od*.19.184 ὁπλότερος γενεῇ (Odysseus as Aithon, younger brother of Idomeneus).

These parallels exclude ‘aux yeux de la postérité’ (Hummel 133): that Antilochus was *already* a model for the youth *of the heroic age* is better than impressing only moderns. Contrast Sim.fr.11.17-18.

41 ἔργον ... τελέσαις: deeds accomplished by heroes: *Il*.10.303 ἔργον ὑποσχόμενος τελέσειε (Dolon); *Od*.2.272 τελέσαι ἔργον (Odysseus); *Od*.3.99 (Odysseus), 275

(Aegisthus); *Od*.4.329 (Odysseus); *Od*.4.663 = *Od*.16.346 (Telemachus); Hes.*Scut*.22, 38 (Amphitryon).

ἔργον πελώριον: *Or.Sib*.3.222 πελώρια ἔργα.

πελώριον: 'not objective measuring of size but rather the subjective impressions and emotions of someone who is scared by the enormity of what he perceives' (de Jong (1987a) 130): **40 ἐδόκησέν** suits this focalization.

42 ὕπατος: in epic, almost always of Zeus (except *Il*.23.165; *Il*.24.787; *h.Hom*.2.21), and thereafter of him or his attributes: Thgn.1.376; *O*.1.42; *O*.13.24; *N*.10.32; fr.70d.32; fr.75.11; B.fr.20E.7; A.*Ag*.509; E.*Rh*.456; Dem.*In.Meid*.52.9; Theocr.*Id*.26.34. Therefore, the epithet assimilates Antilochus to divinity (see **38 θεῖος ἀνήρ**), an effect underscored by responsion with **24 βαρύοπα** (Zeus). There is nonetheless irony in **42 ὕπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν** responding with **24 βαρύοπα στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν**, given the latter's allusion to Zeus' overthrow of his father.

Cf. *P*.10.9 ὕπατον παίδων ἀνέειπεν (proclaiming a boy-victor).

τοκεῦσιν: Antilochus demonstrates virtue only towards his father, but **τοκεῦσιν** (1) varies **39 πατρός**, **45 πατρῴαν**; (2) focalizes his contemporaries' acclaim through Precept 2 (see **27 γονέων**); (3) highlights the familial pun **ἔμμεν** (*v.i.*).

The manner of Antilochus' death makes the epic death-scene motif of a warrior's failure to repay θρεπτήρια to his parents (*Il*.4.477-78 οὐδὲ τοκεῦσι | θρέπτρα φίλοις ἀπέδωκε ~ *Il*.17.301-2; cf. **27**) uniquely inapplicable here.

ἔμμεν: in the context of familial piety, punning on **5 Ἐμμενίδαις**.

ἀρετάν: respect for parents a cardinal virtue: Eur.fr.853.1-3.

43-44 τὰ μὲν ... | τῶν νῦν δὲ: verse-initial articles serve as a hinge for the transition between past and present.

44-45 τῶν νῦν ... μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν: reprising **40-42 τῶν πάλαι ... ὕπατος πρὸς ἀρετάν** to parallel Thrasybulus with Antilochus, superlative in filial devotion in their respective ages. Responsion with Precept 2 (**26-27**) defines the standard he meets; **44-45** also forms a ring with **28-29** on Antilochus' observance of Precept 2.

Being the best of one's age: Sim.fr.506 τίς δὴ τῶν νῦν τοσάδ' (agonistic); Anacr.*Epig*.7.226.3 οὔ τινα γὰρ τοιόνδε νέων (military epitaph); *O*.1.104-5 μή τιν' ... κυριώτερον | τῶν γε νῦν; B.5.4 τῶν γε νῦν; A.*Ag*.531-32 ἀξιώτατος ... τῶν νῦν; A.*Pers*.184 τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα; Th.2.41.3.1 μόνη γὰρ τῶν νῦν; Th.6.34.2.7 δυνατοὶ ... μάλιστα τῶν νῦν. In epinician, the motif is associated with superlative vaunts and applied to victors (see ***O*.2.90-95**): its application to Thrasybulus marks both his filial piety, and, ironically, his elevation over his father in the ode's encomiastic hierarchy.

44 νῦν: marking the transition from past to present: *O*.1.90; ***I*.2.9**; *I*.4.58; *I*.8.61; cf. ***O*.3.34**.

καὶ: marking the transition from past to present exemplar: *Od*.1.301.

44-45 Θρασύβουλος | πατρῴαν: ~ **28-30 Ἀντίλοχος ... πατρός**. Thrasybulus' prominent naming relative to his father is maintained: **5**; **15**.

45 πατρῴαν: ordinarily (1) 'of the father' (*O*.7.75; *P*.4.220; *P*.9.23; *N*.4.48; *N*.10.66; fr.52f.106), or (2) 'hereditary, ancestral' (***O*.2.35**). ***I*.2.44** is ambiguous.

But here **πατρῴαν ... στάθμαν** is equivalent to **42 ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ... ἀρετάν**, i.e. 'standard *of conduct toward* the father' rather than 'standard *set by* the father': it is Theron (**46 πάτρῳ**) whom Thrasybulus emulates.

μάλιστα: ~ **23 μάλιστα**. Thrasybulus excels at displaying filial piety, just as Zeus is the foremost god to receive worship.

45 πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα: in epic, **στάθμαν** indicates a carpenter's plumb-line, used to determine straightness (*Il*.15.410; Most (1987) 573-76). The metaphorical use here is both (1) athletic (*stadion*); (2) moral.

(1) Gerber on *N*.6.7 δραμεῖν ποτὶ στάθμαν rightly rejects 'finish-line' (*contra* Henry) for lack of direct evidence ('start-line' is supported only by Opp.*Hal*.4.101-2). The image is instead of 'track-lines': 'white earth' marked lanes in the 3rd-century Pythian Games (Miller (1980) 159-66). Thrasybulus is praised for adhering to a standard, not for achieving a goal (but *v.i.*).

(2) Cf. Thgn.1.543-44 παρὰ στάθμην καὶ γνώμονα τήνδε δικάσσαι ... δίκην; Thgn.1.944-45 Εἶμι παρὰ στάθμην ὀρθὴν ὁδόν, οὐδετέρωσε | κλινόμενος. X.*Ages*.10.2.1-4 εἰ δὲ καλὸν εὕρημα ... στάθμη καὶ κανὼν πρὸς τὸ ὀρθὰ ἐργάζεσθαι, καλὸν ... ἡ Ἀγησιλάου ἀρετὴ παράδειγμα γενέσθαι τοῖς | ἀνδραγαθίαν ἀσκεῖν βουλομένοις compares the use of a plumb-line to ensure correct work with the use of Agesilaus' virtue as a model for noble conduct, just as **πρὸς στάθμαν** parallels **42 πρὸς ἀρετάν**. Cf. **19-20 ὀρθὰν | ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν**.

πρὸς = 'in respect of, in accordance with', like **42 πρὸς ἀρετάν**.

ἔβα: rendered as perfect by Race ('has come'), although the aorist implies a single action by Thrasybulus, parallel to **39 πρίατο**; **40 ἐδόκησέν**. See **28-42**.

P.'s only other metaphorical use is ***I*.2.9-10 νῦν ... βαῖνον** ~ **44-45 νῦν ... ἔβα**: whereas here the present exemplar (Thrasybulus) is equal to the past, in ***I*.2** it (the modern Muse) is inferior.

Strophe 6

46 πάτρῳ links Strophes 5 and 6 by mirroring **45 πατρῴαν**. Although neither brother is named, Theron's prominence exceeds Xenocrates', since Thrasybulus' virtue-catalogue (**47-54**) is introduced as his *emulation* (**ἐπερχόμενος**) of Theron's splendour, thus praising Theron indirectly – a surprise, given the filial theme, and Theron's lack of victories, although **5 Ἐμμενίδαις** and **15 γενεᾷ** include him. Like Chiron raising Achilles for Peleus (**21-23**), Theron functions as a *surrogate* father on whom Thrasybulus models himself, displacing the nominal laudandus Xenocrates.

The reason for his obtrusion must lie in the relationship between Theron's accession to power, Xenocrates' victory, and ***P.*6**. As argued at ***P.*6.Date**, I accept late 490/early 489 for the ode, soon before Theron's accession. Cummins (2010) 324-26 attractively suggests Theron exploited Xenocrates' victory to promote his rise to power, and that P. neutralizes the fear of tyranny inspired by the brothers' achievements in the polis through triangulation with Thrasybulus, to produce (326) 'a non-threatening picture of an aristocratic family that instills filial piety and other virtues in its young, and that shares the glory of this chariot-victory with the polis'.

Pace Cummins (2010) 326, however, Xenocrates is not pre-eminent, and with the exception of **6** is marginalized in favour of his family: see **5** (Emmenids); **15**, **44**, **47-54** (Thrasybulus); **21-27** (Chiron replacing Peleus as Achilles' surrogate father ~ Theron replacing Xenocrates as Thrasybulus' model); **28-42** (Antilochus the heroic rescuer of his ineffectual father ~ Thrasybulus and Xenocrates). The pattern of Theron and Xenocrates' fraternal relationship in the Emmenid odes sees the lion's share of prestige taken by whichever brother was in the stronger intrafamilial position. Until his decease, that was

Theron: see ***O*.2.48-51**; ***I*.2.28-29**. Traces of the family's aspiration to rule also appear: see **1-18** on **6 Ἀκράγαντι ~ 15 Θρασύβουλε**; **23-27**; **24**; **46 ἀγλαΐαν ἄπασαν**.

Although this would make ***P*.6** a unique example of an epinician ode used to secure the creation, rather than the continuation, of tyrannical rule, there are numerous cases where Panhellenic victories themselves appear to serve both those functions, or at least to correlate strongly: see Kurke (1991) 178-80; Catenacci (1992) 16-18; Luraghi (1994) 240-41. Theron may have taken the Olympic chariot-victor Pantares of Gela, whose son Cleander became tyrant c.505, as a recent model; for the possibility that an addition to the Olympic Geloan Treasury c.491 in honour of Pantares' victory inspired the treasury-image, see **8**. Gelon, who became tyrant of Gela c.491, used his 488 Olympic chariot-victory to secure his existing tyranny, and leveraged it towards his acquisition of Syracuse's tyranny in 485: his post-485 Syracusan coin issues link the victory to his mastery of the city (Morgan (2015) 62).

ἐπερχόμενος: 'approaching, imitating' only here.

ἀγλαΐαν: 'splendour' (*Il*.6.510), but with epinician connotations of (1) victory (*O*.9.99; *O*.13.14; ***I*.2.18**), (2) celebration (*P*.1.2; *N*.9.31), giving the misleading impression that Theron and Thrasybulus are victors (*v.s.*): ***I*.2.18 <u>ἀγλαΐαν</u>** reclaims this Pythian victory for Xenocrates alone.

ἀγλαΐαν ἄπασαν: transmitted ἀγλαΐαν ἔδειξεν ἅπασαν is 3 syllables too long. Since both are ⏑ – x, the easiest correction is to delete either (1) ἔδειξεν (Bergk^{2}); (2) **ἅπασαν** (Byz.). Gentili defends ἔδειξεν on the basis of (a) Σ*.P*.6.44b.3 ἀπέδειξεν; (b) the parallel aorist **45 ἔβα**. But ἀποδείκνυμι is common in scholia (Σ.*O*.2.65c.6; Σ.*O*.9.56.2; Σ.*P*.3.91.5), and instead probably suggested the introduction of ἔδειξεν to a scribe puzzled by the absence of a second finite verb after the ostensibly co-ordinating τε in **45-46 ἔβα ... τ' ἐπερχόμενος**, which is in fact an easily-paralleled construction: *O*.7.81; *N*.8.19;

N.11.44-45; Liberman 276-77. Memory of *O*.13.75 δεῖξέν ... πᾶσαν τελευ-τὰν πράγματος, *N*.4.83 αὐγὰς ἔδειξεν ἁπάσας may have contributed.

Young (1970) 105 regards **ἅπασαν** as an addition, comparing that of πάσαις (**50**). But whereas πάσαις is superfluous and subsequent to a misinterpretation of the paradosis ΟΡΓΑΙΣ as a noun, **ἅπασαν** introduces the catalogue of virtues that comprises Strophe 6, perhaps motivating πάσαις by dittography.

Homeric parallels: *Od*.17.244 τῶ κέ τοι ἀγλαΐας γε διασκεδάσειεν ἁπάσας; *Od*.19.81-82 τῶ νῦν μή ποτε καὶ σύ, γύναι, ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ὀλέσσῃς | ἀγλαΐην.

But a curious difficulty arises: these, the only other instances of the collocation (except A.R.2.447), refer respectively to (1) Eumaeus' prayer, in response to Melanthius' insolence towards the disguised Odysseus, that Odysseus return to scatter the suitors' proud airs; (2) the disguised Odysseus' warning, in response to Melantho's inhospitable treatment, that she may lose her glory amongst the maidservants if Odysseus returns. The doublet Melantho and Melanthius are executed in succession when he does (*Od*.22.465-72, 474-77).

If the use of this distinctive narratological marker was deliberate, the implication that Thrasybulus or Theron were insolent usurpers soon to be chastised by a righteous ruler could hardly be more antithetical to the self-image of an ambitious family poised to seize control of their polis. Far from being an apologist for tyranny, P. would speak biting, albeit purely allusive, truth to power; Rose (1982) 63 theorizes epinicia contained nuances beyond a patron's ability to perceive. Alternatively, Theron may be the Odysseus-figure preparing to set his polis to rights: see **23-27**.

Narratological awareness of the *Odyssey*: ***O*.2.87**.

Cf. *I*.6.62 ἀγλαοὶ παῖδές τε καὶ μάτρως (splendour shared with an uncle).

47-54 The ode concludes with an extensive catalogue of Thrasybulus' virtues. Its closest intrafamilial parallel is Xenocrates' virtue-catalogue (***I*.2.35-42**), which reworks *h.l.* intertextually. *P*.5.109-17 for the young king Arcesilas similarly stresses his surprising mental maturity (109-11 ~ **47-48**), as does *P*.4.281-82 of the young exile Damophilus, who, like Thrasybulus, is devoted to passing his youth in *mousike* (*P*.4.295-96 ~ **48-49**) and the symposium (*P*.4.294 ~ **52-54**), but without offending others (*P*.4.284, 297 ~ **48**). All these catalogues occur towards the end of their odes, to create a lasting impression of their subject's character.

All are also intensely political, crafted to convey an image consistent with the honorand's needs. Thrasybulus' aristocratic youth, equestrian interests (**50-51**), and ambitious family (now endowed with a Panhellenic chariot-victory), were vulnerable to accusations of profligacy and anti-polis behaviour, including tyrannical aspirations (epitomized by Alcibiades: Th.6.15.3). Since those were precisely the family's ambitions, public suspicion had to be neutralized. The ultra-conservative education in religious and filial piety imputed to Thrasybulus by Myths 1 and 2 is now complemented by a broader set of aristocratic qualities grounded in *sophrosyne* and respect for others that continue to reflect adherence to Chironian precepts (cf. Kurke (1990) 98-100). This presents him as an exemplary young nobleman who reflects well on senior Emmenids while deflecting direct scrutiny from them: see **46**.

The climactic praise of Thrasybulus' sympotic congeniality caps this approach, since the symposium can be conceptualized as a social microcosm, where an individual's conduct reveals his moral and political character, again including autocratic ambition: see **52-54**.

The 5 virtues form an expanding structure: (1), (2), (3) (1 verse each); (4) (2 verses); (5) (3 verses); strict avoidance of run-on between virtues stylistically enacts the moral

order and avoidance of excess they imply (cf. **45 στάθμαν**). The virtues are present tense, generalized, social/moral, in contrast to Antilochus' specific battlefield feat: (1) intelligent use of wealth (**47**); (2) lack of youthful insolence (**48**); (3) acquaintance with μουσική (**49**); (4) piety towards Poseidon (**50-51**); (5) sympotic geniality (**52-54**). On whether specific actions underpin them, see **28-42**; **47**. Even if they do not, since the precepts that produced Antilochus' heroism (**23-27**) were also ethical, not technical or military, it is implied that Thrasybulus, having received the equivalent of Chiron's *paideia*, is equipped for comparable achievements.

The catalogue includes 3 of 4 virtues made canonical by Pl.*Resp*.428a-430d (cf. *N*.3.74-75; *I*.8.23-26): wisdom, justice, temperance. The 4th, courage, may be omitted for the reason given in the previous paragraph; its replacement by piety (**50-51**) occurs in Plato and elsewhere (Noreña (2011) 58).

Parallels and contrasts in this catalogue between Thrasybulus and the Antilochus of Myth 2 and the *Iliad*: **47**; **48**; **50-51**.

47-48 νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει, | ἄδικον οὔθ' ὑπέροπλον ἥβαν δρέπων: youth and wealth were considered vulnerable to folly and injustice, esp. in combination. Thgn.1.1121-22 prays to enjoy the former without the latter: δίκηι ζώοιμι κακῶν ἔκτοσθεν ἁπάντων | ἥβηι καὶ πλούτωι θυμὸν ἰαινόμενος.

νόῳ ... ἥβαν: *P*.4.281-82; *P*.5.109-10; A.*Sept*.622 γέροντα τὸν νοῦν, σάρκα δ' ἡβῶσαν φύει. Youth's folly: Thgn.1.629 Ἥβη ... ἐπικουφίζει νόον.

πλοῦτον ... ἄδικον: wealth's injustice: ἄδικον ὁ πλοῦτος.

47 νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει: wealth was criticized as incompatible with personal/moral qualities, including intelligence: Hes.fr.203.2 νοῦν δ' Ἀμυθαονίδαις, πλοῦτον δ' ἔπορ' Ἀτρεΐδηισι; Isoc.*Areopag*.4.3-4 συνακολουθεῖ τοῖς μὲν πλούτοις καὶ ταῖς | δυναστείαις

ἄνοια. As here, P. neutralizes this criticism in every Emmenid ode by interrelating wealth with such qualities: see ***O*.2.10-11**. The lack of such neutralization in their encomia (fr.119.4; fr.124ab.6, 8 (for Thrasybulus)) bespeaks their rarefied audience, although they affect *internal* egalitarianism (see **52-53**).

It is unclear how Thrasybulus is in a position to employ wealth himself. He may, unusually, have been advanced part of his patrimony on attaining the age of majority (cf. Strauss (1993) 61-73). This would increase Thrasybulus' independence of action (*v.i.*), and give salience to his adherence to Precept 2, since an unscrupulous heir's commitment to supporting his parents might weaken upon receipt of an advance (**26-27**). Otherwise, Thrasybulus simply receives funds from his father as a gift, like Pheidippides at Ar.*Nu*.1-125, but without Pheidippides' profligacy.

On what did Thrasybulus spend his wealth? The generalized phrasing here and in the rest of the catalogue makes certainty impossible, but particular items are compatible with explicit notices of Emmenid expenditure elsewhere: **49** ~ commissioning of poetry (problematized at ***I*.2.1-11**); **50-51** ~ spending on horse-racing (***O*.2.48-54**; ***I*.2.38**) or sacrifices (***O*.3.39-41**; ***I*.2.39**); **52-54** ~ hospitality (***I*.2.39-42**). Xenocrates' virtue-catalogue in particular frames many of the generalities here more concretely. This correspondence, taken together with the intertext with fr.124ab.3 at **52-53**, and with the metaphor **39 πρίατο**, suggests Thrasybulus contributed financially to the victory and/or its celebration: see **28-42**.

νόῳ: 'intelligently': *Od*.6.320. νόος, unexpected in a young man, likewise opens the young king Arcesilas' virtue-catalogue: *P*.5.109-110. On its usage here, see Darcus Sullivan (2002a) 367-70; in general: Darcus Sullivan (1990) 179-202 (P. and B.). Cf. **51**; ***O*.2.92**.

Thrasybulus is linked to Antilochus via responsion with **29 <u>νόημα</u>**, a word marking Antilochus' adherence to the Precepts, which parallels Thrasybulus' (*v.i.*). **28-29 <u>Ἀντίλοχος</u> ... <u>νόημα</u>** ~ *Il.*23.612 <u>Ἀντιλόχοιο</u> <u>Νοήμονι</u> itself alludes to a passage in which Antilochus apologizes to Menelaus for his youthful foolishness in the chariot-race (*Il.*23.589-90 <u>νέου ἀνδρὸς</u> <u>ὑπερβασίαι</u> ... κραιπνότερος ... <u>νόος</u>, 604 <u>νόον</u> νίκησε <u>νεοίη</u>). Etymological link between Nestor (**nes*–) and νόος: Frame (2009) 50-58.

<u>ἄγει</u>: 'employs, conducts' (*I.*7.22 <u>ἄγει</u> τ' <u>ἀρετὰν</u>; Th.1.127.3.2 <u>ἄγων</u> τὴν <u>πολιτείαν</u>). The parallel with **20 <u>ἄγεις</u>** (Thrasybulus' adherence to the Precepts in the corresponding line of Strophe 3) confirms these virtues are the result of his moral education (see **29 <u>φέρων</u>**, in responsion with *h.l.*). *V.s.*

48 Negative phrasing underscores the rejection of critical characterizations of youth.

ἄδικον ... ἦβαν: youth is often unjust: A.fr.400 γῆρας γὰρ <u>ἥβης</u> ἐστὶν <u>ἐνδικώτερον</u>; E.*Andr.*184-85 κακόν γε θνητοῖς <u>τὸ νέον</u> <u>ἔν τε τῶι νέωι</u> | <u>τὸ μὴ δίκαιον</u>. The expectation is similarly subverted at *P.*4.280-81 <u>δικαιᾶν</u> | Δαμοφίλου πραπίδων ... ἐν παισὶν <u>νέος</u>; *N.*9.44 <u>σὺν νεότατι</u> ... <u>σύν τε δίκᾳ</u>.

ἄδικον: Theron's justice is one of his key characteristics: see ***O.*2.6**. Tyrants were often presented as unjust (Hdt.5.92.4-7; Th.6.55.1.5; Pl.*Phaed.*82a.3-5), but occasionally as correcting the ruling oligarchy's injustice (Thgn.1.39-52).

Pace Vetta (1979) 87-90, 'erotic justice' (i.e. reciprocation of the poet's feelings: Sapph.fr.1.20 <u>ἀδικήει</u>) is irrelevant here (see **1-4**), although **ἦβαν δρέπων** includes sexual/sensual connotations: *v.i.*

οὔθ': solitary οὔτε negating both preceding and succeeding elements: Hummel 312.

ὑπέροπλον: 'insolent', implying overreaching and lack of sense: *Il.*1.205 ὑπεροπλίῃσι; *Il.*15.185; *Il.*17.170; Hes.*Th.*516, 670.

ἥβαν: not only 'youth', but 'youthful joy': Braswell on *P.*4.295 θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν (the similarly-idealized young Damophilus at a symposium).

Thrasybulus' youth, which underlies the filial/paideutic theme, is first made explicit here.

δρέπων: this favoured Pindaric metaphor for plucking/culling that which is finest is particularly appropriate here due to the common floral metaphor ἥβης ἄνθος (*Il.*13.484): cf. *P.*9.109-10 Ἥβας | καρπὸν ἀνθήσαντ' ἀποδρέψαι. Elsewhere: *O.*1.13 (virtues); *P.*1.49-50 (wealth); *P.*4.130 (festivities); *N.*2.9 (victories); fr.52m.5 (song); fr.122.8 (youth/love); fr.123.1 (love); fr.209 (wisdom).

48-49 δρέπων, | σοφίαν: fr.209 σοφίας καρπὸν δρέπ(ειν); fr.52m.4-5 ἄν]θεα ... ὑμνήσιος δρέπῃ; fr.75.6 ἐαρι-δρόπων ἀοιδᾶν.

49 Addressee's artistic sophistication as praise-motif: *P.*5.115 ἔν τε Μοίσαισι ποτανὸς; B.5.3-6. A mid-5th century inscription from Camarina attests musical skill within the family (*SEG*.42.846 '..keas [son of ?] Thrasys, an Emmenid, is supreme at singing among all the Doristomphoi'), and song was expected of symposiasts (**52-54**; *P.*4.295-97 θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν πολλάκις, ἔν τε σοφοῖς | δαιδαλέαν φόρμιγγα βαστάζων). *Mousike*'s centrality to traditional education (Pl.*Resp.*376e; Bundrick (2005) Ch.3) intertwines this item with the paideutic theme (**21-27**), esp. given the concept of the mimesis of poetic characters (Pl.*Resp.*395c-97e) such as Antilochus. Currie (2013) 275n.195 suggests that mentioning the victor/family's musical accomplishments indicates their role in performance/reperformance: cf. ***I.*2.44-46**.

Thrasybulus' *consumption* of poetry is signalled by the intertext with fr.124ab.3 at **52-53**. For the possibility he commissioned the epinician, see **28-42**.

σοφίαν: connoting 'poetic skill': ***O*.2.86**. Thrasybulus is called **σοφός** at ***I*.2.12**.

The Muses' wisdom is expressed as song/music: Sol.fr.13.1-2 Μουσέων πάρα δῶρα διδαχθείς, | ἱμερτῆς σοφίης μέτρον ἐπιστάμενος; Pigr.*Frag*.2 Μοῦσα ... πείρατ' ἔχεις σοφίης; Ibyc.S151.23 Μοίσαι σεσοφι[σμ]έναι; *P*.1.12; *N*.4.2-3; fr.52h.19-20 ὅ]στις ἄνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων ... ἐρευνᾷ σοφίας ὁδόν; fr.70a.24-25; Ar.*Ve*.1244 σοφὸς καὶ μουσικός.

ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων: μυχοῖσι (generally of a recessed area) is ambiguous between (1) 'vale' (*N*.10.42 Κορίνθου τ' ἐν μυχοῖς); (2) 'cavern' ([A.]*PV*.453 ἄντρων ἐν μυχοῖς).

(2) applies here, given the later image of the 'Cave of the Muses', where poets are inspired: H.*O*.3.4.40 *Pierio recreatis antro*; Prop.3.3.27-36; Mart.12.11.3; Juv.7.59-60 *sub antro* | *Pierio*. Cf. Ion.*Epig*.7.43 ἐν γυάλοισι | Πιερίας (Euripides' epitaph).

Πιερίδων: P. associates the Muses 9x with (1) their birth-place on Pieria near Olympus (Hes.*Th*.53), 3x with (2) Helicon in Boeotia (Hes.*Th*.1). Insofar as distinctions are valid (Clay (2003) 57), (1) became the 'Panhellenic' term, (2) the 'epichoric'/Hesiodic: cf. ***I*.2.34**.

50-51 Thrasybulus' devotion to Poseidon, lord of horses (see **50**), demonstrates piety and implies equestrian interests, including (misleadingly) participation in the victory itself (see **28-42**). In that capacity, and as Isthmian god, Poseidon grants Xenocrates his Isthmian chariot-victory at ***I*.2.13-14 Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν ... Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις**. Poseidon's Delphic connections include an altar within Apollo's Temple, and the myth that he had previously held the oracle with his consort Earth (Fontenrose (1959) 394-97; cf. **4**).

Thrasybulus' bond with Antilochus is strengthened by *Il*.23 parallels (see **28-42**) in which Poseidon's equestrian aspect interacts with Antilochus' chariot-race: *Il*.23.306-7 Ἀντίλοχ' ... Ζεύς τε Ποσειδάων ... ἱπποσύνας ἐδίδαξαν (Zeus and Poseidon taught Antilochus horsemanship); 584-85 ἵππων ἁψάμενος γαιήοχον ἐννοσίγαιον (cf. **50 Ἐλέλιχθον ... ἱππιᾶν**) | ὄμνυθι μὴ μὲν ἑκὼν τὸ ἐμὸν δόλῳ ἅρμα πεδῆσαι (~ **32 ἅρμ' ἐπέδα**) (Menelaus demanding Antilochus swear by earth-shaking Poseidon that he did not impede his chariot unfairly). Poseidon was also Antilochus' great-grandfather (*Od*.11.254), protecting him at *Il*.13.554-55. Thrasybulus enjoys the same divine favour, but without Antilochus' youthful flaws.

Veneration of Poseidon *Hippios* could be political: in 411, the 400 Athenian oligarchs, many drawn from the *hippeis*, met at his cult-site at Colonus (Th.8.67).

50 Transmitted ὀργαῖς πάσαις ὃς ἱππείαν ἔσοδον is unmetrical and lacks sense. ὀργαῖς πάσαις (cf. *I*.1.41 πᾶσαν ὀργάν) is 2 syllables too long (– – ⏑ – for – –): πάσαις, perhaps motivated by **46 ἅπασαν**, is the easiest deletion. A finite verb is required: ὀργαῖς, reinterpreted as ὀργᾷς, would mean 'are eager for' (Christ); but **ἄρχεις** (Bowra) better reflects the god's mastery (cf. *P*.4.45 ἱππάρχου Ποσειδάωνος, with Braswell). Genitive plural **ἱππιᾶν ἐσόδων** requires only reinterpreting the paradosis. Liberman 277-78 rejects the notion that ὀργαῖς πάσαις is a gloss, and connects the paradosis to the original text by positing original *ὀρχᾷς < ὄρχαμος 'leader'; but appeal to an unattested verb is a dramatic remedy, esp. when the attested substantive relates only to leading *people*.

50-51 Ἐλέλιχθον ... Ποσειδάν: multiple vocatives: *h.Hom*.22.4-6 Ἐννοσίγαιε ... Ποσείδαον γαιήοχε κυανοχαῖτα.

The brief invocation varies the catalogue, breaking the ode's exclusive use of the 3rd person since **21**, as well as stylistically enacting Thrasybulus' devotion to Poseidon, esp. since **51 ἀδόντι** implies the performance of cultic prayer/actions.

50 Ἐλέλιχθον: elsewhere only *P*.2.4 ἐλελίχθονος (chariot), in responsion with 12 ὀρσοτρίαιναν εὐρυβίαν καλέων θεόν (Poseidon); S.*Ant*.153-54 (Dionysus).

The novel epithet for Poseidon's traditional role as 'Earthshaker' (Myc. *e-ne-si-da-o-ne* KN.M.719.2; epic ἐννοσίγαιος/ἐνοσίχθων/γαιήοχος) evokes (1) Delphic earthquakes (like **3-4 ἐριβρόμου | χθονὸς**: see **3**); (2) earth-shaking horses: *P*.2.4, 12; *I*.1.52-54 Κρόνου σεισίχθον' υἱόν ... εὐεργέταν | ἁρμάτων ἱπποδρόμιον.

ἄρχεις ὃς: parenthetic *Relativstil*: Hummel 326; postpositive relative: ***O*.2.8**.

ἱππιᾶν ἐσόδων: Σ.*P*.6.49 paraphrases as ἱππικὰς ἁμίλλας (cf. *N*.9.9 ἱππίων ἀέθλων). **ἐσόδων** = 'entry into competition': S.*El*.685 εἰσῆλθε πολλῶν ἁρματηλατῶν μέτα (Pythian chariot-race); Paus.6.20.11.1 ἐσιόντες ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν ἵππων. Although *P*.5.116 ἐπιχωρίων καλῶν ἔσοδοι = '*paths to* native glories', it immediately follows reference to the chariot-victory: 115 ἁρματηλάτας (cf. S.*El*.685).

ἱππιᾶν: echoing Poseidon's cult-title Ἵππιος; metrical overlap with **32 ἵππος** contrasts Nestor's equestrian inadequacy.

51 ἀδόντι: often of pleasing gods by cultic words/actions (see ***O*.3.1**); at *N*.6.36, pleasing the Games-god connotes victory, misleadingly implied for Thrasybulus here: **28-42**.

νόῳ: 47.

προσέχεται: for unmetrical MSS προσέρχεται (Schmid).

52-54 That Thrasybulus' exceptional sympotic sweetness concludes the virtue-catalogue extends the symposium's social/ideological matrix to earlier items, esp. **48** (moderation/σωφροσύνη was key to the symposium's orderly operation: Węcowski (2014) 83) and **49** (symposiasts were expected to make musical/poetic contributions: Collins (2004) 63-163). In itself, this item epitomizes Thrasybulus' aristocratic education, by affirming his mastery of the premier social forum in which Greek aristocracy defined itself (Węcowski (2014) 74-78). The phrasing, by combining harmonious concord (**52-53 γλυκεῖα ... συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν**) and competitiveness (**54 ἀμείβεται**) encapsulates the symposium's paradoxical nature as a 'segregative integrative feast', which 'both enhances exclusivity and serves the purposes of group-renewal and natural selection of aristocratic elites, emphasizing the equality of the diners while driving their competition' (Węcowski (2014) 80).

The symposium's elitism relative to epinician challenged epinician's inclusivity and yet was cherished by much of its audience (Budelmann (2012) 188-89). Therefore (189) 'the end of *P*.6 evokes for Thrasybulus and his friends the symposia that tie them together and form part of their identity, but it does so in a way that will not exclude all those who do not belong to the inner circle by narrowly setting the song at a symposium'. Silk on *O*.12.19 cites 'togetherness' as a closural motif that replicates the coming together of the celebrants at the performance (*O*.5.23; *O*.6.98; *P*.2.96; *P*.4.294-99; **53**; *I*.8.66; *P*.4.294, 299). Cf. Athanassaki (2009a) Ch.3 on the evocation of sympotic contexts in *O*.1, *N*.1, *N*.9 as a means of fostering equality between the Syracusan tyrant's circle and the regular aristocracy. However, the intertext with fr.124ab (see **52-53**) is by definition an in-joke that only the encomium's select sympotic audience will appreciate.

Sympotic behaviour could also symbolize political intent. A peculiar story in Timae.*FGH*.566.F.134 relates Empedocles convicting and sentencing to death a host and

symposiarch for 'tyrannical' behaviour in conducting the symposium. Although more representative than historical, its setting in post-Emmenid Acragas suggests memory of a time when one had to look out for potential tyrants at the symposium.

See ***P.*6.Performance** for implications for the ode's rendition.

52-53 γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν | καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν: ***I.*2.35-37 ὅσον ὀργάν | Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν | ἔσχεν. αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν** reworks Thrasybulus' youthful private entertainments into Xenocrates' mature civic consciousness.

Contemporary allusion to P.'s encomium for Thrasybulus: fr.124ab.3 συμπόταισίν τε γλυκερὸν.

52 γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν: pleasing men, as **51 ἀδόντι νόῳ** does Poseidon.

Cf. *O.*7.8 γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός (laudator's ode paralleling a sympotic toast); B.fr.21.3-5 θυμὸς εὐμενής, | Μοῦσά τε γλυκεῖα ... οἶνος ἡδύς (friendly heart and sweetness in a sympotic invitation).

γλυκεῖα: sweetness from epic onwards connotes anything giving pleasure. Here, Thrasybulus' *metaphorical* sweetness exceeds the honeycomb's *literal* sweetness (**54**). The epithet characterizes many of the symposium's constituents (wine: Pany.fr.20.10; song: *Od.*23.125; water: Xenophan.fr.1.8; *aulos*: fr.52g.11; Muse: B.fr.21.4), which included honey itself (Xenophan.fr.1.10); *O.*6.91 γλυκὺς κρατὴρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν (Aeneas) blends literal and figurative sweetness in another sympotic metaphor. Sweetness towards friends: Sol.fr.13.5 γλυκὺν ... φίλοις. Sweetness is a Vedic praise-topic (*RV.*1.60.3.1 'May our fair praise ... reach him whose tongue ... is sweet as honey'), but only Thrasybulus and Xenocrates (***I.*2.36**) are so characterized amongst Pindaric patrons.

φρὴν: as organ experiencing the symposium's emotions/sensations: fr.124ab.11 (for Thrasybulus); B.20B.8; E.*Alc*.346; Crit.fr.6.15; Pherecrat.152.3 τέρπου φρένα τέρπε τ' ἐκεῖνον (reciprocity).

53 καὶ: climactic (Denniston 316-21).

συμπόταισιν: fr.124ab.3 συμπόταισίν (for Thrasybulus). Except *O*.1.61 (myth), all P.'s other lexical references to symposia open or close their odes (*O*.7.5; *P*.4.294; *N*.9.48; *I*.6.1), thus carrying a marked structural significance.

ὁμιλεῖν: epexegetic infinitive: *N*.10.72 χαλεπὰ δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώ-ποις ὁμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων; ***I*.2.37 αἰδοῖος ... ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν**; with γλυκύς: S.*OT*.1335 ἰδεῖν γλυκύ. The verb as closural device: *O*.1.116; *O*.12.19; *P*.2.96; *h.l.*

Characteristic of the symposium: S.*Ai*.1199-1203 στεφάνων ... κυλίκων .. τέρψιν ὁμιλεῖν ... γλυκὺν αὐλῶν ὄτοβον; E.*Alc*.343 συμποτῶν θ' ὁμιλίας; Athen.11.8.17-18 συμποτικὰς | ὁμιλίας. The laudator's concluding wish **ὁμιλεῖν** with the victorious/noble at *O*.1.115b-16 and *P*.2.96 suggests his potential membership of the sympotic group.

54 μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον: interpretation depends on whether (1) **ἀμείβεται** means (a) 'surpasses' (Σ.*P*.6.49.3-6; LSJ s.v.III; Slater s.v.2d); (b) 'requites' (Farnell 2.189; Kurke (1990) 100-1); (2) **μελισσᾶν ... τρητὸν πόνον** is (a) literal ('honeycomb'); (b) metaphorical ('poem').

(1)(a) and (2)(a) are preferable. *Pace* Kurke (1990) 101n.64, ἀμεύομαι is probably a Doric form of ἀμείβομαι (Finglass on *P*.11.38; Henry on *N*.11.13), with *P*.1.45 supplying a valid parallel for 'surpasses'. Although reciprocity is an important sympotic virtue (Kurke (1990) 101-2), so is competitiveness (**52-54**). Intertextuality with ***I*.2.36 ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν** also supports (1)(a).

That Thrasybulus' **52 γλυκεῖα ... φρὴν** surpasses bees' literal labour matches the commonplace 'sweeter than honey': *Il.*1.248-49 ἡδυεπὴς ... μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή (Nestor); *Il.*18.109 γλυκίων μέλιτος (anger); fr.152 μελισσοτεύκτων κηρίων ἐμὰ γλυκερώτερος ὀμφά (poet's voice).

That (2)(b) might co-exist with (2)(a) is a (slightly-strained) possibility ('his sweet spirit surpasses the honey-comb, i.e. my ode'). Poets/poetry associated with bees: *P.*10.53-56 ἄωτος ὕμνων ... ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον ... ὅπ' ... γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἐμάν; fr.52f.58-59; B.10.10 νασιῶτιν ἐκίνησεν λιγύφθογγον μέλισσαν; Ar.*Av.*749-51 ὡσπερεὶ μέλιττα ... μελέων ἀπεβόσκετο καρπὸν ... φέρων γλυκεῖαν ᾠδάν; Pl.*Ion*.534b.1-3; Call.*H.Apoll.*110; H.*O.*4.27-32; Davies & Kathirithamby (1986) 70-72; also ***I.2.3***; Asclepiad.*Epig.*7.11.1 γλυκὺς Ἠρίννης οὗτος πόνος.

Such an image (intricately-wrought artifact as poem) reprises **7-8 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς**, both as a symbol for poetry, and because the Second Temple was built by bees from beeswax (Paus.10.5.9.5-7; Newman & Newman (1984) 92; Athanassaki (2012) 149-50). Allusion to its destruction: **12**. Pythia as 'Delphic Bee': Braswell on *P.*4.60(c).

μελισσᾶν ... τρητὸν πόνον: honeycomb: S.fr.398 ξουθῆς μελίσσης κηρόπλαστον ὄργανον; cf. [Luc.]*Epig.*10.41.7 μέλισσα πολυτρήτοις ἐνὶ σίμβλοις, Nonn.*Dion.*13.255 μέλιτος γλυκεροῖο πολυτρήτων ἀπὸ σίμβλων (bee-hives).

μελισσᾶν ... πόνον: elsewhere of honey: E.*IT.*165 πόνημα μελισσᾶν; E.fr.papyr.65.85-86 πολυπόνου | καρπὸν μελίσσης.

CHAPTER 2: *OLYMPIAN* 2

TRANSLATION

A′ Lyre-ruling hymns,

what god, what hero, and what man should we celebrate?

First of all, Pisa belongs to Zeus, and the Olympic Games

were founded by Heracles

as a thank-offering for victory in war;

but Theron, on account of his victorious four-horse chariot,

must be proclaimed – just in his respect for guests, the bulwark of Acragas,

and the city-upholding culmination of a line of fair-famed ancestors,

who, after suffering much in their hearts,

took possession of a sacred settlement on the river, and were Sicily's very

eye, while a life of destiny attended them, adding wealth and grace

to their inborn virtues.

So, o Cronian son of Rhea, ruling over your seat on Olympus,

and contests' pinnacle, and the ford of Alpheus, softened by my songs

with kindly mind transfer hereafter the land of their fathers

to the coming generation. When deeds are done,

both just and unjust, not even

Time, the father of all, could undo their fulfilment.

But with a blessed fate, forgetfulness may come.

For at the hand of noble joys suffering dies,

tamed for all its malignancy,

B´ whenever divine Fate sends

bliss high aloft. This saying befits the fair-throned

daughters of Cadmus, who suffered greatly; but heavy grief falls

at the hands of stronger blessings.

There lives amongst the Olympians after death, through the roar

of the lightning-bolt, flowing-haired Semele, and Pallas loves her always,

as does father Zeus, and very much does her son love her, the ivy-bearer.

And they say that in the sea also,

amongst the marine daughters of Nereus, an unfading life

has been assigned to Ino for the whole of time.

Truly, for mortals at least, there has been determined

no limit at all upon death,

nor when we shall end our day of rest – that child of the sun –

and whether we will do so with our good fortune intact.

For various streams do at various times

with both joys and toils come to men.

And so it is that Fate, which holds the kindly inherited

destiny of these men here, alongside their god-sprung bliss

adds a touch of suffering too, to be rolled back at a later time –

from the very day when his fateful son killed Laius

in a chance encounter, and that Pythian oracle,

uttered long ago, fulfilled.

Γ΄ And when the sharp Erinys saw him,

she slew in mutual slaughter his sons from the race of Ares;

but Thersander survived the fallen Polyneices, and in youthful contests

and in the battles of war,

was honoured, saviour scion of the Adrastids' house.
Since it is from that seed that he has his roots, it is fitting
that the son of Aenesidamus
with victory-songs and lyres should meet.

For at Olympia he himself
received the prize, while at Pytho, to his brother who enjoys the same inheritance,
and at the Isthmus, their shared Graces brought garlands won
by the four-horse chariot-team
that runs twelve laps. Victory
grants the man who strives in competition relief from his anxieties.
What is more, wealth embellished with virtues
provides for various accomplishments
the opportunity, by supporting a profound, ranging ambition –

it is the star that outshines all, the truest
light for a man. And if one has it, and knows the future,
namely that, of those who have died here, the lawless spirits immediately
pay the penalty – for those sins committed in this realm of Zeus

does an entity below the earth judge, as to hateful

Necessity he declares his word;

Δ ´ but in nights

and in days that are forever equal to one another in length of sunlight,

a less toilsome

living do the good receive, not furrowing the earth with strength of hand,

nor the water of the deep,

for the sake of a meagre livelihood; instead, by the side of the honoured

gods do those who rejoiced in oath-keeping pass a tearless

lifespan, whereas the others endure sufferings that none can look upon.

But all those who have had the fortitude to endure three times

on each side, while absolutely separating from injustice

their soul, travel Zeus' road to Cronus' tower. There, around the blessed's

Isle do the ocean

breezes waft, and flowers of gold blaze,

some on dry land from gleaming trees, while the water nourishes others;

with chains made from these they entwine their arms and plait crowns

in keeping with the righteous counsels of Rhadamanthys,

whom the great father keeps close at hand by his side,

the husband of Rhea, she who holds the highest throne of all.

Peleus and Cadmus are counted among them;

and Achilles too was brought across, after she persuaded Zeus' heart

with her prayers, by his mother;

E ´ he who overthrew Hector, Troy's

invincible, unbending pillar, and handed Cycnus to Death,

and Eos' Aethiopian son. Many are the swift arrows under my arm

inside my quiver

that have a voice for those with understanding; but to be understood in full,

it is interpreters

they need. Wise is he who knows many things by nature; but learners, impetuous

in their fulsomeness like ravens, utter words that find no fulfilment

– the pair of them –

compared to the divine bird of Zeus.

Aim now your bow at the target, come, my heart. Whom shall we try to hit

as from a gentle spirit we once more fire our glorifying

arrows? It is – mark me – at

Acragas that I will bend my bow

and swear under oath a statement with truthful mind

that no city in a hundred years at least has borne

a man who to his friends is a greater

benefactor in spirit and more unbegrudging of hand

than Theron. But enough, for praise is attacked by the feeling of cloying repletion,

which does not meet with justice, but instead, arising from

men lacking self-control,

desires to mutter and to becloud good men's noble

deeds. For grains of sand escape all number,

and as for all the joys which that man has bestowed on others,

who could declare them?

METRICAL SCHEME

s1	◡ – ◡ – – ◡ – – ‖ BH	◡ e e –
s2	◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ – – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ – ‖ B	∧e e e e e
s3	– – ◡ – – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ ⏑⏑ – – ◡ – ⏑⏑ ◡ – ‖ H	– e e e – e e
s4	– ◡ – ⏑⏑ ◡ – ‖ BH	e e
s5	– – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ – ⏑⏑ ◡ – ⏑⏑ ◡ – ‖ H	– e e e e
s6	◡ – – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ – ◡ – – ◡ – – ‖ BH	∧e e e e^2 e –
s7	– – ◡ – ⏑⏑ ◡ – ◡ – ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ‖‖	– e e^2 ◡ d
e1	– – ◡ – – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ – ‖ B	– e e e
e2	– ◡ – ◡ – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ – – ◡ – – ‖ BH	e^3 e e –
e3	⏑⏑ ◡ – – ◡ – ◡ – ⏑⏑ ◡ – – ◡ – ‖ H	e e^2 e e
e4	– – ◡ – – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ ⏑⏑ – – ‖ BH	– e e e – –
e5	⏒ – ◡ ⏑⏑ – ◡ – – ◡ – – ǀ	x e e e –
e6	◡ – ◡ – ◡ – – ‖‖	◡ e^2 –

DATE

The ode celebrates Theron's 476 Olympic chariot-victory (*P.Oxy*.222.col.1.18). See ***O*.3.Date** for the relative chronology.

PERFORMANCE / REPERFORMANCE CONTEXT

***O*.2**'s lack of explicit performance-context, and its esoteric content, have been thought to bespeak a private performance for Theron's inner circle, in contrast to the public festival occasion implied by ***O*.3** [77]. However, although there are traces of the self-conscious exclusivity associated with Orphic discourse [78], the mystic elements are embedded in a traditional frame comprehensible to non-initiates. The fact that inclusivity was a priority even at the initial performance suggests a large, mixed audience was envisaged.

STRUCTURE

The ode is composed primarily of three sets of elements (praise; myth/quasi-myth; gnomes) which alternate with one another; the only element distinct from these categories is the prayer (**12-15**). This patterning creates a series of interwoven strands that both

[77] Cf. Krummen (1990) 217.
[78] See **85**.

generate sequential cohesion, and articulate non-linear connections via ring-composition, repetition, and responsion.

Direct praise of Theron bisects and rings the ode, marking its beginning (**1-7**), middle (**46-51**), and end (**89-95**; **99-100**).

In the first half, praise of Emmenid victories frames 3 mythic/quasi-mythic narratives concerning the vicissitudes of 3 sets of Theron's ancestors: (1) recent historical ancedents who established themselves in Sicily after hardship (**8-11**); (2) the mythical Cadmeids, whose suffering led to immortalization (**22-30**); (3) the mythical Labdacids, whose cycle of intergenerational killings was broken by Thersander (**38-45**). The chronological perspective reverses from Theron, to his historical ancestors, to the Cadmeids, then progresses (metapoetically observing **15-17** on Time's irreversibility) to the Labdacids, and back to Theron. The narratives are punctuated by gnomes concerning the variability of fortune (**15-22**: bad > good; **30-37** good > bad > good [79]), each of which is illustrated by its following narrative. Since Theron's genealogical connection to these antecedents is explicitly stated at the transition points between myth and praise (7; **46**), his victory and those of Xenocrates implicitly obey the same familial pattern of good fortune following bad, as illustrated in the gnome at **51-52** (the anxieties of competition are dispelled by victory).

The second half is dominated by the most extensive quasi-myth, the eschatology [80]; although unlike the preceding narratives it primarily concerns potential futures after death, the inclusion of Cadmus in the Isle's description (**78**) gives it a comparable genealogical link to Theron, as does the combination in the introductory gnome (**53-56**) of wealth and virtue, a complex attributed to Theron's Emmenid ancestors (**10-11**). The laudator's

[79] See **18-22**, **35-37**, on the gnomes' interlaced repetitions.
[80] See **56-83** on its tripartite structure.

gnomic self-praise (**83-88**) justifies his ability to make extraordinary claims, both in the preceding eschatology, and in the following superlative vaunt for Theron (**89-95**). The laudator's need to avoid engendering tedium in the audience (**95-98**), and his professed inability to praise Theron fully, serve as closural motifs. The final aporetic question both closes the ring with the opening (**98-100 ~ 1-2**), and connects Theron's innumerable benefactions to the coming post-mortem judgement of his conduct (**100 τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο ~ 59-60 τις ... φράσαις** (responsion underlined)). Other significant responsions: **3 Διός ~ 70 Διὸς**; **4 πολέμου ~ 44 πολέμου**; **7 εὐωνύμων ~ 14 εὔφρων ~ 34 εὐθυμιᾶν ~ 94 εὐεργέταν**; **16 δίκᾳ ~ 96 δίκα**, **17 θέμεν ~ 97 θέμεν**, **19 χαρμάτων ~ 99 χάρματ'**; **17 Χρόνος ὁ πάντων ~ 77 πόσις ὁ πάντων**.

INTERPRETATION

***O*.2** is the most elaborate and ambitious of the Emmenid odes, fulfilling multiple objectives for the family.

The strictly epinician aspect is treated briefly, but linked at key junctures to the ode's broader concerns. The opening embeds Theron's victory in his ethical, political, and genealogical excellence (**2-7**). The last of these motivates the victory's reprise at the midpoint (**46-51**), where it is joined by Xenocrates' lesser victories, which reflect their lustre on Theron as well as demonstrating that competitive success is a joint familial endeavour.

It is in part the supremacy of Theron's Olympic chariot-victory in the agonistic sphere that eliminates the need for it to be glorified at length or for greater victories to be

conjured via *Siegeswünsche*. Instead, the ode concentrates on two major themes: consolidation of the Emmenids' political position in Acragas as well as vis-à-vis their Sicilian rivals, and Theron's suitability for a blessed afterlife. These themes share an origin in Theron's consciousness of his own mortality, which is clearly expressed in a wish for the successful transfer of the Emmenids' patrimony to the next generation: this transfer was in real doubt due to the violent misconduct of Theron's son and heir Thrasydaeus, which led rapidly to the tyranny's end after Theron's death [81]. These political concerns are met first by stressing Theron's integral role as Acragas' bulwark (**6**) and greatest son (**89-95**). The latter passage can be construed as alluding to the role claimed for the family by pro-Emmenid traditions in Acragas' foundation a century earlier, a claim implicit in **8-11**. This strategy of augmenting the family's historical prestige is amplified by extending their genealogy into myth via the Cadmeids (**22-30**) and Labdacids (**38-45**): the Argive inheritance from the latter in particular points to an Emmenid strategy of constructing their genealogy to bind themselves to the poleis that contributed to the foundation of Acragas and its parent/grandparent cities in order to aggrandize themselves and counter Deinomenid traditions [82]. The myths' emphasis on the manifest destiny guiding the family enhances their legitimacy [83]. At this inter-polis level, Acragas and Theron are glorified at Hieron's expense [84].

The other major theme arising from Theron's consciousness of mortality is that of eschatology. Although the text contains no explicit explanation of the function of its eschatological elements, I follow the view that they form an implicit argument that Theron merits a blessed afterlife (cf. Hurst (1985) 168; Currie (2005) 3). The reasons for adopting

[81] See **12-15**.
[82] See **8-11**; **45**. Cf. Braswell 1-6 on the use of mythic genealogies and foundation-myths to enhance rulers' claims to power.
[83] See **10**; **21**; **35-37**.
[84] See **9**; **89-95**.

that view are as follows. (1) That the main mythic section of an ode should not have paradigmatic value for the laudandus is inherently improbable. (2) The inclusion of soteriological discourse is atypical of epinician, and thus probably reflects Theron's own convictions, esp. since Sicily and Magna Graecia were centres of Orphic and Pythagorean belief, as attested by both the lamellae and the doctrines developed by Empedocles in Acragas itself. Comparison with Hieron is instructive. Diodorus records that Hieron received posthumous oecist-cult, and had founded Aetna with the explicit intention of achieving it; since Theron repopulated Himera shortly thereafter, and himself received posthumous hero-cult which Diodorus describes in similar terms, it is reasonable to think Theron was emulating his rival in this respect [85]. The appearance of soteriological themes in the myths of several of Hieron's odes provides a further parallel [86]. (3) The ode is structured to support such an implicit argument. (a) Theron possesses moral goodness and justice, which satisfy the ethical criteria set out in the eschatology's mystic vision [87]. (b) He enjoys Zeus' favour as both an Olympic victor (**3**) and a champion of the virtues overseen by Zeus [88], the god who facilitates the immortalization of both Semele (**25-27**) and Achilles (**79-80**), and whose path is taken by the blessed (**70**). (c) Several of his mythical antecedents were immortalized, namely the Cadmeids (**22-30**), and Cadmus himself on the Isle (**78**), which sets a precedent for their descendant [89], who is described as the culmination of his ancestors (**7**). The coexistence of the above mystic and traditional criteria has advantages for Theron should he fear the violence of his rule has disqualified him according to the ethical criteria [90]; it also makes the ode more comprehensible for current and future audience-members who adhere to traditional afterlife beliefs. (d)

[85] *Pace* van den Groenendaal (2006) 283-85: see **9**.
[86] Cf. Currie (2005) 344-405.
[87] See **6**; **56-83**; **89-95**; **99-100**.
[88] See **12-15**.
[89] See **78-80**.
[90] See **15**.

Although the indefinite protasis introducing the eschatology has no formal apodosis, most parallels reference the victor [91]. (e) The intratext (with responsion underlined) **59-60 τις ... <u>φράσαις</u>** ~ **100 τίς ... <u>φράσαι</u>** implies that the only one capable of enumerating Theron's good deeds will be the judge he encounters after death. (f) ***O.*3** exhibits comparable themes concerning spatial/existential permeability, including apotheosis [92]. (g) ***I.*2.28-29 ἀθανάτοις ... τιμαῖς**, in reference to this victory, employs a term that can denote literal immortalization.

The above implicitness is probably necessary because a direct claim would not only violate epinician propriety, but also be presumptuous in the eyes of divinity [93]. Grethlein (2010) 31 instead sees the eschatology as 'a contrastive foil to human life as it is described in the preceding parts of the ode' which illustrates the power of Theron's victory to *temporarily* transcend mortal time. Although the sense of transcendence afforded by victory makes comparisons with eschatological bliss apt (Pl.*Phaedr*.256a.7-b.7 even reverses the comparison, likening the winning of eschatological favour to an Olympic victory), Theron's historical milieu (*v.s.*) was not reticent in aspiring to literal and permanent salvation. The argument of Salviat (2007a) 5 that Xenocrates' death motivates the eschatology is implausible: the treatment of Xenocrates at **49-51** gives no indication of his decease, is unlike any of P.'s regular references to a victor's deceased relatives, and differs entirely from how Xenocrates' death is handled at ***I.*2.35-46**.

[91] See **56 εἰ**.
[92] See ***O.*3.Interpretation**.
[93] See **56-83**.

COMMENTARY

Strophe 1

1-7 Strophe 1, comprising rhapsodic questions (**1-2**) and answers (**3-7**), establishes the data of Theron's Olympic chariot-victory and programmatically anticipates key themes. (1) The interplay of traditional/esoteric religion: (a) divinized **ὕμνοι** are novel, but adopt an epithet and function typical of the Muse (**1**); (b) the conventional hierarchy god > hero > man is undermined by (i) encoding Theron's name across it (**2**); (ii) making **ἄνδρα** the climactic question (**2 δ'**), and Theron the climactic answer (**5-7**); (iii) including Heracles, who transcended the hierarchy (**3**). (2) Theron's qualifications for a privileged afterlife: (a) altruism (**6**; cf. **90-95**; **98-100**); (b) heredity (**7**; cf. **8-11**; **22-30**; **38-47**; **49**; **78-80**). (3) Contemporary intertextuality: (a) with ***O.*3** for Theron, creating thematic interconnections (*v.i.*; **13**; **46**; **79-80**); (b) with *O.*1 and B.5 for Hieron, reflecting both the victors' agonistic and political competitiveness (see **1-3**; **5**; **9 Σικελίας**; **90-95**), and the poets' professional rivalries (see **86-88**); (c) with *O.*10, using Western Greeks' successes at Olympia to strengthen their connection to its landscape and symbolic capital (see **3-5**; **13 πόρον τ' Ἀλφεοῦ**).

ὕμνοι ... Ὀλυμπιάδα ... Θήρωνα ... τετραορίας ... νικαφόρου ... ὅπῃ δίκαιον ξένων ... Ἀκράγαντος ... ἄωτον: *O.*3.1-4 φιλοξείνοις ... Ἀκράγαντα ... Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον ... ἵππων ἄωτον.

1-2 Questions concerning the choice of theme occur in epic, invoking the Muse as fount of knowledge (*Il.*1.8; *Il.*2.484-93; Braswell on *P.*4.70-71), and in NE/IE hymns (West (1997) 563-64; (2007) 94-95, 307; add *RV.*1.76.1.1-2; 4.5.1.1; 4.25.1-3; 5.48.1.1). They often

mark inception, as here and at *I.*7.1-15, fr.29.1-7, engaging listeners by identifying composition-time with performance-time (D'Alessio (2004) 284), an 'oral subterfuge': see Carey 5; Bonifazi (2000) 69-86; *contra* Wells (2009) 30-48. Cf. **89**; *I.*5.39-42; Race (1982a) 5-8; (1990) 102-17; (1992) 13-38. See **98-100** on the closing question in ring-composition.

Other inceptive features: (1) ὕμν– (*h.Hom.*3.19; *h.Hom.*4.1; *h.Hom.*9.1; *h.Hom.*14.2; *h.Hom.*31.1; Hes.*Th.*11; Hes.*Op.*2; Alcm.fr.27.1.3; Terp.fr.3.2 Gostoli; Las.fr.1.2; *O.*1.8; ***O.*3.3**; *O.*6.6; *O.*11.4; *P.*4.3; ***P.*6.7**; *N.*1.5; *N.*4.11; *N.*9.3; ***I.*2.3**; B.3.3; B.5.10; B.9.6; B.12.1; B.16.4; B.19.8); (2) invocations: see **1**; (3) *phorminx*: ***O.*3.8**; *O.*4.2; *P.*1.1; *N.*4.5; *N.*9.8; ***I.*2.2**; B.1.1-2; (4) polysyllabic compounds: ***O.*3.1**; *O.*4.1, 2; *O.*8.1; *O.*10.1; *O.*13.1; *P.*2.1; *P.*5.1; *P.*7.1; *P.*8.1-2; *P.*9.1-2; *N.*5.1; *N.*7.1-2; *N.*10.1; ***I.*2.1**; *I.*5.1; B.1.1-2 Κλυτοφόρμιγγες; B.2.1; B.3.1; B.5.1; B.12.1-2 ὑμνοάνασ- | σ'; B.17.1.

Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι ... κελαδήσομεν: Terp.fr.4.2 Gostoli φόρμιγγι νέους κελαδήσομεν ὕμνους (innovation: heptatonic lyre); *N.*3.65-66 ὕμνος ... κελαδέων; *N.*4.16 ὕμνον κελάδησε; fr.52h.10 κελαδήσαθ' ὕμνους.

1 Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι: invocations regularly open epinicia (P.: 23/45; B.: 9/13). Unlike in epic, Muses are addressed only at *O.*10.3; *P.*4.3; *N.*3.1; *N.*9.1; B.1.1-3; B.3.3; B.12.2, with other divinities/personifications preferred for programmatic relevance (see Braswell on *P.*4.1-3). The Muse's epinician role*:* ***O.*3.4**.

Here, the invocation fuses (1) innovation; (2) tradition.

(1) **ὕμνοι** are invoked only here; **Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες** is a coinage.

(2) **ὕμνοι** are marked as divinized substitutes for the Muses by (a) rhapsodic elements: (i) questions (**2**); (ii) **3 ἤτοι ... μὲν**; (b) ancient interpretations: H.*O.*1.12.2 *Clio*; Men.Rh.*Peri.Epideict.*438.4-7; cf. Σ.*O.*2.2.3-4 (Moschopoulos); (c) the application to the

Muses of B.1.1 Κλ]υτοφόρμιγγες; B.4.7-8 ἀ[να-ξιφόρ]μιγγος; B.6.10 ἀναξιμόλπου; B.12.1-2 ὑμνοάνασ- | σ'; B.fr.65.11 ἀν]αξίχοροι, indicating their power over song, dance, and instruments: cf. Prat.fr.1.6-7 *PMG* ἀοιδὰν κατέστασε Πιε-ρὶς βασίλειαν ... αὐλός | ὕστερον χορευέτω ... ὑπηρέτας. The *phorminx*, attributed to the Muses at B.1.1 and shared with them at *P*.1.1-2, is elsewhere associated with Apollo (*Il*.1.603-4; Hes.*Scut*.203; *h.Hom*.3.514-15; Sim.fr.6.1a.5-6; E.*Ion*.164; Aristonous.*In.Vest*.7; Theocr.7.101; Ael.Arist.fr.3 Φορμίγγων ἄνακτα Παιᾶνα).

Here, the priority of the **ὕμνοι** over the lyre reflects both their status as surrogate Muses, and the contextual importance of selecting the appropriate theme. Contrast *P*.1.1-5, Ar.*Thesm*.124 κίθαρίν τε ματέρ' ὕμνων (instrumental priority over song/dance); **47 μελέων λυρᾶν τε**, ***O*.3.8 φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν**, *O*.4.2 ποικιλοφόρμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς (song and music complementary).

Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες: *v.s.* Elsewhere only B.4.7-8 ἀ[να-ξιφόρ]μιγγος (Urania). All other ἀναξι– epithets are Bacchylidean: B.6.10 ἀναξιμόλπου (Urania; cf. 11 ὕμνος); B.14B.10 ἀ]ναξίππου (Larissa); B.17.66 ἀναξιβρέντας (Zeus); B.20.8 ἀναξίαλος (Poseidon); B.fr.65.11 ἀν]αξίχοροι (12 Μοῦσαι).

Cf. *O*.4.2; B.1.1-2; A.*Supp*.697 φήμα φιλοφόρμιγξ; Opp.*Hal*.5.618 μολπῆς εὐφόρμιγγος.

Phorminx: ***O*.3.8**. *Pace* Santamaría, its occasional Orphic (*P*.4.176-77) and post-mortem (fr.129.7) associations do not significantly anticipate the eschatology.

1-3 ὕμνοι ... κελαδήσομεν ... Διός· Ὀλυμπιάδα: *O*.1.7-10 Ὀλυμπίας ... ὕμνος ... κελαδεῖν | Κρόνου παῖδ'.

1 ὕμνοι: addressed only here (but cf. *N*.5.1 ἀοιδά), ὕμνος occurs in Strophe 1 of every Emmenid ode, making ***O*.2** the latest addition to the **ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς** (***P*.6.7-8**). Hymns

are referred to self-consciously in Vedic openings (*RV*.1.2.1-2; 1.5.1.1-2; 1.36.1.1; 1.53.1.1; 1.90.1.1; 2.27.1.1; 2.43.1.1; 3.51.1.1; 5.45.1.1; 5.80.1.1; 6.5.1.1), as well as personified (*RV*.3.43.2.2; 5.44.11.1; 5.87.1.1; 6.21.1.1-2), and occasionally addressed (*Atharvaveda*.1.15.2 'increase this man, ye songs').

Eidographic implications: **2**.

2 τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα: phonetically encoding **5 Θήρωνα**: cf. Watkins (1995) 280; **83-88**.

It forms a tripartite cosmological schema (Antiph.fr.1.27.4 οὔτε θεοὺς οὔθ' ἥρωας οὔτ' ἀνθρώπους; Isoc.15.39.3 οὔτε θνητὸς οὔθ' ἡμίθεος οὔτ' ἀθάνατος; Philo.*De.Virt*.172.5 'οὔτε ἄνδρα οὔτε ἡμίθεον ἀλλ' ὅλον δαίμονα' κατὰ τὸν Πίνδαρον). The usual emphasis on humans' separation from the others (Hdt.8.109.13-14; X.*Eq*.11.8.1-2; Arist.*Pol*.1332b.17-18 ὅσον τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ ... ἥρωας ... ἀνθρώπων διαφέρειν; Antiphan.fr.206.1-4) is undercut here: **1-7**. Cf. *I*.7.1-21: rhapsodic questions (cf. **1-2**) descend from gods (including Zeus) to heroes (including Heracles) to men (including the victor); Theocr.*Id*.17.1-12: god (Zeus) to man (Ptolemy Philadelphus) to heroes, with **ὕμνοι** (cf. **1**) offered to Ptolemy as an honour fit for gods; H.*O*.1.12.1-3: man to hero to god, implying Augustus occupied the divine category.

A poem's cosmological categories can influence eidography (Lowe (2007) 167-76). Foregrounding the generic flexibility of Pindaric **ὕμνοι** in treating gods, heroes, and men highlights the laudandus' cosmological flexibility: cf. E.*HF*.687-700 (paean addressed to an as-yet-unimmortalized Heracles). Contrast Pl.*Leg*.802a (hymning living men risks aggrandizing them beyond their level); Pl.*Resp*.607a.4; Pl.*Leg*.700a.9-b.1.

τίνα ... τίν' ... τίνα: anaphoric questions: *Il*.5.703 = 11.299 = 16.692; *P*.7.5/6; *P*.8.95; *I*.5.39; fr.70dc.6; Sim.*Epig*.16.23.1-2; E.*Hipp*.572; E.*Hec*.695-6; E.*El*.130, 907-8

τίν' ἀρχὴν πρῶτά σ' ἐξείπω ... ποίας τελευτάς; τίνα μέσον τάξω λόγον, 1198-99; E.*HF*.485-86, 1025-27; E.*Tro*.244-45.

ἥρωα: the answer 'Heracles' (**3**) implies **ἥρωα** includes epic and cultic senses here. The lamellae apply it to those passing the afterlife's trials: *OF*.475.2; *OF*.476.11 ἄλλοισιν μεθ' ἡρώεσσιν ἀνάξει[ς]; *OF*.492.9; cf. fr.133.5 ἥροες ἀ-γνοὶ with Cannatà Fera. On the concept 'hero', see Nagy (2013).

δ': misplaced in the variants τίνα δ' ἥρωα (AN^{ac}E); τίν' ἄνδρα (CN^{pc}γ). Conclusive (Hummel 382), not connective (*pace* Van Leeuwen) force marks the climactic question. Tricolonic: *Od*.8.322-23 ἦλθε ... ἦλθ' ... ἦλθεν δὲ; S.*OT*.1304-5 πόλλ' ... πολλὰ ... πολλὰ δ'.

κελαδήσομεν: aorist short-vowel subjunctive rather than future indicative (*pace* Santamaría): in addition to Gerber (1987) 87-88, note the responses require a question 'whom *should*?' (see **3-7**).

Deliberative interrogatives concerning beginnings: *Od*.9.14; Hes.*Th*.1 (with West); A.*Ch*.855 τί λέγω; πόθεν ἄρξωμαι; E.*El*.907 τίν' ἀρχὴν ... ἐξείπω; cf. **89 τίνα βάλλομεν**. Ambiguity between future indicative and aorist subjunctive in rhapsodic questions: *h.Hom*.3.19, 207 Πῶς ... ὑμνήσω; fr.29.7 ὑμνήσομεν.

The plural adopts the **ὕμνοι** as collaborators, a function fulfilled elsewhere by the Muse (*Epigoni*.fr.1.1 ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσαι; Davies & Finglass on Stes.fr.172.1-3): cf. **89 θυμέ· τίνα βάλλομεν**; *O*.1.4-7 ἦτορ ... αὐδάσομεν; Cat.42.1-5 *adeste, hendecasyllabi* ... *persequamur* ... *reflagitemus*). Differently: *pluralis maiestatis* (Hes.*Th*.1 ἀρχώμεθ' ἀείδειν), or including the performers (see ***P*.6.3**).

3-7 Whereas the questions (**1-2**) each comprise 4 syllables, the responses are of increasing length (syllables: 7; 19; 48), highlighting the paradoxical significance of the hierarchy's

lowest category. *Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder* ('Behaghel's Law'): Behaghel (1909) 110-42; Gerber on *O.*1.4; West (2007) 117-18, 328.

The 'answers' make sense only as responses to 'whom *should*?', not 'whom shall?', because they are not direct answers (e.g. 'Δία') but elliptical *explanations* for the answers on the basis of their connection to the Olympics ('[we should celebrate Zeus *because*] Pisa belongs to Zeus [and Theron won at Pisa]'). Explanation (**5 ἕνεκα**) and obligation (**6 γεγωνητέον**) become explicit in answer 3. *O.*1.3-7 on Olympia's supremacy are presupposed.

The sequence Zeus > Heracles > Theron implies (1) that Theron is the supreme man, since Zeus and Heracles are the supreme god and hero; (2) a genealogical connection, since Zeus and Heracles are father and son; Theron cannot claim descent from Heracles (although both have Theban links), but can from Zeus via Thersander (see **46**): Thersander < Polyneices < Oedipus < Laius < Labdacus < Polydorus < Harmonia (Cadmus' wife) < Ares < Zeus.

The answers generate unusually-detailed victory-data (see ***P.*6.5-6**): victory-site (**3 Πίσα**); Games (**3 Ὀλυμπιάδα**); victor (**4 Θήρωνα**); event (**5 τετραορίας**); polis (**6 Ἀκράγαντος**); family (**7 πατέρων**). Only the father's name is postponed until **46 Αἰνησιδάμου**, to underscore Theron's genetic connection to Thersander.

3 ἤτοι ... μὲν: here, the combination replicates the epic function of opening a narrative after a rhapsodic invocation (Hes.*Th.*116 ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ'; A.R.4.6 Ἤτοι ὁ μὲν; Hardie (2003) 382-83), which Denniston 554 restricts to epic: **3-11** has Muse-like authority.

ἤτοι: Denniston 553: 'τοι serves to bring home a truth of which the certainty is expressed by ἦ'; Hummel 408: 'valeur affirmative'.

Πίσα μὲν Διός: *O.*6.5 Διὸς ἐν Πίσᾳ; Xenophan.fr.2.2-3 Διὸς τέμενος | πὰρ Πίσαο ῥοῇις ἐν Ὀλυμπίηι; Call.*Aet.*fr.76.2 Πισαίου Ζηνὸς; Call.*Aet.*fr.98 Διὶ Πῖσαν ἔχοντι; Posidipp.*Epig.*85.3 Ζε]ῦ Πισᾶτα.

Πίσα: in epinician, a metonymy for the Olympic precinct (*O.*1.18; ***O.*3.9**; *O.*6.5; *O.*8.9; *O.*10.43; *O.*13.29; *O.*14.23; *N.*10.32; fr.94b.49; B.5.182; cf. Hdt.2.7.1-2). Evocation of the Olympic landscape: **12**; **13**.

Reference to Pisa in relation to Zeus, and to Heracles' foundation of the Games from war-booty, may reflect epichoric myth/history. Analysis is complicated by the uncertainty of historical reconstructions, and epinician's varied attitudes towards Elean claims.

Some consider the evidence for an archaic Pisatan polis and its conflict with Elis over Olympia to be an invention of the 4th century, when Pisa briefly took control in 364 (Niese (1910) 26-47; Nafissi (2003) 23-55; Luraghi (2008) 79); however, Kõiv (2013) 315-68 argues for the historicity of a similar struggle in the 6th century.

It is striking that the earliest explicit references to Pisa as a place occur in 476 (*h.l.*; ***O.*3.9**; B.5.182; cf. *IED.*12 c.500-475). Although P.'s references to the Pisatans (*O.*1.70; *O.*9.68) fall in the mythic past, political change was occurring locally in the 470s, culminating in Elis' 471 synoecism (D.S.11.54.1). Paus.5.10.2 states the Eleans conquered Pisa before the construction of Zeus' temple (c.472-458), which was funded by its spoils. Bourke (2011) 11 posits a civil conflict (with 'Pisa' = Elean communities in the Alpheus valley) resolved before the synoecism. It seems there is no reason the conflict could not have ended by 476, thereby partially motivating the Olympic foundation-myths of several 476 odes (see ***O.*3.Interpretation**). *O.*1, an aetiological rather than a foundation myth, makes Pelops' overthrow of Oenomaus symbolize Elis' overthrow of Pisa: their contest's depiction on the East Pediment of Zeus' temple had similar significance. It may be objected that the conflict is conventionally dated post-476, and the 476 odes reflect – if

anything – a 6th-century defeat of Pisa, but some interaction with contemporary politics seems likely.

P.'s versions are not, however, straightforwardly pro-Elean: in *O.*10, Heracles defeats Elis' king, an ode alluded to by **3-5**; at ***O.*3.12**, the Elean Hellanodicas' local legitimacy is confirmed, but the Olympic foundation is Heracles'.

Here, **Πίσα μὲν Διός** *need* mean no more than 'Zeus is the god of Olympia' (where his worship is attested from the 10th century: ***O.*3.19**). But contemporary Elean/Pisatan competition over Zeus' favour is also recorded by Himer.*Decl.*39.1-3 Ἠλεῖοί ποτε τῆς Σιμωνίδου λύρας λαβόμενοι, ὅτε ἐπὶ | τὴν Πίσαν ἔσπευδεν ὕμνῳ κοσμῆσαι τὸν Δία, δημοσίᾳ φω- | νῇ τὴν Διὸς πόλιν πρὸ Διὸς ᾄδειν ἐκέλευον, dated by Bourke (2011) 14-15 to 468, the first Olympiad after the Elean synoecism, when Simonides might have been commissioned to celebrate the new polis.

It is therefore remarkable that P.'s only named references to contemporary Elis occur at *O.*9.7 (468); ***I.*2.24** (c.470), around this period of political revolution, esp. as the latter stresses its connection to Zeus: ***I.*2.24 Ζηνὸς Ἀλεῖοι**, **27-28 γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν τὰν δὴ καλέοισιν Ὀλυμπίου Διός | ἄλσος**. Cf. *N.*7.105 Διὸς Κόρινθος, with Σ.*N.*7.155a.

Διός: heading the answers as (1) Olympic god; (2) traditional rhapsodic opening (Hes.*Op.*1-10; *h.Hom.*23; Terp.fr.3.1-2 Gostoli; Alcm.fr.29.1-2; *N.*5.25; Arat.1.1-18; Hunter on Theocr.*Id.*17.1; cf. P.Derv.12-14); (3) supreme god.

Zeus' dominant presence in ***O.*2** is foregrounded programmatically. The laudator aligns himself with him (**88**), and prays that he preserve the Emmenids' inheritance (**12-15**): since the latter entails Theron's death, and addresses Zeus with reference to Cronus and Rhea (**12**), who reappear in the eschatology as the Isle's guardians (**76-77**), to which Zeus controls access (**70** (responsion); **79**; cf. **27**), it is implied that Zeus may grant Theron a blessed afterlife.

3-5 Ὀλυμπιάδα δ' ἔστασεν Ἡρακλέης | ἀκρόθινα πολέμου ... νικαφόρου: the striking intertext with Heracles' Olympic foundation from Elean booty at *O.*10.56-59 πολέμοιο δόσιν | ἀκρόθινα διελὼν ... ἔστασεν ἑορτὰν σὺν Ὀλυμπιάδι πρώτᾳ | νικαφορίαισί τε implies overlapping audiences. The ***O.*3** version (***O.*3.19-22**) contrasts *h.l.* (eschewing violence: ***O.*3.16**, **27**), but also complements it (Theron like Heracles: ***O.*3.9-38**; *v.i.*).

Ἡρακλέης ... Θήρωνα: *O.*3.43-44 Θήρων ... ἅπτεται ... Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν.

3 Ὀλυμπιάδα: named after Zeus Olympios ('of Olympus': Bourke (2011) 12.n.17), not vice-versa (*pace* Burkert (1985) 184); ***I.*2.27** plays on the ambiguity. Juxtaposition with **Διός** implies Heracles honours his father by naming the new festival after his existing title: cf. ***O.*3.19** on the foundation as an act of filial piety.

Ἡρακλέης: named as (1) quintessential hero; (2) Olympic founder; (3) divinized hero.

(1) Heracles is the most Panhellenic hero, and the most frequently-mentioned in P. (32x). Possible etymology < ἥρως: West (1997) 471.

(2) See ***O.*3.19-22**.

(3) Heracles' transcendence of mortality via apotheosis (see ***O.*3.36**) after vicissitudes prefigures that theme here (see **7**), implying the permeability of cosmological categories (see **2**): he is a 'hero' in both epic and cultic senses. Nonetheless, Heracles' own cult never acquired mystic characteristics, which attached to Heracles only in relation to his Eleusinian initiation (Burkert (1987) 76). Later sources record Orphic associations: the theogony of Hieronymus and Hellanicus *ap.*Damascius.*Princ.*123 equates Heracles with Chronos (DK.1B.12 ὠνομάσθαι δὲ Χρόνον ἀγήραον καὶ Ἡρακλῆα τὸν αὐτόν); cf. **17**. For the late 6th-century Acragantine temple attributed to his worship, see Urquhart (2010) 239.

4 ἀκρόθινα πολέμου: the booty taken from Augeas. The genitive is probably (1) causal ('as a thank-offering for victory in war': Mastronarde on E.*Ph*.281-82 δορὸς ... ἀκροθίνιον), rather than (2) neutrally of origin ('as the spoils of war': E.*IT*.75 ἀκροθίνια ξένων), to emphasize Heracles' piety towards Zeus. Cf. Th.1.132.2.5-6 ὃν ἀνέθεσαν ... ἀπὸ τῶν Μήδων ἀκροθίνιον; Jacquemin (1999) 141-57. Repetition of **πολέμου** in responsion at **44** links Heracles and Thersander, both athletic/military models for Theron.

Potential historical references: (1) Olympia's status as a military thank-offering matches its receipt of military dedications from c.700 (Sinn (2014) 130-34); Paus.5.25.5 may record Acragantine dedications of spoils from Motya at Olympia in Theron's time; (2) Acragantine public works, including the Temple of Olympian Zeus, were built by slaves captured after Himera in 480 (D.S.11.25): an allusion would fit the military and architectural connotations of **5-6 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος ... ὀρθόπολιν**; (3) Elean-Pisatan conflict: see **3**.

ἀκρόθινα: the majority MSS reading, to be preferred to ἀκροθίνια. Intertextuality with P.'s only other use of the form (*O*.10.57): see **3-5**. The form may be accusative singular given *CID*.1:9.D.47 τὰν ἀκρόθινα (4th-century BC; inaccurately cited by Santamaría as τὰ ἀκρόθινα); otherwise, a variant neuter plural of the common ἀκροθίνια (*N*.7.41; fr.357).

5-7 Theron's entitlement to praise for his chariot-victory is specified (**5 ἕνεκα**; **6 γεγωνητέον**). 3 subsidiary reasons (justice towards guests; protection of Acragas; noble descent) address his moral, political, and inherited qualities.

5-6 Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἕνεκα νικαφόρου | γεγωνητέον: *N*.1.7 ἅρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου ... ἔργμασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος.

That victory merits song underpins epinician: ***O*.3.3-4**, **4-9**; ***P*.6.5-9**.

5 Θήρωνα: Theron's name is always verse-initial in the Emmenid odes (except ***O*.3.43**): cf. ***O*.3.9**; ***P*.6.46**; ***I*.2.28-29**. As in ***O*.3**, its recurrence (at **95**) frames the ode. See **2** on its encoding.

τετραορίας ἕνεκα νικαφόρου: contrast *O*.1.110-15b σὺν ἅρματι θοῷ ... νικαφόροις (*Siegeswunsch* for Hieron).

τετραορίας: exclusively Pindaric (*P*.2.4; *N*.4.28; *I*.3.17b).

The charioteer is excluded: ***P*.6.17**; ***O*.3.4**; contrast ***I*.2.22**.

ἕνεκα: in epinician, specifying the agonistic success producing the victor's reward: *O*.1.99; *O*.11.12; *N*.3.83; *N*.6.34; *N*.10.3.

νικαφόρου: a favourite Pindarism; νικηφορία is now attested in a Simonidean epinician (S339(a)+340.6).

As here, indicating entitlement to song at *P*.1.59-60; *P*.8.25-26; *N*.1.7; *N*.3.67; *N*.9.49.

6 γεγωνητέον: the deontic verbal adjective's second attestation after Thgn.1.689: see Tronci (2014) 471-77; *pace* Santamaría, *P*.9.107 is not a parallel. The rare form universalizes the obligation to praise Theron.

All other Pindaric instances of the verb likewise occur in proems, with the victor's name (***O*.3.9**; *P*.9.3); together with the loudness it connotes (*Il*.12.337), this evokes the ἀγγελία (***P*.6.5-6**).

ὅπῑ δίκαιον ξένων: most MSS, and Π^1, transmit ὀπί δίκαιον ξένον.

Following Hermann *ap*.Heyne, GH **ὅπῑ** (< ὄπις 'regard') is preferable (1) metrically: ⏑ – instead of ⏑ ⏑ (cf. μήτῑ: *Il*.23.315, 316, 318, *Od*.13.299); (2) stylistically: (a) although P. employs ὀπί (< *ὄψ 'voice') of victory-song (*P*.10.6, 56; *N*.3.5, 66; *N*.7.84), all Pindaric cases and all dative singulars from Homer until Philodam.*Pae.in.Dion*.61 are modified by

an adjective or genitive (so probably B.1.77); (b) the absolute usage ('vocally') after **γεγωνητέον** would be redundant. ὀπί is *lectio facilior*, aided by homonymy and semantic ambivalence.

δίκαιον ξένον could be defended (Van Leeuwen) on the basis of (1) MSS unanimity; (2) lack of scholia support for **ξένων**.

But (1) the change to **–ων** is easy: P. did not differentiate between o and ω (Braswell on *P*.4.14d), and original **–ων** could have been reinterpreted as –ον to match **δίκαιον**, esp. after **ὅπῑ** was misinterpreted as ὀπί and the genitive left hanging; (2) although Σ.*O*.2.11a, 11b do not contain *genitive* plurals, they explicitly reference Theron's just treatment of plural ξένοι.

Parallels where the object of reverence is a god (Hdt.9.76.14; cf. Thgn.1.734) imply that here Theron reveres guests as if they were gods: cf. Polish 'Gość w dom, Bóg w dom' = 'guest in the house, God in the house'; Sanskrit *atithidevo bhava* = 'treat a guest as a god'. *Xenia* is a key Emmenid virtue, and their practice of theoxeny its ultimate manifestation: see ***O*.3.1-4**, **38-41**; ***I*.2.39-40**.

Theron's characterization as just towards guests is contextually and programmatically crucial. Since observing ξένια is a key manifestation of δική, the two are mutually-reinforcing: *Od*.6.120-21; *Od*.21.312-13; Hes.*Op*.225-26; Thgn.1.793-94; *N*.4.12 δίκᾳ ξεναρκέϊ; *I*.9.5-6 οὐδὲ δίκαν | ξείνων ὑπερβαίνοντες; B.14.23 φιλοξείνου ... ὀρθοδίκου; A.fr.196.1-2 ἐνδικώτατον ... φιλοξενώτατον; E.*Alc*.1147-48 δίκαιος ... εὐσέβει περὶ ξένους; E.*Cyc*.272; E.*Hec*.715 δίκᾳ ξένων, 801-5; E.fr.papyr.66.13. In context, that a ruler's virtue can determine his land's prosperity (*Od*.19.109-14; West on Hes.*Op*.225-47; West (1997) 136-37, 321-22) gives **6-7 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος ... ὀρθόπολιν** a basis in Theron's character. Contrast *O*.10.34 ξεναπάτας of Augeas: Heracles destroyed him for his deceit, then founded the Olympics (**3-4**). Zeus'

concern for justice (Hes.*Op*.8-10, 202-85) and ξένια (Zeus Xenios: *Od*.9.270-71; *Od*.13.624-25; *Od*.14.283-84, 389; *O*.8.21; *N*.5.33; *N*.11.8; A.*Supp*.627, 671-73; A.*Ag*.61-62, 362, 748) makes *h.l.* a *captatio benevolentiae* for Zeus' favour (**12-15**). Within the ode as a whole, justice forms a qualification for the Isle (**69-70**), access to which Zeus also oversees (see **3**), and underpins Theron's desert of praise (**96**). Cf. Theron's generosity: **90-95**; **98-100**; contrast **16** for a discordant note.

6-10 ὅπῃ δίκαιον ξένων, ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος ... ὀφθαλμός, αἰὼν δ' ἔφεπε μόρσιμος, πλοῦτόν ... ἄγων: *P*.5.55-57 on the royal Battiads' wealth displays multiple correspondences: ἔπεται παλαι-ὸς ὄλβος ... πύργος ἄστεος ὄμμα τε ... ξένοισι.

6 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος: representing Theron as the city's mainstay develops the Homeric ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν (*Il*.3.229; fr.52f.85) and ἕρμα πόληος (*Il*.16.549; *Od*.23.121), perhaps derived from the development of Geometric Ionian fortifications (Scully (1990) 81-99); cf. Thgn.1.233-34; Alc.fr.112.10; *P*.5.56; Brock (2013) 85, 89. The closest parallel is fr.76.2 Ἑλλάδος ἔρει-σμα: applying a phrase celebrating Athens' Persian War feats to Theron evokes his Himera victory over the Carthaginians. Since Acragantine public works were funded from Himera's spoils (see **4**), the metaphor unites Theron's political and military indispensability with its physical manifestations (Theron's building-programme: ***P*.6.8**). The imagery coheres with the Emmenid claim to involvement in the founding of Acragas: cf. **9**.

Cf. **81-82 Τροίας ... κίονα**.

Ἀκράγαντος: see ***P*.6.6**.

7 εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν: *N*.7.85 πολίαρχον εὐωνύμῳ πάτρᾳ; *N*.11.20 πάτραν τ' εὐώνυμον.

εὐωνύμων: before P., only Hes.*Th*.409; Sim.fr.14.79.10; also Ebert no.13.2. Euphemistic, given Theron's Labdacid descent (**38-47**).

The **εὐ–** element responds at **14 εὔφρων**, **34 εὐθυμιᾶν** (both concerning the family's destiny), and **94 εὐεργέταν** (Theron's praiseworthy beneficence).

πατέρων: Emmenids: cf. *O*.7.91 (Fratidae); *P*.5.76 (Aegeidae).

Theron's heredity is a key theme: both his recent (**7-11**) and mythological (**22-30**; **38-47**; **78**) ancestors illustrate a cycle of vicissitude governed by fate (**10**; **21-22**; **35-37**), with positive implications for his afterlife: (1) as the pinnacle (**ἄωτον**) of his line, Theron is implicitly the product of the cycle of virtuous reincarnations (**68-70**), and thus qualified for the Isle; (2) since 3 of his ancestors, Semele, Ino, and Cadmus, received exceptional immortality, and his ultimate ancestor Zeus (see **3-7**) (a) translates Semele (**25-27**); (b) grants the blessed access to the Isle (**70**); (c) is open to special pleading even for Achilles, a famous killer (**78-83**), Theron may receive special dispensation too. See **12-15** for his patrimony's onward transmission.

Verbal echoes in the corresponding verses of Antistrophe 1 (**14 πατρίαν**); Strophe 2 (**27 πατήρ**).

ἄωτον: originally of wool or linen in Homer, then via 'the "nap" that lies on the surface of cloth' (Raman (1975) 198) to the metaphorical sense of 'the finest' (cf. **4 ἀκρόθινα**). Cf. ***O*.3.4**.

ὀρθόπολιν: *hapax*: distilling **6 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος**. Keeping cities upright: *N*.11.5 ὀρθὰν φυλάσσοισιν Τένεδον; *I*.5.48 πόλις Αἴαντος ὀρθωθεῖσα; S.*OT*.46; E.fr.239.2; Th.2.60.2.2; Th.8.64.4.5; *Carm.Pop*.884.2; contrast Sol.fr.4a.3 κλινομένην.

Antistrophe 1

8-11 Allusion to the *Odyssey* proem (cf. the rhapsodic elements of **1-3**) grants Emmenid immigration to Sicily a heroic pedigree: (1) **καμόντες** ~ 4 πάθεν ἄλγεα; (2) **οἳ πολλὰ** ~ 1 ὃς μάλα πολλὰ; (3) **θυμῷ** ~ 4 ὃν κατὰ θυμόν; (4) **ἱερὸν ... οἴκημα ποταμοῦ** ~ 2 Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον; cf. **14 ἄρουραν ... πατρίαν**. Most *Odyssey* parallels for **8 καμόντες ... πολλὰ θυμῷ** involve suffering in war and at sea, both (Σ.*O*.2.15b; fr.119.1-2) part of Emmenid experience. See **7** on familial vicissitude.

43-47 asserts the Emmenids' Theban origins. Although their journey to Acragas is not described here, fr.119.1-2 supplies an intermediate residence in Rhodes. The scholia disagree whether they (1) were Rhodians (Σ.*O*.2.15b); (2) migrated from Rhodes to Acragas (a) directly (Σ.*O*.2.15d) or (b) via Gela (Σ.*O*.2.15c); (3) founded Acragas (Σ.*O*.2.15b); cf. Miller (1970) 56. Adornato (2011) 11-29 argues they migrated directly from Rhodes, and that the versions making them Rhodians, settlers in Gela, and/or founders of Acragas, were 5th-century Emmenid attempts to glorify themselves and counter the Deinomenid tradition that Gelon's ancestor co-founded Gela with the Rhodians (Hdt.7.153; *FGH*.532.F.28): see **9 οἴκημα**; **45**; **Introduction (1)**.

8 καμόντες ... πολλὰ θυμῷ: *Il*.7.152; *Il*.24.518; *Od*.1.4 πολλὰ ... ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν; *Od*.5.222-24; *Od*.13.90-91; *Od*.17.284-85; *Od*.23.15. See **8-11**.

καμόντες: as here, Pindaric cognates often explicitly indicate toils for which relief/reward comes: *P*.1.46; *P*.2.19; *P*.3.96; *P*.5.47; *P*.8.48; *P*.12.28; *N*.1.70; *N*.3.17; *N*.8.50; *I*.8.1; fr.124ab.5.

All 4 Homeric instances of the plural aorist participle denote the dead in eschatological contexts: *Il*.3.278 (the only Iliadic passage envisaging postmortem punishment); *Il*.23.72;

Od.11.476; *Od*.24.14. The studied vagueness of **9-10** implies the Emmenids' winning of an otherworldly, as well as an earthly, dwelling: *Il*.23.72-73 εἴργουσι ψυχαὶ εἴδωλα καμόντων, | οὐδέ ... μίσγεσθαι ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ἐῶσιν (Patroclus' ghost).

οἳ: the myth-introducing relative gains formality by opening a stanza: see **81**. Anastrophe stresses the preceding word: **23 ἔπαθον αἳ** echoes word-order, sense, and genealogical reference.

θυμῷ: see **89**.

Likewise verse-final 93/117x *Il*.; 105/114x *Od*.

Cf. **34 εὐθυμιᾶν** introducing familial vicissitudes.

9 ἱερὸν ... οἴκημα ποταμοῦ: Acragas: ***P*.6.6 ποταμία τ' Ἀκράγαντι**.

ἱερὸν: 'that which is of gods' (Clarke (1995) 300). Often of cities (*Il*.1.366; *Il*.7.20; *Od*.1.2; *Od*.9.165; *N*.9.53; fr.75.4) and rivers (*Il*.11.726; *Od*.10.351; Hes.*Th*.788; E.*Med*.410, 846; Plat.*Leg*.824a.17; A.R.2.515; A.R.3.165): thus doubly-relevant to cities named after river-gods, like Acragas.

Also a *captatio benevolentiae* for **12-15** (esp. given the construction of Zeus' Olympieum at Acragas: see ***O*.3.44**) and the eschatology (cf. Persephone's Acragantine cult: Σ.*O*.2.15d.1-4; *P*.12.2-3; Zuntz (1971) 71).

ἔσχον: not only the momentary sense typical of athletic victory ('won': *O*.1.71; *P*.11.48; *N*.10.24), but ingressive ('took possession of': *P*.1.65 ἔσχον δ' Ἀμύκλας (Dorian conquest)): Emmenid rule is retrojected into Acragas' past.

οἴκημα: in poetry only A.*Ag*.334; Eup.fr.42.2; Men.*Sam*.234.

Here, it reflects upon the Emmenids an oecist's glamour (X.*A*.5.6.17.2-4): fr.119.1 ἂν δὲ Ῥόδον κατῴκισθεν echoes this strategy (see **8-11**), polysemous between 'settling' and 'founding' (Casevitz (1985) 114-35, 165-73).

It may also reflect Theron's ambitions concerning oecist cult. D.S.11.53.2.1-4 records Theron received post-mortem heroic honours, but gives no reasons beyond capable rule (D.S.11.53.2.2 ἀρχὴν ἐπιεικῶς διῳκηκώς); from **56-83**, these might be assumed to relate solely to his mystic interests. However, this reference to Theron's heroic honours is preceded by an almost identical reference to Hieron's, except that Hieron is explicitly stated to have founded Aetna in order to receive them (cf. Σ.*N*.1.*Inscr*.a.2-3): D.S.11.49.2.4 τιμὰς ἔχειν ἡρωικάς ~ D.S.11.53.2.4 ἡρωικῶν ἔτυχε τιμῶν. This is consistent with the possibility that Theron obtained cult by establishing himself as 'second founder' of (1) Acragas (building-programme: see **6**); (2) Himera (D.S.11.49.3-4.1, recorded immediately after Hieron's foundation of Aetna). Both Aetna and Himera were refounded in 476: Asheri (1992) 151 suggests Theron emulated Hieron. 5th-century figures casting themselves as oecists: Th.6.5.3 (Hippocrates of Gela: Camarina); Th.5.11.1 (Brasidas usurping Hagnon's oecist-cult: Amphipolis); see Malkin (1987) 189-240.

Σικελίας: elsewhere in P. only in poems for Hieron (*O*.1.13; *P*.1.19; so probably fr.106.7) or his associates (*N*.1.15; 17 references Olympic victories Chromios did not possess). Claiming Sicilian pre-eminence is thus a competitive 'vaunt' (**90-95**; cf. Morrison (2012) 117-20) directed at Hieron, esp. his claim to Sicily in the 2nd line of Antistrophe 1 of *O*.1, as here. B.3.1 Σικελίας κρέουσαν is a counterblast, given Hieron's political and agonistic pre-eminence in 468 (see **86-88**).

10 ὀφθαλμός: valorizing metaphor (cf. **4 ἀκρόθινα**; **7 ἄωτον**). Most accompanying genitives appear partitive, suggesting a naturalistic origin of the eye as the most valued body-part; alternatively, the object most valued by the eye (E.*Ph*.802). Cf. (with exx.

concerning territories quoted) *O*.6.16; *P*.5.18, 56; A.*Ch*.934; A.*Eum*.1025 ὄμμα ... πάσης χθονὸς; A.*Pers*.168-69; E.*And*.406; E.*Ph*.802; Leptines *ap*.Arist.*Rhet*.1411a.5-6 Ἑλ- | λάδα ἑτερόφθαλμον; Cic.*Att*.16.6.2 *ocellos Italiae*; Cic.*ND*.3.91 *oculos orae maritimae effoderunt*; Cat.3.5; Cat.14.1; Cat.31.1-2 *Paene insularum, Sirmio, insularumque* | *ocelle*; Cat.50.19; Cat.82.2; Cat.104.2; H.*Sat*.2.5.35; *Proverbs*.7:2; Luke.11:34; Milton.*PR*.4.240; also ***I*.2.17 Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος** (Xenocrates). **7 εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον** is deepened: Theron is the culmination of his ancestors, themselves Sicily's most precious part.

αἰὼν ... πλοῦτόν: E.*HF*.671-72 αἰ- | ὼν πλοῦτον ... αὔξει.

αἰὼν: 'force and/or duration of life' (< IE **aiw–*; Chantraine s.v.). In P., often connoting a power influencing human life: *O*.9.60; *N*.2.8; *N*.3.75; *I*.3.18; *I*.8.14; Degani (1961) 45-51; Pfeijffer 646-47; Keizer (1999) 24-26. Cf. **67**.

It works alongside fate or as its intermediary, but is not identical to it (Šćepanović (2013) 7-28; *pace* Degani (1961) 49-51), as **μόρσιμος** makes explicit: *I*.7.41-42 μόρσιμον | αἰῶνα (death); A.*Supp*.45 μόρσιμος αἰὼν (birth); E.*Heraclid*.899-900 Μοῖρα ... Αἰών τε Χρόνου παῖς (cf. **17**); E.*IA*.1508-9 αἰ- | ῶνα καὶ μοῖραν; Keizer (1999) 32-35. P. links it particularly with πότμος: *O*.9.60; *P*.3.86; *P*.5.3-7; *N*.10.57-59.

In Orphism: West (1983) 219-20, 230-31; Most (2011) 105-9.

ἔφεπε: although ἕπω is cognate with Vedic *sápati* 'cherish', ἕπομαι with *sácate* 'follow', P. like Homer employs active compounds with middle force (Braswell on *P*.4.133(d)): cf. fr.119.4 ἕσπετο δ' αἰενάου πλούτου νέφος (wealth following Emmenids); *P*.10.17-18 ἕποιτο μοῖρα ... πλοῦτον ἀνθεῖν; Forssman (2006) 111-17.

μόρσιμος: 38 μόριμος links the historical Emmenids to their mythic ancestor.

10-11 πλοῦτόν ... ἀρεταῖς: P. often praises wealth as a tangible, external good, whose value is contingent upon intangible, innate goods in its possessor: Thgn.1.144-47; Sapph.fr.148.1-2 πλοῦτος ἄνευ † ἀρέτας οὐκ ἀσίνης ... ἀμφοτέρων κρᾶσις †εὐδαιμονίας ἔχει τὸ ἄκρον†; Sol.fr.15.1-4; **53 πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος** (virtues); ***O*.3.42-43 χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος ... Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν** (virtues); *P*.2.56 τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχᾳ | πότμου (destined fortune); *P*.5.1-3 πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής, | ὅταν τις ἀρετᾷ κεκραμένον καθαρᾷ ... πότμου παραδόντος αὐτὸν ἀνάγῃ (destined virtue); ***P*.6.47 νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει** (intelligence); *P*.8.92 ἀνορέαις, ἔχων κρέσσονα πλούτου μέριμναν (deeds); *N*.9.46-47 ἅμα κτεάνοις πολλοῖς ... κῦδος (glory); *I*.3.1-2 σθένει πλούτου κατέχει φρασὶν αἰανῆ κόρον (suppressed insolence); Call.*Hymn*.1.95 οὔτ' ἀρετῆς ἄτερ ὄλβος ἐπίσταται ἄνδρας ἀέξειν (virtue); Hubbard (1985) 124-25, 158-60.

This strategy neutralizes the criticism that wealth lacks virtue: Thgn.1.314-16 Πολλοί τοι πλουτοῦσι κακοί, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ πένονται ... οὐ διαμειψόμεθα | τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸν πλοῦτον; Thgn.1.699-700, 1061-62; B.1.160-62. All Emmenid odes employ it (cf. **93-95**; ***O*.3.39-40**; ***I*.2.35-42**); contrast the more elitist attitude of private encomia: fr.119.4; fr.124ab.6, 8.

10 χάριν: see ***P*.6.2**.

11 γνησίαις: 'innate', contrasting external wealth and grace (**10**), but connoting 'genuine, legitimate' (esp. of birth). P.'s view of heredity varies with the victor's circumstances (Boeke (2007) 192-93); its importance here reflects the ode's representation of the Emmenids as an ancient dynasty.

γνησίαις ... ἀρεταῖς: [Lys].*Epit*.43.4-5 γνησίαν ... ἀρετὴν ; Chrys.Phil.fr.522.2; Eus.*Vit.Const*.2.59.1.3; Didym.Caec.fr.*In Psalm*.27.2.

12-15 Transitioning from the Emmenids' past to their future, a cultic prayer asks Zeus to transfer Acragas to their posterity. The unreliability of Theron's heir (see **15**) made this a genuine concern (cf. Baxter (2012) 1-49 on epinician prayers performing a religious as

well as a rhetorical function; 212-15 tabulates all Pindaric prayers), whereas Theron's success in agonism (contrast the *O.*1.106-111 *Siegeswunsch*) and politics was absolute. Since the handover of Acragas implies Theron's death, eschatological connotations are activated (see **12 Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας**; **ἕδος Ὀλύμπου**). Importance of keeping wealth within the family: *O.*10.88-90. Prayers to Zeus are P.'s most frequent type (15x). Prayer in P.: Bundy 76-83; Greengard (1980) 54-62; Mackie (2003) 77-106; Wells (2009) 89-128; Baxter (2012).

Analysis according to the typology of cultic requests (Ausfeld (1903); Norden (1913) 143-77; Bremer (1981) 193-215; Race (1982a) 5-14; Furley & Bremer (2001) 1.50-64) produces *invocatio* (**ὦ ... Ἀλφεοῦ**), *argumentum* (**ἰανθεὶς ἀοιδαῖς**), and *precatio* (**εὔφρων ... γένει**). However, several elements of **1-11** (cf. **12 ἀλλ'**) serve as implicit *argumentum*: **3 Πίσα μὲν Διός· Ὀλυμπιάδα ~ 12-13 Κρόνιε παῖ ... ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν** (Zeus rules the site of Theron's victory); **6 ὅπῃ δίκαιον ξένων** (Theron displays the *xenia* overseen by Zeus Ξένιος: *Od.*9.271-72); **7-11 <u>πατέρων</u> ... ἀρεταῖς ~ 14 <u>πατρίαν</u>** (Emmenid hereditary excellence merits their patrimony's preservation, to which Zeus is sympathetic *qua* Πατρώιος: A.fr.162); **9 ἱερὸν ... ποταμοῦ ~ 13 Ἀλφεοῦ** (Emmenids and Zeus each associated with a sacred river).

The prayer's evocation of the Olympic landscape harnesses its symbolic capital: see ***O.*3.19-22**.

12 ἀλλ': often with imperative in prayers: *O.*4.6-9 <u>ἀλλὰ</u> <u>Κρόνου</u> <u>παῖ</u> ... <u>δέξαι</u>; *O.*7.87-88 <u>ἀλλ'</u> <u>ὦ</u> <u>Ζεῦ</u> ... <u>τίμα</u>; *O.*10.3-5; *N.*9.3, 8. Here marking 'a transition from arguments for action to a statement of the action required' (Denniston 14).

ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας: invocation combining patronymic adjective and matronymic genitive substantive appears unparalleled, but exemplifies Pindaric *variatio* (*N.*8.2 <u>παρθενηΐοις</u> <u>παίδων</u> τ'); cf. *h.Hom.*4.408 <u>Κυλλήνιε</u> <u>Μαιάδος</u> <u>υἱέ</u>. Vocative with patronymic adjective

and pleonastic **παῖ**: *P*.2.18 ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ; A.*PV*.577 ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ; S.*Ai*.134; E.*Tro*.822; E.fr.pap.81.3; Ar.*Eq*.561.

Invoking Zeus by the names of his parents in a prayer for the successful transfer of Theron's patrimony creates a connection with P.'s only other use of the Cronus-Rhea pairing, namely **76-77**, where they oversee the Isle, to which Zeus can be persuaded to grant extraordinary admission through prayer (**79-80**). Since the transfer of patrimony entails Theron's death, the implicit wish must be that Zeus simultaneously transfer his soul to Cronus and Rhea on the Isle.

Cronus and Rhea's Olympic altar (Herodorus *FGH*.31F.34b) grounds them in the landscape which Zeus rules and in which Theron has won, as does allusion to Cronus' Hill: see **12 Κρόνιε**; **13 κορυφὰν**.

Their function elsewhere simply as Zeus' parents is sometimes accompanied by mention of Zeus' overthrow of Cronus (*Il*.14.203; Hes.*Th*.453-56; A.R.1.505-6). In the context of a prayer for patrimonial inheritance, this strikes a discordant note: see ***P*.6.23-27**. Paus.5.7.10 records myths of Zeus wrestling Cronus at Olympia for power, and/or holding the Games to celebrate his victory.

ὦ: see ***P*.6.15**.

12-13 Κρόνιε ... Ὀλύμπου ... Ἀλφεοῦ: B.5.178-81 Κρονίδαν ... Ὀλύμπιον ... Ἀλ- | φεόν.

Κρόνιε ... Ἀλφεοῦ: ***O*.3.22-23 Ἀλφεοῦ ... Κρονίου**; *O*.5.17-18 Κρόνιόν τε ναίων λόφον | τιμῶν τ' Ἀλφεὸν; *O*.10.48-50 πόρον Ἀλφεοῦ ... πάγον | Κρόνου.

12 Κρόνιε: 'son/descendant of Cronus'. Since its substantival form denotes the Olympic Hill of Cronus (*O*.1.11; *O*.5.17; *O*.6.64; *O*.9.3; cf. **12-13** on the pairing of the Hill and Alpheus), and Olympia was one of Cronus' few major cult-centres, the epithet interacts with **13 κορυφὰν** to evoke the Hill (on which see ***O*.3.23**).

Himera was the only Sicilian city to include Cronos on its coinage, its links to whom date back to its 7th-century foundation from Zancle: since Theron's son Thrasydaeus governed Himera, Cronus is appropriately evoked in a prayer for his inheritance: see **15**.

Cronus' relationship to Chronos: **17**.

Aeolic patronymics in –ιος: *O*.10.26 Ποσειδάνιον; *P*.8.19; fr.52b.41; Hummel 137-38; also Myc.PY.Ad.654.8-9 *Etewoklewéhios* < PIE *-iio- (cf. Fortson (2010) 134-35).

Ῥέας: see **77**; *N*.11.1 Παῖ Ῥέας (Hestia); fr.144 Ἐλασίβροντα παῖ Ῥέας (Zeus). Santamaría observes she begins the 1st of 5 mother-son pairings: **12** (Rhea–Zeus); **26-27** (Semele–Dionyus); **79-80** (Thetis–Achilles); **83** (Eos–Memnon); **93** (Acragas–Theron).

12-13 ἕδος Ὀλύμπου ... ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν πόρον τ' Ἀλφεοῦ: double chiasmus by case: a-b-b-a-a-b.

12 ἕδος Ὀλύμπου: elsewhere only epic, of Zeus' domain on Mt. Olympus in Thessaly: *Il*.24.144. At **25-26**, his lightning elevates Semele to it.

νέμων: 'rule, administer': 'inhabit' suits **12 ἕδος Ὀλύμπου**, and **13 κορυφὰν** in its literal sense, but not **13 πόρον τ' Ἀλφεοῦ** (so *O*.5.17 Ζεῦ, Κρόνιόν τε ναίων λόφον, but 18 τιμῶν τ' Ἀλφεὸν); cf. *O*.13.24-26 ἀνάσσων | Ὀλυμπίας ... Ζεῦ.

νέμων often indicates Zeus' powers in prayers: A.*Supp*.403-4; A.*PV*.526-27; S.*OT*.200-2. *Partizipialstil*: Norden (1913) 167; Hummel 70.

13 ἀέθλων ... Ἀλφεοῦ: *O*.3.21-22 ἀέθλων ... Ἀλφεοῦ.

ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν: here **ἀέθλων** = 'contests' rather than 'prizes': *N*.9.9 ἀέθλων κορυφάν (Nemea), *N*.10.32 ἀέθλων κορυφαῖς (Olympics) both refer to the Games' founding (*pace* Slater s.v.ἄεθλον).

τε ... τ': co-ordinating 3 terms: Hummel 394.

κορυφὰν: ‘pinnacle’: denoting a metaphorical peak (*O.*1.13; *N.*1.34; *N.*9.9; *N.*10.32), but connoting the literal Hill of Cronus: see **12 Κρόνιε**. The literal peak **12 Ὀλύμπου**, from which Olympia takes its name (see **3**), enhances the effect (fr.52f.92-94 Ὀλύμποι- | ο ... κορυφα[ῖσι]ν ἴζων ... Ζεὺς).

πόρον τ’ Ἀλφεοῦ: *Il.*2.592 = *h.Hom.*3.423; *h.Hom.*4.398; *O.*1.92; *O.*10.48.

Alpheus is key to Olympia’s evocation: as its river-god (cf. **9 ἱερὸν ... οἴκημα ποταμοῦ**), his divinity sacralizes its landscape and Theron’s victory, as well as activating the prayer (cf. *O.*5.18). As a topographical feature, Alpheus flowed parallel to the hippodrome (Sinn (2000) 73-75). The myth of his pursuit of Arethusa (*N.*1.1) links Olympia and Sicily: see Eckermann (2013) 5-13; ***O.*3.22**. Heracles diverted Alpheus to cleanse Augeas’ stables (D.S.4.13.3), his lack of reward for which led to war and the Olympic foundation (cf. **3-4**).

The restriction of Pindaric parallels for this collocation to 3 476 odes for Western victors, all in proximity to references to the Olympics’ prehistory, indicates a strategy of using a physical and divine symbol of the Panhellenic centre, validated by Homeric phrasing, to transmit its cultural capital to victors on the periphery.

ἰανθεὶς ἀοιδαῖς: ‘softened’. Winning divine favour through song as a prayer-motif: *h.Hom.*2.494 (≈ *h.Hom.*30.18); *h.Hom.*19.48 (= *h.Hom.*21.5); B.17.130-32 χοροῖσι ... ἰανθεὶς | ὄπαζε ... τύχαν; Aristonous.45-47 χαρεὶς ὕμνοις ... ἐφέποις.

14-15 εὖφρων ... λοιπῷ: frequent in prayers for future favour: *O.*4.12-13 θεὸς εὖφρων | εἴη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς; *P.*5.117-19 πρόφρων ... τὸ λοιπὸν ... διδοῖτ’; *N.*7.67-68 λοιπὸς εὖφρων ... χρόνος ἕρποι; A.*Eum.*1030-31 εὖφρων ... τὸ λοιπὸν.

14 εὔφρων ... πατρίαν: the intratext with **35-36 πατρῴϊον ... εὔφρονα** links the prayer for the future transmission of the family's patrimony to successful transmission in the past, even in the face of adversity.

εὔφρων: 'kindly, well-disposed', often of gods in prayers: Fraenkel on A.*Ag*.806; S.*El*.162 Διὸς εὔφρονι; S.*Ai*.705 ξυνείη ... εὔφρων (with Finglass); Philodam.*Pae.In.Dionys*.12 [εὔφρων τάνδε] πόλιν φύλασσ'; **14-15**.

ἄρουραν ... πατρίαν: all instances of πατρὶς ἄρουρα in epic (*Od*.1.407; *Od*.10.29; *Od*.20.193) occur in contexts where Odysseus' return is at issue, which fits the characterization of the Emmenids' immigration to Sicily in Odyssean terms: see **8-11**. P.'s other instances are similarly Odyssean: *I*.1.35-38 πατρῴαν ἄρουραν ... ἐρειδόμενον ναυαγίαις ... δέξατο (his ancestral land welcoming Asopodorus as if from a shipwreck: cf. the storm following *Od*.10.29); fr.52f.106 οὔτε πατρωΐαις ἐν ἀρού[ραις (Neoptolemus' failed *nostos*).

The phrase legitimizes Emmenid possession of Acragas by implying ancestral inheritance rather than usurpation by the present generation.

ἔτι: 'hereafter' (*N*.2.6; *I*.1.65), not 'still': *v.i.* **κόμισον**.

πατρίαν: metrical overlap with **7 πατέρων** in the corresponding verse of Strophe 1 stylistically enacts familial continuity.

σφίσιν: variously interpreted: (1) possessive dative with (a) **14 ἄρουραν**; (b) **15 λοιπῷ γένει**; (2) dative of advantage with (a) **14 κόμισον** (*N*.6.30 σφιν ἔργ' ἐκόμισαν); (b) **14 εὔφρων** (*O*.4.12-13 εὔφρων | εἴη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς); (3) double dative of the part and the whole ('σχῆμα Ἰωνικόν': *O*.8.83-84 σφι Ζεὺς γένει | ὤπασεν; *O*.9.98-99; *P*.1.7-8 ἐπί οἱ ... ἀγκύλῳ κρατί; *I*.1.61-62 Ἡροδότῳ ἔπορεν | ἵπποις; E.*Ba*.336 ἡμῖν τε τιμὴ παντὶ τῶι γένει προσῆι).

But the simplest solution is construal with πατρίαν ('the land hereditary to them': Isoc.7.59.2 πατρίαν ἡμῖν; Hieronym.fr.1a.7 πάτριον σφίσι | πολιτείαν; cf. Koniaris (1997b) 219n.4).

κόμισον: *pace* Hummel 261 (comparing *P*.8.99 κόμιζε), the aspect is significant: the prayer concerns a specific act of inheritance, not a general continuation of prosperity (*v.s.* **ἔτι**).

Epode 1

15 λοιπῷ γένει: *P*.4.256-57 γένος Εὐφά-μου φυτευθὲν λοιπὸν.

Intergenerational transfer is stylistically enacted: the term for Emmenid posterity, concluding the prayer for the preservation of their ancestral land into the future, is itself projected into Epode 1. This transfer was highly insecure: in 476, Theron's son Thrasydaeus' harsh rule had driven the Himeraeans he governed to plan a revolt, averted only when Hieron betrayed it to Theron, who then crushed it with mass executions (D.S.11.48). Similar behaviour at Acragas would contribute to Thrasydaeus losing his tyranny within a year of inheriting it, having waged an ill-judged campaign against Syracuse (D.S.11.53.3-5; cf. D.S.11.53.2.5: Thrasydaeus was βίαιος ... καὶ φονικὸς during Theron's lifetime).

These topical events and anxieties are crucial to understanding the prayer-motif here as a *real* prayer: see **12-15**. These also partially explain the invocation of Zeus as **12 Κρόνιε**, due to Cronus' Himeraean associations; assist the reading of **9 οἴκημα** as a reference to the refoundation which Himera required after the crushing of the revolt; underlie **16 ἐν δίκᾳ τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν**.

15-22 Bipartite gnomic transition from the prayer for the Emmenids' future (**12-15**) to the myth of their Cadmeid ancestors (**22-30**): (1) deeds cannot be undone (**15-17**), but (2) a blessed fortune obscures their memory and relieves suffering (**18-22**). The gnomes' exemplification by the Cadmeid-myth (**22-30**), in which the forgetting of sufferings extraordinarily entails literal immortalization, becomes less surprising when we consider the programmatic significance of the cosmological entities around which the gnomes are respectively constructed, **17 Χρόνος** and **21 Μοῖρα** (dividing up **10 αἰὼν ... μόρσιμος** on the Emmenids' destiny): see **15-17**; **21**.

Interlaced hyperbata (**15-17 πεπραγμένων ... ἔργων** and **16-17 ἀποίητον ... τέλος**) stylistically enact (1) the complex tapestry of events created over time; (2) their finality: delaying **τέλος** to sentence- and verse-end matches its meaning (cf. **33 τελευτάσομεν** (sentence-end); **40 τέλεσσεν** (sentence- and triad-end)).

15-17 ἀποίητον οὐδ' ἄν | Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατὴρ δύναιτο θέμεν ἔργων τέλος: the impossibility of undoing the past is a topos (*Il.*9.249-50; Thgn.1.583-84; Sim.fr.603.*PMG*; S.*Ai.*378; Davies on S.*Tr.*742-43 οὐχ οἷόν τε μὴ τελεσθῆναι ... τίς ἂν δύναιτ' <ἂν> ἀγένητον ποεῖν), here heightened by the paradox that even an all-powerful entity cannot achieve it (*Il.*14.53-54; Agath.fr.5.1-2 μόνου γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ θεὸς στερίσκεται, | ἀγένητα ποιεῖν ... πεπραγμένα), but can only bring forgetfulness (Plin.*N.H.*2.27 *Deus nullum habet in praeterita ius praeterquam oblivionis*). Greek inconsistency concerning divine omnipotence: Versnel (2011) 422-38.

Chronus is a particularly apt entity for this role, since it is characterized not only as a supreme power in general (Sept.Sap.*Apophtheg.*5.16.1-2; Sept.Sap.*Apophtheg.*7.11.1; Thgn.1.967; fr.33.1-2 τὸν πάντων ὑπερ- | βάλλοντα Χρόνον μακάρων; A.*Ch.*965-66; A.*PV.*981; S.*OT.*1213; S.*OC.*1453-54; S.fr.301-2; S.fr.918; E.fr.441; Crit.fr.22), but esp. in relation to destruction (Sim.fr.13.1-2 Χρόνος ... πάντα ψήχει; Sim.fr.26.1.5; B.18.45;

A.fr.469; S.*Ai*.714; S.*OC*.609 συγχεῖ πάνθ' ὁ παγκρατὴς χρόνος; Crat.fr.39.1-2; *Bhagavad.Gita*.11.32 'I am become Time, the destroyer of worlds') as well as generation (**17 πάντων πατὴρ**; B.13.205-7; S.*Ai*.646-47; E.*Supp*.787 Χρόνος παλαιὸς πατὴρ; E.*Heracl*.899-900 πολλὰ γὰρ τίκτει Μοῖρα τελεσσιδώ- | τειρ' Αἰών τε Χρόνου παῖς). It is also well-suited to causing forgetfulness of sufferings, the desired end here (**18 λάθα**): *P*.1.46 χρόνος ... καμάτων δ' ἐπίλασιν παράσχοι; S.fr.954 χρόνος δ' ἀμαυροῖ πάντα κεἰς λήθην ἄγει; Shakespeare.*Rape.Lucr*.939-47 'Time's glory is ... to feed oblivion with decay of things'. Limitations on Chronus' power: Sim.fr.26.1.5 οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.

Χρόνος in P.: Pavlou (2007) 5-37. For the development of its personification from the 6th century, with potential Vedic/Iranian influences, see Corish (1986) 69-78; Santamaría 322-31. As father of all: West (1971) 28-36; (1983) 103-5 (Indic Kāla (Time) developing a cosmogonic role). Chronus' date of appearance and role in Orphic cosmogony are disputed (Betegh (2004) 140-58; Edmonds (2013) 171); when it appears explicitly in the theogony of Hieronymus and Hellanicus, it is in connection with Anagke (see **60**).

Here, its personification is thematically and structurally programmatic.

The ode presents a series of contrasts between levels/types of time, in particular the continuity of the mythological/historical past, and the timelessness of the blessed dead or immortalized Cadmeids (Hurst (1985) 161-62). *Pace* Grethlein (2010) 19-46, who argues that the ode's transcendence of time and chance is a temporary effect tied to the victory moment, the blessed's timelessness is implied to lie in Theron's future.

This theme is embedded in the ode's structure. The myths of the Cadmeids (**22-30**) and Labdacids (**38-45**) unfold Emmenid family history in chronological order down to Theron and Xenocrates in the present (**46-51**), before the chronological rupture of the eschatology; cf. Theunissen (2000) 698-783. The sequence of responsions and repetitions between

Epode 1 and (1) Epode 4, (2) Epode 5, is particularly significant, matching the metrical structure to the cycle of Time.

(1) Repetition of **πατὴρ** and **ὁ πάντων** (the latter in responsion) at **76-77** (with **77 πόσις** = Cronus in responsion with **17 Χρόνος**) implies Chronus' identification with Cronus; cf. **12 Κρόνιε**, likewise a characterization of Cronus as father. This identification is explicit in later sources (Plut.*de.Isid.et.Osir*.363d.6; Cic.*ND*.2.63-64; Macrob.*Sat*.1.7.6-11; Augustin.*de.Civ.Dei*.4.10), but may have appeared in Pherecydes of Syrus (Schibli (1990) 135-39): see Theunissen (2000) 707-8; Pavlou (2014) on *O*.10. Sustained intertextuality with *O*.10.48-55 (48-55 πόρον Ἀλφεοῦ ... πάγον Κρόνου ... Μοῖραι ... ἀλάθειαν ... Χρόνος ~ **12-21 Κρόνιε ... ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν πόρον τ' Ἀλφεοῦ ... Χρόνος ... λάθα ... Μοῖρα**) suggests the idea carries across both odes (cf. **3-5** ~ *O*.10.56-59).

The identification has links with Orphic (*Orph.Hymn*.13.5: Cronus the father of Chronus) and NE traditions (Canaanite El, parallel to Cronus, as both 'father of all' and 'father of time'): see López-Ruiz (2010) 151-70. Here, it implies the irreversible Chronus of this gnome can become the timeless Cronus of the Isle for Theron.

(2) Responsions: **16 δίκᾳ** ~ **96 δίκᾳ**; **17 θέμεν** ~ **97 θέμεν**; **19 χαρμάτων** ~ **99 χάρματ'**. Repetitions: **19 ἐσλῶν** ~ **97 ἐσλῶν**; **17 ἔργων** ~ **98 ἔργοις**. These map exactly onto the concluding passage where the κόρος of envious listeners is opposed by Theron's praiseworthy beneficence, just as good fortune overcomes vicissitude in Epode 1.

Finally, the combination of Time's inability to undo past deeds with their categorization as just/unjust parallels the cycle of rebirths in which justice is a key eschatological criterion at **68-70**. Edmonds (2004) 217n.177 connects Plato's stress on the impossibility of undoing the past as a reason for preferring reformative to retributive punishment (Pl.*Prot*.324b.3 οὐ γὰρ ἂν τό γε πραχθὲν ἀγένητον θείη; Pl.*Leg*.934a.6-7 οὐ

γὰρ | τὸ γεγονὸς ἀγένητον ἔσται ποτέ) with his eschatological focus on multiple reincarnations as a means of purification.

16-17 ἐν δίκᾳ τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν ... Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατὴρ: paternal relationship between Time and justice: E.fr.222.1 Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ' εἶναι χρόνου (Justice the child of Time); E.fr.223.1-2; E.fr.303.1-2 ὁ γὰρ οὐδενὸς ἐκφὺς | χρόνος δικαίους ἐπάγων κανόνας. Time as judge/guarantor of justice: Sol.fr.36.3; fr.159 ἀνδρῶν δικαίων Χρόνος σωτὴρ; A.*Supp*.732-33; S.*OT*.613 χρόνος δίκαιον ἄνδρα δείκνυσιν μόνος, 1213-14 ὁ πάνθ' ὁρῶν χρόνος, | δικάζει; E.*Hipp*.428-30.

16 ἐν δίκᾳ τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν: closest parallels: Jul.*Encom.Const*.35.19 ἐν δίκῃ καὶ παρὰ δίκην; Jul.*Encom.Euseb*.8.81 ἐν δίκῃ τυχὸν ἢ καὶ παρὰ δίκην. But the individual elements (**ἐν δίκᾳ**: *O*.6.12; *P*.5.14; *N*.5.14; S.fr.210.45, 46; S.*Tr*.1069; S.fr.739.1; Ar. (9x); Pl. (25x); **παρὰ δίκαν**: *I*.7.47; E.*IA*.397; E.fr.626.6; E.fr.901.3; Th.3.52.2.10; Th.3.84.1.5; Pl.*Leg*.757e.2) and binary opposition (Thgn.899-900; Sol.fr.36.9-10; A.*Ch*.78; A.*Eum*.468; E.*Hec*.801; E.fr.419.3; Ar.*Ach*.373; Ar.*Eq*.256; Ar.*Nu*.99) are frequent.

The stress on justice has produced biographical explanations: Theron's support of Polyzelus against Hieron (Σ.*O*.2.29c-d; Timaeus.*FGH*.566.F.93.a-b; D.S.11.48.3-6); Emmenid participation in Rhodian stasis (Σ.*O*.2.29c); Theron's Himeraean massacre (Méautis (1962) 71).

But the need for such explanations may be obviated. (1) Contextually: Zeus' inadvertent immolation of Semele (**25-26**) and the Labdacids' transgressions (**38-45**) are sufficient mythic motivation. (2) Linguistically: (a) the passive genitive absolute **15-17 πεπραγμένων ... ἔργων** gives no reason to identify the Emmenids as perpetrators; (b) **16 παρὰ δίκαν** may be part of a polar expression ('merism': Watkins (1995) 44-47, 250; West (2007) 99-104) and thus otiose: 'x' and 'not-x' create a whole without necessarily

emphasizing either member or the quality 'x'. **τε καὶ** similarly implies the elements it unites form a complementary totality (Hummel 397-98).

Nonetheless, δίκη is a key concept in ***O*.2**, esp. as part of Theron's self-image, and as a qualification for the Isle (see **6**; **68-70**). It is therefore possible that P. hints at well-known Emmenid transgressions, such as the Himera massacre, as a strategy for defusing criticism: cf. ***O*.3.16**; *P*.1.88 (Hieron). Theron's consciousness of his unjust actions probably motivates the inclusion of extraordinary means of access to a blessed afterlife other than justice alone: see **78-80**.

16-18 ἄν | ... ἄν |: almost never verse-final outside Attic drama. The repetition strikingly balances the impossibility of undoing with the possibility of forgetting. Only *O*.12.13 attests verse-final κεν, a counterfactual in a similar context of gnomes concerning human vicissitude.

17 ὁ πάντων: **77**; *I*.5.53; fr.169a.1; B.17.66.

πάντων πατὴρ: attestations other than Chronus: van Kooten (2014) 293-324.

δύναιτο: 100 δύναιτο (likewise of the impossible).

τέλος: thematized in an ode concerned with what occurs at the end of life: **33 τελευτάσομεν**; **40 τέλεσσεν**; **70 ἔτειλαν**.

18 λάθα: positive: cf. the epinician concept of forgetting toils through success (*P*.1.46, *N*.10.24). An eschatological connotation is possible (e.g. Lethe), but contrast the lamellae, where Mnemosyne's waters, not Lethe's, are the correct choice (Graf & Johnston (2007) 96-120).

18-22 πότμῳ σὺν εὐδαίμονι ... πῆμα θνάσκει | παλίγκοτον ... θεοῦ Μοῖρα ... ὄλβον: ~ **35-37 Μοῖρ' ... εὔφρονα πότμον, θεόρτῳ σὺν ὄλβῳ ... πῆμ' ἄγει, παλιντράπελον**. The

content of both gnomes (the cyclical nature of fortune controlled by fate) is stylistically enacted by the interlaced repetitions.

18 πότμῳ σὺν εὐδαίμονι: E.*Ion*.1604-5 ἐκ γὰρ τῆσδ' ἀναψυχῆς πόνων | εὐδαίμον' ὑμῖν πότμον (good fortune as relief after toils); also *P*.3.84-86 μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίας ... πότμος (good fortune favouring rulers; followed by Cadmeid vicissitudes, including Semele's immortalization, as here); Xanthus.fr.10.10 εὐποτμία τε καὶ εὐδαιμονία; contrast Emped.fr.9.5 δυσδαίμονα πότμον (criticism of conventional terminology concerning death).

πότμος and δαίμων are sometimes interchangeable (E.*Hel*.669 δαίμων ἢ πότμος; Antiph.fr.49.4 DK καινοῦ δαίμονος ἄρχει, καινοῦ πότμου), but here the latter is an injection of blessed fortune that alters the course of the former: 'while [δαίμων] is actively operating ... πότμος is a static power, permanently established ... If therefore man is εὐδαίμων, it is because a δαίμων, an active divine power, operates on him, and because it is his πότμος that this should be so' (de Heer (1969) 42). The collocation thus mirrors **21 θεοῦ Μοῖρα**.

Cf. **36 εὔφρονα πότμον**. Modification of πότμος by compounds of the form 'εὐ– + root indicating fortune': A.*Pers*.709 εὐτυχεῖ πότμωι; E.*IA*.550 εὐαίωνι πότμωι; also A.*Ag*.246-47 εὔποτμον.

πότμῳ: Thummer (1957) 99; Gerber (1988) 42.

εὐδαίμονι: de Heer (1969). In epinician: (1) genre-specific relating to victory; (2) reflecting special cases of divine favour (Maravela (2011) 33-51). *P*.3.84 and *N*.7.56 likewise occur adjacent to myths of heroization and immortalization, in passages implying a similar afterlife for the victor (Currie (2005) 307-12, 397-405).

19-22 The sentence is bisected by the triadic boundary, balancing the death of pain concluding Triad 1 (**19-20**) with the rise of happiness opening Triad 2 (**21-22**): cycles of vicissitude are stylistically enacted by the cyclical triadic form.

19-20 ἐσλῶν γὰρ ὑπὸ χαρμάτων πῆμα θνάσκει | παλίγκοτον δαμασθέν: the metaphorical death of suffering, heightened by personification (**ὑπὸ** + genitive; **θνάσκει**; **δαμασθέν**), anticipates the Cadmeids' transcendence of physical death. Cf. Christian characterization of the Resurrection as the 'death of Death'; Donne.*Holy Sonnets*.10.14.

19 ἐσλῶν: Aeolic –σλ– preferable in P. to epic –σθλ–: Braswell on *P*.4.175(a).

ἐσλῶν ... πῆμα: likewise of vicissitude at *O*.12.12a ἐσλὸν βαθὺ πήματος; *P*.3.81 ἓν παρ' ἐσλὸν πήματα.

ὑπὸ: with genitive of an instrument only here in P. (*pace* Slater *s.v.*2.d.I on *O*.6.43), strengthening the personification.

χαρμάτων πῆμα: mutually-opposed: *Il*.3.50-51 πατρί ... πῆμα ... δυσμενέσιν ... χάρμα; S.*Tr*.129 πῆμα καὶ χαρὰν (vicissitude).

19-20 πῆμα ... παλίγκοτον: 37 πῆμ' ... παλιντράπελον; A.*Ag*.571-73 πῆμα ... παλιγκότου, 863-65 παλιγκότους ... πῆμα.

19 θνάσκει: 19-20. With inanimates: fr.121.4.

20 παλίγκοτον: 'malignant, festering' (Hipp.*Art*.27.6): concessive, and oxymoronic with **δαμασθέν**: 'tamed for all its malignancy'.

Elsewhere 'hostile' (*N*.4.96, contrasting 95 ἐσλοῖς, as here **19 ἐσλῶν**): so Fraenkel on A.*Ag*.874, but the repetition 863 κληδόνας παλιγκότους ~ 874 κληδόνων παλιγκότων enacts malignancy, as does the herald's ironic overconfidence at 573 τύχης παλιγκότου that suffering is past. Comparison of **19-20 πῆμα ... παλίγκοτον** with 571-73 πῆμα δ' οὐκ

ἀντιρρέπει ... παλιγκότου (cf. **21-22** for scale-imagery), 863-65 παλιγκότους ... πῆμα, suggests Aeschylus adapted *h.l.* (cf. **38-45**).

Santamaría links **παλίγκοτον** and **37 παλιντράπελον** with παλιγγενεσία of souls (cf. **68-70**). But although a thematic connection exists, P. was probably unaware of the term, which is attested late and concerns the Stoic cycle of universal renewal.

δαμασθέν: of death: Hes.*Scut.*11; *P.*3.9.

Strophe 2

21-23 ὅταν θεοῦ Μοῖρα πέμπῃ | ἀνεκὰς ὄλβον ὑψηλόν ... πένθος δὲ πίτνει βαρύ: possible imagery: (1) wheel (Gildersleeve); (2) scales (Fitzgerald (1983) 54); (3) grass (van Leeuwen); (4) corn/wheat (Konstas (2003) 57-70); (5) rooftop (Puech); (6) waves/currents (Vivante (1972) 114; Theunissen (2000) 440); (7) pendulum (Kirkwood).

But the language is too equivocal to guarantee a single image. **19-20** vaguely characterizes the overcoming of 'bad' by 'good' as a form of combat (complicated by the medical **20 παλίγκοτον**). **21-22** expresses the conditions for **19-20** as divine fate 'sending happiness aloft'. **23-24 πένθος ... ἀγαθῶν** chiastically rephrases **19-20**, and balances **21-22** by introducing the image of 'falling' (**23 πίτνει**).

The main clue distinguishing the image from generic notions of fortune as rise and fall (*P.*8.93 τὸ τερπνὸν αὔξεταῖ ... καὶ πίτνει χαμαί; E.fr.420.2-3 μί' ἡμέρα | τὰ μὲν καθεῖλεν ὑψόθεν, τὰ δ' ἦρ' ἄνω) is that it emphasizes *not* the alternating rise and fall of fortune/individuals, but that 'bad' falls in lockstep as 'good' rises, which favours (1) or (2).

(1) An Orphic symbol of the reincarnation cycle (Robinson (1946) 207-216): see **19-22** (metrical mimesis); **25**; **68-70**.

(2) *Il*.8.69-74, *Il*.22.209-13: the winning fate rises, the loser falls. Divine fate linked with scale-imagery: B.17.24-26 ἐκ θεῶν Μοῖρα ... Δίκας ῥέπει τά– | λαντον.

21 ὅταν θεοῦ Μοῖρα πέμπῃ | ἀνεκὰς ὄλβον: Thgn.1.1189; fr.225.1 ὁπόταν θεὸς ἀνδρὶ χάρμα (~ **19 χαρμάτων**) πέμψῃ.

21 ὅταν: in gnomic contexts: Hummel 337-38.

21-22 θεοῦ ... ὄλβον: *Od*.3.208 ἐπέκλωσαν θεοὶ ὄλβον; **36 θεόρτῳ σὺν ὄλβῳ**; *N*.8.17 σὺν θεῷ ... ὄλβος.

21 θεοῦ Μοῖρα: reformulating **18 πότμῳ σὺν εὐδαίμονι**.

Whereas *Odyssey*-parallels (*Od*.3.269 μοῖρα θεῶν ἐπέδησε δαμῆναι; *Od*.11.292 θεοῦ κατὰ μοῖρα πέδησε; *Od*.22.413 μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε θεῶν) entail suffering or death, here **θεοῦ Μοῖρα** brings blessings, with **20 δαμασθέν** describing its suppression of suffering. The lamellae adapt the epic lines for use by souls supplicating Persephone for a blessed afterlife, having been struck down by **Μοῖρα** and by the other gods / Zeus' lightning (*OF*.488.4a/b ἀλά με Μο<ῖ>ρα ἐδάμασε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι / καὶ ἀστεροβλῆτα κεραυνῷ; *OF*.489.5; *OF*.490.5). These present a striking parallel for how the fluctuations of divine fate are here exemplified by Semele's death and immortalization via Zeus' lightning (**26 κεραυνοῦ**); cf. Santamaría 357.

The relative priority of god and fate is inconsistently presented in Greek (see Versnel (2011) 163-79), sometimes within the same text (*H.Orph*.59.11-14). Thummer (1957) 90-109 argues the gods are supreme in P. This is explicit in some parallels (Hes.*Th*.903 Μοίρας ... τιμὴν πόρε μητίετα Ζεύς; B.17.24 ἐκ θεῶν Μοῖρα; A.*Pers*.101; A.*Ag*.1026; A.*Eum*.392; E.*IA*.1605; Paus.8.37.1.9 Μοιραγέτης (Zeus)), and implicit in **θεοῦ Μοῖρα**,

since the genitive is probably possessive (Sem.fr.7.104 θεοῦ μοῖραν; Sol.fr.13.30 θεῶν μοῖρ' ἐπιοῦσα κίχηι; ***O*.3.10 θεόμοροι**; *P*.5.76 οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, ἀλλὰ Μοῖρά τις ἄγεν; Pl.*Rep*.493a.1-2; Arist.fr.var.8.50.641.20 μοῖρα θεῶν ἤγαγεν εἰς Ἀίδην; A.R.1.440). Contrast fr.52f.94-95. Boeke (2007) 32-37 (following Greene (1944) 71-72) sees greater interchangeability. For **Μοῖρα**'s double genealogy, see West on Hes.*Th*.217, 904; in the Derveni Papyrus, she is not identical to Zeus, but is rather his 'active, executive, practical aspect' (Betegh (2004) 202).

In ***O*.2**, compound expressions for fate and/or divinity accompany references to Theron's antecedents: **10 αἰὼν ... μόρσιμος**; **18 πότμῳ σὺν εὐδαίμονι**; *h.l.*; **35-36 Μοῖρ' ... θεόρτῳ**. This minimizes the protagonists' moral agency: the only (implicit) explanation given in the Cadmeid myth for its events is divine love for Semele (**26-27**); the gnomic pivot (**33-34**) gives no reason for human vicissitude; the Labdacids murder one another (**38**; **42**) as pawns of fate (**35-37**; **38 μόριμος**; **39-40 χρησθέν ... τέλεσσεν**) or victims of a goddess (**41-42 Ἐρινύς | ἔπεφνέ**); Thersander is a passive survivor (**43 λείφθη**) and honorand (**45 τιμώμενος**). This emphasis on fate over desert rehabilitates the Labdacids for use as an ancestral exemplum, but also dilutes the worthiness of the Cadmeids and Thersander, in striking contrast to the moral criteria predominant in the eschatology (**57-60**; **62**; **65-67**; **68-70**) and in Theron's praise (**5-7**; **93-95**; **98-100**). I interpret this as a deliberate inconsistency: there exist alternative routes to salvation for privileged individuals, hence they (including Theron) need not rely on moral purity alone: see **78-80**.

21-22 Μοῖρα ... ὄλβον: *Il*.3.182 μοιρηγενὲς ὀλβιόδαιμον; Ibyc.S.166.13-15 ὄλβον ... Μοιρᾶν; **35-36**; *N*.7.57-59 Μοῖρα ... καιρὸν ὄλβου | δίδωσι (to the victor).

πέμπῃ | ἀνεκὰς: paralleling Semele's elevation to Olympus: cf. Ar.*Av*.843-44 πέμψον ... εἰς θεοὺς ἄνω; Ar.*Ve*.18 ἀνεκὰς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

21 πέμπῃ: often of gods sending good/ill to mortals: Thgn.1.1189; *I.*6.49-50; fr.75.1-2; fr.225.1; Ar.*Eq.*1184-85.

22 ὄλβον ὑψηλόν: cf. *P.*3.89 ὄλβον ὑπέρτατον: Cadmus' happiness, tempered by his daughters' vicissitudes (96-99); cf. **22-24**.

ὄλβον: as here, often of divine blessings (*h.Hom.*2.486-89; **36**; *O.*1.56; *P.*2.26; *P.*3.89; *I.*6.12-13; *N.*7.57-59 (from Moira); *N.*8.17; *N.*9.45), esp. the eschatological (*h.Hom.*2.480; Hes.*Op.*171-72 ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι παρ' Ὠκεανὸν (~ **70-71**) ... ὄλβιοι; Hes.*Th.*954-55; *N.*1.71; *I.*4.58-60 (Heracles' elevation to Olympus); fr.137.1-2 (see **56**); *OF.*485.1; *OF.*486.1 νῦν ἔθανες καὶ νῦν ἐγένου, τρισόλβιε, 7; *OF.*486.1; *OF.*488.3, 9; *OF.*489.3; *OF.*490.3; de Heer (1969)). Cf. ***P.6.5***.

ὑψηλόν: both metaphorically valorizing (*O.*4.3; *O.*5.1; *P.*3.111; *I.*5.45; cf. *O.*1.115; *P.*1.100; Race (1990) 63 on 'spatial display'), and literally indicating Olympus' height (**25**): cf. **21-22 πέμπῃ | ἀνεκὰς**.

22-30 The myth of the Cadmeids' death and immortalization (see **25-27**; **28-30**) illustrates **15-22** in a surprising way, since the forgetting of suffering is here represented by literal immortalization. It anticipates key points in the eschatology's final section (**78-80**), namely that several of Theron's ancestors were immortalized (see **23**), and that Zeus is the conduit of translation (for Semele: see **25-26**; **27**).

Reference to Dionysus (**27**) may have special significance. Dionysus is central to the reconstruction of the Orphic Zagreus myth (Graf & Johnston (2007) 66-93; deconstructed by Edmonds (1999) 35-73), where his death and rebirth symbolize the blessed afterlife available for those purified of their Titanic ancestors' sin. For the overlap between Bacchism and Orphism, note the appearance of Dionysus' name on 5th-century bone plaques from Olbia, esp. *OF.*463 βίος θάνατος βίος ... ἀλήθεια ... Διό ... Ὀρφικοί, and in the lamellae (**27**, adding *OF.*474.15-16); cf. Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 697-727.

Here, his presence activates the subtextual resonances inherent in certain details (cf. Santamaría 251-255): **23 πένθος**, **25 ζώει ... ἀποθανοῖσα**, **25-26 βρόμῳ | κεραυνοῦ** (with **21 θεοῦ Μοῖρα**), **26 Παλλὰς**, **27 κισσοφόρος** may evoke the Orphic myth. Dionysus' affection for Semele (**27**) also implies the version in which he rescues her from the Underworld (**25-27**), and the version in which he participates in Ino's myth (**28-30**), both of which have mystic/cultic connotations. See **nn.**

See **53-56** for allusion to his Eleusinian aspect Iacchus.

22 ἔπεται δὲ λόγος: 'this saying is appropriate to' (contrast *N*.3.29). The connection of gnome and myth is unusually explicit: cf. *P*.1.35-37 (relevance of gnome to circumstances); *N*.10.10-11 (myth illustrating claim).

εὐθρόνοις: its almost invariable application to divinities (see ***I*.2.5**) anticipates the myth's key detail, the Cadmeids' divinization; *P*.3.99 similarly employs Semele's divine name (Thyone) proleptically.

23 Κάδμοιο κούραις: Cadmus' 4 daughters (Semele, Ino, Agave, Autonoe: Hes.*Th*.976-77) were famous for their misfortunes. The first two are selected here for their post-mortem restitution (*P*.11.1-2 Κάδμου κόραι, Σεμέλα μὲν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀγυιᾶτι, | Ἰνὼ δὲ Λευκοθέα ποντιᾶν ὁμοθάλαμε Νηρηΐδων; Nonn.*Dion*.10.129 Ἰνώ, πόντον ἔχεις, Σεμέλη λάχε κύκλον Ὀλύμπου), which comprised opposing elements but included an equal immortality and distance from mortals. In *P*.11, with Castor and Polydeuces, they are paradigms for the Theban laudandus' metaphorical apotheosis through victory (see Finglass on *P*.11.1-16). A similar paradigm operates here, with 2 differences: (1) the immortality is literal; (2) genealogical links connect the mythic figures and laudandus: here, these are left to be inferred from Theron's Labdacid genealogy (**46**), since the Labdacids were descended from Cadmus (via his *son* Polydorus), but Σ.*O*.2.39a attests

that an encomium for Theron (fr.118) included his descent from Cadmus, whose naming here anticipates his appearance on the Isle (**78**).

The Cadmeid sisters are thus the first of 3 pairs of siblings from the same family who experience fortune's extremes: (1) **25-30**: Semele and Ino (death redeemed by immortality); (2) **41-42**: Eteocles and Polyneices (mutual fratricide, redeemed by next generation); (3) **48-51**: Theron and Xenocrates (anxieties (**51-52**) redeemed by Panhellenic victories; the following eschatology implies potential immortality too (**56-83**)).

The house of Cadmus in P.: Fehr (1936) 18-21; Giannini (2000) 166-70.

Cf. Ibyc.fr.302 Καδμίδι κούραι (Semele); *P*.11.1 Κάδμου κόραι; E.*Ba*.2, 978, 1089.

ἔπαθον αἳ μεγάλα: parallelism of form and meaning with **8 καμόντες οἳ πολλὰ** underscores the genetic link between Theron's recent and mythic ancestors. At *P*.3.97-99 (note 97 πάθαις), the suffering of Cadmus' daughters is part of his vicissitudes, redeemed by Semele's immortalization (*v.s.*). Cf. *OF*.487.3 παθών τὸ πάθημα τὸ δ' οὔπω πρόσθ'{ε} ἐπεπόνθεις.

23-24 πένθος δὲ πίτνει βαρύ κρεσσόνων πρὸς ἀγαθῶν: chiastically rephrasing **19 ἐσλῶν γὰρ ὑπὸ χαρμάτων πῆμα θνᾴσκει**, with 'falling' imagery introduced to balance that of 'rising' at **21-22**.

23 πένθος: Griffith (1991) 51 sees allusion to Pentheus' death. Since Pentheus was punished for rejecting Dionysus' divinity, and his mother Agave committed the murder while driven insane as punishment for denying that Zeus had impregnated Semele, the allusion both recalls the sufferings of another Cadmeid (*v.s.*) and anticipates **25-27**.

Onomastic puns: E.*Ba*.367 Πενθεὺς ... πένθος; Chaerem.fr.4 Πενθεὺς ἐσομένης συμφορᾶς ἐπώνυμος. Pentheus' literal fall: E.*Ba*.1111-13 ὑψόθεν ... πίπτει ... Πενθεύς. Encoded names: **2**.

Possible Orphic resonance: fr.133.1 πένθεος may allude to the assuaging of Persephone's grief for the murder of her son Dionysus, which leads her to grant a blessed afterlife: see **58**.

πίτνει: for transmitted πιτνεῖ: see LSJ *s.v.*

Balancing the 'rising' imagery of **22**, and etymologically reactivating **18 πότμῳ**. A wrestling-fall may be connoted.

βαρύ: ambiguous between adjectival with **πένθος** (cf. 169b.6 βαρυπε[νθ; B.14.12-13 βαρυπενθέσιν ... μ]άχαις) and adverbial with **πίτνει** (phrasal parallels take the attacker's perspective, whereas here the defender's is meant: *N*.6.50-51 βαρὺ ... νεῖκος Ἀχιλεύς | ἔμπεσε (with identical ambiguity); *I*.4.51; fr.52b.63-64 [βαρεῖα μέν] | ἐπέπεσε μοῖρα; A.*Ag*.1175; A.*Ch*.37 δώμασιν βαρὺς πίτνων).

24 κρεσσόνων πρὸς ἀγαθῶν: reprising the personification of **19 ἑσλῶν ... ὑπὸ χαρμάτων**.

κρεσσόνων: not only 'superior', but 'stronger', given the personification (*v.s.*) and possible wrestling metaphor (**23**): *I*.4.34-35 κρέσσον' ... ἔσφαλε τέχνα.

ἀγαθῶν: substantival neuter: **33**; *O*.8.13; *N*.11.29-30.

25-27 Semele's immortalization here is due to Zeus' lightning, but **27** may imply the version in which Dionysus rescues her from the Underworld: see Hes.*Th*.940-42 with West; Casadio (1991) 161-77; (1994) 284-312.

ζώει μὲν ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις ἀποθανοῖσα ... φιλεῖ ... φιλεῖ: Hes.fr.27.25-32 θάνε ... ζώει δ' ἔνθά περ ἄλλοι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες ... Ἥρη ... πεφίληκε (Heracles' immortalization).

25 ζώει ... ἀποθανοῖσα: expressing Semele's apotheosis through the juxtaposition of what is normally mutually-exclusive, i.e. life and death (*Od*.2.132 ζώει ὅ γ' ἢ τέθνηκε), a pattern found in other mystic sources: Dubois (1996) 154 no.94 βίος θάνατος βίος ...

ἀλήθεια; Heraclit.fr.62.1-2 ἀθάνατοι θνητοί, θνητοὶ ἀθάνατοι, ζῶντες | τὸν ἐκείνων θάνατον, τὸν δὲ ἐκείνων βίον τεθνεῶτες; *OF*.485.1 = *OF*.486.1 νῦν ἔθανες καὶ νῦν ἐγένου; Egyptian *Pyramid Text* 1975b: 'thou art dead, thou art alive'.

ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις: *P*.11.1 Σεμέλα μὲν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀγυιᾶτι; Nonn.*Dion*.7.358 Σεμέλη δ' ἐς Ὄλυμπον ἱκάνει; Nonn.*Dion*.10.129.

ἀποθανοῖσα: oxymoronic with both **ζώει** (*v.s.*) and **ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις** ('deathless' Olympians: *Il*.5.360 ἐς Ὄλυμπον ἵκωμαι ἵν' ἀθανάτων ἕδος).

25-27 βρόμῳ ... Σεμέλα ... Ζεὺς ... κισσοφόρος: *h.Hom*.26.1-2 Κισσοκόμην Διόνυσον ἐρίβρομον ... Ζηνὸς καὶ Σεμέλης; fr.75.9-12 κισσοδαῆ ... Βρόμιον ... ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων ... γυναικῶν τε Καδμεϊάδων; E.*Ph*.649-51 Βρόμιον ... †μάτηρ | Διὸς γάμοισι†, | κισσὸς ὃν περιστεφὴς; Ar.*Thesm*.988-91 κισσοφόρε ... Διὸς σὺ Βρόμιε καὶ Σεμέλας.

25-26 βρόμῳ | κεραυνοῦ: *Od*.23.330-31 κεραυνῷ | Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης; E.*Ph*.182-83 Διὸς βαρύβρομοι βρονταὶ | κεραύνιόν τε φῶς.

Lightning sacralizes/immortalizes (Rohde (1925) 1.581-82). Zeus' appearance to Semele thus caused *both* her death (**ἀποθανοῖσα**) *and* apotheosis (**ζώει**): Nonn.*Dion*.9.206 Σεμέλη κατ' Ὄλυμπον ἔτι πνείουσα κεραυνοῦ; cf. D.S.4.38.4-5 (Heracles); Hes.*Cat*.fr.51 (Asclepius); Currie (2005) 360-63. Semele's cult reflected this phenomenon: a precinct in Thebes marked the place of her immolation (Dodds on E.*Ba*.6-12). Burkert (1961) 208-13 notes Ἠλύσιον (Elysium) may < ἐνηλύσιος 'struck by lightning', and that Μακάρων νῆσος (see **70-71**) was applied to Semele's precinct on the Theban Cadmeion (Parmenides *ap*.Suda; Photius s.v.; Tzetzes on Lycophr.1194, 1204).

3 lamellae (*OF*.488.4b; *OF*.489.5; *OF*.490.5) declare the deceased was overcome by lightning (cf. **21**). Graf & Johnston (2007) 125-27 link this both to lightning's immortalizing effect, and to the Orphic myth of the Titans' destruction by lightning for

murdering Dionysus – a crime for which the Titans' human descendants were themselves punished and purified through lightning.

βρόμῳ evokes Dionysus via his association with thunder, esp. his cult-title Βρόμιος (see **25-27**); cf. **23 πένθος**. The phrase thus anticipates the roles of Zeus and Dionysus in Semele's death and immortalization before direct reference at **27 Ζεὺς πατήρ ... παῖς ὁ κισσοφόρος**.

A variant attesting Dionysus' birth at the Alpheus (*h.Hom*.1.3-4 ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ ποταμῷ ... Σεμέλην τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ; cf. **13**) adds a geographical link to Theron's victory.

τανυέθειρα: *hapax*. Evoking Semele's attractiveness to Zeus, and fragility before his lightning. Dionysus' own luxurious hair: *h.Hom*.7.4; *I*.7.4; E.*Ba*.235, 455 πλόκαμός ... ταναὸς, 493; Nonn.*Dion*.35.328 τανυπλοκάμου.

26-27 φιλεῖ δέ νιν Παλλὰς αἰεί | καὶ Ζεὺς πατήρ: καὶ linking a second subject to a subject and predicate already expressed: *O*.7.38 Οὐρανὸς δ' ἔφριξέ νιν καὶ Γαῖα μάτηρ; *O*.7.15-17; *O*.13.115.

All MSS transmit φιλέοντι δὲ Μοῖσαι after **αἰεί**, an early interpolation *extra metrum* athetized by Aristophanes (Σ.*O*.2.48c). Cf. Philostr.*Imag*.1.14.2.3-7 ἀπόλλυται ... Σεμέλη, τίκτεται δὲ Διόνυσος ... τῆς Σεμέ- | λης εἶδος ἀμυδρὸν διαφαίνεται ἰούσης ἐς οὐρανόν, | καὶ αἱ Μοῦσαι αὐτὴν ἐκεῖ ᾄσονται.

26 φιλεῖ δέ νιν Παλλὰς αἰεί: Athena's affection lacks the obvious motivation of that of Zeus and Dionysus. Nonn.*Dion*.8.416 ὡμίλησεν Ἀθήνῃ has Semele, without explanation, converse with Athena after her apotheosis. The phrase elsewhere indicates Athena's favourite heroes: *Il*.5.61 μιν ἐφίλατο Παλλὰς (Phereclus); *Il*.10.245 φιλεῖ δέ ἑ Παλλὰς (Odysseus). *Il*.10.552-53 φιλεῖ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς | κούρη τ' ... Ἀθήνη unites Zeus and Athena in expressing affection for Diomedes and Odysseus.

Willcock compares Heracles' welcome to Olympus at *I.*4.59 (cf. Hes.fr.27.25-32 θάνε ... ζώει ... Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες ... Ἥρη ... πεφίληκε), and Thetis' by Athena and Hera (*Il.*24.100-2): Athena's gracious ceding of her place of honour beside Zeus would be a natural gesture for her here as Dionysus' sibling; Nonn.*Dion.*1.1-10 directly connects Zeus' auto-gestation of Dionysus with that of Athena. Griffith (1991) 52 believes Athena, Zeus, and Dionysus here represent 3 forms of *philia*: social, conjugal, familial.

Late sources record Athena's rescue of Dionysus' still-beating heart from the Titans (*OF.*314-16; *OF.*326-27), with the name **Παλλὰς** derived from its palpitations (Clem.Alex.*Protrep.*2.18.1.4 Παλλὰς ἐκ τοῦ πάλλειν). On this tradition's 'Orphic' provenance, see Graf & Johnston (2007) 78n.40.

27 Ζεὺς πατήρ: frequent of Zeus as All-father. *Pace* Santamaría, a reference to Zeus' incestuous relationship with Persephone as Dionysus' mother in the Orphic myth is unnecessary, since (1) Semele and Demeter were also attested as Dionysus' mother in different Orphic myths (Edmonds (2013) 181n.62); (2) P. employs the same phrase of Zeus visiting Semele's bed at *P.*3.98-99 Ζεὺς πατήρ ἦλυθεν ἐς λέχος ἱμερτὸν Θυώνᾳ. If a specific point is sought, it is rather that Zeus is the father of the **παῖς** Dionysus.

See **3** on Zeus in ***O.*2**: here, as at **70** and **79**, he is the conduit for access to a blessed afterlife.

μάλα φιλεῖ δὲ: the anaphora is Homeric (Fehling (1969) 193-94): *O.*9.31-32 ἤρειδε ... ἤρειδεν δέ; *O.*10.27-28 πέφνε ... πέφνε δ'.

Some MSS punctuate μάλα, φιλεῖ δὲ to place δὲ second in its clause (so Schroeder), but δὲ can follow two connected words (***P.*6.38**, **44**), and Bergk's punctuation rightly produces a climax in the final element: cf. *Il.*10.229 ἤθελε ... μάλα δ' ἤθελε.

For the version in which Dionysus' affection leads him to retrieve Semele from Hades and immortalize her, see **25-27**.

κισσοφόρος: all parallels evoke Dionysus, due to his connection with ivy: Sim.*Epig*.13.28.2 (dithyrambs); E.*Tro*.1066 (Mount Ida; Dionysus linked to Magna Mater: fr.70b); E.*Ba*.383; Ar.*Thesm*.988; Opp.*Cyn*.1.365; Nonn.*Dion*.12.109, 29.232, 43.67, 48.960; *Orph.Hymn*.54.6. Cf. *h.Hom*.26.1 Κισσοκόμην Διόνυσον; Prat.fr.708.15.*PMG*; fr.75.9-10; fr.128c.3.

In Dionysiac worship, ivy 'in its evergreen vitality ... typifies the victory of vegetation over ... winter' (Dodds on E.*Ba*.81), which coheres with Semele's immortalization here. Strikingly, the Pelinna lamellae, which reference Persephone and Bacchus in connection with death and rebirth (*OF*.485.1-2; *OF*.486.1-2), are ivy-shaped. Díez-Platas (2011) 133-38 notes ivy's resemblance in Dionysiac iconography to the god's heart, from which he was reborn in Orphic myth (**26**). See **22-30** for his potential significance.

Antistrophc 2

28-30 Ino's myth develops from (1) an earlier version, in which she plots the death of her stepchildren Phrixus and Helle, to (2) a later version, where Hera drives Ino insane for nursing the orphan Dionysus. Both end with Ino leaping into the sea and being deified as Leucothea: see Beaulieu (2008) 114-25, who analyses the sea as a nexus between life and death; Hainsworth on *Od*.5.333-35 Κάδμου θυγάτηρ, καλλίσφυρος Ἰνώ, | Λευκοθέη, ἣ πρὶν μὲν ἔην βροτὸς ... νῦν δ' ἁλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι θεῶν ἐξέμμορε τιμῆς; Finglass on *P*.11.2.

Although here her marine immortalization is only sketched, and the evidence for (2) appears later in the 5th century, the Dionysiac tradition is evoked by Ino's myth following

Semele's (esp. **27**), to which it is a chronological as well as a thematic sequel. The version of Dionysus' rescue of Semele from Hades (implied by **27**), which involved a catabasis at Lake Alkyonia (Paus.2.37.5-6), exemplifies the Dionysiac motif of 'diving into the depths' (Lavecchia (2013) 66-68), and creates a thematic link with Ino's immortalization. Ino's son Melicertes was rescued by a dolphin (associated with mystery-cults and Dionysus: Csapo (2003) 69-98) to be worshipped in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Corinth in a cult with Dionysian characteristics: Lavecchia (2013) 66nn.49-50. For Ino's cultic connections with Dionysus, see Athanassakis & Wolkow on *Orph.Hymn*.74.

Parallels with *threnos*-fragments, similarly describing Ino's deification amongst the Nereids after suffering, suggest generic *Kreuzung* here (see ***P*.6.1-4**): fr.128da.2-10 Ἰ]νὼ δ' ἐκ πυ[ρ | [ἁρπά]ξαισα [παῖδ' ...]ἀγλαοκ[όλπου] Δωρίδος | [πε]ντήκο[ντα κο]ύραις ... ἄλλο[τε δ' ἀλ]λοῖαι (~ **33 ῥοαὶ δ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι**) ... ἀ]θαν[ά]ταισι; fr.128ec.7]Λευκοθ[εα.

Ibyc.S222.5-6 pairs Ino with Oedipus as archetypal sufferers; Wilkinson notes both are Theban, kin-murderers, and divinized after death (Oedipus: S.*OC*.1518-32, 1760-67). Here, Oedipus begins the next myth (**38**), but his redemption is left to future generations, while hers is personal and eschatological.

28 λέγοντι: *O*.9.49; *N*.7.84; fr.52m.9; fr.70a.15. Appeal to anonymous authorities despite epic precedent: see ***P*.6.21**.

ἐν καὶ: elsewhere of opposites in close proximity: *O*.7.26 νῦν ἐν καὶ τελευτᾷ; *P*.10.58 ἐν ἄλι-ξι θησέμεν ἐν καὶ παλαιτέροις; *N*.7.31 ἀδόκη-τον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα; here, contrasting the the more distant **25 ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις**. This Pindaric idiosyncrasy has no pre-Hellenistic parallels (Ibyc.S238a.3]εν καὶ τη[is unclear); *pace* Santamaría, avoidance of hiatus is unlikely, as καὶ ἐν is equally common: *O*.13.107; *P*.3.90; *P*.4.254; *P*.9.40. With other prepositions: Hummel 395.

28-29 θαλάσσᾳ | μετὰ κόραισι Νηρῆος ἁλίαις: *Il.*18.139-41 ἁλίῃσι κασιγνήτῃσι ... θαλάσσης ... γέρονθ' ἅλιον καὶ δώματα πατρός (Nereids).

Cf. Alcm.fr.50b.1 Ἰνὼ σαλασσομέδοισ'.

29-30 μετὰ κόραισι Νηρῆος ἁλίαις βίοτον ἄφθιτον | Ἰνοῖ τετάχθαι τὸν ὅλον ἀμφὶ χρόνον: E.*Andr.*1256-58 ἀθάνατον ἄφθιτόν τε ποιήσω θεόν ... Νηρέως ἐν δόμοις ἐμοῦ μέτα | τὸ λοιπὸν (Thetis offering Peleus immortality amongst the Nereids).

29 μετὰ: 'in company with', matching **25 ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις**: the sisters live amongst divinities, but retain their distinctiveness as former mortals (cf. **78**).

κόραισι Νηρῆος ἁλίαις: Nereids (*Il.*18.39-49; Hes.*Th.*240-64 with West). When with Nereus, the epithet usually adheres to him (*Od.*24.58 κοῦραι ἁλίοιο γέροντος; Hes.*Th.*1003 Νηρῆος κοῦραι ἁλίοιο; Ar.*Thesm.*325 Νηρέος εἰναλίου τε κόραι), but occurs with the Nereids on their own (*Il.*24.84 ἅλιαι θεαί).

Ino-Leucothea dwells with them at *P.*11.2 Ἰνὼ δὲ Λευκοθέα ποντιᾶν ὁμοθάλαμε Νηρηΐδων. *Il.*18.86 μετ' ἀθανάτῃς ἁλίῃσι stresses their immortality. Barringer (1995) argues they facilitate transitions, including to the afterlife. A thematic bridge is created with their sister Thetis' intervention to transfer Achilles to the Isle (**79-80**): cf. their escorting of Achilles and Peleus to Leuce (*Aethiop.*Arg.4a-4b; E.*Andr.*1260-68). Csapo (2003) 94-95 posits that their 'functions made them symbols of eternal salvation, giving them a doctrinal role in the mysteries, and a further, more metaphysical, connection with Dionysus': this reinforces Ino's Dionysiac connections here (see **28-30**). For their connection to Dionysiac cult, see Athanassakis & Wolkow on *Orph.Hymn.*24.

Νηρῆος: a name for the 'Old Man of the Sea': see West on Hes.*Th.*233. Although *Orph.Hymn.*23 is addressed to him, he has no role in Orphic cult.

βίοτον ἄφθιτον: divine immortality: S.fr.941.3 ἄφθιτος βίος (Aphrodite); Crit.fr.19.17 δαίμων ἀφθίτῳ θάλλων βίῳ; Nonn.*Dion*.8.414 βίον ἄφθιτον ἔσχεν Ὀλύμπιον (Semele).

ἄφθιτον: of the immortalization process: *h.Hom*.2.260-261 ἀθάνατόν ... ποίησα καὶ ἄφθιτον ὥπασα τιμήν; *O*.1.63-64 ἄφθιτον | θέν; A.*Eum*.724 ἀφθίτους θεῖναι βροτούς; E.*Andr*.1256; E.*Or*.1635 ζῆν νιν ἄφθιτον. Blessed states described through negation: **61-67**. *Il*.13.22: Poseidon's undersea palace.

30 τετάχθαι: the perfect expresses Ino's continuing existence: Hummel 249.

τὸν ὅλον ἀμφὶ χρόνον: 'for all time': *N*.1.69 τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον (deified Heracles); fr.133.5-6 ἐς δὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον (heroized individuals). Contrast *N*.3.49 ὅλον ... ἂν χρόνον 'for the rest of his life'.

30-37 Two sets of gnomes transition from the Cadmeids' vicissitudes to the Labdacids': **30-34** concern the human condition in general, stressing our mortality, ignorance of the future, and vulnerability to fortune's fluctuations; **35-37** are personalized for the Emmenids, and indicate that they enjoy a more favourable and less random lot: their fate-controlled familial destiny is essentially kindly, but occasionally contaminated with suffering that is later reversed.

30-34 Tripartite gnome concerning ordinary mortals: (1) **30-31**: no limit has been placed upon death; (2) **32-33**: nor is their happiness guaranteed to be intact when they die; (3) **33-34**: for various pleasures and pains come upon them at different times.

The sentiments are conventional; however, (1) is conventional only on a *retrospective* appraisal of the passage, since it is phrased ambiguously to permit an eschatological sense on first hearing after **22-30**.

30-32 ἤτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται | πεῖρας οὔ τι θανάτου, | οὐδ' ἡσύχιμον ἀμέραν ὁπότε: Thgn.1.380-81 οὐδέ τι κεκριμένον πρὸς δαίμονός ἐστι βροτοῖσιν, | οὐδ' ὁδὸν ἥντιν' ἰὼν ἀθανάτοισιν ἄδοι.

30-31 ἤτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται | πεῖρας οὔ τι θανάτου: variously interpretable:

(1) 'For mortals, no *end consisting in death* has been *specified in advance*': mortals can die at any time, and *therefore do not know* the time and circumstances of their deaths (Σ.*O*.2.55a-b; Willcock). This takes **31 πεῖρας ... θανάτου** as genitive of specification ('end consisting in death' = death: *Il*.3.309 θανάτοιο τέλος; *Il*.6.143 ὀλέθρου πείραθ').

Conventional wisdom stresses human ignorance of the future (Sem.fr.1.3-5 ἀνθρώποισιν ... ἐπήμεροι ... οὐδὲν εἰδότες | ὅκως ἕκαστον ἐκτελευτήσει θεός; Thgn.1.159-60 οἶδε γὰρ οὐδείς | ἀνθρώπων ὅ τι νὺξ χἠμέρη ἀνδρὶ τελεῖ; Sol.fr.13.65-66; *N*.6.6-7; *N*.11.43-46; B.10.45-46), sometimes specifying the unpredictability of life's duration (Thgn.1.905-9 εἰ μὲν γὰρ κατιδεῖν βιότου τέλος ἦν, ὁπόσον τι | ἤμελλ' ἐκτελέσας εἰς Ἀίδαο περᾶν ... νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔστιν; B.3.78-82; E.fr.816.4-7 κοὐκ ἔστιν ὅρος κείμενος οὐδεὶς ... θνητοῖς, | πλὴν ὅταν ἔλθῃ ... θανάτου πεμφθεῖσα τελευτή) and happiness (Sim.fr.521.1-2 ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν μή ποτε φάσηις ὅ τι γίνεται αὔριον, | μηδ' ἄνδρα ἰδὼν ὄλβιον ὅσσον χρόνον ἔσσεται; S.*OT*.1528-30).

These concepts are clearly relevant to **32-33**. But applying them to **30-31** makes them an otiose precursor to **32-33** ('mortals do not know the time and circumstances of their death ... nor when they will die and whether they will be happy when they do'). Therefore, it is preferable to take **30-31** as:

(2) 'For mortals, no *limit* has been set *upon* death': death is inevitable. This understands **πεῖρας ... θανάτου** as objective genitive ('limit to death'): *Od*.23.248; E.*Andr*.1216; E.*Alc*.890 πέρας ... οὐδὲν ἀλγέων; cf. D.18.97.6 πέρας ... ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις ἐστὶ τοῦ βίου θάνατος.

Parallels: *Il.*12.326-27; Sim.fr.15.1.4 ἄφυκτος ... θάνατος.

This possibility, apparently ignored by commentators, gives excellent grammatical sense and coheres with the following gnome exactly like E.*Alc.*782-85 βροτοῖς ἅπασι κατθανεῖν ὀφείλεται (~ **30-31**), | κοὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν ὅστις ἐξεπίσταται | τὴν αὔριον μέλλουσαν εἰ βιώσεται. | τὸ τῆς τύχης γὰρ ἀφανὲς οἳ προβήσεται (~ **32-33**).

However, both (1) and (2) jar with the Cadmeid myth of immortality mitigating death, prompting a final possibility:

(3) 'For mortals, no *end consisting in death* has been *set*': mortals can live on after death (Ruck (1972) 164; Currie (2005) 32; to **25**, add Emped.fr.8.56 οὐδέ τις οὐλομένου θανάτοιο τελευτή | ἀλλὰ μόνον μίξις τε διάλλαξίς τε μιγέντων: birth/death redefined as elemental mixture/dissolution).

This coheres with the Cadmeid myth, and the eschatology (**56-83**), but not **32-33**: P. makes his audience follow a train of thought (i.e. (3)), then re-evaluate it retrospectively (i.e. (2)), only to re-engage with it later in the ode. This reading is preferable to making **30-31** anaphoric and **32-33** cataphoric (Koniaris (1997a) 33), or divorcing **30-33** from thc Cadmeid myth completely (Santamaría).

ἤτοι: not adversative in itself (*pace* Köhnken *ap.*Lloyd-Jones (1985) 281 'das auf die vorhergehenden *paradeigmata* der Kadmostöchter Semele und Ino zurückweisende ἤτοι'), but underscoring the truth of what follows.

βροτῶν γε: cf. ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι (4x Hom.), *Il.*24.259 ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ, all in contexts differentiating men from gods.

κέκριται: of divine gifts/impositions on mortals: Thgn.1.380-81; E.*Ph.*1663.

οὔ τι: connoting disadvantage/limitation: Thgn.1.167-68 Οὔ τι μάλ' ἀνθρώποις καταθύμια πάντα τελεῖται· | πολλὸν γὰρ θνητῶν κρέσσονες ἀθάνατοι.

32-33 The issue is whether **ἡσύχιμον ἀμέραν ὁπότε ... τελευτάσομεν** is (1) literal ('conclude the day in peace'); (2) metaphorical ('conclude the day *of* peace' = die).

Pace Santamaría, (2) is preferable: (a) the metaphor is frequent, esp. of death: (*Il.*8.72 αἴσιμον ἦμαρ; *Il.*15.613 μόρσιμον ἦμαρ; *Il.*19.294 ὀλέθριον ἦμαρ; *Od.*15.524 τελευτήσει κακὸν ἦμαρ); (b) human ignorance about when and how *life* will end is much more typical than about how a *day* will end: see **30-31**.

ὁπότε as both 'when' [we shall die] and 'whether' [our happiness will be intact when we do] is not insuperably awkward (*pace* Boeckh): Th.1.2.2.5-6 ἄδηλον ὂν ὁπότε τις ... ἀφαιρήσεται; Th.8.96.2.4 ἄδηλον ὂν ὁπότε ... ξυρράξουσι.

32 ἡσύχιμον: *hapax*.

ἀμέραν ... παῖδ' ἀελίου: this personification of the relationship between the sun and the day's length reconfigures the Hes.*Th.*123-25 genealogy, which lists Hemera's parents as Nyx and Erebus (cf. B.7.1-2: Nyx and Chronus), by promoting Helios to an earlier stage. Cf. West on Hes.*Th.*124, who observes that the later stage occupied by Helios there reflects 'the basic antiquity of these cosmologies; primitive man does not realize that sunlight and daylight are the same': P. is more sophisticated. Side B of a Hellenistic altar on Kos (Segre (1993) EV.18) includes Helios and Hemera.

The genealogical metaphor recalls **17 Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατὴρ**. S.fr.752 Ἥλι' ... γεννητὴν θεῶν | πατέρα <τε> πάντων makes Helios a universal progenitor (cf. *O.*7.70 γενέθλιος ἀκτίνων πατήρ); *Orph.Hymn.*8.13 even calls Helios the 'father of Time'. See Athanassakis & Wolkow on *Orph.Hymn.*8 for his Orphic associations.

Maslov (2012) 49-77 contextualizes P.'s genealogical metaphors as means of concept formation before the advent of analytic philosophical categories, classing *h.l.* as an 'occasional innovation'.

Cf. **62 ἀμέραις ἅλιον**; E.*Alc*.244 Ἅλιε καὶ φάος ἀμέρας.

33 ὁπότε: indirect interrogative dependent on **30 κέκριται**.

ἀτειρεῖ σὺν ἀγαθῷ τελευτάσομεν: Thgn.1.135-36 οὐδέ τις ἀνθρώπων ... εἰδώς, | ἐς τέλος εἴτ' ἀγαθὸν γίνεται εἴτε κακόν.

ἀτειρεῖ σὺν ἀγαθῷ: substantival neuter adjective: **24 κρεσσόνων πρὸς ἀγαθῶν**.

τελευτάσομεν: gnomic universalizing plural: *N*.3.73; *N*.6.4; *N*.7.4, 5; *I*.7.42; fr.124ab.7.

ῥοαὶ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι: the idiom often expresses vicissitude gnomically: *Od*.4.236-37 ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ | Ζεὺς ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε διδοῖ; Thgn.1.156, 318; *O*.7.11, 95 ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοῖαι διαιθύσσοισιν αὖραι; *P*.3.104 ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖαι πνοαί (capping the account of Cadmus' daughters and Peleus' son); *P*.8.77; *I*.3.18a-18b αἰὼν δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἀμέραις ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξ | ἄλλαξεν; *I*.4.5 ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖος οὖρος; fr.128da.8 ἄλλο[τε δ' ἀλ]λοῖαι; B.fr.24.4-5; Krause (1976) 91-138. Whereas *O*.7.95, *P*.3.104, *I*.4.5-6 use breeze-imagery, **ῥοαὶ** are currents both metaphorical (fate: E.*HF*.739 παλίρρους πότμος; cf. **36-37**) and literal (immortalizing Ino: **28-29**); cf. the Heraclitean πάντα ῥεῖ.

ἄλλοτ': reprising **32 ὁπότε**.

34 εὐθυμιᾶν: 'good cheer': *I*.1.63; fr.52a.1-4; fr.155.1-3 (personified); B.17.125-26. See **7 εὐωνύμων**.

πόνων: in gnomes of human suffering (*P*.5.54); **62**, **67** refer to the divergent fates of the good and the lawless.

ἔβαν: gnomic aorist: *O*.8.12-13 ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἔβαν | ἀγαθῶν.

Epode 2

35-41 Μοῖρ' ... Ἐρινύς: A.*Sept*.975-77 Μοῖρα ... πότνιά τ' Οἰδίπου σκιά, | μέλαιν' Ἐρινύς; also *Il*.19.87; A.*PV*.516.

πατρώϊον ... Ἐρινύς: A.*Sept*.70 Ἐρινὺς πατρὸς, 723 πατρὸς εὐκταίαν Ἐρινὺν, 885-86 πατρὸς Οἰδιπόδα ... Ἐρινὺς.

35-37 Μοῖρ' ... εὔφρονα πότμον, θεόρτῳ σὺν ὄλβῳ ... πῆμ' ἄγει, παλιντράπελον: recycling **18-22 πότμῳ σὺν εὐδαίμονι ... πῆμα ... παλίγκοτον ... θεοῦ Μοῖρα ... ὄλβον**. Interlaced repetitions stylistically enact the gnomes' introduction of myths (**22-30**; **38-45**) illustrating the cyclical nature of fortune controlled by Fate. Whereas **18-22** indicate reversal from bad to good, here the sequence goes from good to bad to good again, matching the Labdacids' fall from, and return to, happiness. See **30-37** on this gnome's personalization to the Emmenids (**35 πατρώϊον**; **36 τῶνδ'**).

These verses' phrasing is echoed by some later tragedies, including those on the Labdacids: see **nn.**

Μοῖρ' ... παλιντράπελον: E.*Supp*.608-9 τὸν εὐτυχίαι λαμπρὸν ἄν τις αἰροῖ | μοῖρα πάλιν.

35 Μοῖρ': 21.

35-36 πατρώϊον ... εὔφρονα: introducing a myth of Emmenid familial continuity from the past, while reprising the prayer for the Emmenids' future (**14 εὔφρων ἄρουραν ἔτι πατρίαν**).

35 πατρώϊον: see **7**. Ironic, given the myth of Oedipus' patricide (**38**).

36 τῶνδ': unlike **18-22** and **30-34**, this gnome is personalized for the Emmenids, anticipating the explicit genealogical link between the mythic protagonists and Theron

(**46**) left implicit in the Cadmeid myth; the proximal deictic provides living proof of the family's survival. Cf. *N*.8.14 ἀστῶν θ' ὑπὲρ τῶνδ' (Aeginetans).

εὔφρονα πότμον: 18 πότμῳ σὺν εὐδαίμονι.

36-37 πότμον, θεόρτῳ ... παλιντράπελον: S.fr.871.1-8 πότμος ἐν πυκνῷ θεοῦ | τρόχῳ κυκλεῖται ... πάλιν διαρρεῖ ('wheel-of-fortune' imagery: S.*Tr*.126-31, with Davies; cf. **21-23**); E.*HF*.739 θεῶν παλίρρους πότμος.

36 θεόρτῳ σὺν ὄλβῳ: 21-22 θεοῦ ... ὄλβον.

θεόρτῳ: B.25.1; A.*PV*.765.

36-37 ὄλβῳ ... πῆμ': contrast Thgn.1.383 ὄλβον ἔχουσιν ἀπήμονα; fr.52k.8-9.

37 ἐπί ... πῆμ' ἄγει: tmesis: Hummel 167; *Od*.3.152 ἐπὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς ἤρτυε πῆμα. Cf. Hes.*Op*.242 ἐπήγαγε πῆμα Κρονίων (city punished for an evil man); S.*Ant*.594-95 ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδᾶν οἴκων ὁρῶμαι | πήματα φθιτῶν ἐπὶ πήμασι πίπτοντ' (intergenerational Labdacid sufferings); S.*Tr*.129-30 ἐπὶ πῆμα ... κυκλοῦσιν ('wheel-of-fortune': see **36-37**).

πῆμ' ... παλιντράπελον: 19-20 πῆμα ... παλίγκοτον; Lycophr.*Alex*.1350 παλινστροβήτοις πημοναῖς (Odysseus); S.*OC*.1566-67 πημάτων ἱκνουμένων | πάλιν σφε δαίμων δίκαιος αὖξοι (reversal from bad to good: Oedipus).

παλιντράπελον ... χρόνῳ: A.*Ag*.463-66 Ἐρινύες χρόνωι ... παλιντυχεῖ τριβᾶι βίου | τιθεῖσ' ἀμαυρόν (Erinyes reverse the unjust's fortunes).

παλιντράπελον: *hapax*. Cf. S.fr.576.4-5 δαίμων ἀνδρὸς εὐτυχοῦς τὸ πρὶν | μάστιγ' ἐρείσῃ τοῦ βίου παλίντροπον (reversal of fortune).

38-45 P.'s version of the Labdacid myth illustrates the preceding gnome (**35-37**): the family's pre-existing good fortune turns to bad when Laius, king of Thebes, is killed by his son Oedipus in accordance with a Delphic oracle (**38-40**), and the Erinys kills Oedipus' sons as punishment (**41-42**); this misfortune is reversed when Polyneices' son Thersander

survives to save the line (**43-44**). It follows chronologically from the Cadmeid myth (**22-30**), with the Emmenids' genealogical connection to the mythic protagonists now explicit (**46**). However, although the Labdacid myth is likewise one of vicissitude, it presents both advantages and challenges.

On the one hand, the Theban Cycle rivalled the Trojan for prestige, and Labdacid descent was illustrious (*I*.3.17-17b unproblematically links it to wealth and chariot-racing). The family's recovery from such disasters underscores its capacity for self-perpetuation.

On the other, the myth involved not only crimes threatening intrafamilial ties, but often an ancestral curse or Erinys (see **41**), with the risk of transmitting such a taint to Theron, esp. since familial continuity is a key theme (see **7**; **12-15**). The concept of ancestral fault is complex: Sophocles radically downplays it, Euripides develops it (Sewell-Rutter (2007)); Gagné (2013) regards it as an idea that expanded in the 5th century rather than a vestige of primitive beliefs, but concedes its significance here (349); the interpretation of certain 'Orphic' texts partly depends on our view of how the concept applies to them (453-63; see **27**; **58**).

P. therefore neutralizes that risk via the strategies listed below. The myth's implications for the present are multiple: the Labdacid fratricide is *contrasted* with the communality of Theron and Xenocrates (**48-51**), and Thersander is a *positive* exemplum for Theron's victory (**46-47**). The eschatology pointedly rejects the model of inherited punishment: see **57-58**.

(1) Correcting the tradition that the Labdacid line was under a recurring curse. Hdt.4.147-49 relates that the Aegeids, Polyneices' descendants through Thersander, built a temple to the Erinyes of Oedipus and Laius when none of their offspring survived; according to Paus.9.5.15, these same Erinyes passed over Thersander's son Teisamenus, but struck Teisamenus' son Autesion, driving him from Thebes. But here, implicitly, no Erinys is

active from Thersander onwards. Hereditary fault was an issue in 5th-century politics (Alcmaeonid *agos*: Gagné (2013) 206-9, 306-25); a recurring curse would contaminate the succession of virtuous lifetimes at **68-70**.

(2) Downplaying Labdacid responsibility for their transgressions, and omitting several altogether. Although the sparsity of earlier material and P.'s antedating of the canonical tragic treatments creates a methodological problem, this technique may be reconstructed as follows:

(a) Transference of responsibility from the Labdacids to fate (see **7**; **21**; **35-37**; **38 μόριμος**; Athanassaki (2009b) 408-13); chance (**39 συναντόμενος**); the Delphic oracle (**39-40**); the Erinys (**41-42**).

Stesichorus' *Thebais* had emphasized fate's agency, but also Apollo's, in relation to a later prophecy given to Eteocles and Polyneices: Stes.fr.97.209-12 μαντοσύνας ... Ἀπόλλων | μὴ πάσας τέλεσσαι. | αἱ δέ με παίδας ἰδέσθαι ὑπ' ἀλλάλοισι δαμέντας | μόρσιμόν ἐστιν, ἐπεκλώσαν δὲ Μοίρα[ι, 224 Μοιρᾶν ~ **35 Μοῖρ'**, **38 μόριμος**, **39-40 Πυθῶνι χρησθέν ... τέλεσσεν**, **42 ἔπεφνέ οἱ σὺν ἀλλαλοφονίᾳ γένος**.

(b) Omission of:

(i) Laius' rape of Chrysippus, son of Pelops (if pre-Euripidean: see Mastronarde (on E.*Ph.*) 31-38; Davies (2014a) 7-8). Ancestral trangression against Pisa's king ill suits an Olympian ode (cf. **3**).

(ii) Apollo (see **39**), and Laius' disobedience of his oracle (see Hutchinson (on A.*Sept.*) xxiii, xxviii; Davies (2014a) 9; Σ.*O.*2.70b attests its appearance in a paean (fr.68)). This aids the celebration of Xenocrates' Pythian victory (**49**).

(iii) Oedipus' mother and his incest with her. This incest is assumed by the entire tradition; that Oedipus' children were the product of incest is first attested in Pherecydes, but may

be older (see Fowler (2013) 403-8; Davies & Finglass 358-69; Mastronarde (on E.*Ph.*) 21 'it was ... in the interest of families who claimed descent from Polynices' son Thersandros to give Polynices a non-incestuous mother, and it may have been in the interest of Homeric decorum').

(iv) Oedipus' cursing of his sons (see **41-42**).

P. reconfigures passages from the epic *Thebais* to eliminate the curse-tradition (cf. Santamaría 495). First, he recasts what in the epic was the Erinys heeding Oedipus' curse as the Erinys' *independent* perception of Oedipus' murder of Laius: *Theb.*fr.2.8 θοὴν δ' οὐ λάνθαν' Ἐρινύν ~ **41 ἰδοῖσα δ' ὀξεῖ' Ἐρινύς**. Second, he remodels the form of Oedipus' curse on the division of his sons' patrimony to express the *survival* of the Emmenid line here (*Theb.*fr.2.9-10 οὗ οἱ πατρώϊ' ἐνηέι <ἐν> φιλότητι | δάσσαιντ', ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀεὶ πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε ~ **35 πατρώϊον**, **44 ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου**).

(v) The fact that Thersander's military success involved attacking his ancestral city (**44**).

The myth's elements are partitioned for balance and simplicity: each comprises a single sentence that begins verse-initial and ends verse-final; **41-42** is the only section in either set of myths occupying 2 verses instead of 3. This tripartite structure emulates the epic *Oedipodeia*, *Thebais*, and *Epigoni*, insofar as each may have treated a single generation of the same family (cf. the triad of heroes from the *Iliad*, *Cypria*, and *Aethiopis* at **81-83**). It also parallels tragic trilogies, combining the one-generation-per-play configuration of Aeschylus' Theban trilogy (Hutchinson (on A.*Sept.*) xxix-xxx) with the relief from intergenerational disaster of the last play in his *Oresteia*. Might Aeschylus, likely present in Sicily in 476, have been influenced by *h.l.*? Amongst numerous verbal/thematic parallels with A.*Sept.* here (see **35-41**; **39-40**; **41-42**; **42**; **46**; **49-50**), a remarkable one occurs with a collocation ringing the play's second stasimon, which unites the Labdacid myth's intergenerational strands: 723-24 Ἐρινὺν | τελέσαι, 791 μὴ τελέσῃι καμψίπους

Ἐρινύς both express fear that the Erinys of Oedipus' curse will destroy his sons; here, **40-41 τέλεσσεν ... Ἐρινύς** straddles the narratives of Oedipus killing Laius and the Erinys destroying his sons as punishment. Aeschylus' tragic vision reinserts and expands the multigenerational curse that P. so carefully excises.

38 ἐξ οὗπερ: all poetic parallels with **–περ** yield 'from the moment when': E.*Or*.89 ἐξ οὗπερ αἷμα γενέθλιον κατήνυσεν. Without **–περ**: the causal sense (preferred by Santamaría) is mostly prosaic, with poetic parallels (*Od*.21.303; *h.Hom*.3.372; E.fr.896.3; S.*OT*.1202) drawing conclusions from narratives rather than commencing them, as is required here: cf. E.*Ph*.867 νοσεῖ γὰρ ἥδε γῆ πάλαι, Κρέον. | ἐξ οὗ 'τεκνώθη Λάιος βίαι θεῶν | πόσιν τ' ἔφυσε μητρὶ μέλεον Οἰδίπουν.

The antecedent is not **37 χρόνῳ** (*pace* Slater s.v. ὅσπερ), which corresponds to when misery reverts to good under Thersander, but (loosely) **37 πῆμ' ἄγει**, illustrating the moment misery enters the family's destiny with Oedipus.

ἔκτεινε Λᾶον: S.*OT*.309 κτανόντας Λάιον, 813 κτείνω; D.S.4.64.2.11-12 Οἰδίπους ... ἀπέκτεινε τὸν Λάιον.

μόριμος υἱός: the periphrasis stresses (1) Oedipus' role as an agent of fate, to the extent of depersonalizing him by effacing his name; (2) the content of the oracle (**39-40**) that Laius' *son* would be *fated* to killed him (S.*OT*.713 μοῖρα πρὸς παιδὸς θανεῖν); (3) the horror of patricide, accentuated by the theme of paternal continuity (see **7**; the contrast with **35-36 πατρῴϊον ... εὔφρονα πότμον** is pointed).

μόριμος: 'fated' (*Od*.16.392): see **38-45**. Oedipus embodies the operation of **35 Μοῖρ'**: cf. *Il*.19.410-17 Μοῖρα ... μόρσιμόν. The intertext with **10** links Oedipus with Theron's recent ancestors.

39 συναντόμενος: a play on 'meet by chance' (*Od.*15.538) and 'meet in battle' (*Il.*21.34), evoking Oedipus' deadly encounter with Laius at a crossroads (A.fr.387a; S.*OT*.800-13; E.*Ph*.32-45), but deflecting his responsibility (see **38-45**). Sociology of violence at Greek crossroads: Gregory (1995) 144-45.

P.'s view of the encounter's location appears ambivalent between two traditions: (1) sources following the Delphic tradition (cf. **39 Πυθῶνι**) locate the crossroads at Phocis; (2) A.fr.387a places it at Potniae, sacred to the Erinyes (E.*Or*.318 ποτνιάδες θεαί), who witness Oedipus' patricide (**41 ἰδοῖσα ... Ἐρινύς**).

39-40 ἐν δὲ Πυθῶνι χρησθέν | παλαίφατον: see Fontenrose (1978) 96-98, 362-63, on the oracle's sources. Here, its (1) content and (2) circumstances are left to be inferred.

(1) The context implies only that Laius' son would kill him. Two key details are omitted: (a) the prophecy's conditionality or avoidability, thus absolving Laius of responsibility (contrast A.*Sept*.743-52; E.*Ph*.18-20; E.fr.539a), and Oedipus too (cf. S.*OC*.960-1002); (b) Oedipus' incest with his mother (note the pointed singular **39 χρησθέν**).

Cf. A.*Sept*.743-52 παλαιγενῆ ... παρβασίαν ... Ἀπόλλωνος εὖτε Λάιος | βίαι τρὶς εἰπόντος ἐν ... Πυθικοῖς | χρηστηρίοις θνάισκοντα γέν- | νας ἄτερ σώιζειν πόλιν ... ἐκ φιλᾶν ἀβουλιᾶν | ἐγείνατο μὲν μόρον αὑτῶι, | πατροκτόνον Οἰδιπόδαν; S.*OT*.711-14 χρησμὸς γὰρ ἦλθε Λαΐῳ ποτ', οὐκ ἐρῶ | Φοίβου γ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, τῶν δ' ὑπηρετῶν ἄπο ... μοῖρα πρὸς παιδὸς θανεῖν, 852-54 Λαΐου φόνον ... Λοξίας | διεῖπε χρῆναι παιδὸς ἐξ ἐμοῦ θανεῖν; S.*OC*.969-70 θέσφατον πατρὶ | χρησμοῖσιν ... πρὸς παίδων θανεῖν; E.*Ph*.18-20 μὴ σπεῖρε τέκνων ἄλοκα δαιμόνων βίαι· | εἰ γὰρ τεκνώσεις παῖδ', ἀποκτενεῖ σ' ὁ φύς ... πᾶς σὸς οἶκος βήσεται δι' αἵματος; E.fr.539a Φοί]βου ποτε οὐκ ⌊ἐῶντος ἔσπειρεν⌋ τέκν[ο]ν.

(2) **40 παλαίφατον** indicates the oracle is that given to Laius before Oedipus' birth (*v.s.*), not that given to Oedipus at Delphi (S.*OT*.787-93). Avoidance of Apollo's name (**39 Πυθῶνι**) diminishes the god's role, typically foregrounded in tragedy (but contrast

S.*OT*.711-12): see **49 Πυθῶνι**. Fontenrose (1978) no.17 argues the Delphic connection is non-original.

39-40 χρησθέν | παλαίφατον τέλεσσεν: A.*Sept*.766-67 τέλειαι γὰρ παλαιφάτων ἀρᾶν | βαρεῖαι καταλλαγαί (Eteocles and Polyneices' duel); S.*Tr*.822-25 τοὔπος τὸ θεοπρόπον ... παλαιφάτου προνοίας ... ἀναδοχὰν τελεῖν πόνων; E.*Cyc*.696 παλαιὸς χρησμὸς ἐκπεραίνεται.

χρησθέν ... τέλεσσεν: A.*Pers*.740; S.*OT*.797 χρησμῶν ὀνείδη ... τελούμενα (Oedipus' attempt to escape his prophecy); E.*Ph*.641-42 τελεσφόρον ... χρησμόν.

χρησθέν | παλαίφατον: *Od*.9.507 = *Od*.13.172 παλαίφατα θέσφαθ'.

Conventional description of prophecies as 'uttered long ago' (1) enhances their authority; (2) makes their fulfilment more surprising; (3) accentuates their intergenerational effect (A.*Sept*.802 παλαιὰς Λαΐου δυσβουλίας; S.*OT*.1245-47 καλεῖ ... Λάιον πάλαι νεκρόν, | μνήμην παλαιῶν σπερμάτων ἔχουσ', ὑφ' ὧν | θάνοι μὲν αὐτός); (4) masks recent poetic innovation.

40 παλαίφατον τέλεσσεν: aural reprise of the responding **20 παλίγκοτον δαμασθέν** highlights the semantic shift from the metaphorical death of suffering there to its return as literal death here over the intervening triad, stylistically enacting the vicissitude cycle.

τέλεσσεν: the end-stopped triad-final verb signifying completion enacts it.

Strophe 3

41-43 ἰδοῖσα ... ἔπεφνέ ... λείφθη: successive verse-initial verbs emphasize the events' rapid sequence.

41-42 ἰδοῖσα δ' ὀξεῖ' Ἐρινύς | ἔπεφνέ οἱ σὺν ἀλλαλοφονίᾳ γένος ἀρήϊον: Eteocles and Polyneices' duel: A.*Sept*.813-15 πέπωκεν αἷμα γαῖ' ὑπ' ἀλλήλων φόνωι ... ὁ δαίμων κοινὸς ἦν ἀμφοῖν ἄγαν ... ἀναλοῖ δῆτα δύσποτμον γένος, 1054-56 φθερσιγενεῖς ... Ἐρινύες, αἵτ' Οἰδιπόδα | γένος ὠλέσατε; E.*Ph*.252-55 φοινίου μάχας, | ἃν Ἄρης ... παισὶν Οἰδίπου φέρων | πημονὰν Ἐρινύων, 1306 φόνος ἕνεκ' Ἐρινύων. Cf. A.*Ch*.577; E.*Med*.1260.

The Erinys witnesses Oedipus killing his father, and punishes him by killing his sons, Eteocles and Polyneices, in mutual slaughter.

The Erinyes are multifaceted spirits avenging crimes against kin (Heubeck (1986) 143-65; Sewell-Rutter (2007) 78-109). In most other sources concerning the Labdacids, they *execute a curse*, typically Oedipus' upon his sons (*Theb*.fr.2.8; A.*Sept*.70, 723, 886; E.*Ph*.624; cf. S.*OC*.421-30, 1370-96). Here, however, the Erinys' independent action and the curse's omission removes Oedipus' responsibility, and that of his sons for provoking him (see Davies (2014a) 46-47); cf. the 'Erinys of Laius' which presumably punished Oedipus for his patricide (**38-45**; cf. S.*OT*.417-418 μητρός τε κἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ... δεινόπους ἀρά; E.*Ph*.1611 ἀρὰς παραλαβὼν Λαΐου καὶ παισὶ δούς). Oedipus' cultic association with the Erinyes: Edmunds (1981) 221-38. The brothers' quarrel (Davies (2014a) 61-62) is similarly omitted here.

The Erinys may already play a part in post-mortem punishment at *Il*.19.259-60; cf. Betegh (2004) 84-89 for their role in P.Derv.

41 ἰδοῖσα ... Ἐρινύς: tragic Erinyes often witness the wrongs they avenge: S.*Ai*.836-37 ὁρώσας πάντα τἀν βροτοῖς πάθη ... Ἐρινῦς; S.*El*.112-13 Ἐρινύες ... τοὺς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶθ'; S.*OC*.42 πάνθ' ὁρώσας Εὐμενίδας. All-seeing gods: West on Hes.*Op*.267; Men.*Sent*.695 Ὄξὺς θεῶν ὀφθαλμὸς εἰς τὰ πάνθ' ὁρᾶν.

ὀξεῖ': connoting the Erinys' (1) visual acuity (*v.s.*; *N.*10.62; Men.*Sent.*695); (2) quickness to anger (S.*OC.*1193): **Ἐρινύς** < ἐρινύω 'be angry'; (3) blade-like sharpness (*Il.*10.335): see **42 ἔπεφνέ**.

42 ἔπεφνέ ... ἀλλαλοφονίᾳ: *figura etymologica*: *P.*11.37 πέφνεν ... ἐν φοναῖς; B.9.13-14 πέφν' ... φόνου.

ἔπεφνέ: epic: typically of heroes defeating foes: *O.*13.90 (Bellerophon: Chimaera; Solymi); *P.*10.46 (Perseus: Gorgon); fr.171.1-2 (Heracles: Neleus?); cf. B.18.19 (Theseus: Sinis). Characterizing the Erinys as a victorious warrior transfers the brothers' agency to her.

σὺν: making the brothers' mutual slaughter merely the Erinys' instrument: A.*Sept.*884-87 διήλ- | λαχθε σὺν σιδάρωι ... πατρὸς Οἰδιπόδα ... Ἐρινὺς ἐπέκρανεν.

ἀλλαλοφονίᾳ: fr.163 ἀλλαλοφόνους ἐπάξαντο λόγχας (Otus and Ephialtes). Eteocles and Polyneices: *Theb.*fr.3.4 χερσὶν ὑπ' ἀλλήλων; Stes.fr.97.211 ὕπο ἀλλάλοισι δαμέντας; A.*Sept.*813-15 ὑπ' ἀλλήλων φόνωι, 930-31 ἐτελεύτασαν ὑπ' ἀλλαλοφόνοις | χερσὶν ὁμοσπόροισιν. Cf. S.*OC.*1387-88 συγγενεῖ χερὶ | θανεῖν κτανεῖν θ' (Oedipus' curse on Polyneices); E.*Supp.*950 κατ' ἀλλήλων φόνους (aftermath of Seven).

Elsewhere in classical Greek only A.*Ag.*1576; X.*Hier.*3.8.6; Posidon.fr.225.20.

γένος ἀρήϊον: fr.164 φιλόμαχον γένος. Omitting their names, like Oedipus' (**38**), reduces their agency.

γένος: hinting at the suppressed detail of their incestuous birth (see **40-41**). Tragedy could present the brothers' death as the family's extirpation (A.*Sept.*1054-55 φθερσιγενεῖς ... Ἐρινύες; cf. Hutchinson on 749); the epinician requires continuity.

ἀρήϊον: in epic, of heroes: evoking the brothers' death in combat, particularly given their descent from Ares, father of Cadmus' wife Harmonia (Σ.*O.*2.75). Strikingly, E.*Ph.*865-95,

930-59 links the Labdacids' self-destruction to Ares' wrath at Cadmus for his slaying of the Dragon: the mutual slaughter of the Spartoi sprung from the Dragon's teeth serves as the archetype of Labdacid ἀλλαλοφονία (Gagné (2013) 376-86); cf. E.*Ph*.253-55 Ἄρης ... παισὶν Οἰδίπου φέρων | πημονὰν Ἐρινύων, 1123-24 Πολυνείκης πύλαις | Ἄρη προσῆγε. Griffith (1991) 50 suggests a play on ἀραῖος ('accursed': see **41-42**): cf. A.*Sept*.945-46 Ἄρης, ἀρὰν πατρώι- | αν τιθεὶς ἀλαθῆ (Labdacid duel).

43-45 λείφθη δὲ Θέρσανδρος ἐριπέντι Πολυ-νείκει ... Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἀρωγὸν δόμοις: E.*IT*.47-57 δόμων πίτνοντα, πᾶν δ' ἐρείψιμον στέγος ... ἐλείφθη στῦλος ... δόμων πατρώιων... στῦλοι γὰρ οἴκων παῖδές εἰσιν ἄρσενες (Orestes). Individuals as structural linchpins: **6**; **81-82**.

43 λείφθη: 'survived': *Od*.4.495.

Θέρσανδρος: Thersander, who survived Polyneices, marched with the Epigoni against Thebes, becoming king after its capture (Paus.9.5.14; Paus.9.8.7). His early death in Mysia at Telephus' hands during the first Greek expedition against Troy in the *Cypria* suggests a post-Homeric entry into the Trojan Cycle (see *Cypr*.Arg.7a with West).

He is a suitable genealogical link to Theron as a (1) firebreak between the cursed Labdacids and their descendants (see **38-45**); (2) flexible template easily moulded into a prototype for Theron as honoured athlete and warrior (**43-44**); (3) onomastic precursor; (4) recipient of hero-cult (Paus.9.5.14).

ἐριπέντι: frequent in epic formulae for death in battle: *Il*.4.462; *Il*.5.47; *Od*.22.296; Hes.*Scut*.421.

Πολυ-νείκει: now named to clarify the genealogy. His speaking name ('Much-Strife': A.*Sept*.577-78, 658, 829-30; E.*Ph*.1494; Davies (2014a) 48) implies the strife he

embodied perished with him. Griffith (1991) 53-58 links the myth to the Empedoclean alternation of Love and Strife.

νέοις ἐν ἀέθλοις: both (1) 'contests for young men' (*Il.*24.89); (2) 'new contests', i.e. the Nemean Games founded by the Seven (*N.*8.51; Davies (2014a) 66).

43-44 ἀέθλοις | ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου: the collocation of athletics and war (*Il.*16.590-91 ἐν ἀέθλῳ ... καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ; *P.*8.26-27 ἐν ἀέθλοις ... ἐν μάχαις; *I.*1.50 ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολεμίζων; Pl.*Resp.*422b.4 πολέμου ἀθληταί; Currie (2005) 149-51) unites two spheres underwriting a tyrant's claim to political power (Morgan (2015) 180).

44 ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου: *Theb.*fr.2.10 πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε: see **38-45**. Elsewhere: *Il.*1.177; *Il.*5.891; *Il.*16.251; *Il.*20.18; Hes.*Th.*926; *O.*8.34-35 πολέμων ... ἐν μάχαις; *O.*9.40 πόλεμον μάχαν τε; *P.*1.47-48 ἐν πολέμοισι μάχαις ... εὑρί-σκοντο ... τιμάν (praising Hieron); B.18.57-59 (Theseus). **πολέμου** as genitive dependent upon μάχη is, however, without parallel.

Given Thersander's minimal contribution to the first Trojan War, the Epigoni's capture of Thebes is the only possible referent, but is glossed over; his bribery of Eriphyle is similarly omitted.

πολέμου: see **4 πολέμου** (responsion).

45 τιμώμενος: anticipating Theron's honour (**47**). Honour for war: Callin.fr.1.6; *P.*1.47-48; for games: *P.*8.5; ***I.*2.29 τιμαῖς** (of this Olympic victory).

Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος: *O.*6.68 θάλος Ἀλκαϊδᾶν; **Ἀδραστιδᾶν** is a *hapax*.

Adrastus married his daughter Argeia to Polyneices (Σ.*O.*2.76d), and led the Seven to restore him to Thebes, but was the sole survivor. He later organized a second successful attack by the Epigoni, in which his son Aegialeus was the sole casualty, whereupon Adrastus died of grief.

The emphasis on Thersander saving the line of his grandfather Adrastus is unexpected, since Homer assigns that role to Diomedes, son of Tydeus and Adrastus' daughter Deipyle (*Il.*14.110-32). However, *pace* Santamaría, it is not irrelevant: this emphasis on the Emmenids' connection to the Argive royal line is intrinsically flattering, and also fits the Emmenid pattern of constructing their genealogy to tie themselves to the various poleis said to have contributed to the foundation of Acragas and/or its mother/grandmother cities Gela and Rhodes: Rhodes is attested as an Argive foundation by P. himself (*O.*7.19; Th.7.57.6; Σ.*O.*2.16c). This is probably the source of Didymus' view of Theron's Argive descent (Σ.*O.*3.1d). See **8-11**.

θάλος ἀρωγὸν δόμοις: E.fr.316.5-7 οὐδὲν οὕτω λαμπρὸν ... ὡς τοῖς ἅπαισι ... παίδων νεογνῶν ἐν δόμοις ἰδεῖν θάλος; E.*El.*14-15 ἐν δόμοισιν ἔλιφ' ... ἄρσενά τ' Ὀρέστην θῆλύ τ' Ἠλέκτρας θάλος; E.*Ph.*88 οἴκοις Ἀντιγόνη θάλος.

θάλος: metaphorical for offspring: *Il.*22.87. Ambiguity with the sense 'victory-crown' suits Thersander's agonistic success (**43**): Renehan (1969) 221-23.

46-47 Transition to Theron in the present via his genealogical link to the Labdacids. Theron's desert of victory-celebrations has its proximal, explicit cause in Thersander's agonistic prowess (**43**), but implicitly also in his family's destiny (**35-37**); that his Cadmeid antecedents were immortalized (**22-30**) implies a status beyond even that of Olympic victor.

46 ὅθεν: genealogical: *Il.*4.58; *P.*5.74.

46 σπέρματος ... ῥίζαν: organic metaphor for hereditary characteristics, reprising **45 θάλος**: D.*In.Aristog.*48.4 πονηροῦ σπέρμα καὶ ῥίζαν. Literal: Hipp.*Sem.*23.14-15; Pl.*Soph.*265c.2 ἐκ σπερμάτων καὶ ῥιζῶν φύεται.

A.*Sept*.752-56 πατροκτόνον Οἰδιπόδαν, ὅστε ματρὸς ... σπείρας ἄρουραν ἵν' ἐτράφη | ῥίζαν αἱματόεσσαν | ἔτλα perverts the image to describe Oedipus' incestuous progeny.

σπέρματος: genealogical: *O*.7.93; A.*Ch*.503; A.*PV*.705; E.*Ba*.35; E.*Heraclid*.540; E.*IT*.988.

Oedipus' incest: S.*OT*.1405.

ῥίζαν: genealogical: *I*.8.56; E.*IT*.610; E.*Ion*.1576.

The connotation 'last root (= survivor) of the house' (A.*Ag*.966 ῥίζης γὰρ οὔσης φυλλὰς ἵκετ' ἐς δόμους; S.*Ant*.599-600 ἐσχάτας ... ῥίζας ... ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις (Antigone)) precisely evokes Thersander' role (**46 θάλος ἀρωγὸν δόμοις**).

45-47 πρέπει ... ἐγκωμίων ... τυγχανέμεν: Pl.*Leg*.801.9-10 ἐγκωμίων | αὐτοὺς τυγχάνειν πρέπον.

46 πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου: see ***O*.3.9**; ***I*.2.28-29**.

The patronymic, a key piece of victory-data (see **3-7**), is specially postponed until now to provide the climax of the ode's genealogical myths and underscore their relevance to Theron. It is 'fitting' (**πρέπει**) for the son of Aenesidamus to receive victory-odes (1) because of his descent from the athletically-victorious Thersander (**43**); (2) because **Αἰνησιδάμου** is etymologically 'praised-by-the-people'.

Its ambiguity between Theron and Xenocrates (hence **48 αὐτός**) anticipates the victory-catalogue's (**48-51**) representation of their relationship as an equitable partnership, contrasting that of Oedipus' sons.

Theron's father shared his name with a recent tyrant of Leontini, Aenesidamus son of Pataecus (ruled c.498-91). In relation to the Emmenids' genealogical claims (see **8-11**; **45**), it is noteworthy that the name occurs 5x on Rhodes in the Hellenistic period (*LGPN* s.v.).

47 ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε: neutrally reformulating **1** in ring-composition, as the ode returns to Theron's Olympic victory.

ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων: *N*.1.7 ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος. P. employs the epithet in self-conscious references to the epinician genre (*O*.10.77; *O*.13.29; *P*.10.53).

Antistrophe 3

48-51 Emmenid victory-catalogue: Theron's Olympic victory, and Xenocrates' Pythian and Isthmian. Its position in the ode's central stanza heightens its significance.

The brothers conclude a chronological series of paired siblings, all descended from Cadmus (see **23**) and illustrating vicissitude. Like their ancestors' blessings, theirs follow toils (**51-52**), and the transition to the eschatology implies the prospect of Cadmeid-like immortality. To contrast the Labdacids' fratricide, the brothers' individual victories are presented as shared accomplishments (see **49 Πυθῶνι δ' ὁμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεόν**; **50 κοιναὶ**).

This fraternal communality is superficial, however: arrangement in decreasing order of prestige (typical: see ***I*.2.12-32**) places Theron's sole victory first, with **48 αὐτός** orientating the catalogue from his perspective; there follow the two prior, but inferior, victories of Xenocrates, identified only by his relationship to Theron (**49 ἀδελφεόν**); since **48 αὐτός** sequesters Theron's Olympic victory for himself, the ostensible communality of **49 ὁμόκλαρον** and **50 κοιναὶ** is in practice unidirectional, sharing the glory of Xenocrates' victories with Theron, not vice-versa. The argument of Cummins (2010) 323 that in the Emmenid odes 'praise of a brother is carefully subordinated to [that] of the laudandus' applies here but requires reformulation to fit the other odes: it is *Theron*'s political

primacy over Xenocrates that gives him priority even where he is not the laudandus. Note Theron's obtrusion into Thrasybulus' virtue-catalogue (***P.*6.46**), and Xenocrates' absence from ***O.*3**. The sole exception is ***I.*2.28-29**, where Xenocrates can appropriate Theron's victory only after both are (probably) dead.

48 Ὀλυμπίᾳ: found in most Olympian odes to evoke the victory-site (cf. ***O.*3.15**). Here in ring-composition with **3 Ὀλυμπιάδα** to mark the return to Theron's victory, underscored by stanza-initial position.

αὐτός: clarifying **46 τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου** as Theron rather than Xenocrates, and focalizing the victory-catalogue through him. With **49 γέρας ἔδεκτο**, it implies Theron drove himself, eliding the charioteer (contrast *P.*5.31-33 γέρας ἀμφέβαλε τεαῖσιν κόμαις ... δώδεκ' ἂν δρόμων τέμενος; ***I.*2.19-28**).

48-49 Ὀλυμπίᾳ ... γέρας: *P.*5.124 Ὀλυμπία ... γέρας.

49 γέρας: 'victory-prize': *O.*8.11; *P.*5.31; *P.*8.78.

ἔδεκτο: cf. **63 δέκονται** of the good's reward.

Πυθῶνι δ' ὁμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεόν: ὁμόκλαρον occurs elsewhere in pre-Christian literature only at *N.*9.4-5 διδύμοις παίδεσσιν ... Πυθῶνος αἰπεινᾶς ὁμοκλάροις ἐπόπταις: the sibling communality of Apollo and Artemis' joint stewardship of Delphi provides a model for representing Xenocrates' Pythian victory as a possession shared with his brother.

Direct contrasts are made with the Labdacid myth: (1) Delphi (**39 Πυθῶνι**), site of the fatal Delphic oracle leading to patricide and fraternal murder amongst the Emmenids' ancestors, becomes the site of shared fraternal divine favour; (2) **ὁμόκλαρον** evokes *inheritance*, the division of which contributed to the Labdacid fratricide (Stes.fr.97.223

κλαροπαληδον with Davies & Finglass; A.*Sept*.727-33, esp. 727 ξένος δὲ κλήρους ἐπινωμᾶι); cf. **49-50**.

49-50 ἀδελφεόν ... κοιναὶ: siblings possess common blood and interests (S.*Ant*.1 κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον; E.*Or*.865); perverted at A.*Sept*.811-12 αὐτοὺς ἀδελφαῖς χερσὶν ἠναίρονθ' ... ὁ δαίμων κοινὸς ἦν ἀμφοῖν ἄγαν (Labdacid fratricide).

50 κοιναὶ Χάριτες: *P*.5.102 σφὸν ὄλβον υἱῷ τε κοινὰν χάριν (Arcesilas' victory shared with his ancestors).

The Graces explicitly bestow victory only here (see ***P*.6.2**). As with **48 αὐτός**, the charioteer is suppressed.

Χάριτες ἄνθεα: *N*.5.55 ἀνθέων ... στεφανώ-ματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν; Ov.*Fast*.5.219 *accedunt Charites nectuntque coronas*.

ἄνθεα: victory-crowns: *O*.7.80; *N*.4.21; *N*.5.54; *N*.6.63. Interaction of crowning-imagery and victory-data: ***I*.2.15-16**.

τε-θρίππων: 5 τετραορίας.

δυωδεκαδρόμων: *hapax*. See ***O*.3.33 δωδεκάγναμπτον ... δρόμου**.

51-52 τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν | πειρώμενον ἀγωνίας δυσφρονᾶν παραλύει: MSS δυσφροσυνᾶν / δυσφροσύνας / δυσφροσύναν are unmetrical. Possibilities:

(1) ἀφροσύνας (Bowra (1936) 97-98) / ἀφροσυνᾶν (Mommsen): 'victory frees a competitor from charges of folly'.

Some scholia attest a motif that competitors risk looking foolish unless they win (Σ.*O*.2.93b τῷ ἀποτυγχά- | νοντι κοινὸν ἔγκλημα ἡ ἄνοια καὶ ἡ ἀφροσύνη, 93d, 93e, 93h), an idea implicit in *O*.5.16; *P*.8.72-74 τύχαις. | εἰ γάρ τις ἐσλὰ πέπαται ... σοφὸς δοκεῖ πεδ' ἀφρόνων; E.*Hipp*.700; E.fr.1017. These probably read ἀφροσύνας (*P.Oxy*.2092 attests ἀφροσύν[).

But (a) some parallels contradict that motif (X.*Cyr*.1.5.10.7-9 εἴ ... πονήσας καὶ ἀξιόνικος γενόμενος ἀναγώνιστος διατελέσειεν, | οὐδ' ... ἀναίτιος ... ἀφροσύνης: a trained man who does *not* compete is foolish); (b) other parallels have undesirable ramifications (Sol.13.67-70 εὖ ἔρδειν πειρώμενος ... ἐς μεγάλην ἄτην ... ἔπεσεν, | τῶι δὲ κακῶς ἔρδοντι θεὸς ... δίδωσιν | συντυχίην ἀγαθήν, ἔκλυσιν ἀφροσύνης: the striver fails, but luck relieves those who act badly from their folly's consequences); (c) other scholia indicate the relief is from suffering compatible with **δυσφρονᾶν** (Σ.*O*.2.93a λύπην λύει ... ἀθυμίαν ἐκβάλλει, 93c πόνων λύσιν, 93f δυσκόλων φροντίδων ... ἀπολύει, esp. 93g λυσιν ποιεῖ τῆς ἀφροσύνης καὶ τῆς λύπης); (d) here, the present day Emmenids crown the primary theme of the ode's first half, namely the recurrent pattern of ill fortune eventually coming good that has been exemplified by three sets of their ancestors; since the victory-catalogue represents the present generation's good fortune, this gnome must supply the hardship they have overcome, or the entire pattern is destroyed: being relieved of the risk of looking foolish would be a weak climax.

Therefore, (2) **δυσφρονᾶν** (Dindorf (1836) 11-12) is preferable. That ἀ– could = δυσ– in these compounds (Pavese (1990) 44-45) is untenable: only the converse is attested (LSJ.s.v.δύσφρων.III). Although the order **παραλύει δυσφρονᾶν** eliminates two successive irregular responsions (Itsumi (2009) 161; cf. Hes.*Th*.528 ἐλύσατο δυσφροσυνάων), it is stylistically clumsy.

Victory relieving hardship: *O*.1.97-99; *N*.9.44.

52 πειρώμενον ἀγωνίας: *N*.7.10-11 σύμπειρον ἀγωνία ... εἰ δὲ τύχη (~ **51 τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν**).

Responsion: **5 Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας**.

53-56 A gnome on the power of wealth with virtues to support competitive ambition (expense of horse-rearing: ***I*.2.38**) pivots from the Emmenid victory-list (**48-51**) to the eschatology (**56-83**). The former section represents the past rewards which the wealth-

virtue complex has won the Emmenids in life, the latter those it may win them in future when combined with knowledge of potential post-mortem fates.

The structural transition to the eschatology is enriched with a series of mystic, esp. Eleusinian, connotations. **53 πλοῦτος** is elsewhere personified as Πλοῦτος, son of Demeter (Hes.*Th*.969 with West), characterized as a reward for Eleusinian initiates (*h.Hom*.2.473-89), and invoked amongst the Eleusinian divinities (Ar.*Thesm*.295-99). The star-metaphor (**55 ἀστὴρ ἀρίζηλος**) has a particular affinity with Dionysus, Eleusis, and mystery-cult (Csapo (2008) 267-72), which is activated by its application to **53 πλοῦτος**: cf. the characterization of the Eleusian divinity Iacchus/Dionysus (Jiménez San Cristóbal (2013) 276-82) as the 'wealth-giver' (*ABV*.147.6 c.540-30; Σ.Ar.*Ra*.479 Σεμελήι' Ἴακχε πλουτοδόται). **56 φέγγος** ties into the same astral, Dionysiac/Iacchic, Eleusinian complex: Ar.*Ra*.342-44 Ἴακχε, | νυκτέρου τελετῆς φωσφόρος ἀστήρ. | φλογὶ φέγγεται δὲ λειμών. **56 οἶδεν** reflects the concepts of sight/knowledge in mystic initiation: cf. esp. fr.137.1-3 ὄλβιος ὅστις ἰδὼν κεῖν' εἶσ' ὑπὸ χθόν'· | οἶδε μὲν βίου τελευτάν, | οἶδεν δὲ διόσδοτον ἀρχάν (Eleusinian Mysteries). Cf. **54 καιρὸν**; **55 ἐτυμώτατον**.

53 μὰν: emphasizing a new point: Denniston 330-31.

53-56 πλοῦτος ... φέγγος: *Or.Sib*.13.65 ἀγλαοφεγγέι πλούτῳ.

53 πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος: wealth-virtue complex: see **10-11 πλοῦτόν ... ἀρεταῖς** (intratextually linking present-day and antecedent Emmenids). At *P*.5.1-9, it similarly accompanies Arcesilas' chariot-victory.

53 δεδαιδαλμένος: 'embellished' (embodied by Δαίδαλος): Pindaric craft-metaphor (Frontisi-Ducroux (1975) 29-82; Morris (1992) 44-53; Day (2010) 256-60). Here, literal wealth is metaphorically embellished with virtue, creating a brilliant composite. *H.l.* links it to truth (**55 ἐτυμώτατον**), *O*.1.29-30 δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ... ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι to falsehood.

φέρει: 'provides': Pl.*Menex*.246e.3 πλοῦτος κάλλος φέρει.

τῶν τε καὶ τῶν: 'for various achievements' (Race). Not only victories (**48-51**), but moral endeavours facilitating post-mortem bliss.

Strikingly, all poetic parallels (except *N*.1.26-30, with specific antecedents) signify vicissitudes of fortune (Thgn.1.398 τά τε καὶ τὰ φέρειν; *P*.5.54-55; *P*.7.21; *N*.5.52; fr.52f.132-34; S.fr.910.3): exact responsion with **33 ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι** indicates P.'s consciousness of typical usage. The idiom's unexpected departure from it underscores the break between the mythic ancestors' passive portrayal (see **21**), and the emphasis here on Theron and Xenocrates' moral agency, opportunity, and ambition: they can use eschatological knowledge to make moral choices (**56**).

54 καιρὸν: wealth providing opportunity for achievements: Th.2.40.1.2 πλούτῳ τε ἔργου μᾶλλον καιρῷ. Cf. *P*.1.57 ὧν ἔραται καιρὸν διδούς (god); *N*.7.58-59 καιρὸν ὄλβου | δίδωσι (fate). Pindaric usage: Pavlou (2007) 22-29. Here, it represents the opportunity to break the irreversible onward flow of time (**15-17**) and gain access to the Isle's timeless present (**70-77**).

Olympic Kairos-cult: see ***I*.2.22**. Here, the eschatology (**56-83**) may activate its Pythagorean associations: Jennings (2007) 331-46.

βαθεῖαν: 'profound': of mental attributes: *N*.4.8; *N*.7.1.

μέριμναν: 'personal commitment to a future situation' (Pfeijffer on *N*.3.69-70): 'ambition' of desirable goals (*O*.1.108; *h.l.*; *P*.8.92; *N*.3.69; fr.227.1; fr.94b.62), 'anxiety' of unpleasant eventualities (fr.124.5; fr.248).

As at *P*.8.91-92 κρέσσονα πλούτου μέριμναν, *N*.9.32 φίλιπποί ... καὶ κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας, wealth supports ambitions (here eschatological) greater than itself.

ἀγροτέραν: ‘questing’ (Race). Probably connoting hunting (LSJ.s.v.II): cf. Artemis’ cult-title (*Il*.21.470-471 πότνια θηρῶν | Ἄρτεμις ἀγροτέρη; fr.dub.357.3; B.5.123; B.11.37; also *P*.9.6). Puns on Theron’s name (~ θηράω ‘hunt’): ***O*.3.43**.

Epode 3

55-56 ἀστὴρ ... φέγγος: Ar.*Ra*.341-44; B.9.27-29; S.*El*.105-6; A.R.3.1195 εὐφεγγέες ἀστέρες.

55 ἀστὴρ ἀρίζηλος: celestial bodies often form the vehicle in metaphors/similes highlighting the tenor’s brilliance and prominence. To Nisbet & Hubbard on H.*O*.1.12.48, add *Il*.22.26-27 παμφαίνονθ’ ὥς τ’ ἀστέρ’ ... ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαὶ (Achilles); Theocr.*Id*.25.139-41 ἀστέρι πάντες ἔισκον ... ἀρίζηλος δ’ ἐτέτυκτο (Helios’ bull); Q.S.5.131 ἀστὴρ ὣς ἀρίδηλος (Ajax); also fr.33c.6 τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον (Delos); fr.52f.125-26 Διὸς Ἑλ-| λανίου φαεννὸν ἄστρον (Aegina).

Here, the image has multiple resonances. (1) Wealth’s literal gleam (S.fr.314.77 ἀρίζηλα | χρυσοῦ πα[ρ]αδείγματα; cf. **56 φέγγος**), with stanza-initial position combining visual and metrical prominence. (2) The wealth-virtue complex’s pre-eminence amongst other attributes. (3) Agonistic connotations. *O*.1.1-7 χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ | ἅτε διαπρέπει ... ἔξοχα πλούτου ... μηκέτ’ ἀελίου σκόπει ... θαλπνότερον ... φαεν-νὸν ἄστρον compares the Olympics both to wealth and to a star. (4) Mystic connotations. See **53-56**. Cf. the lamellae’s statements of heavenly descent used as passwords (Bernabé & Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 39-46): *OF*.474.10 Γῆς παῖς εἰμι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος; *OF*.477.9 Ἀστέριος ὄνομα (*nom parlant*).

ἐτυμώτατον: superlative only here in classical Greek, underscoring the light's genuineness/truth. Beecroft (2006) 63: '*alêtheia* is a quality claimed, and *etumos* a quality demonstrated through the course of events': here, **56 τὸ μέλλον** will provide confirmation. Mystic 'truth' in the lamellae: Bernabé & Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 37-39.

56 φέγγος: often an epinician metaphor for glory: *P*.8.97; *N*.3.64; *N*.4.13; *N*.9.42; fr.52b.68; B.3.90-92 (light of virtue preserved by poetry after death).

Here, continuing the star-metaphor, both visually and esoterically (see **53-56**; **55-56**). Light/sight underpinned the *epopteia*, Eleusinian initiation's highest level (Riedweg (1987) 47-52; Seaford (2005) 602–606): see **56 οἶδεν**. The word is associated with Demeter (*h.Hom*.2.278); Asclepius (Ar.*Plut*.640 βροτοῖσι φέγγος ~ **ἀνδρὶ φέγγος**; he was an Eleusinian initiate: Paus.2.26.8); Dionysus (fr.153.1-2; Ar.*Ra*.343, 350); initiates (Ar.*Ra*.446, 455).

Light/darkness in ***O*.2**: Adorjáni (2011) Ch.6.

56-83 The eschatology is the ode's dominant component, occupying over a quarter of its length, and the soteriological system it presents has generated voluminous interpretation. This section adumbrates (1) the body of sources that inform the overall content; (2) specific considerations influencing individual details.

(1) The eschatology's influences are a combination of traditional epic material and mystic elements, which are discussed individually *ad loc*.: for a collective treatment, see Lloyd-Jones (1985) 245-83; Santamaría 155-416; Torres (2007) Ch.6; Santamaría (2008) 1161-84. On Orphism in particular, see the material collected in Bernabé & Casadesús (2008); also Santamaría (2012) 211-52; Edmonds (2013); Bremmer (2014) 55-80.

(2) The format of the eschatology is a tripartite scheme. An initial judgement after death (**58-60**) distinguishes between two categories: the lawless, who are punished (**57-58**; **67**),

and the good, who receive a pleasant afterlife characterized primarily as the negation of mortal toil (**61-67**). The third category are the blessed, who access a blissful afterlife on the Isle after 6 lifetimes free from injustice in Earth and/or Hades (**68-70**), or by special translation (**78-80**).

The varied details of Greek eschatologies are largely determined by their genre and intended function, which lead their composer to assemble his version by recombining existing traditions to suit them via a process of *bricolage* (Lévi-Strauss (1962) 16-33; Edmonds (2013) 6). The same considerations guide P. here, creating differences as well as similarities with parallel traditions.

(a) The tripartite scheme is necessary because a bipartite system would not accommodate the exclusivity of the blessed afterlife for which Theron is destined (see ***O*.2.Interpretation**). See Graf & Johnston (2007) 100-8 on bi- and tripartite systems from epic to the lamellae and Plato.

This system requires the good to be reborn repeatedly, with each subsequent life either advancing them towards the blessed or demoting them to the lawless depending on their conduct. However, P. gives no indication that the status of either the lawless or the blessed is time-limited (contrast Pl.*Resp*.617d-20d, where only the incurably wicked are *not* reborn). The status of the latter cannot be temporary here, as that would rob the afterlife promised to Theron of much of its value. Understanding the former as temporary would give hope even to transgressors (cf. fr.133, which is however only a partial parallel insofar as the compensation Persephone accepts from the souls is not for crimes they have personally committed), but there is no need to infer that mechanism when interpreting ***O*.2**'s eschatology, since its explicit details present a coherent system that operates by winnowing rather than endless recycling.

(b) The eschatology's merely indirect connection to Theron is due to epinician propriety; contrast the explicit promises of blessedness and godhood in the lamellae (*OF*.476.11; *OF*.487.4; *OF*.488.9; *OF*.489.7; *OF*.490.7; *OF*.491.4).

(c) The emphasis on ethical over ritual criteria. This is a major difference from the lamellae (*OF*.474.16; *OF*.489.1; *OF*.490.1) and P.'s *threnos*-fragments (fr.131a), which emphasize initiation and ritual purity as the key models of access (cf. Bernabé (2009) 124-25). The paradigm here is more meritocratic and thus both more inclusive for non-initiates and more complimentary to Theron for meeting such high moral standards.

(d) Avoidance of the underworld torments common in Orphic sources (Bernabé (2009) 102-9): although their description is not inadmissible in epinician (see **66**), they are not a prospect envisioned for Theron.

(e) The Isle is decidedly epic, introducing elements familiar to all audiences to balance the mystic method of reaching it (see **70-71**). The special translation of heroes both expands that sense of familiarity, and offers Theron the reassurance of a more traditional, albeit also more elitist, means of accessing the Isle (see **78-80**).

56 εἰ: the absence of a clear apodosis has produced various approaches.

(1) Attempts to identify a specific apodosis are unconvincing:

(a) Preceding: **53-56**: 'Wealth with virtue ... is the truest light ... if one knows the future'.

Regardless of whether **εἰ** is taken to signify (i) proviso ('only if': Boeckh; Hurst (1981) 124), or (ii) reinforcement ('especially if': Santamaría), **εἰ δέ** syntactically cannot be protasis to a preceding apodosis. Boeckh's εἴ γε is foreign to lyric; deletion of **δέ** or substitution of δή (Σ.*O*.2.102a.1-2) is unmetrical; Gildersleeve's remedy that 'δέ in P. is often not far from δή' does not match P.'s usage in protases.

(b) Following:

(i) **56 οἶδεν τὸ μέλλον** (Mommsen (1864b) 22), with **ἔχων** understood as ἔχων ἐστίν. But the construction is dubious before Sophocles/Herodotus (see ***P*.6.28-29**), and **ἔχων** without ἐστίν is naturally understood as a participial subordinate clause within the protasis (*N*.11.13-16 εἰ δέ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφᾷ παραμεύσεται ἄλλους ... μεμνάσθω). Possession of wealth and virtue is irrelevant as a *condition* for eschatological knowledge.

(ii) **61 ἴσαις δὲ**. But this is still part of the description of **56 τὸ μέλλον**, not the consequence of possessing knowledge of it. **61 δὲ** corresponds to **57 μὲν**, articulating a new section within the indirect statement introduced by **57 ὅτι**, itself within the protasis.

(iii) **83 πολλά μοῖ** (Schmidt (1862) 225-26). But an *Abbruchsformel* is an anacolouthon, not an apodosis.

It is better to understand (2) no explicit apodosis (Wilamowitz (1922) 247n.1; Willcock).

A suppressed apodosis of this scope is difficult to parallel. Epic comparanda are small-scale, with contextual clues: *Il*.1.135-7 εἰ μὲν δώσουσι γέρας [‘then all will be well’] ... εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕλωμαι (second protasis with apodosis), 580-81 εἴ ... ἐθέλῃσιν Ὀλύμπιος ... στυφελίξαι [‘then he would do so’]· ὃ γὰρ πολὺ φέρτατός (explanatory clause follows). *Pace* Willcock, *N*.4.79-81 is not a parallel: the apodosis is the imperative 86 εὑρέτω, after the parenthesis 82-85. Scholars following these comparanda understand a similarly-brief suppressed apodosis here (Van Leeuwen: εὖ ἕξει; Willcock ‘all will be well’; Boegehold (1999) 51-52 inserts <GESTURE = well and good> after **58 ἔτεισαν**). Most attractive is the comparison made by Pavese (1975) 81 with the μακαρισμός of Eleusinian initiates (*v.i.* **οἶδεν**): i.e. ‘he is blessed’.

In my view, however, part of the reason why there is no explicit apodosis is because ‘he is blessed’ is only the conclusion of a chain of implicit argumentation spanning the ode’s second half, all of which must be absorbed before that conclusion is reached. The

argument may be reconstructed as follows (cf. Σ.*O*.2.102a, d): (a) the possession of wealth and virtue has won chariot-victories for Xenocrates and Theron (**48-56**); (b) when a person combines these qualities with the knowledge that post-mortem fates vary according to one's moral conduct (**56-83**), such a person, superlatively exemplified by Theron, will employ his wealth altruistically (**90-95**; **98-100**; cf. **6-7**); (c) he may thus expect post-mortem privilege, *and is therefore blessed*. The implicitness is deliberate: unlike athlete-myth, epinician required subtlety in discussing personal immortalization (Currie (2005) 318-21).

In formal terms, the unique need here to introduce a 'myth' relating to the future without placing a prophecy in a mythic character's mouth (as at *P*.4.13-56; *N*.1.60-72) produces this extraordinary introduction in which the 'myth' remains technically embedded in a gnomic protasis, a fact forgotten by the time it breaks off (**83-85**). The anacoluthon's effect is thus comparable with metalepses such as *N*.5.25-39 (cf. de Jong (2013) 97-118).

Pindaric conditional clauses with indefinite protases regularly praise the victor indirectly by ascribing the victor's achievements to the indefinite: *O*.5.23-24 εἴ τις ὄλβον ἄρδει ... μὴ ματεύσῃ θεὸς γενέσθαι; *O*.11.4-6; *P*.8.73-74; *P*.11.55-58; *N*.7.11-12; *N*.11.13-15; *I*.3.1-3; *I*.6.10-13. Their apodoses express the victor's superiority, either directly, or via injunctions to remember mortal limits, including death (*O*.5.23; *N*.11.13-15; cf. *I*.6.10-13): no limits are imposed here. The improved post-mortem lot of *P*.11.55-58 is restricted to the reputation left to posterity.

εἰ δέ can relate (non-syntactically) to what precedes by introducing a priamel's climax (*O*.1.1-3; *O*.6.1-4; *O*.11.1-4; *P*.3.107-10; *N*.3.14-19; *N*.5.48-50; *N*.11.11-13 (dovetailing into 13-15: *v.s.*)), as here. Thus the sequence runs: victory dispels anxiety (**51-52**); wealth

and virtue support such victories (**53-56**); but if one has them and knows the future, then ... (**56**).

νιν: wealth-virtue complex.

τις: often implying the victor in protases (*v.s.*), and elsewhere (*P.*9.103-4; *N.*3.70-71).

οἶδεν τὸ μέλλον: knowledge of the future is normally uncertain (see **30-31**; cf. Sol.fr.13.65-66 οὐδέ τις οἶδεν | πῆι μέλλει σχήσειν χρήματος ἀρχομένου; *O.*12.7-9; B.10.45-46; S.fr.845.1-2; Antiphan.fr.226-27.9 τίς γὰρ οἶδ' ἡμῶν τὸ μέλλον).

οἶδεν: 'sight' and 'knowledge' are etymologically and semantically connected in Greek. Ultramundane knowledge often comes from witnessing initiation-rites, esp. the Eleusinian, as in the following μακαρισμοί: *h.Hom.*2.480 ὄλβιος ὃς τάδ' ὄπωπεν; fr.137.1-3 ὄλβιος ὅστις ἰδὼν κεῖν' εἶσ' ὑπὸ χθόν'· | οἶδε μὲν βίου τελευτάν, | οἶδεν δὲ διόσδοτον ἀρχάν; S.fr.837.1-4 τρισόλβιοι ... οἳ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη | μόλωσ' ἐς Ἅιδου· τοῖσδε γὰρ μόνοις ἐκεῖ | ζῆν ἔστι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἔχειν κακά; E.*Ba.*73-75; cf. E.*HF.*613 (initiation permitted Heracles to enter Hades); P.Derv.col.5.6-11; P.Derv.col.20.6-1-11; Seaford (2010) 201-6 connects mystic light with near-death experience. Emped.fr.132.1 ὄλβιος, ὃς θείων πραπίδων ἐκτήσατο πλοῦτον employs wealth (~ **53**) as a metaphor for divinely-inspired knowledge.

Verbs of knowing introducing mythological paradeigmata: Finglass on S.*El.*837 (knowledge of Amphiaraus' privileged afterlife).

With **85-86 συνετοῖσιν ... εἰδὼς**, it brackets the eschatology.

τὸ μέλλον: potential rather than absolute futurity: moral choice, not predestination, determines the afterlife.

56-57 τὸ μέλλον, | ὅτι θανόντων: *OF.*474.1 ἐπεὶ ἂν μέλλησιν θανεῖσθαι; *OF.*475.1.

57-60 Linguistic ambiguity permits multitudinous interpretations: see **nn.** I take this passage as referencing (1) the post-mortem punishment of the lawless (**57-58**), corresponding to the rewards of the good (**61-67**) and the blessed (**68-83**); (2) the subterranean judicial process undergone by all souls. Chronologically, (1) follows (2) and describes its consequences for the lawless. Both sections mention only the lawless, presumably because the judgement of the good was straightforward, and only the *consequences* for the good are worth mentioning (**61-67**).

57-59 θανόντων μὲν ἐν-θάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες | ποινὰς ἔτεισαν ... ἀλιτρὰ κατὰ γᾶς δικάζει τις: at Pl.*Resp*.366a.5-6 ἐν Ἅιδου δίκην δώσομεν ὧν ἂν ἐνθάδε ἀδικήσωμεν, | ἢ αὐτοὶ ἢ παῖδες παίδων, fear of punishment for earthly sins in Hades is assuaged by Orpheus and Musaeus' doctrines, which offer absolution through sacrifices, purifications, and initiations (364e.4-365a.3, 366a.6-b.2). At Pl.*Resp*.330d.7-e.1 μῦθοι περὶ | τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου, ὡς τὸν ἐνθάδε ἀδικήσαντα δεῖ ἐκεῖ διδόναι | (e.) δίκην, that fear is diminished by wealth (~ **53 πλοῦτος**), which removes the need to transgress, and fr.214 is cited in reference to the hope (for the afterlife) a person conscious of having lived justly enjoys.

57 θανόντων: ostensibly possessive genitive dependent upon **ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες**; but retrospectively partitive, with **63 ἐσλοὶ** and **68 ὅσοι** forming categories 2 and 3.

μὲν: answered by **61 δὲ**, not **58 δ'**, which is explanatory.

ἐν-θάδ': in eschatological contexts, the proximal deictic represents the Earth perspective, the distal that of the other plane: Ar.*Ra*.82 εὔκολος μὲν ἐνθάδ', εὔκολος δ' ἐκεῖ; Pl.*Gorg*.525b.8 ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐν Ἅιδου; Pl.*Resp*.619e.3-4 ἐνθένδε ἐκεῖσε καὶ δεῦρο | πάλιν πορείαν. Since Hades is typically subterranean, 'above' and 'below' similarly represent those planes: fr.129.2 τὰν ἐνθάδε νύκτα κάτω. So here **ἐν-θάδ'** ≈ **58 ἐν τᾶδε Διὸς ἀρχᾷ**; both oppose **59 κατὰ γᾶς**. Exception: Ar.*Ra*.323/24 (set in Hades).

The adverb probably modifies (1) **θανόντων**. The scholia also propose (2) **ἀπάλαμνοι**; (3) **58 ἔτεισαν**.

(1) Of those who have *died on Earth*, the lawless immediately pay the penalty (in Hades) (Σ.*O*.2.102c; Heyne; Wilamowitz (1922) 248n.1; Willcock; Santamaría). With **58 ἐν τᾶδε** and **59 κατὰ γᾶς**, this signposts the ode's shift into the representation of different existential planes.

(2) Of those who have died, *those who have been lawless on Earth*... (Σ.*O*.2.105a). This implies a subdivision within the lawless depending on where they died: see (3)(b). The interposition of **αὐτίκ'** impedes this.

(3) Of those who have died, the lawless *pay the penalty on Earth*. This takes two forms, depending on whether they died (a) on Earth; (b) in Hades.

(a) Those who die on Earth pay the penalty on Earth. Punishment consists in death itself (Lloyd-Jones (1985) 254): *v.i.* **ἀπάλαμνοι**. **ἐν-θάδ' αὐτίκ'** would = 'there and then' (S.*OC*.992 αὐτίκ' ἐνθάδε).

(b) Those who die in Hades pay the penalty on Earth (Σ.*O*.2.102b, 106a (both Aristarchus), 104a). This view anticipates the explicit reference to reincarnation at **68-70**: those dying in Hades are punished on Earth (**57-58**), mirroring the punishment in Hades of those dying on Earth (**58-60**).

However, this misunderstands **68-70**, which does not envisage a reincarnation cycle between Earth and Hades for *all* souls, but only the good, en route to becoming blessed, with failures winnowed out: therefore, the eventuality of souls that have sinned *in Hades* being punished *on Earth* does not arise, since they would simply proceed to the (subterranean) place of punishment (**67**). In any case, **57-58 θανόντων μὲν ἐν-θάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες | ποινὰς ἔτεισαν**, as the eschatology's first words, could only in

retrospect have been taken to mean 'those who have died in Hades are punished here'; the juxtaposition of **ἐν-θάδ'** with **θανόντων**, and its separation from **58 ποινὰς ἔτεισαν**, are serious impediments even in retrospect.

57-58 αὐτίκ' ... ποινὰς ἔτεισαν: swiftness of retribution: Hes.*Op*.219, 259-60 αὐτίκα πὰρ Διὶ ... γηρύετ' ἀνθρώπων ἀδίκων νόον, ὄφρ' ἀποτείσῃ; Dem.19.42.3-4 αὐτίκα ... δώσειν δίκην.

P. adapts Sol.fr.13.27-32 ὅστις ἀλιτρὸν (~ **59 ἀλιτρὰ**) | θυμὸν ἔχει ... ὁ μὲν αὐτίκ' ἔτεισεν, ὁ δ' ὕστερον· οἳ δὲ φύγωσιν | αὐτοί ... τίνουσιν | ἢ παῖδες τούτων ἢ γένος ἐξοπίσω (divine vengeance operates solely on Earth, and can be escaped by death; cf. Thgn.1.204-8). Here, the model whereby Oedipus' descendants are punished for his crime is pointedly discarded: see **38-45**.

57 αὐτίκ': Pl.*Gorg*.523e.4 ἐξαίφνης ἀποθανόντος (soul judged immediately after death).

ἀπάλαμνοι: either (1) 'helpless' (LSJ.I) or (2) 'lawless' (LSJ.II).

(1) *Il*.5.597; Hes.*Op*.20; *O*.1.59; Mommsen (1864b) 24. This requires **58 ποινὰς ἔτεισαν** to be a punishment undergone by *all* souls. It is variously taken as (a) attributive; (b) proleptic.

(a) 'The helpless souls pay the penalty'. Attributive construal means their helplessness *precedes* punishment, and so Willcock argues it reflects all souls' helplessness before their judge (Pl.*Gorg*.523e.1-6). This therefore requires their subsequent punishment to be one undergone by all souls but distinct from helplessness: see **58**.

(b) 'The souls pay the penalty by becoming helpless'. This matches the characterization of most Homeric dead as debilitated shades (*Od*.10.521 νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα; *v.i.* **φρένες**). The version of Lloyd-Jones (1985) 254 ('the penalty consists in their minds becoming feeble, that is to say, in death') is problematic: although in Homer death causes

enfeeblement, and there are parallels for a penalty being paid by the fact of one's death (A.*Ag*.1338-40 προτέρων αἶμ' ἀποτείσηι | καὶ τοῖσι θανοῦσι θανὼν ἄλλων | ποινὰς θανάτων ἐπικράνηι, 1529 θανάτωι τείσας; E.*IT*.445-46 θάνηι | ποινὰς δοῦσ'; E.*Ba*.847 θανὼν δώσει δίκην), the idea of enfeeblement as a metonymy for the penalty paid by the dead through their deaths is forced. But in either case, it is difficult to see how enfeeblement/death, universal misfortunes that apply to *all* humans regardless of moral quality/actions, can be called a *punishment* without adopting the 'Orphic' view (see **58**): the above parallels refer to death as a punishment for specific individuals for specific transgressions.

(2) 'Lawless' (Sol.fr.27.12; Thgn.1.281, 481; Sim.fr.37.1.33-36; Heyne) is preferable. It explains why specific souls undergo punishment, rather than the implicit, allusive causes above; the lawless (reprised at **67**) form a coherent group with the good (**63**) and the blessed (**68-70**).

Moral qualities applied to the φρήν: *O*.7.91 ὀρθαὶ φρένες; B.11.123-24 δικαίας ... φρένας; S.*Ant*.791-92 ἀδίκους | φρένας; E.*Hipp*.1454 φρενὸς σῆς εὐσεβοῦς τε κἀγαθῆς.

φρένες: here probably representing what survives death: cf. *P*.5.101 ἀκούοντί ποι χθονία φρενί (dead Cyrenean kings). Elsewhere this is the ψυχή (see **70**), which Homer distinguishes from the **φρένες**: *Il*.16.504-5 φρένες (lungs) ... ψυχήν (soul); *Il*.23.103-4 καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι | ψυχὴ καὶ εἴδωλον, ἀτὰρ φρένες οὐκ ἔνι πάμπαν (soul lacking wits); *Od*.10.492-95 (Teiresias' soul uniquely granted wits by Persephone); cf. fr.133.1-3 οἷσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοῦ πένθεος | δέξεται ... ἀνδιδοῖ ψυχὰς. The novelty would disappear if the dead's punishment consists in their **φρένες** in particular becoming helpless, as in Homer (*v.s.* **ἀπάλαμνοι**), but that interpretation is less likely.

Is there a special point in P. preferring **φρένες** to ψυχαί here? Santamaría suggests the deceased retain one or the other depending upon post-mortem status (lawless: **φρένες**;

blessed: **70 ψυχάν**), comparing A.fr.273a.4 ἀψύχοις (shades: 'without thought/reason'); S.*El*.841 πάμψυχος (Amphiaraus: 'maintaining the full quality of his soul'; cf. Finglass). But those epithets cannot convey, respectively, the dead's loss or retention *of the soul itself*. Since the soul is that without which the dead would have no identity whatsoever, possessing one signals no special privilege (cf. Ar.*Ra*.1334 ψυχὰν ἄψυχον ἔχοντα). Instead, in those instances the ψυχ- element is what Homer means by **φρένες**, namely an intellectual quality distinct from the mere identity maintained by the ψυχή: the reverse is the case here. Santamaría's distinction would be to the blessed's *disadvantage*.

If a special point is sought, I suggest that the lawless dead are referred to by their **φρένες** because the lawless, and only the lawless, are punished (see **58**) by the loss of their **φρένες**; the good presumably retain theirs in order to have the capacity to make moral decisions (see **68-70**).

58 ποινὰς ἔτεισαν: parallels express a range between 'pay the penalty = be punished' and 'pay recompense'. The inexplicitness of (1) the penalty/recompense, (2) the offence that incurs them, produces various interpretations, of which (1)(a) and (2)(a) are the most natural. Santamaría 271-75 proposes a composite reading incorporating fr.133 and the lamellae, based on a cycle of reincarnation and purification for all souls.

(1)

(a) Unspecified Hades torments: see **67**.

(b) Death/enfeeblement: see **57 ἀπάλαμνοι**.

(c) Servitude to Persephone: see (2)(c).

(d) Reincarnation on Earth: Micheelsen (2010) 19-38. But the Platonic concept of reincarnation as a punishment for base souls (Pl.*Phaedo*.81d; called 'Orphic' at

Pl.*Crat*.400c) has no explicit manifestation here, where it is rather a test/opportunity for the good (**68-70**).

(2)

(a) Lawlessness in life: see **57 ἀπάλαμνοι**; **59 ἀλιτρὰ**. Cf. Pl.*Resp*.615b.2 ἔκτεισμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος ἐκτίνοιεν (post-mortem punishment).

(b) Murder. Rendering **57 θανόντων** as genitive of cause gives 'pay the penalty *for those they have killed*': cf. Hdt.7.134.13-14 ποινὴν τείσειν Ξέρξῃ τῶν | Δαρείου κηρύκων ... ἀπολομένων. But it is unlikely that only murderers are meant here. Σ.*O*.2.104b (Chrysippus) misconstrues the syntax by taking **θανόντων** as genitive of agent (dead punishing their living killers).

(c) Inherited guilt. Here, this does not mean individuals' crimes from past lives, as those would not affect all the dead. According to the reconstructed 'Orphic' Zagreus-myth (see **22-30**), Dionysus-Zagreus was dismembered by the Titans, from whose lightning-blasted ashes human beings arose and thus continue to owe an ancestral debt to his mother Persephone. Cf. fr.133.1-2 οἷσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοῦ πένθεος | δέξεται; *OF*.489.4-7 πο<ι>νὰν δ' ἀνταπέ{ι}τε<ισ'> ἔργων ἕνεκα οὔτι δικαίων ... νῦν δ' ἱκέτι<ς> ἥκω πα<ρα>ὶ ἀγνὴ<ν> Φε<ρ>σεφόνειαν, | ὥς με{ι} πρόφρων πέμψη<ι> ἕδρας ες εὐαγέ{ι}ων (cf. *OF*.490.4-7); *OF*.493.2 ἄποινος ὁ μύστης; P.Gurob.col.1.4 ποινὰς πατέρων.

This reconstruction is compatible with some views of *h.l.*, esp. as it is the best support for the interpretation that here *all* souls pay a penalty consisting in death (see **57 ἀπάλαμνοι**); see **22-30** on potential traces of the Zagreus-myth; cf. **59 τις** on the possibility it signifies Persephone. But if that idea is present, it is far less explicit than in the above parallels, which are themselves contested. Edmonds (2013) 296-326 disputes the

reconstruction, arguing Persephone receives recompense to assuage her grief at her abduction by Hades.

ποινὰς: personified alongside Anagke: see **60**.

ἔτεισαν: for unmetrical MSS ἔτισαν. The gnomic aorist (Sol.fr.13.29) is reprised at **70 ἔτειλαν** (the opposite fate experienced by the blessed).

δ': explanatory (Σ.*O*.2.106a).

ἐν τᾷδε Διὸς ἀρχᾷ: Earth (~ **57 ἐν-θάδ'**). The universe is divided between Cronus' sons at *Il*.15.187-94: sky (Zeus), sea (Poseidon), underworld (Hades), with Earth and Olympus in common. Cf. Hes.*Th*.73-74, 881-85; Pl.*Gorg*.523a.4 διενείμαντο τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ Ζεὺς, 523b.5 Διὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντος; the Babylonian *Atra-Hasis*.43 (Burkert (1992) 88-91). Here, the primary division is between Zeus above and (presumably: **59**) Hades below, with Cronus overseeing the Isle (**76**).

Διὸς: see **3**.

59 ἁλιτρὰ ... δικάζει: Hes.*Op*.239-41 δίκην Κρονίδης τεκμαίρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς ... ὅστις ἁλιτραίνῃ; A.*Eum*.269-72 ἥλιτεν ... δίκης.

ἁλιτρὰ: 'sins', often against the gods/their precepts (*Il*.23.595; *Il*.24.570, 586; *Od*.4.378, 807; Hes.*Scut*.80; Thgn.1.1170; Th.1.126.11.6; Ar.*Eq*.445; Andoc.*de.Myster*.51.7), sometimes resulting in divine punishment (Hes.*Op*.241, 300; Thgn.1.377; Sol.fr.13.27; A.*Eum*.269 (eschatological: 267 κάτω ~ **59 κατὰ γᾶς**), 316; Theocr.*Id*.10.17; A.R.2.215).

κατὰ γᾶς: regularly of Hades: Mimn.fr.2.14; A.*Ch*.377, 475; A.*Eum*.369, 1007; E.*Alc*.237; E.*Hipp*.836; E.*Supp*.1024; E.*El*.144; E.*Ion*.1441; E.*IT*.170; S.*OC*.1701; Ar.*Ra*.1513-14; Erinn.fr.4.2. Cf. *OF*.485.7 εἷς ὑπὸ γῆν τελέσας ἅπερ ὄλβιοι ἄλλοι. Opposite: **57 ἐν-θάδ'**; **58 ἐν τᾷδε Διὸς ἀρχᾷ**.

δικάζει: 'judges' (A.*Supp*.230 δικάζει τἀμπλακήμαθ': Hades): see Santamaría 265-69 on traditional and mystic forms of post-mortem judgement. The outcome for the lawless is given at **58 ποινὰς ἔτεισαν**: cf. A.*Ch*.935-36 Δίκα ... βαρύδικος ποινά; S.*Tr*.808-9 ὧν σε ποίνιμος Δίκη | τείσαιτ'.

Justice: see **6**.

τις: the anonymous subterranean judge is probably (1) Hades (Σ.*O*.2.106c; A.*Eum*.269-75 ἤλιτεν ... δίκης ... Ἅιδης ἐστὶν εὔθυνος βροτῶν | ἔνερθε χθονός), whose name is often avoided euphemistically (*Il*.9.457 Ζεύς τε καταχθόνιος; Hes.*Th*.676 θεοῦ χθονίου; A.*Eum*.175-77 ὑπὸ δὲ γᾶν ... ἕτερον ... μιάστορ'; A.*Pers*.629 βασιλεῦ τ' ἐνέρων; A.*Supp*.158 Ζῆνα τῶν κεκμηκότων, 228-31 'ν Ἅιδου δικάζει τἀμπλακήμαθ' ... Ζεὺς ἄλλος ἐν καμοῦσιν; Pl.*Crat*.403a.5-8 "Ἅιδης" ... φοβούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα "Πλούτωνα" | καλοῦσιν), and whose 'hatefulness' (*Il*.9.158-59 Ἀΐδης ... ἔχθιστος, 312 = *Od*.14.156 ἐχθρὸς ... ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν) matches **59-60 ἐχθρᾷ ... ἀνάγκᾳ**. (2) Minos is unlikely: although P. follows Homer in giving his brother Rhadamanthys a prominent position on the Isle (**75**), Minos at *Od*.11.568-71 merely settles disputes amongst the dead, becoming a gatekeeper judge only at Pl.*Gorg*.523e. (3) Persephone could theoretically appear by reinterpreting **60 φράσαις** as homophonous φράσαισ' (Zuntz (1971) 86; cf. *OF*.488.7; *OF*.489.6-7): see **58**.

59-60 ἐχθρᾷ ... Ἀνάγκᾳ: I follow Hartung and Santamaría in adopting the personification of Anagke from the scholia (Σ.*O*.2.107.2-3 ἐν Ἅιδου <δαίμονά> τινα Ἀνάγκην ὀνόματι, καὶ | ταύτῃ παραδίδοσθαι τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς).

Anagke can be a cosmic force, and also appears in eschatological contexts concerning the soul's destiny, as well as in Orphic theogonies (see Santamaría 275-84; Green (2012) 183-96). Note esp. a volute krater (Naples H.3222: c.350-340) depicting Anagke supervising Sisyphus' punishment in an underworld scene including Orpheus and the Poenae (see **58 ποινὰς**). At Emped.fr.115.47-60, she decrees a punitive cycle of

metempsychosis for murderers and perjurers; *P.Strasb.gr.Inv*.1665-1666.332 ἀ[να]γκα[ίης ὕ]πο λυγρῆς (*editio princeps*: Martin & Primavesi (1999)) bespeaks the inevitable dissolution of death; at Pl.*Resp*.617d.6-e.5, her daughter Lachesis proclaims a new cycle of reincarnation to the souls, which then pass below Anagke's throne (Pl.*Resp*.620e.6-621a.1). **ἐχθρᾷ** could be explained through the compulsion exerted on malefactors (Heyne), or association with Hades' 'hatefulness' (see **59 τις**), but a more specific parallel is possible: at Emped.fr.116.7, Charis (probably = Love) στυγέει δύστλητον Ἀνάγκην.

Necessity directing lawless souls: Pl.*Phaedo*.108c.2 ὑπ' ἀνάγκης.

60 λόγον φράσαις: 'declaring his word' (cf. Pl.*Resp*.617d.6 Ἀνάγκης θυγατρὸς κόρης Λαχέσεως λόγος; *Od*.1.273 μῦθον πέφραδε πᾶσι), rather than 'pronouncing sentence' (Race). The soul 'gives an account' elsewhere (Pl.*Leg*.959b.4-5 παρὰ θεοὺς ... δώσοντα | λόγον), but this idiom is not found with φράζω and requires a dubious sense of **59 δικάζει**.

φράσαις: see **98-100**.

Strophe 4

61-67 The fate of the 'good' (**63 ἐσλοὶ**) is self-contained within Strophe 4, which concludes by adumbrating that of their opposites (**67**). Description by negation (**62 ἀπονέστερον**; **63-64 οὐ ... οὐδὲ**; **66 ἄδακρυν**; cf. Davies (1987) 265-84) presents their sphere as a less toilsome human life, reserving positive characteristics for the Isle (**68-83**). That it is still a *life* is emphasized threefold (**63 βίοτον**; **65 δίαιταν**; **67 αἰῶνα**: cf. **25**; **29**): this must be the part of Hades from which good souls are reborn on Earth and to which they return as they progress towards 3 just lives on each side (**68-70**).

61-62 The issue is (1) relative to what, (2) in what respect, the days and nights are equal, and their integration into the context. On balance, (2)(a) (perpetual equinox) is a preferable interpretation to (2)(b) (perpetual sunlight).

(1) The scholia unanimously relate the comparison to life on Earth (Σ.*O*.2.109, 110a, b, c). Since the comparative **62 ἀπονέστερον** is itself probably relative to Earth, a contrast forms between **ἴσαις** and **ἀπονέστερον** that requires **62 ἔχοντες** to be concessive: 'although they have sunshine in days and nights ever equivalent to Earth's, they receive a life less toilsome than Earth's'. But (a) linguistically, repetition of ἴσος conveys equality *between* the items to which it applies, typically opposites, like the nights and days here: LSJ.s.v.I.2; S.*Ant*.142 ταχθέντες ἴσοι πρὸς ἴσους; E.*Ph*.750 ἴσους ἴσοισι πολεμίοισιν; Hdt.1.2.6 ἴσα πρὸς ἴσα; Cratin.fr.184 ἴσον ἴσῳ φέροντ'; Ar.*Plut*.1132 ἴσον ἴσῳ κεκραμένης; (b) rhetorically, it is more effective for the diurnal situation to be conducive to the good's less toilsome life, rather than a foil to it: **62 ἔχοντες** should be causal, like the parallel participle **63 χαράσσοντες**.

(2) Accepting the nights and days are equal *to one another* (*v.s.*) produces 2 main possibilities for the respect in which this is the case:

(a) 'Having sunshine in days and nights equal to one another *in duration*' (with **62 ἄλιον ἔχοντες** applying only to days): Bergk; Woodbury (1966) 597-616; Defradas (1971) 131-43; Willcock. Σ.*O*.2.109, 110a, b refer to duration, albeit in relation to Earth.

This produces perpetual equinox: D.S.2.56.7.8-9 διὰ παντὸς ... ἡμέραν ἴσην τῇ | νυκτί (Iambulus' islands of the Sun: temperate climate, fruits ripen all year round); Posidon.fr.283.14 Theiler ἴσης τῆς νυκτὸς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (equator: temperate climate). Cf. [Pl.]*Axioch*.371c.5-d.5 (constant vernal climate amongst the pious); Bion.fr.2.15-18 εἶαρ ἐμοὶ τριπόθητον ὅλῳ λυκάβαντι ... ἀνίκα μήτε κρύος μήθ' ἅλιος ἄμμε βαρύνει. | εἴαρι

πάντα κύει, πάντ' εἴαρος ἁδέα βλαστεῖ, | χὰ νὺξ ἀνθρώποισιν ἴσα καὶ ὁμοίιος ἀώς (shepherd prefers eternal spring).

This association of perpetual equinox with paradises in which the earth's constant fertility supplies human needs is directly relevant here: ploughing and sailing (**63-65**) are neither necessary under such conditions, nor prescribed to take place during either equinox (vernal: March; autumnal: September) according to the traditional farmer's year (West on Hes.*Op*.381-617). *Pace* Woodbury (1966) 605-16, who concedes the lack of parallels (607), the equinox does not symbolize justice/equality: it is the *alternation* of day and night, to which the equinox is irrelevant, that does so (see Mastronarde on E.*Ph*.543-45). Rather, perpetual equinox means the *seasons* no longer alternate, arresting the vicissitude that characterizes human life (see **7**).

Equinox: Arat.*Phaen*.1.513 ἤματα νυξὶν ἰσαίεται ἀμφοτέρῃσιν; Chrysipp.fr.log.et.phys.693.13 ἰσημερίας ... νὺξ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἴσαι.

Vernal equinox as occasion linked to rebirth: Christian Easter; Egyptian Sham el-Nessim; Persian Nowruz. Cf. Hecat.fr.5.12-13 (Apollo begins festivities on Hyperborea).

(b) 'Having sunshine in days and nights equal to one another *in having sunshine*' (with **62 ἅλιον ἔχοντες** applying to days and nights): Beck; Boeckh; Wilamowitz (1922) 249n.1; Santamaría; Edmunds (2009) 670. Phrasing: *P*.4.130 νύκτεσσιν ἓν θ' ἁμέραις.

Light is characteristic of blessedness (see **56**), contrasting Hades' typical darkness, particularly where the lawless dwell (see **67**). However, *pace* Santamaría, *perpetual* sunlight lacks parallels: cf. *Od*.10.84-86 (Laestrygonians: minimal night-time); fr.129.1-2 states explicitly only that the sun shines below during night above, *not* during the daylight above as well; Val.Flacc.*Arg*.842-45 *lucet ... amoena piorum ... camposque, ubi sol totumque per annum* | *durat aprica dies* may only mean sunny weather throughout the year; Apul.*Met*.11.23 *calcato Proserpinae limine ... nocte media vidi solem candido*

coruscantem lumine concerns mystic revelation. At ***O*.3.24**, unimpeded sunlight is undesirable for Olympia, although such practical objections are less relevant to paradises.

62-63 ἀπονέστερον ... βίοτον: relative to labour on Earth, rather than to suffering (**67 πόνον**) amongst the lawless: see **61-67**.

Post-mortem/liminal absence of toil: Hes.*Op*.113 ἄτερ τε πόνων (Golden Race); [Pl.].*Axioch*.370d.3-4 ἄπονα ... ἀστένακτα καὶ ἀγήρατα ... κακῶν ἄπονος βίος (afterlife). Cf. **29 βίοτον ἄφθιτον** (Ino).

Toil endemic to life: Sim.fr.181.1-3 †οὐδὲ ... ἡμίθεοι, | ἄπονον ... βίον; E.fr.966; E.*Hipp*.189-90; E.*Supp*.1004-5 ἐς Ἅιδαν καταλύσουσ' ἄμοχθον | βίοτον αἰῶνός τε πόνους (Hades a release).

63 ἐσλοὶ: here moral, but with social connotations (**97**): aloofness from agriculture/commerce (**63-65**) assimilates them to the living rich.

δέκονται: cf. **49 ἔδεκτο**.

63 βίοτον ... χερὸς: Sol.fr.13.50 ἔργα δαεὶς χειροῖν ξυλλέγεται βίοτον (manual labour).

βίοτον: 'means of living' as well as 'life'.

63-65 οὐ ... οὐδὲ ... ἀλλὰ: priamel: *Il*.22.262-64 οὐκ ... οὐδὲ ... ἀλλὰ.

χθόνα χαράσσοντες ... οὐδὲ πόντιον ὕδωρ | κεινὰν παρὰ δίαιταν: subsistence on land and sea is low-status and toilsome (Hes.*Op*.633-38; Sol.fr.13.43-48 κατὰ πόντον ἀλᾶται | ἐν νηυσὶν χρήιζων οἴκαδε κέρδος ἄγειν ... ἄλλος γῆν τέμνων ... λατρεύει ... ἄροτρα; cf. *I*.1.47-51).

Freedom from sea-faring and agriculture characterizes paradises, and often has a moralizing/prelapsarian character: Zeus concealed the method whereby a day's work provides a year's sustenance in retribution for Prometheus' deception (Hes.*Op*.42-48); the Golden Race's privilege (Hes.*Op*.109-26) elapsed during the Silver Race, when the

abolition of perpetual spring gave rise to agriculture (Ov.*Met*.89-150: see **61-62**); the just enjoy it as a reward (Hes.*Op*.236-37), as do the righteous/liminal Gabioi (A.fr.196.3-5 οὔτ' ἄροτρον οὔτε ... τέμνει δίκελλ' ἄρουραν, ἀλλ' αὐτόσποροι | γύαι φέρουσι βίοτον ἄφθονον).

63-64 χθόνα ... πόντιον ὕδωρ: polar and complementary opposites of the two main spheres of human activity: Hes.*Th*.695-96 χθὼν ... πόντός; *h.Hom*.2.69; *h.Hom*.30.2; *I*.4.41; fr.33c.3-4; fr.52k.16-17; fr.220.2-3.

63 χα-ράσσοντες: MSS τα-ράσσοντες in relation to sea and/or land typically describes the action of divine/natural forces: *Od*.5.291 ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον, 304; Archil.fr.105.1-2; Sol.fr.12.1; Ar.*Eq*.431 ταράττων τήν τε γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλατταν; fr.94b.18-20; E.*Tro*.88.

However, **χα-ράσσοντες** (Gedike (1786)) better suits *humans*' marking of land (ploughing: A.P.6.238.3-4 ἀρότρῳ ... χαράσσω | χέρσον; warfare: A.*Pers*.683 χαράσσεται πέδον) and sea (rowing: *Lyr.Adesp*.fr.87.1.3 κληῖδος χαραξιπόντου; Nonn.*Dion*.2.13-14 κῦμα χαράσσων ... ὕδωρ λεύκαινεν ἐρετμοῖς; Nonn.*Dion*.3.46 ὕδωρ ἐχάρασσον ἐρετμοῖς). Cf. Sol.fr.13.47 γῆν τέμνων; S.*Ant*.338 Γᾶν ... ἀποτρύεται; S.*Ai*.6 ἴχνη ... νεοχάραχθ'.

A.*Supp*.1007 πόντος ... ἠρόθη δορί applies ploughing-imagery to seafaring.

ἐν: with instrumental dative: *P*.2.8 ἐν χερσὶ.

χερὸς ἀκμᾷ: manual labour. **ἀκμᾷ** is often metaphorical ('pinnacle'), connoting strength: fr.dub.334b.9 χειρὸς ἀκμᾷ; *O*.1.96 ἀκμαί τ' ἰσχύος; *I*.8.37; A.*Pers*.1059; A.*Eum*.374; E.*Ba*.1207. The literal sense 'edge' (i.e. agricultural implements) is activated by **χα-ράσσοντες** (*v.s.*).

64 πόντιον ὕδωρ: B.3.86 ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου. High seas could be dangerous to archaic ships, esp. in spring (**61-62**): Hes.*Op*.682-93; Ar.*Thesm*.872-73 ποντίῳ σάλῳ | καμόντας ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ ναυαγίαις.

65 κεινὰν: *O*.3.45. Here signifying both the physical emptiness of a poor seafarer's hold, and his labour's metaphorical futility.

παρὰ ... παρὰ: polyptotic repetition underscores the contrast.

δίαιταν: 'living' and 'life', as **63 βίοτον**. Of the dwelling-place of the favoured Pythagorean dead in Hades at Aristophon.fr.12-13.1.

65-66 τιμίοις | θεῶν: the genitive is probably (1) partitive ('those (gods) honoured amongst the gods': Σ.*O*.2.117a), rather than (2) subjective ('those honoured by the gods': Σ.*O*.2.117c).

(1) is syntactically transparent (*Il*.5.381 δῖα θεάων), whereas (2) lacks parallels with τίμιος (but cf. S.*Ant*.77 τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔντιμ' ἀτιμάσασ' ἔχε). Semantically, since **66 οἵτινες ἔχαιρον εὐορκίαις** denotes dead mortals honoured for a specific virtue it would be redundant to place them beside **τιμίοις** if the latter were another set of dead mortals who are favoured *for no specific reason* (e.g. Hesiod's Silver Race: Hes.*Op*.141-42 ὑποχθόνιοι μάκαρες θνητοὶ ... τιμὴ καὶ τοῖσιν ὀπηδεῖ). **τιμίοις** should rather be gods by whose side favoured mortals dwell (**65 παρὰ** ~ **76 πάρεδρον**): cf. Pl.*Phaedo*.69c.6-7 κεκαθαρμένος ... καὶ τετελεσμένος ... μετὰ θεῶν οἰκήσει (initiates); Isoc.9.15.6-7 παρὰ Πλούτωνι καὶ Κόρῃ ... παρεδρεύειν ἐκείνοις (Aeacus); Aristophon.fr.12-13.1-5 (Pythagoreans dine with Hades due to their piety); *CEG*.571.1-2 εἴπερ χρηστοῖς γέρας ... σοι τι[μα]ί ... παρὰ Φερσεφόνει Πλούτωνί τε (epitaph).

Several gods are said to receive particular honour (Fates: A.*Eum*.967 τιμιώταται θεῶν; Poseidon: E.*Tro*.49 ἐν θεοῖς τε τίμιον; Pl.*Symp*.178b.1 Eros: θεὸν τίμιον), including in the underworld (Dionysus: Ar.*Ra*.323/24 Ἴακχ' ὦ πολυτίμητ'; Persephone: Ar.*Ra*.336 πολυτίμητε Δήμητρος κόρη). Hades and Persephone are the likeliest candidates here (*v.s.*; Σ.*O*.2.117b; cf. **59**).

The picture is complicated by mystic/philosophical attestations that mortals could *themselves* become gods: *OF*.487.4 θεὸς ἐγένου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου; *OF*.488.9 θεὸς δ' ἔσῃ ἀντὶ βροτοῖο; Emped.fr.146.3 ἔνθεν ἀναβλαστοῦσι θεοὶ τιμῇσι φέριστοι; Emped.fr.147.1-2.

66 οἵτινες ἔχαιρον εὐορκίαις: some take the antecedent as **θεῶν**, with the gods rejoicing either in mortals' oath-keeping (Giannotti (1971) 41), or their own (West (1983) 110n.82; cf. West on Hes.*Th*.793-805 (gods exiled from Olympus for perjury); Call.*Hymn*.2.68 εὔορκος Ἀπόλλων). But in both cases the imperfect **ἔχαιρον** better describes the past lives of mortals (~ **68 ὅσοι δ' ἐτόλμασαν**) who are now rewarded for their actions (**66-67 ἄδακρυν νέμονται | αἰῶνα ~ 70 ἔτειλαν Διὸς ὁδὸν**) rather than the gods' eternal present; in the latter case, those gods who keep their oaths would logically be *on Olympus*.

It is better to understand these oath-keepers as a specific aspect of **63 ἐσλοὶ**, not a subset or separate group: the rewards each group receives are extremely similar (**62-63 ἀπονέστερον ... δέκονται βίοτον ~ 66-67 ἄδακρυν νέμονται | αἰῶνα**), and non-oathkeepers could not be described as 'good'; the enthusiasm expressed by **66 ἔχαιρον** is an irrelevant consideration, since keeping or not keeping oaths is a binary choice, and perjury a grievous sin.

Oath-keeping is emphasized here because of its thematic resonances. The Greeks' abhorrence of perjury led them to conceive divine punishments for it both terrestrial (*Il*.4.158-62; Hes.*Op*.282-84; Hes.*Th*.231-32) and eschatological (*Il*.3.278-79 ὑπένερθε καμόντας | ἀνθρώπους τίνυσθον ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ; *Il*.19.259-60; Emped.fr.115.7-9; Ar.*Ra*.275; Pl.*Gorg*.524d.7-525a.2; Egyptian Old Kingdom: Stilwell (2000) 252). However, attested *rewards* for oath-keeping are elsewhere only terrestrial (Hes.*Op*.285 ἀνδρὸς δ' εὐόρκου γενεὴ μετόπισθεν ἀμείνων (descendants' prosperity: post-mortem but not eschatological)): P. may innovate by expanding on Homer (Bowra (1964) 92), or by

alluding to the oath's significance in Orphic/Pythagorean contexts (Santamaría 290-93). It also provides a unique underpinning to the laudator's oath at **92**.

εὐορκίαις: Dem.22.45.5.

66-67 ἄδακρυν ... αἰῶνα: contrasting the frequent tearfulness of both life (S.*Ph*.689-90 πανδάκρυτον ... βιοτὰν; E.*Ph*.1520-23 αἰῶνα διάξουσα ... δάκρυσιν) and Hades (E.*HF*.426-27 πολυδάκρυον ... Ἅιδαν; Ar.*Thesm*.1041). Cf. *Psalm*.116.8.1-2 'For thou hast delivered my soul from death, | mine eyes from tears'.

66 νέμονται αἰῶνα: *N*.10.55-59 ἁμέραν ... παρὰ ... Διὶ νέμονται ... εἶλετ' αἰῶνα (Tyndarids' afterlife alternating between Therapne and Olympus). **αἰῶνα** is otherwise exceptional in referring to the afterlife (Keizer (1999) 25): the point is that the **ἐσλοὶ** live another 'life' potentially counting towards **68 ἐστρίς**.

τοὶ δ': probably the lawless in general rather than perjurers specifically (although perjury is the earliest Greek eschatological determinant: see **66 οἵτινες ἔχαιρον εὐορκίαις**), contrasting **63 ἐσλοὶ**: cf. *Od*.10.495 τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀΐσσουσιν (mindless souls contrasting Teiresias). Emphasis on the good leaves both the lawless and their punishment unspecified (*v.i.*).

ἀπροσόρατον: *hapax* before *Orph.Hymn*.39.2 (Corybas), *Orph.Argon*.972-73 ἐξ Ἄϊδαο διὰ φλογὸς ἠγέρθησαν ... ἀπροσόρατοι (Pandora and Hecate), perhaps borrowing from *h.l.* or from a common source.

The sense (1) 'invisible' (Σ.*O*.2.121a, d) could evoke the locale's darkness (fr.130.1-2), in contrast to the light (**61-62**) enjoyed by the good (Plut.*de.Ser.Num.Vind*.565a.1 εἰς τὸ ... ἀόρατον: Erinys condemning irredeemable malefactors to obscurity), and/or play on Hades' name (Pl.*Gorg*.493b.4-7 ἐν Ἅιδου—τὸ ἀιδὲς ... ἀθλιώτατοι ... ἀμύητοι (wretched non-initiates in Hades); cf. Pl.*Phaedo*.79b.7 ψυχή; ὁρατὸν ἢ ἀιδές). However, (2)

'unbearable to look upon' reflects **–προσ–** and suits Underworld torments. References to suffering often mark breaks in Pindaric narrative (see **83**): here the word metapoetically connotes the *irrelevance* of further detail about the lawless' suffering to Theron's potential future. Epinician includes it elsewhere when relevant: *O*.1.55-64 (Tantalus); *P*.2.21-42 (Ixion).

ὀκχέοντι πόνον: ὀκχέοντι is the frequentative of ἔχω, often employed of suffering (*Od*.7.211 ὀχέοντας ὀϊζὺν; *Od*.11.618-19; *Od*.21.302). Santamaría suggests expressive gemination here signifies its intensity/duration: *Od*.9.74-75 δύω νύκτας δύο τ' ἤματα συννεχὲς αἰεὶ | κείμεθ', ὁμοῦ καμάτῳ τε καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ἔδοντες; Watkins (1995) 29.

πόνον contrasts **62 ἀπονέστερον** of the **ἐσλοὶ**.

Without frequentative: *Il*.6.525; Hes.*Th*.629; possible intertext with *O*.1.59-60 ἔχει ... πόνον (Tantalus).

Antistrophe 4

68-83 The 3rd eschatological section modifies the principle in the 1st and 2nd (**57-60**; **61-67**) that moral criteria determine the dead's place in the afterlife, introducing (1) a recursive element to the Isle's moral criterion (avoiding injustice through multiple reincarnations: **68-70**); (2) an alternative criterion (translation by special dispensation: **78-80**). See **56-83**.

68-70 Those who have avoided injustice across 6 reincarnations travel Zeus' path to Cronus' tower: for the operation of metempsychosis in the eschatology, see **56-83**.

Within Greece, the earliest attested adherent of the doctrine of metempsychosis is Pherecydes of Syrus (but only in late sources: *Suda* s.v.Φερεκύδης), with the Pythagoreans

and Orphics its most sustained adherents: see Santamaría (2011) 233-67 on its 6th- and 5th-century manifestations. Although relative priority is often assigned to Protagoras (Σ.*O*.2.123e), Orphism has at least as strong a claim (Zhmud (2012) 221-38), esp. since metempsychosis is structurally-embedded in the Orphic system of ancestral guilt and soteriology but lacks any comparable motivation or goal in Pythagoreanism.

Influences from outside Greece are similarly contested. Hdt.2.123 asserts Egyptian influence on Orphism/Pythagoreanism, but metempsychosis was in fact alien to Egypt (Kees (1980) 6). Borrowing from India has also been postulated (Burkert (1985) 444), but there is little evidence of contemporary contacts (Karttunen (1989) 112-13; Bremmer (2002) 24). See the essays collected in Bernabé & Kahle & Santamaría (2011) for the concept across multiple cultures.

68 ὅσοι: 'all who', but not 'and *only* those who': guaranteeing inclusion to those meeting the criteria, but not *necessarily* excluding those who have not. Contrast Ar.*Ra*.454-59 μόνοις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἥλιος **(~ 61-62)** | καὶ φέγγος **(~ 56)** ... ὅσοι μεμυήμεθ' εὐ- | σεβῆ τε διήγομεν | τρόπον **(~ 68-70)**; Isoc.1.5.5-7 Ὅσοι ... οὗτοι μόνοι. See **78-80**.

In eschatological/reincarnation contexts: Pl.*Tim*.90e.7-91a.1 ὅσοι δειλοὶ καὶ τὸν βίον ἀδίκως διῆλθον ... γυναῖκες μετεφύοντο ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ | (91a) γενέσει; [Pl.]*Axioch*.371c.5-7 ὅσοις ... ἐν | τῷ ζῆν δαίμων ἀγαθὸς ἐπέπνευσεν, εἰς τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν | χῶρον οἰκίζονται; Or.Sib.*Orac*.4.187 ὅσσοι δ' εὐσεβέουσι, πάλιν ζήσοντ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν.

68-69 ἐτόλμασαν ... μείναντες ἀπὸ ... ἀδίκων ἔχειν: Pl.*Resp*.360b.5-6 ὃς ἂν μείνειεν ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ | τολμήσειεν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἀλλοτρίων (difficulty of resisting the temptation to injustice). Justice requiring courage: Ar.*Eq*.510 τολμᾷ τε λέγειν τὰ δίκαια.

68 ἐτόλμασαν: in P., almost always a noble quality of the victor (*P*.5.117; *P*.10.24; *N*.7.59; *N*.10.30; *I*.4.45); laudator (*O*.9.82; *O*.13.11); heroes (fr.29.4).

68-69 ἐστρίς | ἑκατέρωθι: neither the pattern of reincarnations, nor their starting-point, is stated: the former presumably alternated between Earth and Hades; the latter, i.e. the first total abstention from injustice, could equally well begin in Hades – a comfort for those conscious of earthly transgressions.

The number of reincarnations is variously interpreted.

(1) 3 lives in total ('thrice on *either* side': Mommsen (1864b) 30; Van Leeuwen).

This takes the words separately, but ἑκατερ– + numeral coheres idiomatically. A special usage with the number 2, based on the intrinsic duality of ἑκατερ–, permits '2 in total: 1 on each side': *Il*.23.329; *Od*.22.181 τὼ δ' ἔσταν ἑκάτερθε παρὰ σταθμοῖσι; Th.3.6.1.5-6 στρατόπεδα δύο ἑκατέρωθεν τῆς | πόλεως. This includes totals of 3 where the 3rd element occupies the middle: *Od*.9.429-30 σύντρεις ... ὁ μὲν ἐν μέσῳ ... τὼ δ' ἑτέρω ἑκάτερθεν; Hdt.3.102.16-18. However, *pace* Koniaris (1997a) 21, other instances with numerals above 2 behave differently ('2*x* in total: *x* on each side'): *Il*.11.27; *Il*.24.273; Pl.*Critias*.119b.4-5; Pl.*Tim*.36d.4; X.*Cyr*.8.3.19.4 τρεῖς ἑκατέρωθεν τοῦ ἅρματος; Arist.*Hist.Animal*.525b.23 ἐχομένους λεπτοὺς τρεῖς ἐφ' ἑκάτερα; D.H.*Antiq.Rom*.3.12.4.1 τρεῖς δὲ ἄνδρας ἐπιλέκτους ἀφ' ἑκατέρας πόλεως; Philo.*de.Vit.Mos*.2.102.4 ἓξ μὲν κλάδοι, τρεῖς δ' ἑκατέρωθεν; cf. Pl.*Leg*.775a.5 (5); Hdt.1.82.12 (300).

Therefore, (2) is preferable: 6 lives in total ('thrice on *each* side': Rohde (1925) 445n.42; Willcock; Santamaría).

(3) an indefinite number of lives (Σ.*O*.2.123b πολλάκις). But the use of particular for indefinite elsewhere involves large numbers (μυρίοι; *sescenti*); the scholion may have confused this with the intensive prefix τρισ– (Iamblich.*Theol.Arithmet*.16.12-13 'τρισμύριοι' λέγοντες ἀντὶ τοῦ 'πολλάκις πολλοί').

68 ἐστρίς: *in compositio*: *P*.4.61 (with Braswell). **ἐσ**– probably = 'no less than' (Barrett on E.*Hipp*.46).

Multiples of 3 regularly describe time-periods relating to reincarnation: the interval between incarnations (fr.133.2-3 (9 years); Procl.*Comm.in.Pl.Resp*.2.173.13-14 (300 years)); the duration of a cycle of reincarnations (Emped.fr.115 (30,000 seasons); Hdt.2.123.11-12 (3000 years); Pl.*Phaedr*.249a.3-5 (3000 years); cf. Hes.*Th*.803 ἐννέα πάντ' ἔτεα (gods wandering for 9 years for swearing falsely by Styx)). The Chinese poet Fan Chengda (AD 1126-93) states in a poem on his vision of the Buddha's Glory on Mt. Emei that 'in three reincarnations I have maintained the same practices and vows' (33). Santamaría 316-19 identifies the number 3 as a structural principle of ***O*.2**, connecting it to Pythagorean number-theory.

69 ἑκατέρωθι: prosaic.

69-70 ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων ἔχειν | ψυχάν: the concept of justice is key to eschatological criteria (esp. Platonic), with injustice meriting punishment (Pl.*Gorg*.523b.2-4, 525a.1; Pl.*Phaedo*.108b.5; Pl.*Phaedr*.248e.5; Pl.*Resp*.330d.7-e.1, 614c.7; Ar.*Ra*.147), and justice, reward (Pl.*Gorg*.523a.5-b.2; Pl.*Phaedo*.115a.1; Pl.*Phaedr*.248e.4-5; Pl.*Resp*.363c-d, 614c.4-6, 615b.7; Egyptian texts: Stilwell (2000) 358-68). As here, abstention from injustice rather than the active practice of justice is characterized as meriting post-mortem reward (Pl.*Gorg*.522d.1-2 ἄδικον μηδὲν ... εἰργασμένος; Pl.*Resp*.331a.1-2 μηδὲν ἑαυτῷ ἄδικον | συνειδότι ἡδεῖα ἐλπὶς; Pl.*Resp*.496d.9-e.2 καθαρὸς ἀδικίας τε καὶ ἀνοσίων | (e.) ἔργων τόν τε ἐνθάδε βίον βιώσεται καὶ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν αὐτοῦ | μετὰ καλῆς ἐλπίδος ... ἀπαλλάξεται; Stilwell (2000) 360, 362; contrast **66 ἔχαιρον εὐορκίαις**). Since Theron actively practises justice (**6**), the implication is he satisfies this criterion easily. It is striking that the form of the injunction to avoid injustice through a cycle of reincarnations here echoes Emped.fr.140 δάφνης φύλλων ἄπο πάμπαν ἔχεσθαι and Callim.fr.inc.553.1

κυάμων ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχειν (Empedocles' and Pythagoras' respective injunctions to avoid laurel and beans as the vessels for *reincarnated* souls).

Keeping the soul from injustice: Hes.*Op*.333-35 Ζεὺς ... ἔργων ἀντ' ἀδίκων χαλεπὴν ἐπέθηκεν ἀμοιβήν ... τῶν μὲν πάμπαν ἔεργ' ἀεσίφρονα θυμόν; Pl.*Phaedr*.256a.7-b.7 (souls practising philosophy and controlling their base impulses win a privileged afterlife and are metaphorically compared to Olympic victors). Cf. Pl.*Phaedo*.83b.6-7 φιλοσόφου ψυχὴ οὕτως ἀπέχεται τῶν ἡδονῶν τε | καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ λυπῶν (philosopher's soul liberated from material constraints by avoiding emotional disturbances).

Keeping away from injustice in general: *Od*.22.316 κακῶν ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχεσθαι; Isoc.8.138.2 ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἀδικημάτων; Isoc.17.138.2; X.*Mem*.1.4.19.3; X.*Mem*.4.4.11.4; X.*Mem*.4.8.4.9; X.*De.Vect*.5.6.3; Arist.*Probl*.950a.34.

69 ἀπὸ πάμπαν ... ἔχειν: complete abstention: *Od*.20.284-85; Archil.S478a.1 πάμπαν ἀποσχόμενος; X.*De.Rep.Lac*.1.3.4-5.

Tmesis: *Od*.2.49; *O*.13.59-60 ἀπὸ πάμπαν | εἴργοντες; also *P*.3.101.

69-70 ἀδίκων ... ψυχάν: the relationship between justice and the soul is a frequent (esp. philosophical) topos (Pl.*Soph*.247a.2 ψυχὴν ... τὴν μὲν δικαίαν, τὴν δὲ ἄδικόν; E.fr.388.2 ψυχῆς δικαίας; Isoc.7.41.3; Isoc.12.183.7-8). Justice is the soul's excellence/health (Pl.*Resp*.353e.7-11; Pl.*Resp*.612b.3-4; Arist.*de.Virt.et.Vit*.1250a.12), and injustice its baseness/disease (Pl.*Soph*.228e.2-3; Pl.*Gorg*.479b.8; Pl.*Gorg*.480b.1-2), and it was thought possible to direct the soul from the latter to the former (Pl.*Gorg*.504e.1-2 δικαιοσύνη μὲν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς γίγνηται, ἀδικία δὲ ἀπαλ- | λάττηται (effect of rhetoric); X.*Symp*.4.2.5 ψυχὰς δικαιοτέρους ποιεῖς).

70 ψυχάν: enjambement stylistically enacts the separation enjoined. See **57 φρένες**.

ἔτειλαν: Byzantine correction for unmetrical MSS ἔστειλαν, which likely arose from similar expressions with στέλλω meaning 'prepare for a journey': Archil.fr.89.29 ὁδὸν στελλ[; A.*Pers*.607-9; S.*Phil*.1416 ὁδὸν ἣν στέλλῃ. However, τέλλω better suits the sense of completion required here (an overlap with τελέω was perhaps felt in antiquity): *Od*.2.256 τελέει ... ὁδὸν, 273; *Od*.4.663-64 = *Od*.16.346-47; *Od*.10.41, 490-91 ὁδὸν τελέσαι καὶ ἱκέσθαι | εἰς Ἄΐδαο δόμους; Mimn.fr.11.2; Thgn.1.72; Thgn.1.692; Emped.fr.24.4; X.A.4.5.11.3. See **17 τέλος**.

Gnomic/iterative aorist of souls qualifying for the Isle(s): Pl.*Gorg*.526c.5 ἠγάσθη τε καὶ ἐς μακάρων νήσους ἀπέπεμψε.

Διὸς ὁδὸν παρὰ Κρό-νου τύρσιν: the terms recur, with the attributes interchanged, at Procl.*Comm.in.Timae*.3.143.26-27 ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ζανὸς πύργος καὶ ἡ τοῦ Κρόνου | πρόοδος.

This might be taken as a paraphrase of *h.l.* However, it complements Aristotle's report that the Pythagoreans called the universe's Central Fire the Ζανὸς πύργος or Διὸς φυλακή (Arist.fr.var.204.10-13): see Huffman 395-400; (2007) 81-87.

Διὸς ὁδὸν: the genitive is probably possessive ('belonging to Zeus'), matching the possessive **Κρό-νου τύρσιν**: at **79-80**, as at Hes.*Op*.168, Zeus controls *access* to the Isle which Cronus rules (Σ.*O*.2.126c, d, e, f). It is not a path 'to Zeus', since it is Cronus who occupies the Isle (**76-77**). Nor is it likely to be one 'taken by Zeus': at Pl.*Phaedr*.246e.4-5 Ζεύς, ἐλαύνων | πτηνὸν ἅρμα, πρῶτος πορεύεται, souls attempt to follow the celestial path of Zeus' winged chariot, but here such imagery is lacking, the path is a conduit for those who have passed all tests, not a test itself, and there is little indication Zeus visits the Isle. Nonetheless, Lavecchia (2001) 191-92 rightly observes that Zeus' concern for justice (see **6**) makes his road a suitable reward for avoiding **69 ἀδίκων**, comparing A.*Ag*.174-77 Ζῆνα ... φρονεῖν βροτοὺς ὁδώ- | σαντα; E.*Tro*.886-88 Ζεύς ... βαίνων κελεύθου κατὰ δίκην τὰ θνήτ' ἄγεις.

The illogicality of reaching an island by road reflects the geographic discontinuity of ultramundane locales (*P*.10.29-30 ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰών <κεν> εὕροις | ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν), although ὁδός can denote a sea-voyage (Thgn.1.692 τελέσειας ὁδὸν μεγάλου διὰ πόντου). Alternatively, the Isle could be a peninsula (cf. Πέλοπος νῆσος of the Peloponnese: *Cypr*.fr.15.3-4; Tyrt.fr.2.15).

Paths often represent the soul's potential destinies: see Santamaría 284-88; Edmonds (2004). Here, the path is not an obstacle to be traversed or a choice to be made (Parm.fr.2.9-12; Pl.*Phaedo*.108a.1-4; *OF*.474.2-7; *OF*.475.3-9; *OF*.476.1-5; *OF*.477.1-5; *OF*.487.5), but the automatic conduit to the soul's destiny for which it has qualified (Pl.*Gorg*.524a.2-4 δικάσουσιν ... ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ ἐξ ἧς | φέρετον τὼ ὁδώ, ἡ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἡ δ' εἰς Τάρ- | ταρον; Pl.*Resp*.614c.3-7 δικαστὰς ... τοὺς μὲν | δικαίους κελεύειν πορεύεσθαι τὴν εἰς δεξιάν τε καὶ ἄνω διὰ | τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ... ἀδίκους τὴν εἰς ἀριστεράν τε καὶ κάτω *OF*.474.15-16 ὁδὸν ἔρχεα<ι> ἄν ... μύσται καὶ βάκχοι ἱερὰν στείχουσι; *OF*.489.7; *OF*.490.7; Hegesipp.*AP*.7.545.1-2; Posidipp.fr.118.25 μυστικὸν οἶμον ἐπὶ Ῥαδάμανθυν (~ **75**); V.*A*.6.540-43). The image may have been inspired by the Elean, Delphic, and Eleusinian Sacred Ways (Feyerabend (1984) 1-22). In Vedic eschatology, the *devayāna* ('path of the gods') is that followed by those truly faithful to the realization of Brahman, from where they are no longer reborn (cf. *Praśna.Upaniṣad*.1.10). The Iranian *Vidēvdāt*.19.29 relates the creation of post-mortem paths for both the wicked and the righteous by Zurvān (Time: cf. **17 Χρόνος**).

Κρό-νου τύρσιν: the expression must relate to Cronus' (joint) rule of the Isle: see **76-77**.

If taken to represent a physical structure, it might be a tower inhabited by Cronus. Such towers are more typical of the Near East: cf. Horsfall on V.*A*.6.554 s*tat ferrea turris ad auras* (Tartarus ruled by Rhadamanthys: **75**); we might envisage a Sumerian ziggurat with the deity's shrine at its pinnacle, symbolizing access to the divine. The island itself cannot

be physically fortified, given the lack of any barrier between shore and sea at **70-74**, and a guard-post to deny the undeserving access (Koniaris (1997b) 228) would be superfluous, since only the worthy can reach it (*v.s.*). Lycophr.*Alex*.717, 1209, 1273 employs **τύρσιν** of cities, permitting the possibility of a centralized settlement on the Isle.

From a metaphorical perspective, Constantakopoulou (2007) 119-25 suggests that images of fortification express islands' association with security. Manfredi (1993) 35-51 identifies the tower with the volcano Pico del Teide on the Canary Islands. For cosmological fortifications, *v.s.* on Ζανὸς πύργος as a Pythagorean term for the Central Fire. Theron's characterization in architectural terms in relation to Acragas (see **6**) links him to his potential post-mortem abode.

ἔνθα: [Pl.]*Axioch*.371c.6-7 εἰς τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν | χῶρον οἰκίζονται, ἔνθα ἄφθονοι μὲν ὧραι (seat of the pious).

70-73 μακάρων ... χρυσοῦ ...ὕδωρ: ***O*.3.40-42 μακάρων ... ὕδωρ ... χρυσὸς**. See ***O*.3.42**.

70-71 μακάρων | νᾶσον: the first attestation of the Isles of the Blessed similarly makes them an Oceanic paradise for the Race of Heroes: Hes.*Op*.171 μακάρων νήσοισι παρ' Ὠκεανὸν (~ **71 ὠκεανίδες**). They overlap with Elysium (*Od*.4.561-69), a comparable Oceanic paradise which includes translated heroes, enjoys breezes, and is inhabited by Rhadamanthys.

Elsewhere, the Isles are typically plural: *Il.Parv*.fr.32.2-3 μακάρων ν]ήσους ... Ὠκεαν ... Ῥαδάμ[ανθυς (~ **75 Ῥαδαμάνθυος**); Pherecyd.fr.39.18-19 μακάρων νήσους ... Ῥα- | δαμάνθυϊ; Hellan.1a.4.F.19b.6; Ar.*Vesp*.639-40; Pl.*Symp*.179e.1-2 Ἀχιλλέα (~ **79 Ἀχιλλέα**) ... εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀπέπεμψαν, 180b.5; Pl.*Gorg*.523a.6-b.1 ἐπὶ Κρόνου (~ **70 Κρό-νου**; **77**) ... τὸν μὲν δικαίως τὸν βίον διελθόντα (~ **69 ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων**) ... εἰς μακάρων νήσους; Pl.*Menex*.235c.4; Pl.*Resp*.519c.5, 540b.6-7; Dem.60.34.1-3 παρέδρους (~ **76 πάρεδρον**) ... τοῖς κάτω θεοῖς ... ἐν μακάρων νήσοις; Arist.*Protrep*.fr.43.2;

Arist.*Pol*.1334a.28-31 δεῖ δικαιοσύνης ... ἐν μακάρων νήσοις; Alex.Aetol.fr.1.2; Adesp.Papyr.(SH).*Epig*.980.3-4 ἐκ κισσηρεφέος κεφαλῆς (~ **27 κισσοφόρος**) εὔυμνα κυλίων ... καὶ νήσους κώμασον εἰς μακάρων. For μακάρων νῆσοι of Semele's precinct on the Theban Cadmeion, see **25-26**.

G transmits **νᾶσος**, interpreted by Triclinius as Doric accusative plural in –ŏς (so Boeckh; cf. Rocha Pereira (1952) 7-12). But in no passage is the attested variant (cf. *O*.1.53; *N*.1.24; *N*.3.24, 29; *N*.10.62) metrically-required: see Gerber on *O*.1.53; Pfeijffer on *N*.3.29. Sim.fr.22.8 W^2 νῆσον provides a contemporary attestation of the singular: cf. E.*Hel*.1677; Hdt.3.26.6-8 (the Egyptian el-Kharga oasis); Luc.*Ver.Hist*.2.6.7; Luc.*Ver.Hist*.2.35.13. The singular is thus preferable. It (1) accentuates the sense of isolation/exclusivity; (2) suits **70 τύρσιν**, esp. if it refers to the Isle as a whole; (3) parallels both the White Island sometimes inhabited by Achilles (see **78-80**), and Theron's present island, Sicily (**9**).

Attempts have been made to identify the Isle(s) with real-world islands, esp. in the Atlantic: see Manfredi (1993) 25-51; Roller (2006) 44-56; Russo (2013). However, the concept probably has Egyptian or Mesopotamian roots, and may even have been transmitted in the Minoan period (Keyser (1993) 149; Martínez (1999) 243-79). Island utopias: Constantakopoulou (2002a) 178-205. Regardless of the Isle's relationship to real-world geography, its mythical Western Ocean location gives an eschatological dimension to the Pillars in ***O*.3**, with which Theron is already in contact: crossing that spatial/existential barrier will lead him to the Isle (see ***O*.3.42-44**).

70 μακάρων: originally of gods, but by Hes.*Op*.171 also of blessed humans: see West; cf. ***O*.3.41**.

71-72 ὠκεανίδες | αὖραι: in addition to locating the Isle geographically in Ocean (see **70-71**), it is tempting to connect the phrase to P.Derv.col.23.3 Ὠκεανός ἐστιν ὁ ἀήρ, the surprising identification of Ocean with the air, on which see Brisson (2011) 385-403.

72-73 αὖραι ... φλέγει ... χερσόθεν ... ὕδωρ: Hurst *ap.*Lloyd-Jones (1985) 283 suggests these represent the 4 Empedoclean elements (Emped.fr.109: earth; water; air; fire).

72 αὖραι περιπνέοισιν: Hes.*Th.*872 αὖραι ἐπιπνείουσι. Breezes are typical of utopias/islands: *Od.*4.568-69 ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντος ἀήτας | Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν (Ocean breezes in Elysium); Luc.*Ver.Hist.*2.13.1. Contrast *Il.*8.481 τέρποντ' οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι (Tartarus). Juxtaposition with **72-73** suggests the breezes influence the island's vegetation: cf. *Od.*7.119; Malamut (1988) 55; Brun (1996) 35-36.

72 ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ: ἄνθεμον, a poetic equivalent of ἄνθος (Ar.*Ach.*992), sometimes denotes artificial flowers used as jewellery when it occurs in connection with metal (*h.Hom.*6.9-11 ἄνθεμ' ὀρειχάλκου χρυσοῖό τε ... ὅρμοισι χρυσέοισιν (~ **74 ὅρμοισι τῶν**); Cephisodor.fr.4.2 χρυσᾶ ... ἄνθεμα (on sandals)); cf. ἀνθεμόεις = 'embossed with flowers' (*Il.*23.885; *Od.*3.440; *Od.*24.275). Although natural flowers can be 'golden' in colour (Sapph.fr.132.1 χρυσίοισιν ἀνθέμοισιν; Theophrast.*Hist.Plant.*9.19.3.4), here the genitive is of material (*I.*1.20 φιάλαισί τε χρυσοῦ), *pace* Santamaría: see West (1997) 538 on *Gilgam.*9.5-6 (liminal jewelled garden); fr.129.5 χρυσοκάρποισιν βέβριθε <δενδρέοις> (blessed in Hades); Philostrat.*VA.*5.5.1 (poplar of the Sun in the far west, distilling gold); also V.*A.*6.203-11 (golden bough); Hes.*Th.*215-16 (Hesperids' golden apples). The use of terms denoting the artificial reproduction of nature in the normal world thus underscores the Isle's miraculous power to endow the inorganic with life, which the blessed then fashion into jewellery (**74**). The image also borrows literally from that of the Golden Race under Cronus (Hes.*Op.*109-126).

Gold carries a range of positive connotations, esp. imperishability and divinity (***I*.2.1**), wealth (cf. **53**), light (cf. **56**), mystic qualities (Duchemin (1955) 193-228), esp. when juxtaposed with water (see ***O*.3.42**).

Organic flowers in utopias: Sim.fr.22 W^2 13-16; fr.129.3 φοινικορόδοις ... λειμώνεσσι, 9 εὐανθὴς ... τέθ⌋αλεν ὄλβος (metaphorically of bliss); Ar.*Ra*.351, 373-74a; [Pl.]*Axioch*.371c.7-9; Luc.*Ver.Hist*.2.5-6; Luc.*Ver.Hist*.2.13-14.

χρυσοῦ φλέγει: *O*.3.19-20 χρυσάρματος ... ἀντέφλεξε; Simias.fr.4; D.S.37.30.2.11-12.

This radiance (with **73 ἀγλαῶν**: cf. *Lyr.Adesp*.fr.70.1 χρυσὸς ἀγλαὸς) implies abundant sunlight on the Isle: cf. **61-62**.

73 χερσόθεν: since all non-fragmentary Pindaric instances form a contrast with πόντος (*O*.12.3-4; *N*.1.62-63; *N*.4.67-70; *N*.9.43), **ὕδωρ** must be sea-water (*pace* Santamaría): gold's incorruptibility is accentuated by its contact with the corroding sea.

ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων: *O*.9.20 ἀγλαόδενδρον. The wondrous trees parallel those Heracles transfers from Hyperborea to Olympia (***O*.3.23**, **32**). Trees on utopian islands: *Od*.1.51 (Ogygia); Hes.*Th*.216 (Hesperides); *Od*.7.114-15 δένδρεα ... καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι (Scheria); also fr.129.5 χρυσοκάρποισιν βέβριθε <δενδρέοις> (blessed in Hades).

74 ὅρμοισι τῶν χέρας ἀναπλέκοντι καὶ στεφάνους: to avoid the idea of entwining *crowns* around *hands*, most scholars reject the variant στεφάνοις in favour of **στεφάνους**, and construe as a zeugma, with **ἀναπλέκοντι** meaning 'entwine' with **χέρας**, 'plait' with **στεφάνους** (*I*.8.66a-67): stylistic enactment of the plaiting process.

The application of **ὅρμοισι** to **χέρας** is slightly puzzling, insofar as (1) until late antiquity, in parallels mentioning a body-part, ὅρμος always means a chain worn over the neck and / or the chest (cf. *h.Hom*.5.88; *h.Hom*.6.11; Callixen.fr.2.335; Dioscorid.Pedan.*de.Mater.Medic*.1.99.3.8-9; Luc.*de.Domo*.7.7; Aelian.*Var.Hist*.12.1.128-

48), except at Strab.16.4.18.67-69 (neck and wrists); (2) outside P., ὅρμος is gendered as female-orientated (*Od.*15.460-62; *h.Hom.*5.88; E.*El.*176-77), esp. when made of gold, as here (*Od.*15.460; Hes.*Op.*74; E.fr.70.1-2). Esp. if **χέρας** denotes the wrist here, reference to the Isle's female inhabitants may be intended, since the wearing of wrist-ornaments by whatever name was gendered as female. Alternatively, it may evoke the celebration of agonistic victory: *I.*1.66 Ἀλφεοῦ ἔρνεσι φράξαι χεῖρα probably refers to the binding of ταινίαι around the victor's arm, as in an Attic amphora c.480 attributed to Douris (St. Petersburg B.5576).

στεφάνους may similarly recall Theron's victory-crown, likewise the product of ultramundane trees (see **73**): **72 ἄνθεμα ~ 50 ἄνθεα**; ***O.*3.6 στέφανοι**; cf. *O.*7.80-81 τῶν ἄνθεσι ... ἐστεφανώσατο; *N.*5.54 ἀνθέων ... στεφανώ-ματα; *N.*9.52-53 θεμιπλέκτοις ... στεφάνοις; *I.*8.66a-67 πλεκέτω ... στέφανον; B.11.18-19; B.13.69-70. The olive leaves of such crowns are often described metaphorically as 'golden': *O.*8.1; *O.*11.13; *N.*1.17. Here, the crown's funerary, mystic, and eschatological connotations are active: see Santamaría 307-310. Crowns are similarly woven in an ultramundane locale at Sim.fr.22.15-16 W^2 (probably the Isle: 7-8).

Golden crowns are worn by gods (*h.Hom.*6.1), and reward public benefactors (Th.4.121.1.5).

τῶν: genitive of material: see **72**.

Epode 4

75-77 An ascending hierarchy of the Isle's 3 overseers (articulated by **76 ἔχει**; **77 ἐχοίσας**), imagined occupying a set of thrones: Rhadamanthys; Cronus; Rhea.

75 βουλαῖς ἐν ὀρθαῖσι: fr.128da.16 ὀρθαι τ̣ε β[ουλ]αι (possibly of afterlife judgement: Cannatà Fera).

Ῥαδαμάνθυος: found in post-mortem settings from epic onwards: Elysium: *Od.*4.564; cf. A.fr.99.12-13; Isle(s): *Il.Parv.*fr.32.3; Pherecyd.fr.39.18-19; *h.l*; Luc.*Ver.Hist.*2.6.7-8; Hades: Pl.*Apol.*41a.3; Hegesipp.*AP.*7.545.1-4 (with 'the good'); crossroads leading to the Isles or Tartarus: Pl.*Gorg.*524a.4; Tartarus: V.*A.*566; end of a 'mystic path': Posidipp.*Epig.*118.25; cf. Posidipp.*Epig.*43.3. However, he does not judge *admission* before Plato. Here, he regulates the blessed as Cronus' honoured subordinate (**76**): cf. his brothers Minos (*Od.*11.570 θεμιστεύοντα νέκυσσιν) and Aeacus (*I.*8.24 δαιμόνεσσι δίκας ἐπεί-ραινε); also Ar.*Ve.*639-40 κἀν μακάρων δικάζειν ... ἔδοξα νήσοις.

Rhadamanthys' justice (Hes.fr.141.13 δίκαιόν τε Ῥαδάμανθυν; *P.*2.73-74; E.*Cyc.*274-75; Pl.*Apol.*41a.3-4; Pl.*Leg.*624b.5-625a.1) qualifies him for the role, and matches the Isle's admission criteria (**68-70**). His familial connections as grandson of Cronus provide additional support for his presence (see **78-80**).

Nilsson (1950) 621-29 posits a Minoan origin for Rhadamanthys (noting the **–νθ–** element) and Elysium, perhaps borrowed from Egypt; cf. West (1997) 612; Marinatos & Anderson (2010) 13-24.

76-77 Cronus and Rhea's oversight of the Isle retrospectively colours two passages: see **12**; **15-17**.

76 πατὴρ ... μέγας: Cronus: varying **70**. In epic, both epithets attach to Cronus (Hes.*Th.*73; *Il.*5.721), his father Uranus (Hes.*Th.*207-8), and his son Zeus (*Il.*2.146: cf. **27**; *Il.*2.134), but only with Zeus does **πατὴρ** = 'All-father', presumably because epic views Zeus' supremacy as 'current'.

Therefore, the collocation reinforces the passage's divergence from the version in which Zeus imprisoned Cronus in Tartarus (*Il*.8.479-81; Hes.*Th*.851) in favour of his present authority on the Isle, a timeless continuation of his rule over the Golden Race (Hes.*Op*.111, 173a-e, with West).

πατὴρ also emphasizes (1) Rhadamanthys' descent from Cronus (**75**); (2) Zeus' invocation as Cronus' son (**12**: see **76-77**).

ἔχει ... ἑτοῖμον: 'keeps ready' (Hdt.3.123.10 εἶχε ἑτοίμας), presumably as an adviser.

πάρεδρον: often of holding a place of honour beside a (superior) divinity: West on Hes.*Op*.259; *O*.8.22; *P*.4.4; *N*.7.1; *I*.7.3; B.11.52; E.*Med*.843; E.*Or*.1687 (immortalized Helen); Ar.*Av*.1754; Isoc.9.15.5-7 (Rhadamanthys' brother Aeacus beside Pluto and Kore); Dem.60.34.1-3 παρέδρους ... τοῖς κάτω θεοῖς ... ἐν μακάρων νήσοις (war-dead).

77 πόσις: Cronus: see **17** on the responsion with **Χρόνος**.

ὁ πάντων: 17 ὁ πάντων (responsion).

Ῥέας: 12 Ῥέας. As Cronus' consort, her presence is natural, but her *superior* position is remarkable: Santamaría 340-50 notes her possible identification with the Magna Mater, and the mystic/eschatological connotations of enthronement.

She forms a sequence of significant female divinities with Thetis (**80**) and Eos (**83**).

ὑπέρτατον ... θρόνον: thrones (esp. lofty ones) symbolize divine power: *N*.4.65 ὑψιθρόνων (Nereids); *I*.6.16 ὑψίθρονον (Clotho); Licymn.fr.2.1 μᾶτερ ὑψίστα θρόνων (Hygieia); cf. **22 εὐθρόνοις**. *V.s.* on *thronosis*/*enthronismos*.

78-80 The eschatology concludes by naming 3 formerly-mortal inhabitants of the Isle.

That heroes inhabit the Isle is Hesiodic (Hes.*Op*.159-173; cf. *OF*.476.11 ἄλλοισι μεθ' ἡρώεσσιν ἀνάξει[ς]), and implied by Menelaus' place in Elysium (*Od*.4.561-69; cf. 565 ἀνθρώποισιν). Here, only Achilles' accession is explained (**79-80**). Van Leeuwen observes

that the criterion of having lived multiple just lives (**68-70**) is explicitly broken in his case, esp. given the victim-catalogue (**81-83**), and implicitly so in that of the others: P. juxtaposes two seemingly-irreconcilable determinants, the modern/esoteric (righteousness alone), and the traditional (birth and/or divine favour), with the latter as a back-up for those doubting their moral purity (e.g. Theron after his 476 Himera massacre: **16**); cf. Santamaría 220, 414-415, on Achilles as a 'saved sinner'. See **68** on the *inclusiveness* of **ὅσοι**.

The individuals are carefully-selected for their relationships with one another (Peleus-Cadmus: **78**; Peleus-Achilles: **78**), and for the implicit syllogism they form together: (1) Achilles is translated because his mother influences Zeus, and his father inhabits the Isle; (2) Theron is descended from Zeus via his ancestor Harmonia (see **3-7**), and his forefather Cadmus inhabits the Isle; (3) therefore Theron can expect translation. Cadmus' naming here recalls that in relation to his immortalized daughters (**23**): the Nereids' immortalization of Ino (**29**) binds him to the Nereid Thetis and her family; Semele's immortalization, like Achilles', was achieved by Zeus (**25-26**).

Athanassaki (2009a) 132-46 argues that ***P.6***'s evocation of the Siphnian Treasury (***P.6.28-42***) is here reprised: Thetis imploring Zeus for Achilles' immortality (**78-79**), in proximity to Achilles' victim Memnon being named in reference to his mother Eos (**83**), reworks the *psychostasia* on the left side of the Siphnian Treasury's East Frieze, whereas ***P.6*** had adapted the right side. Athanassaki (2014) 206-7 adds that a further parallelism is imported from ***P.6.21-27***, where Achilles and Peleus are analogues for Thrasybulus and Xenocrates: if we take Cadmus as an analogue for Theron here, this metapoetically places all three Emmenids on the Isle. The idea is ingenious, but slightly forced, since there is no pre-existing *familial* link between Cadmus and Peleus: cf. **48-51** on the *brothers* Eteocles-Polyneices easily corresponding to Theron-Xenocrates as a negative paradigm. Depending

on dating, the Olympic Apollonian monument might be a better iconographic model for the *psychostasia* (Barringer (2009) 244).

78 Πηλεύς τε καὶ Κάδμος: at *P*.3.86-103, exemplars of mortal vicissitude (hardship > happiness through divine marriage > misfortune through children's suffering). Their respective marriages to Thetis and Harmonia may explain their translation, since Menelaus reaches Elysium via his marriage to Zeus' daughter Helen (*Od*.4.569). Their post-mortem fates are there unexpressed, but Semele's immortalization is explicit (*P*.3.98-99; cf. **25-27**), and Currie (2005) 344-405 argues that Achilles' consumption by fire at *P*.3.102 symbolizes mystic immortalization, with *P*.3's parallels with ***O*.2** suggesting a comparable intimation of immortality to Hieron. Nowhere else in Greek literature are the two associated by name.

Πηλεύς: elsewhere in P., similarly (except fr.172) in connection with Achilles and/or Thetis (*P*.3.87-100; ***P*.6.23**; *P*.8.100 Πηλεῖ ... Ἀχιλλεῖ; *N*.3.33-43; *N*.4.49-56; *N*.5.25-26; *I*.6.25; *I*.8.35-55 (Peleus; Thetis; Achilles' victims and death); fr.52f.99.

His status as son-in-law of the gods suits a post-mortem fate like Menelaus' (*v.s.*); at E.*Andr*.1253-62 Thetis offers him immortality with Nereus, parallel to Achilles' on Leuce. P. stresses his virtue (*N*.5.31-34), but also his transgressions (the murder of his half-brother Phocus: *N*.5.14 ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον ~ **16 ἐν δίκᾳ τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν**) that violate the Isle's requirements (**69 ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων**).

Paradigm of blessedness: *v.s.*; Hes.fr.211.7 τρὶς μάκαρ Αἰακίδη καὶ τετράκις ὄλβιε Πηλεῦ.

78-79 τε καὶ ... | ... τ': binding elements 1 and 2, with 3 more loosely connected, esp. when metrically/syntactically isolated (Hummel 400): *N*.4.9-10 Κρονίδᾳ τε Διὶ καὶ Νεμέᾳ | Τιμασάρχου τε πάλᾳ; *P*.10.4-5. Achilles dwells with Peleus and Cadmus, yet occupies a special category, capping tricolon, triad, and eschatology.

78 Κάδμος: founder of Thebes (*P.*8.47; *P.*9.83; *N.*1.51; *N.*4.21; *N.*8.51; *I.*1.11; *I.*4.53; *I.*6.75; fr.29.2; fr.52k.44). Elsewhere in P., like Peleus, associated with his wife and/or daughters (**23**; *P.*3.87-100; *P.*11.1; fr.70b.27-30; fr.75.12). At E.*Ba.*1338-39, his marital connection leads to his translation to the blessed: Ἄρης ... μακάρων τ' ἐς αἶαν σὸν καθιδρύσει βίον.

Here, Cadmus caps the ode's tracing of Theron's genealogy (**8-11**; **22-30**; **38-47**) by linking it to salvation, implicit already in the Cadmeids' immortalization (**22-30**).

ἀλέγονται: both (1) 'are counted' (Σ.*O.*2.142); (2) 'are honoured' (Hutchinson on Alcm.fr.1.2 Λύκαισον ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω; cf. *IG.*14.1389.ii.6 ἀλέγειν ἐν ἀθανάτοις).

79-80 Ἀχιλλέα τ' ἔνεικ', ἐπεὶ Ζηνὸς ἦτορ | λιταῖς ἔπεισε, μάτηρ: adapting the Iliadic motif of Thetis supplicating Zeus (*Il.*1.493-530; cf. *Il.*1.394-95 Δία λίσαι ... κραδίην Διὸς, 502 λισσομένη; *Il.*15.77). *Pace* Solmsen (1982) 20-21, this adaptation of Homer does not imply an innovative rejection of the Homeric view of Achilles' afterlife in Hades (*Od.*11.467-540), since the early tradition for Achilles' afterlife is flexible, and Homer is anomalous within it: (1) Hades: *v.s.*; Paus.10.30.3; Luc.*Dial.Mort.*26.2.1-13; (2) Leuce: *Aethiop.*Arg.4b (translated by Thetis); Alc.fr.354; *N.*4.49-50; E.*Andr.*1260-62; E.*IT.*435-38; Paus.3.19.13 (marrying Helen); (3) Isle(s) of the Blessed: *h.l.*; *PMG.*894 (with Harmodius and Diomedes); Pl.*Symp.*179e.1-2; (4) Elysium: Ibyc.fr.291 = Sim.fr.558 (marrying Medea); A.R.4.811; Q.S.14.223-26. See Edwards (1985) 215-27; Burgess (2009) 98-110. The importance of his Euxine cult in 6th- and 5th-century Olbia (Burgess (2009) 126-28) coincides with the Orphic-Bacchic *thiasos* attested there (**22-30**). Here, the varied chiasmus **79-80 Ἀχιλλέα ... μάτηρ ~ 83 Ἀοῦς τε παῖδ' Αἰθίοπα** indicates the *Aethiopis* as primary model: see **83**. Hellan.1a.4.F.19b.5-6 attests Poseidon immortalized his son Lycus on the Isles. Thetis' intervention as a parallel for Orphic intercession: Santamaría 261-62.

Thetis' successful prayer to Zeus is an omen for the laudator's (**12-15**, reactivated by **76-77**).

ἕνεικ', ἐπεὶ ... ἔπεισε: unlike the antistrophe-initial gnomic aorists **68 ἐτόλμασαν**, **70 ἔτειλαν**, which reference the blessed's regular admission, these epode-final punctual aorists convey Achilles' extraordinary translation, breaking with the timeless presents describing the Isle (**72-78**) to conclude the eschatology with a narrative. This dramatizes Thetis' intervention (*pace* Hurst (1985) 171n.14), but also blurs the *Od*.11.494-97 mythic chronology whereby Achilles dies *before* Peleus. **ἕνεικ', ἐπεὶ ... ἔπεισε** stylistically enacts Thetis' persistent persuasion.

See ***O*.3.13-16 ἔνεικεν ... πείσαις** on Heracles' transfer of the olive to Olympia from Hyperborean Ister, mirroring Thetis' translation of Achilles to the Isle here, and enacting through intertextuality the spatial/existential permeability theme in Theron's odes.

79 Ζηνὸς ἦτορ: *Il*.1.395 κραδίην Διὸς; *Il*.9.117; *Il*.21.389; *Od*.15.245; A.*PV*.590.

That Zeus, not Cronus, must be persuaded (1) is intrinsic to the epic models (see **79-80**); (2) implies Zeus controls access to the Isle (**70**).

ἦτορ: 'heart': a psychic entity like κῆρ/κραδίη, with a physical and emotional quality (Darcus Sullivan (1995) 17-38).

79-80 Ζηνὸς ἦτορ | λιταῖς ἔπεισε: Zeus' heart difficult to persuade: *Il*.12.173 οὐδὲ Διὸς πεῖθε φρένα; A.*PV*.34 Διὸς γὰρ δυσπαραίτητοι φρένες, 184-85 κέαρ | ἀπαράμυθον ἔχει Κρόνου παῖς.

Ζηνὸς ... λιταῖς: *Il*.1.503 λισσομένη προσέειπε Δία (see **79-80**); *Il*.9.502 λιταί εἰσι Διὸς κοῦραι.

80 λιταῖς ἔπεισε: E.*Supp*.24 πεῖσαι λιταῖς.

ἔπεισε: 79-80. Cf. Thgn.1.702-3 ἐξ Ἀίδεω πολυϊδρίησιν ἀνῆλθεν | πείσας Περσεφόνην (Sisyphus escaping Hades by persuading Persephone); A.*Eum*.724 Μοίρας ἔπεισας ἀφθίτους θεῖναι βροτούς (Apollo persuading the Fates to grant humans immortality).

μάτηρ: Thetis' designation by her relationship to Achilles (**79**) evokes the pathos of her entreaties; their respective sentence-initial and sentence-final positions stylistically enact their separation.

Strophe 5

81-83 Achilles' career is defined by 3 victims: his greatest (Hector), first (Cycnus), and last (Memnon). The list is conventional (*I*.5.39-41; *I*.8.49-60), and such lists conclude myths elsewhere (*O*.13.87-90; *P*.10.46-48), but here the phrasing connotes the victims' post-mortem fates in order to integrate them with the eschatology. Cf. Currie (2005) 211-16 on *I*.7.31-35: the cult of the 'saving heroes' Meleager, Hector, and Amphiaraus offers the victor's dead uncle a similar status.

Achilles' military prowess may mirror Theron's, esp. his 480 Himera victory. After the Persian Wars, epic was reinterpreted as a paradigm for Greek-Barbarian conflict, esp. the figure of Achilles in Sim.fr.11W^2 (Grethlein (2010) 54-55), and in Polygnotus' *Nekuia* on the Cnidian *Lesche* at Delphi (Kebric (1983) 16-24). Theron mirroring Hector: **6**.

Responsion with the Emmenid victory-list: see **81**.

81 ὃς: myth-introducing relative: Gerber on *O*.1.25; Braswell on *P*.4.4(a); Hummel 326-27; Bonifazi (2004) 42-48.

H.l. suits Davies' observation *ap*.Finglass on *P*.11.17 that the relative's coincidence with a new stanza or triad (cf. **8**; ***O*.3.11**, **31**; ***P*.6.10**; ***I*.2.22**) enhances its formality: the

victim-list is a tricolon representing three epics (Hector: *Iliad*; Cycnus: *Cypria*; Memnon: *Aethiopis*), in responsion with the Emmenid victory-tricolon (**48-50**: Olympian; Pythian; Isthmian) opening Antistrophe 3 (cf. Griffith (1991) 53).

IE/Graeco-Aryan template of hero slaying foes, articulated by relatives: Watkins (1995) 309-12.

Ἕκτορα: in P., usually a victim. 4x in a tricolon of heroic casualties (*h.l.*; *I*.5.39; *I*.7.32; *I*.8.55), but a martial exemplar for the victor at *N*.9.37-42. Death: *Il*.22.248-366. He may have enjoyed Troadic hero-cult by the 5th century: Currie (2005) 213-14.

σφᾶλε: 'overthrow' applies to both the human tenor (*P*.8.15, *I*.4.35) and monumental vehicle (fr.94a.17). At *Il*.22.330, Hector is knocked down before dying.

81-82 Τροίας ... κίονα: mirroring **6 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος** chiastically (cf. Lyc.281-82 κίον' αἰστώσεις δόμων, | ἔρεισμα πάτρας). The parallel may reflect shared Theban identity (through Hector's Theban hero-cult), but the evidence is Hellenistic (Schachter (1981) 233-34).

Columns as metaphors for people: A.*Ag*.897-98; E.*IT*.50-52, 57; Rehm (2002) 108; Stieber (2011) 36-42. Here a subset is activated, namely *deceased* individuals as a city's pillars: [Archil.]325.1-2 Νάξου | κίονας; Irish parallels: Watkins (1994) 2.748; West (2007) 455; also Fatouros (2002) 168-76; cf. ἕρμα πόληος of the dead Sarpedon (*Il*.16.550) and suitors (*Od*.23.121). The referent may be the ὀρθοστάτης supporting a roof. The image fits Hector ('Holder' < ἔχω: *Il*.24.730; Pl.*Crat*.393a.1-b.6), whose death entails Troy's fall (*Il*.22.410-11, 507).

Columns bear funerary connotations from Homer onwards (*Il*.17.434-35; Vermeule (1979) 69): the image thus simultaneously reflects Hector's life and death (displacing the description of his burial with stones/mound at *Il*.24.784-801). McGowan (1995) 615-32

notes the overlapping use of such funerary columns as hippodrome turning-posts, which strikingly matches the responsion here with the Emmenid victory-catalogue: see **81**. There is no reference to Hector's afterlife here, but P. probably knew his cult (**81-83**), and Evans (1901) 158 draws a parallel with Mycenaean pillar-cult.

82 ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ: not semantically redundant (*pace* Hummel 366): the former suits the tenor, the latter both tenor and vehicle, thus fusing warrior and city.

The paradox of defeating the invincible (1) glorifies Achilles; (2) generates pathos by focalizing Hector from the Trojan perspective: cf. laments for Agamemnon (A.*Ch*.55 ἄμαχον ἀδάματον ἀπόλεμον τὸ πρὶν) and Darius (A.*Pers*.855-56 ἀκάκας | ἄμαχος, 862 ἀπόνους ἀπαθεῖς).

Accumulated alpha-privatives, found in epic (pairs: asyndetic: *Od*.1.242; *h.Hom*.2.200; polysyndetic: *Il*.15.697; *Il*.22.304; tricola: asyndetic: *Il*.9.63; polysyndetic: *Il*.24.157), are particularly tragic: Fraenkel on A.*Ag*.412; Rutherford (2010) 446.

ἀστραβῆ: in poetry only here: 'unbending'. Its application to objects (Hipp.*Art*.31.3; Pl.*Tim*.73b.6) suits the inanimate vehicle. Its use with persons (LSJ.s.v. compares ἀστραφής/ἄστρεπτος: for the latter's wrestling connotations ('twisting'), cf. Theocr.24.111-12 ἑδροστρόφοι ... ἀλλάλους σφάλλοντι παλαίσμασιν; Henry on *N*.4.93) suits the human tenor by activating the wrestling-metaphor in **81 σφᾶλε**.

Κύκνον: son of Poseidon and Calyce. Sources mention up to 4 other Cycni: Zardini (2009) 75-82. Invulnerability, death, and onomastic overlap with the Kukunni who preceded Alaksandu of Wilusa: Fowler (2013) 534-35; West on *Cypr*.Arg.10b. His post-mortem transformation into a swan (Ov.*Met*.12.143-45) may underlie his early description as an albino; Plat.*Resp*.620a relates Orpheus' soul passing into a swan.

Θανάτῳ πόρεν: governing both **Κύκνον** and **Ἀοῦς ... παῖδ'**, connecting the former to an afterlife strictly applicable to the latter.

Exact parallels are lacking: *Od.*18.202: θάνατον πόροι; *Il.*22.297 θάνατονδὲ κάλεσσαν; *Il.*1.3 ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν; *N.*1.66 δώσειν μόρῳ (Bergk[3]); E.*IT.*1037 δώσω φόνωι. Contrast Latin: Hofmann & Szantyr (1965) 100; Cat.64.362 *morti quoque reddita* (Polyxena sacrificed to Achilles' ghost, concluding a catalogue of his killings); Ov.*Met.*12.72-73 *leto proles Neptunia Cycnus* | *mille viros dederat* (reworking *h.l.*?).

Θανάτῳ should be personified (*pace* Santamaría). (1) the indirect object of πορεῖν is always a person, expressed or implied (except *O.*10.93 ἔπορε μόχθῳ ... τερπνόν: Slater s.v.b renders 'gained'). (2) the phrase alludes to Memnon's special afterlife. The treatment of Sarpedon's corpse at *Il.*16.454-56 πέμπειν μιν Θάνατον τε φέρειν καὶ νήδυμον Ὕπνον ... ταρχύσουσι κασίγνητοί ... τύμβῳ τε στήλῃ τε is a doublet of Memnon's transportation to the East by Sleep and Death (Janko). The *Iliad* minimizes supernatural phenomena, hence the dead are honoured with burial. But ταρχύω, etymologized through Hittite *tarh-* 'conquer' (via 'deify'), may originate in a south Anatolian funerary ritual for graduation to heroic/divine status (Chantraine s.v.; West (1997) 386). Sarpedon's κασίγνητοί are Minos and Rhadamanthys (cf. **75**), and he probably possessed cult in Lycia. See Currie (2005) 50-52; Fantuzzi (2006) 135-39.

Memnon's translation by Sleep and Death occurs in a red-figure calyx krater c.520-10 (*LIMC* s.v.Thanatos.3).

83 Ἀοῦς τε παῖδ' Αἰθίοπα: chiastically mirroring **79-80 Ἀχιλλέα ... μάτηρ**, and evoking Eos' supplication of Zeus to immortalize her son in the *Aethiopis* (*Aethiop.*Arg.2e). See **78-80** on interaction with the Siphnian Treasury's East Frieze and ***P.*6**. Here (1) a mother saves her son's afterlife, whereas at ***P.*6.28-42** a son saves his father's life; (2) Achilles'

killing of Memnon metapoetically avenges Antilochus' death at Memnon's hands (see ***P.*6.30**).

Ἀοῦς: Memnon's mother: *Od.*4.188; *N.*6.52.

Αἰθίοπα: *P.*6.31. Here, the Aethiopians' Homeric characterization as a *Randvolk* feasting the gods (*Il.*1.423-24; *Il.*23.205-7; *Od.*1.22-25) makes the word a fitting end to the eschatology.

Expressions of suffering/death often precede break-offs (Race (1990) 41-45), dramatically concluding the narrative. But the climax here may not be Memnon's death, but Achilles' at Apollo's hands (briefly posited by Pfeijffer on *N.*3.62-63n.237; Grethlein (2010) 36).

Its inclusion would be natural. Mention of Memnon breaks the reverse chronological order followed since **79**: Achilles' translation; Thetis' persuasion of Zeus; Hector's death (linked to Achilles' in the *Iliad*, sometimes with reference to his killers Paris and Apollo: *Il.*18.95-96; 19.416-17; 22.359-60); Cycnus' death. Achilles' death followed Memnon's in the *Aethiopis* (*Aethiop.*Arg.3a, with West); P.'s repertoire includes it (*I.*8.56-60; *P.*3.101 ἐν πολέμῳ τόξοις (a context including Thetis, Peleus, and Cadmus, as here); fr.52f.75-91), and it would form a ring with his translation to the Isle.

Pindaric *Abbrüche* often undermine their formal function through allusion and imagery, a phenomenon I term 'subverted break-off'. (1) *O.*1.52 rejects the divine-cannibalism myth, but the 'corrected' myth, the description of the banquet at which the ode is performed, and even the opening priamel, are contaminated by intratexts involving cannibalism and perverted sacrifice (1 Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ ~ 48-49 ὕδατος ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν | μαχαίρᾳ τάμον κατὰ μέλη; 16-17 παίζομεν ... ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν ~ 50 τραπέζαισί τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα; 83 γῆρας ... ἕψοι μάταν ~ 55 καταπέψαι); *O.*1.25-27 retains the ivory shoulder of the rejected version as the reason for

Poseidon's desire in the 'corrected' version. (2) *O.*9.41-42 breaks off and rejects the tale of Heracles' combat with Poseidon, Apollo, and Hades with the command ἔα πόλεμον μάχαν τε πᾶσαν | χωρὶς ἀθανάτων. But this 'correction' recalls contradictory epic parallels, reminding the audience of the Homeric/Hesiodic authority for what it attempts to suppress: *Il.*5.891 αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε (Ares, wounded by Diomedes); Hes.*Th.*926 ᾗ κέλαδοί τε ἄδον πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε (Athena). (3) *O.*13.87-92 breaks off Bellerophon's myth with *praeteritio*, after a victim-tricolon (~ **81-83**), by refusing to narrate his death (91), but nonetheless specifying it. A 1st-person statement follows, stressing the need not to hurl τὰ πολλὰ βέλεα παρὰ σκοπὸν (~ **83-84 πολλά ... βέλη**; **89 σκοπῶ**). (4) *P.*11.38-39 breaks off Orestes' killing of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus with κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην, | ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρίν. The crossroads-image, in an ode for a *Theban* victor, in the context of tragic parricide, recalls the famous crossroads where Oedipus slew Laius (cf. **39**): Kurke (2013) 114-17 observes Aeschylus' use of the same words for that encounter in his Theban trilogy (A.fr.387a.2-3 σχιστῆς κελεύθου τρίοδον, ἔνθα ξυμβολὰς | τριῶν κελεύθων Ποτνιάδας ἠμείβομεν). (5) *I.*5.39-51 transitions from Achilles' killing of Cycnus, Hector, and Memnon (~ **81-83**), to Aegina, for which the laudator's tongue possesses πολλὰ ... τοξεύματ' (~ **83-84 πολλά ... βέλη**): his command that Salamis' hailstorm of gore be *drenched* in silence (51 καύχαμα κατάβρεχε σιγᾷ) prolongs what the formal rhetoric attempts to dismiss.

P.'s poet-as-archer metaphor evokes Apollo generally (*v.i.* **βέλη**), and in two specific ways here: (1) **83 Αἰθίοπα. πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος** encodes ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ (see **2**; **83-88**; **87**); (2) **ὠκέα βέλη** recalls Achilles' prophesied death at *Il.*21.278 λαιψηροῖς ὀλέεσθαι Ἀπόλλωνος βελέεσσιν (ὠκύς ≈ λαιψηρός: Archil.fr.181.10-11; *N.*10.63-4; E.fr.1032.1).

This pointed omission (1) dramatizes the laudator's rhetoric of selectivity (**83-85**; **87**; **89-90**; **95-97**; **98-100**) by tantalizing the audience only to keep the myth in his quiver; (2)

allows literary **συνετοῖσιν** to congratulate themselves on their perceptiveness: **85 φωνάεντα** hints at the *sound* of the encoded name (cf. fr.105a.1-2 Σύνες ὅ τοι λέγω ... ἱερῶν ἐπώνυμε: pun on Hieron's name); **83-88** displays similar encoding to that which occurs in the *Gāthās* in the context of the 'speak-to-the-knowing' motif.

83-88 The laudator breaks off the eschatology with claims concerning his abundant poetic material, his audience's capacity to understand it, and his poetic superiority. The break-off serves a structural function: preceded by exposition of the post-mortem rewards accessible only to outstanding individuals (**68-83**), and followed by a superlative vaunt regarding the generosity which identifies Theron as such (**90-95**), the laudator's vaunt asserts his wisdom and authority to make such extraordinary claims (symbiotic prestige of laudator and laudandus: Ibyc.S151.47-48; *O*.1.115-15b; B.3.85-98). The archer-metaphor (**83-84**; **89-91**) initiates each vaunt. *Abbruchsformeln*: Schadewaldt (1928) 267-68; Hamilton (1974) 16-17; Race (1990) 41-57; Mackie (2003) 9-37; also **83**.

The passage is polyvalent, with ambiguity both in the meaning of individual words/phrases and in their relationship to one another. This obscurantism is deliberate, adopting the enigmatic language typical of mystic/soteriological discourse in stylistic continuity with the eschatology while formally breaking away from it (subverted break-off: **83**); cf. **95 αἶνον** (signifying riddles as well as praise: Nagy (1990) 148-49, 239-40). Schwartz (2003) 383-85, (2006) 473-74 compares the Avestan *Gāthās*, positing that 'the connection between the poet's encryptive prowess and his being divinely inspired is an inherited Indo-European theme' ((2006) 474n.12), which manifests as follows:

(1) **85 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν**. Cf. Y.30.1a 'Now I will proclaim to those who will hear the things that the knowing man should understand'. The poem concerns respective rewards and punishments for the followers of Truth and Falsehood. The word *vahištā* ('best things' ≈ 'post-mortem paradise') is encoded in the above lines, and occurs explicitly at Y.30.2a

‘Hear the best things with your ears’; for the wrong listeners, the words are ‘unheard’ (Y.31.1a). Name-encoding: **2**; **83**; **87 παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὣς ἄκραντα γαρύετον** (prolix, inane poets) encodes **91 Ἀκράγαντι τανύσαις** (laudator’s correctly-targeted praise).

(2) **86-88**. Y.31.1-2 describes two opposing groups of poet-priests, one favouring Truth (cf. **92 αὐδάσομαι ... ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ**), the other Falsehood. Cf. Y.31.17: the former ‘knows’ (17b *widwāh* ~ **86 εἰδὼς**), the latter ‘knows not’ (~ **86 μαθόντες**).

Recurring elements suggest the passage divides into two sections, **83-86** and **86-88**. Each opens in asyndeton (**83**; **86**); comprises two sentences, the latter opening with **δὲ** (**85**; **86**); contains **πολλά** in its first sentence (**83**; **86**), and παν- in its second (**85**; **87**). See **83-86**; **86-88**.

83-86 The first sentence, **83-85 πολλά ... συνετοῖσιν** is relatively transparent: the laudator has abundant poetic material, but it speaks to the few who can understand it. There are thus two elements of **83-85 πολλά ... συνετοῖσιν** which the second, **85-86 ἐς δὲ ... χατίζει**, could contrast: **83 πολλά** (quantity of laudator’s unexpressed material: large); **85 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν** (proportion of listeners capable of understanding it: small). Interpretations of **ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν** vary depending on which contrast is favoured, or whether one is avoided altogether. Linguistically, it probably means ‘for the whole subject’ (see **85**), but the lack of a specifying phrase introduces an ambiguity: does P. mean (1) ‘for the whole subject *to be told*’ (reprising **85 φωνάεντα**) or (2) ‘for the whole subject *to be understood*’ (reprising **85 συνετοῖσιν**)? Syntax: cf. Isoc.fr.25.1-2 εἰς δὲ | τὸ εὐδαιμονῆσαι λογισμοῦ δεῖ.

Either is possible, since **ἑρμανέων** is ambiguous between ‘proclaimers’ and ‘interpreters’ (see **85**). (1) reflects P.’s break-off practice and the rhetoric of selectivity/avoiding excess at **87**, **89-90**, **95-97**, **98-100**, which are typical epinician

concerns. (2) is preferable, since the mysticism forming the passage's background is instead concerned with knowledge and revelation (**53-56**; **85**; **86**), but the difficulty in choosing between them is precisely because epinician and mystic themes are intertwined.

(1) **83-86** forms a break-off of the type 'too much to tell' (Race (1990) 51n.13, 52n.15), separated into a statement of (a) abundance (**83-85**); (b) obstacle (**85-86**; *Hindernismotiv*: Thummer 1.83-84, 152). Laudator unable/unwilling to tell all (with πᾶς): *P*.8.29-32; *P*.9.76-79; *N*.4.72; *N*.10.19-20; *I*.1.60-63; *I*.6.56; (without πᾶς): *N*.10.45-48; *O*.13.40-46; *P*.1.81-84; *P*.4.247-48; *N*.4.33-34; *N*.7.50-53. Several of these passages add motifs found here: the need to avoid κόρος (**95**: *P*.1.81-84, *P*.8.29-32, *N*.7.50-53, *N*.10.19-20); the laudator's inability to count sand-grains (**98-100**: *O*.13.40-46); the laudator's claim to leadership in σοφία (**86**: *P*.4.247-48); an abundance of arrows hindered by an obstacle (**83-86**: *I*.5.46-48 πολλὰ ... τοξεύματ' ἔχει ... κελαδέσαι, 51 κατάβρεχε σιγᾷ).

Through this prism, **συνετοῖσιν** = those to whom the story is too familiar to re-tell: Th.2.36.4.3-4 μακρηγορεῖν ἐν εἰ- | δόσιν οὐ βουλόμενος ἐάσω (*pace* Race (1979) 261-63, who implausibly interprets as those who wish the narrative to continue). **ἑρμανέων** would = the 'proclaimers' needed to utter the material's full quantity: *Il*.2.488-89 πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι ... οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι (Σ.*O*.2.152d; cf. *Od*.3.113-14 πόλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖς πάθομεν κακά· τίς κεν ἐκεῖνα | πάντα γε μυθήσαιτο (~ **100**); *Od*.11.516-17 πολλοὺς ... ἔπεφνεν ... πάντας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι), where the lack of voice-organs corresponds to the lack of proclaimers here. Thus: 'many are the swift arrows within the quiver under my arm [i.e. unexpressed themes in my mind] which speak only to those who already understand them [and so do not need to hear them expressed]; but these arrows lack the proclaimers to be expressed in full'. Cf. Race (1979) 251-67; Santamaría on **85-86.4**.

(2) **συνετοῖσιν** = 'those with natural understanding'; **ἑρμανέων** = 'interpreters'. As (1), until **85-86:** 'but these arrows lack the interpreters to be understood/explained in full'.

83 πολλά: the laudator's abundant material demonstrates his innate knowledge (see **86**) and glorifies the victor for inspiring him ('ease-of-praise motif': ***I*.2.33-34**). **πολλά ... βέλη** in break-offs: **83**. Asyndeton in break-offs: Pfeijffer on *N*.3.26-28.

μοι: the 1st person is typical in break-offs (*O*.1.52; *O*.9.35; *O*.13.91, 93; *P*.1.59; *P*.4.247; *P*.8.29; *P*.10.48; *P*.11.38; *N*.5.16; *N*.6.54; *N*.9.29; *N*.10.19; *I*.1.14; *I*.6.56), assisting the discontinuity by concentrating attention on the laudator *qua* poet, with the illusion of real-time composition (see **1-2**). The 1st-person singular's restriction in ***O*.2** to *h.l.* and **92** supports possible reference to P. himself: **86-88**.

ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος: Theocr.17.30 ὑπωλένιόν τε φαρέτραν. Underarm quivers offer readier access: the laudator has been delivering poetic shafts, and is poised to resume.

ὠκέα βέλη: all parallel epic formulae (ὠκὺ βέλος: *Od*.21.138, 165; βέλος ὠκὺ: *Il*.5.106, 112, 187, 287; *Il*.11.397; *Il*.14.407; *Il*.22.292; *Od*.21.148) involve arrows that *fail* to kill or be effective; P. may intend a contrast or imply his arrows' non-lethality.

Poetic material as projectiles: arrows (*O*.1.112; **89-91**; *O*.9.5-12; *P*.1.12; *N*.1.18; *N*.6.26-28; ***I*.2.3**; *I*.5.46-48); javelins (*O*.13.93-5; *P*.1.44-45; *N*.7.70-72; *N*.9.55; ***I*.2.35** (with discus)); cf. Nünlist (1998) 145-48. Archery forms part of Patroclus' funeral games (*Il*.23.850-83), but was never a Panhellenic event, suggesting an older origin for the metaphor than for other athletic images: West (2007) 45 cites Vedic parallels, esp. *RV*.10.42.1 'Like an archer shooting his shaft clear beyond (his rivals), proffer him the praise-song', where it signifies poetic competition (cf. **86-88**). Simpson (1969) 471 links it with speaking κατὰ καιρὸν (A.*Supp*.446), which matches the rhetoric of selectivity here (see **83-86**).

Gerber on *O*.1.122 derives the image from 'the similarity between the shape of the bow and the lyre and from the dual role of Apollo, patron deity of poets, as archer and lyre-player' (*h.Hom*.3.131; cf. **83 Αἰθίοπα** on allusion to Apollo-as-archer). But the bow-lyre analogy may itself be older: Ready (2010) 133-57 compares *Od*.21.405-9 (Odysseus stringing his bow like a singer repairing a lyre) to the Ugaritic *Aqhat*.1.19.I.5-8 (the goddess Anat picking up a broken bow and quiver as a singer does a lyre).

Cf. Heraclit.fr.51.2-4 οὐ ξυνιᾶσιν ... παλίντροπος | ἁρμονίη ὅκωσπερ τόξου καὶ λύρης, with **84**, **85**, **86** for further Heraclitean parallels.

84 ἔνδον: i.e. 'unused' poetic material.

ἐντὶ: the plural predicate with neuter plural subject (K-G.1.64-66; S-D.2.607-8) is not required by **83 πολλά** (cf. *O*.12.10; *N*.8.20), but stresses a multiplicity of *individual* themes; the shift to the collective singular **86 χατίζει** supports taking **85 ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν** as 'for the whole subject'.

φαρέτρας: metaphor for the laudator's mind: see **90**.

At Pl.*Th*.180a.4-5 ὥσπερ ἐκ φαρέτρας | ῥηματίσκια αἰνιγματώδη ἀνασπῶντες ἀποτοξεύουσι, the image is applied to riddling Heracliteans who disavow learning (180b.8-c.3 οὐδὲ γίγνεται τῶν | (c.) τοιούτων ἕτερος ἑτέρου μαθητής, ἀλλ' αὐτόματοι ἀναφύονται): cf. **86**.

85 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν: 'speaking only to those who can understand'. Such paradoxes are typical of riddling and mystic contexts: Heraclit.fr.34 ἀξύνετοι ἀκούσαντες κωφοῖσιν ἐοίκασι; E.*IA*.466 οὐ συνετὰ συνετῶς; E.*IT*.1092 εὐξύνετον ξυνετοῖς βοάν; E.*Ph*.1506 δυσξύνετον ξυνετὸς μέλος ἔγνω (Sphinx's riddle); Eubul.fr.107.3 ἀξύνετα ξυνετοῖσι λέγων (obscene riddle); also A.*Ag*.39 μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ κοὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι. In the *Gāthās*, with name-encoding: **83-88**. *V.i.*

φωνάεντα: elsewhere of Archilochus' (*O*.9.2) and Homer's (*I*.4.40) poetry. Here a personification: 'endowed with speech' (Hes.*Th*.584).

συνετοῖσιν: probably (1) active ('intelligent': *P*.5.107), although (2) passive ('intelligible': Sapph.fr.16.5) can produce sense.

(1) Listeners who can mentally supply information left unexpressed by the laudator (**84**), not those wishing the myth to continue (see **83-86**). *OF*.1a ἀείσω ξυνετοῖσι, the first verse and *sphragis* of the Orphic *Rhapsodies* and other Orphic poems (see Bernabé (1996) 13-37; Beatrice (2005) 137-65; Calame (2011) 7-11 notes parallels with pointed references to the ignorant in P.Derv.) is an attractive intertext, connoting mystic exclusivity. Edmunds (2009) 675 rejects the Orphic allusion, arguing that P. would be 'limiting his audience to Orphics'. But such an allusion would not be exclusive here (as it would be in ritual Orphic practice), but would rather offer varying levels of *inclusion*: **συνετοῖσιν**, which perennially connotes aristocratic elitism (Cancrini (1970) 20-23, 61-64; Nagy (1979) 239-40; Battisti (1990) 5-25), flatters the entire audience, with further enjoyment available for connoisseurs of various types other than the Orphic (see **78-80**; **83**). The laudator's authority is enhanced by assimilating his voice to that of a ritual prorrhesis.

(2) Either neuter plural (Lefkowitz (1976) 137), or with λόγοις understood (Kirk on *Il*.1.539), in the instrumental dative (A.*Sept*.434 χρυσοῖς δὲ φωνεῖ γράμμασιν). But this would be rather weak: better to reinterpret the word division to give φωνάεντ' ἀσυνέτοισιν ('speaking with words difficult to understand; for they need interpreters to be fully understood'). On B.3.85 φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω, see **83-86**.

ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν: the fundamental meaning is 'with regard to the whole' (S-D.2.460). Nuances in order of probability:

(1) 'For the whole subject' (Σ.*O*.2.152d εἰς τὸ πάντα εἰπεῖν, 153c; Fennell; Race (1979) 259; Santamaría): cf. A.*Eum*.538 ἐς τὸ πᾶν σοι λέγω; **83-86**. τὸ πᾶν = 'the whole subject':

A.*PV*.273, 627, 823; S.*El*.680, 1205; S.*Tr*.369, 1134; S.*Ph*.241; S.*OC*.889. See **84 ἐντὶ**; **87 παγγλωσσίᾳ**.

(2) 'In general' (Stoneman (1976) 191; Lloyd-Jones (1985) 257; Willcock). This gives easy sense in preserving a contrast between **συνετοῖσιν** and the masses without requiring an unattested usage (*v.i.* (5)). But close parallels are lacking: Pl.*Leg*.917a.5 ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶν εἰπεῖν 'speaking generally'.

(3) 'Completely' (Heyne 'πάντως'; Most (1986) 307). Most cites parallels for **ἐς τὸ πὰν** in preference to those for **τὸ πὰν**, but limited poetic attestation reduces their usefulness; of the 9 he renders 'completely', only 2 (A.*Eum*.83, 538) unambiguously modify a verb, and the latter supports (1). Rendering 'for they completely lack interpreters' (with 'lack' replacing Most's 'crave') explains **φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν**, but disrupts the contrast with **83 πολλά**: see **83-86**.

(4) 'Pour aller au Tout' (Salviat (2007b) 179; cf. Hurst (1981) 121-33): even the intelligent need interpreters to understand the All (fr.140d τί θεός; τὸ πάν; Pl.*Leg*.903c.1-2 εἰς τὸ πᾶν συντείνει). But the totality of being is not in prospect here.

(5) 'For the masses' (Σ.*O*.2.152c, 153a εἰς τὸ κοινὸν): unparalleled. οἱ πάντες carries the sense at Th.4.86.4-5 (~ τὸ πλέον); cf. E.*IA*.1357-58 τὸ πολὺ 'the masses' ~ πολλοῖσιν, 1400-1 βαρβάρους ~ τὸ μὲν γὰρ δοῦλον. But analogy does not justify un-Pindaric usage.

Orphic allusion to Pan (νοῦς) and Hermes (λόγος): Cornford (1909) 281-84.

ἑρμανέων: first attested here: 'the agent that performs any act of translation of signification from one kind of language in which it is invisible or entirely unintelligible into another kind in which it is visible and intelligible' (Most (1986) 308); cf. Rochette (2002) 25-34. Here, it must mean either (1) 'proclaimer' (Heyne; Most (1986) 313; Edmunds (2009) 675), reprising the idea of speech in **φωνάεντα**, or (2) 'exegete'

(Boeckh; Verdenius (1989) 80), reprising the idea of comprehension in **συνετοῖσιν**: see **83-86**. Since it represents an intermediary between poetry and the audience, it must be distinct from the latter, either the poet himself (fr.52f.6; fr.inc.150 μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ; B.9.3) or a third party (Santamaría 315 suggests individuals such as the priests overseeing initiation (Pl.*Men*.81a-b) or the Derveni commentator).

86 χατίζει: here (1) 'lack, need' rather than (2) 'desire'. *Pace* Most (1986) 313, his parallels *N*.3.6-7, *P*.9.104, *N*.1.12 do not illustrate the idea of poetic themes themselves desiring expression.

86-88 An implicit contrast between poets.

The passage takes the form of an irregular chiastic simile, in which tenor is contrasted with tenor (**86 σοφὸς**; **86 μαθόντες**), and vehicle with vehicle (**87 κόρακες**; **88 ὄρνιχα**). Matching the tenors to their vehicles is straightforward: **86 σοφὸς** and **88 ὄρνιχα** are singular and positively-characterized; **86 μαθόντες** and **87 κόρακες** are plural, negatively-characterized, and explicitly correlated by **87 ὡς**.

More speculative is identifying the eagle-sage and the raven-learners with real-world analogues. Pfeijffer (1994) 305-17 rightly rejects relating epinician eagle-imagery exclusively to the victor (Stoneman (1976) 188-97), or to the poet (Bernardini (1977) 121-26), in favour of judging by context. The eagle is explicitly connected to the laudator by B.5.16-36, and to the victor by *P*.5.11-12; *N*.3.80-83 and *N*.5.21 are related to their context paratactically, although parallel imagery aligns the latter with the laudator.

Here, the eagle-sage is probably the laudator: **86 σοφὸς** often connotes poetic skill (Slater s.v.b); **86 πολλὰ** parallels **83 πολλὰ**, where it is part of the archer-imagery portraying the laudator's capabilities. Identification with the victor is a secondary possibility: the eagle is known for its power, not its song; a sea-eagle appeared on Acragantine coinage (e.g. c.480 didrachm *SNG*.ANS.958). Cf. ***I*.2.12 σοφός**

(Thrasybulus); **86 εἰδὼς ~ 56 οἶδεν** (Theron's eschatological knowledge); **86 φυᾷ ~ 11 γνησίαις** (innate Emmenid virtue).

If the eagle-sage is the laudator, the contrast between it and the raven-learners (**86 δὲ**) implies they are inferior poets: so does their verbal incontinence (**87 παγγλωσσίᾳ**), and garbling of praise (**87 ἄκραντα γαρύετον**). Avian conflict as a device for contrasting ethical/poetic systems: see Theocr.7.47-48 καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδόν ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι (imitating *h.l.*); Cozzoli (1996) 7-36; Steiner (2007) 177-208, who compares Hes.*Op*.202 αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς with **95 αἶνον**, **85 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν**, noting that P. inverts Hesiod's 'hawk-nightingale' parable by assimilating the poet to the bird of prey here. Vedic encomiasts as avians: *RV*.1.173.10 'The praise-song let him sing forth, bursting bird-like'; as rivals: *RV*.1.173.10.1 'Like men in rivalry extolling princes, our friend be, Indra'; *RV*.6.45.29.1 'To thee most invoked, amongst the many singers' rivalry'.

The search for analogues could end there, but the dual cannot easily be dismissed as irrelevant to **86 μαθόντες** (see **87 κόρακες ὣς**; **γαρύετον**), **87 ἄκραντα** alludes to two passages where named persons are identified via ornithomancy, and animal-fables were often employed, esp. by Archilochus and Timocreon, to attack specific rivals (van Dijk (1997) 138-68). Therefore, possible identifications with a specific pair of individuals must be considered:

(1) Simonides and Bacchylides (Σ.*O*.2.157a, 157b, 158c; cf. Σ.*P*.2.163b, 166d, 171c-d; Σ.*N*.3.143; Σ.*N*.4.60b; Σ.*I*.2.9a-b, 15a; Boeckh; Santamaría). Lefkowitz (1991) 96-110 interprets these as biographical fictions which fail to distinguish poet from persona; cf. Klooster (2011) 127: 'in Bourdieu's terms, it was attractive to assume that two actors operating in the same field of cultural production, striving for the same cultural capital, dependent on the same recipients, would end up as rivals'.

But Occam's razor suggests the reflection here of contemporary realities rather than their occlusion: in 476, overlapping audiences could have heard ***O*.2** and ***O*.3** for Theron, and *O*.1 and B.5 for Hieron (with Simonides probably present). Epinician poets' interaction in their shared milieu was complex, and may have included collaboration (Morrison (2011a) 242), but 'professional rivalry' seems the likeliest framework.

Poetic rivalries were often enacted intertextually, via imitation, re-working, and capping. B.'s representation of his laudator as Zeus' eagle, before which lesser birds cower (B.5.15-26 γᾶρυν ... αἰετὸς ... Ζηνὸς ... ὄρνι- | χες) in the same year as ***O*.2** for Hieron's Olympic *keles*-victory seems too close for coincidence. When B. celebrated Hieron's Olympic chariot-victory in 468 (i.e. when Hieron was in Theron's position, and B. in P.'s), his concluding praise of both Hieron and himself (B.3.85-98) pointedly reworks elements of all 4 tyrant-odes of 476: (a) 85 Φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω ~ **85-87 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν ... γαρύετον**; (b) 85-86 βαθὺς μὲν | αἰθὴρ ~ B.5.16-17 βαθὺν | δ' αἰθέρα; (c) 86-87 ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου | οὐ σάπεται· εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός ~ *O*.1.1-7 Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ, ***O*.3.42-44 εἰ δ' ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος**; (d) 97-98 μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν | Κηΐας ἀηδόνος ~ **87 παγγλωσσία κόρακες ὣς**.

(a) and (d) transform P.'s garrulous raven-learners into a mellifluous, authoritative nightingale (*explicitly* identified as the Cean B., for whom animal-analogy was a favourite mode of self-reference: B.4.8 (cock); B.10.10 νασιῶτιν ... λιγύφθογγον μέλισσαν (bee)); (b) reprises his own laudator-as-eagle imagery; (c) appropriates the priamels that frame the *O*.1-***O*.3** 'song-cycle' (see **Conclusion (2)**). Finally, the myth of Croesus' translation to the Hyperboreans for his piety as an exemplar for Hieron at B.3.23-62 recombines elements from the main myths of ***O*.2** and ***O*.3** (see esp. ***O*.3.39**). By this reading, B.3.85-98

triumphantly celebrates the reversal of what in 476 had been Hieron's agonistic subordination to Theron, and B.'s poetic subordination to P.

See ***P*.6.3-4** on that passage's recombination (with ***O*.2.1**) at B.4.4-9.

Other possibilities are less convincing:

(2) Generic epic poets (Loscalzo (2003) 35-59). Professional rhapsodes might be called 'learners', and their plenitude παγγλωσσία; **81-83** condenses 3 epics into 3 lines. But epic was not a rival form of epinician celebration.

(3) Theron's exiled cousins Capys and Hippocrates (Σ.*P*.6.5a; Σ.*O*.2.173f-g). The eagle would symbolize Acragas (*v.s.*), and Theron's authority. But this ill suits **93-95** on Theron's generosity.

(4) The Syracusan rhetoricians Corax and Tisias (Verrall (1880) 197-99). The onomastic pun would be effective. But Arist.fr.137 places Corax's activity post-466, with his pupil younger still – or actually the same person (Cole (1991) 65-84).

(5) Generic *orpheotelestae* (Herrero de Jáuregui (2011) 290n.48). This would suit the eschatology, and the mystic connotations in the break-off (**85**). But the criticism of raven-learners here bears more on poetic incompetence than on doctrinal inaccuracy or charlatanism (as found at Pl.*Resp*.364b-65e).

86 σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ: the laudator: **86-88**.

As a divine gift (*v.i.*) conferring cultural authority, *sophia* generates competing claims: Kurke (2010) 95-124. Usage: Gladigow (1965) 56-74; Maier (1970).

Although his attitude can be flexible (*O*.7.53), P. often values innate (**σοφὸς ... φυᾷ**) over acquired (**μαθόντες**) knowledge: see Pfeijffer on *N*.3.40-42. *Sophia* received by divine inspiration is not considered 'acquired', and so presents no contradiction: *Od*.22.347-48 αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ... ἐνέφυσεν (Phemius); *O*.9.21-29;

O.11.10; *P*.1.41-42. This traditional concept heightens the poet's authority, and aligns him with the Emmenids' innate virtues (**11**).

Denigration of acquired knowledge recurs in philosophical/comic polemic against rivals (cf. **86-88**): Heraclit.fr.40.1-2 πολυμαθίη νόον ἔχειν οὐ διδάσκει (against Hesiod, Pythagoras, Xenophanes, Hecataeus); Heraclit.fr.129.3-4 σοφίην, πολυμαθίην, κακο- | τεχνίην (against Pythagoras). That *polymathia* without *sophia*/*kairos* causes **87 παγγλωσσίᾳ** is set out by Anaxarch.fr.1.8-13: πολυμαθίη κάρτα μὲν ὠφελεῖ ... βλάπτει δὲ τὸν | ῥηϊδίως φωνεῦντα πᾶν ἔπος ... χρὴ δὲ | καιροῦ μέτρα εἰδέναι· σοφίης γὰρ οὗτος ὅρος. οἳ δὲ ἔξω | καιροῦ ῥῆσιν ἀείδουσιν, κἢν πεπνυμένην ἀείδωσιν, οὐ | τιθέμενοι ἐν σοφίηι γνώμην αἰτίην ἔχουσι μωρίης. There is also a significant mystic parallel: at P.Derv.col.20.1-12, the commentator is scathing about those who mistakenly think they have attained true knowledge through learning the forms of the rites.

Since **εἰδὼς** brackets the eschatology with **56 οἶδεν**, it is tempting to link the valorization of inborn knowledge here with the reincarnation cycle (**68-70**): Pl.*Men*.81a-e expounds the doctrine of knowledge as the soul's recollection of past lives (*anamnesis*), quoting fr.133 in support.

πολλὰ εἰδὼς: evoking the gifted poet: *Od*.1.337 πολλὰ ... οἶδας (Phemius). A.fr.390 ὁ χρήσιμ' εἰδώς, οὐχ ὁ πόλλ' εἰδὼς σοφός contrasts quantity with utility.

εἰδὼς ... μαθόντες: the aspects convey innate wisdom's fixity, and acquired knowledge's superficiality: Hummel 252.

φυᾷ: *O*.9.100; *P*.8.44; *N*.1.25; *N*.7.54; fr.52u.12.

λάβροι: of boisterous speech at *Il*.23.474-79 λαβρεύεαι ... λαβρεύεαι ... λαβραγόρην (Oilean Ajax insulting Idomeneus in terms which ironically characterize his own speech); A.*PV*.327; S.*Ai*.1147.

87 παγγλωσσίᾳ: *hapax*: 'fulsomeness, logorrhoea'. παν- compounds with negative connotations ('willing to *x* anything'): παρρησία, πανουργία.

Cf. A.*Ch*.266 γλώσσης χάριν δὲ πάντ' ἀπαγγελεῖ. At *Il*.2.212 ἀμετροεπὴς ἐκολῴα, Thersites' unbounded speech mimics another corvid, the jackdaw (cf. *N*.3.82).

κόρακες ὣς: the simile is probably (1) parenthetical. In P.'s hypotactic similes, where a single finite verb is expressed, that verb almost always belongs to the tenor and must be supplied in the vehicle (*O*.1.1-2; *O*.7.77-80; *O*.10.16-19; *O*.12.13-15; *P*.1.91-92; *P*.2.79-80; *P*.10.53-54; *P*.11.39-40; *I*.4.23-24; *I*.6.51; fr.75.13; fr.104b.1-3; fr.123.10-11). When the comparative is postpositive, the above is uniformly true in P., and regular in Homer (*Il*.2.764 ὄρνιθας ὣς; *Il*.3.2 ὄρνιθες ὣς; *Il*.3.196; *Il*.3.230; *Il*.4.471; *Il*.4.482). Cf. A.*Supp*.751 κόρακες ὥστε; A.*Ag*.1472-73 δίκαν | κόρακος.

Thus **86 μαθόντες** is the subject of **γαρύετον**. This is logical insofar as the verb usually connotes articulate speech, and illogical in having *human* learners uttering inanities against Zeus' *bird*, but for interaction of imagery between tenor and vehicle (esp. human and animal), cf. Silk (1974) 138-49; Lyne (1989) 92-99; Lonsdale (1990) 165-78; this is easier still if **88 ὄρνιχα** is the analogue of a person.

(2) Alternatively, supplying the indicative of εἰμι to form the predicate of **86 μαθόντες** (as at **85 σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ**) allows **κόρακες** to become the subject of **γαρύετον**: 'but learners are impetuous in their fulsomeness, just as a pair of ravens utters inanities against the divine bird of Zeus'. This reading removes the illogic, and by making the ravens alone the subject of **γαρύετον** eliminates the dual's potential influence on **86 μαθόντες** (*v.i.*), but contradicts normal usage (1).

Kirkwood (1981) 242-43 argues the vehicle's *inherent* duality has coloured the tenor's verb, since ravens come in pairs, a trait attested in ancient sources (Thompson (1895) 92) and modern biology (*Corvus corax* forms long-term pair bonds: Neubauer (2011) 102).

But linguistic support is meagre. Despite the interaction of imagery in similes (*v.s.*), influence upon the *number* of the tenor's verb by a vehicle lacks parallels. Only the converse is well-attested (dual vehicles taking their number from a dual tenor: *Il.*5.554-60; *Il.*11.324-26; *Il.*12.145-52; *Il.*13.197-202; *Il.*13.703-8; *Il.*16.756-61). In Homeric bird-similes, the number always matches, except *Il.*5.778 and *Il.*7.59, where a dual tenor has a *plural* vehicle. **κόρακες** is in any case plural here, and it never occurs in the dual, and seldom takes dual verbs (Koniaris (1997b) 233-35). An oft-cited instance is Arat.*Phaen.*966-68 κόρακες ... κρώξαντε, but Kidd considers it either a Homericizing affectation (*dualis pro plurali*), or an imitation of *h.l.* All other Pindaric duals (*O.*9.45: Deucalion and Pyrrha; *N.*10.64: Idas and Lynceus; *O.*10.5: Muse and Alatheia) represent specific individuals in a familial relationship. Kirkwood's theory is therefore unlikely: **γαρύετον** deliberately references two *persons*, and is postponed to stanza-final position for maximum effect.

A factor influencing P.'s representation of **86 μαθόντες** as ravens is their ability to mimic human voices, but without understanding: Plut.*de.soll.animal.*972f.8-73a4 κόρακες ... μανθάνοντες | διαλέγεσθαι καὶ τὸ τῆς φωνῆς πνεῦμα ... μιμηλὸν ἐξαρθροῦν; Neubauer (2011) 105.

ἄκραντα: contrasting the eagle as bird of prophetic fulfilment (**88**), a connotation carried by κραίνω.

Before P., only at *Il.*2.138 ἀκράαντον (Agamemnon's feigned exhortation to abandon Troy); *Od.*2.202 μυθέαι ἀκράαντον (Eurymachus on Halitherses' prophecy of Odysseus' return: cf. 158-59 ἐκέκαστο | ὄρνιθας γνῶναι); *Od.*19.565: ἐλεφαίρονται, ἔπε' ἀκράαντα φέροντες (Penelope on dreams passing through the Ivory Gate).

The *Odyssey* occurrences both occupy the same narratological pattern: eagle-omen (reality; dream); one speaker (Halitherses; dream-eagle) correctly interprets that Odysseus'

return and the suitors' death are envisaged; another speaker (Eurymachus; Penelope) incorrectly rejects this interpretation, declaring it ἀκράαντον. In the latter passage, the dream-eagle presents a key to the allegory of its killing of the geese: *Od.*19.548-50 χῆνες μὲν μνηστῆρες, ἐγὼ δέ τοι αἰετὸς ὄρνις | ἦα πάρος, νῦν αὖτε τεὸς πόσις εἰλήλουθα, | ὃς πᾶσι μνηστῆρσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφήσω.

Although Eurymachus and Penelope wrongly call the correct interpretation ἀκράαντον, P. does not imply that the laudator is wrong in his characterization of the ravens. Instead, P. extracts a word embedded in a narratological context signalling the eagle's potency as an omen and its superiority over lesser birds, then transfers it to the speech of the lesser birds opposing the eagle here. The dream-eagle's key supports taking the birds here as allegories for people (see **86-88**). See ***P.*6.46** on the discordant effect of allusion to narratological markers signalling the avenging Odysseus' return.

Stylistic enactment of the raven-singers' 'lack of fulfilment': **ἄκραντα γαρύετον** jumbles the city's name, which the laudator then enunciates correctly: **91 Ἀκράγαντι**.

γαρύετον: connoting articulate speech (*Il.*4.437); praise-song (*O.*1.3; *O.*13.50; *P.*5.72; *N.*3.32; *N.*6.58; *N.*7.83; *I.*1.34; B.3.85; B.5.15).

Retain transmitted **γαρύετον** (3rd dual present indicative). The paradosis has been reinterpreted as γαρυέτων, taken to represent either (1) 3rd plural present imperative (Schroeder); (2) 3rd dual present imperative (Bergk[4]). But γαρυέτων could only be (2) (Kirkwood (1981) 240-43), a very rare form, unattested in P.

V.s. **κόρακες ὦς**.

Antistrophe 5

88 Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον: eagle. Elsewhere the periphrasis (*O*.13.21; E.*Ion*.158-9) includes a definition (*P*.1.6-7 αἰετός ... ἀρχὸς οἰωνῶν; *I*.6.50; A.*PV*.1021-2; S.fr.884). It is the only bird called **θεῖον**: Arist.*HA*.619b.5-7.

It is Zeus' favourite bird, his messenger, omen of fulfilment (*Il*.24.310-16), and the lord of birds (*O*.13.21; *P*.1.6-7; *I*.6.50); cf. Thompson (1895) 1-10. In Sumerian and later classical parallels it bears the elect to heaven (Bridge (2003) 57-86).

Analogue for the laudator: **86-88**.

πρὸς: probably (1) 'in comparison to', the point of comparison being not **γαρύετον** (since the eagle is not a songbird), but the idea of fulfilment in **87 ἄκραντα**: the raven-poets are ineffective compared to the laudator. (2) 'Against', i.e. a vociferous attack, is inconsistent with **γαρύετον**: the ravens are incompetent encomiasts rather than iambists. (3) 'To' (LSJ.*s.v.*C.1.5) makes the eagle, less plausibly, the victor.

θεῖον: *v.s.*

Cf. θεῖον ἀοιδόν: *Od*.1.336 (Phemius); *Od*.8.43 (Demodocus).

89-95 The preceding break-off (**83-86**), which introduced a superlative vaunt by the laudator for himself (**86-88**), is followed by a second break-off (**89-90**) introducing a superlative vaunt for Theron (**90-95**): the former vaunt establishes the laudator's credibility to make the latter. The archer-image of **83-86** recurs at **89-91**, now shifting from poise to action as the laudator targets Acragas and Theron.

Closing a ring with the proem: **2 τίνα ... κελαδήσομεν ~ 89 τίνα βάλλομεν**; **3 Διός ~ 88 Διὸς**; **5 Θήρωνα ~ 95 Θήρωνος**; **6 Ἀκράγαντος ~ 91 Ἀκράγαντι**; **7 πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν ~ 93 τεκεῖν μή τιν' ... πόλιν**.

3 psychic entities inform the laudator's praise (Darcus Sullivan (2002b) 91-92): **89 θυμέ** ('his ally in choosing his target'); **90 φρενὸς** ('the source of his thoughts'); **91 νόῳ**: ('[confirming] the accuracy of his observation'). His desire to praise Theron with every fibre of his being (emotion; intellect; judgement) leaves no room for insincerity.

89-91 σκοπῷ τόξον ... βάλλομεν ... ὀ-ϊστοὺς ἱέντες ... τανύσαις: the bow-aiming has a heroic ring: Odysseus (*Od*.21.425 οὐδέ ... σκοποῦ ἤμβροτον οὐδέ τι τόξον ... ἔκαμον τανύων; *Od*.22.6-8); Heracles (Theocr.*Id*.24.107 τόξον δ' ἐντανύσαι καὶ ἐπὶ σκοπὸν εἶναι ὀιστόν).

Aiming at a mark symbolizes a new poetic focus and a special need for accuracy, and thus occurs in in the following passages in proximity to vaunts: *O*.13.93-95 ἐμὲ ... ἱέντα ῥόμβον παρὰ σκοπὸν οὐ χρή; *N*.6.27-28 μέγα εἰπὼν σκοποῦ ἄντα τυχεῖν | ὥτ' ἀπὸ τόξου ἰείς· εὖ-θυν' ἐπὶ τοῦτον, ἄγε, Μοῖσα (~ **89 ἄγε θυμέ**). 'Fire arrows at' = 'praise': *O*.9.5-14.

89 ἔπεχε νῦν σκοπῷ τόξον: E.*HF*.984 ἄλλωι ... ἐπεῖχε τόξ'.

ἔπεχε ... βάλλομεν: *Od*.22.15 ἐπισχόμενος βάλεν ἰῷ.

ἔπεχε: imperatives in break-offs: *O*.9.40; *P*.10.51.

νῦν: with imperative, often marking transitions: *O*.6.87; *O*.9.5, 40; *P*.4.263; *I*.5.38.

ἄγε θυμέ: *Anacreont*.fr.60.24 ἄγε, θυμέ.

ἄγε: at *P*.1.60, *N*.6.28, exhorting the Muse to to assist the laudator.

θυμέ: direct address to the heart (de Romilly (1984) 98-102; Dickey (1996) 187) first occurs at *Od*. 20.18, with direct θυμός-address from Archil.fr.128.1 onwards (Ibyc.fr.36b.1; Thgn.1.213, 695, 877, 1029, 1070a; *N*.3.26; fr.123.1; fr.127.4; E.*Med*.1056; Neophr.fr.2.1, 9; Cratin.fr.73.63; Ar.*Ach*.483; Ar.*Eq*.1194), although indirect θυμός-address is Homeric (*Il*.11.403 εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν). At *RV*.7.86.2.1-2 'With mine own heart I commune on the question how Varuna and I may be united. | What gift

of mine will he accept unangered?', the poet likewise questions his heart on the best method of praise.

Here, the θυμός represents internal reflection within the laudator while being externalized as an Muse-like assistant (*v.s.* **ἄγε**): **89-95**. Cf. ***O*.3.38**, where it imposes its will on him, and, as here, facilitates a break-off (cf. *P*.3.61; *N*.3.26-27). Bibliography: Caswell (1990); Pelliccia (1995) 115-354.

τίνα βάλλομεν: deliberative present indicative (Hummel 266: Fr. 'qu'est-ce que tu prends?'); the present is also conative ('try to hit' = 'aim at'). The question mirrors **2 τίνα ... κελαδήσομεν** (in responsion with the latter): whereas invocation of **1 ὕμνοι** gave 3 categories of response, here invocation of **89 θυμέ** produces a focus on Theron alone. The plural is again motivated by the addressed entity's collaboration.

90-91 ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὖτε φρενὸς εὐκλέας ὀ-ϊστοὺς ἱέντες: the quiver (**84**) is replaced by the φρήν, explicitly rendering the arrows mental artefacts. Sim.fr.14.35b.8-10 ἄναξ ἑκαβ[ε-] | λετα ἱέμενοι ἐνοπὰν ἀγανοῖσιν ... εὔφαμον ἀπὸ φρενὸς ὁμορρόθο[υ may include a similar image. The φρήν is often the source of utterances and determines the *attitude* of the person expressing them (***P*.6.36 δονηθεῖσα φρὴν βόασε**; A.*Ag*.546, 1515 φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας τί ποτ' εἴπω; A.*Ch*.107; Lobo.fr.522.5). **89 θυμέ** provides *motivation*.

90 μαλθακᾶς ... φρενὸς: the epithet, connoting encomium in P. (*P*.1.98; *P*.5.99; *P*.8.31; *N*.9.49), clarifies the arrows' gentleness (*v.i.*), as at *O*.9.11-12 ἴει γλυκύν ... ὀϊστόν. Cf. μαλακόφρων (*Orph.Hymn*.59.15; *Orph.Hymn*.69.17).

αὖτε: topicalizing: Revuelta Puigdollers (2009) 83-109. Here marking resumption of praise.

φρενὸς: see **89-95**; **90-91**; ***P*.6.36**.

εὐκλέας: 'glorifying' rather than 'glorious': *N*.6.29; B.5.196; A.*Ch*.321; cf. ***I*.2.2**.

90-95 A superlative vaunt proclaims Theron's generosity. Such vaunts identify a specific field of excellence, and are often supported by truth-claims and hedged with qualifications; linguistic elements may include 'a negative ... an indefinite pronoun (τις), and a comparative adjective or adverb' (Race (1987) 139n.24). Cf. *O.*1.103-5; ***O.*3.38-41**, **42-44**; *O.*13.31-32; *P.*1.47-50; *P.*2.58-61; *P.*3.85-86; ***P.*6.44-45**; *N.*6.24-26; B.3.12, 63-66; B.4.14-16; B.5.4-6; B.8.22-25; B.fr.20C.20-23; A.*Ag.*531-32; S.*El.*689; E.fr.755.2-4; Hdt.3.125.7-9; Hdt.9.64.1-5; Isoc.9.39.1-5, 9 ἀλήθειαν (~ **92 ἀλαθεῖ**); *RV.*6.30.4.1 'This is the truth, none else is like thee, Indra, no God superior to thee'; *RV.*8.63.15.1-5 'The very truth do I declare ... no man is there who gives more horses than Savistha'; *RV.*10.43.5.

Tyrants in particular attract vaunts: whereas private citizens' vaunts involve athletic feats, theirs praise wealth, generosity, and power (Kurke (1991) 224n.53). Intertextual capping may operate with *O.*1.103-5 here (Morrison (2007) 84-86: see **9**; **83-86**; **93**; ***O.*3.42-44**), although Morgan (2015) 414 observes that Emmenid vaunts emphasize moral qualities, while Hieron's articulate power. Here, Theron's moral excellence also serves as an eschatological qualification (**56-83**).

Ring-composition with **2-7**: see **89-95**.

90 τοι: ***P.*6.19**.

91 Ἀκράγαντι: 6 Ἀκράγαντος; **87 ἄκραντα γαρύετον**.

92 αὐδάσομαῖ: whether the tense is 'performative' (Bundy 21) or 'futurative' (Pfeijffer (1999b) 23) depends on whether its fulfilment in the next verse is considered part of the same utterance. Here, idiomatic use of the future in 1st-person oaths suggests it likewise underscores the idea of affirmation inherent in that speech-act: *Il.*1.233 ὅρκον ὀμοῦμαι; *Od.*20.229; *O.*6.21 μαρτυρήσω; *O.*11.16 ἐγγυάσομαι.

1st-person singular: see **83**. The laudator has established his own credentials to make this vaunt believable.

ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ: epinician's reliance on contestable claims makes the laudator's perceived truthfulness critical to its success: cf. Komornicka (1972) 235-53; (1979); (1981) 81-89; Park (2009). Park (2013) 17-36 argues P. neutralizes potential conflicts between his obligation to praise and the truth by presenting the two as mutually-reinforcing. Here, the superlative vaunt requires superlative credibility (see **89-95**; **90-95**). The singer's truthfulness in the the *Rigveda*: 1.180.7.1; 1.185.10.1; 3.55.3.2; 4.23.4.2; 6.30.4.1 (vaunt); 8.63.15.1-2 (vaunt); 8.84.5.2; 8.89.3.1; 9.92.5.1; 10.34.12.2; 10.37.2.1; 10.117.6.1.

Oaths in the authorial person, which support such truth-claims, are rare in poetry outside epinician: *O*.6.20-21; *N*.7.70-73; *N*.11.24-29; B.5.42-45; B.8.19-20 (20-21 σὺν ἀλα- | θείᾳ); cf. Torrance (2014) 348-71, who notes their use in authors between whom rivalries existed (cf. **86-88**). *O*.13.98-99 ἀλαθής τέ μοι | ἔξορκος likewise underpins a superlative vaunt; cf. Antiph.6.16.4 ἀληθέστερα καὶ εὐορκότερα.

Juxtaposition of **ἐνόρκιον λόγον** and **ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ** indicates the laudator's internal judgement matches its externalization in speech: contrast *Od*.13.254-55 οὐδ' ... ἀληθέα εἶπε ... ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόον πολυκερδέα νωμῶν; Thgn.1.365; E.*Hipp*.612 ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος.

ἐνόρκιον: recalling **66 οἵτινες ἔχαιρον εὐορκίαις**: eschatological consequences underpin the laudator's veracity.

ἀλαθεῖ: *v.s.*

The vaunt, implying knowledge of the previous century, activates the etymology 'not-forgetting' (Detienne (1960) 27-35). The substantive recurs in the Olbia bone tablets (*OF*.463-65) and the lamellae (*OF*.477.7). Mystic truth: **55**.

νόῳ: *P*.6.47; **89-95**.

93 Magnifying **7**: Theron is not only the pinnacle of his ancestors, but the equal of any born in the last century, capping the ode's genealogical theme.

τεκεῖν ... πόλιν ... ἄνδρα: the image represents the culmination of the theme of descent (**7**), with Theron now born of the city itself, with which the Emmenids are completely identified.

Intertextuality with Thgn.1.39 = 1081 might strike a discordant note: κύει πόλις ἥδε, δέδοικα δὲ μὴ τέκηι ἄνδρα (city bearing a tyrant (!)).

τιν': construable with either (1) **πόλιν** ('no city ... has borne a man'); (2) **94 ἄνδρα** ('the city ... has borne no man').

(2) follows from **91 Ἀκράγαντι**, and coheres with Acragas' foundation dates (*v.i.*).

(1) is preferable: **μή τιν'** is unlikely to leap-frog the nearer accusative (Race (1979) 264). *Pace* Van Leeuwen, who sees (1) as offensive to other tyrants, competitive superlative vaunts between tyrants are common: see **90-95** on the contemporary *O*.1.103-5. The ambiguity permits overlapping audiences to interpret according to their affiliation.

ἑκατόν ... ἐτέων: a round number, perhaps relating to Acragas' foundation c.580 (Miller (1970) 4-6); cf. **8-11**. It can also represent the maximum human lifespan (Watkins (1995) 350-51 on Latin *saeculum*; cf. the Vedic wish to live 100 autumns/winters: *RV*.1.64.14.2; 1.73.9.2; 1.89.9.1). The concept of a century may have already existed: ML.17 (c.500: 100-year alliance); cf. Hes.*Op*.130; Th.3.114.3.1-2; Arist.*Ath.Pol*.7.2.1-2.

γε: with numerals: Denniston 120-21.

93-94 φίλοις ... εὐεργέταν ... ἀφθονέστερόν: E.*Hipp*.693-94 φίλους ... εὐεργετεῖν. E.*IT*.314; X.*Symp*.4.43.5-6 φίλοις καὶ ἐπιδεικνύω ... ἀφθονίαν.

93 φίλοις: injecting unusual intimacy into the vaunt.

94 εὐεργέταν: Currie (2005) 286-88 argues P.'s usage anticipates its classical/Hellenistic connection to cultic honours, such as Theron received. Eschatological determinant: Pl.*Phaedo*.113d.8; Pl.*Resp*.615b.6.

Responsion of the **εὐ-** element with **7**, **14**, **34** links Theron's beneficence to an intergenerational chain of goodness/good fortune.

πραπίσιν: psychic entity, comparable to *phrenes* (Braswell on *P*.4.281(b); Darcus Sullivan (2000) 56-57), and the 4th to appear in Antistrophe 5, now of the laudandus. Balancing **χέρα**.

With **εὐεργέταν** (*v.s.*), differentiating Theron from **57 ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες**.

ἀφθονέστερόν: 'more unbegrudging'. Doubly-pointed, since tyrants were thought to feel irrational envy (Hdt.3.80.17 τύραννον ἄφθονον ἔδει εἶναι), and be the object of it (***I*.2.43**).

See **95-98** on its connection to *koros*.

Epode 5

95 Θήρωνος: 5. Stanza-initial enjambement: ***O*.3.6**.

95-100 Following the superlative vaunt for Theron (**90-95**), the following serve as closural devices: (1) **95-98**: gnome concerning the need to abridge encomium in order to avoid counter-productive tedium in the audience; (2) **98-100**: aporetic question acknowledging the limitlessness of Theron's benefactions and the laudator's inability to enumerate them. The motifs in (1) and (2) occur in reverse order at *N*.10.19-20.

Responsions/repetitions with Epode 1: see **15-17**.

95-98 Break-off from the superlative vaunt. The passage's terms have been variously interpreted. Text: see **97-98**.

The issue is whether the perspective is of that of (1) poets: **95 κόρος** = excess that produces tedium, **96 μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν** = unrestrained praise-poets (Bundy 29n.71, 90n.123); (2) listeners: **95 κόρος** = tedium produced by excess, **96 μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν** = unrestrained/envious audience-members (Kirkwood). (2) is preferable: this passage reprises **86-88**, now criticizing the *effect* of garrulous poets' songs, instead of the poets themselves.

In 4 parallel passages pairing the need for brevity with a warning about **κόρος**, **κόρος** means 'excess' 1x (*P*.1.81-86), 'tedium' 3x (*P*.8.29-32; *N*.7.50-53; *N*.10.20): all fulfil a transitional/closural function. The origin of 'tedium' within the populace at *N*.10.20 κόρος ἀνθρώ-πων (cf. *P*.1.82 μῶμος ἀνθρώ-πων; B.13.202 βροτῶν ... μῶμος) suggests a similar sense for **96 μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν**. **96 δίκᾳ** means not 'just limits (of praise)' (cf. Race), but 'just desert (of praise)' (*P*.9.96 σύν τε δίκᾳ; B.13.203 σὺν δίκᾳ; cf. *N*.3.29). The break-off *O*.9.38-40 καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρόν | μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει. | μὴ νῦν λαλάγει is the best support for (1), but **97 λαλαγῆσαι** could equally suit a restive audience, and the envious aspect of **96 μάργων** is illustrated by Hdt.8.125.2-5 Τιμόδημος ... τῶν ἐχθρῶν μὲν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος ἐών, ἄλλως δὲ οὐ τῶν | ἐπιφανέων ἀνδρῶν, φθόνῳ καταμαργέων ἐνείκεε τὸν Θεμι- | στοκλέα (envious attack on a publicly-honoured man by a social inferior). Immoderate praise-poets might obscure the victor's fame inadvertently, but not 'willingly' (**97 θέλων**).

Therefore, although Bundy 29n.71 is correct that **κόρος** is not *identical* to φθόνος, the two are linked (hence **94 ἀφθονέστερόν** pointedly contrasting Theron's generosity with his detractors' resentment): *P*.1.82-86 μῶμος ἀνθρώ-πων ... κόρος ... ἀστῶν δ' ἀκοὰ

κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύ-νει μάλιστ' ἐσλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις. | ἀλλ' ὅμως, κρέσσον γὰρ οἰκτιρμοῦ φθόνος, | μὴ παρίει καλά. Whereas here allowance is made for public envy, *P.*1.82-86 and ***I.*2.43-45** are defiant: although envy is a generic commonplace, it also reflected tyrants' reality. Counter-intuitively, that the victor merits so much praise his audience cannot bear to hear it is also glorifying.

The ideal of praising merit regardless of personal affiliation, *and* that ideal's vulnerability to envy/hostility, are epinician topoi with many verbal/semantic intertexts with **95-98**: **αἶνον ... κόρος ... δίκᾳ ... ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν ... θέλων ... κρυφὸν θέμεν ... ἐσλῶν καλοῖς | ἔργοις** ~ *O.*6.11-12 καλὸν εἴ τι ποναθῇ ... αἶνος ἑτοῖμος, ὃν ἐν δίκᾳ; *P.*9.93-96 εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν, εἴ τις ἀντά-εις ... πεπoναμένον εὖ | μὴ ... κρυπτέτω· κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν ... σύν τε δίκᾳ καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν; *N.*1.5-6 θέμεν | αἶνον; *N.*3.29 δίκας ἄωτος, 'ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν'; *N.*4.93-95 αἰνέων ... ἐσλοῖς; B.5.14-16 ἐθέλει ... αἰνεῖν; B.13.199-203 [E]ἰ μή τινα θερσι[ε]πὴς φθό- | νος βιᾶται, | αἰνείτω ... σὺν δίκᾳ. βροτῶν δὲ μῶμος ... ἐπ' ἔργοι[ς; also Thgn.1.1079-80 Οὐδένα τῶν ἐχθρῶν μωμήσομαι ἐσθλὸν ... οὐδὲ μὲν αἰνήσω δειλὸν ἐόντα φίλον; Theocr.*Id.*16.14-15 ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ... ἐσθλοῖς | αἰνεῖσθαι.

95 ἀλλ': 'but (enough, for)': breaking off praise to address a threat to the encomium.

αἶνον: 95-98.

ἐπέβα: 'attacks'. Predicated of disagreeable abstracts: S.*Ai.*138 λόγος ἐκ Δαναῶν κακόθρους ἐπιβῇ (popular discontent); S.*El.*492; S.*Ph.*193-94; cf. S.*OT.*1300; S.*Tr.*298.

95-96 κόρος | οὐ δίκᾳ: Sol.fr.4.7-9 ἄδικος νόος ... οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον; A.*Ag.*382-84.

95 κόρος: see **95-98**; Mackie (2003) 9-37.

96 δίκᾳ: encomiastic justice: see **95-98**.

συναντόμενος: 39 συναντόμενος.

μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν: 95-98. Cf. Thgn.1.581 ἄνδρα τε μάργον; E.*HF*.1082 μάργον ἄνδρ'. Reference to specific individuals is possible (Van Leeuwen), but unlike **86-88**, there is no textual basis for anything more than generic malcontents.

μάργων: all senses connote transgression of appropriate bounds: those of speech and social decorum (Ibyc.S.311.1 Ἔριδός ... μάργον ἔχων στόμα; Hdt.8.125.2-5; A.*PV*.883-86) are relevant here. The frequent sense 'gluttonous' overlaps with **95 κόρος** (cf. Apion.Gramm.74.246.14 μάργος ... ἀκόρεστος).

97-98 τὸ λαλαγῆσαι θέλων κρυφόν τε θέμεν ἐσλῶν καλοῖς | ἔργοις: MSS τὸ λαλαγῆσαι θέλων κρύφιόν τε θέμεν ἐσλὸν κακοῖς | ἔργοις has produced myriad proposals: see Santamaría.

The paradosis gives sense ('wishing to babble, and to make a noble achievement obscure through evil deeds'), but is unmetrical, and minor emendations better fit the context. I follow most editors in emending unmetrical κρύφιόν into **κρυφόν** (after Aristarchus: Σ.*O*.2.177a), for which the former was *lectio facilior*, with **ἐσλῶν** subsequently reinterpreted as ἐσλὸν to provide a noun with which κρύφιόν could agree. The indirect objects **καλοῖς | ἔργοις** (a Pindaric collocation: see **97-98**), then lacking obvious purpose, became κακοῖς | ἔργοις to produce an instrument for the malicious **κόρος**. Hermann's τιθέμεν (to avoid co-ordinating articular and simplex infinitives) is unnecessary: see **97**.

97 τὸ λαλαγῆσαι: 'babble': **95-98**. Cf. Ar.*Ach*.705 λάλῳ, with Olson: 'a favourite Aristophanic term for someone over-full of words'. Anagrammatic repetition stylistically enacts it: **95-97 ἀλλ' αἶνον ... ἀλλὰ ... λαλαγῆσαι**.

Articular infinitive and simplex as complements of verb of desire, often *metri gratia*: S.fr.149.8-9 ἵμερος | δρᾶν καὶ τὸ μὴ δρᾶν πολλάκις προίεται. Cf. S.*El*.264-65 κἀκ τῶνδέ ... λαβεῖν ... καὶ τὸ τητᾶσθαι.

Articular infinitive conveying distaste: S.*Ant*.312 οὐκ ἐξ ἅπαντος δεῖ τὸ κερδαίνειν φιλεῖν; S.*Ph*.1252; S.*Tr*.545-46.

κρυφὸν: 'concealment': Emped.fr.27.16.

Concealment as negative epinician term: *O*.7.92 μὴ κρύπτε; *N*.10.40-41 Ἀργεῖ μὴ κρύπτειν φάος | ὀμμάτων.

ἐσλῶν καλοῖς: juxtaposition reinforces the virtually-synonymous valorizing terms.

ἐσλῶν: in the epinician sense of those deserving praise: see **95-98**; *I*.3.7 ἔργων ἄποινα χρὴ μὲν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν; fr.121.1-4 πρέπει δ' ἐσλοῖσιν ὑμνεῖσθαι ... θνάσκει δὲ σιγαθὲν καλὸν ἔργον. Here, also connoting the morally good: **63 ἐσλοὶ**.

97-98 καλοῖς | ἔργοις: rephrasing **94 εὐεργέταν** to contrast Theron's deeds with his treatment.

Almost all epinician parallels (plus fr.121.1-4) relate to noble deeds' poetic celebration (*N*.6.30 ἀοιδαὶ καὶ λόγοι τὰ καλά σφιν ἔργ' ἐκόμισαν; *N*.7.14 ἔργοις δὲ καλοῖς ἔσοπτρον; *I*.4.42 ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄσβεστος; *I*.6.22 μυρίαι δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέ-τμανθ' ... κέλευθοι), which is here threatened by public resentment (*P*.7.19 φθόνον ἀμειβόμενον τὰ καλὰ ἔργα).

98-100 Coda: concluding praise of Theron's superlative altruism, magnifying **90-95**, and enacting **95-98** (avoidance of *koros*). The ostensibly-unstudied paratactic simile masks the claim's grandeur. Except B.4.19-20, no epinician ends with a question: this forms a ring with **1-2**, but whereas there specific guidance was sought on appropriate subjects for the ode, here the laudator concedes the impossibility of doing justice to his subject's limitlessness. Cf. *Il*.2.488-90 of the poet's inability to enumerate the Danaan multitudes. Motifs of countlessness typically conclude victory-catalogues: *O*.13.43-46, 112-15; *N*.2.23; *N*.10.45-6; *I*.1.60-63; *AP*.13.14.5 ([Sim.]); *CEG*.811.7; Ebert no.15.5; of these,

O.13.113, *N*.2.23, *I*.1.60-63 transition to the close. But only in Theron's odes does the laudator (1) close by conceding impossibility (see ***O*.3.43-45**); (2) employ the motif of benefactions rather than of victories: this is partly because Theron had only *one* victory (**48-51**), but primarily due to the supremacy of an Olympic chariot-victory, and the stress on Theron's *moral* attributes (**5-7**; **90-95**).

Brilliantly, **100 φράσαι** responds exactly with **60 φράσαις**: the intratextual answer to **100 τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο;** is **59-60 τις ... φράσαις** – the judge Theron will meet after death.

Taboo against counting blessings precisely: Cat.5.12-13 *nequis malus invidere possit* | *cum tantum sciat esse basiorum*.

98 ἐπεὶ: introducing paratactic simile (Fraenkel on A.*Ag*.393).

ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν: sand as paradigm of countlessness: *P*.9.45-47 οἶσθα ... ὅσσα ... ψάμαθοι; Hdt.1.47.12 Οἶδα ... ψάμμου τ' ἀριθμὸν; Eupol.fr.286 ἀριθμεῖν θεατὰς ψαμμακοσίους; Septuag.*Odae*.12.9.1; West (1997) 245; (2007) 95-96. Archim.*Aren*.2.134.2-3 rejects it: οἴονταί τινες ... ψάμμου τὸν ἀριθμὸν | ἄπειρον εἶμεν.

99 κεῖνος: i.e. **95 Θήρωνος**.

χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν: *Il*.6.6 φόως δ' ἑτάροισιν ἔθηκεν. Contrasting **97-98 κρυφὸν θέμεν ἐσλῶν καλοῖς | ἔργοις**.

ἄλλοις: generalizing **93 φίλοις**.

100 τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο: erotema equivalent to negative statement: *Od*.3.113-14 τίς κεν ... πάντα γε μυθήσαιτο; Isoc.4.114.3-4 τίς ἂν | δύναιτο διεξελθεῖν. See **98-100**.

CHAPTER 3: *OLYMPIAN* 3

TRANSLATION

A′ To please the Tyndarids who love hospitality, and fair-tressed Helen,

as I honour famous Acragas, do I pray,

when for Theron an Olympic victor's hymn have I erected, unwearying-footed

horses' finest product. And in such a fashion, I reckon, did the Muse

stand by me as I discovered a freshly-gleaming way,

5 that I was able to harmonize with the Dorian measure the voice

of glorious victory-celebration. Because crowns yoked upon his hair

exact from me this god-built debt,

namely to mix the lyre of varied tones and the cry of pipes and words' placement

for Aenesidamus' son appropriately, and Pisa too

demands that I make a proclamation. For from there

10 do divinely-fated songs come to mankind,

whenever for any man, in fulfilment of Heracles' ancient instructions,

the rigorous Hellanodicas, a man of Aetolia, places above his brow

and around his hair the uncanny-hued ornament of olive, which once upon a time

from Ister's shady springs the son of Amphitryon brought back

15 to be the fairest monument of the Games at Olympia,

B′ after he persuaded the Hyperborean people, Apollo's attendants, with his words.

With a trustworthy attitude did he request for Zeus' all-welcoming

grove both a plant to provide shade as a common possession for mankind,

and a crown for glorious deeds.

For already to his father had the altars been consecrated, and

at the mid-month the golden-charioted

20 Moon had in the evening reflected at him her full eye,

and he the great Games' sacred judging, together with the quadrennial cycle,

had established on the numinous banks of the Alpheus.

But not yet flourishing with beautiful trees

was that spot in the glens of the Cronian Hill of Pelops.

Without these, naked did the precinct seem to him,

and subject to the penetrating rays of the sun.

The result was that his heart impelled him to journey to the land

of Istria, where Leto's horse-driving daughter
had received him when he had come from Arcadia's ridges
and much-twisting gorges,
when by means of messages from Eurystheus his father's compulsion urged him
to bring back the golden-horned hind – a female –
which once upon a time Taygeta
had, as a thank-offering in her place, inscribed 'sacred to Orthosia'.

Γ′ It was while pursuing her that he saw that land too,
beyond the blasts of the North Wind's
chill. There at the trees did he wonder, stopped in his tracks.
These were the trees a sweet longing gripped him to implant
around the twelve-lap turning-post
of the hippodrome. Now too does he that festival
propitiously visit with the godlike
twin sons of deep-girdled Leda.

For to them did he entrust, as he departed for Olympus,

the administration of the wondrous contest

involving men's excellence and swift chariots'

carriage-racing. But for my part, in any case, it seems

my heart urges me to say that to the Emmenids,

and to Theron, glory has come as a gift from the horsemen

Tyndarids, because of all mortals

40 with the most abundant hospitable banquets do they attend them,

and with pious minds observe the blessed's rites.

But if in fact an excellent thing is water, whilst of possessions

gold is the most revered,

then now to the furthest extremity

has Theron come with his achievements, and lays his hands

– from home – upon Heracles'

Pillars. But the great beyond neither wise men can tread

45 nor the unwise. I will not pursue it. Empty-handed would I be.

METRICAL SCHEME

s1	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – |	D – e – D
s2	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ – || ^{H}	– D – e
s3	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – | – ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – || ^{H}	– D – e – D
s4	– – ◡ – – | – ◡ – – – ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ – || ^{B}	– e – e – e – D – e
s5	– ◡ – – – ◡ ⏑⏑ – – ◡ – – ||| ^{H}	e – e – e –
e1	– ◡ – – – ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – |	e – e – D
e2	– ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ – – – ◡ – || ^{B}	e – D – e – e
e3	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – | – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ – || ^{H}	D – D – e
e4	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – | – – ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – || ^{H}	D – e – D
e5	– ◡ – – – ◡ – – – ◡ – – |||	e – e – e –

The metrical structure, although formally triadic, presents unusual features that create the impression of a monostrophic arrangement. (1) The number of verses in the strophe/antistrophe and epode is identical. (2) s5 and e5 are identical, as are s1 and e4. (3) According to the analyses of Irigoin (1993a) 249-53; (1993b) 283-302; (2002) 91-101, the

strophe/antistrophe and epode each contain a total of 6 D and 10 e, and each a total of 38 temps marqués ('stressed syllables'). This phenomenon may be linked to the laudator's claim of poetic novelty (see **4-9**). At **14 ἔνεικεν**, **26 νιν**, the licence of –ν making position in order to avoid a short anceps appears to be employed [94].

DATE

Like ***O*.2**, ***O*.3** celebrates Theron's 476 chariot-victory. There is no firm basis for establishing relative chronology in composition; however, a theoxenic premiere for ***O*.3** [95] would imply performance after ***O*.2**, which was not tied to an occasion. I tentatively accept a performance date of spring 475, following Salviat (2007a) 11-12, who compares the dating of theoxenic cults in Dorian calendars, esp. that of Acragas' putative grandmother-city Rhodes.

PERFORMANCE

Internal evidence suggests an Acragantine premiere at the celebration of a theoxenic cult administered by the Emmenids [96]. For potential venues, see Krummen (1990) 222-23. Regular cult provides an inbuilt occasion for reperformance, but the lack of absolute fixity in the text with respect to the theoxeny permits less formal reperformance-settings as well.

[94] See **8**.
[95] See ***O*.3.Performance**.
[96] See **1-4**.

STRUCTURE

The ode has a symmetrical structure. **1-9** concerns the present victory-celebration at Acragas, set in an implied theoxenic context [97]. Two elements of the victory, the crown (**6**) and Olympia itself (**9**), are isolated as key factors motivating the ode. The ode's central myth comprises four Heraclean exploits in an non-chronological structure that provides aetiologies not only for the crown and the Olympics, but also for the Tyndarids' elsewhere-unattested oversight of the Games [98]. **38-45** reprises several elements of the *incipit* in ring-composition [99], connecting its invocation of the Tyndarids with the Emmenids' regular theoxenic worship, which is adduced as the reason for the Tyndarids granting Theron victory. The concluding priamel creates a final link between myth and present, as Theron's achievements are paired with those of Heracles (**42-44**).

INTERPRETATION

The content of ***O*.3** is influenced partly by that of the other 476 odes, in particular its companion piece ***O*.2**. ***O*.2.3-4** briefly references Heracles' founding of the Olympics, which is the primary myth of *O*.10, and integral to ***O*.3**; *O*.1's Pelops-myth is not strictly a foundation-myth, but still an aetiology of the Olympic chariot-race and Pelops' cult. This shared theme may be a means of rehabilitating the image of Magna Graecia following its aloofness during the Persian Wars [100], but is also more generally applicable to colonial

[97] See **1-4**.
[98] See **9-38**.
[99] See **38-41**.
[100] See **19-22**.

victors' desire to situate themselves ideologically at the Greek world's centre by emphasizing their attachment to the Panhellenic victory-site, which is constructed as a landscape of symbolic/cultural value [101].

To this Panhellenic baseline myth, the laudator's self-conscious innovation [102] leads him to graft on a series of details, esp. the Hyperborean elements, Taygeta's dedication, and the Tyndarids' installation as Olympic overseers, all of which are arranged in a non-chronological tour-de-force [103]. The myth seeks to produce a totalizing aetiology not only for the Games' institutions, namely the crown (**6**) and the victory-site (**9**), but for the victory itself and the Tyndarids' presence at the Emmenids' Acragantine theoxeny, the latter two being mutually-interdependent [104]. Krummen (1990) 266 rightly characterizes the whole as 'einheitlich'.

Although lacking ***O.2***'s explicit eschatology, ***O.3*** is pervaded by the theme of spatial/existential permeability. Thus Heracles journeys to the Hyperboreans, whose name implies transcendence of geographical limits; he returns with supernatural artifacts such as the Hind and the olive. Heracles, the Tyndarids, and Pelops are mortal heroes who have crossed into heroized/divinized status, which is implicitly due, in part, to their association with Olympia. Theron has himself transferred the olive to Acragas, having been able to do so due to the victory granted by his worship of the Tyndarids, who in their divinized state now dine with him in celebration of that victory, which has brought him into contact with the Pillars of Heracles themselves [105]; but although the Pillars connote the limits of mortal achievement and signal the ode's conclusion, the transcendence exemplified by the heroes

[101] See ***P.6.1-18***. For the possible relevance of a contemporary Elean-Pisatan conflict, cf. ***O.2.3***.
[102] See **4-9**.
[103] See **9-38**.
[104] See **1-4**; **38-41**.
[105] **43-44**.

into contact with whom Theron's Olympic victory has brought him is implicitly within his grasp.

COMMENTARY

Strophe 1

1-9 The *incipit* treats the laudator's engagement with the present celebration: see **1-4**; **4-9**.

1-4 Prayer that the victory-ode please the Tyndarids and Helen. Their inclusion (Σ.*O*.3.1d contrasts ***O*.2.1-4**) was variously attributed in antiquity to (1) theoxenic performance of the victory-ode (Σ.*O*.3.*Inscr*., 1b, 7c, 61b, 81c); (2) the victory-announcement reaching Acragas during the theoxeny (Σ.*O*.3.*Inscr*., 1a, 1c); (3) Acragantine Tyndarid-worship (Aristarchus: Σ.*O*.3.1a, 1d); (4) Argive Tyndarid-worship inherited by Theron (Didymus: Σ.*O*.3.1d); (5) Tyndarid administration of the Olympics (Σ.*O*.3.1d).

For (3); (4); (5), see **2**; **38**; **36**. (2) is a naive version of (1), the evidence for which is reviewed as follows:

(a) External. The title has no independent value, whether originating from the commentary (Fränkel (1961) 394-97), or as a marginal note on **1 φιλοξείνοις** (Krummen (1990) 219-22).

(b) Internal. The potentially-decisive **34 ταύταν ἐορ-τὰν** probably means the Olympics, not a theoxeny. However, the claim that the Tyndarids administer the Olympics, having been entrusted with them by Heracles (**34-38**), is followed immediately by the statement that the Tyndarids *qua* horsemen and thus as masters of Olympic chariot-contests (**39 εὐίππων** ~ **37-38 ῥιμφαρμάτου | διφρηλασίας**) granted glory to the Emmenids for their

exceptionally-numerous theoxenic feasts (**40 <u>ξεινίαις</u> αὐτοὺς ἐποίχονται τραπέζαις**). The generalized description of these feasts (**40 ἐποίχονται**; **41 φυλάσσοντες**) indicates regular behaviour, and does not *necessarily* reflect the present occasion. However, ring-composition with **1 <u>φιλοξείνοις</u>** retrospectively suggests that epithet was chosen to reflect the Tyndarids' participation in Emmenid theoxenies, and thus connects the generalized description (**39-40**) to the evocation of the *present* celebration at **1-10**, the details of which are compatible with a theoxeny. The inclusion of Helen (**1**) in the prayer would be otiose if the Tyndarids were invoked solely as patrons of Games; instead, the point is her participation in her brothers' theoxenies (Robbins (1984) 219-20). See **nn.** on passages cited above.

(c) Comparative. Several epinicia evoke cultic performance-contexts: Krummen (1990); Currie (2005) 17-18; Neumann-Hartmann (2009) 195-270; Ferrari (2012) 158-72. In particular, ***O*.3** fits a pattern of odes for autocrats and their associates performed in the context of a cult administered by the autocrat's family: Currie (2011) 274-77 on ***O*.3**, *P*.1, *P*.5, *N*.1, B.3. Hieron's 476 foundation of the Zeus Aitnaios cult (at which epinicia for Hieron and his associates were sung: Σ*N*.1.7b), and his hereditary *hierophanteia* of Demeter and Kore (*O*.6.93-96; Hdt.7.153.1-4; Timaeus.*FGH*.566.F.96), provided Theron with a model to emulate. Since, unlike Hieron's *hierophanteia*, the Emmenid theoxeny is elsewhere unattested, ***O*.3** may publicize a little-known family tradition, or even create it (foundation of new private cults: Garland (1992) 118-21; Purvis (2003) 7-13). Cf. *N*.10.49-54, where the legend of an ancestor hosting the Tyndarids may be the aetiology for a contemporary family cult, but does not determine the ode's performance context (Argive Heraea: 22-23).

In conclusion, a theoxenic performance-context best explains the internal references to the Tyndarids (cf. Krummen (1990) 223-36). The laudator prays to please them with his

victory-song because they are *present* to hear it. Theoxenic performance also facilitates the (i) deepening and (ii) perpetuation of Emmenid fame, as well as (iii) conveying an eschatological message. (i) *Xenia* is a key Emmenid virtue (see ***O*.2.6**), and theoxeny represents its transcendental manifestation, explaining 'why hospitality is sacred: any guest could be a god in disguise' (Louden (2011) 32; see 30-56). It tests a host's morality, determining whether he receives the gods' blessing or punishment, and the Emmenids pass with flying colours (**38-41**). (ii) A regular cult provides an ideal reperformance opportunity: note the allusion to **40** at ***I*.2.39-40**, followed by an exhortation to reperform the family's odes (***I*.2.43-45**). That this context is not explicitly fixed permits less formal reperformance-contexts as well: see ***O*.3.Performance**. (iii) Dining with the gods while alive implies Theron is destined to do so in the afterlife: **40-41**.

See further **38-41** on the Tyndarid theoxeny, and ring-composition with **1-4**.

φιλοξείνοις ... Ἀκράγαντα ... Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον ... ἵππων ἄωτον: *O*.2.1-7 ὕμνοι ... Ὀλυμπιάδα ... Θήρωνα ... τετραορίας ... νικαφόρου ... ὄπῑ δίκαιον ξένων ... Ἀκράγαντος ... ἄωτον.

1 Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξείνοις ἁδεῖν καλλιπλοκάμῳ θ' Ἑλένᾳ: chiastic bracketing of the palindromic verse emphasizes the siblings' unity, despite their complex paternity (Kirk on *Il*.3.236-44).

Affinity with the Vedic Aśvins and Sūryā: West (2007) 186-91; Frame (2009) 59-102; **3 ἀκαμαντοπόδων**; **34 νίσεται**; **39 εὐίππων**.

Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξείνοις: ~ 39-40 Τυνδαριδᾶν ... ξεινίαις.

Τυνδαρίδαις: P.'s regular designation for Castor and Polydeuces goes back to epic (Hes.fr.198.1). Διόσκουροι is attested in poetry from the 6th century (Henry on *N*.10.49-54), and at *IG*.12.3.359 Διόϝοροι c.700 (Thera). For their cult, and their appearances in

early Greek poetry and P., see *BNP* s.v. Dioscuri; Farnell (1921) 175-228; Fehr (1936) 134-37; Burkert (1985) 212-13; Finglass on *P*.11.59-64.

Their significance here is as follows. (1) Their attendance at the theoxeny (**1-4**) makes the ode's occasion numinous, and characterizes it as the latest link in a chain of reciprocal *xenia* with the Emmenids (*v.i.*), in which the previous link was their bestowal of victory upon Theron at Olympia (**38-41**). (2) The transition between human and divine that they embody serves as a model for Theron. The tradition varies between making both brothers mortal, and allocating both alternating immortality (Finglass on *P*.11.61-64). Like Heracles, with whom they intersect at **34-38**, (a) a mortal is their 'official' (cf. **14 Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας**), but Zeus their biological, father; (b) they are assimilated to the gods (**41 μακάρων**) through receipt of prayer (**1**) and cult (**38-41**), although a memory of mortality remains in their epithet **34 ἀντιθέοισιν**, which elsewhere applies only to mortal heroes; (c) they were Eleusinian initiates (X.*Hell*.6.3.6). Therefore, within the ode's key theme of spatial/existential permeability, they have crossed from mortal to immortal existentially, but visit pious mortals such as Theron spatially. Epinician's use of liminal figures is explained by des Bouvrie (2004) 376-81 as a recognition of the liminality experienced by a Panhellenic victor; Theron's specific interest in existential transcendence emerges from ***O*.2**. (3) Fraternal unity. Robbins (1984) 223-24 sees the pair as 'ideal emblems' for Theron and Xenocrates. That is the impression given, but since the fraternal dynamic during Theron's lifetime was of his self-aggrandizement at Xenocrates' expense (see ***P*.6.46**; ***O*.2.48-51**), Xenocrates is in practice virtually absent from the ode (except **38 Ἐμμενίδαις**).

φιλοξείνοις: elsewhere of bestowing *xenia* ('loving one's guests': *Od*.6.121, 8.576, 9.176, 13.202; Thgn.2.1358; *N*.1.19-20; ***I*.2.24**; B.3.16; B.5.48-50; B.14.22-23), whereas **39-40** attests Tyndarid *receipt* of it. The paradox may be avoided by understanding the

compound's second element as (1) 'hosts' or 'guest-friends' (LSJ.s.v. ξένος I.1-2; Köhnken (1983) 60), or (2) 'guest-friendship', i.e. the abstract (cf. φιλόσοφος = 'loving *wisdom*', not 'loving the wise'). Either acknowledges the Tyndarids' status as the most widely-attested recipients of *theoxenia* (see **38-41**); cf. their Spartan epiclesis ξένοι (Σ.Lyc.563).

However, since (1) and (2) require a sense unattested in the compound, 'loving one's guests' could be deliberate, for example if ***O*.3** were performed at their Acragantine temple, but textual clues are lacking. I therefore relate the term to a cycle of reciprocal *xenia*: Theron hosts the Tyndarids at theoxenies in Acragas (**38-41**); the Tyndarids host Theron at Olympia (as presiding deities: **34-38**), and grant him victory (**1**; **39**); Theron hosts the Tyndarids at his victory-celebration in Acragas (**1-4**). *Cypr*.Arg.2a (see West) attests that Paris was hosted by the Tyndarids, although they were still mortal at that point.

Verdenius, followed by Krummen (1990) 226-27, has P. '[flatter] the Dioscuri by transferring Theron's hospitality to the gods of his town', but this is arbitrary compared with the carefully-crafted cycle of reciprocity outlined above: the Tyndarids are *recent*, not current, hosts.

ἀδεῖν: often of pleasing deities: ***P*.6.51**.

At *P*.1.29-33, the laudator similarly prays to please Zeus in relation to his cult-role at Aetna, while praising the victory of Hieron, who established both city and cult. Hymns offering gods pleasing song to secure their goodwill: Race (1982a) 8-10; Theocr.*Id*.22.213-15 (Helen and Tyndarids).

καλλιπλοκάμῳ: elsewhere only in epic and at E.*IA*.1040; always of goddesses/heroines.

The epithet, connoting sexual attractiveness (*Il*.14.326; Hes.fr.129.18), suits Helen, who exemplifies it. Epic, which does not apply it to Helen, stresses her beauty with similar

epithets: ἠΰκομος (*Il*.3.329); καλλίκομος (*Od*.15.58; Hes.fr.199.1-2 Κάστορί ... Πολυδεύκει ... Ἑλένης πόσις ἔμμεναι ἠυκόμοιο (Helen's wooing)).

Krummen (1990) 255 has it assimilate her to her ancestor Taygeta (**30**), since their attractiveness led to their abduction, from which the Tyndarids rescued Helen (E.*Hel*.1497-99; Hdt.9.73.4-5). Cf. ***O*.2.26**.

Reference to hair programmatically anticipates its crowning in the corresponding line of Antistrophe 1: **6 χαίταισι ... στέφανοι**.

Ἑλένᾳ: sister of Castor and Polydeuces. Like theirs, her existential status is complex, oscillating between a human with divine parentage in myth to a heroine/divinity in cult. Since her cult extended beyond her main centres at Sparta/Therapne (Farnell (1921) 322-25) only in connection with the Tyndarids (Parker (forthcoming)), her appearance with them here in a cultic address probably indicates she participated in their theoxeny (see **1-4**), direct evidence for which begins at E.*Hel*.1666-69, where Helen is also promised divinity alongside the Tyndarids after death (cf. E.*Or*.1635-37): see Allan, who argues against Euripidean invention. E.*Or*.1684-89 strikingly depicts her immortalization alongside Heracles and the Tyndarids, which encapsulates the existential permeability they symbolize in ***O*.3** (*v.s.*): the view that Helen was originally a goddess is questionable (Edmunds (2007) 1-45).

Shelmerdine (1987) 68 argues Helen's omission from **38-40** excludes her theoxenic participation, and attributes her presence here to the Rhodian Helen Dendritis cult (Paus.3.19.10; Plin.*NH*.33.81; Polyaen.1.13), favoured by the Emmenids due to their Rhodian origins.

But (1) it may be argued that Helen is included in **39 Τυνδαριδᾶν** (E.*Andr*.898-99 Τυνδαρὶς ... Ἑλένη; Synes.16.76.1 Οἱ τρεῖς Τυνδαρίδαι, Κάστωρ, Ἑλένη, Πολυδεύκης), with the Menelaion votives depicting her on horseback (Wace & Thompson & Droop

(1908) 108-57; Fitzhardinge (1980) 48) qualifying her as **39 εὐίππων**. However, it is better to explain (2) that she is omitted because, unlike her brothers, she does not oversee the Games (**34-38**), cannot bestow victory, and is thus irrelevant to the context; (3) the Emmenids' Rhodian roots were probably a political fabrication (see ***O*.2.8-11**).

Cultic links with Artemis Orthia (cf. **30**): Clader (1976) 74-77.

2-4 Victory-data (polis; victor; victory-site; event): see ***P*.6.5-6**. Cf. **9** (father); **38** (family).

2 κλεινὰν: frequent in city-praise: ***I*.2.19**.

Ἀκράγαντα: see ***P*.6.6**.

Acragas possessed several sites potentially associated with the ode's mythic/cultic figures. On the identification of its temples to the Tyndarids and Heracles, see Krummen (1990) 222-23; for the Olympieum, see **44**.

See **38-41** on the polis' omission there.

γεραίρων: here 'honouring with song' (**3 ὕμνον**): *h.Hom*.4.60, 429, 432; *I*.8.62; B.2.13-14; B.4.3, 13; B.6.14. Contrast ***I*.2.17**.

εὔχομαι: since all other Pindaric epinician examples with the aorist infinitive (*O*.8.86; *P*.4.293; *P*.5.124; *N*.9.54; *I*.6.14; regular in futurative wishes: K-G.1.195-97; S-D.2.296) refer *beyond* the ode's timeframe, reperformance at future theoxenies may be signalled (see **1-4**). More prosaically, the prayer may be performative, or instantiated during the ode as the Tyndarids' role in Theron's success is clarified (**36-41**).

Prayers for the victory-celebration to win divine favour: *O*.14.15-17; *P*.1.29; *P*.8.67; the first two reference local cult (see **1 ἀδεῖν**). Prayer in openings: Race (1990) 85-117; in P. generally: ***O*.2.12-15**.

The verb's 1st person occurs 6x in epinician: 2 open (*h.l.*; *O*.14.5), 3 close (*O*.8.86; *P*.5.124; *N*.9.54), their ode.

1st persons frame the ode: absent from the myth (**9-38**), they mark transitions to and from it, and situate the laudator in the present celebration (**2**; **4**; **7**; **9**; **38**; **45**).

3 Θήρωνος: see ***O*.2.5**. As in ***O*.2**, his naming frames the ode (**39**; **43**).

Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον: *O*.7.88 ὕμνου τεθμὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν; cf. *N*.4.16 ὕμνον κελάδησε καλλίνικον.

The phrase recalls ***P*.6.5-8 Πυθιόνικος ... ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς**, but Theron is grammatically the sole recipient, whereas Xenocrates was made to share it with family and city; the –νίκ– compound similarly marks inception.

Naming Olympia anticipates its centrality to the ode as a site of symbolic capital: see **9-38**.

ὕμνον: in Strophe 1 of every Emmenid ode: ***P*.6.7**; ***O*.2.1**; **3**; ***I*.2.3**.

ὕμνον ὀρθώσαις: *I*.1.46 ἔπος εἰ-πόντ' ... ὀρθῶσαι καλόν. The verb creates an architectural image, which (1) marks inception (***P*.6.5-18**); (2) evokes inscriptions when juxtaposed with victory-data (***P*.6.5-6**); (3) frames the ode with **44 σταλᾶν**, which may reference Acragantine structures; (4) sustains the metaphor throughout the Emmenid corpus (***I*.2.44-46**). ***P*.6.7-9 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς ... τετείχισται** similarly fuses song with architecture.

Anagrammatism with **30 Ὀρθωσίας** links Helen (**1**) with her ancestor Taygeta (**29**), since both were abducted from the companions of Artemis Orthia (≈ Orthosia): see **1**; **29-30**. Name-encoding: ***O*.2.2**.

P. exemplifies musical *orthotes* ('correctness') in later reception: Ael.Arist.*in.Plat.pro.quatt*.p.296, quoting fr.32 μουσικὰν ὀρθὰν. Plato contrasts its moral qualities with New Music's degeneracy (Pl.*Leg*.642a.4; Pl.*Leg*.655c.8-d1; Pl.*Leg*.700e.2): see **4 νεοσίγαλον**.

3-4 ἀκαμαντοπόδων | ἵππων: all classical instances open Olympian equestrian odes: *O.*4.1 Ἐλατὴρ ... ἀκαμαντόποδος; *O.*5.3 ἀκαμαντόποδός τ' ἀπήνας.

The only pre-Roman phrasal parallel is *O.*1.87 ἀκάμαντας ἵππους. Theron's horses are assimilated to those of Pelops (Olympic chariot-victory's archetype: **23 Πέλοπος**), thus trumping Hieron's *keles*-victory, which *O.*1 aggrandizes by including only chariots in its myth (77, 87). *O.*1 intertexts: **42-43**. *Chariot*-racing pointedly underscored: **19**; **33**; **34**; **37-38**.

Tireless horses draw the Aśvins' chariot (cf. **1**; **39**): *R.V.*7.67.8 'your strong steeds never weary while speeding forward'.

4 ἵππων ἄωτον: cf. ***O.*2.7**. The genitive with ἄωτος, typically partitive ('best of': *O.*1.15; ***O.*2.7**; *O.*9.19; *P.*4.131, 188; *P.*10.53; *N.*2.9; *N.*8.9; *I.*5.12; *I.*6.4; *I.*7.18; fr.52f.59; fr.111a.7), is here of agent (*O.*8.75 χειρῶν ἄωτον; *I.*1.51 γλώσσας ἄωτον; *I.*8.16a Χαρίτων ἄωτον), therefore 'finest product of', not 'finest reward for' (Race).

4-9 The laudator's claim that the Muse assisted him in composing a novel song (**4-6**), as merited by Theron's Olympic victory (**6-9**).

The present performance's description echoes that of the Hyperboreans' banquet at *P.*10.30-44, esp. regarding the Muse, music, and crowns: 37-38 Μοῖσα δ' οὐκ ἀποδαμεῖ | τρόποις ~ **4 Μοῖσα δ' οὕτω ποι παρέ- στα ... εὑρόντι τρόπον**; 39 λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν ~ **8 φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν**; 40 δάφνᾳ τε χρυσέᾳ κόμας ἀναδήσαν-τες ~ **6 χαίταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι**; cf. Shelmerdine (1987) 75-76.

Allusively transferring *P.*10's Hyperborean myth to the present performance programmatically reifies ***O.*3**'s theme of spatial/existential permeability (**9-38**). The Hyperboreans appear explicitly in the myth as Apollo's devotees and source of the olive-crown (**16-18**). Now, not only does that olive-crown adorn Theron's head (**6**) as Olympic

victor, but the bliss of the Hyperboreans' festivities accompanies it: just as the Hyperboreans feast with gods, so too does Theron at his theoxeny (**1-4**); **43-44** similarly implies Theron's participation in Heracles' legendary bliss.

The celebration's details are also consistent with Tyndarid theoxenies: see **6 ἀγλαόκωμον**.

*P.*10's significance for ***O.*3**'s narrative: **9-38**.

The laudator's polysemous assertion of novelty raises the question of (1) what is being claimed; (2) what innovations in fact occur.

(1) Praise of 'new' song is an IE and NE topos, but whether it represents originality or recentness can be ambiguous: cf. West (2007) 75 'the point about the "new song" is not that it ... breaks with tradition, but on the contrary it is an addition to the body of older poetry'; D'Angour (2011) 191 (on Greek): 'poets may be genuinely innovative, or may appear to be doing little more than paying lip-service to the trope of novelty'. This discourse informs Greek culture from *Od.*1.351-52 onwards (LeVen (2008) 63-90; D'Angour (2011) 184-206), and P. valorizes it: *O.*1.36; *O.*9.48-49; *N.*8.20; *I.*5.63; fr.52h.11-12.

Taking **4-6** at face-value gives 'the Muse assisted me in finding a new-shining way, so as to fit the voice of epinician celebration to dactylo-epitrite', which involves (**8-9**) 'appropriately setting words to the music of the lyre and *aulos*'. Since P. employs dactylo-epitrite in epinician from *P.*12 (490) onwards, and paired lyre-*aulos* accompaniment was traditional and standard in P., we must conclude either that P.'s claim is 'lip-service', or, if his words reflect real innovations, that they either cannot be recovered from the text or must be inferred from its connotations. Although the first or second possibility may well be correct, what follows is an exploration of the last.

(2) (a) Music. The modal connotations in **4 τρόπον**; **5 Δωρίῳ**; **5 ἐναρμόξαι**; **8 ποικιλόγαρυν** permit either (i) 'a new *mode*, so as to *harmonize* the epinician voice with the *Dorian* metre', i.e. matching Dorian mode to dactylo-epitrite; or (ii) modulation between stanzas. See **nn.**

(b) Lexicon. See **4 νεοσίγαλον**.

(c) Myth. See **9-38**.

(d) Metre. (i) The epode's treatment undermines the triadic structure: see ***O*.3 Metre**. (ii) ***O*.3** employs a metrical licence that may have assisted an *aulos*-player to keep in time: see **8**; (iii) Crit.fr.4.1-4 στεφανώσω | Ἀλκιβιάδην νέοισιν ὑμνήσας τρόποις· | οὐ γάρ πως ἦν τοὔνομ' ἐφαρμόζειν ἐλεγείοι, | νῦν δ' ἐν ἰαμβείοι κείσεται οὐκ ἀμέτρως uses similar language to advertise the metrical innovation of replacing a pentameter with iambics to admit Alcibiades' name; but nothing comparable is evident here.

(e) Performance-context. Theoxeny (Σ.*O*.3.8e): see **1-4**.

4-6 Μοῖσα ... ἀγλαόκωμον: fr.inc.199.3 Μοῖσα καὶ Ἀγλαΐα; *P*.4.2-3 κωμάζοντι ... Μοῖσα; *N*.9.1 Κωμάσομεν ... Μοῖσαι.

4-5 Μοῖσα ... Δωρίῳ: Telest.fr.2.2-3 Λυδὸν ὃς ἅρμοσε (~ **5 ἐναρμόξαι**) πρῶτος | Δωρίδος ἀντίπαλον μούσας (Dorian mode).

Μοῖσα ... ἐναρμόξαι: E.*Med*.833-34 Πιερίδας Μούσας λέγουσι ... Ἁρμονίαν φυτεῦσαι.

4 Μοῖσα ... παρέ-στα μοι: *pace* Bernard (1963) 77n.46, not a 'chariot-of-the-Muses' image: (1) the chariot is always explicitly mentioned elsewhere (see ***I*.2.2**); (2) **παρέ-στα** is not employed of sharing a chariot (*vox propria*: παραβαίνω: *Il*.11.104, 522).

The point here is the epic sub-category of divinities aiding (*Il*.10.278-79, 290-91; *Il*.20.119-21; *Il*.21.231; *Il*.23.782-83; *Od*.3.222 ἀναφανδὰ παρίστατο Παλλὰς; *Od*.13.387-90; Archil.fr.94.1-3; *O*.10.52 παρέσταν ... Μοῖραι; *P*.8.70-71 κώμῳ ... Δίκα παρέστακε;

A.fr.168.16-18) or, rarely, hindering (*Od*.9.52-53; *h.Hom*.5.269; Mimn.fr.2.5). Evocation of physical proximity to a divinity parallels the theoxenic context (**1-4**).

Cf. Emped.fr.131.8-11 Μοῦσα ... εὐχομένωι ... παρίστασο ... λόγον ἐμφαίνοντι (Muse asked to assist poet in composing). At *P*.4.1-3 παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ | στᾶμεν ... Μοῖσα, the Muse attends the celebrating victor, but implicitly assists the poet (4 αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων). The epinician Muse no longer supplies facts, as in epic, but assists the poet abstractly without overshadowing his authority: Mackie (2003) 64-67; Sim.fr.11.21 W; ***P*.6.21**. Muse and theoxeny: B.21.4.

Μοῖσα ... νεοσίγαλον: Muse and novelty: fr.70b.23-25 (in the context of dithyrambic innovation); E.*Tro*.512 Μοῦσα, καινῶν ὕμνων; Ar.*Lys*.1295 Μοῦσαν ἐπὶ νέᾳ νέαν; Ar.*Nu*.1030-31 μοῦσαν ἔχων ... λέγειν τι καινόν; Timoth.fr.15.col.5.203 μοῦσαν νεοτευχῆ; Timoth.fr.20.1-5 with Hordern. **Μοῖσα** is itself encoded in **μοι νεοσίγαλον**; name-encoding: ***O*.2.2**.

Contrast ***I*.2.1-10** (criticism of the Muse's socio-economic innovations).

Μοῖσα ... εὑρόντι: Ar.*Eccl*.882-83 Μοῦσαι, δεῦρ' ἴτ' ἐπὶ τοὐμὸν στόμα ... εὑροῦσαί τι τῶν Ἰωνικῶν.

οὕτω ποι: οὕτω is (1) cataphoric, anticipating consecutive **5 ἐναρμόξαι**, rather than (2) anaphoric (Slater 'with this in view', i.e. pleasing the Tyndarids). The indefinite modifies it on the model of cautious epic assertions about divinities: *Il*.2.116 οὕτω που Διὶ μέλλει ὑπερμενέϊ φίλον εἶναι; *Od*.9.262; *h.Hom*.3.527; cf. *P*.5.101; ***I*.2.24**.

νεοσίγαλον ... τρόπον: behaviour: A.*PV*.309-10 μεθάρμοσαι τρόπους | νέους; S.*Ai*.735-36 νέοισιν ἐγκαταζεύξας τρόποις; diction: Agath.fr.13.1 νέος τρόπος; music: Pl.*Resp*.424c.1-2 ποιητήν ... λέγειν οὐκ ἄσματα νέα | ἀλλὰ τρόπον ᾠδῆς νέον.

νεοσίγαλον: *hapax*: 'freshly-gleaming'; probably < σιγαλόεις (epic: 7x of reins).

The epithet programmatically advertises lexical innovation. Of P.'s 9 νεο– compound-epithets, 5 occur *hapax*, 1 in P. alone, 3 first in P.

Shelmerdine (1987) 71n.23 observes that **νεοσίγαλον** inaugurates 11 apparently-original compounds in **4-38**, bracketed by Theron's naming (**3 ~ 39**). Different compounds underscore different types of innovation: **νεοσίγαλον**, **6 ἀγλαόκωμον**, **8 ποικιλόγαρυν** (performance); **12 γλαυκόχροα** (myth: olive); **29 χρυσόκερων** (myth: Hind); **37 ῥιμφαρμάτου**, **38 διφρηλασίας** (myth: Tyndarids supervising Olympics). See **4-9**.

εὑρόντι: laudator discovering/devising poetic material: *O*.1.110 εὑρὼν ὁδὸν λόγων; *O*.9.80-81 εὑρησιεπὴς ... ἐν Μοισᾶν (~ **Μοῖσα**) δίφρῳ; *P*.1.60 ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον; *N*.6.54 ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὗρον; *N*.8.20 νεαρὰ (~ **νεοσίγαλον**) δ' ἐξευρόντα; fr.122.14 ἀρχὰν εὑρόμενον σκολίου; B.fr.5.3-4 ἀρρήτων ἐπέων πύλας | ἐξευρεῖν; also fr.125.1 εὗρεν (Terpander inventing the *barbitos*). εὑρήματα/πρῶτος εὑρετής in Greek music: Hordern on Timoth.fr.791.202-36.

τρόπον: often employed by P. in musical contexts in a general sense ('way, style': *O*.10.77 ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον; fr.52b.101-2 κελαδέοντι ... [τρόπ]ον; fr.107b.2 Κρῆτα ... τρόπον). However, the later technical sense 'modal key' (West (1992) 185-86; Hagel (2009) 421-29) probably occurs at *O*.14.17-18 Λυδῷ ... ἐν τρόπῳ, referencing the Lydian mode (cf. *N*.4.45 Λυδίᾳ σὺν ἁρμονίᾳ; *N*.8.15 with Henry). Here, juxtaposition with **5 Δωρίῳ** and **5 ἐναρμόξαι** may activate their respective modal connotations.

Modulation is also a theoretical possibility. Franklin (2013) 213-36 argues that *polyphonia* originated in the 6th century and was developed in the 5th by Lasus, Simonides, and P. His hypothesis that pre-New-Music modulation occurred at stanzaic boundaries receives striking support from the placement of ethnics potentially referring to modes in Pindaric epinician (for which see Prauscello (2012) 77-82): 4 of 10 (**5**; *O*.5.19; *P*.8.20; *N*.3.79) immediately precede a stanzaic boundary; 1 (*O*.1.101-2) follows. Similarly, the

aulos-epithet πάμφωνος (~ **5 φωνὰν**), taken by Franklin (2013) 225-26 to include reference to *polyphonia*, immediately precedes a stanzaic boundary 2x (*O*.7.12; *I*.5.27), and follows 2x (*P*.3.17; *P*.12.19), out of 4 Pindaric occurrences. Cf. **8**.

5 Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ: mimetic word-order. Cf. the responding **10 θεόμοροι ... ἀοιδαί**; **40 ξεινίαις ... τραπέζαις**. Constituents of distracted noun-phrases adjoining a metrical boundary: Watkins (2002) 321.

Δωρίῳ ... πεδίλῳ has been interpreted as (1) dactylo-epitrite metre (Σ.*O*.3.9b, d; Anderson (1994) 99; D'Angour (2011) 193); (2) Dorian mode (Σ.*O*.3.8c, d, 9c; Ferrari 103n.5): see fr.67; (3) Dorian dialect (Σ.*O*.3.7b, 8b; cf. Gerber on *O*.1.17-18). West (1992) 344-47 is aporetic: 'we cannot identify the novelty or the Dorian component in this combination' (n.76).

(1) is easiest, given **5 πεδίλῳ**. However, the modal connotations of **4 τρόπον**, **5 Δωρίῳ**, **5 ἐναρμόξαι**, which lead to metre and mode being confused at Σ.*O*.3.9b, hint that mode was part of P.'s innovation: perhaps both metre and mode were, unusually, Dorian in ***O*.3** (Prauscello (2012) 65), or a new pattern of modulation was employed (see **4 τρόπον**).

Cf. Prat.fr.708.16 *PMG* ἄκουε τὰν ἐμὰν Δώριον χορείαν; fr.191 Αἰολεὺς ἔβαινε Δωρίαν κέλευθον ὕμνων (with Prauscello (2012) 75-77); fr.67 Δώριον μέλος σεμνότατόν; Arist.*Pol*.1276b.8-9.

As at ***I*.2.15-16**, the ethnic may reflect the ode's promotion of Dorian versions of the foundation-myths of Panhellenic festivals (see **9-38**), and celebrate Acragas' Dorian origins and affiliations: in 476, Theron repopulated Himera with Dorians (D.S.11.48.8; D.S.49.3-4). The Tyndarids (**1**) are quintessentially Dorian (Thomson (1929) 53-54 notes Dorian rhythms coinciding with references to them from Alcm.fr.2.1.1-2 onwards), as are Helen and Taygeta (**1**; **29-30**).

Δωρίῳ ... ἐναρμόξαι: parallels involve tuning to Dorian mode: Ar.*Eq*.989-90 Δωριστὶ μόνην ἂν ἁρ- | μόττεσθαι (*v.l.* ἐναρμόττεσθαι) ... λύραν; Telest.fr.2.2-3 Λυδὸν ὃς ἅρμοσε πρῶτος | Δωρίδος ἀντίπαλον μούσας (~ **4 Μοῖσα**); Pl.*Lach*.188d.6-8 δωριστὶ ... ἥπερ μόνη Ἑλ- | ληνική ἐστιν ἁρμονία; Arist.*Polit*.1276b.8-10 ἁρμονίαν ... Δώριος ὁτὲ δὲ Φρύγιος. εἰ δὴ τοῦ- | τον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον (~ **4 τρόπον**); Clem.Alex.*Stromat*.6.11.88 ἁρμονίαν τὴν Δώριον (on Terp.fr.3 Gostoli).

φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι: Heraclit.fr.10.9-10 μουσικὴ ... φθόγ- | γους μείξασα ἐν διαφόροις φωναῖς μίαν ἀπετέλεσεν ἁρμονίαν; Ion.fr.5.5-6 ἑνδεκάχορδε λύρα ... ἔχοισα ... συμφωνούσας ἁρμονίας τριόδους; Pl.*Symp*.187b.4 ἁρμονία συμφωνία ἐστίν; Pl.*Leg*.665a.1-3 τῇ δὲ αὖ (sc. τάξει) τῆς φωνῆς ... ἁρμονία ὄνομα προσαγο- | ρεύοιτο.

φωνὰν: of epinician celebration (**6 ἀγλαόκωμον**): *N*.2.25; *N*.5.51; *I*.4.40.

ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ: E.fr.911.2 πέδιλ' ἁρμόζεται (literal sandals).

ἐναρμόξαι: 'fit': *I*.1.16 Καστορείῳ ἢ Ἰολάο' ἐναρμόξαι μιν ὕμνῳ (genre); Ar.*Ra*.1202-4 ἐναρμόττειν ... ἐν τοῖς ἰαμβείοισι (metre); *v.s.* **Δωρίῳ ... ἐναρμόξαι**.

Activation of its cognacy with ἁρμονία = 'mode' (Las.fr.702.3 *PMG*; Prat.fr.712(b).3 *PMG*; *N*.4.45; cf. Mathiesen (1976) 3-17): see **4 τρόπον**.

The infinitive is consecutive without ὥστε (*P*.4.146; *I*.3.10; see **4 οὕτω ποι**), not dependent upon **4 τρόπον** (Race: 'way to').

πεδίλῳ: probably metaphorical for 'rhythm': cf. πούς = 'metrical foot' (Ar.*Ra*.1323 with Dover; Pl.*Resp*.400a.1-2).

Cf. A.R.4.1193-95 ὑπαὶ φόρμιγγος ἐυκρέκτου καὶ ἀοιδῆς ... σιγαλόεντι πέδον κροτέοντα πεδίλῳ (Orpheus beating time with his sandal).

Antistrophe 1

6 ἀγλαόκωμον: *hapax* (see **4**). Its components respectively connote epinician victory (***P*.6.46**) and celebration (***I*.2.31**): B.12.36-37 ἀγλααῖσιν | νίκαις [ἐκ]ωμάσθησαν. Stanzaic enjambement (**26**; ***O*.2.15**; ***O*.2.95**) stylistically enacts the difficulty of fitting the epithet, and thus the celebration's exuberance, into the Dorian rhythm (**5**): cf. H.*O*.4.2.7-8 *fervet immensusque ruit profundo* | *Pindarus ore*, 11-12.

A 5th-century Attic *hydria* (*ARV*^{2}.1187.36) inscribed ΚΟΜΟΣ depicts the Tyndarids' arrival at a theoxeny. See ***I*.2.31** on *komoi* and performance.

χαίταισι ... στέφανοι: *O*.14.23-24 Πίσας | ἐστεφάνωσε κυδίμων ἀέθλων πτεροῖσι χαίταν; *I*.7.39; fr.94b.44-49 ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων ... ἐπὶ νίκαις ... χαίταν στεφάνοις ἐκό- | σμηθεν ἔν τε Πίσᾳ; B.11.28-29 χαίταν ἐλαίᾳ | γλαυκᾷ στεφανωσάμενον; B.13.36-37.

χαίταισι: reprising **1 καλλιπλοκάμῳ** in the corresponding line of Strophe 1.

ζευχθέντες ἔπι: the verb's unique application to hair/crowns here reflects the equestrian victory that won the crown. Anastrophic tmesis highlights verse-final **στέφανοι**.

6-9 στέφανοι ... Πίσα: the victory is subdivided into the crown that symbolizes it (**6 στέφανοι**), and the place it was won (**9 Πίσα**): both unite in the myth (**9-38**).

6 στέφανοι: the olive victory-crown, whose aetiology is given in the myth (**9-38**); also of garlands worn at the celebration. The poetic plural masks Theron's solitary victory.

7 πράσσοντί με ... χρέος: the representation of praise as a debt owed to the victor ('χρέος-motif': *O*.10.8; *P*.8.33; *P*.9.103-5 ἐμὲ ... πράσσει χρέος; B.8.21) frames epinician poetry as a gift-exchange for the toil/expense the victor undertook to glorify his community (Kurke (1991) 85-107; Pfeijffer on *P*.8.33): to be indebted is more honourable than to be contractually-obliged (cf. ***I*.2.1-11**).

There is nonetheless a parallel between the poet's indebtedness here giving way to the spontaneous urging of his *thumos* (**38**), and a similar shift from the Labours Heracles undertakes under compulsion (**28**) to the olive-quest undertaken from a combination of *thumos*-impulses (**25**) and desire (**33**).

With the debt's characterization as **θεόδματον**, compare Vedic *ṛṇá* ('praise owed to the gods as a debt': Monier-Williams s.v.).

θεόδματον: outside P., always of cities/structures, an architectural sense present here: *P.*1.61; see **3**. At *I.*6.11, of the divine origins of the laudandus' achievements, as here (**39**). Cf. **10 θεόμοροι**.

8 φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν: words, lyre, and *aulos* similarly celebrate equestrian victory at *N.*9.7-9: ἐπέων... φόρμιγγ' ... αὐλὸν ἐπ' αὐτὰν ὄρσομεν | ἱππίων ἀέθλων κορυφάν.

Reference to word-placement and 'mixing' (**9 συμμεῖξαι**) is stylistically enacted. Formally, substantives and epithets/modifiers comprising the song's acoustic elements are ordered a–b–a–b–b–a in a verse that is palindromic excluding the 1st syllable (cf. **1**). The structure is further complicated by making the latter elements **αὐλῶν** and **ἐπέων** modifiers, whereas **φόρμιγγά** is modified. *V.i.*

φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν: the traditional lyre-*aulos* combination occurs 6x in P.: *Il.*18.494 αὐλοὶ φόρμιγγές τε βοὴν ἔχον; Hes.*Scut.*280-81; Archil.fr.93a.5; Thgn.1.532-34 αὐλῶν φθεγγομένων ἱμερόεσσαν ὄπα ... εὔφθογγον χερσὶ λύρην ὀχέων, 761 φόρμιγξ ... φθέγγοιθ' ... καὶ αὐλός, 975; *O.*7.12 φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν; *O.*10.93-94; *P.*10.39 λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν; *N.*9.7-9; *I.*5.27; E.*Alc.*345-47, 430; Ar.fr.221.1; X.*Symp.*3.1.1. Iconography: Huchzermeyer (1931) 48; Markoe (1985) (Near East); Martin (2003) 170-71.

Henry (2007) 126-31 observes that P.'s pattern of instrumental references indicates the *aulos* did not invariably accompany the lyre in epinician (cf. ***O*.2.47 ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε**), but argues that P.'s avoidance of short-anceps beyond the first triad in dactylo-epitrite anticipated the potential inclusion of an *aulos*-player, since the phenomenon assisted an *aulos*-player to keep in time. This hypothesis has value for ***O*.3**, which seems to employ the rare device of –ν making position in order to avoid short anceps at **14 ἔνεικεν**, **26 νιν**.

Here, both instruments are metaphorically given voice (Arist.*de.anim*.420b.6-7 τῶν γὰρ ἀψύχων οὐθὲν φωνεῖ, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὁμοιό- | τητα λέγεται φωνεῖν, οἷον αὐλὸς καὶ λύρα): this is typical of the *aulos qua* wind-instrument, but occurs of either in the quoted examples above, to which add B.fr.20B.1-2 βάρβιτε ... ἑπτάτονον ... γᾶρυν; A.*Eum*.568-69 σάλπιγξ ... γήρυμα φαινέτω. Their characterization here reflects the greater loudness of the *aulos* vis-à-vis the lyre, although the above passages demonstrate these attributes can be reversed: see Kovacs (2013) 481 with n.14.

Despite their different characterizations, P. valorizes both instruments (***O*.2.1**; *P*.12); contrast the later Athenian dichotomy (S.*Tr*.640-42; Martin (2003) 153-80; Wilson (2004) 269-306).

φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν: *O*.4.2 ποικιλοφόρμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς; *N*.4.14 ποικίλον κιθαρίζων.

φόρμιγγά: *O*.2.1.

ποικιλόγαρυν: *hapax*. Cf. Alcm.fr.4.1.5-7 γαρύματα ... νεόχμ' ... ποικίλα.

–γαρυ–: rarely of voiceless inanimates: B.fr.20B.1-2; A.*Eum*.568-69; E.fr.369.6 δέλτων ... γῆρυν: *v.s.*

ποικιλία ('variety, intricacy'), applied to aspects of song/music elsewhere (Alcm.fr.4.1.5-7; Ibyc.S257(a).fr.27.3 ποικίλος ὕ[μνος; Prat.fr.708.3 *PMG* ποικιλόπτερον

μέλος, 10 φρυνεοῦ ποικίλαν πνοὰν ἔχοντα (poet and chorus vs. aulete)), is a valorizing term in P.: song: *O*.4.2; *O*.6.87; *N*.5.42; fr.179.1-2; fr.194.2-3; lyre-playing: *N*.4.14; Lydian mode: *N*.8.15; selection of material: *P*.9.77-78. Cf. Detienne & Vernant (1978) 25-31; Giannini (2009) 65-82.

LeVen (2013) 229-42 traces a semantic shift from the archaic sense (238: 'self-conscious expression of the sensual nature of [the experience of beauty]') possessing connotations of synaesthesia (cf. **9 συμμεῖξαι**), to a technical term in New Music for *polychordia* and *polyphonia* ([Plut.]*de.mus*.1137a-b; Barker (1995) 41-60), interpreting the epithet here as 'describing the variegatedness of sounds coming from the instrument's different strings' (233). Technical connotations here may include mode (*N*.8.15 Λυδίαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν, with Henry) or even modulation (in the New Music sense: see **4 τρόπον**).

βοὰν αὐλῶν: *Il*.18.494; *P*.10.39; fr.52c.94 αὐλῶν ὀμφάν; B.9.68; S.*Tr*.640; E.*Ba*.127-28 κέρασαν (~ **9 συμμεῖξαι**) ἡδυβόαι ... αὐλῶν πνεύματι; E.*El*.879; Ion.fr.23 Λυδός ... αὐλὸς ἡγείσθω βοῆς; Ar.*Ra*.210-13 ξύναυλον ὕμνων βοὰν ... εὔγηρυν ... ἀοιδάν; Ar.*Av*.682-83, 857-58; *Or.Sib*.3.488.

V.s. on the *aulos*' 'shout'.

βοὰν ... συμμεῖξαι: E.*Ba*.127-28; Ar.*Av*.771 συμμιγῆ βοὴν; Timoth.fr.15.col.2.34 βοὰ δὲ [πα]μμι[γ]ὴς.

αὐλῶν: West (1992) 81-107; *P*.12.19.

ἐπέων τε θέσιν: 'placement of words': Pl.*Symp*.199b.4 θέσει ῥημάτων.

Pindaric word-order: Dornseiff (1921) 102-12; Lauer (1959); Sulzer (1961); Stockert (1969); Hummel 436-52. Watkins (2002) 319-37 and Oswald (2007) demonstrate the affinity of verbs and proper nouns, respectively, for metrical boundaries in P.: here, the

phrase's juxtaposition with the patronymic **9 Αἰνησιδάμου** on either side of a period-boundary stylistically enacts its point. *V.s.*; see **9**.

Since **ἐπέων** can also mean narrative (B.fr.5.3-4), it may signify innovation in the myths' content and structure: **9-38**.

9 Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ: see ***O*.2.46**; ***I*.2.28-29**.

The patronymic always coincides with period-boundary in the Emmenid odes; 83.9% of family-names in P. adjoin metrical boundaries (Oswald (2007) 88): see **8**.

Here it interacts with the theme of patronymics concealing divine parentage (**1**; **14**); **παιδὶ** responds with **19 πατρὶ** (Zeus).

Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόν-τως ... γεγωνεῖν: *I*.2.28-29 Αἰνησιδάμου | παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν; ***O*.2.46 πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου**; ***O*.2.5-6 Θήρωνα ... γεγωνητέον** (all of Theron receiving/deserving honour/song for this Olympic victory).

συμμεῖξαι: 'mixing' in musical contexts: Sapph.fr.44.24 αὖλος ... [κίθαρις] τ' ὀνεμίγνυ[το; *N*.3.77-79 μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῷ | σὺν γάλακτι ... πόμ' ἀοίδιμον Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν; B.10.54-55 αὐλῶν ... μειγν[υ; E.*Ba*.127-28 κέρασαν ἡδυβόαι Φρυγίων | αὐλῶν πνεύματι; Pl.*Leg*.700d.6-7 κεραννύντες δὲ | θρήνους τε ὕμνοις καὶ παίωνας διθυράμβοις (genre); Arist.*Problem*.922a.3-4 αὐλὸς ἡδίων τῆς λύρας, ὥστε καὶ ἡ ᾠδὴ τούτῳ μιχθεῖσα | ἡ λύρα ἡδίων ἂν εἴη, ἐπεὶ τὸ μεμιγμένον τοῦ ἀμίκτου ἥδιόν; Limen.*Pae.Delph*.14 ὅπα μειγνύμενος αἰόλ[οις κιθάριος μέλεσιν; *Hymn.Curet*.6-8 μολπᾷ, | τάν τοι κρέκομεν πακτίσι | μείξαντες ἅμ' αὐλοῖσιν.

πρεπόν-τως: Ford (2002) 13-22 observes that 'archaic appropriateness' shifted in the classical period from social/religious criteria towards formal/technical suitability: both are present here.

Πίσα: *O*.2.3. Here activating the symbolic value of Olympia's landscape: see **9-38**.

γεγωνεῖν: *O*.2.6.

9-38 The ode's core comprises 4 interwoven Heraclean myths: his (1) Hind-quest; (2) Olympic foundation; (3) transplantation of the olive from Hyperborea to Olympia; (4) ascent to Olympus. This section treats their (A) complex structure; (B) symbolic significance.

For the purposes of this analysis, **9-13** and **34-38** count as myth, although they are distinguished from the core narratives by being set in the present, and including only mythic *references* to the past. This is due to their aetiological function in expressing continuity between past and present. They thus serve as transitions between the praise-sections ringing the ode (**1-9**; **38-45**) and the core narratives (**13-34**).

(A) Disruption of chronological order occurs between myths (except (4)), and within them (except (2)). (3) is the dominant narrative, since it provides the aetiology for the crown that symbolizes Theron's victory (**6**); begins and ends at temporal transitions between past and present (**13**; **34**); envelops and subordinates (2) and (1) to provide its motivation and solution, respectively. The overall narrative regresses between **9-34** from (3) to (1), with the only progressive elements being (3)(a)(i) and (3)(a)(ii), which integrate (2) and (1) with (3). (4) provides a progressive coda. Although chronological narrative is the Pindaric norm (cf. Nünlist (2007) 240-42, discussing ***O*.3** and *O*.7), *h.l.* is a major departure.

As a basis for discussing the narrative structure, its chronological sequence is reconstructed in the following table (cf. the analyses of Krummen (1990) 237; Nünlist (2007) 240-41):

Chronological Reconstruction		***O*.3.9-38**	
(1)(a) Taygeta dedicates the hind to Artemis.	**11-13**	(3)(e)	H. bids the Hellanodicae crown Olympic victors with olive.
(1)(b) Zeus via Eurystheus makes H. recover the Hind.	**13-15**	(3)(d)	H. transfers the olive from Ister to Olympia.
(1)(c) H.'s quest for the Hind passes through Hyperborea, where he admires the olive trees.	**16**	(3)(c)	H. persuades the Hyperboreans.
(1)(d) H. travels from Arcadia to Ister and is received by Artemis.	**17-18**	(3)(b)	H. requests the olive from the Hyperboreans.
(2) H. dedicates altars to Zeus and establishes the Olympic Games.	**19-22**	(2)	H. dedicates altars to Zeus and establishes the Olympic Games.
(3)(a) Olympia's lack of shade sends H. to Ister, desiring to plant the olive trees at Olympia.	**23-26**	(3)(a)(i)	Olympia's lack of shade sends H. to Ister.
(3)(b) H. requests the olive from the Hyperboreans.	**26-27**	(1)(d)	H. travels from Arcadia to Ister and is received by Artemis.
(3)(c) H. persuades the Hyperboreans.	**28-29**	(1)(b)	Zeus via Eurystheus makes H. recover the Hind.
(3)(d) H. transfers the olive from Ister to Olympia.	**29-30**	(1)(a)	Taygeta dedicates the Hind to Artemis.
(3)(e) H. bids the Hellanodicae crown Olympic victors with olive.	**31-32**	(1)(c)	H.'s quest for the Hind passes through Hyperborea, where he admires the olive trees.
(4)(a) H. entrusts the Olympics' supervision to the Tyndarids.	**33-34**	(3)(a)(ii)	H. desires to plant the olive trees at Olympia.
(4)(b) H. ascends to Olympus.	**34-35**	(4)(c)	H. regularly visits the Olympic festival with the Tyndarids.
(4)(c) H. regularly visits the Olympic festival with the Tyndarids.	**36-38**	(4)(a)	H. entrusts the Olympics' supervision to the Tyndarids.
	36	(4)(b)	H. ascends to Olympus.

Scholars differ over whether Heracles travels to Istria 1x (for the Hind and the olive: Wilamowitz (1922) 137-38; Illig (1932) 58, 66) or 2x (for the Hind, then the olive: Boeckh; Köhnken (1983) 53-54; Verdenius; van den Berge (2007) 37-39). The latter is preferable. Interpretation hinges on 2 key points where P. manipulates expectations. (3)(a)(i) and (3)(a)(ii) are respectively followed and preceded by connecting relatives (**26 ἔνθα**; **33 τῶν**) that imply continuity of both space *and* time, but in fact signify continuity only in space. The following aorists (**27 δέξατ'**; **33 ἔσχεν**) therefore appear to continue the preceding temporal sequence, but in reality break it, a fact that must be deduced from the context of the following locatives. The deliberateness of the misdirection is clear, since P. elsewhere employs e.g. ἔνθα ποτὲ to mark continuity of place *and* discontinuity of time (*O*.7.34, 71; *P*.4.4; fr.dub.333a.9). The process is analysed as follows:

27. A 4-stage comparison with fr.33d demonstrates how the narrative directs expectations: 1 ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάροιθε φορητὰ ~ **23 ἀλλ' οὐ καλὰ δένδρε' ἔθαλλεν** (prior state); 3-5 ὁπότ' ... ἐπέβα νιν ~ **24 ἔδοξεν γυμνὸς αὐτῷ** (triggering event); 5-6 δὴ τότε ... ἀπώρουσαν ~ **25 δὴ τότ' ἐς γαῖαν πορεύεν θυμὸς ὥρμα** (result). The final element is a *subsequent* event in the same location as the result: 9-10 ἔνθα τεκοῖ- | σ' εὐδαίμον' ἐπόψατο γένναν ('*next*, there, after giving birth, she beheld...'). Therefore, **26-27 ἔνθα Λατοῦς ἱπποσόα θυγάτηρ | δέξατ' ἐλθόντ'** would naturally mean '*next*, there, after his arrival, Artemis received him...'. But the following locative **27 Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν** excludes arrival from Olympia, necessitating that a *prior* occasion (as **31-32** confirms) be understood and **27 δέξατ'** rendered as past-in-the-past ('had received').

33. **ἔσχεν** would naturally be taken as past-in-the-past ('had seized'), continuing the preceding sequence of the past-in-the-past aorist **31 ἴδε** and imperfect **32 θάμβαινε**; since at **23-24 δένδρε' ... τούτων** Heracles occupied the same space and time as the trees, this creates the expectation that the same should be true of **32-33 δένδρεα** ... **τῶν**. But the

following locative **33 δωδεκάγναμπτον περὶ τέρμα δρόμου** excludes Heracles' first visit, since the hippodrome did not yet exist, necessitating that a *subsequent* occasion be understood and **33 ἔσχεν** rendered as narrative ('seized'). This directly continues **25-26,** with which it is linked by ring-composition (**25 θυμὸς ὥρμα** ~ **33 γλυκὺς ἵμερος ἔσχεν**).

What is the point of these strikingly-symmetrical misdirections (a past-in-the-past that looks like a narrative and a narrative that looks like a past-in-the-past) bracketing the Hind myth? The answer is multifaceted. Having the narrative's form mimic its content (Heracles' adventures criss-crossing the Earth) elevates a series of individually-unspectacular events into a tour-de-force of poetic artistry. Heightening the difficulty/complexity of Heracles' achievements glorifies both him and his analogue Theron (*v.i.*). Note the secondary ring-composition of **27 καὶ πολυγνάμπτων** ~ **33 δωδεκάγναμπτον**, which are metrically-identical (though not responding), lexically- and semantically-overlapping, and evoke the convolutedness of the enveloped narrative; **δωδεκά-** denotes the chariot-race's laps, but also connotes Heracles' 12 Labours, including the Hind-quest. On a more conceptually-abstract level, the discontinuous narrative makes a profound statement about the difference between normal and mythic time; P. seems to have associated the concept particularly with the Hyperboreans, whose timeless liminality similarly motivates the ambiguous narrative of *P.*10.29-49 (see van den Berge (2007) 31-34).

Van den Berge (2007) 39-41 suggests the structure here neutralizes the transgressive behaviour of the Hind-quest. But violence is suppressed within it (**27**) as in the rest of the myths (**16**). The distinction is not between violence and peace in the quests' conduct, but between compulsion (**28**) and free-will (**25**; **33**) in their motivation. Krummen (1990) 238-39 suggests the non-chronological juxtaposition of (1)(c) and (3)(a)(ii) presents the olive as Heracles' reward for catching the Hind.

(B) As a group, the myths exhibit a complex unity that contributes to the encomium. On one level, the myths are aetiologies for elements of Theron's victory: (3) gives the origin of his crown (**6**), (2) that of the victory-site (**9**), (4) that of the divinities who granted Theron's victory and attend its celebration; (1) is less direct, but nonetheless adds an earlier stage to the olive's origin, and concerns the ancestor of the Tyndarids attending the celebration. These aetiologies deepen the victory's symbolic value through association with valorized places, heroes, and divinities from the mythic past.

The myths also characterize Heracles' career teleologically: (1) is a superhuman feat performed under compulsion (**28**), (2) and (3) are both filial (**19**) and public (**17-18**) benefactions performed voluntarily (**25**; **33**) and without violence (**16**), (4) is his eschatological reward. A similar course is implied for Theron. Like Heracles, he has translated the olive from afar to a place that lacked it (**6** ~ **14**); founded a precinct of Zeus (**44** ~ **19**); reached the limits of achievement (juxtaposed: **43-44**; cf. **9-11**); enjoys the company of the Tyndarids (**39-40** ~ **34-35**); and anticipates translation to a blessed state (***O*.2.68-83** ~ **36**). (1), (3), and (4) exemplify the key theme of spatial/existential permeability. Only (1) is a canonical Labour, although the canon itself was still being fixed: Fowler (2013) 271-74.

Krummen (1990) 239-55 proposes that pre-existing ritual frames enable P. to integrate the disparate narratives (1), (2), (3).

Discussion of individual myths: (1) Hind-quest: **26-32**; (2) Olympic foundation: **19-22**; (3) olive-quest: **9-18**; (4) apotheosis: **34-38**.

9-18 Myth: olive-quest. The narrative raises questions concerning P.'s originality (see **4**) in having Heracles bring the olive to Olympia, and specifically from Hyperborea, and the symbolic/encomiastic significance of doing so.

Both elements have been considered P.'s invention (Köhnken (1983) 55-58; *contra* Robbins (1982) 299-300) due to the paucity of supporting evidence. The only parallel uniting both is Paus.5.7.6-9, where Heracles the Idaean Dactyl brings the olive to Olympia from the Hyperboreans, a passage probably influenced by P.; however, Hubbard (2007) 27-45 argues the Idaean Heracles predated the Theban, and compares the former's Cretan associations with early Cretan olive cultivation and cult. Cf. Krummen (1990) 239-47, who also adduces the Dendrophoria as a pre-existing ritual frame. Cf. folk-tale journeys to the otherworld to retrieve magical objects (Stith-Thompson H.1254).

The olive's Hyperborean origin is the more obscure tradition: a pre-existing connection is suggested only by Hdt.4.34, which mentions the olive-tree over the Hyperborean maidens' tombs at the shrine of Delian Artemis. Arnould (2007) 137 compares the tradition locating the Hesperides, for whose apples Heracles quested, amongst the Hyperboreans. Perseus' otherwise-unknown Hyperborean sojourn at *P.*10.29-46 implies they were a fruitful source of mythic invention. Locating the olive, which requires a temperate climate, in the far North might be a deliberate paradox, motivating Heracles' wonder at trees he did not expect to find there (**32**). But Sfyroeras (2003) 314-16, following Romm (1992) 65-66, rightly argues that **31 πνοιαῖς ὄπιθεν Βορέα** etymologizes the Hyperboreans' name as locating them *behind* the North Wind's source: the Hyperboreans are not only unaffected by it, but enjoy a perpetually-temperate climate.

This origin makes the olive crown a tangible link between the victor and the Hyperboreans. The nature of this link may range from the Hyperboreans symbolizing Theron's achievement in spatial terms (**43-44**), to sharing their utopian bliss with his victory-celebration (**4-9**), to implying a blessed afterlife for him (Robbins (1984) 224-27; Krummen (1990) 255-63; Sfyroeras (2003) 316-21). Brown (1992) 96n.4 considers the last too inexplicit; but ***O.*3**'s thematic and intertextual (see **13-16**) connections to its

companion ode ***O.*2**, where eschatology is prominent, increase its plausibility. Pavlou (2010) 323 notes that the fact that 5th-century Acragas abounded with olive-trees which generated vast trading fortunes creates another bond between it and Hyperborea.

See **13** for possible polemical correction of the Athenian claim to the olive. Detaching the olive from mainland Greek communities in favour of the Hyperboreans facilitates the creation of a Panhellenic foundation-myth for the premier Panhellenic site (Hubbard (2007) 38).

9-13 Universalizing the laudator's obligation to praise Theron *specifically* (**6-9**) by giving the aetiology for the present-day Hellanodicas' crowning of a victor as Heracles' instruction: this sets up the transition to the olive-myth's narrative at **13**. That Theron's specific crowning is not represented here (an act of symbolic significance in epinician: ***I.*2.15-16**) suggests he was not present at Olympia. Contrast Nicomachus being (misleadingly) represented as having been proclaimed by Elean *spondophoroi* when charioteer for this victory (***I.*2.23-24**).

9-10 τᾶς ἄπο | θεόμοροι νίσοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαί: Olympia as source of song (since it is the source of victory): *O.*1.7-8 Ὀλυμπίας ... ὅθεν ... ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται; *O.*13.29 ἐγκώμιον ... ἐκ Πίσας.

10 θεόμοροι: 'divinely-fated': Pindaric only; cf. ***O.*2.21-22 θεοῦ Μοῖρα**. Just as at *P.*5.5 θεόμορ' it describes a victor who achieved fame through the chariot-victory granted by Castor (9 ἕκατι χρυσαρμάτου Κάστορος), so here does it describe the victory-songs glorifying a chariot-victory granted by the Tyndarids (**38-41**).

Parallelism with **7 θεόδματον** underscores the divine origin of both victory-crowns and victory-song.

νίσοντ': see **34 νίσεται**.

νίσοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαί: ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ('amongst men') is an epic phrase, relating 6x (*Il*.10.213; *Il*.24.202; *Od*.1.299; *Od*.14.403; *Od*.19.334; *Od*.24.94) to the dissemination of *kleos*, as here and at *I*.4.9-11 ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἄηται | μαρτύρια ... δόξας.

Contrast *Od*.24.200-1 στυγερὴ ... ἀοιδὴ ... ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους of the Tyndarid (cf. **1**) Clytemnestra's hateful fame.

Epode 1

11 ᾧ τινι: a generalized victor.

κραίνων ἐφετμὰς Ἡρακλέος προτέρας: modern fidelity to Heracles' Olympic foundation: *O*.10.78 ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἑπόμενοι.

κραίνων ἐφετμὰς: of a civil ceremony (contrast *Il*.5.508-9 ἐκραίαινεν ἐφετμὰς, *Il*.15.593 Διὸς δ' ἐτέλειον ἐφετμάς of battle), marginalizing Heracles' violence: see **16**.

ἐφετμὰς: imposed by gods (*P*.2.21; fr.169a.44) or humans (*P*.4.233; *I*.6.18); their fulfilment (*Il*.1.495; *Il*.5.508) and non-fulfilment (*Il*.24.570, 586) are often stressed.

Ἡρακλέος: named alongside Theron here and at **44**, as the originator of his crown and the measure of his achievement, respectively. Patronymic: **14**. See **9-38**.

προτέρας: often of mythic time: *O*.7.72; *O*.10.78; *N*.3.13; cf. ***P*.6.28 πρότερον**.

12 ἀτρεκὴς: applied to truth (*N*.5.17 ἀλάθεἰ' ἀτρεκής), and linked to justice (Hes.fr.43a.40 ἀ]τρεκέως διέθηκ[ε] δίκην; E.fr.91), it suits the Hellanodicae's oath ἐπὶ δικαίῳ ... ποιεῖσθαι | κρίσιν (Paus.5.24.10.3-4). Cases of bias: Romano (2007) 107-9.

Ἑλλανοδίκας: judges/administrators of the Olympic Games/sanctuary (Slowikowski (1989) 133-41; Crowther (1997) 149-60; Romano (2007) 95-113); their name reflects their exclusion of non-Greeks (Hdt.5.22).

The term occurs first here (cf. *IvO*.14.4 τἐλλα[νοδίκας c.475-50). Siewert (1992) 114-15 suggests it replaced the 6th-century term διαιτητής when the judges were granted oversight of the anti-Persian Panhellenic truce in 481: if so, its combination with the archaizing ethnic **Αἰ-τωλὸς** (*v.i.*) is striking.

Here, the Hellanodicas awards the crown personally (cf. B.8.28-30; Ebert no.65): this probably occurred after each event, not at the festival's conclusion (Lee (2001) 69-75).

12-13 γλεφάρων Αἰ-τωλὸς ἀνὴρ ὑψόθεν | ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάλῃ γλαυκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας: B.8.28-30 περὶ κ[ρατί τ' ὀ]πά[σσαι]ς | γλαυκὸν Αἰτωλίδος | ἄνδημ' ἐλαίας.

12 Αἰ-τωλὸς ἀνὴρ: ancient sources represent the relationship between Elis and Aetolia as a cycle of reciprocal invasions/foundations, first from Elis to Aetolia, then Aetolia to Elis: Taita (2000) 147-63; Gehrke (2003) 10-14; Fowler (2013) 130-33. The characterization here of the Elean Hellanodicas as Aetolian (cf. B.8.29-30; Hdt.8.73.8) demonstrates awareness of the latter.

On the one hand, the myth flatters the Eleans by cementing their right to their land as descendants of the original inhabitants as well as through conquest, and by linking them to epic Epeian heroes (Kõiv (2013) 352). On the other hand, here, as elsewhere in P.'s 476 odes, Heracles' foundation of the Olympics excludes epichoric Elean traditions (Hornblower (2004) 113-14 on *O*.10.51): cf. the version in which they were founded by the Aetolian Oxylus (Strab.8.3.30), who became ruler of Elis after guiding the Heracleidae (Σ.*O*.3.22a, b, c, d).

13 ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάλῃ ... κόσμον: *O*.13.37-39 θῆκε κάλλιστ' ἀμφὶ κόμαις; *P*.5.31 γέρας ἀμφέβαλε τεαῖσιν κόμαις; E.*Med*.980-82 ἀμφὶ κόμαι θήσει ... κόσμον.

γλαυκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας: the epithet is a *hapax* (imitated at Nonn.*Dion*.22.72 γλαυκόχροα θαλλὸν ἐλαίης): see **4**.

γλαυκός is the olive's regular epithet, including at Olympia: B.8.29-30; B.11.28-29 ἐλαίᾳ | γλαυκᾷ στεφανωσάμενον; S.*OC*.701; E.*IT*.1101-2; E.*Tro*.801-2; Archestrat.fr.13.7; Nicand.*Theriac*.680; Limenius.*Paean.Delph*.6. LSJ describes a semantic shift from achromatic ('gleaming') in Homer to chromatic by the Hellenistic period. Maxwell-Stuart (1981) renders 'pale blue', rather than 'grey-green'; cf. Deacy & Villing (2004) 85-90. Stewart (2006) 319-44 argues for the early rise of chromatic and emotional meanings ('uncanny': suiting the olive's otherworldiness here).

Attic myth made the olive Athena's gift, a link strengthened by association with her epithet γλαυκῶπις (E.*Tro*.801-803 ἐλαίας ... ἔδειξε κλάδον γλαυκᾶς Ἀθάνα ... στέφανον ... κόσμον Ἀθάναις (implicitly); S.*OC*.701 γλαυκᾶς ... ἐλαίας, 706 γλαυκῶπις Ἀθάνα). P.'s version may be a polemical correction: Sfyroeras (2003) 322.

κόσμον: 'adornment': metaphorically of Olympic victory at *O*.8.83.

ἐλαίας: of the Olympic wreath at *O*.4.11; *O*.11.13; *N*.1.17; B.8.29; B.11.28: see Blech (1982) 127-31. The word may pointedly contrast the wild olive (κότινος) which Heracles is elsewhere said to have brought from the Hyperboreans (Paus.5.7.7.7-9; cf. Ar.*Plut*.586), symbolizing the suppression of Heracles' violence here (see **16**); contrast S.*Tr*.1197 ἄγριον ἔλαιον (wild olive symbolizing Heracles' ferocity).

13-16 τάν ποτε | Ἴστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν παγᾶν ἔνεικεν Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας, | μνᾶμα τῶν Οὐλυμπίᾳ κάλλιστον ἀέθλων, | δᾶμον Ὑπερβορέων πείσαις Ἀπόλλωνος θεράποντα λόγῳ: verbally, syntactically, and thematically paralleling ***O*.2.79-80 Ἀχιλλέα τ' ἔνεικ', ἐπεὶ Ζηνὸς ἦτορ | λιταῖς ἔπεισε, μάτηρ**. Heracles' translation of the olive to Olympia from Hyperborean Ister matches Thetis' translation of the dead Achilles to the Isle: the theme of spatial/existential permeability in Theron's odes is metapoetically enacted by the intertextuality between them.

See **9-18** on the olive's Hyperborean origin.

13 τάν ποτε: myth-introducing relative: ***O*.2.81**. As here, **ποτε** with the relative often emphasizes an ode's *first* transition to myth (*O*.6.13; *O*.9.9; *P*.1.16; *P*.3.5; *P*.4.4; ***P*.6.21**; *P*.9.5; *P*.10.31; *P*.12.6; *N*.4.25; *N*.5.9; *I*.1.13); cf. Pfeijffer on *N*.5.9-10; Braswell on *P*.4.4(a); contrast **29 ἄν ποτε** (finer distinctions within myth).

14 Ἴστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν παγᾶν: the Danube/Ister.

P. conceives the Ister as flowing from the North (*I*.6.23 likewise situates it in Hyperborean territory, employing the Hyperboreans metonymically for it as a mirror-image of the Nile), as is typical in poetry: A.R.4.284-86 Ἴστρον ... πηγαὶ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πνοιῆς βορέαο (beyond the North Wind: **16**; **31**). Ancient views of its sources: Pearson (1934) 328-337.

The Ister's shadiness anticipates the olive's provision of shade (**18 σκιαρόν**) and contrasts the treeless banks of the Alpheus (**23-24**), likewise a child of Ocean (Hes.*Th*.338-39): see **9-18** on its perpetually *temperate* climate. Shade characterizes the terrestrial *locus amoenus* (Davies on S.*Tr*.144-50; Ibyc.S286.5 σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ' ἔρνεσιν; Thgn.2.1252 κρήνην τε ψυχρὴν ἄλσεά τε σκιερά; X.*Oec*.20.18.5 παρὰ κρήναις καὶ ὑπὸ σκιαῖς ἀναπαυόμενός), but also the pious dead's seat (fr.129.4 λιβάνων σκιαρᾶν), and the Underworld's penumbra (Thgn.1.708 σκιερὸν χῶρον ἀποφθιμένων), all compatible with the Hyperboreans' otherworldliness.

ἔνεικεν: the olive as object activates the secondary sense 'win as a prize' (*O*.9.98), comparing Heracles to Theron (**9-38**).

Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας: 6x Hes., 3x P. (*h.l.*; *I*.6.38; fr.dub.346b.10), 3x B. (B.5.85; B.16.15; B.25.25).

The pseudo-patronymic recalls **1 Τυνδαρίδαις**: Heracles was biologically Zeus' son (**19**; **28**; cf. E.*HF*.1-3), as was Polydeuces. P. elsewhere (*O*.6.68 Ἡρακλέης ... θάλος

Ἀλκαϊδᾶν, πατρί; *N*.10.73 Τυνδαρίδας (with 83); *I*.6.38 (with 42)) highlights the illogicality of the epic 'double paternity' trope (Hes.*Th*.316-17 Διὸς υἱὸς ... Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδης; *h.Hom*.17.2 Τυνδαρίδας οἳ Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἐξεγένοντο; *h.Hom*.33.1-2 Διὸς κούρους ... Τυνδαρίδας). The proliferation of pseudo-patronymics in ***O*.3** makes it tempting to see **9 Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ** as hinting at divine ancestry behind Theron's ostensibly-mortal parentage: see ***O*.2.3-7** for his potential claim to descent from Zeus.

Emphasis on Heracles' human father here may sharpen the contrast between his free will in undertaking the olive-quest (**25**; **33**), and the compulsion from his divine father Zeus (**28**) to undertake the Hind-quest.

15 μνᾶμα ... κάλλιστον: the context evokes the substantive's use in dedications (victory-dedication: *CEG*.393.4; with καλός: *CEG*.252) on monuments that commemorated the victory symbolized by the crown; this activates the same connotation in **13 κόσμον** (fr.194.3; Anacr.*Epig*.6.142.1).

Here, the olive is metaphorically a **μνᾶμα**, insofar as Heracles sets it up it permanently at Olympia in memory of his quest to obtain it and his Olympic foundation; unlike a normal monument, being alive and evergreen it perpetually generates fresh crowns. Epinician monument-imagery: ***P*.6.5-6**.

Οὐλυμπίᾳ ... ἀέθλων: *O*.8.1 ἀέθλων, Οὐλυμπία; *N*.11.23 Ὀλυμπία ἀέθλων.

ἀέθλων: regularly of Games; here also connoting Heracles' Labours (*Il*.8.363 Εὐρυσθῆος ἀέθλων; *I*.6.48).

Strophe 2

16 δᾶμον Ὑπερβορέων πείσαις ... λόγῳ: the Hyperboreans are characterized as a *damos* elsewhere at Simias.fr.1.1; A.R.2.674-75. Even in P., **δᾶμον** carries political connotations (*O*.5.14; *P*.1.70) which are amplified by the stress on persuasion (cf. Ar.*Ach*.626 νικᾷ τοῖσι λόγοισιν, καὶ τὸν δῆμον μεταπείθει; also A.*Supp*.623-24 εὐπειθὴς ... δῆμος Πελασγῶν; X.*Hell*.1.7.6.7 ἔπειθον τὸν δῆμον): *v.i.*

Ὑπερβορέων: etymologized at **31** as 'beyond the North Wind'. Cf. *h.Hom*.7.29; Hes.fr.150.21; *P*.10.30; *I*.6.23; fr.52i.63; B.3.59; Hdt.4.32-26; Bridgman (2005); Fowler (2013) 606-7.

πείσαις ... λόγῳ: A.*Ag*.1052 πείθω νιν λόγωι; Th.3.37.2.3; S.*Ph*.593-94 λόγῳ | πείσαντες ἄξειν, ἢ πρὸς ἰσχύος κράτος.

Pleonasm suggests a paradox is intended with Heracles' often violent behaviour. P. idealizes Heracles generally (to Verdenius' bibliography, add Swift (2011) 391-413), but there may be a more specific intention. Heracles may have seized the olive by force in an earlier version (Heimsoeth (1847) 6): such corrections are Pindaric (see **27**), but P. could equally have disguised his invention by presenting it as a 'correction' of a non-existent antecedent. Krummen (1990) 241 connects Heracles' *politesse* to ritual importuning in dendritic cult.

Since Heracles parallels Theron (**9-38**), mitigating the former's brutality would topically ameliorate the latter's public image after his diametrically-opposite treatment of the Himeraean δᾶμος: mass execution of rebellious citizens c.476 (D.S.11.48.6-8).

Ἀπόλ-λωνος θεράποντα: evoking Apollo's regular sojourns amongst the Hyperboreans, his devoted worshippers: *P.*10.34-36; B.3.58-59; Call.*Aet.*fr.186.8-10; A.R.2.674-75; Bilić (2012) 509-532 (metaphor for annual solar motion).

17 πιστὰ φρονέων: 'with a trustworthy attitude'. Contrast A.fr.399.1-2.

17-18 Λιὸς ... ἄλσει: ***I.*2.27-28 Ὀλυμπίου Λιός | ἄλσος**.

17 Διὸς: named only here in the ode, as god of Olympia (***O.*2.3**). Whereas he dominates ***O.*2**, his function here is restricted to characterizing Heracles' olive-quest (*h.l.*), Olympic foundation (**19 πατρὶ**), and Hind-quest (**28 πατρόθεν**), as acts of filial piety. Zeus' marginalization creates space for the Tyndarids' special role as Olympic overseers (**36-38**).

πανδόκῳ: conveying Olympia's Panhellenic status (*P.*8.61: Delphi), and readiness to receive the olive. Elsewhere it connotes *xenia* (*O.*4.15; A.*Ch.*662), re-activating the concept of the Tyndarids as Olympic hosts: **1**.

18 ἄλσει σκιαρόν τε φύτευμα: contrast *O.*8.9 Πίσας εὔδενδρον ἐπ' Ἀλφεῷ ἄλσος. Precincts typically possessed trees (fr.52s.2 πεφυτευμένον ἄ[λσος; Hdt.2.138.11-12 ἄλσος | δενδρέων μεγίστων πεφυτευμένον περὶ; X.*A.*5.3.12.2; Pl.*Leg.*947e.2) and shade (*Od.*20.278 ἄλσος ὕπο σκιερὸν; *h.Hom.*5.20; Thgn.2.1252; E.*IT.*1246). Cf. Luc.*Ver.Hist.*2.13.2-3 φυτοῖς ἡμέροις τε καὶ σκιεροῖς (Isle).

ἄλσει: the Altis, Olympia's sacred walled enclosure: see Scott (2010) 146-80 on its development.

σκιαρόν: see **14 σκιαρᾶν**.

φύτευμα: 34 φυτεῦσαι. See Krummen (1990) 245-46 on φυτεύειν in a law from Dreros concerning transition to full citizenship.

ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις στέφανόν τ' ἀρετᾶν: juxtaposing the olive's public/communal (shade) and private/elite (victory-crown) functions; cf. **33-34**.

ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις: Archil.fr.110 ξυνὸς ἀνθρώποις Ἄρης; Thgn.1.1006; B.10.12 (victory-ode); E.fr.346.1 (law); S.*Ant*.1023-24 (error). Heracles as mankind's benefactor: E.*HF*.1252 εὐεργέτης βροτοῖσι.

στέφανόν τ' ἀρετᾶν: deeds of excellence produce crowns: E.*Tro*.223 καρύσσεσθαι στεφάνοις ἀρετᾶς (of Sicilian Panhellenic victories); cf. δι' ἀρετὴν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐστεφανωμένους.

19-22 Myth: Heracles' Olympic foundation.

P. uniformly attributes the Olympics' foundation to Heracles: ***O*.2.3-4**; *h.l.*; *O*.6.67-69; *O*.10.24-77; *N*.10.32-33; *N*.11.27. Competing accounts: Nelson (2003) 47-58; Stafford (2012) 160-63. Historical origins: Instone (2007) 71-82. Hubbard (2007) 27-45 argues the Idaean Heracles predated the Theban (see **9-18**), and explains P.'s consistency as a preference for Panhellenic versions with a Dorian bias (cf. **5 Δωρίῳ**); however, although the former may well be an Elean version, it is more probably a reaction to the Theban Heracles than a precursor. The concentration of Olympic foundation myths in P.'s 476 odes for Magna Graecia victors is due less to a lack of local myth than to a desire to bolster Western states' connection to the mainland. This was crucial in the first post-Persian Wars Olympics, which were a venue of political contestation about the war effort, to which the Western states had not contributed: Morgan (2015) 138-39. The foundation-myth also parallels Theron, whose Olympieum could be considered a parallel foundation of an *alsos* to Zeus in Acragas (see **44**). Incorporating Olympia's landmarks and divinities appropriates their symbolic capital: Eckerman (2013) 3-33; cf. ***P*.6.1-18**.

Whereas at ***O*.2.3-4** and *O*.10.24-77 Heracles' military conquest precedes the foundation, it is elided here in line with the ode's eschewal of violence: **16**; **27**.

19 ἤδη: colouring the following aorists (**20**; **22**) as past-in-the-past; accentuating the familiarity of conventional elements of Heracles' foundation (altars; date; judges; quadrennial cycle; site) to highlight the innovation of noticing the lack of trees (**23-24**).

αὐτῷ: the descriptions of Olympia and Ister are secondarily-focalized through Heracles: cf. **24**; **31**; **32**.

πατρὶ: responsion: **9 παιδὶ**. See **14 Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας**.

πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἁγι-σθέντων: the Altis contained Zeus' great altar, a 7m-high ash-mound built up through centuries of sacrifices (Schleif (1934) 139-56), on which occurred the festival's central ritual, a hecatomb-sacrifice. Paus.5.15.10 records over 70 others to various gods, and Heracles was said to have established 6 double-altars there (Herodor.*FGH*.31.F34a; *O*.5.5; *O*.10.25), with one pair dedicated to Zeus and Poseidon.

Here, exclusion of other gods aggrandizes Zeus and characterizes the action as filial devotion (cf. *O*.10.45 υἱὸς σταθμᾶτο ζάθεον ἄλσος πατρὶ; **17**), although the poetic plural hints at the misdirection. Heracles' habit of establishing altars to Zeus as his father: fr.inc.140a.64 βωμὸν πατρί; S.*Tr*.753-54 πατρῴῳ Διὶ | βωμοὺς ὁρίζει.

In fact, the historical cult of Zeus is attested from the early 10th century by terracotta figurines, and thus long predated the Olympics (Morgan (1990) 26).

19-20 διχόμηνις ὅλον χρυσάρματος | ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα: indicating the Olympic festival's timing, underscored by *figura etymologica*: **διχόμηνις** ... **Μήνα**. The lines mirror *O*.10.73-75 ἐν δ' ἕσπερον | ἔφλεξεν εὐώπιδος | σελάνας ἐρατὸν φάος (likewise stanza-final) of the first Games, which were thereafter held on the 2nd or 3rd full moon ('mid-month') after the summer solstice. A quadrennial cycle (**21 πενταετηρίδ'**) generates an Olympiad every 49 or 50 lunar-months (Σ.*O*.3.35g; cf. Hannah (2005) 37-40; B.7.2-3 πεντήκοντα μηνῶν ἁμέραν ἑκ- | καιδεκάταν ἐν Ὀλυμπ[ίᾳ), matching the 50

daughters Selene bore Endymion, king of Elis (Paus.5.1.4.1-3; cf. Sapph.fr.199). Variants of this myth (Bremmer (2009) 305-6) make Endymion the father of Aetolus (see **12 Αἰτωλὸς**), and son of Aethlius (cf. **21 ἀέθλων**). The moon, like the olive, was an eternal aspect of Olympia.

The syntax is ambiguous. **ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν** has been taken as 'eye of evening = moon' (Verdenius; Braswell on *P*.4.40(a)), on the basis of similar metaphors for the sun (S.*Ant*.104 ἁμέρας βλέφαρον; Ar.*Nu*.285 ὄμμα ... αἰθέρος), moon (A.*Sept*.388-90 φλέγονθ' ... πανσέληνος ... νυκτὸς ὀφθαλμός), and night (E.*Ph*.543 νυκτός τ' ἀφεγγὲς βλέφαρον; A.*Pers*.428 κελαινὸν νυκτὸς ὄμμ'; E.*IT*.110 νυκτὸς ὄμμα λυγαίας).

But (1) unlike at A.*Sept*.388-90, **ὀφθαλμὸν** is the object acted upon by the personified Moon, not an apposition: its disc is imagined as a part of itself (Egyptian New Kingdom texts identify the Eye of Horus with the mid-month moon: Priskin (2002) 75-76); (2) the idiom is unparalleled with **ἑσπέρας**; (3) parallels indicate 'in the evening': esp. *h.Hom*.32.8 Σελήνη | ζευξαμένη πώλους ἐριαύχενας αἰγλήεντας ... ἐλάσῃ καλλίτριχας ἵππους | ἑσπερίη διχόμηνος; *O*.10.73-75; also *I*.8.44 διχομηνίδεσ-σιν ... ἑσπέραις; Ar.*Nub*.613-14 ἑσπέρας ... φῶς Σεληναίης; X.*Hell*.1.6.1.1 σελήνη ἐξέλιπεν ἑσπέρας. Therefore, render **ἑσπέρας** as genitive of time within which.

διχόμηνις ... Μήνα: the mid-month was significant in the Vedic, Celtic, Babylonian, Greek, and Roman calendars (O'Neil (1975) 44-45). Greek festivals celebrated then may have included the Eleusinian Mysteries and Spartan Carneia; cf. des Bouvrie (2004) 377 on the full moon in relation to community renewal.

Cf. B.9.29 διχομήνιδο[ς] ... σελάνα (victor outshining competitors); E.*Ion*.1155-56 πανσέληνος ... μηνὸς διχήρης; Arat.*Phaen*.1.78 διχόμηνι σελήνη.

19 ὅλον: the moon's fullness was how the mid-month was determined.

χρυσάρματος: elsewhere only *P*.5.9 (Castor); *I*.6.19 (Aeacids); B.13.157 (Athena). Since gold is characteristic of gods (see ***I.2.1***), golden chariots usually belong to them: *h.Hom*.2.431 ἅρμασι χρυσείοισι (Hades); *h.Hom*.9.4 (Artemis); *h.Hom*.31.15 (Helios); Sapph.1.8-9 (Aphrodite); *P*.9.6-6a (Apollo); Call.*Hymn*.3.111 (Artemis); *RV*.1.35.2.2 (Savitar: solar deity); 4.44.4.1 (Aśvins); 6.29.2.1 (Indra). Two exceptions relate to Pelops' Olympic chariot-victory: *O*.1.87 δίφρον τε χρύσεον (from Poseidon); S.*El*.510 (Myrtilus). Cf. **42**.

Gold also evokes the moon's radiance here: Sim.fr.76.3 χρυσέας τε σελάνας; E.*Ph*.176; Maxim.*Peri.Catarch*.5.81.

The Moon-charioteer image (*h.Hom*.32.8-11; E.*Supp*.991-92; E.fr.1108; Theocr.*Id*.21.19; Nonn.*Dion*.2.405) at the Games it opens parallels Theron's chariot-victory (**33-34**; **37-38**). The pedestal of Zeus' throne at Olympia depicted Selene driving a horse (Paus.5.11.8).

20 e – e – e – chiastically mirrors the first half of **19** (– e – e – e), stylistically enacting the Moon's reflection (**ἀντέφλεξε**) of Heracles' gaze.

ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα: *O*.10.74-75 ἔφλεξεν ... σελάνας; A.*Sept*.388-89 φλέγονθ' ... πανσέληνος.

The moon's response may be sexually connotative (A.fr.243.1-2 νέας γυναικὸς ... φλέγων | ὀφθαλμός, ἥτις ἀνδρὸς ᾗ γεγευμένη), evoking Selene's seduction of Endymion: see **19-20**; cf. **24**.

ἀντέφλεξε: *hapax*. Either 'shone *in his face*' or 'reflected' (Plut.*De.Facie.in.Orb.Lun*.936b.3 σελήνης τὴν ἀντίλαμψιν).

Μήνα: a minor goddess (*h.Hom*.32.1; Hes.*Th*.371-74; Préaux (1973)), also named Selene; cf. **19-20** for her links to Elis. Her traditional pairing with Helios is reflected at **24**.

Antistrophe 2

21 μεγάλων ἀέθλων: 'the great Games' (Bissinger (1966) 213, 311-13): *N*.1.11 μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων (Nemean); *O*.6.68-69 Ἡρακλέης ... πατρί | ἑορτάν τε κτίσῃ πλειστόμβροτον τε-θμόν τε μέγιστον ἀέθλων (Olympic); also *O*.5.5-6 (Olympic).

E.fr.740.2-3 μεγάλων | ἄθλων indicates a potential ambiguity with Heracles' Labours. Cf. **15 ἀέθλων**.

ἀέθλων ... κρίσιν: *pace* Verdenius, 'judging' (cf. **12 Ἑλλανοδίκας**), rather than 'trial': *O*.7.80 κρίσις ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις; *P*.4.253 ἀέθλοις ...κρίσιν (but see Braswell); *N*.10.23; S.*El*.682-84.

21-23 ἀέθλων ἁγνὰν κρίσιν ... ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημνοῖς Ἀλφεοῦ ... Πέλοπος: ~ B.11.24-26 ζαθέοις ἁγ- | νοῦ Πέλοπος δαπέδοις | Ἀλφεὸν παρὰ. Also **6 χαίταισι ... στέφανοι**, **13 γλαυκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας**, **17 πανδόκῳ** ~ B.11.28-29 παγξένῳ χαίταν ἐλαίᾳ | γλαυκᾷ στεφανωσάμενον.

Cf. ***O*.2.13 ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν πόρον τ' Ἀλφεοῦ**.

21 ἁγνὰν: 'sacred-pure' (Burkert (1985) 271): cf. Braswell on *P*.4.103(e); *Od*.21.258-59 (festival); **19 ἁγι-σθέντων**.

πενταετηρίδ': 'quadrennial festival': **19-20**. Of Heracles' Olympic foundation: *O*.10.57; *N*.11.27 πενταετηρίδ' ἑορτὰν Ἡρακλέος τέθμιον.

22 θῆκε: of Heracles' Olympic foundation: *O*.6.69; *N*.10.32-33 Πίσα | Ἡρακλέος τεθμόν; *N*.11.27.

ζαθέοις: 'numinous' (West on Hes.*Th*.3). Often of sacred places, including Games-sites (*O*.10.45; B.11.24); here, signifying the immanent river-god Alpheus in particular.

22-23 These key Olympic landscape features are strikingly concentrated in the 476 odes: their textual collocation replicates their geographical proximity.

Ἀλφεοῦ ... Κρονίου Πέλοπος: B.5.178-81 Κρονίδαν ... Ἀλφεόν, Πέλοπός.

Ἀλφεοῦ ... Πέλοπος: *O*.1.20-24 Ἀλφεῷ ... Πέλοπος, 92-95 Ἀλφεοῦ ... Πέλοπος; B.5.181; B.8.27-31; B.11.25-26.

Ἀλφεοῦ ... Κρονίου: *O*.5.17-18 Κρόνιόν ... λόφον ... Ἀλφεὸν; *O*.10.48-50 Ἀλφεοῦ ... πάγον | Κρόνου; also ***O*.2.12-13 Κρόνιε ... κορυφὰν ... Ἀλφεοῦ**; B.5.178-81. Cronus and Alpheus possessed Olympic altars (see **19**).

22 Ἀλφεοῦ: see ***O*.2.13**.

23 The assertion that Olympia lacked trees before Heracles is polemical: *O*.10.49-51 similarly counters Elean claims that an ancient Cronus-cult on the Hill antedated the Games (Hornblower (2004) 113-15). Krummen (1990) 242 refers to 'das große Noch-Nicht' when a key ingredient is missing before the ritual can begin.

καλὰ δένδρε' ἔθαλλεν: responsion: **18 σκιαρόν τε φύτευμα**. Cf. **32 δένδρεα**.

Trees were characteristic of Olympia: *O*.8.9 Πίσας εὔδενδρον ἐπ' Ἀλφεῷ ἄλσος; *N*.11.25 εὐδένδρῳ ... ὄχθῳ Κρόνου (cf. 27 on Heracles' Olympic foundation). Arnould (2007) 138 compares the splendid trees of eschatological/Golden Age descriptions; cf. *h.Hom*.5.270 δένδρεα καλά (sacred trees in symbiosis with mountain-nymphs). The epithet probably references the καλλιστέφανος tree, from which olive-crowns were created (Σ.*O*.8.1d; Paus.5.15.3; Arist.*de mir.ausc*. 51).

ἔθαλλεν: ostensibly intransitive (*A.P*.7.153.2 δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ), until **χῶρος** requires **δένδρε'** to be cognate accusative *para prosdokian*.

χῶρος ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος: word-order precludes Race's 'land of Pelops in the vales of Kronos' hill' (*pace* Σ.*O*.3.41f). The question is whether **Κρονίου** is (1)

substantival ('Hill of Cronus'), taken with **βάσσαις** (Σ.*O*.3.41b: Aristarchus); (2) adjectival ('Cronian'), taken with **Πέλοπος** (Boeckh). (1) is preferable, although (2) would still imply it: see ***O*.2.12**.

(1) The 123m-high Hill dominates Olympia (*O*.1.111; *O*.5.17; *O*.6.64; *O*.8.17; *O*.9.3; *O*.10.49-50); *O*.9.9-10 makes it Hippodameia's dowry to Pelops; it is well-wooded (*N*.11.25 εὐδένδρῳ ... ὄχθῳ Κρόνου); the formula οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης (esp. *Il*.11.87-88 οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃσιν ... δένδρεα) is formally parallel.

(2) Pelops was Kronos' great-grandson via Zeus (E.*Or*.1-11), or grandson via the nymph Plouto (Σ.*O*.3.41c, d): cf. *Il*.2.102-4 (Zeus' sceptre passed down to Pelops). The context of fr.52wb.7]Κ]ρονίου Πέλοπος does not indicate the Hill; juxtaposition with the proper noun makes genealogical interpretation more natural (E.*Rh*.36 Κρονίου Πανὸς).

Κρονίου: the Hill lies to the NE of the Altis; its base was the ritual centre of Olympia's oldest cults (Scott (2010) 146-57). At *O*.10.49-51, Heracles is said to have named it, displacing earlier traditions of Cronus' cult there (*v.s.*), which date back to the 8th century (Morgan (1990) 287). See Eckerman (2013) 16-19 on its symbolic connotations.

Πέλοπος: *pace* Verdenius, not just a circumlocution for the Peloponnese: except for *N*.2.21, P. names Pelops only in Olympian odes, in relation to his chariot-victory and cult (*O*.1.24, 94; *h.l.*; *O*.9.9; *O*.10.24). Juxtaposition with **Κρονίου** (*v.s.*) evokes his physical manifestation in the landscape, the Pelopeion, W of Zeus' ash altar (**19**). The Pelopeion re-used a Bronze Age tumulus, and *O*.10.24-25 represents its antiquity by having it predate Heracles' foundation of the Games, as it implicitly does here (Eckerman (2013) 25-27). However, the cult itself may be as recent as the 6th century (Kyrieleis (2002) 219). Theron is thus linked to the mythic precursor of Olympic chariot-victory: Pelops' hero-cult (*O*.1.90-93), which in *O*.1 foreshadows Hieron's posthumous cult (Currie (2005) 75), may imply the same for Theron; like Heracles and the Tyndarids, Pelops was a hero connected

with the Olympics who transcended mortality. The possibility that *O*.1.90-92 indicates Pelops receives *theoxenia* (Ekroth (2002) 178) links him to the theoxenic context here (**1-4**). Like Heracles and the Tyndarids (**34-35**), he is a hero from Olympia's past still active in its present.

Both Pelops and Heracles would appear on the sculptures of the Olympic Temple of Zeus (Scott (2010) 184).

24 Heracles' planting of Olympia is characterized as sexual domination (thwarting Helios') both here (**γυμνὸς**; **κᾶπος**; **ὀ-ξείαις ... αὐγαῖς**; **ὑπακουέμεν**) and at **33-34** (**γλυκὺς ἵμερος**; **φυτεῦσαι**): Eckerman (2013) 20-23; cf. ***P*.6.1-4**.

γυμνὸς: besides obvious sexual connotations (*v.s.*), perhaps playing on athletic nudity (*P*.11.49).

αὐτῷ: secondary focalization: **19 <u>αὐτῷ</u>**.

κᾶπος: oxymoronic with **γυμνὸς** (*Od*.4.737 <u>κῆπον</u> ἔχει <u>πολυδένδρεον</u>). P.'s literal uses all signify the precinct of a local god/hero (*P*.9.53; *P*.5.24; *h.l.*). Sexual connotations of gardens: Heirman (2012) 96-99.

ὀ-ξείαις ... αὐγαῖς ἀελίου: *Il*.17.371-72 <u>αὐγὴ</u> | <u>ἠελίου</u> <u>ὀξεῖα</u>; Thgn.1.426 <u>αὐγὰς</u> <u>ὀξέος</u> <u>ἠελίου</u>; A.R.1312-13 <u>ὀξύταται</u> θέρον <u>αὐγαί</u> | <u>ἠελίου</u>; also *Il*.14.344-45 <u>Ἠέλιός</u> ... <u>ὀξύτατον</u> πέλεται φάος. The sharpness of Helios' rays connotes penetration.

ὑπακουέμεν: implying subjection.

ἀελίου: personified by the surrounding sexualized imagery (*v.s.*), and the personification of Helios' counterpart **20 Μήνα** (cf. Emped.fr.40.4).

The imagery makes Helios a sexual rival of Heracles for Olympia, activating their rivalry elsewhere. Thus **αὐγαῖς ἀελίου** may allude to <u>Augeas</u> as son of Helios (Theocr.25.54; Paus.5.1.9), on whom Heracles took revenge (*O*.10.34-42: immediately

followed by Heracles' Olympic foundation) for cheating him of his reward for cleaning his stables, a Labour accomplished by diverting the Alpheus (**22 Ἀλφεοῦ**). Helios facilitated Heracles' Labour to steal Geryon's cattle after Heracles threatened him with his bow for heating him excessively (Apollod.2.5.10; cf. Pherecydes.fr.18a; Davies (2014b) 279-82); here, Helios' excessive heat at Olympia motivates Heracles' journey North.

25 δὴ τότ': epic, almost always verse-initial; inferential (see **9-38**).

ἐς γαῖαν: epic, often of journeys to *Randvölker*: *Il*.23.206 (Aethiopians); *Od*.5.35 (Phaeacians)

πορεύεν θυμὸς ὥρμα: *Anachars.Epist*.2.18 κελεύει θυμὸς πορεύεσθαι.

θυμὸς ὥρμα: the epic **θυμὸς** frequently urges/commands: *Il*.13.73-74; *Od*.1.275; *Od*.4.713 θυμὸς ἐφωρμήθη ἴμεν ἐς Πύλον; Arist.*mag.mor*.2.6.25.3 ὥρμησεν ὁ θυμὸς. Ring-composition with **38 θυμὸς ὀτρύνει** parallels hero and laudator.

Heracles' impulsive initiation of the olive-quest here is underscored by another ring-composition with **33 γλυκὺς ἵμερος ἔσχεν** of the same impulse. Both contrast the Hind-quest's compulsion: see **28**.

On the θυμός, see ***O*.2.89**.

Epode 2

26 Ἰστρίαν: 14 Ἴστρου. Stanzaic enjambement stylistically enacts the distance Heracles travels. Ister and Alpheus (**22**) are kin as children of Tethys and Oceanus (Hes.*Th*.337-39), implicitly linking Olympia and Hyperborea. Alpheus similarly connects distant places to Olympia in *O*.6 and *N*.1: Eckerman (2013) 8-11.

26-32 Myth: Hind-quest.

The ode's earliest mythic kernel is its only canonical Labour, attested before P. in Peisander and in iconography perhaps as early as the 8th century (Stafford (2012) 35-36; Fowler (2013) 271-74, 277-78).

Here, the myth's structural function is to explain Heracles' knowledge of the Hyperborean olive's location (**31-32**). Extending the chase to Hyperborea may therefore be an innovation (Köhnken (1983) 55-56), although the Hind's possession of horns is consonant with the biology of the reindeer, which inhabits northern climes (**29**), and Artemis has Hyperborean connections (**26**). Krummen (1990) 247-55 characterizes the myth of Taygeta's dedication of the Hind and Heracles' pursuit as cultic patterns of pre-marital initiation for girls and boys, respectively, over both of which Artemis presides (**29-30**). Taygeta's status as ancestor of Helen and the Tyndarids (Paus.4.2.1) links the myths' earliest component to the present celebration.

26 ἔνθα: unusually marking geographical but not chronological continuity without a temporal modifier to clarify the latter: **9-38**.

26 Λατοῦς ἱπποσόα θυγάτηρ: Artemis: fr.89a.2-3 Λατώ | καὶ θοᾶν ἵππων ἐλάτειραν.

Artemis intercepts Heracles here as the Hind's dedicatee *qua* Orthia/Orthosia (**30**). Her presence in Hyperborea is on one level the concomitant of relocating the Hind-quest there (**26-32**). However, she does have pre-existing connections. Epode-initial **26 Ἰστρίαν ... Λατοῦς ... θυγάτηρ** mirrors strophe-initial **16 Ὑπερβορέων ... Ἀπόλ-λωνος**, creating a link with her brother's Hyperborean sojourns. The matronymic (cf. B.5.124 Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ) reinforces the point: Arist.*Hist.Animal*.580a.116-19 has the pregnant Leto travel to Delos *from the Hyperboreans* (where she was born: Hecat.*FGH*.3a.264.F.7.10) to bear Apollo and Artemis. In addition to Artemis' relationship to the myth's cultic frame (**26-32**), Krummen (1990) 253-54 notes the tradition of Orthia's cult-image originating amongst the northern Taurians.

ἱπποσόα: highlighting Theron's chariot-victory (she drives a chariot at *h.Hom*.9.3-4), and reflecting Artemis' iconography (Massa-Pairault (1999) 106-7) and cult: Σ.*N*.1.*Inscr*.b attests a Syracusan cult of Artemis Hippike, credited at *P*.2.5-8 with helping Hieron train his horses; equestrian votives were Artemis Orthia's (**30**) most common dedications (Hooker (1980) 52-53, 94; similar offerings to Helen at Therapne: **1**).

27 δέξατ': Devereux (1966) 289-98 plausibly sees ambiguity between the friendly and hostile (LSJ.s.v.II.2 'receive as an enemy') senses as the self-conscious suppression of a violent encounter (cf. **16**; *O*.9.29-41) between Heracles and Apollo and/or Artemis over the Hind on the basis of literary/iconographic parallels (add Camerata Scovazzo (1993-94) 1436-40); contrast D.S.4.13.1.7, who claims this Labour was performed ἄνευ βίας. As the Hind's dedicatee (**30**), Artemis would naturally be hostile, since she both hunts and protects deer, and does not suffer slights/lost offerings with equanimity: S.*El*.568-70 with Finglass; B.5.97-110; Call.*Hymn*.3.124, 260-67; Call.*Aet*.fr.96.1-2 Θεοὶ πάντες κομποῖς νεμεσήμονες, ἐκ δέ τε πάντων | Ἄρτεμις; Ov.*Her*.20.99-100 *nihil est uiolentius illa* | *cum sua ... numina laesa uidet*. There is little reason for a friendly reception unless Heracles comes to Hyperborea a 3rd (!) time to return the Hind.

Apollod.2.81-82 strikingly parallels P.'s diction, but diverges in content: 82.1 διὰ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ~ **27 Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν**; 81.2-3 ἔλαφος ἐν | Οἰνόῃ, χρυσόκερως, Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερά ~ **29 χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον**, **30 Ὀρθωσίας ἔγραψεν ἱεράν**; 82.3-4 ὑποτιμησάμενος τὴν ἀνάγκην ... αἴτιον εἰπὼν Εὐρυσθέα ~ **28 ἀγγελίαις | Εὐρυσθέος ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα πατρόθεν**. There, Heracles is intercepted en route to Eurystheus in Mycenae after capturing the Hind in Arcadia; here, the Hind leads Heracles from Arcadia to the Ister, where Artemis meets him after (by implication) he captured it there. There, Artemis criticizes Heracles for trying to kill her sacred animal and attempts to retake it, but Heracles escapes retribution by pleading necessity and Eurystheus' agency; here, no

connection is made between Aphrodite's apparently warm welcome and the Labour's necessity.

The simplest explanation for this phenomenon is that Apollodorus imitated P.'s phrasing whilst eliding his innovations (the journey to Ister; Artemis' favourable reception), but his reason for doing so is opaque; perhaps both drew on a common source that included a confrontation.

Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν: i.e. not from Elis, but having tracked the Hind from its home in Arcadia, where the tradition associates it with various locations: Mt. Ceryneia (Apollod.2.81); Mt. Parthenius (Ov.*Met*.9.188); Mt. Maenalus (Sen.*HF*.222). **δειρᾶν** evokes mountain-glens (*O*.9.59 Μαιναλίαισιν ἐν δειραῖς).

πολυγνάμπτων: evoking the complexity of landscape and narrative: Nonn.*Dion*.11.399 πολυγνάμπτου ποταμοῖο; *A.P*.9.191.1 πολυγνάμπτοις λαβυρίνθοις. See **9-38**; cf. **33**.

28 The distinction between Heracles performing the canonical Labour under compulsion here, but other exploits of his own free will (**25**; **33**), is attested by Paus.3.17.3.2-3 πολλὰ μὲν τῶν ἄθλων Ἡρακλέους, πολλὰ δὲ ... ἐθελοντὴς κατώρθωσε; cf. Epicharm.fr.7.3-4; A.R.1.130-31 αὐτὸς δ' ᾗ ἰότητι παρὲκ νόον Εὐρυσθῆος | ὡρμήθη (Heracles defying Eurystheus to join the Argonauts). Heracles is presented as a benefactor of mankind even when not obligated: cf. his choice of toil at X.*Mem*.2.1.21-34. *V.i.*

εὖτέ: temporal in archaic Greek; the causal sense (S.*OC*.84) would explain Artemis' welcome of Heracles as acceptance of his plea of compulsion (see **27**).

νιν: retention despite unanimous MSS μιν: Braswell on *P*.4.79(e); *contra* Pfeijffer on *N*.5.31.

ἀγγελίαις Εὐρυσθέος: Eurystheus, variously king of Mycenae, Tiryns, and Argos, commanded Heracles via his messenger Copreus: *Il*.15.639-40 Εὐρυσθῆος ... ἀγγελίης

οἴχνεσκε βίῃ Ἡρακληείῃ; cf. *h.Hom*.15.5 πομπῆσιν ὕπ' Εὐρυσθῆος; E.*HF*.553 Εὐρυσθέως κήρυκες ἤγγελλον, 580 Εὐρυσθέως πομπαῖσι, 1278 ἐντολαῖς Εὐρυσθέως. Here, Eurystheus is represented as an agent of Zeus' compulsion (*v.i.*).

ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα: Thgn.1.195-96 ἀνάγκη | ἐντύνει; contrast **25**; **38**.

Heracles' subjection to necessity: E.*HF*.1281; Epicharm.fr.7.3 ἀνάγκαι ταῦτα πάντα ποιέω.

ἀνάγκα πατρόθεν: fr.93.2 ἀνάγκᾳ Ζεὺς πατήρ. Zeus' role in originating the Labour can be variously explained. (1) The compulsion is unwilling: Zeus' oath, tricked from him by Hera, ensured Eurystheus would rule and impose the Labours on Heracles (Fowler (2013) 260). (2) Zeus desires Heracles to complete the Labours to benefit mankind and win immortality (Fowler (2013) 271). Zeus' (failed) pursuit of Taygeta (see **29-30**), for which she dedicated the Hind, personally connects him to this Labour. The Stoic Epictet.*Diatr*.2.16.42-46 characterizes Heracles' performance of his Labours as filial obedience: cf. **17**; **19**.

Contrast **14 Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας** of Heracles acting on his own initiative.

29-30 Taygeta's dedication of the Hind to Artemis explains the goddess' special interest in Heracles' quest (**26-27**). **30 ἀντιθεῖσ'** suggests awareness of versions where Taygeta was transformed into a hind by Artemis, whether to save her from Zeus (Σ.*O*.3.53c, d), or out of jealousy (E.*Hel*.382 χρυσοκέρατ' ἔλαφον: identified as Taygeta by Robinson (2006) 151-72), and dedicated the Hind when human again (on the Hind's paradoxical continuing existence, cf. Fowler (2013) 278). Krummen (1990) 247-255 relates these myths to rituals initiating girls into adulthood/marriage, esp. at the temple of Artemis Limnatis near Mount Taygetus (Paus.4.4.2; Strab.6.3.3; Strab.8.4.9), and of Artemis Orthia in Sparta (from which Theseus abducts Taygeta's descendant Helen: **30**; **1**); iconography collocates Artemis and hinds in similar initiatory contexts. Thus Taygeta's dedication is a substitute-

sacrifice that mirrors the votives girls offered on leaving temple service for marriage; Heracles' pursuit is itself an initiatory *dromos*.

29 χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον: similarly described in other attestations of the Labour: E.fr.740.2 χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον (Euripides' *Temenidae*); Call.*Hymn*.3.100-2 (cf. 107-9); D.S.4.13.1-2 χρυσόκε- | ρων ... ἔλαφον; Apollod.2.81.2-3; Nonn.*Dion*.223; *Anth.Graec*.16.92 χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον; cf. E.*Hel*.382. This represents a supernatural version either of the sacrificial practice of gilding horns (*Il*.10.294 χρυσὸν κέρασιν), since the Hind was a dedication (**30**), or the practice of attaching false horns to a ritual costume (Fowler (2013) 278).

θήλειαν: pleonastically (**29 ἄν**) underscoring the peculiarity of a *female* deer possessing antlers (Arist.*Hist.Anim*.538b.18-19 κέρα- | τα ἔλαφος θήλεια οὐκ ἔχει). Since most earlier poetry (Σ.*O*.3.50b) and iconography (Boeotian fibula c.700BC: Bates (1911) 1-17) make the Hind female, it may originally have been imagined as a reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*: Meuli (1960) 125-139), the only cervid with antlered females, which ventured further south in antiquity than its current arctic/sub-arctic habitat (Arist.*de.mir.ausc*.832b.7-16; Theophrast.fr.172; Clutton-Brock (1981) 160-66). This explains (1) an 'Arcadian' (**27**) creature's affinity for Hyperborea, the *temperate* (**9-18**) climate of which does not inhibit horn-growth (cf. Hdt.4.29 on Scythian cattle's hornlessness due to the cold climate; Hdt.4.129 claims donkeys cannot survive a cold climate, but *P*.10.33 locates them in Hyperborea); (2) the pursuit's extreme distance (*Rangifer tarandus* is capable of the longest migration of any land mammal: Olmstead and Kuhlmeier (2015) 166).

Its gender also makes it a suitable substitute for Taygeta: **29-30**.

ἄξονθ': metrical overlap with **14 ἔνεικεν** aligns the Hind- and olive-quests' goals.

Cf. *Il*.8.368 ἄξοντα (Eurystheus sends Heracles to Hades for Cerberus).

29 ἄν ποτε: 13.

Ταϋγέτα: eponym of Mount Taygetus (sacred to Artemis), and ancestor of Lacedaimon by Zeus (Paus.3.1.2); the latter myth co-exists with that of her escape from Zeus (**29-30**).

30 ἀντιθεῖσ': ambiguous between (1) syncopated present participle of ἀνατίθημι ('dedicate'), (2) aorist participle of ἀντιτίθημι ('give in exchange'), due to the tradition of deer-substitution for girls in relation to Artemis (E.*IT*.28-29 ἐξέκλεψεν ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου | Ἄρτεμις, 783-84 ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου ... Ἄρτεμις; S.*El*.568-72 κεράστην ἔλαφον ... μηνίσασα Λητῴα κόρη ... ἕως πατὴρ ἀντίσταθμον | τοῦ θηρὸς ἐκθύσειε τὴν αὑτοῦ κόρην): **29-30**.

Ὀρθωσίας: Ahrens for MSS Ὀρθωσίᾳ. Although the dative is typical after ἀνατίθημι, the genitive after **ἱεράν** in the main clause is preferable (*v.i.*).

The epiclesis' overlap with Orthia is confirmed by inscriptions at the Spartan temple of Artemis Orthia (*IG*.5.1.1572 ἀνέθε]κε τᾶι Ϝορθασίαι: 7th-century; cf. Jucker (1979) 27). As here (implicitly), it is identified with Artemis at Hdt.4.87.10 Ὀρθωσίης Ἀρτέμιδος; Arist.*Mir.Ausc*.847b.1 Ἀρτέμιδος Ὀρθωσίας. For the cult's status as either of fertility or initiation, and consequent etymologies, see des Bouvrie (2009) 153-90. **3 ὀρθώσαις** anagrammatically connects *h.l.* with Taygeta's Spartan decendants (**1**).

Σ.*O*.3.54a (Didymus) attests an Elean temple of Orthosia; at Olympia, Artemis shared an altar with Alpheus (cf. **19**; **22**), and possessed another as Artemis Elaphaia at the hippodrome. Since Artemis' worship at Elis relates to its vegetation (Sinn (2000) 11), this links the Hind- and olive-myths.

ἔγραψεν ἱεράν: reflecting epigraphic practice concerning offerings. Here, the phrase = 'inscribed (with the words) "sacred to Orthosia"', as in a 4th-century catalogue of inscribed

treasures: *IG*.II^2.1492.17-18 ὑδρία χρυσῆ ἐφ' ἧι ἐπιγέγρα]- | [πται ἱερὰ] Ἀρτέμιδος Βρα[υρωνίας.

This can apply to living creatures, as in the myth here: Krummen (1990) 250 notes that a hind with an inscribed collar lived in the grove of Despoina at Lycosura (Paus.8.10.10); X.*A*.5.3.7-13 relates Xenophon's hunting of sacred animals from Artemis' precinct near his Triphylian estate. In cultic contexts, it works equally with inanimate votives (including deer-votives, popular with Artemis Orthia post-500: Bevan (1986) 100-14): a bronze mirror dedicated to Artemis Limnatis c.500 reads *h*ιαρὸν Ἀρτάμιτος Λιμνάτιος (*IED*.41).

Strophe 3

31 τὰν: the stanza-initial relative highlights the only break in the Hind-quest's retrograde narrative: **9-38**.

31-32 ἴδε καὶ κείναν χθόνα ... δένδρεα θάμβαινε: trees provoking admiration: *Od*.6.166-67 καὶ κεῖνο ἰδὼν ἐτεθήπεα ... ἐκ δόρυ γαίης; Hdt.7.31; X.*Oec*.4.21.1-3 ἐν Σάρδεσι παράδεισον ... ἐθαύμαζεν ... δένδρα.

πνοιαῖς ... Βορέα | ψυχροῦ: Hes.*Op*.547 ψυχρὴ ... ἠὼς πέλεται Βορέαο πεσόντος; Hipp.*De.Diaet*.1-4.38.14 βορέας ψυχρὸς πνέειν; Ael.Arist.*Hier.Log*.5.352.34-35 βορέου πνεῦμα ... ψυχρότατον. *Pace* Köhnken (1983) 57, **ψυχροῦ** = 'chilly' here.

31 πνοιαῖς ὄπιθεν Βορέα: A.R.4.286 ὑπὲρ πνοιῆς βορέαο.

This passage etymologizes **16 Ὑπερβορέων**, conveying P.'s conception of Ister's location in a *temperate* zone *behind* the North Wind, which makes it conducive to tree-growth: see **9-18**. North Wind ravaging trees: Hes.fr.204.124-26 δενδρέων ... ῥέεσκε δὲ καρπὸς ἔραζε | π]νείοντος Βορέαο.

Hecat.*FGH*.3a.264.F.7.1-9 makes Hyperborea 'an island no smaller than Sicily' (νῆσον οὐκ ἐλάττω τῆς Σικελίας), and equivalent to it in fertility, 'beyond the North Wind' (ὀνομα- | ζομένων Ὑπερβορέων ἀπὸ τοῦ πορρωτέρω κεῖσθαι τῆς βορείου πνοῆς). The Sicilian comparison gives special point to P.'s linking of Acragas and Hyperborea: **9-18**.

At A.fr.195.2 βορεάδας ἥξεις πρὸς πνοάς, Prometheus gives Heracles instructions for a similar journey.

32-33 δένδρεα ... | τῶν: reprising Heracles' reaction at Olympia (**23-24 δένδρε' ... | τούτων**): syntactical parallelism makes the temporal discontinuity between antecedent and pronoun here striking: **9-38**.

32 θάμβαινε σταθείς: 'came to a stop', rather than 'stood': accentuated by decelerating rhythm (from D to e) and verse-final **σταθείς**, denoting a pause in Heracles' chase, and metapoetically signalling the following break in narrative sequence (**32-33**).

33 τῶν: partitive.

νιν: 26.

γλυκὺς ἵμερος: often of erotic desire (*Il*.3.446 = *Il*.14.328; *h.Hom*.5.2, 45-46, 53, 143; Archil.fr.188.3; A.R.1.850). Heracles' planting of the olive at Olympia as sexual domination of the female: **24**. Female relative pronouns of the objects of Heracles' quests: **13**; **29**; **31**.

ἵμερος ἔσχεν: S.*OC*.1725 ἵμερος ἔχει; Theocr.*Id*.16.65 ἔχοι ἵμερος.

33-34 δωδεκάγναμπτον περὶ τέρμα δρόμου | ἵππων: Lee (1986) 162-74 convincingly argues that this is a reference to the West *terma* (turning-post and finish-line), where chariot-races ended after 12 laps in total, although technically it was rounded only 11 times. The inaccuracy results from P.'s regular habit of referring to 12 laps (***O*.2.50 τε-**

θρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων; *O*.6.75 περὶ δωδέκατον δρόμον; *P*.5.33 δώδεκ' ἂν δρόμων τέμενος), and may be obviated by applying the epithet to **δρόμου** by enallage.

Heracles' desire to plant the trees specifically at the *hippodrome* has no internal motivation in the myth. Instead, it supplies an aetiology for olive-trees visible there in P.'s time (Eckerman (2013) 24-25), and suits the chariot-victory: the language used to describe the *planting* here matches that applied to the *driving* elsewhere (*v.s.*; **33 περὶ τέρμα**), which is particularly effective in that charioteers were racing towards a finish-line where the symbols of their victory were growing. Whereas **23-24** implies providing shade for the entire enclosure, **33** isolates the finish/starting line, replicating the public/victor distinction at **18 σκιαρόν τε φύτευμα ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις στέφανόν τ' ἀρετᾶν**.

33 δωδεκάγναμπτον περὶ τέρμα δρόμου: responsion: **23 χῶρος ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος** (treeless Olympia).

δωδεκάγναμπτον: *hapax*: cf. ***O*.2.50**; *I*.1.57 γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις.

12 laps defined the *chariot*-race, pointedly trumping the 6-lap *keles*: see **4 ἵππων**; **37-38**.

Heracles' 12 Labours (**28**) may also be evoked: Zeus' Temple at Olympia (472-58) provides the figure's first clear attestation, but restoring fr.169a.43]εκατ.[as δυωδέκατον supplies a Pindaric example.

Reprise of **27 πολυγνάμπτων** brackets the Hind-quest and compares the chariot-victory to Heracles' questing.

περὶ τέρμα: elsewhere always of the chariot-racing skill involved in rounding the turning-post: *Il*.22.162 ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μώνυχες ἵπποι; *Il*.23.309, 462, 466.

34 ἵππων: responsion: **4 ἵππων**.

φυτεῦσαι: *Od*.18.359 δένδρεα μακρὰ φυτεύων.

Ritual significance: **18 <u>φύτευμα</u>**.

Sexual sense (see **33**): *N*.7.84.

34-38 Myth: Heracles' apotheosis. The ode transitions to the present, when Heracles attends the Olympic Games (see **34**) with the Tyndarids, to whom he entrusted them (see **36-38**) at his apotheosis (see **36**). The unusualness of heroic figures continuing their activities in the present underscores the divinization they have achieved. Uniting the key cult-figures of the present celebration (**1-4**) and the key hero of its aetiological myths (**9-38**) here creates a bridge between those contexts.

Heracles and the Tyndarids often occur together. They are cousins; both administer Games (*N*.10.51-53); Zeus made both immortal (X.*Symp*.29); they were the first Eleusinian initiates (X.*Hell*.6.3.6); both attend theoxenies (Verbanck-Piérard (1992) 85-106), although that is probably not the sense of **34 ταύταν ἑορ-τὰν**.

34 καί νυν ἐς ταύταν ἑορ-τὰν: universally understood by Σ.*O*.3.61a-d as the present theoxenic performance (so Wilamowitz (1922) 237; Robbins (1984) 222). However, although theoxenic performance *is* likely (**1-4**), this line probably does *not* reference it (Köhnken (1983) 59; Krummen (1990) 231-34): the present celebration appears only after the 1st-person transition (**38**).

(1) *Pace* Robbins (1984) 222, that **καί νυν** can 'refer to the actual time and place of the singing of the ode' does not make **ταύταν ἑορ-τὰν** the theoxeny. All Pindaric instances either (a) give a present example of a preceding generalization (*O*.7.13; *P*.5.20; *N*.6.8); or (b) illustrate continuity between present and past (*h.l.*; *O*.10.78; *P*.3.66; *P*.9.71; *P*.11.7; *N*.5.43; *I*.5.48; *I*.8.61). Heracles now attends the Olympics with the Tyndarids, since in the past he founded the festival (**33-34**) and entrusted it to them (**36-38**).

(2) οὗτος (*pace* Robbins (1984) 222) is not interchangeable with ὅδε in referencing the present celebration. All other examples of οὗτος at Slater s.v.3 (*O.*9.25, 108; *N.*6.58; fr.124.2) reference the *song*, whereas ὅδε includes performance-context as well (*komos*: *O.*4.9; *O.*8.10; *O.*14.16; *P.*5.22; audience: ***O.*2.36**; *N.*8.14; polis: *O.*5.20; *O.*7.30; *O.*8.25; *P.*8.99; *P.*9.91; *N.*3.68; *N.*6.46; *I.*5.22; *I.*6.21, 65). All other Pindaric instances of οὗτος are either (a) retrospective or (b) prospective, which here indicates the Olympics either way (**33-34** or **36**): *O.*10.51 ταύτᾳ δ' ἐν πρωτογόνῳ τελετᾷ (Heracles' establishment of the Games' precinct: 43-51) suggests (a), **36 γὰρ** (Heracles attends the Games with the Tyndarids now *because* he entrusted them to them), (b).

(3) Although *O.*6.95 ἑορτὰν reflects Hieron's hereditary hierophancy of Demeter and Kore, a possible model for an Emmenid theoxeny (**1-4**), P.'s 7 other instances designate Games (*O.*5.5; *O.*6.69; *O.*10.58; *P.*8.66; *N.*9.11; *N.*11.27; fr.193), 4 specifically Heracles' foundation of the Olympics (*O.*5.5; *O.*6.68-69; *O.*10.58; *N.*11.27).

(4) **νίσεται** (to Olympia) mirrors **10 νίσοντ'** (from Olympia).

(5) **ἐς ταύταν ἑορ-τὰν** responds with **19 πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἀγι-σθέντων**.

(6) Taking **ταύταν ἑορ-τὰν** as the theoxeny would mean Heracles also attends; although Heracles could receive theoxeny (Verbanck-Piérard (1992) 85-106), **39-40** names the Tyndarids alone.

καί νυν: 14x in P.; 7, including *h.l.*, have a metrically-guaranteed short upsilon and the temporal sense 'now' (Finglass (2007) 269-73). *V.s.*

ἵλαος ... νίσεται: *Pae.Erythr.In.Aesculap.*19 ἵλαος δ' ἐπινίσεο.

ἵλαος: often of propitious gods: B.11.15-17 (Apollo granting victory as Pythian god).

ἀντιθέοισιν: always of heroes: possibly of the Tyndarids at Ibyc.S166.18-19 Κάστορι] θ' ἱπποδάμωι καὶ π[...]ες ἀντιθέοι (see Wilkinson). Cf. **41 μακάρων** for their ambiguous heroic/divine status.

νίσεται: *v.s.*

Juxtaposition with the Tyndarids (**35**) highlights a parallel between them and the Aśvins (**3-4**; **39**): their epithet *Nāsatya*, like **νίσεται**, is cognate with PIE **nes*– ('return'); cf. Frame (2009) 60-61.

35 Replacing MSS βαθυζώνου with **βαθυζώνοιο** *metri gratia* is an easy change. **διδύμοις** has been suspected for introducing ***O*.3**'s sole instance of resolution in the 2nd longum of e, which is rare and usually requires special conditions (Braswell on *P*.4.253(c)): the metre may enact the Tyndarids' twinness here.

σὺν βαθυζώνοιο διδύμοις παισὶ Λήδας: B.11.15-16 υἱ- | ὸς βαθυζώνο[ιο] Λατοῦς; Posidipp.*Epig*.114.19 [σὺ]ν παιδὶ βαθυζώνοιο Διώνης.

διδύμοις παισὶ: excluding Helen (**1-4**): E.*Hel*.205-6 Κάστορός τε συγγόνου τε | διδυμογενὲς ἄγαλμα.

παισὶ Λήδας: *Od*.11.298-301 Λήδην ... παῖδε, | Κάστορά ... Πολυδεύκεα describes their alternating death/divinity: cf. **34 ἀντιθέοισιν**.

Antistrophe 3

36-38 Heracles' entrusting of the Olympics' administration to the Tyndarids is peculiar, despite *N*.10.51-53 linking both as overseers of contests (cf. *IG*.IX.1.649). On the one hand, this makes them functionaries, mythical antecedents of the Hellanodicae (**12**) or the agonothetes (see **36**); on the other, they bestow victory (**39**) in a manner usually restricted

to the Games-god, i.e. Zeus (see **17**). However, there is nothing elsewhere to indicate their *lordship* of the Olympics: Pausanias records a Tyndarid altar near the Olympic hippodrome (Paus.5.15.5), and that they were the first Olympic victors (Paus.5.8.4). Therefore, Wilamowitz (1922) 238 is right to posit a Pindaric invention to supply a causal link between Theron's victory and his pre-existing piety towards the Tyndarids.

The reference to the Emmenids' reward of victory for reverencing the Tyndarids (**38-41**) links them to Heracles (1) vertically (Heracles grants authority to the Tyndarids; the Tyndarids grant victory to the Emmenids); (2) horizontally (Heracles is immortalized for righteous deeds; the Emmenids receive victory for their piety).

36 τοῖς γὰρ ἐπέτραπεν Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἰὼν: *Il.*10.59 τοῖσιν γὰρ ἐπετράπομέν; *Od.*2.226 οἱ ἰὼν ... ἐπέτρεπεν.

ἐπέτραπεν ... ἀγῶνα: Paus.5.9.4.5-5.1 ἀνδράσι δύο ... Ἠλείων ἐπετράπη ποιῆσαι τὰ | Ὀλύμπια ... ἀγωνοθετῶν records that from 580-400 two Eleans were appointed as agonothetes, perhaps inspiring P. to assign the role to the twins. Cf. Paus.5.16.6.4 ἀγῶνα ἐπετράπησαν (Heraea entrusted to Elean women).

Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἰὼν: Heracles' apotheosis is a relatively-late development (West on Hes.*Th.*947-55; Winiarczyk (2000) 13-29). *Il.*18.115-19 considers him a mortal hero, a status co-existing at *Od.*11.601-19 with that of immortal god. Iconography begins to depict his apotheosis c.600 (Stafford (2012) 163-65, 173-74), but ambiguity between his heroic and divine nature persists into the 5th century: see Pfeijffer on *N.*3.22 ἥρως θεὸς; Hdt.2.44. The ἥρως θεὸς concept was useful to P., esp. in the Emmenid odes, since it depicted a hero who could cross existential boundaries (***O.*2.3**), and had earned the right to do so through his achievements – an ideal model for Theron (see **9-38**). That the apotheosis rewarded virtuous acts is implicit here (as at Hes.*Th.*950-55), since it concludes a long chain of his exploits, and explicit at *N.*1.61-72; *I.*4.52-66 (cf. 55 Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἔβα; 11-13 ~ **43-44**);

Sen.*H.Oet*.1942-43; D.S.4.10.7. His travels to the Earth's limits here anticipate the apotheosis: an Attic red-figure *stamnos* (St.Petersburg.B640 c.470) depicts one of the Hesperides' apples being offered to Zeus as Heracles arrives on Olympus. The suppression of Heracles' immolation on Mt. Oeta (S.*Tr*.787-90) implies a painless transition to immortality. H.*O*.3.3.9-12 overtly predicts Augustus' apotheosis alongside Hercules and Pollux for his virtue.

Heracles is unique in being the only hero admitted to Olympus, but cf. ***O*.2.25** (Semele).

θαητὸν ἀγῶνα: responsion: **21 καὶ πενταετηρίδ'**.

θαητὸν: mostly epinician: appropriate to an Olympia furnished with wondrous (**32**) trees.

ἀγῶνα νέμειν: contrast ***O*.2.12-13 νέμων | ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν** (Zeus).

36-37 ἀγῶνα ... ἀνδρῶν: Xenophan.fr.2.18 ἀνδρῶν ἔργ' ἐν ἀγῶνι (Panhellenic competition).

ἀγῶνα ... ἀνδρῶν τ' ἀρετᾶς πέρι: Hdt.8.26.13-27.1 ἄνδρας ... οἳ οὐ περὶ χρημά- | των τὸν ἀγῶνα ποιεῦνται ἀλλὰ περὶ ἀρετῆς (Olympics); X.*Cyr*.2.3.8.3 ἀγωνίζεσθαι περὶ ἀρετῆς.

37 ἀνδρῶν τ' ἀρετᾶς: the sphere in which men's excellence is determined shifts from war in epic and martial elegy (*Il*.13.277; Tyrt.fr.12.1-2 οὔτ' ἐν λόγωι ἄνδρα τιθείην | οὔτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὔτε παλαιμοσύνης, 13-14) to agonism in epinician (*O*.7.88-89 Ὀλυμπιονίκαν, | ἄνδρα τε πὺξ ἀρετὰν εὐ-ρόντα; *N*.1.9; *I*.3.13 ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετάν).

37-38 ῥιμφαρμάτου | διφρηλασίας: both *hapax* (except S.*OC*.1062-63 ῥιμφαρμάτοις ... ἁμίλλαις). Novel expression (see **4**) stylistically enacts the innovation of entrusting the Tyndarids with the Olympics (**36-38**). The pleonasm underscores the pre-eminence of Theron's *chariot*-victory while excluding *keles*-racing: see **3-4**; **19**; **33**; **34**.

Cf. Hes.*Scut*.324 δίφρου ἐπεμβεβαὼς ἰθύνετο καμπύλον ἅρμα; *P*.2.10-11 δίφρον | ἔν θ' ἅρματα; Crit.fr.2.17 ἁρματόεντα δίφρον; Melanippid.fr.1.3 ἁρμάτεσσι διφρού-χοις; also ***I*.2.2-3 δίφρον ... ῥίμφα**.

37 ῥιμφαρμάτου: S.*OC*.1062; cf. *Il*.11.533 ῥίμφ' ἔφερον θοὸν ἅρμα.

38 διφρηλασίας: suffixes < ἐλαύνω are Homeric (*Il*.4.387 ἱππηλάτα); cf. *P*.5.115 ἁρματηλάτας; *P*.9.81a διφρηλάτα; *I*.1.17. Given Heracles' handover of the chariot-races to the Tyndarids, it is striking that *P*.5.115 and *P*.9.81a apply to Amphitryon and Castor, respectively. Cf. Call.*Aet*.fr.1.27 δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν.

38-41 Transition from myth to praise. The statement that the Tyndarids bestowed victory on the Emmenids and Theron as a result of their superlative theoxenic offerings heightens the impression that the immediately-preceding characterization of the Tyndarids as overseers of the Olympics, esp. chariot-racing (**36-38**), is either an invention or the promotion of a rare tradition intended to link the theoxeny to the victory. This elevates the victory from a unilateral divine gift from the Games' divinities to a *reciprocal* one. *N*.10.49-54 similarly implies that the Tyndarids, who administer games, support the victor's family's athletic success because they were hosted by the victor's ancestor; so *O*.6.77-81 (Hermes).

The Tyndarids are theoxeny's most widely-attested recipients (*OCD*[4] s.v.'Dioscuri', '*theoxenia*'). They may have possessed a temple at Acragas (see **2**), but their theoxeny there is attested only in relation to this ode, which may create the tradition (**1-4**). Theoxenic ritual in general: Ekroth (2002) 136-40, 177-79, 276-86. Aśvins accepting regular hospitality: *R.V*.5.76.2.1 'Most frequent guests, they scorn not what is ready: even now the lauded Aśvins are beside us, 3.2 Not only now the draught hath drawn the Aśvins'. See **1-4** for the regular theoxeny here as the ode's likely performance-context.

Varied ring-composition with **1-4**. Recurring elements: (1) Tyndarids (**1 Τυνδαρίδαις** ~ **39 Τυνδαριδᾶν**); (2) *xenia* (**1 φιλοξείνοις** ~ **40 ξεινίαις**); (3) 1st person (**2 εὔχομαι** ~ **38 ἐμὲ**); (4) victor (**3 Θήρωνος** ~ **39 Θήρωνί**); (5) victory (**3 Ὀλυμπιονίκαν** ~ **39 κῦδος**); (6) event (**39 εὐίππων** ~ **4 ἵππων**). Alterations: (1) Helen, irrelevant to horse-racing, disappears; (2) Acragas is replaced by the Emmenids (see ***P*.6.5-6**), which supports the feast's assignation to a private family cult (Nilsson (1906) 419), rather than a public festival (Shelmerdine (1987) 67n.7), and shares Theron's prestige with his family; (3) the Tyndarids explicitly *grant* victory (**39 διδόν-των**), exercising the authority Heracles bestowed (**36-38**), and do so *because* (**39 ὅτι**) of Emmenid piety.

38 ἐμὲ ... πᾳ θυμὸς ὀτρύνει φάμεν: the laudator is assimilated to epic figures urged on by their **θυμός**, including heroes (*Il*.10.220 ἔμ' ὀτρύνει ... θυμὸς; *Od*.21.194 φάσθαι δέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει), and poets such as Demodocus (*Od*.8.45 ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃσιν ἀείδειν), who is free to sing as he wishes. Within ***O*.3**, the parallel is Heracles' heroic impulse to seek (**25 θυμὸς ὥρμα**) and plant (**33 ἵμερος ἔσχεν**) the olive: thus, the laudator's praise is (1) freely-given, therefore genuine (see ***I*.2.1-11**); (2) likely to succeed. See **7**.

The indefinite **πᾳ** makes a cautious assertion about an entity influencing the poet, just like **4 Μοῖσα ... ποι παρέ-στα μοι**: cf. *Il*.15.41-43 μὴ δι' ἐμὴν ἰότητα ... ἀλλά που αὐτὸν θυμὸς ἐποτρύνει.

ἐμὲ δ' ὤν: transition (myth > praise): cf. *P*.9.103-4 ἐμὲ δ' οὖν (praise > myth). See **3** on 1st persons structuring the ode, and ***O*.2.83** on 1st-person break-offs.

38-39 Ἐμμενίδαις | Θήρωνί τ': *P*.6.5-6 Ἐμμενίδαις | ... Ξενοκράτει (victor's glory shared with family).

38 Ἐμμενίδαις: *P*.6.5. Here, the family name implies (1) parallelism/reciprocity with **39 Τυνδαριδᾶν**; (2) their Tyndarid-worship is hereditary: *pace* Didymus (Σ.*O*.3.1d), who

attributes the theoxenic cult to the Emmenids' Argive roots (see Krummen (1990) 224n.4), this probably masks its relative newness (see **1-4**).

39-44: see ***I*.2.39-42**.

39 Θήρωνί τ' ἐλθεῖν κῦδος: responsion: **9 Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ**; see **3**.

κῦδος εὐίππων διδόν-των Τυνδαριδᾶν: Games' divinity granting glory in horse-racing: *P*.4.66-67 Ἀπόλλων ... κῦδος ... ἔπορεν | ἱπποδρομίας; at *P*.5.9 ἕκατι χρυσαρμάτου Κάστορος, Castor is responsible for Arcesilas' chariot-victory.

κῦδος ... διδόν-των: frequent in epic of gods granting glory (*Il*.1.279 Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν); cf. *P*.2.52, 89.

εὐίππων: usage: Braswell on *P*.4.2.

The epithet is particularly appropriate. (1) The Tyndarids have intrinsic equestrian associations (Allan on E.*Hel*.1495-96). The Aśvins (= 'having horses') possess an epithet *suáśvā* (*RV*.7.68.1; cf. *RV*.7.69.3) cognate with εὔιππος (cf. **3 ἀκαμαντοπόδων**). (2) Their oversight of Olympic chariot-races here (**36-38**) allows them to bestow Theron's chariot-victory, although in any case P. assigns them equestrian epithets only in equestrian victory-odes (*P*.1.66 λευκοπώλων Τυνδαριδᾶν; *P*.5.9 χρυσαρμάτου Κάστορος). (3) Iconography often depicts their arrival at theoxenies on horseback (Köhne (1998) 128-33). (4) It reprises **4 ἵππων**, **34 ἵππων**, in the corresponding lines of Strophes 1 and 3.

Τυνδαριδᾶν: 1.

ὅτι πλείσταισι βροτῶν: that the Emmenids are theoxeny's most lavish practitioners parallels their characterization at fr.119.3-4 πλεῖστα μὲν δῶρ' ἀθανάτοις ἀνέχοντες, | ἔσπετο δ' αἰενάου πλούτου νέφος, where their piety likewise produces rewards. In possible imitation of *h.l.* (cf. ***O*.2.86-88**), B.3.61 δι' εὐσέβειαν (see **41 εὐσεβεῖ**), ὅτι μέ[γιστα] θνατῶν has Apollo translate Croesus to the Hyperboreans (~ **16**) for his piety in

making a superlative number of Delphic offerings; the myth can be read as an eschatological promise to Hieron, who has done the same in modern times (63-66). Contrast *Od.*19.365-66 οὐ γάρ πώ τις τόσσα βροτῶν Διὶ ... μηρί' ἔκη' (superlative offerings not rewarded). The superlative vaunt here concerns the Emmenids' moral actions, as at ***O.*2.90-95**.

40-41 Theoxeny's special character is expressed through phrasing and metre.

Parallels for **40 ξεινίαις ... τραπέζαις** (*Od.*14.158 = 17.155 ξενίη τε τράπεζα; *Od.*21.27-28; *N.*11.8-9; ***I.*2.39-40 ξενίαν ... τράπεζαν**; A.*Ag.*401-2; E.*IT.*949; E.*Rh.*337; Aesch.*In.Ctesiph.*224.11; Euphorion.fr.415.col.2.11) all denote hospitality towards *human* guests (although τράπεζα was the term for the cult-table used in theoxenies: **40**): the phrase thus assimilates the ritual's divine recipients to corporeal guests.

On the other hand, the verses' division between stanzas stylistically enacts the typical divide between *xenia* and *teletai*, human and divine, the bridging of which is a major theme (see **9-38**; **13-16**; **27**; **36**; **41**). The ritual distinction between theoxeny and normal sacrifice is that food suitable for human consumption was used in the former; cf. Ekroth (2002) 282: 'the ritual serves to emphasize that the relations between gods and men can be characterized by reciprocity and exchange', re-enacting the human-divine feasts of the heroic age (see ***I.*2.39**). Theoxeny coheres with the paradoxical motif of Theron grasping the Pillars from home (**43-44**): the Tyndarids cross an existential boundary to feast at Acragas, and human-divine feasting was situated spatially amongst the blessed peoples of the Earth's periphery (cf. Pavlou (2010) 322). Moreover, since dining with the gods was one of the characteristics of a blessed afterlife (Krummen (1990) 260), Theron's experience of it while alive implies that he was predestined for such a fate.

40 ξεινίαις: see **1**.

τραπέζαις: tables set before human (**40-41**) and divine (*PCair.Zen*.569.24 τράπεζαν τῶν Διοσκόρων) guests.

Epode 3

41 εὐσεβεῖ γνώμᾳ φυλάσσοντες μακάρων τελετάς: embedding the theoxeny (**39-40**) in a wider pattern of Emmenid piety: Dem.*De.Cor*.7.4 πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν φυλάττων.

εὐσεβεῖ γνώμᾳ: *O*.4.16 καθαρᾷ γνώμᾳ.

εὐσεβεῖ: of reverence towards gods and those the gods hold sacred, esp. *xenoi* (A.*Eum*.270 θεὸν ἢ ξένον τιν' ἀσεβῶν; E.*Alc*.1148 εὐσέβει περὶ ξένους): its connotations combine when the gods themselves are guests.

All 3 remaining Pindaric instances similarly depict the *eusebeis* receiving divine blessings in return: *O*.6.79; *O*.8.8; *I*.8.40. The term can overlap/co-exist with mystic initiation, with the rewards developing an eschatological dimension: Ar.*Ra*.456-58 εὐ-σεβῆ τε διήγομεν | τρόπον περὶ τοὺς ξένους, with Dover (cf. ***O*.2.68-70**); χῶρος εὐσεβέων is found in Hellenistic epitaphs, including one for Isidorus, son of Nicostratus, a Samothracian and Eleusinian initiate (*SEG*.55.723.21), and *Etym.Magn*.s.v.Ἠλύσιον equates it with νῆσοι μακάρων; Plut.*Cons.ad.Apollon*.120c.5 prefaces fr.129 as περὶ τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐν Ἅιδου; on B.3.61, see **39**.

γνώμᾳ φυλάσσοντες μακάρων τελετάς: responsion: **11 κραίνων ἐφετμὰς Ἡρακλέος προτέρας**.

μακάρων τελετάς: of various divine rites, including the mystic: cf. Ar.*Pa*.419 τελετὰς ... θεῶν (Panathenaea; Eleusinian mysteries; Dipolieia; Adonia).

Mystic connotations are strong in other parallels, esp. with μάκαρ: Alcm.fr.7.1.4-5 ἀσανάτας τελε- | [τὰς (glossed as concerning Menelaus' receipt of heroic honours at Therapne with the Tyndarids); E.*Ba*.73-75 μάκαρ, ὅστις εὐδαί- | μων τελετὰς θεῶν εἰ- | δὼς βιοτὰν ἁγιστεύει (knowledge of the gods' rites makes the worshipper blessed: ***O*.2.56**); Pl.*Phaedr*.250b8-c1 ἐτελοῦντο τῶν τελετῶν ἦν ... μακαριωτάτην.

Since the Tyndarids, like Heracles, had been mystic initiates (X.*Hell*.6.3.6) but were now divinities, there is special point in the Emmenids' worship of them, given their likely interest in mystery-cult (***O*.2.53-56**).

μακάρων: unlikely to reference the Tyndarids alone. Unqualified, it typically = 'gods', but although overseeing Games (**36-38**) is normally a god's role, **34 ἀντιθέοισιν** makes the Tyndarids merely 'godlike'; *N*.10.55-90 follows *Od*.11.301-4 in postulating alternating life and death for them. Therefore, the term probably includes other divinities, and can connote blessed humans (*v.s.*). Cf. ***O*.2.70**.

τελετάς: see Schuddeboom (2009) 7-37, 201-25. Pindaric usage varies with genre. (1) Epinician: festivals (*O*.10.51; *P*.9.97; *N*.10.54). (2) Dithyrambs/*threnoi*: Dionysiac rites and mysteries (fr.70a.33; fr.70b.6; fr.70c.6; fr.131a ὄλβιοι δ' ἅπαντες αἵσᾳ λυσιπόνων τελετᾶν; fr.346.5 (Heracles' Eleusinian initiation)). *Pace* Schuddeboom (2009) 8, not to be identified solely with theoxeny here: *v.s.*

42-44 A highly-allusive priamel, composed of 3 members of increasing length (cf. ***O*.2.3-7**), ending in a climactic comparison of Theron's achievements to Heracles' quests. Priamels' inductive logic: Bundy 5; Race (1982b); Kirby (1985) 142-44.

The first 2 members virtually quote those of *O*.1's opening priamel (*O*.1.1 Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ ~ **42 εἰ δ' ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος**), but the climax replaces Olympia (7) with Theron himself (**43**): whereas *O*.1 describes the supreme Games, ***O*.3** describes the supreme *competitor*, capping

Hieron's inferior *keles*-victory at the same Games (see **4**). Race (1982b) 74-76 observes a comparable capping of *O*.1's concluding priamel on Hieron's achievement (*O*.1.113-16 τὸ δ' ἔ-σχατον κορυφοῦται | βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον ... πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ ~ **43-44 πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν Θήρων ... τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον**). 476 song-cycle: see **Conclusion (2)**.

B.3.85-98 adapts the 476 tyrant-odes extensively (see ***O*.2.86-88**), including the above priamels. As here, B.3.85-98 denotes mortal limits, but connotes post-mortem possibilities (cf. Currie (2005) 386-90, 404): B.3.85 alludes to ***O*.2.85**; B.3.23-62 on Croesus' translation to the Hyperboreans for piety mirrors the Hyperborean olive's translation to Theron for his piety here (see **9-38**; **39**); water and gold (B.3.86-87 ὕδωρ ... χρυσός) possess mystic qualities (**42**).

The climactic apodosis exhibits a similar tension between text and subtext via allusion to *P*.10 and *I*.4: **43-44 πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται | οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν. τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον** ~ *P*.10.22-28 ὑμνη-τὸς ... σοφοῖς ... ἀρετᾷ κρατήσαις ... οὐρανὸς οὔ ποτ' ἀμβατὸς ... ἀγλαΐαις ἁ-πτόμεσθα, περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον; *I*.4.11-13 ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν | οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις ... μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν. As here, these Pillars-references (implicit at *P*.10.22-28) limit mortal endeavour, but also compare the victor's achievements to a heroic journey across spatial/existential bounds: *P*.10.22-28 is immediately followed by Perseus' Hyperborean journey (**4-9** alludes to *P*.10.37-40); *I*.4.52-66 presents Heracles' apotheosis and cult as a reward for his feats (*I*.4.55 Οὔλυμπόνδ' ἔβα ~ **36 Οὔλυμπόνδ' ἰὼν**). Implicitly, Theron has already begun to transcend mortal limits, as at the priamel's climax his achievements bring him into paradoxical contact with the Pillars without leaving home: cf. the undatable *N*.3.20-22 οὐκέτι πρόσω | ἀβάταν ἅλα κιόνων ὕπερ Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές, | ἥρως θεὸς ἃς ἔθηκε ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας, where the Pillars are linked to

Heracles' transition from hero to god. The belief that the Blessed Isle(s) lay to the West beyond the Pillars (Keyser (1993) 149-68) implicitly ties this passage to the Isle in ***O.*2**'s eschatology (see **42**), which Theron hopes to reach.

42 As at *O.*1.1-2, gold's supremacy is categorized explicitly in relation to wealth, but water's is left unspecified. Race (1981) 119-24 argues that what is to be supplied is neither a universal (πάντων), nor a reference to the elements (στοιχείων), but a category that balances material wealth: the natural world, where water is the source of life.

The ritual (**38-41**) and eschatological (**36**) context, however, creates more mystic connotations: gold is associated with divinity (***I.*2.1**); *h.l.* is intertextually-linked to the Isle's gold and water (**41-42 μακάρων τελετάς ... ὕδωρ ... χρυσὸς ~ *O.*2.70-73 μακάρων | νᾶσον ... χρυσοῦ... ὕδωρ**), where the wondrous trees produce crowns for the blessed that parallel the wondrous trees generating Theron's olive-crown here (***O.*2.73-74 ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων ... στεφάνους ~ 18-23 στέφανόν ... καλὰ δένδρε'**); cf. Krummen (1990) 261-62. See **42-44**.

εἰ: signalling not uncertainty, but the allusion ('if, as I have claimed elsewhere').

ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ: Gerber on *O.*1.1.

κτεάνων δὲ χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος: *O.*7.4 πάγχρυσον, κορυφὰν κτεάνων; also E.fr.1132.30-31 χρυσὸς ... ποθεινὸν εἰδὼς κτῆμα; Hipp.*Epist.*27.159-60; Call.*Hymn.*2.34-35.

Gold's divine nature: ***I.*2.1**. Modern economists, following Aristotle, analyse its suitability as currency in terms of its durability, divisibility, portability, uniformity, and intrinsic value (Ekelund & Hébert (2014) 18).

Gold also represents Emmenid wealth, key to their self-representation (***O.*2.10**; cf. ***I.*2.11 κτεάνων**); *P.*5.18 αἰδοιότατον γέρας marks the respect commanded by royal power. References to wealth softened by juxtaposition with *arete* (as here: **43**): ***O.*2.10-11**.

43 δὲ: apodotic.

πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν: like the Pillars (**44**), of geographical (Hes.*Th.*275, 622) and personal (*I.*6.11-13) limits; cf. *P.*10.28-30 πρὸς ἔσχατον ... ἐς Ὑπερβορέων.

43-45 Θήρων ... Ἡρακλέος: ***O.*2.3-5 Ἡρακλέης ... Θήρωνα**; **9-11 Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ ...Ἡρακλέος**.

43 Θήρων: see **3**. The parallelism between Theron's achievements and Heracles' quests (**43-45**) reaches its climax, activating the etymology of Theron's name (< θηράω 'hunt'; cf. **45 διώξω**; *P.*3.22-23 τὰ πόρσω (~ **44 τὸ πόρσω**) ... θηρεύων).

ἀρεταῖσιν: linking Theron *qua* victor to the crown (**18 στέφανόν τ' ἀρετᾶν**), the Tyndarids (**37 ἀνδρῶν τ' ἀρετᾶς**), and Heracles (**44**), who exemplifies *arete* (*N.*1.33-34 Ἡ-ρακλέος ἀντέχομαι ... ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετᾶν).

ἅπτεται: *P.*10.28; *I.*4.12. The act of touching the Pillars from afar is paradoxical, heroic, and instantiates contact across spatial/existential boundaries.

44 οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν. τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον: responsion with **14** implies the limits *can* be crossed: **Ἴστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν παγᾶν ἔνεικεν Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας**.

οἴκοθεν: (1) metaphorical: inborn Emmenid virtues (**43 ἀρεταῖσιν**: cf. ***O.*2.11 γνησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς**; *N.*7.51-52 ἀρεταῖς ... οἴκοθεν; *I.*4.12-13 οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις ... μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν; Th.4.126.2.3 οἰκείαν ἀρετήν); (2) spatial: exalting Theron through his paradoxical ability to reach the Pillars without questing, as exemplified by the Hyperborean olive coming to him; cf. ***I.*2.39-42** (Xenocrates' domestic *xenia* paradoxically framed as travel to the world's limits).

Pavlou (2010) 313-26 posits allusion to the Acragantine Olympieum, commissioned by Theron (Mertens (2006) 261-66), thus linking their massive *Atlantes* to Atlas, who stood holding up the world near the Pillars and whom Heracles encountered on his Labours; the implication would be that the Pillars had in some sense been transported to Acragas from the magical periphery, just as had the olive (**9-38**) and the Tyndarids (**1-4**; **38-41**). The foundation of its precinct by Theron would also parallel Heracles' establishment of the Games for Zeus (Krummen (1990) 235). Although not constructed by Theron, I suggest the Acragantine Temple of Heracles would be a more obvious candidate.

Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν: see **42-44**.

The Pillars, in myth established by Heracles to mark the limits of navigation (Pfeijffer on *N*.3.20-21), are first attested by Hecataeus (Braun (2004) 301-2). Unlike Herodotus, who identifies them with the Straits of Gibraltar, P. sites them at Cadiz (fr.256), with their legend perhaps based on real-life Phoenician pillars set up to Heracles-Melqart (West (1997) 464); cf. Fowler (2013) 295-96.

Their symbolic function as spatial/existential limits metapoetically constrains the laudator (cf. *N*.3.21: triad-final; *N*.4.69: preceding break-off; *I*.4.12: stanza-final), who characterizes the ode's continuation as a futile version of the Heraclean quests narrated at **9-38** (**44 ἄβατον**; **45 διώξω**; **κεινὸς**).

Ἡρακλέος: 11.

σταλᾶν: Sim.fr.76.1.4 στάλας (mimetic sentence-final deceleration in rhythm).

44-45 The coda parallels ***O*.2.98-100** in that the aporetic laudator employs a paradigm of impossibility (counting the limitless/crossing the ultimate limit) to characterize Theron's excellence and conclude the ode. However, unlike the 2nd-person injunction not to cross the Pillars at *I*.4.13, the 1st-person refusal here binds only the laudator, not Theron. Since a

refusal to go further is a crowning irony in an ode devoted to the permeability of boundaries (**9-38**), the implication is that Theron himself will do so (see **42-44**).

44 πόρσω: often of human limits: *O.*1.114; *P.*3.22; *N.*3.20; *N.*9.47; E.*Rh.*482.

44-45 σοφοῖς ... κἀσόφοις: theoretically, a merism (***O.*2.16**): 'wise and not-wise' = 'everyone'. However, **σοφοῖς** connotes 'poets' (***O.*2.86**: compare the laudator's garrulous opponents), implying a metapoetic need to conclude (see **44**); cf. the closing *O.*1.116 σοφία of an ode whose opening priamel has just been capped (see **42-44**).

44 ἄβατον: of journeying beyond the Pillars at *N.*3.21 (cf. *N.*4.69 οὐ περατόν); at E.*HF.*851-52, of Heracles civilizing the Earth. Its secondary application to sacred precincts (LSJ.s.v.I.2) supports allusion to the Acragantine Olympieum (*v.s.*).

Greeks had entered the Atlantic since Colaeus c.630 (Hdt.4.152; Roller (2006) 1-21), but knowledge of it was tenuous (Arist.*Met.*354a.22-23 calls it shallow and calm). P. is primarily interested in the Pillars' symbolic value as an absolute limit, but *N.*3.20-21 οὐκέτι ... περᾶν εὐμαρές admits the *possibility* of crossing. Their impassability had special resonance for Sicilians, since their Carthaginian rivals had closed the straits to Greeks post-500 (Roller (2006) 22-43).

45 Stuttering sentence-rhythm stylistically enacts coming to a halt.

κἀσόφοις: elsewhere only Thgn.1.370; E.*El.*1302; X.*Mem.*3.9.4.6.

οὔ νιν διώξω: laudator rejecting a poetic course: *O.*4.17 οὐ ψεύδεϊ τέγξω; fr.11 οὐ ψεῦδος ἐρίξω.

νιν: i.e. **44 τὸ πόρσω**. But since all ***O.*3** instances (**26**; **28**; **33**) reference Heracles, it suggests following his footsteps.

διώξω: in context, both 'hunt', as Heracles did the Hind, and, metaphorically, of poetic activity (*I.*4.3; fr.52b.4 παι]ᾶνα [δι]ώξω; fr.107a.3).

The 1st-person verb closes the ring with **2**. Laudator obtruding himself in endings: *O.*1.115b-16; *O.*6.105; *O.*8.86-88; *O.*10.100; *O.*11.16; *O.*14.18; *P.*2.96; *P.*3.111; *P.*4.299; *P.*5.124; *P.*7.18; *P.*10.64; *N.*3.76-77; *N.*6.65; *N.*7.102; *N.*8.48; *N.*9.54; ***I.*2.48**; *I.*4.72b; *I.*5.69; *I.*6.74; B.3.96; B.10.51; B.13.221.

κεινὸς εἴην: the striking asyndetic ending is ambiguous.

(1) 'I would be empty-headed (Ar.*Ra.*530: equivalent to **κἀσόφοις**) / empty-handed (*Il.*2.298: picking up the hunting-metaphor in **διώξω**)'. Epinicia often end by rejecting that which is impossible (***O.*2.98-100**; *O.*5.24; *O.*11.19-20) or foolish (*N.*7.104-5). On this view, **κεινὸς** = κενός (***O.*2.65**), and so **εἴην** must be potential optative with ἄν/κε omitted (Verdenius). However, omission of ἄν/κε is uncertain in P. The verb could therefore be optative of wish:

(2)(a) 'Set me down an empty fool (if I do)': Gildersleeve, comparing Lys.22.1 μαινοίμην, where, however, ἄν is easily introduced, and the idiom is dubious. One possibility with the optative of wish remains:

(2)(b) 'May I be the former': reading **κεινὸς** as pronominal (κεῖνος), i.e. one of the σοφοί rather than the ἄσοφοι. This would (i) make **44-45 σοφοῖς ... κἀσόφοις** more than a merism; (ii) heighten the parallel with *O.*1's concluding wish (see **42-44**): *O.*1.115-16 εἴη ... ἐμέ ... πρόφαντον σοφία; other concluding wishes: *O.*8.88; *P.*2.96; B.5.200. However, κεῖνος = 'the former' appears prosaic. (1) is preferable.

CHAPTER 4: *ISTHMIAN* 2

TRANSLATION

A′ The men of old, o Thrasybulus, who the gold-crowned
Muses' chariot would board, as they touched the glorifying lyre,
used at speed to fire off their honey-voiced boy-hymns
at any beauty who had the sweetest bloom of summer ripeness
that calls Aphrodite,
5 the faired-throned goddess, to mind.

For the Muse was not yet in love with profit then, nor a working-girl,
nor were sweet songs put up for sale by honey-toned Terpsichore,
their voices soft, their faces silvered-over.
But now she bids us heed the Argive's
10 saying, which to truth's standard closest comes:

'Money, money makythe man', said he,
when his possessions were lost and his friends along with them.

But enough, for you are wise. Not unknown is

the Isthmian chariot-victory I sing,

which to Xenocrates Poseidon granted,

and a Dorian crown to him

he sent, to bind his hair with celery,

B′ thus honouring the man of fine chariots,

the Acragantine people's very light.

And in Crisa mighty Apollo saw him, and gifted him splendour

there too. And when with the glorious graces of the Erechtheids he was outfitted

in gleaming Athens, he could not fault

the chariot-saving hand of that horse-driving man,

which Nicomachus applied just right to all the reins.

And him, moreover, did the heralds of the seasons recognize,

the Elean truce-bearers of Cronus' son

Zeus, having experienced, no doubt, some act of hospitality.

And sweet-breathing was the voice with which they welcomed him,

as he fell at the knees of golden Nike

in the land that is their own, the one men call Olympian Zeus'

sacred grove. There with immortal honours were Aenesidamus'

sons commingled.

And so, not unfamiliar is your house

with victory-revels, o Thrasybulus, that bring delight,

nor with the honey-sweet vaunts of song.

Γ΄ For there is no uphill struggle, nor is the highway steep,

when it is to famous men's homes

that one leads the honours of the Heliconian maidens.

Long may I make my discus-throw, and hurl the javelin as far,

as with his character

Xenocrates all men in sweetness

surpassed. He was respectful in his dealings with the citizens,

and horse-rearing did he practise according to Panhellenic practice.

And the gods' feasts he embraced, every one. And never around his hospitable

board did a too-favouring gust make him furl his sails.

Instead, he would voyage to Phasis in summer seasons,

and in winter sail to the Nile's shore.

So let him not, merely because envious hopes hang around mortals' minds,

let him never keep silent his father's [106] excellence,

nor these hymns. For – mark this –

not to be inert did I fashion them.

These words, Nicasippus, impart to him, when

to my dear old guest-friend you come.

[106] Or *fathers'*.

METRICAL SCHEME

s1	– – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏑ – ◡ – – – – ◡ ⏑ ‖ HB	– D ⏑ e – e
s2	– ◡ – – – ◡ – – ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – |	e – e e – D
s3	– ◡ – – – ◡ – ⏑ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏑ |	e – e ⏑ D x
s4	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏑ – ◡ – ⏑ |	D ⏑ e x
s5	– ◡ – – – ◡ – – – ◡ – – ‖‖	e – e – e –
e1	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ⏑ – ◡ – ‖ B	D – D ⏑ e
e2	– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – – – ◡ – – ‖ H	D – e –
e3	– ◡ – – – ◡ – – ‖ H	e – e –
e4	– ◡ – ⏑ – ◡ – ⏑ – ◡ ◡ – ‖ H	e ⏑ e ⏑ d
e5	– ◡ – – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – |	e – D
e6	– ◡ ◡ ◡ – – ◡ – ‖‖	e‿‿ – e –

DATE

I defend the tentative date of 470 proposed by S.-M.

The certain *terminus post quem* is 476: ***O*.2.50** mentions Xenocrates' Isthmian victory, but gives no indication of his death, which is here confirmed by the past tenses of **35-42**. The date of Xenocrates' death cannot be independently confirmed. The *terminus post quem* may be lowered to 474 if we accept that as a plausible, but not certain, date for Xenocrates' Panathenaic victory [107].

The remaining internal evidence is indirect. The reference to φθόνος may be generic [108], or reflect the political difficulties of the remaining Emmenids [109]. The systematic marginalization of Theron, both via Xenocrates' appropriation of his glory, and his displacement from his own Olympic victory, reversing Theron's appropriation of Xenocrates' glory in ***P*.6** and ***O*.2**, strongly suggests Theron, and probably Thrasydaeus, were dead [110]. The political settlement that followed the Emmenids post-471 was non-tyrannical, whether a democracy [111], or, more probably, an oligarchy, first of 'The Thousand' for three years, then on a broader basis [112]. This may explain the ode's primarily conservative perspective [113], tempered with populist touches [114]. The emphasis on Elis' control of Olympia may reference their 471 synoecism, and perhaps even an Elean coin issue depicting Nike soon after that date [115].

---

[107] See **19-20**.
[108] von der Mühll (1964) 170.
[109] See **43**.
[110] See **12-32**; **19-28**; **28-29**; **35-42**; also **17**; **18**; **39-40**.
[111] D.S.1153.5.
[112] Asheri (1992) 168.
[113] See **1-11**.
[114] **17**; **35-37**.
[115] See **24**; **26**; **27-28**.

PERFORMANCE

The lack of a recent agonistic occasion, and the coda's instruction to deliver the ode to Thrasybulus, implies an Acragantine premiere. Since the ode is explicitly [116] and implicitly [117] a reperformative artifact, it belongs to a special category in which reperformance is its primary purpose. The symposium would be a natural venue [118], but a more public setting may be envisaged [119], given the apparent public pressure against reperformance [120].

STRUCTURE

The ode's structure is relatively pellucid. Strophe 1 and Antistrophe 1 respectively contrast past and present economic conditions for poetic production (**1-10**) [121], which are crystallized in a quoted aphorism in the first verse of Epode 1 (**11**). A rapid transition introduces a catalogue of four Emmenid victories that extends to the end of Triad 2 (**12-32**), whose remarkable order is designed to advantage Xenocrates over Theron [122]. Triad 3 begins with a gnomic transition expressing the ease of praising the famous (**33-34**), which leads to a eulogy of the dead Xenocrates (**35-42**). Epode 3 consists of an injunction that Thrasybulus not leave the odes he has inherited unperformed (**43-46**), with a coda instructed Nicasippus to deliver the ode to him (**47-48**).

---

[116] See **43-46**.
[117] See **1-11**.
[118] See **4 καλὸς**.
[119] See **30-32**.
[120] See **43**.
[121] See **1-11**.
[122] See **12-32**.

Metrical patterning provides further interconnections. The opening verse or two of every strophe and antistrophe, except Antistrophe 1, contains an equestrian reference: **1-2** (earlier poets as charioteers); **17** (Xenocrates' chariots); **22-23** (the charioteer Nicomachus); **33-34** (laudator as charioteer); **38** (Xenocrates' horse-rearing). The responsion **1-2** ~ **33-34** in particular associates the laudator with earlier poets, as does **3 ῥίμφα ... ἐτόξευον** ~ **35 μακρὰ ... ἀκοντίσσαιμι** (poetic projectiles), while **6-7 οὐ ... οὐδ' ... ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας** ~ **33-34 οὐ ... οὐδὲ ... Ἑλικωνιάδων** contrasts his traditional Muses with their modern mercenary counterparts.

INTERPRETATION

I.2's classification amongst the *Isthmians* is probably due to the fact that Xenocrates' Isthmian victory opens its victory-catalogue, and may have been his final win [123]. It is not an ordinary epinician, but should not be characterized as an encomium/scolium [124], poetic epistle [125], or dunning letter [126]. Instead, it is an explicitly reperformative artifact [127] intended for Xenocrates' son Thrasybulus, in the context of Xenocrates' death and the probable fall of the Emmenid tyranny. Under those circumstances, the ode performs several functions for Thrasybulus. First, it commemorates the achievements, agonistic and personal, of the Emmenid brothers, with Theron's now appropriated for Xenocrates' benefit [128]. Second, it defends the Emmenid legacy against the envious criticisms of erstwhile social inferiors. The opening parable implicitly contrasts fleeting commercial

[123] See **12-17**.
[124] Gerber (on *O.*9) 73n.6.
[125] Wilamowitz (1922) 310.
[126] Bowra (1964) 126.
[127] See ***I.2.Performance***.
[128] See **12-32**; **19-28**. Cf. Currie (2011) 271n.9 on 'career' odes.

relationships with the long and unmercenary bond between P. himself and the Emmenids, a bond instantiated by the victory-catalogue, and by the strategic use of the 1st person and self-quotations from almost every earlier Emmenid composition [129].

COMMENTARY

Strophe 1

1-11 The meaning of the *incipit* and its relationship to what follows is a long-standing crux. It takes the form of a contrast, articulated between Strophe 1 and Antistrophe 1, between the production of poetry in the past as a love-gift, and in the present as a monetary transaction. Simpson (1969) 470-73 observes that the present is characterized as inferior to the past: **1-5** (gold; homosexuality; freely-given desire; initiative; elite status); **6-10** (silver; heterosexuality; purchased carnality; passivity; déclassé status). Verdenius' objection that '**γλυκεῖαι**, **μελιφθόγγου**, **μαλθακόφωνοι** (**7-8**) denote the highest poetical qualities' misses the point that their juxtaposition with **7 ἐπέρναντο**, **8 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα** is intentionally oxymoronic: the quality of poetry is still high, but the motive for its composition has been sullied.

The passage has been variously interpreted in light of the debate on the economics of poetic production, which hinges on whether P. and other poets took fees, and contemporary social attitudes to this. This produces 4 primary permutations: (1) fees were taken, and regarded (a) positively; (b) negatively; (2) fees were not taken, and regarded (a)

[129] See **1-11**.

positively; (b) negatively. These are discussed below, followed by (3) interpretations adopting other perspectives; (4) my conclusion.

(1)(a) Σ*I*.2.1b (cf. Farnell; Gzella (1971) 189-202; Verdenius; Masaracchia (1991) 161-65) has P. unashamedly seeking the fee that constituted his livelihood.

This view is reflected in IE traditions. (i) The thematized eroticism of the relationship here is paralleled by Celtic poets' self-representation as their patrons' lovers/spouses (Mac Cana (1988) 79-85); the Indic *purohita-* ('poet-sacrificer') was linked to his king in a ritual redolent of marriage liturgy (Campanile (1977) 27-33). (ii) With respect to payment, Indic and Celtic poets could have a stable relationship with a prince, or frequent several courts in succession; the material gifts they received earned the patron further praise for his generosity (West (2007) 30). Watkins (1995) 68-84 compares ***I*.2** to a Vedic *dānastuti* ('praise of the gift'): 'a memorial of prior munificence and a clear hint for more' (80); that poets received largesse for praise was not embarrassing, but a moral/ideological necessity for the Indo-European aristocracy (70). The irony of P.'s description of **6 φιλο<u>κερδής</u>** as a *new* quality of the Muse emerges from comparing the senses of the Greek root <u>κερδ</u>– ('profit') with that of its Celtic cognate <u>*cerd*</u> ('craft, poetry'): poetry *is* profit, and the Muse has *always* loved gain (see **8** for the remuneration taken by earlier poets). Cf. P.'s self-quotation at **45-46** of *N*.5.1, on which Σ*N*.5.1a refers to the extraordinary fees P. expected. On this reading, P.'s references to his own μισθός ('fee': *P*.1.77; *P*.11.42) are *positive*: cf. the etymology < **misdho-* as 'honorific compensation for deed performed' (Watkins (1995) 71). That P. employs μισθός of the praise received by the *victor* for his accomplishment (*N*.7.63; *I*.1.47) suggests its connotations cannot be purely mercenary.

However, comparative evidence cannot guarantee Greek practice, esp. as P. himself underlies the Greek comparison. The uniqueness of dedicating a quarter of the ode to the topic makes it improbable that this is P.'s regular method of confronting inadequate

payment. Nonetheless, P. makes one other explicit reference to the Muse for hire at *P.*11.41-42.

(1)(b) Much New Historicist scholarship accepts the 'fee-for-praise' model, but argues that the increasing commodification of poetic composition caused social/ideological anxiety for patron and poet, who then cloaked the economic transaction in the aristocratic gift economy by evoking a bond of personal affection (Gentili (1988) 160-61; Kurke (1991) 240-56; Nicholson (2000) 235-59).

However, the basis for assuming this anxiety is vulnerable: despite New Historicism's treatment of sources as constructed representations, it takes the evidence for anxiety as straightforward representations of reality, whereas it is more likely to be normative but not necessarily reflective of the spectrum of social practice. Pelliccia (2009b) 6n.9 argues that if commodified exchange were taboo, as it is in a pure gift economy (Bourdieu (1977) 6, 172-73), it would never be openly discussed as it is here and at *O.*10.1-12, *P.*11.41; cf. ***O.*3.7**.

The evidence for the taking of fees lies in the biographical tradition and in assumptions about the poets' need for a livelihood. Both can be questioned: Pelliccia (2009b) 1-20 persuasively traces the tradition for poetic venality to the tendentious accounts of the comic poets and Plato (cf. **1**). The case of Simonides is instructive: Σ.*I.*2.9a, 9b have P. implicitly criticize Simonides for soliciting payment, quoting in support Call.*Iamb.*fr.222.1-2 οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω ... Μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλίχου νέπους, which reprises **6 Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής ... οὐδ' ἐργάτις**, and explicitly makes Simonides the Muse's *pornoboskos*. However, Simonides' father Leoprepes was an athletic victor and thus a member of the Cean elite, and Call.*Iamb.*fr.222.1-2 itself attests Simonides' membership of the Hylichidae (Bowie (2012) 87). A polemical allusion to Simonides cannot be absolutely excluded, regardless of his real-life social status, esp. since he also

celebrated Xenocrates' Isthmian victory (Sim.fr.513.*PMG*); unlike ***O*.2.86-88**, however, where I find such an allusion attractive, all the blame here falls on the Muse herself (see **6-8**), without any obvious analogue for Simonides. Simonides' biographical tradition: Bell (1978); Lefkowitz (1981) 49-56; Molyneux (1992); Ferreira (2013) 174-78.

The class background of P. or B. is ambiguous (B.'s grandfather is attested as 'Bacchylides the athlete', and Aegeid ancestry is theorized for P. from *P*.5.75-76), but other 5th-century poets (e.g. Sophocles, Euripides, Agathon, Carcinus, Critias) had upper-class roots (Pelliccia (2009a)): such poets were not necessarily dependent upon fees.

(2)(a) Theoretically, independently-wealthy poets might decline even an honourable payment, but the possibility is marginal.

(2)(b) If taking fees was regarded negatively, poets may have chosen to eschew them.

This would be easiest for poets of independent means (see (1)(b)). However, it might have been open to poets to obtain fees in contexts that did not carry oppobrium, in particular compositions for poleis, and then use that income to cross-subsidize 'private' work. For instance, P., B., and Sim. composed dithyrambs for Athens (Sim.T101, *FGE* 27 = *AP*.6.213 (56 victories); P.: *P.Oxy*.2438.8-10, frr.75-77; B.18, 19). These might have carried rewards between 1000 (for 1st place in the 330s Peiraeus Dionysia) and 10,000 drachmas (Isoc.*Antid*.166: P.'s remuneration for praising Athens as fr.76.2-3 Ἑλλάδος ἔρει- | σμα in reference to Athenian feats in the Persian Wars); cf. Wilson (2008) 100-5. The mixture of the embedded/disembedded at *P*.1.75-77 ἀρέομαι πὰρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθαναίων χάριν μισθόν hints at the rewards P. received from poleis. See **19**; **20**.

If poets operated on a spectrum of professionalism from remunerated festival compositions for poleis to unremunerated personal compositions for friends, this has the advantage of permitting poets' claims of *xenia* with their addressees not to be taken as disingenuous (Pelliccia (2009b) 3). Crucially, the polis/individual distinction may in

practice have vanished in the quarter of P.'s epinicia composed for autocrats, since the laudandus was head of state (cf. Carey (2007) 200-1): P. may have considered any recompense received for ***O*.2** and ***O*.3** an honorarium from Acragas.

(3) Cairns (2011) 21-36 understands the past poetry here not as monodic love songs but as choral pederastic encomia performed by low-cost choruses of fellow boys, in contrast to the present-day employment of expensive professional choruses/musicians: the issue is thus not the fee (since poets had always been remunerated), but exorbitant contemporary choral expenditure, which highlights the patron's generosity in supporting it. But (i) **1 φῶτες** are *adults*; (ii) although **1 φῶτες** is plural, it refers to *individual* poets as a class, not to a chorus: only one can mount the Muses' chariot at a time, and the poet-as-archer image elsewhere always represents solo activity; (iii) the subject of the poet-as-archer metaphor is the poet as *composer*, not the chorus as *performer* (as Cairns (2011) 30n.41 admits); (iv) P. deprecates not only *excessive* costs (**6 φιλοκερδής**), but the *principle* of financial remuneration (**6 ἐργάτις**; **7 ἐπέρναντο**). Objections (i)-(iii) disappear if the past poetry is understood as monody by adults, but (iv) remains: modern poetry is here characterized as choral (see **7**) not to deprecate its greater cost, but its professionalism and lack of spontaneity – choruses take time and planning to be trained/equipped.

Pelliccia (2009b) 5-6 has P. console Thrasybulus through the example of how his professional commitments override his emotions in order to persuade Thrasybulus to re-engage with the world after his bereavement; he compares *I*.1.1-10, where, conversely, professional obligation is sacrificed to personal affection. But there is little indication that the former/present Muse dichotomy is intended to *parallel* Thrasybulus' situation, and the present Muse carries disreputable connotations which would be inappropriate for P. or Thrasybulus. The consolation more probably takes the form of P.'s rejection of modern professionalism (see (4)).

(4) In conclusion, both the nature of remuneration and the attitude towards it is likely to have been more complex than the debate's traditional polarities. The former varied from nil to substantial sums, depending on the context of the commission. The latter, which the New Historicist consensus traces to a 'great transformation' from embedded to disembedded economics (Polanyi (1944)), was inconsistent and/or operated via doublethink: one cannot necessarily assume that if poets wrote for a fee, their claims of *xenia* are false, nor *vice versa*. In the case of P., if any of the above testimonia for his income from earlier compositions are accurate, he had no *need* to be remunerated for ***I.2***. The following interpretation attempts to provide a coherent view of how the rhetoric serves Emmenid interests under specific circumstances, but ends with a caution that P. problematizes the issue.

Since Xenocrates was deceased, the interests of *Thrasybulus* (who is addressed in the ode's first verse and designated its recipient in the last) were paramount. If the ode was composed after the Emmenid tyranny's fall, it assisted Thrasybulus' transition from member of a ruling house to private aristocratic citizen (Kurke (1991) 255-56), mirroring ***P.6***'s role in facilitating the family's transition in the opposite direction. This involved (a) commemorating the Emmenid legacy; (b) defending it against the envious criticisms of erstwhile social inferiors (see **37**; **43**).

(a) is addressed primarily though the victory-catalogue (**12-32**) and virtue-catalogue (**35-42**), enumerating the achievements for which they deserved poetic (and perhaps literal: **28-29**) immortalization. Pervasive self-quotation of earlier Emmenid odes (*v.i.*) underwrites the promise of their fame's survival through reperformance and Panhellenic transmission (see **44-46**).

(b) Popular criticism of the Emmenids would have centred on the grandiose lifestyle of conspicuous expenditure (*megaloprepeia*) afforded by their position, and also upon the

moral failings typically attributed to tyrants. The latter are addressed in part by the virtue-catalogue (see **35-42**). The former may explain the ode's emphasis on economic issues. Thus Kurke (1991) 240-56 is correct to argue that Triads 2 and 3 demonstrate that the Emmenids' *megaloprepeia*, considered a negative characteristic of tyranny, involved an appropriate use of wealth in line with aristocratic values. They may also address a level *below* the aristocracy: Xenocrates' respect for the citizenry (**17**; **35-37**) is stressed to a degree unparalleled in earlier Emmenid odes, with the latter passage allusively reworking ***P.*6.52-54**; elitist *hippotrophia* is justified by appeal to Panhellenic values (**38**); the symposium gives way to the *komos* (**30-32**); Emmenid wealth, crucial to their earlier self-image (see ***P.*6.5**) is never explicitly mentioned, and its loss implied instead (**11**); Theron's presence is minimised (**17**; **19-28**; **28-29**; **35-42**), and his virtual replacement by Nicomachus at **22-28** (in addition to the benefits to Xenocrates of marginalizing his more glorious brother) may advertise Emmenid willingness to allow a social inferior to share the limelight.

Where I depart from Kurke, however, is her argument that from Triad 1 to Triads 2 and 3, P. 'turns the negative depiction of the mercenary Muse on its head ... [and] validates ... a new aristocratic ethos, which depends on embracing the money economy ... guiding his audience from a traditional negative view of wealth to a positive reevaluation' (Kurke (1991) 254-55). This assumes that similar anxiety was felt about *all* categories of financial expenditure, whereas the particular concern of the proem is that lucre distorts and falsifies *natural human relations*, such as the affection shown by a lover or the praise given by a friend, which is not relevant to expenditure upon material things, such as horse-rearing. Even if the logic is that socially-controversial transactions are validated by comparison with socially-uncontroversial transactions, it is difficult to see how persuasive that could be. Indeed, a novel dialectic attempting to demonstrate that the mercenary Muse was now

socially-acceptable would have been highly risky, since those conservative audience-members who rejected it would see P. explicitly associating his own poetry with a venal motive, and thus discrediting himself in their eyes.

It is therefore better to interpret the laudator's conservative critique of the mercenary Muse as intended to be taken at face-value. Triad 1 counters a specific criticism of *megaloprepeia*, namely that modern poets are paid to say whatever their patrons want and so cannot be trusted (as the tradition around Simonides shows: see (1)(b)). This credibility gap fundamentally challenges P.'s commemoration of the Emmenids' legacy, since all P.'s previous praise could have been dismissed as venal flattery had he abandoned them when they lost their status (as mercenaries do: **11 κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων**). The laudator thus presents himself, in contrast to other, mercenary, poets, as a family friend who has not deserted them in their decline. Whether or not P.'s professions of *xenia* elsewhere are sincere, here they have become true: whereas commodification, according to Nicholson (2005) 6, 'is defined by the lack of an enduring relationship between the parties to the exchange', the fact that P.'s engagement with the Emmenids had been the longest of his career, and that they had lost or were about to lose their tyranny, gave him an opportunity to contrast his true *xenia* with the fickle affections of hangers-on. Instead of eliding the economic workings of poetic patronage, he exposes them to highlight his ability to rise above them.

Triad 1 thus presents a moral parable delivered as the sincere stance of P. himself, in order to demonstrate his unmercenary loyalty towards the family and Thrasybulus. This personal attachment is instantiated by 2 striking techniques: (i) P. deploys 14 strategic self-quotations from almost every Emmenid ode and encomium (**4** ~ ***P.*6.1**; **12** ~ ***P.*6.49**; **12-14** ~ ***O.*2.49-51**; **17** ~ ***O.*3.2**; **18** ~ ***P.*6.18**; **24** ~ ***O.*3.1**; **27-28** ~ ***O.*3.17-18**; **28-29** ~ ***O.*2.46**, ***O.*3.9**; **31-32** ~ fr.124ab.1-2; **35-37** ~ ***P.*6.52-54**; **39-40** ~ ***O.*3.39-40**; **42** ~

fr.124ab.7; **44** ~ ***P.*6.42-45**; **45** ~ ***P.*6.7-8**): this is one of the only guaranteed means of matching the laudator's voice to P.'s, since it references statements external to the ode that we know to have been composed by the latter (see **Conclusion (2)**); (ii) 3 of 4 1st-person references (**12**; **46**; **48**) make statements true of the historical poet, with 2 coinciding with self-quotations (one from a non-Emmenid ode). In addition, several passages align P. and/or the laudator with the ethos of the earlier poets: **1**; **2**; **3**; **5**; **33-34**; **35**; **45**; **47-48**. The message is twofold: 'the Emmenids spent lavishly, but for unimpeachably conservative reasons, and with respect for the citizenry: therefore, let envy not obscure the fame they deserve; we live in a mercenary age when praise is bought and sold, but *I* adhere to an older standard: therefore, you can trust my praise, as an old family friend'.

However, P. is aware that economic and social tensions cannot be completely smoothed over, and so problematizes the issue on other levels. Thus (i) the motif of honey-sweetness is applied to traditional poetry (**3**); mercenary poetry (**7**); *and* P.'s own (**32**; cf. **8 μαλθακόφωνοι**); (ii) allusions to Anacreon (**8**) and Alcaeus (**9-11**) on the one hand support the laudator's criticism, but on the other, the fact that the criticism was current even in the idealized age of erotic poets (**1**) ironizes it considerably; (iii) the Panathenaic victory's characterization as a guest-exchange (**19-20**) is incongruous given its chrematitic nature; (iv) on the one hand, the charioteer Nicomachus is characterized as an independent aristocrat, which parallels the laudator who praises the Emmenids as a friend: the veil may be lifted on a second economic relationship that victory-commemoration typically suppressed, in order to support the laudator's position here (see **19-28**); on the other, he is an agent (**20-21**), and his central position invites questions about the operation of this patron-agent relationship in the light of others thematized by the ode (**7-8**: Terpsichore ~ song-prostitutes; **9-14**: Emmenids ~ P.; **23-24** Zeus ~ Elean heralds; **47-48** P. ~ Nicasippus); (v) although Nicasippus could be seen, like Nicomachus, as an independent

man doing a favour for a friend, his presence in the coda creates a discrepancy between the intimate tone and evocation of *xenia* in the rest of the ode and P. sending a agent to Thrasybulus to do a job (**47-48**).

1 Οἱ μὲν πάλαι ... φῶτες: Σ.*I*.2.1b names Alcaeus, Anacreon, and Ibycus as the pederastic poets intended; cf. Cic.*Tusc*.4.33.71. Pelliccia (2009b) 8 suggests Σ.*I*.2.1b derives these names from Ar.*Thesm*.161-62 Ἴβυκος ... κἀνακρέων ... κἀλκαῖος. However, **8** and **11** respectively allude to Anacreon and Alcaeus, and **3 παιδείους ... ὕμνους** are attributed to Ibycus: cf. *N*.6.53 παλαιότεροι (Arctinus, unnamed).

The inexplicitness (1) underscores the amateur, universal nature of this idealized age of pederastic poetry (cf. **1 φῶτες**); (2) includes P. himself, by re-imagining ***P*.6**'s address to Thrasybulus as a fully-fledged *paideios hymnos* (see ***P*.6.1-4**; **1 πάλαι**; **5 μνάστειραν**); (3) allows tradition to be moulded to suit his argument (see ***P*.6.21**).

Passages aligning P. and/or the laudator with the earlier poets: **1**; **2**; **3**; **5**; **33-34**; **35**; **45**; **47-48**.

μὲν: not *solitarium* (*P*.4.1), but with δέ unusually postponed until **9**. Opening contrasts: *O*.1.1; *O*.9.1-5; *P*.11.1-2; *N*.8.3; *N*.11.3-4; *I*.6.3-7.

πάλαι: often in contrasts with the present, as here with **9 νῦν** (*Il*.9.105; Arist.fr.1.14.92.14-15 εὐγενεῖς γὰρ οἱ πάλαι, | κρείττους δὲ οἱ νῦν). However, although the formal contrast is delayed until **9** (*v.s.*), it begins semantically with Antistrophe 1, masked by the negative causal clause (**6-8**). Whereas at ***P*.6.40-45 τῶν πάλαι ... τῶν νῦν ... Θρασύβουλος** the present exemplar was equal to the past, here the contrast marks a decline: the concept's manifestation in Hesiod's Myth of Races (Hes.*Op*.106-201) is here mirrored by the shift from gold (**1 χρυσαμπύκων**) to silver (**8 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι**).

However, **πάλαι** need not mean the *distant* past: P. evokes his praise of the young Thrasybulus in ***P.*6** as if were a *paideios hymnos* (cf. Sapph.fr.49.1 ἠράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἄτθι, πάλαι): *v.s.*

Openings referencing the past as a foil to the present: S.*Tr.*1.ff with Davies.

ὦ Θρασύβουλε: P.'s only first-line address to a human (Kambylis (1964) 181n.3; cf. *I.*4.2). Since Thrasybulus is also the only Emmenid addressed by P. (***P.*6.15**; fr.124.ab.1; **31**), the vocative evokes a history of personal intimacy (*v.s.*); contrast Xenocrates' 3rd-person references (***P.*6.6**; **14**; **36**).

The naming recalls Thrasybulus' prominence in ***P.*6**, the only ode other than *P.*1 (58) and ***I.*2** to name the victor's son (unnamed sons: *O.*5.23). Whereas there his role is ambiguous (see ***P.*6.15**), here Xenocrates' death (**35-42**) establishes him as heir and guarantor of his father's legacy (**44-46**).

2nd-person addresses structure the ode: **1** ~ **12** frame the proem, **12** ~ **31** the victory-catalogue, **31** ~ **47** the virtue-catalogue, **1** ~ **47** the whole.

ὦ: see ***O.*2.12**.

φῶτες: pleonastic with **Οἱ μὲν πάλαι**: *v.s.*

χρυσαμπύκων: associated particularly with Muses (Hes.*Th.*915-17; *P.*3.89-92; B.5.13; B.fr.12a.13); horses (*Il.*5.358, 363, 720, 8.382); Horae (*h.Hom.*6.5-12; fr.30.6).

Here, its (1) occurrence in Hesiod's account of the Muses' birth implies their depiction in Strophe 1 matches their original character; (2) application to horses in epic suits the chariot-of-the-Muses image (**2**: so Silk (1974) 154). Both connotations unite if the Muses are the team pulling the chariot (Ar.*Ve.*1022; Lobo.fr.518.1-2).

Gold is often associated with gods, due to its lustre, imperishability, and use in cult-statues: West (1997) 112n.32-34; (2007) 153-54; **26**.

Mention of gold frequently opens *Homeric Hymns* (*h.Hom*.2.4; *h.Hom*.6.1; *h.Hom*.8.1; *h.Hom*.12.1; *h.Hom*.27.1; *h.Hom*.28.6; *h.Hom*.32.6), a pattern imitated by P. and B.: *O*.1.1; *O*.6.1; *O*.7.4; *O*.8.1; *O*.13.8; *P*.1.1; *P*.4.4; *P*.5.9; ***P*.6.8**; *P*.9.6; *P*.11.4; *N*.5.7; *I*.1.1; *I*.5.3; *I*.7.5; *I*.8.5a; fr.29.1; fr.37.1; fr.52f.1; fr.94b.1; fr.128c.1; fr.194.1; B.4.2; B.9.1; B.10.6; B.14B.1; B.15.4; B.16.2; also E.*Ph*.1-2 [χρυσοκολλήτοισιν ... δίφροις]. Cf. *RV*.5.55.1.1; 5.56.1.1; 5.57.1.1; 6.71.1.1; 7.38.1.1; 7.69.1.1; 8.29.1.1; 9.72.1.1.

Gold's connection with the Muses: *N*.7.77-79; *I*.8.5a-6; fr.215b.col.?.8; B.3.3-4; Timoth.fr.15.col.5.202-3; Davies & Finglass on Stes.fr.90.10. Contrasting silver (**8**): *v.s.*

2 ἐς δίφρον ... ἔβαι-νον: the epic expression for chariot-mounting grants the poets an archaic/heroic air: cf. **1 χρυσαμπύκων**.

δίφρον Μοισᾶν: the laudator rides the Muses' chariot at *O*.9.81 ἐν Μοισᾶν δίφρῳ: cf. *P*.10.65; *I*.8.61; fr.52h.11-14; B.5.176-78; Emped.fr.3.8-10; Luc.*Hist.Conscr*.8.5-6; Ael.Aristid.50.23; Ael.Aristid.391.24-27; also Sim.*Epig*.13.28.9-12 (Charites' chariot). **1 χρυσαμπύκων** suggests the Muses are the chariot-team to the poet's charioteer.

Chariot-image for poetry: *Od*.8.500 (reading ἔνθεν ἐλῶν produces the earliest Greek example); *O*.1.109-11; *O*.6.22-24; *N*.1.7; **33**; *I*.5.38; fr.124ab.1-2; fr.140b.8-10; B.10.51-52; Ar.*Ve*.1049-50; Choer.fr.317.3-5; Call.fr.1.25-28; Lucr.6.47, 92-93; V.*G*.2.541-42. Rigvedic chariots represent (1) the poem; (2) the means by which the poet competes in a poetic contest, as if in a race: see West (2007) 41-43. Cf. Simpson (1969) 470-73; Steiner (1986) 58-59; Henderson (1992) 148-58.

Here, the metaphor (1) matches the chariot-victory celebrated; (2) heroizes the earlier poets; (3) as an image used of his own poetry (including for the Emmenids: fr.124ab.1 Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατᾶν ὄχημ' ἀοιδᾶν), links P. to the earlier poets, esp. as it recurs in the responding **33-34**; (4) relates to poetry's economics: Platte (2010) links the IE 'chariot-of-

song' image inherited by P. with the use of horses as payment for poetry in Vedic and Avestan literature (cf. **1-11**).

Since the first 1 or 2 lines of every ***I*.2** strophe/antistrophe (except Antistrophe 1) reference either charioteering or horse-rearing, they become a *leitmotif*, esp. in relation to the ode's complex portrayal of patron-agent relationships: **2 δίφρον Μοισᾶν** (poets praised for 'driving' without reference to a patron's commission); **17 εὐάρματον** (victor honoured for a chariot driven by an agent); **21** (agent praised for driving victor's chariot), **22** (agent recognized as quasi-victor himself); **33-34** (laudator driving poetic chariot to his patrons); **38** (victor praised for horse-rearing).

δίφρον ... φόρμιγγι: association between chariots/lyres: ζυγόν = 'yoke' and 'cross-bar of a lyre' (*Il*.9.187).

Μοισᾶν ... φόρμιγγι: Muses and lyre: ***O*.2.1**.

Μοισᾶν: frequent invocation of the Muses in openings (see ***O*.2.1**) means their mention alone marks inception: ***O*.3.4**; *O*.9.5; *P*.1.2; *N*.1.12; *N*.4.3; *N*.7.12; *I*.6.2.

2 κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι: fr.140a.60-61 κλυτᾶν ἀυ- | τά, Ἑκαβόλ̣ε, φορμίγγων. The epithet's application to celebratory song/music in epinician (*O*.1.105; *P*.10.6; *N*.7.16; *I*.7.19) supports the causative 'glorifying' here. Less probable is the passive 'glorious': the Muses are 'famed for the lyre' at B.1.1-3 [Κλ]υτοφόρμιγγες ... Πι]ερίδες, and the passive is the only epic sense, which is the context here (*Il*.22.399 ἐς δίφρον δ' ἀναβὰς ἀνά τε κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἀείρας).

2-3 φόρμιγγι ... ἐτόξευον: lyre and bow relationship: ***O*.2.83**.

2 φόρμιγγι: marking openings: ***O*.2.1**.

3 ῥίμφα: elsewhere primarily in hexameter verse, except fr.70b.19, A.*Ag*.407. Its association with chariots (*Il*.11.533; *Il*.17.458; *Il*.22.163; *h.Hom*.2.89; *h.Hom*.9.4;

Hes.*Scut*.342) motivates its use here: cf. ῥιμφαρμάτος (***O*.3.37**; S.*OC*.1062). Extension of the regular sense 'swiftly' to 'spontaneously' (Simpson (1969) 471; Nisetich (1977) 140) is unparalleled: instead, the poets' speed implies their passion; contrast **7-8** of setting out wares for sale.

παιδείους ... ὕμνους: the attestation in Athen.13.601a that Stesichorus established a pederastic genre addressed to youths (τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλεῖτο παίδεια καὶ παιδικά) is probably inaccurate (Davies & Finglass 21). Ibycus is a likelier practitioner: Chamaeleon (fr.25 Wehrli) gives Ibyc.S286 as an example (see **1**). B.fr.4.80 παιδικοί θ' ὕμνοι φλέγονται probably means songs sung to boys rather than by them, since φλέγονται connotes passion's blaze.

Ancient biographical interpretation of erotic poetry: see Rawles (2011) 139-59, who considers the historical reasons for Thrasybulus' prominence in ***P*.6** and ***I*.2** irrecoverable, but speculates (158n.47) that 'Thrasybulus was a fine musician who had been a celebrated beauty in his youth'. Metapoetically, ***P*.6**'s praise of Thrasybulus is reprised here. That praise was 'pederastic' in the sense that (1) any praise of a youth is so *ipso facto*; (2) the paraenetic genre which ***P*.6** adapted carried pederastic overtones (see ***P*.6.21-27**). However, as argued at ***P*.6.1-4**, scholars have exaggerated ***P*.6**'s purely implicit pederastic dimension by retrojecting the explicit reference to pederasty here, and thus missing the point that here P. *re-imagines* ***P*.6** in order to support his present argument.

ἐτόξευον: 'archery-as-poetry': ***O*.2.83**, **89-91**. P.'s application of a favoured metaphor for his own craft to the older poets assimilates him to them (see **1**). Here the image interacts with that of the 'arrows-of-love', assuming the poets aimed to engender love in their targets: see Spatafora (1995) 366-81; Pace (2001) 19-26; Cánovas (2011) 553-79; B.10.42-43 ἐπὶ παισὶ ... τόξον τιταίνει. These arrows are not restricted to Eros (Olson on Ar.*Ach*.991) or Aphrodite (Braswell on *P*.4.13), who do not desire love *for themselves*.

Elsewhere, the 'arrows-of-love' are the human gaze, emitted by the object of desire (A.*PV*.649-59; E.*Tro*.255), or its subject (A.*Supp*.1003-5 παρθένων χλιδαῖσιν ... πᾶς τις παρελθὼν ὄμματος θελκτήριον | τόξευμ' ἔπεμψεν).

Poems as arrows from the Muses' bow: *O*.9.5.

Bow- and chariot-imagery fuse into a super-valorized image for poetry (Simpson (1969) 437-73). There is little evidence for Greek Bronze Age chariot-archery, but the practice was common in Egyptian/NE warfare (Littauer & Crouwel (1996) 297-305).

μελιγάρυας ὕμνους: elsewhere in P. of his own poetry: *O*.11.4 μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι; *P*.3.64-65 μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι | ἀμέτεροι. P. links himself to the former poets (see **1**).

μελιγάρυας: often of captivating song: *Od*.12.187 (Sirens); *h.Hom*.3.516-19; *h.Hom*.19.16-18 (nightingale); Alcm.fr.26.1; Sim.fr.90.1.3-4; *N*.3.4-6; fr.52c.12-13; fr.52e.44-48; Pl.*Phaedr*.269a.5; Theocr.4.11-12.

Honey-sweetness (***P*.6.52**, **54**), which characterizes speech/poetry because the mouth is where sweetness is perceived, is a favourite lyric image (*O*.7.7-8; *I*.7.20 ἁδυμελεῖ σὺν ὕμνῳ; *N*.11.18 μελιγδούποισι ... ἀοιδαῖς; B.3.97 μελιγλώσσου; Dunbar on Ar.*Av*.747-51; *RV*.1.110.1.1 'my sweetest hymn is sung to celebrate your praise', 5.42.1.1 'our sweetest song with deep devotion'). Here, it forms a leitmotif connecting past poetry with (1) present poetry (**7 μελιφθόγγου**); (2) the heralds' *aggelia* (**25 ἁδυπνόῳ**); (3) P.'s previous Emmenid compositions (**32 μελικόμπων**). Cf. ***P*.6.54**.

The balancing sweetness of the boy's beauty (**5 ἁδίσταν**) enacts the exchange's unmaterialistic *reciprocity*.

4 ὅστις: sc. παῖς, as if **3 παιδείους** were παίδων. Ellipse: S.*Tr*.259-60 with Davies.

καλὸς: in P., always of physical beauty with persons, esp. victors: *O*.8.19 ἐσορᾶν καλός; *O*.9.94 ὡραῖος ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς; *O*.10.103-4 ἰδέᾳ τε καλὸν | ὥρᾳ τε κεκραμένον; *N*.3.19 ἐὼν καλὸς.

This subset of epinician praise often links beauty with youth, like **4-5**, thus overlapping with **3 παιδείους ... ὕμνους**. In particular, P.'s use of the nominative with persons (except *O*.10.103) echoes the sympotic use of καλός-inscriptions (i.e. erotic praise-motifs for boys) on *kylikes* c.550-450, esp. from Athens (Lissarague (1999) 361), a set of which Thrasybulus owned: fr.124ab.3-4 συμπόταισίν ... καὶ κυλίκεσσιν Ἀθαναίαισι κέντρον. Inscriptions: Dover (1978) 111-24.

The symposium would thus likewise have been a natural venue for the pederastic poetry idealized here. Since the symposium was also a (re-)performance context for epinicia/encomia (see ***P*.6.52-54**), this links ***I*.2**'s opening to its closing exhortation to Thrasybulus to reperform the family's odes (**44-46**), which themselves include the valorized pederastic praise-motifs.

Ἀφροδίτας: ***P*.6.1 Ἀφροδίτας**. Association with beauty: *h.Hom*.6.1; E.fr.781.13. Bestowing the *eromenos*' short-lived allure: Thgn.2.1304, 1319-20.

5 εὐθρόνου: 1x *Il*., 5x *Od*. (Eos); ***O*.2.22** (Cadmeids); *P*.9.60 (Horae); *N*.3.83 (Cleo); fr.128b (?); B.16.3 (Urania); A.R.1.1093 (Magna Mater). Cf. Sapph.fr.1.1 πο]ικιλόθρο[ν' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα.

–θρονος compounds in the archaic/classical period are restricted to females, almost always divinities. Braswell on *P*.4.260-61(c) prefers (1) '-throned' to (2) '-flowered', given the frequency of θρόνος = 'throne' over θρόνα = 'flowers embroidered on cloth'; Kölligan (2007) 115-18 adduces Aphrodite and Uṣas' connection with chariots to posit reference to a chariot-seat, which would cohere with **2 δίφρον Μοισᾶν** (cf. Aphrodite riding in the Charites' chariot at Sapph.fr.194 = Him.*Orat*.9.4). On the other hand, (2)

would match the image of erotic bloom (**5 ὀπώραν**), and Sapph.fr.1.1 (the only other application of a –θρονος compound to Aphrodite, likewise in an erotic context) may have coined πο]ικιλόθρο[ν' directly from *Il*.22.441 θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσε.

μνάστειραν: 'reminding' (Σ.*I*.2.1a) over 'wooing' (Bury) (1) fits the nostalgic context (see **1**); (2) metapoetically recalls ***P*.6.1 Ἀφροδίτας**, reimagining that ode as a *paideios hymnos* to Thrasybulus (see **3**), and programmatically signalling that ***I*.2** will recall previous Emmenid poems (see **1-11**). Cf. Chrys.Phil.fr.622.9 μνησθεὶς δὲ Ἀφροδίτης; Aristoph.Gramm.2.89.2 μνημονεύουσιν ἀφροδίτης; *Od*.22.445 ἐκλελάθωντ' Ἀφροδίτης.

ἀδίσταν: erotic sweetness: *P*.9.41 ἀδείας ... εὐνᾶς; E.*Alc*.790-91 ἡδίστην ... Κύπριν.

ὀπώραν: 'late summer' (Nicand.fr.75.2 ἡδεῖαν ὀπώρην), metaphorical for sexual ripeness (Pfeijffer on *N*.5.6; Aristaenet.2.1.38 σὴ ὀπώρα ἡδίων τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων).

Likewise stanza-final at *N*.5 Strophe 1: 6 οὔπω γένυσι φαίνων τερείνας ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν (boy-victor on the cusp of sexual maturity). Given multiple *N*.5 allusions (**7-8**; **26**; **46**), this one may have direct relevance to the context: P. praised a παῖς erotically before; *N*.5.6 itself imitates erotic material from Alcaeus (Alc.fr.397 τερένας ἄνθος ὀπώρας) or Ibycus (Ibyc.fr.5.4 οἰνανθίδες), to whom **1** may refer.

Antistrophe 1

6-8 The modern Muse's characterization continues the past tenses of **1-5**, but uses negatives to underscore the break with the past. Whereas in **1-5** the Muses assisted the poets, and songs were the poets' arrows, here no mention is made of the poets or their addressees. Instead, it is the Muse who sells herself (**6**); pimps her songs (**7-8**); recommends the new *status quo* (**9**): the responsibility and disgrace is assigned to female

entities (note **8 ἀοιδαί** vs. **3 ὕμνους**) who represent the 'product' itself, whilst eliding the male parties to the transaction (so *P.*11.41 Μοῖσα, τὸ δὲ τεόν, εἰ μισθοῖο συνέθευ). P. condemns the mercenary Muse, but insulates both poets and patrons by appealing to Greek misogyny: see **6**.

The lack of explicit reference to epinician poetry further insulates P.: **1-5** clearly concerns love-poetry, and **7 Τερψιχόρας** indicates a shift to choral performance, but without specifying the genre it accompanies.

Theocr.*Id.*16 makes the opposite complaint: greed prevents *patrons* from paying poets as they used to.

6 ἀ Μοῖσα: 2 Μοισᾶν.

γὰρ οὐ ... πω τότ': accentuating explanatory contrasts between past and present: *h.Hom.*3.226-27 οὐ γάρ πώ τις ἔναιε ... οὐδ' ἄρα πω τότε γ' ἦσαν ἀταρπιτοὶ; Ar.*Nu.*1228 οὐ γάρ πω τότ' ἐξηπίστατο; X.*Hell.*7.2.3.1-2 οὐ | γάρ πω τότε ἀφέστασαν; Dem.18.18.1-2 οὐ γὰρ ... ἐπολιτευόμην πω τότε. Anacr.fr.39.1 οὐδ' ἀργυρῆ κω τότ' ἔλαμπε Πειθώ: see **8**. The variant ποτε would typically expect the punctual aorist (*Il.*1.154).

6-7 οὐ ... οὐδ' ... οὐδ': the triple negative underscores decline from past to present; however, the double negative **33**, and triple negatives **30-32**, **43-45**, depict song, esp. for the Emmenids, positively.

6 φιλοκερδής: greed often incurs moral censure (Thgn.1.196-201; Ar.*Plut.*590-91; cf. S.*Ant.*312; *P.*1.92; *N.*11.47); *P.*3.54 deprecates the enthralling of σοφία to κέρδος. Definition: [Pl.]*Hipparch.*227d.1-3: ὃς ἂν | σπουδάζῃ ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ἀξιοῖ κερδαίνειν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἀφ' ὧν | οἱ χρηστοὶ οὐ τολμῶσι κερδαίνειν. The poets' sexual desires (**4-5**) become the Muses' love of gain.

IE etymology linking poetry with profit: **1-11**.

ἐργάτις: 'working-girl, prostitute' (Wilamowitz (1922) 311n.1; cf. Archil.fr.208; Hdt.5.13.14; Call.*Iamb*.fr.222.1-2). Prostitute Muse: Ar.*Ra*.1305-8, with Dover; Juven.7.86-87; Baudelaire.*La Muse Vénale*.9-14. The metaphor derives force from the Muses' typical virginity: fr.52f.54; Ar.*Ra*.875-76; D.S.473.4-6. Contrast Ar.*Ra*.1308 ἡ Μοῦσ' οὐκ ἐλεσβίαζεν, οὔ (Muse's lack of carnality as a *negative* trait, suggesting ugliness).

The use of the prostitute-Muse as the counterpart of the pederast-poet creates effective contrasts and asymmetries. Whereas for the pederast-poet *literal* love/sex is the goal towards which his *metaphorical* free gifts are the means, for the prostitute-Muse *literal* money is the goal towards which her *metaphorical* love/sex is the means, illustrating money's power to corrupt human affections. Her short-lived economic relationship with successive clients encapsulates the poetry the laudator rejects. Using the female Muse is the only way the prostitute-image could be employed here: the logical alternative of a male prostitute poet would unacceptably implicate P. in the literal sale of his poetry and the metaphorical sale of himself: see **6-8**.

Cf. P.'s sympathetic treatment of the hierodules in fr.122: Kurke (1996) 49-75; Burnett (2011) 49-60.

7 ἐπέρναντο: metaphor of prostitution-as-sale (cf. **6 ἐργάτις**): Aeschin.*in.Timarch*.29.6-9; Harp.*Lex.Dec.Orat.Att*. s.v.*Πωλῶσι*: πορνεύειν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ περνάναι.

7-8 γλυκεῖ-αι μελιφθόγγου ... ἀοιδαί: hyperbaton of **γλυκεῖ-αι** relative to **ἀοιδαί** reinforces the songs' sweetness by juxtaposition with **μελιφθόγγου**. Song's (honey-) sweetness: see **3**; also *h.Hom*.7.59 γλυκερὴν κοσμῆσαι ἀοιδήν; *O*.6.91 γλυκὺς κρατὴρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν; *N*.5.2 γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά (likewise treating song's commodification; *N*.5 allusions: **5**; **26**; **46**).

The Emmenids' sweetness (**36**) makes the songs appropriate to them, even though the mode of exchange is deprecated.

7 μελιφθόγγου: Heyne for MSS μελίφθογγοι: 4 adjectives to a noun is un-Pindaric, and redundant with **8 μαλθακόφωνοι**. Only in P. before Athanas.*Apol.Arian*.75.6.28: *O*.6.21 μελίφθογ-γοι ... Μοῖσαι; *I*.6.9 μελιφθόγγοις ἀοιδαῖς.

Τερψιχόρας: Muse of choral poetry: Hes.*Th*.78; Pl.*Phaedr*.259c.6; Corinn.fr.2.1.1-2; A.R.4.896; D.S.4.7.4.13-14; Cornut.16.10-15. Etymologically ambiguous between 'giving joy to' or 'taking joy in' choruses: cf. Ar.*Ra*.674-75 Μοῦσα, χορῶν ἱερῶν ἐπίβηθι καὶ ἔλθ' ἐπὶ τέρψιν ἀ- | οιδᾶς. See **1-11**.

Here, Terpsichore acts as *pornoboskousa* (madam), with the songs (**8 ἀοιδαί**) as her *paidiskai* (sex-workers). Greek brothel-keepers (Glazebrook (2011) 49-53) had a poor reputation (Olson on Ar.*Pa*.848-49). Whereas Call.*Iamb*.fr.222.1-2 makes the poet the *pornoboskos*, here the Muse bears the stigma (**6-8**).

8 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα: the prized silver complexion (Alcm.fr.1.55 ἀργύριον πρόσωπον) which women, including prostitutes, acquired through white lead: Ar.*Eccl*.878; Ar.*Plut*.1064-65; Ar.fr.320.3; Lys.1.14.6; Eubul.fr.98.1; Alexis.fr.98.17. Cosmetic artificiality compares poorly (X.*Oec*.10.2-13) with the natural beauty of earlier poets' targets (**4-5**; Simpson (1969) 471n.65), and implies immodest self-advertisement/greed.

Naming the metal simultaneously evokes the monetary exchange involved in prostitution and, by implication, in poetry: cf. the more direct *P*.11.41-42 Μοῖσα ... μισθοῖο συνέθευ ... φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον; fr.287.1 Μοῖσαι ἀργύρεαι. Contrasting gold: **1**.

Woodbury (1968) 533 detects allusion to Anacr.fr.39.1 οὐδ' ἀργυρῇ κω τότ' ἔλαμπε Πειθώ: P. focalizes the modern Muse's negative portrayal through earlier poets (likewise **10 'χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ'** through Alcaeus). Ironically, the allusive implication is that

the complaint is as old as the earlier poets whose age is compared favourably with the present.

πρόσωπα: πρόσωπον (Thiersch) is unnecessary: Barrett (2007) 145 with n.74.

μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί: semantic and metrical overlap with **3 μελιγάρυας ὕμνους** indicates continuity of the songs' *quality* between past and present, although now the *motive* for its composition is sullied. Cf. **32 μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν**.

μαλθακόφωνοι: *hapax* (except D.H.*de.Dem.dict*.40.50 μαλακόφωνα). Connotations: (1) soothing speech (*P*.4.137); (2) victory-song (*P*.8.31; *N*.9.49), ironically suggesting the genre *is* implicated with the mercenary Muse; (3) indecency/prostitution: Ar.*Nu*.979-80 οὐδ' ἂν μαλακὴν φυρασάμενος τὴν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν ἐραστὴν ... ἑαυτὸν προαγωγεύων similarly criticizes modern boys for adopting a simpering tone toward their lover and pimping themselves; (4) technical vocal qualities (Arist.*de.audib*.801b.33-35).

ἀοιδαί: change of gender from **3 ὕμνους**: see **6-8**. Personification elsewhere as the Muses' daughters (*N*.4.3 Μοισᾶν θύγατρες ἀοιδαὶ) makes their prostitution by Terpsichore particularly transgressive.

9-11 Σ*I*.2.17 cites Alc.fr.360, in which Alcaeus quotes Aristodemus' saying about the primacy of wealth, as the source of the Argive's saying here. However, P. does not simply extract the saying, but reworks the Alcaeus passage. (1) Aristodemus' name and the site of his utterance at Sparta are replaced by the ethnic **9 τὼργείου**, punning on **8 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι**, which illustrates the saying's point (*I*.6.58-59 also attests Argive laconicism). (2) The anonymous report Alc.fr.360.1 φαῖσ' becomes the Muse' *endorsement* (**9 ἐφίητι ... φυλάξαι**). (3) The litotes Alc.fr.360.1 οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον becomes a positive statement of truth (**10 ἀλαθείας <στάθμας> ἄγχιστα**). (4) Alc.fr.360.2 χρήματ' ἀνήρ becomes **11 χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ** through epizeuxis, intensifying the complaint's pathos, and stylistically enacting wealth's predominance in determining a man's worth;

ἀνήρ in reverse fits almost perfectly within **χρήματ'**. (5) Alc.fr.360.2 πένιχρος δ' οὐδ' εἷς πέλετ' ἔσλος οὐδὲ τίμιος is removed from the saying and becomes the speaker's *personal motivation* for the complaint (**11 ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων**, perhaps hinting at Thrasybulus' own altered circumstances: see **12**).

The use of an authority to deliver moral messages of a novel and dubious sort makes the passage a corrupted form of the Chironian precepts observed by Thrasybulus: ***P*.6.19-27**. Here, the laudator is doubly-insulated by having an authority give the advice, and the Muse endorse it (**9 ἐφίητι**).

9 νῦν δ': answering **1 μὲν**.

ἐφίητι: 9-11.

<τὸ>: article signalling notoriety: Hummel 181-82.

τὠργείου: 9-11.

Allusion to specific older poets: **1**. Irony of repeating a complaint already current in Alcaeus: **8**.

10 ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <στάθμας> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον: 9-11.

The lacuna obscures the metaphor. Kurke (1991) 246 sees reprise of the arrow-image from **3** (cf. *N*.9.55 ἀκοντίζων σκοποῖ' ἄγχιστα Μοισᾶν). However, **βαῖνον** (motion on land/water) does not suit a projectile-image, and supplementing <ὁδῶν> or **<στάθμας>** produces a path-image: *v.i.*

ῥῆμ': 'saying': *P*.4.277-78 Ὁμήρου ... ῥῆμα πόρσυν' (with Braswell). Incantatory with **11 'χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ'**.

ἀλαθείας: see ***O*.2.92**. Here, the point is not that the words are not falsehoods, but that they match reality: *O*.7.68-69 λόγων κορυφαί | ἐν ἀλαθείᾳ πετοῖσαι.

<στάθμας>: selected supplements: (1) ὁδῶν (Hermann); (2) ἐτᾶς (Bergk); (3) **στάθμας** (Schnitzer; ⏑–: *P*.2.90).

(1) Cf. *P*.3.103 ἀλαθείας ὁδόν; E.fr.289.2 ἀληθείας ὁδὸς. Emulating the singulars would require unmetrical ὁδοῦ (Kurke (1991) 246n.12), but the plural occurs with other abstracts (fr.94b.64 δίκας ὁδούς; fr.180.2 σιγᾶς ὁδοί).

(2) Cf. *O*.10.54 ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον, *N*.5.17 ἀλάθει᾽ ἀτρεκές.

(3) Given P.'s Emmenid self-quotations (**1-11**), he may reprise his only other metaphorical use of βαίνω at ***P*.6.45 πατρῴαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα**, which likewise compares past and present (**9-10 νῦν ... βαῖνον** ~ ***P*.6.44-45 νῦν ... ἔβα**), but where the present exemplar (Thrasybulus) was equal to the past.

βαῖνον: *v.s.*; contrast with the past is underscored by reprising **2 ἔβαι-νον**.

Epode 1

11 'χρήματα χρήματ᾽ ἀνήρ', ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ᾽ ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων: 9-11. Cf. 'money makythe the man' (Greene (1935) 263 c. AD 1500). Epode-initial position and direct speech highlights the saying.

Money's power over friendships/social standing (*Od*.11.358-61; *P*.5.1-4) is often criticized: Thgn.1.928-30 χρήματ᾽ ἄριστον ἔχειν. | ἢν μὲν γὰρ πλουτῇς, πολλοὶ φίλοι, ἢν δὲ πένηαι, | παῦροι, κοὐκέθ᾽ ὁμῶς αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός (contrast Isoc.21.9.4 χρήματα μὲν ὀλίγα, φίλους δὲ πολλοὺς κέκτηται); also Thgn.1.621; S.fr.88.1; E.fr.325.1; Mastronarde on E.*Ph*.439-40; Nisbet & Hubbard on H.*O*.1.35.26-27 *diffugiunt cadis | cum faece siccatis amici*. P. links wealth to moral qualities in every Emmenid ode to pre-empt criticism (see ***O*.2.10-11**; **35-42**). Nonetheless, since in other Emmenid odes wealth's

social power is intrinsic to the family's self-image (see ***P.*6.5**), its deprecation here is remarkable, and consistent with a decline in Emmenid wealth.

The chiastic link **6 φιλοκερδής ~ 11 κτεάνων ... φίλων** confirms that **11 φίλων** includes venal poets.

'χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ': χρήματα as 'money' is always negative in P.: fr.123.7 (favoured over pederasty); fr.157.

κτεάνων: like **χρήματα** (Apoll.*Lex.Hom.*163.9), with more positive connotations (***O.*3.42**).

θ' ἅμα ... καὶ: emphasizing the simultaneity of financial loss and social abandonment.

λειφθεὶς: zeugma. With **κτεάνων**: 'lacking' (LSJ B.II.4); with **φίλων**: 'abandoned by' (LSJ B.II.1).

φίλων: Pelliccia (2009b) 6 compares *N.*10.78 οἴχεται τιμὰ φίλων τατωμένῳ, of Polydeuces' bereavement, with Thrasybulus'. This is a possible subtext, but remote from the line's point that the loss of money *causes* abandonment by friends. Emmenid generosity to *philoi* is no longer reciprocated: ***O.*2.93-94 φίλοις ... εὐεργέταν**.

12 ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὢν σοφός: the direct address brackets the proem by ring-composition with **1 Θρασύβουλε**. This implies the proem is an intimate communication with personal relevance for Thrasybulus, as does the intertext with ***P.*6.49 σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων**, which likewise denotes Thrasybulus' wisdom concerning the Muses/poetry. The break-off cryptically implies that Thrasybulus, as a poetic connoisseur, will understand the proem's meaning (cf. ***O.*2.83-85**): see **1-11** for the possibilities. In my view, the allusion to ***O.*2** in the following explanatory asyndeton points the answer, namely that P.'s long-term loyalty to the family distinguishes him from venal praise-poets: see **12-13**.

ἐσσὶ: elsewhere (except *O*.6.90: Aeneas; *N*.10.80: Polydeuces), always in concise addresses to a victor who is an autocrat: *P*.1.88 πολλῶν ταμίας ἐσσί (~ *Il*.9.97-98 πολλῶν ... ἐσσι ἄναξ); *P*.2.72 γένοι', οἷος ἐσσὶ μαθών; *P*.4.270 ἐσσὶ δ' ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος; *P*.5.15-16 ὅτι βασιλεύς | ἐσσί (~ *Il*.9.69 σὺ γὰρ βασιλεύτατός ἐσσι). P. addresses Thrasybulus in an intimate but highly-honorific tone.

γὰρ ὦν: 'I need say no more, for ...' (Verdenius, after Fennell): break-off and transition. Combination: Bakker (2009) 41-61. Contrast E.fr.48.1 σοφὸς μὲν οὖν εἶ, Πρίαμ', ὅμως δέ σοι λέγω.

σοφός: ***P*.6.49**. Perhaps referencing Aristodemus' membership of the ἑπτὰ σοφοὶ (Dicaearch.fr.32).

12-32 Emmenid victory-catalogue: Xenocrates' Isthmian (**12-17**), Pythian (**18-19**), and Panathenaic (**19-22**) victories, and Theron's Olympic (**23-29**).

The catalogue is bracketed by 2 similar phrases in ring-composition (**12 οὐκ ἄγνωτ' ἀείδω** ~ **30-32 οὐκ ἀγνῶτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι ... ἀοιδᾶν**) which explicitly link the listed victories to their celebration in P.'s earlier Emmenid odes, as do the intervening self-quotations allusively: **12-14** ~ ***O*.2.49-51**; **18** ~ ***P*.6.18**; **27-28** ~ ***O*.3.17-18**; **28-29** ~ ***O*.2.46**, ***O*.3.9**; **31-32** ~ fr.124ab.1-2). This inserts the historical P. into the catalogue to illustrate the point of **1-11**: P.'s relationship with the Emmenids is long-standing and unmercenary.

In accordance with that thematic eschewal of venality, all 4 victories are characterized as gift-exchange: the 1st and 2nd are divine (**13-17**: Isthmus: Poseidon; **18**: Delphi: Apollo); the 3rd and 4th, human (**19-22**: Athens: Athenians; **23-29**: Olympia: Elean heralds), although the Elean heralds are also Zeus' agents.

The victory-catalogue's structure breaks the almost-invariable Pindaric rule that lists containing more than one Panhellenic victory proceed in descending order of prestige,

with the Panathenaea ranked 5th where it occurs (Gerber (on *O.*9) 71-73 ignores the Panathenaea's usual positioning). Here, the Panhellenic Games are in ascending order, interrupted by the Panathenaea in penultimate position.

The explanation lies in the difficulty created by Xenocrates' subordinate victories relative to his brother: whereas at *I.*4.19-33 Melissus' Isthmian victory transcends his family's local wins, here all *except* the Olympic belong to Xenocrates, and so following the traditional order would render his victories anticlimactic. Instead, the regular order (***O.*2.48-51**) is reversed, and Xenocrates is inserted into Theron's victory (see **28-29**). Theron's name is suppressed, and even his victor-status is masked by elevating the charioteer Nicomachus (see **19-28**): the Panathenaea's position facilitates Nicomachus' insertion into the Olympic, since he drove for both. Cf. *FD.*3.1.510: the Athenian Callias claims a full *periodos*, despite the Olympic victory belonging to another family member (Bousquet (1992) 585-606).

***I.*2** is the only Emmenid ode without a myth: the victory-list creates a contemporary myth of the family's agonistic greatness, assimilated to legend by the victories' characterization as divine gifts.

12-17 The Isthmian victory can be dated only roughly (488-476: Molyneux (1992) 234-35).

***I.*2**'s categorization amongst the *Isthmians* is probably due to the Isthmian victory's initial position in the catalogue, where it attracts the naming-complex's 4 primary elements (**Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι ... Ξενοκράτει ... εὐάρματον ... Ἀκραγαντίνων**: see ***P.*6.5-6**). Hellenistic editors may have considered it Xenocrates' most recent victory, given the Panathenaic's uncertain date (see **19-22**), but the catalogue was structured for encomiastic, not chronological, reasons (**12-32**).

12-13 οὐκ ἀγνῶτ' ἀείδω | Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν: ~ *O*.2.49-51 ἐς ἀδελφεόν | Ἰσθμοῖ τε κοιναὶ Χάριτες ἄνθεα τε-θρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων | ἄγαγον. Xenocrates' Isthmian victory is 'not unknown' precisely because the ***O*.2** victory-catalogue included it: *O*.6.96-97 νιν | λύραι μολπαί τε γινώσκοντι (Hieron) likewise = 'I have composed odes for him before'. The 1st person **12 ἀείδω** is indistinguishable from P. himself, due to the referencing of P.'s poetic history here (likewise **46**; **48**). P. thus allusively contrasts his own poetic practice with that deprecated in the proem (**12 ἀείδω ~ 8 ἀοιδαί**: both verse-final). See **12**; **1-11**.

12 οὐκ ἀγνῶτ': accusative singular < ἀγνώς (**B**), not neuter plural < ἄγνωτος (ἄγνωτ' **DΣ**^{γρ}).

Cf. *Od*.5.79 οὐ ... ἀγνῶτες; S.*OT*.58 γνωτὰ κοὐκ ἄγνωτά; E.*Hel*.504 οὐκ ἄγνωστος; also *N*.10.31 γνώτ' ἀείδω (implicit *Siegeswunsch*); Call.fr.612.1 ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω. Contrast **30 οὐκ ἀγνῶτες**.

ἀείδω: 12-13.

13 Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν: *O*.2.50 Ἰσθμοῖ ... τε-θρίππων; Arist.fr.var.47.617.2-3 Ξενοκράτης ... Ἴσθμια νενίκηκεν ἵπποις.

Ἰσθμίαν ... νίκαν: *P*.7.13/14; *P*.8.37; *I*.7.20-21; *I*.8.4; B.1.156; B.10.26.

ἵπποισι νίκαν: *P*.6.16 ἅρματι νίκαν; **47 Νικάσιππ'**. Similar collocations characterize agonistic epigram (***P*.6.5-6**): Ebert (1972) no.3.3 *hί*ποισίν νικέ[σας; no.4.2 νικήσας ἵπποις; no.8.2 [*hί*π(π)]οις νικάσας; no.28.1 ἵπποις νικῶν; Phaenias.fr.11.33 νικήσας ἵπποισι; Polem.fr.22.7-8 ἵπποισι νι- | κῶν.

13-14 νίκαν ... ὀπάσαις: Hes.*Th*.433 (Hecate); *O*.13.14 νικαφόρον ἀγλαΐαν ὤπασαν (Horae); Ar.*Thesm*.973. The Isthmus itself bestows victory at *I*.1.11 ὤπασεν.

14 Ξενοκράτει: named at the head of the victory-catalogue here as of the virtue-catalogue (**36**).

Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις: the verb is typical of the gods' gifts (cf. **13-14**): *Il.*14.357-58 Ποσείδαον ... κῦδος ὄπαζε; *I.*7.38 Γαιάοχος εὐδίαν ὄπασσεν; E.*Hipp.*45 Ποσειδῶν ὤπασεν Θησεῖ γέρας (~ **17 γεραίρων**). These include that of victory from the Games' god (*O.*8.83-84; *P.*8.64-65). Poseidon grants victory as god of the Isthmian Games (*N.*5.37 Ποσειδάωνα ... νίσεται Ἰσθμὸν Δωρίαν) and lord of horses (***P.*6.50-51**).

15-16 Crowning (see ***O.*3.11-13**) is an epinician commonplace because it memorializes and re-enacts the moment in which the victory was *physically* recognized, just as the naming-complex (***P.*6.5-6**) does the *aggelia* which recognized the victory *verbally*: those functions are united by embedding the crowning within the naming-complex here (**12-17**). Cf. ***O.*2.50**, ***O.*3.6**: strikingly, ***P.*6**, which diffuses Xenocrates' glory amongst family members, is the only Emmenid ode to omit crowning.

Δωρίων ... σελίνων: the Isthmian victor's wild celery crown (Andrews (1949) 91-99; Blech (1982) 131-37): *I.*8.63-64 Ἴσθμιον ἂν νάπος | Δωρίων ἔλαχεν σελί-νων; *O.*13.33 σελίνων ἐν Ἰσθμιάδεσσιν; *N.*4.88 Κορινθίοις σελίνοις. Genitive of material with garlands: ***O.*2.72**; *P.*4.240; *N.*5.54; *I.*8.67.

P. may here, as at fr.5.1-3, promote the Corinthian version of the Isthmian Games' foundation (*Hypoth.Isthm.*a: funeral games for Melicertes) over the Athenian (*Hypoth.Isthm.*b: commemorating Theseus' defeat of Sinis): (1) 'Dorian' is a metonymy for 'Corinthian', since Corinth, which controlled the Isthmus, was a quintessentially Dorian polis (conquest by the Dorians: Fowler (2013) 341n.21); (2) Corinth may have replaced the pine crown (associated with Sinis the pine-bender) with wild celery (associated with Nemea and Heracles) at the Isthmus in the early 5th century (A.fr.78a.34; A.fr.78c.49-50; Plut.*Quaest.Conv.*672d; Broneer (1962) 259-63) – P. gives no hint of the

earlier material. Hubbard (2007) 27-45 argues that P. promotes Dorian versions of Panhellenic festivals' foundation-myths, reflecting Thebes' contemporary alignment with Sparta and other Dorian states (see ***O*.3.11**).

The point here may be to chime with Acragas' Dorian pride (note **17 Ἀκραγαντίνων**; ***O*.3.5**), or present Xenocrates' victory as an act of one-upmanship over Corinth's Dorian colony Syracuse. That the epithet's remaining applications to Corinth (*N*.5.37; *I*.8.64) occur in Aeginetan odes similarly matches Aegina's Dorianism (in P., only Aegina receives the parallel epithet Δωριεύς: *O*.8.30; *P*.8.20; *I*.9.4; fr.52f.123).

Celery was employed for garlands of the dead (Garland (2001) 26, 116), and its use in victory-garlands at Nemea and the Isthmus reflects their putative origins as funeral games. This association programmatically links Xenocrates' victory and his death: it is striking that 3 of 4 Pindaric mentions of Isthmian celery occur in reference to *dead* victors (*N*.4.88; *h.l.*; *I*.8.64).

The hyperbaton (Hummel 440) mimetically binds the verses as the garland does the victor's hair (**15 κόμᾳ** lies precisely in between, separated on either side by 2 words totalling 6 syllables): cf. ***O*.3.5 Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ**.

στεφάνωμα κόμᾳ | πέμπεν ἀναδεῖσθαι: oxymoronic juxtaposition. Elsewhere in P., the middle **ἀναδεῖσθαι** always applies to victors who won *in propria persona* (*N*.11.28; *I*.1.28), as does the middle of στεφανόω (cf. B.9.23-24 στεφάνῳ ... ἐρέψωνται κόμαν). **16 πέμπεν** hints at the typically-suppressed fact that most equestrian victors did not compete in person, and perhaps did not always attend the Games (cf. *N*.9.52-53 ἵπποι κτησάμεναι Χρομίῳ πέμψαν θεμιπλέκτοις ἁμᾶ ... στεφάνοις ἐκ τᾶς ἱερᾶς Σικυῶνος), but instead contributed financially: see **38**. This tension anticipates the charioteer Nicomachus' extraordinary prominence (see **19-28**). Cf. **17 εὐάρματον**.

Strophe 2

17 εὐάρματον: obscuring the distinction between owning and driving: see **15-16**. The poets' means of praise (**2 δίφρον Μοισᾶν**) becomes Xenocrates' reason for deserving it. Elsewhere only *P*.2.5 (Hieron); *P*.4.74 (Cyrene); fr.195 (Thebes); S.*Ant*.845 (Thebes); Manass.*Brev.Chron*.5673 (chariots); cf. ***O*.3.39**.

γεραίρων Ἀκραγαντίνων: ***O*.3.2 Ἀκράγαντα γεραίρων** (*Theron's* victory).

γεραίρων: here, honouring with a physical *geras* (*Il*.7.321), the crown (*P*.5.31; X.*Hell*.1.7.33.6-7; *Epig.ap*.Aeschin.3.190.5); contrast ***O*.3.2** (song).

Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος: reviving metaphors for the Emmenids' key role in their polis/island: ***O*.2.6 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος**, **9-10 Σικελίας ... ὀφθαλμός**. At *O*.5.14, the victor brings the community into the light: ἄγων ἐς φάος τόνδε δᾶμον ἀστῶν.

Ἀκραγαντίνων: every Emmenid ode names the city (see ***P*.6.5**), but the citizenry are named only here, stressing Xenocrates' personal relationship with them (see **37**).

φάος: metaphorical of persons as a 'saving light' (*Il*.17.615; *Il*.18.102; *P*.3.75-76) or 'welcome sight' (*Od*.16.23). Light as Pindaric valorizing term: ***O*.2.55-56**; contrast the description of *wealth* there as **ἐτυμώτατον | ἀνδρὶ φέγγος**.

18-19 ἐν Κρίσᾳ δ' εὐρυσθενὴς εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν | καὶ τόθι·: Xenocrates' 490 Pythian victory, recalling ***P*.6.8 Ἀπολλωνία**, **18 Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς**, **46 ἀγλαΐαν**.

18 εὐρυσθενὴς: 3x in epic of Poseidon (*Il*.7.455; *Il*.8.201; *Od*.13.140); elsewhere in P. and B., of gods (*O*.13.80: Poseidon; B.19.17: Zeus), heroes, men, cities, wealth. Perhaps motivated by *h.Hom*.3.268-69 σεῦ δὲ σθένος ἐστὶ μέγιστον· | ἐν Κρίσῃ ποίησαι (Apollo founding his Temple).

εἶδ': characterizing Apollo both as arbiter of his Games ('looked with favour upon', i.e. granted victory (cf. B.11.15-17)), and as appreciative *spectator* (*O.*10.100; *P.*9.98; also B.5.40 εἶδε νικάσαντα ... Ἀώς). Here, Xenocrates' personal attendance is implied; contrast **15-16**.

Ἀπόλλων ... πόρε: the verb often indicates the gods' gifts (like **14 ὀπάσαις**). It denotes Apollo's granting of Delphic victory at *P.*4.66-67 Ἀπόλλων ἅ τε Πυθὼ κῦδος ... ἔπορεν | ἱπποδρομίας; *I.*7.49-51 πόρε, Λοξία ... Πυθόϊ στέφανον. Cf. the formula πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Il.*1.72; *Il.*11.353; *Il.*15.441; Hes.fr.33a.29).

ἀγλαΐαν: victory's splendour; contrast ***P.*6.46 ἀγλαΐαν**, which was shared with *Theron*. Granted by a divinity: *O.*13.14 (Charites); *N.*1.13 (Muse?). The Charis Aglaia has a throne beside Apollo (*O.*14.10-13; see **19 χαρίτεσσιν**), and Apollo is associated with the noun in celebratory contexts at *P.*1.1-2; fr.148; B.fr.4.55-57.

19 καὶ τόθι· κλεινᾶις <τ'> Ἐρεχθειδᾶν χαρίτεσσιν ἀραρώς: punctuation is necessary to avoid a grammatical clash between **18 Ἀπόλλων** and **19 ἀραρώς** (Xenocrates). Bowra punctuates after **18 ἀγλαΐαν**, but this ignores the fact that strongly-anaphoric **τόθι** refers back to **18 Κρίσᾳ**. I therefore punctuate after **τόθι**, retaining **<τ'>** (Bergk) as sentence-connective. *Pace* Nicholson (2005) 233n.1, the need for punctuation means **<τ'>** does not determine whether or not Nicomachus drove in Xenocrates' Pythian victory, and there is no textual indication here that he did so. The variant καὶ τότε (**D**[1]), with punctuation after **18 ἀγλαΐαν**, would obviate the need for **<τ'>**.

19-28 Nicomachus drove in Xenocrates' Panathenaic victory (**20-22**), and Theron's Olympic (**23-28**). He probably did not drive in Xenocrates' Isthmian (Nicholson (2005) 65; *pace* Bell (1995) 21n.118), nor his Pythian (see **19**).

His identity is unknown. Σ*I.*2.28b's report that he is an Athenian seems extrapolated from **19-20**; although the name's most frequent *LGPN* attestations are Attic, it occurs

across the Greek world, including 5th-century Camarina (Cordano 27). Hypothetical identification with the Motya charioteer: Bell (1995) 17-42.

Nicomachus' prominence is extraordinary. Earlier Emmenid odes not only avoid mentioning a charioteer, but imply that the victor (***O*.2.48**) or his kinsman (***P*.6.28-42**) drove. Victory-commemorations typically record the rare occasions when the charioteer was the victor (*I*.1.15), or a member of the elite (e.g. Carrhotus, Arcesilas' brother-in-law (*P*.5.26; Σ*P*.5.34); Cnopiadas, a Boeotian aristocrat (*CEG*.302, with Day (2010) 209)). However, they suppress the non-elite, whether because they represented commodity-exchange (Nicholson (2005) 8-21) or diverted attention from the victor, who could easily be marginalized since he did not physically participate in his victory (cf. **15-16**).

Here, Nicomachus is represented as an elite *xenia*-participant (**24**), and almost a victor himself (**26**), although the Olympic victory is assigned to Aenesidamus' sons (**28-29**). Athanassaki (2014) 212-19 accepts his elite status, and posits that he commissioned the ode. Nicholson (2005) 64-81 sees him as a professional, citing the lack of patronymic, albeit one whose fame made celebrating the victory without him less credible.

On balance, he was probably non-elite, but the point is not his fame (since if ***O*.2** and ***O*.3** could be celebrated without him, so could ***I*.2**), but his tripartite function within the ode:

(1) Economic dynamics. Within the same ode, P. deliberately exposes two typically-suppressed mechanisms relating to victory, namely the charioteer who drove, and the commissioning process of the poet who commemorated. Just as the laudator's implicit argument is that he assists the Emmenids out of friendship (**1-11**), so in parallel is the charioteer presented as an elite figure who is not only not a hireling, but *bestows xenia* (**24**). Compare the similarly free-spirited earlier poets who ride in *the Muses' chariot* (**1-5**).

(2) Family politics. The victory-catalogue is structured to counteract Xenocrates' disadvantage in possessing less prestigious victories than his brother, juxtaposing Xenocrates' Panathenaic and Theron's Olympic victory so that Nicomachus can segue from one to the other: see **12-32**. Theron is not only unnamed, as he was at ***P.*6.46**, and as was Xenocrates at ***O.*2.49** (see Cummins (2010) 323-33 on rivalrous brothers from ruling families suppressing one another's names), but is supplanted by Nicomachus, who becomes a surrogate object of praise: Xenocrates is no longer overshadowed by Theron, but shares his victory (see **28-29**) without the *oikos* losing its glory. This process reverses ***P.*6.46-54**, ***O.*2.48-51**, where Theron takes a disproportionate share of Xenocrates' praise, even in Xenocrates' own ode, which indicates Theron must also have been dead by ***I.*2** for the strategy to be possible here. In particular, the strategy mirrors the overwhelming but false impression given in ***P.*6** that Thrasybulus drove Xenocrates' chariot, which was intended to detach Xenocrates from his victory, and allow Theron to appropriate its prestige via Thrasybulus' emulation of him: see ***P.*6.28-42**. Naming is so vital to fame's survival through reperformance (Carey (2007) 210) that Theron's victory could eventually have been attributed to Xenocrates.

(3) Polis politics. Especially if Nicomachus was a social inferior, placing him in the ode's central stanza as a quasi-Olympic-victor advertises Emmenid willingness to devolve prestige downwards – an effective message to envious citizens, as is avoidance of Theron's name, esp. after the tyranny's fall. See **1-11**; **37**; **43**.

19-20 Xenocrates' Panathenaic victory: unlike his Isthmian, it was not mentioned in ***O.*2**. Bell (1995) 19 thus takes 476 as the victory's *terminus post quem*, with 474 the likeliest date given Xenocrates was dead by 470. However, a brother's non-stephanitic victories may have been too insignificant to include in ***O.*2**: cf. *I.*6.60-62, where an uncle's local

wins, previously recorded at *N*.5.44-46 for one brother, are omitted from a Panhellenic victory-catalogue for the other brother, the first brother, and their uncle.

Athanassaki (2014) 213n.29 states 124ab.4 κυλίκεσσιν Ἀθαναίαισι 'must be an allusion to Xenocrates' Panathenaic victory'. But since ***P*.6.52-54** alludes to that encomium, Nicomachus would have had to have been active by 490.

Representation as a guest-gift (**19**) masks the victory's chrematitic nature (contrast *N*.10.33-36).

19 κλειναῖς: in P., of places (see ***O*.3.2**). Here a virtual enallage (S.fr.323.2 κλεινοῖς Ἀθηναίων πάγοις), due to its frequent application to Athens: fr.76.1-3 λιπαραὶ ... κλειναὶ Ἀθᾶναι; A.*Pers*.474; S.*Ai*.861; E.*Heraclid*.38; E.*Hipp*.423, 760-61, 1094; E.*Ion*.30, 262, 590, 1038; E.fr.14.9 Page; E.fr.224.3 (parodied by Eubul.fr.10.5).

It is striking that all non-Pindaric instances of κλειναὶ Ἀθᾶναι come from dramas funded by the Athenian state, while P.'s only other example is in a dithyramb (fr.76) for which Isoc.*Antid*.166 states P. received 10,000 drachmas from Athens. P. highlights the allusion to fr.76 by employing another epithet typical of Athens, λιπαραί (**19-20 κλειναῖς ... λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις** ~ fr.76.1-3 λιπαραὶ ... κλειναὶ Ἀθᾶναι), which suggests a deliberate reference to the sort of poetry paid for by a polis: see **1-11**; **20**; *v.i.*

Ἐρεχθειδᾶν: the Athenians' mythic descent from Erechtheus, underpinning their self-promotion as autochthonous inhabitants of Attica, bolstered internal unity and justified external pre-eminence: Rosivach (1987) 294-306; Blok (2009) 251-75; Lape (2010); cf. *P*.7.10 Ἐρεχθέος ἀστῶν. Popularized in Attic drama: A.*Eum*.855; S.*Ai*.202; E.*Med*.824; E.*Erechtheus*; Ar.*Eq*.1015.

P.'s endorsement coheres with his use of **κλειναῖς** (*v.s.*): cf. *P*.7.10 Ἐρεχθέος ἀστῶν (Athenian victor). Harpocration s.v.αὐτόχθονες = fr.253 cites P. for Erichthonius' emergence from the earth.

χαρίτεσσιν: ‘favours, requital’, rather than ‘victories’ (cf. *P*.1.76 Ἀθαναίων χάριν). The word frames the victory as a guest-gift (see **12-32**), and plays on **18 ἀγλαΐαν** as the name of a Charis. Since the Panathenaea was chrematitic, its real-world referents were the olive-oil amphoras awarded as prizes: the number awarded for the four-horse chariot is not attested, but doubtless exceeded the 140 recorded for the two-horse *zeugos* (*IG*.II^2.2311 c.380).

ἀραρώς: ‘fixed to, fitted with’ (Pfeijffer on *N*.5.44): punning on **17 εὐάρματον**.

20 ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις: the epithet (‘shining’) often describes cities, esp. Athens: *N*.4.18-19; fr.76.1-3; E.*Alc*.452; E.*Tro*.803; E.*IT*.1130-31; Hdt.8.77.6; Ar.*Eq*.1329; Ar.*Nu*.300; Ar.fr.110.2.

Ar.*Ach*.639-41 εἰ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπεύσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν Ἀθήνας | ηὕρετο πᾶν ἂν διὰ τὰς λιπαράς ... πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἄξιος (note 637 ἰοστεφάνους) alludes to fr.76.1-3 in relation to the epithets’ power to flatter Athenians and win rich rewards (with Blaydes’ emendation ἄξιος for αἴτιος): P.’s lucrative model of adulation remained embedded in Athenian consciousness half a century later. See **19 κλειναῖς**.

With article: *P*.7.1; *N*.2.8.

οὐκ ἐμέμφθη: ‘could not fault’. The collocation may be litotic (A.*Supp*.136; E.*Hel*.636; cf. **12**) or neutral (*N*.7.64; A.*Eum*.596). The former is probable here, but comparison with *P*.5.27-28 οὐ τὰν Ἐπιμαθέος ἄγων | ὀψινόου θυγατέρα Πρόφασιν, 34 κατέκλασε γὰρ ἐντέων σθένος οὐδέν (praise through negation of the victorious charioteer who preserves his vehicle) suggests failure could incur blame.

21 ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο φωτός: elegantly balanced by case (a–a–b–b), part of speech (a–b–a–b), syllables (4–2–4–2), and sense (chariot-protecting hand, horse-striking man); metrically palindromic excluding the final syllable. Nicomachus is presented as an

impressive man of action, but an agent nonetheless, since the emphasis is on his body and his performance of the *functions* necessary to win the race. Stanza-final position generates suspense concerning his identity, and stylistically enacts rounding a turning-post.

ῥυσίδιφρον: *hapax*. Crashes were frequent (Finglass on S.*El*.728-30), and avoiding them proved the driver's prowess: *P*.5.32 ἀκηράτοις ἀνίαις, 34, 49-51 ἐν τεσσαράκοντα γάρ | πετόντεσσιν ἀνιόχοις ὅλον | δίφρον κομίξαις.

21-22 ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα ... νεῖμ' ... ἀνίαις: *I*.1.14-15 ἅρματι τεθρίππῳ ... ἀνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ' (self-driving victor).

The charioteer's skilful control is highlighted: *Il*.23.337 εἶξαί ... ἡνία χερσίν; S.*El*.712-13 ἡνίας χεροῖν | ἔσεισαν. Greek charioteers in fact used both hands, each holding a set of reins, which had to be variably manipulated to round the turning-post (Miller (2004) 76): the poetic singular implies a spectacular feat.

21 πλαξίπποιο: in epic, of heroes including Pelops (*Il*.2.104), archetype of Olympic chariot-victory (*O*.1.65-96).

Antistrophe 2

22 τὰν: relative at stanzaic pivots: ***O*.2.81**. Here (with **23 ὅν**), introducing not a myth, but Nicomachus' victorious racing.

Νικόμαχος: delayed (as the awkward juxtaposition with **21 φωτός** reveals) to frame the ode's central stanza with 'victory': **22 Νικόμαχος ... 26 ... Νίκας** (stanzaic framing: ***P*.6.9**). Onomastic pun: *I*.5.54-55 καλλίνικον ... Κλεονίκου; *I*.8.61-65 Νικοκλέος ... ἐνίκασε; B.5.37-40 Φερένικον ... νικάσαντα; B.6.1-2 Λάχων ... λάχε; Sim.*Epig*.13.19.1-2 ἐνίκα ... Νικολάδας. See **47 Νικάσιππ'**.

κατὰ καιρὸν: fr.123.1-2; fr.127.1-2. Cf. Pfeijffer on *P*.8.7 ('exactly the right behaviour in relation to the circumstances'); Braswell on *P*.4.270(c). Strategy involved in applying the reins during a race: *Il*.23.322-25, 334-37; S.*El*.731-45.

References to *kairos* here and at ***O*.2.54** in the context of an Olympic victory may allude to the (possibly 5th-century) Olympic cult of Kairos (Paus.5.14.9; Jennings (2007) 331-46).

23 καὶ: 'moreover'.

κάρυκες ὠ-ρᾶν: the Elean heralds (1) proclaim the Olympic truce to the Greek cities (S.*Ai*.1240 ἀγῶνας Ἀργείοισι κηρῦξαι; S.fr.378.1 ἀγῶνα πάγξενον κηρύσσεται); (2) acclaim victors after their events (see ***P*.6.5-6**). The expression is unparalleled, but must refer to (1), i.e. the seasons for competition; cf. *O*.4.1 (personified Ὧραι sending the laudator as witness of the Olympics to the victor's polis).

ἀνέγνον: 'recognized' as in (1) being already acquainted (*Od*.4.250; see **24**); (2) proclaiming his victory: *O*.10.1 Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἀνάγνωτέ ('read aloud the name') re-enacts the *aggelia*. Cf. **12 οὐκ ἀγνῶτ'**.

Although charioteers might receive fillets as a mark of victory (Day (2010) 214), or perhaps even accept the crown on the owner's behalf (Bell (1995) 21-22), the impression produced by (2) that Nicomachus was treated as if he were the victor is unparalleled in epinician: see **19-28**.

σπονδοφόροι: 'truce-bearers', announcing the Olympic truce to the Greek cities. Although the term, first attested here, was used of those announcing the Athenian Eleusinia, Panathenaea, and Mysteries in the classical/Hellenistic period, it seems never to have been the technical term for the Olympic announcers (Perlman (2000) 15n.11; Rutherford (2013) 72, 88): a newly-published bronze disc from Olympia c.475-50 attests

the collective term *theāriā* (Siewert (2002) 359-70). Since, by contrast, P.'s use of ***O*.3.12 Ἑλλανοδίκας** *is* supported by contemporary epigraphy, we must conclude either that he used a contemporary term which has dropped out of the epigraphic record, or deliberately chose another: if the latter, the choice may have been motivated by Nicomachus' driving in the Panathenaea (**19-20**).

The Olympic truce was not a Panhellenic cessation of hostilities, but a limited prohibition against attacks upon Olympia or those travelling to or from the Games: Rutherford (2013) 187-89.

Reception by *theorodokoi*: **24**.

23-24 Κρονίδα | Ζηνὸς: juxtaposition of Zeus' name and patronymic is Homeric (*Il*.1.502), and occurs in epinician both in myth (*O*.8.43-44; *P*.4.171; *N*.1.72) and in relation to his patronage of Games (*N*.4.9; B.10.29), as here. Having his name open the central stanza's central verse heightens his pre-eminence.

Zeus' patronage of Olympia: ***O*.2.3**. His father Cronus: ***O*.2.12**; ***P*.6.23**.

The genitive emphasizes the heralds' sacred mission, as well as their status as Zeus' *agents*, as Nicomachus is Xenocrates': *Il*.1.334 κήρυκες Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν (Talthybius; Eurybates); *Il*.2.26 Διὸς ... ἄγγελός (Iris); B.5.19-20 ἄγγελος | Ζηνὸς (eagle). The selection of Elean *spondophoroi* from the sons of *theokoloi* ('servants of the god': Dillon (1997) 6) creates a still-closer connection to Zeus: see **24**.

24 Ζηνὸς Ἀλεῖοι: Elis' connection to Zeus and Olympia: **27-28**.

παθόντες πού τι φιλόξενον ἔργον: the Eleans recognize Nicomachus because they experienced *xenia* from him. What exactly this vague phrase means is crucial. Kurke (1991) 152-54 and Nicholson (2005) 234n.6 see it purely as a metaphor for Nicomachus'

victorious driving, just as *xenia* characterizes the other victories in the catalogue (see **12-32**); cf. *P*.5.31 ὕδατι Κασταλίας ξενωθεὶς of the victorious charioteer Carrhotus.

This is plausible, but unlike Carrhotus, Nicomachus is implied to have previously *provided* the Eleans *xenia*. Given the Eleans' characterization as *spondophoroi*, i.e. in relation to institutional arrangements for the promulgation of Panhellenic truces (see **23**), the implication is that Nicomachus received them as a *theorodokos* when they came to Acragas in 476. Our information for his background is limited (see **19-28**), but he might theoretically have done so, whether he was an Athenian or a Sicilian: *theorodokoi* were not *necessarily* citizens (Perlman (2000) 39), or men of more than moderate means (Perlman (2000) 37-45). However, it is better to assume, with Cummins (2010) 332, that as a member of the Emmenid circle he assisted the Olympic heralds when they were received by Theron, who was himself the *theorodokos*: 4th-century Sicilian tyrants are attested as *theorodokoi* at Syracuse and Leontini (Perlman (2000) 257, 261, 264). Theron's consent to the truce was in any case required as head of state.

The Acragantine Temple of Zeus (see ***O*.3.44**) would have been a suitable venue to receive the **σπονδοφόροι** (see Currie (2005) 339 on *theorodokoi* inviting *theoroi* to a sacrifice at the local shrine of the deity whose festival they were proclaiming).

As Cummins (2010) 332-37 observes, P. is less interested in the relationship's details that in using it to replace Theron with Nicomachus as a surrogate victor: see **19-28**.

πού τι: Verdenius' 'no doubt' is appropriate here (*O*.1.28; Th.2.87.2.4), but an ironic sense should not be discounted, given that Nicomachus' role with the *spondophoroi* was unusual, if it had any basis at all (*v.s.*). Cf. Sicking (1993) 59: 'with **που** a speaker presents his statement as a surmise whose accuracy he does not vouch for'.

φιλόξενον: ~ ***O*.3.1 <u>φιλοξείνοις</u>**. All epinician examples (except B.14.22-23) occur in odes for a tyrant/associate: see ***O*.2.6** on *xenia* as a key quality of Theron and the Emmenids.

Here, Nicomachus assumes Theron's roles as (1) *theorodokos* of the Elean *spondophoroi*; (2) host of the Tyndarids as victor in 476.

25 ἀδυπνόῳ τέ νιν ἀσπάζοντο φωνᾷ: noun and adjective enveloping the object stylistically enact the verb's action: **15-16**.

The phrasing (*v.i.*) implies Nicomachus received the *aggelia,* which was the case insofar as he was present, but in reality Theron was the one proclaimed.

ἀδυπνόῳ: elsewhere in P. only *O*.13.22 (Muse).

Here, the heralds' voices possess this poetic sweetness either because their victory-proclamation leads to epinician song, or because it produces the same pleasure as poetry: *O*.13.100 ἀδύγλωσσος βοὰ κάρυκος.

The epithet elsewhere evokes pleasure/sensuality: S.*El*.480 (dreams); E.*Med*.840 (breezes); Teleclid.fr.24-25.2 (drinking-cup); Nicias.9.564.3 (meadow).

ἀσπάζοντο: epic, of affectionate welcoming: *Od*.3.34-35 (of *xenoi*).

φωνᾷ: vocal quality was heralds' defining characteristic; Eleans won the inaugural 4th-century heralds' contest at Olympia: Wolicki (2002) 69-97.

26 χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας: *N*.5.42 Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων (*N*.5 allusions: **5**): Nicomachus participates in a similar image to that in which a *victor* does in *N*.5. The exact image here is less clear, since ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι, which connotes the victory as a sexual triumph (see Pfeijffer), is replaced by a reference to knees. **ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα** is closely paralleled at *Il*.5.370 ἐν γούνασι πῖπτε, where Aphrodite falls at her mother's knees for comfort after a *defeat*. Elsewhere it indicates supplication (S.*Ph*.485 προσπίτνω σε γόνασι; E.*Andr*.860 δούλα δούλας γόνασι προσπέσω; E.*HF*.986 γόνασι προσπεσὼν πατρὸς; E.*Or*.1332 ἱκέτης γὰρ Ἑλένης γόνασι προσπεσὼν). Supplication typically implies a request, not the expression of gratitude, but perhaps *N*.8.13-16, where the laudator clasps

Aeacus' knees as he offers his ode as a metaphorical dedication in honour of the victors, can square the circle: Nicomachus may here be imagined to supplicate a cult-image like that of Calamis' Olympic Nike (Paus.5.26.5).

χρυσέας ... Νίκας: gold of divinities: **1**. Possibly of Nike's cultic representation: see Ar.*Av*.573 Νίκη πέτεται πτερύγοιν χρυσαῖν, with Dunbar: 'Since Greeks usually coloured their statues ... cult-statues of both Nike and Eros ... often, perhaps always, had gilded wings'. Cf. the golden Nike dedicated by Hieron at Delphi (Theopomp.*ap*.Athen.6.232b).

Νίκας: a personification (Hes.*Th*.383-84: daughter of Styx and Pallas) rare in P. (*v.s.*), but favoured by B. as the source of (1) victory (B.3.5; B.10.15; B.11.1); (2) song (B.5.33; B.6.11; B.12.5; B.13.26); cf. *A.P*.6.313.

Upon seizing Syracuse, Gelon altered the Syracusan tetradrachm in reference to his Olympic chariot-victory, with a flying Nike crowning the horses/charioteer (Rutter (1997) 123-32; Morgan (2015) 62); Nike crowns charioteers on an Athenian votive relief c.425 (BM.814).

Nike had an Olympic altar (Paus.5.14.8), but her cult there was primarily military, not agonistic (Sinn (2014) 130-34). Given the emphasis on Elean control of Olympia (see **27-28**), P. may reference the new coin issue by Elis post-471 depicting Nike (e.g. Elis stater BCD.Olympia.7; cf. Seltman (1921) Series II, IV-XIII).

Epode 2

27-28 The Elean heralds' devotion to Zeus (**23-24**) here develops into Elis itself being called Olympian Zeus' grove. This heavy emphasis reflects Elis' control of Olympia, secured by their recent conquest of Pisa, and the heightened political self-consciousness

expressed in its 471 synoecism (D.S.11.54.1; Strab.8.3.2): see ***O*.2.3 Πίσα μὲν Διός** (cf. a c.360 coin inscribed ΦΑΛΕΙΟΝ on the obverse next to Zeus's head, with ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑ by a nymph's head on the reverse (Weir (2007) 191n.25)).

27 ἀνὰ: 'in' rather than 'throughout': often of sacred precincts in P., as here (**28 ἄλσος**): *P*.5.33 δώδεκ' ἂν δρόμων τέμενος (likewise of a charioteer's victory); *N*.6.41; *I*.8.63.

σφετέραν: asserting Elean ownership of Olympia: **27-28**.

τὰν δὴ καλέοισιν: based on epic formulae specifically naming a general item: (with δή) *Od*.12.61 Πλαγκτὰς δή τοι τάς γε θεοὶ μάκαρες καλέουσι; Hes.*Th*.271 τὰς δὴ Γραίας καλέουσιν; Hes.fr.23a.25-26 τὴν δὴ νῦν καλέο[υσιν ... Ἄρτεμιν εἰνοδί[ην; Hes.fr.91.3 τ]ὴν δὴ νῦ[ν καλέουσι.

Since elsewhere the subject is either unexpressed, or generic (men: *N*.9.41 ἄνθρωποι καλέοισι; gods: fr.96.3 καλέοισιν Ὀλύμπιοι), the Eleans are not the subject here (*pace* Verdenius): the point of adapting the formula is to provide the Elean claim to Olympia (**27-28**) with *universal* authority (see ***P*.6.21**).

The epic formulae occasionally introduce etymological puns (Hes.*Th*.270-71 γραίας ... Γραίας; *h.Hom*.3.373-74 Πύθειον ... πῦσε): so perhaps **24 Ἀλεῖοι ~ 28 ἄλσος**; cf. **9**.

The verb metapoetically signposts the allusion at **27-28** to ***O*.3.17-18**.

δὴ: after relative: (*v.s.*); cf. *O*.9.9; *P*.11.17; Hajdú (1989) 89.

27-28 Ὀλυμπίου Λιός | ἄλσος: ~ ***O*.3.17-18 Λιὸς αἴτει πανδόκῳ | ἄλσει** (celebrating *Theron*'s Olympic victory), with **28-29** making the allusion explicit.

The epithet's ambiguity between Olympus (fr.52f.1) and Olympia (*O*.10.101) underscores (1) Elean claims that Zeus favoured their control of Olympia (**23-24**; **27-28**); (2) the allusion to ***O*.3**, which describes the moment Zeus first became 'of Olympia' when his altars there were consecrated (***O*.3.19**).

28-29 ἀθανάτοις ... τιμαῖς: fr.121.1-3 πρέπει δ' ἐσλοῖσιν ὑμνεῖσθαι ... ἀθανάτοις τιμαῖς ποτιψαύει defines the phrase as immortalization through song (cf. *I.*4.40-43). However, prose from Ctesias onwards employs it of heroic honours as literal immortality (Ctes.3c.688.fr.1b.393 ἀθανάτου τεύξεσθαι τιμῆς; Theocr.*Id.*17.16-17; Megasth.fr.1.165; Megasth.fr.1.193-94 Ἡρακλέα ... ἀθανάτου τυχεῖν τιμῆς); cf. D.S.11.53.2.4 ἡρωικῶν ἔτυχε τιμῶν (Theron's heroic honours). The adjective is causative. P. shares ***O.*2**'s eschatological vision with Xenocrates (cf. ***O.*2.48-57**: Theron and Xenocrates' agonistic fates linked just prior to the eschatology), *as well as* the immortality through song exemplified by P.'s self-quotations (**1-11**): a poignant tribute if both brothers were deceased.

Enveloping word-order stylistically enacts **29 ἔμιχθεν**.

Αἰνησιδάμου | παῖδες ... ἔμιχθεν: both earlier versions of the patronymic phrase refer to Theron's Olympic victory meriting epinician music, thus activating the etymology 'praised-by-the-people': ***O.*2.46-47 πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου | ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν**; ***O.*3.6-9 στέφανοι | πράσσοντί ... φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν | Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόν-τως**. **ἔμιχθεν** picks up ***O.*3.9 συμμεῖξαι**, just as ***O.*3.9 πρεπόν-τως** picks up ***O.*2.46 πρέπει**, all grouped around the patronymic phrase: an intertextual conversation ends here.

The patronymic's earlier versions always reference or include reference to Theron, never Xenocrates alone. Here, the plural shares Theron's personal victory with Xenocrates, reversing Theron's obtrusion into the praise of Xenocrates and Thrasybulus at ***P.*6.46**, as well as Theron's appropriation of Xenocrates' glory at ***O.*2.48-51**, and Xenocrates' absence from ***O.*3**. Theron's death permitted his glory to be underplayed, just as his intrafamilial seniority had aggrandized it in life: cf. *P.*1.79 παίδεσσιν ...

Δεινομένεος, which allows Hieron to appropriate the glory of his dead elder brother Gelon's victory at Himera. See **19-28**.

Nonetheless, although the overall picture is that each brother seized as much prestige relative to the other as circumstances permitted, even appropriation includes the language of mutuality and reciprocity (***O*.2.49-50 ὁμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεόν ... κοιναὶ Χάριτες**). Here both are united at the conclusion of their victory-catalogue; *v.s.* **ἀθανάτοις ... τιμαῖς**.

29 τιμαῖς: the plural combines the senses 'victories' (*I*.5.54); 'poetic celebrations' (**34**); 'cultic honours' (**28-29**).

ἔμιχθεν: ***O*.3.9 συμμεῖξαι**. Metaphorically of victories: *N*.1.17-18 Ὀλυμ-πιάδων φύλλοις ... μιχθέντα; Hoey (1965) 235-62; its erotic connotation compares the Olympic victories to a sexual conquest (cf. ***P*.6.1-4**; ***O*.3.33**).

30-32 καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνῶτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι | οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν, | οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν: that the Emmenids' house (physical and metaphorical) is not unacquainted with celebrations and songs (cf. *N*.1.22-24 ἀλλοδαπῶν | οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι | ἐντί: laudator brings victory-song to the victor's halls and receives *xenia*) is exemplified by allusion to fr.124ab.1-2 Ὦ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατᾶν ὄχημ' ἀοιδᾶν | τοῦτό <τοι> πέμπω μεταδόρπιον.

This striking allusion to an encomium for a non-victor to conclude a victory-catalogue facilitates Thrasybulus' participation in the family's victories and acknowledges his likely role in organizing their celebration (see ***P*.6.28-42**). Note that whenever the 2nd-person plural pronoun (**30 ὑμῖν**) occurs with a vocative singular elsewhere in P. (*O*.8.15; *P*.4.255, 259; *P*.7.17; *P*.8.72; *N*.10.37; *I*.4.3), the vocative is a victor whose glory is thus shared with the family. Here, glory is shared in reverse, representing the non-victor Thrasybulus as if he were a victor himself. However, the elision of Thrasybulus' *sympotic* activities (***P*.6.53**; fr.124ab.3) in favour of the *komos* is significant. Although the terms overlap, the

symposium represents an elitism (see ***P.*6.52-54**) that is now downplayed to suit the political context (likewise **35-37**).

Ring-composition: **30 οὐκ ἀγνῶτες** (active) ~ **12 <u>οὐκ</u> ἀγνῶτ'** (passive): both are exemplified via adjacent allusion to earlier Emmenid poems. See **12-13**.

Triple negative: *P.*3.87-88; see **6-7**.

30 καὶ γὰρ: in P., mostly causal (*P.*1.10; *P.*9.42; *P.*10.59; *N.*1.67; *N.*6.34; *I.*5.26), with a subset exemplifying what precedes (*O.*7.28; *I.*5.4; fr.52k.47). But here the introduction of a general conclusion after specific examples is inferential ('and so'): cf. *N.*1.50.

δόμοι: both physical ('halls': a literal setting for **31 κώμων** (see **30-31**)) and metaphorical ('family': recalling P.'s only other metaphorical use at ***O.*2.45 Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἀρωγὸν <u>δόμοις</u>**): Thrasybulus is implicitly the last remnant of the Emmenid line as Thersander was of Adrastus'.

30-31 δόμοι ... κώμων: *O.*6.98-99 δέξαιτο <u>κῶμον</u> | <u>οἴκοθεν</u> <u>οἴκαδ'</u>; *N.*9.1-3; A.*Ag.*1189; E.*Cyc.*39-40; E.*Alc.*343-44.

31 κώμων ... ἐρατῶν: *komos*' erotic dimension: ***P.*6.1-4**; *O.*6.98; [Dem.]47.19.3 <u>κῶμος</u> ἢ <u>ἔρως</u>; *Anacreont.*43.12-16 <u>Ἔρως</u> ... <u>ἐπήρατον</u> ... <u>κῶμον</u> μέτεισι χαίρων.

κώμων: Eckermann (2010) 302-12 argues the core meaning in P. and B. is 'celebration', with the noun reflecting specific manifestations of celebration depending on the context ('chorus'; 'ode'; 'procession'; 'revel-band'): thus the disjunction between **κώμων** and **32 ἀοιδᾶν** indicates they are not synonyms but the latter an expression of the former.

The performative significance of this reference to the *komos* is complicated by its occurrence within an allusion to an encomium whose context is self-consciously sympotic (see **30-32**). However, here and at ***O.*3.6 ἀγλαό<u>κωμον</u>**, the implication is that *komoi* may have been involved in performing the family's odes.

Relevance of *komos*-references to choral/monodic performance: Heath (1988) 180-95; Lefkowitz (1988) 1-11; Carey (1989) 545-65; (1991) 192-200; Heath & Lefkowitz (1991) 173-91; Morgan (1993) 1-15. Agócs (2012) 191-223 examines their generic function.

ὦ Θρασύβουλ': 1.

32 μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν: 3 μελιγάρυας ὕμνους; **8 μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί**; *h.Hom*.3.519 μελίγηρυν ἀοιδήν; *N*.11.18; *I*.6.9; B.fr.4.63; Ar.*Av*.910 (context: parodying P. and Sim.'s venality).

μελικόμπων: *hapax* combining κόμπος as victor-praise (*N*.8.49; *I*.1.43; *I*.5.24) with the honey-sweet-poetry motif (see **3**; **7 μελιφθόγγου**).

ἀοιδᾶν: 8 ἀοιδαί; **12 ἀείδω**; fr.124ab ἀοιδᾶν (all verse-final). The victory-catalogue's last, triad-final word explicitly references the Pindaric poems to which it alludes (**12-32**).

Strophe 3

33-34 Transition from the victory-catalogue (**12-32**) to Xenocrates' virtue-catalogue (**35-42**) via an 'ease-of-praise motif' (Bundy 61-64): the Emmenids' fame removes barriers to praise. Its expression as a road bringing them the Muses' honours (**κέλευθος** suitable for chariots: *O*.6.22-24) reactivates the chariot-of-the-Muses image in the responding **1-2**, associating the laudator with the earlier poets.

The laudator's ease of travel (by land) in his praise in the first 2 verses of Strophe 3 is matched by Xenocrates' (by sea) in his hospitality in the final 2 verses of Antistrophe 3 (**41-42**).

οὐ ... οὐδὲ: 6-7.

πάγος: typically inaccessible: *Od*.5.410-11 ἔκβασις οὔ πῃ φαίνεθ' ... πάγοι ὀξέες; Hes.*Scut*.439; Archil.fr.176.1-2. Since P. employs **πάγος** elsewhere only of the Hill of Cronus (*O*.10.49-50), which is associated with Olympic victory (***O*.3.23**), its use is ironic given the praise of Olympic victory at **23-29**. The Emmenids' *lofty* city (fr.119.2 ὑψηλὰν πόλιν ἀμφινέμονται) ironizes the image further.

προσάντης: X.*Mem*.3.5.25.4; Hipp.*de.Arte*.12.15; Anaxandrid.56.1-2 προσάντης ... ὁδός; Polyb.1.55.9.2-10.1.

κέλευθος: path-imagery in ease-of-praise motif: *I*.4.1 μυρία παντᾷ κέλευθος; *I*.6.22 μυρίαι δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέ-τμανθ' ἑκατόμπεδοι ... κέλευθοι | καὶ πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν καὶ δι' Ὑπερβορέους (cf. **41-42**); B.5.31; Becker (1937) 72.

34 εἴ τις: indefinite 3rd persons in gnomes: ***O*.2.56**. Of poets: *P*.2.58-59; *P*.9.87; *I*.4.40-41.

εὐδόξων ... ἀν-δρῶν: reprising **17 εὐάρματον ἄνδρα**.

εὐδόξων: of victors at *P*.12.5, *N*.7.8: in both, the present song makes the victor famous for his *immediate* victory. Here, the Emmenids are even easier to praise because they are *already* εὔδοξοι from *past* victories and epinicia: ***P*.6.15-17 πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾶ ... εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν**.

ἐς ἀν-δρῶν: *sc*. οἶκον. Omission: K-G.1.269; S-D.2.120.

ἄγοι: perhaps reprising ***P*.6.20 ἄγεις** (wedding-imagery).

τιμὰς: 'poetic celebrations': cf. **29 τιμαῖς**.

Ἑλικωνιάδων: P. prefers to situate the Muses on Pieria over Helicon (see ***P*.6.49**). Here, the Hesiodic term (Hes.*Th*.1; Hes.*Op*.658) re-activates that applied to the Muses in the corresponding **1-2 χρυσαμπύκων ... Μοισᾶν** via ring-composition. Cf. B.fr.dub.12a.13-14 χρυσάμ[πυκες] ... Ἑλι]κῶνα λιπ[οῦσαι] (Muses). The laudator associates the earlier poets

and himself with the Muses in their *original* form, distancing himself from their modern decline: **7 ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας ~ 34 Ἑλικωνιάδων** respond.

35-42 Xenocrates' virtue-catalogue recalls Thrasybulus' (***P.*6.44-54**). Both occur towards the ode's end; employ *Er-Stil*; emphasize social virtues.

***P.*6.44-54**	**35-42**
[*0.* Thrasybulus' filial piety, and emulation of his uncle]	
1. Wealth with intelligence.	1. Exceptionally-sweet nature towards citizens.
2. Youth without injustice.	2. Panhellenic horse-rearing.
3. Poetic wisdom.	3. Piety towards all gods' feasts.
4. Piety towards Poseidon as horse-lord.	4. Exceptional hospitality towards *xenoi*.
5. Exceptionally-sweet nature towards symposiasts.	[5. Thrasybulus' filial piety: **44**.]

There are nonetheless significant differences and reworkings. First, Xenocrates' death shifts the tenses and imparts an elegiac tone to the eulogy, with possible eschatological connotations at **42**.

Second, the praise is delicately balanced, to convey the grandeur of Emmenid *megaloprepeia* to family members and allies, while conciliating less sympathetic citizens in a post-tyranny age: see **43 φθονεραὶ**. The first item here (1.) allusively reconfigures the final item in ***P.*6** (*5.*), setting the catalogue's programme as civic inclusivity instead of sympotic elitism (see **35-37**). 1., 3., 4. relate to appropriate displays of respect towards men and gods, implicitly inviting the same in return. Explicit mention of Emmenid wealth (*1.*) is absent, but 2., 3., 4. are all aristocratic activities that require it in abundance. 2. and 3. divide *4.* between them. Cf. *O.*4.14-16 (combining 1., 2., 4.).

Third, whereas at ***P*.6.46** Theron displaced Xenocrates as Thrasybulus' model ([*0.*]), here Xenocrates is praised in his own right, and items equally applicable to Theron (2., 3., 4.) become Xenocrates' alone, suggesting Theron had predeceased Xenocrates (see **19-28**; **28-29**).

Thrasybulus' filial piety [(*0.*)], a prologue to his catalogue, becomes a postscript to Xenocrates' ([5.]), since it now involves keeping Xenocrates' fame alive (see **43-46**).

35-37 The transition from praise of Emmenid *victories* (**12-32**) to that of Xenocrates' *personal qualities* (**35-42**) takes the form of a superlative vaunt, in which the laudator employs an *athletic* metaphor for his wish that his praise match Xenocrates' *social* excellence. Therefore the vaunt replicates on a small scale the larger structural shift.

This helps to explain why the vaunt itself appears so unusual: normally, a discus- or javelin-throw is a simile's *vehicle* (*Il.*23.431-33 ὅσσα δὲ δίσκου οὖρα κατωμαδίοιο πέλονται ... τόσσον ἐπιδραμέτην; *P.*1.44-45; *N.*7.70-73), not its (metaphorical) tenor. The message is that Xenocrates took his social responsibilities as seriously and competitively as he did agonism itself, hence the laudator claims he must exert himself physically in order for his praise to match Xenocrates' worth.

This point is reflected in the evolution of Thrasybulus' youthful private entertainments (***P*.6.52-53 γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν | καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν**) into Xenocrates' mature civic consciousness (**35-37 ὅσον ὀργάν | Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν | ἔσχεν. αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν**), whereby citizens pointedly replace symposiasts: see **30-32**.

Theron's superlative vaunt (***O*.2.90-95**) comparably stresses social over agonistic excellence, and includes 1st-person references and poetic projectiles, as here. Hyperbaton (**35-36 ὀργάν ... γλυκεῖαν**) stylistically enacts the javelin-throw.

35 μακρὰ: adverbial with the participle: *Il.*2.224; *P.*1.45.

P. employs it 3x in athletic metaphors for the laudator's exertions, all from the pentathlon's first 3 events (τριαγμὸς: long jump; javelin; discus), since these were (mostly) judged by distance: *h.l.* (discus + javelin); *P.*1.42-45 (javelin); *N.*5.19-20 (long jump).

δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι: the events are often combined, as in the pentathlon (Sim.*Epig.*16.3.2 ἅλμα, ποδωκείην, δίσκον, ἄκοντα, πάλην): *Il.*2.774; *O.*10.71-72 ἄκοντι Φράστωρ ... Νικεὺς ἔδικε πέτρῳ χέρα κυκλώσαις | ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων (~ **36 ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων**); *I.*1.24-25; B.9.32-34.

Melding two events into a composite expresses the prodigious effort required to match Xenocrates: the contrast with the preceding 'ease-of-praise' image (**33-34**) is sharpened by the fact that **33** and **35** are metrical mirror-images. Praise-as-projectile imagery: see **3**. The laudator links himself to earlier poets via a striking responsion: **3 ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον** ~ **35 μακρὰ δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι**. Here, the imagery differs in that (1) distance is stressed over accuracy; (2) both are contemporary sporting-events.

P.'s athletic metaphors for poetry often, but not always, match the event the ode celebrates (Hubbard (1985) 152-53). The shift from the dominant chariot-imagery (**1-2**; **33-34**) in an equestrian ode is nonetheless surprising: it connects laudator and laudandus while maintaining the latter's superiority. Mixed agonistic images: simile: *Il.*23.431-33 (vehicle: discus-throw; tenor: chariot-racing); metaphor: *Od.*8.229 δουρὶ δ' ἀκοντίζω ὅσον οὐκ ἄλλος τις ὀϊστῷ; Ebert (1972) no.12.2 παλαιμοσύνης δεξιὸν ἡνίοχον.

Athletic metaphors in P.: Steiner (1986) 111-21; Nünlist (1998) 142-61.

δισκήσαις: event: Langdon (1990) 177-82; Lavrencic & Doblhofer & Mauritsch (1991).

ἀκοντίσσαιμι: the event involved hitting a target (*O.*10.71; *O.*13.93-95; *N.*9.54-55) or setting a distance (*P.*1.42-45; *h.l.*): Doblhofer & Mauritsch & Lavrencic (1993).

In all 4 other Pindaric uses of the javelin in an image for the laudator's praise (metaphor: *O*.13.93-95; *N*.9.54-55; simile: *P*.1.44-45; *N*.7.70-73), the javelin is the vehicle, not the tenor: see **35-37**. All contain futurative expressions relating to success: *O*.13.93-95 (obligation); *P*.1.44-45 (hope); *N*.7.70-73 (oath); *N*.9.54-55 (wish); compare performative wishes that the laudator's praise be successful: ***O*.3.1-2**; *I*.4.43. The metaphor here makes the prayer like one an athlete might naturally utter in competition (*O*.4.13).

As at **12**, **46**, the 1st person aligns not only with the laudator (by referencing poetic composition), but with P. himself by introducing a self-quotation (see **35-37**), and reprising the projectile-as-poetry metaphor from ***O*.2.83-85**.

τοσοῦθ', ὅσον: prosaic: in pre-Hellenistic poetry only S.*OT*.1191; S.*Ant*.775; S.*Phil*.1076; S.*OC*.748-49. Similes in P. and B.: ***O*.2.87**; Fearn (2012) 332-43.

ὀργάν: 'disposition'.

36 Ξεινοκράτης: –**ει**– *metri gratia*. See **14**.

ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων: Xenocrates receives his only superlative vaunt here, and is the last named family member to do so: ***P*.6.44-46**, **54**; ***O*.2.92-95**.

Cf. *O*.10.72 ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων (discus-throw); fr.61.2 ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς ἴσχει.

In the laudator's athletic metaphors, outdoing the competition is often stressed (*P*.1.45; *N*.9.54); here, that competitive edge is transferred to the laudandus.

γλυκεῖαν: *P*.6.52 γλυκεῖα; **7 γλυκεῖ-αι.**

37 ἔσχεν: enjambement brings the laudator's javelin to earth. Historic tenses (**37 ἦν**; **39 προσέπτυκτο**; **40 ὑπέστειλ'**; **41 ἐπέρα**) indicate Xenocrates' decease; the aorist might otherwise have been understood as perfective (***P*.6.45 ἔβα**).

αἰδοῖος ... ἀστοῖς: the adjective occurs in some passages where reverence is *received* from the citizenry: there it is found in both active ('respectful': *O*.7.89-90 αἰδοίαν χάριν ... ποτ'

ἀστῶν καὶ ποτὶ ξεί-νων) and passive senses ('respected': Archil.fr.133.1 οὔτις αἰδοῖος μετ' ἀστῶν οὐδὲ περίφημος θανὼν – polemically countered here?). Cf. Tyrt.fr.12.39-40.

Here, the allusion to ***P.*6.52-54** (see **35-37**), together with the virtue-catalogue's theme of respect *towards* others (**35-42**), makes the active preferable: cf. **17**. Kindness towards ἀστοί and ξένοι together is a praise-topos (*O.*13.2-3 ἥμερον ἀστοῖς | ξένοισι δὲ; *P.*3.71; *P.*5.56-57; *I.*6.69-70), here reflected by the two groups bracketing the virtue-catalogue (**37 ~ 39-42**).

ἀστοῖς: replacing ***P.*6.53 συμπόταισιν**. 22x in P. vs. 5x πολίτας; B. employs neither. Osborne (2011) 93 states that in P. 'neither term is used to distinguish one section of the population of the city from another, or to flag up those who have political capacity', attributing only a residency requirement to both.

This is broadly correct, but note the opposition, found only in tyrant-odes, between citizens and (1) kings (*P.*1.68 ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλεῦσιν), (2) the elite (*P.*2.81-82 ἀδύνατα δ' ἔπος ἐκβαλεῖν κραταιὸν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς | δόλιον ἀστόν; *P.*3.71 πραῢς ἀστοῖς, οὐ φθονέων ἀγαθοῖς). Laudandi claimed praise from citizens (*N.*11.17 ἐν λόγοις δ' ἀστῶν ἀγαθοῖσιν ἐπαινεῖσθαι χρεών; *I.*1.50-51; *I.*3.33 ἄξιος εὐλογίαις ἀστῶν μεμίχθαι), but were often begrudged/envied instead (*O.*6.7 ἐπικύρσαις ἀφθόνων ἀστῶν; *P.*1.84-85 ἀστῶν δ' ἀκοὰ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύ-νει μάλιστ' ἐσλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις ... φθόνος; *P.*9.93 εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν, εἴ τις ἀντάεις; *P.*11.28-29 κακολόγοι δὲ πολῖται ... φθόνον; E.*Med.*297 φθόνον πρὸς ἀστῶν; Th.6.16.3.1-2 ὅσα αὖ ἐν τῇ πόλει ... λαμπρύνομαι, τοῖς μὲν ἀστοῖς φθονεῖται (Alcibiades defending his Olympic victories); Hdt.7.237.7 πολιήτης μὲν πολιήτῃ εὖ πρήσσοντι φθονέει). This tendency makes their appeasement necessary (*v.s.*): see **43 φθονεραὶ**, where it is explicit.

ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν: S.*OT*.1489 ἀστῶν ἥξετ' εἰς ὁμιλίας.

ὁμιλεῖν: *P.*6.53 ὁμιλεῖν.

Antistrophe 3

38 ἱπποτροφίας: horse-rearing is an elite praise-topos (*I.*4.14 ἱπποτρόφοι; Hdt.6.35.4 οἰκίης τεθριπποτρόφου; Hdt.6.125.24-25 τεθριπποτροφήσας Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀναιρέεται). It could win popular admiration (Th.6.12.3-4 ὅπως θαυμασθῇ ... ἀπὸ τῆς ἱπποτροφίας (Alcibiades); Pl.*Lys.*205c.2-5 ἡ πόλις ὅλη ἄδει περὶ Δημοκράτους ... καὶ πάντων πέρι τῶν προ- | γόνων, πλούτους τε καὶ ἱπποτροφίας καὶ νίκας Πυθοῖ καὶ | Ἰσθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέᾳ τεθρίπποις τε καὶ κέλησι), but excessive conspicuous expenditure risked causing alienation (Th.6.15.3.1-4 (Alcibiades); *P.*7.19 (Megacles): 2 ostraca call him ἱπποτρόφος (Brenne (2002) 108-20)). See **37 ἀστοῖς** on Alcibiades' claim, in relation to his Olympic chariot-victories, that the citizens envy anyone who distinguishes himself in the city.

P.'s defence of Emmenid *megaloprepeia*: **1-11**. At *O.*4.14-16, the term is likewise softened by combination with *xenia* and civic peace. The word's position is the culmination of references to charioteering in the first 2 verses of every strophe/antistrophe except Antistrophe 2; it emphasizes Xenocrates' role as breeder rather than driver (see **19-28**; contrast Thrasybulus' devotion to Poseidon Hippios (***P.*6.50-51**), designed to give the opposite impression).

ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ: appeals to Panhellenic norms generate support for a position by presenting an established cultural consensus, real or imaginary: E.*Supp.*311, 526 Πανελλήνων νόμον, 671 Πανελλήνων νόμον (burial); A.*Sept.*269 (*ololugmos*); E.*Hel.*1241 (burial); E.*Heraclid.*1010 (respecting surrender); E.*Or.*495 (criminal law); E.fr.228.8 (naming); E.fr.853.3; Th.1.41.1.2; Th.3.9.1.1; Th.3.58.3.4; Th.3.59.1.2; Th.3.67.6.2; Th.4.97.3.1; X.*Mem.*4.4.16.4. Here it makes Xenocrates' *hippotrophia* more palatable to the citizenry, justifying the Panhellenic victories listed at **12-32**. Reinforced by *figura etymologica* (E.*El.*234): **νομίζων ... νόμῳ**.

Contrast E.fr.282.13 ἐμεμψάμην ... Ἑλλήνων νόμον (criticizing Panhellenic fetishization of athletic competition).

Equestrian victors came from across the Greek world; however, in mainland Greece only the area north of the Boeotian plain suited large-scale horse-rearing, as did Sicily and southern Italy (Sage (1996) 46-47): Xenocrates had a local advantage.

Participation in the Games and appeals to Panhellenism bolstered the Hellenic identity of those on the Greek world's periphery: ***P.*6.1-18**.

Πανελλάνων: although West identifies Hes.*Op.*528 as the first occurrence in the sense 'Panhellenic' (contrast *Il.*2.530: distinguishing northern Greeks from southern), nascent Panhellenism is present in the *Iliad* (Ross (2005) 299-316); Euripides retrojects it when treating Homeric themes (E.*Tro.*413-14, 721; E.*IA.*350, 414-15).

The term is rare in epinician, despite the concept's centrality to the genre: *I.*4.14-29 ἱπποτρόφοι ... Πανελλά-νεσσι δ' ἐριζόμενοι δαπάνᾳ χαῖρον ἵππων; B.13.198 Πανελλάνων ἀέθλοις (Nemea); fr.52f.62-63 ὑπὲρ Πανελ- | λάδος (Delphi). Given Panhellenism's maturation in response to the Persian Wars (Hall (2002) 172-228), it is striking that the word's occurrence at *I.*4.29 is preceded by reference to the death of 4 family members in a single battle (16-17b), possibly Plataea. Scott (2010) 250-73 questions the concept's pre-Roman applicability but acknowledges it in P.; cf. Eckerman (2008) 37-48.

Balancing passages focusing on Acragas (**17**; **37**; **43**), the word programmatically highlights the ode's Panhellenic dimensions: the Emmenids' victories (**12-32**); their ambition to place Acragas and Sicily at the centre of the Greek world (**41-42**); the dissemination of their fame (**45-46**).

39-42: reworking ***O.*3.39-44**: Xenocrates' devotion to divine worship and *xenia* is expressed in terms of travel to the Earth's limits, whereas in ***O.*3** Emmenid devotion to

divine worship and *xenia* leads to praise of Theron's agonistic achievements, which are expressed in terms of travel to the Earth's limits.

39 Xenocrates' embrace of every divine feast exemplifies the conservative use of wealth to express piety (a praise-topos relevant to ruling families typically reviled for impiety). Currie (2011) 281-82 characterizes it as supererogatory public service.

Although here this item on divine feasts is syntactically separate from the following one on human *xenia* (**39-42**), the self-quotation **39-40** ~ ***O*.3.39-40** interconnects the two by allusion to the Emmenid theoxeny: see **39-40**.

This interconnection is anticipated and signposted by the phrase **θεῶν δαῖτας**, which can mean a feast (1) attended by gods (*O*.14.9), or (2) in honour of the gods, i.e. a sacrificial banquet (*Od*.3.336 θεῶν ἐν δαιτὶ; *Od*.8.76; Hes.*Op*.736, 742; *O*.9.112; *P*.5.80; *I*.4.61; fr.52a.8; E.*Ba*.383). (1) and (2) could overlap in the heroic age: *Od*.3.420 ἐναργὴς ἦλθε θεοῦ ἐς δαῖτα; Hes.fr.1.6-7 ξυναὶ γὰρ τότε δαῖτες ... ἀθανάτοις τε θεοῖσι καταθνητοῖς τ' ἀνθρώποις; Davies (2010) 331-55.

δαῖτας here supports a theoxenic performance context for ***O*.3**, since comparable occurrences at *O*.9.112; *P*.5.80; *I*.4.61; fr.52a.8 may reflect ritual performance contexts.

προσέπτυκτο: of physical embrace between intimates (*Od*.11.451 πατέρα προσπτύξεται; S.*Ant*.1236-37; E.*Med*.1400; E.*Ph*.1671; E.*Ba*.1319; E.*Tro*.782), or a metaphorical warm greeting (*Od*.8.478; *Od*.17.509; *h.Hom*.2.198-99); the object is almost invariably a person/body part. Its unusual application to divine feasts evokes a physicality beyond regular piety, highlighting the allusion to the ***O*.3** theoxeny (*v.s.*). Cf. E.*El*.1254-55 (embracing Athena's statue). Close contact with gods: ***P*.6.51 προσέχεται**; **26 ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας**.

39-42 Xenocrates' boundless hospitality is extolled via the metaphor of sailing to the world's Eastern extremities in summer, and the Southern in winter. Since *xenia* is bestowed by hosts *at home*, the idea is paradoxical, recalling ***O*.3.43-44 πρὸς ἑσχατιὰν ... ἱκάνων ἅπτεται | οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν**. See **39-40** for allusion to ***O*.3.39-40**. The theme activates his name's etymology.

39-41 οὐδέ ποτε ... ἀλλ': 'never ... but instead': *Il*.5.408-10; *Il*.16.644-46; *Od*.8.562-64; Hes.*Scut*.310-11.

39-40 οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν | οὖρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ' ἱστίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν: although in P. **οὖρος** is sometimes only a metrical equivalent for αὔρα/ἄνεμος (Braswell on *P*.4.292(c)), the epic sense 'favouring wind' (*O*.13.28; *P*.1.34; *P*.4.3; *N*.6.28) should be retained here, esp. since **ἐμπνεύσαις** in a sailing context is consistent with such wind swelling the sails: E.*Andr*.554-55 κατ' οὖρον ὥσπερ ἱστίοις | ἐμπνεύσομαι (note 650-51 ὑπὲρ Νείλου ῥοὰς | ὑπέρ τε Φᾶσιν ~ **41-42**). The point is not that an 'oncoming wind' (Race), i.e. obstacles, could not force Xenocrates to curtail his hospitality, but that the strong gusts of a *favouring* wind, i.e. a fear of being *too* lavish, never impelled him to moderation: contrast H.*O*.2.10.23-24 *contrahes vento nimium secundo* | *turgida vela* (with Nisbet & Hubbard); cf. *P*.1.90-92 μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις· | ἐξίει ... ἱστίον ἀνεμόεν.

Cf. *Od*.3.182-83 οὐδέ ποτ' ἔσβη | οὖρος (constant favouring winds); contrast *Od*.4.360-61 οὐδέ ποτ' οὖροι | πνείοντες (lack of favouring winds at Pharos near the Nile Delta).

The idea of Xenocrates sailing his table like a raft is light-hearted, but not ridiculous: the 'symposium-at-sea' is a sympotic motif (Slater (1976) 161-70; Corner (2010) 352-80; Timae.566.F.149 records a house in Acragas named 'Trireme' after a sympotic hallucination of sailing). It occurs in Thrasybulus' encomium, to which **42 πρὸς ἀκτάν** alludes: fr.124ab.7 πάντες ἴσᾳ νέομεν ψευδῆ πρὸς ἀκτάν. This image may reflect (1) the symposium's elitism (Murray (1990) 149-53; Morris (1996) 19-48), i.e. a hermetic space

where aristocrats preserve their privileges by excluding the 'middling' community; or (2) an inclusive transcendence of the *oikos*, not the polis (Corner (2010) 352-80). Both perspectives are active here: (1) the lavish *xenia* and elite mobility (**41-42**) evoked are elitist, distinct from Xenocrates' respect for the *astoi* (**37**), and sharpening the following reference to envy (**43**); (2) the Emmenid desire for the goodwill of those outside their family is clear: **37 ἀστοῖς** intertextually reverses the exclusivity of ***P*.6.52-54** (cf. **30-32**), and even there the symposium is evoked without being stipulated as the performance context, which would have excluded social outsiders.

ξενίαν ... τράπεζαν: despite here denoting *human* hospitality, the phrase continues the previous item on divine hospitality by allusion to the 476 Tyndarid theoxeny: ***O*.3.39-40 πλείσταισι βροτῶν | ξεινίαις αὐτοὺς ἐποίχονται τραπέζαις**; cf. **24 φιλόξενον**.

This allusion (1) exemplifies Xenocrates' piety; (2) credits him with a celebration that was primarily *Theron's* (see **19-28**); (3) covertly celebrates Emmenid agonism despite its ostensible restriction in the virtue-catalogue to **38**, since the theoxeny was the setting for an epinician celebration.

Hyperbaton expands the phrase like a sail blown full by the wind.

40 ἐμπνεύσαις: typically of favouring winds (*h.Hom*.7.33; E.*Andr*.554-55), rarely of blowing off-course (E.*Cyc*.19-20).

ὑπέστειλ': *vox propria* for furling sails; metaphorically of self-restraint (E.*Or*.607). Cf. συστέλλω (Ar.*Eq*.432-33; Ar.*Ra*.999-1000).

ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν: banquets: *O*.1.17 ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν; fr.187 ἥρωες ... ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν; E.fr.147 ἀμφὶ δαῖτα καὶ τράπεζαν.

41 ἐπέρα: similarly of crossing (1) the sea (*P*.3.76); (2) the world's limits (*N*.3.21: Pillars of Heracles).

41-42 Φᾶσιν θερείαις | ἐν δὲ χειμῶνι ... Νείλου: varied chiasmus: Xenocrates' hospitality knew no bounds of space or season.

The use of geographical extremities as metaphors for the limits of achievement in ***O*.3**, where the Hyperboreans/Ister (***O*.3.14**, **16**, **26**, **31**) and Pillars of Heracles (***O*.3.44**) represent the N and W limits, is mirrored here by the Phasis and Nile as the E and S limits. Cf. *h.Hom*.7.28-29 (Egypt: S; Cyprus: E; Hyperboreans: N); *I*.6.23 (Nile: S; Hyperboreans: N); *P*.10.28-30 (Hyperboreans); *N*.6.49-50 (Ethiopians); *N*.3.21-23, *N*.4.69-72, *I*.4.12-13 (Pillars); Pl.*Phaed*.109b.1 (Pillars: W; Phasis: E); Hdt.4.45.5-10 (Nile the border of Asia and Libya; Phasis the border of Asia and Europe, with the Tanais as an emergent alternative); Ael.Aristid.42.519.9-11 (Nile and Phasis the boundaries of Asia); Agathem.3.1-6 (Pillars divide Europe and Libya, the Nile Libya and Asia, and the Phasis Asia and Europe); at E.*Andr*.650-51 ὑπὲρ Νείλου ῥοὰς | ὑπέρ τε Φᾶσιν (stressing Andromache's barbarian status), the Nile and Phasis bound the *civilised* world.

The spatial orientation here and in ***O*.3**, esp. the north-south axis, better matches mainland/Ionian Greece. In part, this is because 5th-century divisions of the world take an East Greek perspective in general, esp. due to their correspondence with Ionian science (Thomas (2000) 75-101), and because 'East-Greek commercial interests were predominantly clustered in the Black Sea and in Egypt' (78); cf. Romm (2010) 215-35. The balancing of the 'cold' N with summer and the 'hot' S with winter here similarly suggests the climate-based, bipolar Ionian world map. However, applying the same schema to peripheral Sicily implicitly repositions it towards the Greek world's centre (see **38 Πανελλάνων**).

Whether Xenocrates visited either is irrelevant, since the point is to express the extent of his *xenia*, and perhaps the geographical range from which his *xenoi* were drawn, through the paradoxical image of him voyaging to practise a social ritual that took place *at*

home; that his putative travels took place in the most comfortable season (Péron (1974) 86-87) evokes membership of a leisured and mobile Panhellenic elite.

41 Φᾶσιν: a Colchian river on the Black Sea's eastern shore. In myth, the Argonauts' destination (Braswell on *P*.4.211(b)). Miletus founded a homonymous polis c.600 BC: Lordkipanidze (2000).

41-42 θερείαις ... χειμῶνι: the polarity may represent the year's halves (*Od*.7.118 χείματος οὐδὲ θέρευς, ἐπετήσιος; *P*.3.50) rather than 2 individual seasons (of 4: Alcm.fr.20.1-3). However, **χειμῶνι** is not necessarily redundant: winter sailing, previously considered minimal (Casson (1995) 270-71), may have been widespread: see Beresford (2013), esp. 17-18 on the Elephantine Palimpsest (475 or 454 BC) recording the arrival and departure of Ionian ships at an Egyptian city, perhaps on the Nile, between 6 March and 14 December (cf. Dem.56.30). He rejects (79ff.) Race's theory that summer winds favoured sailing south, and winter winds, north, but cf. Morton (2001) 259-60.

42 Νείλου: Greek contact with Egypt, esp. Naucratis on the Nile Delta: Möller (2000); Höckmann & Kreikenbom (2001). Sailing patterns: **41-42**.

πρὸς ἀκτάν: since it denotes the Nile Delta, the distinction between 'shore' and 'bank' is blurred; cf. Sol.fr.28 Νείλου ἐπὶ προχοῆισι, Κανωβίδος ἐγγύθεν ἀκτῆς.

Coincidence with verse- and stanza-end stylistically enacts arrival and closes the virtue-catalogue; cf. fr.124b.6 πρὸς ἀκτάν (symposium at sea: see **39-40**).

The phrase's closural position in a dead man's eulogy suggests eschatological symbolism: S.*OT*.177 ἀκτὰν πρὸς ἑσπέρου θεοῦ.

Epode 3

43-46 3rd-person exhortation to Thrasybulus (unnamed) not to allow his father's glory/songs to remain silent in the face of public envy, encapsulating the ode's function as a capstone to the Emmenids' legacy as crystallized in P.'s songs.

43 μή: anticipatory before negatives: E.*IA*.141-42 μή νυν μήτ' ἀλσώδεις ἵζου | κρήνας μήθ' ὕπνωι θελχθῆις. The injunction's extraordinary sequence of 4 verse-initial negatives implies it counters heavy social pressure on Thrasybulus to leave the odes *unperformed*.

νυν: inferential: *N*.1.13 σπεῖρέ νυν. With **μή** and imperative: A.*Sept*.242, 246; S.*Ai*.1129; E.*IA*.141-42; E.*Tro*.1049 μή νυν ... ἐσβήτω.

ὅτι: 'merely because': why Thrasybulus might keep his father's achievements silent (they stimulate envy: **43-44**), not why Thrasybulus should follow the advice not to keep them silent.

43-45 φθονεραὶ ... ἀρετάν ... ὕμνους: excellence attracts envy (fr.94a.8-9 φθόνος ... ἀρετᾶς; also *O*.6.72-76; *P*.1.81-85; *P*.11.54; *I*.1.41-44 εἰ δ' ἀρετᾷ κατάκειται ... χρή νιν εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον | μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν | γνώμαις; Isoc.*Panath*.158.4 φθονήσασαι ... ἀρεταῖς), as does its celebration in song (***O*.2.94-98**; *O*.6.6-7 τίνα κεν φύγοι ὕμνον ... ἐπικύρσαις | ἀφθόνων ἀστῶν ἐν ἱμερταῖς ἀοιδαῖς; *O*.8.54-55 ὕμνῳ, | μὴ βαλέτω ... φθόνος; *O*.11.4-8; *N*.3.7-9; *I*.5.22-25).

43 φθονεραὶ θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες: *O*.7.24-25 ἀμφὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων φρασὶν ἀμπλακίαι ... κρέμανται; also E.fr.551.1-2 φθόνος ... φρένα διαφθείρων βροτῶν.

The minds may belong to (1) the envious (i.e. those whose minds the hopes affect: *O*.7.24-25); or (2) the envied (those whom the hopes threaten: *O*.6.74-76 μῶμος ἐξ ἄλ-λων κρέμαται φθονεόντων ... οἷς ποτε πρώτοις περὶ δωδέκατον δρόμον | ἐλαυνόντεσσιν; *I*.8.14

δόλιος γὰρ αἰ-ὼν ἐπ᾽ ἀνδράσι κρέμαται). The parallels (*v.i.* **θνατῶν φρένας**) make (1) slightly preferable, but threat is connoted in any case. Epithet-noun hyperbaton stylistically enacts the verb.

The foregrounding of φθόνος at the head of the final epode underscores its significance. Its meaning is influenced by genre: epic restricts the sense 'envy' to unheroic characters/subjects; this develops in elegy and lyric, and proliferates in epinician, which focalizes envy from the perspective of the elite of the elite, whose achievements and celebrations incur it from social/agonistic inferiors (**43-45**; Konstan (2006) 111-28; Sanders (2010) 47-51): ἀρετή, song, and φθόνος form a nexus at *O.*6.4-11; *O.*11.4-8; *P.*10.19-24; *N.*3.6-11; Isoc.*Evag.*6.1-7. Kirkwood (1984) 169-83 suggests being envied is itself a praise-topos, but P. does not characterize it positively. For him, envy attacks victories and commemorations undeservedly, and must be delegitimized: 'no self-respecting aristocrat wants to deserve envy in the sense of being perceived to possess good things to which he is not entitled' (Konstan (2006) 310n.26). Here the tone is defiant and elitist: even though *arete* and *hymnos* aggravate envy (*v.s.*), Thrasybulus is enjoined to embrace them; *P.*1.85-86 similarly exhorts Hieron not to avoid glory on account of public envy.

Although φθόνος is a topos, there are implications for the ode's date/political context. Here, it is unique in applying to the odes' *reperformance*, not to a fresh victory or celebration, implying that the Emmenids' legacy had become contentious; this is underscored by the sense of threat in **ἀμφικρέμανται** (*v.s.*). The combination of φθόνος with **ἐλπίδες** sharpens the attitude of envy with the expectation of *results*: the gnomic reference to **ἐλπίδες** at *O.*12.6a occurs in the context of Himera's liberation from the Emmenid and Deinomenid tyrannies (D.S.11.68.5; D.S.11.76.4-6). External evidence

confirms the vague reference to envy at *P.*7.19 had a real-life basis in Megacles' ostracism, to which his *hippotrophia* (see **38**) contributed.

Envy in P.: Kirkwood (1984) 169-83; Vallozza (1989) 13-30; Kurke (1991) 195-224; Bulman (1992); Most (2003) 133-41; Sanders (2010) 47-51.

Fellow-citizens envying social superiors: **37 ἀστοῖς**.

φθόνος as closural device: ***O.*2.94-98**; *P.*1.85; *P.*2.90; *P.*7.19; *P.*11.54; *I.*7.39.

θνατῶν φρένας: in generalized criticisms: *P.*3.59 θναταῖς φρασίν; *P.*4.139-40; E.*Hipp.*1014-15; E.fr.551.1-2; also fr.61.5; Crit.fr.7.23.

θνατῶν φρένας ... ἐλπίδες: hope influences human minds: Sim.fr.8.3-4 ἐλπὶς ἑκάστωι | ἀνδρῶν ... στήθεσιν ἐμφύεται; fr.214.3 Ἐλπίς ... θνατῶν πολύστροφον γνώ-μαν κυβερνᾷ; B.fr.20B.8 ἐλπὶς δ<ι>αιθύσσῃ φρένας; S.*El.*809-10; S.fr.948; E.fr.650 ἐλπίδες ψεύδουσι ... βροτούς; Hermach.fr.24.3 ἐλπὶς δὲ φρένας παραθαρσύνει.

φρένας: seat of emotions (***P.*6.36**), liable to hope and envy (*v.s.*).

ἀμφικρέμανται: *hapax. V.s.*

44-46 The injunction to Thrasybulus not to keep silent his father's excellence or 'these songs' epitomizes several ***I.*2**/Emmenid themes.

45 τούσδ' ὕμνους (*pace* Verdenius, who understands an amplifying plural for ***I.*2** alone) means the Emmenid corpus. Although this appears incompatible with the proximal deictic's frequent reference to the current ode (*P.*2.3; *P.*10.65; *N.*3.76-79; *I.*4.21), its expanded scope is justified as follows. (1) **12-32** contains explicit remembrance of all victories for which the family received epinicia. (2) ***I.*2** employs pervasive self-quotation from the Emmenid corpus (see **1-11**). The last Emmenid self-quotation occurs here: **44 μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρώαν** ~ ***P.*6.42-45 ὕπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν ... Θρασύβουλος | πατρώαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα**. Crucially, this

reconfigures the exceptional filial piety for which Thrasybulus was celebrated in ***P.*6** in terms of his duty to keep memory of his father's excellence alive now – indeed, not only his father's, since **πατρώαν** also = 'hereditary', and includes Theron as well (***P.*6.46 πάτρῳ**). If the whole corpus were not reperformed, these self-quotations would lose their force. (3) Several motifs unite the corpus: (a) every Emmenid ode's status as ὕμνος is thematized by the word's occurrence in Strophe 1 (***P.*6.7**; ***O.*2.1**; ***O.*3.3**; **3**); (b) architectural motifs symbolize the corpus' superstructure: built up in every earlier ode via allusions to the Siphnian Treasury sculptures (***P.*6.28-42**; ***O.*2.79-83**), and the Acragantine Olympieum (***O.*3.43-44**), this poetic edifice receives its capstone here, as ***P.*6.7-8 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς** in particular is reactivated though the sculptural metaphor for poetry in **46 οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν** (alluding to *N.*5.1-2 Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος | ἑστᾰότ'), together with **45 τούσδ' ὕμνους**.

The corpus is thus unified into a song-cycle by themes shared by its constituents, and by ***I.*2**'s self-conscious distillation of the whole – a family heirloom for Thrasybulus to reactivate through regular reperformance in defiance of popular envy.

On the relevance of the *N.*5.1-2 allusion to the Emmenid legacy, see **Conclusion (2)**.

Σ.*N.*5.1a records that P.'s odes required fees comparable to a sculptor's (see **1-11**). Other *N.*5 allusions: **5**.

44 μήτ' ... σιγάτω: that achievements should not be kept silent is an epinician *topos* justifying the genre: *O.*7.92; *P.*9.92-94; *N.*9.6-7 ἐσλόν | μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾷ καλύψαι; fr.121.1-4; fr.240 μὴ σιγᾷ βρεχέσθω; B.3.94-98; Isoc.*Hel.Enc.*60.7-8. Contrast *N.*5.18; *I.*5.51; fr.180.2.

Here, a specific exhortation for Thrasybulus to reperform his father's/family's odes: *N.*4.13-16 (father reperforming for son).

44-45 ἀρετάν ... ὕμνους: excellence/achievement merits song: *O.*7.88-89 τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν ... ἄνδρα ... ἀρετὰν εὐ- ρόντα; *O.*11.4-6 εἰ ... τις εὖ πράσσοι, μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι ... ὅρκιον μεγάλαις ἀρεταῖς; *P.*1.79-80; *P.*2.14 ὕμνον ἄποιν' ἀρετᾶς; *P.*10.22-23 ὑμνη-τὸς ... ἀρετᾷ κρατήσαις; *N.*10.2; *I.*4.3; *I.*7.20-22; B.5.32-33 ἀρετὰν | ὑμνεῖν.

Epinician 3rd-person imperatives often express the obligation to celebrate victory: *P.*9.93-94; *N.*9.50-51; *I.*8.3-4, 66; B.13.199-201 [E]ἰ μή ... φθόνος βιᾶται (~ **43 φθονεραὶ**), | αἰνείτω σοφὸν ἄνδρα.

44 ἀρετάν ... πατρῴαν: 'hereditary', i.e. ambiguous between 'of the father' and 'of the fathers': see **44-46**.

In contexts of continuity amongst children/descendants: *Il.*14.118; *Od.*8.244-45 ἡμετέρης ἀρετῆς ... ἐξ ἔτι πατρῶν; Th.7.69.2.9-10 πατρικὰς ἀρετάς ... μὴ ἀφα- | νίζειν; Isoc.7.11.6-7 μιμητὴν ... τῆς πατρῴας | ἀρετῆς; Pl.*Menex.*249a.7-b.1 ἀναμιμνή- | σκουσα ... πατρῴας | ἀρετῆς; [Lys.]*Epitaph.*15.9 πατρὸς ἀρετὴν.

Commemorating dead fathers' excellence: Aphareus.*Epig.*1.1-2 πατρὸς εἰκόνα τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε ... σέβων καὶ γονέων ἀρετήν.

45 τούσδ' ὕμνους: see **44-46**.

Ring-composition with **3 ὕμνους** links the laudator with earlier poets.

τοι: creating intimacy: see ***P.6.19*** (likewise of Thrasybulus obeying an injunction to honour his father).

46 οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας ... ἐργασάμαν: *N.*5.1. See **44-46**.

οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας: the verb often connotes idleness, motivating its invariable use with a negative in classical poetry and Herodotus: *N.*5.1; fr.104b.4; A.*PV.*53, 529; Ar.*Thesm.*598; Hdt.1.68.1; Hdt.7.56.3-4; Hdt.8.71.13-14.

ἐργασάμαν: manual craft, here of sculpture (*N.*5.1; also *O.*8.42; A.*PV.*242).

As at **12**, **35**, the 1st person aligns itself with the historical P. by referencing poetic composition, in proximity to a self-quotation. The intratext with **6 ἐργάτις** is probably disassociative, but with a dash of ironic humour.

47-48 Coda. P.'s instruction to Nicasippus to relay his advice to Thrasybulus departs from the earlier direct address (**1**; **12**; **31**) by reframing the ode as a message/text and breaking the hitherto-assumed identity between composition and performance (a break anticipated by the 3rd person **44 σιγάτω**). P. occasionally entrusts delivery/performance of an ode to an intermediary (see **47**), but rarely flags it so explicitly. Command to deliver song in the coda: *O.*9.108-12; *O.*14.20-24; *I.*5.62-63; cf. *N.*3.76-80.

On the one hand, the ode becomes a mobile guest-gift, mirroring Xenocrates' metaphorical mobile *xenia* (**39-42**), and justified in its ability to spread poetic immortality by the preceding *N.*5 allusion (see **44-46**). Such a gift aligns P. with the old-fashioned poetic model (**1-5**). **47 ταῦτα ... ἀπόνειμον** need mean only 'impart this advice', masking the transmission of the poem itself.

On the other, despite the note of personal affection (**48**), metaphorical and spatial distance is created between P. and Thrasybulus, widened by Nicasippus' apparent status as an agent.

47 ταῦτα, Νικάσιππ', ἀπόνειμον: 'demonstrative – vocative – imperative' introducing coda*:* *N.*2.24-25 τόν, ὦ πολῖ-ται, κωμάξατε.

Νικάσιππ': an obscure individual. The name's attestations are restricted to mainland Greece/Aegean islands. Interestingly, the earliest is the Attic καλός-inscription (see **4**) *ABV.*p.671 = *PA.*10750 c.520 for a close contemporary of Pindar. The name *might* imply athlete-status, or be merely aspirational (Kurke (2013) 160n.173).

He may have been the choregus for the ode's performance, like Aeneas at *O*.6.85-91 (see Hutchinson), but no personal connection like that of Aeneas with Hagesias is evident. Mullen (1982) 34 suggests that when P. did not travel to lead the *komos*, he would name his substitute, but we might then expect more frequent naming. Here, the name may appear purely for its serendipitous connection with the victory, recalling **13 ἵπποισι νίκαν** (cf. **22 Νικόμαχος** ~ **26 Νίκας**); Thummer regards it as a fiction invented for the sake of word-play. *Pace* Bell (1995) 26-27, there is no basis for taking it as Nicomachus' nickname.

His similarity to Nicomachus (comparable name; no patronymic; participating in *xenia*; agent) complements the ode's patron-agent theme (see **1-11**). Nicholson (2005) 73-74 argues that Nicasippus' depiction as P.'s trusted servant retrojects that dynamic onto the relationship between Nicomachus and the Emmenids. But this slightly misses the point that, whatever the reality, P. characterizes the charioteer and the choregus as the voluntary, unmercenary, and (potentially) elite agents of their patron, to reinforce that same characterization of the poet-patron relationship: see **1-11**.

ἀπόνειμον: 'impart'. Catenacci (1999) 49-61 defends 'read' (Σ*I*.2.68), a sense found in the simplex, comparing the command to perform song delivered as an artifact at *O*.6.87-91 and *N*.5.3 (cf. **44-46**). However, envisaging performance specifically as 'lettura cantata' (57) is unnecessary, since *O*.10.1 ἀνάγνωτέ 'read' metaphorically signifies 'perform'.

Reprise of **22 νεῖμ'** (Nicomachus driving Xenocrates' chariot) parallels the victor-charioteer and poet-choregus relationships: *v.s.*

48 ξεῖνον ἐμὸν: *Od*.1.417 ξεῖνος ... ἐμὸς, 11.338, 24.263; *P*.10.64; *I*.6.46; E.*Alc*.816; E.*Hec*.709-10; E.*HF*.1156; Isoc.5.38.6; Isoc.16.18.3-4.

Assertion of *xenia* with Thrasybulus (1) closes the ring with the intimate address in **1**; (2) claims a non-commercial poet-patron relationship; (3) caps the theme of Emmenid

xenia prominent in ***I.2*** (**24**; **39**; Xenocrates' name) and their corpus (see ***O.2.6***). Although such claims (*N.*7.61 ξεῖνός εἰμι; *O.*1.103; *P.*3.69) may be conventional, the pervasive recollection of P.'s long-term relationship with the Emmenids implies it has become real, with the 1st person aligning with the historical poet (see **1-11**). On the other hand, P. sends an intermediary instead of coming in person: **47-48**.

ἠθαῖον: Doric for ἠθεῖος 'familiar friend'. Cognate with Latin *sodalis*; cf. Watkins (1995) 81n.12: 'with whom one shares consecrated usage'; Jackson (2014) 94-95 adduces *RV.*10.15.12 to explain **ξεῖνον ... ἠθαῖον** in terms of the IE motif of ritual commensality.

Elsewhere only in epic, always of males in close bonds, whether of brotherhood (*Il.*6.518; *Il.*10.37; *Il.*22.229, 239) or friendship (*Od.*14.147; *Il.*23.94; Hes.*Scut.*103).

ἔλθῃς: arrival of the song-bearing laudator at the victor's home is an epinician motif (*O.*7.13; *O.*14.18; *P.*2.3-4 ὔμμιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων | μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν τετραορίας; *I.*5.21; *I.*6.21; Bundy 23-27; Nünlist (1998) 229-38), often framed as an act of *xenia* (*O.*9.83 προξενίᾳ ... ἦλθον; *P.*3.68-73 μόλον ... παρ' Αἰτναῖον ξένον ... ἄγων ... κῶμόν; *N.*1.19-20; *N.*9.1-2; fr.94b.39-41 ἤλυθον ... ἀμφὶ προξενίαισι).

Whether or not the above instances are conventional, it is striking that their application to Nicasippus implies he stands in for P. not only in organizing the performance, but as a *xenos*: see **47-48**.

Arrival as closural motif: **42**.

CONCLUSION

'... the singer raises the question of his topic: given the undefined number of possible topics, the one chosen theme will serve to distinguish this song from all others and to realize it as a *specific* text. We are dealing here not primarily with the difference between the genre ὕμνοι and the single exemplar, but rather with the relationship between a text and all of its possible alternatives ...'

— Patten (2009) 168

ἔστι δὲ ξ[ένη τις ἡ] πόησις

[κ]αὶ ἀνθρώ[ποις] αἰνι[γμ]ατώδης.

— P.Derv.col.7.4-5

The commentary format is geared more towards the minute examination of textual morsels than the development of overarching arguments, and so a large part of the value of this commentary must lie in its treatment of discrete words, phrases, and controversial passages. However, the cumulative results of the study reveal significant patterns and allow a range of conclusions to be drawn about the varied needs of Pindar's Emmenid honorands, the strategies he employs to satisfy them, and the techniques whereby

individual occasional odes are moulded into a coherent corpus. I therefore set these out below, πολλῶν πείρατα συντανύσαις | ἐν βραχεῖ [130].

(1) Emmenid *Selbstdarstellung*

The core function of epinician has been consistently understood as the praise and glorification of the victor [131]. More recent studies have extended this function along socio-political and anthropological lines, ranging from reconciling or reintegrating the victor on his return home [132], to conveying the honorand's chosen self-image. This section examines how the latter concept is manifested in the Emmenid corpus, building on the case made by van den Groenendaal (2006) in his treatment of *Selbstdarstellung* in Pindar's Sicilian odes.

In my view, Pindar's epinician goal is not only to praise his honorands, but to exploit all the communicative opportunities afforded by an ode to serve their interests, both general and specific. Especially in the case of his most politically-ambitious and powerful laudandi, such as the Emmenids, 'praise-poet' seems an inadequate descriptor of his role: his modern equivalents are the public relations guru and the brand manager. Here, I identify three levels on which Pindar's superbly-crafted messages operate: intrafamilial, intra-polis, and inter-polis.

The intrafamilial dimension has received recent attention from Cummins (2010) 321-39, who identifies tensions concerning the praise of brothers within odes for ruling families. However, it is not strictly the case that in the Emmenid odes 'praise of a brother

[130] *P.*1.81-82.
[131] Bundy 3: 'there is no passage in Pindar and Bakkhulides that is not in its primary intent enkomiastic – that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron'. By contrast, see ***P.*6.46** for the theoretical possibility of Pindar undermining his honorands through epic allusion.
[132] Crotty (1982) 110; Kurke (1991) 6.

is carefully subordinated to [that] of the laudandus' [133]; rather it is *Theron's* primacy over Xenocrates that gives his interests priority in ***P.6***, ***O.2***, and ***O.3*** even when he is not the laudandus, a dynamic reversed in ***I.2*** to suit Thrasybulus' present needs and Xenocrates' reputation when both Theron and Xenocrates are deceased.

This perspective is particularly important for interpreting ***P.6***'s extraordinary aspects, esp. the marginalization of the victor Xenocrates in favour of his son Thrasybulus [134], and Thrasybulus' emulation of Theron rather than his father [135]: these techniques detach Xenocrates from his victory, with Thrasybulus the conduit for transmitting its glory to Theron [136]. Theron's dominance is more overt in the 476 odes, with Xenocrates absent from ***O.3*** except in a reference to the family [137], and his victories included in ***O.2*** primarily to add lustre to Theron's [138]. Although ***I.2*** encapsulates all the Emmenids' victories, it presents them in the manner most helpful to Xenocrates and Thrasybulus. The victory-list's conventional order is broken to facilitate the insertion of the charioteer Nicomachus [139]. Nicomachus' exceptional prominence, and his characterization as an aristocrat and virtually an Olympic victor [140], detaches Theron from his victory just as Thrasybulus detached Xenocrates in ***P.6*** [141]. Allusions to earlier odes similarly transfer Theron's glories to Xenocrates and/or Thrasybulus: the phrasing of Xenocrates' Pythian win in the victory-list reappropriates Theron's original appropriation of its glory in ***P.6*** [142]; what in ***O.3*** was cast primarily as Theron's theoxenic celebration and metaphorical travel to the Earth's

[133] Cummins (2010) 323.
[134] See ***P.6.5***, **15**.
[135] See ***P.6.46***.
[136] See ***P.6.28-42***.
[137] ***O.3.38***.
[138] See ***O.2.48-51***.
[139] See ***I.2.12-32***.
[140] See ***I.2.23***, **24**, **26**.
[141] See ***I.2.19-28***, **28-29**.
[142] ***I.2.18*** ~ ***P.6.46***.

limits is similarly claimed for Xenocrates [143]; the address to Thrasybulus that concludes the victory-list is designed to share the family's victories with him [144].

Intra-polis positioning is equally nuanced. In ***P.6***, Thrasybulus is cast as an idealized young aristocrat, educated in the most traditional style to observe every tenet of correct noble behaviour, in order to deflect the suspicion that the senior Emmenids, flush with their first Panhellenic victory, possessed tyrannical aspirations [145]. Simultaneously, however, the metaphorical inscription upon the song-treasury intimates precisely such ambitions, an effect heightened by the elision of Acragas and its replacement by Thrasybulus' name in the second metaphorical inscription, as if by epigraphic erasure [146]; epic allusions to Zeus' overthrow of Cronus [147] and Odysseus' vengeful return [148] may carry comparable implications. Military themes [149] flag attentiveness to external barbarian threats. ***P.6*** also initiates a strategy common to all the Emmenid odes, namely the neutralization of public criticism of their wealth by invariably interrelating it to personal/moral qualities [150]; that the family's encomia are, by contrast, entirely uninhibited about wealth [151] is in part a difference of genre, but one that most probably reflects the social reality of the encomia's more elitist sympotic audience, albeit one that affects a degree of internal egalitarianism.

The image of Theron's rule constructed by the 476 odes is finely balanced. On the one hand, he receives no royal titles [152], unlike Hieron and Arcesilas, and relative to Hieron is

---

[143] See ***I.2.39-42***, **39-40**.
[144] See ***I.2.30-32***.
[145] See ***P.6.21-27***, **47-54**, **52-54**. Cf. Kurke (1991) 203: 'smoothing out the political tensions inherent in athletic success'.
[146] See ***P.6.1-18***, **5-6**.
[147] See ***P.6.24***.
[148] See ***P.6.46***.
[149] See ***P.6.12***, **31**.
[150] See ***P.6.47***; ***O.2.1-11***, **53**; ***O.3.42-43***; ***I.2.37-38***.
[151] fr.119.4; fr.124ab.6, 8.
[152] Cf. Haillet (2001) 153n.5, 157n.5, on Theron's possible use of such titles outside epinician.

praised more for his moral qualities than for his power [153]. In part, this forms a continuum with Emmenid praise in ***P.6*** and ***I.2***, and may be due to the nature of Acragantine political culture: van den Groenendaal (2006) 194-96 adduces lower levels of internal strife in Acragas, as well as Theron's relative popularity and status as *primus inter pares*. On the other hand, it is an exaggeration to claim, with Morgan (2015) 416, that 'there is nothing in the Emmenid odes that could not be extravagant praise of a wealthy and powerful aristocrat in an oligarchy'. Thus in ***O.2*** the Emmenids are represented as fundamentally inseparable from the polis: Theron is the city's bulwark and upholder, mirroring Hector's role in relation to Troy, and evoking the Acragantine building-programme [154]; the elaborate genealogy, controlled by fate, connects the family to the mythical rulers of Thebes and Argos, with references to more recent history activating the pro-Emmenid story of their involvement in Acragas' foundation [155]. The relative eschewal of hard power in these odes [156] may be topically-motivated: the violent rule of Thrasydaeus, a source of Emmenid concern about the dynasty's future, had caused an uprising in Himera and required a forceful intervention from Theron to quell it in 476 [157]. Since Theron's military power had been recently demonstrated, the epinicia had a motivation to downplay rather than to stress it [158]. ***O.2***'s eschatology and ***O.3***'s theoxeny have a political dimension insofar as they imply the Emmenids' enjoyment of extraordinary divine favour.

By the time of ***I.2***, the family has lost its tyranny, the senior Emmenids are deceased, and Thrasybulus requires a means of commemorating their achievements while conciliating those ill-disposed to the former autocrats. Xenocrates' positive relationship with the citizenry is underscored, a strategy including intertextual reconfiguration of

[153] Morgan (2015) 413-20.
[154] See ***O.2.6-7***, **81-82**.
[155] See **Introduction (1)**; ***O.2.Interpretation***.
[156] But cf. **4 <u>πολέμου</u> ~ 44 <u>πολέμου</u>** (responsion) in relation to two of Theron's models, Heracles and Thersander; **81-83**.
[157] See **12-15**.
[158] See ***O.3.16***, **27**.

Thrasybulus' more elitist sympotic virtues from ***P.6*** [159]; his piety is represented as supererogatory public service [160], and his horse-rearing is justified by appeal to Panhellenic norms [161], as is his lavish *xenia* [162]. The marginalization of Theron and his effective replacement by Nicomachus noted above is politically diplomatic. The conclusion nonetheless strikes a defiant tone to resist the envy of those hoping to silence the family's glory [163]. Remarkably, the laudator's persona is assimilated to that of the historical poet, whose status as a loyal unmercenary friend underpins the credibility of the Emmenids' characterization [164]. We may observe a progression in Pindar's use of the 1st person to represent his own poetic persona: totally absent from ***P.6*** (in the singular), it performs a structural function and adjoins significant praise passages in Theron's odes, before playing the key role of the **ξεῖνον ... ἠθαῖον** [165] in ***I.2*** as just noted.

The inter-polis aspect of messaging is marginal before and after the tyranny, as might be expected. An interesting exception occurs in ***P.6*** with a potential complimentary reference to Anaxilas of Rhegium's renaming of Zancle as Messene [166]. By contrast, Theron's odes contain multiple references that bring him into contact with Hieron. How these are interpreted depends in part on our understanding of the crisis in relations between the tyrants in the *mouvementé* year of 476, in which open conflict was narrowly avoided [167]. This outcome can be viewed as an acknowledgement by Theron of Hieron's political superiority, which some see reflected in the contrast between the primacy of generosity in Theron's superlative vaunt at ***O.2.90-95*** vs. that of power in Hieron's at

[159] See ***I.2.17***, **35-37**.
[160] See ***I.2.39***.
[161] See ***I.2.38***.
[162] ***I.2.39-42***.
[163] ***I.2.43-45***.
[164] See ***I.2.1-11***.
[165] ***I.2.48***.
[166] See ***P.6.35***.
[167] Luraghi (1994) 260-61, 328-30.

O.1.103-5 [168]. However, the natural construal of ***O*.2.93** is openly competitive with Acragas' rival cities, and there are internal reasons why Theron's vaunt emphasizes moral qualities, such as their special eschatological significance [169], and the recent crushing of Himera's revolt noted above. The theory that the dynasties avoided competition with one another has already been rejected [170], and I detect several passages in Theron's odes where both his superior agonistic success [171] and political influence [172] are phrased so as to trump Hieron's.

(2) <u>Pindaric Intertextuality</u>

One of the primary aims of this thesis has been to test how the potential for overlapping audiences, reperformance, and the circulation of written texts postulated in recent scholarship, might have affected the composition of the Emmenid odes and encouraged Pindar to link them together [173]. My conclusion is that such interconnections are real and consciously-applied, growing progressively in number and significance until their fullest deployment in ***I*.2**. In addition to this emphasis on intra-corpus intertextuality, this section also discusses some important intertexts with poems both within and beyond the Sicilian milieu.

Although only the first Emmenid epinician, ***P*.6** manifests a remarkable intertext with Pindar's encomium for Thrasybulus [174]: the epinician delicately evokes the symposium in

[168] Cf. Morgan (2015) 414.
[169] See ***O*.2.68-70**.
[170] See **Introduction (1)**.
[171] See ***O*.2.1-3**, **5**; ***O*.3.3-4**, **19**, **33**, **34**, **42-44**.
[172] See ***O*.2.9 Σικελίας**.
[173] See **Introduction (2)**.
[174] ***P*.6.52-54** ~ fr.124ab.2-4.

a manner that does not exclude its audience, but simultaneously encodes in the words of that evocation a precise allusion to a text that only the select attendees of Thrasybulus' symposia could perceive. Superficial inclusiveness thus co-exists with a knowing elitism. A similar attitude emerges from a comparison between the naked celebration of wealth in the encomia with the epinicians' careful association of wealth with personal/moral qualities [175], which suggests the latter was a pose adopted by the more public genre to blunt popular hostility.

***P*.6** also displays certain motifs that help to articulate the collection as it builds. Although a feature found elsewhere in epinician, it is notable that all four odes open with a self-conscious treatment of poetry/performance [176], emblematized by the prominent deployment of the word ὕμνος in Strophe 1 of every Emmenid ode [177]. The coincidence of the two at ***P*.6 ὕμνων | θησαυρὸς** sets up a recurrent engagement with monumental architecture and sculpture that acts as a metapoetic superstructure for the corpus [178].

The range of the mutual interconnections increases in ***O*.2** and ***O*.3**, as does their depth. The openings of both odes (***O*.2.1-7 ~ *O*.3.1-4**) include 7 points of contact, thus marking a programmatic intention that the poems be received as a pair; the odes' codas are also unique in closing exactly on the laudator's admission of the impossibility of his praise doing justice to the laudandus (***O*.2.98-100 ~ *O*.3.44-45**). Further links demonstrate an overlap in the odes' key concepts. With respect to ***O*.2.79-80 ~ *O*.3.14-16**, both passages denote the permeability of spatial/existential boundaries (in opposite directions) that is thematized in Theron's odes, and enact it metapoetically through the intertext itself. Similarly, in the case of ***O*.2.70-74 ~ *O*.3.41-42**, a connection is developed between water,

[175] See **Conclusion (1)**.
[176] ***P*.6.1-18** (poetry embedded in the landscape/architecture of the Games-site); ***O*.2.1-2** (dramatization of the choice of theme by addressing the divinized ὕμνοι themselves); ***O*.3.4-9** (direct blazoning of the laudator's innovation); ***I*.2.1-11** (comparison of past and present poetic economics).
[177] ***P*.7; *O*.2.1**; ***O*.3.3**; ***I*.2.3**.
[178] See ***P*.6.28-42**; ***O*.2.78-80**; ***O*.3.44**; ***I*.2.44-46**; cf. Athanassaki (2009a) 149-56.

gold, and the rites of the blessed celebrated by Theron in the latter, and the water and gold enjoyed by the blessed on the Isle in the former; the link is strengthened by the fact that the blessed employ the leaves of those miraculous, otherworldly trees to craft garlands for themselves (***O*.2.73-74**), just as Theron's Olympic victory-crown is itself the product of otherworldly trees transferred to Olympia (***O*.3.18-23**). ***O*.2.3-5** juxtaposes Theron's victory with Heracles' Olympic foundation as a microcosm of the extended parallels between them developed at ***O*.3.9-11**, **43-44**.

O*.2**'s description of the heroic immigration of Theron's ancestors to Sicily, where wealth has since attended them, echoes an encomium for Theron conveying a similar message [179]; the same encomium is alluded to in reference to the Emmenids' superlative offerings to the gods in ***O*.3** [180]. Clay (2011) 337-45 regards *O*.1-O*.3** as a Sicilian triptych [181] on the basis of their content and the year's political reconciliation; their intertexts with *O*.1 for Hieron have been noted in **Conclusion (1)**. However, the Western Greek nexus of that year extends still further, to Epizephyrian Locri: 5 points of verbal contact link two passages of ***O*.2** and ***O*.10** describing Heracles' Olympic foundation [182], which is narrated at length in the latter, thus making the former a Pindaric 'cf.'. This implies overlapping reception between contemporary odes for a Locrian boy-victor and an Acragantine tyrant (cf. ***O*.2.12-21** ~ *O*.10.48-55; ***O*.3.19-20** ~ *O*.10.73-75; *O*.1.43-45 ~ *O*.10.102-5 [183]). In 468, B.3.85-98 would rework elements of all 4 476 tyrant-odes in order to elevate Hieron over Theron, and Bacchylides over Pindar [184].

[179] ***O*.2.8-11** ~ fr.119.1-4.
[180] ***O*.3.39** ~ fr.119.3-4.
[181] So already Newman & Newman (1984) 188-89.
[182] ***O*.2.3-5** ~ *O*.10.56-59.
[183] Nicholson (2013) 17-19, who notes only the last intertext, connects it to Hieron's protection of Locri.
[184] See ***O*.2.86-88**.

The most far-reaching intertextual implications are those for ***I.*2**, where I count 14 significant self-quotations of every prior Emmenid composition except frr.118-19 [185]: here, intertextuality is elevated from a secondary phenomenon to a major device underlying several aspects of the ode's function. As argued in detail in **Chapter 4**, these self-quotations establish the poem as a 'memorial ode', not only for Xenocrates but for the Emmenids as a ruling house; assimilate the laudator to the historical poet, especially where the self-quotations intersect with 1st-person references, and thus substantiate the laudator's implicit argument that his praise is the result of long friendship, not mercenary interest [186]; appropriate for Xenocrates what in earlier odes were Theron's glories; adapt to the altered political context. The injunction that Thrasybulus should not keep his father's excellence silent itself contains a self-quotation referencing Thrasybulus' supreme filial piety [187], and thus both explicitly and metapoetically renders their odes an intertextual corpus that would lose its power and meaning without regular reperformance.

The importance of the ode's final intertext (***I.*2.46 <u>οὐκ</u> <u>ἐλινύσοντας</u> αὐτοὺς <u>ἐργασάμαν</u>** ~ *N.*5.1-2 <u>Οὐκ</u> ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' <u>ἐλινύσοντα</u> <u>ἐργά-ζεσθαι</u> ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος | ἑστᾰότ') to the Emmenid legacy has not been fully appreciated. It has rightly been observed that this allusion to the sculptural imagery of *N.*5.1 reactivates a recurrent pattern of references to monumental sculpture in earlier Emmenid odes [188]; given the proximity of ***I.*2.45 τούσδ' <u>ὕμνους</u>**, it must especially recall ***P.*6.7-8 <u>ὕμνων</u> | θησαυρὸς**, allusively defining what the Emmenid corpus has become. However, although ***I.*2.46** conveys enough information on its own to be understood as a craft-metaphor, it includes none of the technical terms relating to sculpture (*N.*5.1 ἀνδριαντοποιός ...

[185] See ***I.*2.1-11**.
[186] The use of this technique in ***I.*2** is one of the only guaranteed means we possess of matching the laudator's voice to Pindar's, since it references texts external to the ode that we know to have been composed by the latter.
[187] ***I.*2.43-45** ~ ***P.*6.42-45**.
[188] See above.

ἀγάλματ' ... βαθμίδος). Full understanding thus requires the audience to recognize an allusion to a specific line of *N*.5 and to import contextual information from it. If they do, they will recall the laudator's command that immediately follows it, namely to spread the fame of Pytheas' victory in every ship that sails from Aegina: *N*.5.2-5 ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά, | στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι | Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενής | νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον. The very fact of the audience recognizing this allusion to a victory-ode composed in the previous decade for a different victor (Pytheas), whose polis (Aegina), event (pancratium), Games (Nemean), age-category (boy), and political standing (non-tyrant) were totally removed from those of Xenocrates, is a practical *demonstration* that the laudator's command had been successful in spreading Pytheas' fame to Sicily, thus guaranteeing that Emmenid fame can survive in the same way. This interpretation is supported by a further series of intertexts with *N*.5 in ***I*.2** [189], and also by ***I*.2.47-48**, which metapoetically commands Nicasippus to impart ***I*.2.44-46** to Thrasybulus after transporting the ode across the sea to Acragas, precisely as the *N*.5 allusion it contains had already travelled [190]. Whether or not Pindar was the conduit for transmission, it is striking that the odes for Lampon's sons (*N*.5; B.13; *I*.6; *I*.5) likewise formed an intertextual familial corpus for a pair of victorious brothers [191], and engaged in dialogue with monumental sculpture [192]. Pindar's odes for the Psalychids were in many ways a precursor for the Emmenids'.

[189] See ***I*.2.5**.
[190] Cf. ***I*.2.38**, **41-42**, on Xenocrates' Panhellenic outlook and mobility.
[191] Morrison (2011a) 227-53.
[192] Indergaard (2011) 294-322.

(3) Future Research

The approaches employed in this thesis have a wide range of potential ramifications. In particular, the study of intertextuality in epinician should be opened up to include the possibility of viewing such links not only as features of the genre, or idiosyncrasies of the poet, but as a key part of the fulfilment of epinician's promise of undying Panhellenic fame. Pindar's odes are in a constant state of dialogue with one another, not only within the same local milieu, but from one end of the Greek world to the other; they also interact closely with the compositions of rival contemporary poets. Further exploration of a subset of this phenomenon, the technique identified in ***I.2*** of using strategic self-quotation to refer to a specific body of earlier work, would allow more progress to be made in unravelling long-standing cruces concerning the presence of the historical poet in 1st-person references in epinician.

Beyond the spread of fame, however, it should be recognized that epinician's function in serving the needs of its honorands is as fluid and varied as are the needs themselves. Therefore, whilst both the traditional view of epinician's key function as praise and more recent analyses in terms of social mediation remain indispensable, appreciating the uniqueness of an ode requires adopting a multi-level approach to its representational strategies, which incorporated the personal, familial, intra- and interpolitical dynamics of the time. Although gaps in our historical data are a constant hindrance, awareness of the existence of such dynamics can assist our understanding of ostensible paradoxes, such as the relative marginalization of an actual victor found in ***P.6*** and ***I.2***.

The most natural future step in research would be to apply these analytical techniques in a commentary on other groups of odes that form clusters participating in a shared

familial and/or sociopolitical milieu. The Psalychid odes mentioned above [193], as well as those for Hieron and his associates [194], would form a particularly productive group; so too, more broadly, would those for the Aeginetans [195] or Thebans [196].

[193] **Conclusion (2)**.
[194] *O*.1; *O*.6; *P*.1; *P*.2; *P*.3; *N*.1; *N*.9; B.3; B.4; B.5.
[195] *O*.8; *P*.8; *N*.3; *N*.4; *N*.5; *N*.6; *N*.7; *N*.8; *I*.5; *I*.6; *I*.8; B.12; B.13. Cf. Morrison (2011a) 227-53; (2011b) 311-35.
[196] *P*.11; *I*.1; *I*.3; *I*.4; *I*.7.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABV	Beazley, J.D. (1956), *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford).
ARV^2	Beazley, J.D. (1963), *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (2nd Ed.; Oxford).
BCD	Walker, A.S. (2006), *Coins of Peloponnesos: The BCD Collection. Auction LHS 96, 8-9 May 2006* (Zürich).
BM	The British Museum, London.
BNP	H. Cancik, H. Schneider, C. Salazar, D. Orton (edd.) (2002-10), *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World* (16 Vols.; Leiden).
CEG	P.A Hansen (ed.) (1983-89), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* (2 Vols.; Berlin).
CID	*Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes* (1977-) (Paris).
DK	H. Diels (1903), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (3 Vols.; 6th Ed. revised by W. Kranz (1952); Berlin).
FD	*Fouilles de Delphes* (1902-) (Paris).
FGE	D.L. Page (ed.) (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge).
FGH	F. Jacoby *et al*. (edd.) (1923-), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin).
GDI	H. Collitz, F. Bechtel, *et al.* (1884-1915), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (4 Vols.; Göttingen).
IED	S. Minon (2007), *Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VIe-IIe siècle avant J.-C.).* Vol I: *Textes* (Geneva).
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae* (1873-) (Berlin).
IvO	W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold (edd.) (1896), *Die Inschriften von Olympia* (Berlin).
K-G	R. Kühner, B. Gerth (1898-1904), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (2 Vols.; Hannover).
KN	J. Chadwick, J.T. Killen, J.P. Olivier (1971), *The Knossos Tablets: A*

	Transliteration (4th Ed.; Cambridge).
LGPN	P.M. Fraser, E. Matthews (edd.) (1987-), *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (Oxford).
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (1981-) (Zürich).
LSJ	H.G Liddell, R.Scott (1940), *A Greek-English Lexicon*[9] (rev. H. Stuart-Jones *et al*.; Oxford).
ML	R. Meiggs, D. Lewis (edd.) (1989), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford).
Myc.	Mycenaean.
OCD[4]	S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, E. Eidinow (edd.) (2012), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (4th Ed.; Oxford).
OF	A. Bernabé (ed.) (2004-2007), *Poetae epici Graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta. Pars II. Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta* (3 Fasc.; Munich/Leipzig (2004-5); Berlin/New York (2007)).
PA	J. Kirchner (1901-3), *Prosopographia Attica* (2 Vols.; Berlin).
PMG	D.L. Page (ed.) (1962), *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford).
P.Oxy.	B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt *et al*. (edd.) (1898-), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London).
PY	E.L. Bennett, J.-P. Olivier (1973), *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed* (Rome).
Σ	A.B. Drachmann (ed.) (1903-27), *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina* (3 Vols.; Leipzig).
S-D	E. Schwyzer, A. Debrunner (1934-39, 1950), *Griechische Grammatik* (2 Vols.; Munich).
SEG	*Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum* (1923-).
S.-M.	Maehler, H. (1987-89), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis, post Brunonem Snell edidit H. Maehler* (2 Vols.; 8th Ed.; Stuttgart/Leipzig).

Snell-Maehler	= S.-M.
SNG.ANS	*Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum*, American Numismatic Society (1969-) (New York).
Stith Thompson	Thompson, S. (1955-58), *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (6 Vols.; Copenhagen).
TLG	*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) Cited by Author's Name

Ahrens, H.L. (1848), 'De hiatu apud elegiacos Graecorum poetas antiquiores', *Philologus* 3: 223-37.

Allan, W. (2008), *Euripides*: Helen (Cambridge).

Athanassakis, A.N. & Wolkow, B.M. (2013), *The Orphic Hymns* (2nd Ed.; Baltimore).

Barrett, W.S. (1964), *Euripides*: Hippolytos (Oxford).

Beck, C.D. (1792-95), *Pindari carmina et fragmenta* (2 Vols.; Leipzig).

Bergk, T. (1843[1], 1853[2], 1866[3], 1878[4]), *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig).

Blaydes, F.H.M. (1887), *Aristophanis* Acharnenses (Halle).

Boeckh, A. (1821), *Pindari opera quae supersunt* (I.1-II.2; Leipzig).

Bowra (1935), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis* (Oxford).

Braswell, B.K. (1988), *A Commentary on the* Fourth Pythian Ode *of Pindar* (Berlin).

Bundy, E.L. (1986), *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley) [first published 1962 as *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 18.1-2].

Bury, J.B. (1892), *The* Isthmian Odes *of Pindar* (London).

Campbell, D.A. (1992), *Greek Lyric IV: Bacchylides, Corinna, and Others* (Cambridge, MA).

Cannatà Fera, M. (1990), *Pindarus: Threnorum fragmenta* (Roma).

Carey, C. (1981), *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York).

Chantraine, P. (1968-80), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris).

Christ, W. (1896), *Pindari carmina prolegomenis et commentariis instructa* (Leipzig).

Cordano, F. (1992), *Le tessere pubbliche del tempio di Atena a Camarina* (Rome).

Davies, M. (1991), *Sophocles:* Trachiniae, *with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford).

Davies, M. & Finglass, P.J. (edd.) (2014), *Stesichorus: The Poems* (*Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries* 54; Cambridge).

Denniston, J.D. (1954), *The Greek Particles*[2] (Oxford).

Dodds, E.R. (1960), *Euripides'* Bacchae (2nd Ed.; Oxford).

Dover, K.J. (1993), *Aristophanes*: Frogs (Oxford).

Dunbar, N. (1995), *Aristophanes*: Birds (Oxford).

Ebert, J. (1972), *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (*Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 63.2; Berlin).

Farnell, L.R. (1932), *The Works of Pindar II: Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar* (London).

Fennell, C.A.M. (1899), *Pindar: The* Nemean *and* Isthmian Odes (2nd Ed.; Cambridge).

Ferrari, F. (1998), *Pindaro*: Olimpiche (Milan).

Finglass, P.J. (2007a), *Sophocles:* Electra (*Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries* 44; Cambridge).

——— (2007b), *Pindar:* Pythian Eleven (*Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries* 45; Cambridge).

——— (2011), *Sophocles*: Ajax (*Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries* 48; Cambridge).

Fraenkel, E. (1950), *Aeschylus:* Agamemnon (3 Vols.; Oxford).

Gedike, F. (1786), *Pindari carmina selecta* (Berlin).

Gentili, B. *et al*. (1995), *Pindaro:* le Pitiche (Verona).

Gerber, D.E. (1982), *Pindar's* Olympian One*: A Commentary* (Toronto).

——— (1999), 'Pindar *Nemean* 6: A Commentary', *HSPh* 99: 33-91.

——— (2002), *A Commentary on Pindar* Olympian Nine (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 87; Stuttgart).

Gildersleeve, B.L. (1885), *Pindar: The* Olympian *and* Pythian *odes* (New York).

Gostoli, A. (1990), *Terpandro: Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Roma).

Hainsworth, B. (1993), *The* Iliad: *a commentary. Vol. III: Books 9-12* (Cambridge).

Harder, A. (2012), *Callimachus*: Aetia (2 Vols.; Oxford).

Harrison, S.J. (1991), *Vergil*: Aeneid 10 (Oxford).

Hartung, J.A. (1855-56), *Pindars Werke* (4 Vols.; Leipzig).

Henry, W.B. (2005), *Pindar's* Nemeans*: A Selection* (Munich/Leipzig).

Hermann, G. (1827-77), *Godofredi Hermanni opuscula* I-VIII (Leipzig).

Heubeck, A. & West, S. & Hainsworth, J.B. (1988), *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey. *Vol. 1. Introduction and Books I-VIII* (Oxford).

Heyne, C.G. (1807), *Pindari Carmina et Fragmenta* (Oxford).

Hordern, J.H. (2002), *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford).

Horsfall, N. (2013), *Virgil,* Aeneid 6*: A Commentary* (2 Vols.; Berlin).

Huffman, C.A. (1993), *Philolaus of Croton: Pythagorean and Presocratic* (Cambridge).

Hummel, P. (1993), *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Paris).

Hutchinson, G.O. (1985), *Aeschylus*: Seven against Thebes (Oxford).

——— (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry: A commentary on selected larger pieces* (Oxford).

Janko, R. (1994), *The* Iliad: *A Commentary. Vol. IV: Books 13-16* (Cambridge).

Kidd, D. (1998), *Aratus*: Phaenomena (Cambridge).

Kirk, G.S. (1985), *The* Iliad: *A Commentary. Vol. I: Books 1-4* (Cambridge).

Kirkwood, G.M. (1982), *Selections from Pindar* (Chico, CA).

Liberman, G. (2004), *Pindare,* Pythiques (Paris).

Mastronarde, D.J. (1994), *Euripides*: Phoenissae (*Classical Texts and Commentaries* 29; Cambridge).

——— (2002), *Euripides*: Medea (Cambridge).

Mommsen, T. (1864a), *Pindari Carmina* (Berlin).

Monier-Williams, M. (1899), *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford).

Nisbet, R.G.M. & Hubbard, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes Book I (Oxford).

——— (1978), *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes Book II (Oxford).

Nisbet, R.G.M. & Rudd, N. (2004), *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes Book III (Oxford).

Olson, S.D. (1998), *Aristophanes*: Peace (Oxford).

——— (2002), *Aristophanes:* Acharnians (Oxford).

Pfeijffer, I.L. (1999a), *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar* (Leiden).

Preller, L. (1838), *Polemonis Periegetae Fragmenta* (Leipzig).

Puech, A. (1922-23), *Pindare* (4 Vols.; Paris).

Race, W.H. (1997), i. *Pindar:* Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes; ii. *Pindar:* Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, *Fragments* (Cambridge, MA).

Richardson, N. (1993), The Iliad: *A Commentary. Vol. VI: Books 21-24* (Cambridge).

——— (2010), *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite. Hymns 3, 4, and 5* (Cambridge).

Santamaría, M.A. (2004), Φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν. *Píndaro y los misterios: edición y comentario de la* Olímpica Segunda (Diss. Salamanca).

Schmid, E. (1616), *Pindarou Periodos* (Wittenberg).

Schnitzer, C.F. (1867), *De Pindaro nuperrime emendato* (Ellwangen).

Schroeder, O. (1900), *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig).

Silk, M.S. (2007), 'Pindar's Poetry as Poetry: A Literary Commentary on *Olympian* 12', in S. Hornblower, C. Morgan (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford): 177-97.

Slater, W.J. (1969), *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin).

Theiler, W. (1982), *Posidonius. Die Fragmente* (Berlin).

Thiersch, F. (1820), *Pindarus, Werke* (Leipzig).

Thummer, E. (1968-69), *Pindar:* Die Isthmischen Gedichte I-II (Heidelberg).

Turyn, A. (1952), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis* (Oxford).

Van Leeuwen, J. (1964), *Pindarus'* tweede Olympische ode (2 Vols.; Assen).

Verdenius, W.J. (1982), 'Pindar's *Second Isthmian* Ode: A Commentary', *Mnemosyne* Series 4 35.1-2: 1-37.

——— (1988), *Commentaries on Pindar*. Vol. 1: Olympian *Odes* 3, 7, 12, 14 (Leiden).

Wehrli, F. (1969), *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Vol. 9: *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (Basel).

West, M.L. (1966), *Hesiod:* Theogony (Oxford).

——— (1978), *Hesiod:* Works and Days (Oxford).

——— (2013), *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford).

Wilkinson, C.L. (2013), *The Lyric of Ibycus: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (*Sozomena* 13; Berlin).

Willcock, M.M. (1995), *Pindar, Victory Odes*: Olympians 2, 7, and 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, and 7 (Cambridge).

(2) <u>Cited by Author's Name and Date</u>

Adorjáni, Z. (2011), *Auge und Sehen in Pindars Dichtung* (*Spudasmata* 139; Hildesheim).

Adornato, G. (2008), 'Delphic Enigmas? The Γέλας ἀνάσσων, Polyzalos, and the Charioteer Statue', *AJA* 112: 29-55.

——— (2011), *Akragas arcaica. Modelli culturali e linguaggi artistici di una città greca d'Occidente* (*Archeologia e Arte antica* 3; Milan).

Aerts, W.J. (1965), *Periphrastica* (Amsterdam).

Agócs, P. (2012), 'Performance and Genre: Reading Pindar's κῶμοι', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 191-223.

Anderson, W.D. (1994), *Music and Musicians in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY).

Andrews, A.C. (1949), 'Celery and Parsley as Foods in the Greco-Roman Period', *CP* 44: 91-9.

Arnould, D. (2007), 'À l'ombre des oliviers d'Héraclès: Pindare, *Olympique* III', in S. David, É. Geny (edd.), *Troïka: Parcours antiques. Mélanges offerts à Michel Woronoff* (Vol. 1; Besançon): 133-39.

Asheri, D. (1988), 'Carthaginians and Greeks', in J. Boardman, N.G.L. Hammond, D.M. Lewis, M. Ostwald (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* IV (2nd Ed.; Cambridge): 739-80.

——— (1992), 'Sicily, 478-431 BC', in D.M. Lewis, J. Boardman, J.K. Davies, M. Ostwald (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* V (2nd Ed.; Cambridge): 147-70.

Athanassaki, L. (2009a), *Ἀείδετο πὰν τέμενος: οι χορικές παραστάσεις και το κοινό τους στην αρχαική και πρώιμ κλασική περίοδο* (Ierakleio).

——— (2009b), 'Apollo and his Oracle in Pindar's Epinicians: Poetic Representations, Politics, and Ideology', in L. Athanassaki, R. Martin, J. Miller (edd.), *Apolline Politics and Poetics* (Athens): 405-71.

——— (2011), 'Song, Politics, and Cultural Memory: Pindar's *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmaeonid Temple of Apollo', in L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (*Trends in Classics*, Suppl. 10; Berlin): 235-68.

——— (2012), 'Performance and Re-performance: The Siphnian Treasury Evoked (Pindar's *Pythian* 6, *Olympian* 2, and *Isthmian* 2)', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 134-57.

——— (2014), 'The Creative Impact of the Occasion: Pindar's Songs for the Emmenids and Horace's *Odes* 1.2 and 4.2', in D. Cairns, R. Scodel (edd.), *Defining Greek Narrative* (Edinburgh): 197-225.

Ausfeld, C. (1903), 'De Graecorum precationibus quaestiones', *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* 28: 502-47.

Bakker, S.J. (2009), 'On the Curious Combination of the Particles γάρ and οὖν', in S.J. Bakker, G.C. Wakker (edd.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (*Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* 16; Leiden): 41-61.

Balla, P. (2003), *The Child-Parent Relationship in the New Testament and its Environment* (*WUNT* 155; Tübingen).

Barker, A. (1995), '*Heterophonia* and *Poikilia*: Accompaniments to Greek Melody', in B. Gentili, F. Perusino (edd.), *Mousike: Metrica, Ritmica e Musica Greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti* (Pisa/Rome): 41-60.

Barrett, W.S. (2007), *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism: Collected papers*. Assembled and edited by M.L. West (Oxford).

Barringer, J.M. (1995), *Divine Escorts: Nereids in Archaic and Classical Greek Art* (Ann Arbor).

——— (2009), 'The Olympic Altis Before the Temple of Zeus', *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 124: 223-50.

Bates, W.N. (1911), 'Two Labors of Heracles on a Geometric Fibula', *AJA* 15: 1-17.

Battisti, D. (1990), 'σύνετος as Aristocratic Self-Description', *GRBS* 31: 5-25.

Baxter, K.N. (2012), *Pindar the Pious Poet: Prayer and its Significance in Pindar's Epinician Odes* (Diss. Rutgers).

Beaulieu, M.-C. (2008), *The Sea as a Two-Way Passage between Life and Death in Greek Mythology* (Diss. Texas).

Becker, O. (1937), *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 4; Berlin).

Beecroft, A.J. (2006), '"This is not a true story": Stesichorus's *Palinode* and the Revenge of the Epichoric', *TAPA* 136: 47-69.

Behaghel, O. (1909), 'Beziehung zwischen Umfang und Reihenfolge von Satzgliedern', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 25: 110-42.

Bell, J.M. (1978), 'Κίμβιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition', *QUCC* 28: 29-86.

Bell, M. (1995), 'The Motya Charioteer and Pindar's *Isthmian* 2', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*: 1-30.

Beresford, J. (2013), *The Ancient Sailing Season* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 351; Leiden).

Bernabé, A (1996), 'La fórmula órfica "cerrad las puertas, profanos". Del profano religioso al profano en la materia', *'Ilu. Revista de ciencias de las religiones* 1: 13-37.

——— (2009), 'Imago Inferorum Orphica', in G. Casadio, P.A. Johnston (edd.), *Mystic Cults in Magna Graecia* (Austin, TX): 95-130.

Bernabé, A. & Casadesús, F. (edd.) (2008), *Orfeo y la tradición órfica: un reencuentro* (2 Vols.; Madrid).

Bernabé, A. & Jiménez San Cristóbal, A.I. (2008), *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets* (Leiden/Boston).

Bernabé, A. & Kahle, M. & Santamaría, M.A. (edd.) (2011), *Reencarnación. La transmigración de las almas entre Oriente y Occidente* (Madrid).

Bernard, M. (1963), *Pindars Denken in Bildern* (Pfullingen).

Bernardini, P.A. (1977), 'L'aquila tebana vola ancora', *QUCC* 26: 121-26.

Betegh, G. (2004), *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation* (Cambridge).

Bevan, E. (1986), *Representations of Animals in Sanctuaries of Artemis and other Olympian Deities* (*BAR International Series* 315; Oxford).

Bilić, T. (2012), 'Apollo, Helios, and the Solstices in the Athenian, Delphian, and Delian Calendars', *Numen* 59: 509-32.

Bissinger, M. (1966), *Das Adjektiv* μέγας *in der griechischen Dichtung* (Diss. Munich).

Björck, G. (1940), *Ἦν διδασκων. Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen* (Diss. Uppsala).

Blech, M. (1982), *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (Berlin).

Blok, J.H. (2009), 'Gentrifying Genealogy: On the Genesis of the Athenian Autochthony Myth', in U. Dill, C. Walde (edd.), *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen* (Berlin): 251-74.

Boeckh, A. (1855), *Zur Geschichte der Mondcyclen der Hellenen* (Leipzig).

Boegehold, A.L. (1999), *When a Gesture Was Expected: A Selection of Examples from Archaic and Classical Greek Literature* (Princeton).

Boeke, H. (2007), *The Value of Victory in Pindar's Odes* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 285; Leiden).

Bonifazi, A. (2000), 'Sull'idea di sotterfugio orale negli epinici pindarici', *QUCC* 95: 69-86.

——— (2004), 'Relative Pronouns and Memory: Pindar Beyond Syntax', *HSCP* 102: 41-68.

Bourdieu, P. (1977), *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Trans. R. Nice; Cambridge).

Bourke, G. (2011), 'The Statue of Zeus at Olympia and the *Polis* of the Eleans', in J. McWilliam, R. Taraporewalla, T. Stevenson, S. Puttock (edd.), *The Statue of Zeus at Olympia: New Approaches* (Newcastle upon Tyne): 9-22.

Bousquet, J. (1992), 'Deux épigrammes grecques', *BCH* 116: 585-606.

Bowie, E. (2012), 'Epinicians and "patrons"', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 83-92.

Bowra, C.M. (1936), 'The Metre of Pindar, *Olympian* II', *CQ* 30: 94-99.

——— (1964), *Pindar* (Oxford).

Braun, T. (2004), 'Hecataeus' Knowledge of the Western Mediterranean', in K. Lomas (ed.), *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 246; Leiden/Boston): 287-347.

Breitenberger, B. (2007), *Aphrodite and Eros* (Routledge).

Bremer, J. (1981), 'Greek Hymns', in H.S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship* (Leiden): 193-215.

Bremmer, J.N. (2002), *The Rise And Fall Of The Afterlife* (London).

——— (2009), 'Zeus' Own Country: Cult and Myth in the Pride of Halicarnassus', in U. Dill, C. Walde (edd.), *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen* (Berlin): 292-312.

——— (2014), *Initiation into the Mysteries of the Ancient World* (*Münchner Vorlesungen zu antiken Welten* 1; Berlin/Boston).

Brenne, S. (2002), 'Die Ostraka (487 – ca 416 v. Chr.) als Testimonien (T 1)', in P. Siewert (ed.), *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I* (Stuttgart): 36-166.

Bridge, S.L. (2003), *Where the Eagles are Gathered: The Deliverance of the Elect in Lukan Eschatology* (London).

Bridgman, T.M. (2005), *Hyperboreans: Myth and History in Celtic-Hellenic Contacts* (New York/London).

Brinkmann, V. (1985), 'Die aufgemalten Namensbeischriften am Nord- und Ostfries des Siphnierschatzhauses', *BCH* 109: 77-130.

Brisson, L. (1997), 'Chronos in Column XII of the Derveni Papyrus', in A. Laks, G.W. Most (edd.), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford): 149-65.

——— (2011), 'Okéanos dans la colonne XXIII du Papyrus de Derveni', in M. Herrero de Jáuregui *et al*. (edd.), *Tracing Orpheus: Studies of Orphic Fragments In Honour of Alberto Bernabé* (*Sozomena* 10; Berlin/New York): 385-92.

Brock, R. (2013), *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle* (London/New York).

Broneer, O. (1962), 'The Isthmian Victory Crown', *AJA* 66.3: 259-63.

Brown, C.G (1992), 'The Hyperboreans and Nemesis in Pindar's *Tenth Pythian*', *Phoenix* 46: 95-107.

Brun, P. (1996), *Les archipels égéens dans l'antiquité grecque (Ve - IIe siècles av. notre ère)* (Paris).

Budelmann, F. (2012), 'Epinician and the *Symposion*: A Comparison with the *Enkomia*', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 173-90.

Budin, S.L. (2003), *The Origin of Aphrodite* (Bethesda).

Bulman, P. (1992), Phthonos *in Pindar* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford).

Bundrick, S. (2005), *Music and Image in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).

Buongiovanni, A.M. (1985), 'Una tradizione filo-emmenide sulla fondazione di Acragas', *ASNP* 15: 493-99.

Burgess, J.S. (2001), *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore).

——— (2009), *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles* (Baltimore).

Burkert, W. (1961), 'Elysion', *Glotta* 39: 208-13.

——— (1985), *Greek Religion* (Trans. K. Raffan; Oxford).

——— (1987), *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge).

Burnett, A.P. (2005), *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford).

——— (2011), 'Servants of Peitho: Pindar fr.122 S', *GRBS* 5: 49-60.

Burton, R.W.B. (1962), *Pindar's* Pythian Odes (Oxford).

Cairns, F. (2011), 'Money and the Poet: The First Stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2', *Mnemosyne* 64: 21-36.

Calame, C. (2011), 'L'écriture de la voix enchanteresse d'Orphée (*OF* 1)', in M. Herrero de Jáuregui *et al*. (edd.), *Tracing Orpheus: Studies of Orphic Fragments In Honour of Alberto Bernabé* (*Sozomena* 10; Berlin/New York): 7-11.

Camerata Scovazzo, R. (1993-94), 'Soprintendenza Beni Culturali e Ambientali. Sezione per i Beni archeologici – Trapani', *Kokalos* 39-40: 1423-56.

Campagner, R. (1993), 'Metafore agricole in Pindaro', *Rudiae* 5: 41-56.

Campanile, E. (1977), *Ricerche di cultura poetica indoeuropea* (Pisa).

Cancrini, A. (1970), *Suneidesis: Il tema semantica della 'conscientia' nella Grecia antiqua* (Rome).

Cánovas, C.P. (2011), 'The Genesis of the Arrows of Love: Diachronic Conceptual Integration in Greek Mythology', *AJP* 132.4: 553-79.

Cardete del Olmo, M.C. (2008), 'La construction idéologique du passé agrigentin: Théron et les ossements de Minos', *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* 34.1: 9-26.

Carey, C. (1975), 'Pindar, *Pythian* 6.19-20', *Maia* N.S. 27: 289-90.

——— (1980), 'Three Myths in Pindar', *Eranos* 78: 143-62.

——— (1989), 'Performance of the Victory Ode', *AJP* 110: 545-56.

——— (1991), 'The Victory Ode in Performance: the Case for the Chorus', *CP* 86: 192-200.

——— (2007), 'Pindar, Place, and Performance', in S. Hornblower, C. Morgan (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford): 199-210.

Casadio, G. (1991), 'Dioniso e Semele: morte di un dio e resurrezione di una donna', in F. Berti (ed.), *Dionysos. Mito e mistero: Atti del convegno internazionale, Comacchio 3-5 novembre 1989* (Ferrara): 361-77.

——— (1994), *Storia del culto di Dioniso in Argolide* (Rome).

Caserta, C. (1995), *Gli Emmenidi e le tradizioni poetiche e storiografiche su Akragas fino alla battaglia di Himera* (Palermo).

——— (2000), 'Le genealogie mitiche degli Emmenidi negli *Scholia Vetera* all'*Olimpica II* di Pindaro', *Hormos* 2: 5-42.

Casevitz, M. (1985), *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien. Étude lexicologique: les familles de ktizō et de oikeō-oikizō* (Paris).

Casson, L. (1995), *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Baltimore).

Caswell, C.P. (1990), *A Study of Thumos in Early Greek Epic* (Leiden).

Catenacci, C. (1992), 'Il tiranno alle Colonne d'Eracle: l'agonistica e le tirannidi arcaiche', *Nikephoros* 5: 11-36.

——— (1999), 'Ἀπονέμειν/"leggere" (Pind. *Isthm*. 2, 47; Soph. fr. 44 Radt; Ar. *Av*. 1289)', *QUCC* 62: 49-61.

Chevalier, J. & Gheerbrant, A. (1996), *The Penguin Dictionary of Symbols* (tr. John Buchanan-Brown; London).

Clader, L. (1976), *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition* (Leiden).

Clarke, M.J. (1995), 'The Wisdom of Thales and the Problem of the Word ἱερός', *CQ* N.S. 45: 296-317.

Clay, J.S. (1999), 'Pindar's Sympotic Epinicia', *QUCC* N.S. 62: 25-34.

——— (2003), *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge).

——— (2011), '*Olympians* 1–3: A Song Cycle?', in L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (*Trends in Classics*, Suppl. 10; Berlin): 337-45.

Clayman, D. L. (1987), 'Sigmatism in Greek Poetry', *TAPA* 117: 69-84.

Clear, R. (2012), *Family, Community and Divinity in Pindar's Victory Odes* (Diss. Utrecht).

Clutton-Brock, J. (1981), *Domesticated Animals from Early Times* (London).

Cole, T. (1991), 'Who was Corax?', *ICS* 16: 65-84.

Collins, D. (2004), *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry* (Cambridge, MA).

Constantakopoulou, C. (2002), *The Dance of the Islands: Perceptions of Insularity in Classical Greece* (Diss. Oxford).

——— (2007), *The Dance of the Islands: Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire, and the Aegean World* (Oxford).

Cook, E.F. (2009), 'On the "Importance" of *Iliad* Book 8', *CP* 104.2: 133-61.

Corish, D. (1986), 'The Emergence of Time: A Study in the Origins of Western Thought', in J.T. Fraser, N. Lawrence, F.C. Haber (edd.), *Time, Science, Society in China and the West* (*The Study of Time* 5; Amherst): 69-78.

Corner, S. (2010), 'Transcendent Drinking: The Symposium at Sea Reconsidered', *CQ* N.S. 60: 352-80.

Cornford, F.M. (1909), 'Hermes-Nous, Pan-Logos', *CQ* 3: 281-84.

Cozzoli, A. (1996), 'Aspetti intertestuali nelle polemiche letterarie degli antichi: Da Pindaro a Persio', *QUCC* 54: 7-36.

Crotty K. (1982), *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar* (Baltimore/London).

Crowther, N.B. (1997), '"*Sed quis custodiet ipsos custodes*?": The Impartiality of the Olympic Judges and the Case of Leon of Ambracia', *Nikephoros* 10: 149-60.

Csapo, E. (2003), 'The Dolphins of Dionysus', in E. Csapo, M.C. Miller (edd.), *Poetry, Theory, Praxis: The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece* (Oxford): 69-98.

——— (2008), 'Star Choruses: Eleusis, Orphism, and New Musical Imagery and Dance', in M. Revermann, P. Wilson (edd.), *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford): 262-90.

Cummins, M.F. (2010), 'Sicilian Tyrants and their Victorious Brothers I: The Emmenids', *CJ* 105: 321-39.

Currie, B. (2004), 'Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes', in C. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 248; Leiden): 49-69.

——— (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).

——— (2011), 'Epinician Choregia: Funding a Pindaric Chorus', in L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (*Trends in Classics*, Suppl. 10; Berlin): 269-310.

——— (2013), 'The Pindaric First Person in Flux', *ClAnt* 32.2: 243-82.

D'Alessio, G.B. (2004), 'Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Greek Archaic Lyric', *Arethusa* 37: 267-94.

——— (2005), 'Ordered from the Catalogue: Pindar, Bacchylides and Genealogical Poetry', in R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge): 217-38.

D'Angour, A. (2011), *The Greeks and the New: Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience* (Cambridge).

Darcus, S.M. (1979), 'A Person's Relation to *phren* in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets', *Glotta* 57: 159-73.

Darcus Sullivan, S.M. (1990), 'An Analysis of the Psychic Term *noos* in Pindar and Bacchylides', *Glotta* 68: 179-202.

——— (1995), '*Kradiē*, *Ētor*, and *Kēr* in Poetry after Homer', *RBP* 73: 17-38.

——— (2000), *Euripides' Use of Psychological Terminology* (Montreal).

——— (2002a), '*Noos* in Pindar, *Pythian* 6.47 and 51', *Euphrosyne* 30: 367-70.

——— (2002b), 'Aspects of the "Fictive I" in Pindar: Address to Psychic Entities', *Emerita* 70: 83-102.

Davies, M. (2010), '"Sins of the Fathers": Omitted Sacrifices and Offended Deities in Greek Literature and the Folk-tale', *Eikasmos* 21: 331-35.

——— (2014a), *The Theban Epics* (Cambridge, MA).

——— (2014b), 'Pediasimus, Heracles, and the Mid-day Heat', *Prometheus* 40: 279-82.

Davies, M. & Kathirithamby, J. (1986), *Greek Insects* (London).

Day, J. (2010), *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance* (Cambridge).

——— (2013), 'Epigraphic Literacy in Fifth-Century Epinician and its Audiences', in P. Liddel, P. Low (edd.), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford): 217-30.

Deacy, S. & Villing, A. (2004), 'Athena Blues: Athena and Colour in Ancient Greek Myth and Art', in L. Cleland, K. Stears (edd.), *Colour in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford): 85-90.

Defradas, J. (1971), 'Sur l'interprétation de la deuxième *Olympique* de Pindare', *REG* 84: 131-43.

Degani, E. (1961), *AIΩN da Omero ad Aristotele* (Padua).

de Heer, C. (1969), *ΜΑΚΑΡ-ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ-ΟΛΒΙΟΣ-ΕΥΤΥΧΗΣ: A Study on the Semantic Field Denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek to the End of the 5th Century BC* (Amsterdam).

de Jong, I.J.F. (1987a), *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad (Amsterdam).

——— (1987b), 'Paris/Alexandros in the *Iliad*', *Mnemosyne* 40: 124-28.

——— (2013), 'Metalepsis and Embedded Speech in Pindaric and Bacchylidean Myth', in U.E. Eisen, P. von Möllendorff (edd.), *Über die Grenze: Metalepse in Text- und Bildmedien des Altertums* (Berlin/Boston): 97-118.

de Romilly, J. (1984), *"Patience mon cœur!". L'Essor de la psychologie dans la littérature grecque classique* (Paris).

des Bouvrie, S. (2004), 'Olympia and the Epinikion: A Creation of Symbols', in S. des Bouvrie (ed.), *Myth and Symbol II. Symbolic Phenomena in Ancient Greek Culture* (*Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens* 7; Bergen): 353-91.

——— (2009), 'Artemis Ortheia: A Goddess of Nature or a Goddess of Culture?', in T. Fischer-Hansen, B. Poulsen (edd.), *From Artemis to Diana: The Goddess of Man and Beast* (*Acta Hyperborea* 12; Copenhagen): 153-90.

Detienne, M. (1960), 'La notion mythique d'ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ', *REG* 73: 27-35.

Detienne, M. & Vernant, J.P. (1978), *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* (Trans. J.Lloyd; Hassocks).

Deubner, L. (1908), 'Totengericht (Pind. *Ol.* II 57-60)', *Hermes* 43: 638-42.

Devereux, G. (1966), 'The Exploitation of Ambiguity in Pindar's *O.*3.27', *RhM* 109: 289-98.

Dickey, E. (1996), *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford).

Díez Platas, F. (2011), 'From the Heart and with a Serpent: on *OF* 329', in M. Herrero de Jáuregui *et al*. (edd.), *Tracing Orpheus: Studies of Orphic Fragments In Honour of Alberto Bernabé* (*Sozomena* 10; Berlin/New York): 133-38.

Dillon, M. (1997), *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* (London/New York).

Dindorf, W. (1836), 'Schreiben an den Herausgeber', *ZA* 3: 5-14.

Doblhofer, G. & Mauritsch, P. & Lavrencic, M. (1993), *Speerwurf* (Vienna).

Dornseiff, F. (1921), *Pindars Stil* (Berlin).

Dover, K.J. (1978), *Greek Homosexuality* (London).

Dubois, L. (1996), *Inscriptions grecques dialectales d'Olbia du Pont* (Geneva).

du Bois, P. (1988), *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women* (Chicago; London).

Duchemin, J. (1955), *Pindare, poéte et prophète* (Paris).

Durante, M. (1958), 'EPEA PTEROENTA: La parola come "cammino" in imaggini greche e vediche', *Rendiconti dell' Academia dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 13: 3-14.

Dyer, L. (1905), 'Olympian Treasuries and Treasuries in General', *JHS* 25: 294-319.

Eckerman, C. (2008), 'Pindar's κοινὸς λόγος and Panhellenism in *Olympian* 10', *RhM* 151: 37-48.

——— (2010), 'The κῶμος of Pindar and Bacchylides and the Semantics of Celebration', *CQ* N.S. 60: 302-12.

——— (2011), 'Pindar's *Pythian* 6: On the Place of Performance and an Interpretive Crux', *RhM* 154: 1-8.

——— (2012), 'Was Epinician Poetry Performed at Panhellenic Sanctuaries?', *GRBS* 52: 338-60.

——— (2013), 'The Landscape and Heritage of Pindar's Olympia', *CW* 107.1: 3-33.

——— (2014), 'Pindar's Delphi', in K. Gilhuly, N. Worman (edd.), *Place, Space, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture* (Cambridge): 21-62.

Edmonds, R. (1999), 'Tearing Apart the Zagreus Myth: A Few Disparaging Remarks on Orphism and Original Sin', *ClAnt* 18: 35-73.

——— (2004), *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the "Orphic" Gold Tablets* (Cambridge).

——— (2013), *Redefining Ancient Orphism: A Study in Greek Religion* (Cambridge).

Edmunds, L. (1981), 'The Cults and the Legend of Oedipus', *HSCP* 85: 221-38.

——— (2007), 'Helen's Divine Origins', *ElectronAnt* 10.2: 1-45.

——— (2009), 'A Hermeneutic Commentary on the Eschatological Passage in Pindar *Olympian* 2 (57-83)', in U. Dill, C. Walde (edd.), *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, (Berlin/New York): 662-77.

Edwards, A. (1985), 'Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad, Odyssey* and *Aithiopis*', *GRBS* 26: 215-27.

Ekelund, R.B. & Hébert, R.F. (2014), *A History of Economic Theory and Method* (6th Ed.; Long Grove, IL).

Ekroth, G. (2002), *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods* (*Kernos* Suppl. 12; Liège).

Evans, A. (1901), 'Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult and Its Mediterranean Relations', *JHS* 21: 99-204.

Fantuzzi, M. (2006), 'The Myths of Dolon and Rhesus from Homer to the "Homeric / Cyclic" Tragedy *Rhesus*', in E.J. Bakker, F. Montanari, A. Rengakos (edd.), *La poésie épique grecque: Métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* (Geneva): 135-82.

Farnell, L.R. (1921), *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford).

Fatouros, G. (2002), 'ΚΙΩΝ-ΣΤΥΛΟΣ. Zur Geschichte einer Metapher', *Glotta* 76: 168-76.

Fearn, D. (2007), *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford).

——— (2012), 'Bacchylidean Myths', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 321-43.

——— (2013), 'Kleos v Stone? Lyric Poetry and Contexts for Memorialization', in P. Liddel, P. Low (edd.), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford): 231-53.

Fehling, D. (1969), *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin).

Fehr, K. (1936), *Die Mythen bei Pindar* (Diss. Zürich).

Felson, N. (1999), 'Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's *Pythian* Four', *HSCP* 99: 1-31.

Fenik, B. (1968), *Typical Battle Scenes in the* Iliad (Wiesbaden).

Ferrari, F. (2012), 'Representations of Cult in Epinician Poetry', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 158-72.

Ferreira, L. (2013), *Mobilidade poética na Grécia antiga: uma leitura da obra de Simónides* (Coimbra).

Feyerabend, B. (1984), 'Zur Wegmetaphorik beim Goldblättchen aus Hipponion und dem Proömium des Parmenides', *RhM* 127: 1-22.

Finglass, P.J. (2007), 'νῦν and νυν in Pindar', *Mnemosyne* 60: 269-73.

Fitzgerald, W. (1983), 'Pindar's *Second Olympian*', *Helios* 10: 49-70.

Fitzhardinge, L.F. (1980), *The Spartans* (London).

Fontenrose, J. (1959), *Python: A study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley).

——— (1978), *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations with a Catalogue of Responses* (Berkeley).

Ford, A. (2002), *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton).

Forssman, B. (2006), 'Epischer und chorlyrischer Literaturdialekt: Das Verbum ΕΦΕΠΩ', *ILing* 29: 111-17.

Fortson, B. (2010), *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (2nd Ed.; Malden, MA/Oxford).

Fowler, D.P. (1997), 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *MD* 39: 13-34.

Fowler, R.L. (2013), *Early Greek Mythography Volume 2: Commentary* (Oxford).

Fränkel, H. (1961), 'Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars *Nemeen* 7 und *Olympien* 3', *Hermes* 89: 385-97.

Frame, D. (2009), *Hippota Nestor* (Washington, DC).

Franklin, J.C. (2013), '"Song-Benders of Circular Choruses": Dithyramb and the "Demise of Music"', in P. Wilson, B. Kowalzig (edd.), *Dithyramb in Context* (Oxford): 213-36.

Friedländer, P. (1913), 'Ὑποθῆκαι', *Hermes* 48: 558-616.

Friis Johansen, K. (1939), 'Achill bei Chiron', in K. Hanell, E.J. Knudtzen, N. Valmin (edd.), *ΔΡΑΓΜΑ: M.P. Nilsson dedicatum* (Lund): 181-205.

Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1975), *Dédale. Mythologie de l'artisan en Grèce ancienne* (Paris).

Furley, W.D. & Bremer, J.M. (2001), *Greek Hymns* (2 Vols.; Tübingen).

Gagné, R. (2013), *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).

Gardiner, E. (1925), *Olympia: Its History and Remains* (Oxford).

Garland, R. (1992), *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion* (London).

——— (2001), *The Greek Way of Death* (2nd Ed.; Ithaca, NY).

Gehrke, H.-J. (2003), 'Sull'etnicità elea', *GeogrAnt* 12: 5-22.

Gelzer, T. (1985), 'Μοῦσα αὐθιγενής: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Backhylideischer Epinikien', *MH* 42: 95-120.

Gentili, B. (1988), *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece* (Trans. A.T. Cole; Baltimore).

Gerber, D.E. (1976), *Emendations in Pindar 1513-1972* (Amsterdam).

——— (1987), 'Short-vowel Subjunctives in Pindar', *HSCP* 91: 83-90.

——— (1988), '*Potmos* from Homer to Euripides', in P. Pucci (ed.), *Language and the Tragic Hero: Essays in Greek Tragedy in Honor of Gordon M. Kirkwood* (Atlanta): 39-53.

Giannini, P. (2000), 'Le antiche tradizioni tebane negli epinici di Pindaro', in P.A. Bernardini (ed.), *Presenza e Funzione della Città di Tebe nella Cultura Greca. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Urbino 7-9 luglio 1997)* (Pisa/Rome): 163-78.

——— (2009), 'La poikilia nell'età arcaica e in Pindaro', in E. Berardi, F.L. Lisi, D. Micalella (edd.), *Poikilia. Variazioni sul tema* (Acireale/Rome): 65-82.

Giannotti, G.F. (1971), 'Sull'*Olimpica seconda* di Pindaro', *RFIC* 99: 26-52.

Gladigow, B. (1965), *Sophia und Kosmos* (Hildesheim).

Glazebrook, A. (2011), 'Porneion: Prostitution in Athenian Civic Space', in A. Glazebrook, M.M. Henry (edd.), *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean 800 BCE - 200 CE* (Madison): 34-59.

Graf, F. & Johnston, S.I. (2007), *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets* (London/New York).

Green, A.C. (2012), *The Concept of Ananke in Greek Literature Before 400 BCE* (Diss. Exeter).

Greene, R.L. (1935), *The Early English Carols* (Oxford).

Greene, W.C. (1944), *Moira: Fate, Good and Evil in Greek Thought* (Cambridge, MA).

Greengard, C. (1980), *The Structure of Pindar's Epinician Odes* (Amsterdam).

Gregory, J. (1995), 'The Encounter at the Crossroads in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*', *JHS* 115: 141-46.

Grethlein, J. (2010), *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge/New York).

Griffith, R.D. (1991), 'Oedipus's Bloodthirsty Sons: Love and Strife in Pindar's *Second Olympian Ode*', *ClAnt* 10: 46-58.

——— (1998), 'The Origin of Memnon', *ClAnt* 17: 212-34.

Gzella, S. (1971), 'The Problem of the Fee in Greek Choral Lyric', *Eos* 59: 189-202.

Hagel, S. (2009), *Ancient Greek Music: A New Technical History* (Cambridge).

Haillet, J. (2001), *Diodore de Sicile:* Bibliothèque Historique XI (Paris).

Hajdú, I. (1989), *Über die Stellung der Enklitika und Quasi-Enklitika bei Pindar und Bakchylides* (Diss. Lund).

Hall, J.M. (2002), *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago).

Halliwell, J.M. (2008), *Epinician Precepts: A Study of Chiron and the Wise Adviser in Pindar* (Diss. Birmingham).

Hamilton, J.T. (2003), *Soliciting Darkness. Pindar, Obscurity, and the Classical Tradition* (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature* 47; Cambridge, MA).

Hamilton, R. (1974), *Epinikion* (The Hague).

Hannah, R. (2005), *Greek and Roman Calendars: Constructions of Time in the Classical World* (London).

Hardie, A. (2003), 'The Pindaric Sources of Horace *Odes* 1.12', *HSCP* 101: 371-404.

Harrell, S.E. (2002), 'King or Private Citizen: Fifth-Century Sicilian Tyrants at Olympia and Delphi', *Mnemosyne* 55: 439-64.

Heath, M. (1988), 'Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician', *AJP* 109: 180-95.

Heath, M. & Lefkowitz, M.R. (1991), 'Epinician Performance', *CP* 86: 173-91.

Heimsoeth, F. (1847), 'Erklärungen zu Pindar', *RhM* 5: 1-32.

Heirman, J. (2012), *Space in Archaic Greek Lyric: City, Countryside and Sea* (Amsterdam).

Henderson, J. (1992), 'Pindar, fr.140B Snell-Maehler: The Chariot and the Dolphin', *Hermes* 120: 148-58.

Henry, W.B. (2007), 'Pindaric Accompaniments', in P.J. Finglass, C. Collard, N.J. Richardson (edd.), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford): 126-31.

Herington, J. (1985), *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley).

Herrero de Jáuregui, M. (2011), 'Dialogues of Immortality from the *Iliad* to the Gold Leaves', in R.G. Edmonds III (ed.), *The "Orphic" Gold Tablets and Greek Religion: Further Along the Path* (Cambridge): 271-90.

Heubeck, A. (1986), 'Erinys in der archaischen Epik', *Glotta* 64: 143-65.

Höckmann, U. & Kreikenbom, D. (2001), *Naukratis: Die Beziehungen zu Ostgriechenland, Ägypten und Zypern in archaischer Zeit* (Möhnesee).

Hoey, T. (1965), 'Fusion in Pindar', *HSCP* 70: 235-62.

Hofmann, J.B. & Szantyr, A. (1965), *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich).

Hooker, J.T. (1980), *The Ancient Spartans* (London).

Hornblower, S. (2004), *Thucydides and Pindar* (Oxford).

Howe, T. (2003), 'Pastoralism, the Delphic Amphiktyony and the First Sacred War: The Creation of Apollo's Sacred Pastures', *Historia* 52: 129-46.

Hubbard, T.K. (1985), *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (Leiden).

——— (2004), 'The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts', in C. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 248; Leiden): 71-93.

——— (2007), 'Pindar, Heracles the Idaean Dactyl, and the Foundation of the Olympic Games', in G. Schaus, S. Wenn (edd.), *Onward to the Olympics: Historical Perspectives on the Olympic Games* (Waterloo, ON): 27-45.

Huchzermeyer, H. (1931), *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit* (Emsdetten).

Huffman, C.A. (2007), 'Philolaus and the Central Fire', in S. Stern-Gillet, K. Corrigan (edd.), *Reading Ancient Texts, Volume I: Presocratics and Plato, Essays in Honour of Denis O'Brien* (Leiden): 57-94.

Hunter, R.L. (2014), *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days* (Cambridge).

Hurst, A. (1981), 'Observations sur la *Deuxiéme Olympique* de Pindare', *ZAnt* 31: 121-33.

——— (1985), 'Aspects du temps chez Pindare', in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare* (*Entretiens Hardt* 31; Geneva): 155-205.

Illig, L. (1932), *Zu Form der Pindarischen Erzählung* (Berlin).

Indergaard, H. (2011), 'Thebes, Aegina, and the Temple of Aphaia: A Reading of Pindar's *Isthmian* 6', in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry* (Oxford): 294-322.

Instone, S. (2007), 'Origins of the Olympics', in S. Hornblower, C. Morgan (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford): 71-82.

Irigoin, J. (1993a), 'La composition métrique de la IIIe *Olympique* de Pindare', in M. Bandini, F.G. Pericoli (edd.), *Scritti in memoria di Dino Pieraccioni* (Florence): 249-53.

——— (1993b), 'Architecture métrique et mouvements du choeur dans la lyrique chorale grecque', *REG* 106: 283-302.

——— (2002), 'Un révélateur métrique: le décompte des temps marqués dans la poésie lyrique grecque', *Pallas* 59: 91-101.

Itsumi, K. (2009), *Pindaric Metre: The Other Half* (Oxford).

Jackson, P. (2014), 'Themes of Commensality in Indo-European Lore: Greek ξένος and Proto-Germanic **etuna*-', in H. Craig Melchert, E. Rieken, T. Steer (edd.), *Munus amicitiae: Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum* (New York): 92-100.

Jacquemin, A. (1999), 'Guerres et offrandes dans les sanctuaires', *Pallas* 51: 141-57.

Jennings, V. (2007), 'Ion's Hymn to Kairos', in V. Jennings, A. Katsaros (edd.), *The World of Ion of Chios* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 288; Leiden): 331-46.

Jiménez San Cristóbal, A.I. (2008), 'Orfismo y dionisismo', in A. Bernabé, F. Casadesús (edd.), *Orfeo y la tradición órfica: un reencuentro* (2 Vols.; Madrid): 697-727.

——— (2013), 'The Sophoclean Dionysos', in A. Bernabé, M. Herrero, A.I. Jiménez, R. Martín (edd.), *Redefining Dionysos* (Berlin): 272-300.

Jucker, H. (1979), 'Orthia oder Ortheia? – Zum Namen der Göttin "Orthia"', *HefteABern* 5: 27.

Kambylis, A. (1964), 'Anredeformen bei Pindar', in *Χάρις Κονστ. Ι. Βουρβέρη* (Athens): 95-199.

Karttunen, K. (1989), *India in Early Greek Literature* (Helsinki).

Kebric, R.B. (1983), *The Paintings in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi and their Historical Context* (Leiden).

Kees, H. (1980), *Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter* (4th Ed.; Berlin).

Keizer, H.M. (1999), *Life, Time, Entirety. A Study of AION in Greek Literature and Philosophy, the Septuagint and Philo* (Diss. Amsterdam).

Kelly, A. (2006), 'Neoanalysis and the *Nestorbedrängnis*: A Test Case', *Hermes* 134: 1-25.

Keyser, P.T. (1993), 'From Myth to Map: The Blessed Isles in the First Century B.C.', *AncW* 24:149-68.

Kirby, J. (1985), 'Toward a General Theory of the Priamel', *CJ* 89: 142-44.

Kirkwood, G.M. (1981), 'Pindar's Ravens (*Olymp*. 2.87)', *CQ* N.S. 31: 240-43.

——— (1984), 'Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician', in D.E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of L. Woodbury* (Chico): 169-83.

Klooster, J. (2011), *Poetry as Window and Mirror: Positioning the Poet in Hellenistic Poetry* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 330; Leiden).

Köhne, E. (1998), *Die Dioskuren in der griechischen Kunst von der Archaik bis zum Ende des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Hamburg).

Köhnken, A. (1983), 'Mythical Chronology and Thematic Coherence in Pindar's Third *Olympian* Ode', *HSCP* 87: 49-63.

Kölligan, D. (2007), 'Aphrodite of the Dawn: Indo-European Heritage in Greek Divine Epithets and Theonyms', *Letras Clássicas* 11: 105-34.

Kõiv, M. (2013), 'Early History of Elis and Pisa: Invented or Evolving Traditions?', *Klio* 95: 315-68.

Komornicka, A.M. (1972), 'Quelques Remarques sur la Notion d'ΑΛΑΘΗΕΙΑ et de ΨΕΥΔΟΣ chez Pindare', *Eos* 60: 235-53.

——— (1979), *Étude sur Pindare et la lyrique archaïque grecque. Termes désignant le vrai et le faux* (Łódź).

——— (1981), 'Termes déterminant le vrai et le faux chez Pindare', in E.G. Schmidt (ed.), *Aischylos und Pindar: Studien zu Werk und Nachwirkung* (Berlin): 81-89.

Koniaris, G.I. (1997a), 'Again on Pindar's *O*.2: I. Major Points of Interpretation', *Hellenica* 47: 7-34.

——— (1997b), 'Again on Pindar's *O*.2: II. Points *Minoris Momenti*', *Hellenica* 47: 217-40.

Konstan, D. (2006), *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Toronto/Buffalo/London).

Konstas, P. (2003), 'Eine pindarische Metapher (*O*. 2,21/22)', *WS* 116: 57-70.

Kovacs, G. (2013), 'Stringed Instruments in Fifth-Century Drama', in G. Harrison, V. Liapis (edd.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Tragedy* (Leiden): 477-99.

Krause, J. (1976), *Ἄλλοτε ἄλλος: Untersuchungen zum Motiv des Schicksalwechsels in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides* (Diss. Munich).

Krummen, E. (1990), *Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation* (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 *und* 3) (*Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte* 35; Berlin).

Kurke, L. (1990), 'Pindar's Sixth *Pythian* and the Tradition of Advice Poetry', *TAPA* 120: 85-107.

——— (1991), *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca, NY).

——— (1996), 'Pindar and the Prostitutes', *Arion* Series 3 4.2: 49-75.

——— (2010), *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose* (Princeton).

——— (2013), 'Pindar's *Pythian* 11 and the *Oresteia*: Contestatory Ritual Poetics in the 5th c. BCE', *ClAnt* 32.1: 101-75.

Kyrieleis, H. (2002), 'Zu den Anfängen des Heiligtums von Olympia', in H. Kyrieleis (ed.), *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen. Internationales Symposion, Berlin 9-11 November 2000* (Mainz): 213-20.

Langdon, M.K. (1990), 'Throwing the Discus in Antiquity: The Literary Evidence', *Nikephoros* 3: 177-82.

Lape, S. (2010), *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge/New York).

Lapini, W. & Luraghi, N. (1996), 'La genealogia degli Emmenidi nella scoliastica pindarica: Note di lettura a *Schol*. Pind. *Pyth*. 6.5a', *PP* 51: 213-20.

Latacz, J. (2004), *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery* (Oxford).

Lauer, S. (1959), *Zur Wortstellung bei Pindar* (Winterthur).

Lavecchia, S. (2001), 'La *via di Zeus* nella seconda *Olimpica* di Pindaro', in G.B. D'Alessio, M. Cannatà Fera (edd.), *I lirici greci: Forme della communicazione e storia del testo* (Messina): 187-92.

——— (2013), 'Becoming Like Dionysos: Dithyramb and Dionysian Initiation', in P. Wilson, B. Kowalzig (edd.), *Dithyramb in Context* (Oxford): 59-75.

Lavrencic, M. & Doblhofer, G. & Mauritsch, P. (1991), *Diskos* (Vienna).

Lee, H.M. (1986), 'Pindar *Olympian* 3.33-34: "The Twelve-Turned *terma*" and the Length of the Four-Horse Chariot Race', *AJP* 107.2: 162-74.

——— (2001), *The Program and Schedule of the Ancient Olympic Games* (*Nikephoros* Beiheft 6; Hildesheim).

Lefkowitz, M.R. (1976), *The Victory Ode: An Introduction* (New Jersey).

——— (1981), *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London).

——— (1988), 'Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?', *AJP* 109: 1-11.

——— (1991), *First Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"* (Oxford).

LeVen, P. (2008), *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in Fourth-Century BC Greek Lyric Poetry* (Diss. Sorbonne).

——— (2013), 'The Colors of Sound: *Poikilia* in its Aesthetic Contexts', *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* 1 (2013): 229-42.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1962), *La pensée sauvage* (Paris).

Lissarrague, F. (1999), 'Publicity and Performance: *kalos* Inscriptions in Attic Vase-painting', in S. Goldhill, R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance, Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge): 359-73.

Littauer, M.A. & Crouwel, J.H. (1996), 'Robert Drews and the Role of Chariotry in Bronze Age Greece', *OxfJA* 15: 297-305.

Lloyd, M. (1989), 'Paris/Alexandros in Homer and Euripides', *Mnemosyne* 42.1-2: 76-79.

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1985), 'Pindar and the Afterlife', in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare* (*Entretiens Hardt* 31; Geneva): 245-83.

Lonsdale, S.H. (1990), *Creatures of Speech: Lion, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the* Iliad (Stuttgart).

López-Ruiz, C. (2010), *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East* (Cambridge, MA).

Lordkipanidze, O. (2000), *Phasis: The River and City in Colchis* (*Geographica Historica* 15; Stuttgart).

Loscalzo, D. (2003), *La parola inestinguibile: studi sull'epinicio pindarico* (Roma).

Louden, B. (2011), *Homer's* Odyssey *and the Near East* (Cambridge).

Lowe, N.J. (2007), 'Epinikian Eidography', in S. Hornblower, C. Morgan (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford): 167-76.

Luraghi, N. (1994), *Tirannidi archaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia: da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi* (Florence).

——— (2008), *The Ancient Messenians: Construction of Ethnicity and Memory* (Cambridge).

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1989), *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).

Mac Cana, P. (1988), 'The Poet as Spouse of his Patron', *Ériu* 39: 79-85.

Mackie, H. (2003), *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise* (Michigan).

MacLachlan, B. (1993), *The Age of Charis* (Princeton).

Maier, F. (1970), *Der Sophos-Begriff* (Augsburg).

Malamut, E. (1988), *Les îles de l'empire Byzantin* (Paris).

Malkin, I. (1987), *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden).

——— (2011), *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford).

Manfredi, V.M. (1993), *Le isole fortunate: Topografia di un mito* (Rome).

Maravela, A. (2011), 'The Athlete's "Happiness": *Eudaimonia* in Archaic Greek Epinicians', *Symbolae Osloenses* 85: 33-51.

Marinatos, N. & Anderson, S.A (2010), 'Elysion and Egypt', *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 2: 13-24.

Markoe, G. (1985), *Phoenician Bronze and Silver Bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean* (*University of California Publications: Classical Studies* 26; Berkeley).

Martin, A. & Primavesi, O. (1999), *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg* (Berlin).

Martin, R. (2003), 'The Pipes Are Brawling: Conceptualizing Musical Performance in Athens', in C. Doughtery, L. Kurke (edd.), *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge): 153-80.

Martínez, M. (1999), 'Las islas de los bienaventurados: Historia de un mito en la literatura griega arcaica y clásica', *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 9: 243-79.

Masaracchia, A. (1991), 'Sul proemio della II *Istmica*', in *Studi di Filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco* (Vol. 1; Palermo): 161-65.

Maslov, B. (2012), 'From (Theogonic) Mythos to (Poetic) Logos: Reading Pindar's Genealogical Metaphors after Freidenberg', *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12.1: 49-77.

Massa-Pairault, F.H. (1999), 'Megarica: En hommage à Georges Vallet', in *La colonisation grecque en Méditerranée occidentale* (*CEFR* 251; Rome): 103-19.

Mathiesen, T.J. (1976), 'Problems of Terminology in Ancient Greek Theory: APMONIA', in B.L. Karson (ed.), *Festival Essays for Pauline Alderman* (Provo, UT): 3-17.

Maxwell-Stuart, P.G. (1981), *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology 1: ΓΛΑΥΚΟΣ* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 65; Leiden).

McGowan, E.P. (1995), 'Tomb Marker and Turning Post: Funerary Columns in the Archaic Period', *AJA* 99: 615-32.

Méautis, G. (1962), *Pindare: le Dorien* (Neuchâtel).

Mertens, D. (2006), *Städte und Bauten der Westgriechen: Von der Kolonisationszeit bis zur Krise um 400 vor Christus* (Munich).

Meuli, K. (1960), 'Scythica Vergiliana. Ethnographisches, Archäologisches und Mythologisches zu Vergils *Georgica* III 367ff.', *Schweiz. Archiv für Volkskunde* 56: 88-200.

Micheelsen, L. (2010), '*Poinas Eteisan*: Punishment and Reward in Pindar's *Second Olympian*', *Journal of Hellenic Religion* 3: 19-38.

Miller, M. (1970), *The Sicilian Colony Dates* (Albany, NY).

Miller, S.G. (1980), 'Turns and Lanes in the Greek Stadium', *AJA* 84: 159-66.

——— (2004), *Ancient Greek Athletics* (New Haven).

Möller, A. (2000), *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece* (New York/Oxford).

Molyneux, J.H. (1992), *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Wauconda).

Mommsen, T. (1864b), *Annotationis criticae supplementum ad Pindari Olympias* (Berlin).

Morgan, C. (1990), *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge).

Morgan, K.A. (1993), 'Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the κῶμος', *CP* 88: 1-15.

——— (2015), *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford).

Morris, I. (1996), 'The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy', in J. Ober, C. Hedrick (edd.), *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern* (Princeton): 19-48.

Morris, S. (1992), *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton).

Morrison, A.D. (2007), *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (*BICS* Suppl. 95; London).

——— (2011a), 'Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality', in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry* (Oxford): 227-53.

——— (2011b), 'Pindar and the Aeginetan *patrai*: Pindar's Intersecting Audiences', in L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (*Trends in Classics*, Suppl. 10; Berlin): 311-35.

——— (2012), 'Performance, Re-performance and Pindar's Audiences', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 111-33.

Morton, J. (2001), *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring* (Leiden).

Most, G. (1986), 'Pindar, *O*.2.83–90', *CQ* N.S. 36: 304-16.

——— (1987), 'Two Leaden Metaphors in Pindar *P*.2', *AJP* 108: 569-84.

——— (2003), 'Epinician Envies', in D. Konstan, N.K. Rutter (edd.), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: the Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh): 123-42.

——— (2011), 'Heraclitus' Fragment B52 DK (on *OF* 242)', in M. Herrero de Jáuregui *et al*. (edd.), *Tracing Orpheus: Studies of Orphic Fragments In Honour of Alberto Bernabé* (*Sozomena* 10; Berlin/New York): 105-9.

Mühlestein, H. (1987), *Homerische Namenstudien* (Frankfurt am Main).

Mullen, W. (1982), *Choreia: Pindar and Dance* (Princeton).

Murray, O. (1990), 'The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking Group', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford): 149-61.

Nafissi, M. (2003), 'Elei e Pisati. Geografia, storia e instituzioni politiche della regione di Olimpia', *GeogrAnt* 12: 23-55.

Nagy, G. (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore).

——— (1990), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore/London).

——— (1994), 'Genre and Occasion', *Mètis* 9: 11-25.

——— (2013), *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours* (Cambridge, MA).

Nash, L.L. (1990), *The Aggelia in Pindar* (New York).

Neer, R.T. (2001), 'Framing the Gift: The Siphnian Treasury at Delphi and the Politics of Architectural Sculpture', *CA* 20.2: 273-336.

——— (2004), 'The Athenian Treasury at Delphi and the Material of Politics', *CA* 23.1: 63-94.

Nelson, M. (2007), 'The First Olympic Games', in G. Schaus, S. Wenn (edd.), *Onward to the Olympics: Historical Perspectives on the Olympic Games* (Waterloo, ON): 47-58.

Neubauer, R.L. (2011), *Evolution and the Emergent Self* (Columbia).

Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2009), *Epinikien und ihr Aufführungsrahmen* (*Nikephoros* Suppl. 17; Hildesheim).

Newman, J.K. & Newman, F.S. (1984), *Pindar's Art: Its Tradition and Aims* (Hildesheim).

Nicholson, N. (2000), 'Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons in Late Archaic Lyric', *CW* 93: 235-65.

——— (2005), *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge).

——— (2013), 'Cultural Studies, Oral Tradition, and the Promise of Intertextuality', *AJP* 134: 9-21.

Niese, B. (1910), 'Drei Kapitel eleischer Geschichte', in *Genethliakon. Carl Robert zum 8. März 1910* (Berlin): 3-47.

Nilsson, M.P. (1906), *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen* (Leipzig).

——— (1950), *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion* (2nd Ed.; Lund).

Nisetich, F. (1977), 'Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian* 2', *CSCA* 10: 133-56.

——— (1980), *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore).

Norden, E. (1913), *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig).

Noreña, C.F. (2011), *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* (Cambridge).

Nünlist, R. (1998), *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart).

——— (2007), 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in I.J.F.de Jong, R. Nünlist (edd.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (*Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* 2; Leiden): 233-51.

Oakley, J.H. & Sinos, R.H. (1993), *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison, Wisconsin).

Ober, J. (2015), *The Rise and Fall of Classical Greece* (Princeton).

Olmstead, M.C. & Kuhlmeier, V.A. (2015), *Comparative Cognition* (Cambridge).

Olson, D.W. & Doescher, R.L. & Olson, M.S. (2004), 'The Moon and the Marathon', *Sky and Telescope* 108: 34-41.

O'Neil, W.M. (1975), *Time and the Calendars* (Sydney).

Osborne, R. (2011), *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body* (Cambridge).

O'Sullivan, P. (2003), 'Victory Statue, Victory Song: Pindar's Agonistic Poetics and its Legacy', in D. Phillips, D. Pritchard (edd.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea): 75-100.

Oswald, S. (2007), *The Laudator and the Laudandus: Pindar and Emphasis* (MA Thesis Auckland).

Pace, C. (2001), 'Le frecce degli Eroti', *Eikasmos* 12: 19-26.

Park, A. (2009), *Truth, Falsehood, and Reciprocity in Pindar and Aeschylus* (Diss. North Carolina).

——— (2013), 'Truth and Genre in Pindar', *CQ* N.S. 63: 17-36.

Parker, R. (forthcoming), 'The cult', in H.W. Catling (ed.), *Menelaion II: The sanctuary of Helen and Menelaus* (British School at Athens).

Partida, E.C. (2000), *The Treasuries at Delphi: An Architectural Study* (Jonsered).

Patten, G. (2009), *Pindar's Metaphors: A Study in Rhetoric and Meaning* (Heidelberg).

Pavese, C.O. (1975), 'Le *Olimpiche* di Pindaro', *QUCC* 20: 65-121.

——— (1990), 'Pindarica II: Note critiche al testo delle *Olimpiche* e delle *Pitiche*', *Eikasmos* 1: 37-82.

Pavlou, M. (2007), *Time in Pindar* (Diss. Bristol).

——— (2010), 'Pindar *Olympian* 3: Mapping Acragas on the Periphery of the Earth', *CQ* N.S. 60: 313-26.

——— (2012), 'Pindar and the Reconstruction of the Past', in J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, C. Maciver (edd.), *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras* (Edinburgh): 95-112.

——— (2014), '*Khronos*, Cronos, and the Cronion Hill: The Spatialization of Time in Pindar's *Olympian* 10', *CHS Research Bulletin* 2.2 (http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hlnc.essay:PavlouM.Chronos_Kronos_and_the_Kronion_Hill.2014).

Pearson, L. (1934), 'Herodotus on the Source of the Danube', *CP* 29: 328-37.

Pelliccia, H. (1995), *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar* (*Hypomnemata* 107; Göttingen).

——— (2009a), 'Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, (Cambridge): 240-262.

——— (2009b), 'Poets' Pay in Ancient Greece', https://www.academia.edu/464635/Toronto_talk_Poets_Pay_in_Ancient_Greece_text (accessed 01 July 2013).

Perlman, P.J. (2000), *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese* (*Hypomnemata* 121; Göttingen).

Péron, J. (1974), *Les images maritimes de Pindare* (Paris).

Pfeijffer, I.L. (1994), 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CPh* 89: 305-17.

——— (1999b), *First Person Futures in Pindar* (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 81; Stuttgart).

Piccardi, L. (2000), 'Active Faulting at Delphi, Greece: Seismotectonic Remarks and a Hypothesis for the Geologic Environment of a Myth', *Geology* 28: 651-54.

Platte, Ryan (2010), 'The Poet and the Charioteer', https://camws.org/meeting/2010/program/abstracts/07F4.Platte.pdf (accessed 13 October 2012).

Polanyi, K. (1944), *The Great Transformation* (New York).

Prag, J.R.W. (2010), 'Tyrannizing Sicily: The Despots Who Cried "Carthage!"', in A. Turner, K.O. Chong-Gossard, F. Vervaet (edd.), *Private and Public Lies: The Discourse of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World* (*Impact of Empire* 11; Leiden): 51-71.

Prauscello, L. (2012), 'Epinician Sounds: Pindar and Musical Innovation', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 58-82.

Préaux, C. (1973), *La lune dans la pensée grecque* (Brussels).

Priskin, G. (2002), 'The Eye of Horus and the Synodic Month', *Discussions in Egyptology* 53: 75-81.

Purvis, A. (2003), *Singular Dedications: Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece* (London).

Race, W.H. (1979), 'The End of *Olympian* 2: Pindar and the *Vulgus*', *CSCA* 12: 251-67.

——— (1981), 'Pindar's "Best is Water": Best of What?', *GRBS* 22: 119-24.

——— (1982a), 'Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns', *GRBS* 23: 5-14.

——— (1982b), *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden).

——— (1987), 'Pindaric Encomium and Isokrates' *Evagoras*', *TAPA* 117: 131-55.

——— (1990), *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (*American Classical Studies* 24; Atlanta).

——— (1992), 'How Greek Poems Begin', *Yale Classical Studies* 29: 13-38.

Raman, R.A. (1975), 'Homeric ἄωτος and Pindaric ἄωτος. A Semantic Problem', *Glotta* 53: 195-207.

Rawles, R. (2011), 'Eros and Praise in Early Greek Lyric', in L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (*Trends in Classics*, Suppl. 10; Berlin): 139-59.

Ready, J.L. (2010), 'Why Odysseus Strings His Bow', *GRBS* 50: 133-57.

Reece, S. (2009), *Homer's Winged Words: The Evolution of Early Greek Epic Diction in the Light of Oral Theory* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 313; Leiden/Boston).

Rehm, R. (2002), *The Play of Space: Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton).

Renehan, R.F. (1969), 'Conscious Ambiguities in Pindar and Bacchylides', *GRBS* 10: 217-28.

Revuelta Puigdollers, A.R. (2009), 'The Particles αὖ and αὖτε in Ancient Greek as Topicalizing Devices', in S.J. Bakker, G.C. Wakker (edd.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden): 83-109.

Riedweg, C. (1987), *Mysterienterminologie bei Plato, Philo and Klemens von Alexandria* (Berlin).

Robbins, E. (1982), 'Heracles, the Hyperboreans, and the Wind: Pindar, *Ol.* 3', *Phoenix* 36: 295-305.

——— (1984), 'Intimations of Immortality: Pindar *Ol*.3.34–35', in D.E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico): 219-28.

——— (1993), 'The Education of Achilles', *QUCC* 45: 7-20.

Robinson, D.B. (2006), 'Stars and Heroines in Euripides' *Helen* (*Helen* 375-85)', in D. Cairns, V. Liapis (edd.), *Dionysalexandros: Essays on Aeschylus and His Fellow Tragedians in Honour of Alexander F. Garvie* (Swansea): 151-72.

Robinson, D.M. (1946), 'The Wheel of Fortune', *CP* 41.4: 207-16.

Rocha Pereira, M.H. (1952), 'Notas a um passo de Píndaro (*Ol*. 2, 77-78)', *Humanitas* 4: 7-12.

Rochette, B. (2002), 'Remarques sur le vocabulaire grec de la traduction', *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 80: 25-34.

Rohde, E. (1925), *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and the Belief in Immortality among the Greeks* (Trans. W.B. Hillis; London).

Roller, D.W. (2006), *Through the Pillars of Herakles: Greco-Roman Exploration of the Atlantic* (London/New York).

Romano, D. (2007), 'Judges and Judging at the Ancient Olympic Games', in G. Schaus, S. Wenn (edd.), *Onward to the Olympics: Historical Perspectives on the Olympic Games* (Waterloo, ON): 95-113.

Romm, J. (1992), *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction* (Princeton).

——— (2010), 'Continents, Climates, and Cultures: Greek Theories of Global Structure', in K. Raaflaub, R. Talbert (edd.), *Geography and Ethnography: Perceptions of the World in Pre-Modern Societies* (Malden, MA): 215-35.

Rose, P.W. (1982), 'Towards a Dialectical Hermeneutics of Pindar's *Pythian* X', *Helios* 9: 47-73.

Rosivach, V.J. (1987), 'Autochthony and the Athenians', *CQ* N.S. 37: 294-306.

Ross, S.A. (2005), '*Barbarophonos*: Language and Panhellenism in the *Iliad*', *CP* 100: 299-316.

Ruck, C.A.P. (1972), 'Marginalia Pindarica', *Hermes* 100: 143-69.

Russo, L. (2013), *L'America dimenticata* (Milano).

Rutherford, I. (2001), *Pindar's* Paeans: *A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).

——— (2003), 'The Prosodion: Approaches to a Lyric Genre', in F. Benedetti, S. Grandolini (edd.), *Studi di filologia e tradizione greca in memoria di Aristide Colonna* (*Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane*; Naples): 713-26.

——— (2013), *State-Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece: A Study of Theōriā and Theōroi* (Cambridge).

Rutherford, R.B. (2010), 'The Greek of Athenian Tragedy', in E.J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Oxford): 441-54.

Rutter, N.K. (1997), *The Greek Coinages of Southern Italy and Sicily* (London).

——— (2000), 'Coin Types and Identity: Greek Cities in Sicily', in C. Smith, J. Serrati (edd.), *Sicily from Aeneas to Augustus* (Edinburgh): 73-83.

Sage, M. (1996), *Warfare in Ancient Greece* (New York).

Salviat, F. (2007a), 'La pensée de Pindare et la 2e *Olympique*. I: Victoire, mort et visions d'au-delà', *JS* 2007: 3-85.

——— (2007b), 'La pensée de Pindare et la 2e *Olympique*. II: Dieu cosmique, harmonie, sagesse', *JS* 2007: 173-259.

Sanders, E.M. (2010), *Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens* (Diss. London).

Santamaría, M.A. (2008), 'Píndaro y el orfismo', in A. Bernabé, F. Casadesús (edd.), *Orfeo y la tradición órfica: un reencuentro* (2 Vols.; Madrid): 1161-84.

——— (2011), 'La transmigración del alma en Grecia de Ferecides de Siros a Píndaro (Siglos VI-V A.C.)', in A. Bernabé, M. Kahle, M.A. Santamaría (edd.), *Reencarnación. La transmigración de las almas entre Oriente y Occidente* (Madrid): 233-67.

——— (2012), 'Orfeo y el orfismo. Actualización bibliográfica (2004–2012)', *'Ilu. Revista de ciencias de las religiones* 17: 211-52.

Šćepanović, S. (2013), 'A Commentary on αἰών in Pindar', *Lucida intervalla* 42: 7-28.

Schachter, A. (1981-94), *Cults of Boiotia* (4 Vols.; London).

Schadewaldt, W. (1928), *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle).

Schibli, H.S. (1990), *Pherekydes of Syros* (Oxford).

Schleif, H. (1934), 'Der Zeusaltar von Olympia', *JDAI* 49: 139-56.

Schmidt, L. (1862), *Pindars Leben und Dichtung* (Bonn).

Schuddeboom, F.L. (2009), *Greek Religious Terminology – Telete & Orgia: A Revised and Expanded English Edition of the Studies by Zijderveld and Van der Burg* (*Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 169; Leiden/Boston).

Schwartz, J. (1960), *Pseudo-Hesiodea: Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'œuvres attribuées à Hésiode* (Leiden).

Schwartz, M. (2003), 'Encryptions in the *Gāthās*: Zarathushtra's Variations on the Theme of Bliss', in C. Cereti, M. Maggi, E. Provasi (edd.), *Religious Themes and Texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in Honour of Professor Gharardo Gnoli on the Occasion of his 65th birthday on 6th December 2002* (*Beiträge zur Iranistik* 24; Wiesbaden): 375-90.

——— (2006), 'The *Gāthās* and Other Old Avestan Poetry', in G.-J. Pinault, D. Petit (edd.), *La langue poétique indo-européenne* (Paris): 459-98.

Scodel, R. (2001), 'Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition on Hesiod and Pindar', in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden): 109-38.

Scott, M. (2010), *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Cambridge).

Scully, S. (1990), *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca, NY).

Seaford, R. (2005), 'Mystic Light in Aeschylus' *Bassarai*', *CQ* N.S. 55: 602-6.

——— (2010), 'Mystic Light and Near-Death Experience', in M. Christopoulos, E. Karakantza, O. Levaniouk (edd.), *Light and Darkness in Ancient Greek Myth and Religion* (Lanham, MD): 201-6.

Segre, M. (1993), *Iscrizioni di Cos* (2 Vols.; Rome).

Seltman, C.T. (1921), *The Temple Coins of Olympia* (Cambridge).

Sewell-Rutter, N.J. (2007), *Guilt by Descent: Moral Inheritance and Decision Making in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).

Sfyroeras, P. (2003), 'Olive Trees, North Wind, and Time: A Symbol in Pindar, *Olympian* 3', *Mouseion* 3: 313-24.

Shapiro, K. (1988), '*Ἴμνων θησαυρός*: Pindar's *Sixth Pythian* Ode and the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi', *MH* 45: 1-5.

Shaw, P.-J. (2003), *Discrepancies in Olympiad Dating and Chronological Problems of Archaic Peloponnesian History* (*Historia* Einzelschriften 166; Stuttgart).

Shelmerdine, S. (1987), 'Pindaric Praise and the *Third Olympian*', *HSCP* 91: 65-81.

Sicking, C.M.J. (1993), 'Devices for Text Articulation in Lysias I and XII', in C.M.J. Sicking, J.M. van Ophuijsen (edd.), *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage* (Leiden): 1-66.

Siewert, P. (1992), 'The Olympic Rules', in W. Coulson, H. Kyrieleis (edd.), *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympian Games, 5-9 September 1988* (Athens): 113-17.

——— (2002), 'Die wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Bronze-Urkunden aus Olympia, mit der Erstedition einer frühen Theorodokie-Verleihung als Beispiel', in H. Kyrieleis (ed.), *Olympia 1875-2000: 125 Jahre Deutsche Ausgrabungen* (Mainz): 359-70.

Silk, M.S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (London).

——— (2012), 'Reading Pindar', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 347-64.

Simpson, M. (1969), 'The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes', *TAPA* 100: 437-73.

Sinn, U. (2000), *Olympia: Cult, Sport and Ancient Festival* (Trans. T. Thornton; Princeton).

——— (2014), 'Olympia: The Place of the Contests in the Cult of Zeus Olympios', in T.F. Scanlon (ed.), *Sport in the Greek and Roman Worlds. Volume 1: Early Greece, the Olympics, and Contests* (*Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*; Oxford): 120-42.

Slater, W.J. (1976), 'Symposium at Sea', *HSCP* 80: 161-70.

Slowikowski, S. (1989), 'The Symbolic Hellanodikai', *Aethlon* 7: 133-41.

Smith, R.R.R. (2007), 'Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit', in S. Hornblower, C. Morgan (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford): 83-139.

Snowden, F.M. (1970), *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience* (Cambridge, MA).

Solmsen, F. (1982), 'Achilles on the Islands of the Blessed: Pindar vs. Homer and Hesiod', *AJP* 103: 19-24.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1979), 'The Myth of the Four Temples at Delphi', *CQ* N.S. 29: 231-51.

——— (1987), 'A Series of Erotic Pursuits: Images and Meanings', *JHS* 107: 131-53.

Spatafora, G. (1995), 'La metafora delle frecce di Eros nella poesia greca antica', *Orpheus* 16: 366-81.

Stafford, E.J. (2012), *Herakles* (London).

Steiner, D. (1986), *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar* (Oxford).

——— (1993), 'Pindar's "Oggetti Parlanti"', *HSPh* 95: 159-80.

——— (2007), 'Feathers Flying: Avian Poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus', *AJP* 128.2: 177-208.

Stewart, S. (2006), 'The "Blues" of Aratus', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Reguit, C.G. Wakker (edd.), *Beyond the Canon* (*Hellenistica Groningana* 11; Leuven): 319-44.

Stieber, M. (2011), *Euripides and the Language of Craft* (Leiden/Boston).

Stilwell, G.A. (2000), *Conduct and Behaviour as Determinants for the Afterlife: A Comparison of the Judgments of the Dead in Ancient Egypt and Ancient Greece* (Diss. Florida).

Stockert, W. (1969), *Klangfiguren und Wortresponsionen bei Pindar* (Vienna).

Stoneman, R. (1976), 'The Theban Eagle', *CQ* N.S. 26: 188-97.

Strauss, B.S. (1993), *Fathers and Sons in Athens: Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War* (Princeton).

Sulzer, A.-I. (1961), *ΚΛΥΤΑΙΣΙ ΔΑΙΔΑΛΩΣΕΜΕΝ ΥΜΝΩΝ ΠΤΥΧΑΙΣ: Zur Wortstellung und Satzbildung bei Pindar* (Zürich).

Svenbro, J. (1976), *La parole et le marbre: Aux origines de la poétique grecque* (Diss. Lund).

——— (1988), *Phrasikleia: anthropologie de la lecture en Grèce ancienne* (Paris).

Swift, L.A. (2011), 'Epinician and Tragic Worlds: The Case of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*', in L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie (edd.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (*Trends in Classics*, Suppl. 10; Berlin): 391-413.

Taita, J. (2000), 'Gli Αἰτωλοί di Olimpia. L'identità etnica della communità di vicinato del santuario olimpico', *Tyche* 15: 147-88.

Theunissen, M. (2000), *Pindar: Menschenlos und Wende der Zeit* (Munich).

Thomas, R. (2000), *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).

——— (2007), 'Fame, Memorial and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinician Poetry – An Historical Study', in S. Hornblower, C. Morgan (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford): 141-66.

Thompson, D.W. (1895), *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford).

Thomson, G. (1929), *Greek Lyric Metre* (Cambridge).

Thummer, E. (1957), *Die Religiosität Pindars* (*Commentationes Aenipontanae* 13; Innsbruck).

Torrance, I.C. (2014), 'Ch.13a: Swearing Oaths in the Authorial Person', in A.H. Sommerstein, I.C. Torrance (edd.), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece* (*Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 307; Berlin/Boston): 348-71.

Torres, D.A. (2007), *La escatología en la lírica de Píndaro y sus fuentes* (*Textos y estudios* 7; Buenos Aires).

Tronci, L. (2014), 'Verbal Adjectives', in G.K. Giannakis *et al.* (edd.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (Vol. 3; Leiden): 471-77.

Tsumura, D.T. (2005), *Creation and Destruction: A Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament* (Winona Lake, IN).

Urquhart, L.M. (2010), *Colonial Religion and Indigenous Society in the Archaic Western Mediterranean, C.750-400 BCE* (Diss. Stanford).

Vallozza, M. (1989), 'Il motivo dell'invidia in Pindaro', *QUCC* N.S.31: 13-30.

Vanbremeersch, N. (1987), 'Représentation de la terre et du travail agricole chez Pindare', *QS* 25: 73-95.

van Compernolle, T. (1989), 'Architecture et tyrannie', *AC* 58: 44-70.

——— (1992), *L'influence de la politique des Deinoménides et des Emménides sur l'architecture et l'urbanisme sicéliotes* (*Fonds René Draguet* 9; Louvain).

van den Berge (2007), 'Mythical Chronology in the Odes of Pindar: The Cases of *Pythian* 10 and *Olympian* 3', in R.J. Allan, M. Buijs (edd.), *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (*Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* 13; Leiden): 29-41.

van den Groenendaal, W. (2006), *Selbstdarstellung in Pindar's and Bacchylides' Epinician Odes Composed for Sicilian Laudandi* (Diss. Glasgow).

van Dijk, G.-J. (1997), *AINOI, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature* (*Mnem*. Suppl. 166; Leiden).

van Groningen, B.A. (1958), *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam).

van Kooten, G.H. (2014), 'The Divine Father of the Universe from the Presocratics to Celsus: The Graeco-Roman Background to the "Father of All" in Paul's Letter to the Ephesians', in F. Albrecht, R. Feldmeier (edd.), *The Divine Father: Religious and Philosophical Concepts of Divine Parenthood in Antiquity* (*Themes in Biblical Narrative* 18; Leiden): 293-323.

Verbanck-Piérard, A. (1992), 'Herakles at Feast in Attic Art: A Mythical or Cultic Iconography?', in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Iconography of Greek Cult in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (*Kernos* Suppl. 1; Athens/Liège): 85-106.

Verdenius, W.J. (1989), 'Pindar *O*.2.83-86', *Mnemosyne* 42: 79-82.

Vermeule, E. (1979), *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley).

Verrall, A.W. (1880), 'Korax and Tisias', *JP* 9: 197-210.

Versnel, H.S. (2011), *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (*Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 173; Leiden).

Vetta, M. (1979), 'La giovinezza giusta di Trasibulo: Pind.*Pyth*.VI.48', *QUCC* 31.2 N.S.: 87-90.

Visa-Ondarçuhu, V. (2002), '"Des mots qui ne tomberont pas à terre" (Pindar, *Olympiques* 9, 12): image d'un poète archer ou lutteur?', *Pallas* 59: 167-76.

Vivante, P. (1972), 'On Time in Pindar', *Arethusa* 5: 107-31.

von der Mühll, P. (1964), 'Weitere pindarische Notizen', *MH* 21: 168-72.

von Kamptz, H. (1982), *Homerische Personennamen* (Göttingen).

Wace, A.J.B. & Thompson, M.S. & Droop, J.P. (1909), 'Laconia I. Excavations at Sparta 1909: The Menelaion', *BSA* 15: 108-57.

Watkins, C. (1994), *Selected Writings* (2 Vols.; Innsbruck).

——— (1995), *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford).

——— (2002), 'ΕΠΕΩΝ ΘΕΣΙΣ. Poetic Grammar: Word Order and Metrical Structure in the Odes of Pindar', in H. Hettrich, J.-S. Kim. (edd.), *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven* (Wiesbaden): 319-37.

Węcowski, M. (2014), *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet* (Oxford).

Weir, R. (2007), 'Commemorative Cash: The Coins of the Ancient and Modern Olympics', in G. Schaus, S. Wenn (edd.), *Onward to the Olympics: Historical Perspectives on the Olympic Games* (Waterloo, ON): 179-92.

Welcker, F.G. (1834), 'Ibykos', *RhM* 2: 211-44.

——— (1882), *Der epische Cyclus oder die Homerischen Dichter* II (2nd Ed.; Bonn).

Wells, J.B. (2009), *Pindar's Verbal Art* (Washington, DC).

West, M.L. (1971), *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford).

——— (1983), *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford).

——— (1992), *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).

——— (1997), *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford).

——— (2007), *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).

——— (2011), 'Pindar as a Man of Letters', in D. Obbink, R. Rutherford (edd.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford): 50-68.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1908), 'Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht', *Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad.*: 328-52.

——— (1922), *Pindaros* (Berlin).

Wilson, P. (2004), 'Athenian Strings', in P. Murray, P. Wilson (edd.), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford): 269-306.

——— (2008), 'Costing the Dionysia', in M. Revermann, P. Wilson (edd.), *Performance, Reception, Iconography: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford): 88-127.

Winiarczyk, M. (2000), 'La mort et l'apotheose d'Heracles', *WienSt* 113: 13-29.

Wolicki, A. (2002), 'The Heralds and the Games in Archaic and Classical Greece', *Nikephoros* 15: 69-97.

Woodbury, L. (1966), 'Equinox at Acragas: Pindar, *Ol.* 2.61-2', *TAPA* 97: 597-616.

——— (1968), 'Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: *Isthm*.2.1-13', *TAPA* 99: 527-42.

Xanthou, M.G. (2011), 'The Anxiety over Pindar's Consistent Inconsistency in *Ol.* 12: E. L. Bundy's Critical Discourse and Modern Pindaric Hermeneutics', *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 16.2: 187-202.

Young, D.C.C. (1970), 'Some Types of Scribal Error in Manuscripts of Pindar', in W.M. Calder, J. Stern (edd.), *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (*Wege der Forschung* 134; Darmstadt): 96-126 [= *GRBS* 6 (1965): 247-73].

Zardini, F. (2009), *The Myth of Herakles and Kyknos: A Study in Greek Vase-painting and Literature* (Verona).

Zhmud, L. (2012), *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans* (Oxford).

Zuntz, G. (1971), *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford).