Pearson, Lionel. 1977. The Dynamics of Pindar's Music: Ninth Nemean and Third Olympian. *ICS* 2: 54–69.
Porter, James I. 2010. *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece: Matter, Sensation, and Experience*. Cambridge.
———. 2016. *The Sublime in Antiquity*. Cambridge.
Race, William, ed., trans., comm. 1997. *Pindar*. Vols. 1–2. Cambridge, MA.
———. 2010. Horace's Debt to Pindar. In *A Companion to Horace*, ed. Gregson Davis, 147–73. Chichester.
Rocconi, Eleonora. 2004. Colours in Music: Metaphoric Musical Language in Greek Antiquity. In *Music-Archaeological Sources: Excavated Finds, Oral Transmission, Written Evidence*, ed. E. Hickmann and R. Eichmann, 29–34. Rahden.
Segal, Charles. 1986. *Pindar's Mythmaking: The Fourth Pythian Ode*. Princeton, NJ.
Silk, Michael. 1974. *Interaction in Poetic Imagery*. Cambridge.
Stanford, W. B. 1967. *The Sound of Greek: Studies in the Greek Theory and Practice of Euphony*. Sather Classical Lectures 38. Berkeley, CA.
———. 1969. The Lily Voice of the Cicadas (*Iliad* 3.152). *Phoenix* 23: 3–8.
———. 1981. Sound, Sense, and Music in Greek Poetry. *GaR* 28: 127–40.
Steiner, Deborah. 1986. *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*. Oxford.
———. 1993. Pindar's "Oggeti Parlanti." *HSCP* 95: 159–80.
———. 2015. The Poetics of Sound: Callimachus' Rereading of Pindar Fragment 70B S.-M. *CP* 110: 99–123.
Treu, Max. 1955. *Von Homer zur Lyrik: Wandlungen des griechischen Weltbildes im Spiegel der Sprache*. Munich.
Vivante, Paolo. 1972. On Time in Pindar. *Arethusa* 5: 107–31.
Wells, James Bradley. 2010. *Pindar's Verbal Art: An Ethnographic Study of Epinician Style*. Hellenic Studies 40. Washington, DC.
Worman, Nancy. 2015. *Landscape and the Spaces of Metaphor in Ancient Literary Theory and Criticism*. Cambridge.

SOMETHING TO DO WITH DIONYSUS? DOLPHINS AND DITHYRAMB IN PINDAR FRAGMENT 236 SM

Pindar fragment 236 SM has been unduly neglected. This fragment consists of only five words, but the fact that it is cited in three related discussions of Homer and alluded to in one further source provides us with tantalizing clues concerning the context of the original poem. The fragment runs as follows:

φιλάνορα δ' οὐκ ἔλιπον βιοτάν

. . . but they have not abandoned their man-loving lifestyle.[1]

In the edition of Bruno Snell and Herwig Maehler details from all three of the sources that cite the fragment are combined to demonstrate that these words refer to "those men who have been transformed into dolphins from pirates" (οἱ δελφῖνες [sc. ἐκ τῶν λῃστῶν γενόμενοι]). This is undoubtedly correct, as the examination below of the four sources that relate to this fragment will show. It is clear that fragment 236 SM derives from Pindar's version of the mythic narrative of Dionysus' capture by pirates who are subse-

1. All Pindaric text is from Snell and Maehler 1987 and Maehler 1989. All translations are my own.

quently transformed by the god into dolphins. This fragment is therefore the first extant literary reference we have to this myth subsequent to the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (7).[2]

Fragment 236 SM relates to the experience of the pirate-dolphins after their metamorphosis. This is something that the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* does not focus upon. In the *Hymn* the moment of metamorphosis is immediate and there is no indication of what the pirates' post-metamorphic experience is like, as if they cast off all of their human experience at the very moment of transformation (51–53):

> οἱ δὲ θύραζε κακὸν μόρον ἐξαλύοντες
> πάντες ὁμῶς πήδησαν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον, εἰς ἅλα δῖαν,
> δελφῖνες δ' ἐγένοντο.
>
> And springing away from an evil fate they all leapt, when they saw this [i.e., Dionysus in the form of a lion], into the divine sea, and they became dolphins.

In the narrative of the *Hymn*, the pirates are human one moment and dolphin the next, with no sense that they are at any point a hybrid mixture of the two. Pindar seems to take a different approach in his narrative. By examining fragment 236 SM and the contexts in which it is found more closely, we can see that as well as narrating the story of Dionysus and the pirates, Pindar may have been interested in the question of the precise nature and extent of metamorphosis itself.

In order to show this I will explore a set of related questions that arise about this fragment: how and why do the source texts in which we find these words use Pindar to further their own discussions? What can we glean from the fragment about Pindar's use of language and treatment of this story? How does this fragment fit into ancient ideas about and poetic uses of dolphins in general? How does the use of imagery here fit with references to dolphins elsewhere in our extant Pindaric corpus? Is there anything we can say about the type of song this fragment might come from? In order to approach these questions I will first examine the four source texts that relate to this Pindaric fragment in detail in section 1. In section 2 I will focus on the discussions of metamorphosis in the Homeric scholarship in which Pindar's words are cited to demonstrate what we can say about the wider context of the fragment on the basis of its use in Homeric criticism. Section 3 deals with the language of the fragment itself and concentrates on Pindar's ambiguous and evocative use of the adjective φιλάνωρ—a word that brings with it a whole set of complex associations in relation to Greek thought about dolphins. Finally, I will discuss the use of dolphin imagery elsewhere in our extant corpus of Pindaric poetry, demonstrating how and why it differs from what Pindar seems to be doing in his narrative of Dionysus and the pirates, before turning to the question of the possible generic context of this passage.

1. PINDAR AND THE PIRATES

The earliest reference to Pindar's version of the story of Dionysus and the metamorphosed pirates is found in a remark in a treatise of the first-century-BCE Epicurean phi-

2. See Jaillard 2011, 143–44 on versions of the pirates and Dionysus myth subsequent to the *Hymn. Hom. Dion*. Faulkner (2011, 15) argues that Pindar's reference to this myth, in conjunction with the possible reflection of the story on the Exekias cup (ca. 530 BCE), might help to date the *Hymn* to the late sixth or early fifth century, though an earlier date is still possible. West (2003, 16) suggests that the *Hymn* appears not long before Pindar's time because of a possible reference to lines 28–29 of the poem at *Isthmian* 6.23.

losopher and poet Philodemus. In the catalogue of poets in the second part of his treatise *On Piety*, Pindar's work is mentioned in conjunction with the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (*P. Herc.* 1088 VI.1–5):

ληστῶν ἁλ[ῶναι
γράφει· καὶ Π[ίνδα-
ρος δὲ διέρχ[εται
περὶ τῆς λη[στεί-
ας.

[Homer in his *Hymns*] writes that [Dionysus] was seized [by] pirates. And Pindar recounts the episode of piracy all the way through.[3]

In this section of his treatise, Philodemus surveys a range of poets and mythographers and assesses their representations of the divine.[4] His aim is to demonstrate that all the poetic representations he mentions are unfitting for the gods, and he seems to be suggesting that both the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* and Pindar's version of the story concerning piracy are unfitting portrayals of Dionysus in general.[5]

An examination of the three direct citations we have of fragment 236 SM confirms that the original song which this fragment derives from is Pindar's version of the piracy episode. All three citations are related to one another and pertain to one Homeric line, *Odyssey* 10.240: καὶ δέμας, αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἔμπεδος, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ ("but their minds were steadfast, just as they were before"). This Homeric line describes the extent of the metamorphosis that Odysseus' men underwent when they were transformed into swine by Circe. I will discuss the reasons why the Homeric commentators found this line so intriguing in the next section, but for now I will set out the various citations of Pindar's text. The shortest discussion that cites the Pindaric fragment is found in a D-scholion on this Odyssean line:

αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἔμπεδος, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ: οὐχ ὁ σύμπας, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ φιλάνθρωπον μόνον—διὸ καὶ σαίνουσιν—ὥσπερ δελφῖνες "φιλάνορα δ' οὐκ ἔλιπον βιοτάν" κατὰ τὸν Πίνδαρον.[6]

"But their minds were steadfast, just as they were before": not in terms of their whole minds, but in relation to their philanthropic feeling alone—on account of which they also "fawn" [cf. *Od.* 10.215, 219)]—just as dolphins "have not abandoned their man-loving lifestyle" according to Pindar.

It is almost certain that this scholion ultimately derives from the *Homeric Questions on the Odyssey* by the third-century-CE Neoplatonic philosopher and critic Porphyry.[7] Hermann Schrader assigns the words of the above scholion to Porphyry's wider discussion of *Odyssey* 10.239–40, followed by this further reflection (p. 99.16–p. 100.4 Schrader):

ἐκ τοῦδε δῆλον, ὅτι ἡδονῇ σχεθεὶς τὸν νοῦν οὐκ ἀποβάλλει, ὥστε, εἰ θέλει, πάλιν ἐπανέρχεται εἰς καλὴν διαγωγήν.

3. Text from Schober 1988, 87. The words just before the first line of this column are lost, but from the context of the preceding and following text Schober suggests that something like "τὸν Διόνυσον δὲ Ὅμηρος ἐν τοῖς ὕμνοις ὑπὸ etc." must have come before the beginning of this column.
4. See Obbink 1996, 279–80 for details of the structure of the second half of *On Piety*.
5. See Obbink 1995, 203–6 on Philodemus' argument in this section of the treatise.
6. Text from Ernst 2004, 211.
7. See Erbse 1960, 17–77 on the debt of the Homeric scholia to Porphyry.

> From this it is clear that a person held by pleasure does not cast away his mind, with the result that, if he wishes, he returns back to a good way of life.

From this discussion it is evident that Porphyry, in line with contemporary philosophical concerns, is interested in questions about the impact of pleasure (something which Circe was thought to be able to offer in abundance) and the effects of outside influences on the human body and mind.[8] For this reason he finds Pindar's words about the metamorphosis of the pirates of particular interest in relation to his discussion of the transformation of Odysseus' companions in *Odyssey* 10.

The potential for the episode of the transformation of Odysseus' men to lend itself easily to philosophical and/or allegorical readings is also evident from the latest text we possess which cites fragment 236 SM, the *Commentary on the Odyssey* by the twelfth-century-CE scholar, critic, and archbishop Eustathius of Thessalonike (1.379.28–31):

> τὸ δὲ νοῦς ἔμπεδος, κατηγορεῖ τῶν χοιροβίων εἴπερ τὸν νοῦν περισώζοντες, εἶτα τῇ κατὰ Κίρκην τρυφῇ γίνονται ἄλογοι. φασὶ δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ ὡς οὐχ' ὁ σύμπας νοῦς τοῖς τοιούτοις περισώσεται, ἀλλ' ὁ κατὰ μόνον τὸ φιλάνθρωπον, διὸ καὶ σαίνουσιν. ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ δελφῖνες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενοι "φιλάνορα οὐκ ἔλιπον βιοτὰν" κατὰ Πίνδαρον.[9]
>
> And in saying "their minds were steadfast" [*Od.* 10.240], he [i.e., Homer] is denouncing those with a swinish sort of lifestyle, [saying that] even if they kept their minds intact, even so they become irrational because of the luxury of Circe's lifestyle. But the previous authorities say that not the whole mind will survive intact in such people, but the philanthropic part alone, on account of which they also "fawn" [cf. *Od.* 10.215, 219]. Just as those who became dolphins from men "have not abandoned their man-loving lifestyle" according to Pindar.

It is also clear from Eustathius' discussion that he is reading the supposed transformation of Odysseus' men into pigs in a highly allegorical fashion. He suggests that the "transformation" of Odysseus' men is not literally a physical change, but an allegorical reflection of the swinish sort of lifestyle they lead due to their susceptibility to pleasure.[10] In this respect he seems to disagree with the "previous authorities"—in this case, most likely Porphyry and possibly other previous commentators—who argue that only the part of the mind that is friendly toward other men remains.[11]

2. CIRCE'S ANIMALS AND PINDAR'S DOLPHINS

It is now worth delving further into the matter of precisely how and why Homeric scholars were interested in using Pindar's words to advance their arguments in order to

8. Porphyry's interest in problems surrounding the nature of metamorphosis and the effect of outside influences on the body and mind which this line and others connected to metamorphosis in *Odyssey* 10 raise is also seen in another of his works of unknown genre, a fragment of which is cited by Stobaeus (*Ecl.* 1.41.60). In this work Porphyry explores the meaning of these lines at greater length with an allegorical reading that accords with Neoplatonic views on the fate of the soul: see Lamberton 1986, 115–19.

9. Text from Stallbaum 1825.

10. This becomes even clearer when we reach Eustathius' discussion of *Odyssey* 10.283 (ἔρχαται ὥς τε σύες πυκινοὺς κευθμῶνας ἔχοντες) a little later in his *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1.382.22–23). Eustathius refers back to this discussion of the "swinish sort of lifestyle" of Odysseus' companions here as his previous "allegorical reading" (ῥηθεῖσαν ἀλληγορίαν) and argues that *Odyssey* 10.283 further supports his reading that the companions "do not literally become pigs, but they are 'pig-like', as it were, on account of the swinishness of their lifestyle" (μὴ ἄντικρυς γινομένων συῶν, ἀλλ' ὥστε ἤγουν ὡσανεὶ συῶν διὰ τὸ χοιρῶδες τοῦ βίου).

11. Cf. van der Valk 1963, 86–106 on the relation of Eustathius to Porphyry and the Homeric scholia.

assess what we might learn about the larger context of the Pindaric fragment from these discussions. As previously mentioned, *Odyssey* 10.240 comes in the middle of the description of Circe's transformation of Odysseus' men into swine (*Od.* 10.237–40):

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δῶκέν τε καὶ ἔκπιον, αὐτίκ᾽ ἔπειτα
> ῥάβδῳ πεπληγυῖα κατὰ συφεοῖσιν ἐέργνυ.
> οἱ δὲ συῶν μὲν ἔχον κεφαλὰς φωνήν τε τρίχας τε
> καὶ δέμας, αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἔμπεδος, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ.
>
> But when she had given it to them [i.e., the mixture containing baleful drugs] and they had drunk it, at that moment after striking them with her wand she immediately began to pen them into the pig-sties. And they possessed the heads and the voices and the bristles and the form of swine, but their minds were steadfast, just as they were before.

At first glance line 240 is not overly difficult to understand: Homer is telling us that while the bodily form of Odysseus' men might have been utterly transformed, their minds remained just as human as before. But for commentators on Homer, matters were not so simple. This is because narratives of metamorphosis very often provoke concerns about the extent to which an original form changes or stays the same, and it is this very question of precisely which aspects of their human minds Odysseus' men retain which thus exercises ancient exegetes on this passage.[12]

In fact, Porphyry's citation of Pindar's words in relation to line 10.240 forms part of a much longer discussion concerning a later line, *Odyssey* 10.329. In this line ancient critics were puzzled by the fact that Circe is surprised that Odysseus is immune to her transformative magic and that she specifically says to him that she is amazed that "the mind in your breast is not able to be enchanted" (σοὶ δέ τις ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀκήλητος νόος ἐστιν). From a certain (pedantic) angle, these words can seem to create an inconsistency with Homer's statement at *Odyssey* 10.240 (αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἔμπεδος): if the minds of Odysseus' transformed companions remain steadfast even as their bodies change form, why is Circe surprised that Odysseus' mind should remain equally impermeable to enchantment? This might seem like a trivial issue to the modern reader, but it is of course this sort of superficial seeming inconsistency that Homeric scholars in antiquity delighted in discussing, and which seems in this instance to have confirmed the impression that the nature of metamorphosis itself is a contentious issue in the *Odyssey*.

It is within this context that the words of Pindar fragment 236 SM appear in relation to *Odyssey* 10.240. In the various discussions of that line cited in the previous section, it is unclear at first glance who is being said to "fawn" (σαίνουσιν) on account of their "feeling for their fellow men" (τὸ φιλάνθρωπον) just as Pindar suggests dolphins behave (ὥσπερ δελφῖνες . . . κατὰ τὸν Πίνδαρον), since Odysseus' companions are certainly not described as "fawning" at any point in the narrative. But after examining the use of this verb elsewhere in the *Odyssey* it soon becomes clear that we are required to draw yet another passage in Book 10 into the debate about the nature and effect of metamorphosis, this time from before line 10.240. The somewhat cryptic remark "on account of which they fawn" (διὸ καὶ σαίνουσιν) refers not to Odysseus' men at this point in the nar-

12. This is summarized succinctly in Buxton's recent treatment of the metamorphosis theme in Greek myth (2009, 9): "Fundamental to most tales of metamorphosis are two antitheses: that between continuity and change, and that between body and mind/spirit/soul. These antitheses are of course fraught with complexity, which metamorphosis takes delight in exploring."

rative, but to the wolves and lions that have just fawned about the companions as they approached Circe's house (*Od.* 10.214–19):

> οὐδ᾽ οἵ γ᾽ ὡρμήθησαν ἐπ᾽ ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα τοί γε
> οὐρῇσιν μακρῇσι περισσαίνοντες ἀνέσταν.
> ὡς δ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ἂν ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα κύνες δαίτηθεν ἰόντα
> σαίνωσ᾽, αἰεὶ γάρ τε φέρει μειλίγματα θυμοῦ,
> ὣς τοὺς ἀμφὶ λύκοι κρατερώνυχες ἠδὲ λέοντες
> σαῖνον· τοὶ δ᾽ ἔδεισαν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰνὰ πέλωρα.
>
> But the wolves and lions did not rush upon the men, instead they stood on their hind legs and fawned around them, wagging their long tails. Just as when dogs fawn around their master coming back from a feast, for he always bears scraps of food to please their hearts, just so the strong-clawed wolves and lions were fawning upon the men; but they were terrified when they saw the fearful monsters.

The reference to "fawning" in the discussions of line 10.240 is therefore a typical example of the well-known "clarifying Homer from Homer" (Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν) principle, utilized in this case in an attempt to explain the precise nature of the later metamorphosis of Odysseus' companions.[13] The commentators on line 240 thus argue that Odysseus' men maintain their own minds in as much as they still possess friendly feelings toward their fellow men even after their bodies have been changed, just as Circe's wolves and lions show themselves to be well-disposed toward humans when the men approach her house. What is implied here is that the wolves and lions that surround Circe's home were themselves once humans who themselves strayed into the goddess' clutches and underwent physical transformation at some previous point.

The question of whether the wild animals around Circe's house used to be humans or not is itself another Homeric crux concerning metamorphosis of which we can see traces in the Odyssean scholia. The extant scholia on line 10.213 attest to the fact that several views concerning whether Circe's wild animals were really once humans or not were current in antiquity. On the one hand, Eurylochus' words later in Book 10 certainly imply that he believes that the wild animals were once humans when he tries to warn Odysseus off from venturing forth to Circe's house, arguing that "she will make us all into pigs or wolves or lions" (ἤ κεν ἅπαντας / ἢ σῦς ἠὲ λύκους ποιήσεται ἠὲ λέοντας, *Od.* 10.432–33). One scholiast argues that this can be used as evidence that Circe "did not tame wild animals, but made the beasts out of men" (οὐκ ἐξ ἀγρίων τιθασεύουσα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων θῆρας ποιήσασα). On the other hand, the view that "the enchantment does not signify a change of bodily form, rather it signifies making [the animals] more sluggish in terms of their movements" (τὸ ἔθελξεν οὐ τὸ μεταμορφῶσαι σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ τὸ νωθέστερον ποιῆσαι πρὸς τὰς ἐνεργείας) is also attested in the scholia on this line. Modern commentators tend to side with the latter view and argue that the metamorphosis in question here is simply the transformation of the wild animals into tame creatures.[14] However, even if

13. Porphyry himself discusses his use of this principle (see, e.g., Porph. *Homeric Questions on the Iliad* 1.1.12–14: αὐτὸς μὲν ἑαυτὸν τὰ πολλὰ Ὅμηρος ἐξηγεῖται). On Porphyry's use of this method, see van der Valk 1963, 104; MacPhail 2010, 4. On the principle of "clarifying Homer from Homer" more generally, see, e.g., Pfeiffer 1968, 225–27; Nünlist 2015, 385–403.

14. Both de Jong (2001, 258) and Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989, 55–56) maintain that the metamorphosis in question concerning the beasts in front of Circe's house is only a reversal of the expected behavior of the wild animals, i.e., they act tamely rather than fiercely.

we accept that it is not clear that Circe's tame wolves and lions were also once humans at the moment when Odysseus' men first encounter them, it is undeniable that this idea is introduced into the narrative a few hundred lines later in Eurylochus' speech. As a result it is not surprising that this passage spawned such a range of ideas about the nature of metamorphosis. This sense of variant responses is reinforced by examples of visual art relating to either the myth of Circe in general, or to Homer's version of the Circe episode in particular. For example, the famous mid-sixth-century-BCE *kylix* (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 99.518) that depicts Circe with Odysseus' transformed companions presents the men as hybrid creatures with human bodies and the heads of various animals (a pig, lion, ram, and wolf), perhaps suggesting that the painter thinks of Circe's wild animals as metamorphosed humans.[15] Regardless of which side of the debate about the previous life of Circe's animals one comes down on, one thing remains certain: the status and nature of metamorphosis in *Odyssey* 10 is somewhat ambiguous in nature and as such it provoked variant responses in antiquity.

The discussion of Homeric commentators on *Odyssey* 10.240 therefore draws upon a wider question about the nature of metamorphosis as a whole, and it is within this context that Pindar's words about Dionysus' transformation of pirates into dolphins is found. For the Homeric commentators, Pindar's words about the "man-loving" nature of the transformed dolphins in the story of Dionysus and the pirates are used to support the view that metamorphosed humans maintain their kindly inclinations toward their fellow men. The advantage of using Pindar's words here is twofold. First, they provide an answer to the question of which aspects of *nous* remain steadfast in Odysseus' companions: it is the part of the mind that is friendly toward one's fellow men. In addition, they allow the Homeric commentators to make sense of the earlier passage in Book 10 (10.214–19) concerning the fawning behavior of Circe's wolves and lions: if metamorphosed humans maintain their friendly feelings toward their fellow humans, and the wolves and lions are expressing this friendly feeling toward Odysseus' men, then it follows that Circe's wild creatures were once humans as well. It therefore seems that the original Pindaric song from which fragment 236 SM derives dealt to some degree with the nature of metamorphosis and the extent to which a human's previous nature is abandoned or changed once corporeal transformation occurs. For the Homeric commentators, Pindar's poem about metamorphosed dolphins evidently raised similar issues concerning bodily transformation as those found in *Odyssey* 10. In the next section I will suggest that their reading of the poem was correct, as the language of fragment 236 SM suggests that Pindar was indeed exploring current ideas concerning metamorphosis himself.

3. δελφῖνες φιλάνορες: THE LANGUAGE OF FRAGMENT 236 SM

What, then, might the language of fragment 236 SM suggest to us about the wider focus of Pindar's lost song in conjunction with what we now know about the context in which these words were found? The description of the lifestyle that the dolphin/pirates are reluctant to leave plays on several different meanings of the relatively rare adjective

15. On how this cup varies from Homer's version of the transformation of Odysseus' men into swine alone, see Alexandridis 2009, 270–71.

φιλάνωρ. First of all, in conjunction with οὐκ ἔλιπον ("they have not abandoned"), which introduces a sense of strong reluctance, this adjective perhaps suggests that the pirates love(d) the state of *being* men, and are now in some sense regretful that they have had to leave a human life behind. Like Circe's men, who maintained their *nous* despite the change of physical form they suffered, the use of this adjective suggests that the pirates perhaps cling on to the memory of their human form.

But there is also an element of paradox and irony in this description of the metamorphosed sailors' reluctance to leave their "philanthropic" lifestyle behind. In the *Homeric Hymn*, and in later versions of the myth, the sailors are transformed in the first place because of their ill treatment of Dionysus, whom they abduct in the clear expectation of gain after mistaking him for a prince with rich kinsmen (as the *Homeric Hymn* makes clear: υἱὸν γάρ μιν ἔφαντο διοτρεφέων βασιλήων / εἶναι, 11–12; cf. ἐρεῖ αὐτοῦ τε φίλους καὶ κτήματα πάντα / οὕς τε κασιγνήτους, 30–31). The lifestyle the pirates were leading before their transformation can scarcely be described as "man-loving" or "friendly toward men" since they are clearly only interested in benefitting themselves rather than their fellow man. There is therefore certainly an element of playfulness in Pindar's use of φιλάνορα: the pirates may be reluctant to abandon their lives as men, but, ironically, their lifestyle as dolphins will be much more affectionate toward men than their human lifestyle ever was.

But as well as demonstrating a certain playfulness on Pindar's part, the complex issue of what exactly changes and what stays the same during metamorphosis is raised by the use of this adjective. The vicious personality traits that the pirates display in their human lives seem to have been transformed along with their corporeal form in Pindar's version of the story. This also accords with the view of the nature of dolphins that we find elsewhere in the Greek literary tradition as a whole, since these creatures are often portrayed as the most affectionate toward men of all animals. The most famous example remaining to us of this tradition is the story of Arion's rescue from pirates by dolphins in Herodotus' *Histories* (1.23–24), a narrative that itself owes much to the myth of Dionysus and the pirates.[16] But this is not the only example of the theme of the friendly dolphin in Greek (and later Latin) literature: the image of the friendly or affectionate dolphin eventually comes to extend into a long tradition of stories relating to the strangely anthropomorphic nature of this animal.[17]

In fragment 236 SM Pindar is clearly picking up on the current idea that dolphins are somehow exceptionally well-disposed toward men in using the adjective φιλάνωρ. As I mentioned above, the adjective φιλάνωρ is relatively rare. It appears once in Bacchylides' first *Ode* with reference to the victories that Apollo is said to have bestowed on the victor Argeius' father Pantheides, because of his "man-loving honoring of strangers" (ξείνων τε [φι]λάνορι τ[ι]μᾶι, 150). But elsewhere it is used exclusively in connection with close human relationships. In Aeschylus' works the word appears three times. In *Persians* the chorus sings of the Persian women who weep with "man-loving longing" (πόθῳ φιλάνορι, 135) for the husbands who have been sent away from their beds. In the *Agamemnon* the same adjective is used twice in an extremely ambivalent manner. In the play's first stasimon the

16. See, e.g., Hedreen 2013, 187; cf. Lavecchia 2013, 63–66.

17. The strangely anthropomorphic qualities of the dolphin are discussed at, e.g., Arist. *Hist. an.* 631a9–631b5; Ael. *NA* 2.6, 6.15, 12.6; Plin. *HN* 9.7–10; Plut. *Mor. De soll. an.* 984a–985c; Ath. *Deipnosophistae* 606d; Oppian *Halieutica* 5.416–588; Gell. *NA* 6.8. For a general overview of the use of the dolphin in Greek and Latin literature, see Stebbins 1929.

chorus sing of the "husband-loving/man-loving footprints" (στίβοι φιλάνορες) of Helen, though it is not clear whether the man in question is Menelaus or Paris here.[18] The adjective takes on a similarly ambivalent cast later in the play, when Clytemnestra opens her first address to Agamemnon with the claim that she is not ashamed to speak of her "man/husband-loving ways" (τοὺς φιλάνορας τρόπους, 856). Again, Aeschylus is playing on the double meaning this adjective takes on in the context of the action of the play: with reference to Agamemnon this word becomes savagely ironic, but perhaps it refers to Aegisthus instead—not technically Clytemnestra's husband, but certainly the man she loves at this point. In Aeschylus then φιλάνωρ becomes a powerfully ambiguous word that covers both conjugal affection and adulterous lasciviousness. After Aeschylus, we do not find the adjective used again in any of our extant texts until much later in the literary tradition, but there again it is used with reference to the relationship between husband and wife.[19]

Pindar's use of φιλάνορα in fragment 236 SM similarly picks up on the idea of the dolphin's exceptionally affectionate and philanthropic nature, and he is perhaps also hinting that all dolphins were once humans at some point. The focus on the liminal status of dolphins and on the nature of metamorphosis itself is thus something we can already see in the few words of the fragment that remain to us.

4. Dionysus, Dolphins, and Dithyrambs

After taking all of this into account, is there anything else we can say about Pindar fragment 236 SM? Although the fragment is frustratingly brief, there are a few things that we can plausibly say about the Pindaric poem from which it comes: this poem has something to do with dolphins, and it has something to do with Dionysus. We can also say that in fragment 236 SM, Pindar's focus is on the peculiar status of the dolphin as an inherently anthropomorphic creature in relation to the effects and nature of metamorphosis. This differs greatly from the use of dolphin imagery elsewhere in his corpus.

In Pindar's epinician poetry dolphins are mostly mentioned in relation to their preeminent status among sea creatures, particularly in relation to their swiftness. At *Pythian* 4.17 short-finned dolphins, as swift animals in the sea, are compared to swift horses on land (ἀντὶ δελφίνων δ' ἐλαχυπτερύγων ἵππους ἀμείψαντες θοάς). The focus on the dolphin's swiftness is also very evident at *Nemean* 6.64–65 when Pindar praises the trainer Melesias: "I would say that Melesias is equal in speed to a dolphin through the salt sea" (δελφῖνι καὶ τάχος δι' ἅλμας / ἶσον <κ'> εἴποιμι Μελησίαν). At *Pythian* 2.50–51 only the god is said to be able to outstrip the dolphin (θεός . . . θαλασσαῖον παραμείβεται δελφῖνα), while at *Isthmian* 9.6–7 Aeginetans are compared to dolphins in the sea in terms of their virtue (οἷοι δ' ἀρετάν / δελφῖνες ἐν πόντῳ). Again, this seems to link to the idea of the dolphin's swiftness: just as dolphins are the finest sea creatures in terms of their speed, so the Aeginetans are preeminent in terms of their manly virtue. In Pindar's extant epinician odes the dolphin, as a swift and splendid animal, is always used as one half of a comparison, whether explicit or implicit.

18. Fraenkel (1950, 215) dismisses the suggestion of ambiguity, but, as Raeburn and Thomas (2011, 115) note, a question is surely raised in these lines.

19. Cf. Nonnus *Dion.* 34.95: φιλήνορι Χαλκομεδείῃ ("husband-loving Chalcomedia," a new bride); Colluthus *Rape of Helen* 214: Φυλλίδος . . . φιλήνορος ("husband-loving Phyllis," who hanged herself when abandoned by her husband Demophoon).

Outside of epinician Pindar uses the image of the dolphin in a slightly different way in a lyric poem of indeterminate genre, fragment 140b SM.[20] In this poem Pindar focuses on another famous aspect of the dolphin's supposed nature, its love of music (13–17):

ἐρε-
θίζομαι πρὸς αυ .[
ἁλίου δελφῖνος ὑπόκρισιν,
τὸν μὲν ἀκύμονος ἐν πόντου πελάγει
αὐλῶν ἐκίνησ᾽ ἐρατὸν μέλος.

I am provoked in response in the manner of a dolphin of the sea, which the lovely tune of *auloi* has set in motion in the expanse of the waveless sea.

This fragment makes the association between dolphins, a love of music, and the response to music particularly clear when we find the reaction of Pindar and the chorus to the song of his predecessor Xenocritus compared to that of a dolphin excited by the lovely melody of *auloi*. Pindar is clearly playing here with the idea of dolphins as particularly "music-loving" animals, natural "choruses" which dance around ships.[21] In another fragment of unknown genre, 234 SM, Pindar again focuses on the dolphin's speed and supposed closeness to human endeavors by proposing that "the dolphin advances most swiftly beside a ship" (παρὰ ναῦν δ᾽ ἰθύει τάχιστα δελφίς) in what seems to be a priamel that also includes horses and chariots, oxen and ploughs, and dogs and hunting. The focus in this fragment seems to be on the usefulness of certain animals in connection with certain human activities: the dolphin is once again portrayed as an animal close to humans and swiftest in the realm of the sea.

It is clear that the focus in fragment 236 SM is slightly different from Pindar's use of dolphin imagery elsewhere. The fragment comes from a narrative that is in some sense *about* dolphins; in other examples in Pindar the image of the dolphin is utilized very differently as one half of an explicit or implicit comparison. Given the shortness of the fragment it is of course impossible to name the performance context of the original poem with any certainty. But it is worth noting that the connections between Dionysus, dithyramb, and dolphins have recently been drawn out at length by numerous scholars. Eric Csapo led the way in his examination of the connections of dolphins and dithyrambs in visual art and poetry from the Archaic period onward.[22] This is most obvious in Herodotus' version of the story of the pirates, dolphins, and Arion, who is said to have first made, named, and taught the dithyramb (διθύραμβον πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ποιήσαντά τε καὶ ὀνομάσαντα καὶ διδάξαντα).[23] Guy Hedreen has even gone so far as to suggest that the story of Dionysus and the Tyrrhenian pirate-dolphins in the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* is "[a]n important mythological guide to the semantics of dithyrambic dance in the sixth century."[24] As well as the strong general links between Dionysus, dolphins, dance, and

20. On the lack of certainty regarding the genre of frag. 140b, see Fileni 1987, 21–32, 52–53; Henderson 1992, 156; Rutherford 2001, 386–87. On the suggestion that the song combines dithyrambic and paeanic features, see Steiner 2016, 143–48.

21. For the general association of the dolphin with ships and music and its relevance to this fragment, see Fileni 1987, 46; Henderson 1992, 154–55.

22. Csapo 2003, 69–98.

23. On the connections between dolphins, dithyramb, and Dionysus, cf. also Kowalzig 2013, 31–58; Hedreen 2013, 171–97. Cf. Vidali 1997, 105–11 on the portrayal of dolphins in connection with Dionysus in particular.

24. Hedreen 2013, 187. Cf. Lavecchia 2013, 65: "a dithyrambization of the dolphins also seems to be presupposed in the mythic tradition concerning Dionysus and the pirates."

dithyramb on which these scholars draw, the focus in fragment 236 SM on the pirates' metamorphosis is particularly intriguing in relation to dithyramb. The importance of metamorphosis and transformation as a theme and effect of dithyrambic song has also been recently emphasized.[25] It has even been suggested that the way in which Dionysus is often conceived of as a presence within the performance of dithyrambic song itself has an inherently transformative effect on the chorus involved.[26] In addition, Barbara Kowalzig has recently explored how Pindar's dithyrambs often use Dionysiac "resistance myths" to portray the simultaneous rejection and acceptance of Dionysus on the part of the whole community: as the chorus narrates a story concerning the rejection of Dionysus, they simultaneously adopt Dionysiac rites through the use of the organized dithyrambic chorus itself.[27] In light of the importance of Dionysiac transformation and metamorphosis as a theme of dithyramb in general, and of Dionysiac resistance myths in Pindar's dithyrambs in particular, the play with the obvious "resistance myth" of the pirates' metamorphic moment in fragment 236 SM might suggest that these words were originally from a dithyrambic context.

There are a few things then which we can say for sure about Pindar fragment 236 SM. Even within the few short words of the fragment Pindar's customary linguistic art is apparent in his play with the multiple meanings of the adjective φιλάνωρ. Pindar also seems to be interested in the effects of metamorphosis in the poem from which the fragment comes, and scholars in antiquity certainly found it useful to bring Pindar's poems into their own debates about the nature of metamorphosis. We can also say for sure that the song from which the fragment comes has something to do with Dionysus. This is of course by no means enough to confirm that Pindar's original poem was a dithyramb, but makes that a possibility to be reckoned with.

JESSICA LIGHTFOOT
Trinity College, University of Cambridge

25. Lavecchia (2013, 60) suggests that "dithyramb in a sense *performs* the concept of change." Cf. Hedreen (2013, 197), who argues that the myth of the pirate-dolphins, "which describes the power or experience of Dionysus in terms of the transformation of men into animals, suggests that a fundamental content of early dithyrambic performance was the idea that, through choral song and dance, one could experience the transformative power of Dionysus." Cf. Ford 2013, 313 and Steiner 2016, 146 on dithyrambs, transformation, and innovation.

26. Kowalzig and Wilson 2013b, 7. Cf. Lavecchia 2013, 62.

27. See Kowalzig 2007, 230 and Kowalzig and Wilson 2013b, 9 on dithyramb and Dionysiac resistance myths.

LITERATURE CITED

Alexandridis, Annetta. 2009. Shifting Species: Animal and Human Bodies in Attic Vase Painting of the 6th and 5th Centuries B.C. In *Bodies and Boundaries in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, ed. Thorsten Fögen and Mireille M. Lee, 261–82. Berlin.

Buxton, Richard. 2009. *Forms of Astonishment: Greek Myths of Metamorphosis*. Oxford.

Csapo, Eric. 2003. The Dolphins of Dionysus. In *Poetry, Theory, Praxis: The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece; Essays in Honour of William J. Slater*, ed. Eric Csapo and Margaret C. Miller, 69–98. Oxford.

Erbse, Hartmut. 1960. *Beiträge zur Ueberlieferung der Iliasscholien*. Munich.

Ernst, Nicola. 2004. *Die D-Scholien zur Odyssee: Kritische Ausgabe*. PhD diss., Universität zu Köln.

Faulkner, Andrew. 2011. Introduction: Modern Scholarship on the *Homeric Hymns*. In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, ed. Andrew Faulkner, 1–26. Oxford.
Fileni, Maria G. 1987. *Senocrito di Locri e Pindaro (fr. 140b Sn.-Maehl.)*. Rome.
Ford, Andrew. 2013. The Poetics of Dithyramb. In Kowalzig and Wilson 2013a, 313–31.
Fraenkel, Eduard, ed., comm. 1950. *Agamemnon*. Oxford.
Hedreen, Guy. 2013. The Semantics of Processional Dithyramb: Pindar's *Second Dithyramb* and Archaic Athenian Vase Painting. In Kowalzig and Wilson 2013a, 171–97.
Henderson, John W. 1992. Pindar Fr. 140b Snell-Maehler: The Chariot and the Dolphin. *Hermes* 120: 148–58.
Heubeck, Alfred, and Arie Hoekstra, comm. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's "Odyssey."* Vol. 1, *Books IX–XVI*. Oxford.
Jaillard, Dominique. 2011. The Seventh *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*: An Epiphanic Sketch. In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, ed. Andrew Faulkner, 133–50. Oxford.
Jong, Irene J. F. de. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the "Odyssey."* Cambridge.
Kowalzig, Barbara. 2007. And Now All the World Shall Dance! (Eur. *Bacch.* 114): Dionysus' *Choroi* between Drama and Ritual. In *The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama*, ed. Eric Csapo and Margaret C. Miller, 221–51. Cambridge.
———. 2013. Dancing Dolphins on the Wine-Dark Sea: Dithyramb and Social Change in the Archaic Mediterranean. In Kowalzig and Wilson 2013a, 31–58.
Kowalzig, Barbara, and Peter J. Wilson, eds. 2013a. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford
———. 2013b. Introduction: The World of Dithyramb. In Kowalzig and Wilson 2013a, 1–27.
Lamberton, Robert. 1986. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Readings and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Berkeley, CA.
Lavecchia, Salvatore. 2013. Becoming Like Dionysos: Dithyramb and Dionysian Initiation. In Kowalzig and Wilson 2013a, 59–75.
MacPhail, John A., ed., comm., trans. 2010. *Porphyry's Homeric Questions on the "Iliad."* New York.
Maehler, Herwig, ed. 1989. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Vol. 2, *Fragmenta, Indices*. Leipzig.
Nünlist, René. 2015. What Does Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν Actually Mean? *Hermes* 143: 385–403.
Obbink, Dirk. 1995. How to Read Poetry about Gods. In *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*, ed. Dirk Obbink, 189–209. Oxford.
———, ed., comm. 1996. *Philodemus "On Piety," Part 1: Critical Text with Commentary*. Oxford.
Pfeiffer, Rudolf. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
Raeburn, David, and Oliver Thomas, eds., comm. 2011. *The "Agamemnon" of Aeschylus*. Oxford.
Rutherford, Ian. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans*. Oxford.
Schober, Adolf. 1988. Philodemi *Περὶ εὐσεβείας* libelli pars prior. *CErc* 18: 67–125.
Schrader, Hermann, ed. 1890. *Porphyrii Quaestionum homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias*. Leipzig.
Snell, Bruno, and Herwig Maehler, eds. 1987. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*[8]. Leipzig.
Stallbaum, Johann, ed. 1825. *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*. Leipzig.
Stebbins, Eunice B. 1929. *The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome*. Menasha, WI.
Steiner, Deborah. 2016. Harmonic Divergence: Pindar's Fr. 140B and Early Fifth-Century Choral Polemics. *JHS* 136: 132–51.
van der Valk, Marchinus. 1963. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the "Iliad" I*. Leiden.
Vidali, Stamatoula. 1997. *Archaische Delphindarstellungen*. Würzburg.
West, Martin L., ed., trans. 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.