

Pindar and his Audiences

Henry L. Spelman, Balliol College



Faculty of Classics, University of Oxford

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classics

Trinity Term 2015

Preface

This thesis explores Pindar's relationship to his audiences. Part One demonstrates how his victory odes take into account an audience present at their premiere performance and also secondary audiences throughout space and time. It argues that getting the most out of the epinicians involves simultaneously assuming the perspectives of both their initial and subsequent audiences. Part Two describes how Pindar uses his audiences' knowledge of other lyric to situate his work both within an immanent poetic history and within a contemporary poetic culture. It sets out Pindar's vision of the literary world past and present and suggests how this framework shapes an audience's experience of his work. Part Three explains how Pindar's victory odes made lucid sense as linear unities to fifth-century Greeks imbued in the traditions of choral lyric. An annotated text shows how each sentence in the epinician corpus forms part of a coherent chain of rational discourse.

I am grateful to the Rhodes Trust, Balliol College, Oxford, Magdalen College, Oxford, and the Oxford classics faculty for financial assistance that enabled me to enjoy the luxury of spending years thinking about ancient literature with a roof over my head and food in my stomach. Professor William Race once thought it worth three hours of his week to read all of Pindar with a brash teenager who wanted to do an independent study. He also read the doctoral thesis that eventually grew from those meetings. Professor Patrick Finglass kindly agreed to supervise the first year of my doctorate and has since continued to share his sage advice and warm friendship. My supervisor, Professor Gregory Hutchinson, guided me along the road to submission with his singular erudition, insight, humour, and humanity. Without his example and support both this project and I myself would be very different and very much worse off. To these learned

scholars and generous mentors I owe inexpressible thanks. More purely personal debts, too numerous to be recorded here, have been acknowledged elsewhere in other ways.

Pindar and his Audiences

Part One. Vital Light

Introduction: **6**

I. Secondary Audiences: **14**

1. Knowledge of First Performance: **19**
2. Knowledge of External Realities: **29**
 - A. Public Matters: **2**
 - B. Private Circumstances: **34**
 - C. Mythology: **35**
3. Difficult Pleasures: **38**
4. Orality and Writing: **41**

II. Vital Light: **46**

1. Celestial Light: **48**
2. Fire: **54**
3. *Isthmian* 4: **58**

III. Event then Artefact: **72**

1. *Isthmian* 2.43-8: **74**
2. *Olympian* 10.91-6: **75**
3. Bacchylides 13.220-31: **77**
4. Pindar fr. 52o: **78**
5. *Nemean* 3.76-84: **80**
6. Bacchylides 3.90-8: **81**
7. Conclusions: **83**

IV. Temporal Perspectives: **88**

1. Time Travel: *Pythian* 1: **88**
2. The Victor's Perspective: *Nemean* 4: **93**
3. Epinician Lessons: *Pythian* 6: **97**
4. Epic Analogues: *Pythian* 3: **106**
5. Epigrammatic Interactions: *Nemean* 5: **114**
6. Interwoven Perspectives: *Nemean* 7: **123**

V. Genre and Tradition: **133**

1. Genre: **133**
 - A. Occasions and Audiences in Cultic Poetry: **136**
 - B. Permanence outside Epinician: **140**
 - i. *Paeon* 7b: **143**
 - ii. *Dithyramb* 2: **146**
 - C. Conclusions: Rhetoric and Reality: **147**
2. Tradition: **148**

- A. Alcman and Stesichorus: **150**
- B. Alcaeus and Sappho: **156**
- C. Ibycus and Anacreon: **163**
- D. Common Considerations: **166**
- E. Conclusions: Development and Continuity: **168**
- 3. Coda: **169**

Part Two. Pindar and the Lyric Tradition

Introduction: **170**

VI. The Epinician Past: **176**

- 1. Epinician Origins in History: Athletics, Ibycus, Simonides: **177**
- 2. Epinician Origins in Epinician: from Revel to Literature: **185**
 - A. *Nemean* 8: **188**
 - B. *Olympian* 10: **190**
- 3. *Olympian* 9: **196**

VII. The Epinician Present: **204**

- 1. Generic References: **204**
- 2. Auto-citations: **209**
- 3. Patrons, Communities: **216**
- 4. Other Eulogists: **221**
- 5. Epinician Revels: **226**
- 6. Conclusions: **229**
- 7. *Nemean* 6: **231**

VIII. The Lyric Past: **237**

- 1. Lyric History: **237**
- 2. Generic Enrichment: **241**
 - A. *Pythian* 2: **242**
 - B. *Pythian* 1: **243**
 - C. *Isthmian* 2: **247**
- 3. Conclusions: **254**

Part Three. Paths of Song: Linear Cohesion in Pindar

Introduction: **257**

- 1. Webs and Chains: Experiencing Pindar's Odes: **262**
- 2. Introducing the Annotated Text: **273**
 - A. Argumentative Relationships: **279**
 - i. Logical: **280**
 - ii. Narrative: **285**

- iii. Transitional: **288**
 - B. Conceptual Key: **292**
 - i. The Victor's Narrative: **292**
 - ii. Characters: **293**
 - iii. Topics of Praise: **295**
 - iv. Time: **295**
 - v. Positive and Negative: **296**
 - vi. Contrastive and Complementary Pairs: **296**
 - C. Verbal Reference: **298**
- 3. Patterns of Cohesion: **299**
 - A. Verbal Orders: **299**
 - B. Contrasts and Complements: **302**
 - C. Delayed Continuities: **303**
 - D. Asymmetries: **306**
- 4. *Isthmian* 5: **311**
- Conclusion: **322**

Bibliography

- 1. Texts: **326**
- 2. Abbreviations: **327**
- 3. Works Cited: **329**

Appendix

- Key to Abbreviations: **389**
- An Annotated Text of Pindar's Victory Odes: **390**

Part One. Vital Light

Introduction

The question of how we should interpret Pindar's epinicians as historical artefacts is intertwined with the question of what audience he addressed. The intended receiver plays a role in the interpretation of any act of communication.¹ A papyrus, for instance, forbidding anyone from entering the house of a priest has a different usefulness as evidence if we understand that it is a public sign, not a personal letter.² Pindaric scholarship since Bundy has given the poet's audience an increasingly central role. In one of the few appeals to extra-textual reality in *Studia Pindarica*, Bundy (1986) 33 programmatically states that he seeks to elucidate 'a grammar of choral style that will tell us what systems of shared symbols enabled the poet and his audience to view the odes as unified artistic wholes'. Much subsequent scholarship has focused on Pindar's original 'listening audience' (Bundy (1986) 35), but in a different way.

Alongside the rhetorical approach descending from Bundy there has developed a 'pragmatic'³ approach which emphasises the necessity of situating Greek lyric in the immediate circumstances of its initial production and reception.⁴ In the last 30 years the so-called Urbino School led by Bruno Gentili has exerted considerable influence in the study of Pindar and Greek lyric generally. Gentili's *magnum opus* (1984, incorporating earlier articles; English translation 1988) remains among the most cited works in the field. Herington (1985) brought attention to

¹ Grice (1957) 385.

² Text and photograph in Cavallo and Maehler (2008) 28-9.

³ Cf. Gentili (1990).

⁴ Fearn (2011b) 211: 'there is an ever-increasing realisation amongst scholars that epichoric conditions provide the key to a rounded understanding of choral lyric'.

non-verbal elements of performance.⁵ Calame's study of maiden choruses (1977; English translation 2001) paved the way for later works with an anthropological focus. Wolfgang Rösler's book on Alcaeus (1980) set an example for much subsequent scholarship by examining the social role of lyric among its first audiences.

The performance-oriented approach to Greek lyric, born in the 1970s and 1980s but developing threads inherent in earlier scholarship,⁶ has matured into orthodoxy.⁷ Since Simonides' Plataea elegy was published in 1992, its original performance context has received an outsize amount of attention.⁸ Caciagli's *Poeti e società* (2011) features a reference to Rösler's *Dichter und Gruppe* (1980) in the title, a foreword from Calame, and a bibliography with eleven items from Gentili. Many recent monographs on Pindar and Bacchylides make initial performance the primary focus of research. Kurke (1991) seeks to describe how epinician negotiated ideological fault lines within the victor's community. Krummen (1990) studies Pindar as 'Gelegenheitsdichtung' (1) in which 'die Gedichte selbst richten sich an ein unmittelbar anwesendes, dem Dichter bekanntes Publikum' (4). Cole (1992) 15 aspires towards 'getting at the entire experience of which these texts were once a part'. Pfeijffer (1999a) 11 holds that each epinician 'is designed to function for a specific audience at a specific moment in time'. Focusing on Aegina,

⁵ Cf. Ford (2003) 37: 'the literally unforgettable songs that we read were surrounded by an untranscribable world that we can only read (*sic*), but we must find ways to do so if we wish to unfold once again the tablets of song'.

⁶ E.g. Merkelbach (1957) 6, Fränkel (1962) 148.

⁷ Budelmann (2009b) 15: 'as scholarship in the humanities started taking a performative turn performance became the heart also of a new paradigm for Greek lyric, pioneered by Bruno Gentili and John Herington in the 1980s and dominant ever since'.

⁸ The range of answers, from Sparta, the obvious and hence most attractive solution (e.g. Pavese (1995), Bearzot (1997)), to the Black Sea (Schachter (1998), Shaw (2001)), does not bode well for the prospects of reaching a decisive answer on internal evidence. Plutarch does not seem to know where the poem was first performed (Aloni (2001) 101). Simonides' citation of Homeric precedent (11.15-28 W) suggests that assuming the perspective 'del pubblico a cui il carne era destinato' (Sbardella (2000) 9) involves taking a broad perspective. A neglected Pindaric allusion to this work militates in favour of a debut performance ἐν Σπάρτῃ (*P.* 1.77; see VIII.2.b).

Burnett (2005) 5 tries to recover ‘the pleasures taken and the influences felt as a particular audience watched each performance’. Currie (2005) interprets *Isthmian* 7 as a meditation on an unmentioned and not securely attested Theban hero cult for the war dead (205-25), which, if it did exist, was presumably not well known outside Thebes. Fearn (2007) stresses the necessity of reading ‘in context’ (1). For him, this entails presuming extensive collaboration between patron and poet to advance certain ideological interests (22-3). The undated Bacchylides 15, conjectured to have been performed at the Panathenaia, is interpreted as a meditation on Athenian ideology and the tyrannicide during the Panathenaic procession of 514 BCE, evoked through some highly specific Homeric intertexts (315-23). Kowalzig (2007) 8 studies cultic lyric ‘as a form of social practice operating in the here and now’. She studies the grain trade to gain new insight into *Paean* 6 (222). Neumann-Hartmann (2009) attempts to ascertain the original performance setting of every epinician. Scholars, positioning their work as a development of a novel school of thought, perhaps sometimes overstate or overestimate the importance of the central tenants of that school.

It is significant that the last paragraph contains several quotes from introductions like this one.⁹ A certain view of Pindar’s audience is sometimes taken as a point of departure, not a proposition requiring substantive argumentation. Part One puts forward a different understanding of Pindar’s audiences and their importance to his work. This introduction sketches some problems facing the performance-oriented approach and then addresses the question of how Pindaric epinician related to its public.

⁹ Cf. Calame (2001) 9: early Greek lyric ‘assumes a definite social function and can only be understood by reference to the circumstances of its creation’; the first words of Stehle (1997) 1: ‘like love, Greek poetry was not for hereafter but shared in the present’; Caciagli (2014) 57: ‘individuare il contesto performativo di un carme della Grecia arcaica è decisivo per l’interpretazione del suo contenuto’. If this is true in a strong sense, it entails that we would be able to reach a ‘decisive’ interpretation of the content of a fairly small minority of Pindar’s odes.

Many recent works study Pindar ‘in context’. As Most (1994) 132 writes, ‘in the most general terms, interpretation is nothing other than recontextualisation’. Scholars have extensively studied various political and performative contexts behind Pindar’s poems but have neglected the context of poetry itself as a historically-situated cultural practice. A focus on immediate contexts of performance and production can occlude larger contexts of literary¹⁰ culture as a broadly shared practice.¹¹ This context shaped the experience of various audiences to at least an equal degree and is more easily recoverable through available evidence. We can say a great deal about the literary culture behind Pindar’s poems because Pindar has a great deal to say on the subject.¹² Studying Pindar’s poems within a literary culture rather than the immediate circumstances of their production and reception may lead one to different and incompatible conclusions.

The performance-oriented school tends to operate with a more or less explicit conception of large-scale literary history. Early lyric is often emplotted¹³ in narratives tracing the rise of ‘book poetry’ from older, less familiar poetry that ‘realised its primary function in actual life rather than in what we mean by literature’ (Fraenkel (1957) 30).¹⁴ Such stories contain some truth,

¹⁰ Zwaan (1993) ch. 1 gives a history of the concept of literariness. I use ‘literary’ and ‘literature’ in the quotidian honourific sense (cf. *OED* s.v. literature 3b) but do not thereby mean to insist on the importance of writing (cf. I.4).

¹¹ Cf. Feeney (1998) 141: ‘we must beware of making those other contexts “primary” and “real”, with literature “secondary” and “unreal”; for literature is itself, so to speak, another context’; cf. Davis (1991) 6.

¹² Bowra (1964) 1: ‘no Greek poet says so much as Pindar about his art’. Many poetological metaphors and tropes common in later authors trace their way back ultimately (at least for us) to Pindar (F. Cairns (1984) 96, 106).

¹³ For the terminology see White (1987).

¹⁴ E.g. Bernardini (1983) 39, discussing Gentili: ‘una svolta nell’interpretazione della poesia pindarica si è avuta quando l’epinicio è stato studiato non più alla stregua di un componimento poetico concepito per la lettura, ma come un’opera destinata alla pubblica *performance* di fronte ad un uditorio predisposto all’ascolto’.

but also some distortion.¹⁵ Scholars focus on the performance occasions of early lyric in part because this is perceived as a feature differentiating such texts from later poetry which imagines a fictionalised occasion (e.g. Callimachus *Hymns* 2, Catullus 61);¹⁶ scholars underestimate the degree to which Pindar's occasions are fictionalised. Unlike book poetry, the story goes, early lyric addresses a definite, immediate audience, not an indefinite public; scholars neglect Pindar's indefinite secondary audiences. Pindar presents his own immanent literary history (see Part Two). Already he looks back to the vanished, simpler days of unmediated face-to-face performance.¹⁷ The implication is that he is doing something very different.¹⁸

At present there is a salubrious if somewhat predictable movement in scholarship towards emphasising performative aspects of 'book' poetry and looking beyond the first performance of 'performative' poetry (cf. Budelmann (2011) 15-16).¹⁹ This thesis may be viewed as part of a trend over the last decade or so to forefront the importance of subsequent reception for our understanding of Pindar's odes.²⁰ This project is distinguished in part by an attempt to place a cer-

¹⁵ Cameron (1995) 72 speaks of a tendency to 'romanticize the otherness' of archaic poetry (similarly Morrison (2007b) 37-8, Feeney (2009) 225-6); cf. the first words of Gentili (1988) 3: 'Greek poetry differed profoundly from modern poetry'; the title of Kurke (2000): 'The strangeness of "song culture"'. Williams (1993) 1-4 discusses the rhetorical approaches of familiarising or exoticising antiquity; cf. Taplin (1978) 7-8.

¹⁶ E.g. Rösler (1980b, 1983, 1984, 1990), Bulloch (1985) 3-13, Hopkinson (1984) 32-43, Bing (1993) 190; contrast Feeney (1998) 38-44, Barchiesi (2009) 422-3. The passage which Rösler (1983) selects from all of Hellenistic and Roman poetry to illustrate the supposed gulf between 'performative' and 'book' poetry, Hor. *Carm.* 1.19.13-16, may in fact evoke an archaic model, perhaps Anacreon: θύω[με]ν Ἀφροδ[ίτη] (P. Mich. Inv. 3498+3250b recto col. ii.13; see Borges and Sampson (2012) with Henry *apud* Bernsdorff (2014) 10 for the correct reading). If true, this might be thought indicative of larger problems with Rösler's thesis.

¹⁷ See VI.3 on *Olympian* 10 and VIII.2.C on *Isthmian* 2.

¹⁸ Cf. Bundy (1972) 87n108: 'there have always been and always will be neoterics'.

¹⁹ Cf. two recent conferences: 'Textual Events' (Oxford, 2015); 'Drama and Performance in Hellenistic Poetry' (Groningen, 2015).

²⁰ I use the more inclusive 'reception' rather than the more standard but potentially misleading 're-performance' to describe how a poem may be remembered as a poem after its debut performance. A work that enjoys a lasting reception may be described as 'traditional'.

tain conception of Pindar's historical audience at the centre of the literary interpretation of his work.

Whereas historicism before Bundy often introduced or invented an external datum to elucidate a problematic text (cf. Most (1985a) 30),²¹ newer arguments with a historical bent often posit a supplementary meaning beyond the lucid surface of the text (cf. Kurke (1991) 10, Pfeijffer (1999a) 5). Thus Pavlou (2010a) interprets *O.* 3.44-3 as simultaneously a *topos* and an allusion to an architectural motif of the Atlantes from a temple in Acragas. Arguments about specific circumstances surrounding the odes often face problems of overdetermination. Bury (1892), for example, explains the imperfect πέμπεν (*I.* 2.16) by positing that the Delphic officials sent a crown commemorating an earlier victory to Xenocrates, who died before it reached him. The imperfect would be intelligible against this background, but it is not licit to infer this background from the imperfect. In Greek, the imperfect where one might expect an aorist is idiomatic with verbs of sending.²² Bury's interpretation is not impossible but it does not have adequate support. Much the same may be said of Bornemann's (1885) thesis that Sogenes, the honorand of *Nemean* 7, died of sunstroke. Similar objections may be brought against Fearn's (2011) 201 contention that the end of *Nemean* 7 may be 'a statement that the Euxenidae have an excellent working relationship with Neoptolemos and his north-western associates, unlike some other Aeginetan rivals'. Pindar's odes may have communicated in esoteric ways with their first audiences, but it often proves difficult to show convincingly that they do so in specific cases. Simpler explanations often lie to hand.

The problem with many learned attempts to recover specific circumstances is not that their particular conclusions are demonstrably false but rather that they are not sufficiently likely

²¹ Consider Farnell (1930-2) iii.127 on χαῖρε at *P.* 2.67.

²² Svennson (1930) 68-77, Schwyzler (1934-71) 260-2, Hummel (1993) 240.

to be true or are too fragile to inspire confidence.²³ Kurke (2007) 65 takes ‘an imaginative reconstruction’ of the performance context of the second *Partheneion* as the subject for a 40-page article which draws heavily on indirect evidence roughly a millennium younger than Pindar and includes some dicey reconstruction of a fragmentary text. As ‘imaginative’ suggests, such detailed reconstruction based on a sparse historical record is very difficult.

More promising approaches are available. Some historically oriented studies focus not on specific circumstances but rather on broader ideological structures which united Pindar and his audiences.²⁴ I pursue a related method. A historically inflected study of Pindar’s relationship to his various audiences can help explain why a rhetorical approach, sometimes labelled ahistorical, has such robust explanatory power, which is widely acknowledged in theory and still more widely acknowledged in practice. The long history of Pindaric scholarship may be characterised in large part as an ongoing debate between formalists and contextualists;²⁵ a study of Pindar’s formal rhetoric within a broad historical context may escape this dichotomy and break new ground.²⁶

Besides conceptual problems with the approach to Pindar’s audience inherent in some recent scholarship, there is also the question of its fundamental accuracy. According to Pfeijffer (1999a) 10, ‘the impact of a Pindaric ode on subsequent audiences can be compared to a pebble that is thrown into a pond, causing concentric circles of rippling water, the intensity of which decreases the further away one gets from the centre’. Here the research programme is determined:

²³ Cf. Perkins (1992) 146-7.

²⁴ E.g. Kurke (1991) ch. 7, Fearn (2007) ch. 3.

²⁵ See Young (1970) for the standard account, now supplemented to a certain extent by Patten (2009).

²⁶ Cf. Fearn (2013) 231: ‘the contextualizing manoeuvre involves a drive towards specificity, in terms of sensitivity to the specifics of individual times and places’. There is no necessary connection between contextualisation and specificity.

the scholar's task is to return as far as possible to the moment of first performance— perhaps fifteen minutes around 2,500 years ago. Such an approach misconstrues Pindar's orientation toward his audiences. It not only attributes insufficient weight to secondary audiences but also occludes how first and subsequent audiences' awareness of other perspectives constitutes a vital part of how these poems worked and still work in a variety of settings. The interplay between performance and reception that has occupied some recent scholarship also interested the poet. While many scholars posit a fundamental divide between first and subsequent audiences, Pindar makes his various audiences acutely aware of one another. The interaction between their views is fundamental to the odes' economy of meaning. Scholars situate Pindar's poems in a specific time and place; he worked to make his poems travel through space and time. Attempts to understand what an ode meant in one particular time and place must take this into account.

Chapter I lays the groundwork for what follows by showing how Pindar's epinicians, despite being occasional poetry, take into account audiences beyond their first performance. Chapter II explores an unnoticed distinction within one of Pindar's most pervasive conceits, light representing poetry and fame, to bring out the Janus-faced nature of Pindar's epinicians as both events and artefacts. Chapter III examines how epinicians thematise and trace their own journey from unrepeatable event to perpetuated poem. Chapter IV describes ways in which the viewpoints of different audiences contribute to the meaning of Pindar's poems. Finally, Chapter V expands the scope of inquiry beyond epinician to the rest of Pindar's oeuvre and to earlier lyric.

I. Secondary Audiences

Regarding the early reception and textual history of Pindar's epinicians the first thing to know is that comparatively little is known.²⁷ Discussions of archaic dissemination often proceed on the basis of a meagre historical record or on a comparative, theoretical plane. The former approach sometimes assigns substantial weight to later anecdotes of dubious provenience and questionable probative value. The latter approach sometimes draws parallels with other societies that exhibit enough variety amongst themselves to undermine confidence in the method.

The scant external evidence for Pindar's early reception has been repeatedly sifted since Irigoin (1952) and Herington (1985). More may be said about how the texts themselves anticipate and elicit an extended reception. Pindar's poems provide the most direct evidence for the nature of his audience. We do not have better evidence for the circulation of poetry in this period than four papyrus rolls' worth of poetry discussing its circulation. As in other matters, our first principle here should be Πίνδαρον ἐκ Πινδάρου σαφηνίζειν.²⁸

The fact that Pindar frequently, coherently, and confidently discusses his own reception²⁹ is strong evidence that he envisioned a wide diffusion and lasting afterlife for his poetry. Whatever else it might be, an epinician is an attempt to persuade the largest possible audience that this poem should be remembered and the victory thereby glorified. δόξαν ... περικίμβροτον (B. 9.1-2) captures something essential about the genre. Poetic immortality is a key theme that is central to the logic of many odes. Pindar may exaggerate, but to be effective rhetoric his exaggerations

²⁷ Irigoin (1952) 1-27 remains fundamental. See further Herington (1985) 41-57, Nagy (1990) 114-5, 411-12, Carey (1995) 85-90, Loscalzo (2003) 2-18, Currie (2004), Morrison (2012).

²⁸ Gildersleeve *apud* R. L. Fowler (1984) 116.

²⁹ E.g. O. 9.21-7, N. 5.1-6, I. 4.40-5. Many common metaphors surrounding poetry stress durability and the ability to travel (cf. Svenbro (1976) 187-212, Steiner (1986) 122-35, Ford (2002) ch. 4 and 5, Calame (2012)).

must be grounded in reality.³⁰ We should be cautious in drawing inferences about the real world from the text-world of his poems, but it would be wrongheaded to separate the two categorically.³¹ These poems do not belong entirely to a dream world.³² Patron and poet had pragmatic reasons to hope that compositions bearing their names and reputations would prove popular and durable (compare and contrast R. Thomas (2007) 166). The context of a literary culture that remembers and values poems, to which Pindar refers time and again, is more likely to have in fact existed than many of the other, more specific contexts that have been conjectured on the basis of posited indirect allusions.

Pindar's oft-expressed hopes to immortalise his subject should be taken seriously. If his poems do not seem suited to accomplishing this self-described goal, it may be that we should revise our assumptions about how poems won dissemination rather than discounting our best evidence for dissemination.

Other internal evidence supports an approach that takes account of a layered audience. Pindar views earlier poets as absorbed in the praise (*I.* 2.1-5) and blame (*P.* 2.54-6) of their contemporaries but creating works intelligible to and valued by later generations and indeed *intending* to have their works be so valued (*I.* 4.39; the infinitive is final). He may have understood his own poetry in an analogous way. The geographical distribution of Pindar's commissions, from Abdera to Africa, from Rhodes to Acragas, suggests that a widespread reputation preceded him during his lifetime. This point of pride is reflected within his work (e.g. *O.* 1.116; cf. *Ibyc.* S151.47-8). Pindar sometimes takes his present theme from geographically diverse potential commissions (*P.* 1.75-80, *I.* 1.1-10, 5.26-35). His far-flung attested commissions trump even the

³⁰ Carey (2007) 209: 'the aspiration was sufficiently plausible to prompt commissions'.

³¹ Cf. Feeney (2009) 18 on Horace's depiction of his own reception.

³² Burnett (1985) 78 sees Pindar's references to future fame as related to a certain 'daimonic success-magic'.

itineraries of the athletes whom he celebrates. It is reasonable to posit that in commissioning a Pindaric victory ode patrons sought a new iteration of a known product (as is suggested by *O.* 1.116; cf. Fearn (2007) 82, 156). The very shape of Pindar's career is perhaps unthinkable without the context of a broadly shared literary culture in which poems travel far past their debut performance and last long past their first utterance.

The epinician genre, like its dialect, was not the property of any single community, but stemmed from and constituted a living Hellenic tradition. As the Theban Pindar and the Cean Bacchylides draw on essentially the same linguistic heritage (on which see now Maslov (2013)), so they depend on a shared language of convention to communicate with a broad audience versed in the generic tradition (see Part Three). Differences between poems, however, are as telling as similarities. Despite fundamental congruencies between the subjects celebrated and the themes treated in extant epinician, among approximately 60 surviving specimens no two Pindaric or Bacchylidean victory odes narrate the same myth at length.³³ This suggests that patrons and poets were aware of previous compositions and desired a singular memorial. A contrast with Archilochus' proto-epinician, appropriate for every victory (*O.* 9.1-12 with C 1a), shows that uniqueness was consciously prized (cf. *O.* 3.4-5, 9.48-9, *N.* 8.20, *I.* 5.62; contrast the ready-made lyric at Ar. *Av.* 905-10). The uniform metrical diversity of the corpus supports this hypothesis (see p. 58n175 on *Isthmian* 3 and 4). On the smallest scale, a remarkable dearth of substantive

³³ Genre seems important. The myths of *Nemean* 7 and *Paeon* 6 (see Erbse (1999)) and also of *Nemean* 1 and fr. 52u (see Bona (1988) 291-6) are far more similar than those of any two extant epinicians. Note also B. 5 and Pind. fr. 249a. Pindar can contradict older versions of myths (see e.g. Griffith (1990)), but there is an internal consistency between his own myths that looks deliberate. Note e.g. ἀρχαῖοι κάματι πὰρ Πέλοπος (*O.* 10.24), looking to πολυξενωτάτοι παρὰ βομῶι (*O.* 1.93), composed for victories in the same Olympiad.

verbal repetition in the Pindaric corpus³⁴ reinforces the impression of an artist conscious of a body of work and at pains not to repeat himself. ‘In constructing a particular poem, Pindar is also keenly aware of his other poems’ (Race (1990) 187).

It seems that at least some among Pindar’s public were also expected to be familiar with works first performed in various locations. *I.* 1.3-10 refers to the interrupted composition of a paean for the Ceans. In all likelihood we know the finished composition as *Paeon* 4.³⁵ This poem, like the prologue of *Isthmian* 1, deals with the power of proprietary affection for one’s homeland. The extended treatment of this theme is not common in Pindar and Bacchylides. It is hard not to suppose that these two poems are meant to be interpreted together. Indeed, Pindar encourages his audience to do so. ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων cὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος (*I.* 1.6)³⁶ suggests a substantial relationship between two works. Unless one supposes that Pindar played a strange sort of intertextual solitaire, it follows that some among his audiences were expected to be familiar both with an epinician performed in Thebes and a paean performed on Ceos.³⁷

A range of evidence suggests that Pindar’s odes took account of secondary audiences. Would such audiences have cared about, appreciated, and understood his occasional poetry? The crucial question is to what degree extra-textual factors inevitably lost after first performance in fact are, as Cole (1992) 13 asserts, an ‘essential ingredient in the success of any Greek victory

³⁴ ὥς ἄρ’ αὐδάσαντος (*N.* 10.89 = *P.* 4.232, both at line beginning); μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι (*O.* 11.4 = *P.* 3.64, both at line end). The former is an exception that proves the rule: it illustrates how readily a colourless phrase fits into Pindar’s common dactylo-epitritic rhythm. Such phrases capping character speech are among the most rigidly formulaic elements of *epos*. In Bacchylides note δι|ν]ᾶντα φοινίξει|ν Cκ]άμανδρ|ον (13.164-5 = 27.36). Some Pindaric verbal repetitions look like pointed auto-allusions (e.g. *O.* 1.1-7 and 3.42-5 with Morrison (2007a) 87, Clay (2011) 341; *N.* 5.1 and *I.* 2.45; *Pae.* 7b.18-20 and 9.1-4).

³⁵ Cf. Grenfell and Hunt (1908) 18, Privitera (1982) 9, D’Alessio (1994) 64, I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 284.

³⁶ For earlier poets’ auto-citations see Hubbard (1991) 40, Spelman (2014a) 61n59.

³⁷ *Paeon* 4 performed on Ceos, not Delos: Grenfell and Hunt (1908) 18, I. C. Rutherford (2000) 609-10, (2001) 292-3 (*pace* Käppel (1992) 146, Fearn (2011) 228-31).

ode’.

We require a definition of epinician success, which Cole does not provide. Any assertion of ‘the’ purpose of Pindar’s poetry is likely to be reductive and certain to be controversial,³⁸ but among the most frequently stated goals of his epinicians is to transcend the circumstances of initial performance and become a lasting memorial.³⁹ Are the odes built to succeed at this self-described task? As D’Alessio (2009a) 117 writes, discussing early lyric generally, ‘the fact itself that the poems have been preserved suggests that in most cases the texts that have survived were capable of “working” in more than one context’ (cf. D’Alessio (2007) 96). The documented interest in Pindar’s epinicians from the fifth century onwards is the best evidence for their robust capabilities as instruments of memorialisation.⁴⁰ The ability of the genre to interest those distant from its first performances is a datum in need of explanation, not a theory requiring proof.

Looking more closely at the texts, one can see how Pindar’s epinicians anticipate and accommodate various audiences. The following sections examine types of knowledge necessary for understanding the poems: first, knowledge of debut performance contexts; secondly, knowledge of external data including public events, private circumstances, and mythological traditions. The

³⁸ E.g. Crotty (1982) 106: ‘the purpose of the epinicians is to secure a proper reception of the victor upon his return to the community’.

³⁹ Some pragmatic goals were doubtless dependent on literary success. Psaumis probably sought power in Camarina (cf. *O.* 4.16, 5.13-14, where he is the subject in a passage dedicated to his praise; see Mader (1990)). Through Pindar’s work he perhaps aimed to advance his interests by establishing his fledgling city’s reputation abroad (*O.* 4.10-12; cf. *N.* 10.39-42). Pindar perhaps earnestly wanted to make Hippocleas more attractive to others (*P.* 10.55-9), but he aimed to do so through a good poem (57). *Pythian* 4, exceptional in many respects, prominently incorporates a political objective into the text (263-99). But probably the reconciliation had already been brokered and was subsequently commemorated (Gildersleeve (1885) 278, Carey (1980a) 148, Braswell (1988) 360). The final lines imagine Damophilus fulfilling his hopes of returning to Cyrene and delivering Pindar’s poem (298-9). Compare votive plaques that by their very existence attest to the success of the prayer which they record (see Lazzarini (1976) 352-6).

⁴⁰ Comedy: Kugelmeier (1996) 41-4, Carey (2011) 457-60, Agócs (2013); tragedy: Bagordo (2003) 166-218, Swift (2010) 112-14, Carey (2012); fifth-century inscriptions: Bernardini (2000) 36; Hellenistic poetry: Fuhrer (1992), Kampakoglou (2013).

conclusion emerges that knowledge available to debut audiences but unavailable to secondary audiences is largely inessential for understanding and appreciating Pindar's poetry.⁴¹

1. Knowledge of First Performance

The painter's vision in not a lens ...

...

Yet why not say what happened?

– Robert Lowell, *Epilogue*

'In its longevity, song outweighs the revel' (Bundy (1986) 2n9). But song also carries the revel into the future. Pindar's epinicians are occasional poetry. Unlike bardic epic, which in a sense is never the first iteration of its traditional theme,⁴² epinician presents itself as the record of a unique, unrepeatable occasion, which will be remembered as such.⁴³ The 'occasion' is less victory and more the choral celebration of victory. This moment features prominently. Occasionality is characteristic of lyric from Alcman onwards, but this genealogical explanation should not occlude how important occasionality is to the aesthetics of Pindar's poems, which are imbued by the vivid charms of specificity and urgency. Their occasion 'has acquired so permanent a form that, even without being realised or understood, it is still part of the total meaning' (Gadamer (1975) 125).

To a high degree, however, the occasion *is* capable of being realised and understood by secondary audiences (cf. I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 175-8). Descriptions of performance function

⁴¹ Contrast Krummen (1990) 4: 'der Sprechende macht sich eine bestimmte Vortstellung vom Wissen des Gesprächspartners, auf dessen Hintergrund er argumentiert. Es ist dieses "Wissen", das der Leser Pindars teilen muß, um die Gedichte zu verstehen'.

⁴² Cf. εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν (*Od.* 1.10), Bakker (1993b) 11, Tsagalis (2011) 225.

⁴³ Day (1994) 40-1 discusses epinician as a reactivation of its occasion but overestimates the ritual element.

not merely as transparent windows onto reality but rather as meaningful parts of a composition. ‘Because that is what actually happened’ is never an adequate explanation of why the text describes its own first performance. *Nemean* 1, for example, was presumably performed outside Chromius’ house, but this does not explain why the speaker says as much (19-20; cf. *N.* 9.2-3). The celebratory feast to be enjoyed inside Chromius’ house immediately following performance⁴⁴ substantiates praise of his generosity (22-4). This feast also connects with a closing mention of the celebratory feast, marking his attainment of immortality, which Herakles enjoyed in Zeus’s house (72 with Slater (1981) 206, (1984) 240-53, Dickie (1984) 88). The occasion of performance, drawn into the poem, is transmuted from ephemeral event into a symbol of attained permanence. This could stand for the role of the occasion in all Pindaric epinician.

References to performance are frequent and detailed enough to mark it as a memorable event and a part of the meaning of the ode, but not so obtrusive or opaque so as to constitute a grave obstacle to the involvement and understanding of secondary audiences. Pervasive ambiguity and vagueness about setting, execution, and speaking voice may be explained through an orientation toward secondary audiences.⁴⁵ ‘If the epinician ode is not itself pre-programmed for oblivion, its choral performance unavoidably is’ (Power (2000) 17). Unregulated, organic re-performances⁴⁶ probably took various forms, most if not all without a full choral accompaniment

⁴⁴ κεκόσμηται (22, perfect) implies readiness.

⁴⁵ Cf. K. A. Morgan (1993) 12, Nagy (1994) 19-20, Aloni (1998) 89, Carey (2007) 199, Morrison (2007a) 44, Agócs (2012) 119-20, and, more generally, Calame (2004, 2012).

⁴⁶ Descriptions of the reception of poems and their themes sometimes deploy verbs and participles which convey continued, unpredictable motion: cf. e.g. ἀμφιπέληται (*Od.* 1.352 with Biles (2003) 196), βλητρίζοντες (Xenophanes 8.2), στρωφωμένος (Thgn. 247), ἔρπει (*I.* 4.40), στρωφᾶται (B. 13.180).

of music and dance.⁴⁷ The texts seldom describe such activity.⁴⁸ The fact that scholars have hypothesised (albeit incorrectly) that the epinicians were performed by a soloist, not a chorus, evinces the relative unimportance of chorality.⁴⁹ References to the voice of poet and performers, in a sense re-activated in every act of reception,⁵⁰ greatly outnumber references to dance. At a basic level, the created world of epinician imagery is more vivid, absorbing, varied, and pervasive than the ‘real’ world of performance (cf. Hutchinson (2012)).

Pindar’s epinicians neither transmit nor presume extensive knowledge of their first performance. There are no explicit appeals to deixis *ad oculos*⁵¹ like those found in poems addressing imagined or real spectators.⁵² There is no epinician passage in which seeing its performers’ actions would clearly advance in great measure our understanding of the poet’s words— although a video of the first performance of *Nemean* 5 might help us choose more confidently between φέρε (Wilamowitz, convincingly) and φέρειν (MSS) in line 54.

Some data seem to be provided exclusively for secondary audiences. It is difficult to believe that information like performance location is provided for the benefit of first audiences (cf. Currie (2012) 288). Deictic phrases like ‘this city’, virtually an epinician formula (Bundy (1986) 23n53), always follow and never precede more explicit, clearer denominations of performance

⁴⁷ Cf. Hubbard (2004) 86-9, Morrison (2011) 232-3. It is easy to imagine why certain vested interests might want a choral re-performance, but no firm evidence for the phenomenon survives (cf. Currie (2004) 63-5, (2011) 58, Hubbard (2004) 75-80).

⁴⁸ Herington (1985) 29: ‘somewhat surprisingly, the Pindaric texts present ... only the vaguest picture of the singer-dancers themselves’.

⁴⁹ Heath (1988), Lefkowitz (1988), Heath and Lefkowitz (1991), Lefkowitz (1995). I am not aware of any active Pindaric scholar who subscribes to the soloist theory.

⁵⁰ Cf. *P.* 10.55-6: Ἐφουραίῳ | ὄπ’ ἀμφὶ Πηνειὸν γλυκεῖαν προχέοντων ἐμάν.

⁵¹ See Danielewicz (1990), Bonifazi (2000) 35-41, (2004a), Felson (2004b). D’Alessio (2007) shows that deictic words are far more frequent in drama than in lyric.

⁵² ἦ οὐχ ὀρήϊς; (*Alcm.* 1.50; cf. Peponi (2004)); αὐγάζδεο (anon. 870 PMG, Spartan *trichoria*); ἦν ἰδοῦ (*Pratinas* 708.14); οὐχ ὀράαις; (*Callim. Hy.* 2.4); *videne* ... ? (*Catull.* 61.77).

location.⁵³ Did the Aeginetans who first heard *Isthmian* 6 need to be told that Pindar meant Αἴγιναν (8) by τάνδ' ... νᾶcov (21)? Because the epinician occasion is largely stereotyped, constructing the text-world of performance depends more on knowledge of genre than on knowledge of unique events.⁵⁴ When, for example, one reads that a chorus has 'arrived' in honour of Psaumis (*O.* 4.10), the question 'where from?' is not appropriate. Choruses conventionally arrive to perform as if responding to events (Burnett (1998) 496, 501). They need not have a clearly defined origin (e.g. *Alcm.* 3.8, *Pind. Parth.* 2.39-41, *B. fr.* 15, *Eur. HF* 107-11).

The text-world of epinician cannot be straightforwardly identified with the real world,⁵⁵ though the two were related in ways which we cannot recover.⁵⁶ Many descriptions of performance cannot be treated as straightforwardly factual;⁵⁷ some are transparently fictional.⁵⁸ Discussion surrounding the epinician speaker has largely moved away from unmasking the 'I' to unpacking rhetoric.⁵⁹ The analysis of performance should likewise shift away from unmasking realities and toward interpreting representations. If we stop looking to the texts simply to reflect the real world, we might see deeper into the world that they create.

A literal-minded approach to the sending and arrival motifs, for instance, has hampered un-

⁵³ *O.* 5.20, 8.25, 13.27, *P.* 8.99, 9.91, *N.* 3.68, 7.83, *I.* 5.22, 6.21, 65. On 'denomination' see de Jong (1993).

⁵⁴ Cf. Werth (1999) 96-106 on sorts of knowledge necessary for building a text-world. I invoke the idea of text-worlds to avoid the pitfalls of a strong dichotomy between truth and fiction. Gavins (2007) provides an introduction to the concept.

⁵⁵ Contrast e.g. Sotiriou (2013).

⁵⁶ Rösler (1983, 1990) argues for a strong coincidence of text and reality in archaic lyric; contrast D'Alessio (2004) 269.

⁵⁷ Similarly K. A. Morgan (1993) 3, Agócs (2012) 192.

⁵⁸ Consider *O.* 1.17-18 (with D'Alessio (2004) 285), 5.10, 8.9-10, *P.* 5.103-5, *N.* 3.3-5, 9.1-5, 50-1, 10.21-2, *I.* 8.1-4; cf. *Alcm.* 3.7-9. Nagy (1994) 19: 'only an open-ended series of actual occasions could provide all the features of an absolutised occasion'. But there has probably been no occasion on which the speaker of *Olympian* 1 took his lyre from its peg *after* beginning his song.

⁵⁹ J. M. Bremer (1990) 45, D'Alessio (1994), K. A. Morgan (1994), Schmid (1998), Currie (2013).

derstanding. Earlier scholars drafted for Pindar itineraries around the Mediterranean based on his claim to have ‘arrived’ various places. This approach has fallen from favour, with reason. In one poem Pindar claims both to ‘arrive’ with his work and to ‘send’ his work from afar: ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων | μέλος ἔρχομαι (*P.* 2.3-4); τόδε ... μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἀλὸς πέμπεται (67-8). These parallel meta-textual descriptions framing the main body of the poem are intended to be related (cf. Most (1985a) 69). It is artificial, however, to chop logic to achieve coherence (Barrett (2007) 59). The statements have their normal and mutually contradictory meaning.⁶⁰

Many have tried to untangle fiction from reality. No one, to my knowledge, has observed that the arrival motif, stressing the speaker’s presence, is typically connected with Pindar’s poetic task as it relates to personal and religious relationships⁶¹ while the sending motif, stressing the separateness of author from performance, is typically connected with Pindar *qua* celebrated professional poet.⁶² Thus in *Pythian* 2 he brings his work as a dedication to Syracuse (note τέμενος, 2) but sends it as merchandise (ἐμπολάν, 67).

So far from being transparent windows onto reality, Pindar’s epinicians can be interested in conveying false impressions. ‘These poems are clearly concerned with tricking us’ (Lefkowitz (1995) 142; cf. Cole (1987)). *P.* 2.5-12 suggests that Hieron piloted his own victorious chariot. This is highly unlikely (cf. *I.* 1.15 with Privitera (1982)). Audiences probably understood these lines as a conventional fiction and did not think that Hieron piloted his own chariot any more

⁶⁰ *Pace* Tedeschi (1985), the fullest discussion. A λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου attributes lines 3-4 to the chorus or the poem itself. But epigrams speak; epinicians do not. Epinician choruses, as far as we can tell, always come from the victor’s community (e.g. *O.* 6.7, *I.* 8.1), never from Pindar’s Thebes (ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν, *P.* 2.3), which is often associated with him *qua* poet (*O.* 6.84-7, 10.85, *P.* 4.299, *I.* 1.1, 6.74-5, 8.16-16a). πέμπεται (*P.* 2.68) is unlikely to mean ‘is being escorted (by me)’. The next line wishes for reception in the future as if it is to take place in the speaker’s absence.

⁶¹ Arrival motif: *O.* 4.2, 5.19, 7.13, 9.83-4, 13.96-7, *P.* 2.4, *N.* 4.73-5, 7.69, *I.* 6.57-8, *Pae.* 6.7-11, *Parth.* 2.39-41.

⁶² Sending motif: *O.* 7.8, 9.25, *P.* 2.68, *N.* 3.77, *I.* 5.63, fr. 124; cf. *P.* 4.298-9, *I.* 2.45-8.

than they thought that Artemis personally assisted him in preparing it. Without embarrassment Pindar elsewhere describes the king Arcesilas as ἀρματηλάτας κοφός (115) and also describes at length the skill of his actual charioteer (26-53; cf. *I.* 2.17-22).⁶³

Pindar's realism is a literary strategy and must be so interpreted. ἀλλὰ Δωρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου | λάμβαν' (17-18) is patently fictional: the song has already begun;⁶⁴ it was probably first uttered by a chorus, not a soloist with a lyre (cf. Eckerman (2011b)). 'If the poet says "Go and catch a falling star" or whatever it may be, he doesn't seriously issue an order' (Austin (1962) 104). 'Take down the lyre', however, is importantly different from 'go and catch a star'. The former gives the impression of a real event; the latter is extravagantly fantastical.

Pindar's realism sometimes elicits excessive literalism.⁶⁵ This can obscure his artifice. Of *N.* 9.50-5 Clay (1999) 31 writes that 'Pindar's dramatic depiction of a symposium in progress gains immeasurably if we find ourselves indeed at the very occasion so vividly described. Chroomius' silver cups, brimming with wine, are really in our hands as we listen to Pindar's song'. Scholars may soberly disagree about how much a cup of wine increases one's appreciation of *Nemean* 9; experimentation is encouraged. Yet probably there were never enough commemorative silver cups for the hospitable Hieron's many guests (ἀναπεπταμέναι ξείνων νενίκανται θύραι, 2; cf. *N.* 1.19-24).⁶⁶ In any event, a literalist approach to performance flattens out this poem. Emphasis on a real event 'in progress' draws attention away from the 'inscriptional' ποθ' (52 with Braswell (1999)) focalised from the perspectives of subsequent audiences. The realistic closing symposium, moreover, is the goal of an imaginary revel, parasitic on the real spontane-

⁶³ Cf. Nicholson (2005) 25-6, who notes our passage as an exceptional instantiation of a general trend to minimise the role of the charioteer.

⁶⁴ Cf. Alc. 346, Anacr. 356, 396, presumably performed at symposia in progress, not beginning.

⁶⁵ Neumann-Hartmann (2009b) and Eckerman (2012) undermine literal readings of particular tropes.

⁶⁶ Cf. Carey (2007) 205.

ous revel at the site of the games (Κικυωνόθε, 1) that began with the beginning of the poem (Κωμάκομεν, 1; cf. Carey (1993) 105-6). This epinician is thus at once a spontaneous revel, a processional song (1-3), a sympotic song with poet presiding as symposiarch (50),⁶⁷ and a literary artefact always already viewed from the future. Adding yet another layer of nuance, Pindar creates a speaking situation *before* first performance:⁶⁸ the last words of the poem look forward to its first utterance (53-5). If we focus on real cups we might miss what is really going on.

In looking to recover details about performance context from the epinicians we must be conscious that we are looking to extract information which the texts are not reliably concerned to transmit. It is significant that those who seek to reconstruct performance contexts habitually end in uncertainty.⁶⁹ Contexts of performance are more difficult to recover than is sometimes supposed. Krummen (1990) argues that *Isthmian* 4 debuted at the festival that it describes (61-8). This hypothesis is unnecessary and perhaps false.⁷⁰ *O.* 3.35 leads Krummen (1990) 223 to read that poem as part of a festival of *theoxenia*. The following line undermines the best evidence for this argument: ταύταν ἑορτάν (34) is the Olympic games.⁷¹ It is not clear that *Pythian* 5 was, as Krummer (1990) argues, performed as part of the Carneia in Cyrene.⁷²

⁶⁷ See Lyne (2007) 317-19.

⁶⁸ Cf. D'Alessio (2004) 284-5.

⁶⁹ Currie (2005) 17: 'the interpretation is nearly always controversial'.

⁷⁰ D'Alessio (1994) 123n19, Ferrari (2000) 229-30, Carey (2007) 202. The present-tense verbs of *I.* 4.62-8 suggest recurrent action (ἐτερίων ... ἀέθλων, 67), not action coterminous with performance (contrast Alc. 130b.18-20, Neumann-Hartmann (2009a) 57). Other poems end with mention of past local victories (*Nemean* 5, *Olympian* 7, 9). *O.* 7.73-82 is a very close parallel for the sequence of myth to cult to victory in local games tied to that cult.

⁷¹ Cf. Köhnken (1983) 59n44, Sheldermine (1987) 79, Verdenius (1987-88); contrast Robbins (1984). Heracles' ancient return from the Istrian land to Pisa parallels his present returns from Olympus (ἐνείκεν, 14 → καί νυν ... νίεται, 34, ringing the narrative).

⁷² Ferrari (2002) 229-30, (2012) 170-2, adducing important new archaeological evidence, Eckerman (2015).

Epinician can incorporate cultic material without partaking in cultic practice. For epinician, cult is ‘good to think with’ (cf. Power (2000), Ferrari (2012)). In Bacchylides 11, for instance, there are deep parallels between Bacchylides’ poem and Artemis’ altar in Metapontum on the one hand and maiden choruses and Artemis’ altar in Argos on the other hand (110-20). Yet Bacchylides’ epinician takes place in the city centre, not by Artemis’ exurban altar, and is performed by a masculine, not a feminine chorus (νέων ... ἄστυ, 11-12).⁷³ *Isthmian* 5 incorporates itself into a tradition of cultic poetry celebrating the Aeacidae (see Part Three section 4); it is not clearly connected to cultic practice except insofar as Pindar says that it is.

One cannot safely posit that an epinician is connected to cultic practices which it describes. *Olympian* 7 mentions and, on that basis, has been connected with *multiple* Rhodian festivals (48-9, 77-80; cf. Hornblower (2004) 133, Kowalzig (2007) 225, Currie (2011) 285). One might wonder how to adjudicate between possibilities. But this poem is not clearly associated with any established rite. Pindar justifies a prayer to Zeus by citing his patron’s generosity: Ἐρατιδᾶν τοι σὺν χαρίτεσσιν ἔχει | θαλίας καὶ πόλιν (93-4), ‘for together with the celebrations of the Eratidae the city also enjoys festivities’ (see p. 291). This could be taken to describe the performance of *Olympian* 7, not as an annex to any established festival but rather as the centrepiece of an extraordinary celebration that, through the extraordinary generosity of the Eratidae, includes the citizen body (compare and contrast Currie (2011) 283-4). The only traditional practice that this epinician clearly partakes in is the epinician genre itself (7-12).

In other odes, the performance setting can be discerned with greater confidence but does not shape the text. How much does it matter that *Nemean* 4 was apparently performed at a festi-

⁷³ Compare and contrast Kowalzig (2007) 368, Neumann-Hartmann (2009) 257, D. L. Cairns (2005c) 47-50, Currie (2010) 229-31.

val of the new moon (36)? *Olympian* 9 connects itself to a feast of the lesser Ajax.⁷⁴ If the hero is relevant to the poem, however, it is only as a tacit negative exemplum buried in the background (cf. Bernardini (1983) 153-4). Gildersleeve's (1885) 201 comment that 'the assumption of a banquet gives more point to' αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων | νεωτέρων (48-9) sheds more light on the unimportance of performance setting than on these lines. *Nemean* 10, performed at the Argive Heraea (21-3), has little to do with Hera (cf. τελείαι παρὰ μητέρι, 18). It has more to do with the *theoxenia* of the Tyndaridae by the victor's family (49-51), but it is not connected to their sacred spaces in Argos (see fr. 52s, D'Alessio (1997) 41, I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 425, Henry (2005) on *N.* 10.49-54) or any contemporary instance of *theoxenia*. Finglass (2007b) 29-32 dismantles the theory that *Pythian* 11 was tied to the Theban daphnephoric festival.⁷⁵ The vividly described performance setting (1-8) contributes to the meaning of the poem; yet if we knew far more about the real occasion behind the text, this knowledge would not resolve the issues of the poem. Every audience, including the first, is meant to be puzzled by the relevance of the central myth (38-40).

In seeking to reconstruct the circumstances of first performance we are playing a game not always built to be won for stakes that might not be as high as they are sometimes taken to be. Epinician fitted into various political, civic, and institutional settings while maintaining a recognisable generic form. Pindar's epinicians plausibly and frequently present themselves as both the centrepiece and a chief cause behind their occasions (e.g. μένοντ' ... ὅπα μαιόμενοι, *N.* 3.4-5). A

⁷⁴ Neumann-Hartmann (2009b) 9 doubts this. But the closing lines will be climactic praise of the victory celebrated in this poem, not a previous victory (note τοῦτο δὲ προσφέρων ἄεθλον, 108; cf. I. C. Rutherford (1997) 49-51 on crowning as a motif of closure).

⁷⁵ Contrast Bernardini (1989), Krummen (1990) 274, Sevieri (1997), Currie (2011) 296-7. Finglass (2007b) 32 asks 'why would the poet need to evoke the place with such insistence if his audience could see it for themselves?' Cf. Friedländer (1931) 36: 'die Wahrnehmung wird betont, gerade weil sie (grob gesagt) nicht da ist' (discussing Hellenistic poetry).

view of the genre founded on possible exceptions to this generalisation may prove misleading. It is likely that for many the debut of the work of a celebrated poet like Pindar *was* the occasion (see p. 214).⁷⁶

Where does this discussion of the rhetoric of performance leave us? Pindar's epinicians are rooted in the occasions of their first performance but do not require extensive knowledge of these occasions in order to be understood or enjoyed. This has important implications.

The odes have a complex relation to extra-textual reality, hardly exhaustively studied here, which is implicated in their aesthetic economy. It would be naïve to believe that the epinicians provide a transparent window onto reality and wrongheaded to believe that they are not often interested in giving an impression of reality. Yet the epinicians do not invite their audiences to weigh carefully every statement about performance for its truth value. A co-operative credulity will yield most from the texts. One may take realistic descriptions as *ipso facto* 'real' within the text-world of the poems. The aim is not to uncover realities but to understand poems. These constructed occasions, reflecting real occasions in complex and unrecoverable ways, were accessible to all of Pindar's audiences and remain so for us.

2. Knowledge of External Realities

It might be argued that poetry addressed to posterity will avoid references likely to be lost on later audiences.⁷⁷ It is not clear that any ancient lyric fully satisfies this criterion. Those interested in the epinicians as sources for various types of information will find various levels of opacity.

⁷⁶ There is no evidence that a κῶμος upon the victor's return to his city from the games was a traditional practice. The process of composing a poem and training a chorus may have provided the chief reason for holding such events. The occasion, in other words, might exist for the poetry rather than *vice versa* (contrast Crotty (1982) ch. 4, Kurke (1991) ch. 1).

⁷⁷ Cf. Rösler (1980) 41-5.

One should not assume that most ancient secondary audiences were interested in the same matters as some modern scholars. A certain opaqueness may reflect a literary strategy rather than an orientation toward a parochial audience. Several have argued that Pindar creates an impression, familiar from earlier lyric, of overhearing words addressed to an immediate, knowing audience.⁷⁸ In reading Pindar one gets the impression that there is a fuller reality behind the text to which one has only imperfect access; at the same time one also gets the impression that this impression is also a poetic effect. Many do not find whatever opacity there is in Pindar's epinicians (over and above the level inherent to complex poetic communication) to be more off-putting than the opacity of later authors, from Catullus to Robert Lowell, who pursue a texture of intimate communication. The attested early reception of Pindar's epinicians suggests that this attitude is not an exclusively modern one.

It is rewarding to examine to what extent the epinicians in fact depend on their audiences' knowledge of external realities. The following section treats public matters, personal circumstances, and mythology.

A. Public Matters

The odes allude to historical events, as no one, including Bundy,⁷⁹ would deny. There is much truth to Carey's (1978) 21 observation that 'when Pindar touches on contemporary events he usually gives us all the details necessary for an understanding of their function in the poem'. *Pythian* 4 is intriguing in this regard. Knowing the particulars, if such there were, behind the vague language of *P.* 1.51-2 (cὸν δ' ἀνάγκαι νιν φίλον | καὶ τις ἐὼν μεγάλανωρ ἔκανε) would

⁷⁸ Carey (1995) 90-2, Scodel (1996) 60-1, and Morrison (2007b) 41 discuss 'false intimacy' (Scodel's term) as a literary technique in Pindar and early lyric. Cf. Schmitz (1999) and Hutchinson (1988) 6-7 on Hellenistic poetry.

⁷⁹ Lee (1978) 66, Slater (1977) 193, R. L. Fowler (1984) 123.

not greatly advance our understanding of the poem. Carey (1981) 62 accurately describes *Pythian* 2 as ‘carefully stripped of all peculiarities’ (one might prefer ‘particularities’). Young (1971) 46 writes of *Isthmian* 7 that ‘it looks as if [Pindar] purposely omitted historical details’.

Knowledge available to a cultured fifth-century Greek is always sufficient to understand each epinician as a coherent linear progression of thought (see Part Three); less broadly shared knowledge will have added further resonances. The recent political fortunes of Himera, for instance, are relevant to the opening hymn to Tyche in *Olympian* 12 (Ἰμέραν εὐρυθενέ’ ἀμφιπόλει, 2): the city had just recently been liberated from outside oppression (Barrett (2007) 86-97). Some outside Sicily might well have grasped this background, but those ignorant of the city’s newfound freedom may still understand Pindar’s address as adequately motivated by Tyche’s role in political life in general (3-5) and the victor’s experience in particular (13-16). To assert the capability of Pindar’s poetry of communicating with a broad audience is not tantamount to denying the possibility that it communicated in different ways with narrower groups.

One must not downplay the degree to which the odes presume outside knowledge. Rather than taking this as an indication of a parochial orientation, one may instead emphasise that Pindar’s epinicians address cosmopolitan secondary audiences⁸⁰ and discuss subjects of broad interest. *Pythian* 7 alludes to an event about which we are uncommonly well informed, the exile of the Alcmaeonidae (18-19), who financed Apollo’s temple at Delphi more than a half century before the debut of Pindar’s poem (10-11/12). The fact that we know about this background from Herodotus (5.62) suggests that the story was considered important. Indeed, Pindar himself asserts that the Alcmaeonidae enjoy a widespread reputation: πάσαισι γὰρ πολίεσι λόγος ὁμιλεῖ | Ἐρεχθέος ἀκτῶν, Ἄπολλον, οἱ τεόν | δόμον Πυθῶνι δίαί θαητὸν ἔτευξαν (9-11/12; cf. H. *Hy.*

⁸⁰ Clay (1989) 48: ‘we should not foist off nineteenth-century parochialism on the Greeks’. Cf. Lewis (1997) 46-50 on what citizens of various cities knew of the affairs of other cities.

3.299). The personifying ὁμιλεῖ (9) connotes frequency (Gildersleeve (1885)) and a familiar relationship. There is a rhetorically coercive dimension to the ‘everybody knows’ motif, familiar from Athenian oratory, but rhetoric, to be persuasive, must be grounded in reality (cf. Athanassaki (2011b) 249). Perhaps some outside Athens understood a topical background to ‘envy repaying good deeds’ (18-19).

Herodotus (6.125) knows not only of the Alcmaeonidae’s benefactions at Delphi but also of the family’s Olympic chariot victory in 592, an event to which Pindar, composing nearly a century afterwards, alludes in passing (13/14-15). Athletics, the proprietary subject of epinician, were broadly interesting subjects worthy of being remembered (cf. *Pae.* 4.21-4). Pindar’s poems purport to appeal because their information is of concern to many. This is not implausible. As commissioned epinicians attest, athletics attracted extraordinary energies in Pindar’s day (cf. Hornblower (2004) 10-11). Some passages presume widespread interest in the ‘news’ of recent victory being promulgated (*O.* 9.21-5, *N.* 5.1-8). Victory in the games is presented as memorable even independently of epinician poetry (e.g. *O.* 8.10-11, *B.* 7.8-10, 9.21-4, 13.58-66, Kurke (1993)). Previous victories unconnected to poetry are remembered as contributions to an enduring legacy (e.g. *O.* 7.86-7, 13.35-6, *N.* 6.20-1). The chronological range, geographic scope, and striking specificity of categorical vaunts evince the care with which athletic accomplishments were remembered and compared (e.g. *O.* 13.30-1, *N.* 6.24-6, *B.* 8.21-5). Pindar mentions written records at the games (*O.* 7.86-7). Bacchylides (2.9-10) mentions 70 Isthmian victories for Ceos; he may have draw on civic archives like those from the fourth or third century discovered on the island (see Jebb (1906) 186-8, D. Schmidt (1999)). Pind. fr. 23 compares a contemporary victor to an exceptional boxer of the sixth century (Paus. 6.18.7) evidently still remembered. *N.* 6.15-

18, describing Aegina's first Olympic victory (see Fenno (2003)), remembers athletes of the same period.

One hardly needs to wait until the Hellenistic period to find an interest in the affairs and customs of other communities.⁸¹ One should not forget that Pindar, still composing in 446 (*Pythian* 8), was not too far distant in time (and perhaps also in spirit) from Herodotus.⁸² Epinicians sometimes describe matters outside the victor's city.⁸³ The panhellenic audience at Olympia is presented as aware of Hieron's peerless political stature and wealth (B. 3.9-14 with D. L. Cairns (2010); cf. *P.* 1.48-50).⁸⁴ An ode for a Sicilian victor indirectly denominates Orchomenus—hardly the pinnacle of political importance—as καλλίχορον ... πόλιν Χαρίτων | Καφικίδος ἐν τεμένει (*P.* 12.26-7; cf. *O.* 14.1-5, for a victor from Orchomenus). A Molossian may be denominated as an 'Argive man dwelling above the Ionian sea' (*N.* 7.64-5) in an ode for an Aeginetan (cf. Most (1985b) 321). In order to understand the rhetoric of *O.* 6.88, both Stymphalian and Syracusan audiences (see p. 39n104) had to understand that Hera Partheneia was a distinctively Boeotian topic of song (cf. Paus. 8.22.2, Burkert (1977) 211). Pindar's Cyrenean audience was presumed to know about the minor Iolaia games in Thebes (*P.* 9.81-3, a passage often misunderstood in modern times; see Carey (1981), Nash (1982) 77-9). In the same ode Νίκου τ' ἐν λόφῳ (91) refers to equally minor games at Megara. Examples could be multiplied.

Like inscriptions, epinicians trust posterity to take interest and make an effort to understand the past (see IV.5). One of Bacchylides' epinicians for Hieron recounts the dedications of

⁸¹ Athenian theatre, for example, shows a certain interest in non-local practices (e.g. Soph. *OT* 19-21, Heath (2011) 171).

⁸² Considering the importance of periodisation, one might muse on the stakes of, somewhat arbitrarily, labelling Pindar as early classical rather than, as usual, late archaic (cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 463, Most (1985a) 214-18).

⁸³ E.g. *P.* 2.15-17, *I.* 5.30-3.

⁸⁴ Hellenic audience at major games: B. 9.30, 10.20, 13.81-2.

Croesus (B. 3.23-62), an earlier monarch from the other side of the Mediterranean. It stands to reason, then, that those distant in space (92-4) and time (96-7) will also remember Hieron's dedications, the greatest among the Greeks (63-6), as Croesus' dedications are remembered by Bacchylides and his contemporaries. Pindar makes a similar point almost explicitly (*P.* 1.94). It is no coincidence that Pindar's greatest patron was also the most politically powerful man in the Greek world. Pindar's victory odes self-consciously try to influence contemporary opinion⁸⁵ and shape the way the present will someday be remembered.⁸⁶ Developing parallels between the Trojan and Persian wars, Pindar (*I.* 5.44-51, 8.46a-65), like Simonides before him (11 W), makes an implicit predication and suggestion about how 'coloro | che questo tempo chiameranno antico' (Dante, *Par.* 17.119-20) might regard the events commemorated through his poem.⁸⁷

Pindar's epinician should be viewed as part of a robust climate of remembrance that also included quotidian conversation,⁸⁸ the visual arts and inscriptions (see IV.5), dedications (*P.* 5.34-42), written records (*O.* 7.86-7), and probably written prose.⁸⁹ Conceptions of the poet as sole and mystically privileged arbiter of truth about the past are inapplicable to Pindar (despite *N.*

⁸⁵ *O.* 4.11-12 (with Barrett (2007) 42), 6.89-90, fr. 70b.23-5, 194, *B.* 11.123-5 with Fearn (2003); cf. *Ar. Av.* 940 and following. See further Pfeijffer (2005) 37, Hubbard (2001) 395, (2004) 74 and, more generally, D'Alessio (2009b).

⁸⁶ See most recently Grethlein (2010) and Marincola *et al.* (2012) on Greek historical consciousness before the advent of full-fledged historiography.

⁸⁷ Cf. Kierdorf (1967) 65-7, Grethlein (2010) ch. 3.

⁸⁸ 'Prose' (unmarked speech) as a complementary but subordinate medium of memory: *Ibyc.* 303a, *O.* 1.28b, 7.10, 11.4-6, *P.* 1.93-4, 96, 3.112-14, 6.15-18, *N.* 6.30, 11.17-18, *I.* 1.51. Poetry may draw on prose (e.g. *O.* 1.47-51) and prose may draw on poetry (e.g. *O.* 11.4-6). Cf. Olson (1995) 1-22 on word of mouth in Homer. Perhaps Pindar's poems served as a spur to conversation in the symposium (cf. E. L. Bowie (1993)).

⁸⁹ *P.* 1.94 mentions λόγοι in addition to poets as sources of remembrance. At *N.* 6.45 λόγοι implicitly includes Pindar. The word probably refers to 'those versed in tales'. This neither denotes nor excludes prose chroniclers (Calabrese De Feo (1987) 33-5, Nagy (1990) 221-4, M. L. West (2011-13) i.146, Luraghi (2001) 156-8, Henry (2005) on *N.* 6.45). On pre-Herodotean prose see R. L. Fowler (1996).

7.14, fr. 121.3).⁹⁰ It is crucial to his rhetoric of truth that he is subject to everyday constraints of verification (e.g. *O.* 4.17-18, *N.* 7.61-9).

B. Private Circumstances

When knowledge of the victor's personal circumstances is necessary for grasping the poem, Pindar supplies the requisite information.⁹¹ *N.* 7.86-92, for example, would be incomprehensible to anyone ignorant of Aeginetan real estate if Pindar did not say, as he does, that Sogenes lives amidst land sacred to Heracles. The lone confident appeal to knowledge of the victor's personal circumstance in Pindar (ἴστε μὲν Κλεωνόμου | δόξαν παλαιὰν ἄρμασιν, *I.* 3.15-16 with Farnell (1930-2) iii.348) refers to something described in a Pindaric ode composed previously (*I.* 4.25-7). There is no place in the epinicians where further knowledge of the victor's personal circumstances would certainly render an unclear text clear. In this regard, a comparison with Aristophanic comedy is suggestive.

It is characteristic of epinician that an effort to understand the train of thought compels an audience to make inferences about the victor's individual situation. From the opening hymn to Hora in *Nemean* 8 one deduces that Deinias is young and attractive. In *Olympian* 8 it follows from the generalisation that success answers piety (8) that the victor is pious. Like Hellenistic epigrams (Bing (1995)), already archaic epinicians presume in their secondary audiences a willingness to make an intellectual effort toward reconstruction; these poems provoke deductions (*N.* 2.13-17 is especially interesting in this respect).

⁹⁰ See Detienne (1967) with Williams' (2002) 271-3 criticism.

⁹¹ Cf. Morrison (2007a) 129.

C. Mythology⁹²

It is difficult to ascertain to what extent Pindar's epinicians draw on knowledge of mythological material unavailable to broad secondary audiences. It is not easy to determine what was distinctively local. Homeric epic, presumably not intended for any single community, sometimes presumes knowledge of mythological material puzzling to modern and ancient commentators (e.g. *Il.* 5.395-7). *O.* 10.15-16 apparently hinges on a mythological datum known to the author of the Hesiodic *Aspis* (353-4 with Lloyd-Jones (2005) 56), and hence presumably known to some of Pindar's contemporary secondary audiences, but unknown to the later mythological tradition.⁹³

It is clear, however, that the epinicians presume in their audiences extensive knowledge of a wide range of material.⁹⁴ The Theban Strepsiades follows the example of three non-Theban heroes from three different sagas (*I.* 7.31-6). In the past a Libyan nomad knew Argive lore (*P.* 9.112-14). In a short and allusive narrative *Olympian* 4 only indirectly denominates the relatively obscure Argonaut Erginus, a minor figure without any civic or familial connection to the Sicilian victor (Κλυμένοιο παῖδα, 19; cf. Patroclus first denominated as Μενοιτιάδῃ at *Il.* 1.307).⁹⁵ *Ne-mean* 5 announces it will go abroad from Aegina into the world (1-5) and then passes over a dark spot in Aegina's history, the murder of Phocus, through a *praeteritio* that suggests a familiar topic (14-18). This draws more, not less, attention to the episode. Pindar's rhetoric of silence presumes that an audience knows what he is not talking about.

⁹² This word raises a number of fascinating issues, which are not my present concern. I use it as a term of convenience to refer to Pindar's distant past.

⁹³ Cynus, it seems, was a Locrian (Lloyd-Jones (2005) 55-7 with references; *prob.* Davies and Finglass (2014) 464; cf. Zardini (2009) 33). The scholia record autoschediastic guesses (H. J. Rose (1957)). Praise of the victor follows from praise of his mythical analogue (μάχα, 15→πύκτας, 16; τράπε, 15→νικῶν, 16; cf. *N.* 2.13-15). Cynus, son of Ares, instantiates the preceding praise of the Locrians' military prowess (χάλκεος Ἄρης, 15). Metropolis and colony share a mythical heritage (cf. *B.* 11.123-6).

⁹⁴ Cf. Herington (1985) 63-5.

⁹⁵ Cf. Schmitz (1994).

Though singing of local themes is a self-consciously navigated generic expectation (cf. *N.* 3.30-2),⁹⁶ already established by Simonides' day (511 fr. 1b with Budelmann; cf. Ibycus S220 with Wilkinson (2013) 26), numerous epinicians include mythological material not connected to the victor or his community by civic, genealogical, or institutional ties.⁹⁷ *Pythian* 8, an Aeginetan ode, treats Theban material in a way that thematises the audience's knowledge of the saga (αἰνίξατο, 40). Sometimes a prominent literary background helps explain the relevance of non-local material (e.g. *I.* 4.35-42), but in other cases a literary background seems either unlikely or less relevant (e.g. *P.* 11.59-60).

Pindar often highlights the fact that themes of special interest to the victor's community are also of interest to others (e.g. *O.* 6.71, 7.50-3, *P.* 1.26, *I.* 6.22-7, 9.1, *B.* 9.40-55, 11.123-6). In the epinicians, local traditions are generally presented in a manner comprehensible to broader audiences.⁹⁸ Pindar and Bacchylides' many Aeginetan odes make no mention of Aphaea, a goddess worshipped at an important temple on the island (see Watson (2011)) and apparently nowhere else;⁹⁹ Aeginetan odes frequently trumpet the Aeacidae as the objects of universal acclaim (e.g. *I.* 6.19-27). Some poems seem interested in propagating local traditions and/or interweaving them with better-known material. *Olympian* 7 may draw on local traditions (φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαί | ῥήσιες, 54-5), but it clearly draws on the *Iliad* (2.653-70→*O.* 7.27-34; cf. Young (1968) 82-3). It is hard to believe that Pindar describes a distinctively Rhodian rite exclusively

⁹⁶ This passage is humorous. Heracles' travels to the ends of the earth are labelled as a non-local topic (ἄλλοδαπὸν, 26; ἄλλοτριῶν, 30; contrast χώρας ἄγαλμα, 13; ἐπιχώριον χάρμα, 66). Though they take place far from Aegina, they turn out to be relevant to the poet's self-described themes: Heracles, too, is the blood of Zeus (65-6; cf. *N.* 7.86) and at home in his hymn (10-11).

⁹⁷ E.g. *O.* 4.21-7, 6.12-17, *P.* 9.79-89a, 11.59-64, *I.* 1.15-32, 4.28-30, *Pae.* 4.28-30. Heracles is left aside.

⁹⁸ Cf. Morrison (2007a) 123.

⁹⁹ Hornblower (2007) 288 would explain Aphaea's absence through details of Aeginetan society for which there is no evidence. Pindar reportedly wrote a cultic poem for Aphaea (fr. 89b).

for the Rhodians' benefit (7.34-50) or announces (ἀγγέλλων, 21) their own lineage primarily to them. Bacchylides 11 ends with a reference to anyone who will search the past for Achaean achievement with an unbiased outlook (δικαίαια | ὅστις ἔχει φρένας ... εὐ|ρή|σει, 123-5); this is unlikely to describe a Metapontian.

Pindar's epinicians avoid local material that would be opaque to a secondary audience and also material closely associated with certain authoritative non-local poems. Perhaps yet more striking than the absence of the distinctively local Aphaea is the absence of any extensive treatment of an episode from the paradigmatically non-local *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Probably this reflects a desire to produce a unique, authoritative account (Stoneman (1981) 63, Mann (1994) 333-5). Pindar sometimes navigates around the two monumental Homeric poems, alluding to these texts but avoiding substantial overlap (see IV.4).¹⁰⁰ Bacchylides 13 is a remarkable exception: it retells a story from the *Iliad* and extensively discusses superlative fame in such a way as to call to mind epic precedent (168-81 with Fearn (2007) 120-2). The epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides, as Part Two demonstrates, are deeply integrated into a broadly shared literary culture.

If Pindar's odes included material unknown to his secondary audiences, this could have contributed toward, not detracted from their attractiveness. The poet sometimes points up departures from tradition and highlights his revisionary élan (e.g. *cē δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι*, *O.* 1.36). The popularity of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, an important intertext for Pindar's myths (D'Alessio (2005)), shows that in this period many were not exclusively interested in parochial mythological matters. Indeed, the *Catalogue* attests to interest in mythological infor-

¹⁰⁰ One might term this sort of avoidance negative intertextuality. It is not uncommon in archaic literature. The *Odyssey* does not narrate events covered in the *Iliad* ('Monro's law'); this probably reflects a conscious strategy (so e.g. Currie (2006) 44). The cyclic epics clearly crop around the Homeric poems. Stesichorus' long narratives seem to have avoided Achilles and Odysseus (Carey (2015) 57).

mation *for the sake of information* (M. L. West (1985) 8). Aristotle was not the first Greek to enjoy learning something new: *μανθάνειν οὐ μόνον τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἥδιστον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμοίως* (*Poet.* 1448b; cf. Hippias at Pl. *Hp. mai.* 285d = *FGrH* 6 T 3, Peponi (2012) 80-1).

3. Difficult Pleasures

I think one of the strongest human cravings is for difficulty.

– Robert Pinsky

Would Pindar's epinicians have been too difficult to appeal to secondary audiences? He flatters his audiences' literary expertise (see VII.3). Complexity is prized within his poems;¹⁰¹ some must have regarded it as a desideratum (compare and contrast R. Thomas (2012)). Pindar of Thebes was a successful professional for more than half a century. His product must have satisfied some market share.¹⁰²

One might interpret difficulty as a spur, rather than an obstacle, to the involvement of secondary audiences.¹⁰³ Complexity, so far from dooming the odes to oblivion, contributes to their success as absorbing monuments to which one may repeatedly return (cf. Lowrie (1997) 12 on Horace). An audience is involved all the more deeply in the text as they work to grasp its meaning (Pfeijffer (1999a) 29). The universal generalisation εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλεόν πεδέρχεται (*N.* 7.74; cf. *B.* 1.174-7) is relevant to reception as well as composition. Such descriptions of the poet's hard work in composition (cf. *N.* 3.12, *I.* 1.4), like similar descriptions in later

¹⁰¹ E.g. *N.* 7.77-9, *P.* 10.53-4. Contrast the simplistic, repetitive refrain (τριπλόος, *O.* 9.2 with Gerber (2002)) of Archilochus' proto-epinician (324 spur.).

¹⁰² Pindar can present himself as concerned to please his audience: cf. e.g. *O.* 1.35, *P.* 2.52-6, 9.77-8.

¹⁰³ Cf. Scodel (1996) 59-60. Aeschylus' reputation during and after his lifetime attests to the compatibility of linguistic density (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 1004-5) and popularity (ibid. 868-9 with Dover (1993)).

authors (cf. e.g. Theoc. 7.50-1, Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.31-2, Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 5), exist in part to elicit a careful reception from the poet's audience. A single reading or listening does not exhaust Pindar's sophisticated texts, which, as most would agree, reward sustained attention with deepened insight. These texts command attention and provoke a sense of wonder (cf. θαυμαστὸν ὄμνον, *I.* 4.21, describing both content and form) which does not soon wear off. Pindar presents his authorial skill as justifying a lasting reception (e.g. *N.* 4.6-8). Some of his earliest audiences, like modern scholars, regarded his poems as worthy of repeated attention (θαμά, *N.* 4.15, where the hypothetical nature of the sentence perhaps suggest a commonplace practice).¹⁰⁴ Appeals to the limited 'powers of a listening audience' (Bundy (1986) 35; cf. Carey (1981) 145) are less compelling when an audience listens more than once. If fifth-century Greeks read Pindar without an eye toward memorisation and re-performance (cf. *I.* 4), they probably practiced what Darnton (1990), writing about another period of history, terms 'intensive' rather than 'extensive' reading: careful and repeated engagement with a relatively small set of texts, each holding great importance. We should not necessarily regard the paradigmatic experience of Pindar's various historical audiences as consisting merely of one listening lasting perhaps fifteen minutes.

Probably Pindar's odes were less prohibitively difficult for his contemporaries than they have seemed to some moderns. Outside the scholia the poet was not taxed with obscurity in antiquity (see p. 257n776). Ancient audiences imbued in the conventions of choral lyric will have

¹⁰⁴ Pindar generally describes poetry as a repeating, abiding presence in the world: *O.* 6.96-7, *P.* 2.15-16, 54-6, 3.78, 4.295-6, 12.25, *N.* 2.2, 5.37, 11.7, *I.* 5.27-9, fr. 6a(k), *Pae.* 2.98, 6.16, 180, fr. 75.18, *B.* 13.94, 16.12, fr. 4.57 (note already αἰεῖ, *Od.* 1.341). *B.* 20b directs itself to a generalised occasion reoccurring monthly ([ἐν] εἰκάδεσσι ... εὔτε, 5-6). At *I.* 2.43-5 'let him never keep silent' is polar litotes for 'let him always celebrate'. *Olympian* 6 envisions multiple performances (Stamatopoulou (2014), Adorjáni (2014) 64; cf. Morrison (2007a) 71-2 for doxography).

brought to these demanding works a range of useful shared knowledge.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, Pindar often calls attention to its audience's knowledge of his genre (see VII.1). His contemporaries were experienced not only as audiences but also as active participants in choruses.¹⁰⁶ Choral lyric, for modern readers a modest set of texts, was for them a pervasive social practice. Doubtless much such poetry was far less challenging than Pindar, but some will have been comparable in various respects (see p. 178). The similarities between the works of the Theban Pindar and Cean Bacchylides for far-flung clients suggest that shared knowledge derived from precedent was widespread. This will have enabled felicitous communication with far-flung secondary audiences.

As his audience learnt to understand Pindar by experiencing previous poems, so the poet presumably came to compose intelligible works by learning from the tradition. Only one passage might provide a naturalistic biographical explanation of the poet's skill as acquired through quotidian experience rather than endowed by the divine:¹⁰⁷ οὔτοι με ξένον | οὐδ' ἀδαήμονα Μοικᾶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταί | Θῆβαι (fr. 198a). The first person here could conceivably represent a Theban chorus rather than Pindar of Thebes.¹⁰⁸ This might be something of a false dichotomy (see p. 141n29); either possibility supports the arguments being advanced here. This fragment is not a reference to some Theban public school system but rather to the city's musico-poetic culture, a real point of civic pride (see p. 219n666). Theban public poetic performances have educated the

¹⁰⁵ Bundy (1986) 26 speaks of 'the frequent experience their audience can be presumed to have had of *enkomia*'; cf. Fränkel (1975) 428 'the difficulties of his language arise ... from his speaking as supreme master, at the very end of his epoch'.

¹⁰⁶ Widespread choral participation: Bacon (1995) 16, I. C. Rutherford (2008) 80. Revermann (2006) 104-5, 108, writing on Athenian theatre, makes a similar argument for spectator competence through performance experience.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. B. fr. 5: ἕτερος ἐξ ἑτέρου σοφὸς | τό τε πάλαι τό τε νῦν; contrast e.g. *Od.* 22.347-9, *Hes. Theog.* 22-3, *Pind. N.* 4.41-3.

¹⁰⁸ The interpretation of fr. 198a advanced here receives support from an unnoticed allusion in the *Epitaph for Bion* ([Mosch.] 3.93-7), which I identify in a forthcoming note. The anonymous learned author, I believe, took this description of poetic skill to refer to the skilled poet Pindar of Thebes, whose Theban birth he mentions not much earlier (88).

native speaker so as to be no ‘foreigner’ to the Muses¹⁰⁹ but thoroughly knowledgeable in the sort of choral poetry from which this fragment emerges.¹¹⁰

If Pindar and Bacchylides’ poems have struck some as prohibitively difficult, this may be because modern readers, unlike the speaker of fr. 198a, are ‘foreign’ to the traditions through which archaic poets and audiences learnt how to speak and understand the language of choral poetry. By recovering structures of genre we may recover something of the processes through which these poems made sense to their first audiences. For us ‘understanding Pindar depends on finding parallels’ (Slater (1977) 195). The arid ‘cf. e.g.’ represents a mechanical effort to reconstruct ancient audiences’ organic understanding now only ‘recoverable from comparative study’ (Bundy (1986) 35). Often this is the most concise way to lay bare the thought process that leads a scholar to one particular interpretation rather than another.

4. Orality and Writing

Pindar’s epinicians take account of secondary audiences removed in space and time from their first performances. How did they reach such audiences?

The scant external evidence suggests that Pindar’s epinicians survived primarily in oral re-performances relying on written texts.¹¹¹ As many have observed, nowhere in the odes is permanence explicitly depicted as being guaranteed by writing.¹¹² Older Near-Eastern hymns, by

¹⁰⁹ Theban pride in cosmopolitan sophistication: *O.* 6.89-90, *Dithy.* 2.23-6, fr. 215a.1-7.

¹¹⁰ *Choreia* and education: e.g. Pl. *Leg.* 653e-654e, Calame (2001) 222-3, Peponi (2007).

¹¹¹ Herington (1985) 41: ‘although *performances* were universally oral, it rested on a firm sub-structure of carefully meditated written texts’. Cf. Irigoin (1952) 8-19, Havelock (1982) 188-9, Hubbard (1985) 66-7, R. Thomas (1992) 119-20.

¹¹² *Pace* e.g. Hubbard (1985) 65-6. Imagery involving epigrams (see IV.5) comes closest to linking permanence and writing.

contrast, frequently link textualisation to durability.¹¹³ It would be overhasty, however, to infer that writing played no role in early epinician reception. The depiction of the afterlife of a poem is a rhetorical strategy. Oral reception takes centre stage because this was the means by which most audiences experienced Pindar's poems. Hellenistic and Roman poets discuss reading because this was the primary means through which others experienced their work.¹¹⁴ When Pindar aims for a similar self-reflexive effect, he describes his poems as being experienced aurally. Timocritus (*N.* 4.14-22) would likely require a text to memorise the 96 lines of *Nemean* 4,¹¹⁵ but during his hypothetical re-performance he holds a lyre, not a scroll.

If Pindar's poems were primarily experienced by secondary audiences as oral re-performances, we should not discount the possibility of a relatively modest readership.¹¹⁶ 'There must have been a certain number of people, however small, who read books and copied them' (M. L. West (2011) 65; cf. Carey (2011) 452). A robust circumstantial case may be mounted on the basis of motive and opportunity.

Pindar was hardly ignorant of writing (*O.* 3.29-30, 7.86-7, 10.1-3, *Pae.* 7b.24). Our remarkably uncorrupted texts probably go back to his autograph copy (Herington (1985) 45, Morrison (2007a) 114-15). The author of the Nestor's cup inscription is already familiar with poems

¹¹³ See Metcalf (2013) ch. 1. The terms 'oral' and 'written' can obscure complex interactions between utterance and text (cf. Finnegan (1988) 175, M. L. West (2011-13) i.160, Nagy (1990) 17-40, Janko (1998)). One should be wary of exaggerating differences between 'oral' and 'written' poetry (R. Thomas (1992) *passim*, M. L. West (2011-13) i.150, de Jong (2006) 203). Morrison (2007b) 66 discusses how re-performance can 'textualize' song even in the absence of writing. Finnegan (1977) 73-5, 144-8 discusses oral cultures that value nearly word-for-word reproduction (cf. M. L. West (2011-13) i.162, Garner (2011) 416).

¹¹⁴ Cf. Bing (1988) ch. 3.

¹¹⁵ It seems improbable that anyone other than a savant could re-perform a Pindaric epinician after one hearing (cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 228a5-c6, Theophr. *Char.* 27.6). It took me a business week to memorise *Nemean* 4.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Hubbard (2004, 2011). His arguments are different.

written in stichic fashion.¹¹⁷ One can now compare a cup from Methone with an iambic inscription from around the same period (see Besios *et al.* (2012) 340). Hecataeus proudly and programmatically states that he writes (F 1 Fowler); he wrote for someone—evidently already an established, familiar practice.¹¹⁸ Thgn. 19-24 perhaps involves writing and connects textuality to durability.¹¹⁹ Polycrates and Peisistratus reportedly collected books.¹²⁰ Herodotus (6.27) describes 120 Chian children learning the alphabet in 496. Perhaps the one who survived the collapse of the roof lived to read some Pindar. During Pindar's career writing appeared prominently and frequently on Athenian vases and stages (Pfeiffer (1968) 26). Around 430 a performer and/or poet was buried with his lyre and writing tablets (Pöhlmann and West (2012)). One would like to imagine him reading and performing Pindar. Wright (2012) ch. 5 compellingly argues that in Athens during the 420s there existed a coterie of highly literate and highly learned readers. Such a situation in the decades after the end of Pindar's career probably did not suddenly spring up *ex nihilo*.

There must have been books circulating in the fifth century since a number have reached us (Gerber (1997b) 3-4, Scodel (2002) 125). Harris (1989) 114-15 estimates growing literacy rates at around 5 to 10% between 520 and 480. These figures are neither astronomical nor negligible. Roman and Hellenistic poets, who often speak of lasting poetic afterlife, addressed a relatively small readership.¹²¹ Perhaps Pindar could do the same.

If readers existed, who were they? Epinicians purport to be of universal interest both in first

¹¹⁷ Immerwahr (1990) 18-19; cf. Pöhlmann (1990) 12-13.

¹¹⁸ For the date of Hecataeus see R. L. Fowler ii.658-60.

¹¹⁹ Pratt (1993) restates this controversial position; contrast e.g. Ford (1985). On Theognis' date see now Selle (2008) 229-46.

¹²⁰ Ath. 3a, Gell. 7.17.1, Aloni (1989) 121-2.

¹²¹ Contrast the iconoclastic H. N. Parker (2009), who cites received wisdom.

performance (e.g. *P.* 10.55-9)¹²² and in subsequent reception (e.g. *N.* 5.2-3; contrast Nagy (1990) 148, 181);¹²³ in reality they would have been of special interest to some. In a primarily oral society textualisation will tend to reflect perceived worth and often also an attempt to secure advantage. It is easy to believe that Pindar's patrons, who, as he stresses, spared no expense to excel in the games and commission an excellent commemorative poet, would also have actively promoted the dissemination of commemorative poems (cf. *N.* 6.29-34, *I.* 2.43-8, neither necessarily implying texts).¹²⁴ Elites were interconnected.¹²⁵ They also had ideological reasons for glorifying past achievement¹²⁶ and trumpeting present pre-eminence. It would not be surprising if texts circulated in informal networks. Poets (cf. *P.* 4.248, *B.* fr. 5.1-2), performers (cf. *N.* 4.13-16), and educators (cf. *P.* 6.48-9, Herington (1985) 203-4) could have had professional reasons for wanting a text (compare and contrast Carey (1995) 90, Currie (2004) 52).

One ought not to discount the possibility that Pindar anticipated a readership. Reading poetry may not have been an ordinary phenomenon, but his epinicians are extraordinary phenomena (*I.* 4.40-5) that were extraordinarily important to some (*O.* 10.85-96). One might nominate Thrasylus as the most likely reader—aside from the poet himself (cf. M. L. West (2011))—to appear in Pindar. Two odes present him as familiar with a range of poetry from cyclic epic to Anacreon (see IV.3 and VIII.2.C). He is not simply a card-carrying member of a 'song culture'

¹²² See Race (1976) and Most (1986a) on *O.* 2.83-6, a passage often misunderstood. Lavecchia (2000b) would revert to understanding τὸ πᾶν (85) to mean 'the masses'. But his parallel is much later and not close. Add *P.* 2.65-7 (with Gildersleeve (1885)) to the evidence for Race's reading, which I adopt.

¹²³ Cf. Lloyd-Jones (1973) 111: 'doubtless ... the best connoisseurs of poetry were the best educated; but are we to suppose that at Athens only Megacles and a few noblemen could enjoy Pindar's poetry?' The ability to play the lyre and sing was a basic expectation for a cultured male (*P.* 4.295-6, *N.* 4.13-16, fr. 129.7, *Ar. Nub.* 1355-6 with Dover (1968), Stehle (1997) 25-7, Landels (1999) 8). The pool of potential Pindaric re-performers would not be insignificant.

¹²⁴ Cf. Hubbard (2004) 82.

¹²⁵ Lewis (1997) 27-8, Carey (2007) 200n5, Pelliccia (2009) 245.

¹²⁶ Cf. Morris (1996) 32; note the reservations of Hammer (2004).

but someone distinguished by an enthusiasm for literature (*P.* 6.48-9, *I.* 2.12). It would not be surprising if this noble's zeal lead him to acquire written texts. The Emmenidae, as extant choral lyric attests, were willing to spend on poetry.

II. Vital Light

The Poets light but Lamps-
 Themselves- go out-
 The wicks they stimulate-
 If vital Light

Inhere as do the Suns-
 Each age a Lens
 Disseminating their
 Circumference-

– Emily Dickinson

Pindar can distinguish two natural longings of those who have achieved success: celebration amid the congratulations of one's fellows, and song to immortalize one's achievement. The one serves an immediate, the other an enduring need.

– Bundy (1986) 11

Gildersleeve (1885) xxxvi observes that Pindar 'drains dry the Greek vocabulary of words for light and bright, shine and shimmer, glitter and glisten, ray and radiance, flame and flare and flash, gleam and glow, burn and blaze'. Many have addressed the poet's pervasive light imagery.¹²⁷ Scholars generally conflate, however, images of fire, representing poetry as an utterance, and images of celestial light, representing enduring fame.¹²⁸ These related but distinct images map onto the related but distinct dimensions of the victory ode both as a part of a fleeting κῶμος and as an enduring record of achievement.¹²⁹ The former is evoked through the symbol of brilliant but ephemeral fire. The latter is represented by that celestial light whose reach through

¹²⁷ Dornseiff (1921) 56-7, Gundert (1935) 11-29, Duchemin (1953) 193-228, Tarrant (1960), Mugler (1960), Treu (1965), Ciani (1974), D. Bremer (1976) 280-313, Steiner (1986) 124-9, Nünlist (1998) 162-73, Pfeijffer (1999a) 370-2, Adorjáni (2011) 78-90, 172-96, Hutchinson (2012) 279-80.

¹²⁸ Bowra (1964) 34-5 and Hutchinson (2012) 279-80 observe a distinction but do not draw it along these lines.

¹²⁹ κῶμος is Pindar's word for the epinician occasion; see Eckerman (2010) and Agócs (2012); cf. Simon. 519 fr. 1. col. ii.2 (εὔφρονα κωμ[]); note also Ibyc. S178 with scholia: . νεπικωμα[. A form of (συν)ἐπικωμάζω would be attractive. I see no equally plausible alternative articulation. See further p. 195n562.

space and time captures Pindar's highest aspirations. By paying attention to the full power of these cognate images one can better see how the poet figures the relationship between initial performance and subsequent reception.

The value of conspicuousness explains the frequency and positive connotations of both sorts of light in Pindar. High, loud, bright, big: these are his stock-in-trade.¹³⁰ Light imagery 'conveys the idea that the victor is the object of others' attention' (D. L. Cairns (2005b) 132). Though intimately related, fire and celestial light were for Pindar and his fifth-century audiences different phenomena. Celestial bodies are associated with fire from Homer onwards, but archaic cosmology did not regard them as simply masses of fire.¹³¹ Fire and heavenly light have different connotations. Like performance and fame, they differ along the axes of time and space.¹³² Fire, like the celebratory revel, is conspicuous to those in the immediate vicinity but dies away; celestial light, like fame, is universally perceptible and shines into eternity. These different phenomena are, as a rule, described with different vocabularies in Pindar. Borrowing grammatical terminology, one might say that the vocabulary of fire and heavenly light in Pindar tend to have a different aspect in relation to time and place. Ciani (1974) 171 observes that in Pindar *φάος*, *φέγγος*, and *αὐγή* refer to heavenly light while *κέλας* refers to firelight.¹³³ Pindar's two principal verbs for describing light, *λάμπω*, 'the standard verb to describe the sun's shining' (Gerber (1982) on *O.* 1.23), and *φλέγω*, etymologically related to *φλόξ* (Beekes s.v.), tend to display the

¹³⁰ Race (1990) 63 provides a catalogue.

¹³¹ See Mugler (1960) 45, Dicks (1970) 51. Cf. *O.* 7.70-1: (of the sun) *ὁ γενέθλιος ἀκτίνων πατήρ, | πῦρ πνεόντων ἀρχὸς ἵππων*.

¹³² M. L. West (2007) 406: fame's 'ideal properties are volume and extent over space and time'. As a rule, in archaic poetry dissemination through space precedes and implies durability through time; this tendency is likely to reflect the realities of reception. Theognis is paradigmatic: first Cynus' fame will spread worldwide during his lifetime (237-43) and then after death it will preserve his name (243-50; cf. Sappho 65, Pind. *O.* 9.21-7, *N.* 5.1-5).

¹³³ For full documentation of these terms in Pindar and earlier poetry see Ciani (1971) 5-11, 21-5, 85-89, 14-18, 26-7, 92-5.

same semantic division.¹³⁴ One must be clear that these are tendencies, not laws. The vocabulary especially appropriate to one phenomenon may be coherently applied to the other,¹³⁵ but the figurative use of these terms tends to be parasitic upon their most normal usage. The following sections explain how a particular image is evoked in specific cases and brings out overarching patterns. These arguments have cumulative force.

1. Celestial Light

Experience and the literary tradition explain why celestial light often symbolises fame in Pindar.¹³⁶ Celestial light and glory reach through space and time. In Homer fame rises into the heavens.¹³⁷ The spread of fame through space is linked to the light of the sun in Homer (*Il.* 7.451, 458), Sappho (65.8-9), and later poets. Simon. 16 W is a striking instantiation of this trope. The Corinthians have made the sun, composed of everlasting gold (χρυκοῦ τιμήεντος ἐν αἰθέρι; cf. Mastronarde (2002) on Eur. *Med.* 1255; contrast Luppe (1994)), a witness of their deeds; the sun spreads their fame abroad (ἄξει | αὐτῶν τ' εὐρεῖαν κληδόνα). The new Marathon epigram (*SEG* 56.430) evidently associates the glory of the fallen with solar light (φάος) and the furthest reaches of time (αἰεὶ) and space (ἔχχστα γαίης; cf. anon. 896 *PMG*). Unfortunately the text is corrupt, perhaps beyond repair.¹³⁸ In Greek literature sunlight idiomatically connotes 'everywhere'¹³⁹ and

¹³⁴ For documentation see Ciani (1974) 135-48.

¹³⁵ E.g. ἀελίου τε φλογί (Simon. 581.4); céλας καθαρὸν | ἀμέρας (Pind. fr. 108b); B. 17.103-5.

¹³⁶ I doubt that mystery religion is very relevant. High poetry may shape mystical discourse rather than *vice versa*.

¹³⁷ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει (*Il.* 8.192 and elsewhere); cf. Simon. 11.27 W, Pind. *N.* 8.40-2, Near-Eastern parallels in M. L. West (2007) 407.

¹³⁸ See Janko (2014) for a recent attempt at a solution.

¹³⁹ *Il.* 4.44-5, *Od.* 3.1-3, Sappho 65.8-9, [Thgn.] 616, 850, Ibyc. S166.23-5.

defines the realm of the living, often in distinction to that of the dead.¹⁴⁰ Paradigmatically indestructible and eternal (e.g. Simon. 581.3), the sun evokes the power of poetry to transcend its immediate circumstances (e.g. Thgn. 251-2).¹⁴¹ From Homer onwards *φάος* also denotes the figurative light of salvation (e.g. *Il.* 6.6, Alc. 34.11, Puelma (1977) 13-14). Fame, like deliverance, defies destruction.¹⁴²

Associations of reach through space and endurance through time come across when Pindar describes fame as a *φάος* or *φέγγος*, each a common term for celestial light and especially daylight.¹⁴³ At *O.* 4.9-10 the durative quality of glory is explicit: *τόνδε κῶμον | χρονιώτατον φάος* *εὐρυθενέων ἀρετῶν*.¹⁴⁴ The victor seeks to inaugurate the reputation of his fledgling community (*κῦδος ὄρσαι | σπεύδει Καμαρίναι*, 11-12). *O.* 10.20-3 is equally clear:

θάξαις δέ κε φύντ' ἀρετῶν ποτί
 πελώριον ὀρμάσαι κλέος ἄ-
 νήρ θεοῦ σὺν παλάμαις.

ἄπονον δ' ἔλαβον χάρμα παῦροί τινες,
ἔργων πρὸ πάντων βιότῳ φάος.

φάος evokes a perspective over a lifetime and contrasts with ephemeral deeds (cf. *N.* 4.6). The victor takes enduring joy (*χάρμα*, 22) in knowing that his glory, like an heir, will survive his demise and carry on some part of his identity (86-96; cf. *Parth.* 1.16-21). At *P.* 8.96-7 emphasis

¹⁴⁰ E.g. *Il.* 18.61, Hes. *Op.* 155, Aesch. *Pers.* 299, B. fr. 20c.21-4; further examples from Sumeria to Rome in Fraenkel (1957) 451n4.

¹⁴¹ M. L. West (1997) 514-15 discusses Near-Eastern parallels.

¹⁴² E.g. Tyrt. 12.31-2, Simon. 531, *CEG* 683, Eur. *Andr.* 775-6.

¹⁴³ In Pindar *φέγγος* is synonymous with *φάος* (Ciani (1974) 24; *pace* Lyde (1935)).

¹⁴⁴ See Mader (1990) and Gerber (1987). Eckerman (2010) 310 would explain the emphasis on durability through the victor's memory of the revel. But the revel is identified with the poem. The next sentence refers to the glory which Psauis hopes to bring to his newly-founded city (11-12). *Χαρίτων θ' ἑκατὶ* (9) emphasises poetic merit. The Charites, who endow song with beauty, will help it last (cf. *O.* 9.26-8, *N.* 4.7-8). The *δέξαι*-motif (see Schadewaldt (1928) 269, 274) often unites song and celebration since a deity is asked to 'accept' the revel band as its host and 'accept' the poem as a dedication (see p. 206).

again falls on an entire life: ἀλλ' ὅταν αἴγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθῃ, | λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μείλιχος αἰών. Victory, described in spatial terms as a definite event, gives way to the lasting light of glory, a durative state. *Nemean 3* uses similar vocabulary to emphasise spatial rather than temporal reach. The *laudandus*' fame has now shone forth through the help of Pindar and the significantly named Cleo (83-4): τίν γε μὲν, εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοΐας, ἀεθλοφόρου λήματος ἔνεκεν | Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος.¹⁴⁵ Connotations of durability are clear earlier in the same poem when the same image is applied to Achilles' exploits: τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν (64). Referring to the place of Achilles' duel with Memnon,¹⁴⁶ αὐτόθεν (64) connotes a distant location and time, thereby highlighting the duration and spread of the Aeacidae's renown from the Trojan War to the present and from Troy to Aegina. ἄραρε (64, perfect) points up fixity through time and suggests a monument anchored in space (cf. *I.* 2.19).

Similar stress on permanence comes through at *N.* 9.41-2: Chromius' glory beams forth (δέδορκεν | παιδὶ τοῦθ' Ἀγησιδάμου φέγγος ἐν ἀλικίαι πρώται) like the fame of Hector, the hero to whom he is compared (λέγεται μὲν Ἑκτορι μὲν κλέος ἀνθῆσαι, 39). τοῦθ' (42) is anaphoric, looking back to κλέος (39). The glory of the ancient hero and the glory of the modern warrior are identified as rays of the same light. Again the celestial light of fame influences an entire life. Chromius won glory in youth (ἐν ἀλικίαι πρώται, 42), but as a result his old age is ameliorated (τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἡμέρα, 44 with Braswell (1999)). The fame of Hector and Chromius shines forth from the bodies of water where they triumphed; the Seven against Thebes were con-

¹⁴⁵ For the sense and tense of the verb see Gerber (1982) on *O.* 1.94.

¹⁴⁶ Pfeijffer (1999a), privileging first performance, refers αὐτόθεν (64) to Aegina. This is improbable. The island is not mentioned here. Like the beam of the victor's fame (84 with Privitera (1977) 266), the beam of Achilles' fame shines from the site of his victory (cf. e.g. *O.* 1.23-4, *N.* 9.39-44).

sumed by the passing fire of the funeral pyre by the river where they were defeated (22-3). At *Pae.* 2.68 ὑπέρτατον ... φέγγος evokes the lasting glory of long deceased ancestors (τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων, 56), which the chorus now renews in this poem (χρὴ δ' ἄνδρα τοκεῦσιν φέρειν βαθύδοξον αἶσαν, 57-8).¹⁴⁷

Other passages less directly connect φάος with fame. The forces of inclement weather cannot damage Pindar's monumental ὕμνων θησαυρός (*P.* 6.7-8); into eternity it will announce Xenocrates' victory 'in unblemished daylight' (φάει ... ἐν καθαρῷ, 14; cf. fr. 108b.4-5), making it known amongst mankind (λόγοις θνατῶν | εὐδοξον, 16-17).¹⁴⁸ Fame is imagined as an unnatural eternity of uninterrupted sunshine,¹⁴⁹ contrasting with the preceding weather imagery (10-14), commonplaces for the (negative) vicissitudes of time.¹⁵⁰ In *Isthmian* 2, the deceased Xenocrates is described as Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος (17) in part because of the panhellenic victories and previous commemorative epinicians, including Pindar's own, mentioned in the following lines (18-32). *Isthmian* 6 describes the collective achievement of a family: ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐκ φάος οἶαν μοῖραν ὕμνων (62). The underlined phrase draws on an idiom for birth¹⁵¹ and suggests these glorifying epinicians, including Pindar's own previous composition for the Bassidae (see p. 232), are still

¹⁴⁷ Radt (1958) and D. Bremer (1976) 277 correctly observe that φέγγος (68) evokes fame (cf. 57-8) and salvation alike.

¹⁴⁸ For celestial light associated with a permanent edifice cf. *N.* 4.12-3, where δίκαι ξεναρκέει κοινόν | φέγγος stands in apposition to εὐρύπυργον ἔδος (12; M. L. West *apud* Henry (2005); ἡύπυργον codd., with suspicious vocalisation). κοινόν, 'shared, common to all Greeks' (cf. *O.* 8.25-6, fr. 188), points up the universal reach of Aegina's reputation for hospitality (*O.* 8.21-3, *N.* 3.2, 5.8, *I.* 9.5-6, Hornblower (2004) 214-15). At fr. 33c.6 the description of Delos as τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον likewise evokes both the island's fixity (ἀκίνητον, 4) in contrast to previous wanderings (cf. 33d.1) and its far-shining light reaching the gods (μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ, fr. 33c.5). At *P.* 4.255-6 solar imagery (ὕμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου) suggests temporal and spatial reach: one definite occasion in the past (ἄμαρ ἢ νύκτες, 256) on Lemnos (τόθι, 256) reverberates into the future (λοιπὸν αἰεὶ, 256) and in contemporary Cyrene.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. *Od.* 4.566-7, Pind. *Pae.* 2.50-2, *O.* 1.97-8, B. 13.175-81.

¹⁵⁰ Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 139.

¹⁵¹ See *N.* 1.35 with Braswell (1992) and Carey (1981), Kurke (1991) 80. Epinician as offspring: *O.* 10.86-90.

‘living’ and remembered. In *Pythian* 3 salvation and fame converge in an image of celestial light suited to both.¹⁵² If Pindar could persuade Chiron to provide a second Asclepius, he would have come to Sicily with the twin boons of health and glory (διδύμας χάριτας, 72) and appeared in doubled splendour: ἀτέρος οὐρανίου φαμί τηλαυγέστερον κείνῳι φάος | ἐξικόμαν κε βαθὺν πόντον περάσαι (74-6). Poetic immortality, which Pindar can and does provide (110-15 with Young (1968) 57, 62), trumps the physical healing which he cannot.¹⁵³ At *O.* 2.55-6 wealth, an ephemeral resource for securing lasting glory,¹⁵⁴ is described with celestial imagery in such a way so as to call to mind enduring fame:¹⁵⁵ ἀκτήρ ἀρίζηλος, ἐτυμώτατον | ἀνδρὶ φέγγος· εἰ δέ νιν ἔχων τις οἶδεν τὸ μέλλον ... Again celestial light is associated with the *longue durée*, here embodied in the afterlife.

λάμπω, frequently predicated of celestial light and especially the sun, often carries similar connotations of enduring and widespread fame. Consider *O.* 1.23-4: λάμπει δέ οἱ (sc. Hieron) κλέος | ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίαι. Diction is shaped by the preceding comparison of the Olympic games to the sun (6; cf. Gerber (1982) on 23-4).¹⁵⁶ In the same poem the glory of the games shines forth for all to see like a heavenly body: τὸ δὲ κλέος | τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις | Πέλοπος (93-5). *I.* 1.22 describes the glory of Castor and Iolaus: λάμπει δὲ καφῆς ἀρετά. The present tense predicated of these heroes describes an ancient legacy as a contemporary phenomenon (cf. *P.* 1.94, 11.60). καφῆς, ‘clear, distinct’, evokes the visual sphere (cf. Barrett (1964) on Eur. *Hipp.* 346). Their glory shines now with the same light as it did

¹⁵² Saving light of healing: Παιάν τέ σοι τιμᾷ φάος (*P.* 4.270) with Braswell (1988).

¹⁵³ Slater (1988). Compare now Sappho 16a.16-21, bolstering Slater’s hypothesis of a traditional lyric pattern.

¹⁵⁴ Woodbury (1968), Szastynska-Siemion (1981), Carson (1984), Compagner (1988) 82, Kurke (1991) 183-94.

¹⁵⁵ Nisetich (1988) 8.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Silk (1974) 152-3 on literal ‘preparation’ for figurative language.

in the past when they competed (24-5 with Privitera (1982)). Fr. 227 draws on a similar constellation of images: νέων δὲ μέριμναι σὺν πόνοισι εἰλισσομένοι | δόξαν εὐρίσκοντι· λάμπει δὲ χρόνῳ | ἔργα μετ' αἰθέρ' ἀερόθεντα. Youthful ambitions,¹⁵⁷ when realised through effort, win repute; accomplishments, exalted to the sky, shine into the future. μετ' αἰθέρ'¹⁵⁸ and λάμπει suggest heavenly light. ἀερόθεντα, convincingly restored by Boeckh, connotes poetic exaltation (cf. *N.* 8.41, *I.* 1.64-5, fr. 52o.40) and an ascending heavenly body (cf. *Alcm.* 1.63, *Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 3.162, Kidd (1997) on *Arat.* 326). In *Isthmian* 4, discussed further below, a family's resurrected glory is compared to the dawn star: ἀλλ' ἀνεγειρομένα χροῶτα λάμπει, | Ἀοσφόρος θαητὸς ὥς ἄστροισι ἐν ἄλλοις (23-4). A long-standing reputation (φάμαν παλαιάν, 22) is renewed within Pindar's poem.

Other terms for celestial light are also tied to fame. In *Paeon* 6 Aegina is described as a radiant star (φαεννὸν ἄστρον, 126) because of her glory (ὀνομακλύτα, 123) derived in part from her wide-ranging naval power (123-4; cf. anon. 128 *TrGF*). *Isthmian* 5 makes Theia, the mother of the sun (1), bestow glory (ποθεινόν | κλέος, 7-8). In a description of the victor's ancestors at *P.* 11.46-8, the noun ἀκτίς, a common term for a sunbeam,¹⁵⁹ represents lasting glory: τὰ μὲν <ἐν> ἄρμασι καλλίνικοι πάλαι | Ὀλυμπίαι τ' ἀγώνων πολυφάτων | ἔχον θοὰν ἀκτῖνα σὺν ἵπποις. Emphasis on past success (πάλαι, 46) and the prestige of the Olympic games (πολυφάτων, 47) shows that θοὰν ἀκτῖνα (48) refers to enduring fame won on a definite occasion in the past. The previous clause identifies the family's reputation as Pindar's theme (δόξ', 45). *Pythian* 11 later meditates on glory passed down across generations as an heirloom (54-8; cf. *N.* 8.36-7). In *Isthmian* 4, discussed more fully below, the glorious beam of Homer's poetry matches the limitless

¹⁵⁷ μέριμνα≈βουλή (Maehler (1982-97) on *B.* 3.57).

¹⁵⁸ See Gerber (1982) on *O.* 1.6.

¹⁵⁹ LSJ⁹ and Slater s.v.

reach through space and time of celestial light: τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾷεν ἔρπει, | εἴ τις εὔ
εἵπηι τι· καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν | ἐργμάτων ἄκτις καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεὶ
(40-2).¹⁶⁰ Unending worldwide travel calls to mind the sun (cf. *Mimn.* 12, *B.* 13.175-81).

2. Fire

The passages discussed above use celestial light to evoke fame and its reach through space and time. A different network of associations is at work when we turn to fire. This symbol is consistently linked with the time-bound phenomena of the comastic revel and poetry as an utterance. Experience and the literary tradition explain the resonances of the image. The victory revel at the site of the games regularly took place at night following the day's competition and so would have often been illuminated by torchlight.¹⁶¹ In ancient literature fire often serves as a metaphor for loud, conspicuous sound.¹⁶² The following passages are best considered together:

¹⁶⁰ Homer as sun: Antipater of Sidon 225-6 *HE*, Leonidas of Tarentum 2147-50 *HE*.

¹⁶¹ *O.* 10.73-6, Henry (2005) on *N.* 6.37, Gildersleeve (1885) on *P.* 11.45, Heath (1988) 180.

¹⁶² E.g. *Il.* 2.93, 6.328-9, 12.35, *Od.* 20.353, Aesch. *Pers.* 395 with Garvie (2009), Eur. *El.* 694-5, *Ph.* 1377-8 with Mastronarde (1994), Ar. *Ach.* 665, Verg. *Aen.* 6.165, 10.895.

- 1) *P.* 5.45
 Ἀλεξιβιάδα, σὲ δ' ἡύκομοι φλέγοντι
 Χάριτες.
- 2) *I.* 7.23-5
φλέγεται δὲ ἰοπλόκοις Μοίαις,
 μάτρωί θ' ὁμωνύμωι δέδωκε κοινὸν θάλας,
 χάλκαςπις ὧι πότμον μὲν Ἄρης ἔμειξεν ...
- 3) *N.* 6.35-8
 κράτησεν ἀπὸ ταύτας
 αἷμα πάτρας
 χρυσαλακάτου ποτὲ Καλλίας ἀδὼν

 ἔρνεσι Λατοῦς, παρὰ Κασταλίαν τε Χαρίτων
 ἐσπέριος ὁμάδωι φλέγεν...
- 4) *Pae.* 2.66-7
 ὁ δὲ καλὸν τι πονή[σ]αις
 εὐαγορίαις φλέγει.
- 5) *N.* 10.1-3.
 Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρό
 -ων τε πεντήκοντα κορᾶν, Χάριτες,
 Ἄργος Ἦρας δῶμα θεοπρεπὲς ὑμνεῖτε·
φλέγεται δ' ἀρεταῖς μυρίαις ἔργων θρασέων
 ἔνεκεν.
- 6) *P.* 11.41-5
 Μοῖσα, τὸ δὲ τεόν, εἰ μισθοῖο συνέθευ
 παρέχειν
 φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι ταρασκέμεν

 ἦ πατρὶ Πυθονίκωι
 τό γέ νυν ἦ Θρακυδαίωι,
 τῶν εὐφροσύνα τε καὶ δόξ' ἐπιφλέγει.
- 7) *O.* 9.21-5
 ἐγὼ δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν
μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων αἰοδαῖς,
 καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου
 θᾶσσαν καὶ ναὸς ὑποπτέρου παντᾶι
 ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν ...
- 8) *Fr.* 52s.18.1-5
 Ἐν Τυν]δαριδᾶν ἱερῶι
- τεμέ]νει πεφυτευμένον ἄ[λκος
 ἀνδ]ρὶ σοφῶι παρέχει μέλος [
].ν' ἀμφὶ πόλιν φλεγε[
]ν ὕμνων κέλας ἐξ ἀκαμαν[το .
- 9) *I.* 4.43-5
 προφρόνων Μοικᾶν τύχοιμεν,
 κεῖνον ἄψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων
 καὶ Μελίσσῳι, παγκρατίου στεφάνωμ'
 ἐπάξιον,
 ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιάδα.

In these passages there is a strong association between fire and the poet's utterance within the initial performance of his ode. The Muses (2, 6, 9) and Charites (1, 3, 5), who represent different aspects of poetry (see p. 212n642), here often stand for musical performance.¹⁶³

The verb φλέγω, present in many of these passages, is a common term for the blaze of firelight.¹⁶⁴ The verb usually appears in the present and refers to the moment of celebration in which the speaker performs. Conversely, when Pindar describes permanent fame he often uses a perfect to point up durative aspect.¹⁶⁵ Almost all of these passages are closely tied to the first person, who speaks of his performance as an ongoing process. What is ablaze is typically the subject of praise in the present moment. To say that something is ablaze with song means that it is being celebrated. When in (1) Pindar extraordinarily shifts focus to the victor's charioteer and tells him that he is 'ablaze with the Muses', these words are performative: Carrhotus is ablaze because he is now being praised. Strepsiades 'is ablaze with the Muses and gave his uncle a shared crown' (2) because the boy is being celebrated in the present poem and requested that his deceased relative also be commemorated.¹⁶⁶ δόξ' ἐπιφλέγει (6), 'their fame is being celebrated', is a reminder to the wayward Muse of her proper theme. The dutiful goddess picks up this topic in the following lines (46-8). In (5) Argos is being celebrated in the *hic et nunc* because of the accomplishments which Pindar goes on to treat. In (4) εὐαγορίαὶ φλέγει refers to speech most generally, not poetry.¹⁶⁷ The generalisation that success earns words of praise is in the following

¹⁶³ Slater s.v. μοῖα 2aβ.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. LSJ⁹ s.v.

¹⁶⁵ τετείχισται (*P.* 6.9); ἄραρε φέγγος (*N.* 3.64); δέδορκεν φάος (84); δέδορκεν ... φέγγος (*N.* 9.41-2); τετίμακεν (*I.* 4.37).

¹⁶⁶ For what might be termed the dedicatory motif cf. *O.* 4.11-12, 13.49, *N.* 4.79-81, 9.4-5, *P.* 9.103-5, *B.* 10.16-17 (always reflecting an unselfish agenda set by the patron).

¹⁶⁷ I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 271 sees a reference to the paean cry. This seems overly specific for a universal gnome. To my knowledge no one has observed that the ἀγορ- root is never applied to

lines instantiated with, and capped by, the specific, superlative, lasting fame that the chorus' ancestors won long ago.¹⁶⁸ In these passages fire represents an utterance, not a tradition. (7) and (9), discussed more fully below, represent the speaker's utterance becoming part of a tradition (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.9.1-4).

Comparative evidence suggests that the symbols of fire for poetic utterance and celestial light for fame were in some sense traditional,¹⁶⁹ not Pindar's private property. Bacchylides uses this same imagery, albeit proportionately less frequently,¹⁷⁰ and observes the same distinction. Fr. 4.80 describes erotic songs: παιδικοί θ' ὕμνοι φλέγονται. The verb suggests loud sound, love's flame,¹⁷¹ and nocturnal sympotic festivities. At B. 3.90-2 the immortal beam of fame contrasts with the mortal body: ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει | βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ | Μοῦσά νιν τρέφει. Here φέγγος (91) recalls the sun and thus links fame with the paradigmatically immortal, unchanging natural elements (αἰθὴρ ἀμίαντος· ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου | οὐ κάπεται, 85-6) which are contrasted with mutable mortals (88-90) in the preceding lines.¹⁷² In time the body wanes; in time fame waxes within the poetic tradition (Μοῦσα, 93).¹⁷³ B. 13.175-81 evokes the sun through a polar contrast with night and emphasis on repeated, unending worldwide travel:

οὐ γὰρ ἀλαμπέϊ νυκ[τός]
 πασιφανῆς Ἀρετ[ᾶ]
 κρυφθεῖς ἁμαυροῦται

Pindar's poetry but sometimes describes what Pindar's poetry eschews (*O.* 1.53, *P.* 2.53, 8.30). Sol. 1 uses the same root to distinguish poetry from prose.

¹⁶⁸ Führer (1967) 65 correctly elucidates the movement of thought.

¹⁶⁹ A distinction between short-lived, local fire and the eternal, universal sun is, of course, intuitive and hardly the property of epinician (cf. Pl. *Resp.* 514a-15e, Emily Dickinson as quoted in the epigraph).

¹⁷⁰ According to the *TLG* we have 10,477 words of Bacchylides and 32,729 of Pindar. 1:3 would be a rough-and-ready expected ratio of occurrence.

¹⁷¹ See Headlam (1922) on Herod. 8.78.

¹⁷² See Carey (1977/78), Capra (1999) 163, Stenger (2004) 97, 111-12.

¹⁷³ Cf. Pind. *O.* 10.95-6, *N.* 8.40-2 with Salvador Castillo (1996) 126-30, B. 13.205-7, Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.1773-5, Prop. 3.1.33-4, Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.45-6, 3.30.8.

ἀλλ' ἔμπεδον ἀκ[αμάται
 βρύουσα δόξαι
 στρωφᾶται κατὰ γᾶν [τε
 καὶ πολὺπλαγκτον θ[άλασσαν.

Ἀρετ[ά here, as at *P.* 1.94 and *Eur. Andr.* 775-6, stands not simply for achievement but for achievement and its afterlife. If the consensus interpretation of lines 168-9 is substantially correct (see Maehler (1982-97), Fearn (2007) 125),¹⁷⁴ Bacchylides asserts that, though their bodies are destroyed, the Aeacidae's fame shines on eternally (cf. *B.* 3.90-2, *Cic. Arch.* 24). In this epinician, which uniquely narrates at length an episode from the *Iliad*, the sun-like spread and durability of fame are closely associated with Homeric epic, in fifth-century lyric a paradigm of the unlimited reach through time and space of poetry (see IV.4). The sun is still more closely linked with the reception of epic in Pindar's *Isthmian* 4.

3. *Isthmian* 4

The last section showed that in approximately 30 passages the image of firelight is associated with the poetic utterance within the celebratory occasion of the ode while the image of celestial light is linked to widespread and enduring fame. *Isthmian* 4¹⁷⁵ deploys this imagery and thematises various types of light to a unique degree.¹⁷⁶ This section offers an interpretation focused on

¹⁷⁴ βαθυξύλω[1 (169) probably refers to Achilles' pyre. The passing funeral fire evidently contrasts with the sun-like light of glory (cf. *N.* 9.22-4, 41-2, Fearn (2007) 125-6).

¹⁷⁵ *Isthmian* 3 and 4 are separate poems. See Cole (2003) 241-2 for an overview of scholarship. Barrett (2007) 315n3 and R. Hamilton (1974) 111 give compelling metrical and structural evidence, respectively, for division. Repeated encomiastic information (Köhnken (1971) 92-3) militates against unity and suggests both poems could exist as independent memorials. If we have one poem, then we also have a sequence of thought unparalleled in Pindar (see p. 277). Lidov (1976), Cole (2003), and Carey (2007) 199 would explain identical metre through linked performance circumstances. *Isthmian* 3 celebrates an equestrian victory (13) not mentioned in *Isthmian* 4 and so is generally taken to be later.

¹⁷⁶ McNeal (1978) and Segal (1981) discuss light imagery from a structuralist perspective and focus on binary oppositions.

the interplay between fire and celestial light in order to show how these symbols invite meditation on the paradoxical nature of this poem and indeed all of Pindaric epinician as simultaneously an utterance forming part of a transitory revel aimed at an immediate audience and an enduring artefact addressing posterity.

In *Isthmian* 4 the victor's relationship to familial tradition parallels the poet's relationship to literary tradition (cf. *Pythian* 6, *Nemean* 6, *Isthmian* 2). Both are introduced against an impressive background; both eventually overshadow their predecessors. Pindar and Melissus pick up Theban legacies and carry them onto the Hellenic stage.

Melissus' victory is introduced as a continuation of his family's history. The Cleonymidae have been consistently distinguished (4-12). Their illustrious and time-honoured reputation is described as a reality (λέγονται, 7) to which the poet can attest (cf. *N.* 2.16-18). This legacy is complicated, however, by the fact that war claimed four family members in one day (16-17b).¹⁷⁷ As Pindar turns to his proprietary subject, he describes the family's newly rejuvenated reputation (21-7):

τόνδε πορῶν γενεᾷ θαυμαστὸν ὕμνον
 ἐκ λεχέων ἀνάγει (sc. Poseidon) φάμαν παλαιάν
 εὐκλέων ἔργων· ἐν ὕπνῳ
 γὰρ πέσεν· ἀλλ' ἀνεγειρομένα χρωτὰ λάμπει,
 Ἀσφόροσ θητὸς ὥς ἄστροις ἐν ἄλλοις·
 ἃ τε κὰν γουνοῖς Ἀθανᾶν
 ἄρμα καρύξαισα νικᾶν
 ἐν τ' Ἀδραστείοις ἀέθλοισι Κυκυῶνος ὥπασεν
 τοιάδε τῶν τότε' ἐόντων φύλλ' αἰοιδᾶν.

Again a lasting reputation is linked to celestial light. The vagaries of the wind (ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλοιός, 5) give way to the constant rhythm of the seasons (winter yielding to spring) and day-

¹⁷⁷ The 'snowstorm of battle' (τραχεῖα νιφὰς πολέμοιο, 17; cf. *Il.* 17.243-4, *N.* 10.9) picks up the weather imagery of lines 5-6 and instantiates the thought expressed therein.

light (night broken by the morning star).¹⁷⁸

Pindar, however, does not merely continue the Cleonymidae's legacy; he brings it to its τέλος. His work surpasses previous epinicians as the victor's panhellenic victory surpasses his family's earlier local accomplishments. Though celebrated for victories in minor contests (25-7), the Cleonymidae had never before won in the four major games (παναγυρίων ξυνᾶν ... Πανελλάνεσσι, 28-9).¹⁷⁹ The remarkably extended description of their lack of success (ἀφάνεια τύχας, 31) contrasts with the opening description of the victor's recent panhellenic triumph (εὐμαχανίαν γὰρ ἔφανας Ἴσθμίοις, 2; cf. νίκαν ἀνεφάνατο, 71), precisely what eluded previous generations.

Pindar, like Melissus, continues a tradition and brings it to its culmination. He revives the family's reputation (φάμαν παλαιάν, 22)¹⁸⁰ but asserts his pre-eminence over earlier epinicians. The Cleonymidae until now enjoyed local celebrity: they have long been honoured in their hometown (7) and neighbouring communities (26) for regional successes and ethical conduct. In the past they also enjoyed epinicians for minor victories: τοιάδε τῶν τότε' ἐόντων φύλλ' αἰοιδᾶν (27). Here τοιάδε draws an explicit generic link with the epinicians of an earlier generation.¹⁸¹ It is not clear whether Pindar refers to epinician poems remembered as texts or epinician revels that included poetry but were remembered only as events (see VII.5). It is clear, however, that *Isthmian* 4 incorporates epinician precedent in order to highlight its superior power along the axes of

¹⁷⁸ Regular periodicity of heavenly bodies: *O.* 4.2, *N.* 2.10-12, *Arat.* 451-3 with Kidd (1997).

¹⁷⁹ Jebb (1906) on *B.* 13.198: 'the four great πανηγύρεις are "Panhellenic" as distinguished from minor local festivals'. On our passage see Gundert (1935) 13, Woodbury (1947) 369-70, Thummer (1968) ii.55; contrast Köhnken (1971) 98-104.

¹⁸⁰ Kurke (1991) 43-76 discusses how epinician reactivates memory of previous victories but does not discuss previous epinicians.

¹⁸¹ Cf. fr. 52m.4-5: ἄνθεα τοιαῦτα |] ὑμνήσιος. *B.* 20.3 (τοιόνδε μέλος) establishes a more general link with a previous performance (cf. *Ar. Av.* 1735: ἐν τοιῷδ' ὑμεναίῳ).

time and space (cf. *O.* 9.1-4, 21-5).¹⁸² Pindar would not pray to emulate these previous epinicians as he prays to emulate Homeric epic (43-5). The reception of these earlier epinicians could not be described in the same superlative terms as that of Homeric epic (37-42). On the contrary, these epinicians failed in their commemorative purpose. These earlier poems, as Willcock (1995) writes, are ‘not up to Pindar’s standard’.

‘Flowers of song’ (27) suggests an athletic crown but also brings to mind the theme of seasonal bloom and decay, which is prominent in the preceding verses (18b with Woodbury (1974)).¹⁸³ Despite these previous celebrations, the Cleonymidae’s glory lapsed into the darkness of being forgotten (23). Because of Pindar’s superior skill (cf. εἴ τις εὖ εἴπηι τι, 41), the eternal light of his poem will never be so dimmed (cf. ἄσβεστος αἰεὶ, 42) and the family will never again be so forgotten.¹⁸⁴ They have been honoured in Thebes (Θήβαισι, 7), but through *Isthmian* 4 their fame will spread as widely as sunlight (δι’ ἀνθρώπων, 37) and reach later generations (λοιποῖς, 39) as long as the sun shines.

The implicit comparison between Pindar’s epinician and its generic predecessors becomes clearer when a different genre with different associations emerges into view later in the poem. As often (see IV.4), the past reception of epic serves to depict the idealised future reception of Pindar’s epinician. The first myth of *Isthmian* 4 is a story about story-telling,¹⁸⁵ a narrative as much about Homer as about Ajax (37-42):

ἀλλ’ Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμα-
 κεν δι’ ἀνθρώπων, ὃς αὐτοῦ (sc. Ajax)
 πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν
 θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.
 τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾷεν ἔρπει,

¹⁸² φάμαν (22) may suggest word of mouth; cf. Greindl (1938) 85-6.

¹⁸³ Cf. *O.* 12.15 with Nisetich (1977), Segal (1981) 72, and, more generally, Griffith (1999).

¹⁸⁴ Cf. *I.* 7.16-22 with Currie (2005) 219-21.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. *N.* 6.45-54, also looking to Homer.

εἴ τις εὖ εἴπῃ τι· καὶ πάγ-
καρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν
ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄβεστος αἰεὶ.

Ajax is introduced as an example of the vulnerability of valour (34-5) but becomes an example of the power of poetry to redeem valour (Hubbard (1985) 113, Calabrese De Feo (1985) 128-9).¹⁸⁶ As Pindar resurrects the Cleonymidae's reputation, so Homer redeems Ajax,¹⁸⁷ who in the *Aethiopis* commits suicide in the dark of ignominy and the gloom of night (ὀψίαι | ἐν νυκτί, 35b-6, cf. *Aethiopis* fr. 6 GEF, M. L. West (2013) 161-2). Again celestial light is closely linked to a lasting and widespread tradition. This second description of poetry in *Isthmian* 4, however, caps the earlier description of resurrected glory (23-4) by evoking the sun heralded by the morning star (cf. *Od.* 13.93-5). The dawn star suggests a return from darkness; ἄβεστος αἰεὶ (42) suggests an unnatural super-sun never quenched in darkness (cf. *P.* 6.10-14, *B.* 13.178-81). The dawn star shines pre-eminently among others (24); the sun has no rival.¹⁸⁸

This passage is designed to activate an audience's knowledge of a poetic tradition. Homer's immortalisation of Ajax, a hero without civic or familial connection to the Theban victor, makes this story relevant. ἄβεστος αἰεὶ (42) expands on the Homeric ἄβεστον κλέος (*Od.* 4.484, 7.333) and applies the vocabulary of epic to its reception so as to affirm the vision of its afterlife

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Moulton 1977 (19-27) on the shifting reference of some Homeric similes.

¹⁸⁷ Nisetich (1989) 11-12 argues that Pindar contrasts the *Aethiopis*-poet with Homer. The pivotal phrase is ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι (37). This marks a contrast, as Nisetich asserts, but the relevant one is between Ajax's dishonour (the topic of the immediately preceding clause) and his posthumous redemption (36b-7 with Farnell (1930-2), Segal (1981) 76), not between Homer and another unmentioned poet. On μομφὰν ἔχει (36) see Carden (1974) 22-3. ὀρθώσαις (38) need not imply a correction (see Slater s.v., Young (1968) 78n3). An *implicit* contrast between Homer and the *Aethiopis*-poet would be just possible if they were commonly held to be different individuals in Pindar's day. They were not (Fitch (1924), Pfeiffer (1968) 73, Burkert (2001) 114, M. L. West (2013) 28-9, Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 15-34). Herodotus (2.117, 4.32) shows that scepticism started early, but he hardly sounds like a man relying on consensus. It is crucial to the consolatory purpose of *Isthmian* 4 that both Pindar and Homer memorialise tragedy and triumph alike.

¹⁸⁸ *O.* 1.5-6, Simon. 605.

embodied within that genre.¹⁸⁹ βέβακεν (*I.* 4.41) is a gnomic perfect (Gildersleeve (1900-10) i.111), ‘stressing the continuity or permanence’ of the action (Gerber (1982) on *O.* 1.53). The perfect τετίμακεν (37) highlights durative aspect.¹⁹⁰ τοι (37) ‘bring[s] home to the comprehension of the person addressed a truth’ (Denniston 537). ἴστε μάν (35) ostentatiously draws on the audience’s knowledge of a well-known story. Pindar makes that knowledge an object of reflection. Proof positive of the immortalising power of poetry lies in the fact that the audience does know of Ajax’s excellence through Homer. A listener’s ability to follow the argument confirms its proposition. Indeed, Pindar’s elliptical reference to the unnamed Odysseus’ τέχνα (35 with Thummer (1968-9), Privitera (1982), Köhnken (1971) 109) presumes in his audiences a robust knowledge of the poetry of ‘Homer’.

Homer is assimilated to a rhapsode of the sort that recited epic for Pindar’s fifth-century audiences.¹⁹¹ Pindar depicts a living tradition stemming from Homer’s performance long ago and replicated in subsequent re-performances such as those known to his contemporaries: Homer’s utterance echoes into the future as his work speaks with the voice of its creator to later generations (ἔφρακεν, 38→φωναῖεν, 40→εἵπηι, 41).¹⁹² There is a blurring of subjectivity as the epic poet’s voice is perpetuated in those who utter his poems.¹⁹³ Homer, moreover, intends for his work to be so repeated: ἀθύρειν (39) is a final infinitive (cf. Hummel (1993) 280). Pindar’s hope to immortalise his subject has manifest precedent—albeit not an epinician one.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Sappho 44.4, Ibyc. S151.46-7, Simon. 11.15-17 W.

¹⁹⁰ Nisetich (1989) 12; cf. Simon. 11.15 W: ἀθά]νατον κέχρυται κλέος (also of Homer).

¹⁹¹ Graziosi (2002) 30; cf. Pl. *Leg.* 658b-d. ῥάβδος as identifying icon of rhapsodes: M. L. West (1966) on Hes. *Theog.* 30.

¹⁹² For the aorist cf. Simon. 564.4, 11.18 W (with West’s attractive supplement), *P.* 4.278, B. 5.191, Pelliccia (2003) 107-8.

¹⁹³ Cf. *P.* 10.55-6: Ἐφουραίῳ | ὅπ’ ἀμφὶ Πηνεῖδον γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἐμάν. The *Iliad* can present itself to audiences as the *repetition* of an original inscribed oral performance: consider the reference to the voice of the composer at *Il.* 2.489-90.

ἄσβεστος (42), which Pindar applies to the sun-like ray of glory, in Homer describes flames (*Il.* 16.123, 17.88-9) as well as fame. Diction thus prepares for the fire imagery of lines 43-5, where the implicit comparison between epic and epinician becomes explicit:

προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν,
 κεῖνον ἄγαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων
 καὶ Μελίccωι, παγκρατίου στεφάνωμ' ἐπάξιον,
 ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιάδα.

These lines insist on a close parallel (καὶ Μελίccωι, 44;¹⁹⁴ κεῖνον, 43, anaphoric).¹⁹⁵ Nonetheless, the differences between fire and celestial light reflect the differences between Pindar's poem as an unfolding event and the established tradition of Homeric epic.¹⁹⁶ The flame of song, as in the examples discussed above, is linked to the moment of poetic utterance. The prayer looks to the future. ἄγαι (43) connotes beginning. Homer's wondrous words (θεσπεσίων ἐπέων, 39, again deploying epic vocabulary to describe the reception of epic) have already won a universal audience;¹⁹⁷ Pindar, speaking before or during the debut performance of his work, can only pray to the Muses, the goddesses who bestow the sort of aesthetic appeal that secures such a reception.¹⁹⁸

The immediate juxtaposition of fire and celestial light encapsulates the way performance relates to tradition in Pindaric epinician: the poet hopes that the passing fire of performance might be transmuted into the enduring light of tradition (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.35-6). As Herington (1985) 62 writes, Pindar's 'task, both for his own sake and for that of his clients, was nothing

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Simon. 11.23 W: καὶ τόνδ[ε] (also looking to Homeric precedent), Currie (2005) 220. In this context ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιάδα (*I.* 4.45) is an epicising locution (Hutchinson *per litteras*).

¹⁹⁵ Cf. τοῦθ' ... φέγγος, *N.* 9.42.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Silk (1974) 116-17, Segal (1981) 75, Hutchinson (2012) 280.

¹⁹⁷ Homer linked to a universal audience in the archaic period: Graziosi (2002) 59.

¹⁹⁸ With προφρόνων Μοισᾶν (43) cf. Κλεοῦς ἐθελοίcas (*N.* 3.83), Κλεός ἐ[κατι (*Pae.* 7a.7). On Pindar's relationship to the Muses see Lanata (1963) 74-97, Tigerstedt (1970), P. Murray (1981), Finkelberg (1998) ch. 6, Kantzios (2003), Ledbetter (2003) ch. 3.

less than to achieve incorporation into [the] tradition, or, in other words, to compose poems good enough to merit re-performance'. This task of canonisation is a central theme of Pindar's self-reflexive work. If we posit that his poetry 'realised its primary function in actual life rather than in what we mean by literature' (Fraenkel (1957) 30), we not only disregard as historical evidence much of what his poems say about themselves but also hinder our understanding of these texts as literature.

A literal upward movement of fire toward the heavens occurs later in Pindar's description of a distinctively Theban rite for the Heraclidae. Again flames are juxtaposed with celestial light. The light imagery of *Isthmian* 4 runs the course of a day, from morning star (23-4) to sunlight (41-2) to a flame blazing through the night (65-6): τοῖσιν ἐν δυθμαῖσιν αὐγᾶν φλόξ ἀνατελλομένα συνεχὲς παννυχίζει, | αἰθέρα κνικάεντι λακτίζοις καπνῶι ... Mirroring the setting sun (65), a flame rises like a planet¹⁹⁹ and kicks against the sky, the realm of the celestial bodies.²⁰⁰ The vigorous λακτίζοις (66) suggests the victor's violent discipline and perhaps also a request for entry.²⁰¹ In *Isthmian* 4, interconnecting light imagery invites audiences to think about how epinician poetry resembles not just epic poetry but also religious ritual (cf. Segal (1981) 78). Like a cultic rite, epinician can approach the permanence of natural elements and of the gods through being repeated²⁰² by successive generations of mortals. Like a cultic rite, epinician gains its value as a social practice in part from its participants' knowledge that they are partaking in a tradition stretching across time (see IV.1). 'The actual value of [these] activities depends on their place in an ongoing human history' (Scheffler (2013) 54, discussing tradition as a philosophical notion).

¹⁹⁹ See LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀνατέλλω II.

²⁰⁰ In Homer, smoke (*Il.* 1.317) and fame (8.192) both reach the sky.

²⁰¹ The *pancratium* allowed kicking (Poliakoff (1986) 10-11). Instead of knocking on a door the ancients sometimes kicked: Ar. *Nub.* 136, Callim. *Hy.* 2.3, Hor. *Carm.* 1.4.13-14 with Nisbet and Hubbard (1970).

²⁰² Cf. ἐτείων (67) with *Pae.* 1.5.

Isthmian 4 participates in a tradition both by looking backwards to a legacy of previous victory celebrations (25-7) and by looking forward to its future existence as part of a literary tradition (43-5).

A contrast between Theban origins and universal goals runs throughout *Isthmian* 4.²⁰³ Whether or not debuting at the festival that it describes, *Isthmian* 4 was first performed in Thebes for Thebans. Yet the poem also sought to engage a secondary audience through space and time. The Theban poet, who brings his civic identity into the poem (ἄκτοί ... αὔξομεν, 62-3),²⁰⁴ aims for his epinician first performed in his home town to achieve the universal dispersal of epic.²⁰⁵ As the Theban Heracles' wide travels eventually won immortality on Olympus (58-60), so Pindar's poem, by its diffusion across the space that Heracles opened for civilised traffic (55-6; cf. 41),²⁰⁶ can achieve a different but analogous sort of immortality like that already achieved by Homeric epic and by Heracles himself (τετίμακεν, 37→τετίματαί, 59). Melissus follows in Heracles' footsteps not only as a relatively small wrestler (50-5)²⁰⁷ but also in his journey outward from Thebes, metaphorically in reaching the pillars of Heracles by his supreme achievement (οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἄπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις, 12) and more literally through the wide travels of Pindar's poem celebrating that achievement.²⁰⁸ Melissus began his athletic *cursus honorum* in

²⁰³ Segal (1981) 70. Descriptions of travel: 1-3, 5, 11-12, 32, 36b, 41-2, 53-7 (cf. Calame (2012)).

²⁰⁴ Cf. *I.* 1.52, 7.37, 49, *B.* 2.9, Neumann-Hartmann (2005), Currie (2013) 271. I take the plural here as including the poet, chorus, and other Thebans.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Carey (2007) 209: 'the ideal was to free the victor's fame from the confines of its own polis by creating poetry of sufficient appeal to achieve re-performance in other cities'.

²⁰⁶ Heracles' Libyan wrestling match presents him as globe-trotting civiliser (52-5; cf. 11-12). Song can spread throughout the world because he forcibly rendered it navigable (55-7). ἡμερώαις (57 with Thummer (1968-9)), like English 'pacify', can connote violence (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 14, Hdt. 7.5.8).

²⁰⁷ Cf. *Il.* 2.529-30, 5.801, [Simon.] 52 *FGE*, Boeke (2007) 128-9.

²⁰⁸ Poetic glory as journey: Thgn. 247-50, *B.* 9.47-50, Köhnken (1971) 158-60 on *Pythian* 10, Hor. *Carm.* 2.20.13-16 with the prefatory remarks of Nisbet and Hubbard (1978).

Thebes as a boy (ὄδ' ἄνῆρ, 70, contrasts with παίδων, 71) and progressed to panhellenic victory at the Isthmus as a man (cf. ἀνορέαις, 11). The Cleonymidae have been honoured in Thebes (7) and now will extend their reputation to a Hellenic level through Pindar's poem. The relationship between the local and the super-local is a central theme self-consciously negotiated throughout this ode.

In *Isthmian* 4 Pindar invites reflection on the reception of his epinician outside Thebes through his own reception of the non-Theban Homer: ὅς αὐτοῦ (sc. Ajax) | πᾶσαν ὀρθώσαις ἀρετὰν κατὰ ράβδον ἔφρασεν | θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν (37-9). Here λοιποῖς (39) recalls the Homeric motif whereby characters express their awareness that they will become characters known to future generations.²⁰⁹ This backward-looking reference to a forward-looking figuration of reception in an earlier work exemplifies a common Pindaric intertextual strategy and advances an implicit argument: this ode will survive as previous works have survived (see IV.4). Pindar identifies his contemporary public with that later audience imagined by Homeric characters. His re-deployment of epic material re-confirms these characters' prediction already confirmed in Homer. ἀθύρειν (39) describes the pleasure of secondary audiences, which secures a lasting afterlife for a work (cf. ἄθ]ηρμα, B. 9.87 with Maehler (1982-97)).²¹⁰ The infinitive, with its ludic connotations,²¹¹ is strikingly predicated of Ajax's deadly serious martial prowess and, implicitly, his suicide (cf. B. 18.57). The contrast between aesthetic delight and its grim object

²⁰⁹ E.g. *Il.* 6.357-8, *Od.* 3.203-4, 8.579-80. Later evocations: Stesich. 112.6 (with West's supplement), Sappho 147, [Hes.] fr. 212b.6, Thgn. 251, Eur. *Supp.* 1225, *Tro.* 1245, Theoc. 12.11, Callim. *Hy.* 5.121.

²¹⁰ Since λοιποῖς (39), looking back to ἀνθρώπων (37) and evoking the Homeric ἐκκομμένοι (e.g. *Il.* 2.119), refers to future generations most generally (cf. Eur. *El.* 1268), ἀθύρειν (39) probably refers not to rhapsodic performance (*pace* Currie (2004) 65) but to audience reception. The verb here means 'sport with, take delight in' (Slater s.v.).

²¹¹ Cf. Alc. 70.3, H. *Hy.* 4.485 with Richardson (2010), N. 3.44 with Pfeijffer (1999a), Pind. *O.* 1.16.

recalls and exemplifies the Homeric paradox that poetry recounting suffering can be a source of enjoyment for a detached audience.²¹² Audiences enjoy hearing how Ajax killed others and killed himself. This is odd.

As Pindar's contemporaries could see themselves as 'men to come' remembering past figures, so they could imagine future generations remembering them. Thinking of this abstracted perspective would have had importance for the pragmatic goals of Pindar's poem in its original setting. In *Isthmian* 4 the common theme of memorialisation has a specific consolatory application: Melissus' contribution to his family's glory is weighed against the death of his relatives in war (16-17b). In a real sense Pindar's poem is not just for the victor but for his family (τόνδε ... γενεῇ θαυμαστὸν ὕμνον, 21). Ajax's death is outweighed by his glorious afterlife; the Cleonymidae's grief may be alleviated but not erased by contemplating their future glory. ἐκλῶν γὰρ ὑπὸ χαρμάτων πῆμα θνάσκει | παλίγκοτον δαμασθέν (*O.* 2.19-20).

Isthmian 4 highlights a paradox central to Pindaric epinician: the poem succeeds in its original setting by promising to transcend it. One can agree that each ode 'is designed to function for a specific audience at a specific moment in time' (Pfeijffer (1999a) 11), but one must add that each ode was also designed to function for other audiences at other moments in time. One may add the corollary that it would have been important to a specific audience at a specific moment in time that the poem could also function for others. It is true that 'Pindar wrote to praise and to please his patrons' (Carnes (1995) 25), but pleasing his patrons involved pleasing many others. Even if we take as our goal describing the experience of the historical individuals who made up Pindar's first audiences, one should not underrate the degree to which their experience would have been shaped by their thoughts of the impending reception of what they heard. This prospect

²¹² Maceod (2001), Griffin (1980) 98.

of renown was, after all, probably a chief justification for the expense of hiring a poet of Pindar's prestige. Indeed, patrons are frequently lauded for their foresight in realising their mortality and spending to hire a poet who could secure immortal glory.²¹³ It is characteristic of Pindar's self-reflexive approach that he weaves his commemorative *raison d'être* into the fabric of his work.²¹⁴

By making prospective reception an important theme, Pindar encouraged his first audience to think of how the work that they heard enter the world in its first performance would later travel through time and space. Secondary audiences are encouraged to reflect on the qualities that have allowed the ode to travel from fifth-century Thebes to the point of reception, wherever and whenever that may be. Every audience's attention is drawn toward the act of reception and the act of composition.

Considering how future audiences might react to Pindar's poem would have been a natural part of the experience of its first audience. Conversely, considering how its first audience might have reacted to Pindar's poem, as the last paragraph does, is a natural part of the experience of any secondary audience.²¹⁵ Understanding an epinician as a poetic artefact involves moving toward the perspective of those who experienced it as enacted celebration. As future reception was crucial to the pragmatic goals of *Isthmian* 4 in its immediate historical setting, so its unique origin in a specific situation is involved in its aesthetic success among secondary audiences. No small part of the appeal of the poem, the quality which enabled and enables it to

²¹³ *P.* 1.92-4, *N.* 7.11-13, 17-18 with Most (1985a) 144-5, *I.* 1.40 (contrast οὐ φράζεται, 68) with Woodbury (1981).

²¹⁴ Carey (1995) 99: 'Pindar is also unusual in the degree to which he makes the actual process of composition the subject of his song, so that the odes acquire a reflexive quality'; Maehler (1963) 96: 'Pindar ist selbstbewußt wie kaum ein anderer griechischer Dichter'.

²¹⁵ Felson (2004a) 264-5 discusses how secondary audiences may 're-imagine a lost historical performance'.

spread abroad from Thebes, is derived from the vivid depiction of a diminutive but determined victor, his proud but vulnerable family, and a specifically Theban ritual from the perspective of its participants. The specificity of the ode is inseparable from and indeed helps to constitute its universal appeal.²¹⁶

The Theban poet, too, appears as a compelling character in his own right. ‘Pindaric poetry fights ephemerality’ (Scodel (2001) 125), and that battle, though played out in the real world, is part of the internal drama of the poems. Each ode gradually becomes, as an utterance unfolding in real time,²¹⁷ a complete artefact shaped by the decisions of the poet into something worthy of being remembered (cf. Crotty (1982) 27-8). Each work is a stable edifice that records the process of its construction (cf. *O.* 6.1-3), at once an act and an artefact (cf. *P.* 6.1-9, where present ἀναπολίζομεν, 3, contrasts with perfect τετείχισται, 9).

Isthmian 4 suggests the limitations of approaching any epinician exclusively from the perspective of first performance or exclusively from the perspective of subsequent afterlife. Like one gazing through the two lenses of binoculars, one sees best through both perspectives simultaneously. The Janus-faced nature of each epinician, both an unrepeatable event always already looking back on itself and a lasting monument contemplating its future, is captured by the opening metaphor of *Olympian* 7. The sympotic scene resonates with the performance setting of Pindar’s epinician.²¹⁸ This is not just any party, however, but a betrothal ceremony sealing a lasting relationship (6).²¹⁹ The poem is compared to the gift of a golden cup, a precious keepsake (4),

²¹⁶ Contrast Nagy (1990) 349.

²¹⁷ See p. 259n780 on Pindar’s ‘oral subterfuge’.

²¹⁸ Krummen (1990) 275-6 and Clay (1999) 27-8 argue for sympotic performance; Hornblower (2004) 132-3 and Currie (2011) 284-5 argue for a public festival. These options are not mutually exclusive (cf. Clay (1999) 27).

²¹⁹ Braswell (1976) 240-2 identifies the ἐγγύησις.

and nectar, an agent of immortalisation (7).²²⁰ Like the act of giving an heirloom, epinician performance is a concrete action that derives its distinctive value from its consequences ramifying into the future. We misconstrue its essence if we discount the consciousness of posterity which pervades the act or if we sever the link between the artefact and its origin in a particular moment.

²²⁰ Cf. *O.* 1.62 with Gerber (1982), *P.* 9.63, fr. 194, O. L. Smith (1967) 174, Young (1968) 74, Brown (1984) 49, Steiner (1986) 130.

III. Event then Artefact

And Pindar, poet of the Olympian and Isthmian
And Pythian games, wrote also of the boundless
And forgetful savannas of time.

– Robert Pinsky, *Glory*

Some recent scholarship explores how early Greek poetry reactivates the past.²²¹ Less attention has been paid to how poets envisage their works as being reactivated in the future. This chapter examines the interplay between first performance and subsequent reception. This dynamic is foreign to our contemporary conceptions of lyric (cf. Mullen (1982) 41) and so makes an all the more potentially rewarding topic of study. By strongly identifying an ode with its first performance, one can neglect the way in which the stages of an ode's life in the world become a prominent concern. These poems often describe their own journey from event to artefact.

The epinician narrator, as D'Alessio (2004) demonstrates, speaks before or during the first performance of his work.²²² So anchored in time, he often prefigures the future of his work. Pindar addresses his contemporaries but speaks in a stage whisper and tells them that posterity is listening. Indeed, Pindaric epinician tends to emphasise its permanence alongside the depiction of itself as an ephemeral event. Pindar is interested in bringing these facets of his work into dialogue. In *Olympian* 4 the chorus has just arrived to perform (ἵκει, 10) but has come in order to

²²¹ Epic: Bakker (1993a, 1993b); hymns: Clay (2011b) 236; lyric: Calame (2012).

²²² A striking exception would be the 'inscriptional' πότε (Young (1983a); cf. Wade-Gery (1933) 73). *N.* 9.52 is strongest candidate (where see Braswell (1999)). Other temporal particles may be focalised from future time (e.g. Eur. *El.* 975 with Denniston (1939)). *N.* 4.16 (κελάδησε, aorist) is a past counterfactual conditional— as if Pindar's poem already existed in order to be re-performed time and again. Aorist and perfect verbs sometimes look backward to a completed section (e.g. *P.* 11.38-40, *N.* 3.65, 7.76) or to a completed poem (*O.* 10.98, 100, *I.* 2.46 with Pfeijffer (1999b) 32); cf. *exegi* (*Hor. Carm.* 3.30.1, *Ov. Met.* 15.872) and the 'epistolary aorist' focalised from the perspective of the receiver (Goodwin (1879) 18).

inaugurate²²³ the glory of Camarina (κῦδος ὄρσαι, 11). The ode is thus both a passing revel and a poetic lodestar shining through space and time: τόνδε κῶμον, | χρονιώτατον φάος (9-10 with Mader (1990)). *Isthmian* 7 celebrates a recent event (φέρει, 21, present) in comastic revel (κώμαζ', 20). As an artefact of superlative aesthetic value (17-19), it will also be remembered alongside the canonical glories of Theban history recounted in roughly chronological order in the proem (1-15; cf. Young (1971) 46). *Olympian* 8 asks to be accepted as a revel (τόνδε κῶμον, 10) and then describes the lasting glory attending Olympic victors (μέγα τοι κλέος αἰεὶ, 10). In *Pythian* 5, Carrhotus is celebrated in the present moment in a blaze of song (cὲ δ' ἠύκομοι φλέγοντι Χάριτες, 45) but he holds onto these words as a lasting memorial (ἔχεις ... λόγων φερτάτων | μναμῆι', 46-9). At the close of *Isthmian* 5 the poet, who has come to Aegina (21-2, 34-5), describes a crown presented in a face-to-face situation and his 'winged poem' being sent off beyond the island (62-3): λάμβανέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὐμαλλον μίτραν, | καὶ πτερόεντα νέον κύμπεμψον ὕμνον. The speaker grounds himself in the moment when his poem enters the world (νέον, 63) and begins its afterlife (πτερόεντα, 63 with Silk (1998) 77-9). At the end of *Pythian* 4 Damophilus has just recently 'discovered' Pindar's immortal poem in Thebes (εὔρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων, πρόσφατον Θήβαι ξενωθείς, 299). *Olympian* 6 ends by describing the poem/revel going to Sicily from Arcadia (98-100) and then gestures at even further performances: ἐμῶν δ' ὕμνων ἄεξ' εὐτερπέεσσι ἄνθος. Here εὐτερπέεσσι (105) looks to the literary excellence that will allow this poem to 'grow' in secondary reception, a common closing motif (compare and contrast Stern (1970) 340, Hubbard (1985) 141, Gentili *et al.* (2013)). The song has recently

²²³ Cf. Barrett (2007) 42 on ὄρσαι (11): 'the verb— to get it going, set it moving— implies clearly enough the production of glory where there has been none before'.

blossomed but will long endure (cf. Adorjáni (2014)).²²⁴ This κῶμον (98) travels on from Sicily to visit many others.

Bacchylides fr. 20b opens with a brief cletic hymn to the lyre (3-4): δεῦρ' ἐκ ἐμὰς χέρας· ὀρμαίνω τι πέμπ[ειν | χρύσειον Μουσᾶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳι πτερόν. Composition is presented as extemporaneous: τι (3) has its full indefinite force. Yet the poem is not merely something improvised for those within earshot.²²⁵ πέμπ[ειν ... πτερόν (3-4) recalls the journey of the poem through space to its distant Macedonian addressee. χρύσειον (4), together with the following description of a recurring performance scenario (ἐν] εἰκάδεσ[ειν ... εὔτε, 5-6; cf. Eur. Alc. 449-51), points up durability. The voice of the poet melds into the 'voice' (γᾶρον, 5) of the lyre, which speaks in acts of reception.

Pindar's epinicians bear the imprint of their occasional genesis, but they also thematise the process of transcending that genesis. The following sections treat in greater detail passages that juxtapose first performance and subsequent reception. I then draw overarching conclusions.

1. *Isthmian* 2.43-8

μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ
 θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες,
 μήτ' ἀρετὰν ποτε σιγάτω πατρώϊαν,
 μηδὲ τούτδ' ὕμνους· ἐπεὶ τοι
 οὐκ ἐλινύσσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν.
 ταῦτα, Νικάσιππ', ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν
 ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἡθαῖον ἔλθῃς.

The poet, speaking before first performance, presents his composition as a completed affair (ἐργασάμαν, 46, aorist) and begins to look toward its afterlife. Nicasippus will deliver the ode for

²²⁴ Loscalzo (2003) 112 thinks of Poseidon helping Pindar's poem to be spread over the sea (cf. N. 1.1-5).

²²⁵ Cf. Carey (1989c) 564n49, Fearn (2007) 41.

its debut in the near future (ὅταν, 47 with D'Alessio (2004) 286),²²⁶ but this will not be the end of its existence. The poet's skill ensures that it will travel abroad to meet audiences outside Acragas.²²⁷ 'Not in order to remain still' (46) is polar litotes²²⁸ for 'in order to travel widely' (cf. *N.* 5.1-5, perhaps an intertext). Initial delivery at one moment contrasts with widespread circulation afterwards. μήτ' ... ποτε ciγάτω (44) may exhort Thrasybulus to remember his father through this poem time and again (cf. θαμά, *N.* 4.15; μή ποτε, *O.* 9.77).

2. *Olympian* 10.91-6

The same relationship between definite debut and indefinite reception is articulated in the end of *Olympian* 10. This work has come into the world in Pindar's Thebes (τὰ παρ' εὐκλεί Δίρκαί χρόνῳ μὲν φάνεν, 85); it will be executed in choral performance among the Epizephyrean Locrians (χλιδῶσα δὲ μολπὰ πρὸς κάλαμον ἀντιάξει μελέων, 84, future)²²⁹ and then travel outward (91-6):

καὶ ὅταν καλὰ ἔρξαις ἀοιδᾶς ἄτερ,
 Ἀγησίδαμ', εἰς Αἶδα σταθμόν
 ἀνὴρ ἴκηται, κενεὰ πνεύσαις ἔπορε μόχθῳ
 βραχὺ τι τερπνόν. τιν' δ' ἀδυεπὴς τε λύρα
 γλυκύς τ' αὐλὸς ἀναπάσσει χάριν
 τρέφοντι δ' εὐρὺ κλέος
 κόραι Πιερίδες Διός.

The passage of time, which had increased the poet's debt (7-8), will now increase the value of his repayment (see VI.3). Performance, an ongoing process (ἀναπάσσει, 94, present) with musical

²²⁶ Nicasippus is apparently the leader of the chorus (e.g. Mullen (1982) 34; cf. *O.* 6.88 with Hutchinson (2001), Adorjani (2014) 48-51). Catenacci (1999) makes a case for taking ἀπόνειμον (47) to mean 'read' (metaphorically, probably).

²²⁷ Bernadini (1983) 36-7, Morrison (2007a) 89, Clear (2013) 34n9; contrast D'Alessio (2004) 286-7.

²²⁸ See Köhnken (1976) 66, Race (1990) 75.

²²⁹ See D'Alessio (2004) 291-2 on the remarkable play of tenses in this passage. μολπὰ is the *vox propria* for enacted choral performance (Cingano (1993) 349-53).

accompaniment (ἀδυεπιῆς τε λύρα | γλυκύς τ' αὐλός, 93-4) focalised from the perspective of the addressee (τίν, 93), contrasts with enduring fame. The poet has finished the composition promised in the proem:²³⁰ he uses the aorist to describe a completed task (ἀμφέπεσον, 98; αἶνῃα, 100). As the work ends, its afterlife comes into view in the form of a generalisation (95-6) contrasting with the preceding specific statement in the first-person voice: widespread reception (εὐρὸν κλέος, 95) is outside the poet's control and depends on the Muses. He has joined them in celebrating the victor (συγχοπαπτόμενος, 97; cf. 3-6), but his part in the process is finished. τρέφοντι (95) evokes gradual, organic growth over time. As it moves forward Time will reveal the truth of Pindar's promise to his patron (53-5; ψευδέων, 5 ≠ ἀλάθειαν, 54).

The temporally 'short' (βραχύ, 93) pleasure of one who dies without song contrasts with the spatially 'wide' (εὐρύ, 95) dissemination of song that will ensure durability (cf. Simon. 16 W). The 'charm' (χάριν, 94) which is realised in first performance is the same aesthetic attractiveness which will ensure that the song survives beyond this moment (MacLachlan (1993) 87; cf. B. 3.97 with Hutchinson (2001)). As Ganymede won immortality through youthful beauty (104-5), so the beautiful victor has secured his poetic immortality through youthful success (cf. Ibyc. S151.46-8). Even when he ages, his youth will be preserved in a song, which, like a young heir (86), consoles him with the knowledge that some part of him survives death (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.6-7). The victor, a boy, is invited to look forward from the present moment toward time beyond his demise. As Zeus immortalised the beautiful young Ganymede (105), so within the semipiternal world of the poem the victor will remain attractive and young (99-100) as he was on the day of his victory (κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον, 102) even when he reaches old age (ἴκοντι νεότατος τὸ πάλιν ἤδη, 87) and even when he dies (εἰς Αἶδα σταθμόν | ἀνὴρ ἵκηται, 92-3). *Olympian* 10 be-

²³⁰ γλυκὺ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέλος ὀφείλων (3) → γλυκύς τ' αὐλός ἀναπάσσει χάριν (94).

gins as a name in the poet's mind (1-3), then becomes a composition (85), then a choral performance (93-4), then a *fait accompli* (97-100), and finally an enduring artefact that contains all these.

3. Bacchylides 13.220-31

ἐλπίδι θυμὸν ἰαίν[-
 τᾷ καὶ ἐγὼ πίκυνο[
 φοινικοκραδέμοις [τε Μούσαις
 ὕμνων τινὰ τάνδε ν[εόπλοκον δόσιν
 φαίνω, ξενίαν τε [φιλά-
 γλαον γεραίρω,
 τὰν ἐμοὶ Λάμπων [
 βληχρὰν ἐπαθρήσαις²³¹ τ[
 τὰν εἰς ἐτύμως ἄρα Κλειῶ
 πανθαλής ἐμαῖς ἐνέσταξ[εν φρασίαν,
 τερψιπεεῖς νιν ἄ[ο]ῖδαί
 παντὶ καρύξοντι λα[ῶ]ι.

Composition prior to performance (ἐμαῖς ἐνέσταξ[εν φρασίαν, 229, aorist)²³² contrasts with public debut and subsequent afterlife. φαίνω (224, present) describes the revelation of a new work (cf. ν[εόπλοκον, 223, if correct). καρύξοντι (231, future) connotes the herald's task of publicising 'news'.²³³ τᾷ καὶ ἐγὼ (221) suggests that the lost preceding lines perhaps dealt with other pursuits aimed at glory, which introduced poetry as a climax.²³⁴ In the present moment of performance the speaker is gladdened by the prospect of the impending future of his work (cf. ἐλπίδι

²³¹ ἐπαθρήσαις (227), implying close inspection (Dodds (1960) on Eur. *Ba.* 1281), will be an optative of wish rather than the Aeolic form of the aorist participle, which appears in Pindar but nowhere else in Bacchylides (cf. Braswell (1984), Barrett (2007) 291n145). Cf. B. 5.6-8 (ἄθρησεν), P. 2.69-71 (ἄθρησεν), and O. 10.9 (ὁράτω, Fennell's conjecture, which I have accepted), all addressed to a patron and emphasising aesthetic quality.

²³² φρήν as location of composition: N. 4.8, Pae. 9.37.

²³³ D. L. Cairns (2010) takes the verb as 'a straight-forward text-external future ... referring to the immediate and long-term reception of the ode by its public'. But λα[ῶ]ι (231) will refer to those present at first performance (cf. Pind. Pae. 2.3), not an indefinite public (*pace* Fearn (2007) 158, who does not cite a parallel).

²³⁴ So, attractively, Jebb (1906); cf. e.g. I. 1.47-51, B. 10.35-42.

θυμὸν ἰαίν[-, 220).²³⁵ This future-directed hope depends on the Muses as a group (222) and in particular on the significantly named Cleo (228),²³⁶ singled out as source of inspiration. She is πανθαλής (229) because through her poems flourish. Her influence will be revealed in the aesthetic charm (τερψιπεῖς, 230) which can secure the κλέος promised by her name.

Though looking forward to its reception, the poem remains anchored to the time and place of its debut (Calame (2009) 13-15). Lampon (226), Bacchylides' patron, and an immediate Aeginetan audience (231), both explicitly denominated, are invited to share the poet's confidence in his work. The final sentence is couched as an indirect question (εἰκ' ἐτύμως ἄρα, 228) to be answered by an impending public reception (παντί ... λα[ῶ]ι, 231). Those present at its first performance are invited to ask themselves if Cleo has inspired the poet and if his work indeed deserves to survive beyond its debut. The Aeginetans could imagine how 'all-subduing time' would in time increase the glory of a recent victory (cf. 204-7).

4. Pindar fr. 52o

Only the final lines of fr. 52o, probably a *prosodion* rather than a paeon (D'Alessio (1997) 25), survive in a readable state. This poem also closed by juxtaposing first performance and later reception. The event to be remembered, however, is not a revel but a rite. The last verses are rich in tropes familiar from epinician (31-40):

εὐδοξίας δ' ἐπίχειρα δε[
θε· λίγεια μὲν Μοῖς' ἀφα.[
μων τελευταῖς ἀρίζε[ι
λόγον τερπνῶν ἐπέων [
μνάσει δὲ καί τινα ναίο[ν-

²³⁵ Hope in early Greek poetry often has negative connotations, but here the verb can only denote positive anticipation of good (cf. Zink (1962) *passim*).

²³⁶ ἐτύμως (229) points up the 'etymology'; cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 949-51 with Garvie (1986), Diggle (1970) 225, F. Cairns (2002) 472.

θ' ἐκάς ἡρωΐδος
 θεαρίας· βακανι-
 cθέντι δὲ χρυσῶι τέλος. [
 γνώμας δὲ ταχείας συν[
 σοφίαι γὰρ ἀείρεται πλει[

εὐδοξίας δ' ἐπίχειρα (31) refers to poetry²³⁷ and introduces the closing theme. The next sentence contrasts an initial ritual context and subsequent reception amongst widespread secondary audiences (cf. D'Alessio (1997) 34). The description of the Muse, in the present tense, highlights audible musical execution tied to a specific occasion: λίγεια μὲν Μοῖς' ἄφα. |]μων τελευταῖς ᾠαρίζε[ι (32-3).²³⁸ λόγον τερπνῶν ἐπέων (34) describes the poetic excellence that may win an extended reception. Future audiences are next invoked with the future tense (μνάσει ... τινα, 35; see p. 124). A soft utterance in one particular time and place will paradoxically reach far and wide through its aesthetic appeal.²³⁹ 'Someone living far off' suggests a broad, indefinite secondary audience.²⁴⁰ θεαρίας (37) probably picks up τελευταῖς (33): even one not present at first performance will think of the event which this poem commemorates. Similarly the speaker of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, whoever he might purport to be,²⁴¹ imagines spreading the glory of the festival at which he performs (146-76).

²³⁷ I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 407 attractively wishes to take the genitive as defining ('wages consisting of renown'; similarly Prodi (2013) 189). But 'the gen[itive] after ἐπίχειρα always denotes that *for which* the reward is given' (Jebb (1900) on Soph. *Ant.* 820). The idea that one receives poetic commemoration as a reward for fame is paradoxical but Pindaric (*P.* 4.68-9, *I.* 2.30-4, *Pae.* 6.123-9).

²³⁸ Ferrari (1991a), thinking of a *hieros gamos*, suggests γά]μων (32-3). One might try ἄφ' ᾠ[γνῶν (Hutchinson, Prodi, Spelman, independently).

²³⁹ ᾠαρίζω has erotic connotations in early hexameter but became a less marked word for speech (Braswell (1988) on *P.* 4.137). Pindaric usages of the verb and its cognates seem compatible with 'say/sing *softly*' (cf. Slater s.v.).

²⁴⁰ S-M (apparatus) moot a reference to the poet. This is discordant with the generalised description and would be difficult to parallel. 'Someone dwelling far off' seems unlikely to be limited in reference to those in a particular city which commissioned a work to be performed at a distant sanctuary (pace I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 407).

²⁴¹ See, most recently, Richardson (2010) for the possibilities.

Lines 37-40 describe a test of the ability of a poem to attract a secondary audience.²⁴² Generalisations about poetry thus contextualise the preceding prediction about this particular poem. Pindar's work 'will be shown to be good if it stands the test of time' (I. C. Rutherford (1992) 62), but these lines stress spatial dissemination, not chronological durability. The 'test' is therefore primarily the judgement of audiences removed from the ritual who will be impressed by the poet's skill (σοφία, 40; cf. *τερπνῶν ἐπέων*, 34). Reception is an index of aesthetic value as the touchstone is an index of the value of genuine gold.

5. *Nemean* 3.76-84

χαῖρε, φίλος· ἐγὼ τόδε τοι
πέμπω μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῶι
 $\sigma\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ γάλακτι, κίρναμένα δ' ἔερς' ἀμφέπει,
πόμ' ἀοίδιμον Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν,

ὀψέ περ. ἔστι δ' αἰετὸς ὠκὺς ἐν ποτανοῖς,
ὅς ἔλαβεν αἶψα, τηλόθε μεταμαιόμενος,
δαφοινὸν ἄγραν ποσίν·
κραγέται δὲ κολοιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται.
τίν γε μέν, εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοί-
 $\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, ἀεθλοφόρου λήματος ἔνεκεν
Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος.

A newly created poetic libation (πόμ' ἀοίδιμον, 79), still frothing from recent mixture (78), will quench the immediate, pressing 'thirst' (*διψῆ*, 6) for commemoration that occasioned it (cf. *O.* 11.1-6, Hubbard (1985) 45). This image expresses the freshness of a concoction just created (cf. *πρόσφατον*, *P.* 4.299) in the professional poet's native Thebes (cf. *τηλόθε*, 81) and 'sent off' to Aegina, thereby enacting the opening cletic prayer to the Muse to come to the island for the de-

²⁴² For the metaphor see Imperio (2000) with bibliography. Time as *βάσανος*: eleg. adesp. 22 W. In *γνώμας δὲ ταχείας* (39) I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 410, comparing *P.* 1.82-3, sees 'perhaps a condemnation of hasty judgements of value' (cf. also *P.* 4.139-40). *ταχύς* does not elsewhere have negative overtones (Prodi (2013) 203). Alternatively excellent poetry, like gold (cf. Thgn. 119-20), could evince its worth quickly (cf. *O.* 9.21-5, *N.* 5.1-5).

but of the poem. Musical accompaniment is closely tied to premiere performance (Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν, 79). Emphasis on initial performance sets in relief the ambitions of this work to endure. One might compare Catullus 1 for the contrast between a composition as both a fresh product (*arida modo pumice expolitur*, 2) and a lasting monument (*quod, <ο> patrona virgo, | plus uno maneat perenne saeclo*, 9-10).²⁴³

The contrast at work throughout this passage is between inferior praise poets who cannot achieve lasting glory (82) and Pindar, an exceptional professional worth his fee (see p. 223). Enduring fame renders a delay insignificant (cf. *Olympian* 10, the other ‘late’ ode). Again the after-life of the poem depends on the significantly named Cleo (83). Though from one perspective the work is now being realised in performance, from another perspective the victor’s lasting fame, by virtue of the existence of the ode,²⁴⁴ has already been secured: δέδορκεν φάος (80). The verb in the final syllables of the poem should be taken at least in part as self-referential: now that the composition is completed, the victor’s glory is a *fait accompli* (cf. δέδεκται, *P.* 1.100, in a gnome). Theognis similarly speaks of his addressee’s glory as already ensured by his outstanding work (ἐγὼ πτέρ’ ἔδωκα, 236) but still to be actuated in the future (ἄϊονται, 243).

6. Bacchylides 3.90-8

ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει
βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ
Μοῦσά νιν τρέφει.] Ἰέρων, σὺ δ’ ὄλβου

κάλλιστ’ ἐπεδ[εῖξ]ας θνατοῖς
ἄνθεα· πράξα[ντι] δ’ εὖ

²⁴³ Catullus’ model, Callim. *Aet.* fr. 7.13-14, similarly contrasts materiality and transcendental potential (cf. Cinna 13-14 Hollis, Catull. 115.7-8).

²⁴⁴ εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοΐσας (83) shows that poetry and not merely athletic success is the source of fame. In Pindar and Bacchylides the Muses are not associated with reputations independent of verse.

οὐ φέρει κόσμ[ον τι]ω-
 πά· cὺν δ' ἀλαθ[εΐαι] καλῶν²⁴⁵
 καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνῆσει χάριν
 Κηΐας ἀηδόνο.

Direct address at least imaginatively situates the speaker in a time of face-to-face communication with his contemporary.²⁴⁶ This moment is to a certain degree preserved within the text: as Bacchylides' poem circulates, Hieron will be verbally conjured into presence even when his body has vanished from the world (90-2). Both Bacchylides and Hieron will be viewed from the distance of the future as historical personalities worthy of being remembered for their respective superlative accomplishments (cf. Ibyc. S151.47-8).

τις ὑμνῆσει (97), with a standard indefinite description of secondary audiences, echoes the Homeric trope whereby a speaker imagines how after his death 'someone' will remember him in speech.²⁴⁷ But whereas Homeric characters only vaguely imagine remembrance spurred by events or a monument, Bacchylides has a more specific and self-referential vision. Following a description of poetic immortality (90-2), ὑμνῆσει (97), a normal word for lyric performance, will refer to future renditions of Bacchylides' own song (e.g. Morrison (2007a) 14, D. L. Cairns (2010) 213-14). The χάριν (97) of 'the sweet-tongued nightingale' probably then refers to this poem as a charming aesthetic whole (cf. μελιγλώσσου, 97).²⁴⁸ Bacchylides' skill attracts future audiences, who will choose to remember his work.²⁴⁹ From the perspective of secondary audi-

²⁴⁵ D. L. Cairns (2010) and Maehler (1982-97) convincingly defend the construction with the genitive (obelised by Hutchinson (2001)). The noun has an active sense: 'with the remembrance of your noble deeds' (cf. B. 9.85, Woodbury (1969)).

²⁴⁶ Cf. Danielewicz (1990) 9.

²⁴⁷ E.g. *Il.* 7. 91: ὅς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κλέος οὐ ποτ' ὀλεῖται. Homeric 'τις-Reden': de Jong (1987).

²⁴⁸ Cf. *O.* 10.78, *P.* 2.70, *N.* 7.75, MacLachlan (1993) 98-9n13, Hutchinson (2001) 357; D. L. Cairns (2010) reviews options for our passage.

²⁴⁹ Pace Woodbury (1969) 334-5 and Lennartz (1997), ὑμνῆσει (97) calls for an expressed direct object and finds one to hand in the neighbouring χάριν (97).

ences, this final sentence is a self-fulfilling prophecy which reflexively brings attention to the act of reception. Indeed, epinicians always presents a triumphant history of their life in the world: they succeeded if anyone receives the message of success.

7. Conclusions

These passages link distinct but related stages in the life of a poem. The autobiography, as it were, of an ode is a prominent theme: each begins in the poet's mind, premieres in choral performance before a particular audience, and then reaches into the world and into the future. I now draw conclusions and suggest some connections between rhetoric and reality.

Many of these passages come from the end of poems.²⁵⁰ Morrison (2012) 132 argues that Pindar frontloads essential encomiastic information because these purple passages were more likely to be re-performed than the whole composition (similarly Pfeijffer (1999a) 10). Yet this information might tend to appear at the beginning simply to announce the subject of a work (cf. hexameter *exordia*). The fact that references to secondary audiences often occur toward the end of poems suggests that Pindar and Bacchylides conceived of such audiences as, at least paradigmatically, experiencing their works as integral wholes. Other passages (e.g. *P.* 6.1-18) imply that an ode will endure as a stable and complete entity.

The rhetoric of permanence provides not only a sense of closure, but also a sense of openness. At the moment when the work ends, it points outward to its continuous existence. 'The life of the poem is not concluded but, in fact, begins at the moment of its completion, at that moment when it has successfully fulfilled the need of the motivating event for permanent remembrance' (Greengard (1980) 120; cf. Danielewicz (2001) 7-8). A closing future verb often captures 'the

²⁵⁰ Cf. Kranz (1961), I. C. Rutherford (1997) 46-8, Calame (2011) 126-8. I avoid the modern term *κορηγία*, which derives from a debatable interpretation of Thgn. 19.

encomiastic paradox ... that the ode itself points beyond itself by referring to its own future reception' (Pelliccia (1995) 331; add Hor. *Carm.* 4.15.32 to his examples). The rhetoric of permanence provides a climax; in a way each work is oriented toward this τέλος. By pointing to widespread reception in the final lines, Pindar suggests that he has achieved 'the final triumph of poetry' (R. W. B. Burton (1962) 89). The poem, as an utterance unfolding in real time, eventually earns the extended afterlife which it envisions in its final lines. Some odes, like *Olympian* 10 and *Nemean* 3, are concerned with mapping their reception in the world onto the linear progression of the text (Slater (1969) 87-8, D'Alessio (2004) 277). To the limited extent that one may generalise that scene-setting references to performance tend to occur at the beginning of odes and references to poetic afterlife tend to occur toward the end of odes, one may say that epinicians tend to replicate their large-scale life in the world within the small-scale structure of the ode.

None of these passages furnishes a clear picture of secondary audiences. Whereas epinician can describe its performance occasion with considerable vividness, vagueness is characteristic feature of descriptions of reception. If descriptions of performance can aim for the 'reality effect' (Barthes) through specificity, descriptions of reception can aim for an 'ideality effect' through vagueness. Such passages are sometimes vivid enough to stir the imagination but indefinite enough to suggest a generalised scene repeating over time (cf. e.g. Thgn. 239-43, *P.* 3.92-8). The faceless 'someone' of secondary reception is defined only by his absence from the debut performance.²⁵¹ He is 'someone ... meaning everyone' (Scodel (1992) 61). Anyone may see himself in this featureless portrait. Rather than imagining Pindar's audience as definite individuals about whom we can attempt to know a great deal, we should imagine a plurality of audiences, some

²⁵¹ Cf. e.g. *Il.* 7.87-91, Thgn. 22, Sappho 147, Simon. 11.24 W, Pind. *N.* 7.68, fr. 52o.35, B. 3.97, Callim. fr. 384.23, J. R. Wilson (1979).

little more familiar to the poet than to us.²⁵² ‘The contextualizing manoeuvre’ with its ‘drive towards specificity’ (Fearn (2013) 231) does not provide the best tools for coming to grips with Pindar’s vague descriptions of his secondary audiences.

Vague descriptions of reception involve secondary audiences in the poem but also highlight their distance from the vividly described original occasion, which remains paradigmatic yet not fully recoverable. Morrison (2012) 115 writes that ‘each re-performance creates [a performance] frame anew for its audience as it is performed’. But a description of dancing youths by the Asopus obviously does not really create youths or the Aeginetan Asopus (*N.* 3.1-5 with Privitera (1988), Pfeijffer (1999a), Eckerman (2014)). Pindar’s epinicians are interested not only in imaginatively transporting secondary audiences back to their occasions but also in charting the distance covered and all that is lost over the journey.

Most of the passages discussed above more or less explicitly index dissemination to authorial excellence.²⁵³ This suggests that many, potentially including those indifferent to athletics, might have been interested in epinicians primarily as aesthetic artefacts. The intended secondary audience of these poems is thus not just ‘someone’ but, slightly more specifically, everyone who cares about good poetry. These would be the connoisseurs envisioned by Theognis: *πᾶσι δ’ ὅσοισι μέμνηε καὶ ἐκκομένοισιν αἰοιδῇ | ἔσσηι ὁμῶς, ὄφρ’ ἄν γῆ τε καὶ ἡέλιος* (251-2 with Hudson-Williams (1910); cf. *Od.* 1.59, *Hes. Theog.* 60-1, *H. Hy.* 3.188). It is reasonable to infer that such people existed. Archaic poems are our best evidence for their existence in this period.

²⁵² Contrast Krummen (1990) 4: ‘die Gedichte selbst richten sich an ein unmittelbar anwesendes, dem Dichter bekanntes Publikum’.

²⁵³ Cf. *O.* 9.21-7, *P.* 3.115, *N.* 4.6-8, *I.* 7.18-19, *B.* 3.96-8. At *Simon.* 11.15 W we should probably read *μελ]ίρρονα* (Parsons) and understand a similar connection between an attractive song and indefinite secondary reception (*ἵνα τις*, 16). Spacing, it seems, is not beyond doubt, but the list of potential supplements is not long and no other word on that short list produces equally attractive sense.

Whereas initial performance is often linked to descriptions of music, subsequent reception is consistently linked to words. Pindar probably did not transcribe the music that originally accompanied his odes (Pausanias (2006) ch. 1.4). Throughout Pindar the verbal element, independent of music and dance but dependent on authorial skill, is consistently presented as securing an extended reception.²⁵⁴ This suggests that for secondary audiences, as for us, epinician was primarily a verbal experience.²⁵⁵ It is misleading and reductive to describe the ‘extant texts of ancient Greek choral lyric’ as ‘the bare bones of productions that fused poetry and music with dance’ (Ferrari (2008) 1) or to assert that ‘what is left to us, to be sure, is nothing but the skeleton of a gaudy spectacle’ (McNeal (1978) 136). Pindar’s bare words are capable of winning an afterlife for themselves.

Pindar describes his poems debut performance and he describes their subsequent reception. By bringing together the various stages of its life in the world the Pindaric epinician prevents its various audiences, who encounter the poem at one stage in its life, from wholly identifying the poem with that particular stage.²⁵⁶ Any audience, including the first, is obliged to think of the full lifespan of a poem and thereby its potential meaning to others. Whereas some scholarship seeks to recover the perspective of ‘a particular audience [who] watched each performance’

²⁵⁴ ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν (*P.* 3.113); παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων (4.298); λόγων φερτάτων | μναμήϊ (*P.* 5.48-9); ῥῆμα δ’ ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει (*N.* 4.6); οὔρον ἐπέων (6.28b); αἰοδαὶ καὶ λόγοι (30); κλυταῖς ἐπέων αἰοδαῖς (*N.* 7.16); λόγον Ὀδυσσεύς (7.21); λόγον τεθνακότων (7.32); ἐπέων ... φωνᾶεν ... εἴ τις εὔ εἴπητι τι (*I.* 4.38-41); λόγον ἐκέρδαναν (5.27); κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν (7.19); τερπνῶν ἐπέων (fr. 520.34). Words as separable element: *O.* 2.46, 3.7-8, *P.* 8.29-31, *N.* 3.11-12, *Pae.* 9.35-7.

²⁵⁵ Cf. the oft-quoted anecdote of Solon asking to learn a poem by Sappho (Ath. 588). Ford (2003) 23 writes that ‘when an Athenian aristocrat took on the themes and dialect from Lesbos, the words were a small part of the show’. But Solon is content to learn the poem and die before he can put on a show.

²⁵⁶ Mullen (1982) 42: Pindar ‘wished for his original audiences to keep before their minds the ode’s destined survival as text no less than for his later readers to keep in mind its radiant first appearance as music and dance’.

(Burnett (2005) 5), the Pindaric epinician encourages its various audiences to take on multiple perspectives simultaneously. A plurality of perspectives is so fundamental to the logic of these works that an attempt to isolate one strand may turn out to be reductive and misleading.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁷ Scodel (1996) 60: ‘we need to improve the sophistication of the ways we talk about various levels of audience’. Cf. Citroni (2009) on Horace.

IV. Temporal Perspectives

The previous chapter described how poems chart their journey from event to artefact. In this chapter readings of several passages are used to advance broader claims about different ways in which the viewpoints of different audiences contribute to the meaning of Pindar's epinicians. *Pythian* 1 illustrates how the aesthetics of traditionality enrich any audience's experience. *Nemean* 4 exemplifies how Pindar invites audiences to adopt the victor's perspective and how an awareness of subsequent reception may have shaped the victor's experience of the ode. *Pythian* 6 illustrates how, by depicting his contemporaries as learning from previous poetry, Pindar calls to mind the future use of his work as a source of ethical instruction for secondary audiences. *Pythian* 3 shows how Pindar's reception of epic invites reflection on the future reception of his work. *Nemean* 5 exemplifies Pindar's engagement with monumental commemoration and the rhetoric of inscriptions.

Nemean 7 advertises the poet's ability to communicate with both immediate and subsequent audiences. I interpret the notoriously difficult final lines in a manner consonant with this self-presentation and discuss the possible relevance of the final triad of *Paeon* 6. This discussion is intended to illustrate and vindicate a principle by applying it to a difficult test case: when puzzled, one should work to an understanding by employing knowledge available to Pindar's secondary audiences.

1. Time Travel: *Pythian* 1

It avails not, neither time or place— distance avails not;
I am with you, you men and women of a generation, or ever so many generations hence;
I project myself —also I return— I am with you, and know how it is.

— Walt Whitman, *Crossing Brooklyn Ferry*

Tradition in Pindar is not, as in Homeric poetry, a massive yet mostly silent force behind the text

but rather a frequent object of attention on the surface of the discourse. The end of *Pythian* 1 looks backward to the tradition from which it emerges and forward toward its life as part of a tradition. Engagement with the past suggests how future audiences will engage with this poem (92-8):

ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας

οἷον ἀποιομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει
καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς. οὐ φθίνει Κροί-
κου φιλόφρων ἀρετά.
τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον
ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντῶι φάτις,
οὐδέ νιν φόρμιγγες ὑπώροφαι κοινανίαν
μαλθακὰν παίδων ὀάροισι δέκονται.

Like the parallel opening address to the lyre (1-4), this closing passage gains resonance from an implicit similarity with the moment of enactment of Pindar's poem: Hieron's fame will be perpetuated in a sympotic setting resembling to some degree the performance occasion of *Pythian* 1.²⁵⁸ The lyre, at the very least, connects debut performance and subsequent reception (φόρμιγξ, 1 → φόρμιγγες, 98). The moment of performance will to be partially perpetuated when the ode is recalled in the future. Indeed, Pindar's poems celebrating Hieron were in fact re-performed in symposia (see Athanassaki (2009) 273 with references).

Within the moment of performance, the addressee is invited to 'learn to perceive both his past and his present from the vantage of posterity' (Walsh (1984) 51). Pindar moves from exhorting Hieron to seek the pleasure of his contemporaries' praise (εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοὰν ἀδεῖαν αἰεὶ κλύειν, 90) to exhorting him to secure a legacy which outlasts his ability to enjoy it. Like the deceased Megas addressed at *N.* 8.44-5, Hieron is invited to imagine his life as a totality viewed

²⁵⁸ Cf. *cὺν εὐφώνοις θαλίσαις ὀνυμαστάν* (38, in the future as now), Athanassaki (2009). Sympotic setting: Crotty (1982) ch. 3, Clay (1999), Neumann-Hartmann (2009a) 134-42 with the reservations of Budelmann (2012). This was apparently a traditional feature: cf. Simon. 512, 328.5 *SLG* with Trombetta (1999).

from the outside. After his demise only (οἶον, 93) repute will communicate to posterity his victory and the values that it embodies. δίαίταν (93) denotes an ethical sphere wider than just athletics, as the following examples confirm. Pindar substantiates his claim about ‘the posthumous vaunt of glory’ (cf. *Fama superstes*, Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.8) by describing the afterlife of Croesus and Phalaris, two kings whom the king Hieron could have known only through repute.

These lines enact the maxim which they expound: Pindar exemplifies how poets (94) receive the past.²⁵⁹ οὐ φθίνει (94) expands on the traditional (at least within Greek literature) κλέος ἄφθιτον.²⁶⁰ Here κατέχει παντῶι φάτις (96, present) describes a contemporary reality as a shared experience. A juxtaposition of non-Greek and local examples from both sides of the Mediterranean evokes a community of remembrance stretching through time (οὐ φθίνει, 94) and space (παντῶι, 96 ≈ the Greek world; cf. *O.* 1.116, 9.24, *P.* 4.171) and emphatically including Hieron’s native Sicily.

Besides these explicit examples of fame, Pindar also implicitly substantiates his claim about the power of poetry in particular (ᾠδοῖς, 94) through an allusion to Theognis’ parallel description of his addressee’s immortality.²⁶¹ This exemplifies a common Pindaric intertextual strategy: a backward-looking reference to a forward-looking figuration of reception in an earlier work. It also advances an implicit argument: Pindar’s ode will survive as previous works have survived and be understood as part of a tradition including these previous works. On a general

²⁵⁹ I take καὶ λογίοις καὶ ᾠδοῖς (94) as indirect object implicitly including Pindar (cf. *N.* 6.46) rather than as a dative of means (*pace* Calabrese De Feo (1987) 33, Gentili *et al.* (1995)). For that sense one expects καὶ λόγοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς. A personal indirect object suits μανύει (93; cf. *I.* 8.55-55a).

²⁶⁰ *Il.* 9.413, Sappho 44.4, [Hes.] fr. 70.5, Ibyc. S151.47, M. L. West (2007) 406-10 (compare and contrast Finkelberg (1986, 2007)).

²⁶¹ So, more cautiously, Carey (1989c) 554, Athanassaki (2009) 257. D. L. Cairns (2010) 319 detects an allusion to this same Theognis passage at B. 13.180-1. Note the citation of Theognis at Pl. *Men.* 95d-e.

level, intertextuality is closely related to the rhetoric of permanence. As Barchiesi (1993) 352 puts it, ‘every allusive text makes also some broader reflexive statement: “I am poetry”, or “fiction”, or “I belong in a *tradition*”’ (my emphasis). It is no coincidence that many major instances of the rhetoric of permanence, from *Isthmian* 4 to Theocritus 16 to Horace *Odes* 3.30, are also highly allusive.

In Theognis, as in *Pythian* 3, fame is perpetuated in symposia throughout the Greek world (θοίνηις δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνηι παρέσσει | ἐν πάσαις πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν, 239-40). There as well young performers (νέοι ἄνδρες | εὐκόσμως ἐρατοί, 241-2) suggest life in song ever refreshed after an individual’s death (242-3) and the enduring didactic value of poetry for new generations (see IV.3). Both poets play with the idea of their vanished subject becoming present again as a member of the symposium (παρέσσει ... κείμενος, Thgn. 239-40, evoking a reclining symposiast; νιν ... δέκονται, *P.* 1.97-8).²⁶² Even when his body has left the world (cf. ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν, 93 with Kurke (1991) 47), Hieron will return through Pindar’s poem. The idea is all the more striking when one recalls other passages in which death is defined by one’s absence from the pleasures of the symposium (e.g. Alc. 38a, [Thgn.] 973-8, anon. 1009 *PMG*, attributed to Pindar by Bergk, Hor. *Carm.* 1.4.17-18). In both authors the description of reception is vivid enough to stir the imagination but indefinite enough to suggest a composite, generalised scene being repeated over time. The effect is not unlike a montage.

Looking backward to its antecedents and forward to its reception, *Pythian* 1 was and is about its ability to participate in a tradition. Like the lines of Whitman quoted above, this ode

²⁶² δέκονται (98) connotes admission indoors (ὑπωρόφια, 97; cf. Alc. 374, [Thgn.] 1045-6, Heath (1988) 180). κοινανίαν (97; cf. *N.* 3.12, fr. 59.8-9) is an accusative of result (Kirkwood (1982), M. L. West *per litteras*). It evokes the communal ethos of a symposium (cf. fr. 124a.2-3, [Thgn.] 495, O. Murray (1990) 39-40). παίδων (98) could describe a chorus (Loscalzo (2003) 101-2), but the vague register and a Theognidean intertext instead suggest a generalising plural. No other description of epinician re-performance involves a chorus.

evokes a sense of a community unbounded by space and time. Pindaric scholarship often invokes tradition as a means of explicating puzzling formal features (e.g. χαῖρε at *P.* 2.67 with Most (1985a) 96-9) but seldom as a means of explaining how these poems engaged and continue to engage audiences. Thinking about tradition in a philosophical rather than philological framework might help to clarify what makes these odes not only intelligible but compelling. Traditions, according to Scheffler (2010) 305, are ‘human practices whose organising purpose is to preserve what is valued beyond the lifespan of any single individual or generation’. Taking part in a tradition enables one ‘to travel back in time before she lived and forward to a time when she will live no more’ (Scheffler (2010) 301). One becomes ‘heir to, and custodian of, values ... This adds value to one’s life’ (Scheffler (2010) 305).²⁶³

In reading Pindar’s odes one travels through time and participates in a tradition, as the poems advertise (e.g. κὰν νόμον ἐρδομένων, *O.* 8.78; ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι, 10.78; ἐγκώμιον τεθμὸν, 13.29; see VII.1). Both the forward and the backward aspects of time travel are important. On the one hand, it is satisfying to receive these poems and participate self-consciously in a tradition. For those who encountered *Pythian* 1 in a sympotic setting like that described in lines 97-8, this would have been an especially natural emotional response to Pindar’s work. On the other hand, by taking the perspective of the victor and poet, audiences also vicariously fulfil a desire to reach into the future (cf. Griffith (2009) 90-1). Not for Hieron alone is it affecting to imagine a version of posterity capable of understanding and sharing his values. Pindar’s real secondary audiences may identify with the secondary audience imagined within the

²⁶³ Goldie (2007) 386 tentatively puts something related to this idea at the centre of his recent virtue theory of art: ‘why is artmaking and art appreciation not a luxury, but ... important to our lives as human beings as ethics or contemplation? ... The answer will, I suspect, throw light on the way art, when successful, can bind us together as fellow humans— can appeal to, and reveal, our shared experiences and our shared emotional responses to those experiences’.

text but also, as the next section stresses, with the original addressee.

Pindar's first audiences were invited to imagine the perspectives of future audiences; later audiences are invited to imagine the perspectives of his first audiences. Thus, in a certain sense, these divergent perspectives begin to converge and overlap. Diverse audiences may assume the viewpoints of others; all audiences may thereby share a sense of sharing in a tradition and in a community reaching through space and time and centred on the text and what it represents. Pindar contains multitudes. He invites his audiences to join.

This sense of community and this sharing are imperfect and limited. Pindar's first audiences were invited to imagine future generations about whom they knew very little; for Pindar's secondary audiences aspects of his first audience's experience remain opaque. Both initial and subsequent audiences meet on the common ground of the text and encounter something only partially known. When the poet describes men who will know Hieron only through words (οἶον, *P.* 1.93), audiences fitting this description may feel a sense of rupture as well as connection with the past.

2. The Victor's Perspective: *Nemean* 4

haec vero sive a meo sensu post mortem afutura est sive —ut sapientissimi homines putaverunt— ad aliquam mei partem pertinebit, nunc quidem certe cogitatione quadam speque delector.

— Cic. *Arch.* 30

The opening of *Nemean* 4 derives the distinctive value of debut performance from future reception. This passage illuminates what an epinician means for its human subject. Not least through frequent apostrophes,²⁶⁴ the genre invites audiences to take on the perspective of the victor, at the

²⁶⁴ See the lists in Kambylis (1964).

moment of performance one of the most fortunate men in Greece.²⁶⁵ In a sense the typologised character of ‘the victor’ is the stock protagonist of the genre. His psychology is an epinician theme which, it seems, is already visible in Simonides (519 fr. 79). Entering into his mental landscape one sees how an exceptional individual copes with the universal problem of mortality.

‘In seeking to ensure the survival over time of what one values, one diminishes the perceived significance of one’s own death’ (Scheffler (2010) 305). Glory alleviates a fear of death: Αἶδα τοι λάθεται | ἄρμενα πράξαις ἀνὴρ (*O.* 8.72-3). Here a man forgets Hades because he will be remembered by others (cf. *μναμοσύναν*, 74). Similarly Chromius’ old age is ameliorated (*N.* 9.44 with Braswell (1999)) because of the lasting fame that he won in his youth (39-42). ἵκτω (45) aims to make him aware that he possesses, like Hector, a legacy that will endure beyond his lifetime. Psaumis’ gentle old age derives from his knowledge that his own achievement and resultant glory will, like his sons, survive him (*O.* 5.21-4). At *I.* 6.14 τοῖαισιν ὀργαῖς refers to the aged Lampon’s placid acceptance of death, enabled by his knowledge that his glory (δόξαν ἐπήρατον, 12) and his sons will survive him (10-13 with Privitera (1982); contrast Kurke (1991) 78). Like an heir, an epinician is a joy to the victor while alive because it will outlast his lifetime (*O.* 10.86-96; cf. *O.* 9.60-2, fr. 94a.16-21). Pindar often describes how a hope for future glory illuminates the present.²⁶⁶

²⁶⁵ See Maravela (2011) on the victor’s happiness.

²⁶⁶ *N.* 1.31, *P.* 3.110-11, 8.91-2, *B.* 1.164, 10.39-41, 13.220-1. The hope of Pind. fr. 214 is similar in its psychological efficacy but perhaps mystical rather than poetic. In fr. 10 (ἐλπίζειν ἀθανάταις ἄρμοϊ φέρονται) the adjective perhaps connotes the aim of the hope (cf. Sol. 34.1: ἐλπίδ’ ... ἀφνεήν, Aesch. *Ag.* 262 with Fraenkel (1950), K-G i.261-2).

The proem of *Nemean* 4 may be profitably read alongside such passages. The poem justifies itself by elucidating from the victor's perspective the worth of celebration (εὐφροσύνα, 1) and song (ᾠοδαί, 3), a constituent part of celebration (1-16):²⁶⁷

Ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων
 ἱατρός· αἱ δὲ σοφαί
 Μοικᾶν θύγατρ' ᾠοδαὶ θέλξαν νιν ἀπτόμεναι.
 οὐδὲ θερμὸν ὕδωρ τόσον γε μαλθακὰ τεύχει
 γυῖα, τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος.
 ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει,
 ὅ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι
 γλῶσσαι φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας.

τό μοι θέμεν Κρονίδαι τε Διὶ καὶ Νεμέαι
 Τιμαάρχου τε πάλαι
 ὕμνου προκώμιον εἴη· δέξαιτο δ' Αἰακιδᾶν
 εὐρύπυργον ἔδος, δίκαι ξεναρκέει κοινόν
 φέγγος. εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἀλίωι
 σὺν πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων
 θαμά κε, τῶιδε μέλει κλιθεῖς,
 υἱὸν κελάδῃσιν καλλίνικον ...

In the moment of its debut performance, an epinician has physical effects on a body still sore from recent toil. These concrete, immediate benefits paradoxically derive in part from the victor's abstract knowledge that the praise which he receives will outlast the moment in which he receives it. The opening sentences of the poem form a lucid chain of reasoning moving forward in time, not a heap of loosely related maxims. Celebration is the best healer for successful exertions; *this is because* poems charm pain to forgetfulness;²⁶⁸ they have this capability in part *because* poetry lasts longer than deeds. δ(έ) (6) is not contrastive but continuative and in part ex-

²⁶⁷ Cf. B. 10.52-4, 11.12. Bundy (1986) 2-3 posits an overly strong opposition between poetry and celebration but introduces a useful distinction (cf. Machemer (1993) 137-8, K. A. Morgan (1993), Agócs (2012)). In our passage a sustained medical conceit shows that they work in tandem.

²⁶⁸ νιν (3) looks to πόνων (1). It is unattractive to take εὐφροσύνα (1) as the antecedent (with Machemer (1993)) since the required sense of θέλξαν (3) is very unlikely (Henry (2005)).

planatory.²⁶⁹ A doctor prolongs mortal life; epinician alleviates pain by promising prolonged remembrance. The healing power of poetry derives in part from its ability to endure beyond its first performance.²⁷⁰

The opening of *Nemean* 4 highlights its ability to do just that. The ode is first described as a musical event following victory (εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάροπος, 5), then as an enduring verbal artefact (ῥῆμα, 6). The verb βιοτεύει (6), strikingly predicated of an inorganic subject,²⁷¹ suggests that a poem can outlive its mortal *laudandus*. The deceased Timocritus' hypothetical re-performance (13-16) illustrates how it might do so.²⁷² The frequency with which he would have re-enacted the first performance of this poem (θαμά, 15) reflects his pride (cf. *Il.* 1.396-7) and the excellence of Pindar's composition (cf. 7-8), which merits repeated attention.²⁷³ Initial performance merges with imagined re-performance from line 16 onwards as Pindar's words coincide with Timocritus' hypothetical rendition of Pindar's words.²⁷⁴ Initial performance and imagined secondary performances are closely aligned (cf. Sappho P. Köln XI 429 1.4-6: γέρθε δὲ γᾶς ... ὥς νῦν ἔπι γᾶς).

Speaking within the moment of initial performance, the poet expresses a hope to create a work good enough to endure (9-11).²⁷⁵ *Nemean* 4 is vividly tied to an occasion as real as a sore

²⁶⁹ See Denniston 169-70, Slater s.v. δέ 2h.

²⁷⁰ Healing power linked to remembrance: *P.* 3.72-6, 4.187 with Race (1985), *N.* 3.17-18, 8.49-50, Thummer (1968-9) ii.24-5.

²⁷¹ See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) on Hor. *Carm.* 1.32.3.

²⁷² Crotty (1982) 59, Cole (1992) 97, and Nicholson (2001) 35 posit that Timocritus would perform an original composition. τῶιδε μέλει (15) looks self-referential (cf. *O.* 10.3). κλιθεῖς (15) does not suggest independence.

²⁷³ Currie (2004) 89 envisions anniversary celebrations. But representations of reception are typically vague. Indefinite repetitions of song: *P.* 2.15-16, 3.78, 4.295, *N.* 2.2, *Pae.* 2.98, 6.16, 182.

²⁷⁴ Cf. *N.* 5.25, where Pindar's song merges with the Muses' song (Cannatà Fera (2000), Power (2000) 75, Pfeijffer (2004) 228-30).

²⁷⁵ τό (9) will look back to the idea of a lasting word (6-8, note neuter singulars; cf. *I.* 8.61; contrast Fennell (1899)), not simply the preceding statement (*pace* e.g. Willcock (1995)). It would

muscle but gained its distinctive value within that definite setting by projecting itself into the indefinite future. Anyone who experiences the poem, including Timasarchus of Aegina, is thus invited to view it both through the eyes of its immediate addressee and from the eyes of a detached secondary audience.

3. Epinician Lessons: *Pythian* 6

τῳιάδε τις δείξας παραδε[ί]γματα παισὶν ἑαυτῷ
 μᾶλλον ὀρεξασθαι τῆς ἀρετῆς προτρέπει.
 – 768 CEG

Why might a fifth-century Greek have been interested in a poem celebrating an Isthmian victor from another city? One may plausibly suppose two types of reasons, which should not be kept absolutely separate.²⁷⁶ Greek lyric purports to delight and instruct.²⁷⁷ One may hypothesise that a fifth-century individual would be interested in Pindar's poems not only because he enjoyed them but also because he thought that they expressed something important about his life.²⁷⁸

Scholars have not failed to note the didactic dimensions of epinician.²⁷⁹ Many types of poetry were regarded as having some instructive capacity (Verdenius (1983) 32-3, Herington (1985) 70-1). Many fifth-century Greeks may well have agreed that the epinician poet had a didactic role while not approaching his work primarily as an ethics lecture.²⁸⁰ The didactic function of

not make sense to pray 'may I say what I just said'; a prayer for an excellent poem makes excellent sense (cf. *P.* 9.89a, *N.* 7.67, 9.53, *I.* 4.43). θέμεν (9) stresses permanence (cf. Bury (1890)).

²⁷⁶ Cf. Peponi (2012) 80-1 on the pleasures of learning in archaic poetry.

²⁷⁷ Bundy (1972) 79n95: 'the literary theory combining pleasure (τὸ τερπνόν) with instruction (τὸ χρήσιμον), generally considered Horatian in origin, is the creation of the Greek poets and orators'; cf. *Od.* 12.188, Dover (1993) 12. These two functions may be linked to the Charites and the Muses, respectively (p. 212n642).

²⁷⁸ Similarly Taplin (1997) on the appeal of Athenian tragedy to non-Athenian audiences.

²⁷⁹ E.g. Herington (1985) 70, Gentili (1988) 3, Carey (1995) 86.

²⁸⁰ Cf. Dover (1993) 16 on Athenian theatre.

epinician is sometimes explicit. The victor may learn from the poem²⁸¹ or be inspired to further success (*P.* 8.88-92, *I.* 1.64-7). Others can learn from the victor's example contained within an epinician.²⁸² Poets can learn from Pindar's display of skill (*P.* 4.248; cf. *B.* fr. 5). Some myths expound morals of explicitly universal applicability (e.g. *P.* 2.21-3, 41). Gnomai express general truths. At a fundamental level praise is related to instruction (cf. *Arist. Rh.* 1367b37). Pindar's epinicians are not just about athletics but also about what Nagel (1979) ix terms 'mortal questions': 'mortal life: how to understand it and how to live it'.

This section focuses on how Pindar presents his contemporaries as learning from previous literature so as to call to mind the afterlife of his own work as a source of instruction for subsequent audiences. The Pindaric epinician, by depicting contemporaries learning from older poetry, suggests how future audiences might relate to it (cf. already *Il.* 9.524-6 and 16.31-2). Inset acts of reception prefigure future acts of reception. The poet, his patrons, and his various audiences participate in a culture in which poetry is valued as a source of ethical learning.

Several times older hexameter poets are cited as authoritative sources of wisdom. For Pindar these canonical poets were, among other things, storehouses of quotable maxims.²⁸³ In *Pythian* 4 Arcesilas, possessed of a broad command of Homeric poetry, is asked to show his understanding of one particular saying: *τῶν δ' Ὀμήρου καὶ τόδε συνθέμενος | ῥῆμα πόρυν* (277-8; see Braswell (1988) for the debate over the source). Homer's acknowledged status as a fount of

²⁸¹ *P.* 2.72: γένοι', οἷος ἐκὶ μαθών. For the grammar see Schroeder (1922) 119-24, Woodbury (1945) 19-20, Thummer (1972) 295-6, Lloyd-Jones (1973) 124, Carey (1981), and Most (1985a) 102-3. I translate 'learn who you are and show yourself to be such'.

²⁸² *I.* 5.54-6: μαρνάθω τις ἔρδων | ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου | ἐκμαθών. Here *τις* points to secondary audiences unfamiliar with the family.

²⁸³ Cf. Führer (1967) 81-5, M. L. West (1974) 180, Goldhill (1994) 60, Burkert (2001) 94, Ford (1998) 98, E. L. Bowie (2010) 79. Morson (2011) discusses 'quotationality'. Simon. 20.13-16 W seems to assert or imply that Homer has escaped oblivion because of his wisdom.

wisdom mirrors the role which Pindar hopes to fulfil in persuading the king.²⁸⁴ Bacchylides cites Hesiod by name and reputation: Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ τᾷδε φών[ησεν, γλυκεῖαν | Ἥσιόδοος πρόπολος | Μουσᾶν, ὃν <ᾶν> ἀθάνατοι τι[μῶσι, τούτῳ | καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἔπ[εσθαι (5.191-4).²⁸⁵ P. 3.80-2 depicts Hieron as a conscientious student of the literary tradition: εἰ δὲ λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, Ἰέρων, ὀρθὰν ἐπίσται, μανθάνων οἷσθα προτέρων | ἐν παρ' ἐκλὸν πῆματα κύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς | ἀθάνατοι (80-2). Despite doubts,²⁸⁶ these lines probably allude to *Il.* 24.527-8:²⁸⁷ δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει | δῶρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων. Pindar, unlike most modern scholars, perhaps understood this to describe three jars, not two. ὀρθὰν ἐπίσται (80) then perhaps implies other possible interpretations and flatters Hieron's acumen (cf. Cannatà Fera (1986)).²⁸⁸ The meta-traditional προτέρων (80) invites reflection on previous poetry.²⁸⁹ Context militates in favour of allusion. Both Pindar and Achilles deploy exempla: Peleus and Priam for Achilles (*Il.* 24.534-45), Peleus and Cadmus for Pindar (86-99). In Pindar Achilles' fate (100-3) illustrates the maxim uttered by the hero himself in the *Iliad*.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Simon. 20 W: the addressee, it seems, is invited to learn from Simonides (ταῦτα μάθων, 11) and also Homer (φράζεο ... Ὅμηρος, 13-14).

²⁸⁵ Either looking to a lost work or *Theog.* 81-97 (see D. L. Cairns (2010), making a good case for the latter; but note [Thgn.] 169-70).

²⁸⁶ Luppino (1959), connecting λόγων (80) with προτέρων (80), understands a reference to the previous verses. With his interpretation of those verses contrast Schroeder (1922) on 81: 'Niemand wird so geschmacklos sein wollen, die zwei Leiden und die eine Freude hier nachzurechnen'. The moral which Pindar advances is not clearly present in the preceding lines. Luppino's interpretation also posits very harsh word-order. μανθάνω + genitive of source is a faultless poetic locution (cf. e.g. Soph. *Trach.* 187, 408), which here produces smooth word-order. Currie (2005) 347, following the construction of Luppino but not citing his article, moots a reference to mystery rites.

²⁸⁷ Young (1968) 50-1, Robbins (1990) 313, Mann (1994) 318-20, Ford (1998) 97, Sotiriou (1998) 109-11.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Simon. 19.3-4 W, after quoting *Il.* 6.146. Perhaps Simonides alludes to a perceived allusion to the same Homeric passage in Mimnarm. 2 (Sider (1996) 273-4; cf. Sol. 20, looking to Mimnarm. 6). Simonides would be anticipating the later practice of window allusions.

²⁸⁹ The bare προτέρων (80) is unlikely to refer to previous interpreters (*pace* Cannatà Fera (1986); cf. *N.* 3.52, 6.53). Homer's antiquity bolsters his authority (cf. χρονία, 115).

In *Isthmian* 6 Lampon applies a saying from Hesiod to his life and passes it along to his sons (66-8): Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν | ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾷ τοῦτ' ἔπος, | υἱοῖσί τε φράζων παραινεῖ. Pindar cites Lampon citing Hesiod (*Op.* 412): μελέτη δέ τοι ἔργον ὀφέλλει.²⁹⁰ The thought is not remarkably original (cf. e.g. Archil. 17), but it comes with an authoritative imprimatur. The following description of Lampon's character, drawing on Hesiodic language and themes, suggests a pervasive influence.²⁹¹ Pindar's central myth is drawn from the Hesiodic *Megalai Ehoiai* (fr. 250). 'Hesiod' is a central theme. As Hesiod advises all men, so Lampon advises his sons (φράζων παραινεῖ, 68, a notable pleonism).²⁹² Their shared success shows that they heed their father's instruction and example (cf. πόνωι, 11). Lampon is 'a whetstone among athletes' (73) because he has sharpened his sons for success (cf. θάξαις, *O.* 10.20) in part through his Hesiodic advice, which he passes along to others through *Isthmian* 6. As the Aeginetan Lampon repurposed the Boeotian Hesiod's advice on farming to apply to athletics, so Pindar's future audiences may reapply traditional wisdom to their own concerns. Wisdom, like the poems in which it circulates, can be decontextualised.

Isthmian 7 presents a contemporary as learning not from an individual older poet but from the tradition more generally. Previous poetry, however, is at issue. Strepsiades 'approves' of three heroes by following their example (31-6):

τὸ δέ, Διοδότοιο παῖ, μαχατάν
αἰνέων Μελέαγρον, αἰνέων δὲ καὶ Ἴκτορα
Ἀμφιάραόν τε,
εὐανθέ' ἀπέπνευσε ἀλικίαν

²⁹⁰ Cf. D'Alessio (2005) 231.

²⁹¹ μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι· καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος (*Op.* 694) → μέτρα μὲν γνῶμαι διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων (71). Benevolence toward *xenoi* (ξένων εὐεργεσίαις, 70) is a Hesiodic theme (*Op.* 327). Lampon's prudent speech (γλῶσσα δ' οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν, 72) follows Hesiodic precedent (*Op.* 709).

²⁹² φράζω (Hes. *Op.* 367, 404, 688, [Hes.] fr. 283, [Thgn.] 100) and cognates of αἶνος (Hes. *Op.* 202, Pind. *P.* 6.23) call to mind the relationship between didactic speaker and addressee.

προμάχων ἀν' ὄμιλον, ἔνθ' ἄριστοι
ἔσχον πολέμοιο νεῖκος ἐσχάταις ἐλπίσιν.

Strepsiades was presumably not thinking of heroic precedent at the moment of his demise, but his action nonetheless manifests his approval of a certain ethic. His death is admirable in part because he consciously chose it as an expression of his preference for virtue and glory over mere survival (cf. Dem. 60.2, Lys. 2.79, Loraux (1986) 105, Balot (2014) 7). Repeated αἰνέων ... αἰνέων (32) connotes deliberate approval of known models.²⁹³ Pindar's passing reference to Mel-eager, Hector, and Amphiaraus does not explicitly point to definite earlier poems,²⁹⁴ but Strepsiades doubtlessly knew these ancient heroes in no small part through poetry, the aspect of mythological discourse most relevant to Pindar's concerns: ἀμνάμονες δὲ βροτοί, | ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον | κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκηται ζυγὲν (17-19). The elder Strepsiades was not oblivious to ancient heroic precedent, which he knew (in part) through poetry.

These three heroes represent three separate generations and derive from the three different sagas. Like Nestor and Sarpedon at *P.* 3.112, they are cited as much for their diversity as for their similarity.²⁹⁵ Together they illustrate a universal principle (cf. ὅστις, 27). Strepsiades affirms a temporally and geographically broad moral code; his homonymous nephew in turn affirms his uncle's example by stipulating that he be celebrated in Pindar's poem (24).

Context also suggests that Strepsiades consciously followed precedent. His case follows as an instantiation of generalisations (26-30):

²⁹³ Nowhere does the verb clearly mean simply 'emulating'. At *N.* 4.93 it means 'praising' (φάσθαι, 92→αἰνέων, 93).

²⁹⁴ Cf. Todorov (1981) 24-25 on intertextuality that evokes not specific texts but an 'anonymous ensemble'.

²⁹⁵ The search for a unifying factor beyond youthful death in battle has, perhaps tellingly, not achieved consensus: see Bowra (1964) 350, Thummer (1969) ii.122, Young (1971) 22, Privitera (1982) 222, Willcock (1995) 66-7, Currie (2005) 206-10.

τιμὰ δ' ἀγαθοῖσιν ἀντίκειται.
 ἵκτω γὰρ καφῆς ὅστις ἐν ταύται νεφέλαι χάλα-
 ζαν αἵματος πρὸ φίλας πάτρας ἀμύνεται,

λοιγὸν ἅντα φέρων ἐναντίωι στρατῶι,
 ἅκτων γενεᾷ μέγιστον κλέος αὔξων
 ζῶων τ' ἀπὸ καὶ θανόν.

Strepsiades did know (ἵκτω ... καφῆς, 27) that by defending his homeland he was cultivating lasting fame because he knew the lasting fame of ancient warriors.²⁹⁶ ἀντίκειται (26), suggesting materiality, stresses permanence.²⁹⁷ The enduring glory of Meleager, Hector, and Amphiaraus, familiar to Pindar's audience, exemplifies this generalisation.²⁹⁸ Strepsiades learnt from the past and thereby may become an object lesson for the future through Pindar's enduring poem (κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν, 19; cf. κλέος, 29). Strepsiades, 'like Hektor, Meleager, and Amphiaraus that served as exempla for his own deed, may prove exemplary' (Young (1971) 46; cf. Currie (2005) 218-22). The Theban Strepsiades approved of an ancient hero who perished attacking Thebes (Amphiaraus); others may view Strepsiades with similar detachment from the future.

Pythian 6 is perhaps Pindar's most extensive reflection on the didactic role of poetry. The victor's son takes centre stage as a diligent pupil of previous literature. His relationship to the past mirrors the poet's relation to the past. As Thrasybulus comes after and emulates his older relatives (45-6) and ancient heroes (19-23), so Pindar comes after and emulates the canonical

²⁹⁶ Currie (2005) 206-7 provides a doxography of interpretations of ἅκτων γενεᾷ (29). 'For the race of his fellow citizens' suits diction and context (cf. πάτρας, 27, *O.* 5.14, *Pae.* 1.9, 2.48, *Tyr.* 12.24). Strepsiades' death is an immediate pain (cf. 37) but a long-term glory for all of Thebes (cf. 1-3).

²⁹⁷ Cf. Barrett (2007) 56.

²⁹⁸ This achievable form of immortality realised through an admirable death contrasts with Bellerophon's vain attempt to enter Olympus (43-7; cf. *O.* 1.59-64, 82-5, *Pythian* 3 with Slater (1988), *N.* 8.44-50).

works to which he refers.²⁹⁹ As with Horace's allusion to *Pythian* 6 in *Odes* 3.30, so already in Pindar's ode engagement with previous literature evokes validating precedent for the poet's ambition to create an enduring work of his own (*P.* 6.5-18). Pindar's Pythian treasury of song finds its place in a landscape already populated with monuments. There may be yet another layer of epigonality at work. Simonides wrote another epinician for Xenocrates' same victory (C inscr. a = Simon. 513).³⁰⁰ The older poet probably focused on the victor; Pindar focuses on his son. On several levels *Pythian* 6 is about coming after.

Thrasybulus shapes his character through the study of poetry: νόωι δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει, | ἄδικον οὐθ' ὑπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων, | σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων (47-9). Implying usufruct and pleasure, δρέπων (47) here refers to experiencing poetry as an audience, not being its subject (contrast fr. 52m.4-8) or its creator. Because he has culled wisdom from verse, Thrasybulus does not indulge in the vices characteristic of youth (47; cf. *Il.* 3.108-10, Solon 27.11-14, Thgn. 629-30, Arist. *Rh.* 1389a-b, Dover (1974) 103).³⁰¹ Culture overcomes natural proclivity. The qualities here praised—liberality, justice, erudition—are epinician commonplaces, but the causative relationship implied between them is unique and significant.³⁰²

The rest of *Pythian* 6 suggests the sort of literary wisdom that Thrasybulus enjoys. ἐν

²⁹⁹ Hinds (1998) 115 'for poets who handle mythological themes, occasion for negotiation between the time-frames of the narrated world and the time-frames of their own poetic tradition will tend to arise again and again'.

³⁰⁰ Cf. Bury (1982) 28, 33.

³⁰¹ Vetta (1979) posits an erotic sense. These lines are intellectualised (νόωι, 47; σοφίαν, 49; νόωι, 51; φρήν, 52) and seem more broadly ethical. A sweet disposition (52) is not necessarily erotic (ὀργάν ... γλυκεῖαν, *I.* 2.35-6). ὑπέροπλον (48) does not usually have erotic implications. Youth's ethical education in poetry: Thgn. 27-8, Eur. fr. 1028 *TrGF*, Ar. *Nub.* 964-72, Pl. *Prt.* 325e-6a, Aeschin. 3.135, Robb (1994) 184-92.

³⁰² Kurke (1990) 99: 'by setting the enjoyment of poetic σοφία in direct contrast to an arrogant and overweening youth, Pindar implies a causal connection which gives to poetry a paideutic function' (cf. Kurke (1991) 158-9). Pindar's other poem addressed to Thrasybulus highlights his literary expertise (cf. *I.* 2.12, 30-2).

μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων (48) evokes the separate, detached word of poetry (Nisbet and Rudd (2004) on Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.40) and extensive study (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 452, *Alc.* 962-4). The Boeotian epithet is Hesiodic, not Homeric (M. L. West (1966) on Hes. *Theog.* 1). Together with the noun, it recalls Hesiod's *Dichterweihe*, when he met the Muses in a valley, Ἑλικῶνος ὑπο ζαθέοιο (*Theog.* 23).³⁰³ A Hesiodic description of Thrasybulus' literary experience links with a reference to the Hesiodic *Sayings of Chiron* earlier in the poem. The central narrative section of *Pythian* 6 draws on a canonical poem from which Thrasybulus has 'culled wisdom' (19-27):

κύ τοι cχεθών νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός, ὀρθάν
 ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν,
 τά ποτ' ἐν οὔρεσι φαντὶ μεγαλοθνεῖ
 Φιλύρας υἱὸν ὀρφανίζομένωι
 Πηλείδαι παραινεῖν· μάλιστα μὲν Κρονίδαν,
 βαρυόπαν cτεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν,
 θεῶν cέβεσθαι·
 ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς
 ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον.

The *dicitur* motif draws attention to a story's background, whatever that may be.³⁰⁴ This instance directs audiences' attention to the *Sayings of Chiron*, a lost piece of wisdom literature evidently popular in Pindar's day.³⁰⁵ φαντὶ (21), introducing an extended accusative and infinitive construction rare in Pindar's epinicians, here points not to a nebulous tradition but rather to a well-known composition.³⁰⁶ Thrasybulus shows that he has understood the advice which the Centaur gave to the young Achilles: ὀρθάν | ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν (19-20). The metaphor drawn from chariot

³⁰³ Geography: Wallace (1974); scene: Kambylis (1965) 31-68. B. 5.191-2 also alludes to this episode (Maehler (1982-97), D. L. Cairns (2010)). ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων (*P.* 6.48) connects with the setting of Chiron's advice (ἐν οὔρεσι, 21) and perhaps also the imaginative setting of Pindar's ode (Ἀπολλωνίαι ...νάπαι, 9; Κρικαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς, 18).

³⁰⁴ See Pfeiffer (1968) 125-6, Hopkinson (1984) 52, Stinton (1990) 239-42.

³⁰⁵ See [Hes.] fr. 283-5 with testimonia, Braswell (1988) on *P.* 4.102-3, Kurke (1990).

³⁰⁶ Cf. τις λόγος (Simon. 579), λέγοντι (*O.* 9.49), λέγεται (*N.* 9.39, all looking to specific models), Scodel (2001) 124, Pavlou (2012b) 107-8. The 'Hellenistic footnote' (Ross (1975) 78) functions similarly.

racing³⁰⁷ connotes intentional navigation by a known point of reference (cf. πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα, 45; see p. 308n855). ὀρθάν (19) suggests interpretation (cf. *P.* 3.80, LSJ⁹ III.2). Thrasybulus does not simply exemplify a gnome; he abides by a precept (cf. Φαμὶ διδασκαλίαν Χίρωνος οἶσιν, *P.* 4.102).

The second half of Pindar's diptych also draws on a literary precedent, the *Aethiopis*.³⁰⁸ It is reasonable to suppose that Thrasybulus' extensive studies included this well-known work, elsewhere alluded to as broadly shared cultural property (*N.* 3.64, 6.63-4, *I.* 4.37-42). Pindar first describes a boy learning a lesson in Greece (Achilles) and then a young man (Antilochus, ὁ θεῖος ἀνὴρ, 38) later in time exemplifying that maxim in action at Troy (cf. *N.* 3.56-64). This progression reflects Thrasybulus' education through literature and subsequent maturation toward adult achievement (cf. 46-51). Antilochus was once a paragon in mythical time; Thrasybulus sets the standard for his cohort (40-5):

ἔδόκησέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾷ
 ὀπλοτέροισιν ἔργον πελώριον τελέσαις
 ὕπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν.
 τὰ μὲν παρίκει·
 τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος
 πατρώϊαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα ...

Pindar puts heroic precedent in the past (τὰ μὲν παρίκει, 43) and celebrates a parallel contemporary theme (τῶν νῦν, 44; cf. *Ibyc.* S151.46-8). Yet at the same time intertextuality attests to the durability of Antilochus' example. As Chiron's advice and Antilochus' actions guided Thra-

³⁰⁷ Carey (1975) identifies the metaphor and persuasively argues that νῦν (19) looks to ἐφημοσύνην (20; cf. *C* 19c, Gildersleeve (1885)); contrast e.g. Schroeder (1922), R. W. B. Burton (1962) 20-1, Sandgren (1966).

³⁰⁸ Kelly (2006), while not going so far as to deny the influence of the *Aethiopis*, goes too far in asserting that Iliadic influence vitiates this passage's value as a source of evidence for the *Aethiopis* (Heitsch (2008), M. L. West (2013) 146n28). Nestor, Antilochus, and chariots (33; cf. 16-17) bring to mind *Iliad* 23 as a secondary intertext (cf. Carey (1975) 290, Nagy (1990) 207, Kelly (2006) 16). There too learning and instruction are at issue.

sybulus, so Thrasybulus will serve as a measuring stick and inspiration as long as Pindar's immortal treasury of song endures. Thrasybulus does not compete with Antilochus any more than Pindar's epinician competes with Hesiodic wisdom literature; rather, both the poet and his *laudandus* uphold a tradition and, by bringing the lessons of the past to bear on the present, may hope to influence the future.³⁰⁹

By aligning himself with two different canonical texts, Pindar makes a claim to speak with a voice of authority to his generation and to future audiences, who, like Thrasybulus, will look back to previous literature as a source of instruction. By showing how the literary tradition shaped a contemporary individual's character, Pindar suggests how his poem may in turn shape others' characters when his work has become part of the literary tradition. Similarly an inscription quoted by Aeschines (*in Ctes.* 183; text at Page (1981) 257) recalls how Homer once glorified the Athenians who fought at Troy and then cites as a parallel the Athenians who fought the Persians. The inscription and monument will in turn spur on future generations: μάλλον τις τάδ' ἰδὼν καὶ ἐπεκκομένων ἐθελήσει | ἀμφὶ περὶ ξυνοῖς πράγμασι δῆριν ἔχειν (cf. 768 *CEG*, Kierdorf (1966) 22).

4. Epic Analogues: *Pythian* 3

Intertextuality constitutes one of Pindar's primary means of meditating on literary quality. Allusions to canonical poetry can buttress the poet's claim to create a canonical work. In earlier lyric, too, intertextuality with epic in particular sometimes makes a similar contribution to a similar

³⁰⁹ Carey (1999) 29: 'didacticism in Greek poetry is not necessarily to be understood as the presentation of new knowledge; it is more often to be found in the (re)presentation of shared values'. Headlam (1910) 53 describes the attitude of Greek lyric as τὰ κοινὰ καὶνῶς.

implicit argument.³¹⁰ This section briefly discusses Pindaric references to Trojan epics commonly ascribed to Homer and then examines one particular passage that employs the reception of epic to bring to mind the potential reception of Pindar's work.

In the last third of the sixth century 'Homer springs to life' (M. L. West (2011-13) i.429). Pindar displays interest in a personality behind certain poems.³¹¹ He allegedly discussed Homer's geographical origins (fr. 264; cf. fr. 140b.4-6, B. 5.192-3, fr. 48) and claimed that Homer gave the *Cypria* away as a dowry (fr. 265; cf. *O.* 1.53, *P.* 2.52-6, *I.* 2.1-11). Neither report is inherently implausible; both may derive from errant ancient interpretation.³¹² At any rate, Pindar understood Homer to have been an historical individual and a paragon of authorial excellence: his work has endured and spread (*I.* 4.37-9). Pindar's frequently expressed awareness of his own privileged place in contemporary culture (e.g. *O.* 1.116) and literary history (e.g. *O.* 9.1-3; see Part Two) should dissuade us from viewing his presentation of himself as a sort of *alter Homerus* as merely a poetic flight of fancy. Bypassing more recent figures, Pindar sets himself alongside perhaps the most distinguished canonical figure of the past and constructs a foreshortened large-scale immanent history in which he plays a central role.

But what does Pindar refer to when he refers to 'Homer'? Detailed allusions to surviving poems evidently presume the existence of stable texts not radically different from those still read today.³¹³ Both subtle intertexts and a remarkable lack of substantial overlap (Stoneman (1981)

³¹⁰ Cf. Sappho 44 with Spelman (forthcoming), Ibyc. S151, Simon. 11 W.

³¹¹ On Pindar and Homer see Köhnken (1985) 86-7, Pelliccia (1987), Nisetich (1989), Nagy (1990), Mann (1994), Sotiriou (1998), Briand (2001), M. L. West (2011).

³¹² Cf. Davison (1968) 77. The Homeridae, whom Pindar mentions (*N.* 2.1), told stories about their namesake (Pl. *Resp.* 599e, Isoc. 10.65). Heraclitus (B 56 D-K) already knows the story of the riddle which caused Homer's death. Biographical fiction started very early indeed (Momigliano (1971) 25).

³¹³ Cf. M. L. West (2011). Pelliccia (2003) provides incisive criticism of the leading rival hypothesis.

63, Mann (1994) 335) suggest the extent and nature of Homer's influence on Pindar's myths. *O.* 13.60-2, for example, looks to Glaucus' speech in *Iliad* 6, a minor and not particularly memorable episode unlikely to be traditional (ἐξεύχετ', *O.* 13.61 → εὐχομαι, *Il.* 6.211).³¹⁴ Pindar alludes to Iliadic character speech as *character speech*.³¹⁵ Indeed, it is not entirely clear in Pindar where Glaucus' quoted speech stops. The poet, like Glaucus, tells the story of Bellerophon but scrupulously avoids overlap and narrates the taming of Pegasus, a fantastical tale characteristically suppressed in the *Iliad* (cf. Griffin (1977)). The Iliadic Bellerophon succeeds θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας (6.183); in Pindar the goddess Athena gives Bellerophon the τέρας (*O.* 13.73) of the bridle that enables his success. Pindar and Glaucus both suppress in silence the ugly fate of Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.200-2; *O.* 13.91).

Several Pindaric references to episodes treated in lost poems of the Trojan cycle also apparently look to notionally³¹⁶ stable texts.³¹⁷ This hypothesis cannot be proven; it seems plausible. I hope to treat this topic more extensively in a subsequent monograph on the reception of epic in archaic Greek lyric. Pindar, like at least most of his contemporaries, attributed to Homer more than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (*I.* 4.37-9 with p. 62n187, *P.* 4. 277-8 with Braswell (1988),

³¹⁴ Compare and contrast Hubbard (1986) 35.

³¹⁵ Cf. ἄκουεν at *N.* 2.14, which looks to Ajax's speech at *Il.* 7.198-9 (Monro (1892) 4, Mann (1994) 324, Sotiriou (2000)): καὶ μὰν ἅ Καλαμὶς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατάν | δυνατός (*N.* 2.13-14) → ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ' ἐμὲ νήϊδά γ' οὕτως ἔλπομαι ἐν Καλαμῖνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε (*Il.* 7.198-9; cf. Pind. fr. 198a). This ode opens by referring to the Homeridae (1-3). Sotiriou (2000) argues that ἄκουεν (14) means 'submitted to'. This sense of the simplex verb is unparalleled in Pindar and generally goes with orders. Monro (1892) and Mann (1994) 324 suppose that Pindar depicts Ajax as speaking to Hector. Pindar may rather depict Hector overhearing a public proclamation. At *Il.* 7.194-5 Ajax assumes that the Trojans will overhear the Greeks.

³¹⁶ Finkelberg (2000) plausibly argues that the textual tradition of cyclic epic was more fluid and 'multiform' than that of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Cf. Currie (2006) 46 on the early fixity of epic traditions.

³¹⁷ Cf. M. L. West (2013) 41-4, who writes that 'it is in Pindar that we find the most striking response to the Cycle' (44); cf. Rutherford (forthcoming); compare and contrast Nagy (1990) 437, J. S. Burgess (2001) 172-4, neither mentioning the most important Pindaric evidence.

Pae. 7b.10-14 with p. 144). A few highly specific allusions to episodes covered in the cyclic poems buttress the supposition that Pindar knew this material in much the same way as he knew of Odysseus' *πάθαν* (*N.* 7.21) through Homer's *Odyssey*.³¹⁸ There is no compelling reason to doubt the scholia stating that the nocturnal suicide of Ajax (*I.* 4.36) is drawn from the *Aethiopis* (C 58b ~ fr. 6 *GEF*; cf. M. L. West (2013) 161-2). Like Lynceus' lookout from Taygetus and the hollow oak looking to the *Cypria* at *N.* 10.61-2 (C 114a ~ fr. 16 *GEF*), this highly specific detail is most plausibly explained as a pointed allusion. Similarly, Μύσιον *ἀμπελόεν* (*I.* 8.49) glances at the vine tripping Telephus in the *Cypria* (*arg.* 7 *GEF*). I find it difficult to believe that such details belonged to a nebulous tradition rather than fixed poetic accounts.

Three of the four Pindaric passages that name Homer also highlight his broad audience.³¹⁹ At *Pae.* 7b.11 ἀμαξιτόν indicates the popularity of Homer's work (cf. *N.* 6.54). In *Neemean* 7 Homer's art dupes ὄμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ *πλεῖστος* (24). In ποτανᾶι ... μαχανᾶι (22) the adjective reflects the broad reach of Homer's work (cf. Köhnken (1971) 54-5, Most (1985a) 150-1) and the noun denotes the skill that secures such dissemination. In *Isthmian* 4 the beam of Homer's poetry has travelled undimmed through space and time (37-2).

Even when Homer is not explicitly named, episodes from the Trojan saga are repeatedly presented as broadly familiar. Abundant and prominent meta-traditional references³²⁰ surrounding this material are all the more striking when one considers the relative dearth of comparable

³¹⁸ Köhnken (1971) 68, Most (1985a) 149, Mann (1994) 327, Loscalzo (2000), and others attractively see a reference to the proem of the *Odyssey* (1.4: πολλὰ δ' ὃ γ' ἐν πόντῳ *πάθεν* ἄλγεα ὄν κατὰ θυμόν). Opening lines are disproportionately well-represented in later quotations (Brink on *Hor. Epist.* 2.2.41-2, Rawles (2013) 199; cf. μ]ᾶνιν, B. 13.78).

³¹⁹ Graziosi (2002) 30 notes that Homer is often linked with a universal audience in archaic poetry.

³²⁰ I use 'meta-traditional' to describe references to a tradition as a tradition (e.g. Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα, *Od.* 12.70, best printed thus); cf. Tsagalis (2011) 221.

framing around Pindar's many other diverse mythical themes.³²¹ The outsize representation of Aeginetan patrons in the corpus would help to explain a disparity in frequency but not marked differences in scope and intensity. I take the following passages to allude at least in part to epic poetry, which played a prominent role in the afterlife of the Trojan War in Pindar's day. As Pindar's references to his patrons' future fame can include his own song but also other channels of memorialisation, so references to the afterlife of the Trojan War may include epic but may also include other channels of memorialisation from the visual arts to everyday speech.³²² It would be wrong to equate myth with poetry, but it is reasonable to suppose that the poet Pindar is chiefly concerned with previous poetry. The diction of several passages supports this inference.

Nemean 9 cites Hector as an exemplum of fame: λέγεται μὲν Ἑκτορι μὲν κλέος ἀνθῆσαι (39).³²³ Here λέγεται μὲν (39)³²⁴ alludes to a tradition as a shared contemporary reality. In *Nemean* 6 the Aeacidae's ancient name still flies far beyond Aegina: πέταται δ' ἐπὶ τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ

³²¹ Significant meta-traditional framing of non-Trojan material: *P.* 2.15-16 (Cinyras), 4.67-9, 174-5 (Argonauts), 9.87-8 (Heracles and Iphicles), 11.59-61 (Iphicles and the Dioscouri), *N.* 1.34 (Heracles), *I.* 1.22-3 (Castor and Iolaus), 5.26-33 (various heroes). There is a striking lack of overt meta-traditional references to Theban epic; note, however, *O.* 6.12-18 with Hutchinson (2001), M. Davies (2015) 92-5.

³²² On non-literary modes of mythological discourse see now Finkelberg (2014).

³²³ Scholars underestimate the relevance of the Homeric Hector to *Nemean* 9. Thus Carey (1993) 104: 'Hector is evidently chosen here as the archetype of the patriotic warrior, a brave man with a just cause'. Chromius' sense of shame spurs him to glory (αἰδώς ... ἃ φέρει δόξαν, 33-4). Hector is selected as an analogue for Chromius' fame because Hector 'is a hero of *aidos*' (Schein (2011); cf. Goldhill (1991) 92, D. L. Cairns (1993) 78-83, Redfield (1994) 118). At two decisive junctures in the *Iliad* (6.442-6, 22.105-10), shame prevents Hector from retreat (cf. Latacz (1977) 210-13, 226-8; contrast πρὶν νῶτα τυπέντα μαχατάν | θυμὸν αἰχλυνθῆμεν, *N.* 9.26-7, of Amphiaraus) and a desire for fame impels him to fight (cf. *N.* 9.39-40). If valid, these arguments would undermine the claim of Ford (1998) 107: 'not before the time of Antisthenes do we clearly see Greeks basing interpretations of Homeric epic in the play of whole texts'.

³²⁴ Braswell (1999) and Slater s.v. b assign the particle an adversative sense. But Hector and Chromius belong to the παῖδοι (37). Denniston 335 assigns the particle an 'inceptive' function. It is instead best taken closely with the verb and given its usual emphatic force: cf. λέγοντι μὲν (*O.* 9.49), λέγονται μὲν (*P.* 3.88), ἴτε μὲν (*I.* 3.15), ἴτε μὲν (4.35), Hummel (1993) 404, Pfeijffer (1999a) 496.

θαλάσσης τηλόθεν | ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν (48-9). There follows an account of Achilles' duel with Memnon (49-53), an episode from the *Aethiopis* (arg. 2 *GEF*). Pindar advertises that he is re-iterating a theme that has been treated before (καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι | ὁδὸν ἀμαξίτον εὖρον, 53-4).³²⁵ In *Nemean* 3 the same episode is linked to broad and lasting glory: τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν (64). In *Isthmian* 8 poets have informed everyone of Achilles' valour: καὶ νεαρὰν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν | τόματ' ἀπείροισιν ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλλέος (47-8). Saying that poets³²⁶ informed the ignorant implies through litotes that no one is now ignorant, i.e. that everyone knows (cf. *Soph. Ant.* 33-4).³²⁷ The audience's knowledge of this subject justifies the following summary treatment of Trojan material (49-60). At *I.* 5.39-42 everyone knows who killed Hector (in the *Iliad*), Cycnus (in the *Cypria*), and Memnon (in the *Aethiopis*), and who wounded Telephus (in the *Cypria*)— but also later cured him ἐὼι δορί (42; cf. *Cypria* arg. 7 *GEF*).³²⁸ The poet need not name Achilles (43-4). Indeed, suppression of his name thematises shared knowledge of a well-known topic (see p. 211n593). This passage is preceded by an epicising request to the Muse for precise information about the distant past (λέγε, τίνας, 39; see p. 193n586).

The end of *Pythian* 3, like so many Pindaric endings (see p. 83-4), looks to the future reception of his poem. These lines provide a striking example of how Homeric precedent shapes

³²⁵ A path may be 'discovered' (εὖρον, 54) only once (cf. *O.* 1.110). In poetic contexts εὐρίσκω often connotes composition (Gerber (1982) on *O.* 1.110, Henry (2005) on *N.* 8.20).

³²⁶ By σοφῶν (46b) Farnell (1930-2) and Thummer (1968-9) understand prophets. In Pindar the substantive adjective often denotes poets, never elsewhere prophets. I see no compelling reason to make these poets contemporary with Achilles (*pace* Carey (1981)). σοφῶν (47) picks up φαντί (46a). νεαρὰν ... ἀρετὰν (47-8) is explained by what follows; it is not an opaque reference to Chiron (*pace* Privitera (1982)). Warriors are generally young (e.g. *I.* 7.34). Youthful valour is an important theme in *Isthmian* 8 (ἀλικία, 1; ἀλίκων, 77; ἥβαν, 70). ὁ καί (49) moves from general to particular (cf. *N.* 3.34) and begins detailed narrative after a leading summary statement of theme (cf. *H. Hy.* 4.20, *I.* 5.35; note [Hes.] *Sc.* 56).

³²⁷ Cf. *I.* 6.24-7, *P.* 9.87-8 with Young (1979), *B.* 9.53-5.

³²⁸ There is no compelling reason to suppose (*pace* Thummer (1968-9)) that in Pindar Achilles kills Telephus. οἷς (55) looks to the preceding catch-all phrase. Emphasis on blood (50) suggests wounding, not death (cf. τρωῶεν, *I.* 5.25).

Pindar's self-presentation. Trojan themes, emphasis on literary excellence, and reference to an enduring afterlife suggest that Pindar is concerned at least in part with an author and his reception, not merely a nebulous mythological tradition (112-15):

Νέστορα καὶ Λύκιον Σαρπηδόν', ἀνθρώπων φάτις,
ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί
ἄρμους, γινώσκουσιν· ἃ δ' ἀρετὰ κλειναῖς ἀοιδαῖς
χρονία τελέθει· παύροις δὲ πράξασθ' εὐμαρέε.

Nestor and Sarpedon died long ago but still enjoy glory (cf. *χρονία*, 115) in the living tradition of poetry (*κλειναῖς ἀοιδαῖς*, 114). This is presented as a continuous practice with which the audience is familiar. The first-person plural *γινώσκουσιν* (114), a highly personal verb taking ancient heroes as its object,³²⁹ represents the Greek world generally (cf. *ἴκαμεν*, *N.* 7.14).³³⁰ The audience's knowledge of these figures confirms the poet's argument. 'Pindar offers Hieron an accessible, proven product' (Young (1968) 62).

For fifth-century audiences who knew Nestor and Sarpedon from resounding verses, this passage would have likely brought to mind the most famous author behind poems featuring Nestor and Sarpedon. Archaic poets do not explicitly link any poet other than Homer with the Trojan War;³³¹ Simon. 11.15-18 W makes Homer responsible for the later memory of the heroes of the Trojan war. *Pythian* 3 earlier makes fairly explicit and detailed reference to the *Iliad* (80-2; see p. 99). Here, as there, generalising plurals are compatible with a reference to particular antecedent. *τέκτονες* ... *σοφοί* (113) suggest poets skilled enough to create lasting verbal structures, not just any versifier.

³²⁹ Cf. Theoc. 16.49, an allusion to our passage.

³³⁰ Cf. Neumann-Hartmann (2005) 131.

³³¹ Cf. e.g. Pind. fr. dub. 347: Φρυγίας κομήτορα μάχας (sc. Homer). The play on Homeric language (e.g. *κομήτορε λαῶν*, *Il.* 1.16) does not strike me as obviously Pindaric.

The final sentence of the poem, ‘to succeed is easy for but a few’ (115),³³² has relevance to both Hieron and Pindar (Wilamowitz (1922) 284, R. W. B. Burton (1962) 59, Young (1968) 63n3). It is difficult to accomplish something memorable (ἀρετά, 114) but also difficult to make achievement remembered for a long time (χρονία τελέθει, 115).³³³ παύροις (115) suggests a shared aim achieved by a select few (cf. Ar. *Eq.* 517). Homer’s exceptional skill (κοφοί, 113) has enabled his work to endure (cf. *N.* 7.20-2, *I.* 4.37-42). The vast majority of poets fall short of this standard. Though generalisation lends a veil of modesty, the implication is clear enough: Pindar is such a rare talent; Hieron, like a Homeric hero, will be remembered. Though Pindar cannot provide a divine healer (63-76), he can provide literary immortality through his authorial skill (cf. τὰν δ’ ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν, 62 with Lefkowitz (1991) 51). *Pythian* 3 opens with an impossible wish for a vanished era when a centaur born from Cronus walked on Mount Pelion; it ends with a less exotic and more achievable implicit wish to match to the enduring precedent of Homeric poetry.

Scholars disagree about the specific relevance of Nestor and Sarpedon.³³⁴ As with the troika of heroes at *I.* 7.32-3, their dissimilarity is significant. Young and old, ‘one shining lamp ... out of each camp’ (Gildersleeve (1885)), they constitute an inclusive doublet suggesting diversity. In

³³² It seems preferable to take the infinitive by itself, ‘to succeed’ (cf. e.g. τὸ ... τυχεῖν, *O.* 2.51). For the absolute use of πράσσω see LSJ⁹ s.v. III.2. Some take πράξαθ’ (115) with an implied object ‘songs’ (ᾠδαῖς, 114; Race (1997), Gentili *et al.* (1995)). But it is not clear that πράσσω ᾠδαῖς, hardly a common locution, would mean ‘I win songs’ (contrast γλυκὺν ὕμνον πράσσετε, *N.* 9.3). Some (e.g. Schroeder (1922)) follow the scholia in understanding τὸ καὶ πλουτεῖν καὶ ἐπαινεῖσθαι (C 202a) as object. But one naturally connects the infinitive with the closer and less specific ἀρετά (114). Wealth is not really relevant to the examples of Nestor and Sarpedon.

³³³ The root τέλος in τελέθει (115) may be felt (cf. Braswell (1988) on *P.* 4.257).

³³⁴ Duchemin (1967) 56 sees paragons of strength and wisdom. Sarpedon is strong, but so are many others. Sider (1992) (followed by Gentili *et al.* (1995) 80) sees a pair of characters who proclaim their own immortality. Miller (1994) rightly objects that neither does so. He argues that both symbolise longevity and adduces later evidence for the mythological tradition that Zeus granted Sarpedon extended life. Yet there is no trace of this fantastical story in Pindar, Homer or, as far as we can tell, the cycle. The latter two, I think, are most relevant here.

particular the two heroes' contrasting fates are probably relevant to *Pythian* 3, a poem much concerned with death. Sarpedon's demise at the hands of Patroclus is the most memorable episode with which he is associated in the Trojan saga (*Il.* 16.477-501). Nestor, by contrast, represents aged experience and exceptional longevity at Troy (*Il.* 1.250-2) and returned home safe. His most conspicuous appearance in the epic cycle seems to have been when he was rescued by his son, Antilochus (*Aethiopis* arg. 2 *GEF*; cf. *P.* 6.30-42). Together the contrasting figures of Nestor and Sarpedon make a consolatory point: poetic immortality dwarfs any mortal lifespan, whether long or short (compare and contrast Miller (1994) 386). The time scales of biography and history are weighed against each other.

As in *Isthmian* 4, so here an analogy with Homeric epic calls to mind future reception of Pindar's poem and thereby helps to accomplish a practical consolatory purpose for its addressee. The pragmatic goals of the ode in its original setting and its literary aspirations toward later reception are closely intertwined.

5. Epigrammatic Interactions: *Nemean* 5

It chose that way to grow and not to move.
 The monument's an object, yet those decorations,
 carelessly nailed, looking like nothing at all,
 give it away as having life, and wishing;
 wanting to be a monument, to cherish something.
 The crudest scroll-work says 'commemorate',
 while once each day the light goes around it
 like a prowling animal,
 or the rain falls on it, or the wind blows into it.

...

Watch it closely.

– Elizabeth Bishop, *The Monument*

The person who entrusts his message to a tombstone inscription is addressing a future society, which he envisages as valuing this message and before which he wants to assert himself.

– Susini (1973) 64

We may attain a fresh perspective on the rhetoric and realities of epinician commemoration by considering a related but more humble set of texts: early inscriptional epigrams.³³⁵ This section examines odes that engage with inscriptional commemoration and then delves into larger congruities between epinicians and epigrams.

Ergoteles of Himera, the subject of *Olympian* 12, also erected a statue at Olympia as another ἄθλον μνηστέον (393 *CEG*; cf. *O.* 12.13-19). Pindar himself repeatedly presents epinician as parallel to and (at least notionally) in competition with monumental commemoration.³³⁶ Inscriptions, however, are also probably at issue in such passages. Through iconography alone and without a textual component, a fifth-century monument for athletic victory could not identify for posterity its specific, non-mythological subject and thereby fulfil its commemorative purpose (cf. Steiner (1993) 170). Such monuments hence regularly include inscriptions (see Ebert (1972)). In order to involve a parallel medium of memorialisation, Pindar's comparisons of his work to physical memorials must also encompass an inscriptional element. This inference is buttressed by verbal parallels with the language of epigrams described below.

³³⁵ In this section *comparanda* are drawn from *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*. Numbers in italics refer to items in *CEG*.

³³⁶ On Pindar and the plastic arts see, most recently, Steiner (1993), Ford (2002) 119-223, O'Sullivan (2003), R. Thomas (2007), R. R. R. Smith (2007), Pavlou (2009, 2010b), Athanassaki (2011a, 2011b), Eckerman (2011a), Day (2013), Fearn (2013). The present discussion is distinguished by its focus on epigrams and their specific modes of expression. Scholars tend to emphasise either contrasts or parallels with physical memorials. Both are usually present in a given passage; one or the other usually predominates.

Inscriptional commemoration, like epinician, aimed at permanence; unlike Pindar's epinicians, inscriptions communicated with a geographically narrow public³³⁷ and were at least usually not tied to a well-known author.³³⁸ Pindar's references to this related mode of memorialisation sometimes stress the superior power of his poetry by asserting a claim to a broader audience because of his authorial skill. Funerary inscriptions emphasise the attractiveness of the physical monument (e.g. 124, 161, 165), which is presented as the primary means of commemoration and is often ascribed to a named craftsman, as the inscription is not.³³⁹ Pindar's poems emphasise their verbal artistry, which will enable them to fulfil their commemorative function by attracting secondary audiences. A grave inscription closes by naming the artist who endowed the monument with the qualities which every viewer is invited to appreciate: καλὸν ἰδεῖν αὐτὰρ Φαίδιμος ἐργάσατο (18). *Isthmian* 2 closes by highlighting the poet's skill, which will garner widespread interest: οὐκ ἐλινύοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν (*I.* 2.46).³⁴⁰

In *P.* 6.1-18 poetry outstrips a paragon of durability: a monument's claim to permanence resides in its stable physical structure, but immaterial words, if they are of unforgettable quality, cannot be destroyed (10-18).³⁴¹ As in many inscriptions, the text advertises its permanence through a future-tense verb (ἀπαγγελεῖ, 18) which fulfils its promise and points toward time to come.³⁴² As in inscriptions,³⁴³ negatives in a description of the future (10-14) evoke the natural course of destruction and oblivion which artificial memorialisation overcomes.

³³⁷ An inscription 'is meant to remain in place, speaking in a local voice' (Scodel (1992) 70).

³³⁸ Page (1981) 196: 'inscriptions were unassigned, and as a rule nobody in the fifth century B.C. showed curiosity about their authorship'; note Sider (2007) 117-19 on Simonides.

³³⁹ Cf. Day (2013) 224-5; 887, a full-fledged poem, is the exception proving the rule.

³⁴⁰ If οὐκ ἐλινύοντας (46) looks to *N.* 5.1-2, probably composed earlier, one may understand a reference to statuary.

³⁴¹ Cf. Simon. 581, Svenbro (1976) 188-92, Ford (2002) 105-9. Ford (1992) 136-67 and Scodel (1992) 66 find in the *Iliad* a similar eristic engagement with physical memorials.

³⁴² E.g. 19, 108, 142, 491, 492.

In *N.* 8.44-7, as in real funerary inscriptions (e.g. 19, 69, 95), the deceased is imaginatively conjured back into presence through direct address. Pindar's λίθον Μοιχαῖον (47) consoles the deceased and his family by enacting a vision of posthumous glory previously articulated (35-9). Real funeral monuments record the same desire for a reputation for oneself and one's children that Pindar realises for Megas.³⁴⁴

At *N.* 4.79-88 Pindar records his patron's request to memorialise his relative and thereby evokes the convention of funerary inscriptions recording the family members who erected the memorial for the deceased (e.g. 35, 40, 41). In inscriptions τίθημι (cf. θέμεν, 81) is a common verb for establishing such a monument (see *CEG indices* s.v.). By locating his praise at the Isthmus (86-8), the site of Callicles' triumph,³⁴⁵ Pindar also evokes a statue erected at the sites of the games.³⁴⁶ Inscriptions often highlight the attractiveness of their accompanying monument (e.g. 153: Παρίο λίθο). *Nemean* 4 appropriates this self-reflexive rhetoric but sets itself apart through a 'supra-superlative': πτάλαν ... Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν (81).³⁴⁷ This poetic memorial is brighter than even the brightest, most luxuriant monument because it engages more attention than any physical monument could. Pindar's poem makes Callicles as prosperous as a king, a paradigm of wealth (βασιλεῦσιν ἰσοδαίμονα, 84).³⁴⁸ ἰσοδαίμονα (84), however, connotes εὐδαιμονία and thereby a broader well-being (cf. de Heer (1968) 38-44) in which a common citizen may eclipse royalty (cf. *Hdt.* 1.30-3, *Sappho* 55 with testimonia). 'Equal in flourishing'

³⁴³ E.g. 491, 611, 627; cf. *Thgn.* 245, *Simon.* 531, *B.* 3.90-2, 13.175-81.

³⁴⁴ E.g. 493, 570, 683.

³⁴⁵ Henry (2005) understands compressed phrasing: something like 'let him find my tongue celebrating (the place) where'. But it is hard to believe that εὐρίσκω followed by the locative relative does not suggest actual finding.

³⁴⁶ For the practice see Steiner (1993) 160, Köhnken (2007) 295.

³⁴⁷ Cf. Zellner (2010).

³⁴⁸ Finglass (2007b) on *P.* 11.53, Young (1968) 10-12.

means, through poetic meiosis,³⁴⁹ ‘more blessed still’.³⁵⁰ Wealth is a source of pleasure within one’s lifetime, but enduring poetry is more valuable insofar as it shapes the meaning of one’s life viewed as a whole. Inscriptions purport to console through an excellent monument and enduring renown; Pindar’s poem does both to a degree that makes even Parian marble look cheap.

Isthmian 8 enacts the principle illustrated in its Trojan myth (τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον, 61)³⁵¹ as the poet turns to memorialising Nicocles, the victor’s deceased relative. Pindar’s poetic μνᾶμα (62), a *vox propria* for a funerary memorial (*CEG* indices s.v.),³⁵² evokes a material tomb parallel with that of Achilles (τάφον, 57). Yet the salient parallel for Pindar’s song is less Achilles’ tomb and more the hero’s threnody: as the Muses sang for Achilles, so Pindar in the Muses’ chariot now sings for Nicocles.³⁵³ The description of Achilles’ funeral looks to the *Aethiopis* (*arg.* 4 *GEF* with M. L. West (2013) 153-6) and perhaps also the *Odyssey* (24.60-2),³⁵⁴ both elsewhere alluded to as widely-known works (*I.* 4.35-45, *N.* 7.20-4). The preceding résumé of Achilles’ achievements explicitly recalls poetic precedent (47-8; see p. 111n326). The Muses’

³⁴⁹ Cf. ὁμοίως at *O.* 11.10 and *P.* 9.78, Bundy (1986) 18.

³⁵⁰ ‘Richer/happier than a king’ is the standard trope on which this passage is parasitic (see Nisbet and Rudd (2004) on Hor. *Carm.* 3.9.4).

³⁵¹ τὸ (61) refers to the preceding maxim (cf. *O.* 6.17). καὶ νῦν (60) links heroic past and epinician present (cf. Sappho 17.11-12, *O.* 10.78). φέρει λόγον (60), recalling ἔδοξ’ (59), evidently means ‘applies, hold true’ (cf. Carey (1981); contrast Thummer (1968-9), Köhnken (1975) 30, Nagy (1990) 204), something like ἔχει λόγον (*C* 133b; cf. ἔπεται δὲ λόγος, *O.* 2.22).

³⁵² Cf. fr. 128c.5: ὥς οἱ σταθῆι μνάματ’ ἀποφθιμένων. Verb, noun, and purpose clause (see p. 122n363) evoke funerary inscriptions.

³⁵³ Cf. Köhnken (1975) 30-1.

³⁵⁴ Mann (1994) 315 persuasively argues that this passage looks primarily to the *Aethiopis*: there the ‘funeral was presented not as digression, but as part of the main course of the narrative’. Soti-riou (1998) 242-4 discusses verbal similarities with *Odyssey* 24.

threnody, the memory of which was preserved in well-known epics, provides a paradigmatic example of poetry memorialising valour.³⁵⁵

Funerary monuments regularly claim to confer lasting glory (Lattimore (1942) 241-3, Häusle (1980)), but *Isthmian* 8 makes a bolder implicit claim by assimilating a contemporary individual to Achilles, a paragon of glory (cf. Simon. 11.19-25 W). This epinician disassociates itself from the everyday genre of inscriptions, which littered the roadsides, and assimilates itself to a more elevated congener with a different place in the literary landscape: canonical hexameter texts. Pindaric epinician implicitly promises a degree of commemoration beyond the normal plot of earth and slab of stone with some verses.

The opening of *Nemean* 5 is the *locus classicus* for Pindar's engagement with the plastic arts (1-5):

Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύκοντα ἐργά-
 ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος
 ἐσταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας
 ὀλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτωι, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,
 στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοις, ὅτι
 Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυςθενής
 νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον ...

Aegina's tradition of producing sculpture for export (see R. R. R. Smith (2007) 137-8) is relevant here (Burnett (2005) 63). Another profession involved in the economy of athletic memorialisation calls to mind the profession of the epinician poet. Pindar both assimilates and dissimilates his trade to statuary. His charge to his ode to 'spread the announcement' (*διαγγέλλοις*, 3) evokes the speaking objects of epigram.³⁵⁶ An exceptionally compressed delivery of 'necessary encomiastic information' in the following lines (3-5) reproduces the necessarily brief compass of lapi-

³⁵⁵ πολύφαμον (58), predicated of the Muses' threnody, may include an association of fame in addition to its dominant literal meaning ('with many voices') suited to a chorus (cf. Kaimio (1977) 159, Hummel (1992)).

³⁵⁶ Cf. Burzachechi (1962), Steiner (1993) 176, Tueller (2008), O'Sullivan (2012) 82.

dary inscriptions preserving essential facts for posterity.³⁵⁷

Inscriptions often proudly claim to have been placed in a high-traffic area, where they were likeliest to be read and thereby fulfil their commemorative function (see p. 121). *Nemean* 5 turns this trope on its head: far from claiming a single desirable location (ἐπ’ αὐτῆς βαθμίδος, 1), it will reproduce itself through countless channels of dissemination (ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ’ ἀκάτωι, 2 ≈ every ship). The poem becomes a sort of living statue (cf. Steiner (1986) 74): *στεῖχ’* (3), contrasting with *ἐταότ’* (2), is standardly predicated of an animate subject.³⁵⁸ Excellent statuary approximates motion (*O.* 7.52); excellent odes really move. *γλυκεῖ’* (2), evoking the enjoyment of secondary audiences, explains why the ode will travel widely (cf. *O.* 9.21-8). This epinician has statuesque durability but surpasses monumental commemoration on the spatial axis.

An affinity between epinician and monumental commemoration was consciously felt and actively explored. Rhetorical commonalities between victory odes and inscriptions point toward deeper congruities. Like epinicians, inscriptions are constructed to communicate with a public ignorant of their subject and derive worth from their ability to do so (cf. 108: δεῦρο ἰὸν ἀνάνεμαι, ἀνὲρ τίς τῆδε τέθαππται). Some inscriptions enact a dialogue between knowledgeable stone and naïve but curious human interlocutor.³⁵⁹ Inscriptions feature a generalised speaking scenario capable of reiteration (Schmitz (2010)).

³⁵⁷ The ‘necessary encomiastic information’ common to inscriptions and epinicians (cf. Ebert (1972) 62, Race (1986) 26, Day (1994) 71) is the victor’s community (ἀπ’ Αἰγίνας, 3), name (Πυθέας, 4), father (Λάμπωνος υἱός, 4), event (παγκρατίου, 5), and festival (Νεμείαις, 5).

³⁵⁸ Before Pindar the verb is predicated of an inanimate subject only at Alc. 6.2; cf. B. 9.47 (personified fame).

³⁵⁹ E.g. 286, 429 with Kassel (1983).

Both epinician and epigram aim at the greatest possible reception.³⁶⁰ Epinician remarks on its own dissemination; inscriptions point up the fact that they stand where they may attract the most attention.³⁶¹ The audience of an inscription is sometimes identified as ‘those who walk by’ (e.g. 28, 80, 109, 518, Tueller (2010)). A sixth-century Athenian grave inscription addresses the passer-by as ‘either citizen or a stranger come from elsewhere’ (13; cf. 462, *N.* 7.64-9). 865 informs a stranger who will bear this information abroad in time to come (ἐπ’ ἀλλοδαπῶν ἄκτεα νικόμενος; cf. *H. Hy.* 3.174-5, *Pind. O.* 9.21-7, *N.* 5.1-5).

In both epinicians and epigrams the rhetoric of permanence often has a consolatory function and also enlarges audiences’ experience by calling to mind others who have approached and will approach the same text. Some inscriptions invoke later generations explicitly, often with the substantive future participle familiar from Homer and virtually confined to this usage (e.g. πολλοῖς μνᾶμα καὶ ἐκομένοισι, 136; 264, 356; cf. *I.* 4.39, *B.* 9.81).³⁶² Funerary inscriptions, like victory odes (e.g. *O.* 10.91-6, *B.* 13.61-6), often contrast their mortal subject with its immortal afterlife (e.g. 103, 109, 548, 780, 885).

Both epinicians and inscriptions make their commemorative purpose, fulfilled in interactions with their audiences, a central theme. A fifth-century public inscription describes its audience: βροτοῖσι δὲ πᾶσι τὸ λοιπὸν | φράζεσθαι λογίον ἔθηκε τέλος (5; cf. *P.* 6.14-18). 10 describes its goal as ‘making evident’ the excellence of its subject (σεμαίνειν ἀρετ[έν, 3.2; cf. δίαιταν μανύει, *P.* 1.93; τεὰν ἀρετὰν | μανῶν ἐπιχθονίοισιν, *B.* 10.13-14). 19 announces that a passer-by will come to recognise (γνό[σεται] the individual memorialised (cf. *P.* 3.112-14). 286 imparts the same message to all who question it. The new Marathon epigram (*SEG* 56.430) evidently en-

³⁶⁰ Walsh (1991) 78: ‘an inscribed stone was meant not just to announce “here lies so-and-so”, but also to disseminate the information as widely as possible’.

³⁶¹ E.g. 16, 39, 74, 167.

³⁶² See Bulloch (1985) on Callim. *Hy.* 5.121.

courages its audience to perpetuate the fame of its subject (φημίαι with Janko (2014)) and describes how others will receive its message (πεύσεται; cf. fr. 52o.35).

Both inscriptions and epinicians thematise intentional communication. Inscriptions frequently state that someone created a memorial *in order* for its subject to be remembered.³⁶³ Pindar evokes this rhetoric of intentionality when engaging with epigrams (N. 4.79-85, 8.44-50, fr. 128c.5). Even when not looking to monumental commemoration, victory odes frequently forefront the poet's desire to commemorate his subject and the victor's desire to be remembered, what impelled him to undertake the outlay of competing in the games and commissioning a poet to achieve ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν (O. 8.64). This represented desire for commemoration is fulfilled in real acts of receptions. In both inscriptions and epinicians various audiences' awareness of an intention represented within the text shapes their experience of the text in which that intention is fulfilled. It is something like this sort of embodied intentionality that Bishop evokes in her poem quoted above, the closest thing that she wrote to an *ars poetica*.

A comparison with epigrams may also shed light on the type of commemoration which Pindar's poetry is interested in providing. Epinician can convey a more vivid picture of a particular person than any inscription, but neither medium depicts an individualised portrait of the sort found in modern or Plutarchan biography.³⁶⁴ Both epinicians and inscriptions deploy an arsenal of tropes to connect a name with an ideal which is formulaic though susceptible to infinite variation. By assimilating their subject to a generalised archetype these commemorative media render individuals in a way more, and not less, memorable. An inscription, like an epinician, at once

³⁶³ Exegetic infinitives: e.g. 5, 399, 518, 624; purpose clauses: e.g. 344, 459 (c̃μα τόζ' Ἰδαμενεὺς ποίησα hína κλέος εἶη), 698, 865. *Od.* 4.584, 11.75-6, 24.80-4 may echo such language.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Young (1971) 46 on *Isthmian* 7: 'it looks as if [Pindar] purposely omitted historical details ... Strepsiades' death passes from the topical world into the area of permanent truth'.

preserves the irreducible singularity of a name, the single most important datum to be recorded,³⁶⁵ and erases individuality by subsuming a person into an enduring public ideal already familiar to every audience.³⁶⁶

6. Interwoven Perspectives: *Nemean 7*

οἱ δ' ἐπὶ δὴ πείκονται, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐτήτυμόν ἐστιν.

– H. Hy. 3.176

N. 7.61-9 advertises an ability to satisfy both an immediate and a secondary audience:

ξεῖνός εἰμι· σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον,
 ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων
 κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω·
 ποτίφορος δ' ἀγαθοῖσι μισθὸς οὗτος.

ἐὼν δ' ἐγγυς Ἀχαιὸς οὐ μέμψεται μ' ἀνήρ
 Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἄλλος οἱ-
 κέων, καὶ προξενίαί πέποιθ', ἔν τε δαμόταις
 ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλόν,
 βίαία πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις· ὁ δὲ λοιπὸς εὐφρων
 ποτὶ χρόνος ἔρποι. μαθὼν δέ τις ἀνερεῖ,
 εἰ πὰρ μέλος ἔρχομαι ψάγιον ὄαρὸν ἐννέπων.

Pindar analyses his multi-layered public into its constituent parts. He has a personal relationship with his patron (61),³⁶⁷ but his praise adheres to objective standards of truth.³⁶⁸ *Nemean 7* satisfies all present at its premiere performance, no matter where they come from. The poet can meet the gaze of the Aeginetans, who have a special interest in the Aeacidae (9-10) and first-hand knowledge of Pindar's patron and his character (58-60). ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν (66) suggests

³⁶⁵ Cf. Carey (1989) 3, Day (2010) 7.

³⁶⁶ Day (1989) 18: 'this is the kind of "biography" that lies at the heart of archaic encomium, namely brief formulaic expressions which cause the subject to conform to an archetype'.

³⁶⁷ Speaker as ξένος: Gundert (1935) 32-9, 77-107, Crotty (1982) ch. 3, Kurke (1991) ch. 6. The poet's status as guest-friend is crucial to his objectivity (cf. Slater (1979) 80, Park (2013) 17).

³⁶⁸ Cf. Park (2013) 26, 35.

confidence in face-to-face interpersonal interactions with the audience that he addresses on Aegina as a ξεῖνός (61).³⁶⁹ 66-7 abjure distortive exaggeration easily detected by them (cf. *O.* 4.17-8) and explain why the poet is confident: he tells the truth (see p. 271). In addition to the Aeginetans, a Molossian with a vested interest in Neoptolemus and his Molossian connections (cf. 38-40), if present (i.e. if he hears the song), will find no fault with the hero's treatment. Aeginetans and a Molossian constitute a universalising doublet of locals and non-locals (Pavese (1978) 675-6; cf. *O.* 7.90, *I.* 1.51).

In addition to this potentially diverse audience present at first performance, there is also a remote and vague secondary audience. The idea of 'time to come' (67-8) introduces subsequent reception (cf. ἀνερεῖ, 68, future; cf. οἱ δ' ἐπὶ δὴ πείκονται, *H. Hy.* 3.176; πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ, *Thgn.* 22; μνάσει ... τινα, *Pind.* fr. 52o.35; τις ὑμνήσει, *B.* 3.97).³⁷⁰ This passage, like many others (see III), traces the life of an epinician from performance to reception. Pindar's wish for a kindly future is defined in part by opposition to the next sentence:³⁷¹ if others proclaim that he lies, the future will not be kind. Taken together, these statements assert the speaker's truthfulness: 'if I lie, I will be found out; in full awareness of this, I will not lie' (cf. *O.* 4.18-19 with Mader (1990); see p. 271).

³⁶⁹ Cf. *N.* 10.40-1, D. L. Cairns (2005b) 30 (contrast Park (2013) 35). Pace D'Alessio (1994) 133n53, Pindar does not describe his relationship to his fellow Thebans, an issue not much discussed in other poems for non-Thebans (cf. Bundy (1972) 81n99, Most (1985b) 327-30, Loscalzo (2000), Currie (2005) 316, (2013) 247). καὶ προξενία πέποιθ' (65) suggests that his relationship with the Aeginetans is the sustained focus of the sentence (cf. *P.* 10.64, *B.* 13.224).

³⁷⁰ Cf. *N.* 4.43 with Miller (1983) 213n42, Bulman (1992) 66. Most (1985a) 190 instead posits a reference to future poems in our passage. *N.* 7.68-9 could be a general statement, but lines 70-3 and sustained stress on veracity instead suggest that the present song and its reception are still at issue. ἔρχομαι (69) may refer to Pindar's present visit to Aegina (cf. *O.* 5.19, *P.* 2.4) or, as I think less likely, it may be a present of recurrent action.

³⁷¹ Cf. *I.* 7.39-42.

τις (68), as often elsewhere in Pindar (see p. 84), includes everyone who will encounter this work after its debut (cf. Howie (2012) 395).³⁷² Similarly Theognis contrasts his subsequent reception (ὧδε δὲ παῖς τις ἐρεῖ· “Θεὺ γινιδός ἐστιν ἔπη | τοῦ Μεγαρέως”· πάντας δὲ κατ’ ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός, 22-3) against his fraught immediate relationship with his Megarian contemporaries (ἀκτοῖσιν δ’ οὐπω παῖσιν ἀδεῖν δύναμαι, 24). Whereas Theognis will be eventually vindicated by unbiased judges, Pindar stresses the agreement of all his audiences. If in time to come anyone finds his praise false (παρ μέλος ... ψάγιον ὄαρρον, 69), his goal of lasting commemoration (12-16) fails: falsehood cannot last.³⁷³ *Nemean* 7 enacts this principle explicitly by attacking Odysseus’ exaggerated reputation (20-4)³⁷⁴ and implicitly by rehabilitating ‘the tainted hero’ (Pelliccia (1995) 351) Neoptolemus. Pindar attacks Odysseus’ rotten fame and, with the help of the god (τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται | ὧν θεὸς ἀβρόν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων, 31-2 with Köhnken (1971) 45), perpetuates the true and therefore lasting fame of Neoptolemus. *Nemean* 7 is praise *cὸν θεοῖς* (*I.* 1.6), i.e. with truth, sincerity, insight, and inspired skill (cf. Bundy (1986) 29-30; contrast Homer’s artificial *μαχανᾶι*, *N.* 7.20).

For Pindar, it is emphatically not the case that ‘the local traditions on which the poet’s immediate audience have been reared constitute the ultimate criterion of “truth”’ (Nagy (1979) 3n6). In order to constitute κλέος (63), this epinician must be true for a range of audiences, in

³⁷² μαθών (68) may be taken multiple ways: either absolutely to mean ‘an expert’ (cf. *O.* 2.87) or with an object implied by the following clause or preceding verses (cf. *P.* 2.72; see Carey (1981), Most (1985a) 207, Loscalzo (2000), Currie (2005) 316). The important point is that either reading attributes to Pindar’s secondary audiences the knowledge necessary to judge his poem. The former reading seems preferable: to label Pindar a liar one needs to know not only his words but also the truth.

³⁷³ [Thgn.] 607-10, *H. Hy.* 3.173-6, *Simon.* 541.3-5, 20.13-18 W, *B.* 13.204-9, Pratt (1993) 117.

³⁷⁴ Time finds all and brings forth the truth: see Pearson (1917) i.217. In *Olympian* 1 time reveals the truth about Tantalus (33-4; cf. *fr.* 159). In *Nemean* 8 falsehood metastasised into tradition constitutes κῦδος ... καθρόν (34). This glory ‘must be qualified as rotten because in time it will prove as specious as Odysseus’ own rhetoric’ (Bulman (1992) 49; cf. Carey (1976) 33).

Aegina and everywhere, now and in the future.³⁷⁵ This passage makes the various parts of Pindar's audiences acutely aware of each other's perspectives. Secondary audiences think of how the Aeginetans once received this poem; the Aeginetans would have been invited to imagine how Pindar's praise of Neoptolemus, a figure with a less than sparkling reputation, would be received beyond the bounds of their community. All audiences are meant to have the impression of sharing objective truth with others.

Pindar presents himself as producing a poem that will be judged acceptable to notional secondary audiences. This should make one wary of the idea that *Nemean* 7 reflects a controversy over *Paean* 6 which, if it did in fact exist, was unlikely to be well-known outside Aegina. This 'apology thesis', espoused by most Pindarists since Alexandrian times,³⁷⁶ deserves as much *prima facie* deference as the competing notion that Sogenes was announced as the victor although an Achaean named Neoptolemus actually competed (C 1a). Both hypotheses are crutches put together from the evidence of the text by interpreters unable to make sense of the text on its own terms.³⁷⁷ There is no need of such artificial and untrustworthy supports.

Proponents of the apology hypothesis generally and rightly agree that the closing lines represent their strongest evidence.³⁷⁸ But there is good reason to believe that the end of *Nemean* 7, like the rest of Pindar, was intended to be comprehensible to secondary audiences. This pas-

³⁷⁵ Bowra (1964) 32: 'in putting his trust in time to put things right Pindar asserts his desire to make his songs endure through the ages, knowing that any touch of falsehood will in due course discredit and ruin them'.

³⁷⁶ Dissenting voices include Bundy (1986) 4, 28-9, Lefkowitz (1963) 182, Slater (1969), Thummer (1968-9) i.94-8, Köhnken (1971) 37-86, Burnett (1998), Currie (2005) 326-31.

³⁷⁷ Hermann (1828) 22, Fränkel (1961) 388-9, O. L. Smith (1984) 8-11, Bundy (1986) 4n14, Heath (1993) 191.

³⁷⁸ Tughenat (1960) 404, Gianotti (1966) 405, Setti (1970) 428, Fogelmark (1972) 106, Lloyd-Jones (1973) 128, Kirkwood (1975) 85, Carey (1981) 135, Most (1985a) 208, Arrighetti (1987b), Bernard (1996-7) 105, I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 322.

sage, perhaps the most difficult in Pindar, may be explained using knowledge available to his contemporary secondary audiences (102-4):

τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ ποτε φάσει κέαρ
ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἐλκύσαι
ἔπεσι·

Although it may be impossible to achieve consensus on the many challenges of these lines, it is certainly possible to interpret them without reference to the apology hypothesis. Translate thus: ‘my heart will say that it never³⁷⁹ took down³⁸⁰ Neoptolemus with harsh words’.³⁸¹ As often in Pindar, here a denial amounts to an assertion (e.g. οὐ μέμψεται, 64 ≈ will praise; cf. Carey (1981) 160, Race (1990) 70).³⁸² By denying that he ‘took down’ Neoptolemus with ‘harsh words’ Pindar asserts that he has exalted Neoptolemus with gentle words of praise: cf. *χρὴ δὲ κωμάζοντ' ἄγαναϊς χαρίτεσσιν βαττάσαι* (*I.* 3.8). As at *O.* 10.97-100, the poet here asserts at the end of his work that he has completed his task of praise.

Emphasis on the first person (τὸ δ' ἐμὸν, 102, fronted) suggests a contrast (cf. *P.* 5.72, *I.* 5.19). In immediate context, the poet’s completed work (something under his control) contrasts

³⁷⁹ The negative is best construed with the infinitive, not with the verb of saying (Slater (1969) 93, J. R. Wilson (1988), Race (1990) 61n6, Hummel (1993) §382). Compelling grammatical arguments have not been brought against this construction (Slater (2001)).

³⁸⁰ ἐλκύσαι (103) does not refer to dogs rending a corpse, *pace* C 150a, Steiner (2001), and ‘almost everyone since antiquity till now’ (Lloyd-Jones (1973) 136). Dogs do not feature in *Nemean* 7. It is unlikely that the bare verb evokes an uncommon and grizzly scenario. ἐλκύσαι (103) refers to wrestling (cf. *N.* 4.35, 94-6 with Henry (2005), Gardiner (1905) 266, Poliakoff (1986) 138, 141; compare and contrast Köhnken (1971) 80-1). Earlier in *Nemean* 7 Pindar likens the remaining part of work to the wrestling portion of the pentathlon, the final event (70-4; cf. *B.* 9.36 with Maehler (1982-97)).

³⁸¹ The sense of ἀτρόποισι (103) is highly debated (Loscalzo (2000) provides a doxography). I understand it to mean that which does not turn and hence what is hard, harsh. Compare ἄγναμπος from γνάμπω and ἄτρεπτος from τρέφω. Praise is conventionally gentle; abuse is conventionally hard (Hubbard (1985) 71-5). A concrete sense of ἀτρόποισι (103) suits ἐλκύσαι (103).

³⁸² *Pace* Cerri (1976) 86. Not all Pindaric litotes are equivalent to their precise opposite (e.g. *P.* 8.21, *N.* 3.15-16; cf. Köhnken (1976), Race (1990)). Blame, not silence, as the opposite of praise: *Il.* 10.249, *Alcm.* 1.43-4, *N.* 7.64, 8.39, *I.* 4.36a-9, fr. 181, Detienne (1996) 45-9.

with the preceding prayer to Heracles for the future (something outside his control; cf. *O.* 10.95-100, *P.* 1.41-5, *Theoc.* 17.136-7). On another level, however, the speaker's attitude toward Neoptolemus contrasts with the literary tradition and with older epic poetry in particular.³⁸³ This closing statement is part of Pindar's 'rehabilitation of the tainted hero' (Pelliccia (1995) 351). With a future-tense verb that both makes a statement and asserts an enduring identification with that statement,³⁸⁴ Pindar affirms a special commitment to Neoptolemus (κέαρ, 102; cf. *I.* 5.19-20).³⁸⁵ This is a rhetorical stance, but one grounded in reality. Aegina commissioned more surviving Pindaric epinicians than any other community. There was a bond of kinship between Thebes and Aegina, as Pindar repeatedly stresses.³⁸⁶

Nemean 7 dwells at length on the *raison d'être* of its genre: to be an enduring record of worthy deeds (14-20, 48-9, 61-74). One might suppose that if Pindar had composed the opaque, backbiting song which many have thought that he did, then the citizens of 'song-loving' Aegina (9) would have been justly angry with him— not for an insulting paean but for a bad epinician. One of the few secure historical facts about Pindar of Thebes is that he was very good at his job. It is hard to believe that this poet, who elsewhere displays extensive familiarity with local tradi-

³⁸³ Cf. Lefkowitz (1991) 142. A variety of media depicted Neoptolemus negatively, but epic is of paramount importance to *Nemean* 7 (cf. 20-7). In the *Little Iliad* Neoptolemus kills Astyanax (fr. 29 *GEF*) on his own initiative (fr. 18) and kills Priam at the door to his house (fr. 25). In the *Sack of Ilium* he kills Priam at the altar of Zeus (*arg.* 2; cf. *Pae.* 6.114). Vases at *LIMC* s.v. Neoptolemus suggest a widespread perception of nastiness (cf. Anderson (1997) s.v. Neoptolemos, Hedreen (2011)).

³⁸⁴ Cf. φαρὶ καὶ φάσω (*B.* 1.159); Pelliccia (1995) 328, Pfeijffer (1999b) 47-8, 51-2. Compare the commoner 'I've said and still say' (e.g. *Il.* 9.105, *Soph. El.* 676). τρὶς τετράκι τ' (*N.* 7.104) suggests potential repetition.

³⁸⁵ Cf. οὐδέ πη ἔστιν | κεῖό γε ληθόμενον γλυκερὴν κομῆσαι ἀοιδὴν (*H. Hy.* 7.58-9); *H. Hy.* 3.167-8; οὔποτε κεῖο | λήσομαι ἀρχόμενος οὐδ' ἀποπαυόμενος (*Thgn.* 1-2); [*Thgn.*] 1327-8; αἰὲν ἔμοι πάρος οὗτος εἶη (*Ibycus* S221); *Pind. P.* 9.87-8; *N.* 1.33-4; [*Aesch.*] *PV.* 340, *Soph. El.* 103-6, οὐ πάρος (Eur. *HF* 673 with Bond (1981)).

³⁸⁶ Cf. *N.* 4.22-3, *I.* 8.16-20, *B.* 9.54-5, *Hdt.* 5.79-81, Hornblower (2004) 118-19, 209, Fearn (2007) 88-95, Indergaard (2011) 303-6.

tions, would commit a *faux pas* with the community which commissioned more of his surviving works than any other³⁸⁷ in a paean evidently commissioned by that community.³⁸⁸ If Pindar does touch on the Aeginetans' reaction to his paean, he assumes, on most readings, an insulting stance toward them.³⁸⁹ This is antithetical to all that we know about epinician. Aegina almost certainly commissioned Pindar after *Nemean* 7.³⁹⁰

Since its publication in 1908, *Paean* 6 has often been taken to confirm the apology thesis.³⁹¹ But its final triad constituted a serious obstacle: could the Aeginetans have been angry with a poem containing such high praise of Aegina? D'Alessio (1997) and I. C. Rutherford (1997) added a new layer to an old debate: the final triad of the paean was also transmitted among Pindar's *prosodia*.³⁹² This curious fact has been taken as potential evidence for the apology thesis. The poem's final triad, however, is unlikely to have been added later (*pace* I. C. Rutherford (1997) 13-19) or constitute an originally separate composition (*pace* Ferrari (1999), Prodi (2013) 344).

The final triad is probably an integral and organic part of *Paean* 6, as Horace, a 'hardly con-

³⁸⁷ Lloyd-Jones (1973) 137 can advance no better parallel for the Aeginetans' supposed indignation than Stesichorus' *Palinode*(s). But there is no compelling reason to believe that this work had anything to do with Sparta (Arrighetti (1994) 25, Davies and Finglass (2014) 28-9). Pindar may depict heroes connected to the victor in a negative light (e.g. *O.* 13.91, *N.* 5.14-16, both 'hushed' so as to bring more, not less, attention to omitted nastiness, *O.* 2.37-42, 7.27-31). Some do not believe that *Paean* 6 depicts Neoptolemus in a negative light (e.g. Currie (2005) 326, Kowalzig (2007) 222).

³⁸⁸ Aeginetan chorus of *Paean* 6: Wilamowitz (1922) 134-5, Wüst (1967) 134, Bona (1988) 101, Burnett (1998) 504, Currie (2005) 327; *pace* Radt (1958) 89, Hoekstra (1962), Gentili (1979) 9, Pavese (1993). Little recommends and nothing requires the more complex hypothesis of a mixed chorus (contrasts I. C. Rutherford (1997) 21, Kurke (2005)).

³⁸⁹ Cf. Slater (1977) 204.

³⁹⁰ *Pythian* 8, for an Aeginetan, is Pindar's latest dateable poem (446; in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary I assume the manuscript date is correct). The date of *Nemean* 7 remains uncertain, despite numerous modern studies, which convince one of nothing so much as the difficulty of the task. It is not clear how or if Alexandrian scholars knew *Paean* 6 to be later. The apology hypothesis stands a decent chance of being chronologically impossible.

³⁹¹ See Grenfell and Hunt (1908) with Wilamowitz (1908).

³⁹² Cf. Römer (2013) 130-3 on Alcman 3.

temptible student of Pindar’ (cf. Young (1987) 156), took it to be.³⁹³ There are several reasons to suppose this. Most obviously, the final triad is metrically identical to *Paean* 6. Furthermore, there seem to be thematic and verbal linkages between the final triad and the rest of the composition.³⁹⁴ More decisively, the opening lines of the final triad label what follows as a continuation. This hypothesis best explains the Greek.

After scrutinising the papyrus with a microscope, I am convinced that the reading in line 123 is γάρ ἐστι (I. C. Rutherford), as partially preserved in the Homeric scholia,³⁹⁵ and not γ’ ἔνεστι, printed by previous editors. This produces superior sense. γ(ε) lacks clear point; γάρ, as often,³⁹⁶ justifies the preceding imperative: ‘send forth (i.e. sing), youths, the measures of paeans;³⁹⁷ (I ask you to do so) because ...’ παιόνων (127), picking up παιό|νων (121-2), strengthens the connection. For obvious reasons γάρ never appears in the first sentence of an archaic poem.³⁹⁸

οὐ κε παιόνων | ἄδορπον εὐνάξομεν (127-8) marks what follows as a continuation, not a beginning. The verb connotes closure³⁹⁹ and suggests that the paean is reaching its end, as it is (cf. αἰοῖδ᾽ | δίψαν ἀκειόμενον, *P.* 9.103-4). Diction lacks clear point unless the speaker is con-

³⁹³ Horace has not been invoked by Pindaric scholars. See Pasquali (1920) 751-5 and Fraenkel (1957) 400-1 on Horace’s engagement with Pindar’s *Paean* 6 in *Carm.* 4.6, another poem which has been (wrongly) thought to be two separate compositions. Pindar’s work ‘provides a model for [Horace’s] abrupt transition in the second part of the poem’ (R. F. Thomas (2011) 166). Horace provides our only evidence for someone reading *Paean* 6 as a unity before 1908 (see Prodi (2013) 230). He thus undermines the best evidence for division.

³⁹⁴ Radt (1958) 89-90, Burnett (1998) 515n80, 517n85, I. C. Rutherford (2001) 331-2, Currie (2005) 325n163, Kowalzig (2007) 183.

³⁹⁵ C T Hom. X 51: ὀνομακλύτα γάρ ἐστι (ἐστι Radt).

³⁹⁶ E.g. *O.* 10.3, 7, 14.17, *P.* 4.14, 263, 6.1, *N.* 3.3, 4.71, 6.29.

³⁹⁷ On the imperatives in 121-2 see Ferrari (2000b) 314, Henry (2003) 7.

³⁹⁸ Spelman (2014a) 60; compare and contrast Prodi (2013) 262-3. The particle probably does not look forward to οὐνεκεν (127; *pace* I. C. Rutherford (1997) 13). There would be no secure Pindaric parallel. At *P.* 9.90 γάρ looks at least primarily backwards to a prayer, not forward to οὐνεκεν (93; cf. Hummel (1993) 406, R. W. B. Burton (1962) 50-6, Race (1990) 83, D’Alessio (1994) 131-2).

³⁹⁹ Race (1990) 61-2. Contrast ἐγείρω used to begin a theme: *O.* 9.47, *P.* 9.104, *N.* 10.21, *I.* 8.3.

tinuing and not beginning: they will put Aegina to bed only after providing a feast of praise (cf. *N.* 7.70-6).⁴⁰⁰ I doubt that Pindar would begin a poem with ‘we will not put you to bed’; advocates for division are encouraged to produce a parallel for the phrasing.

ἄδορπον (128) is also remarkable. Poetry is often likened to liquids; an unusual comparison of poetry to *food* suggests some unusual motivation.⁴⁰¹ The adjective draws on the performance occasion of Pindar’s paean, the Delphic *theoxenia*, ‘a festival which centred on a meal believed to be shared by the gods’ (I. C. Rutherford (2001) 310; cf. *Pae.* 6.61). Pindar metaphorically includes Aegina in the feast as he includes her in its accompanying poem.⁴⁰² The final triad, then, was likely composed for the same ritual occasion as the rest of *Paeon* 6. This hypothesis best explains the rich ‘feast’ of Pindar’s poetic language.

Elsewhere the paean cry introduces a shift as it does at *Pae.* 6.121-2 (cf. *Pae.* 1.5, 2.70, 5.43). The best parallel is *Pae.* 5.35-48: the speaker ends a catalogue of Athenian colonies with Delos, the site of his performance (cf. *Pae.* 6.120). The paean call (43; cf. 121-2) transitions to the present occasion (44-8; cf. *Pae.* 6.127-31).

We do not know the story behind the double transmission of the last triad of *Paeon* 6. Perhaps ancient scholars manufactured the marginal title to suit the apology hypothesis.⁴⁰³ But this would not account for the reference to a *prosodion*, a designation, it seems, based at least in part on performance (cf. D’Alessio (1997) 30, Prodi (2013) 39-94). Perhaps the triad was later

⁴⁰⁰ In our passage the negative is best taken with the verb (Race (1990) 61-2). Cf. οὐ λήξω ... ὑμνέων (H. *Hy.* 3.177-8) with Miller (1979) 183: the speaker declares that he will not stop praising Apollo ‘just when it might appear that he *has*’.

⁴⁰¹ Cf. Radt (1958) 175-6, Burnett (1998) 504, both overstating the point somewhat: witness *P.* 2.54-6, *N.* 8.21; fr. 124c looks comparable. Note also θύκων διθύραμβον (fr. 86a).

⁴⁰² Contrast Nünlist (1998) 194. Wüst (1967) 135 sees a connection to a marriage feast. But Zeus and Aegina hardly had a formal marriage (ἀγερέψατο, 136). There is no strong reason to imagine performance before nightfall (*pace* Radt (1958) 176).

⁴⁰³ Cf. I. C. Rutherford (1997) 14, Currie (2005) 328. Farnell (1930-2) i.313 contemplated a similar move.

re-performed (presumably with adaptations) as an independent composition,⁴⁰⁴ perhaps in connection with the worship of Aeacus.⁴⁰⁵ Far from being offended by Pindar's work, then, the Aeginetans may have liked it enough to bring it home and re-perform it. In any event, it seems likely that the final triad of *Paean* 6 constitutes an integral part of the composition and therefore strong evidence against, not evidence for, the apology thesis.

We have lingered on one of the most extensive controversies of Pindaric scholarship. This discussion has sought to vindicate a principle by applying it to a particularly difficult and complex test case. The principle is this: when puzzled, we should work toward an understanding using knowledge that would have been available to Pindar's contemporary secondary audiences. As *Nemean* 7 advertises, he composed his odes to be intelligible not only those who heard them in their debut performances but also 'someone who knows' in time to come. We should try to take on the perspective of μαθών ... τις (68). The remains of Pindar's poetry make it much easier to assume his view than to recover the mindset of those Aeginetans who first heard *Nemean* 7. Part Three demonstrates that Pindar's epinicians, including this difficult ode, are always intelligible as linear unities to secondary audiences.

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. D'Alessio (1997) 30.

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. fr. 52p (probably a *prosodion*), D'Alessio (1997) 26, Kurke (2005) 121-3, Prodi (2013) 245.

V. Genre and Tradition

This chapter broadens the scope of inquiry and considers the rhetoric of permanence within the contexts of genre and literary history. First it turns from epinician to Pindar's fragmentary poetry to determine what conclusions can be drawn about representations and realities of reception as they relate to genre. Next it examines earlier lyric to determine how Pindar's orientation toward his layered public relates to the poetic tradition from which he emerges. Though the rhetoric of permanence is less common outside epinician, Pindar's other genres also sought to engage secondary audiences. Fifth-century poets celebrate their afterlife with exceptional brio, but earlier lyric poets, too, aimed to achieve a broad reception and associated dissemination with poetic excellence.

1. Genre

This section focuses on Pindar's cultic works.⁴⁰⁶ Attached to a particular form of worship, such poetry might seem, amongst all ancient lyric, least intrinsically appealing to secondary audiences unconnected to its original performance setting. Thus Kurke (2007) 105 appeals to a 'common perception' that Pindar's epinicians are more 'pan-Hellenic' than his cultic poetry.

⁴⁰⁶ What is cultic poetry? The 'embeddedness' of Greek religion (R. Parker (1986) 265) renders unattractive any absolute opposition between the religious and the secular. We should conceive of cultic poetry as a spectrum. I am here primarily interested in one end of that spectrum. I regard as fundamentally cultic hymns, paeans, and *prosodia*. Other genres seem less intrinsically and/or consistently linked to ritual. Modifying I. C. Rutherford (2008) 73, I propose a layered definition of cultic poetry: a) poems accompanying ritual; b) poems constituting ritual; c) poems debuting within but not integrally connected to ritualised occasions. Pleasing a divine audience is a characteristic concern of such poetry: Alc. 1.87-8, H. Hy. 3.149-50, Pind. fr. 75.6, B. 17.130-3, Race (1982c) 8-10. The closing imperative 'rejoice' (e.g. H. Hy. 3.545) captures something essential (cf. Bundy (1972) 49-51). The *charis* of song 'is seen as a means of obtaining divine *charis* ... by reciprocal exchange' (Furley (2011) 223; cf. Race (1992) 20-2, Furley and Bremer (2001) i.61-3).

This ‘common perception’ is problematic.⁴⁰⁷ Traceable early reception suggests a different picture. Until the second century CE Pindar’s lost poems, including cultic works, were cited proportionately more frequently than his epinicians (Irigoin (1952) 13-20). The texts themselves show signs of anticipating widespread reception. *Isthmian* 1, performed in Thebes, refers to *Pae-an* 4, performed on Ceos; Pindar evidently anticipated that some would encounter both (see p. 17). Indeed, *Pae-an* 4 includes itself among poetry that bolsters Ceos’ panhellenic reputation: δια|γινώσκομαι μὲν ἀρεταῖς ἀέθλων | Ἑλλανίειν, γινώσκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ | μοῖσαν παρέχων ἄλλοις (4.21-4).⁴⁰⁸ Other cultic poems, discussed below, discuss their own afterlife. In commissioning from Pindar *Pae-an* 2, the Abderites presumably ordered a new instantiation of a known product which had reached as far as Thrace during the poet’s lifetime. Indeed, cultic poetry for a variety of performance setting accounts for no small part of Pindar’s total output.⁴⁰⁹ It is essential to the shape of his professional career.

The possibility of subsequent reception among secondary audiences was presumably no small part of the justification for hiring Pindar of Thebes to create a new composition rather than performing a traditional song⁴¹⁰ or the work of a less renowned poet. In discussing Pindaric cultic poetry one must remember the ‘Pindaric’ as well as the ‘cultic’ part. His cultic poems, like his epinicians (see VII), should be understood against the background of a widespread practice. A well-known fact bears repeating: ‘extant pieces of cult song are tantalizingly few compared to

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. Hubbard (2011), whose arguments are very different from mine.

⁴⁰⁸ Cassio (1972) takes this passage to mean that Ceos provides material for poets to praise. But for that sense one would strongly expect a dative denoting poets (contrast Bona (1988); cf. Carey (1991) 15, Henry (2005) on *N.* 6.33). The dative Ἑλλανίειν (23), denoting a universal audience, is construed *apo koinou* as indirect object. Complex and simplex verbs have the same meaning (Renehan (1969) 77-9).

⁴⁰⁹ Hymns, paeans, and prosodia made up four books of Pindar’s Alexandrian edition.

⁴¹⁰ Cf. Pòrtulas (2012) 236; note the (apocryphal) anecdote about Aeschylus reported in Porph. *Abst.* 2.18.

the extent of choral activity that must have taken place’ (Kowalzig (2007) 6; cf. Wilamowitz (1921) 242). ‘The χορός was an element so essential and characteristic that, in a Greek mouth, the question τί δεῖ με χορεύειν; would import, “why maintain the solemn rites of public worship?”’ (Jebb (1893) on Soph. *OT* 896, a sound observation if a debateable interpretation of this line). This essential form of worship has left a paltry textual trace which is unrepresentative of the whole phenomenon. Religious songs could be associated with a composer,⁴¹¹ but in the archaic period authorship was not necessarily central to traditional songs.⁴¹² Literary merit seems less important to some such works than the ritual that they accompanied.⁴¹³ Pieces of sub-literary cultic lyric that have happened to survive are manifestly something different from Pindar’s compositions. Few would mistake the composer of the Ereuthrian Paeon (p. 136 *CA*) for the Theban Eagle. It would be a mistake to assume that the monumental, wide-ranging *Paeon* 6 related to cultic practice in the same way as did the incantatory *Hymnus Curetum* (p. 160-1 *CA*).

The remnants of Pindar’s cultic poetry suggest how it could have appealed to secondary audiences— as it evidently did. Familiar concerns here pose themselves in somewhat different ways. Some arguments about the ability of Pindar’s epinicians to communicate with secondary audiences also apply here; some special considerations require special analysis. This section first discusses why cultic poetry might have engaged audiences beyond its premiere performance and then examines passages describing their subsequent reception.

⁴¹¹ See Furley and Bremer (2001) i.146-51 on the murky figure of Olen.

⁴¹² J. M. Bremer (1998) 514, Furley and Bremer (2001) i.25; cf. I. C. Rutherford (2008) 75 on Near-Eastern parallels.

⁴¹³ Cf. Wilamowitz (1886) 84 (memorably overstating the point): ‘Poetischen Wert braucht das Kultlied nicht’. Cf. Norden (1913) 160, Feeney (1998) 41-2.

A. Occasions and Audiences in Cultic Poetry

How did Pindar's cultic poetry relate to its performance occasion, its premiere audience, and subsequent audiences? The fragmentary nature of the evidence may excuse the following somewhat impressionistic analysis.

In comparison to epinician, cultic poetry was both more and less tied to a singular occasion: it is linked to a cultic event more unique than the largely typologised victory revel, but that cultic event is iterable. Unlike epinician, religious poetry had a built-in re-performance scenario in the worship sustained at the site of its debut performance.⁴¹⁴ Pindar consistently describes other cultic performance traditions as repeating phenomena.⁴¹⁵ Some of his cultic poetry describes its traditional background in such a way so as to suggest implicitly its own possible afterlife as part of a continuing practice.⁴¹⁶

⁴¹⁴ Cf. I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 176 and, more generally, Depew (2000).

⁴¹⁵ *πολλάκις* (*P.* 2.15), *θαμά* (*P.* 3.78), *θαμά* (*Pae.* 2.98), *θαμινά* (6.16). *ταρφέως* (B. 13.26) might have a similar meaning (Power (2000) 81; but note *Od.* 3.379). Timeless presents of recurrent performances: *κελαδέοντι* (*P.* 2.15), *μέλπονται* (*P.* 3.78), *δέκονται* (*N.* 5.38), *βρέμεται* (11.7), *κλέονται* (*I.* 5.27), *λέγοντι προβώμιον* (fr. 6a(k)), *καλέονται* (*Pae.* 2.96), *κροτέο[ντι]* (6.18), *ἄχεϊ* (fr. 75.18), *μέλπουσι* (B. 13.94), *ἀνθ]εῦς[ι]* (fr. 4.57); cf. the timeless aorist *κελάδησαν* (B. 16.12). It is not clear in a given passage if Pindar refers to the re-performance of stable works or a series of works on the same theme. One need not assume uniformity. *I.* 5.26-9 suggests not enduring poems but rather a stable theme refreshed by new poets (like Pindar). *H. Hy.* 3.174-6 could be taken as referring to subsequent performances in other locations of a hymn originally performed on Delos (cf. Thalmann (1984) 132). It seems plausible to suppose a poet will spread fame by poetry rather than through word of mouth (contrast *Od.* 8.496-8).

⁴¹⁶ Pind. fr. 75.18-19, 140a.59-68, B. fr. 4.50-68 with Kowalzig (2007) 159. Pind. fr. 52m presents itself as part of a tradition of *theoria* (4-8; cf. I. C. Rutherford (2013) 240). *Paeon* 6 ends with an appeal: *Μοι�ᾶν | ἐπαβολέοντ[α] πολλάκι, Παιάν, δέ[ξ'] ἐννόμων ἐ[νοπ]ᾶν* (181-3; text after I. C. Rutherford (2001a), who takes account of D'Alessio and Ferrari (1988)). *πολλάκι* and *ἐννόμων*, probably 'sanctioned by custom' (cf. *O.* 7.84 with Verdenius (1987-88)) rather than 'harmonious' (I. C. Rutherford), point to a continued practice (cf. Radt (1958) 193n4, Prodi (2013) 296). This could link with the speaker's opening statement that he performs in order to defend *ἐμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ίς* (11), perhaps the honour of performing on the prestigious occasion of the Delphic *theoxenia* (Burnett (1998) 504, Currie (2005) 324; compare Radt (1958)).

Ritual is an essentially iterative phenomenon; ritual poetry, however, can be closely linked with one particular iteration. *Paean* 9, responding to a solar eclipse, is a striking example. *Paean* 2 looks forward to a ‘final war’ (105-6). Praise of contemporary individuals is integral to *Partheneion* 2 (6-11, 31-49 with Spelman (2014b)). As in epinician, so, too, in cultic poetry a sense of immediacy is cultivated as a literary strategy. *Paean* 9 will have taken considerable time to compose and execute, but Pindar conveys the arresting impression that the eclipse is still happening (note tenses: μήκαι, 1; κλεπτόμενον, 3; ἐλαύνεις, 6).⁴¹⁷ A vivid link between the poem and its extraordinary motivating event seems to have augmented, not reduced, the appeal of this paean for later audiences, who knew that the eclipse had not in fact harbingered the impending end of the human race: witness the complex and detailed allusion at Soph. *Ant.* 100-9.⁴¹⁸

Unlike epinicians debuting in the victor’s home city, some cultic poems debuted before a Hellenic audience at Hellenic festivals. The song of the Charmers on an older Delphic temple serves as an analogue for Pindar’s *Paean* 8, first performed near a successor temple:⁴¹⁹ both arrest various visitors to the sanctuary (ξένοι, 76). Works first performed at panhellenic sanctuaries could have transmitted information about a particular community to a diverse premiere audience.⁴²⁰ *Paean* 6 highlights the importance of its Delphic ritual (63-4) and its Trojan myth to the Greek world. Simultaneous engagement with Delphic and Aeginetan themes suggests that communities were in close contact with and involved in rites performed at Hellenic sanctuaries. Indeed, the final triad was perhaps subsequently performed on Aegina as a *prosodion* (see p. 132).

⁴¹⁷ Cf. pseudo-spontaneous reactions to weather in earlier lyric (e.g. Archil. 105 with Clay (1982), Alc. 338).

⁴¹⁸ Cf. Griffith (1999), Swift (2010) 29-30, Budelmann (2013) 84.

⁴¹⁹ I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 214, Power (2011); cf. Simon 519 fr. 55.

⁴²⁰ Cf. θέλγουσι δὲ φῶλ’ ἀνθρώπων (Hom. *Hy.* 3.161, of the Deliades), Philodamus Scarpheus p. 168 CA 110-14.

Theoretic choruses performing at the great sites⁴²¹ will have enabled ongoing dialogue between local and panhellenic choral rituals. *Paean* 2, performed in the self-consciously peripheral Abdera (24-6), sets itself alongside choruses at Apollo's two chief centres of worship, Delos and Delphi (96-102). By assimilating his work to these well-known paragons of cultic poetry, the speaker implies a claim to widespread attention (perhaps asserted in 102-3). He puts himself on the map.⁴²²

Some cultic poems trace the origins of their own ritual setting (e.g. fr. 51a-b, *Pae.* 6.58-65, 7.12-18, 7b.42-52, 8.62-80, 9.41-9, fr. 52m.8-20), perhaps in part to inform the uninformed (J. M. Bremer (1998) 515, I. C. Rutherford (2008) 51). Fr. 52o will make a distant notional audience think of the rite that it accompanies (see III.4). Though explaining origins is a characteristic concern of ritual poems,⁴²³ some aspects of their occasional context would have perhaps remained opaque for secondary audiences. A fifth-century Athenian might have been familiar with the Theban Ismenion (Soph. *OT* 21) but not the details of rites and stories connected to it. In this matter one needs to remember why a fifth-century Greek would have been interested in poetry connected to a rite belonging to another community. As with epinician, the broad appeal of cultic poetry outside its original setting must have depended primarily on its aesthetic merit. The end of fr. 52o makes this point almost explicitly, but all of Pindar's religious poetry highlights its charm.

On the whole, Pindar's cultic poems do not require a great deal of specialised knowledge in order to be enjoyed. Scholars debate the precise nature of the ritual behind the second *Parthenion*;⁴²⁴ ancient secondary audiences with a complete text may not have been significantly better informed. But this poem is still enjoyable for its verbal art (cf. 76-8) even if one does not ap-

⁴²¹ See Kowalzig (2005), I. C. Rutherford (2013) ch. 14.

⁴²² Cf. I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 273-4, Power (2011) 105.

⁴²³ On aetiology see Kowalzig (2007) 24-32.

⁴²⁴ See, most recently, Olivieri (2011) 171-86.

prehend the precise ritual significance of the κωπώ (cf. 69 with S-M's introductory apparatus to the fragment). A similar argument applies to Alcman 1, an instance of an earlier form of cultic poetry that Pindar draws on in fr. 94b:⁴²⁵ one need not know if the φάρος (61; *sic*) carried by the maidens is a plough or, as is far more probable, a cloak⁴²⁶ in order to enjoy Alcman's poem. Pindar's cultic works are not intended to be transcripts of rituals and were probably not approached as such by fifth-century secondary audiences. Reading them in this way can mislead modern scholars.⁴²⁷

We may attain a clearer sense of how Pindar's cultic poetry related to its occasion and its audiences by comparing broadly analogous works from other cultures. Near Eastern religious songs are far more thoroughly integrated into their ritual context (I. C. Rutherford (2008) 80). In Pindar's religious songs one finds only scattered and passing mentions of sacrifice (*Pae.* 6.63, fr. 52m.5-8, 59.11-12, *Dithy.* 1.11, fr. 75.4) and libation (fr. 52p.8-9). These poems are far more concerned with poetry itself as a different but complementary form of dedication (cf. *Pae.* 2.3-4, 5.44-8, 6.1-18, 58-61, 127-9, 181-3, 7.9-11, 7b.10-22, 9.33-40, 12.4-5, fr. 52s.1-5, *Dithy.* 1.14-15, 2.1-26, θύκων διθύραμβον, fr. 86a).

How much would we learn about one of Pindar's cultic poems if we suddenly were to learn a great deal about its occasion? Horace's *Carmen saeculare* provides material for a thought

⁴²⁵ Bowra (1964) 363-4, Hutchinson (2001) 367, Carey (2011) 445, Spelman (2014c) 26n18.

⁴²⁶ See Priestly (2007).

⁴²⁷ The opening lines of *Paeon* 2, for instance, are sometimes taken to indicate processional performance (Dougherty (1994) 215, I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 266-7, Pavlou (2011) 64). Nothing prevents this or any other Pindaric poem from being so performed, but little supports the hypothesis (cf. Radt (1958) 3-19). διώξω (4) exemplifies the voluntative future of openings (cf. D'Alessio (2004) 281) and connotes beginning: 'set in motion (i.e. begin) a paean' (cf. Diggle (1970) on Eur. *Phaethon* 72; contrast Lefkowitz (1991) 12-13). This may propose not a real processional itinerary but a metaphorical itinerary of song (cf. *Od.* 8.499-500, Pind. fr. 75.7-10 with Van der Weiden (1991), *P.* 6.3-4, *N.* 1.4-6, 9.1-2).

experiment. Unique among its author's lyric output,⁴²⁸ this ode was performed by a chorus and accompanied a public religious rite, like the archaic Greek cultic lyric that it programmatically evokes (*tempore sacro*, Hor. *Carm. saec.* 4→ἐν ζαθέωι ... χρόνῳ, Pind. *Pae.* 6.5; so Kiessling and Heinze). 'About these celebrations we are uncommonly well informed' (Fraenkel (1957) 365). The discovery in 1890 of an inscription adding to our knowledge of Horace's cultic occasion, the *Ludi Saeculares*, might have reasonably been expected to enrich dramatically the understanding of his poem. The inscription clarified the address to the Capitoline deities at line 37 but, to the disappointment of Mommsen, its first editor, also evinced Horace's independence from the ceremonial programme. 'So far from forming a part of [the ceremonies], the *carmen* is deliberately placed outside of them' (Fraenkel (1957) 378; cf. R. F. Thomas (2011) 58). The *Carmen saeculare* was intended to live beyond its debut performance and be experienced alongside Horace's other lyric works (cf. *Carm.* 4.6, Barchiesi (1996) 8-9, Bitto (2012)). 'Horace is celebrating and preserving a particular moment of sacred time' (Feeney (1998) 37).

We should not assume that the occasions behind Pindar's cultic poems hold the key to their meaning any more than the *Ludi Saeculares* provide a skeleton key to the *Carmen saeculare*. Indeed, these works, like the *Carmen saeculare*, were designed to transcend their initial setting and, as the next subsection demonstrates, sometimes advertise their ability to do so.

B. Permanence outside Epinician

The 'common perception' invoked by Kurke (2007) 105 likely derives in no small part from the fact that Pindar's cultic poems do not prominently advertise their dissemination and durability as do his epinicians. From this one cannot legitimately infer that Pindar's cultic poetry was parochi-

⁴²⁸ Barchiesi (2002) 108.

al in its orientation toward its audiences. The rhetoric of permanence is not a transparent indication of intended audiences; it is implicated in configurations of speaker, addressee, and occasion-al that are deeply related to the concept of genre. Claims of immortality, so frequent in Pindar's epinicians, are usually advanced by a speaker closely identified with the celebrated professional poet Pindar of Thebes (see VII.4). The voice of the author *qua* author is less prominent in, if not absent from, cultic lyric, which often speaks on behalf of and through a citizen community. The corporate choral enunciator of cultic lyric is characterised as performer and citizen to an extent foreign to the choral voice in epinician.⁴²⁹ Cultic poetry also has a different internal audience. In epinician poetic immortality constitutes a consolation and reward for exceptional mortal honorands.⁴³⁰ The distinctive addressees of cultic poetry are ontological immortals for whom poetic immortality is rather less important. Gods are concerned with the aesthetic merit of a poem, an ἄγαλμα dedicated like any other, and hold human aesthetic standards, but they are not presented as concerned with the reception of a poem amongst mankind. Among the fragmentary genres of

⁴²⁹ The speaking voice in Pindar is a construct that may draw on the rhetorical resources of its enunciator (who performs the poem) and its author (who composed the poem). Experiencing epinician is unlike answering the telephone: one does not routinely ask 'who is speaking?' and there is not necessarily a single correct answer (cf. D'Alessio (1994) 117, Bonifazi (2004a) 397-8). Lefkowitz (1991) 11-4, 25-30 distinguishes the choral voice of cultic poetry from the poetic voice of epinician. D'Alessio (1994), Schmid (1998), Lavecchia (2000a) 169, Kurke (2005) 86-90, Fearn (2007) 7, Calame (2011), and Currie (2013) rightly object to the dichotomy. It is worth remembering that the congruities of self-presentation between the poetic and choral voice are stronger than the discrepancies. The choral speaker can be identified as an extemporaneous composer through a conventional fiction (cf. Alc. 3.1, fr.94b.37, D'Alessio (1994) 119). Alc. 1.85-7, Pind. *Pae.* 4.21-4, and fr. 94b.31-41 play with the gap and congruity between composer and enunciator. Archaic audiences were of course capable of differentiating between the two (*P.* 10.55-6). The speaker of cultic poetry may well draw on the rhetorical resource of Pindar of Thebes at *Pae.* 6.6, 7b.15-22, fr. 52s.3, *Dithy.* 2.23-5. See p. 147n447 on Bacchylides 19. I am open to the possibility of finding the voice of the composer in these passages, a move which to me seems very natural, but do not insist on that reading. It would be helpful to have a more secure horizon of generic expectation.

⁴³⁰ Compare the remains of Pindar's threnodies, evidently revolving around different, more eschatological forms of immortality (129, 131a-b, 133, 137; contrast 128c.5, depicting the poem as a lasting memorial).

Pindar and Bacchylides, the rhetoric of permanence is disproportionately common in *encomia*.⁴³¹ In that genre, as in epinician, a speaker associated with the historical composer addresses another exceptional mortal.⁴³²

There are nonetheless among the remnants of Pindar's cultic poetry several passages which envision broad secondary audiences and an enduring poetic afterlife.⁴³³ Fr. 52o and *Paeon* 4 have been discussed. *Paeon* 7a evidently ended by envisioning its future reception, a common closing theme.⁴³⁴ The female narrator of a *partheneion* proudly compares her small, precious work to the enormous salt sea: μή νῦν νέκταρ[ρ]νας ἐμαῖς | διψῶντ' α[.....] παρ' ἄλμυρόν | οἷχεσθον (fr. 94b.76-8; cf. Callim. *Hy.* 2.105-12 with Poliakoff (1980)). In this competitive meta-poetic context, nectar likely connotes permanence (see p. 71n220). The addressees 'thirst' for song probably because they long for commemoration (cf. *O.* 11.1-6, *N.* 3.6-8, 76-84). I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 216 plausibly suggests that at *Pae.* 8.1-4 the speaker intends to extend the fame of his subject worldwide (cf. *κλυτοὶ μάντι*[ε, 1), but this passage could reflect the arrival motif.

Paeon 7b and *Dithyramb* 2 provide the most extensive evidence for the rhetoric of permanence in cultic poetry. In both genres, a speaker with close affinities to the historical composer addresses a mortal audience and engages in an agonistic justification of his privileged place in the literary landscape.

⁴³¹ Pind. fr. 121, B. fr. 20b.3-4. The sample size is admittedly miniscule.

⁴³² Relationship of epinicians to *encomia*: Cingano (2003), Budelmann (2012).

⁴³³ Contrast Pavlou (2011) 74n55, who asserts that references to future reception 'are omitted in the cult songs'.

⁴³⁴ The speaker evidently resolves to tell the truth and hopes that his work will survive with divine help. Beside *κλοπα*[(6) a marginal scholia reads: ἀληθῆ καὶ οὐ ψευδῆ (cf. *Od.* 11.364, Denniston (1939) on Eur. *El.* 364). ἐκ φρεν[ός (5) connotes sincerity (Groeneboom (1938) on Aesch. *Sept.* 874). Truth was perhaps here, as elsewhere (see p. 125), connected to durability. A marginal scholia to line 7 reads:]θήσω μολάν ἱ.. Perhaps read ἀνα]θήσω (cf. *O.* 5.8-9, *P.* 8.29-31, *Pae* 9.39) or κατα]θήσω (cf. *N.* 7.76). The future probably reflects Pindar's text (cf. e.g. *I.* 4.72b, 6.74). Κλεός ἐ[κατι (7) is restored from the scholia to *N.* 3.83. As there and at B. 13.228, the Muse's name in our passage presages the afterlife of the poem.

i. *Paeon 7b*

This poem debuted in the panhellenic sanctuary of Apollo on Delos. It moves into narrative through an explicit comparison with the panhellenic precedent of Homer (10-22; text after I. C. Rutherford (2001a)):

κελαδήκαθ' ὕμνους,
 Ὀμήρου [τρι]πτὸν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν
 ἰόντες, ἀ[ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις,
 ἐπεὶ αὖ[π]τανὸν ἄρμα
 Μοισα[]μεν.
 ἐ]πεύχο[μαι] δ' Οὐρανοῦ τ' εὐπέπλωι θυγατρὶ
 Μναμ[ο]κύ[ν]αι κόραισί τ' εὐ-
 μαχανίαν διδόμεν.
 τ]υφλα[ῖ γὰρ] ἀνδρῶν φρένες,
 ὅ]στις ἄνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων
 βαθεῖαν ε..[...].ων ἐρευνᾷ κοφίας ὁδόν.
 ἐμοὶ δὲ τοῦτο[ν] διέδω-
 κ.ν] ἀθάνατ[ο]ν πόνον ...

A preliminary comparison with previous poetry helps articulate the aims of a new work (cf. *Olympian* 9, *Isthmian* 2, *Dithyramb* 2, fr. 140b). Contrasting imperfect human knowledge with the Muses' superior insight, the speaker draws on the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships (2.484-6→Pind. *Pae.* 7b.18-20), Homer's most programmatic statement of privileged access to the past.⁴³⁵ The Pindaric speaker lays claim to similar authority and, as we shall see, a similar universal audience (cf. Ibycus S151.23-6). The fact that Homer is named suggests that authorship is at issue— even if the narrator is not simply here to be identified with Pindar of Thebes. For his ancient secondary audiences the authorship of his poetry delivered through a choral voice was presumably nev-

⁴³⁵ Benjamin (2010) 18, 205 attractively interprets the invocation before the Catalogue of Ships as a meditation on the nature of epic. Unusually in epic, this passage thematises the relationship between the speaking personality and his theme, a pervasive concern of lyric. Prominent lyric allusions to this passage (Ibyc. S151.23-31, Simon. 11.16-17 W, Pind. *Pae.* 6.54-8, 7b15-20) suggest its importance to archaic conceptions of Homeric poetics and poetics generally. It would be hard to cite a Homeric passage with an equally spectacular archaic afterlife.

er more in question than in his epinicians, where he is never explicitly named, though he looms large as a personality.⁴³⁶

Engagement with tradition highlights innovation. Mention of Homer primes audiences to interpret what follows against the background of his work. The imperfectly preserved myth of *Paean* 7b, as I. C. Rutherford (1988) demonstrates,⁴³⁷ differs substantively from the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*, commonly regarded by Pindar's contemporaries as the work of Homer (M. L. West (1975) 166, I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 247, Faulkner (2011) 177, 199-200). Pindar's novel work on a familiar theme derives from the same divine source as previous poems but blazes a new path.⁴³⁸ The contrast between a divinely-granted flying chariot (13)⁴³⁹ and the well-trodden path (11) sets the speaker not only above those who rehash worn Homeric themes but also above Homer, who established a terrestrial course. ἀμαξιτόν (11) and τρι]πτόν (11), if correct, depict Homer's work as a classic already reiterated time and again. δέλτου (24, preserved in the margin) could even implicate the textual afterlife of Homer's hymn.⁴⁴⁰ The Pindaric speaker's privileged relation to the divine, evident in the quality of his work, affords him a new and superior 'road of skill' (20; cf. B. 19.12-14).⁴⁴¹

⁴³⁶ Cf. e.g. Ibyc. S151.46-8, Ar. *Thesm.* 101-29 (Agathon's maiden chorus), Hor. *Carm.* 4.6 (authorship of the *Carmen saeculare*). Bacchylides can indirectly denominate Ceos as ζαθέας νάκου (5.10-11; cf. γασιῶτιν, 9.10); the victor's community, by contrast, is always more explicitly denominated (see p. 21-2).

⁴³⁷ Cf. D'Alessio (1992) 371-2, I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 252.

⁴³⁸ Contrast Aloni (1998) 31, who asserts that for Pindar the Muses and Homer are functionally the same (cf. Bing (1988) 35, Scodel (2001)).

⁴³⁹ Cf. *I.* 5.38 (see p. 318n874). D'Alessio (1988, 1995), I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 249, and Ferrari (2002) assert that Pindar's work sets itself apart from its Homeric predecessor (*contra* Di Benedetto (1991) 173, (2003)). Precise supplements remain uncertain, but so much seems reasonably secure.

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. Fearn (2007) 14-15.

⁴⁴¹ The point is not that Homer's poem is popular while 'Pindar's is only for the chosen few' (Graziosi (2002) 59, importing Callimacheanism).

Exceptional among the Homeric hymns, the *Hymn to Apollo* explicitly identifies its performance location: Delos (146-75). The Pindaric speaker sets his Delian paean against a canonical poem first performed at the same centre of Apollo's worship.⁴⁴² *Paean* 7b thereby takes up a challenge articulated by the *Hymn to Apollo*, a work similarly concerned with its place in the tradition. The speaker asserts the superiority of his composition over future works: τοῦ (sc. the blind man from Ceos) πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριτεύουσιν αἰοιδαί (173). These words appeal to a proven reputation, augur the afterlife of this particular poem, and imply a competition between newer and older works. πᾶσαι (173) identifies authorship as the common factor ensuring the success of a corpus. As Burkert (2001) 112 writes, 'this is the clearest expression in epic diction of the notion of a classic, an absolute classic, that I can imagine'. Homer's canonical status, already celebrated in the *Hymn to Apollo* and reflected within Pindar's paean (11-12), both serves as a spur to competition and as a validating precedent for the younger poet's ambition for his Delian performance eventually to enter the Hellenic literary tradition.⁴⁴³

In a passage so concerned with authorial competition and reception, τοῦτο[ν] ... ἄθανατ[ο]ν πόνον (21-2) probably describes this poem as an immortal creation.⁴⁴⁴ πόνον is the work of composition; ἄθανατ[ο]ν predicts the successful result of that labour (cf. Simon. 11.28 W, *I.* 4.40, fr. 121.3, B.10.11, 13.65). In contrast to the ineffectual struggles of one without the

⁴⁴² The scholia to line 5 apparently mention an assembly (πανηγυρε..); cf. the description of the festival at H. *Hy.* 3.146-76.

⁴⁴³ The 'blind wits' (18) of those who compose without the Muses might be a swipe at the blind man of Ceos (Bing (1988) 104-5, Fearn (2007) 11).

⁴⁴⁴ I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 249 understands an immortal rite (cf. Alc. 7.4-5, Simon. 519 fr. 35b.6, Pind. fr. 70c.16, Eur. *Ba.* 65-6, Fraenkel (1950) on Aesch. *Ag.* 1550). But ritual is not in sight in our passage, which is more concerned with poetry. πόνον (22) need not refer to the activity of a chorus (cf. Ibyc. S221, Pind. *N.* 3.12, 7.74). Ferrari (2002) 207-10, following Becker (1937) 76, champions the original reading πόρον (22) against the superscribed alternative, which is usually taken as a true correction. A path, however, makes an odd gift. πόρον could have mistakenly arisen from preceding talk of roads. πόνον would be harder to account for as a corruption.

guidance of the Muses (ἐρευνᾶι, 20→πόνον, 22), this poem will succeed as Homer's work has already succeeded. The form of the argument all but requires that the speaker's present work stands as a contrastive instantiation of poetic success following the preceding gnome about poetic failure (cf. *N.* 4.39-43 and *P.* 2.58-63). ὅ]στις (20) contrasts with ἐμοί (21), which will refer to the speaker *qua* composer. He prays for the facility in composition (16-17) and skill (σοφίας, 20) which ensure lasting poetic glory.

ii. *Dithyramb* 2⁴⁴⁵

This poem also begins by situating itself within an immanent literary history. The nature of the opening comparison with earlier poetry remains uncertain,⁴⁴⁶ but it somehow helps to prepare for a bold boast (23-6):

ἐμὲ δ' ἐξαίρετο[ν
 κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων
 Μοῖς' ἀνέκτας' Ἑλλάδι κα[λ]λ[ι]χόρῳι
 εὐχόμενον βρισαρμάτοισι Θήβαις ...

As 'herald' of a new a new and superior style, the speaker sets himself against antecedents evoked by the proem (Πρὶν μὲν, 1). Newness and skill (σοφῶν ἐπέων, 24) win the interest of a broad audience (Ἑλλάδι, 25). The speaker is appointed (ἀνέκτας', 25) by the Muse, the conduit

⁴⁴⁵ It is unclear to what extent archaic dithyramb may be meaningfully labelled cultic (see Van der Weiden (1991) 3-4, Zimmermann (1992), Lavecchia (2000a) 11-13, Fearn (2007) II.3; cf. Scullion (2002) on tragedy). Since I am primarily concerned with rhetoric, I leave aside the question of poems which were later labelled 'dithyrambs' but do not connect themselves to Dionysus (see Fearn (2007) 205-12, D'Alessio (2013)). At least some dithyrambs seem linked to cult (Pind. fr. 70a.11, 75). Pindar's *Dithyramb* 2, at any rate, is concerned with pleasing Dionysus (cf. 22-3) and evidently presents itself as in some sense a τελε]τάν (6 with Lavecchia (2000a); cf. fr. 346.5, probably from the same poem).

⁴⁴⁶ D'Angour (1997) proposes a contrast between older linear choruses and circular choruses after Lasus of Hermione (*pro* Porter (2007) 3-4; *contra* Lavecchia (2000a) 125n68, D'Alessio (2013) 166n10). Lavecchia (1997), (2000a) 125-30 argues for a comparison with older poets whose clauses and metre dragged on unattractively (cf. M. L. West (1992) 344). Neither hypothesis is clearly reflected in the Olympian performance of 5-23.

between mortals and the Olympian realm (6-8), to a distinguished place on the contemporary Hellenic stage and within lyric history (cf. M. L. West (1992) 344). As in *Paean* 7b, so here a privileged relation to the Muse represents and explains creative excellence. Local Theban identity (26-7) contrasts with the speaker's Hellenic reach (cf. B. 9.9-14). The speaker may here be identified as Pindar of Thebes,⁴⁴⁷ perhaps in contrast to the chorus (? νεαν[ίαι, 5, D'Angour), but in any event his authorship is important to the poem. This dithyramb, like the god that it celebrates, was born in Thebes but will become well-known abroad (τέκ' εὐδοξο[ν παρ'] ἀνθρώπο[ις] γενεάν, 30, of Dionysus). *Dithyramb* 2, like many epinicians, highlights its ability to engage a geographically diverse audience.

C. Conclusions: Rhetoric and Reality

It is *prima facie* unlikely that *Paean* 7b and *Dithyramb* 2 are exceptional in being oriented toward an audience reaching through space and time. Rather, generically unusual features of their speaking situations set them apart from the majority of Pindar's fragmentary religious poetry. In both the speaker is associated with if not outright identified with the creator of the work, who endows it with the qualities enabling dissemination. Both passages competitively engage with the literary tradition. Both look primarily to mortal, rather than divine, reception.

All of Pindar's cultic poetry likely aimed to live beyond one performance. These poems are probably at once fully literary in that they seek to please a diverse human audience and also fully religious in that they seek to please gods within ritual. Perhaps this duality was less concep-

⁴⁴⁷ D'Alessio (1994) 126; contra I. C. Rutherford (1988) 67. In Bacchylides 19, classified as a dithyramb in Alexandria and probably regarded as such by the poet's contemporaries (50-1), the speaker/composer is identified as Bacchylides (11). There is no compelling reason to have the chorus address the poet here; there is good reason to identify εὐαίνετε Κηῖα μέριμνα (11), who weaves the song (8), with ἐμοί (37), who decides how the song proceeds.

tually strange to the Greeks than it is to us (cf. Budelmann (2013) 93). Like his epinicians, Pindar's cultic poetry can present itself both as the record of an unrepeatable event and as an enduring artefact. Like his epinicians, it seems genuinely to have been both. The important point for interpretation lies not in affording 'logical and ontological priority' (Kurke (2005) 84) to the text, but rather in realising that a cultic poem pursues goals related to, yet not simply identifiable with, the goals of the ritual that it once accompanied.⁴⁴⁸

2. Tradition

According to various versions of a popular scholarly narrative about early lyric, the parochial perspective evident in Alcman eventually evolved, for one reason or another, into the panhellenic vistas of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides.⁴⁴⁹ A survey of how early lyric⁴⁵⁰ poets envisioned their audiences problematises this familiar story. This section assembles and interprets primary evidence and then suggests an alternative hypothesis of how early Greek lyric related to its public. Taking canonical authors in chronological order and in contrastive pairs, subsections examine traces of the rhetoric of permanence before Simonides. There is good reason to believe that early lyric poets aimed for a widespread and enduring reception. This has important implications for the way in which we understand their work and also Pindar's place in a tradition.

⁴⁴⁸ Contrast Kurke (2005) 84: 'poem and context are *simply* interacting parts of the *same process* of ritualisation' (my emphasis).

⁴⁴⁹ E.g. Snell (1961) ch. 4, Maehler (1963) 25, Rösler (1980) 73-6, Woodbury (1985) 206, Hubbard (1985) 33, Stein (1990), Ford (2002) 114, Beecroft (2010) 11-12. Nagy's influential career-long project is wedded to an evolutionary narrative (e.g. (1990) 53), but he asserts that 'in the archaic period ... poets of the polis ... are from the very start more Panhellenic than local' (434).

⁴⁵⁰ In this section 'lyric' is used in the narrow sense of 'melic'.

A preliminary word is in order about the relationship between the rhetoric of reception and genre. Homer and Hesiod are largely silent about their secondary audiences.⁴⁵¹ A connection between artistic quality and permanence is not prominent in Hesiod or Homeric epic⁴⁵² but is central to programmatic passages in the *Hymn to Apollo* (171-3) and lyric. Fame was evidently a concern of poetry since time immemorial (cf. M. L. West (2007) 397-410), but one must be clear about the type of fame envisioned. It is one thing to proclaim ‘as long as there are singers, Hyfaidd will be praised’ (with the bard quoted in M. L. West (2007) 404); it is another thing to say ‘Hyfaidd will be praised *as long as this song is sung*’. The first imagines the glory of tradition; the second envisions glory tied to the merits of a particular poem remembered within a tradition. The former conception is reflected in the Homeric poems. The latter conceptualisation is central to lyric poets’ self-presentation. This is a strong and sweeping schematic opposition that will require nuancing in individual cases. This does not undermine its basic usefulness.

The lyric poet, unlike the epic bard, prominently discusses his own process of creation.⁴⁵³ He thus may highlight his skill *qua* creator. Homer receives truth from the Muses (*Il.* 2.484-93); Alcman, while in contact with the Muses, discovers something: *Ἔπη τάδε καὶ μέλος Ἀλκμᾶν | εὔπε* (39). In lyric, poetic excellence is associated with the rhetoric of permanence from the ear-

⁴⁵¹ Cf. e.g. Griffith (1983), Graziosi (2002) 57, Kelly (2008) 180-1.

⁴⁵² The best potential counterexample seems to be *Od.* 24.196-8. But I doubt both that in this context *ᾠοιδὴν ... χαρίεσσαν* simply refers to the *Odyssey* and that the adjective connotes the artistic charm that secures the poetic immortality envisioned (cf. *κυγερή ... ᾠοιδή*, 200). In Homer immortality is linked to heroic, not poetic achievement (Maehler (1964) 19-20, Stein (1990) 266; de Jong (2006) downplays this). Note, however, *Od.* 1.325 ≈ 8.83 ≈ 521 (*ᾠοιδός ... περικλυτός*) and 8.496-8 (Odysseus promises to report the skill of Demodocus).

⁴⁵³ M. L. West (2011-13) i.410. Compare and contrast Krauss (1955) 78, R. Thomas (1995) 115, Finkelberg (1998) 164, and Carey (2000) 166, all assuming a chronological development. We should be wary of mistaking the structures of genre for the story of literary history. Speculation about the authorship of cyclic poems suggests that anonymity was perceived as a generic feature of epic. It is quite possible that Alcman was a contemporary of the *Odyssey* poet and predated the author of the longer Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*. One must thoroughly get past the now-discredited notion of a ‘lyric age’.

liest period for which substantial and reliable evidence survives.

Two related factors are consistently connected with the rhetoric of permanence in archaic lyric: emphasis on the poet's role as poet and a competitive stance toward others. When the first person is primarily a character within his own story (Alcaeus, Anacreon) or an unobtrusive narrator outside his story (Stesichorus), subsequent reception is not a prominent theme. When the poet's status *qua* poet features within the text (Alcman, Sappho, Ibycus), literary excellence, as evinced by reception, appears as a theme.

This section proceeds on the inherently plausible assumption of a strong generic continuity between early and late archaic lyric but also aims to support that thesis by evidencing shared rhetorical patterns. Rather than arguing away from later parallels, I argue through them.⁴⁵⁴ As studying earlier lyric can help one appreciate the background behind Pindar, Bacchylides, and Simonides, so patterns evident in this fifth-century troika can help one better appreciate their less well-preserved predecessors. Later parallels can elucidate earlier fragmentary texts (M. Davies (1986a) 13). Pindar is too often studied in isolation from previous lyric poets, against whom he sometimes positions himself (see VIII). A comparative approach may thus win two-fold returns. Often methods of interpretation first applied to earlier lyric have been subsequently applied to Pindar;⁴⁵⁵ one might gain new insights by working in the opposite direction.

A. Alcman and Stesichorus

⁴⁵⁴ Contrast Rösler (1980) 73-6. We should not *a priori* rule out the possibility that early archaic poets envisioned secondary reception. We do not have better evidence for the outlook of these poets than their surviving fragments.

⁴⁵⁵ Krummen (1990) 7, for example, acknowledges a debt to Rösler (1980); Bernardini (1983) 39 acknowledges a debt to Gentili.

Greek lyric emerges from the fog of semi-mythology and hazily reconstructed backgrounds into the clear light of preserved texts with the enigmatic works of a Spartan poet. The recorded history of lyric begins with Alcman,⁴⁵⁶ the poet who has seemed the most parochial of the canonical nine. No archaic text seems as intimately tied to its first performance as his longest surviving fragment, the ‘Grand Partheneion’,⁴⁵⁷ or bedevils scholars with such obstacles to basic understanding.⁴⁵⁸ Since the Louvre papyrus returned to light, there has followed a quest after an external datum that will make the text readily comprehensible. Advancing new theories into a crowded field,⁴⁵⁹ recent works argue that Alcman’s performers dressed as heavenly bodies (Ferrari (2008)); that a μίτρα (67) is not simply a μίτρα but a parody of a warrior’s helmet (Luginbill (2009)); that the poem reflects an otherwise unattested myth about harpies (E. L. Bowie (2011)).

So much speculation has crystalised around the text that one can almost forget that the body of primary evidence is discouragingly small. Perhaps 3% of Alcman’s Alexandrian edition survives (Hinge (2009) 215), mostly in tattered scraps and isolated verses. Perhaps reading the

⁴⁵⁶ Evidence for the pre-history of choral lyric does not yield a detailed picture but evinces a tradition long predating Alcman. Trümper (1986) shows that in some respects the language of choral lyric appears to go back to Mycenaean Greek (see now Maslov (2013)). Webster (1970) 1-11 reviews visual evidence for the chorus predating Alcman. Koehler (1965) discusses the etymology of μέλος. Maas and Synder (1989) and M. L. West (1992) discuss the origins of instruments. Nagy (1974) discusses metre. Dalby (2009) and I. C. Rutherford (2011) collect references to lyric in *epos*. I. C. Rutherford (2008) explores potential Near-Eastern connections.

⁴⁵⁷ Nagy (1990) 349 and Hinge (2001) 292, (2009) hypothesise that Alcman’s *partheneia* were a play of characters re-enacted year after year. This hypothesis finds little positive support. Fr. 5 describes historical individuals (see M. L. West (1992); cf. Pind. fr. 94b.45-9).

⁴⁵⁸ Page (1951) v on Alcman. 1: ‘for its audience the *Partheneion* was surely a very simple entertainment; for us it is exceptionally difficult’; Barrett (1961) on Alcman. 3: ‘limpid, no doubt, to an audience familiar with the personalities and the ritual, riddling to us who know nothing of either’; cf. Peponi (2004) 295. Doubtlessly Alcman’s absorbing poems were also challenging for their first audiences. They may be concerned to *depict* the texture of intimate relations between chorus members (cf. Sappho 27.4-10; maidens in a chorus addressing a mother?).

⁴⁵⁹ Other theories noted in Spelman (2014b) 26n19.

vanished 97% as a corpus would confer lucidity on its individual pieces.⁴⁶⁰ If this seems like a vain appeal to the impossible, it should be remembered that Alcman's second most substantial fragment (3) displays manifest generic congruencies with the Grand Partheneion that have been continually noted since P. Oxy. 2387 was published in 1957.⁴⁶¹ These parallels allow scholars to move beyond guesswork and make reasoned inferences (cf. e.g. Stehle (1997) 86-94). Much archaic poetry is fully comprehensible only against cumulative backgrounds of a sort that are largely unavailable in the case of Alcman. If *Olympian* 11 were the lone surviving epinician, lines 8-16 would be puzzling. Sappho's Brothers Poem (text in Obbink (2014)) makes robust sense only against the larger narrative of her oeuvre (cf. Spelman (2014a) 61, advancing a point now strengthened by recent papyrus finds). We should not underestimate the power of archaic lyric to create its own context in various ways.

A better sense of their literary context might allow us better to appreciate why Alcman's poems could be, as they in fact were,⁴⁶² interesting and engaging to ancient secondary audiences who, like modern scholars, were not privy to various details of rituals, personalities, and performances. Alcman made his first audiences aware that his work was not intended solely for immediate consumption. At least one fragment suggests that he conceived of the afterlife of his work as extending well beyond Sparta (148i = Arist. *Or.* 28.54):⁴⁶³ ἐτέρωθι τοίνυν καλλωπιζόμενος παρ' ὅσοις εὐδοκιμεῖ τοιαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα ἔθνη καταλέγει ὥστ' ἔτι νῦν τοὺς ἀθλίου

⁴⁶⁰ It is true that, to judge by their opinions preserved in the scholia, ancient scholars, who had at least six rolls of Alcman, were at times almost as befuddled as their modern counterparts (cf. Clay (1991) 51). Yet the scholia to Pindar's epinicians sometimes record comparable confusions.

⁴⁶¹ See the comments of Lobel (1957a) in the *editio princeps*.

⁴⁶² Hinge (2001) 295-304 argues that Alcman's *partheneia* were not much known outside Sparta. This seems unlikely: cf. P. Oxy. 2389 fr. 9 col. i.8-10 (see p. 241), Pind. fr. 94b, Eup. fr. 148 PCG with Olson (2007) 181-2, Ar. *Lys.* 1247-1321 with Swift (2009) 425-6, Av. 250-2, Carey (2011).

⁴⁶³ Cf. Maehler (1963) 69-70; contrast Rösler (1980) 65n86, 67n90.

γραμματιστικὰς ζητεῖν οὐ γῆρ ταῦτ' εἶναι. Aristides' account of Alcman's words tallies with rhetorical patterns preserved in later poets.⁴⁶⁴ The report is *prima facie* credible. A reference to contemporary scholarly practice seems incompatible with outright fabrication. Aristides quotes Alcman's *ipsissima verba* not much later (*Or.* 28.54 = fr. 106); he is working with a text. στεγανόποδας (148ii) looks like an independent quotation from this passage (cf. fr. 149-157). Hor. *Carm.* 2.20 probably alludes to this piece of Alcman (Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 333, Spelman (2014b) 27). We lack compelling grounds to judge inauthentic what the Alexandrians evidently judged authentic.

The present-tense εὐδοκιμεῖ (148i) invokes a reputation already established within the poet's lifetime; this may well reflect Alcman's text (cf. Sappho P. Köln XI 429 1.3-8, Ibyc. S151.48, Pind. *O.* 1.116). καλλωπιζόμενος (148i) connotes a familiar connection between authorial pride and widespread renown (cf. Sappho 65, Pind. *O.* 9.21-8). A catalogue of exotic ethnicities will have made a powerful impression on Spartan audiences imaginatively transported to far-off settings. But one need not take this rhetoric at face value in order to attribute significance to it. Probably Alcman did not any more than Horace (cf. Syndikus (2001) i.483) earnestly envision his popularity beyond the pale of civilisation amongst peoples as strange as the Umbrella-foots (148ii; cf. the humour of Ar. *Pax* 645-8). Nonetheless, this fragment demonstrates that Alcman valued dissemination *as an ideal*. This is significant. It is also plausible. Alcman's work manifests a cosmopolitan ethos and a sense of Sparta's place in the larger world (cf. 1.50-1, 58-9, 67-8, 100-1, 3.71-2, M. L. West (1966) 193).

Other fragments buttress the hypothesis that Alcman envisioned secondary audiences. He could have imagined that his poem accompanying 'deathless rites' in Sparta (ἀθανάτας τελετάς,

⁴⁶⁴ See Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) on Horace *C.* 2.20.17-20.

7.4-5) would endure within this durable setting. Indeed, his work did survive in re-performance within traditional Spartan ritual (TB7 = Sosibius *FGrH* 595 F 5). A corrupt fragment appears to assert the possibility of preserving the present for posterity, presumably through poetry (118): ἔστι παρέντων μνᾶσιν †ἐπιθέσθαι† (ἐπιέσθαι Sitzler; cf. Calame (1983) 594). This might have invited its first audience to view present circumstances (παρέντων; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. II, Simon. 947, Hdt. 1.113.1) through the lens of imagined future remembrance (μνᾶσιν; cf. Simon. 531.3). For later audiences the continued existence of Alcman's words would confirm this proposition. Haslam (1977) 3 attractively suggests that the κλέος in fr. 4a.3 belongs to the poet, not his subject, and derives from the Muses. It may be relevant that this fragment comes from the final poem in the sixth book of the Alexandrian edition (cf. Sappho. 44.4, Ibyc. S151.46-8, both from the end of papyrus rolls, Hor. *Carm.* 2.20 with Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 332-7, 3.30). Vestrheim (2004) 16-17 interprets fr. 26 as a wish for fame. It may, however, simply be an impossible wish to escape old age (for the imagery see Barrett (1964) on Eur. *Hipp.* 732-41).

An awareness of newness presumes a background of older works and hence a certain conception of literary history: καὶ]μαστὰ δ' ἀνθ[(ἀνθ[ρώποις(ι), Lobel, attractively) ... γάρυματὰ μαλκακά ... νεόχμα ἔδειξαν τερπ[(4.4-6).⁴⁶⁵ This seems to describe a novel poetic creation. The fragment may describe Alcman's predecessors, perhaps even naming individuals (Lobel (1957b) 23, M. Davies (1986b), Calame, mooted a reference to Terpander in 6; cf. Pind. fr. 140b). Alcman is said to have mentioned Polymnastus (145). If he remembered earlier poets, it would not be difficult for Alcman to envision himself being remembered in the future. 11, a papyrus commentary, discusses the poet's creativity (τὰς εὐ[ρ]έσεις, 22; cf. fr. 39). In this context, ἐπέων π[τεροέντων (24), a poetic quotation, might suggest the ability of the poet's words to fly outside

⁴⁶⁵ Hinds (1998) 55: 'proclamations of one poet's newness are inevitably proclamations of another poet's oldness'.

the context of their first utterance (cf. *P.* 8.34, *N.* 7.22, *I.* 5.63). In lyric ‘winged’ is not an ornamental epithet freely applied to speech, let alone to the poet’s very special sort of speech.⁴⁶⁶

Some poems prominently feature a choral narrator, but Alcman also appears within his work as a skilled poet. He names himself (17, 39) and seems to have held a privileged and perhaps institutional position in Spartan society by virtue of his poetic skill.⁴⁶⁷ 17.6-8 suggests elevated social rank (ὥπερ ὁ δᾶμος pleads too much). Evidently Alcman, like Pindar, had pragmatic reasons to highlight the recognised social value of his craftsmanship.

Alcman exhibits concepts central to lyric authorship; Stesichorus is the most ‘epic’ of lyric poets not only in diction and narrative style but also in authorial persona. Neither the rhetoric of performance nor the rhetoric of permanence seems very important to his work. He probably never mentioned his own name.⁴⁶⁸ Little suggests that he meditated explicitly on the afterlife of his work. In the proem of the *Sack of Troy*, Stesichorus (100), like Homer (*Il.* 2.484-93), asks the Muses to help him sing a traditional theme meta-traditionally labelled as such (κλέος, 14; cf. 117.9: ἀνθρώπους κλέος[c]. δαμώματα (172) labels his poetry as public property. Though his lengthy works likely debuted at public occasions (cf. 173.1), those poems for which substantial evidence survives do not closely link themselves with any particular context. Remains of the *Oresteia* (172-3) suggest some interplay between occasion and composition, but the content of that poem, as evidenced by its title and surviving fragments, is not manifestly linked to any festival (compare and contrast Burnett (1988)). We now have a significant fragment from the proem of the *Sack of Troy* (see Finglass (2013)), which evidently moves straight into narrative after an exordium. It seems probable that Stesichorus’ narrative, like the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* and unlike

⁴⁶⁶ See Köhnken (1971) 183, Most (1985a) 151n73.

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 75. Later tradition, perhaps through a misunderstanding of his poetry, held that the Spartans sent for Alcman from abroad (TA 1-9).

⁴⁶⁸ M. L. West (2011-13) i.410, Davies and Finglass (2014) 15.

most archaic lyric, lacked an enunciative frame grounding it in a particular place and time.

Even if it did not discuss its own dispersal, Stesichorus' poetry is unlikely to have had an exclusively parochial orientation. The author travelled (see Davies and Finglass (2014) 12-14, 24-5, Carey (2015) 54); probably he meant for his work to travel. 'If Stesichorus had been composing for performance mainly or wholly in a single locality, we might expect to see some indication of that in his poetry, via content or dialect. Since we do not, it is reasonable to infer that he envisioned a panhellenic audience' (Davies and Finglass (2014) 23; cf. Burkert (2001) 210, Arrighetti (1994) 30).⁴⁶⁹ There is no good reason to believe that Stesichorus' 'Homeric' work aimed at a more limited reception than Homer's poetry had in fact achieved during Stesichorus' lifetime.⁴⁷⁰

B. Alcaeus and Sappho

A comparison of Sappho and Alcaeus suggests how authorial persona relates to the rhetoric of permanence. These near contemporary Lesbians composed poetry broadly similar in form but differ starkly in how they envision its reception. Little in Alcaeus' surviving work directly shows that he envisioned an audience wider than his faction or expected his songs to last beyond their first utterance.⁴⁷¹ Only one corrupt fragment (309), couched as a generalisation, apparently suggests the possibility of poetic permanence: τὸ γὰρ θεῶν ἰότατι ὕμμε λαχόντων ἴαφουτον θήκει γέρας† (γέρας ἄφουτον ἀνθήκει Bekker). Scholars have reasonably supposed that this line from

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. Burkert (2001) 107, Arrighetti (1994).

⁴⁷⁰ Detailed allusions presume familiarity with Homeric poetry. Note especially Stesich. 170→*Od.* 15.160 and following, a specific and not particularly memorable scene that is unlikely to be traditional (cf. Davies and Finglass (2014) 475-6, Kelly (2015) 34-42).

⁴⁷¹ It would be hard to overstate the influence of Rösler (1980); cf. e.g. Caciagli (2011) 11.

Book 1 of the Alexandrian edition belonged to a hymn to the Muses.⁴⁷² There is no comparably plausible rival hypothesis. Again poetic achievement would be linked to divine favour. A future verb, lost to corruption, may have brought a first audience's attention to the impending fate of the poem that they heard (contrast Rösler (1980) 75).

In Sappho the rhetoric of permanence plays a far more central role.⁴⁷³ She appears to have meditated on the reception of her work more than any canonical lyric poet before Simonides.⁴⁷⁴ Sappho presumes a tradition of Lesbian poetry preceding her⁴⁷⁵ and could plausibly have imagined herself enduring as part of a tradition.

She declares that she will not be forgotten in time to come: μνάεσθαι τινά φαῖμι †καὶ ἕτερον† (ἄψερρον Lobel; cf. now 17.6) ἀμμέων (147).⁴⁷⁶ The τικ is familiar from Pindar's descriptions of his secondary audiences. φαῖμι expresses a confident prediction (cf. *Il.* 5.103-5, 652-5, *Pind. P.* 4.13, *B.* 13.58). The plural ἀμμέων might show that Sappho envisioned the survival of this particular composition in which she spoke to another individual thereby rescued from oblivion. Elsewhere she dissuades her daughter from weeping: οὐ γὰρ θέμις ἐν μοικοπόλῳ <δόμῳ> | θρηνον ἔμμεν' < ... > οὐ κ' ἄμμι πρόποι τάδε (150). An unnoticed Horatian allusion is

⁴⁷² Treu (1952) 152, M. L. West (1990) 2, Tsomis (2001) 90-1.

⁴⁷³ I write on the assumption, soon to be challenged by publications responding to the Brothers Poem, that the realistic parts of Sappho's poetry reflect or depict everyday experience and not a cultic drama (contrast Lidov (forthcoming)). This hypothesis, which has the virtues of simplicity and economy, is not clearly falsified by existing evidence and receives support from the comparative evidence of Alcaeus.

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. Bowra (1961) 206-7, Maehler (1963) 59-60, M. L. West (2011-13) i.31, Stehle (1997) 273, Aloni (1997) 100, 116-17, Hutchinson (2001) 146, Ferrari (2010) 63.

⁴⁷⁵ Sappho, expressing local pride within a broader perspective, favourably compares the Lesbian poet to that of another land (106; cf. Archil. 121.1: Λέσβιον παιήονα with Power (2010) 378-9). The murky figures of Arion and Terpander suggest a tradition (cf. Hooker (1977) 59). Hooker (1977) and A. M. Bowie (1981) demonstrate that Sappho and Alcaeus did not write in quotidian Lesbian but an inherited poetic register. Nagy (1974) 118-39 discusses links between Lesbian and Indo-European metre.

⁴⁷⁶ The traditional, vague phrase (see p. 84) militates against Rösler (1980) 74, who would limit the reference to Sappho's circle.

suggestive: *absint inani funere neniae | luctusque turpes et querimoniae* (Carm. 2.20.21-2).⁴⁷⁷

The text of the Sappho fragment is compatible with a speaking situation like that imagined by Horace. Because she will live on in song, a threnody is not fitting for Sappho. Emphasis falls on the poet's privileged status (ἄμμι) and relationship to the divine (μοῖσσοπόλων). Fame is a source of consolation, as it is for Pindar's mortal victors. This poem, which celebrates exceptional achievement, in a sense replaces the standard threnody which accompanied standard obsequies (cf. *mitte supervacuos honores*, Hor. Carm. 2.20.24). Sappho, like Pindar (see VII.5), is playing with genres and contrasting her own poetry with other, commoner forms of song.

Sappho elsewhere denies someone posthumous memorialisation (55):

καθάνοις δὲ κείῃ οὐδέ ποτα μναμοσύνα θέθεν
ἔσσειτ' οὐδὲ ἴποκ' ἴ ὕστερον· οὐ γὰρ πεδέχῃς βρόδων
τῶν ἐκ Πιερίας, ἀλλ' ἀφάνης κὰν Αἶδα δόμῳ
φοιτάς τις πεδ' ἀμαύρων νεκύων ἐκπεποταμένα.

Because the addressee (unlike Sappho) does not partake in immortalising verse,⁴⁷⁸ she will not be remembered in time to come and death for her will be absolute. The rhetoric of permanence is inverted. Whereas Pindar invites the victor to imagine living on posthumously in song as a presence among the living (P. 1.97-8), Sappho invites her addressee to imagine herself as a corpse

⁴⁷⁷ Spelman (2014b) 27n26. For *nenia* ≈ θρῆνος see Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 30. I do not see any convincing evidence that Sappho belonged to a cult of the Muses (contrast Wilamowitz (1913) 73, Lanata (1963) 51-2, Gentili (1988) 84, Hardie (2005), Caciagli (2011) 215; cf. Page (1955) 139-40, H. N. Parker (1993), Aloni (1997) 248-9, Palmisciano (1998), Bettarini (2008), Ferrari (2010) 147). One might expect to find a clear reflection of this hypothetical cult in extant fragments or later testimonia.

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. Barrett *apud* Page (1955) 137n3, Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 306, who note that our passage is 'commonly misinterpreted', Aloni (1997) 100; contrast Rösler (1980) 73. ἐκ Πιερίας (3) rules out a literal crown; cf. Antipater of Sidon 239 *HE*: (Peitho with the help of Sappho) ἔπλεκε' ἀείζωον Πιερίδων στέφανον. Such allusions in later authors, who read much more Sappho than we read, are *prima facie* unlikely to stem from a systematic misunderstanding of the nature of her work.

(κείνη, 1).⁴⁷⁹ She will not enjoy the light of glory but will remain invisible (ἀφάνης, 3). She will not fly among the living (cf. Thgn. 247-50) but will take flight from the world and roam about (φοιτάκης, 4)⁴⁸⁰ as another insubstantial and unremarkable ghost (cf. *Od.* 11.222). Present lack (οὐ ... πεδέχης, 2, present), perhaps enacted within a poem that suppresses its addressee's name (cf. πρὸς τινα πλουσίαν, Plut. *praec. coni.* 146a), ensures a permanent fate (ἔccετ', 2, future). καί (3) looks like it emphasises a parallel: then in the afterlife as now on earth (cf. P. Köln XI 429 1.4-6).⁴⁸¹

Plutarch's quotation suggests that Sappho contrasted wealth with the superior power of enduring poetry.⁴⁸² Fr. 193 (= Ael. Arist. *Or.* 28.51) involves similar contrasts and may refer to the same passage.⁴⁸³ οἶμαι δέ ce καὶ Καφροῦς ἀκηκοέναι πρὸς τινὰ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων δοκουσῶν εἶναι γυναικῶν μεγαλαυχουμένης καὶ λεγούσης ὡς αὐτὴν αἱ Μοῦσαι τῷ ὄντι ὀλβίαν τε καὶ ζηλωτὴν ἐποίησαν καὶ ὡς οὐδ' ἀποθανούσης ἔcται λήθη. The true wealth (τῷ ὄντι ὀλβίαν) of poetic glory outstrips material riches (cf. *N.* 4.79-85) that last but a lifetime (cf. *Sol.* 24, *I.* 1.67-8, *B.* 1.159-63, 178-84, Alcaeus 154-5 *HE*).

I here summarise some arguments from Spelman (forthcoming). In Sappho 44 κλέος ἄφθιτον (4) is a meta-traditional reference to the fame of the Trojan saga perpetuated in large part through epic, the genre which Sappho evokes through metre, prosody, flexion, vocabulary, narrative style, and content. As in Homer, the characters within Sappho's poem look forward to how they will be viewed by posterity. Idaeus' optimistic prediction of undying fame for the brid-

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. *Il.* 18.121, [Thgn.] 568, anon. 1009.1 *PMG*, *Soph. Ant.* 73.

⁴⁸⁰ The verb implies repeated motion (Bulloch (1985) on Callim. *Hy.* 5.130).

⁴⁸¹ Luppino (1967); contrast Tzamali (1996) 284-5.

⁴⁸² Sapphic attacks on materialism: 132, 148; cf. Spelman (2015b) on 101. In the Brothers Poem the addressee's hope that Charaxus return with valuable cargo (νᾶϊ cὺν πλῆαι, 2) contrasts with the speaker's prayer that he return safe (cάαν ... νᾶα, 7-8).

⁴⁸³ See Page (1955) 137n2, Maehler (1963) 61n2, Lardinois (2008) 81n10.

al pair is loaded with irony for all those familiar with a saga in which this happy marriage was eclipsed by the arc of a larger story that did not end happily for the Trojans or for Hector and Andromache in particular. Yet the herald's prediction, in a way undercut by the saga to which he belongs, is also in a way confirmed by Sappho's enduring poem.

Elsewhere Aphrodite evidently assures Sappho that her fame will spread as far as the rays of the sun and endure beyond her demise (65.5-10):⁴⁸⁴

Ψάπφοι, κεφίλ[
 Κύπρωι β[α]σίλ[
 καίτοι μέγα δ.[
 ὄ]σσοις φάεθων [
 πάντα κλέος [
 καί σ' ἐνν Ἀχέρ[οντ

A familiar sequence of thought is roughly discernible. In line 7 Fränkel attractively supplements μέγα δῶ[ρον (cf. *Il.* 9.576, [Hes.] fr. 211.8). This phrase and κεφίλ[(5) suggest divine favour (cf. fr. 32, 193) as a necessary condition for the fame subsequently described. Lines 8-9 deal with the geographical extent of glory.⁴⁸⁵ The sun, defining the realm of the living, contrasts with the dark underworld (cf. Tullius Laurea 3908-16 *GP*, probably looking to our passage). As in Theognis (237-50), fame will spread through space and then last through time after Sappho has left the world.

There is no strong reason to suppose that Sappho supposed that she would be famous for anything other than that for which she is still famous, namely her poetry. Helen of Troy, whose beauty dragged civilisations into war, can reasonably count on being a subject of the epic tradi-

⁴⁸⁴ I am not convinced by Ferrari (2005). His reconstruction is open to objections on metrical, linguistic, and papyrological grounds, as I hope to show in a future paper.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. *Ov. Her.* 15.12-13: *sum brevis, at nomen, quod terras impleat omnes, | est mihi*. Here *nomen* may look to Ψάπφοι (Sa. 65.5) and *terras ... omnes* may look to πάντα (65.9).

tion (*Il.* 6.357-8); Sappho, whom later tradition sometimes remembered as unattractive,⁴⁸⁶ has only her verse by which to claim remembrance.⁴⁸⁷

Another fragment also contrasts the worlds of the living and the dead. Preceding the Old Age Poem⁴⁸⁸ in the Cologne papyrus are several scrappy verses: νῦν θα[λ]ία ... γέρθε δὲ γᾶς ... ἔχοιαν γέρας ὥς [ἔ]οικεν ... ὥς νῦν ἔπι γᾶς ἔοικαν ... λιγύραν [α]ῖ κεν ἔλοικα πᾶκτιν ... χε]λύγαν ... ἀείδω (3-8).⁴⁸⁹ The drift of sense seems reasonably clear. As many have observed (e.g. Di Benedetto (2005) 8), Horace *Carm.* 2.13.24-5 alludes to these lines. The prestige which Sappho claims in this life and the next (γέρας, 5) is tied to her vocation. ὥς [ἔ]οικεν (5) suggests pride in a social reality (cf. μεγαλαυχουμένης, fr. 193). The Lesbians, after all, valued Sappho enough to have her compose for civic occasions (fr. 17). The generalising [α]ῖ κεν (7) connotes a reputation accrued over the course of successive performances that together constitute something like a poetic career (cf. VII.2). Like her tortoise shell (χε]λύγαν, 8), Sappho will sing even in death.⁴⁹⁰ One particular festive occasion, presented as the moment of enunciation (νῦν θα[λ]ία, 3), will be repeated in the hereafter.⁴⁹¹ Sappho's immediate audience would be invited to imagine the present moment paralleled in the underworld. A secondary audience is invited to think of Sappho singing from beyond the grave. As at *N.* 4.13-16 and *B.* 3.96-8, the present performance

⁴⁸⁶ See e.g. *Ov. Her.* 15.10-11 and Kivilo (2010) 173; note also Posidippus 122 A-B (more poignant if the beautiful Doricha implicitly contrasts with the plainer Sappho).

⁴⁸⁷ Contrast Lardinois (2008) 89: 'what the references in Sappho's poetry to her fame after death primarily imply is the *memory of the performances* of her songs by her near contemporaries' (my emphasis). πάντῃ (65.9) militates against this. Presumably what made Sappho's performances memorable was her poetry.

⁴⁸⁸ In the Old Age Poem the immortal voice of Tithonus might be taken as an analogue for Sappho's immortal song (cf. Rawles (2006a) 7; contrast Lardinois (2008) 93).

⁴⁸⁹ Text from M. L. West (2005) 1.

⁴⁹⁰ See Nisbet and Rudd (2004) on *Hor. Carm.* 3.11.5-6 for the trope.

⁴⁹¹ Cf. Stehle (2009) 127.

and hypothetical performances are aligned (νέρθε δὲ γᾶς ... ὦς νῦν ἔπι γᾶς, 4-6).⁴⁹² The figure of the poet singing in the underworld, as often in Hellenistic epigram (see Kerkhecker (1999) 14), evokes a parallel afterlife in poetry remembered by later generations above ground (cf. Ferrari (2010) 66).

Sappho could have conceived of some of her works as being perpetuated in a public institutional setting on Lesbos. New papyrus finds reveal for the first time a piece manifestly connected to a civic ritual (see Burris, Fish, and Obbink (2014), Neri (2014)). In 17 the poet and her contemporaries continue a rite established long ago by heroes returning from Troy: νῦν δὲ κ[αί ... πόημεν | κατὰ τὸ πάλ[αον (11-12). This poem may have been first performed by a female chorus (13-14; cf. Burris, Fish, and Obbink (2014) 5 and, more generally, Lardinois (1996)). It would not be unreasonable if Sappho thought that her work might endure and be iterated as a part of the enduring, iterative social practice.

Sappho and Alcaeus composed broadly similar poetry at roughly the same time on the same island. It is *prima facie* unlikely that only one of them could plausibly envision lasting and widespread reception.⁴⁹³ A disparity in the rhetoric of permanence probably reflects not differences in their orientation toward their audiences but rather differences in their authorial personae, which were shaped in part by external circumstances.

I here indulge in some speculation. Sappho, it seems, was a teacher of some sort and perhaps a professional one (a hypothesis raised in Spelman (2015b)). She perhaps attracted a geograph-

⁴⁹² Bettarini (2008) 30 posits contrast rather than congruity between life and afterlife. But ὦς νῦν (6) *prima facie* suggests a parallel. The Horatian intertext, which seems valid, supports the consensus interpretation. Bettarini's proposed reconstruction produces somewhat odd sense: 'they (sc. Sappho's companions) would not wonder at me, *although* I have the γέρας of the Muses, as is fitting'. One expects 'they would wonder at me *because*'.

⁴⁹³ Cf. Liberman (1999) xxxv.

ically diverse group of companions.⁴⁹⁴ This might suggest a widespread contemporary reputation.⁴⁹⁵ Some fragments address rivals of some sort.⁴⁹⁶ An agonistic stance is often apparent. Sappho's poetry is about being an excellent poet and thus often discusses literary excellence and its manifestation in subsequent reception. Conversely, Alcaeus' status as author is seldom central to his work, which exhibits a robust sense of corporate solidarity (cf. 140 with Spelman (2015a)). He typically addresses other members of his faction and tends to put himself on the same level as his internal audience. There is much more going on, however, under the surface.

C. Ibycus and Anacreon

Ibycus and Anacreon anticipated the careers of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides. Both apparently travelled to Samos.⁴⁹⁷ Both seem to have enjoyed patronage throughout the Greek world.⁴⁹⁸ Their reputation and hence their work presumably preceded them abroad. Like Sappho and Alcaeus, this pair composed very broadly comparable poetry at roughly the same time but do not, as far as we can tell, discuss poetic permanence to a comparable degree.

Anacreon's poetic vocation does not figure centrally in his work. As in Archilochus and Hipponax, the first person appears primarily as a character in a homodiegetic narrative, not as an exceptional craftsman. Anacreon boasts of his ability to win attractive youths (402c), not wide-

⁴⁹⁴ 253 Voigt, 261a *SLG*. H. N. Parker (1994) 320n22 speculates that this tradition of non-Lesbian companions comes from Attic comedy rather than Sappho's poetry. But there is nothing inherently farcical about the story. It is unlikely that two sources would on multiple occasions confuse destination (cf. 96.6-7) with origin.

⁴⁹⁵ One can, of course, imagine other reasons for these people coming to Lesbos, but other hypotheses will have even less supporting evidence.

⁴⁹⁶ See, most recently, Ferrari (2010) 31-54.

⁴⁹⁷ In my opinion it would be a surprising coincidence indeed if the later tradition were misguided and Ibycus' Polycrates were not *the* Polycrates (contrast e.g. E. L. Bowie (2009) 122-7). Ornaghi (2008) and Wilkinson (2013) 7-8 review the tangled web of evidence.

⁴⁹⁸ Hutchinson (2001) 231-4, 257-60, Wilkinson (2013) 3-4.

spread audiences. There can be little doubt, however, that the poet, who appeared on Attic vases during his own lifetime (Hutchinson (2001) 259), was in reality a celebrated figure. His literary ambition does not feature in his predominantly playful work, which at times deflates grandiose themes.⁴⁹⁹ The comic mode has an affinity for the ephemeral (Mayer (1994) 90) and tends to eschew the rhetoric of permanence. Critias (B 1 D-K) trumpets Anacreon's immortality through a parody of the rhetoric of permanence and perhaps the Cleobolus inscription in particular (Ford (2002) 107). This homage is faithful to the *laudandus*' spirit. Anacreon's work is ostensibly pragmatic but in reality likely had ambitions more elevated than pacifying a tyrant's raucous symposia (contrast Kantzios (2005)). Presumably Polycrates could have hired other peacekeepers with less expense and more probable success.

Ibycus' most extensive surviving fragment, the Polycrates Ode (S151), is also his most extensive meditation on poetic permanence. As often in Pindar, subsequent reception comes into view when the author sets himself alongside Homer, a paradigm of authorial excellence (see III.4). Intertextuality advances an implicit argument. Epic vocabulary and themes, presented with meta-traditional framing (περικλεές, 2; πολύμυλον, 6), recall the epic poetry which had preserved the fame of the heroes whom Ibycus mentions.⁵⁰⁰ The younger poet's ambition to immortalise his subject has precedent woven into his work.

Ibycus' poem, like many Pindaric odes, cannot be fully appreciated without knowledge of the literary past.⁵⁰¹ N. 7.20-7 shows similar interest in undermining the claim of epic to represent the past accurately (cf. Ibyc. S151.23-6 with Barron (1969) 133-4, Hutchinson (2001),

⁴⁹⁹ E.g. 347, 385 (looking to Sappho?), 395 (looking to Sappho's Old Age Poem?).

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. Barron (1969) 135, Woodbury (1985) 198, Sbardella (2012) 229-35.

⁵⁰¹ R. L. Fowler (1987) 36: 'this poem is the first certain example we have encountered where the passage imitated must be recalled by the audience in order to understand the point of the imitation; the mind's eye has to look two places at once'.

Dougherty (2001) 20-7, Steiner (2005)). *O.* 13.60-92 shows a comparable interest in evoking epic while avoiding direct overlap in subject matter (see p. 37). In Ibycus 'it was not my desire to sing X' (10-11) implies 'because someone has already sung X' (cf. *N.* 4.89-90, 5.53-7, Bundy (1972) 66). Ibycus offers as paradigms of fame three younger heroes, Kyanippus, Zeuxippus, and Troilus (36-45), whose fame in the real world could not have matched that of the older Iliadic heroes like Achilles and Agamemnon previously mentioned.⁵⁰² Yet these relatively minor figures' glory is perpetuated within Ibycus' poem, which selects for extensive praise qualities different from those generally lionised in martial epic. Ibycus describes a second sailing to Troy after the one recounted in the Catalogue of Ships (cf. Barron (1969) 131). Perhaps, as in Pindar's *Pythian* 6, Ibycus' younger heroic subject reflects his own epigonal relationship to literary precedent. In any event Ibycus' poem is to be understood against previous poetry and remembered within a tradition.

In the closing lines, the speaker moves forward from the distant past to the present, a trajectory fundamental to epinician narrative,⁵⁰³ and promises his addressee a share of the same fame (cf. τοῦθ' ... φέγγος, *N.* 9.42) which ancient heroes still enjoy (46-8):⁵⁰⁴

τοῖς μὲν πεδὰ κάλλεος αἰὲν
καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς,
ὥς κατ' αἰοιδᾶν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.

These difficult lines may be translated thus: 'amongst whom you, too,⁵⁰⁵ O Polycrates, will for-

⁵⁰² Cf. Cingano (1989) 31. Ibyc. 303a may cite Cassandra as an exemplum of immortality (cf. *P.* 1.96 for the diction).

⁵⁰³ Illig (1932) 58n1, H. S. Mackie (2003) 62-3.

⁵⁰⁴ The text printed here differs from *PMGF*. See the next two notes.

⁵⁰⁵ Against the punctuation of the papyrus, πεδὰ (46) should be taken as a preposition governing τοῖς (46) and not as the equivalent of μέτεστι. The latter construction (espoused by e.g. Péron (1982) 39-40, Barron (1969) 135, Budelmann (forthcoming)) yields quasi-Platonic sense alien to archaic lyric (cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 511, Gerber (1970) 213, Woodbury (1985) 203-5,

ever have undying fame for beauty, just as my fame (exists) by dint of song'.⁵⁰⁶ Polycrates will enjoy fame for beauty alongside heroes as the poet will enjoy fame for poetic excellence alongside Homer (cf. Simon. 11.15-25 W, Pind. *I.* 4.37-44, B. 13 *passim*). Indeed, Ibycus can confidently predict his addressee's glory *because* of his own established glory (cf. Goldhill (1991) 118). The author's actual reputation, which had already brought him to the Samian court, is highly relevant (cf. *O.* 1.116). The Ibycean narrator, like the Pindaric narrator, draws on the rhetorical resources of the historical author.

As often in Pindar, a closing future verb (Pelliccia (1995) 331) evokes future reception. Direct address evokes a moment of face-to-face debut performance, which is to a certain degree preserved within the text. The young Polycrates will be verbally conjured into presence again and again. Lasting fame contrasts with time-bound, age-specific beauty, which is the source of that fame (cf. Thgn. 237-54, *O.* 10.95-105; note also Simon. 11.17-18 W). Ibycus, like Pindar, makes the ability of his work to travel through time a central theme for any audience.

D. Common Considerations

Besides the textual traces of the rhetoric of permanence explored above, there are other, more general forms of evidence which support the notion that early lyric poets consciously participated in a tradition and expected their work to outlast its first utterance. Several travelled practising

Hutchinson (2001), Wilkinson (2013) 84). In precisely what sense could Troilus be said to have a share in beauty forever?

⁵⁰⁶ ἐμὸν κλέος (48) evidently responds to κύ ... κλέος (47). καί (48) emphasises the parallel. ὥς κατ' αἰοιδᾶν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος (48) is less likely to mean 'to the extent of my song and fame' (e.g. Snell (1961) 54-6, Barron (1965) 135, Gianotti (1973) 407-10). This would have to be, I think, an odd hendiadys for 'the fame of my song'; I do not know a parallel. The meaning of ὥς would also be left unclear (Hutchinson (2001) 253).

their craft.⁵⁰⁷ Many echo the work of earlier poets. It is not difficult to imagine one's work will travel when one has travelled abroad spreading one's own work. It is not hard to imagine that one's work will last when one has received the lasting work of predecessors.⁵⁰⁸ The survival of early lyric suggests that it was written down during these poets' lifetimes.⁵⁰⁹ Textualisation will have reflected contemporary perceptions of value.⁵¹⁰ Indeed, Alcman (εὐδοκιμεῖ, 148i), Sappho (P. Köln XI 429 1.3-8), and Ibycus (S151.48) speak of contemporaries' regard for their skill. The sheer amount of archaic lyric that reached Alexandria, dwarfing the output of some later 'bookish' poets,⁵¹¹ perhaps as well as the content of the poems themselves,⁵¹² suggest that these were textualised over time, not in one fell swoop. Poets will have lived for some time with the possibility of communicating with secondary audiences. Already there seems to have been, as there clearly is in Pindar and Bacchylides, a sense of a career embodied in the poems (see VII.2).⁵¹³

Motifs specific to non-hexameter genres that appear in geographically diverse poets suggest that they drew on the shared property of a tradition. Consider the *ρίψασις* theme. Though doubtlessly a common enough experience, the numerous appearances of this shameful phenomenon in early homodiegetic poetry (Archil. 5, Alc. 401b, Anacr. 381b) suggest convention and/or imitation rather than unmediated reportage of reality (contrast Rösler (1980) 110-12). Already

⁵⁰⁷ See E. L. Bowie (2009).

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. Tsagarakis (1977) 9.

⁵⁰⁹ E.g. Ford (2003) 20.

⁵¹⁰ E.g. M. L. West (2011-13) i.173, Scodel (1990) 60.

⁵¹¹ The nine rolls of Alcaeus' Alexandrian edition will have outweighed the works of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius *combined*. See Latacz (1990) 258 for the estimated number of verses in the Alexandrian editions of archaic poets.

⁵¹² Sappho is the most important case: the Old Age Poem contrasts the speaker with her younger addressees; in the Brothers Poem her younger sibling Larichus is not yet an adult. This subsidiary line of argumentation depends on a highly debatable but not disproven identification between speaking persona and biographical author.

⁵¹³ Xenophanes conceives of a career with a dateable start: ἤδη δ' ἐπτά τ' ἔασι καὶ ἐξήκοντ' ἐνιαυτοὶ | βλητρίζοντες ἐμὴν φροντίδ' ἄν' Ἑλλάδα γῆν (8.1-2).

Anacreon, like Horace (*Carm.* 2.7.9-10), was evoking a lyric *topos* as a *topos*. Erotic poems that begin with δηῦτε (see Mace (1993)) recall a situation recurrent not only within an author's oeuvre but also within a tradition.

E. Conclusions: Development and Continuity

From the earliest period from which substantial and reliable evidence survives, diffusion and permanence are central to expressed ideals of lyric authorship. The excellent lyric poet is the one who creates works valued through space and time. It is reasonable to suppose that all of the lyric poets whose work reached Alexandria were trying to be excellent lyric poets.

The rhetoric of permanence does not reliably track with the passage of time. It would be a mistake to suppose that 'panhellenic' lyric was discovered at some point or gradually developed over the centuries. Doubtless works of parochial orientation existed in all periods (cf. [Thgn.] 1057-8: αὐται (sc. the Muses) γὰρ τάδ' ἔδωκαν ἔχειν κεχαρισμένα δῶρα | τοῖ καὶ ἐμοί, <μέλο>μεν δ' ὑμυπερικτίον). Such poetry was something different from the works of those authors whose subsequent reception was the realisation of an ambition. Whatever pragmatic purposes their poems served in the immediate context of their production and initial reception, they were not entirely circumscribed by those circumstances.

Modern interpretation should take account of how archaic lyric takes account of secondary audiences. If reception is important to this poetry, then talk of 'the performance context' starts to look misconceived and talk of 'the original performance context' loses something of its urgency. In reading lyric we are not imperfectly returning to a one-off concert but rather replaying an artefact meant to be replayed. To unpack satisfactorily the implications of this conclusion would require another thesis.

In stressing continuity, however, one runs the risk of downplaying diachronic change. The novel centrality of the rhetoric of permanence in Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides is best explained not by a fundamental shift in the relation of lyric to its audience but rather by a shift in the speaker's relation to his subject brought about through the rise of serialised commissions. The two factors associated with the rhetoric of permanence are deeply implicated in every hired composition. Pindar often presents himself as in competition with others (see VII.4). His professional task, securing his patron's immortality, is a perennially relevant topic. Indeed, the authorial personae of Bacchylides and Pindar are defined in no small part by their ability to accomplish this task (see VII.4).

This is not to say, however, that Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides otherwise belonged to the same world as Alcman. Rising wealth and literacy will have fostered an increasingly interconnected literary landscape. Changes in lyric brought about by such large-scale shifts more probably represented the development of a tradition than a fundamental break with the past.

3. Coda

Part One has explored Pindar's epinicians as both enacted events and perpetuated traditions. This chapter argued that these two dimensions were features of lyric poetry from Alcman onwards. There seem to be significant degrees of difference, however, in the relevant importance of performance and reception to various works (cf. Budelmann (2012) 95). Alcman 3 evidently derives its meaning as literature in no small part from describing physical actions concurrent with its debut choral performance (cf. Carey (2001) 18, Peponi (2007)). Alcman 1 is in large part *about* the chorus. Matters are generally different with Pindaric epinician. The physical action of the performers is seldom important to the meaning of an ode (as e.g. at *N.* 1.19-20). Sometimes their

very presence makes a vanishingly small contribution. Since Wilamowitz (1922) 280 some (e.g. R. W. B. Burton (1962) 80) have taken *Pythian* 3 to be a ‘poetic epistle’ not intended for choral performance. No such genre was recognised in Pindar’s day (Young (1983a) 32), but this misunderstanding derives from a substantial insight: choral performance does not feature in the text of *Pythian* 3. A cancelled comastic performance in Syracuse (73-6) is in a sense replaced by a rite enacted by a maiden chorus near the author’s home in Thebes (77-9).⁵¹⁴ Emphasis falls on Pindar composing at a distance from his subject (cf. *P.* 4.298-9, *I.* 2.45-8, 6.74-5), not a chorus performing his work before Hieron.⁵¹⁵ The final lines concentrate on perpetuating Hieron’s fame through an excellent verbal artefact. Chorality is not integral to this work as literature. The same could not be said of Alcman 3.

This discussion might seem to be leading toward a certain conclusion: debut performance and subsequent reception were dimensions of lyric poetry from very early on, but over time the importance of performance declined while the importance of reception rose. I do not espouse this position, which has some plausibility and may even be reflected self-consciously in Pindar’s poetry (see VI.3 on *Olympian* 10 and VIII.2.C on *Isthmian* 2). The mind’s impulse is to connect scattered points of data into a unifying, satisfying narrative. The unexciting truth is that we do

⁵¹⁴ Wilamowitz (1922) 283, Robbins (1990), and Cingano (1991) deny that *Pythian* 3 celebrates an athletic victory. It is one thing to mention a near miss at the games (e.g. *N.* 6.61-3, *B.* 4.11-14), another to dedicate a poem to an unmentioned near miss. *P.* 3.63-76 implies that Pindar, under normal circumstances, would have celebrated an epinician κῶμος. The impossibility of a cure (64-7), not an unmentioned misfortune at the games, cancels the revel (cf. Pelliccia (1987) 51, Slater (1988) 59; contrast Robbins (1990) 310).

⁵¹⁵ The speaker of 77-9 is Pindar (Young (1968) 47, D’Alessio (1994) 139, Ferrari (2000) 239; *pace* Slater (1971), (1988) 59). This must be the same ‘I’ who would have arrived from overseas (75-6). The chorus, a group, could not speak of something happening παρ’ ἐμὸν πρόθυρον (78; cf. Lehnus (1979) 5-18 on the scene). There is nothing in epinician comparable to the illogicality of e.g. ἐμοί τις ἦν | ἐν γένει (Eur. *Alc.* 903-4, uttered by the chorus). The prepositional phrase could not without further specification intelligibly refer to the tyrant’s palace or to the city of Syracuse.

not have the requisite evidence to trace the relative importance of performance and reception in lyric poetry from Alcman to Pindar. One can, however, sketch significant points of contact and discontinuity between Pindar and his generic predecessors. In this project much work remains to be done. If we cannot write a history of archaic lyric, we can at least read Pindar's own immanent lyric history. To this task we now turn.

Part Two. Pindar and the Lyric Tradition

We need an essay on the ancient and modern in Pindar intended to reveal his thought on how the central tradition is or ought to be preserved and developed. It is one of his two or three principle (*sic*) themes and it is probable that all his themes meet in this one.

– Bundy (1972) 88n109

Introduction

Pindar is the first substantially surviving Greek author in whose work literary history features as a pervasive theme.⁵¹⁶ As M. L. West (2011) 130 puts it, ‘we get the impression [Pindar] had in his head the materials for a history of early Greek poetry and music’ (cf. (1992) 344-5). He alludes to previous authors by name (*O.* 9.1), advertises his adherence to (*N.* 6.53-4) or scepticism (*N.* 7.20-3) of poetic precedent, and defines himself against the canonical representative of another genre (*P.* 2.54-6). Bacchylides displays a no less robust intimacy with older literature,⁵¹⁷ but his own brand of creative intertextuality tends to be less explicit and less historically inflected. This is related to the difference in the importance of the narratorial voice within the two poets’ work, a frequently observed point of divergence.

N. 8.19-21 exemplifies an awareness of earlier poetry as a category:

ἴσταμαι δὴ ποσσὶ κούφοις,
 ἀμπνέων τε πρὶν τι φάμεν.
 πολλὰ γὰρ πολλῶι λέλεκται, νεαρὰ δ’ ἐξευ-
 ρόντα δόμεν βασιάνωι
 ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος.

⁵¹⁶ Kurke (1991) 259: ‘Pindar’s greatest innovation is his self-conscious traditionality’. This may be the illusory result of the vagaries of textual survival (cf. Simon. 11 W, 19-20 W, 542, 564, 581, 602). With Wordsworth one wishes for ‘one precious, tender-hearted scroll | of pure Simonides’ (*Upon the Same Occasion*).

⁵¹⁷ Consider the reworking of *Il.* 15.624-9 at *B.* 13.121-40 with Fearn (2012) 334-7 and Most (2012) 257-8. It would not be easy to cite from Pindar a similarly complex allusion to a particular Homeric passage.

In a moment of abrupt arrest, the speaker catches his breath before tackling his central task of praising recent victory.⁵¹⁸ *πολλὰ γὰρ πολλὰι λέλεκται* (20) and in particular the perfect verb show that many previous treatments of various subjects are still remembered. An ode for recent victory defines itself as novel against a body of past works about the past.⁵¹⁹

This part of the thesis examines Pindar's place in the lyric landscape. The topic has not attracted much attention.⁵²⁰ Pindar and Bacchylides are not frequently studied against the background of previous lyric.⁵²¹ From very early on melic poets engage with hexameter works;⁵²² intrageneric interactions in melic poetry are less frequent and less prominent.⁵²³ Nonetheless, Pindar often draws on his audiences' knowledge of earlier lyric. His poems use other poetry to tell

⁵¹⁸ Cf. [Hes.] fr. 76.23: ἔστη δ' ἄμπνείων (immediately after a race). Contrast Bury (1890) and O'Higgins (1987) 118, who see a start to a race.

⁵¹⁹ Köhnken (1971) 24-6, Miller (1982), and Lattmann (2010) 23 persuasively argue that Pindar's new subject is recent victory, not a novel version of mythology (*pace* O'Higgins (1987), Nisetich (1989) 19-21, Burnett (2005) 154). Bulman (1992) 43 proposes an attractive compromise: in the immediate context the reference is to recent victory, but in retrospect one understands an allusion to Pindar's engagement with the Trojan cycle (on which hazy matter see Nisetich (1989) 17-20).

⁵²⁰ Several works address Pindar's relationship to epic (see p. 107n311). M. L. West (2011) is more comprehensive but cursory. His contention is that Pindar owned a library. On Pindar and the past see Huxley (1975), Scodel (2001), Grethlein (2010) ch. 2, Howie (2012) ch. 8-10, Pavlou (2012b), all rightly stressing his sophistication. Appeals to rudimentary 'archaic mentalities' are misplaced.

⁵²¹ Exceptions include Lefkowitz (1991) 17-20, Carey (1995, 2000), Pavese (1997), Hutchinson (2001).

⁵²² See Spelman (forthcoming) and Kelly (forthcoming).

⁵²³ Sappho and Alcaeus may have known each other's work, but the most direct pieces of evidence are both problematic: Sappho 137 (see Page (1955) 106-9, Ferrari (2010) 75-80) and Alc. 384 (see Liberman (1988), Tsomis (2001) 92-6, Yatromanolakis (2007) 169-70). Sappho 16.5-6 and Alc. 42.3-4 look related (see Rissman (1983) 58n26). Anacreon (358, 376, 381b, 395) may allude to Sappho and Alcaeus. Simon. 581 attacks the Cleobolus inscription. Simon. 564 cites Stesichorus as an authority on a par with Homer. B. 9.27-9 may look to Sappho 96.6-9 (Maehler (1982-97), Fearn (2003) 362-4). B. 5.16-30 may look to Ibyc. S223 and 289b (Barron (1984) 16-17). B. 20a.12 may look to Sappho's Old Age Poem (Danielewicz (2006)). B. 20b may look to Alcaeus 140 (Fearn (2007) 66). If we had more archaic lyric we would surely see more connections.

stories about themselves.⁵²⁴ Indeed, understanding Pindar entails understanding an immanent literary history reaching into the present.

By examining allusions across the corpus, one can discern a coherent view of the poetic world. The overarching context of a shared literary culture pervades Pindar's work and shapes its meaning. Chapter V explores the origins of epinician within history and as represented within Pindar's odes. Chapter VI examines the more recent history of epinician. Chapter VII expands the scope of inquiry to explore the lyric past in Pindar most generally.

The concerns of this part of the dissertation link with those of the first part. Pindar's vision of the future of his own work is often shaped by comparison with past works which had lasted down to his day. The aesthetics of canonicity are central to the meaning of Pindar's poetry, which looks back to the past and forward to the future, often simultaneously. The fact that the victory odes engage with a wide variety of older poetry suggests that they are to be interpreted within the context of a literary culture stretching through space and time. To appreciate fully the resonances of these texts we must investigate the literary world to which they belong.

I am interested in exploring how intertextuality functions as an instrument of communication between poet and audience in specific instances.⁵²⁵ I focus on prominent and explicit allusions.⁵²⁶ Sometimes I posit detailed, specific references to older poetry in Pindar. Some may be

⁵²⁴ Hinds (1998) 133: 'every allusion made by a poet ... mobilizes its own *ad hoc* literary historical narrative'. 'Every allusion' perhaps overstates the point.

⁵²⁵ Pfeijffer (1999c) 43: 'deliberate intertextuality implies a knowledge of the text quoted or alluded to which is shared by the speaker and his addressee ... Deliberate intertextuality is a means of communication'.

⁵²⁶ This note gathers potential references not discussed elsewhere. Pindar's sympathetic treatment of Geryon (fr. 81) looks indebted to Stesichorus' eponymous work (Bornmann (1978)). *O.* 10.15-16 may look to Stesichorus' *Cycnus* (Hubbard (1989)). *Pae.* 4.50-1 (ἔα, φρήν, κυπάριττον, ἔα δὲ νομὸν Περιδάϊον) may echo Archilochus (ἔα Πάρον καὶ κύκα κείνα καὶ θαλάσσιον βίον, 116; cf. I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 290). The allusion would be pointed: Archilochus left Paros for Thasos; Euxantios, turning down a life of great wealth (46-8), retains his an-

sceptical that this sort of intertextuality was an interpretative possibility for fifth-century audiences. Firstly, it is important to remember that the following arguments have cumulative force. The sceptic should reserve judgement. Secondly, this sort of intertextuality, which scholars are accustomed to observe in later poetry, will appear the more intrinsically plausible the further one moves away from conceptualising an audience's experience of Pindar's poems as consisting in a single listening lasting perhaps fifteen minutes. Part One argued against this approach. Thirdly, one should not conceive of Pindar's audience as a monolith. Doubtless his public encompassed varying levels of literary knowledge.⁵²⁷ In order to 'count', an intertext does not have to have been recognised by everyone. There is no reason not to be interested in the experience of Pindar's most learned audience members. Finally, uncontroversial specific and detailed allusions support the possibility of similar connections elsewhere. For illustrative purposes it is sufficient to cite Pindar's citation of Lampon's citation of Hesiod *Op.* 412 (*I.* 6.66-8).

cestral home out of a sense of piety. On another level Pindar's poetry exalts his homeland and Ceos; Archilochus disparages his own community (cf. 21, 22, 102). *Nemean* 10.64-5 (καὶ μέγα ἔργον ἐμήσαντ' ὠκέως | καὶ πάθον δεινόν) may look to Alcman (ἄλαστα δὲ | ἔργα πάσον κακὰ μῆκαμνοι, 1.34-5; cf. Robbins (1994) 15). Fr. 75.14-15 may look to Alc. 296b.3-4 (Spelman (2014a) 55n21). Fr. 94b may evoke Alcman's maiden songs (Spelman (2014b) 26n18). *Pae.* 9.1-21 may evoke Archil. 122 (Phillips (forthcoming)). D'Alessio (2006) 20 suggests a plausible connection between ἐν γὰρ δαιμονίοισι φόβοις φεύγοντι καὶ παῖδες θεῶν (*N.* 9.27) and Archilochus' Telephus poem.

⁵²⁷ Pavlou (2008) 539, D. L. Cairns (2010) 58, Phillips (forthcoming). Cf. Revermann (2006) on Athenian comedy. Fearn (2007) takes intertextuality to extremes but does not argue much for this approach.

VI. The Epinician Past

Scholarship on genre in archaic lyric has emphasised the artificiality of some later categorisations and the inapplicability of some familiar hermeneutical approaches.⁵²⁸ Such work has cleared the theoretical ground but has perhaps deflected attention away from how genre, such as it existed in this period, functions within the texts on a pragmatic level. Pindar's epinicians provide a unique opportunity to observe how genre worked in archaic lyric as a tool of communication between poet and audience on the surface, as it were, of the discourse. Here alone we have a critical mass of comparative evidence. If the operative conceptualisation of genre is different from that immanent in later poetry, this only makes the topic a more potentially rewarding object of inquiry.

Genre is connected to literary history. In order for a poem to belong to a type, that type must already exist as a publicly recognised phenomenon. The epinician genre itself is among Pindar's epinician themes. One is repeatedly reminded that these poems gain their fullest meaning when set against a background of similar works. Gestures toward generic precedent may be described as 'meta-traditional', i.e. as self-reflexive references to the tradition to which these poems belong. This rhetorical strategy is hardly a fifth-century invention,⁵²⁹ but it plays a remarkably prominent role in Pindar's poetics. We may gain a deeper understanding of the meaning of his victory odes by investigating how he presents the history of his genre and relates contemporary practice to past precedent.

Section 1 investigates the historical origins of epinician. Section 2 explores the distant ge-

⁵²⁸ Harvey (1955), Calame (1974, 1998), Pavese (1972), R. L. Fowler (1987) ch. 3, Käppel (1992) 10-26, Nagy (1994), Ford (2002) 250-72, (2006), I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 3-18, Carey (2009), Swift (2010) 5-34. "'Genre' is really just a type of work" (Hutchinson (2013a) 223). Pindar conceives of epinician as a poetic type distinct from, say, a wedding song (*P.* 3.17-19) or erotic lyric (*I.* 2.1-5). More interestingly, Pindar conceived of these types as related (see p. 178).

⁵²⁹ Scodel (2002) 65-70 discusses the 'rhetoric of traditionality' in Homeric poetry.

neric past as depicted within Pindar's poems. It is argued that the poet held a view of the history of his genre compatible with the broad outlines of modern scholarly consensus. He understood that, on the one hand, he had a relatively novel relationship to his audience as a professional author and that, on the other hand, he was continuing a time-honoured tradition rooted in less sophisticated epinician celebrations. Section 3 interprets *Olympian* 9, a poem enmeshed in the themes explored in this part of the thesis.

1. Epinician Origins in History: Athletics, Ibycus, Simonides

The epinician appears fully formed as a genre in Pindar's earliest poems and underwent remarkably little formal development over the course of his career, which spanned more than half a century.⁵³⁰ Much the same may be said of Bacchylides.⁵³¹ When did poems like these first appear? This section discusses textual traces of pre-Pindaric epinician and advances a narrative about the historical origins of the genre.

Some Ibycean fragments reveal works praising athletics but not certainly taking the celebration of victory as their *raison d'être* and the comastic revel as their occasion (cf. S166, S176, S220, S221).⁵³² Nonetheless, the congruities between the Ibycean and the Pindaric *laudatores* are highly significant. Consider Ibycus S221: αἰὲν ἐμοὶ πόνος οὗτος εἴη· | αἱ δέ τις βροτῶν μ' ἐνίπτει | νόσφιν ... ἐγὼν δ' ἔτι μ[εῖζο]ν' αὔχων | τίθεμαι περὶ τούτων. The speaker eagerly wages a cam-

⁵³⁰ It is significant that Fogelmark (1972), seeking to date *Nemean* 7, finds no more objective criterion of comparison than colour terminology.

⁵³¹ One may contrast developments in the role of the chorus over the careers of Euripides and Aristophanes.

⁵³² Page (1970) 94, Barron (1984) 19-22, Cavallini (1993) 65-7, Carey (2000) 171, Hornblower (2004) 21-2, Neumann-Hartmann (2009a) 18-19, K. A. Morgan (2012) 46, Rawles (2012) 6-12, 26-7, Wilkinson (2013) 24-7. Tyrt. 12.1-4, which should be considered genuine in the absence of decisive evidence to the contrary, presumes athletics as a plausible topic of praise but hardly constitutes evidence for poems dedicated to that subject.

paign of public praise against notional covert criticism (cf. 311). Core concerns of the Pindaric epinician narrator are implicated here.⁵³³ Indeed, the very degree of narratorial involvement reminds one of nothing so much as Pindar's victory odes. Ibycus' poem was titled 'Callias' and was probably devoted in no small part to his praise. Another poem discussed in the preceding part of the same papyrus (S220) provides strong indications of athletic subject matter.⁵³⁴

In seeking to explain the intricate, developed 'grammar of choral style' (Bundy (1986) 32) evident in Pindar, one should take into account different sorts of older poetry, with various degrees of familial resemblance to the victory ode both in form and in content. The genus of praise poetry was older than the species of epinician.⁵³⁵ Pindar's non-epinician poems sometimes praise athletic victories (*N.* 11.19-21, *Parth.* 2.41-8, *Pae.* 4.21-4). His victory odes self-consciously approximate themselves to and incorporate elements from a wide variety of older genres of praise poetry broadly conceived (cf. Power (2000), Currie (2005) 21-4, Budelmann (2012) 189).⁵³⁶

⁵³³ The speaker reacts to a hypothetical anonymous attack with greater praise: *O.* 8.54-9 (cf. *Od.* 17.14-15 for the γάρ). πόνος of the speaker's task: *N.* 3.12, 7.74. Wish to continue praising: *O.* 1.108-11, 13.103-5. Covert criticism: *O.* 1.47. Blame attaching to the speaker: *O.* 1.35, *P.* 1.82. With αὔχα cf. *P.* 1.92, *N.* 9.7, *I.* 5.51; with αἰέ cf. *P.* 9.87-8, *I.* 5.19-20.

⁵³⁴ ἄνπερ[...]ν ποδῶν ... πόδ]ας ἐν τῇ ἀθλ[ή]σει ... ὁ γάρ νικ[(S220.19-22). The lemma and commentary apparently refer to victory in a race. Earlier Ibycus' thought is glossed as possibly this: γλυκερὰ γίν[εται ἡ καύχη]σις ἐάν ἐπιτύχηι (17-19). This suggests a poem which responds to victory. The generalised conditional, presumably with transparent relevance to a particular situation (see Hutchinson (2001) on *O.* 6.4-7), readily suggests Pindaric parallels: e.g. *N.* 7.11-12 (note εἰ δὲ τύχη τις ἔρδων), *I.* 5.22-5 (note κόμπων).

⁵³⁵ Compare Alc. 1 with Pind. fr. 94b (*partheneia* praising contemporaries); Alc. 332 with Pind. *N.* 9.50-2 (exhortation to drink within sympotic celebration); Ibyc. S151.46-8 with Pind. *O.* 10.99-105 (encomia of exceptional mortals guaranteeing their immortality); Ibyc. S257a.6-8 and 288 with Pind. fr. 123.13-15 (exaggerated erotic praise); Ibyc. S166.23-6, 36-7 with e.g. Pind. *O.* 9.41-4 (praise of beauty and athletics).

⁵³⁶ Threnody: *I.* 8.56a-65; erotic praise: *I.* 2.1-5; praise of kings: *P.* 2.13-17; poetry for hero cult: *I.* 5.26-35 (cf. Alc. 7, Pind. fr. 52p); wedding song: *N.* 5.22-5; maiden song: *P.* 11.1-16; sympotic praise: *O.* 1.14-18; hymn: e.g. *N.* 2.1-5, 24-5 (cf. Kambylis (1964) 145-7, J. M. Bremer (2008)). Like tragedy (see Swift (2010)), epinician is generically capacious and voracious (cf. D. L. Cairns (2010) 19). Kurke (1988) does not convince.

Both Alcman 1 and Ibycus S166 display the building blocks of the victory odes: universal *gnomai* (Alcm. 1.36-9; Ibyc. S166.10-14), mythological narratives (1.1-35; S166.15-19), references to performance (1.39-40; S166.5), and praise of contemporaries (1.40-59; S166.23-6). Alcman, Ibycus, and Pindar all seem interested in swift and challenging movements of thought between apparently disparate topics.⁵³⁷ One might conceptualise a ‘supergenre’⁵³⁸ of choral praise or praise of contemporaries, but we lack the requisite evidence to give substance to this broad category, let alone chart its development.

With Simonides matters become more definite. His epinician fragments suggest works fundamentally similar in content and expression to those of Pindar and Bacchylides. Some book fragments express jocular tones alien to Pindar’s dignified memorials (cf. Bagordo (1999), Trombetta (1999)),⁵³⁹ but papyrus fragments, preserved through chance rather than the interests of later authors, reveal a type of poetry that is continued in Pindar and Bacchylides’ epinicians. Simonides 511 fr. 1a-b is ‘epinician praise as we know it, straight out of the tin’ (Rawles (2013) 200, with questionable connotations of perfunctory iteration). A grand opening links the *laudandi* to the gods and the site of athletic victory (fr. 1a), the event motivating the ode. A local myth evidently followed (fr. 1b with Budelmann). There is little in this fragment for which Pindaric and Bacchylidean parallels do not suggest themselves.⁵⁴⁰ It would be overhasty to credit Simonides with ‘inventing’ the epinician (*pace* Kurke (1991) 259), but he represents a firm *terminus*.

⁵³⁷ Alcman moves from battlefield gore (1.34-5) to Spartan maidens (39-40). Pindar moves from Locrian maidens (*P.* 2.18-20) to the underworld (21-3).

⁵³⁸ For the concept see Hutchinson (2013b), who stresses the importance of metre.

⁵³⁹ Simon. 519 fr. 92 (cf. Pind. *O.* 4.4-5, 10.98); 507 (cf. Pind. *O.* 6.56-7, fr. 105a, B. 6.1-2); 509 (cf. Pind. *P.* 6.43-5).

⁵⁴⁰ See Poltera’s (2008) 99-100 collection of parallels. In line 3 I suggest δέρεκε]ται (cf. e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 81-2 with M. L. West (1966), *P.* 3.85-6, B. 11.15-17 with D. L. Cairns (2010), Aesch. *Ag.* 951-2). Schneider’s δέδεκε]ται does not find a parallel for the perfect in many attested instances of the reception motif.

His earliest dateable victory ode is perhaps from 520 (Molyneux (1992) 33-42), 22 years before Pindar's first securely dateable victory ode, *Pythian* 10 in 498.

In conjunction with such limited textual evidence one can hypothesise a suitably rudimentary historical narrative. Probably literary epinician was an offshoot of praise poetry whose fortunes rose with the fortunes of major athletic victory, its proprietary subject.⁵⁴¹ The epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides belong to a certain historical moment. Epinician is not among the various types of lyric, all tied to the ageless rhythms of communal life, attested in the *Iliad*.⁵⁴² Greeks perhaps had marriage songs almost as long as they had marriages.⁵⁴³ Conversely, it is difficult to imagine that epinicians like those of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides predated a degree of interest and outlay in panhellenic athletics which cannot be retrojected into time immemorial.⁵⁴⁴

Sports were a traditional source of social distinction,⁵⁴⁵ and Greeks may long have celebrated success therein with garlands (cf. *P.* 9.123-5) and other mementos (cf. *Il.* 23.618-19, *I.* 1.19-20), music (cf. *Il.* 22.391-4 with I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 45), dance (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 23 with Denniston and Page), drinking (cf. *Il.* 6.528), verbal congratulations (cf. *P.* 4.240-1), and simple songs like Archilochus' 'proto-epinician' (324 spur.). Such matters are organic responses to success;⁵⁴⁶ dazzlingly complex works dedicated to athletes and composed by a professional poet of Hellenic

⁵⁴¹ The division of Pindar's epinicians into four books for the four major games reflects an *ad hoc* strategy of convenience, as shown by the different organisation of Simonides' and Bacchylides' epinicians (see Lowe (2007)). Nonetheless, the Alexandrian edition reflects a tendency for major victory to motivate commissions. Exceptions and possible exceptions: *Pythian* 2-3, *Nemean* 9-11, lost poems appended to the *Isthmians* (see D'Alessio (2012)).

⁵⁴² See Dalby (2009) and Richardson (2011); cf. Calame (1974) 117.

⁵⁴³ Cf. *Il.* 18.493, [Hes.] *Sc.* 274, Alcman *TA* 6 with Spelman (2014b) 26n19, Sappho 44.26, 31-3.

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. K. A. Morgan (1990) 10-11 and R. Thomas (2007) 164-5. On the rise of the panhellenic games see C. Morgan (1990), Instone (2007), J. A. Davies (2007).

⁵⁴⁵ οὐ μὲν γὰρ μεῖζον κλέος ἄνθρωπος, ὄφρα κεν ἦιεν, | ἢ ὅ τι ποσσὶν τε ῥέξῃ καὶ χερσὶν ἐῆιεν (*Od.* 8.147-8); τοκεῦσι δὲ κῦδος ὀπάξει (Hes. *Theog.* 438), both of athletics.

⁵⁴⁶ B. 10.52-3: πέφαται θνατοῖσι νίκας | ὕστερον εὐφροσύνα.

repute for choral performance in the victor's home city after the games and for an extended reception afterwards were very likely, in relative terms, 'something absolutely new' (J. M. Bremer (1990) 42; cf. Kurke (1991) 258-9, Power (2000) 76). Choral celebration of athletics does not clearly appear on vases until the late archaic and early classical period (Lawler (1948), Webster (1970) 15-16). Over the sixth century there is a pronounced shift in athletic monuments towards celebrating individuals; this may be plausibly if only loosely connected with the rise of epinician (R. Thomas (2007) 152-3). Antiquity does not record the name of an historical pre-Simonidean epinician poet.⁵⁴⁷

This sketch tallies suspiciously well with evidence from Pindar's poems. Various forms of indirect evidence together support an abductive case. Pindar viewed serial patronage as a recent development. *Isthmian* 2 contrasts the modern professional Muse with older poets who praised beautiful youths for free. Traceable allusions suggest that Οἱ μὲν πάλαι (1) includes Alcaeus (*I.* 2.11→360) and also Anacreon (*I.* 2.7-8→384; see VIII.2.C). The latter was still alive close to the beginning of Pindar's career.⁵⁴⁸ The evidence from Pindar is compatible with the later tradition that Simonides was the first to produce poems for serial commission (see Woodbury (1968) 535n11 for the testimonia). Pindar presents Archilochus (*P.* 2.54-6; see VII.2.C) and perhaps also Homer (fr. 265 with Graziosi (2002) 157) not as flourishing professionals like himself but rather as materially indigent. In extant epinician only one broadly comparable work is attributed to named poet older than Simonides. Archilochus' μέλος ... καλλίνικος (*O.* 9.1-2), however, has little in common with literary epinician— as Pindar emphasises. It may be generic propriety that

⁵⁴⁷ In Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.159-63 Orpheus evidently performs a choral epinician (Fränkel (1968) 164).

⁵⁴⁸ Hutchinson (2001) 257-60, the most recent discussion of Anacreon's date, concludes that 'one might be reluctant to credit him living much past 500' (260). πάλαι of the relatively recent past: *P.* 11.46, fr. 94b.42; cf. Pavlou (2012b) 101.

prevents Pindar and Bacchylides from referring to epinician poets earlier than Simonides as they refer to many other older poets,⁵⁴⁹ but the fact that earlier epinician poets are not attested elsewhere militates against this possibility.

Additional indirect evidence for a dearth of pre-Simonidean literary epinician may be found in the fact that Pindar's patrons sometimes requested commemoration for a deceased member of a previous generation who was victorious in the games. This *prima facie* suggests that an epinician celebrating these men had not survived. In all three instances, Pindar asserts the durability of his work by likening it to a funerary monument (*N.* 4.79-90, 8.44-8, *I.* 8.61-2). *Nemean* 8 programmatically purports to celebrate deceased father and living son (16). It answers their shared need (χρεῖται, 42) for glory.⁵⁵⁰ The figure of Ajax, who suffered λάθα (24) because he lacked eloquence, has relevance not only for the victor (cf. Köhnken (1971) 24-34, Carey (1976) 36, Calabrese De Feo (1985) 128-9) but also for his father (cf. θανόν ὡς παις κλέος | μὴ τὸ δύσφραμον πρόσάψω, 36-7).

These arguments do not prove that previous generations were ignorant of literary epinician. Perhaps being celebrated once would not have been enough. Perhaps the men posthumously celebrated by Pindar simply did not elect to commission a similar work during their lifetime. A literary ode probably did not always follow a major victory. Theaeus commissioned *Nemean* 10 to celebrate multiple panhellenic victories as well as triumphs in the local games (25-8).⁵⁵¹ It

⁵⁴⁹ The lack of any highly explicit reference in Pindar to Bacchylides and Simonides (and *vice versa*) is remarkable (note less overt references discussed below). Pindar and Bacchylides composed odes for the same victory which do not acknowledge each other (compare and contrast Morrison (2011) 242-5). Note also *Olympian* 13 and Simon. 339, 340 *SLG* (with Barrett (2007) 98-116); *Pythian* 6 and Simon. 513.

⁵⁵⁰ Burnett (2005) 170n18: 'the ode seems to imply that ... Megas was not granted a song celebration at the time of his victory'. The ode implies only that such a song had not lasted.

⁵⁵¹ Μοίκαίσι τ' ἔδωκ' ἀρόσαι (*N.* 10.26) apparently refers to the present commissioned ode. For the aorist cf. δέδωκε (*I.* 7.24) and ἔξευξεν (*P.* 10.65); for the metaphor cf. *N.* 6.32-4.

is plausible that literary epinicians dedicated to these major earlier successes did not already exist.

Nemean 4 is the only ode which might depict the re-performance of a preserved epinician from a previous generation. Probably, however, it instead refers to the possibility of a new amateur composition. Mention of his commission (συνθέμενος, 75) leads Pindar to mention the victor's request to celebrate his deceased uncle. After briefly complying (85-8), the poet, through a sort of *recusatio* (Bundy (1972) 66n73),⁵⁵² delegates the task of further praise (89-92):

τὸν Εὐφάνησ ἐθέλων γεραιὸς προπάτωρ
ἀείκεται, παῖ, ὁ κόος.⁵⁵³
ἄλλοις δ' ἄλικες ἄλλοι· τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ἀντιτύχηι,
ἔλπεταί τις ἕκαστος ἐξοχώτατα φάσθαι.

An adult refers his young addressee (παῖ, 90) to a yet older figure (γεραιός, 89). Euphanes' first-hand experience makes him a better candidate to praise Callicles (91-2; cf. *Il.* 2.485, *Od.* 8.491, Spelman (2014c) 33). But what will he sing? Currie (2004) 59-60 argues for the re-performance of an existing epinician. This does not convince. The fact that the victor requests Pindar to commemorate the deceased *prima facie* suggests that an ode fulfilling that function did not already exist. The text supports this inference. The gnome in lines 91-2 reflects on Euphanes, who is, like the Pindaric narrator elsewhere, eager (ἐθέλων, 89) to praise.⁵⁵⁴ ἔλπεται (92) implies that he has a future-directed aspiration to express well something which he has not yet expressed (cf. *O.*

⁵⁵² As often in *recusationes*, the poet partially does what he ostensibly refuses to do: cf. Davis (1991) 30-6; note Ibyc. S151.10-15 (without worrying too much about the technical definition of 'recusatio').

⁵⁵³ ὁ κόος ἀείκεται, παῖ MSS. The metrical oddity of Mommsen's text printed here (and by Turyn (1952), Race (1997), and Henry (2005); cf. Currie (2004) 59) does not seem fatal (see Itsumi (2009) 296 on the hiatus). κόος ἄεικεν ποτε, παῖ (Boeckh), printed by S-M, may be rejected. Paleographically unattractive, it yields inferior sense. ἔλπεται (92) looks to the future, which is supported by the scholia (144a, c). γεραιός (89) will refer to someone living, not someone deceased (Henry (2005)). The aorist lacks consolatory force.

⁵⁵⁴ *O.* 7.20, 11.9, Gundert (1935) 41, Maehler (1982-97) and D. L. Cairns (2010) on B. 5.14-16.

1.109), not an arrogant expectation of supremacy. ἐξοχώτατα (92) connotes competition. This idea is picked up in the wrestling imagery of the following lines (93-6), which describe someone⁵⁵⁵ who would (κε ... στρέφοι, 93) compose a *new* eulogy of Melesias (ρήματα πλέκων, 94). The future αείκεται (90) could refer to a hypothetical work (cf. μακρότεροι ... ἔψοντ' ... αἰοδαί, O. 13.41-2; ἀρέομαι ... ἐρέω, P. 1.75-7). Later *recusationes* often use futures similarly.⁵⁵⁶

Nemean 4 presumes the possibility of amateur praise.⁵⁵⁷ This was evidently plausible. Euphanes is not motivated by a contract to celebrate his son (contrast συνθέμενος, 75; cf. 13-16).⁵⁵⁸ It is difficult to say much more about his hypothetical composition. The younger professional Pindar, not the older amateur Euphanes, was selected to celebrate the recent victory of Timasarchus. Though amateur epinician was available, Pindar's patrons wanted something else. Like the Homeric epics⁵⁵⁹ and other archaic lyric,⁵⁶⁰ Pindar's victory odes related to similar but less accomplished contemporary poetry which has not been transmitted to us. We can progress some way towards grasping this vanished background by investigating scattered references in its literary congeners.

The next section continues to interpret traces of non-Pindaric epinician celebration in Pindar. Although for us his odes are paradigmatic of a literary genre, these poems were likely

⁵⁵⁵ For the indefinite subject, τις (92), cf. Hes. *Theog.* 741 with M. L. West (1966), *N.* 11.13-18, K-G i.35-6, ii.561-2, Bury (1890), Wilamowitz (1922) 397n1, Köhnken (1971) 215-19, Kirkwood (1989) 8. It is less attractive to posit Euphanes as the subject (e.g. Henry (2005)). The potential eulogist, who constitutes a Pindaric ideal (95-6), not an antitype, will wrestle with doing justice to the extraordinary Melesias (οἶον, 93; cf. *I.* 2.35-7), not with an extraordinary resentment against Melesias (*pace* Bowra (1964) 150-1, Kirkwood (1989) 10). He will be ἔφεδρος (96) for Melesias himself.

⁵⁵⁶ See Nibset and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.6.1, 7.1.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. Nicholson (2001), whose interpretation of the central myth does not convince.

⁵⁵⁸ Euphanes is evidently the victor's maternal grandfather (Currie (2004) 69).

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. J. S. Burgess (2006) on Homeric intertextuality.

⁵⁶⁰ This is clearly true of the Lesbians. Some of Sappho's companions seem to be poets and/or performers in their own right (21.11-12, 22.9-11, 96.5). The symposia of Alcaeus' enemies feature poetry (70.3-4)—but presumably not Alcaeus' sympotic poems reviling them.

perceived by their contemporaries also as exceptional instantiations of more common phenomena. Fully understanding Pindaric epinician requires developing a sense of what it is not.

2. Epinician Origins in Epinician: from Revel to Literature

Modern scholars cannot confidently trace full-fledged literary epinicians back further in time than Simonides. Perhaps Pindar could not either. Yet both scholars and the poet recognise that epinician celebration is older than professional literary epinician poetry. Pindar describes recognisably similar revels at the sites of the games for his contemporaries (*N.* 10.33-5), their ancestors (*N.* 6.34-8), and victors in ancient time (*O.* 10.73-7). The κῶμος was not closely linked to the celebration of major victory (e.g. *B.* fr. 4.67-8). It may therefore be plausibly retrojected into a more distant past than the professional victory ode. The literary epinician likely evolved from such boisterous events⁵⁶¹ and self-consciously preserves vestigial features of them. Literary odes also evince a conscious connection with spontaneous revels by identifying their occasion and sometimes themselves with the same word, κῶμος, and its cognates.⁵⁶² One may describe such vocabulary as an epinician ‘generic signature’ (cf. I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 72 on paeans). Literary odes often more or less explicitly liken themselves to revels at the games (cf. VII.1). Bacchylides 6, for example, suggests parallels between earlier celebrations at Olympia (ἄεικάν ποτ’ Ὀλυμπίαι, 6)⁵⁶³ and the framing poem performed in front of the victor’s home (προδόμοιοι

⁵⁶¹ Lefkowitz (1990) 70, K. A. Morgan (1993) 10-11, Nagy (1994) 24, Agócs (2012) 217-18.

⁵⁶² Heath (1988) 183-4, K. A. Morgan (1993) 8-9, Hutchinson (2001) 369-70, Henry (2005) on *N.* 6.32, Eckerman (2010), Agócs (2012). On comastic celebrations inside and outside Pindar see Heath (1988) and Carey (2007).

⁵⁶³ Jebb (1906) and Maehler (1982-97) connect ἄεικάν (6) to Ὀλυμπίαι (6) but do not adequately argue the point (cf. Eckerman (2012) 351-2). νεανίαι (9) are not members of a chorus but youthful victors, as their (Isthmian) garlands suggest (8-9). Like the youthful victor Lachon, they glorify Ceos (5-6→15-16). The epinician chorus can be composed of men (*P.* 5.22) or youths (*N.*

ἄοιδαῖς, 14-15).⁵⁶⁴ Inset descriptions of comastic celebrations often highlight connections with the framing poem, as perhaps most clearly at O. 9.1-10 and 10.73-82.

Yet both these passages also distance themselves from the inset celebration at the site of the games, as will be argued in detail. Pindar's odes were perceived to be and really were something related yet different. In contrast to spontaneous celebrations at the site of the games immediately after victory, his elaborate works typically if not always debuted in the victor's home community some time after the games.⁵⁶⁵ Literary quality is the most significant distinguishing factor between Pindar's epinicians and their comastic analogues. It is difficult to infer from Pindar's brief descriptions much about the role of poetry within celebrations at the games (see VII.5), but neither a lasting poem nor a creative poet is ever certainly involved. Temporal constraints would have limited the sophistication of any work performed soon after victory.⁵⁶⁶ In literary epinician, by contrast, the verbal element of celebration attains a level of achievement that allows the poem to transcend its occasion and interest others removed in space and time. Its ability to do so is presented as the primary index of its distinctive value.

It may be useful to distinguish between a folk genre and its literary manifestation or between an organic social practice and the mediated artistic realisation of that practice. Cognate contrasts

3.66). Bacchylides could not have presumed to describe all previous Olympian victories as being celebrated by youths.

⁵⁶⁴ Geltzer (1985) 99 and Maehler (2004) understand songs performed before the temple of Zeus at Olympia. This unusual sense is not clear from the context (cf. Maehler (1982-97), Eckerman (2012) 353; contrast *N.* 5.53). The usual sense, 'before a (private) house', is appropriate (*N.* 1.19, *P.* 2.18, 3.78, *I.* 8.2, Woodbury (1978) 293-4) and supported by the nearby name of the victor's father (12).

⁵⁶⁵ Pace e.g. Gelzer (1985), Bagordo (1995-6), and Neumann-Hartmann (2009a), Eckerman (2012) persuasively argues that there is no conclusive evidence that any extant epinician was first performed at the site of the games immediately after victory (cf. R. Hamilton (1974) 53, Heath (1988) 192).

⁵⁶⁶ Gelzer (1985) 108-9, Eckerman (2012) 358. One may doubt that even Pindar could be expected to compose *Olympian* 8 and train a chorus over the five days of the Olympic festival (cf. Race (1990) 152n22, Neumann-Hartmann (2009b) 5, Athanassaki (2011a)).

can be found elsewhere, in archaic lyric⁵⁶⁷ as well as in later poetry.⁵⁶⁸ One may also, *mutatis mutandis*, invoke Bakhtin's (1986) 61 distinction between 'primary (simple) and secondary (complex) speech genres'. According to him, 'secondary (complex) speech genres ... arise in more complex and comparatively highly developed and organised cultural communication (primarily written) that is artistic, scientific, sociopolitical, and so on. During the process of their formation, they absorb and digest various primary (simple) genres that have taken form in unmediated speech communion' (62). Whatever they sang at the first Olympic games (76-7) relates to *Olympian* 10 roughly as the paean cry of the Athenians sailing to Crete (17.128-9) relates to Bacchylides' paean.⁵⁶⁹ The crucial point is that the poets and their audiences saw the matter this way.

It is likely that Pindar and his audiences correctly supposed that the literary epinician had evolved from spontaneous revels immediately after the games. This would tally with patterns evident in Pindar's discussion of other genres. According to him, the dithyramb traces its origins to a cry accompanying the birth of Dionysus (fr. 85) in Nysa (fr. 85a) but also underwent certain changes in historical times because of human actors in Corinth (*O.* 13.18-19). It continues to evolve in Pindar's work (*Dithy.* 2.1-26), which links back to the birth of Dionysus (29-30).⁵⁷⁰ Ancient narratives about various genres typically posit unsophisticated beginnings developing

⁵⁶⁷ *Dithy.* 2.6-23, fr. 52m.14-18, B. 17.128-32, Lonsdale (1994/5) 29, Kowalzig (2007) 60-3, de Jong (2009) 107-8, Pavlou (2011) 61. I. C. Rutherford (1991) argues for a similar phenomenon in *Paean* 6.

⁵⁶⁸ E.g. Callim. *Hy.* 2.97-104, Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.703-12, Limenius p. 149 *CA* lines 13-20, Philodamus Scarpheus p. 166-7 *CA* lines 8-10, 58-62.

⁵⁶⁹ This poem, later classified as a dithyramb, was probably considered a paean by Bacchylides' contemporaries (cf. Maehler (1982-97) ii.167-8, I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 35-6, 73, Pavlou (2012a) 510-11 with further references).

⁵⁷⁰ Similarly Bacchylides' novel work (καίνον, B. 19.9) looks back to the birth of Dionysus, χορῶν στεφαν[αφόρων ἄνακτα (51).

into more complex manifestations.⁵⁷¹ It would not be surprising if Pindar held a view of the epinician past in substantial agreement with modern scholarly consensus. He and his audience would have reasoned from essentially similar evidence: the textual record (or lack thereof) and quasi-anthropological inferences about past social practice drawn from more recent social practice (cf. *Lucr.* 5.1444-7).

For Pindar the epinician past includes both distant generic analogues associated with comastic celebration and more recent preserved victory odes. This bifurcated vision explains his paradoxical deployment of precedent. On the one hand, he generalises in such a way as to suggest an extensive generic tradition (see VII.1). On the other hand, he is aware of his novel position as a professional and never demonstrates knowledge of preserved epinicians older than Simonides (see VI.1).

Nemean 8 and *Olympian* 10 connect themselves to the foundation of crown games and forefront the antiquity of epinician celebration. Pindar draws authority from participating in ancient practices but also, in *Olympian* 10, distances his literary art from its simpler antecedents.

A. *Nemean* 8

In Pindar the language of fitness and necessity often articulates the relationship of epinician to athletic achievement.⁵⁷² An epinician is essentially the proper response to athletic success. Hence for fifth-century audiences the genre was at least as old as the contests from which it drew its themes. ‘A song of victory is as old as victory itself’ (Gildersleeve (1885) xvii). The close of

⁵⁷¹ E.g. *Ar. Ran.* 1004-5 with Dover (1993), *Pax* 747-52, *Arist. Poet.* 1449a-b with Else (1957) 152-3, *De Poetis* F38 Janko, *Hor. AP* 275-80 with Brink (1963-82); see further D’Alton (1931) 271, Fairweather (1974) 264, Russell (1981) 164, 167, Hunter (2009) 50-1, Hutchinson (2013a) 27.

⁵⁷² Schadewaldt (1928) 278n1, Bundy (1986) 10-11, Carey (1981) on *P.* 2.14.

Nemean 8 asserts something similar: ἦν γε μὰν ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος | δὴ πάλαι καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι τὰν Ἀδράκτου τὰν τε Καδμείων ἔριν (50-1). The reference is to the Nemean games, established by the Seven against Thebes (*O.* 2.43, Bacchylides 9, M. Davies (2015) 66), and may include the Sicyonian games (*N.* 9.9). Pindar gives a *terminus ante quem* for his genre.⁵⁷³ A Nemean epinician is as traditional as the Nemean festival.

The preceding central myth of *Nemean* 8, engaging Trojan epic, illustrates the antiquity of deceitful speech (32-4) and at least raises the possibility that the poetic tradition may itself be misleading (see p. 173n519). The poem ends, however, by linking epinician to a past before the Trojan War and hence necessarily before Trojan epic (ἦν γε μὰν ... δὴ πάλαι καὶ πρὶν, 51-2; ἄρα πάροφας ἦν καὶ πάλαι, 32).⁵⁷⁴ Pindar asserts the greater antiquity of his genre relative to a story preserved in epic and so sets epinician against the paradigmatic ‘poetry of the past’ (Ford (1992)). The pedigree of the victory ode helps to authorise its contemporary representative to put forward his own version of ancient events.

The immediate argumentative purpose of this reference to the antiquity of epinician, however, is not to attack another genre but rather to buttress an argument from precedent. The statement about the Seven against Thebes follows and substantiates a generalisation: ἐπαιδαῖς δ’ ἀνὴρ | νόδονον καὶ τις κάματον θῆκεν (49-50). Here καὶ τις (50) means ‘many a man’ (cf. τιν’ ἄγλωσσαν, 24).⁵⁷⁵ In the long stretch of time in which the genre has existed, many have eased the

⁵⁷³ The point is not that epinician predates epic (*pace* Nagy (1990) 222-4, Carnes (1996) 88, Burnett (2005) 177) or praise predates blame (*pace* Bulman (1992) 54) but rather that epinician is very old and older than the Trojan cycle (cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 408, Köhnken (1971) 34-5, Carey (1976) 37, O’Higgins (1987) 129, Agócs (2012) 218).

⁵⁷⁴ The Seven against Thebes feature in analepsis in the *Iliad* (e.g. 6.222-3).

⁵⁷⁵ Cf. *P.* 2.13-14, Gildersleeve (1885) on *P.* 2.51, Des Places (1947) 82, Fraenkel (1950) on Aesch. *Ag.* 369.

pain of toil through the ‘healing songs’ of epinician, the appropriate response to athletic achievement (πρόσφορον | ἐν μὲν ἔργῳι κόμπον, 49-50).

Unlike an impossible cure for mortality (44-5), Pindar’s poetic palliative treatment is possible (ἐλαφρόν, 46)⁵⁷⁶ and trustworthy (cf. πιστόν, 44) because it has a long history. In celebrating a traditional victory ode, the poet pursues a realistic goal (cf. τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων ἐπικρατεῖν δύνασθαι, 5; contrast οὐ μοι δυνατόν, 45). He cannot return the deceased to the world but he can provide a monument for a worthy subject by celebrating an epinician as men have done since the time of Adrastus.⁵⁷⁷ Similarly in *Pythian* 3 the impossible wish to procure a divine healer (1-5) sets up a closing promise of poetic immortality supported by an argument from precedent (110-15).

Previous poetry, which had earlier featured in *Nemean* 8 as a background against which this new work will be judged (19-21) and as a pernicious tradition (κῦδος ... σαθρόν, 34), at the end of the ode provides a validating genealogy. Pindar challenges the poetic past in his engagement with Trojan epic but also honours the older epinician tradition by fulfilling a time-honoured human need (cf. χρᾶναι, 42), the desire for recognition, which had motivated every manifestation of his genre from the time of Adrastus to the present.

B. *Olympian* 10

⁵⁷⁶ See Henry (2005) and Carey (1976) 41n53 for the text. λάβρον (MSS) is nicely paradoxical, but so is Cookesly’s ἐλαφρόν, a slight change which gives the infinitive a lucid construction.

⁵⁷⁷ This hard truth contrasts with the wheedling lies deprecated earlier (αἰμύλων μύθων, 33; cf. Carey (1976) 36).

Like *Nemean* 8, *Olympian* 10⁵⁷⁸ links epinician with the origins of major games. This ode, however, also distances Pindar's contemporary professional practice from its primordial antecedent.

The central narrative opens with a gesture toward convention: ἀγῶνα δ' ἐξαίρετον ἀεῖσαι θέμιτες ὄρσαν Διός (24). Here θέμιτες (24) represent not 'die Ordnung des olympischen Festes' (Wüst (1967) 263; cf. Nassen (1975) 229) but rather a poetic custom.⁵⁷⁹ This force of tradition at work in the present is subsequently shown to derive from the first Olympic celebration (76-83):

αἰεῖδετο δὲ πᾶν τέμενος τερπναῖσι θαλίσαις
τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον.
ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι
καὶ νῦν ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν
νίκας ἀγερώχου κελαδησόμεθα βροντάν
καὶ πυρπάλαιμον βέλος
ὀρσικτύπου Διός,
ἐν ᾧ παντὶ κράτει αἶθωνα κεραυνὸν ἀραρότα ...

The congruity between contemporary and ancient practice is explicit. Latest celebration parallels first celebration as latest triumph parallels first triumph (ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι καὶ νῦν, 78; cf. Sappho 17.11-12: νῦν δὲ κ[αί] ... πόημεν | κατὰ τὸ πάλ[αον], of a ritual). The description of epinician as 'a *charis* named for victory' (ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν | νίκας, 78-9)⁵⁸⁰ points up the 'etymology' of the ἐπινίκιος αἰοιδή (cf. *O.* 8.75, *N.* 4.78, *B.* 2.13). The name of the genre captures its essence preserved through time: from ancient days song has followed victory. Now as then cele-

⁵⁷⁸ *Olympian* 11 does not promise *Olympian* 10 (Bundy (1986) 36, Race (2004) 86; *pace* Pfeijffer (1999b) 61-5). I note that the natural next step to the thought 'when a man wins he requires song' (1-6) is surely not 'and I will sing of you later in another song' (cf. αὐτίκ', *O.* 4.5).

⁵⁷⁹ Barrett (2007) 66; cf. *O.* 7.88, 13.29, *N.* 4.33, *I.* 6.20. Διός (24) goes with θέμιτες (24), as word-order suggests. The genitive should not be taken with ἀγῶνα (24; *pace* Köhnken (1977) 267). The following relative clause provides the requisite specification. Zeus is often associated with *themis* (e.g. *Il.* 1.238-9 with Kirk (1985), Διὸς μέγαλοιο θέμιστες, *Od.* 16.403).

⁵⁸⁰ χάριν (78) is an internal accusative (Verdenius (1987-88), Gentili *et al.* (2013)). 'A remarkable equation of [the] poem to the thunderbolt of Zeus' (D. L. Burgess (1990) 278; cf. Farnell (1930-2)) is unlikely.

bration resounds ‘in that encomiastic fashion’ (τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον, 77),⁵⁸¹ now as then victory at his Olympic festival, an enduring cultic practice, elicits a hymn to Zeus. ἐν ᾧπαντι κράτει (82) suggests that after the first Olympic games they appropriately sang a hymn to Zeus (K. A. Morgan (1993) 8, Agócs (2012) 217) in his new sanctuary (76). θέμιτες ... Διός (24) ultimately lead Pindar, too, to hymn the god.

The victory ode finds an analogue in its institutional subject: epinician, like the Olympic festival founded by Heracles, is a perpetuated tradition (see VII.1).⁵⁸² Indeed, the evocation of the distant past through parallel present practice is reminiscent of nothing so much as the poetics of cult (cf. R. Parker (2011) 200) and cultic poetry (Pavlou (2011) 64). One thinks of how epinician resembles and in a certain sense constitutes both.

For his account of the first Olympic games Pindar is surely not dependent on a preserved victory ode which once debuted on that historic evening and had been preserved down to his day.⁵⁸³ Yet this primordial celebration is nonetheless evoked as a validating precedent for the memorialising power of Pindar’s work.⁵⁸⁴ A request to the Muse for precise information about the distant past (τίς δῆ, 60), paralleling the opening request to the Muse for the victor’s name (1-3),⁵⁸⁵ intro-

⁵⁸¹ The article can be like a weak deictic (K-G i.598, Hummel (1993) 181-2, Bonifazi (2004a) 405). Here it points up a familiar phenomenon. τρόπον (77), ‘manner, way’, does not connote any musical mode (*pace* Verdenius (1987-88)); several were appropriate to epinician (Prauscello (2012) 77-82).

⁵⁸² Cf. ἑορτὰν τε κτίσῃ πλειστόμβροτον τεθμόν τε μέγιστον ἀέθλων (*O.* 6.69); Ἡρακλέος τεθμόν (*N.* 10.33); ἑορτὰν Ἡρακλέος τέθμιον (11.26). Ritual nature of major athletic festivals: e.g. *O.* 3.21, 8.64, 10.55-9, 13.15, *N.* 2.4, 6.59, 10.34.

⁵⁸³ ‘Pindar must, I think, have inherited [these names] from an earlier source’ (Barrett (2007) 71), but it is idle to speculate about official records (Wilamowitz (1922) 223-4, Hubbard (1987) 67) or ‘a pro-Argolic poetical source’ (Huxley (1975) 40). These names could have been reached Pindar through a ‘source’ as nebulous as the oral tradition.

⁵⁸⁴ Similarly the Muses’ threnody for Achilles parallels Pindar’s memorial at *I.* 8.56a-62.

⁵⁸⁵ ἀνάγνωτε (1) is addressed to the Muse and Alatheia (3-4). For the subject of an imperative supplied by the following sentences cf. *O.* 11.16-17, *P.* 8.78-80, *I.* 2.43-8. For the mixture of dual and plural see Gerber (2002) on *O.* 9.43. For imperative-justification-imperative, a common

duces the names immediately following in the manner of epic invocation and response.⁵⁸⁶ The daughters of Zeus have preserved these ancient victors (60-73) and now will preserve a new victor in their company (τρέφοντι δ' εὐρὸν κλέος | κόραι Πιερίδες Διός, 95-6). The first Olympic champions did not go without poetic celebration (ᾠοῖδ' ἄτερ, 91 → ἀεῖδετο, 76) and so they did not have but brief joy (βραχὺ τι τερπνόν, 93 → τερπναῖσι θαλίαις, 76). For them an evening's revel resulted in lasting fame (βιότῳι φάος, 23 → κελάνας ἐρατὸν φάος, 75). The fact that the ancient and otherwise obscure Samus, son of Halirothius, is still remembered in Pindar's poem gives the young Hagesidamus, son of Archestratus, an intimation of how he will someday be remembered. His name, once recorded in Pindar's mind (2-3),⁵⁸⁷ will be re-recorded in the minds of all who encounter this ode.⁵⁸⁸

Scholars have gone some way towards elucidating Pindar's uses of epinician precedent in *Olympian* 10. They have not brought out lines of discontinuity with the past. The celebration on the night following the first Olympic games was something fundamentally different from Pindar's work composed after the Olympic games circa 476. *Olympian* 10 was created on commission by a celebrated professional poet in Thebes (Δίρκαι, 85) and subsequently performed with full choral accompaniment in the victor's community on the other side of the Greek world (84) a

pattern, see p. 291. The second person plural rules out self-address and militates against an inscription (contrast Fearn (2013) 248); inscriptions generally address a singular passer-by. Neither the chorus nor the audience (*pace* Gildersleeve (1885)) may directly access the poet's mind (φρενός, 2); goddesses can (e.g. B. 12.1-3, 13.229). I do not know what it means for an imperative to be used 'absolutely' (Verdenius (1987-88)).

⁵⁸⁶ See Minton (1962) 191-3, M. L. West (1966) on Hes. *Theog.* 114-15, Braswell (1988) on *P.* 4.70-1.

⁵⁸⁷ Mental writing connotes permanence (Sansone (1975) 60-2). Pindar claims to have forgotten and suggests that he has not.

⁵⁸⁸ Naming and paternity are important themes. A male heir (86-90) will be identified by his patronymic (as is the victor in line 2) and thereby sustain his father's memory (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 505-7 with Garvie (1986)). Heracles gives the previously anonymous hill of Kronos (νόνημος, 51) its enduring designation linked to his grandfather.

considerable time after his triumph (ἔκαθεν, 7; βαθύ, 8; χρόνῳ, 85). The figure of the poet, so conspicuous in Pindar's poem, is conspicuously absent from the first Olympian celebration.⁵⁸⁹ What the poet describes taking place is not the debut performance of a sophisticated literary artefact like his ode but rather a spontaneous comastic revel of the sort that his contemporaries still enjoyed at the site of the games immediately after victory.

Olympian 10, like *Dithyramb* 2, juxtaposes a paradigmatic performance occasion with its related but different contemporary literary manifestation.⁵⁹⁰ Pindar's professional vocation, which he perceived to be a recent development (*I.* 2.1-7), is a pervasive concern. The opening image of the ledger (1-3), financial language (ὀφείλων, 3; χρέος, 8; τόκος, 9),⁵⁹¹ and a myth about breach of contract (λάτριον ... μισθόν, 28-9; ἀλιτόξενον, 6→ξεναπάτας, 34)⁵⁹² leave little doubt that this is a commissioned work. Indeed, 'forgetting' (3) perhaps represents the polite but transparent excuse of a professional busied with other commissions (cf. *I.* 1.1-10, Verdenius (1987-88) i.20, Race (1997) i.164). In 476 Pindar's ledger included some of the most powerful men in the Greek world (*Olympians* 1-3) as well as a youth from Epizephyrean Locri.

There were no hired poets like Pindar in the days of the first Olympic games. As the victor is now no longer a man who happened to be in Heracles' army but someone whose birth and training have led him to this moment (20-1), so the source of epinician celebration is now not merely

⁵⁸⁹ D. L. Burgess (1990) 277 mentions 'the primal epinician poet of the first Olympian games'. But the impersonal construction of line 76 (for which see Wilkins on Eur. *Heracl.* 401, K-G i.126-7) is pointedly vague.

⁵⁹⁰ The novel *Dithyramb* 2 is somehow connected to parallel celebrations on Olympus (5-8). Yet poetry evidently does not figure centrally in the divine scene. στοναχαί | μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί (12-13) look incompatible with verbal subtleties. χορευοίκασι (22) may contrast with σοφῶν ἐπέων (24).

⁵⁹¹ Cf. Norwood (1945) 111-12, Nassen (1975) 221, Verdenius (1987-88) *passim*, Kromer (1975) 423-5.

⁵⁹² Bernardini (1982) 64-8.

amateur performers but a professional poet devoted to his craft. This development is not nostalgically depicted as lamentable.

Like *Isthmian* 2, *Olympian* 10 transcends the commercialism of its opening without dissembling its own commercial nature.⁵⁹³ Pindar provides a superabundance of praise above the letter of his contract (9-12) in an expression of friendship (φίλαν ... ἐκ χάριν, 12; cf. Kurke (1991) 234). As his poem travels back in time to the first Olympic celebration, it returns to the emotions underlying that paradigmatic event and all comastic revels. *Olympian* 10 closes by vividly and exceptionally reporting the speaker's experience at the games (100-4)⁵⁹⁴ and stressing motives of admiration and desire rather than contract.⁵⁹⁵ Pindar, it turns out, remembers far more than some letters in his ledger.

On the day of Hagesidamus' victory Pindar of Thebes claims to have been present at Olympia where the first Olympic epinician celebration once took place (τέμενος 76; βωμόν παρ' Ὀλύμπιον, 101). His sophisticated ode, however, did not debut there on that night but was long delayed. The gap between triumph and celebration, at first depicted as blameworthy (1-8), is subsequently refigured. By identifying his poem with the 'interest' (τόκος, 9) owed to the victor,⁵⁹⁶ Pindar implies that 'the quality of his song will correspond to the length of time it has been delayed' (Kromer (1976) 428). This 'interest' of literary quality is tied to the afterlife of the poem. Pindar's τόκος (9) is at once interest and, metaphorically, a child (LSJ⁹ s.v. 2), who will survive the victor when this ode is remembered as a literary artefact (παῖς, 86; cf. D. L. Burgess

⁵⁹³ Kromer (1976) 421 sees a 'compromise'. D. L. Burgess (1990) 281: 'an erotic relationship has replaced a financial one'.

⁵⁹⁴ Compare and contrast *O.* 1.18-23, 8.19.

⁵⁹⁵ σπουδαῖ (97), ἀμφέπεσον (98), ἐρατόν (99), καλόν (103), ὄραι (104), Κυπρογενεῖ (105). Erotic descriptions of the victor are conventional (Von der Mühl (1964b), Nicholson (2001)) but *depict* real feelings (cf. Carey (1976) 26).

⁵⁹⁶ Gildersleeve (1885), Bundy (1986) 1, Verdenius (1987-88), Barrett (2007) 55; contrast Kabiersch (1999).

(1990) 279).

Olympian 10 initiates a dialogue between past and present. Pindar emphasises distinguishing features of his modern art and forefronts time-honoured features of its tradition. We misconstrue the ode if we neglect either how the author integrates his work into ancient practice or how he sets himself apart from the simplicity of the vanished past. Pindar does not apologise for his professionalism or rehabilitate the Mercenary muse; he demonstrates how his modern practice preserves the essence of epinician.

3. *Olympian* 9

Scholars have elucidated the juxtaposition between epinician celebration and literary epinician poetry in *Olympian* 9.⁵⁹⁷ But they have largely neglected the historical dimension of the comparison between Pindar and Archilochus.⁵⁹⁸ The opening reference to Archilochus is but the first of many encounters with the poetic past in this ode. *Olympian* 9 as a whole articulates an implicit argument for poetry which brings the heritage of the canon to bear on present concerns. This ode is among Pindar's most complex meditations on the tradition and his own place within it.

In the first lines different time frames run in parallel: in the recent past Epharmostus has been celebrated with an old song; now he will be celebrated with a modern song. Archilochus is associated with the proverbially old Cronus (Κρόνιον, 3; cf. Dover (1968) on Ar. *Nub.* 398); Pindar is associated with the younger Zeus (Δία, 6). Like the erotic poets of *Isthmian* 2, Archilochus serves as a counterpoint for an extended opening contrast that clarifies Pindar's different place in literary history and contemporary social life (1-8):

⁵⁹⁷ Bernardini (1983) 123-4, K. A. Morgan (1993) 3-4, Pavlou (2008) 541-5.

⁵⁹⁸ Pavlou (2008) is the exception. I follow in attempting to integrate Pindar's allusions into a coherent reading, although mine is different.

Τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος
 φωνᾷεν Ὀλυμπίαι, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδῶς,
 ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι
 κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμότῳ σὺν ἑταίροις·
 ἀλλὰ νῦν ἑκαταβόλων Μοικᾶν ἀπὸ τόξων
 Δία τε φοινικοτερόπαν σεμνόν τ' ἐπίνειμαι
 ἀκρωτήριον Ἰλίδος
 τοιοῖδε βέλεσεν ...

The piece in question was evidently ascribed to Archilochus because of its metre and perceived antiquity: τήνελλα καλλίνικε | χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλειε, | αὐτός τε καϊόλαος, αἰχμητὰ δύο (324 spur.). Pindar's description of this μέλος ... καλλίνικος (1-2) brings out broad commonalities with his own work, but *Olympian* 9 is obviously more sophisticated in many respects. τριπλόος (2) probably denotes a repetitive refrain⁵⁹⁹ alien to the metrically and verbally unique choral literary epinician, which prizes complexity (e.g. *P.* 10.53-4, *N.* 7.77-9). τοιοῖδε βέλεσεν (8) evokes such fundamental formal and qualitative distinctions. *Olympian* 9, like Archilochus' song, spotlights Heracles' martial prowess (29-35) but presents him in a more provocative light as a θεομάχος.

The literary epinician addresses a need for lasting commemoration rather than immediate celebration (cf. Bundy (1986) 11). Archilochus' song once 'sufficed' (ἄρκεσε, 3) to fill a concrete need tied to a definite place and time (φωνᾷεν Ὀλυμπίαι, 2); Pindar's artefact will travel and last.⁶⁰⁰ His words are launched from the bow of the 'far-shooting Muses' (ἑκαταβόλων Μοικᾶν ἀπὸ τόξων, 5) because they interest an audience wider than the victor's friends who accompanied him to the games with a personal interest in his success (21-5).⁶⁰¹

⁵⁹⁹ M. L. West (1974) 138-9; cf. Gerber (2002). On refrains, which are often found in subliterate verse, see Gow (1950) on Theoc. 8.30, Silk (1980) 114.

⁶⁰⁰ πέμψω (25) looks both to the rest of the composition and to subsequent reception (cf. Pfeijffer (1999b) 57-8).

⁶⁰¹ Pavlou (2008) 544-5. Contrast Simpson (1969b) 115, for whom the bow represents speech κατὰ καιρόν.

ἐγὼ δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν
 μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων αἰοδαῖς,
 καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου
 θᾶσσον καὶ ναὸς ὑποπτέρου παντᾷ
 ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν ...

Dissemination through space precedes and implies durability through time (see p. 47n132). ἵππου ... ναός (23-4) connote land and sea, the polar halves of παντᾷ (24).⁶⁰² ἀγγελίαν (25) points to secondary audiences interested in this epinician as a source of news. Rapid dispersal (23-4) assumes an eager reception. Poetry outstrips paradigms of speed probably because it multiplies in its dispersal and hence may travel faster than any single physical thing (cf. ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος, *N.* 5.2). Archilochus' song, 'una sorta di *urràh* non personalizzato' (Bernardini (1983) 124) suitable to any victory (C 1f), is already universally familiar;⁶⁰³ Pindar's poem, linked to a unique recent event, will be of universal interest for its artistry. Archilochus' proto-epinician serves as a precedent for the canonical status which *Olympian* 9 aims to achieve and also provides a foil bringing out Pindar's superior claim to the attention of contemporary audiences.

The extended reception envisioned in this passage is explicitly linked to the pleasure of secondary audiences. A conditional clause follows (26-8):

εἰ cύν τινι μοιριδίῳι παλάμαι
 ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον·
 κεῖναι γὰρ ὅπασαν τὰ τέρπν'.

Pindar here highlights the process of composition (see, in general, Miller (1993a)). An audience is invited to observe how he cultivates the garden of the Charites over the course of the ode so as to reap a certain type of poetic flourishing (cf. 48-9). Later in the poem, Pindar prays for qualities belonging to the 'fated skill' necessary for dissemination: inventive fluidity (εὐρησιεπής, 80),

⁶⁰² Kemmer (1903) 160: 'Erde und Meer bilden das Erdganze, die Welt'; cf. Thgn. 237-8, *I.* 4.41-2, *N.* 6.48-9, *B.* 13.180-1.

⁶⁰³ The article in καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος (2) suggests shared knowledge (see p. 191n581).

expressive power (ἀμφιλαφής δύναμις, 82), creative boldness (τόλμα, 82).⁶⁰⁴ Such virtues are what Pindar's subject requires and what his audiences want to hear. None are to be found in Archilochus' proto-epinician.

Creative engagement with the tradition is itself another quality that differentiates Pindar's self-conscious composition from Archilochus' exuberant chant, which does not implicate its audience in an immanent literary history any more than the Rhodian swallow song does (848 *PMG*). The opening comparison with Archilochus' proto-epinician is only the first and most explicit of numerous allusions to earlier poetry in *Olympian* 9. Pindar transmits news of recent victory but also transmits material already covered in older works familiar to many among his audiences. A gnome alluding to Simonides introduces a narrative section referring to the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, the cyclic *Cypria*, and the Homeric *Iliad*. This intertextual *tour de force* advances an implicit argument for how the literary tradition ought to be continued in the present.

Using imagery related to the metaphor of the Charites' garden, Pindar endorses a preference for new poems *tout court* but simultaneously refers to older poetry: αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων | νεωτέρων (48-9). The passage of time improves certain wines⁶⁰⁵ but does not increase literary quality. On the contrary, new poems are, like fresh flowers, desirable for their newness (cf. 5-6, 25). This gnome looks to a passage of Simonides preserved in the Pindaric scholia (C 74b):⁶⁰⁶ ἐξελέγχει νέος οἶνος οὐπω | <τὸ> πέρυσι δῶρον ἀμπέλου· | κούρων δ' μῦθος ὅδε κενεόφρων (Simon. 602, with an uncertain restoration of the last line).⁶⁰⁷ There is no

⁶⁰⁴ Daring linked to newness: *N.* 8.20-1, *Ar. Ran.* 99, *Ec.* 585, *Callim. Ia.* 13.19, *Enn. Ann.* 216 *Skutch*, *Lucr.* 1.66-7, *Catul.* 1.5, *Veg. G.* 1.40, 2.174-6, *Hor. Carm.* 3.25.18-20, *Ov. Am.* 2.1.11.

⁶⁰⁵ See Brink (1963-82) on *Hor. Epist.* 2.1.34-5 (a reference to our passage).

⁶⁰⁶ Lattimore (1945) 231, Molyneux (1992) 259-63, Pavlou (2008) 556, D'Angour (2011) 102.

⁶⁰⁷ MSS: ὁ δὲ μῦθος· ὁ δὲ κενεόφρων· κούρων δέ. I tentatively print Page's reconstruction, relegated to his apparatus. Producing similar sense, Poltera (2008) prints μῦθος ὅδε κενεόφρων. But I doubt that κούρων is an inept gloss.

reason to doubt authenticity. Though the accompanying vignette is biographical fiction (contrast Gentili *et al.* (2013) on *O.* 9.48-9),⁶⁰⁸ the scholia have noticed a genuine intertext. Poetry is often likened to wine (see Nünlist (1998) 203-5), but a *topos* is insufficient to explain the deeper similarities between these passages.

Olympian 9 was probably composed after the end of Simonides' career (Molyneux (1992) 259-63; cf. Hutchinson (2001) 288). We can thus infer the direction of the intertextual connection. Pindar's mention of old and new poetry would trigger his audiences' knowledge of previous works. Simonides seems to express a thought in basic *agreement* with Pindar's gnome (cf. Page in his apparatus, Gerber (2002) 45, Poltera (2008) 557-9). It appears that Simonides quotes someone denigrating new wine and then rejects this sentiment.⁶⁰⁹ He would then be defending the 'new'. Simonides was presumably, as the Pindaric scholia suggest, concerned not with wine but with poetry. Probably this was clear from context.

If this reconstruction has not taken a wrong step, *O.* 9.48-9 emerges as a highly complex instance of Pindaric intertextuality. Pindar would be seconding Simonides' approval of new poetry but also 'correcting' him on the superiority of old wine. The rhetorical move of echoing and then critiquing a previous authority recalls Simonides himself (cf. 542, 581; cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1395a, Easterling (1982) on Soph. *Trach.* 4-5).

In *Olympian* 9 a younger poet probably echoes with respect an older poet's endorsement of the new. The tradition demands novelty; Pindar answers the call. Past literature is also important to the narratives which this gnome introduces. The story of Deucalion and Pyrrha (41-66)

⁶⁰⁸ The story has no plausible origin in a reliable textual source but plausibly could exhibit a sort of false inference very common in the scholia (cf. Fairweather (1974) 239).

⁶⁰⁹ See Molyneux (1992) 259-63. The crucial question is whether μῦθος ὅδε refers backwards to the sentiment quoted or to something else. The former seems more likely (cf. ἄδε βούλα at 581.7, looking backwards to a sentiment being rejected). The scholia quote these lines as a self-contained expression.

provides a corrective to the aborted tale of Heracles battling the gods (29-35). This new myth depicts a different configuration of the relationship between men and gods: now the Olympians are vastly more powerful but also beneficent (Διὸς αἵαι, 42; Ζηνὸς τέχναις, 52). Pindar emphasises the chronological antiquity of his theme (Πρωτογενείας, 41; πρῶτον, 44; ἀρχᾶθεν, 55) and also its literary pedigree. The *dicitur* motif (λέγοντι μάν, 49) here points to a well-known antecedent, the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*.⁶¹⁰ Pindar assimilates himself to this genealogical poem by drawing a genealogical conclusion from his narrative (ὕμέτεροι πρόγονοι, 54).⁶¹¹ While ‘it is difficult ... to pinpoint [Pindar’s] personal contribution to the story’ (226), D’Alessio (2005), who rightly insists on an allusion to the *Catalogue*, identifies plausible lines of innovation.⁶¹²

The story of Achilles and Patroclus on the Mysian campaign (70-9) follows the myth of Deucalion and Pyrrha in chronological sequence. *Olympian* 9 here again draws on another well-known source, the *Cypria* (arg. 7 GEF; cf. M. L. West (2013) 106-7).⁶¹³ Pindar’s version, furthermore, foreshadows Patroclus’ death as depicted in the *Iliad*, a memorable and pivotal episode in another canonical poem.⁶¹⁴ Mention of Patroclus’ first entry into battle looks forward to his last (οὐλίῳι ... ἐν Ἄρει, 76). Emphasis on Achilles’ spear (79) recalls the wounding and cure of Telephus (*Cypria* arg. 7 GEF) but also how Patroclus could not carry this extraordinary weapon into the fight on the day of his death (*Il.* 16.140-4). On that day, contrary to his friend’s orders as reported by Pindar, Patroclus entered the fray without Achilles: παραγορεῖτο μὴ ποτε | σφετέρᾳς ἄτερθε ταξιοῦσθαι | δαμασιμβρότου αἰχμᾶς (*O.* 9.77-9); cf. μὴ κύ γ’ ἄνευθεν ἐμεῖο λιλαίεσθαι

⁶¹⁰ D’Alessio (2005) 220-7, Pavlou (2008) 555.

⁶¹¹ Miller (1993a) 134n53 persuasively refers this to the Opountians as a group. Epharmostus’ family is not mentioned. The Hesiodic *Catalogue* was likely of special interest to those claiming descent from figures treated therein (M. L. West (1985) 8-9, R. L. Fowler (1998)).

⁶¹² Cf. Gerber (2002) 46, Miller (1993a) 132.

⁶¹³ Hes. fr. 165.8-14 also mentions the campaign.

⁶¹⁴ I. C. Rutherford (1997) 55, Rengakos (2000) 102.

πολεμίζειν | Τρωὶ φιλοπτολέμοισιν (*Il.* 16.89-90). The Pindaric scholia perceptively cite this Iliadic passage (C 115d). Pindar's narrative ends on a portentous, forward-looking note (ἐξ οὗ, 76; μή ποτε, 77) that invites an audience to think of later events in the saga, a technique common in Bacchylides.⁶¹⁵ A hint of a dark, inappropriate next step in his narrative helps to motivate a transitional prayer to proceed appropriately (πρόσφορος, 81; see p. 290).⁶¹⁶

Pindar, it seems, is approaching an Alexandrian level of intertextual sophistication. There may be yet another layer here. Archilochus also treated the Mysian expedition (see Obbink (2005, 2006)) but emphasises those who fled, not those who stood their ground. According to Archilochus, Telephus alone put the Greeks to route (μοῦνος ... ἐφόβησε πολλὸν στρατ[όν, 5-6); according to Pindar, Achilles and Patroclus alone stood their ground while the rest fled (ἔστα cὺν Ἀχιλλεῖ | μόνος, 71-2). The presence of Heracles in Archilochus' version (22-5) and an emphasis on the power of the gods overcoming even the strongest men (θεοῦ κρατερῆ[ς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, 1; μοῖρα θεῶν ἐφόβει, 7) suggests further lines of contact and discontinuity with *Olympian* 9 as a whole. Pindar's poem cites Heracles standing to face the gods in battle (29-35) and meditates on the relationship between mortal and divine.⁶¹⁷ There is reason to think that Archilochus is relevant to more than just the opening lines of *Olympian* 9.

The first narrative of *Olympian* 9 (29-35) also probably engages the mythological tradition. I see no compelling reason to associate Heracles' battle(s) against the gods with a particular text or genre,⁶¹⁸ but Pindar is unlikely to have invented this tale from whole cloth only in order to

⁶¹⁵ Cf. B. 5.176-8, 16.30-5, 18.60, Burnett (1985) 146-7, Carey (1999) 20, D. L. Cairns (2010) 244.

⁶¹⁶ Cf. O. 13.94 (παρὰ σκοπόν), N. 5.15, B. 5.176-8, Race (1980), Miller (1993a) 138.

⁶¹⁷ Note ἦρειδε ... ἦρειδε (O. 9.30-2), of the gods fighting Heracles, and Archilochus' ἦρειδε (25), of Telephus fighting the Greeks.

⁶¹⁸ The story has been linked with Archilochus' chant (Simpson (1969b) 119; challenged by Carney (1980c) 153n42) and epic (Pavlou (2008) 550).

dismiss it forthwith as impious.⁶¹⁹ The rhetoric of revisionism suggests that he retells and then rejects a tale (or tales) which had seemed acceptable to others in the past.

We cannot recover the vanished pieces of the background against which some of Pindar's references once derived their fullest meaning. We can, however, discern that *Olympian* 9 is intensely interested in revisiting and revising the past. More significant than any single allusion is the attitude toward the literary heritage embodied in the ode as a whole. This poem is at once traditional and novel, incorporating earlier poetry but forging a new path. Indeed, enthusiasm for newness is a stable facet of the Greek poetic tradition, which Pindar endorses in his turn.⁶²⁰ As the victor has already been celebrated with an older form of epinician praise but still requires a new ode, so the poet's mythological themes have already been treated in previous poems but may be revived and recombined in a fresh, different, and perhaps superior form.

New poems always have an intrinsic claim special sorts of attention (25, 48-9; cf. Miller (1982) 113), but the best older works are not forgotten. Pindar manifestly has a conception of canonical works with abiding appeal. Yet he is not burdened by deference to an inherently superior past. His work engages with and even perhaps aims to surpass poems that have achieved the enduring reception to which his own offering aspires. Entering into conversation with the canon, *Olympian* 9 advances a claim to join it.⁶²¹

⁶¹⁹ Molyneux (1972) 301-13.

⁶²⁰ See Lavecchia (2000a) 134, D'Angrou (2011) 57-6, 98-9 for relevant passages.

⁶²¹ Pavlou (2008) 564: Pindar 'makes himself part of the tradition'.

VII. The Epinician Present

We turn from the distant past of epinician to its more recent history in the literary culture of Pindar's day. This chapter gathers and analyses different sorts of allusions and draws conclusions from each type. Section 1 examines references to the epinician genre, to Pindar's career, to patrons' history of patronage, to other praise poets, and to revels at the games. These categories overlap but provide a useful framework for productive comparisons. Repetition is avoided. A conclusion synthesises preceding subsections. The chapter closes with a reading of *Nemean* 6 (Section 2). This ode negotiates a two-fold legacy consisting of both previous epinician celebrations for the Bassidae and previous epic poems glorifying the Aeacidae.

By examining how Pindar's poems contextualise themselves within a living practice, we can enrich our understanding of many passages and win insight into the literary environment in which these odes found meaning for their first audiences. The production and reception of literary works is a historically situated institutional practice.⁶²² This practice is a frequent object of self-reflexive attention in Pindar's work. An interpretative community, which stretches beyond the bounds of the victor's home community, is an important context for understanding these poems.

1. Generic References.

Pindar draws on his audiences' knowledge of epinician as a type. An appeal to generically specific criteria of evaluation presumes a background of convention as shared knowledge already

⁶²² Lamarque and Olsen (1994) 255-6: 'a text is identified as a literary work by recognizing the author's intention that the text is produced and meant to be read within the framework of conventions defining the practicing (constituting the institution) of literature ... An institutional practice, as we understand it, is *constituted* by a set of conventions and concepts which both regulate and *define* the actions and products involved in the practice'.

established at the time of Pindar's earliest epinician: ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄνωτος ὕμνων | ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλιττα θύνει λόγον (*P.* 10.53-4; cf. *P.* 11.41-5, Lanata (1963) 103). Many other passages, like this one, use genre-defining language to reflect on the obligations of epinician.⁶²³ In μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων | Μοῖττα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ (*N.* 1.11-12) the verb connotes desire (cf. *N.* 3.7) but also habit (cf. *B.* 13.204, LSJ⁹ s.v. II).⁶²⁴ Elsewhere reference to the 'much-celebrated' Olympic precinct (ἐν πολυμνήτῳ Διὸς ἄλσει, *N.* 2.5) points up established generic ties. Like the description of Delphi elsewhere as ὁμφαλὸν παρ' ᾠοίδιμον (*P.* 8.59), this description evokes Olympic epinician celebrations but is not necessarily so limited in reference.⁶²⁵ As a matter of course, poems in honour of victors migrate from Olympia to meet wider audiences: τᾶς (sc. Pisa) ἄπο | θεόμοροι νίκοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ᾠοιδαί, | ὧι τι ... (*O.* 3.9-10).⁶²⁶ Answering Pisa's demand for celebratory song (9) Pindar continues a tradition, just like the Ἑλλανοδίκας (12) who continues the tradition of the games (κραίνων ἐφετμὰς Ἡρακλέος προτέρας, 11). An Olympic epinician is as traditional as the Olympic crown (11-15), another time-honoured μνᾶμα (15).

Lasting poetic praise is secured for Olympic victors: ἀφθόνητος δ' αἶνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαις | οὗτος ἄγκειται (*O.* 11.7-8).⁶²⁷ Epinician generally charms the victor's pains to forgetfulness (*N.* 4.1-8). Bacchylides moves from gnomic meditation to his own performance by appealing to a universal: πέφαται θνατοῖσι νίκας | ὅς τε]ρον εὐφροσύνα (10.52-3; cf. *N.* 3.7-8). Discerning audiences of praise prefer concise treatment (ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς, *P.* 9.78 with Schroeder (1922), Young

⁶²³ *O.* 2.47, 3.6, 8.75, *P.* 10.6, *N.* 1.7, *I.* 5.54, 6.58.

⁶²⁴ Cf. φιλέοισιν (*P.* 3.18), where both enjoyment and habit (οἶα, 18) heighten pathos.

⁶²⁵ Cf. *Pae.* 6.14-17, Philodamus Scarpheus p. 166 *CA* line 19, both looking primarily to cultic poetry.

⁶²⁶ Probably songs move from Pisa because the Olympics are their theme (cf. *O.* 1.8-9, *P.* 5.105-7, 6.5-9, *N.* 3.83-4), not because they are performed there.

⁶²⁷ Barrett (2007) 56 on ἄγκειται (8): 'the word serves as perfect passive of ἀνατίθημι, properly "set up" when you dedicate an offering or monument. The praise is not something transitory, uttered and then forgotten'.

(1983b), Race (1990) 80-1; cf. *P.* 1.81-2). Many generalisations about poetry are less specific to epinician but presume an audience familiar with broadly similar works (e.g. ἔργοις δὲ καλοῖς ἔσοπτρον ἱκάμεν ἐνὶ cὺν τρόπῳ, *N.* 7.14). Maxims about enduring poetic glory presume knowledge of precedent, however generally conceived (e.g. *O.* 11.4-6, *N.* 8.40-2, *B.* 9.81-7). In *Olympian* 7 the custom of choral praise (ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζῳθάλμιος ἀδυμελεῖ | θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοις τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν, 11-12) serves as a foil for the current epinician celebration of the remarkable *periodonikes* Diagoras (καί νυν, 13; cf. *O.* 1.14-23).

As at *O.* 10.24 (θέμιτες), Pindar sometimes explicitly refers to epinician as a tradition.⁶²⁸ Some of these passages closely associate the ode with the κῶμος, which was in fact traditional. Some passages, like *Olympian* 10 as a whole, approximate epinician to cultic ritual, which was quintessentially traditional and perceived as such (e.g. *Pae.* 4.46-8). In *Olympian* 13 Zeus is entreated to 'accept' the present poem both as a dedication and as a revel: δέξαι τέ οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμόν, τὸν ἄγει (sc. the victor) πεδίων ἐκ Πίσας, | πενταέθλοι ἅμα σταδίου νικῶν δρόμον (29-30). Here δέξαι (29) combines welcoming a κῶμος (cf. ἔπεccιν, 25, *P.* 5.22, Heath (1988) 189-90, Agócs (2012) 210) and accepting a crown as a dedication (cf. *O.* 4.8-9, 6.98, 8.10). ἄγει (29) combines carrying away spoils (cf. *P.* 4.161, 9.75) and leading a revel (cf. *P.* 3.73). The performance of the literary victory ode is fictionally presented as the organic continuation of a revel which began at Olympia and now reaches its destination (cf. *N.* 9.1-3). Customary celebration contrasts with the unprecedented achievement celebrated (30-1). Tradition and invention, central themes of *Olympian* 13, are here programmatically united (cf. 14-22, 67-9, 80-2).

⁶²⁸ Cf. Bundy (1986) 10-11, 42.

Elsewhere Zeus is asked to honour a customary Olympian epinician (τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν, *O.* 7.88) by enabling the ode to achieve its goal of securing the victor's reputation (89-90). τεθμὸν (88) serves as a *hypomnesis* reminding the games' tutelary deity of earlier Olympic epinicians. In *Nemean* 4 the rule of his genre urges the poet to curtail his mythological narrative: τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός (33 with Miller (1983) 205-8). Pindar is not operating with a manual of epinician style (Carey (1980c) 147, Agócs (2012) 197), but a tendency to curtail long mythological narrative and praise contemporaries is a real generic feature.

In *Olympian* 8 Pindar reflects on his generically specific task (ἄωτον ... ἐπίνικον, 75) and then presents his work as an iteration of a rite: ἔστι δὲ καὶ τι θανόντεσσιν μέρος | κὰν νόμον ἐρδομένων (77-8). This likens epinician to cultic practice and to sacrifice in particular.⁶²⁹ Religious overtones buttress a claim to open up a potential line of communication with the dead (79-84; cf. Segal (1985) 209-10, Kurke (1991) 69). *P.* 5.96-103 similarly approximates the outpouring of epinician to ritual libations for the dead (δρόσῳ μαλθακᾷ | ῥανθειᾶν κόμων ὑπὸ χεύμασιν, 99-100; cf. Currie (2005) 236). *Pythian* 6 opens by drawing attention to a traditional background linked to a religious setting. ἀναπολίζομεν (3) probably means 'plough again' rather than simply 'plough'.⁶³⁰ If one understands this sense and takes the verb of motion with the participle of motion (ὀμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου | χθονὸς ἐκ ναίων προκοιχόμενοι, 3-4), as is natural, this passage points to a tradition of Pythian epinicians in particular: this poem reiterates an estab-

⁶²⁹ Gildersleeve (1885), Farnell (1930-2), Kurke (1991) 66; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 417: ἔρδων ἱερὰ καλὰ κατὰ νόμον (with West (1966)), LSJ⁹ s.v. ἔρδω 2.

⁶³⁰ LSJ⁹ s.v., Schroeder (1922), R. W. B. Burton (1962) 16, Gentili *et al.* (1995); contrast Slater s.v. Carey (1981) on *N.* 7.104 holds that the verb means simply 'plough' since it is accompanied by iterative adverbs there and at Soph. *Ph.* 1238 (where see Jebb (1898)). The adverbs may be emphatic.

lished course of song. Ritual overtones (Ἀκούσατ', 1),⁶³¹ suited to imaginative setting (νάιον, 4), connote iteration. *Pythian* 6 was probably not first performed at Delphi,⁶³² but it metaphorically evokes the κῶμος to Apollo's temple⁶³³ much as *Olympian* 8 evokes a revel procession in Olympia (τόνδε κῶμον καὶ στεφαναφορίαν δέξαι, 10). Unlike the traditional spontaneous victory revel, however, *Pythian* 6 will endure as a landmark in the literary landscape (5-18; cf. *O.* 9.1-28).

Pindar is interested in *creating* a sense of the epinician past.⁶³⁴ Although his rhetoric of traditionality is parasitic on realities of past epinician celebration and past choral poetry, several of the passages discussed above might reasonably be thought to have an element of exaggeration or even fictionality (e.g. *O.* 3.9-10). Professional literary epinician poetry, which was very probably relatively new (see VI.1), vests itself with the authority of antiquity.

Some recent Pindaric scholarship aims to isolate unique features of individual performances. The poems, however, depict their occasion as anything but a unique affair. References to epinician tradition create a tone of solemnity and high dignity. The poet continues a practice of accepted worth with a long history linked to the history of prestigious games. A certain sense of a primordial rite being re-enacted also enables Pindar's work to emerge as novel. References to genre guide audiences' reactions. Invocations of generic precedent presume, and also help to create, an audience which is attuned to convention and hence appreciative of innovation. Bundy's (1986) 92 exhortation that 'the study of Pindar must become a study of genre' has good textual

⁶³¹ Contrast Schroeder (1922). Cf. Dodds (1960) on Eur. *Ba.* 68-70, Nisbet and Rudd (2004) on Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.2.

⁶³² Morrison (2007a) 42-3, Eckerman (2011a) 1-4, Clear (2013) 41; compare and contrast Neumann-Hartmann (2009a) 34-5, Athanassaki (2012).

⁶³³ Cf. *P.* 8.18-20 with Gentili *et al.* (1995), Pfeijffer (1999a), Neumann-Hartmann (2009a) 64. Κίρραθεν (19) and Ἀπόλλωνος (18) imply movement to Apollo's temple. Apollo welcomed the victor at Delphi as Hesychia welcomes him on Aegina (δέκευ, 5→ἔδεκτο, 19). As often the literary epinician and the epinician revel are brought into parallel.

⁶³⁴ Cf. Scodel (2002) 32: 'traditionality does not depend entirely on objective tradition. It is a cultural construct, the social memory of the past'.

support. These poems are meant to be interpreted against similar works. In this sense Pindar's epinician poetry 'contains within itself a *manual for reading*, a set of implicit instructions on how it may best be used' (Landy (2012) 12).

2. Auto-citations

Pindar sometimes alludes to his own history as an author.⁶³⁵ The narrator is the most interesting character in epinician; he has a backstory. References to a proven authorial reputation draw on previous victory odes— Pindar's most frequent source of commissions, representing a fourth of his Alexandrian edition— but are not necessarily so limited in scope. The poet's career figures not so much as a developing narrative, as it does in Horace (Feeney (2009)) or Callimachus (Kerkhecker (1999) 287), but rather in the fact of a widely recognised pre-eminence.⁶³⁶ One sees a man standing at the summit and so imagines his climb.

At *P.* 4.248, πολλοῖσι δ' ἄγῃμαί σοφίας ἐτέροις, the perfect highlights an established position of prominence (Gentili *et al.* (1995)) continued in this poem, in which Pindar advises the king of Cyrene almost as his equal (cf. γνῶθι νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν, 263). Pindar's prayer at *O.* 1.115b-16 is to continue doing what he is now doing: ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις | ὁμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφαί καθ' Ἑλλανας ἐόντα παντῶι.⁶³⁷ In this ode Pindar is 'mingling with victors, foremost in skill among Hellenes everywhere'. ὁμιλεῖν (116) evokes the milieu of Hieron's court (cf. ἐς ἀφνεῶν ἰκομένους | μάκαιραν Ἰέρωνος ἐτίαν, 10-11; φίλαν ... τράπεζαν, 16-17 with Car-

⁶³⁵ On career criticism see the introduction and essays in Hardie and Moore (2010) and Hutchinson (2008) 251-2, 260-5, all on later poetry.

⁶³⁶ P. Wilson (1980) 102: 'Pindar ... plays an unusually conscious role in the founding of his own reputation'; D'Alessio (1994) 138: 'Pindar is undoubtedly the first creator of the biographical legend later developed around his figure'.

⁶³⁷ Gerber (1982) and Verdenius (1987-88) take the participle as a statement of fact, not part of the wish. They do not cite a parallel for the construction (note ἐόντα at *O.* 6.104).

ey (2007) 205). The poet has come to Sicily because Hieron, a singular judge of poetry (104 with Verdenius (1987-88); cf. *O.* 11.18, *B.* 5.3-6), has commissioned him. ‘Foremost in poetic skill’ is the condition that enables ‘mingling with victors throughout Greece’. τοccάδε (115b), parallel with τοῦτον ... χρόνον (115, ‘your lifetime’),⁶³⁸ looks forward to a continuing career. Other passages depict a well-known professional taking his theme from a range of potential commissions from across the Greek world (*P.* 1.75-80, *I.* 1.1-10, 5.28-35).

Though at pains to stress that lucre is not his sole motivation to praise the worthy, Pindar is hardly reticent about his professionalism (*P.* 2.67, 11.41-2 with Finglass (2007b), *N.* 4.75, *I.* 2.6-12, fr. 205 with Gentili (1981)). On the contrary, each contract is fresh proof of the publicly recognised worth of his skill (cf. Von Reden (1995)). The proem of *Nemean* 5 contrasts two vocations in the panhellenic economy of athletic fame, the sculptor of immobile statues and the poet skilled enough to create circulating works of universal interest (1-5). In *Pythian* 3 there is a contrast between the doctor Asclepius, paid to transgress the limits of his craft and revive the dead (κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεται, 54), and Pindar of Thebes, paid to provide a different sort of immortality through his own craft (τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί | ἄρμωσαν, 113-14; cf. τέκτονα νοδυνίας, 6, of Asclepius) and through his own μαλακαῖς ἐπαιοιδαῖς (51; cf. *N.* 8.49-51). In *Pythian* 2 Archilochus’ poverty (ἀμαχανία, 54; see VIII.2.C) and the following contrastive gnome about wealth (56) call to mind Pindar’s professional success, which is embodied in this poem for the wealthiest man in Greek history (58-61).

Gestures towards proven authorial excellence are repeatedly linked to poetic immortality. Patrons hire Pindar to do what he has done before, namely to produce an enduring work. Already

⁶³⁸ Gerber (1982). Congruity between addressee and speaker features in many lyric endings (Hutchinson (2001) 254). ‘May I join victors whenever they win’ (Race (1997)) would be an unrealistic wish.

Ibycus advertises his own fame through song, that which brought him to his Samian patron's attention, and guarantees his addressee's fame, which will be perpetuated in this song (S151.46-8). Many epinicians pair closing references to poetic afterlife with biographical information about their creator as a historical personality.⁶³⁹

Bacchylides asks the Charites for broad appeal (Δόξαν ... πεισίμβροτον, 9.1-2) and reminds them of his privileged authorial status (Μουσᾶν γε ἰοβλεφάρων θεῖος προφ[άτ]ας, 3; cf. Theoc. 1.65). If they answer his prayer, Bacchylides' poem will reach future generations: καὶ τοῖς ἐπιγινόμενοις αἰεὶ πιφαύσκοι | cᾶν Νε]μέαι νίκαν (81-2). The literary excellence of his ode will enable it to survive the victor (82-7) with the help of the Muses (παρὰ δαίμοσι, 84→Μουσ[ᾶν, 87]).⁶⁴⁰ Elsewhere an opening invocation to the significantly-named Cleo looks to previous occasions on which she has inspired the poet (εὔθυνε Κλειοῖ | νῦν φρένας ἀμετέρας, | εἰ δὴ ποτε καὶ πάρος, 12.2-4, a common formula of prayer). In another poem Bacchylides' reputation (γασιῶτιν ἐκίνησεν λιγύφθογον μέλιccαν, 10.10),⁶⁴¹ what motivated his Athenian patron to commission him (9-10), is linked to his ability to delight a universal audience: ἐ[γ]χειρὲς ἔν' ἀθάνατον Μουσᾶν ἄγαλμα | ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποισιν εἶη | χάρμα (11-13; cf. Φή]μα, 1). Cean origins contrast with Hellenic reception (cf. Pind. *Dithy.* 2.23-6).

⁶³⁹ O. 10.91-105, P. 4.298-9, N. 3.76-84, I. 2.44-8, 6.74-5, B. 3.95-8, Calame (1995) 22-4, (2011) 126-8.

⁶⁴⁰ δαίμοσι (84) are perhaps the Muses in particular (cf. γνηρίων ὕμνων τυχόν, 83, expressing a necessary precondition for the permanence expressed by the main verb; O. 10.95-6, B. 3.92); if a deed is celebrated with excellent song, it remains as a permanent joy in the possession of the Muses. The Charites belong to the category of δαίμων' at O. 9.28.

⁵⁹³ From the archaic period onwards, geographical periphrases for authors connote reputations (H. Hy. 3.172, Simon. 19 W, Pind. fr. 140b, Krevans (1983) 205-6, D. Burton (2011) 66-7). On a more general level periphrastic denomination in place of a proper name may thematise shared knowledge of a well-known figure (e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 826-31).

Bacchylides 19 opens with a generalisation capped by its instantiation in an exceptional individual. A poet favoured by the Muses and Charites can produce ‘ambrosial’ works that last (1-8):

Πάρεστι μυρία κέλευθος
ἀμβροσίων μελέων,
 ὅς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων λά-
 χησι δῶρα Μουσᾶν,
 ἰοβλέφαροί τε κ'όρῃαι
 φερεστέφανοι Χάριτες
 βάλωσιν ἀμφὶ τιμὰν
 ὕμνοισιν.

Bacchylides fits this general description but excels to a unique degree. He has received a superlative gift from the Muses (δῶρα Μουσᾶν, 4→παρὰ Καλλιόπας λα|χοῖσαν ἔξοχον γέρας, 13-14). Through the influence of the Charites, his work has garnered him exceptional prestige (εὐαίνετε Κηῖα μέριμνα, 11; cf. O. 1.30-1).⁶⁴²

εὐαίνετε (11) points to the same reputation which elsewhere Bacchylides gestures towards in a metaphor: he is an eagle ἀρί|γνωτος {μετ'} ἀνθρώποις ἰδεῖν (5.29-30). The extended simile (16-30) evokes the present journey of his poem through space from Ceos to Hieron's Sicilian court (10-12). Inferior poets, those not selected for this prestigious commission (πεῖθομαι εὐμαρέως, 195) by the foremost judge of poetry in the world (cf. 3-6), yield to the Bacchylidean eagle (22-3). He gives glory to Hieron (191-7), but also enjoys glory in his own right (χρυσαμπυκος Οὐρανίας | κλεινός⁶⁴³ θεράπων, 13-14; cf. B. 3.96-8). Like the canonical Hesiod (πρόπολος | Μουσᾶν, 192-3), he has a privileged relationship to the Muses (13-14). Like Hesiod

⁶⁴² On the relationship between the Charites (who bestow charm) and the Muses (who bestow truth) see Bundy (1986) 7-8, Race (1990) 125, 185, MacLachlan (1993) 103, Braswell (1999) on N. 9.54-5.

⁶⁴³ Cf. ἀοιδός ... περικλυτός, Od. 1.325 ≈ 8.83 ≈ 521. Housman's καινός yields inferior sense. The poet's composition may be described as novel (cf. B. 19.9), but not he himself. This passage hardly suggests that Bacchylides is a new arrival on the scene.

(Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ, 191), Bacchylides enjoys a reputation far beyond his home community (ἀπὸ | ζαθέας νάκου, 10-11).

Besides references to a general reputation, there are also explicit allusions to specific parts of Pindar's oeuvre.⁶⁴⁴ *Isthmian* 1 looks to *Paean* 4 (see p. 17). At *I.* 2.30-2 Thrasybulus continues his father's custom of commissioning epinicians: οὐκ ἀγνώτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι | οὔτε κώμων, ὧ̃ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν, | οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδῶν. 'Neither revels nor songs' is hendiadys for 'revels accompanied by songs,' i.e. epinicians. 'Not unfamiliar' means, through polar litotes, 'very familiar' (cf. *N.* 1.22-4). This description, which is connected with the family's lasting fame for victory (28-9), implicates Pindar's previous ode for Xenocrates (*Pythian* 6) and Simonides' epinician for the same victory (513; cf. Nisetich (1971) 144) as well as *Olympian* 2 and *Olympian* 3 for Theron (23-9). The repute of this household, derived in part from these previous poems, makes it easy to praise them again (33-4).

At *I.* 6.62-4 a description of a family's cumulative epinician haul rounds off a victory catalogue: ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς φάος οἶαν μοῖραν ὕμνων | τὰν Ψαλυχιαδῶν δὲ πάτρην Χαρίτων | ἄρδοντι καλλίσται δρόκοι. This includes but is not limited to the present composition. οἶαν μοῖραν (62), looking back to the previous catalogue, connotes impressive quantity. The subject is Lampon's sons, not merely Phylacidas. The opening lines of this epinician (δεύτερον, 2; αὖτε, 5) refer to a previous epinician for Phylacidas' brother, *Nemean* 5.

In a Bacchylidean *encomium* for Hieron a *hypomnesis* to the Muse (εἰ καὶ | πρ]όσθεν ὕμνήσας, 20c.8-9) also reminds his audiences of a previous poem for the same patron, probably Bacchylides 4 (cf. Cingano (1991), Maehler (2004) 251-2). ἐμοὶ τότε κοῦραι[(fr. 20c.13) looks like a reference to past inspiration. Bacchylides 4 mentions Hieron being celebrated for a third

⁶⁴⁴ I here omit possible verbal allusions like οὐκ ἐλινύκοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν (*I.* 2.46) → ἐλινύκοντα ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' (*N.* 5.1).

equestrian Pythian victory: *τρίτον γὰρ παρ' [ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονός | Πυ[θ]ιονικός ἀ[εῖδε]ται* (4-5).⁶⁴⁵ The damaged lines 7-9 (especially with Snell's plausible supplements) look like a reference to a previous poem, probably Bacchylides 5.⁶⁴⁶

The biographical approach to the Pindaric first-person has, with reason, fallen from favour, in no small part due to Bundy (1986) and Lefkowitz (1991). Scholars generally no longer believe, for instance, that *P.* 11.52-3 is concerned to absolve Pindar in the eyes of his fellow Thebans from a perceived connection with tyranny. Yet the past experience of the first-person speaker *qua* author is often relevant (cf. D'Alessio (1994) 138), as the passages discussed above demonstrate. The distinguished poet's status as distinguished poet makes a substantive contribution to the meaning of his poems. In the odes we meet a 'multitude of conventional masks' (Bundy (1986) 35) but also an historical individual, who relates to his conventional masks in complex ways (cf. Morrison (2007b) 61-4). Though Pindar of Thebes is never named within his epinicians,⁶⁴⁷ the fact of his authorship is relevant to many of them. A career and a reputation tower in the background of individual odes.

What was it like to attend the debut performance of one of Pindar's works? Scholars are keen to investigate the influence of various performance circumstances on the poet's audiences, but one should not underestimate the degree to which the premiere of a work by a celebrated author would have *constituted* the occasion for those present (cf. the Corinthian sailors' excitement at hearing Arion: *Hdt.* 1.23-4). For a contemporary comparison one might think of a famous musical act hired to perform at a particularly lavish birthday party.

⁶⁴⁵ *παρ' ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονός* (4) is best construed with *Πυ[θ]ιονικός* (5), not *ἀ[εῖδε]ται* (5), as Eckerman (2012) 346-7 argues (cf. *N.* 3.17-18).

⁶⁴⁶ See Morrison (2007a) 88.

⁶⁴⁷ Contrast *Alcm.* 17, 39, *Alc.* 401b, *Sappho* 1.20, 65.5, 94.5, 133.

At least some among his first audiences were evidently familiar with Pindar's body of work, not merely his reputation. Passages referring to other Pindaric poems are always intelligible on their own terms but gain resonance from being contextualised within an oeuvre.⁶⁴⁸ This provides valuable internal evidence for the afterlife of epinician and supports an intertextual approach not unlike that pursued in Morrison's various publications. His work, however, has tended to focus on poems for the same or related individuals and their reception among specific local audiences.⁶⁴⁹ The study of connections between poems need not be so circumscribed. *Isthmian* 1 and *Paeon* 4 were commissioned for distant initial performance settings but can be profitably interpreted as a pair.

Focusing on performance will lead us to view each of Pindar's odes as a discrete event. The texts also support another approach: viewing each event as also part of a corpus and as part of a narrative of the author's career.⁶⁵⁰ To do so we need not necessarily speculate about linked performances of various poems (contrast e.g. Lidov (1974), Clay (2011) 344, Clear (2013)). Pindar conceived of earlier authors' works as forming something like a corpus, as his allusive practice shows.⁶⁵¹ 'Intertextuality and allusive art is a form of hermeneutic' (R. F. Thomas (2001)

⁶⁴⁸ The end of *Nemean* 7, on the standard apology thesis, would not be readily intelligible to audiences unfamiliar with *Paeon* 6. This counts against the theory. There is probably no reference to another Pindaric poem at *P.* 2.67-71 (*pace* e.g. Ferrari (2012) 166; Phillips (2013) 45-8 provides a doxography). I prefer to see an internal sectioning of Pindar's poem (cf. Simon. 11.19-20 W with Obbink (2001), *I.* 1.32-4, *N.* 7.77). Proponents of external reference do not explain how it would contribute to the train of thought. Line 72 focuses on the reception of *Pythian* 2, not another poem.

⁶⁴⁹ See, however, Morrison (2007a) 116-17, (2011) 250-1.

⁶⁵⁰ See already Morrison (2007a), Nicholson (2011), Clay (2011a), Athanassaki (2012), all following concerns different from those envisioned here.

⁶⁵¹ Pindar mentions the Homeridae (*N.* 2.1-3), who doubtlessly played a role in the establishment of a Homeric corpus. Cf. *πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριτεύουσιν αἰοδαί* (*H. Hy.* 3.173), envisioning a corpus. Some of Pindar's Homeric allusions combine references to multiple works: *N.* 7.20-30 (the *Odyssey* and the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships); *Paeon* 7b (the *Hymn to Apollo* and the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships). *Isthmian* 6 reacts to the Hesiodic corpus (cf. 66-8 and 35-54 with Hes. *Op.*

55), and we are justified in applying to Pindar hermeneutic strategies which he himself applies to other poets. If Pindar approaches other authors' work as a corpus, it is reasonable to infer that he could envision others approaching his work in a similar way. This evidently would not have been an absurd expectation. It is significant that the first recorded person to quote Pindar's *ipsissima verba* is reacting not only to the passage which he quotes but also to Pindar's oeuvre as a whole: Hdt. 3.38 combines a quotation of Pind. fr. 169a.1-4 with a more subtle allusion to fr. 215a.1-2, lines from a different poem on a related theme (so, convincingly, Ferrari (1991b)).

3. Patrons, Communities

As Pindar's epinicians highlight their author's experience *qua* author, so they highlight their patrons' experience *qua* patron. Often such references can be linked with other extant choral works. A poem for Hagesias notes that Hieron, Pindar and Bacchylides' most frequent patron (see Schade (2006)), is no stranger to praise poetry: ἀδύλογοι δέ νιν | λύραι μολπαί τε γινώσκοντι (*O.* 6.96-7).⁶⁵² In *Olympian* 1 a description of habitual sympotic performances in Hieron's court (ἀγλαΐζεται ... μουσικᾶς ἐν ᾠῳται, | οἷα παίζομεν φίλαν | ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν, 14-17) suggests lines of comparison and contrast with the framing epinician (cf. Morrison (2007a) 59-61).⁶⁵³ One thinks of sympotic poetry celebrating Hieron, perhaps including Pindar's own.⁶⁵⁴ It may be that the narrator of *Olympian* 1, like the Homeric Demodocus, hangs his lyre in the hall of a patron with whom he has a sustained relationship (17-18→*Od.* 8.67, 105). The victory ode

412 and [Hes.] fr. 250, respectively). Broad descriptions of earlier lyric authors' bodies of work: *P.* 2.54-6, *I.* 2.1-5.

⁶⁵² The antecedent of the pronoun is Hieron, not Syracuse (Race (1990) 76n47, Adorjányi (2014); *contra* Hutchinson (2001)).

⁶⁵³ K. A. Morgan (1993) 3 understands a contrast between professional epinician and amateur sympotic poetry. ἀγλαΐζεται (14), however, connotes resplendent glory and ᾠῳται (15) suggests quality. The verb is best taken as passive (Gerber (1982)).

⁶⁵⁴ Fr. 124d, 125, 126. Dates are uncertain.

has the same performance setting as this frequent sympotic poetry⁶⁵⁵ and makes conviviality an important theme⁶⁵⁶ but celebrates a unique, superlative victory, which the speaker has witnessed (18-19) and come to Sicily in order to memorialise (9-11).

Arcesilas has been celebrated in verse from his earliest days onward: ἔν τε Μοίαισι ποτανὸς ἀπὸ ματρὸς φίλας (P. 5.114).⁶⁵⁷ These lines recapitulate 6-8: κλυτᾶς | αἰῶνος ἀκρᾶν βαθμίδων ἄπο | σὺν εὐδοξίαι. The same ode gestures towards a generalised background of praise: ἄνδρα κεῖνον ἐπαινέοντι συνετοί· | λεγόμενον ἐρέω (107-8). Here συνετοί (107), like σοφοί elsewhere (Slater s.v. 1b), may suggest poets like Pindar, but the word is not clearly so limited in reference.⁶⁵⁸ In *Nemean* 4 Pindar mentions his current epinician commission (συνθέμενος, 75) and then describes a clan's sustained dedication to this genre: πάτραν ἴν' ἀκούομεν, | Τιμάραρχε, τεὰν ἐπινικίοισιν αἰοδαῖς | πόπολον ἔμμεναι (77-9). The first-person plural perhaps includes the Greek world⁶⁵⁹ and confirms that the family has achieved the fame that motivated their dedication to the genre. Elsewhere numerous gestures toward patrons' connoisseurship evoke past experience, not just as an audience of poetry but also as its subject.⁶⁶⁰ Thus Bacchylides crowns Hieron, perhaps the foremost individual patron of choral poetry in the Greek world, as the most qualified living judge of literary quality: γνώχη μὲν [i]οστεφάνων | Μοικᾶν γλυκ[ύ]δωρον ἄγαλμα, τῶν γε

⁶⁵⁵ Krummen (1990) 157-8, Carey (2001) 22, Morrison (2007a) 59.

⁶⁵⁶ Slater (1989) 491-2, Steiner (2002).

⁶⁵⁷ It would not greatly contribute to Arcesilas' praise to say that he was educated by his mother. Some older scholars thought that the king was himself a poet. The common metaphor of flight for fame (see Pearson (1917) on Soph. fr. 941.11) in close connection to athletic achievement (115-17) suggests that this refers to him as the subject of poetry.

⁶⁵⁸ B. 1.151-2 perhaps refers to poetry celebrating the victor's deceased father: [ε]ῦ δὲ λαχὼν [X]αρίτων | πολλοῖς τε θ[αυ]μασθεῖς βροτῶν (differently Jebb (1906), Maehler (1982-97)). Cf. Alc. 309, B. 3.71, 10.39, 19.3-4, anon. 1001 *PMG*, all of the poet or his subject. The following section meditates on poetic fame (159-84).

⁶⁵⁹ Cf. Neumann-Hartmann (2005) 135. If the first-person plural is equivalent to a first-person singular then the statement borders on inane.

⁶⁶⁰ O. 1.104, P. 3.80, 4.263, 6.49, I. 2.12, all of individuals and families who are the subject of multiple surviving choral works.

νῦν | αἶ τις ἐπιχθονίων, ὁρ|θῶς (5.3-6; cf. Maehler (1982-97) i.118, *O.* 1.104).⁶⁶¹

Pindar also highlights the literary résumé of whole communities. Civic choral culture is repeatedly linked with civic glory. Indeed, Pindar's odes sometimes reflect on their ability to shape the reputation of a city (see p. 33n85). Fifth-century lyric is concerned to communicate local identity to a Hellenic audience (cf. Nagy (1990) 67, Kowalzig (2007) 10). Cities, no less than individuals, had robust motives for wanting to extend their reputations through song (Hornblower (2011) 45-6). Presumably communities, no less than individuals, also helped ensure the continued afterlife of the poems that they commissioned. Descriptions of civic choral culture may hence connote not only an experienced premiere audience but also a subsequent afterlife.⁶⁶²

Aegina alone is repeatedly lauded for devotion to epinician in particular. The corpus of surviving victory odes amply justifies this praise.⁶⁶³ The victor is celebrated with *Nemean* 7 because he inhabits an island of enthusiasts: εὐδοξος αἰδέεται ᾠγένης μετὰ πενταέθλοισι. | πόλιν γὰρ φιλόμολπον οἰκεῖ | Αἰακιδᾶν (7.8-10). *I.* 9.7-8 describes the Aeginetans as expert masters of athletics and poetry: ταμίαι τε κοφροί | Μοικᾶν ἀγωνίων τ' ἀέθλων. In *Pythian* 8 mention of the victor's musical epinician revel at Delphi (Κίρραθεν ἔτεφανωμένον | υἱὸν ποῖαι Παρνακκίδι Δωριεῖ τε κώμῳ, 19-20) instantiates the following generalisation that Aegina has 'not fallen far from the Charites' (ἔπεσε δ' οὐ Χαρῖτων ἑκάς, 21), i.e. the island is often celebrated in verse (cf. *P.* 10.37-

⁶⁶¹ Ostentatious appeals to literary expertise are disproportionately common in odes for tyrants. Poetic culture for them may have had special ideological significance (cf. Aloni (1989) 121-2, Hubbard (2004) 81-2).

⁶⁶² Civic re-performances: Herington (1985) 56, Currie (2004) 66-9, (2011) 309-10. *I.* 7.1-20 implies that this poem will be especially remembered in Thebes. In *Isthmian* 5 the Aeacidae are continually honoured on Aegina in lyric (27-8, 34-5); Pindar's lyric poem honouring them may be continually remembered.

⁶⁶³ Aeginetan epinicians: Pindar: 11 of 44; Bacchylides: 2 of 16; Simonides: 507.

9).⁶⁶⁴ As a result, Aegina enjoys consummate fame consonant with its mythological heritage: τελέαν δ' ἔχει | δόξαν ἀπ' ἀρχαῖς (24-5). The substance and media of this reputation are explicated in the following sentence: πολλοῖσι μὲν γὰρ αἰδεῖται | νικαφόροις ἐν ἀέθλοις θρέψαι καὶ θοαῖς | ὑπερτάτους ἥρωας ἐν μάχαις (25-7). The present-tense αἰδεῖται (25) and emphasis on plurality shows that this refers to a performance tradition embodied in, but not limited to, the present poem. Pindar's new ode for a young victor flies beyond Aegina to join a tradition: ἴτω τεὸν χρέος, ὃ παῖ, νεώτατον καλῶν, | ἐμῇ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾷ (33-4; cf. ἀπ' ἀρχαῖς, 25; ἥρωας, 27; ἀνδράσιν, 28).⁶⁶⁵

A community's choral culture was a real point of collective pride.⁶⁶⁶ Often Pindar highlights the musico-poetic culture of a community without specific reference to epinician but with an emphasis on chorality that evinces the meta-traditional quality of the description.⁶⁶⁷ A continuing civic custom is enacted by the citizen performers of each ode. Ceos is recognised throughout Greece for athletic success and dedication to poetry exemplified in this composition performed on the island (*Pae.* 4.21-4). Hellenic athletics are paired with Hellenic poetry as matching sources of renown. It is hard to doubt the relevance of Simonides and Bacchylides and in particular their poems for fellow Ceans (Bacchylides 1, 2, 6, 7, 8?, 17; cf. I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 286, Fearn (2011c); note anon. *SLG* 460 (? Simonides)).

⁶⁶⁴ ποῖαι Παρνακκίδι (20)→ἀρεταῖς (22); κώμῳ (20)→Χαρίτων (21). Contrast Pfeijffer (1999a): 'this line poetically states that Aegina is a beautiful and pleasant island'. Pindar does not praise Aegina's landscape so vaguely elsewhere; he often highlights its poetic glory (see p. 111).

⁶⁶⁵ Contrast Pfeijffer (1999a): 'of the demonstrations of your nobility, the newest'.

⁶⁶⁶ Cf. Ibyc. S166.31, Soph. *OC* 691-2, Eur. *Med.* 830-3, [Eur.] *Rh.* 941-2, Ar. *Vesp.* 1060, *Eq.* 581-5, *Lys.* 1305-6, Kienzle (1936) 74-6, Pavese (1997) 328.

⁶⁶⁷ *O.* 10.14, 11.16-19, 13.22, *P.* 1.47-8 (projecting a future tradition), 10.37-9, *N.* 11.7, *I.* 9.7-9, fr. 198a, 199. When one examines these passages together, it becomes clear that they are references at least primarily to performance cultures exemplified in Pindar's work, not to previous local poets.

Allusions to previous commissions convey some idea of the lively network of artists and patrons against which Pindar's victory odes first found their place in the real world. Probably there was an interconnected web of cultured elites (R. Thomas (1995) 122-3) and communities spanning the Mediterranean; certainly Pindar is concerned to give the impression of such. Both *laudator* and *laudandus* are proud and self-conscious participants in a literary culture reaching through time and space. The poet addresses individuals, families, and communities with the knowledge necessary to appreciate his work. Sometimes references to past compositions suggest a sustained, ethical relationship between patron and author— something not necessarily associated with the system of serial commissions.⁶⁶⁸ Both conceptions of the poet's career already found in Homer— the poet who is a travelling craftsman in demand (e.g. *Od.* 17.382-5) and the poet who is engaged in a stable relationship with his patrons (e.g. *Od.* 8.105-6)— are implicated in Pindar's self-presentation, although to different degrees.

Pindar's depiction of his first audiences guides the way that secondary audiences approach his poems.⁶⁶⁹ Experiencing these texts, one is invited to become a member of σοφοί,⁶⁷⁰ those capable of understanding (cf. Bundy (1986) 25-6, Most (1986a) 313). The odes appeal to a form of σοφία that is not purely intellectual but also moral, aesthetic, and ideological.⁶⁷¹ The wise understand Pindar's words and also the values which they reflect. They show themselves to be wise by valuing his words (cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 1048, *Callim. Aet.* fr. 1.29-30). Secondary audiences are invited to join this coterie. A cultivated air of exclusivity, which does not straightforwardly

⁶⁶⁸ Cf. ξεινον ἐμὸν ἠθαῖον (*I.* 2.48); φίλαν ... τράπεζαν (*O.* 1.16-17).

⁶⁶⁹ Cf. descriptions of the dedicatee in later poetry: Gallus 145.8-9 Hollis with Hutchinson's reading confirmed by Capasso's (2003) re-inspection, *Catull.* 1.3-7, *Hor. Carm.* 1.1.35-6.

⁶⁷⁰ *O.* 11.19, *P.* 9.78, 4.295, *N.* 8.41 (where the adjective embraces poet and public), *I.* 9.7, *B.* 3.85, R. W. B. Burton (1962) 45-6, Loscalzo (2003) 60-1. Cf. already *Alcm.* 16.2-3 (although the context is quite unclear), *Thgn.* (?) 681-2.

⁶⁷¹ Cf. Gladigow (1965) 39-56, Maehler (1963) 94-8; Martin (2004) 362: 'a key part of epinikion ideology is an affirmation of the truest solidarity'.

indicate the poet's intended public,⁶⁷² invites one to feel a sense of complicity and privileged understanding. Pindar's poems create an expanding community of audiences (see IV.1)

4. Other Eulogists

Pindar and Bacchylides probably did not monopolise the evidently robust and widespread market for literary epinician. 'Both ... present themselves as leaders in an environment in which there were many competing poets' (Carey (2007) 206). *Isthmian* 2 presumes a class of contemporary professionals parallel with Οἱ μὲν πάλαι (1). If *Olympian* 5 could be proven spurious, one might attain a clearer, less prejudiced idea of the ambitions and capabilities of other poets. The phrase in the scholia that has aroused suspicion, however, is not well understood.⁶⁷³ Arguments against authenticity on internal evidence are not overwhelming.⁶⁷⁴ But Pindar's unquestionably authentic poems suggest a background of lesser lights. Generalised references denote a type, not specific individuals.⁶⁷⁵ Other eulogists are not always marked explicitly as poets, but the fact that they are compared to the narrator suggests a shared orientation. Antitypes highlight outstanding aspects of Pindar's art.

⁶⁷² Many passages convey an inclusive vision of Pindar's audience (see p. 43-4). Some odes evidently address an undifferentiated citizen body (cf. *O.* 7.93-4, 13.49, *N.* 10.23, *Pae.* 2.3, *B.* 13.231; note δῆμον ἅπαντα, *Od.* 9.6).

⁶⁷³ On the puzzling noun ἐδαφίοις (C inscr. a) see, most recently, Ruffa (2001), Ferrari (2006).

⁶⁷⁴ See Mader (1990) 109-13 with the works cited there.

⁶⁷⁵ E.g. Bundy (1986) 3n11, Carey (1981) 50-1, Lefkowitz (1991) 149-50, Loscalzo (2003) 35-45 (who sees references to epic), D. L. Cairns (2010) 6; *contra* Gzella (1969). On the dual at *O.* 2.87 see Kirkwood (1981), arguing convincingly for a proverbial pair rather than a covert reference to Simonides and Bacchylides (*pace* e.g. van Leeuwen). Pindar's numerous other attacks on a notional class support this interpretation (contrast Gentili *et al.* (2013)).

The meta-poetic language of epinician is often competitive and sometimes refers to other competitors.⁶⁷⁶ καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονέει καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῷ (Hes. *Op.* 26). In *Olympian* 13, Pindar disputes with many eulogists: δηρίομαι πολέειν | περὶ πλήθει καλῶν· ὥς μὰν σαφές | οὐκ ἄν εἰδείην λέγειν ποντιᾶν ψάφων ἀριθμόν (44-6). The poet gives the best account by refusing to give a precise account. The previous sentence mentions the possibility of other, longer songs celebrating the family (41-2). Similarly at *O.* 2.95-100 the unskilled defeat their purposes by obscuring their subject (κρυφόν, 97) with their own verbiage (cf. *παγγλωσσίαι*, 87) while erroneously suggesting that their theme could be adequately expressed. πολλοῖσι δ' ἄγῃμαι σοφίας ἑτέροις (*P.* 4.248) refers to many other poets (Carey (2000) 175), not a large audience (which would give less point to ἑτέροις, 248). σοφίας (248) denotes artistic expertise (Braswell (1988)) and looks back to ἵκαμι (248). Pindar's talent is revealed in compression (οἷμον ἵκαμι βραχύν, 248; cf. *P.* 9.76-8). It is implied that other poets will be influenced by his example (cf. *B.* fr. 5.1-2, *Ar. Nub.* 554-5, 559, *Hor. Epist.* 1.19.10-11). This metanarrative break-off involves a distinctively Pindaric rhetoric of brevity and concision (Bernardini (1967) 84-5). He may be meditating on his role in the development of epinician poetics (cf. *Ar. Pax* 739-53). Pindar, like Aristophanes (Hubbard (1991) 31) and Callimachus after him (cf. *Aet.* fr. 1.21-9, *Hy.* 2.107-13), seems interested in advancing a certain aesthetic programme advocated for and embodied throughout a body of work.

At *N.* 3.76-84 a professional poet elucidates the worth of his product by contrasting it with inferior wares:

ἐγὼ τόδε τοι
πέμπω μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῷ
σὺν γάλακτι, κίρναμένα δ' ἔεργ' ἀμφέπει,

⁶⁷⁶ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν τε τιμαλφεῖν λόγοις (*N.* 9.54); μακρὰ δὲ ῥίψαις ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους (*P.* 1.45). See Lefkowitz (1991) 161-8 on athletic metaphors for the poet's task.

πόμ' αἰδίμον Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν,
 ὀψέ περ. ἔστι δ' αἰετὸς ὥκυς ἐν ποτανοῖς,
 ὃς ἔλαβεν αἶψα, τηλόθε μεταμαιόμενος,
 δαφοινὸν ἄγραν ποσὶν·
 κραγέται δὲ κολοιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται.
 τίν γε μὲν, εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοί-
 ρας, ἀεθλοφόρου λήματος ἔνεκεν
 Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος.

The victor could have commissioned another, less distinguished poet, presumably with less expense and without an unusual delay.⁶⁷⁷ But his lasting glory would not have been secured by an inferior eulogist. Throughout this passage, Pindar is compared to other poets (Bernardini (1977)). A *syncrisis* between the victor and other athletes in lines 81-2 would sever the connection between the avian imagery and the preceding lines.⁶⁷⁸ With the sentence beginning τίν γε μὲν (83), the contrast is still between Pindar and other poets, but it is now articulated indirectly in terms of what they can do for their patrons:⁶⁷⁹ lesser poets do not reach the heights of achievement in immortalising their subject; Aristocleides, thanks to Pindar's poem, will be remembered (cf. *O.* 10.91-4). εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοίρας (83) shows that poetry remains at issue. Cleo's name is significant.

Here a generalised foil throws into relief the excellence of the poet, who is identified with the less common, more majestic species, ἀρχὸν οἰωνῶν μέγαν αἰετόν (*I.* 6.50; cf. *B.* 5.16-23). One recalls the world of epic simile, in which a single superior animal sometimes overpowers a group of inferiors (e.g. *Il.* 15.690-4, of the eagle; cf. *Od.* 19.536-40). The onomatopoetic

⁶⁷⁷ Cf. Carey (2007) 206; note the ready-made ode at *Ar. Av.* 920-1.

⁶⁷⁸ Thus Stoneman (1976) 194 is compelled to assert implausibly that 'there is no need to assume a connection of thought at all'.

⁶⁷⁹ Bowra *apud* Denniston 387; *contra* Pfeijffer (1994) 314-15.

κραγέται (82 with Pfeijffer (1999a)),⁶⁸⁰ unsuited to athletes, connotes poetry not attractive enough to endure. ταπεινὰ νέμονται (82) denigrates habitual inferiority. Like the victor and his mythical analogue Achilles (40, 52), Pindar excels through innate excellence.⁶⁸¹ Emphasis on speed and rhetorical contrasts with antitypes link lines 40-7 with lines 80-4.⁶⁸² Though slow to execute (80), Pindar is, like the eagle, quick in reaching his goal, namely his patron's fame, which is proclaimed in the final words of the ode (83-4).⁶⁸³ For artists, as well as for athletes, excellence becomes manifest only in competition with rivals (70-1).

N. 4.34-43 articulates a similar contrast. The narrator resists the temptation to curtail his treatment of mythological themes.⁶⁸⁴

τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός
 ὥραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι·
 ἵυγγι δ' ἔλκομαι ἦτορ νεομηνίαι θιγέμεν.
 ἔμπα, καίπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντιάς ἄλμα
 μέσسون, ἀντίτειν' ἐπιβουλίαι· σφόδρα δόξομεν
 δαΐων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν·
 φθονερά δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων
 γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλίνδει

χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν. ἐμοὶ δ' ὁποίαν ἀρετάν
 ἔδωκε Πότμος ἄναξ,
 εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι χρόνος ἔρπων πεπρωμέναν τελέσει.

As if composing extemporaneously (cf. ἐξύφαινε ... αὐτίκα, 44), Pindar meditates on what will ensure the lasting success of his work unfolding in the moment. He here enacts the generalisation

⁶⁸⁰ Cf. λάβροι (*O.* 2.86 with Carey (1981) on *P.* 2.87), λυγρόφθογγοι (*B.* 5.23 with D. L. Cairns (2010)).

⁶⁸¹ Cf. *O.* 2.86-8, *N.* 4.39-43, Hubbard (1985) 45.

⁶⁸² ποσσὶ γὰρ κράτεσκε (52) → ἔλαβεν ... δαφαινὸν ἄγρην ποσσὶν (81), both of hunting.

⁶⁸³ Contrast Steiner (2007) 190, who vaguely describes Pindar's goal as the 'perfectly apposite treatment of his theme'.

⁶⁸⁴ Bundy (1986) 4n11, Miller (1983), Palaiogeorgou (2003), Henry (2005), Lattmann (2010) 128; *contra* Köhnken (1971) 206-12, Kyriakou (1996). Pindar does continue treating myth (καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, 44). The enormous sea represents his vast topic (βαθεῖα ποντιάς ἄλμα, 36 → Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον, 69), which threatens to overwhelm him (cf. ἔκνευον, *O.* 13.114).

to which his proem leads: ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, | ὅ τι κε cὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι | γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας (6-8). The passage of time (χρόνος ἔρπων, 43; cf. *χρονιώτερον*, 6) and with it later reception will reveal the extent of the author's skill.⁶⁸⁵ δόξομεν (37) appeals to an impending public judgement and looks both to the rest of the poem and its reception (contrast Pfeijffer (1999b) 49-50). The fate of this work emerges through a contrast with its antitype (cf. *P.* 2.58-63): it will achieve the immortal light of fame (contrast *κρότωι*, 40; cf. *ἐν φάει*, 38) and fly abroad (contrast *χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν*, 41).⁶⁸⁶ This afterlife elucidates what it means to 'complete our journey in the light of glory and safety superior to our foes' (*δαίων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν*, 38).⁶⁸⁷ The immediate timeframe of performance exerts pressure on the poet (*ῶραι*, 35; *νεομηνίαι*, 36), but he looks to the reception of his work beyond the moment (*χρόνος ἔρπων*, 43). An individual, innate quality (41-3) here licenses the poet not to obey a standard convention (34). The myth of Pindar as solitary genius starts with Pindar himself (cf. Lefkowitz (1981) 66).

The ability to create works transcending their first performance, according to his poems, sets Pindar apart from his peers. No doubt this rhetoric had some bearing on reality, as the actual afterlife of Pindar's work suggests. In attempting to tie his victory odes closely to their premiere performance, one risks assimilating them to a sort of poetry from which they consistently disassociate themselves.

⁶⁸⁵ Cf. Miller (1983) 213n42, Bulman (1992) 66: 'time, therefore, will prove false the mere technician who, out of excessive allegiance to encomiastic law, disrespects its spirit'; Kyriakou (1996) 22. Cf. *N.* 7.67-9, fr. 52o.37-40, Bion fr. 8.1-2.

⁶⁸⁶ Cf. *χαμαιπετέων* (*O.* 9.12), also contrasting with widespread dissemination (21-5).

⁶⁸⁷ *καταβαίνειν* (38), drawing on the preceding sea imagery, means not 'enter the lists' (*pace* Köhnken (1971) 208-09, Bulman (1992) 64-65, Race (1997), Pfeijffer (1990a) 657-8), a sense never certainly required in Pindar (Radt (1958) on *Pae.* 2.34), but rather 'disembark, complete the journey' (LSJ⁹ s.v. II, Kurke (1991) 52n34). It is irrelevant how one *starts* a competition relative to one's opponents (cf. *N.* 3.70-1). The speaker will not drown (36-7) but complete his journey. *ἐν φάει* (38) combines physical salvation and poetic glory (cf. *P.* 3.75, *Pae.* 2.68).

5. Epinician Revels

Pindar and Bacchylides sometimes mention epinician celebrations at the site of the games, often briefly within a catalogue of victories (e.g. B. 12.37: ἐκ]ωμάσθησαν). These revels were related to the occasion of literary epinician (see VI.2), but it is unclear if they ever also included a lasting poetic element like Pindar's odes or were always remembered as events, not texts. The question, to my knowledge, has not been directly posed.

Some celebrations involved song (ποικίλων ... ὕμνων, *N.* 5.42; ὁμοφαί, *N.* 10.34). The victor (*N.* 10.33-5) and his homeland (B. 6.5-6) may be its subject. Outside epinician literary characters imagine improvising victory songs.⁶⁸⁸ The traditional κῶμος could have been presumed to have taken place even if no poetic record survived (cf. *N.* 11.27-8, in a counterfactual conditional: πενταετηρίδ' ἑορτὰν Ἡρακλέος τέθμιον | κωμάσαις). Poems performed at the games could have existed but not lasted.

N. 5.41-2 exemplifies recurrent uncertainties: τὸ δ' Αἰγίναθε δῖς, Εὐθύμενες, | Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίπνων ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων. This refers to two previous epinician celebrations.⁶⁸⁹ Movement from Aegina (Αἰγίναθε, 41; cf. *I.* 2.26) to triumph and song suggests performances at the games. This inference is buttressed by preceding mention of performances at the Isthmus (37-9). But precisely what did Euthymenes enjoy? ποικίλων (42) could describe a sophisticated artefact like a Pindaric ode (see Slater s.v.) or nothing more complex than an improvised chant.⁶⁹⁰ The description is too brief to determine precisely what is described. It is not clear that fifth-century secondary audiences would have had a clearer understanding.

⁶⁸⁸ E.g. Eur. *El.* 864-5, *Heracl.* 180, 680-1, Ar. *Nub.* 1204-5, fr. 505 *PCG* with Macleod (1983) 49-51, Carey (2007) 34.

⁶⁸⁹ For text and interpretation see Carey (1989b) 295, Fearn (2007) 345-6 (contrast Pfeijffer (1999a) 169-70, Adorjáni (2010)).

⁶⁹⁰ On musical variety see Kaimio (1977) 149, M. L. West (1992) 345-6, LeVen (2013).

Other passages point in contradictory directions. One need not assume that the same phenomenon lies behind all. *O.* 9.1-4 describes a revel accompanied by a generic song attributed to Archilochus, which was also sung outside athletic contexts (see Olson (2002) on *Ar. Ach.* 1227). *φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίαι* (2) might suggest a recurrent custom. Epharmostus' celebration was remembered as an event; this is why he needs Pindar's poem. Conversely, other odes link past revels with enduring reputations. This does not, however, necessarily imply lasting texts (see p. 31). In *Pythian* 8 a revel at Delphi exemplifies a poetic tradition which makes Aegina famous (18-27; see p. 110). *τοιάδε τῶν τότ' ἐόντων φύλλ' αἰοιδᾶν* (27) links *Isthmian* 4 with epinicians from a previous generation. It is not clear that these previous epinicians were performed at the sites of the games, though they are linked with the herald's announcement (*καρύξαια*, 25). These odes are associated in grammar and sense with the family's lasting glory (25). Pindar earlier mentions a multitude of 'testimonies' to their fame: *ὅσσα δ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἄηται | μαρτύρια φθιμένων ζῶων τε φωτῶν | ἀπλέτου δόξας, ἐπέψαυσαν κατὰ πᾶν τέλος* (9-11). *Nemean* 6 describes the accumulated athletic glory of a household (31-4) and then an epinician celebration at Delphi more than half a century earlier (36-8). The Bassidae are perhaps said to preserve earlier victory odes (32; see p. 232).

Did epinician celebrations at the games ever involve lasting odes? One must pronounce *non liquet*. I incline toward the negative in most if not all cases. *I.* 4.27 is the strongest candidate for a reference to enduring works. Yet the uncertain factual question of *what* Pindar describes may be subordinated in each instance to the interpretative question of *why* he mentions past revels at all. He sometimes invokes these celebrations as precedent and sometimes emphasises his higher ambitions. The pursuit of different rhetorical ends can lead him to stress connections with the traditional κῶμος or to distance his professional ode from its comastic congener (cf. K. A. Morgan

(1990)). It is rewarding to tease out lines of comparison and contrast between inset epinician revel and framing epinician poem (cf. Agócs (2012) 221, helpfully invoking the idea of intertextuality).

Nemean 10 exemplifies how a passing reference to past epinician celebration may advance larger themes and enrich an entire poem. Pindar describes the reputation of the victor's family: ἔπεται δέ, Θεαῖε, ματρώων πολύγνωτον γένος ὑμετέρων | εὐάγων τιμὰ Χαρίτεσσιν τε καὶ σὺν Τυνδαρίδασι θαμάκις (37-8; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 418-19). θαμάκις (38) and the present ἔπεται (37) mark a repeated phenomenon exemplified in, but not limited to, Pindar's poem. The Tyn-daridae bestow athletic success;⁶⁹¹ the Charites, as often, represent music and poetry.⁶⁹² Connoting the 'double crown' of achievement and celebration,⁶⁹³ these divinities together produce a reputation (εὐάγων τιμὰ, 38) which makes the family renowned (πολύγνωτον, 37, predicative). This prestige is explicated in the following lines on the regard afforded to the family within Argos because of their many victories (39-41; note asyndeton)⁶⁹⁴ glorifying the community (41-2).

The generalisation in lines 37-8 follows an instantiation of the 'double crown': ἀδεῖται γέ μὲν ἀμβολάδαν | ἐν τελεταῖς δις Ἀθηναίων νιν ὁμφαί | κόμασαν (33-5). The Dioscouri and Charites manifest their influence in musical revels for athletic success at the Panathenaic Games. An athletic career becomes a musico-poetic performance: celebrations after minor victories are a 'prelude' (ἀμβολάδαν, 33)⁶⁹⁵ to a climactic Olympic triumph still to come (29-33). One thinks of

⁶⁹¹ Cf. *N.* 10.49-51, *O.* 3.39-41, *P.* 5.9, *Theoc.* 22.24 with Gow (1950), Parmenon 273-8 *FGE* with Page.

⁶⁹² The Charites may have a similar connection with comastic celebration at *O.* 2.49-51 (cf. Aloni (1988) 169). The Charites generally do not determine athletic success (*O.* 6.75-6 is no counterexample; *O.* 14.19-20 is a special case). They are frequently associated with celebration.

⁶⁹³ Cf. Calabrese De Feo (1984) 127, Race (1990) 194.

⁶⁹⁴ Kurke (1991) 27 understands reference to taking part in athletic competition outside Argos. But this would not really explain ὁμμάτων (*N.* 10.41), for which see D. L. Cairns (2005b) 30.

⁶⁹⁵ Cf. *N.* 2.1-12, 24-5.

Pindar's present poem as forming part of the same metaphorical performance of Theaeus' career. These earlier revels at Athens, however, probably did not include a lasting poem like *Nemean* 10 (cf. Callim. fr. 384.35-40, an allusion to our passage). There may be a contrast between the ephemeral revel at the games and the prize amphorae that return to Argos as a permanent memorial (35-6).

In part through a description of past epinician revels, Pindar conveys an impression of a family with a distinguished reputation, to which his new work contributes. The closing myth reflects the unique contribution to this legacy made by Pindar's literary victory ode. Polydeuces' reasons for preferring death to life without his brother bear on the victor's circumstances: οἴχεται τιμὰ φίλων τατωμένωι φωτί· παῦροι δ' ἐν πόνωι πιστοὶ βροτῶν | καμάτου μεταλαμβάνειν (78-9). Theaeus and his relatives enjoy honour in Argos through their relationship to a celebrated family, their very closest φίλοι (τιμά, 38→τιμά, 78).⁶⁹⁶ Through Pindar's poem, they will also together enjoy together another form of honour, namely immortality in song that is analogous to the after-life of the Dioscouri.⁶⁹⁷ Athletic victory and its attendant revels have already won for this family the regard of their Argive contemporaries; Pindar's victory ode implicitly promises them a related but superior honour beyond the short reach of the voices that celebrated Theaeus at Athens.

6. Conclusions

Numerous Pindaric references to epinician precedent can be confirmed to be essentially accurate through the evidence of surviving poems. This lends a measure of credibility to similar plausible

⁶⁹⁶ Blondell (1989) 39-40.

⁶⁹⁷ Closing mythological analogues for poetic immortality (itself a common closing theme): *O.* 10.104-5, *P.* 3.112-15, 11.59-64, *N.* 1.69-72, Radt (1966) 165. Young (1993) elucidates the exemplary function of the Dioscouri in *Nemean* 10 but neglects the familial aspect of the implicit comparison that makes it especially appropriate to Theaeus, who owes his success to his family's character (49-51).

depictions which cannot be similarly verified. The literary environment described in these poems is realistic. Pindar's odes do not take place entirely in a dream world: they create their own imaginative *cosmos* but also participate in a recognised social practice grounded in the real world. As references to performance are parasitic on the real world but also include an element of fictionalisation, so references to the literary environment are not straightforward windows onto reality but interact with reality in complex ways. References to the literary environment, like references to performance, shape how Pindar's audiences approach his poems.

Taken together, the passages discussed above provide a fairly definite picture of a literary background which is internally consistent across the corpus. This context behind each composition may be presented through a typologised narrative.

The victor is celebrated at the games with the κῶμος from which literary epinician was perceived to have evolved. Probably this event did not produce a lasting text. Not content with this traditional celebration, the victor, who has experienced many literary odes, elects to commission Pindar of Thebes from a pool of praise poets because of his outstanding reputation for creating lasting works. The epinician is then performed within the victor's community as an expression of its civic choral culture. After its first performance, the epinician travels to meet secondary audiences familiar with the genre and with Pindar's work.

Individual epinicians afford glimpses into the pre-history and afterlife surrounding every ode, a background which was probably taken for granted by many of Pindar's contemporaries, who experienced the genre as a living social practice. By assembling these clues one can see further into an overarching cultural and intellectual context which shapes many passages and indeed the significance of Pindar's work as a whole.

7. *Nemean 6*

Nemean 6, like *Isthmian 4*, engages a two-fold past and refers to older epinician celebrations and older epic poetry. This ‘glorifying wind of verse’ (οὔρον ἐπέων | εὐκλέα, 28b-9 with Gerber (1999)) celebrates an island and a clan both already glorious in their own right (νᾶσον εὐκλέα, 46; κλειτᾷ γενεᾷ, 61). The ode exemplifies Pindar’s characteristic uses of previous victory revels and epic poetry: he stresses parallels with past epinician celebrations but also associates his art closely with canonical epic and its reach through space and time.

The Bassidae, whose reputation is described at considerable length (8-22, 34-44), claim more boxing garlands than any other Greek household (24-6 with Gerber (1999)). Pindar takes direct aim at this illustrious subject (28-34):

εὖ-
 θυν’ ἐπὶ τοῦτον (sc. house), ἄγε, Μοῖσα,
 οὔρον ἐπέων
 εὐκλέα· παροιχομένων γὰρ ἀνέρων

 ᾠδοὶ καὶ λόγοι τὰ καλά σφιν ἔργ’ ἐκόμισαν,
 Βασσιδαῖσιν ἅ τ’ οὐ σπανίζει· παλαίφατος γενεά,
 ἴδια ναυτολέοντες ἐπικ-
 ῶμια, Πιερίδων ἀρόταις
 δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολὺν ὕμνον ἀγερώχων ἐργμάτων
 ἔνεκεν.

The Bassidae require a ‘glorifying breeze’ (28b-9) since verbal commemoration confers permanence beyond the span of one’s natural life. They already have a considerable body of accomplishments. *παλαίφατος* (31) suggests accumulated fame. *ναυτολέοντες* (32), evoking Aegina’s well-known mercantilism,⁶⁹⁸ connotes abundance (cf. οὐ σπανίζει, 31; πολὺν ὕμνον, 33, *Il.* 20.247). The sailing metaphor (on which see Perón (1974) 181-3) depicts the course of familial history as a continuous collective enterprise spanning across generations.

⁶⁹⁸ Hubbard (2004) 89. On Aeginetan trade, see Kowalzig (2011), who discusses an ‘ideology of connectivity’ (145).

In precisely what sense do the Bassidae ‘traffic shiploads of their own epinicians’ (32)? A close parallel from Bacchylides (ὅλ]κάδ’ ἔπεμψεν ἐμοὶ χρυσέαν ... πολυ]φάτων γέμουσαν ὕμνων, 16.2-4; cf. Pind. fr. 355 dub.) suggests that they furnish poets with so much material for praise that they practically compose the poems on their own (ἴδια, *N.* 6.32).⁶⁹⁹ The participial phrase is thus glossed by the following clause: Πιερίδων ἀρόταις | δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολλὸν ὕμνον (32-3). A description of the family’s accomplishments persuades the Muse of their attractiveness as a theme (cf. *N.* 10.2-3).

Diction and context suggest a further possibility, which is not incompatible with this dominant sense. Pindar may refer to previous odes preserved by the Bassidae and not merely their previous accomplishments. ἴδια ... ἐπικώμια (32), in other words, could refer to older epinicians and not subject matter for a new epinician. On this reading, Pindar’s task of praising the Bassidae would be easy because they have already received similar works (cf. *I.* 2.30-4). *Nemean* 6 is one of several and not the earliest surviving epinician for the family.⁷⁰⁰ It would hardly be surprising if such an ambitious clan took an active interest in not only commissioning poems but also preserving them and even perhaps promoting their dissemination (ναυτολέοντες, 32; cf. *N.* 5.2-3).⁷⁰¹

Pindar explicitly refers to a background of previous epinician celebration, if not necessarily preserved epinician poetry. A specific example follows the generalisation about the Bassidae’s accomplishments (καὶ γάρ, 34).⁷⁰² Callias, the victor’s grand uncle,⁷⁰³ long ago triumphed

⁶⁹⁹ Cf. *O.* 1.8, where ὕμνος refers not to the ode but to its subject matter; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. αἰοδή 4.

⁷⁰⁰ Poems for the Bassidae: *Isthmian* 6, *Isthmian* 5, *Nemean* 5, Bacchylides 13.

⁷⁰¹ Thrasybulus is perhaps encouraged to promote the dissemination of *Isthmian* 2 (44-6). Family archives as a potential repository for texts: Wilamowitz (1900) 37-40, Irigoin (1952) 8-9, Herington (1985) 35. For different reasons Schmid (1998) 73-4 posits that our passage refers to written poems (cf. Loscalzo (2003) 108-9).

⁷⁰² Cf. *P.* 9.42, Fraenkel (1957) 185, Wüst (1967) 243-5, Slater s.v. γάρ 3αβ-γ.

at Delphi and was there celebrated with song: παρὰ Κακταλίαν τε Χαρίτων | ἐσπέριος ὁμάδωι φλέγεν (37-8). This past victory is one reason why the Bassidae are ‘famous of old’ (31). This celebration, if it was preserved in a poem, would exemplify their epinician cargo (32). One is perhaps to infer, as Carey (1989a) 8 suggests, that Callias has perished.⁷⁰⁴ His epinician celebration—in addition to Pindar’s ode—might then substantiate the previous generalisation about the power of poetry to preserve accomplishments after death (29-30; cf. *P.* 1.92-8).

Here we run into familiar uncertainties. Callias’ revel could have been remembered through the oral tradition rather than a lasting poem (cf. αἰδοῖ καὶ λόγῳ, 30).⁷⁰⁵ However this may be, one can still say something definite about the rhetorical functions of this passage. On the one hand, earlier epinician celebration provides a validating precedent for Pindar’s newest epinician celebration for the Bassidae. On the other hand, it also serves as foil for the author’s more sophisticated work. Callias was feted at Delphi on the night after his victory, not by a well-known poet on Aegina after the games. Χαρίτων ... ὁμάδωι (37-8) suggests more enthusiasm than art. ὄμαδος elsewhere consistently describes ‘unmusical din’ (Bury (1890); cf. Kaimio (1977) 19, 155). Gerber (1999), comparing *Iliad* 10.13, suggests that the word ‘is intended to convey something of the riotous atmosphere, the less restrained singing and dancing than that which would accompany ... the formal victory ode’. This boisterous earlier revel is closely bound to one particular evening at one particular place (cf. *O.* 9.1-4); Pindar’s ode has higher aspirations.

⁷⁰³ Carey (1989a) 7-8 (*contra* Burnett (2005) 161n16, Henry (2005) 59-60).

⁷⁰⁴ Praxidamas, the victor’s grandfather (15-18), triumphed in 544 (Paus. 6.18.7), more than half a century before the debut of *Nemean* 6 (see Fearn (2007) 342-50, D. L. Cairns (2007) for the approximate date). Callias will not have won at Delphi dramatically later than his brother Praxidamas’ victory.

⁷⁰⁵ λόγῳ Pauw; λόγοι MSS. Pace Calabrese De Feo (1987), Henry (2005) convincingly argues that metre requires emendation.

In *Nemean* 6 Pindar's relationship to his patrons parallels his relationship to Aegina's mythical past. Singing what has been sung is a unifying theme. The topic of past accomplishments provides a gliding transition between programme and myth (45-9):

πλατεῖται πάντοθεν λογίοισιν ἐντὶ πρόκοδοι
 νᾶσον εὐκλέα τάνδε κοσμεῖν· ἐπεὶ σφιν Αἰακίδαι
 ἔπορον ἔξοχον αἴσαν ἀρε-
 τὰς ἀποδεικνύμενοι μεγάλας,
 πέταται δ' ἐπὶ τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσης τηλόθεν
 ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν.

The Aeacidae, like the Bassidae, give eulogists much to praise. In grammar and sense, lines 45-7 parallel the earlier description of the victor's family (R. Hamilton (1974) 59), another Aeginetan clan with a tradition of excellence spanning generations: Πιερίδων ἀρόταις | δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολὺν ὕμνον ἀγερώχων ἐργμάτων | ἔνεκεν (32-4)→σφιν (sc. λογίοισιν)⁷⁰⁶ ... ἔπορον ἔξοχον αἴσαν ἀρετὰς ἀποδεικνύμενοι μεγάλας (46-7). It is easy to praise Aegina *because* (ἐπεὶ, 46) the fame of the Aeacidae has already spread through well-known poems including the *Aethiopis*, a work to which the following lines ostentatiously allude.

The *Aethiopis*, if not Callias' revel, illustrates how poetry can preserve accomplishment and prefigures the afterlife of Pindar's work. The myth of Achilles in *Nemean* 6, like the myth of Ajax in *Isthmian* 4, is as much about events as about their reception. It is crucial to Pindar's rhetorical purposes that his tale is associated with a well-known source. Achilles' duel with Memnon was a central episode of the *Aethiopis* (arg. 2 GEF) and doubtlessly, as the title suggests, among its most memorable scenes.⁷⁰⁷ The 'approaches' available to Pindar (πρόκοδοι, 45) are both metaphorically and practically cognate with the established paths of epic (παλαιότεροι | ὁδὸν ἁμαξίτων εὖρον, 53-4). 'Highway of song' (54) suggests frequent use and thereby the char-

⁷⁰⁶ The antecedent of σφιν (46) could be implicit in νᾶσον (46; Gerber (1999)). This is less attractive than the more obvious antecedent λογίοισιν (45; Henry (2005)).

⁷⁰⁷ Cf. M. L. West (2013) 147-8. J. S. Burgess (2004) discusses potential artistic representations.

acteristic popularity of epic. There was a time when this material was ‘discovered’ (εὔρον, 54), but now a younger poet retraces an established course (ἔπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτός, 54).

The literary background of Pindar’s theme at once provides the impetus for telling the story and justifies its curtailment.⁷⁰⁸ His remarkably brief narrative,⁷⁰⁹ dependent upon his audiences’ knowledge of a longer work, is framed by prominent meta-traditional references: πέταται δ’ ἐπὶ τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσης τηλόθεν | ὄνυμ’ αὐτῶν (48-9); καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι | ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὔρον (53-4). The verb πέταται (48) presents the dissemination of Achilles’ fame as an ongoing process in contrast with the antiquity of the events recounted (ἔπαλτο, 50, aorist) and also in contrast with the time-tested media in which these events are still remembered (παλαιότεροι, 53). Both sentences of the narrative proper focus on the perspective of the Aethiopians (ἐκ Αἰθίοπας, 49; σφιν, 50). A paradigmatically distant race,⁷¹⁰ they evince the reach of glory through space. The immediate effects of Achilles’ victory are thus elided with its subsequent widespread afterlife (cf. 48).⁷¹¹ Here, as often elsewhere (see IV.4), the past reception of epic serves as an idealised model for the future reception of epinician.

Alcimidas presumably enjoyed at Nemea the same sort of traditional celebration that his ancestor Callias enjoyed at Delphi more than a half century earlier. After Alcimidas’ victory, however, the Bassidae also commissioned a leading professional author to provide something related to but different from the comastic revel. Pindar’s ode fulfilling this commission continues a familial tradition of epinician celebration but aims to approximate the enduring glory of epic.

⁷⁰⁸ Cf. Bundy (1972) 66.

⁷⁰⁹ Gerber (1999) 75: ‘the myth here takes up a much smaller proportion of the ode than in any other ode with central myth’. Kakridis (1966) 25 makes the general point that lyric narratives, which are short almost by definition (cf. *N.* 4.33-4), are often parasitic on audiences’ knowledge of more extensive epic accounts.

⁷¹⁰ S. R. (1990) West on *Od.* 1.22-3, MacLachlan (1992).

⁷¹¹ Cf. *I.* 6.19-27 with Kurke (1991) 55-6, B. 9.40-6 for similar slippage.

For Pindar's fifth-century secondary audiences, Callias' Pythian victory, even if remembered in an epinician, was surely not, like Achilles' victory over Memnon, a familiar theme associated with a well-known text. Pindar's literary epinician aspires to just such a distinguished afterlife. Journeying is a dominant conceit throughout.⁷¹² The poet's glorifying breeze (28b-9) will propel the Bassidae into the world so that their fame spreads, endures, and approximates that already achieved by their mythical analogues, the Aeacidae. This sort of perpetuation is the essential task of literary epinician— as Pindar himself declares (29-30).

⁷¹² 7, 11, 15, 23-4, 29-30, 32, 45-6, 48-50, 53-7, Calame (2012) 318.

VIII. The Lyric Past

This chapter studies Pindar's references to older non-epinician lyric. Left aside are victory odes which incorporate aspects of other genres but do not refer to specific earlier works (see p. 178n536). Section 1 discusses mainly fragmentary evidence for Pindar's knowledge of and engagement with the lyric past. Section 2 interprets three epinicians which prominently draw on older poets. Section 3 concludes Part Three. It describes Pindar's immanent literary history and how it shapes the meaning of his work.

1. Lyric History

For Pindar genres generally emerge from the distant past.⁷¹³ More recent history encompasses inventions attributable to human actors.⁷¹⁴ 'We get the impression that Pindar has the concept of an evolutionary history in which a succession of innovators in different parts of Greece created and modified the various poetic and musical forms' (M. L. West (2011) 59; cf. Timotheus 791.221-36 *PMG*).⁷¹⁵ Fragmentary pieces of evidence combine to suggest a poet acutely aware of a lyric past including many individuals like himself. He uses these past figures to situate his poems and their audiences within a continuous tradition.

If D'Angour (1997) is correct, *Dithyramb* 2 alludes to Lasus of Hermione's 'invention' of the linear chorus. Pindar would presume in his audiences a robust knowledge of performance history (cf. D'Angour (2011) 198). This is plausible. The Lesbian Arion's contribution to the de-

⁷¹³ Generic origins in Pindar: fr. 31, fr. 52m.14-18 with Kowalzig (2007) 60-3, 71, 85, 115, 125 with [Plut.] *de mus.* 1140f, 128c with Cannatà Fera (1990) 140.

⁷¹⁴ Note also poets in the distant past: *P.* 4.176-7 (Orpheus, depicted as the first poet: see M. L. West (1966) 40, Braswell (1988)), fr. 128c.12 (Orpheus), 157 (Olympus).

⁷¹⁵ In this as in other matters one sees in Pindar the roots of the peripatetic approach to literary history.

velopment of the dithyramb in Corinth, whatever it might have been thought to be,⁷¹⁶ is alluded to elliptically as a well-known fact (O. 13.18-19). Fr. 140b, discussed below, credits the Epizephyrean Locrian Xenocritus with the invention of the Locrian *nomos*. Perhaps Sacadas of Argos (fr. 269), credited in antiquity with the invention of the Pythian *nomos* (Paus. 2.22.8), was mentioned for similar reasons.⁷¹⁷ Fr. 125 describes Terpander's invention of the *barbitos*: τὸν ῥὰ Τέρπανδρός ποθ' ὁ Λέκβιος εὔρεν | πρῶτος, ἐν δείπνοισι Λυδῶν.⁷¹⁸ Pindar's *encomium* probably debuted at a occasion similar to the one described⁷¹⁹ and was accompanied by the instrument which the Lesbian poet once discovered (cf. βαρβι[τί]ξαι, fr. 124d, B. fr. 20b-c, Van Groningen (1960) 113, Power (2010) 410). As in *Olympian* 10, a distant primordial occasion is re-enacted in the present. The same poem perhaps attributed to Terpander the invention of *scolia* ([Plut.] *de mus.* 1140f-g, Van Groningen (1960) 118, Gostoli (1990) 89-90). Pindar's poem could have been regarded as a *scolion* by his contemporaries (cf. fr. 122.14, Cingano (2003)).

Fr. 140b, perhaps from a *hyporchema*,⁷²⁰ is Pindar's most extensive surviving description of lyric invention. The fragment 'expresses [his] awareness of the musico-poetic tradition and the value of one particular predecessor's work, but also of his own originality within that tradition' (W. J. Henderson (1992) 54). The poem opens by citing the past (text after I. C. Rutherford (2001a)):

⁷¹⁶ See Hdt. 1.23, Zimmermann (1992) 6-25, Fearn (2007) 168-70, D'Alessio (2013) 114.

⁷¹⁷ Other inventions of *nomoi*: P. 12.19-23, [Plut.] *de mus.* 1136c (quoted in S-M's apparatus to Pind. fr. 52n).

⁷¹⁸ On the motif see Kleingünther (1933).

⁷¹⁹ *Encomia* at feasts: fr. 124a-c, B. fr. 20b, Budelmann (2012).

⁷²⁰ Apolline associations (W. J. Henderson (1992) 156, Gigante (1977) 626) and perhaps the contents of the papyrus roll (D'Alessio (1997) 45) suggest a paean (cf. παῖς[ο], 9). But emphasis on vigorous mimetic dancing strongly suggests a *hyporchema* (Wilamowitz (1922) 321, Fileni (1987) 52-3): cf. 13-17 with fr. 107a-b (potentially in fact Simonides). There is nothing comparable with these lines in the much more extensive remains of Pindar's paeans. The form of the papyrus title militates against a paean (I. C. Rutherford (2001a) 386).

Ἴων[
 αἰδ[ὸν κ]αὶ ἁρμονίαν
 αὐλ[οῖς ἐ]πεφράσ[ατο
 τῶ[ν τε Λο]κρῶν τις, οἳ τ' ἁργίλοφον
 παρ Ζεφυρίου κολώναν
 ν[αῖον ὑπὲ]ρ Αὐσονία[ς ἀλόε
 λ[ιπαρὰ πόλ]ις ἀνθ.[
 οῖον [ὄ]χημα λιγ[υ καὶ εὐπλ-
 κὲς Λο[κρ]ὸν⁷²¹ πατήρ[
 Ἀπόλλωνί τε καὶ [
 ἄρμενον. ἐγὼ μ[
 παῦρα μελ[ι]ζόμεν[
 [γλώ]σσαργον ἀμφέπω[ν ἐρε-
 θίζομαι πρὸς αὐ. [
 ἀλίου δελφῖνος ὑπόκριτιν,
 τὸν μὲν ἀκύμονος ἐν πόντου πελάγει
 αὐλῶν ἐκίνης' ἐρατὸν μέλος.

By only periphrastically denominating his predecessor, Pindar is not being 'coy' (M. L. West (2011) 60) but thematising his audiences' knowledge of a well-known figure.⁷²² Once in the past Xenocritus, a seventh-century choral lyricist,⁷²³ devised the melody which a contemporary audience now hears (2-3). As in fr. 125, there is an implicit contrast between a single event and its lasting consequences as well as a parallel contrast between the distant site of invention and its legacy audible in the here and now (αὐλ[οῖς, 3→αὐλῶν, 17).⁷²⁴

Perhaps Xenocritus' invention of the Locrian *nomos* was presented as a response to the pre-existing tradition in its own right. Ἴων[(1) looks like a reference to the Ionian *nomos* (Ἴων[ίδος ἀντίπαλον Μοίcas, Schroeder; cf. Telestes 806.2-3 *PMG*: ὅς ἁρμοσε πρῶτος | Δωρίδος ἀντίπαλον μούcas, perhaps a reference to our passage). Pindar thus may project his own engagement with the past onto his predecessor and present a layered literary history. In any event, tradition and invention are fused in the present performance. The tune is traditional, it

⁷²¹ See Ferrari (1990) for the reading.

⁷²² Cf. Callim. fr. 669, an allusion to our passage.

⁷²³ Fileni (1987) 14-15, 56-9 sets out what is known of Xenocritus.

⁷²⁴ K. A. Morgan (2012) 41. 140b.4-6 suggests a distant locale.

seems, but the words are original. Fronted ἐγώ (11), as often, suggests a contrast (see p. 295). In what follows focus shifts from past to present. γλῶ]σσαργον (12) apparently connotes verbal artifice (cf. Fileni (1987) 48-9, I. C. Rutherford (2001) 385).

For Pindar's fifth-century audiences previous lyricists were not famous for their inventions alone. Some poets' words, too, remained in circulation. Fr. 188 apparently appeals to a well-known saying of Polymnastus, a seventh-century poet from Colophon, which is unknown to us: φθέγμα μὲν πάγκοινον ἔγνωκας Πολυμνάστου Κολοφωνίου ἀνδρός. Pindar is the best and most frequently suspected candidate for the author of verses preserved in P. Oxy. 2389 fr. 9 col. i (= Alcman 13a) and unfortunately omitted from the *dubia* in S-M.⁷²⁵ ἀντίφαριν Λάκωνι τέκτον(-) πα]ρθενίων σοφῶν Ἀλκμᾶ[νι. Alcman composed at least two books of *partheneia*, which was considered his characteristic genre in antiquity (Spelman (2014b) 25n17). Diction and metre are redolent of the fifth century. Competition with a named lyric poet suggests a lyric source. Overt, historicising, and competitive reference to the lyric past points toward Pindar in particular. The metaphor of poet as τέκτων, though perhaps traditional (cf. M. L. West (2007) 38-40), is apparently unique to him among fifth-century lyric poets (Carey (2011) 446). ποτίφορον (10) is rare outside Pindar (see Pfeijffer (1999a) on N. 3.31). Pindar composed for a Spartan maiden chorus.⁷²⁶

⁷²⁵ Cf. Lobel (1957c) 41, Führer (1971) 233, Carey (2011) 445-6, M. L. West (2011-13) ii.137. One cannot rule out Simonides (Ar. Av. 919 with Dunbar (1995)) and Bacchylides ([Plut.] *de mus.* 17 = p. 89 S-M), who probably composed *parthenia*. Davison (1968) 174 attributes these lines to Alcman. But the author of the papyrus counterbalances contradictory authorities (ἐχέγγυος, 5, does not look ironical). Alcman himself could not reasonably be put on a par with Aristotle (contrast TA 1a, a discussion of Alcman's words). Pindar would make a strong early witness for Alcman's homeland (cf. fr. 264 on Homer; note B. fr. 48).

⁷²⁶ Λάκαινα μὲν παρθένων ἀγέλα (112). μὲν with the ethnic adjective may have introduced a contrast between Spartan performers and Theban poet (cf. fr. 107b: Κρήτα μὲν καλέοντι τρόπον, τὸ δ' ὄργανον Μολοσσόν). Bacchylides, too, apparently composed for female Spartan choruses (B. 20, fr. dub. 61 with D'Alessio (2013) 123-8).

The poet of our fragment presents himself as the rival of a long-deceased predecessor whose work has lived on as a spur to competition.⁷²⁷ τέκτον(-), if correct and a dative rather than an accusative, as seems marginally more attractive,⁷²⁸ depicts Alcman as the architect of durable lyric structures. σοφὸν acknowledges his achievement and, by implication, that of the speaker (cf. εἰ δὲ χρὴ καὶ παρ σοφὸν ἀντιπερίξαι, *P.* 9.50, looking to Hes. *Op.* 210). Like *H. Hy.* 3.173 and *O.* 9.48-9, this passage depicts a competition within the arena of a literary culture preserving a continuous memory of the past; the prize is the attention and admiration of those who experience the poems. Three epinicians also enter into this arena to meet lyric predecessors.

2. Generic Enrichment

There are relatively few places in the epinicians where Pindar makes extensive discernible allusions to the work of predecessors who composed a different sort of lyric. Nonetheless, several odes presume in their audiences substantive knowledge of older lyric. It seems that some of the poets cited by Herodotus and Aristophanes⁷²⁹ had already achieved canonical status in Pindar's day. He uses older lyric to tell a story about how his own poems fit into a tradition and also stand apart from the past. The three odes discussed here include characteristic elements of the genre to which Pindar alludes⁷³⁰ and thereby expand the scope of the victory ode while positioning epinician within a wider generic framework.

⁷²⁷ Burkert (2001) 113 notes a timeless present of a predecessor's work at *H. Hy.* 3.172 and *Simon.* 581.1 (cf. Herington (1985) 62, Nagy (1990) 79).

⁷²⁸ Dative: Davison (1968) 174, Calame (1983) 54, Nünlist (1998) 102, M. L. West (2011-13) ii.137. Accusative: Lobel (1957c) 41, Barrett (1961) 686, Carey (2011) 445. The supplement should be treated with greater caution than it has been.

⁷²⁹ Herodotus: Nagy (1990) 321, S. R. West (2004); comedy: Hutchinson (2001) 427n1, Carey (2011) 457-60.

⁷³⁰ In general see Harrison (2007), whose work furnishes this section with its title.

A. *Pythian* 2

Mention of fame (κῦδος ἀγήραον, 52) reminds the poet of his encomiastic obligation (ἐμὲ δὲ χρεών, 52) and the goal of his genre, the glory of its subject. As Pindar moves from blaming Ixion to praising Hieron, Archilochus is cited in order to bring out by contrast what is distinctive and superior about praise poetry (54-6):⁷³¹

εἶδον γὰρ ἐκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίαι
 ψογερόν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν
 παινόμενον.

A much older poet is presented as a living presence in the world.⁷³² τὰ πόλλ' (54) bespeaks a broad view over his oeuvre (cf. *N.* 2.2) and an even-handed judgement. The blame poet feeds insatiably alone and disfigures himself through selfishness (παινόμενον, 56; cf. *B.* 3.68); Pindar espouses courtly sociability (ἀδόντα δ' εἴη με τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὀμιλεῖν, 96). Archilochus' work is characterised by an immoderation (δάκος ἀδινόν,⁷³³ 32; παινόμενον, 56; cf. μάργων, *Ibyc.* 311; *O.* 2.96) that contrasts with the framing poem (μέτρον, 34). Whereas Archilochus is often impoverished (ἐν ἀμαχανίαι, 54),⁷³⁴ Pindar enjoys wealth through his successful career as a praise

⁷³¹ See Carey (1981), Miller (1981), Most (1985a) 86-92, Nagy (1996) 393-5, Held (2003), Brown (2006).

⁷³² In the earliest reception of Greek literature, the boundary between text world and real world is often friable. Heraclitus B 42 D-K identifies Homer and Archilochus with those who re-performed their poems. J. Henderson (1987) on *Ar. Lys.* 188-9 discusses the tendency to identify dramatic authors with those who act their work. Graziosi (2002) 158-63 notes how epic poets are projected into the world of their poems.

⁷³³ 'Persistent': see Richardson (1979) on *H. Hy.* 2.67, Miller (1981) 138n13.

⁷³⁴ Cf. ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους (*O.* 1.53). Miller (1981) 139 makes the strongest arguments for the minority position that ἀμαχανίαι (*P.* 2.54) describes poverty of ingenuity rather than wealth (or, more precisely, the helplessness resulting from poverty: cf. *Hes. Op.* 496-7, *Alc.* 364, *Thgn.* 384-5, 392). This does not convince (cf. Held (2003)). It is not clear *why* blame should entail bad poetry. Archilochus is not a bad poet, as evinced by the survival of his work (see Heringon (1985) 194-5 for testimonia). Archilochus, like Hipponax (e.g. 32, 34, 36), evidently presented himself as impoverished (cf. *Critias* 44 D-K with Gentili (1988) ch. 10, Rotstein (2006), Rosen (2007) ch. 7). The next sentence provides the most serious obstacle to Miller's reading; see next note.

poet (τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχαι πότμου σοφίας ἄριστον, 56)⁷³⁵ in service to men like his present patron, the wealthiest individual in Greek history (58-61). Indeed, *Pythian* 2 advertises its status as merchandise (κατὰ Φοίνικσαν ἐμπολάν, 67). Archilochus' poetry— and so also thereby Pindar's (cf. e.g. *P.* 2.83-5)— is depicted as the product of a holistic ethical personality.

Yet in our passage a simple dichotomy between praise and blame collapses, since by blaming the paradigmatic poet of blame the praise poet briefly and to a limited degree becomes his own antithesis. ἐκὰς ἐόν (54) connotes unfriendliness.⁷³⁶ πιαινόμενον (56, prepared for by βαρυλόγοις, 55) suggests an earthy register near the bottom of epinician propriety.⁷³⁷ This *ad hominem* attack contrasts with Pindar's numerous polemics against anonymous, notional rival eulogists (see VII.4) and suggests the separate generic code of iambic invective. 'Archilochus is ... presented as a victim of his own genre' (Brown (2006) 37). *Pythian* 2 briefly becomes invective to suggest what is distinctively epinician and also to show how epinician can include invective in its proper place within a different and more expansive worldview. Blame is implicated in praise as its antithesis and finds a limited place in the victory ode.

B. *Pythian* 1

⁷³⁵ Gerber (1960) convincingly rules out several interpretations of this difficult sentence and endorses the best solution (with Lloyd-Jones (1973) 121-2, Carey (1981), Race (1997)). Translate 'to be wealthy through a kindly fate ($\approx$ χρήματα ... θεόδοτα, Hes. *Op.* 320 $\approx$ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως, anon. 890.3 *PMG*) is the highest aim of wisdom' (cf. *P.* 5.1-4). τὸ πλουτεῖν (56) contrasts with ἀμαχανία (54) and helps to determine its precise sense. Word-order makes it difficult to construe the infinitive with σοφίας (56). The metaphor of intellectual wealth is not prominent in Pindar (but note *O.* 7.1-6; cf. M. L. West (1978) on Hes. *Op.* 455). σοφίας (56) looks to ἐλευθέραι φρενί (57, of Hieron's material generosity).

⁷³⁶ Cf. [Thgn.] 970, Miller (1981) 141 for the ethical distance. M. L. West (2011-13) ii.137 and Gentili *et al.* (1995) understand temporal distance. This seems inconsonant with εἶδον (*P.* 2.54).

⁷³⁷ Brown (2006) 37; cf. *O.* 2.96, *P.* 4.150, B. 3.68, anon. 343a *TrGF*.

In 1992 the publication of P. Oxy. 3965 returned to the world substantial parts of Simonides' 'Plataea Elegy'. These finds, invaluable in their own right, also allow us to appreciate better an allusion in Pindar.⁷³⁸ In *Pythian* 1 'Ελλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας (75), describing Hieron's defeat of the Carthaginians, evokes a trope of poetry on the Persian Wars that may well have featured in Simonides' works on that theme.⁷³⁹ In Pindar this slogan springs a priamel canvassing notional poems on the most significant battles in recent memory (75-80):

ἀρέομαι
 πὰρ μὲν Καλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν
 μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρται δ' ἐρέω πρὸ Κιθαιρῶνος μάχαν,
 ταῖσι Μῆδειοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι,
 παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὐυδρον ἄκταν
 Ἰμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσας,
 τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἄμφ' ἀρετῇ, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.

Simonides evidently composed two poems fundamentally similar to the two hypothetical works described here: one on the battle of Salamis (Plut. *Them.* 15.4, Vit. Pind. Ambros. p. 2.21-5 Drachmann, Suda C 439)⁷⁴⁰ and another on the battle of Plataea (P. Oxy. 3965).⁷⁴¹ It is hard to believe that Pindar does not refer to these poems by a contemporary to whom he elsewhere refers with comparable indirectness (*O.* 9.48-9, *I.* 2.30-2, *Pae.* 4.21-4). Poems for recent battles are not attested as a traditional genre.⁷⁴² Pindar is not just talking about *mentioning* these battles but

⁷³⁸ An allusion has been suggested, to my knowledge, only by Hutchinson (2001) 285-6 and only in passing there.

⁷³⁹ 'Ελλά[δα μ]ὴ πᾶσαν δούλιο[ν ἡμᾶρ ἰδεῖν, ([Sim.] *FGE* XX), *CEG* 467.3, 625, 658.6, 789.5, 798. The trope of saving Greece from slavery, if not these epigrams, may be genuinely Simonidean (cf. Petrovic (2007) 169, Sider (2007) 117-19). Later tradition associates Simonides with the Persian Wars more frequently and more closely than any other poet (Bravi (2006) 42-8).

⁷⁴⁰ There is a chance that 5-9 W come from this poem, but this does not seem very probable (M. L. West (1993) 2-3).

⁷⁴¹ M. L. West (1993) 2-3 discusses the textually troubled passage in the Suda. Kowerski (2005) ch.1 hypothesises a single poem celebrating multiple battles. This does not convince (cf. Rawles (2006b)). *Pythian* 1, not cited by Kowerski (2005), militates against this thesis.

⁷⁴² I. C. Rutherford (2001b) 177. The evidence for elegy performed at public occasions collected by E. L. Bowie (1986) 28-34 suggests a wide range of possible topics (cf. Sider (2006)).

about delivering a composition (ῥῆμον, *P.* 1.79) in order to celebrate military victory. It would not be surprising if both Simonides' poem on Plataean and his poem on Salamis garnered widespread repute soon after their first performance. Both celebrated an event viewed as supremely significant to all Greeks. Both were composed by a leading poet, who, to judge from *Pythian* 1, was commissioned by the two leading states of the day, Athens and Sparta.⁷⁴³

Other connections reinforce the case for understanding an allusion. Simonides likens contemporaries to Achilles (11.19-20 W), who perished in war (11.1-8 W with M. L. West (1992) 5, Barchiesi (2001)); Pindar likens Hieron to Philoctetes, who was responsible for the sack of Troy and survived (*P.* 1.50-5). Simonides, commissioned by a city, makes the sack of Troy a corporate endeavour (τοὶ δὲ πόλιν]ν πέρσαντες, 13); Pindar, commissioned by a monarch, makes it the accomplishment of one fated individual (ὃς Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρσεν, τελεύτασέν τε πόνου Δαναοῖς, 54).⁷⁴⁴

Pythian 1 reacts to two poems which must have been among the most exciting events in recent literary history. It asserts the poet and his patrons' matching places on the highest level of the Hellenic economy of prestige represented by these Simonidean works. The defeat of the Carthaginians in the west is put on a par with the defeat of the Persians in the east. The individual Sicilian Deinomenidae are put on a par with the foremost mainland powers (Pfeijffer (2005) 30). Pindar, too, is presented as the equal of Simonides, the older poet selected for such grand commissions. *Pythian* 1 conveys the impression that the Theban poet, a recognised figure in high demand, takes his current theme from among the most illustrious possible topics, others of which he might be privileged to treat elsewhere (cf. fr. 76-7). He expands the scope of his epinician to

⁷⁴³ ἐν Πάρται (77) *prima facie* suggests that the 'Plataea Elegy' was first performed in Sparta as ἐν Κέωι (*I.* 1.8) suggests that *Paeon* 4 was performed on Ceos (see p. 17).

⁷⁴⁴ πέρθω + πόλις is a fairly common combination in epic, but the connection between Simonides and Pindar is still, I think, significant.

include martial as well as athletic victory (73-5; cf. *I.* 5.38-54). The break-off about brevity in 81-4 is motivated in part by the prospect of composing a monumental poem like the Plataea Elegy. Recognising the inclusion of elements from another and perhaps longer type of poetry adds another layer of meaning to the poet's description of his own compositional technique: *καὶρὸν εἰ φθέγξαιο, πολλῶν πείρατα συντανύσαις | ἐν βραχεῖ, μείων ἔπεται μῶμος ἀνθρώπων* (81-2).

Simonides' professionalism is relevant to our passage, if only indirectly. The later biographical tradition about his mercenary character probably stems from a skewed reading of his poetry.⁷⁴⁵ Evoking the work of a fellow professional, Pindar stresses ethical motives. *χάρην | μισθόν* (76-7) is a striking collocation of conceptual spheres which are typically opposed (cf. *O.* 10.7-12, *P.* 2.67-71). The final term of the priamel moves further away the vocabulary of contract. So far from receiving remuneration, Pindar will 'pay' (*τελέσαις*, 79) the Deinomenidae his ode as a debt of thanks for their service to Greece (cf. *τείομεν*, *O.* 10.12). A backhanded swipe at Simonides' venality seems unlikely in this exalted setting. Rather, an inversion of the language of commerce reflects on the prestige of the subject: a renowned professional like Simonides or Pindar might take a contract to praise the worthy, but being selected to celebrate a battle that saves the Greek world is payment in itself.

If these arguments point in the right direction, *Pythian* 1 provides fascinating insight into the contemporary economy of prestige in which Pindar worked. Literary and political histories are brought into close parallel. An allusion to the 'Plataea Elegy' in *Pythian* 1, first performed on Sicily in 470, just nine years after the battle of Plataea, would show that Simonides' hopes for a widespread reception matching that of Homeric epic (11.15-24 W) were neither entirely unrealis-

⁷⁴⁵ Cf. Xenophanes B 21 D-K, Lefkowitz (1981) 55, Kivilo (2010) 207 and, more generally, Bell (1978). Cf. references to Pindar in *Ar. Av.* 924-52.

tic nor merely conventional poetic fancy.⁷⁴⁶ Putting his own epinician alongside Simonides' well-known works, Pindar advances a claim to a similar recognition among his contemporaries and in time to come.⁷⁴⁷ The final lines look forward explicitly to this possibility (93-100).

Pythian 1 is not the only time that Pindar alludes to Simonides. Having left behind the fictions of bitter acrimony and veiled jibes found in the scholia, scholars now need to take a more nuanced view of Pindar's relation to his lyric contemporaries.

C. *Isthmian* 2

Isthmian 2 is perhaps Pindar's most remarkable mediation on the nature of the literary tradition and his own place within it. The poem is permeated by the past. The opening *syncrisis* contrasts older erotic authors with commercialised contemporary poetry. Pindar explicitly recalls his previous odes for the Emmenidae. Xenocrates, the primary recipient of praise, has evidently perished;⁷⁴⁸ his son Thrasybulus is addressed. This is an ode very much about coming after.

Pindar emerges as a hybrid incorporating elements of both older and contemporary literature. The opening comparison and indeed the entire ode may be framed in terms of what Bundy terms *φυσία* and *τέχνη*.⁷⁴⁹ Pindar has the guileless sincerity of older erotic encomium (*φυσία*) lacking from hireling contemporaries, but he is superior to older poets in artistic sophistication (*τέχνη*). Far from being a detachable prelude, as it is sometimes treated, the opening comparison sets the

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. Irigoin (1952) 9, Hubbard (2004) 71-2 on the rapid dissemination of Pindar.

⁷⁴⁷ Contrast Athanassaki (2009) 253, who writes that *P.* 1.75-80 'serves as a reminder that the appeal of song is conditional, subject to local bounds'.

⁷⁴⁸ Xenocrates' death is never mentioned but is commonly inferred, with reason. He is described in the past tense throughout and never addressed.

⁷⁴⁹ Bundy (1986) 29, who does not discuss *Isthmian* 2. Cf. K. A. Morgan (1993) 14, speaking generally: 'Pindar must show himself a professional competent to immortalise and also an amateur who speaks artlessly and sincerely'.

thematic agenda for the ode. Eventually both nostalgia and cynicism are left behind.⁷⁵⁰

Pindar initially suggests a potential line of criticism in order to highlight his distinct achievement in the area to which this challenge pertains (1-11):⁷⁵¹

Οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε,
 φῶτες, οἱ χρυσαμπύκων
 ἐς δίφρον Μοικᾶν ἔβαι-
 νον κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,
 ῥίμφα παιδεῖους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,
 ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας
 εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν.

ἂ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής
 πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·
 οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖ-
 αι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι αἰοιδαί.
 νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τώργειοι φυλάξαι
 ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας < ~ - > ἄγχιτα βαῖνον,

‘χρήματα χρήματ’ ἀνήρ’
 ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ’ ἅμα λειφθεῖς καὶ φίλων.

This opening is not just about poetry but, like other Pindaric proems (cf. Hutchinson (2001) 375), about opening a poem. ἐς δίφρον Μοικᾶν ἔβαινον (2) connotes initiating a journey (cf. *N.* 9.4). ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα (8) describes gaudy preludes.⁷⁵² The proem is where a poet selects his theme: desire, not cash, once dictated the subject of praise.⁷⁵³ Pindar contrasts contemporary pro-

⁷⁵⁰ Bundy (1972) 88n109: ‘what envy he has of the impulsive singers of old is thus rejected’.

⁷⁵¹ Cf. Callim. *Aet. fr.* 1.1-6, *Iamb.* 13.11-22. Thummer (1968-9) i.36 discusses Pindar’s opening ‘Hindernismotiv’.

⁷⁵² Cf. *O.* 6.3, Eur. *Phoen.* 1336 with Mastronarde (1984).

⁷⁵³ In Pindar’s day some still praised beautiful youths in poetry for free (cf. *B. fr.* 4.80, Burnett (1988) 139, Nagy (1990) 342). Pindar’s point appears to be that this art form no longer attracts leading talents, who could market their skill. κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι (2) marks ‘the poets of old’ as canonical if, as seems probable, the adjective means ‘glorious’ (see Braswell (1999) on *N.* 9.10) rather than ‘resounding’. The former sense is supported by allusions to canonical poets in the following lines. In the Pindaric corpus only at fr. 140a.60-1 might the κλυτ- stem refer exclusively to sound (see Finglass (2011) on Soph. *Aj.* 375).

fessional panegyric with older paederastic verse.⁷⁵⁴

Contemporary professional poetry peddles gratification as indiscriminately as a prostitute. The description of the meretricious Muse emphasises pleasure: οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας | ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι αἰοδαί (7-8). Nothing in archaic poetry foreshadows the audacious conceit of poems prostituted by their *lena* Terpsichore.⁷⁵⁵ Literary culture has degenerated even worse than Hesiod's races (*Op.* 109, 127-8) from gold (χρυσάμπυκων, 1) to the artificial silver veneer of makeup (ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα, 8) attracting the eye of a customer.⁷⁵⁶ The Muse has become a lover of gain, not human beings (φιλοκερδής, 6; contrast φιλόξενον, 24, of Xenocrates).

Pindar distances himself from hollow contemporary poetry by highlighting his sustained relationship to his patron and by stressing that his praise is unforced and objectively merited. A subsequent victory catalogue ends by alluding to previous odes celebrating the Emmenidae (30-2). *Isthmian* 2 is an expression of φιλία in a sustained personal relationship (cf. ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἡθαῖον, 48), not merely merchandise. Conversely, the contemporary Muse, like a prostitute,⁷⁵⁷ has no stable connection with those who employ her services.

The Emmenidae have a respected résumé. The past victory that Pindar now celebrates is al-

⁷⁵⁴ Kurke (1991) 241-56 and Nicholson (2000) situate *Isthmian* 2 in archaic mentalities surrounding money and sexuality, respectively. Woodbury (1968) sees a comparison between solo and choral poets. After M. Davies (1988) this seems unattractive. Only Τερψιχόρας (7) suggests chorality. The first half of her name is more relevant. F. Cairns (2011), adapting Woodbury's approach, sees a contrast between inexpensive choral performance and lavish choral performance. The text does not provide much support for this.

⁷⁵⁵ ἐργάτις (6): cf. Archil. 208, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐργατήριον, English 'working girl', Nicholson (2000) 241.

⁷⁵⁶ Wilamowitz (1922) 331n1, Bowra (1964) 356, Simpson (1969) 471, Nisetich (1971) 141; cf. Finglass (2007b) on *P.* 11.42. Fr. 287 (Μοῖσαι ἀργύρεαι) looks like a banalisation of our passage (Woodbury (1968) 528n3).

⁷⁵⁷ Cf. e.g. Ar. *Eccl.* 1161-2.

ready well-known in its own right: οὐκ ἀγνώτ' αἰείδω | Ἴσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν (12-13).⁷⁵⁸ The publicly recognised achievements of the Emmenidae, celebrated in previous songs (30-2), make it easy to praise them (33-4): οὐ γὰρ πάγος οὐδὲ προσάντης ἅ κέλευθος γίνεται, | εἴ τις εὐδόξων ἐκ ἀνδρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰς Ἑλικωνιάδων (cf. *N.* 6.32-4, 7.67). The motif of poetic journeying connects with the opening description of older poets (ἐκ δίφρον Μοικᾶν, 2).⁷⁵⁹ The younger poet, like his predecessors, does not passively take orders from Terpsichore, but actively directs the Muses to his chosen subject (ἄγοι, 34). His ease recalls the ease of older poets (ρίμφα, 3).

Pindar sets himself apart from widespread contemporary practice, but he does not identify his work with older lyric. He elsewhere unabashedly mentions his fee, and there is no compelling reason to suppose that *Isthmian* 2 is not a commissioned work like any other Pindaric ode (*pace*, most recently, E. L. Bowie (2012) 88-9).⁷⁶⁰ The initial criticism of modern art should not be taken at face value. In decrying the decline of poetry, Pindar alludes to two canonical older erotic poets brought to mind by his opening lines. Complex, detailed allusions suit a work addressing a discerning subject familiar with the literary history recounted in the proem (ἐκκὶ γὰρ ὧν σοφός, 12).⁷⁶¹ Pindar also lauds Thrasybulus' literary expertise in an earlier work (*P.* 6.48-9).

⁷⁵⁸ Read ἀγνώτ(α) (note accentuation), an accusative singular describing the victory. An accusative plural yields less lucid and appropriate sense. A dative predicated of Thrasybulus posits a suspect elision (Braswell (2013) 256).

⁷⁵⁹ κέλευθος (33) is suited to chariots (Becker (1937) 7-14, Lolos (2003) 148-9).

⁷⁶⁰ Nagy (1989) 141 states that in *Isthmian* 2 Pindar re-asserts 'the transcendent nature of his compensation' (cf. (1990) 188). Indo-European roots are insufficient to establish a religious connotation for μισθός in Pindar. Dennett (1995) 465 discusses the fallacy of 'inferring current function or meaning from ancestral function or meaning'.

⁷⁶¹ 'But I need say no more since you are wise'; cf. *O.* 2.95, K-G ii.156, Thummer (1968-9), Nisetich (1971) 155, Verdenius (1987-88), Race (1997). It is not attractive to take this sentence as looking forward (Denniston 446); Thrasybulus' knowledge of his own father's victory would have little to do with his being σοφός. Here σοφός (12), whatever else it might do, implies that Thrasybulus is familiar with the literary history being recounted (cf. Bury (1890) 28-30, Thummer (1968-9) ii.42; compare and contrast Pavese (1966) 110-11, Privitera (1982)). With γὰρ 'compression of thought is often the source of difficulty' (Denniston 61).

The scholia to *Isthmian* 2 (C 13) cite Anacreon: οὐδ' ἀργυρῇ κω τότ' ἔλαμπε Πειθώ (384).⁷⁶² As often with comedy, here ancient scholarship preserves a genuine intertext (cf. Woodbury (1968) 503, Nisetich (1977a) 137, Kurke (1991) 245). A silvery personified goddess associated with money and a nostalgic comparison between new and old make it probable that Pindar has his eye on this passage in describing silvery professional modern songs (οὐ ... πω τότ', 6, echoing the word-order of Anacreon; ἀργυρωθεῖσαι, 8). By referring to a poet of the lost golden era who decried the loss of a golden era before his own time, Pindar suggests that decrying the decay of traditional values is itself traditional.⁷⁶³ As the modern poet echoes an older poet in his attack on modernity, so also the modern Muse follows an antique script. Alcaeus, another canonical older poet who composed erotic verse for beautiful youths,⁷⁶⁴ already quoted a version of Aristodemus' well-known saying as a well-known saying (fr. 360): ὥς γὰρ δῆποτ' Ἀριστόδα|μον φραῖς οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον ἐν Cπάρται λόγον | εἶπην, χρήματ' ἄνηρ, πένι|χρος δ' οὐδ' εἰς πέλετ' ἔκλος οὐδὲ τίμιος. Again the Pindaric scholia (C 17) preserve this genuine intertext. In *Isthmian* 2 the new Muse promulgates old news already cited as old news by an old poet. Pindar, however, does not straightforwardly endorse her message.⁷⁶⁵ It takes more than wealth to make a man praiseworthy— as the following praise of Xenocrates suggests.

Pindar's more expansive, complex, and distinguished subject sets him apart from the older authors of the proem. Erotic lyric begins to appear trivial in comparison with epinician (cf. B.

⁷⁶² Bowra (1961) 296 attractively posits an erotic context. Striking a pose familiar from later poetry (see Kerkhecker (1999) 70n41), Anacreon may be lamenting that money, not words (cf. fr. 402c) now persuades the beautiful.

⁷⁶³ Compare and contrast Kurke (1991) 245: Pindar 'allows the older poets to have their say about the present condition of poetry'.

⁷⁶⁴ Vetta (1982), Spelman (2014a) 59.

⁷⁶⁵ 'Coming nearest truth' (10) is not the truth (cf. *prope vera*, Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.28). χρήματα χρήματ' ἄνῆρ (11) is a betrayed man's jibe at fair-weather friends. If this nearly succeeds as a description of reality, it is not endorsed as a moral norm. If few remain true to friends in hard times, the majority do not have right on their side (cf. *N.* 10.78-9).

10.42-3; contrast Nagy (1990) 341). The initial description of Thrasybulus as σοφός (12) sets the programme for praise of character rather than praise of beauty. Since Pavese (1966) scholars generally see indirect commendation of generosity in the proem.⁷⁶⁶ Pindar, however, is concerned with a more holistic assessment which includes but is not limited to generosity. Xenocrates spent liberally, but his outlay pointed to other substantive values.⁷⁶⁷

Xenocrates is praised for various manifestations of his kind disposition (ὀργάν ... γλυκεῖαν, 35-6). By contrast, ὅστις ἐὼν καλός (4), together with ρίμφα (3), connoting both quickness and ease,⁷⁶⁸ suggests that older poets were indifferent to ethical attributes and even fickle in their affections. Whereas they praised ephemeral beauty (εἶχεν, 4, imperfect), Xenocrates' temperament was a permanent characteristic (ἔχεν, 37, aorist).⁷⁶⁹ Youthful beauty is confined to one passing season of life (ὀπώραν, 5); Xenocrates' hospitality was always 'in season' (θερείαις ... χειμῶνι, 41-2). Like the short-term cash transactions of venal modern encomia, homosexual erotic poetry is predicated upon a personal relationship which is circumscribed by time: the addressee's impending maturity will render him unattractive.⁷⁷⁰ Epinician takes a more complex and challenging theme: mature human excellence.

Parallel metaphors of poetic projectiles delineate differences and similarities between Pindar and older poets: ρίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους (3); μακρὰ δισκήκαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ', ὅσον ὀργάν | Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν | ἔχεν (35-7). Both

⁷⁶⁶ Kurke (1991) 242: 'the ultimate point of this contrast is praise of Thrasyboulos' *megalo-prepeia*'.

⁷⁶⁷ Qualities praised: civic dedication (17), respect for fellow citizens (37), dedication to athletics (38), enthusiasm for religious rites (39), and, climactically, hospitality to guest-friends like Pindar (39-42).

⁷⁶⁸ Fraenkel (1950) on Aesch. *Ag.* 407.

⁷⁶⁹ "'Obtained" (from fate or from the gods)' (Verdenius (1987-88)).

⁷⁷⁰ Cf. e.g. *Mimn.* 5, Tarán (1985). A bond of friendship would ideally persist after the *eromenos* matured (cf. *O.* 1.75-8); erotic encomia would not ([Thgn.] 1327-8).

Pindar and older poets match a pleasing song (μελιγάρυσ ὕμνους, 3; μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν, 32) to a similar subject (ἀδίσταν ὁπώραν, 5; ὀργάν ... γλυκεῖαν, 35-6). Older poets sang of any attractive youth, but Pindar praises an individual without equal (ὕπερ ἀνθρώπων, 36). A superlative theme requires his utmost effort (ρίμφα, 3 vs. μακρά, 35, in corresponding strophic position).

Epinician differs from older erotic poetry not only in its relation to its subject but also in its relation to its audience. παιδείους ... ὕμνους (3; contrast τούτδ' ὕμνους, 45, of Pindar's epinician) are poems in praise of youths (cf. B. fr. 4.80, Von der Mühl (1964b) 168-72, Kurke (1988) 204-7, Burnett (1988) 139). They are 'shot' at their subject because they aim to capture his affections (cf. B. 10.42-3).⁷⁷¹ The description of the addressee's beauty as Ἀφροδίτας | εὐθρόνου μνάττειραν ἀδίσταν ὁπώραν (4-5) leaves little doubt about the motivations and desires of the composer.⁷⁷² Like hired panegyric, these poems are, on a certain view, instruments for winning some concrete good for the poet from his addressee. Pindaric epinician, by contrast, is associated with friendship rather than erotic desire or contractual services and addresses the poet's social equal (ξεῖνον, 46). Pindar seeks not to seduce a rich patron or to persuade a beautiful youth but rather to reach a universal secondary audience. The ode, like many others, closes by looking toward this ultimate goal (43-6):

μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ
 θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες,
 μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε ciγᾶτω πατρώϊαν,
 μηδὲ τούτδ' ὕμνους· ἐπεὶ τοι
 οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν ...

While not merely following the modern professional Muse, Pindar prides himself in the professional quality of his craftsmanship (ἐργασάμαν, 46; cf. ἐργάτις, 6).⁷⁷³ He does not casually shoot

⁷⁷¹ Anac. 402c explicitly acknowledges this persuasive goal.

⁷⁷² For μνάττειραν (5), 'wooer', see Carey (1981) on N. 1.16.

⁷⁷³ Cf. Kurke (1991) 250-1.

off odes at boys (ρίμφοι, 3) but crafts artefacts to be launched into the world (45-6). The poet's hard work is reflected in a literary excellence which secures a lasting reception. Older erotic poets have achieved canonical status, but their artistic project, according to Pindar, was bound up with pragmatic erotic goals; for Pindar, attaining canonical status is the practical goal.

Meditation on earlier literature suits a poem dealing with a son's relationship to his father. Poet and addressee alike must negotiate the legacy of the past. Thrasybulus is encouraged to lay a claim to his father's virtues. πατρώϊαν (44) connotes not just 'belonging to your father' but 'paternal'. It suggests an inherited characteristic (Nisetich (1977) 147, Clear (2013) 32). By publicly performing *Isthmian* 2, Thrasybulus will announce his intention to emulate Xenocrates, as he did when he was young (*P.* 6.44-5). Indeed, the diptych of *Isthmian* 2 and *Pythian* 6 depicts father and son as a matching pair (cf. Bury (1892) 32, Morrison (2007a) 89, Clear (2013)). Thrasybulus' γλυκεῖα ... φρήν (*P.* 6.52) perpetuates his father's ὀργάν ... γλυκεῖαν (*I.* 2.35-6).⁷⁷⁴ By commissioning a poem dedicated to Xenocrates' virtues, Thrasybulus already continues his father's cultural sophistication and liberality.

As the previous paragraph suggests, Pindar's engagement with past poetry is not merely about the ludic interplay of texts. The poet's thinking on the tradition has 'equal application to art and life' (Bundy (1972) 88n109). His work is often about working out an understanding of how the present continues from and the past. This theme is as important to the poet as it is to his patrons and to all those born into the flow of history.

III. Conclusions

Isthmian 2, like many of Pindar's odes, invites its audience to situate the author and his work

⁷⁷⁴ Note parallel praise of use of wealth (*I.* 2.39-43; *P.* 6.46), horsemanship (*I.* 2.38; *P.* 6.50-1), and respect for others (*I.* 2.37; *P.* 6.48).

both within a diachronic history and within a contemporary literary landscape. Though much of this intellectual context which was familiar to many among his contemporary public is lost to us, we can nonetheless, by assembling evidence from across the corpus, attain a fairly robust, intrinsically plausible, and internally coherent idea of Pindar's vision of the poetic world both past and present.

Synthesising the preceding arguments, this section tentatively sketches Pindar's immanent literary history. There are, of course, potential pitfalls to building a unified narrative from individual passages. Effective rhetoric, however, must have some bearing on public perceptions of how the world is. Pindar can tell different stories to achieve different rhetorical ends, but his stories are based on real data. Thus Homer may be presented as an idealised praise poet (*I.* 4.37-42) or a liar (*N.* 7.20-4), but both passages presuppose the widespread dissemination of his poetry. The similitude of various references to other literature in Pindar encourages one to explore overarching patterns between them. Similarly we cannot extract from the victory odes a systematic, rationalised theory of poetry (cf. Carey (1995) 99), but we can make illuminating connections between various poetological passages.

For Pindar genres are very old. They came into being in the distant past in order to fulfil time-honoured social needs like mourning the dead (fr. 128c). New occasions constantly elicit fresh iterations of ancient forms (*O.* 10.76-81). Over time there has also accrued a series of musical and technical innovations resulting from cultural interchange (fr. 125) and individual talent (fr. 140b). These are uniformly presented as valuable, permanent contributions. Besides such inventions, authors can also transmit an integral composition into the future. Artistic quality keeps a work in circulation and remembered (*I.* 7.17-19); time winnows out all but the best (*N.* 4.39-43). A variety of authors like Homer (*I.* 4.37-42) and Archilochus (*P.* 2.1.54-6) have become

landmarks in the literary landscape. Such deceased authors can be presented as living presences in the world. New works are contextualised against the background of a canon (*O.* 9.47-9) and within a conversation of imitation and emulation with the voices of the past.

The relatively recent emergence of a Hellenic economy of glory is the most significant development separating Pindar's historical moment from the past (*I.* 2.1-12). The best poets now do not simply respond to the needs of a moment or their own first-hand experience but are commissioned by a series of patrons, usually from distant communities, expressly in order to perpetuate fame (*O.* 4.11-12). Both author and patron positively define themselves by their participation in a panhellenic network of excellence (*P.* 1.75-80). The epinician genre in particular has evolved from an organic outburst of joy after victory into an artefact crafted in order to reach into the world and into the future (*Olympian* 10). *Olympian* 9 and *Isthmian* 2 perhaps suggest that a self-conscious and thoroughgoing orientation towards secondary reception separates Pindar's work from his lyric predecessors. Poetry is still imbedded in social life and the author's experience, but it now focuses on transcending its immediate context. Among contemporary eulogists, Pindar is the consummate professional. He is uniquely capable of creating works that fulfil their highest purpose: to enter the canon (*N.* 3.80-4). Each of his odes is presented as literary history unfolding in the present. To interpret them as such has been the task of this part of the thesis.

Part Three. Paths of Song: Linear Cohesion in Pindar's Epinicians

Introduction

Pindar's aesthetic sense seems to demand that once silence has been broken, everything must appear to emerge naturally and persuasively from what precedes and lead naturally and persuasively into what follows ...

– Miller (1993a) 120-1

Since the Renaissance, Pindar has garnered a reputation for obscurity unmatched among classical poets.⁷⁷⁵ Indeed, he has often been and sometimes still is valued *for* being obscure. Later ancient writers, however, do not regard him as incomprehensible.⁷⁷⁶ Pindar's odes cultivate an aesthetic of challenging intricacy (see I.3), but evidently many fifth-century Greeks did not encounter the same prohibitive difficulty as some modern readers have found. The poet was popular amongst geographically diverse contemporary patrons; he claims to communicate with widespread secondary audiences.

What accounts for the marked divergence between ancient and modern reception? The challenge faced by modern readers is not primarily grammatical. Though his Greek is not as challenging as Sophocles', we have much greater difficulty understanding Pindar (Lloyd-Jones (1983) 139). The chief obstacle lies not in parsing individual sentences but in grasping how one sentence leads coherently to the next. This is in large part because the connective tissue of argumentation remains implicit. The movement of thought is often not signposted; the reader must infer the relationship of a new thought to what precedes.⁷⁷⁷ 'The poet appeals to a capacity in the

⁷⁷⁵ See J. T. Hamilton (2003) ch. 1.

⁷⁷⁶ Most (1985a) 12: 'Pindar is discussed by many ancient poets, prose writers, and literary theorists— and not one provides even the slightest hint that Pindar's poetry might offer any obstacle whatsoever to the understanding'; cf. Lefkowitz (1976) 96, P. Wilson (1980) 97, Köhnken (2005). J. T. Hamilton (2003) argues that 'darkness' is central to Pindar's poetics. Yet Pindar associates poetry with light (see II).

⁷⁷⁷ Dornseiff (1921) 94: 'Der Chorlyriker meidet die logischen Partikeln bewußt'. Consider rates of occurrence for γάρ (incidences divided by words in corpus): Pindar's epinicians: .0069; Bac-

listener or reader to grasp the coherence of independent statements which are juxtaposed without any signal guiding him in his interpretation of how they cohere' (Pfeijffer (1999a) 28; cf. Miller (1993a) 114). An audience is all the more involved in the poem as they work out its meaning (cf. Carey (1999) 27-8).

This part of the thesis tackles a central challenge of reading Pindar by demonstrating how each victory ode functions as a coherent train of thought. An annotated text explains how every sentence in the corpus forms part of a lucid chain of reasoning. 'A single thread of rational discourse' (Miller (1993a) 120) is pursued through every epinician. One may say of each ode, as Bundy (1986) 91 writes of *Isthmian* 1, that 'its linear development from start to finish is perfectly lucid'.⁷⁷⁸ Throughout Pindar 'each topic develops logically from the previous ones and plays an important role in the consecutive argument of the poem' (Race (2004) 93). When the implicit connective tissue of argumentation is rendered explicit, we can discern patterns structuring passages which might at first glance resemble free association. When these patterns are identified and explicated, they may provide insights into the fabric of the poems.

This analysis suggests that Pindar's epinicians are more rigorously argumentative than they are sometimes taken to be. Older scholars sometimes characterise the epinicians as essentially meandering association.⁷⁷⁹ More recent scholars stress how Pindar imitates extemporaneous

chylides' epinicians: .0055; Sophocles' surviving plays: .0133; Euripides' surviving plays (including [Eur.] *Rhesus*): .0114; Lysias 1-15: .0129; Aristotle *De Anima*: .0191; *Metaphysics*: .0200.

⁷⁷⁸ Schadewaldt (1928) 301, 305 discusses each poem's single 'Gedankengang', but he downplays its logical quality; cf. Fränkel (1962) 425. Race (1990) 6-7, (2004) 69-70 articulates the mostly implicit role of linear continuity in Bundy's project.

⁷⁷⁹ Cf. e.g. Croiset (1880) 409, Dornseiff (1921) 21, 110 ('kein Fluß, keine rechte Bewegung'), Schadewaldt (1928) 298, 307 ('vorlogischen Denkens'), Gianotti (1966) 387 ('il suo caratteristico processo associativo, basato sulle immagini'), M. L. West (1980) ('one is often left with the impression of a suitcase filled rather at random'), Verdenius (1987-88) ii.87 ('the poet ... connects some standard elements ... in an associative way'). Fränkel (1924) has proved influential,

speech through ‘oral subterfuge’:⁷⁸⁰ the poems are ‘dramatic mimesis’ (Miller (1993a) 121) depicting a mind working in real time. In both approaches, the associative element of Pindar’s discourse, viewed as either primitive defect or artistic affect, receives distortive emphasis. Far more sentences are linked by argumentative connections than merely by topical association. The associative links in the epinicians, moreover, are generally not idiosyncratic or capricious. The genre connects certain concepts so frequently that, for an experienced audience, they follow coherently from one another. Grasping the linear continuity of one poem requires background knowledge derived from experiencing many similar poems.

Scholars perhaps neglect cohesion in Pindar in part because some passages advertise an ostensible lack of cohesion. In *P.* 9.103-5, for instance, as the poet brings a theme to a satisfying conclusion (δίψαν ἀκειόμενον, 104), a new assignment suddenly obtrudes: ἐμὲ δ’ οὖν τις ἀοιδᾶν | δίψαν ἀκειόμενον πράττει χρέος, αὐτίς ἐγεῖραι | καὶ παλαιὰν δόξαν ἔων προγόνων. This mid-performance commission is patently fictional. The ensuing narrative has manifest thematic continuities with the rest of the poem, yet Pindar has introduced a new topic in such a way as to create an arresting impression of discontinuity. His odes sometimes show their seams and they are meant to do so (cf. Greengard (1980) 5). One should be wary either of taking at face value such indications of a spontaneous associative texture or of taking them as straightforwardly indicative of the nature of the corpus.⁷⁸¹

Perceptions of Pindar’s vatic inscrutability or extemporaneous insouciance can be self-perpetuating. One may not find argumentative connections because one does not believe that

but the roots of this prejudice may go as deep as the myth of poetic madness (on which see Tügelstedt (1970)).

⁷⁸⁰ Carey (1981) 5, attractively labelling what earlier scholars had perceived (e.g. Setti (1970) 426); cf. Miller (1993a, 1993b), Scodel (1996), Pfeijffer (1999a) 48, Bonifazi (2000). Cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 148 on Sappho (ὥπερ μετανοήσῃ) and Walsh (1990) on Callimachus.

⁷⁸¹ Cf. Carey (1980c) 156, Miller (1993a) 138, Finglass (2007b) on *P.* 11.38-40.

they are there to be found and so does not look very hard. Thus the King in *Alice in Wonderland* states that ‘if there’s no meaning in it ... that saves a world of trouble, you know, as we needn’t try to find any’. The first requirement for making sense of Pindar, or of any speaker, is expecting him to make sense.⁷⁸² Pindar calls for philology as the art of slow reading, and reading is a linear activity. Getting the most out of these texts requires scrutinising how they progress from point to point. If the odes do not at first glance appear to be comprehensible arguments amenable to such analysis, this may be because we are unfamiliar with the premises underlying their argument. Similarly what looks like a random assortment of letters may in fact be a coherent sentence in a language unknown to us.

The concerns of this part of the thesis link with the concerns of Part One. The annotated text demonstrates how many a fifth-century Greek could have followed Pindar’s train of thought and enjoyed an ode without extensive knowledge of its first performance, the victor’s personal circumstances, or local politics. The epinicians accommodate such a reception. One scholarly gambit in the interpretation of a difficult passage is to posit some external datum unknown to us but obvious to the victor’s acquaintances or fellow citizens. Part One argued on a theoretical level against this hermeneutical manoeuvre, usually invoked in dire straits when it seems that the text does not make adequate sense on its own terms. The annotated text demonstrates how each ode *always* makes sense on its own terms *as a linear unity*. Privileged knowledge may add further resonances, but the epinicians, as coherent chains of sentences, never require knowledge unavailable to secondary audiences. Whatever might be the ‘irreducible private aspect of the Pin-

⁷⁸² Cf. Grice (1976).

daric ode' (Silk (1998) 80)— and we are *ex hypothesi* not in a good place to judge this— it nowhere constitutes an unsurmountable obstacle to linear cohesion.⁷⁸³

The concerns of this part of the thesis also link with the concerns of Part Two. Pindar's odes were intelligible as linear unities to contemporary audiences imbued in the traditions of choral lyric because they made sense to them in the same ways as other lyric poems had made sense to them in the past. The best evidence for this sweeping assertion is the patterns, described below, found throughout Pindar's epinicians, which span more than half a century. Even a casual comparison with Bacchylides' epinicians, furthermore, would suggest that these patterns were not Pindar's private property but the stuff of publicly shared convention. Nor are these patterns limited to the epinician genre: consider *Nemean* 11, analysed in the annotated text. Pindar's longer fragments look amenable to similar analysis.

The patterns appearing across Pindar and Bacchylides' choral lyric output are unlikely to have originated with them. In a future article, I hope to flesh out this intrinsically plausible contention through an analysis of linear cohesion in Alcman 1.⁷⁸⁴ For now I limit myself to cursory references to this text, which must play a central role in any account of the history of choral lyric before Pindar.

Section 2 introduces and explains the annotated text. Section 3 generalises about how the speaker shapes his thoughts and provides some novel observations about Pindar's discursive style. Section 4 interprets a single ode, *Isthmian* 5, from the perspective of its linear cohesion. It may be helpful for one to read this section alongside the annotated text of *Isthmian* 5 before us-

⁷⁸³ Contrast Bowra (1964) 329: 'the importance of the personal element accounts for much that is hard to follow'; Krummen (1990) 4.

⁷⁸⁴ Many helpful observations of Pindaric parallels may already be found throughout Puelma (1977).

ing the annotated text on its own. By way of introduction it is necessary first to contextualise this project within a broader account of how Pindar's epinicians produce meaning.

1. Webs and Chains: Experiencing Pindar's Odes

Pindar's poems derive much of their distinctive quality from the interplay between their synchronic and diachronic dimensions. These odes combine the fluidity of extemporaneous speech (on the diachronic level) with a strong sense of an overarching design (on the synchronic level).⁷⁸⁵ An epinician may be presented both as an enunciation unfolding in real time and as a text carefully composed before performance.⁷⁸⁶ These thematically and metrically byzantine monuments also cultivate an impression of having been tossed off on the fly. Apologetic passages drawing attention to ostensible mistakes (e.g. *P.* 11.38-40) and ostentatiously abrupt transitions (e.g. *P.* 9.103-5) highlight spontaneity. Metaphors depicting a whole ode as a crafted system (e.g. *O.* 6.1-3) and descriptions of the poet's work (e.g. *I.* 1.4) highlight premeditated design.

The odes provoke an audience to reconcile their diachronic and synchronic dimensions. One repeatedly asks, even after countless re-readings, 'how did we get here?' In *Nemean* 3, for instance, Pindar prays for the Muse to come to Aegina (1-3); her visit takes the speaker to the ends of the world (19-26). In Pindar the train of thought travels in unpredictable directions

⁷⁸⁵ In his analysis of discursive, non-narrative English poems of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, Tillotson (1961) identifies a pervasive tension between surprise and design. Non-narrative poems, he stresses, should be read slowly and scrutinised with a view toward their sense of progressive order which is not reducible to formal logic but has a strong argumentative element. Much here is relevant to Pindar. Cf. Silk (2012) 357: 'there is no "logic" here, but argument, or rather enactment, by association'. Both 'argument by association' and 'enactment by association' make for strange English.

⁷⁸⁶ Cf. D'Alessio (2004); composition before performance: *O.* 3.4-6, 10.85, *P.* 4.298-9, *I.* 1.4, 2.46.

through a series of individually well-motivated steps, modulating between general and particular and navigating various oppositions.⁷⁸⁷ There is an exhilarating quality to the precipitous movement of ideas (cf. *P.* 10.53-4, *Hor. Carm.* 4.2.5-8). At the same time, the poet encourages the belief that each poem is meaningful as a whole, and hence that sustained reflection on underlying connections will be rewarded with further insight— as most readers would agree that it is. Like the Muse's creation at *N.* 7.77-9, an ode is made of disparate choice elements which together form a whole which is luxurious and strange, not an immediately recognisable quotidian object.

The epinician narrator, such a prominent presence within his poems, is an interpreter in his own right. His job is to elicit the meaning of events. The manner in which he approaches this task of interpreting reality suggests ways in which audiences may in turn interpret his words. The poet asserts unobvious links between myth, programme, and performance. He thereby encourages his audience to do the same and to look beyond the connections explicitly made to discover further connections across the text. The Pindaric speaker moves in a world shot through with connections and invites his audiences to join him there. The odes not only express thoughts but model ways of thinking (cf. Landy (2012) 12 on texts as 'training-grounds for reasoning').

Pindar's epinicians produce meaning on two different but interrelated planes. On the diachronic level, each is a chain of sentences following from one another. On the synchronic level, each is a vastly complex and perhaps inexhaustible web of interconnecting motifs and ideas (cf. e.g. Schein (1988) 245 on 'artistic' and 'linear' unity, B. H. Fowler (1986)). In interpretation, di-

⁷⁸⁷ Cf. Mayer (1991) 34 on Horace's *epistles*: 'we wonder how we got to this point and so try to absorb the full force of the idea'. Macleod (1986) xv describes Horace's *Epistles* as 'carefully designed meanderings'.

achronic progression should take priority over synchronic connections. Whether one reads or listens, the meaning of each sentence is first determined in its immediate rhetorical context.⁷⁸⁸ This is not a polemical assertion about epinician poetry but a pedestrian truism about language processing and comprehension. Without an understanding of how individual statements fit into the linear progression of thought, more complex arguments about the thematic structures of Pindar's epinicians are ill-founded. Thus Race (2004) 70n2 asserts that 'one must at least understand the train of thought ... before engaging in further analysis'.⁷⁸⁹

The annotated text aims to establish the chain of linear reasoning in each victory ode. Ignoring overarching themes, it focuses on describing links between adjacent sentences. In doing so, it does not seek to exhaust the meaning of the poems but to establish a basis for further understanding. This project is atomising⁷⁹⁰ but not reductive. By studying atoms one does not deny that they make up larger things. We need different, complementary levels of analysis. For obvious reasons, it is easier to give a satisfying and sufficient account of the relationship between two sentences than of the meaning of an entire ode. In the former matter scholarly consensus is conceivable (at least in most cases).

The priority of diachronic argumentation over synchronic thematic links has far-reaching implications. Here I stress some interrelated points through a series of examples. All these points may be very crudely summarised thus: when we neglect Pindar's train of thought, we get into trouble.

⁷⁸⁸ Compare and contrast Erbse (1979) 94: 'wer ihn verstehen wollte, mußte sich bereit bei der ersten Aufführung eines solchen Chorliedes auf die Form seiner Aussage einstellen. Und der Dichter wird erwartet haben, daß man das tat'.

⁷⁸⁹ Slater (1973) 199 describes linear progression as 'a bare minimum' for interpretation; Carey (1980a) 152: 'if we wish to extract the meaning we must follow Pindar's words slowly and carefully'.

⁷⁹⁰ Cf. Most (1985) 36.

The less emphasis is placed on discerning a definite train of thought, the more idiosyncratic free association will hold sway.⁷⁹¹ Thus ἐκλοῖσι μάρναται περὶ πᾶσα πόλις (*N.* 5.47) could, taken by itself, conceivably refer to Aegina's fight for freedom against Athenian domination (Pfeijffer (1999a))— though ἐκλοῖσι (47) would be a curiously vague locution (cf. *P.* 1.84). Yet this interpretation is unlikely when the quoted phrase follows a catalogue of Aeginetan victors (40-5) as well as mention of the Aeginetan games (45) and precedes mention of another Aeginetan athletic victory (48-9). Line 47 generalises about the Aeginetans' dedication to athletics.⁷⁹² The surrounding sentences are more decisive for interpretation than decades of history.

Discerning and valuing poetic ambiguity should not be an impediment to ascertaining a chain of poetic reasoning. The epinicians will remain inert and vague if one does not work out the concrete meaning of statements and phrases as contributions to the development of an argument.⁷⁹³ Consider *N.* 7.16-17: σοφοὶ δὲ μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον | ἔμαθον, οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβεν. Taken out of context, 'the wise' cannot be securely identified. In Pindar the substantive adjective sometimes (but not always) describes poets. Some have argued that the word has that meaning here.⁷⁹⁴ In context, however, 'the wise' must have particular reference to prudent individuals who liberally (contrast ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβεν, 18; cf. Hes. *Op.* 323-4, *P.* 1.92) commission poems like *Nemean* 7. This sentence forms part of a sustained meditation on the motivations be-

⁷⁹¹ Cf. Miller (1981) 141 on *P.* 2.56: 'the critical debate that this line has inspired, inconclusive as it has been in other respects, has yielded at least one important result: it has demonstrated to perfection that words taken in isolation from their context can mean nearly anything one wishes them to mean'.

⁷⁹² Cf. *P.* 8.28, *N.* 7.10, *I.* 9.7-8.

⁷⁹³ Cf. Bundy (1986) 2: 'words like εὐφροσύνα [*N.* 4.1], left vague in line after line, so attenuate the concrete sense intended that it is impossible for a reader to follow it or for a critic to know what he is criticizing'.

⁷⁹⁴ Fennell (1899), Gildersleeve (1910) 129, Wilamowitz (1922) 161-2, Schadewaldt (1928) 300, Segal (1967) 442, Wüst (1967) 142, Bernard (1997) 109.

hind commission that began five lines earlier (cf. e.g. Young (1970) 640-3, Lloyd-Jones (1973) 110, Carey (1981), Most (1985a) 144-5).

It is consistently rewarding to probe connections between adjacent sentences which might, at first glance, appear unrelated. The odes repay such close analysis. Pindar's 'chryselephantine work challenges the scrutiny of the microscope' (Gildersleeve (1885) xlii). Consider the end of *Isthmian* 3 (15-18b):

ἴστε μὰν Κλεωνύμου
δόξαν παλαιὰν ἄρμασιν·
καὶ ματρώθε Λαβδακίδαισιν σύννομοι
πλούτου διέττειχον τετραοριᾶν πόνοις.
αἰὼν δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἀμέραις ἄλλ' ἄλλοι' ἐξ
ἄλλαζεν. ἄτρωτοί γε μὰν παῖδες θεῶν.

Many do not integrate the underlined gnome into an argument but limit themselves to citing parallels and observing that many epinicians close with statements about the variability of life. The fact that a thought is commonplace, however, hardly explains its presence and function in a particular passage. The gnome here explains why, despite the fact that they spared neither expense nor effort (πλούτου ... πόνοις, 17b) and continually competed (διέττειχον, 17b, imperfect),⁷⁹⁵ the victor's maternal relatives did not attain athletic glory (contrast δόξαν, 16; cf. *I.* 4.28-30).⁷⁹⁶ κυλινδομέναις (18) suggests random vicissitude beyond human control (cf. *O.* 12.6a). αἰὼν (18 with Privitera (1982)) here denotes the long, unpredictable course of a lifetime.⁷⁹⁷ A lack of success on the distaff side is not baldly stated but tactfully left to be deduced from the description of

⁷⁹⁵ Thummer (1968-9) takes the verb to imply success. He does not argue the point. *Isthmian* 4 does not mention victories for Melissus' maternal relatives. One might suppose that, if such victories existed to be praised, Pindar would have praised them.

⁷⁹⁶ Other substantive explanations are less satisfactory. Bury (1892) imports thoughts with little basis in the Greek. Privitera (1982) suggests that Λαβδακίδαισιν (17) recalls the dark history of this family and that the following gnome has a consolatory force. But one may doubt that a bare name recalls a mythological saga. Furthermore, one hardly requires consolation for being related to such a line (cf. *O.* 2.35-47).

⁷⁹⁷ Cf. *I.* 8.14-15: δόλιος γὰρ αἰὼν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κρέματα, | ἐλίccων βίου πόρον.

their efforts (but not success)⁷⁹⁸ and the following *gnomai*. In contrast to the vicissitudes and failures that afflict all mortals (including the victor's worthy maternal relatives), only the divine remains ever above harm (cf. *N.* 6.2-4).⁷⁹⁹

The background necessary for the comprehension of a statement is not to be sought diffused throughout the fabric of each poem but is to be grasped in the immediate rhetorical setting of a statement. Consider *O.* 7.92-5:

μὴ κρύπτε κοινόν
 σπέρμ' ἀπὸ Καλλιάνακτος·
 Ἐρατιδᾶν τοι σὺν χαρίτεσσιν ἔχει
 θαλίας καὶ πόλις· ἐν δὲ μιᾷ μοίραι χρόνου
 ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοῖαι διαθύσσοισιν αὖραι.

The final gnome is not 'a characteristically anticlimactic ending, probably aiming to lessen the dangers incurred by excessive praise' (Willcock (1995); cf. Farnell (1930-2), Verdenius (1987-88)). There is no suggestion here of excessive praise. Gentili *et al.* (2013) write that 'la massima sulla mutevolezza delle sorti umane conclude l'epinicio con una nota consolatoria'. But this happy context hardly calls for consolation (χαρίτεσσιν ... θαλίας, 93-4). The force of the gnome is the opposite of consolatory. An adversative consideration of the uncertain future contrasts with the celebratory present described in the previous sentence (cf. *I.* 8.12-16a). A reminder of time's vagaries implies an injunction to those at the premiere performance: *carpe diem* (cf. Fennell (1899)).⁸⁰⁰ The possibility of other days less happy than today lends poignancy to the poet's request for Zeus's continued favour (92-3).

⁷⁹⁸ The 'victor's narrative' is interrupted: see 2.B.1 below.

⁷⁹⁹ παῖδες θεῶν (18b) is periphrasis for the gods. Heroes are eminently woundable. The locution makes the lineage of the gods the source of their strength and marks a contrast with the family's distinguished but mortal lineage (Λαβδακίδαισιν, 17).

⁸⁰⁰ Cf. Kirkwood (1982): 'the variability of fortune stresses the greatness of such moments of human glory as those won by the victor's prowess'.

One must interpret language in context, and immediate context is most immediately relevant. Interpretations will generally be less persuasive the further from the passage in question they travel to find support. In arguing for an interpretation, one should progress from arguments derived from immediate rhetorical context to supporting evidence derived from the whole of an ode and epinician themes, and not *vice versa*. When puzzled by Pindar one should not turn the page but look closer. Consider *O.* 10.9-16:

ὀράτω νῦν ψᾶφον ἐλικομένην
ὅπᾳ κῦμα κατακλύσσει ῥέον,
ὅπᾳ τε κοινὸν λόγον
φίλαν τεύχομεν ἐς χάριν.

νέμει γὰρ Ἀτρέκεια πόλιν Λοκρῶν Ζεφυρίων,
μέλει τέ σφισι Καλλιόπα
καὶ χάλκεος Ἄρης. τράπε δὲ Κύ-
κνεια μάχα καὶ ὑπέρβιον
Ἡρακλέα·

Eckermann (2008) takes κοινὸν λόγον (11) to mean ‘pan-Hellenic myth’.⁸⁰¹ The phrase, he argues, ‘needs to be understood in its broader poetic context’ (39). This affords insufficient weight to immediate rhetorical context. Audiences cannot be expected to suspend their interpretation of this phrase until they hear a narrative which does not begin for ten lines. The adjective means not ‘pan-Hellenic’ but rather ‘shared with the community, of concern to the community’.⁸⁰² There is here no mention of the panhellenic community;⁸⁰³ there is an extended description of the victor’s community. Ensuing praise of the Epizephyrean Locrians’ character explains (γάρ, 13) the poet’s intention to deliver a κοινὸν λόγον (11; cf. Gildersleeve (1885)). He will offer a poem of concern

⁸⁰¹ Similarly Barrett (2007) 61. Advocates for the sense ‘an account agreed upon between us’ (Farnell (1930-2), Nassen (1975) 222n9) do not adduce parallels. Pindar’s repayment goes *beyond* the letter of his contract (9-12).

⁸⁰² Gildersleeve (1885), Bundy (1986) 64-5, Verdenius (1987-88); cf. *O.* 7.20-1, *P.* 9.96, *I.* 1.46.

⁸⁰³ The posited sense of the adjective is questionable. *N.* 4.12 and fr. 188.1 are not very similar. The idea of a ‘panhellenic myth’ is perhaps more intuitive to scholars after Nagy (1979) than it was to Pindar’s contemporaries.

to the community because justice demands it and because the Locrians merit it and because they will appreciate it. The qualities that Pindar lauds in the Locrians (justice, poetic culture, valour) are central to the poem dedicated in part to them. κοινὸν λόγον (11) draws on the conventional ἴδιος/κοινός dichotomy,⁸⁰⁴ here evoked by the conjunction of victor and community, a pairing fundamental to epinician and common in *exordia* outlining the subjects of an ode (O. 7.13-14, 13.1-5, P. 2.1-8, 7.1-8, 9.1-4, 12.1-8, N. 1.1-7). The epilogue corresponding to this prologue declares that Pindar eulogised both the victor and his city (97-100).

Linear cohesion is the Ariadne's thread leading any audience through the text. No audience totally forgets what they have heard earlier or is unable to make connections across the whole poem after experiencing it as a whole; it is desirable to have the entire ode 'present' in one's mind while reading in a linear fashion. The crucial point, however, is that in Pindar's epinicians the flow of sense directs audiences' attention toward what is necessary for grasping each new thought. In experiencing these poems one follows an intention that reveals itself as it moves from point to point. Understanding an ode involves first and foremost following a chain of ratiocination, not consulting an outline.⁸⁰⁵ Consider N. 7.43-53:

βάρυνθεν δὲ περιεὶ Δελφοὶ ξεναγέται.
 ἀλλὰ τὸ μόριμον ἀπέδω-
 κεν· ἐχρῆν δέ τιν' ἔνδον ἄλσει παλαιτάτῳ
 Αἰακιδᾶν κρεόντων τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι
 θεοῦ παρ' εὐτειχέα δόμον, ἥροϊαις δὲ πομπαῖς
 θεμικόπον οἰκεῖν ἐόντα πολυθύτοις.
 εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει·
 οὐ ψεῦδις ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιτατεῖ.⁸⁰⁶
 Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διός τ' ἐκ-

⁸⁰⁴ Hubbard (1985) 75-9.

⁸⁰⁵ Cf. the schemata in Dissen (1843-7) lviii, Most (1985) 56, Wells (2009) Appendix.

⁸⁰⁶ For the punctuation of line 50 see Carey (1981) and Loscalzo (2000). This seems by far the most probable text, but the point is not essential to my argument. The rhetoric works best if the apostrophe and first-person statement combine to provide a name cap (on which see Bundy (1986) 5n18); cf. Bury (1890), Pavese (1978) 674, Most (1985a) 175.

γόνων θρασύ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν

φαενναῖς ἀρεταῖς ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων
οἴκοθεν· ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀνάπαυ-
σις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργωι· κόρον δ' ἔχει
καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίεια.

Some hold that ὁ μάρτυς (49) refers to Apollo.⁸⁰⁷ But precisely how would Apollo be serving as witness? Fate (ἐχρήν ... τὸ μόρσιμον, 44) is not the same thing as Apollo (cf. *Pae.* 6.94-5). Apollo can interpret (e.g. *O.* 8.41) and accomplish (e.g. *P.* 5.60-2) but he does not *determine* what is destined. Other versions of the tale identify Apollo with the man who killed Neoptolemus in Delphi,⁸⁰⁸ but *Nemean* 7 highlights impersonal necessity (cf. πότμωι, 6; Μοῖρα, 57). This ode does not present Apollo as willing Neoptolemus to be buried in his sanctuary (contrast *Pae.* 6.112-20).⁸⁰⁹ It is hazardous to interpret Pindar's myth on the basis of something that he does not mention.

The concatenation of thought and the epinician thematic repertoire suggest that the witness in question be identified as the poet himself.⁸¹⁰ Mention of Neoptolemus' final resting place closes the narrative in a ring (cf. 34-6). εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέει (48), like many other break-off passages in asyndeton, hinges on brevity (see p. 290).⁸¹¹ For an experienced audience this conjunction of form and topic brings to mind the concerns of the poet *qua* poet. The following lines confirm this intuition. The 'three words' necessary for a good reputation are explicated by what follows: οὐ ψεῦδος ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ (49). Truthful witness is a pervasive

⁸⁰⁷ Finley (1951) 77, Carey (1981), Dönt (1985) 176, Most (1985a) 177, Teffeteller (2005) 85. Loscalzo (2000) and Currie (2005) 313 record other, less probable hypotheses.

⁸⁰⁸ See the extensive and varied material in Fontenrose (1970), Woodbury (1979).

⁸⁰⁹ It is very far from clear that the god of *N.* 7.31-2 is to be simply identified as Apollo in particular. Immediate context suggests the more general sense of 'the divine' (cf. Currie (2005) 309 with further references).

⁸¹⁰ Gildersleeve (1910) 131, Tugendhat (1960) 295, Segal (1967) 449, Lloyd-Jones (1973) 133-4.

⁸¹¹ Schadewaldt (1928) 312n3. The objections of Carey (1981) derive from an overly rigid definition of the break-off.

concern of the Pindaric narrator in *Nemean* 7 and elsewhere (Lloyd-Jones (1973) 133-4), but here the language remains general. The next lines, however, follow with climactic apostrophe as a specific example of this principle: Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διός τ' ἐκγόνων θρασύ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν ... (50).⁸¹² Linear cohesion is lost if one does not identify this first-person statement as an instantiation of the preceding generalisation. It is natural to connect a gnome about witness for great deeds with a first-person statement offering witness for great deeds (ἔργμασιν, 49→ἀρεταῖς, 51). Asyndeton encourages an audience to do so.

Thematic considerations buttress this interpretation. The following lines expand on the theme of concision first sounded in τρία ἔπεα (48; cf. ἀνάπαυσις ... κόπον, 52; contrast 104-5). Homer bears false witness for Odysseus (ψεύδεσι, 22); Pindar bears truthful witness for his patrons (κλέος ἐτήτυμον, 63) and in our passage for the Aeacidae (cf. 24-30). He is bold (θρασύ, 50) because he is confident in the truth of his words (οὐ ψεῦδις, 49; cf. *P.* 2.65-7, 4.17-18, 6.19-21 with Adorjani (2014), 9.109, 13.11-13, *N.* 6.26-8, 7.64-7).⁸¹³ He need not, like Homer, inflate his subject; he can simply tell it like it is. 'La materia mitica fornita dagli Eacidi giustifica il timore di Pindaro' (Loscalzo (2000)). It is easy to praise such an illustrious group, who provide much to praise (see Bundy (1986) 61-2 on the *eumachania*-motif).

In Pindar each thought springs from what came before and motivates what comes next. Interpretations that rupture either the forward or the backward link in the chain of ratiocination are generally unsatisfactory. Bundy (1986) 54 asserts that *I.* 1.40 generalises from the experience of

⁸¹² I translate: 'I am bold to say that for the radiant achievements of the descendants of you and Zeus there is an authoritative road of words from your home'. For this construction see Fennell (1899), Köhnken (1971) 56-7, Carey (1981), Loscalzo (2000), Teffeteller (2005) 84; contrast Most (1985a) 175. Emendation is not clearly required. The important point is that, 'whatever the exact syntax, the general sense is clear ... Pindar is speaking of his own art' (Lloyd-Jones (1973) 134).

⁸¹³ Thus κυρίαν (51), 'authoritative, valid' (cf. Köhnken (1971) 74, Slater s.v., Most (1985a) 179), makes good sense (μυρίαν *conj.* Janko (1991)).

the victor's father Asopodorus, but the following gnome concerned with athletics has reference to Herodotus himself (40-5):

ὁ πονή-
 καίς δὲ νόωι καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει.

 εἰ δ' ἀρετᾷ κατὰκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν,
 ἀμφοτέρων δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις,
 χρή νιν εὐρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπων
 μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν
 γνώμας.

Bundy's (1986) 54 chief argument is that 'the gnome of line 40 marks a division between topics' (cf. Woodbury (1981) 241-2). This is implausible. Gnomai in Pindar are integrated into a linear argument. His odes take the mimetic form (related to circumstances of their actual performance and reception) of an oral monologue in which each statement emerges from what precedes. There is no paragraphing, at stanza break or elsewhere.⁸¹⁴ Transitions are accomplished through a panoply of motifs (see 2.A.iii below). One should be wary of claims like 'here begins a new movement' which relax constraints on linear cohesion. In Pindar there are no 'unverbundene Themen' (*pace* Thummer (1968-9) i.122; compare his examples with their treatment in the annotated text).

Bundy's interpretation also disrupts a link between προμάθειαν (40) and ὀργάν (41). Mention of intellectual virtue would be followed by a description of the intellectual virtue of another type of person. A distinctive sequence of topics, moreover, is disturbed by this reading. If one instead takes the indefinite subject of line 40 as the same indefinite subject of what follows, a familiar *lucidus ordo* results: an individual attains a certain character (40), puts his character into

⁸¹⁴ A very few odes seem to divide their subject matter (roughly) by triads (Christ (1896) 97). But there can be no expectation that this will happen.

action (41-2), succeeds (viv⁸¹⁵ εὐρόντεσσιν, 43), and thereby earns praise (43-5). This traces, with individuating variations from the general pattern, the ‘victor’s narrative’ (see 2.B.1 below), a typologised sequence of topics. Lastly, Bundy’s interpretation leaves προμάθειαν (40) unsatisfyingly vague: foreknowledge of what? If one posits linear continuity, the following lines provide a satisfying answer in harmony with epinician ideology: one who has struggled may manifest his foreknowledge of his own demise and of the human condition by dedicating himself wholly to the pursuit of noble action and enduring glory (see p. 69n213; cf. *P.* 4.286-7 for similar learning linked to misfortune).

Since each sentence in the odes derives from what came before and motivates what follows, a misstep at any point along the path may have far-reaching consequences. Bundy’s interpretation begins from a false premise. viv (36) refers to the victor⁸¹⁶ and not his father, as Bundy assumes without argument. Now with the present Isthmian victory (vῶν δ’ αὔτις, 39) the fate of the family (Πότμος ... συγγενής, 39-40) has returned Herodotus to the good fortune once enjoyed by his father (ἀγακλέα τὸν Ἀσωποδώρου πατρὸς αἴσαν, 34; ἀρχαίαι ... εὐαμερίας, 39-40) after Herodotus suffered misfortune (συντυχίαι, 38≠εὐαμερίας, 40).

2. Introducing the Annotated Text

Though necessarily implicated in any attempt to understand Pindar, linear cohesion, the topic of this part of the thesis, is seldom treated directly. Traditional forms of scholarship are not suited to addressing the issue comprehensively, explicitly, and concisely. The lemmatised commentary, which tends to treat sentences as discrete units, can sometimes gloss over how

⁸¹⁵ The antecedent of viv (43) is ἀρετῇ (41; see e.g. Privitera (1982)).

⁸¹⁶ Bowra (1964) 114, Thummer (1968-9), Privitera (1978) 115; cf. *N.* 11.11-16. The subject of the sentence is explicitly described as τοῦδ’ ἀνδρὸς (sc. Herodotus) ἐν τιμαῖσιν (*I.* 1.34).

sentences connect. Essays and monographs create their own discursive structures rather than following those of the poems. Formal studies focus on generic themes and the structures of odes. A felicitous translation need not spell out the train of thought. We require a novel approach if we are to get to grips with Pindar's linear cohesion. *νεαρά δ' ἐξευρόντα δόμεν βαράνῳ | ἐκ ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος* (*N.* 8.20-1).

Linguists have long studied the flow of everyday conversations in search of insight into communication (see, for instance, Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008)). Related methods of analysis may be applied to Pindar's difficult poetry, which imitates flowing quotidian speech (cf. Miller (1993b) 23). In particular text linguistics, which is primarily concerned with relations of meaning between sentences,⁸¹⁷ offers a helpful framework for studying the progression of thought in Pindar's epinicians.

One concept from the toolkit of text linguistics is especially helpful. Cohesion 'refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text' (Halliday and Hasan (1976) 4).⁸¹⁸ Perhaps unsurprisingly, specialists continue to debate precisely what creates and constitutes cohesion. For present purposes, it is sufficient to illustrate the concept in a rough-and-ready way through examples (borrowed from Nunan (1993) 21):

- a) It said in a statement on Sunday that 135 people were killed in the Capital of Bujumbura and surrounding areas and 137 more in the northern provinces of Citiboke and Bubanza. The government said order had been restored but security forces were still on alert for attacks from rebels. Burundi has said 272 people were killed in clashes between security forces and rebels.
- b) At least 14 people died on Saturday after drinking a cheap alcoholic beverage, raising to 20 the number of people killed by the poisonous brew in two days, news reports said. The quake measured 5.7 on the Richter scale. In England, however, the tungsten-tipped spikes would tear thin tarmac surfaces.

⁸¹⁷ De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) 15.

⁸¹⁸ Cf. the definition of Tanskanen (2006) 19-20: 'the grammatical and lexical elements on the surface of a text which form relations that connect parts of the text'. For some different applications of the concept to ancient Greek literature see Wakker and Bakker (2009).

Textual cohesion separates a), a text, from b), a heap of sentences, which, while individually well-formed and comprehensible, do not relate to one another so as to make a whole. ‘There exist separate principles of text-construction, beyond the rules for making sentences’ (R. Fowler (1991) 59).

It is no small part of the Pindarist’s claim to expertise that she can explain how the text coheres.⁸¹⁹ To the untrained eye, *O.* 10.11-21 (transl. Race (1997)) might appear more like b) than a):

... so shall we pay back a theme of general concern as a friendly favor. For Strictness rules the city of the Western Locrians, and dear to them are Calliope and brazen Ares. The battle with Cyncnus turned back even mighty Heracles, and as a victorious boxer at the Olympic games, let Hagesidamus offer gratitude to Ilas as Patroclus did to Achilles. By honing someone born for excellence a man may, with divine help, urge him on to prodigious fame ...

No sentence is grammatically troublesome, but as a whole the passage is difficult to comprehend because it is not readily apparent how each sentence relates to its neighbours. One can sympathise with undergraduates who, after working hard to translate Pindar accurately, are dispirited to discover that they do not understand what they have translated accurately. The challenge lies grasping how one thought leads to the next.

The annotated text seeks to address this challenge across the epinician corpus. The Greek is arranged in order to bring out relationships of textual cohesion rather than metrical form. The units of analysis are thus not *cola* but sentences and independent clauses as indicated in Race’s edition by full stops and raised dots.⁸²⁰ For lack of a better word I term these divisions ‘units’. A parenthetical gloss explains how each unit follows from what precedes. Glosses describe in order

⁸¹⁹ Tanskanen (2006) 20: ‘some texts may be coherent and meaningful to some receivers but uninterpretable to others’.

⁸²⁰ There is a certain amount of subjectivity in how editors elect to punctuate. This is not fatal for my project, which could easily accommodate various plausible articulations of the text.

three types of links, each separated by a semicolon, that contribute to textual cohesion in a different way: argumentative relationship, conceptual content, and verbal reference. Thus the lemma on the sentence beginning at *O.* 5.9 reads: (S; success/commemoration, games/home; ἔδραν→ἄλκοc). ‘S’ denotes the argumentative relationship of ‘Sequence’; ‘success/commemoration’ denotes the conceptual connection between these ideas; ἔδραν→ἄλκοc denotes verbal reference between these words.

The first element of the parenthetical glosses concerns argumentative relationships.⁸²¹ This refers to connections in reasoning that obtain between the unit glossed and the preceding unit. Sometimes a particle (e.g. γάρ) may suggest a certain type of link, but typically argumentative relationships remain implicit. A particular success, for instance, may follow as an instantiation of a gnome about success with no explicit verbal marker of the logical connection (e.g. *P.* 1.94). Through extended engagement with epinician, one becomes attuned to typical patterns. Certain combinations of topics come to suggest certain relationships of sense. A gnome about poetry, for instance, tends to be followed by its exemplification in the words of the speaker (e.g. *P.* 9.77-9).⁸²² The key below describes twenty basic terms that together describe the relationship between nearly all adjacent units in Pindar’s odes. As scholars cite parallels for epinician themes and vocabulary, so they should cite parallels for patterns of argumentation. Most (1985a) 203, for instance, takes *N.* 7.102-4 as justification for the preceding prayer: Heracles should grant the poet’s request because he has not maltreated Neoptolemus. One looks in vain through many Pindaric examples, however, for a justification of a prayer

⁸²¹ Cf. Haliday and Hasan (1976) 226-7 on the concept of conjunction in text linguistics.

⁸²² Signposted exceptions: *P.* 1.85, *N.* 4.35, 10.21.

that cites an individual's treatment of *another* divinity.⁸²³ Most's reading posits odd rhetoric and odd theology. If *Isthmian* 3 and 4 are one poem, then we have a universal generalisation unrelated to poetry (*I.* 3.18b) followed by an unconnected authorial statement (*I.* 4.1). Such does not happen elsewhere in Pindar. This may be added to the reasons to think that *Isthmian* 3 and 4 are separate poems (see p. 58n175). The key below describes various argumentative relationships (see 2.A).

The second element of the parenthetical glosses regards conceptual content. This refers to the connection between related topics in adjacent units. Topics are printed in the order of their appearance with a slash representing the movement between units. Thus 'success/celebration' represents a connection between the previous unit describing athletic success and a new unit describing celebration attending athletic success (e.g. *N.* 1.10-12). In epinician, as in other types of discourse, some concepts are so closely associated that mention of one may naturally prompt mention of the other. Grasping cohesion often entails understanding what concepts are being balanced or contrasted. Some sets of ideas are obvious enough (e.g. impossible and possible), but others, axiomatic to Pindar's first audiences, are far from self-evident to modern audiences.⁸²⁴ Through extended engagement with the poems, one absorbs the ideology of the genre and its typical concatenations of themes. Patterns of contrast clearly observed many times over may well also be more subtly at work elsewhere. The best argument for a particular interpretation may

⁸²³ *O.* 4.16 and *N.* 11.8-9 are different: these cite the victor's dedication to abstractions, which stand for virtues.

⁸²⁴ Cf. Slater (1977) 198, comparing Aristotelian enthymemes: 'Pindar states the minor premise, the major we are supposed to take as axiomatic. The trouble often is that we do not know what ancient aristocrats thought to be axiomatic, and we have to work by analogy and parallels from the minor to the major premise, in the hope of discovering precisely what an ancient audience took for granted'.

then be a set of passages articulating the same contrast. A list below sets out concepts commonly linked in epinician (see 2.B).

The third element of the parenthetical glosses regards relations of verbal reference.⁸²⁵ This describes how related concepts are carried over in recognisable form from the language of one unit into the language of the next. ‘A noble man’, for instance, may have a relation of reference with the name of the victor’s ancestor, a noble man, in the next unit (e.g. *I.* 8.59-62). Pindar’s meaning can be radically underdetermined. By being clear about relations of verbal reference, one may flesh out how immediate context determines precise sense. Out of context, for example, προμαθείας δ’ ἀπόκεινται ῥοαί (*N.* 11.46) could mean ‘the streams of foreknowledge are neglected’ (Henry (2005)). This possibility is effectively ruled out, however, by a contrast with the preceding unit: δέδεταί γὰρ ἀναιδεῖ | ἐλπίδι γυνῆα (45-6). Expressing a close spatial relation of necessary subordination, δέδεταί (45; cf. *P.* 3.54) contrasts with ἀπόκεινται (46), which expresses a distant spatial relationship of impossibility (cf. *I.* 7.43-4). The problem is not that men neglect available foresight but that knowledge of the future lies beyond their ken (τὸ δ’ ἐκ Διὸς ἀνθρώποισι καφὲς οὐχ ἔπεται | τέκμαρ, 43-4). Often, as in this passage, working out Pindar’s logic involves tracing metaphorical language. The key below describes five symbols used to denote different types of verbal reference (see 2.C).

In addition to parenthetical glosses, the annotated text also employs the space of the page to bring out relations of cohesion. On the vertical axis, consecutive units fulfilling the same argumentative function are printed without intervening space in order to indicate that they form a single step in the progression of thought. Thus at *N.* 5.20-5 three consecutive justifications are printed together and labelled A, B, and C. Some groups of sentences and rhetorical structures are

⁸²⁵ Cf. Halliday and Hasan (1976) 88 on the concepts of substitution and ellipsis in text linguistics.

likewise printed without intervening space to indicate that they contribute to the progression of thought not as individual units but rather as a single structure taken together (see 3.C below). In such cases the first parenthetical gloss describes the function of the whole structure. Thus at *O.* 11.1 ‘Priamel (Ju [of Pindar’s song])’ indicates a priamel which, as a whole, provides a justification for Pindar’s song. On the horizontal axis, units that interrupt a larger structure of thought, like the gnome in the midst of an extended narrative at *O.* 7.30-1, are indented in order to highlight the stronger connection obtaining between the preceding and following units, which remain on the left-hand margin. Argumentative relationships always describe the relationship of the unit being glossed to the unit appearing above it.

As the foregoing paragraphs suggest, the annotated text, despite its mechanical appearance, is a work of literary interpretation. It makes no claim to absolute objectivity. Someone else, beginning from the same premises, would annotate differently (but not, I hope, too differently). It would be a gargantuan task— amounting to little less than a commentary on the epinician corpus— to justify adequately each of the judgements implicated in this project. One is heartily encouraged to argue against the particular articulation of linear cohesion proposed in passages where I am in error, but the greatest utility of the project resides in how it models an approach to reading the text and tackling its difficulties. If one puzzled by the flow of Pindar’s thought finds a helpful resource, or if scholars are provoked to think more closely about argumentation, ask themselves different questions, and formulate new arguments, then this work will have served a purpose.

A. Argumentative Relationships

Parenthetical glosses list applicable terms in order of importance to the connection between

units. Many categories bleed into one another. Argumentative relationships are divided into three categories: logical, narrative, and transitional.

i. Logical

Generalisation (Gen): a topic from the preceding unit is presented as an instantiation of a broader phenomenon forming a topic in the new unit. Thus Bellerophon's failed attempt to enter Olympus is followed by the generalisation that a bitter end awaits injustice (*I.* 7.44-8). In the victory odes there are ~120 generalisations.⁸²⁶ These are sometimes marked as universal (e.g. with πολλά, τις, αἰεὶ, plurals, words for 'mortals', abstract language, present tenses, and timeless aorists). An affirmative particle may stress the applicability and/or truth of a generality (e.g. ἤ, ἥτοι, τοι). Many generalisations appear in the midst of an extended narrative as 'a moral drawn from what precedes and colouring what follows' (Carey (1981) on *P.* 2.34; cf. *Alcm.* 1.16-21). This accounts for ~30 instances.

There are three fundamental epinician subjects with their own associated modes of discourse: the distant past (narrative), the recent programmatic past (praise), and the celebratory present (self-reference).⁸²⁷ A generalisation initially derived from one subject may then be related to another (cf. Illig (1932) 61). Thus at *P.* 3.59-60 Asclepius' death exemplifies a maxim which the poet next applies to himself in the rest of his work (Buongiovanni (1985), Lefkowitz (1991) 51; cf. *Alcm.* 1.37-40). Conversely, at *O.* 9.28-9 a gnome derived from reflection on poetic practice is next illustrated in the case of Heracles.

Generalisations usually do more than merely generalise. They often explain or add information. In *Olympian* 8 the nature of the μένOC | γήραOC ἀντίπαλον (70-1) imparted by the vic-

⁸²⁶ The tilde indicates an approximate figure.

⁸²⁷ For this standard tripartite analysis see e.g. Smyth (1900) lxxxviii, Dornseiff (1921) 115.

tor to his grandfather is explicated by the following gnome: Αἶδα τοι λάθεται | ἄρμενα πράξαις ἀνὴρ (72-3). In the same ode τὸ διδάσασθαι δέ τοι | εἰδότι ράϊτερον (59-60) springs from the idea of Melesias' expertise (εἰδότι), evident in his own athletic victories just recounted, but also introduces the new topic of his training.

In ~5 instances a generalisation precedes, rather than follows, its instantiation. These are labelled **Prospective Generalisations (ProGen)**. Thus ἀλλὰ κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεταί (P. 3.54) precedes a description of the skilled Asclepius' corruption. Prospective generalisations with their instantiations always together form a single step in a mythical narrative. Most generalisations have a forward and backward aspect; in prospective generalisations one aspect dominates.

Instantiation (Inst): a phenomenon is followed by a particular example. Thus 'Salamis can produce a fighter' is followed by the instantiation of the Salaminian fighter Ajax (N. 2.13-14). There are ~140 instantiations. Many are introduced by words stressing the parallel between generality and illustration: οὕτω and other anaphoric deictics, καί,⁸²⁸ καὶ γάρ, καὶ τοὶ γάρ, καὶ τότε, καὶ νῦν, καὶ νυν, ἦτοι καί, τοῦνεκα. Instantiations often implicitly provide evidence for a preceding generalisation (explicitly so at N. 10.11).

Enactment (En): some aspect of the preceding unit is put into practice in the words of the speaker. Enactment is the fulfilment of a more or less explicit promise. Thus 'praise the victor's city' may be followed by praise of the victor's city (O. 9.14-20). Enactment can also be far more subtle and artful (cf. Ibyc. S151.10-22). In *Olympian* 6 the statement 'we must travel to Pitana today' is enacted in the next sentence which takes Pitana as its subject (28-30). *Pythian* 6 de-

⁸²⁸ Cf. Race (1990) 89n15, 97n33 on particularising καί.

clares that it will announce Xenocrates' victory shared with his clan (κοινάν τε γενεᾷ, 15). This is enacted in the following lines praising Xenocrates' son (cf. *O.* 2.5-11).

There are ~120 instances. Expressions of authorial intent (cf. *Alcm.* 1.39-40), imperatives relating to performance, *gnomai* about poetry, and descriptions of glory are all commonly followed by enactment.

Inference (Inf): a conclusion or course of action is derived in light of what has just been said (cf. *Simon.* 542.21). Thus Pindar infers from the story of the award of Achilles' arms that deceitful speech existed long ago (*N.* 8.32-4). There are ~70 inferences, several introduced by inferential particles like ἦρα, τῶ, τοίνυν, οὐνεκεν, and ἔπειτεν. Inferences need not have the force of logical necessity (e.g. *O.* 1.35, *P.* 2.89). Thus κερδέων δὲ χρηὸν μέτρον θηρευέμεν (*N.* 11.47) follows loosely but intelligibly from the preceding statements that men inevitably hope and labour toward achievement but do not know the future (43-6): unattainable hopes beyond due measure, as the next unit explicitly states, are too painful to sustain (47-8 with Henry (2005)).

Most inferences (~50) take the form of an imperative (**Inf [Imp]**): because X is the case, one should do Y. Thus a description of supreme achievement may be followed by an inferential imperative not to seek further achievement (e.g. *I.* 5.14). Imperatives to praise often follow descriptions of praise-worthy deeds. Many inferential imperatives may be described as cases in which justification precedes rather than follows an imperative (cf. e.g. *I.* 7.16-21).

Justification (Ju): a unit is followed by supporting reasons. Thus 'come to Aegina, O Muse' is justified by 'for the chorus is waiting for you' (*N.* 3.1-5). There are ~110 instances, many introduced by γάρ, some by ἐπεὶ (Slater s.v. b), a few by τοι. Justifications commonly follow impera-

tives (~80), expressions of necessity tantamount to imperatives (~10), and first-person declarations of intention (~15; cf. *Alcm.* 1.83-4). Justification often shades into the enactment of the action being justified. Thus in *Olympian* 11 Pindar's justification to the Muses for visiting the Epizephyrean Locrians (16-20) enacts the praise just promised to them (*Ζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν γενεὰν ἀλέγων*, 15; cf. *N.* 7.80-6). Justifications may take the form of a citation of specific circumstances (e.g. *N.* 9.4-5) or a general axiom (e.g. *N.* 9.6-7) or both (e.g. *N.* 6.29-31).

Recapitulation (Recap): an idea from the previous unit is expressed again but in a different way. Thus *Pythian* 5 describes lions fleeing from Battus and then recapitulates the episode focusing on the role of Apollo (57-62). Recapitulations often specify, clarify or add new information. There are ~100 instances.

A common form of recapitulation is the **Polarisation (Recap [Pol])**. A thought similar (but not necessarily identical)⁸²⁹ to that of the preceding unit is articulated in an opposite way so that a negative formulation is followed by a positive formulation or *vice versa* (cf. *Simon.* 542.37-40). Thus 'she did not evade Apollo's notice' may be followed by the polarisation 'he learnt what happened' (*P.* 3.27-9). Many polarisations are far from precisely the opposite of the preceding thought (e.g. *I.* 4.49-51). There are ~40 polarisations, many introduced by *ἀλλά* (cf. Slater s.v. 1). These are printed without intervening space to indicate that positive and negative formulations represent one step in the argument.

Explanation (Exp): an idea or implication in the last unit is explained by what follows. Thus 'poets of old composed spontaneously' is explained by 'for the Muse was not yet a lover of prof-

⁸²⁹ Thus *μη κάμνε* *λίαν δαπάναις* (*P.* 1.90) emphasises continuity, but the next unit, a polarisation, suggests increase: *ἐξίει δ' ὥσπερ κυβερνάτας ἀνήρ | ἰκτίον ἀνεμόεν* (91-2).

it' (*I.* 2.1-6). Units which in English could be introduced with 'for' or 'because' may be classified as explanations. Even with γάρ, the nature of an explanation is often far from self-evident (cf. *Alcm.* 1.60-3).⁸³⁰ In the annotated text explanations may be explained in [brackets]. There are ~220 instances, many introduced by ἐπεὶ or γάρ. Hymnic addresses may be followed by an explanation of why a particular god is selected for prayer (Norden (1913) 157-60). There can sometimes be a thin line between explanation ('I ask you because you can') and justification ('do this because you can').

Adversative (Adv): a counterbalancing or contrasting thought follows. Thus 'what is done cannot be undone' may be followed by 'but one might forget what is done' (*O.* 2.15-18). Adversatives often turn on common conceptual pairings (see 2.B below). There are ~130 instances. Strong adversatives may be signalled by ἀλλά, ἀλλὰ μάν, or (ἀλλ') ὅμως. In the midst of a narrative ἀλλά may signal a peak of interest. Most extended gnomic sections⁸³¹ include at least one adversative (cf. *Alcm.* 1.36-9). Many such passages trace a highly complex series of contrasts (e.g. *P.* 2.78-96; cf. Thummer (1968-9) i.135-7).

Argumentative relationships may be **polarised (Pol)** (written e.g. PolGen, PolInst) so that the next unit in some sense describes the opposite of a topic described in the previous unit. Thus the generalisation 'men who die uncelebrated do not live on in song' is followed by the polarised instantiation 'you are celebrated (and so will live on in song)' (*O.* 10.91-4). Conversely, a description of Archilochus' poverty is followed a polarised generalisation about wealth (*P.* 2.54-6).

⁸³⁰ Denniston 61 on γάρ: 'compression of thought is often the source of difficulty'.

⁸³¹ Cf. M. L. West (1966) on *Theog.* 94-7, R. Hamilton (1974) 115-16, Slater (1979) 66.

ii. Narrative

Sequence (S): a new unit describes a related action occurring after the beginning of an action described in the last unit. This form of connection is naturally dominant in extended narratives, in which the order of events structures the order of topics, but sequence is also evident elsewhere. The victor has his own typologised narrative (see 2.B.i below). A series of *gnomai* may trace a generalised narrative (e.g. *P.* 3.80-3).

Sequence backwards (Sb): a unit describes a related action occurring before the beginning of an action described in the last unit. There are ~45 instances. Sequence backwards typically explains ('Idas stabbed Castor, for he had seen them...', *N.* 10.61-3). This is common in the opening of narratives after an initial summary statement of theme.⁸³²

Expansion and relative expansion (Ex, Re): something mentioned in the last unit is described more fully (Ex), sometimes with a linking relative (Re). Beyond the syntactic connection with its antecedent, a relative expansion may have only a very tenuous logical relationship with what precedes. Some introduce comparatively irrelevant material and thereby help to motivate a return to a more relevant topic (*O.* 2.81, *N.* 10.17, *I.* 1.12). Some have an explanatory force apparent only in retrospect. There is no way of telling, when the narrative of *Olympian* 1 begins with a relative expansion (25), that the next seventy lines or so will trace Pelops' life from birth to burial and explain the words immediately preceding the start of the narrative: ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίαι (24; cf. 90-3; *P.* 3.8 and 11.17 function similarly).

⁸³² Cf. Slater (1979, 1983), expanding on Illig (1932) and noting congruencies with earlier lyric, Griffith (1993).

Although linking relatives are common, the Re designation is reserved for cases in which another, more substantive argumentative relationship does not obtain. Thus, for instance, the unit beginning *ὅς* *ὃς* *μὲν* *Νεμέαι* *πρόφατον* (*O.* 8.16) is glossed as an explanation, not a relative expansion, since it explains why Pindar says that the victor's family has been allotted to Zeus (15-16).

Numerous relative expansions move into or out of extended narratives.⁸³³ Of all parts of Pindar's epinicians, myths can be the least thoroughly integrated into the linear argument (e.g. *O.* 7.54; cf. Dornseiff (1921) 120, Carey (1981) 11, Miller (1993b) 24, Pfeijffer (1999a) 23-4). Relating a long narrative to the rest of the poem is an interpretative task that is self-consciously posed within the text (*P.* 11.38-40). By not making a myth play a single clear-cut role in the argument, Pindar encourages audiences to explore its relationships with many aspects of the poem.

The following are subcategories of expansion:

Parallel (Ex [Par]): an analogy follows (cf. *Alcm.* 1.90-5). Thus 'Aegina's heroes were outstanding' is followed by 'and Aegina's men are also outstanding' (*P.* 8.25-8; cf. *Ibyc.* S151.45). Parallels are often marked with deictics (e.g. *οὕτω*) or particles emphasising likeness (*καί, δὲ καί, καὶ νῦν*). There are ~50 instances.

Catalogue (Ex [Cat]): a series of related topics (e.g. victories, victims) are listed (cf. *Alcm.* 1.1-12, *Ibyc.* S151.32-45). There are ~60 instances.

Description (Ex [Desc]): a static or generalised scene is described. Thus Pindar spends several consecutive units describing Typhos under Aetna (*P.* 1.19-28). Description is rare in Pindar's vigorous, condensed narratives. There are ~25 instances, many concentrated in just a few passages.

⁸³³ See Bonifazi (2004b) and Finglass (2007b) on *P.* 11.17 with bibliography.

The following comparatively rare designations describe rhetorical structures.

Priamel and Cap: ‘the priamel is a focusing or selecting device in which one or more terms serve as foil for the point of particular interest’ (Bundy (1986) 5; cf. Race (1982a) 7-10). In the annotated text, this designation is applied in a restricted set of cases where individual units contribute to the chain of thought primarily or exclusively as part of the larger priamel structure. Such Pindaric priamels are frequently introduced by words indicating plurality or diversity (e.g. ἄλλοι, ἕτεραι, παντοῖαι; cf. Bundy (1986) 6-7, Braswell (1992) on *N.* 1.25-30). **Cap** describes the final, climactic term of a priamel. This may be signalled by adversative particles (e.g. *I.* 5.34), superlatives (e.g. *O.* 1.114), conditionals (e.g. *O.* 1.3), apostrophe (e.g. *I.* 8.21) or some other syntactic shift (e.g. the verbal adjective at *O.* 3.6; cf. Bundy (1986) 5-6, 11n33, 36n2). In the annotated text, the cap designation is also sometimes applied more freely to a climactic term selected from a plurality of topics which does not constitute a priamel in the sense described above (e.g. ‘Perseus is honoured in Argos, Heracles in Thebes; [Cap] but the Aeacidae are worshipped on Aegina’, *I.* 5.30-5). The terms of a priamel are often a series of parallels or instantiations of a leading generalisation (e.g. *O.* 11.1-6).

Direct speech (Ds): the first unit of quoted speech. After this character text is analysed just as narrator text, although characters sometimes reason differently from the narrator. The argument in *O.* 1.81-5, *P.* 4.156-9, and *N.* 10.76-9, for example, is far more elliptical than is characteristic of the Pindaric speaker.

Speech frame (Sf): the capping phrase following a direct speech (e.g. ‘and so he spoke’).

Indirect speech (Is): the narrator's words follow the course of character speech being reported. Thus 'he asked them if they had seen the child' may be followed by 'he said that Apollo was the father' (*O.* 6.47-52). This is a form of sequence.

Question and Answer (Q, A): the speaker poses a question and then answers it.⁸³⁴ Questions, like transitional motifs (see below), react to what is happening in the text. Thus Clytemnestra's murder of her husband elicits from the speaker shocked questions as to what could have possibly motivated such a heinous crime (*P.* 11.22-5; cf. *P.* 9.33-5). Questions, like transitional motifs, are accompanied by descriptions of their motivation in [brackets]. There are ~15 questions.

iii. Transitional

Transitional motifs are typically motivated more by association than by logic. Nonetheless, they are generally integrated into the linear argument. Labelling something 'transitional' must not be mistaken for explaining how it fits into the train of thought. Thus in *Nemean* 8 Pindar cries out to Zeus when the description of deceitful speech approaches closest to his concerns *qua* commemorative poet: (sc. πάρφασις) τῶν δ' ἀφάντων κῦδος ἀντείνει καθρόν. | εἴη μή ποτέ μοι τοιοῦτον ἦθος (34-6).⁸³⁵ To describe the speaker here as merely a faceless 'exemplary first-person' is to neglect the dramatic quality of the monologue and its ethopoetic subtlety (*pace* Des Places (1947) 9, Carey (1976) 33). Though he wishes conform to a broadly applicable ethic, it is Pindar of Thebes who wants to live αἰνέων αἰνιητά, μομφὰν δ' ἐπιπείρων ἀλιτροῖς (39). The following

⁸³⁴ Some rhetorical questions with an obvious answer are treated like statements (see p. 309).

⁸³⁵ Compare and contrast *P.* 2.51-2: καὶ ὑψιφρόνων τιν' ἔκαμψε βροτῶν, | ἐτέροισι δὲ κῦδος ἀγήραον παρέδωκ'. ἐμὲ δὲ χρεῶν ...

lines reflect more explicitly on poetic practice (cf. Race (1990) 45n6, Lefkowitz (1991) 8).

In the annotated text, the motivation for a transition, arising from what has just been said, is explained in [brackets]. A definite set of concerns tends to trigger a set of related motifs. Pindar's transitions are thus less jarring for an experienced audience than for an epinician neophyte.

Authorial intervention (Authin): the poet intervenes in order to move his poem in a certain direction or reflect on his own composition.⁸³⁶ The designation 'authorial intervention' highlights the creative capacity of the composer. The first person is extremely prominent (e.g. ἐμὲ δὲ χρεών, *P.* 2.52).⁸³⁷ First-person pronouns are often emphatically fronted (*Alc.* 1.39, *Ibyc.* S151.10, *Schadewaldt* (1928) 300n6, *Pfeijffer* (1999a) 399). Programmatic verbs of performance are common, as are futures and auxiliary verbs of intention. ἀλλά may signal a strong break. Many first-person statements follow trenchantly in asyndeton (*van Groningen* (1958) 327, *Hutchinson* (2001) on *O.* 6.82-4, *Maehler* (2000) 424). A minority of authorial interventions do not feature the first person but implicate the speaker through a gnome relevant to his task or a citation of the circumstances surrounding his performance. There are ~85 instances.

Professional concerns tend to motivate authorial interventions. Taken together, these passages convey a characterisation of the internal narrator which is consistent across the corpus. Implications of lasting glory (*O.* 8.74, 9.21, 10.24, *P.* 2.52, 4.67, *N.* 7.33) or descriptions of poetry (*O.* 1.17, 111, 2.89, *P.* 1.42) can remind him of his task. Mention of the victor's success may remind him of his encomiastic duty (*P.* 2.62, *I.* 4.72, 6.74, 7.39). A drift toward the irrelevant (*O.* 13.93, *P.* 10.4, 51, 11.38, *N.* 3.26, *I.* 1.14) or inappropriate (*O.* 1.52, 9.35, 80, 13.91, *N.* 5.14) may

⁸³⁶ On the related concept of break-offs see *Schadewaldt* (1928) 9-10, 28, 54, *Bowra* (1964) 312, *Thummer* (1968-9) i.122-5, *Carey* (1980c) 143, *Race* (1990) ch. 2, *Kyriakou* (1999) 17-19, *H. S. Mackie* (2003) ch. 1, *Morrison* (2007b) 68-9.

⁸³⁷ *Lefkowitz* (1991) 179-82 discusses the transitional uses of the first person.

prompt a change of course. The size of a topic may justify its abandonment (*O.* 2.95, 13.47, 114, *P.* 4.247, 8.29, *N.* 4.69, 7.52, 10.19, *I.* 1.60, 6.56) and/or elicit reflection on the best means of expression (*O.* 2.83, 11.8, 13.11, *P.* 1.81, *N.* 1.18, 4.33, *I.* 5.46). Praise may be presented as almost too good to be true as the speaker intervenes to assert his truthfulness (*O.* 4.17, 6.19, *N.* 1.18, 3.52, 7.61, 9.33). Sometimes the poet intervenes to pick out a particular instance from a general category (e.g. *P.* 10.69, *N.* 1.33, *I.* 5.59).

Although common motivations are discernible, some authorial interventions are highly individual. In *Nemean* 8, for instance, the speaker announces in asyndeton that he has come as a suppliant of the divine Aeacus (ἰκέτας Αἰακοῦ, 13). This thought apparently springs from a description of how many once ‘prayed’ (λιτάνευον, 8) to have an audience with Aeacus while he was living. Some passages seem contrived so as to provoke an abrupt shift. The gratuitous, ornate description of the giant snake guarding the golden fleece at *P.* 4.245-6, for instance, helps to spring an authorial intervention justifying not treating a huge mythological subject which includes but is hardly limited to a huge snake.⁸³⁸

Some of the most abrupt Pindaric transitions enact authorial interventions. Consider *N.* 7.52-6:

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀνάπαν-
 ρις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργωι· κόρον δ’ ἔχει
 καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν’ ἄνθε’ Ἀφροδίτια.
 φυᾷ δ’ ἕκαστος διαφέρομεν βιοτὰν λαχόντες
 ὁ μὲν τά, τὰ δ’ ἄλλοι· τυχεῖν δ’ ἔν’ ἀδύνατον
 εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπασαν ἀνελόμενον.

How do the last two units connect with what precedes? On the surface there is no robust connection, although there may be a weak conceptual link between the need for artistic variety and the

⁸³⁸ Imagery re-enforces the connection in thought, as often. πεντηκόντερον ναῦν (245) contrasts with οἶμον ... βραχύν (248; cf. Silk (1974) 156).

variety of human nature. On another level, however, the lack of any strong connection enacts the principle just expounded: Pindar justifies abandoning his present theme and then embarks on a new theme (cf. *O.* 13.47-9, *I.* 1.63-7).

Imperative (Imp): a request for action. Appeals to the chorus or to the Muses or to the poet himself are closely related to authorial interventions (cf. also *O.* 6.22, to a mule driver, 88, to the leader of the chorus). Imperatives tend to come in clusters that hang together as a rhetorical unit. The requests in a series of imperatives may be more or less closely related.⁸³⁹ Often a second imperative will essentially restate the first. In such cases the second imperative is labelled a **RecapImp** (~25 instances). Thus, for example, ‘celebrate Zeus’ is recapitulated by ‘start off with a sweet voice’ (*N.* 2.24-5). Sometimes justification or generalisation intervenes between imperatives (e.g. *N.* 11.1-10). A second imperative may follow as an inference from the justification just given for the first request (e.g. *O.* 6.22-7).

The debated imperative at *O.* 7.92 is not addressed to the victor (*pace* e.g. Willcock (1995)) or the poet (*pace* e.g. Race (1990) 126) but essentially recapitulates the request to Zeus in 87-90 (δίδοι τέ οἱ αἰδοίαν χάριν, 89 ≈ μὴ κρύπτε, 92).⁸⁴⁰ An unexpressed change of subject between two close second-person singular imperatives would be harsh and unparalleled; a second, complementary imperative would be typical. The injunction ‘do not hide the family’ means ‘do not make the family obscure, i.e. make them glorious’ (cf. *P.* 9.94, *N.* 9.6-7, *B.* 3.13-14). *πέρι* (93) varies and extends the request: it encompasses all descendants of Callianax, includ-

⁸³⁹ *O.* 9.35-49 includes five units glossed as imperatives, each subtly advancing the line of thought.

⁸⁴⁰ This connection supports the consensus view that αἰδοίαν χάριν | καὶ ποτ’ ἄτῶν καὶ ποτὶ ξείνων (89-90) describes respect from others (cf. *O.* 6.76, 13.115), not respect *for* others (*pace* Bowra (1964) 175, Hubbard (1985) 142), which the victor already has (90-1).

ing future generations (cf. Young (1968) 95-6, Verdenius (1987-88)). Both imperatives are justified by citing conduct meriting divine favour (cf. *O.* 4.13-15, 5.4-7, *N.* 9.32-3, 10.30, 11.8-9).

A subset of the imperative is the **Prayer (Imp [Pr])**, an appeal to a divinity other than the Muses.⁸⁴¹ Wishes not formally addressed to a deity are also classified as prayers. There are ~50 instances.

O. 13.25-6 exemplifies the motivation behind many prayers: ἀφθόνητος ἔπεcciv | γένοιο χρόνον ᾗπαντα, Ζεῦ πάτερ. Extraordinary success and praise raise the implicit possibility of divine envy, which is then explicitly allayed. Many prayers and wishes follow direct praise (e.g. *O.* 2.12, 7.87). The necessity of diverting divine φθόνος suggests nearly super-human accomplishment (cf. Most (2003) 139). Most prayers are, in various ways, for a) no reversals or b) more of the same good fortune. Such colourless requests suggest the victor's supreme happiness (cf. *I.* 6.7-13). Mention of the reception of poetry (*N.* 4.9, 7.67, *I.* 4.43) or the poet's present task may prompt a prayer for artistic success (*P.* 9.89a, *N.* 9.53).

B. Conceptual Key

The following headings cover commonly contrasted and counterbalanced concepts in Pindar's odes. The key does not include every instance of these themes but only those helpful for understanding the movement of thought between adjacent units. Very often these topics are fluidly connected within the same unit or bridged by a generalisation. Such cases are not recorded here.

i. The Victor's Narrative

⁸⁴¹ See Bundy (1986) 78-9 on the transitional role of prayers.

The chief subject of epinician, the victor, has his own typologised narrative: he is endowed with exceptional traits (a), puts these traits into action by competing (b), succeeds (c), wins commemoration (d), and thereby achieves immortality (e).

Capacity (a); effort (b); success (c); commemoration (d); immortality (e): *O.* 1.17-24: c-d; 84-5: b-c; 93-9: c-d; 2.35-41: b-c; 46-51: d-c; 51-6: c-a; 3.35-41: b-c; 5.5-10: d-e; 15-16: b-c; 5.4-16: b-c-d-b-c; 6.50-3: a-c-d; 80-3: c-d; 7.7-10: d-e; 52-3: b-c; 86-90: c-d; 8.1-11: b-c-d; 37-42: d-e; 65-76: c-b-c-d; 9.16-20: c-d; 101-4: b-d; 10.93-9: d-e-d; *P.* 1.99: c-d; 4.66-9: c-d-e; 5.111-15: b-c-d; 7.13-17b: c-d; 8.61-9: c-d; 9.69-76: c-d; 89a-94: d-c-d; 10.4-9: d-b-c; *N.* 1.7-12: d-a-b-c-d; 29-32: a-d; 67-70: c-e; 2.23-4: c-d; 3.12-18: b-d; 56-64: c-e; 114-15: e-c; 4.4-8: d-e; 5.38-41: b-c; 44-9: c-b-c; 7.10-12: d-b-c; 8.37-41: d-e; 10.29-30: c-b; 33-7: c-d; 11.22-9: b-c; *I.* 1.6-11: d-c; 26-31: b-d; 40-45: b-c; 2.25-31: c-e-d; 4.25-9: c-b; 30-2: b-c; 69-72: c-d; 5.11-13: c-d; 17-20: c-d; 35-8: c-d; 6.26-31: c-d; 6.72-5 c-d; 7.20-5: c-d-c; 8.37-9: c-d; 65a-70: c-d-c-d-c.

Epinician performance is presented as the pinnacle of the victor's life: it celebrates his preceding triumph and past preparation but also secures his future immortality. Celebration is therefore enmeshed in another conceptual chain centred on the *ne plus ultra* theme: the victor has reached the summit of achievement and can go no further (see Race (1990) 192-5).

Celebration (a); *ne plus ultra* (b); further (c): *O.* 1.113-14: a-b; 3.38-45: a-c; 5.17-24: b-a; *P.* 10.27-9: c-b; *N.* 3.17-23: a-b; 9.46-8: b-a; 11.13-18: b-a; *I.* 4.29-31: a-b; 5.12-14: b-a.

ii. Characters

The Pindaric epinician provides surprisingly little athletic play-by-play.⁸⁴² Victory is less a virtuoso feat of athletic skill and more a manifestation of character and larger interweaving patterns of meaning like fate and familial⁸⁴³ or civic⁸⁴⁴ identity. A number of other characters are thus central to the genre. Mention of one may prompt the mention of another.

Victor (a); family (b); trainer (c): *O.* 2.5-11: a-b; 7.90-3: a-b; 13.34-40: a-b; *P.* 1.56-60: a-b; 4.61-5: b-a; 9.97-105: a-b; *N.* 5.49-50: c-b; *I.* 3.9-14: a-b; 7.21-5: a-b.

Heroes (a); contemporaries (b): *O.* 2.3-7: a-b; 43-7: a-b; 6.16-18: a-b; 10.13-19: a-b-a; *P.* 6.44-6: a-b; 8.25-8: a-b; 10.29-34: b-a; *N.* 2.14-15: a-b; 4.71-9: a-b; 6.54-7: a-b; *I.* 1.10-16: b-a-b; 31-8: a-b; 4.51-5: b-a; 5.22-7: b-a; 6.16-21: b-a; 56-8: a-b; 8.59-62: a-b.

Men (a); gods (b): *O.* 1.54-8: b-a; 2.3-4: b-a; 5.16-23: a-b; 6.74-81: a-b; 8.23-30: a-b; 9.100-4: a-b; 10.95-9: a-b; 12.1-6a: b-a; 13.103-5: a-b; 14.5-12: a-b-b-a; *P.* 6.23-7: b-a; 8.76-7: a-b; 10.21-9: b-a-b-a; 12.13-32: a-b-a-b; *N.* 1.64-9: a-b; 7.30-2: a-b; 86-92: a-b; 98-104: b-a; 8.1-5: b-a; 10.69-72: a-b; 80-2: a-b; *I.* 2.37-9: a-b-a; 3.1-6: a-b-a; 18-18b: a-b; 4.58-64: b-a; 5.7-13: a-b-a; 7.39-42: b-a.

Often pronouns signal a marked contrast between different persons. The first-person of the poet is frequently set against others.

Me (a); you (b); someone (c); he/she (d): *O.* 1.46-52: c-a; 81-5: c-a; 10.91-4: c-a; *P.* 2.58-62: c-a; 4.66-8: d-a; 157-8: a-b; 5.17-23: b-a; 8.56-66: d-b; 9.97-105: b-a; 11.39-45: a-b; *N.* 2.14-15: d-

⁸⁴² ‘Pindar is remarkable for his reluctance to describe the victory which occasions the ode’ (Carey (1995) 91). Descriptions of athletics are more prominent but hardly central in Bacchylides (5.44-9, 9.27-39, 10.21-8, 11.17-23; cf. Simon. 516).

⁸⁴³ See Kurke (1991) ch. 2.

⁸⁴⁴ P. W. Rose (1974) 152 counts ‘twenty-three odes in which the excellence of the victor is presented as inherited from the heroes of his homeland’.

b; 3.10.10-12: b-a; 76-8: b-a; 4.39-43: c-a; 85-90: a-d; 6.53-4: c-a; 7.98-104: b-a; 10.80-3: b-d; 11.9-12: b-a; *I.* 1.32-8: b-a; 2.12-17: b-a; 6.17-20: b-a; 6.16-21: a-b; 8.1-6: c-a.

iii. Topics of Praise

In epinician victory is presented as an expression of an individual and collective ethos, not merely a feat of skill and strength. The poems praise more than just athletics. Passages of extended praise, which are surprisingly rare, often moves between certain recurrent topics.⁸⁴⁵

Athletics (a); ethics (b); war (c); culture (d); wealth (e): *O.* 1.1-7 e-a; 100-5: a-b; 2.51-6: e-a; 9.11-17: a-d-a; *P.* 1.63-7: c-b; 5.111-15: b-a-d; 6.47-54: b-a-b; 72-3: e-a; 7.9-17a: d-a; *N.* 1.13-18: e-c; 29-32 b-d; *I.* 5.1-10: e-c-a; 52-8: c-a; 6.72-3: b-a; 7.9-10: d-a.

iv. Time

It is central to the generic identity of epinician that it ranges through time, from the heroic past to the present moment of performance and into the future. Often these stages of time are prominently juxtaposed in adjacent units to highlight continuity or disjunction.

Then (a); now (b); future (c): *O.* 1.23-7: a-b; 89-93: a-b; 106-12: b-c-b; 2.31-5: a-b; 43-7: a-b; 8-15: a-c; 4.11-13: b-c; 6.28-30: b-a; 96-100: b-c; 8.81-8: b-c; 86-90: a-b; 9.1-10: a-b; 10.77-83: a-b; 13.22-8: b-c; 101-7: a-c-b-c-a; *P.* 1.13-19 b-a-b; 42-5: b-c-a; 56-9: c-b; 62-8: b-a-c; 3.1-7: b-a; 107-11: b-c; 4.61-5: a-b; 116-121: a-c; 6.43-4: a-b; 8.17-20: a-b; 48-52: b-c; 55-60: a-b; 61-72: a-b-c; 9.54-6a: c-b; 10.15-18: a-c; 29-37: b-a-b; 42-6: b-a; 63-6: c-b; 42-8: b-a; 12.29-32: b-c; *N.* 2.1-10: b-c; 14-15: a-b; 5.2-16: b-a; 34-9: a-b; 40-3: a-b; 7.64-8: b-c; 68-74: c-b; 98-104: c-b;

⁸⁴⁵ Cf. Thummer (1968-9) i.46-7.

8.9-16: a-b; 18-19: a-b; 10.25-9: a-b; 11.9-12: c-b; *I.* 1.10-18: b-a-b-a; 32-40: a-b; 2.7-12: a-b; 4.16-19: a-b; 19-7: b-a-b-a; 51-60: a-b-a-b; 7.37-8: a-b; 39-40: b-c; 8.59-62: a-b; 64-6: a-b.

v. Positive and Negative

‘Positive’ denotes that which, according to the narrator’s worldview, is worthy of choice or praise; ‘negative’ denotes that which is worthy of dispraise or avoidance. Epinician articulates its discourse through the juxtaposition of ‘light’ and ‘dark’ material. This form of *variatio* structures many passages.

Positive (a); negative (b): *O.* 1.54-8: a-b; 2.22-4: a-b; 41-5: b-a; 58-67: b-a; 86-8: a-b; 7.43-7: a-b; 93-5: a-b; 8.23-30: b-a; 60-1: a-b; 61-4: b-a; 9.40-5 b-a; 100-2: a-b; 12.1-6a: a-b; 13.90-2: a-b-a; *P.* 1.10-16: a-b; 94-9: a-b-a; 2.18-23: a-b; 30-6: b-a-b; 52-6: a-b-a; 57-63: a-b-a; 72-6: a-b-a-b; 78-82: b-a-b; 82-3: b-a; 88-90: a-b; 90-6: b-a-b-a; 3.47-54: a-b; 85-95: a-b-a; 95-106: a-b-a-b-a-b-a; 4.264-70: b-a; 287-9: a-b; 289-91: b-a; 5.54-7: b-a; 7.17b-21: a-b-a; 48-9: b-a; 8.6-15: a-b-a-b; 17-20: b-a; 48-52: a-b; 81-92: a-b-a; 92-4: a-b; 95: a-b; 95-7: b-a; 11.54-8: a-b-a; *N.* 3.40-7: a-b-a; 80-4: a-b-a; 4. 37-43: a-b-a; 5.9-16: a-b; 7.11-16: a-b-a; 24-32: b-a-b-a; 43-7: b-a; 9.14-15: b-a; 16-19: a-b; 11.19-30: a-b-a-b; 30-7: b-a; 47-8: a-b; *I.* 1.32-40: b-a; 64-8: a-b; 4.4-9: a-b-a; 14-19: a-b-a; 19-24: a-b-a; 35-9: b-a; *I.* 7.36-8: b-a; 47-51: b-a; 8.14-15b: b-a.

vi. Contrastive and Complementary Pairs

The following headings are self-explanatory or readily apprehended through the perusal of a few of the passages cited.

Truth (a); falsity or appearance (b): *O.* 1.30-4: b-a; 4.24-7: a-b; *P.* 2.38-40: b-a; 72-5: b-a; 8.73-7: b-a; *N.* 5.25-31: b-a.

Reality (a); counterfactual (b): *P.* 3.72-9: b-a; 4.42-53: b-a-b; *N.* 11.22-9: a-b.

Understanding (a); ignorance (b): *O.* 2.83-5: a-b-a; *P.* 8.59-60: a-b.

Near (a); far (b): *O.* 1.97-100: b-a; *P.* 3.72-9: b-a; 107-11: a-b; *P.* 8.95-7: a-b; 10.61-6: a-b-a; *N.* 6.55-7: b-a; *I.* 7.40-4: a-b; 8.11-15: b-a-b.

Possible (a) impossible (b): *O.* 2.15-18: b-a; 3.43-5: b-a; *P.* 3.61-7: a-b; 72-9: b-a; 10.22-30: a-b-a-b; 61-3: a-b; *N.* 4.71-9: b-a; 8.44-8: b-a.

Easy (a); difficult (b): *O.* 1.81-4: b-a; 6.9-12: a-b; 10.20-4: b-a; *P.* 4.272-4: a-b; *N.* 7.77-9: a-b, *I.* 2.33-7: a-b.

Nature (a); learning (b): *O.* 2.83-8: b-a-b-a; 9.100-2: a-b; 107-12: b-a; *N.* 1.25: b-a; 3.40-7: a-b-a.

One (a); many (b): *O.* 1.113-14: b-a; 8.12-16: b-a; 9.100-7: a-b-a-b-a; *N.* 1.25-6: b-a; 9.24-7: b-a; *I.* 1.49-51: b-a.

Unity (a); diversity (b): *O.* 8.10-14: a-b; *P.* 8.29-34: b-a; 10.59-62: b-a; *N.* 4.91-2: b-a; 6.1-7: a-b-a; 7.2-5: a-b; 54-6: b-a; *I.* 1.47-9: b-a; 7.42-3: a-b.

Constancy (a); instability (b): *O.* 1.97-9: a-b; 2.30-4: a-b; 8.23-30: b-a; *P.* 8.95-7: b-a; 11.33-7: a-b; *I.* 3.17a-18b: a-b-a; 4.4-9: a-b-a.

Hope or intention (a); result (b): *P.* 2.25-9: a-b; 76-8: a-b; 81-2: a-b; 8.56-66: a-b; 10.59-62: a-b; *N.* 3.65-74: a-b; 59-61: a-b; 10.29-30: a-b; 11.22-9: a-b; *I.* 8.29-31: a-b.

Merits (a); result (b): *P.* 4.287-9: a-b; *N.* 7.24-30: b-a; 8.27-32: b-a; *I.* 4.30-2: a-b.

Remember (a); forget (b): *O.* 6.9-12 b-a; 8.72-7: b-a; *P.* 1.46-50: b-a.

Friends (a); enemies (b): *P.* 1.10-16: a-b; 2.83-5: a-b.

Success (a); failure (b): *P.* 8.92-4: a-b; 11.54-8: b-a; 12.29-32: a-b; *N.* 3.40-4: a-b-a; 80-4: a-b-a; 4.37-43: a-b-a; 6.57a-66: a-b; 8. 24-5: b-a; 11.24-30: a-b; *I.* 4.14-19: a-b-a.

Local (a); non-local (b): *O.* 9.66-8: a-b; *P.* 5.116-21: a-b; *N.* 3.26-32: b-a-b-a; 5.46-9: a-b; 49-50: b-a; 10.24-8: a-b; 11.19-23: a-b; *I.* 4.25-9 a-b.

Games (a); home (b): *O.* 5.6-14: a-b; 9.14-20: b-a-b; *P.* 9.71-5: a-b; *N.* 2.20-5: a-b; 10.33-6: a-b; *I.* 1.18-25: b-a; 2.28-32 a-b.

Public (a); private (b): *I.* 1.64-8: a-b; *P.* 4.148-55: b-a; 11.52-4: b-a.

Beginning (a); end (b): *P.* 1.33-5: a-b; *N.* 1.8-11: a-b; 11.1-10: a-b.

Relevant (a); irrelevant (b): *P.* 4.111-17: b-a; 10.4-6: b-a; 11.39-45: b-a; *N.* 3.26-8: b-a.

C. Verbal Reference

The annotated text links related words or phrases in adjacent units to illustrate connections in ideas carried over from one statement to the next. It does not join words clearly referring to precisely the same thing, such as pronouns and antecedents. Repetition is avoided. Thus, for example, in the unit at *O.* 1.8-17 ὕμνος (8), κελαδεῖν (9), μουσικᾶς (15), and παίζομεν (16) all refer to music. The connection with the idea of music in the next unit is signalled simply by ὕμνος→φόρμιγγα. Different symbols are used to indicate different types of connections.

< >: both denote that a word or phrase belongs to a larger category indicated by another word or phrase. Thus πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν>Ἡρακλῆος (*N.* 1.33) and Ἡρακλῆος<πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν indicate that Heracles belongs to the category of much-labouring men. This type of link is common in logical connections moving between general and particular.

≈: links roughly equivalent concepts (e.g. αὐδάσομεν≈κελαδεῖν, *O.* 1.7-9).

≠: links concepts that are strongly opposed or polar opposites (e.g. ῥάιδιον≠δυσπαλές, *P.* 4.272-3). This type of link is common in adversatives and polarisations.

→: denotes a variety of intuitive connections not captured by other symbols. Thus, for instance, ἐτίμασαν→ὄλβον (*O.* 1.55-6) links the action of the gods honouring Tantalus with his blessedness, the result of the gods' honour. ἔλκομαι→ἔχει ... μέεσσιν (*N.* 4.35-7) connects phrases continuing a wrestling conceit.

3. Patterns of Cohesion

A. Verbal Orders

To grasp linear cohesion in Pindar's odes, one must pay careful attention not only to the progression of sentences but also to the progression of clauses within sentences. When one surveys links of verbal cohesion, it becomes clear that the last words of one unit disproportionately tend to get picked up by the first words of the next. In seeking to ascertain the connection between units, it is often helpful to begin with the final clause of the first. At *P.* 1.75, for example, Ἐλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας, the final clause in a long sentence, evokes a common theme of poetry celebrating the Persian Wars and prompts a priamel (in asyndeton) including commemorative poems on that subject (see VIII.2.B). At *P.* 1.28-9 Typhos' punishment motivates the speaker's prayer to avoid a similarly painful fate: ἅπαν νῶτον ποτικεκλιμένον κεντεῖ. | εἴη, Ζεῦ, τὴν εἴη ἀνδάνειν ... Here, as throughout the odes, Pindar reacts to his thoughts as they unfold (cf. C 56a, Race (1990) 42, Scodel (1996) on earlier lyric).

The last element of one unit often provides the topic of the next. Consider, for example, *P.* 10.10-12: Ἀπολλων, γλυκὺ δ' ἀνθρώπων τέλος ἀρχὰ τε δαίμονος ὀρνύοντος αὖξεται | ὁ μὲν

που τεοῖς τε μήδεσι τοῦτ' ἔπραξεν, | τὸ δὲ συγγενὲς ἐμβέβακεν ἔχγεσιν πατρός. In the second unit the μὲν-clause instantiates the gnome of the preceding unit (δαίμονος→τεοῖς) while the δέ-clause introduces the related theme of familial destiny continued in the next unit. 'Hinge' statements of this shape are common: the first clause connects with what precedes and the second clause moves in a related but different direction. Consider *O.* 1.28a-29: ἧ θαύματα πολλά, καὶ πού τι καὶ βροτῶν | φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον | δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι. The first clause springs from the preceding mention of Pelops' wondrous ivory shoulder while the second clause looks to the concerns of the next unit, which explains how wondrous fabrications pass for truth (cf. *O.* 2.30-3, 12.10-12a, *N.* 8.21-2). Compare *P.* 5.23-6: τῷ σε μὴ λαθέτω, | Κυράναι γλυκὺν ἀμφὶ κῆπον Ἀφροδίτας ἀειδόμενον, | παντὶ μὲν θεὸν αἴτιον ὑπερτιθέμεν, | φιλεῖν δὲ Κάρρωτον ἔξοχ' ἑταίρων. Giving thanks to the god looks to the last words of the previous unit (Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα, 23), while giving thanks to the mortal Carrhotus introduces the concerns of the next (cf. *P.* 4.67-8, 6.44-6).

The arrangement of topics within longer sentences can enable fluid transitions. A prayer to Zeus to avoid the fate of Typhos introduces Hieron's victory by tying it to one of the god's *sedes* (*P.* 1.29-33). The unit in *N.* 5.34-7 begins with Zeus giving Peleus one of the Nereids to wed, thus completing the central narrative in a ring (cf. 22). The unit closes, however, with a trailing relative clause about Poseidon's Isthmian worship. This topic is only very loosely connected to the thrust of the main thought (and the myth) but introduces athletics, the next topic (38-9; cf. *P.* 4.262). In *Olympian* 8, mention of Aeacus, the subject of the ensuing myth, is postponed until the final words of a long sentence (30); his name is syntactically isolated by an intervening parenthetical prayer (cf. Pisa at *O.* 3.9). Some of Pindar's longest sentences, like these last two, move into or out of narratives (e.g. *O.* 10.24-34, *P.* 4.1-11, 11.1-16).

Lists comprise a significant portion of Pindar's odes. Even short lists and even those without clear principles of overall organisation tend to end with the term most relevant to what follows.⁸⁴⁶ In this respect lists resemble priamels. In *Olympian* 10 a catalogue of the virtues of the Epizephyrean Locrians culminates with martial valour, a quality exemplified by Cynus in the following lines (13-16). Sequential organisation is far more often than not apparent even in the briefest two-term lists. *P.* 9.70, for instance, describes Cyrene: καλλίσταν πόλιν ... κλεινάν τ' ἀέθλοις. The next unit illustrates the final term (καί νυν ἐν Πυθῶνι νιν ἀγαθέαι, 71; cf. e.g. *O.* 13.14-17, *I.* 4.14-15). *P.* 8.19-20 describes the victor: ἐστεφανωμένον ... ποίαι Παρνακκίδι Δωριεῖ τε κώμοι. The final term (and the final word) prompts extended reflections on poetry celebrating Aegina (Χαρίτων, 21; δόξαν, 25; αἰδεται, 25).

The order of words and clauses is sometimes neglected. Consider *N.* 7.20-3:

ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι
λόγον Ὀδυσσεός ἢ πάθαν
διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὅμηρον.

ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσσι οἱ ποτανᾶι <τε> μαχανᾶι
σεμνὸν ἔπεσσι τι· σοφία
δὲ κλέπτει παράγοις μύθοις.

Some hold that the antecedent of οἱ (22) is ambiguous, potentially Homer or Odysseus.⁸⁴⁷ The antecedent is Homer. The unit beginning in line 22 explains the immediately preceding prepositional phrase (διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὅμηρον, 21). Indeed, it dilates on ἄδυεπῆ (21). An audience can hardly be expected to think back past 'sweet-speaking Homer' and think of Odysseus' artifice, which is not explicitly mentioned. One naturally connects adjacent descriptions of verbal

⁸⁴⁶ Bundy (1986) 67: 'either the first or last term of a series may be the focal point, the central term never'. This sweeping assertion (surprisingly) holds true in every case.

⁸⁴⁷ E.g. Kromer (1975), Most (1985a) 150-1, Poiss (1993) 94. Köhnken (1972) 50 sees a reference to Odysseus alone. <τε> (22) is a palmary supplement. <γε> (Schmid) is omitted from S-M's apparatus, with reason. On οἱ in general see Hummel (1993) 198.

skill.

B. Contrasts and Complements

The counterbalance of opposite and complementary thoughts is fundamental to epinician cohesion.⁸⁴⁸ Understanding the text frequently entails grasping which concepts are being contrasted. Often one assertion is followed by another articulating a related but different facet of truth. In *Olympian* 1, for instance, mention of the exceptional victor's long-term future (ὁ νικῶν δὲ λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίον | ἔχει μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν | ἀέθλων γ' ἔνεκεν, 97) springs a counterbalancing consideration of the more variable and broader short-term goals common to all (τὸ δ' αἰεὶ παρόμερον ἐκλόν | ὕπατον ἔρχεται παντὶ βροτῶν, 99-100). This topic in turn calls to mind the poet's task on this particular day (100-3; cf. *Alcm.* 1.37-40). As a whole, the passage mediates between two different dimensions of mortal flourishing in time (cf. *B.* 3.78-84). In *Pythian* 8 a similar concatenation of thought is traced in the opposite direction to different effect: men are susceptible to the changes of a day (ἐπάμεροι, 95), but an extraordinary success spreads its lustre over a lifetime (μείλιχος αἰών, 97; cf. *P.* 3.107-11). The odes require audiences to hold different truths in balance and in tension.⁸⁴⁹

Perhaps the most fundamental of contrasts in Pindar is that between 'light' and 'dark' material. A statement about success, for instance, is often followed by a statement about failure putting it into relief (e.g. *P.* 8.92-94). In the epinicians there is far more fragility, failure, folly, and futility than one might expect to find in poems for the happiest occasions. On a local level, this material functions as 'dark foil' (Bundy (1986) 14) and contributes to *variatio*. On another level,

⁸⁴⁸ Hubbard (1985) discusses the mediation of opposites in Pindar but concentrates on the thematic interpretation of whole odes.

⁸⁴⁹ Cf. the apparent contradiction in *Simon.* 542.

hard truths lend credibility to their speaker. Balanced considerations contribute to the characterisation of a scrupulous, wise narrator concerned to provide an even-handed and expansive representation of the world as it is (cf. Simon. 542.14-18).

More subtle rhetorical ends can also be pursued through balanced thoughts. Consider *N.* 11.24-32:

ναὶ μὰ γὰρ ὄρκον, ἐμὰν δόξαν παρὰ Κασταλῖαι
καὶ παρ' εὐδένδρῳι μολῶν ὄχθῳι Κρόνου
κάλλιον ἂν δηριώντων ἐνόστης' ἀντιπάλων,

πενταετηρίδ' ἐορτὰν Ἡρακλῆος τέθμιον
κωμάσαις ἀνδηράμενός τε κόμαν ἐν πορφυρέοις
ἔρνεσιν. ἀλλὰ βροτῶν τὸν μὲν κενεόφρονες αὖχαι
ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔβαλον· τὸν δ' αὖ καταμεμθέντ' ἄγαν
ἰσχὺν οἰκείων παρέσφαλεν καλῶν
χειρὸς ἔλκων ὁπίσσω θυμὸς ἄτολμος ἐών.

The two *gnomai* concern athletes. Yet one naturally connects αὖχαι (29) with the bold claim that Aristagoras, with minor local victories to his credit (19-21), would have beaten the best of Greece if he had competed at Olympia. Here counterbalanced generalisations raise the possibility that the speaker's confidence is misplaced and the caution of Aristagoras' parents (ἐλπίδες δ' ὀκνηρότεραι, 22) well-founded, rather than *vice versa*. We do not and cannot know for certain which of the two *gnomai* applies more closely to Aristagoras.⁸⁵⁰ The epinician narrator, impressed with his subject and strongly committed to a bold proposition, retains epistemic humility (ἐμὰν δόξαν, 24). The poem concludes by observing that men do not know the future (45) and endorsing moderate goals (47-8 with Henry (2005)).

C. Delayed Continuities

⁸⁵⁰ With typical Pindaric asymmetry of thought (see 3.D below) the two *gnomai* are not precisely calibrated to the situation of the *laudandus*: it was not Aristagoras but his parents who decided that he would not compete at the highest level.

The annotated text generally describes how each unit follows from what immediately precedes. Sometimes, however, a unit belongs to a larger construction that contributes to the train of thought only or primarily as a whole. In such cases there need not be any strong link between the first unit of the larger construction and what comes before. Linear continuity becomes evident when the rhetorical structure reaches its conclusion. Priamels regularly function thus. Consider *O.* 1.112-14:

Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει·
ἐν ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ' ἔ-
σχατον κορυφοῦται
 βασιλεῦσι.

The underlined unit does not have any robust connection with what comes before. The signal of diversity in *ἐν ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι* (113), however, prepares an experienced audience for a priamel (see p. 288). The function of the whole structure becomes manifest with its cap: Hieron's kingship is the most powerful weapon in Pindar's poetic arsenal (*καρτερώτατον* → *ἔσχατον* ... *κορυφοῦται*). The priamel, as a whole, enacts the promise of supreme praise implicit in line 112.

Gnomic complexes function similarly. Consider *P.* 8.8-15:

τὸ δ' ὅποταν τις ἀμείλιχον
 καρδίαι κότον ἐνελάσῃ,
 τραχεῖα δυσμενέων
 ὑπαντιάξαια κράτει τιθεῖς
 ὕβριν ἐν ἄντλῳ, τὰν οὐδὲ Πορφυρίων μάθεν
 παρ' αἵσαν ἐξερεθίζων. κέρδος δὲ φίλτατον,
ἐκόντος εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων φέροι.

βία δὲ καὶ μέγалаυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῳ.

The underlined gnome does not have a very precise connection with the preceding unit, though it may have a loose relationship of opposition. A stronger continuity becomes clear, however, as the next unit, referring to violence, completes a two-term gnomic complex (*κέρδος* ≠ *ἔσφαλεν*;

ἐκόντος≠βία). This thought about violence unites the examples of Porphyryon (12) and Typhos (16). The unit about profit contributes to the train of thought primarily by contrasting with the following thought about violence.

Gnomic complexes and priamels are only the commonest forms of delayed continuity. In *Pythian* 2 it is not immediately clear how the story of Ixion beginning in line 21 follows from the Locrian maiden celebrating Hieron (18-20). Ixion's message to mortals, however, related in the next lines, constitutes a generalisation looking to the Locrian maiden: τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς ἀμοιβαῖς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι (24).⁸⁵¹ Some full-scale myths exhibit analogous delayed cohesion on a larger scale, though these are not printed in the annotated text as unified rhetorical structures. In *Olympian* 6, for example, one does not fully grasp why it is necessary to travel to Pitana (28) until her role in the victor's genealogy eventually becomes evident (cf. ἱκωμαί τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν | καὶ γένος, 24-5). In *Nemean* 10 it is not clear how the myth of the Tyndaridae illustrates the thought καὶ μὲν θεῶν πιττὸν γένος (54) until Polydeuces displays his faithfulness at the end of the poem (76-90) and one learns *why* he preferred a mixed afterlife with his brother to full immortality without him (cf. πιττοί, 78). *Pythian* 3 is the most spectacular case: the particular reason behind Pindar's commonplace prayer (1-5) becomes evident only much later (63-76).

Consider *N.* 1.31-5:

οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν
 μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν,
 ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦ-
 και φίλοις ἐξαρκέων. κοιναὶ γὰρ ἔρχοντ' ἐλπίδες

πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν. ἐγὼ δ' Ἡ-
 ρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως

⁸⁵¹ Note πρὸ δόμων (18)→ἐποιχομένους (25). This connection makes it seem more probable that the Locrian maiden *comes forth* from her home (e.g. Lloyd-Jones (1973) 119n61, Woodbury (1978) 297-8) rather than performs before a temple (*pace* Currie (2005) 272). Cf. Christ (1896) 128-9: 'aedibus *egredientes* in publico' (my emphasis).

ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετῶν μεγάλαις,
 ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων λόγον,
 ὥς, ἐπεὶ σπλάγχων ὕπο ματέρος ...

It is not clear how the ‘ancient story’ of Heracles relates to the preceding gnome about the hopes of much-toiling men that advance the common weal⁸⁵² until the poem ends by describing Heracles’ immortality some thirty-five lines later. The speaker’s modest hope for the reward of a good reputation for benefactions (32) becomes absolutised in the immortal Heracles translated to Olympus as a reward for his benefactions (61-72). The initial citation of the story points to his fame (ἀρχαῖον ... λόγον, 34). Heracles exemplifies the successful fulfilment of the shared hopes of much-toiling men.⁸⁵³ This connection may perhaps be grasped only on a second journey through the poem.

D. Asymmetries

The intricate, challenging expression of fairly simple, fairly commonplace ideas is central to Pindar’s power to defamiliarise (cf. Silk (2012) 348-9). On the level of verbal expression, a lack of exact parallelism is characteristic of his style.⁸⁵⁴ On the level of discourse cohesion, too, he

⁸⁵² κοιναί (32) means ‘that benefit others’ (e.g. Carey (1981); cf. *P.* 11.54 with Finglass (2007b), *I.* 1.46, 6.69, Kurke (1991) 188-9), not ‘shared by much-toiling men’ (*pace* e.g. Braswell (1992); cf. *N.* 7.29-30). This produces a more cohesive and meaningful chain of reasoning. The adjective, the first word of its sentence, recalls the last words of the previous sentence, φίλοις ἐξαρκέων (32), and contrasts with πολλὸν ἐν μεγάροις πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν (31; cf. *I.* 1.64-8). The fact that the speaker belongs to a universal pattern would not advance the argument; this is already implied.

⁸⁵³ The myth of course also has other functions and meanings (some recorded by Carey (1981) 118-20). Indeed, the scale of the narrative encourages an audience to attribute to it a level of significance commensurate with its size and hence not necessarily limited to its definite role in the argument.

⁸⁵⁴ Dornseiff (1921) 103-9 (‘Symmetrie wird gemieden’, 103), Poultney (1987), Pfeijffer (1999a) 51-2.

cultivates a certain *poikilia*. His epinicians move in comprehensible but not predictable ways.

Expectations are often met in a surprising manner. Consider *N.* 5.19-23:

εἰ δ' ὄλβον ἢ χειρῶν βίαν ἢ κυδαρίταν ἐπαινῇ-
 και πόλεμον δεδόκηται, μακρά μοι
 αὐτόθεν ἄλμαθ' ὑποσκά-
 πτοι τις· ἔχων γονάτων ὀρμὰν ἐλαφράν·
 καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί.
 πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοισ ἄειδ' ἐν Παλίῳι
 Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορὸς ...

The Muses' performance at the wedding of Peleus provides a precedent for Pindar's eager performance (πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοισ, 22 with Pfeijffer (1999a); cf. *P.* 2.13-17). Yet his song merges into theirs in the following lines. The change of topic proposed in 19-20 is thus fluidly accomplished: ὄλβον (19), exemplified in Peleus' wedding (cf. *P.* 3.89), turns out to be the new subject. The justification for the transition enacts the transition.

Shifts in the train of thought often have discernible rhetorical goals beyond mere surprise. In *Olympian* 2 the question τίνα βάλλομεν (89) is not simply answered 'Theron'; the poet aims at Acragas (90-5) and proclaims that no city has produced the match of Theron in a century (cf. *N.* 1.11-15, *I.* 5.39-44). The community is implicated in the praise of the individual. In *Pythian* 1 a prayer for external military success is buttressed by an appeal to Zeus's power to foster internal harmony (67-70). Aetna's Spartan-like military strength (67-8) is made to depend on its Spartan-like civic concord (cf. 61-2). In *Pythian* 5 the inference ἐκόντι τοίνυν πρέπει | νόῳ τὸν εὐεργέταν ὑπαντιάσαι (43-4) applies obviously to the king Arcesilas, who should thank his charioteer (cf. 26). This thought is enacted, however, by the poet in the following lines: Pindar meets Carrhotus with eager praise on the charioteer's return to Cyrene (45-53; ὑπαντιάσαι, 44→ἤλθεο ἤδη, 52). By presenting Carrhotus as his own benefactor, the poet presents himself as emotionally invested in his patron's success (cf. e.g. *O.* 4.4-5; note *I.* 1.52-4, for a Theban). He may even

here in a way ventriloquise the voice of Arcesilas and speak on his behalf (as more explicitly in lines 103-4, looking back to 23-5; cf. *O.* 5.10, Currie (2013) 275). In *Pythian* 9 an imperative for all citizens to praise the victor is enacted in the following praise delivered by the speaker (93-103), who in a way co-opts the voice of the community.

In Pindar there is sometimes a tension between the logical signposting of the argument and the actual content of its statements (cf. Sappho 16.6-20 with Macleod (1974), Pfeijffer (2000)). Pindar makes sense, but it can be a strange sort of sense. In *N.* 6.4-11 a gnome about the unpredictability of an individual's destiny on any given day or night (6-7)⁸⁵⁵ is instantiated in the case of the victor (καί νυν, 8), who on the day of his victorious return manifests the *partial* predictability of inherited excellence over generations (8-11). In *Isthmian* 4 the continuous good fortune of the Cleonymidae is at first contrasted with the vicissitudes that afflict all men (4-9). Later an audience learns that the Cleonymidae, too, are not untouched by misfortune (16-17b, 31-5). At *O.* 7.43-8 a contrastive pair of gnomai *both* turn out to apply to the Rhodians (as do a corresponding pair of gnomai at *O.* 7.24-6). At *O.* 2.33-4 ῥοαὶ δ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι | εὐθυμῖαν τε μέτα καὶ πόνων ἐκ ἀνδρᾶς ἔβαν suggests a constant stream of randomly mixed vicissitudes of joy and pain. The following instantiation moves in a somewhat different direction: οὕτω δὲ Μοῖρ', ἃ τε πατρώιον | τῶνδ' ἔχει τὸν εὖφρονα πότμον, θεόρτωι σὺν ὀλβωι | ἐπὶ τι καὶ πῆμ' ἄγει, παλιντράπελον ἄλλωι χρόνωι (35-7). The deictic οὕτω asserts a parallel between general and particular, but one now gets an overall positive pattern (εὖφρονα ... παλιντράπελον) guided by an intelligible purpose (θεόρτωι ... ἄγει). Here εὐθυμῖαν τε μέτα καὶ πόνων (34) suggests an even balance, but τι καὶ πῆμ' (37) suggests a net positive balance. The victor's family is an instantiation of broader human patterns, but they are an exceptional instance (cf. *P.* 5.54-7).

⁸⁵⁵ ποτὶ στάθμαν (7) probably describes a course to be run, not a goal (Mezger (1880), Bury (1890), Most (1987), Gerber (1999)).

In Pindar there is often a lack of precise fit between the syntactical form of a unit and its pragmatic argumentative function. The boundaries between different types of utterances are friable.⁸⁵⁶ Conditional clauses may have causative force (e.g. *N.* 3.19-20).⁸⁵⁷ First-person statements sometimes function as the equivalent of a generalisation which also implies, with a quasi-imperative force, that everyone should act or think similarly (e.g. *P.* 11.50-1).⁸⁵⁸ In *Pythian* 1 the poet's self-directive *μὴ παρίει καλά* (86) is enacted by the following imperatives that function like praise.⁸⁵⁹ In *Pythian* 3 the maxim that destiny favours kings (85-6) is counterbalanced by two examples of favoured kings: *αἰὼν δ' ἀσφαλῆς | οὐκ ἔγεντ' οὗτ' Αἰακίδαι παρὰ Πηλεΐ | οὔτε παρ' ἀντιθέωι Κάδμωι* (86-8). These figures illustrate *a fortiori* a generalisation: everyone, and even the supremely fortunate (cf. *ὄλβον ὑπέρτατον*, 89), suffers misfortune (cf. *N.* 7.52-3). In Pelops' speech in *Olympian* 1, a rhetorical question implying a negative answer (82-4) functions like a statement: 'since all must die, one ought not to grow old in anonymity but seek glory' (cf. *P.* 2.78, *N.* 10.76-7, *I.* 1.5). In *Isthmian* 4 the generalisation *χρὴ δὲ πᾶν ἔρδοντ' ἀμαυρῶσαι τὸν ἐχθρόν* (48) is followed by a description of the victor: *οὐ γὰρ φύειν Ὠαριωνεῖαν ἔλαχεν* (49). This unit explicates why this generalisation applies to Melissus *in particular* (cf. *O.* 2.98-100).

Sometimes in Pindar one must supply a skipped step in the progression of thought. In *Olympian* 6, for instance, audiences infer from the generalisation that envy attaches to victors (74-6) that envy attaches to Hagesias and that this is one of many signs testifying to the glory of the Iamidae (*τεκμαίρει | χρῆμ' ἕκαστον*, 73-4). In *Olympian* 8 mention of Poseidon travelling to the Isthmus prompts the poet to reflect on the hazards of praising an Isthmian victory which he

⁸⁵⁶ Cf. Carey (1980c) on myths functioning as praise.

⁸⁵⁷ Bundy (1986) 56, Hummel (1993) 356, Mader (1990) 98; cf. Pfeijffer (1999a) on *N.* 5.50.

⁸⁵⁸ See R. W. B. Burton (1962) 86, 88-9, Young (1968) 58-60, Lefkowitz (1980) 38-9, Bundy (1986) 85, D'Alessio (1994) 128.

⁸⁵⁹ Cf. Kohnken (1970). Hieron ought to keep doing what he already does (*παρμένων ... μὴ κάμνε*, 90 with Miller (1989) 482n56, Robbins (1997) 266-7).

has not yet mentioned: *τερπνὸν δ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἴσον ἔσσεται* οὐδέν. | *εἰ δ' ἐγὼ Μελησία ἐξ ἄγενείων κῦδος ἀνέδραμον ὕμνῳ*, | *μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος* (53-5).⁸⁶⁰ The conditional functions as the equivalent to a statement and, through a sort of *prateritio*, enacts the praise of Melesias' victory (ἀνέδραμον, aorist, with Race (1990) 156n32).

The transition from myth to programme in *Pythian* 12 functions similarly. The description of the nome discovered long ago by Athena shades closer to the reality of the present in a long, trailing sentence (23-9):

... ὠνόμασεν (sc. Athena) κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον,
εὐκλεᾶ λαοσσόν μναστῆρ' ἀγώνων,

λεπτοῦ διανισόμενον χαλκοῦ θαμὰ καὶ δονάκων,
τοὶ παρὰ καλλίχορον ναίοισι πόλιν Χαρίτων
Καφισίδος ἐν τεμένει, πιστοὶ χορευτᾶν μάρτυρες.
εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου
οὐ φαίνεται

The gnome about ὄλβος (28) has some connection to the preceding myth (18-10 with Köhnken (1978) 94n2), but Pindar's story focuses more on Athena and her invention than on Perseus and his ὄλβος or κάματος. Perseus, moreover, has not been mentioned for around ten lines. The primary point of connection in thought is not with the myth but rather with the case of the victor (so, for example, Privitera (1982)), whose situation has been brought to mind by the preceding description of musical competitions (λαοσσόν ... ἀγώνων, 24) and *aulos* playing (25). Midas has laboured to develop his skill; his ὄλβος is now realised in his Pythian triumph.

⁸⁶⁰ Von der Mühl (1976) 233-4 and Carey (1989b) 287-90 identify the Isthmian victory. On the first sentence see Carey (1989b), who provides a doxography, and Lloyd-Jones (1991), who conjectures *ἀεὶ* for *ἴσον* (*κάον*, Hutchinson *per litteras*). The sense required seems to be 'nothing will be equally pleasing to everyone' (so, most recently, Gentili *et al.* (2013); cf. e.g. Thgn. 801-2 and K-G i.175 for the thought and the future). The best hope for the transmitted text seems to be taking *ἐν ἀνθρώποις* to mean 'among men, i.e. in the eyes of men' (cf. *παρ' ἀνδράσιν* ... *τίμαι*, *O.* 6.10, *καλός* ... *παρὰ παισίν*, *P.* 2.73, *ἐν ἀνδράσι γερασφόρον*, *P.* 2.43). I am not sure that this is possible, but Pindar can surprise with his usage of prepositions. I have vacillated at length and finally obelised.

4. *Isthmian* 5

Isthmian 5, an understudied ode, may provide a case study exemplifying the nature of epinician linear cohesion and the methodology applied throughout the annotated text. A fuller, more explicit analysis of one specimen of Pindar's art may also demonstrate how he crafts unique poems by creatively employing conventional patterns.

Like 22 other Pindaric odes, *Isthmian* 5 begins by invoking a deity (1-11):

Μᾶτερ Ἀελίου πολυώνυμε Θεία,
 céo ἔκατι καὶ μεγαθενῇ νόμικαν
 χρυσὸν ἄνθρωποι περιώσιον ἄλλων·
 καὶ γὰρ ἐριζόμεναι
 νᾶες ἐν πόντῳ καὶ <ύφ> ἄρμασιν ἵπποι
 διὰ τεάν, ὄνασσα, τιμὰν ὠκυδινά-
 τοις ἐν ἀμίλλαισι θαυμασταὶ πέλονται·

ἐν τ' ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοισι ποθεινόν
 κλέος ἔπραξεν, ὅντιν' ἀθρόοι στέφανοι
 χερσὶ νικάσαντ' ἀνέδρασαν ἔθειραν
 ἢ ταχυτᾶτι ποδῶν.
 κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.

The opening address is not followed by the standard imperative (cf. *Pythian* 1, *Nemean* 8). Pindar's reasons for calling on Theia must be inferred from what follows. The hymnic catalogue of her powers progresses toward a climactic final term most relevant to the ode (see 3.A above). From wealth (2-3) Pindar moves to war (4-6).⁸⁶¹ Within this second term, ἐριζόμεναι (4), chariots

⁸⁶¹ The generalisation is anachronistic (cf. e.g. πολέμου ... χαλκεντέος, *N.* 1.16) and/or exotic: chariots did not feature in fifth-century Greek warfare. ἐν τ' ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοισι (7), parallel with ἐν ἀμίλλαισι (6), signals a fresh category (cf. ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν, 55). It is therefore unlikely that Pindar describes ship races (*pace* Farnell (1930-2), Wüst (1967) 232). Military exercises seem too rare to be Pindar's subject (*pace* Privitera (1982)). With ὠκυδινάτοις (6), capturing the swift, unpredictable reversals of combat, cf. λαιψηροί (*O.* 12.4 with Verdenius (1987-88)). With ἀμίλλαισι (6) cf. Th. 7.71.3.24. Wealth (2-3), war (4-6), and athletics (7-10) constitute a Pindaric troika (e.g. *N.* 5.19). Chariots and ships connote land and sea, thereby defining Theia's universal

(5), and ἐν ἀμίλλαισι (6) shade toward athletics, the final and longest term. The general statement in line 11 embraces the last two terms: ἀλκά (11) suits both warfare (e.g. *O.* 13.55) and athletics—and especially the victor’s violent discipline, the pancration (cf. *N.* 2.14). The pairing of war and athletics proves to be a central theme of *Isthmian* 5 (22-7, 48-56).

The gnome of line 11 shifts focus away from Theia by subsuming her into a larger pattern: κρίνεται δ’ ἀλκά διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν (11).⁸⁶² Argumentative form and verbal reference combine to give this thought its precise, most appropriate sense. Among plausible readings the one that renders the train of thought most cohesive wins conviction. The sentence should be translated so as to generalise from what precedes. διὰ δαίμονας (11) looks back to διὰ τεάν, ὄνασσα, τιμάν (6, implicitly repeated in lines 7-10) as ἀνδρῶν (11) looks back to ὄντιν’ (8) as ἀλκά (11) looks back to χερσί ... ταχυτᾷτι (9-10). κρίνεται (11), then, looks back to νικάσαντ’ (9). The verb is best translated ‘is distinguished (as successful)’.⁸⁶³ The next sentence buttresses this interpretation: εὖ πάχων (13)⁸⁶⁴ recalls κρίνεται (11). The sense ‘è assegnato’ (Privitera (1982); ‘allotted’, Slater s.v. b), is possible but less appropriate.⁸⁶⁵ It may be present as a secondary meaning. The gods’ role in human flourishing will be a motif (θεοδότων ἔργων, 23; Διὸς ἕκατι, 29; Διὸς ὄμβρωι, 49; Ζεὺς τά τε καὶ τὰ νέμει, 52).

influence (cf. *O.* 12.3-5); Pindar will celebrate Aeginetan martial triumphs on land (35-42) and sea (48-50).

⁸⁶² Burnett (2005) 94-5 sees a contrast between Theia and other gods. But Theia belongs to the category of δαίμονας (11).

⁸⁶³ Thummer (1968-9): ‘wird ... entschieden’; Farnell (1930-2): ‘becomes distinguished’; cf. *N.* 4.1 with Henry (2005), *N.* 5.40-1, 7.7 with Most (1985) 140, B. 7.6.

⁸⁶⁴ ‘Having succeeded’; see Carey (1981) on *N.* 1.32.

⁸⁶⁵ *N.* 7.31 presents similar ambiguity: ἀδόκητον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα could mean ‘the expectant and the unexpecting’ or ‘the glorious and the inglorious’ (see Loscalzo (2000) for a doxography). The latter is preferable: this phrase follows an extended description of Ajax’s excellence and precedes a generalisation about posthumous glory. The obvious fact that Ajax expected to die when he killed himself is less clearly relevant to the argument. ‘The glorious and inglorious’ looks back to ἀφνεὸς πενιχρός τε (19; cf. *Od.* 3.236-8).

The gnome concluding the opening movement focuses on success (11). The next sentence, remaining on the general level (ὄντιν', 8→τις, 13), traces in sequence the 'victor's narrative' from success to praise, the cap of the 'double crown' (12-16):

δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαί-
νοντι τὸν ἄλπνικτον εὐανθεῖ cὺν ὀλβωι,

εἴ τις εὖ πάσχω· λόγον ἐκλὸν ἀκούη.
μὴ μάτευσ· Ζεὺς γενέσθαι· πάντ' ἔχεις,
εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν.
θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.

The first, subordinated element, εὖ πάσχω (13), recalls κρίνεται (11). ἐκλὸν ἀκούη (13), later both in the sentence and in the typologised narrative, introduces a new element, which is now the focus. ἄωτον ... τὸν ἄλπνικτον (12-13), virtually a superlative squared (cf. ἄωτον ἄκρον, *I.* 7.18), sounds the *ne plus ultra* theme and thereby motivates the inferential imperative not to surpass this pinnacle (14; see p. 294). This injunction is in turn followed by two complementary justifications: one who has such blessings has all (14-15); anything more would be wrong for a mortal to pursue (16). This last thought is essentially a polarised recapitulation of μὴ μάτευσ· Ζεὺς γενέσθαι (14).

Pindar next moves from the general to the particular. An instantiation of the *ne plus ultra* theme emerges into view as direct address spotlights the victor (17-25):

τὴν δ' ἐν Ἴσθμῳ διπλόα θάλλοις ἀρετά,
Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέαι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν
Πυθέαι τε, παγκρατίου. τὸ δ' ἐμόν
οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται·
cὺν Χάρισιν δ' ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς

τάνδ' ἐς εὖνομον πόλιν. εἰ δὲ τέτραπται
θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἂν καθαρὰν,
μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ' ἀοιδᾷ
κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων.

The reason behind the opening address becomes apparent: because of Theia, Phylacidas has achieved athletic glory, and she receives Pindar's hymn in recompense; through the gods' favour Phylacidas' valour has been distinguished (θεοδότων ἔργων, 23; cf. διὰ δαίμονα, 11). The victor enters the scene illuminated by what has gone before. ἀρετά (17) looks back to εὖ πάσχω (13); θάλλοις (17) looks back to εὐανθεῖ cὺν ὄλβῳ (12). A certain lack of fit between generalisation and instantiation (see 3.D above) redounds to Phylacidas' praise:⁸⁶⁶ he has not just any 'share' in success and praise (μοῖρ' ... καλῶν, 15) but a haul of multiple major victories and praise from a major poet.

Lines 17-20 retrace in a specific instance the movement of thought traced on a general level in lines 11-13. Praise again follows success. τίν (17) is counterbalanced by ἐμόν (19; see 2.B.ii). The fronted first-person adjective introduces an authorial intervention reacting to mention of athletic victory (see p. 290; cf. *P.* 4.66-8). The baroque statement 'not without the descendants of Aeacus does my heart taste song' is explained and unpacked by the following sentence, a recapitulation: Pindar has come to Aegina with a song for Lampon's sons, descendants of Aeacus.⁸⁶⁷ The arrival motif (cὺν Χάρικιν δ' ἔμολον, 21) connotes the purpose of his visit;⁸⁶⁸ focus moves from the games (Ἰσθμῷ ... Νεμέαι, 17-18) to the victor's community (22; see p. 298). Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς (21) suggests personal obligation. It is all the more imperative to render just praise in a city

⁸⁶⁶ Cf. *O.* 6.3-7, *I.* 3.9-13.

⁸⁶⁷ Does Αἰακιδᾶν (20) refer to heroes (the consensus interpretation) or all the descendants of Aeacus, including contemporary Aeginetans? Both are possible (Slater s.v; cf. *Sa.* 44.13, *O.* 13.14). The latter makes better sense and makes the train of thought more lucid. cὺν Χάρικιν (21) recalls ὕμνων (20). Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς (21) looks back to Αἰακιδᾶν (20). τάνδ' ἐς εὖνομον πόλιν (22) will require preceding specification (see p. 21-2). Heroes are not relevant to the immediately following lines. καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων (26) introduces heroes as a fresh topic. τέτραπται (22) suggests recent achievement. The you/me juxtaposition (17-20) can be complementary, not contrastive (cf. *O.* 1.84-5). *I.* 6.20, often cited as a parallel for our passage, is very different.

⁸⁶⁸ There is no suggestion that 'un'ode per Egina senza il mito degli Eacidi sarebbe composta senza la Grazie' (Privitera (1982)). The Charites connote Pindar's poetic vocation (cf. *O.* 9.83-4, 13.49-52, 96-7, *N.* 6.57b, *I.* 6.57).

characterised by obedience to law (τάνδ' ἐς εὖνομον⁸⁶⁹ πόλιν, 22; cf. *O.* 10.13, *Soph. OC* 913-16).

Mention of the poet's arrival is followed by a generalised conditional and by an imperative that again trace the link between achievement and celebration (22-5).⁸⁷⁰ The general thought also adds fresh information about the victor (see p. 281). καθάραν (23) likely has an ethical element (e.g. *O.* 4.16; cf. *N.* 1.25) as well as suggesting a divinely granted course free from obstruction (e.g. *O.* 6.23; cf. *O.* 9.104-5). A universal norm governs the present: since Pindar has come to celebrate achievement, he should not stint in praise. Surprisingly, however, this imperative is not straightforwardly followed by its enactment, i.e. by the praise of Lampon's sons, but rather by a justification which prompts a move to a different theme occupying the next 28 lines. Similarly at *N.* 8.19-22 the thought of treating a new theme, recent victory, leads the poet to treat an old theme at length (see p. 173n519). There, as in our passage, the internal narrator's argument gets away from him (cf. Miller (1993b)).

Pindar justifies epinician praise of his contemporaries by citing precedent from another genre (26-35):

καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ
λόγον ἐκέρδαναν· κλέονται δ' ἔν τε φορμίγ-
γεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφόνοις ὁμοκλαῖς

μυρίον χρόνον· μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς

⁸⁶⁹ Slater glosses the adjective 'well-ordered, harmonious' while LSJ⁹ glosses 'under good laws, well-ordered'. The sense is 'characterised by εὖνομία', a concept which refers not so much to a constitution but rather to obedience to its laws (Ostwald (1969) 71). For praise as just action see Bundy (1986) 61n69.

⁸⁷⁰ The subject is an understood 'someone' (Mezger (1880), Wüst (1967) 234, Bundy (1986) 56, noting a broad pattern; cf. Fraenkel (1950) on Aesch. *Ag.* 71) with transparent relevance to the victor (cf. Hutchinson (2001) on *O.* 6.4-7). Bury (1892), Thummer (1968-9), and Lefkowitz (1991) 38 take Aegina as the subject. τέτραπται (22) and μὴ φθόνει (24) suit an individual. The plural Λάμπωνος νόις (21) preceding the singular verb (22) militates against taking Phylacidas as the subject (*pace* Privitera (1982)).

Διὸς ἔκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι·
 ἐν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν θυσίαισι φαενναῖς
 Οἰνεῖδαι κρατεροί,
 ἐν δὲ Θήβαις ἵπποδάμους Ἴδλαος
 γέρας ἔχει, Περσεὺς δ' ἐν Ἄργει, Κάστορος δ' αἰχ-
 μὰ Πολυδεύκεός τ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα ρεέθροις.

ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνῶναι μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί
 Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε·

The theme of praise as recompense (ἀντὶ πόνων, 25→λόγον ἐκέρδαναν, 27) establishes the argument from precedent (cf. Theoc. 17.5-8, a reference to our passage). καὶ γάρ (26) introduces a parallel⁸⁷¹ for epinician praise (αἰοιδᾶι, 24→λόγον, 27), but the performance traditions cited are not epinician.⁸⁷² πολεμισταί (26) suggests the exploits for which these heroes are celebrated (cf. ἔργων, 23; κρατεροί, 31; ἵπποδάμους, 32; αἰχμὰ, 33; σὺν μάχαις, 35) and recalls the victor's violent event while also preparing for ensuing praise of Aeginetan martial valour (48-50). A connection in cultic language between σεβιζόμενοι (29) on a general level and θυσίαισι (30) in a particular case marks the ensuing catalogue as a series of instantiations (cf. Currie (2005) 78). The argumentative force of the list lies in its geographical sweep evoking a standard custom. The list finds its cap (ἀλλ', 34) in the location of performance, Aegina, now denominated with the archaizing Oinona.⁸⁷³

The speaker next enacts his statement that the Aeacidae are honoured on Aegina: having come to the island (ἔμολον ... τάνδ' ἐκ εὖνομον πόλιν, 21-2; cf. ἐν Οἰνῶναι, 34), he now honours them in song; they continue to provide a theme for wise poets like Pindar (28-9). Epinician approximates cultic poetry here as Pindar's ode becomes an instantiation of the preceding generalisation (cf. *O.* 1.14-18). He delivers a song in recompense for achievement (24-5), but his song is

⁸⁷¹ Cf. *O.* 7.27, *P.* 9.42, *N.* 6.34, Denniston 108.

⁸⁷² Alc. 7 and Pind. fr. 52p exemplify the genre in question.

⁸⁷³ Cf. *N.* 4.46, 5.16, 8.7, all connected to the mythical past.

now dedicated to ancient heroes, not Lampon's sons. An opening relative initiates a narrative (35-45):

τοὶ καὶ σὺν μάχαις
 δις πόλιν Τρώων πρᾶθον, ἐσπόμενοι
 Ἡρακλεῖ προτέρων,
 καὶ σὺν Ἀτρεΐδαϊς. ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν·
 λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἑκτορα πέφνον,
 καὶ στράταρχον Αἰθιοπῶν ἄφοβον
 Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν· τίς ἄρ' ἐκλὼν Τήλεφον
 τρῶσεν ἐὼι δορὶ Καΐκου παρ' ὄχθαις;

τοῖσιν Αἴγιναν προφέρει στόμα πάτραν,
 διαπρεπέα νᾶσον· τετείχισται δὲ πάλαι
 πύργος ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν.

Mention of the second Trojan expedition, which will be Pindar's primary theme, springs an address to the Muse in asyndeton: ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν (38). Drawing on the common poetological metaphor of a chariot, Pindar here suggests an upward movement in space that reflects a heightening in tone.⁸⁷⁴ Like the invocation before the Iliadic catalogue of ships (2.484-93), this address depicts an upcoming subject as especially challenging and creates a sense of anticipation. The request is enacted in the following lines which evoke epic in both content and rhetoric (see p. 111). After becoming like cultic poetry, *Isthmian* 5 now becomes like epic.

An address to the Muse, as often in epic, is followed by a request for precise information.⁸⁷⁵ Pindar's questions, however, unlike their hexameter models, have an obvious answer and are tantamount to vaunts.⁸⁷⁶ Nowhere in epic, furthermore, are so many questions listed in rapid succession (cf. *Il.* 5.703, 11.299, 16.692 for double questions). Multiple questions suggest an abun-

⁸⁷⁴ With the verb of driving the literal sense of πεδόθεν (38) comes to mind. There would be no discernible point to driving a poetic chariot uphill (cf. *I.* 2.33); flight is implied (cf. Farnell (1930-2), Simpson (1969) 460, D'Alessio (1994) 175-6).

⁸⁷⁵ Cf. Minton (1960, 1962), Braswell (1988) on *P.* 4.70-1, H. S. Mackie (2003) 51-3.

⁸⁷⁶ Cf. *O.* 13.18-22.

dance of topics and put into relief their single answer.

The poet does not simply provide the answer to his own question (see p. 307), thereby emphasising its obviousness and Achilles' universal fame. He instead depicts an individual's achievements as a shared glory: τοῖσιν Αἴγινα προφέρει στόμα πάτρων (43).⁸⁷⁷ The hero's exploits are next more explicitly depicted as instantiations of a general Aeginetan tradition (44-5). By sacking the towers of Troy (πράθον, 36), the Aeacidae have constructed a metaphorical tower of excellence at home. The island enjoys an enduring legacy (τετείχισται δὲ πάλαι, 44, perfect), which one might now continue by 'scaling' a structure erected long ago.⁸⁷⁸

This broad generalisation facilitates a fluid movement from the past to the present (46-58):

πολλὰ μὲν ἄρτιεπής
 γλῶσά μοι τοξεύματ' ἔχει περὶ κείνων
 κελαδέσαι· καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἄρει μαρτυρήσαι
 κεν πόλις Αἴαντος ὀρθοθεῖσα ναύταις

ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Καλαμίδι Διὸς ὄμβρῳ
 ἀναρίθμων ἀνδρῶν χαλαζάντι φόνῳ.
 ἀλλ' ὅμως καύχασμα κατάβρεχε κυγαί·
 Ζεὺς τὰ τε καὶ τὰ νέμει,
 Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος. ἐν δ' ἐρατεινῷ
 μέλιτι καὶ τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ καλλίνικον
 χάρμ' ἀγαπάζοντι. μαρνάσθω τις ἔρδων

ἄμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου
 ἐκμαθῶν· οὗτοι τετύφλωται μακρός
 μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι
 ἐλπίδων ἔκνις' ὅπιν.

⁸⁷⁷ This unit answers the preceding questions. στόμα (43) therefore does not belong to the Aeginetans (*pace* Bury (1892)) or to Achilles (*pace* Fennell (1899)) but to anyone who answers the questions (cf. Farnell (1930-2), Thummer (1968-9); note the lack of a pronoun or possessive adjective) and in particular to the speaker himself (Privitera (1982); cf. γλῶσά μοι, 47).

⁸⁷⁸ Aegina's metaphorical πύργος (45) is not a defensive structure (contrast Wilamowitz (1922) 203) but a conspicuous monument (cf. πύργος, *P.* 5.56; *B.* 3.13-14, *Ar. Pax* 749, *Ra.* 1004). Those who would scale it are not attackers but the Aeginetan themselves, as the following lines suggest.

Mention of a vast theme (Aeginetan excellence past and present) prompts an authorial intervention (see p. 290): πολλά (46) looks back to ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς (45). One here expects praise of the Aeginetans to follow as enactment. This expectation is met in a surprising way. In contrast to past glories (πάλαι, 44), a recent military victory is selected as a possible instantiation of the theme (καὶ νῦν, 48). But praise is put into the mouth of an objective witness (μαρτυρήσαι, 48), not offered by the speaker himself. The potential optative further distances the poet from this theme, which remains but a hypothetical topic (cf. *N.* 4.93). Through a sort of *praeteritio*, the strong adversative ἀλλ’ ὅμως (51) rejects this potential subject (κελαδέσαι, 48=κιγαῖ, 51). ἀναρίθμων ἀνδρῶν (50), together with πολυφθόρῳ (49), suggests an overwhelming subject and thereby helps to motivate the break-off (cf. *O.* 2.98, 13.46, *N.* 2.23, 10.46 for the countless introducing a shift). ‘Hyperbole is at once a rhetorical enlargement of that theme and an excuse for abandoning it’ (Bundy (1986) 13).

Lines 51-4 have sometimes been misunderstood (e.g. Lefkowitz (1991) 40-1, Burnett (2005) 97-8). The basic sense is this: Zeus dispenses different sorts of success, which all require praise. The crucial point is that Ζεὺς τὰ τε καὶ τὰ νέμει, | Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος (52-3) does not by itself provide an independent justification for abandoning the theme of Salamis; there is no implication of impiety. This unit must be taken with the next; delayed continuity is at work. τὰ τε καὶ τὰ (52) are not ‘good and bad’⁸⁷⁹ but an indefinite ‘this and that’, i.e. a variety of blessings, here martial and athletic success in particular.⁸⁸⁰ The notion that a merited boast, which piously credits the gods (Διὸς ὄμβρῳ, 49; cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 827-8), would ‘offend heaven’ is contrary to both Pindar’s art and the canons of common sense. The idea is rather that Zeus, whose power embraces all (cf. Διὸς ἕκῃ, 29), was at work in the Aeginetan victory at Salamis (49) and also at work in

⁸⁷⁹ Radt (1958) 178, Thummer (1968-9), Carey (1981) 114-15, Burnett (2005) 98.

⁸⁸⁰ Cf. Bundy (1986) 74n100, Race (1982b), (1990) 53-4, Hummel (1993) 177.

the athletic victories (cf. 54-5) which Pindar goes on to treat. πάντων (53) recalls τά τε καὶ τά (52). One now sees more deeply the truth of line 11: κρίνεται δ' ἄλκᾳ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.

τοιαῖδε (54) is cataphoric, looking forward to ἀέθλοισιν (55), as asyndeton suggests. καὶ τοιαῖδε τιμαί (54) shows that Pindar intends to include another, different sort of victory (καλλίνικον, 54) in his song (ἐν δ' ἐρατεινῷ | μέλιτι, 53-4). He does so not because 'variety is the spice of life' (Bundy (1986) 75n100) but because athletic success also rejoices in celebration: ἀγαπάζοντι (54) conveys the *chreos* motif (cf. ἀθλονικία δὲ μάλιστ' αἰοδὸν φιλεῖ, *N.* 3.7). One may recall that Pindar has not yet delivered the 'fitting vaunt' (24) promised to Lampon's sons some 30 lines earlier.

The imperative μαρνάσθω τις (54) follows closely in asyndeton and begins to enact the new theme promised in the preceding unit. The injunction to learn from Lampon's sons is supported by a description of the family that justifies the imperative: they provide a paradigm of success for all (56-8).⁸⁸¹ The text is questionable here,⁸⁸² but it seems clear enough that the family has traced the victor's narrative from ambition (ἐλπίδων, 58) to effort (μόχθος, 57) to fame, their ultimate goal (cf. ποθεινόν | κλέος, 7-8): οὔτοι τετύφλωται (56) suggests by polar litotes that their efforts have become gloriously conspicuous (cf. Race (1990) 69). Because of their persistent efforts and resultant glory, Lampon's sons are an inspiration to others who would dedicate themselves to

⁸⁸¹ The train of thought is tauter if ἀνδρῶν (57) refers to γενεὰν Κλεονίκου (55) in particular and not men generally (*pace* Silk (1998) 27). ἐκμαθών (56) promises a description of the family, which is provided in the following lines (cf. *P.* 2.72 with Carey (1981) 50).

⁸⁸² This passage is among the most difficult and debated in Pindar. Obelisation may be the safest course. Silk (1998) and Adorjányi (2011) 140-70 provide the most recent and extensive discussions. Silk's (1998) drastic textual surgery does not produce convincing Pindaric Greek: οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρόν | μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι (a dative of purpose) | ἐλπίς ἔκνιξ'. ὅπῃ δ' ὦν αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν. Adorjányi (2011) 160-70 defends the text printed here. ὅπιν (58) presents the most serious problems. The sense 'pious regard' is apparently attested at *O.* 2.6 (see Gentili *et al.* (2013)). Pindar can freely deploy religious/ethical language to describe the athlete's enterprise (e.g. *P.* 5.2, *I.* 5.23). It seems just possible to translate 'nor did all their expenditures distress the reverent gaze of their ambitions' ('der Blick der Hoffnungen', Adorjányi (2011) 170).

noble deeds.⁸⁸³

This general description of the family is followed by an instantiation (59-63):

αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις,
 Φυλακίδα, πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι
 χειρὶ δεξιόν, νόωι ἀντίπαλον.
 λάμβανέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὖμαλλον μίτραν,
 καὶ πτερόεντα νέον κύπελλον ὕμνον.

The first-person voice intervenes to pick out a particular individual (καὶ Πυθέαν, 59) from the category of ἀνδρῶν (57). On the standard interpretation, Pythias is somewhat obscurely said to have trained his brother Phylacidas. On Silk's (1998) reading, which I have adopted, Pythias' triumph is celebrated. Instead of the usual dative of advantage, Silk retains the vocative Φυλακίδα, the reading of manuscript B, which has been misreported. εὐθυπορῆσαι (60) is then taken to depend on δεξιόν (61) and not on αἰνέω (59), which would create a highly unusual if not quite unparalleled construction of the verb of praise (see Silk (1998) 56-7). However this may be, standard inferential imperatives follow a description of success (see p. 290): since a man has triumphed, he must be crowned and praised (62-3; cf. 22-5).

In his final verses Pindar delivers the 'fitting vaunt' promised to the sons of Lampon (Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς, 21→γενεὰν Κλεονίκου, 55). The path of ratiocination that has led him to this point from his opening invocation of Theia is individual, unpredictable, and not easily summarised. But each individual step is clear. In winding his way to the goal of his work, Pindar expands its scope to include cults, other poetic genres, gods, myths, and recent history. The resulting journey is a wide-ranging and thought-provoking meditation on the variety and essence of mortal glory. *Isthmian* 5 is indeed a representative specimen of Pindar's art.

⁸⁸³ Contrast Bury (1892): 'let him learn what sort of athletes the race of Kleonikos produces before he dares to compete with them'.

Conclusion

ταῦτὰ δὲ τρις τετράκι τ' ἀμπολεῖν
ἀπορία τελέθει, τέκνοισιν ᾗτε μαψυλάκας “Διὸς Κόρινθος.”
– N. 7.104-5

This coda surveys conclusions, makes some further connections, and suggests how this project might be supplemented.

The first pages of this thesis cited Most (1994) 132: ‘in the most general terms, interpretation is nothing other than recontextualization’. The hundreds of pages that followed this quotation interpreted Pindar by re-contextualising his words within three interlocking and complementary frameworks: performance and reception, a literary landscape, and the linear argument of each ode.

Part One explored how Pindar’s different audiences feature within his poems and contribute to their meaning. Pindar’s poetry implicates its layered public to a remarkable degree. Both initial and secondary audiences feature so centrally in these texts that they become, in a certain sense, characters in their own right. Getting the most out of an epinician involves simultaneously assuming the perspectives of both its initial and subsequent audiences. Diverse audiences are invited to imagine the viewpoints of others; all audiences may thereby share a sense of partaking in a tradition and in a community centred on the text and what it represents. A minimal claim would be that that these arguments bring out patterns of meaning encoded in the texts. I have also claimed that Pindar’s poems reflect reality, albeit in complex ways: the odes were performed at occasions like those that they describe and were later remembered in various other settings, as the poet anticipated that they would be. His odes conjure up an imaginative world which is also grounded in the real world. This part of the thesis attempted to wed literary history to literary interpretation in order to win gains in both.

These arguments tally with some recent thinking about tragedy. After decades of focusing on the immediate performative and social setting of this genre, scholars are increasingly alive to the possibility that these plays were also oriented toward re-performance, reading, and audiences outside Attica.⁸⁸⁴ In this respect, too, tragedy may be viewed as a development of a tradition.

Part Two explored Pindar's depiction of his place within a shared literary culture. The author participates in a contemporary poetic environment which involves his patrons, their communities, secondary audiences, and other authors. Pindar also inserts himself into a narrative of literary history. He uses his audiences' knowledge of other lyric poetry, both past and present, to tell stories about his work. Pindar of Thebes features as a distinguished figure who is heir to a tradition and who will be remembered as part of that tradition. Literature as an institutional practice is one of his central themes. In this matter, as with his representations of performance and reception, there is reason to believe that his rhetoric is meant to be plausible.

I focus on lyric; a fuller investigation of Pindar's presentation of his place within a literary culture would pay greater attention to hexameter poetry and especially to the Homeric and cyclic epics. I have touched on some related issues, many shrouded in uncertainty (IV.4). In a future work on the reception of epic in archaic Greek lyric I hope to discuss Pindar as a witness for the emergence of canonical epic texts and to explore more fully how his understanding of 'Homer' informs his understanding of authorship in general.

Part Three explained how each of the approximately 1,600 sentences in Pindar's epinician corpus springs from what came before and introduces what comes next so as to form part of a lucid chain of reasoning. In many respects this project constitutes the systematic, formalised

⁸⁸⁴ See, for example, Griffith (2011), essays in Bosher (2012), Wright (2012), Vahtikari (2014).

application of everyday strategies of language comprehension to Pindar's odes, which imitate everyday speech unfolding in real time. These poems were performed and re-performed as oral monologues and present themselves to a reader as such. I have interpreted them in a way consonant with this. This project models a way of reading Pindar. In my analysis the context and knowledge necessary for grasping the basic meaning of a statement are always to be found in the immediately surrounding statements and in conventional motifs. If they are persuasive, these arguments would greatly reduce the range of plausible solutions to many difficulties in the Pindaric corpus.

There is something distinctive about how Pindar navigates from idea to idea. The form of discourse cohesion that one encounters in his work is an element of what one recognises as his style, an intuitive concept hard to define with precision.⁸⁸⁵ The terms and methods of analysis developed here might be applied to other authors whose style is related to Pindar's style in various ways. I have promised a study of Alcman's first *partheneion*. One might also explore, for instance, how Horace imitates the texture of choral lyric discourse in poems like *Carm.* 4.6.⁸⁸⁶ The most pressing work still to be done, however, is on Pindar himself. The writing accompanying the annotated text seeks to describe the typical rather than elucidate the extraordinary. If the word limit had allowed, I would have tackled at length some notoriously difficult passages in order to illustrate how my approach can yield novel insight into old quandaries. As it stands, the shorthand analysis of the annotated text is perhaps unlikely to convert those not already in agreement with my reading of the most challenging Pindaric passages, many of which present grammatical and lexical difficulties that my project is not designed to address (e.g. *P.* 2.17). I

⁸⁸⁵ R. B. Rutherford (2012) 4-16 provides an interesting discussion.

⁸⁸⁶ Cf. F. Cairns (1975) 131 on *Carm.* 3.11.

should like to write a series of longer, more explicit interpretations of some of these passages, either as articles or within an expanded study of epinician discourse cohesion.

The arguments of this thesis combine to paint a coherent picture of Pindar's enterprise. He is composing for an unrepeatable event a poem that will be remembered and repeated. This view of the present and future of his work is derived from his view of the past: Pindar and his audiences remember earlier poets who composed works embedded in the present but reaching into the future. There is reason to believe that earlier lyric poets really conceived of their own project along similar lines. Pindar hopes to be understood and valued both by present and future audiences because, as he stresses, he composes according to aesthetic and rhetorical conventions broadly shared across the Greek world and throughout time. A study of Pindar's discourse coherence reveals the intricate, fine-grained workings of these conventions and vindicates the poet's claim to produce works which diverse audiences may find intelligible and compelling.

The word 'audiences' in the title of this thesis is intended to include contemporary scholars. Throughout I have sought to mingle the interpretation of specific passages with broader methodological and literary reflections on how we, as Pindar's latest audience, can respond to his poems. Over the course of composing this work my own approach to being Pindar's audience has evolved and will no doubt continue to evolve in the months and years ahead. If this exercise has left me with one conviction, however, it is that time spent scrutinizing Pindar's language is never time wasted. This poetry ever repays renewed and refocused study. I hope to have only begun that study. ἀδυμελεῖ δ' ἐξάρχετε φωνᾷ (*N.* 2.25).

Bibliography

1. Texts

For Pindar's epinicians I refer to Race's edition with the following divergent readings, all in the annotated text: *O.* 6.15: read τελεσθειῶν (Pauw) for τελεσθέντων; *O.* 8.24: read διακρίναι for διακρίνειν; *O.* 8.53: read ἴσον ἔσσεται; *O.* 10.25: read ἴβωμῳ for βωμῶν; *P.* 3.18: read ἐταῖραι (West) for ἐταῖραι; *P.* 8.76-9: text as in S-M; *P.* 11.33: read πυρωθέντας (Bergk) for πυρωθέντων; *N.* 4.12: read εὐρύπυργον (West) for ἡύπυργον; *N.* 8.46: read τ' ἐλαφρόν (Cooke) for τε λάβρον; *N.* 6.16 read ὁμαιμίῳ (Schroeder) for ὁμαιμίου; *N.* 6.18 read ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ ἄγαγεν (Barrett, Fenno) for ἔνεικεν ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ; *N.* 11.36: read ῥοᾶν for ῥοᾶν; *I.* 2.12: read ἀγνώτ' for ἄγνωτ'; *I.* 5.60: read Φυλακίδα for Φυλακίδα, delete comma after εὐθυπορῆσαι.

Homer: Monro and Allen. Homeric Hymns: West. Hesiod: Solmsen. Hesiodic fragments: Merkelbach and West *apud* Solmsen. Iambic and elegiac poets: West. Alcman and Ibycus: Davies. Stesichorus: Davies and Finglass. Sappho and Alcaeus: Voigt. Anacreon: Page. Simonides: Page for lyric, West for iambic. Pindar's fragments: Snell and Maehler. Pindaric scholia: Drachmann. Bacchylides: Snell and Maehler. Aeschylus: Page. Sophocles: Lloyd-Jones and Wilson. Euripides: Diggle. Aristophanes: Wilson. Callimachus: D'Alessio. Theocritus: Gow. Catullus: Mynors. Horace: Shackleton-Bailey. For other authors I refer to the standard editions, usually the *OCT*.

2. Abbreviations

Beekes = R. S. B. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10; Leiden 2010).

CA = J. U. Powell ed., *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford 1925).

CEG = P. A. Hansen ed., *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols. (Texte und Kommentare 12, 15; Berlin 1983–9).

Denniston = J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*², rev. K. J. Dover (Oxford 1954).

D-K = H. Diels ed., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*⁶, 3 vols., rev. W. Kranz (Berlin 1951–2).

FGE = D. L. Page ed., *Further Greek Epigrams. Epigrams before A.D. 50 from The Greek Anthology and other sources not included in Hellenistic Epigrams or The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge 1981).

FGrHist = F. Jacoby *et al.* edd., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Leiden 1923–).

Fowler = R. L. Fowler ed., *Early Greek Mythography*, 2 vols. (Oxford 2000–13).

GEF = M. L. West ed., *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, MA 2003).

GP = A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page edd., *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and some contemporary epigrams* (Cambridge 1968).

HE = A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page edd., *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic epigrams* (Cambridge 1965).

K-G = R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. 2. Teil: Satzlehre*², rev. B. Gerth, 2 vols. (Hannover 1898–1904).

LSJ⁹ = H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*⁹, rev. H. Stuart-Jones *et al.* (Oxford 1940).

PCG = R. Kassel and C. F. L. Austin edd., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. to date (Berlin 1983–).

PMG = D. L. Page ed., *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962, corrected reprint 1967).

Slater = W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969).

SLG = D. L. Page ed., *Supplementum lyricis Graecis. Poetarum lyricorum Graecorum fragmenta quae recens innotuerunt* (Oxford 1974).

S-M = B. Snell and H. Maehler edd., *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1987-9).

TrGF = *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 1 *Didascaliae Tragicae, Catalogi Tragicorum et Tragoediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta Tragicorum Minorum* (ed. B. Snell; Göttingen 1971¹, 1986²); vol. 2 *Fragmenta Adespota* (edd. R. Kannicht and B. Snell; 1981); vol. 3 *Aeschylus* (ed. S. L. Radt; 1977); vol. 4 *Sophocles* (ed. S. L. Radt; 1985¹, 1999²); vol. 5 *Euripides* (ed. R. Kannicht; 2 parts; 2004).

W = M. L. West ed., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*², 2 vols. (Oxford 1989-92).

3. Works Cited

N. B. Commentaries and translations are cited by the author's name and date alone when the passage in question is clear.

Adorjáni, Z. (2010) 'Poseidon auf Aigina. Pindar N. 5.42 aus neuer Sicht', *AAntHung* 50: 373-87.

—. (2011) *Auge und Sehen in Pindars Dichtung* (Spudasmata 139; Hildesheim).

—. (2014) *Pindars sechste olympische Siegesode. Text, Einleitung und Kommentar* (Mnem. Suppl. 370; Leiden).

Agócs, P. (2012) 'Performance and genre: reading Pindar's κῶμοι', in Agócs *et al.* (2012): 191-223.

Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. edd. (2012a) *Reading the Victory Odes* (Cambridge).

Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. edd. (2012b) *Receiving the komos. Receptions of the victory ode* (BICS Suppl. 112; London).

Aloni, A. ed. (1997) *Saffo. Frammenti* (Milan).

—. (1989) *L'ado e i tiranni: ricerche sull'Inno omerico a Apollo* (Filologia e critica 59; Rome).

—. (1998) *Cantare glorie di eroi. Comunicazione e performance poetica nella Grecia arcaica* (Turin).

—. (2001) 'The proem of Simonides' Plataea Elegy and the circumstances of its performance', in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 86-105.

Aloni, A. and Ornaghi, M. edd. (2011) *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali. Nuovi contributi* (Orione 3; Messina).

Amundsen, L. and Skånland V. edd. (1961) *Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Papyrology. Oslo, 19th-22nd August, 1958* (Oslo).

Anastasiou, A. A., Skiadas, A. D., and Kambylis, A. edd. (1964) *Charis. Kōnstantinō I. Vouverē aphierōma tōn mathētōn tou epi tē exēkontapentaetēridi tou viou autou* (Athens).

Anderson, M. J. (1997) *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford).

Arrighetti, G. (1987a) *Poeti, eruditi e biografì. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 52; Pisa).

—. ed. (1987b) *Ricerche di Filologia classica* III. *Interpretazioni antiche e moderne di testi greci* (Pisa).

—. (1994) 'Stesicoro e il suo pubblico', *MD* 23: 9-30.

Athanassaki, L. (2009) 'Deixis, narratology, and the performance of choral lyric: on Pindar's *First Pythian Ode*', in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009): 241-73.

—. (2011a) 'Giving wings to the Aeginetan sculptures: the panhellenic aspirations of Pindar's *Eighth Olympian*', in Fearn (2011): 257-93.

—. (2011b) 'Song, politics, and cultural memory: Pindar's *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmaeonid temple of Apollo', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 235-67.

—. (2012) 'Performance and reperformance: the Siphnian Treasury evoked (Pindar's *Pythian* 6, *Olympian* 2 and *Isthmian* 2)', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 134-57.

Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. edd. (2011) *Archaic and Classical Choral Song. Performance, politics, and dissemination* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 10; Berlin).

Austin, J. L. (1962) *How To Do Things with Words* (Oxford).

Ayres, L. ed. (1995) *The Passionate Intellect. Essays on the transformation of classical traditions presented to Professor I. G. Kidd* (Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 7; New Brunswick, NJ).

Bacon, H. H. (1995) 'The chorus in Greek life and drama', *Arion* 3: 6-24.

Bagnasco, M. B. ed. (1977) *Locri Epizefiri. Atti del XVI convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Naples).

Bagordo, A. (1995-6) 'Μοῦς' αὐθιγενής (Bacchyl. 2,11)', *Glotta* 73: 137-41.

—. (1999) 'Eine Bemerkung zum Epinikion', *Hermes* 127: 118-20.

—. (2003) *Reminiszenzen früher Lyrik bei den attischen Tragikern. Beiträge zur Anspielungstechnik und poetischen Tradition* (Zetemata 118; Munich).

Bagordo, A. and Zimmermann B. edd. (2000) *Bakchylides hundert Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung* (Zetemata 106; Munich).

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (transl. V. W. McGee; edd. C. Emerson and M. Holquist; Austin).

Bakker, S. J. and Wakker, G. C. edd. (2009) *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 16; Amsterdam).

- Bakker, E. J. (1993a) 'Activation and preservation: the interdependence of text and performance in an oral tradition', *Oral Tradition* 8: 5-20.
- . (1993b) 'Discourse and performance: involvement, visualization and "presence" in Homeric poetry', *CA* 12: 1-29.
- Bakker, E. J. and Kahane, A. edd. (1997) *Written Voices, Spoken Signs. Tradition, performance, and the epic text* (Washington, DC).
- Bakola, E., Prauscello, L., and Telò, M. edd. (2013) *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres* (Cambridge).
- Balot, R. K. (2014) *Courage in the Democratic Polis. Ideology and critique in classical Athens* (Oxford).
- Barchiesi, A. (1993) 'Future reflexive: two modes of allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*', *HSCP* 95: 333-65.
- . (1996) 'Poetry, praise, and patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*', *CA* 15: 5-47.
- . (2001) 'Simonides and Horace on the death of Achilles', in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 255-60.
- . (2002) 'The uniqueness of the *Carmen Saeculare* and its tradition', in Woodman and Feeney (2002): 107-23.
- . (2009) 'Rituals in ink: Horace on the Greek lyric tradition', in Lowrie (2009): 418-40.
- Barrett, W. S. (1956) 'Dactylo-epitrites in Bacchylides', *Hermes* 84: 248-9. [= (2007) 314-21]
- . (1961) Review of P. Oxy. Vol. 24, *Gnomon* 33: 682-92.
- . (1964) *Euripides*. Hippolytus (Oxford).
- . (1978) 'The Oligaitheidai and their victories (Pindar, *Olympian* 13; *SLG* 339, 340)', in Dawe *et al.* (1978): 1-20. [= (2007) 98-117]
- . (2007) *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism. Collected papers* (ed. M. L. West; Oxford).
- Barron, J. P. (1969) 'Ibycus: to Polycrates', *BICS* 16: 119-49.
- . (1984) 'Ibycus, Gorgias, and other poems', *BICS* 31: 13-24.

Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., and Petrovic, I. edd. (2010) *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge).

Bearzot, C. (1997) 'P. Oxy. 3985: considerazioni sulla data e sull'ispirazione dell'elegia di Simonide per la battaglia di Platea', in Kramer *et al.* (1997): 71-9.

de Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. U. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (Longman Linguistics Library 26; London).

Becker, O. (1937) *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Hermes Einzelschriften 4; Berlin).

Beecroft, A. J. (2010) *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China. Patterns of literary circulation* (Cambridge).

Beister, H., Bucker, J., and Lauffen, S. edd. (1989) *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Siegfried Lauffer* (Munich).

Bell, J. M. (1978) 'Κίμψιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the anecdotal tradition', *QUCC* 28: 29-86.

Benedetti, F. and Grandolini, S. edd. (2003) *Studi di filologia e tradizione greca in memoria di Aristide Colonna*, 2 vols. (Naples).

Benjamin, S. (2010) *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue* (Oxford).

Bernard, M. (1996-7) 'Der Dichter und sein Gegenstand: zu Pindars siebentem nemeischen Lied', *WJA* 21: 101-27.

Bernardini, P. A. (1967) 'Linguaggio e programma poetico in Pindaro', *QUCC* 4: 80-97.

—. (1977) 'L' "aquila tebana" vola ancora', *QUCC* 26: 121-6.

—. (1982) 'Eracle, i Molioni e Augia nell'Olimpica 10 di Pindaro', *QUCC* 11: 55-68.

—. (1983) *Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro. La Nemea 4, l'Olimpica 9, l'Olimpica 7* (Filologia e critica 47; Rome).

—. (1989) 'Il proemio della *Pitica* XI di Pindaro e i culti tebani', in Beister *et al.* (1989): 39-47.

—. (1992) 'La storia dell'epinicio: aspetti socio-economici', *SIFC* 3: 965-78.

—. (2000) 'Epinici e iscrizioni agonistiche: un percorso da ricostruire', in Pizzani and Cannatà Fera (2000): 29-41.

Bernsdorff, H. (2014) 'Notes on P. Mich. inv. 3498 + 3250b recto, 3250a and 3250c recto (list of lyric and tragic incipits)', *APF* 60: 3-11.

Besios, M. et al. (2012) *Methone Pierias. 1. Epigraphes, charagmata kai emporika symbola ste geometrike kai archaike keramike apo to 'Hypogeio' tes Methones Pierias ste Makedonia* (Thessaloniki).

Biles, Z. (2003) 'Perils of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*', *Phoenix* 57: 191-208.

Billings, J., Budelmann, F., and Macintosh, F. edd. (2013) *Choruses, Ancient and Modern* (Oxford).

Bing, P. (1988) *The Well-Read Muse. Present and past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic poets* (Hypomnemata 90; Göttingen).

—. (1993) 'Impersonation of voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*', *TAPA* 123: 181-98.

—. (1995) 'Ergänzungsspiel in the epigrams of Callimachus', *A&A* 41: 115-31.

Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. edd. (2007) *The Brill Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden).

Bitto, V. G. (2012) 'Regina Odarum? Zur Publikation des *Carmen Saeculare*', *RhM* 155: 166-84.

Blondell, R. (1989) *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies. A Study in Sophocles and Greek ethics* (Cambridge).

Boardman, J. et al. edd. (1986) *The Oxford History of the Classical World* (Oxford).

Boedeker, D. and Sider, D. edd. (2001) *The New Simonides. Contexts of praise and desire* (Oxford).

Boeke, H. (2007) *The Value of Victory in Pindar's Odes. Gnomai, cosmology and the role of the poet* (Mnem. Suppl. 285; Leiden).

Bona, G. (1988) *Pindaro. I peani. Testo, traduzione, scoli e commento* (Cuneo).

Bond, G. W. (1981). *Euripides. Heracles* (Oxford).

Bonifazi, A. (2000) 'Sull'idea di sotterfugio orale negli epinici pindarici', *QUCC* 66: 69-86.

—. (2001) *Mescolare un cratere di canti. Pragmatica della poesia epinicia in Pindaro* (Alexandria).

—. (2004a) 'Communication in Pindar's deictic acts', *Arethusa* 37: 391-414.

—. (2004b) 'Relative pronouns and memory: Pindar beyond syntax', *HSCP* 102: 41-68.

- Borges, C. and Sampson, C. M. (2012) *New Literary Papyri from the Michigan Collection. Mythographic lyric and a catalogue of poetic first lines* (Ann Arbor).
- Bornemann, L. (1885) 'Pindars 7. nemeische Ode: ein Siegetodtenlied', *Philologus* 45: 596-613.
- Bornmann, F. (1978) 'Zur Geryoneis des Stesichoros und Pindars Herakles-Dithyrambos', *ZPE* 31: 33-5.
- Boscher, K. ed. (2012) *Theater outside Athens. Drama in Greek Sicily and south Italy* (Cambridge).
- Bothmer, D. von ed. (1987) *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World. Colloquium Sponsored by the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities and Symposium Sponsored by the J. Paul Getty Museum* (Malibu).
- Bowersock, G. W., Burkert, W., and Putnam, M. C. J. edd. (1979) *Arktouros. Hellenic studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Berlin).
- Bowie, A. M. (1981) *The Poetic Dialect of Sappho and Alcaeus* (Salem, NH).
- Bowie, E. L. (1986) 'Early Greek elegy, symposium, and public festival', *JHS* 106: 13-35.
- . (1993) 'Greek table-talk before Plato', *Rhetorica* 11: 355-71.
- . (2009) 'Wandering poets, archaic style', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009): 242-305.
- . (2010) 'The Trojan War's reception in early Greek lyric, iambic, and elegiac poetry', in Foxhall *et al.* (2010): 57-87.
- . (2011) 'Alcman's first *partheneion* and the song of the sirens', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 33-66.
- . (2012) 'Epinicians and patrons', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 83-92.
- Bowman, A. K. *et al.* edd. (1977) *Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XLV* (Oxford).
- Bowra, C. M. (1964) *Pindar* (Oxford).
- Braswell, B. K. (1976) 'Notes on the prooemium to Pindar's *Seventh Olympian Ode*', *Mnemosyne* 29: 233-42.
- . (1984) 'Color epicus in Pindar: a falsely assumed type', in Gerber (1984): 33-6.
- . (1988) *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Texte und Kommentare 14; Berlin).

- . (1992) *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Fribourg).
- . (1999) *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Texte und Kommentare 19; Berlin).
- . (2013) *Didymos of Alexandria. Commentary on Pindar* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 41; Basel).
- Bravi, L. (2006) *Gli epigrammi di Simonide e le vie della tradizione* (Filologia e critica 94; Rome).
- Bremer, D. (1976) *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung. Interpretationen zur Vorgeschichte der Lichtmetaphysik* (Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte Supplementheft 1; Bonn).
- Bremer, J. M. (1990) 'Pindar's paradoxical ego and a recent controversy about the performance of his epinicians', in Slings (1990): 41-58.
- . (1998) 'Greek cultic poetry: some ideas behind a forthcoming edition', *Mnemosyne* 51: 513-24.
- . (2008) 'Traces of the hymn in the *Epinikion*', *Mnemosyne* 81: 1-17.
- Briand, M. (2001) 'Quand Pindare nomme Homère ... Théories du nom propre, étymologies, intertextualités et énonciation lyrique', in Dubel and Rabau (2001): 25-46.
- Brillante, C., Cantilena, M., and Pavese, C. O. edd. (1977) *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale* (Padua).
- Brink, C. O. (1963-82) *Horace on Poetry*, 3 vols. (Cambridge).
- Brown, C. G. (1984) 'The bridegroom and the athlete: the proem to Pindar's *Seventh Olympian*', in Gerber (1984): 37-50.
- . (2006) 'Pindar on Archilochus and the gluttony of blame (*Pyth.* 2.52-6)', *JHS* 126: 36-46.
- Budelmann, F. ed. (2009a) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge).
- . (2009b) 'Introducing Greek lyric', in Budelmann (2009a): 1-18.
- . (2012) 'Epinician and the *symposion*: a comparison with the *enkomia*', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 173-90.
- . (2013) 'Greek festival choruses in and out of context', in Billings *et al.* (2013): 81-98.
- . (forthcoming) *Greek Lyric. A selection* (Cambridge).
- Bundy, E. L. (1962a) *Studia Pindarica. I. The Eleventh Olympian Ode* (Univ. Cal. Publ. in Cl.

Phil. 18/1: 1-33; Berkeley). [= (1986) 1-33]

—. (1962b) *Studia Pindarica*. II. *The First Isthmian Ode* (Univ. Cal. Publ. in Cl. Phil. 18/2: 35-92; Berkeley). [= (1986) 35-92]

—. (1972) 'The "Quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios" part I: the epilogue of Kallimachos's *Hymn to Apollo*', *CSCA* 5: 39-94.

—. (1986) *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

Bulloch, A. W. (1985) *Callimachus*. *The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 26; Cambridge).

Bulman, P. (1992) *Phthonos in Pindar* (Univ. Cal. Publ. in Cl. Phil. 35; Berkeley).

Buongiovanni, A. M. (1985) 'Sulla composizione della III *Pitica*', *Athenaeum* 73: 327-35.

Burgess, D. L. (1990) 'Pindar's *Olympian* 10', *Hermes* 118: 273-81.

Burgess, J. S. (2001) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore).

—. (2004) 'Early images of Achilles and Memnon?', *QUCC* 76: 33-51.

—. (2006) 'Neoanalysis, orality, and intertextuality: an examination of Homeric motif transference', *Oral Tradition* 21: 148-89.

Burkert, W. (1977) *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart).

—. (1987a) *Greek Religion Archaic and Classical* (transl. J. Raffan; Oxford).

—. (1987b) 'The making of Homer in the sixth century B.C.: rhapsodes versus Stesichoros', in Bothmer (1987): 43-62. [= D. L. Cairns (2001) 92-116]

Burnett, A. P. (1985) *The Art of Bacchylides* (Cambridge, MA).

—. (1988) 'Jocasta in the West. The Lille Stesichorus', *CA* 7: 107-54.

—. (1998) 'Spontaneity, savaging, and praise in Pindar's *Sixth Paean*', *AJP* 119: 493-520.

—. (2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aegina* (Oxford).

Burris, S., Fish, J., and Obbink, D. (2014) 'New fragments of book 1 of Sappho', *ZPE* 189: 1-28.

Burton, R. W. B. (1962) *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in interpretation* (Oxford).

- Burton, D. (2011) 'Response and composition in archaic Greek poetry', *Antichthon* 45: 58-76.
- Bury, J. B. (1890) *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London).
- . (1892) *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London).
- Burzachechi, M. (1962) 'Oggetti parlanti nelle epigrafi greche', *Epigraphica* 24: 5-54.
- Caciagli, S. (2011) *Poeti e società. Comunicazione poetica e formazioni sociali nella Lesbo del VII/VI secolo a.C.* (Lexis Suppl. 64; Amsterdam).
- . (2014) 'Case di uomini, case di dèi. Per un contesto di Alc. fr. 140 V.', *QUCC* 108: 57-92
- Cairns, D. L. (1993) *Aidōs. The psychology and ethics of honour and shame in ancient Greek literature* (Oxford).
- . ed. (2001) *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford).
- . ed. (2005a) *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Swansea).
- . (2005b) 'Bullish looks and sidelong glances: social interaction and the eyes in ancient Greek culture', in D. L. Cairns (2005a): 125-55.
- . (2005c) 'Myth and the polis in Bacchylides' Eleventh Ode', *JHS* 125: 35-50.
- . (2007) 'Dating *Nemean* 5 and Bacchylides 13: criteria and conclusions', *Nikephoros* 20: 33-47.
- . (2010) *Bacchylides. Five epinician odes* (Cambridge).
- Cairns, F. (1972) *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh).
- . (1984) 'Theocritus' first *Idyll*. The literary programme', *WS* 18: 89-113.
- . (1975) '*Splendide mendax*: Horace *Odes* III.11', *GR* 22: 129-39.
- . (2002) 'Acontius and his οὔνομα κούριδιον: Callimachus *Aetia* fr. 67.1-4', *CQ* 52: 471-7.
- . (2011) 'Money and the poet: the first stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2', *Mnemosyne* 64: 21-36.
- Calabrese De Feo, M. R. (1984) 'La figura di Aiace in Pindaro', *PP* 39: 120-32.
- . (1987) 'Interpretazione e restauro testuale in Pindaro *Py.* I 92-94 e *Ne.* VI 29-30', in Arrighetti (1987b): 113-28.
- Calame, C. (1974) 'Réflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque', *QUCC* 17: 113-28.

- . (1977) *Les Chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*, 2 vols. (Filologia e critica 20-1; Rome).
- . (1983) *Alcman* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 6; Rome).
- . (1995) *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece* (transl. J. Orion; Paris).
- . (2001) *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece. Their morphology, religious role, and social function*² (transl. D. Collins and J. Orion; Lanham, MD).
- . (2004) 'Deictic ambiguity and auto-referentiality: some examples from Greek poetics', *Arethusa* 37: 414-43.
- . (2009) 'Referential fiction and poetic ritual: towards a pragmatics of myth (Sappho 17 and Bacchylides 13)', *Trends in Classics* 1: 1-15.
- . (2009) 'Enunciative fiction and poetic performance', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 115-38.
- . (2012) 'Metaphorical travel and ritual performance', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 303-20.
- Calder, W. M. III and Stern, J. edd. (1970) *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (Darmstadt).
- Cameron, A. (1995) *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton).
- Campagner, R. (1988) 'Reciprocità economica in Pindaro', *QUCC* 77-93.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (1986) 'Pindaro interprete di Omero in *Pyth.* 3, 81-2', *GIF* 38: 85-9.
- . (1990) *Pindarus. Threnorum fragmenta* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 7; Rome).
- . (2000) 'Il canto delle Muse e il canto del poeta (Pind. *Nem.* 5, 22-31)', in Pizzani and Cannatà Fera (2000): 141-7.
- Cannatà Fera, M. and D'Alessio, G.B. edd. (2001) *I lirici greci. Forme della comunicazione e storia del testo. Atti dell'incontro di studi, Messina, 5-6 novembre 1999* (Messina).
- Capasso, M. (2003) *Il ritorno di Cornelio Gallo: il papiro di Qaṣr Ibrîm venticinque anni dopo* (Album del Centro di studi papirologici dell'Università degli studi di Lecce 5; Naples).
- Capra, A. (1999) 'Immortalità, letizia o gloria poetica? L'epinicio III di Bacchilide', *SCO* 47: 158-74.
- Carden, R. (1974) *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* (Texte und Kommentare 7; Berlin).

- Carey, C. (1975) 'Pindar, *Pythian* 6, 19-20', *Maia* 27: 289-90.
- . (1976) 'Pindar's *Eighth Nemean Ode*', *PCPS* 22: 26-42.
- . (1977/8) 'Bacchylides 3.85-90', *Maia* 29/30: 69-71.
- . (1978) 'Pindarica', in Dawe *et al.* (1978): 21-45.
- . (1980a) 'The epilogue of Pindar's *Fourth Pythian*', *Maia* 32: 143-52.
- . (1980b) 'Bacchylides experiments: Ode 11', *Mnemosyne* 33: 225-43.
- . (1980c) 'Three myths in Pindar: *N.* 4, *O.* 9, *N.* 3', *Eranos* 78: 143-62.
- . (1981) *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York).
- . (1989a) 'Prosopographica Pindarica', *CQ* 39: 1-9.
- . (1989b) 'Two transitions in Pindar', *CQ* 39: 287-95.
- . (1989c) 'The performance of the victory ode', *AJP* 110: 545-65.
- . (1991) Review of Bona (1988), *CR* 41: 14-15.
- . (1993) 'Pindar's *Ninth Nemean Ode*', in Jocelyn (1993): 97-107.
- . (1995) 'Pindar and the victory ode', in Ayres (1995): 85-101.
- . (1999) 'Ethos and pathos in Bacchylides', in Pfeijffer and Slings (1999): 17-29.
- . (2000) 'The panegyrist's persona', in Pizzani and Cannatà Fera (2000): 165-77.
- . (2001) 'Poesia pubblica in *performance*', in Cannatà-Fera and D'Alessio (2001): 11-26.
- . (2007) 'Pindar, place and performance', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 199-210.
- . (2009) 'Genre, occasion and performance', in Budelmann (2009a): 21-38.
- . (2012) 'The victory ode in the theatre', in Agócs *et al.* (2012b): 17-36.
- . (2015) 'Stesichorus and the epic cycle', in Finglass and Kelly (2015): 45-62.
- Carnes, J. S. (1990) 'The Aeginetan genesis of the Myrmidons: a note on *Nemean* 4.13-16', *CW* 84: 41-4.
- . (1995) 'Why should I mention Aiakos? Myth and politics in Pindar's *Nemean* 8 [Part

I]’, *QUCC* 51: 7-48.

—. (1996) ‘Why should I mention Aiakos? Myth and politics in Pindar’s *Nemean* 8 [Part II]’, *QUCC* 52: 83-92.

Carson, A. (1984) ‘The burners: a reading of Bacchylides’ Third Epinician Ode’, *Phoenix* 38: 111-19.

Carter, D. M. ed. (2011) *Why Athens? A reappraisal of tragic politics* (Oxford).

Cassio, A. C. (1972) ‘Pind. *Pae.* 4. (fr. 52 d. Sn.), 21-24’, *ASNP* 2: 469-71.

Catenacci, C. (1999) ‘ἀπονέμειν/ “Leggere” (Pind. *Isthm.* 2, 47; Soph. fr. 144 Radt; Aristoph. *Av.* 1289)’, *QUCC* 62: 49-61.

Cavallo, G. and Maehler, H. (2008) *Hellenistic Bookhands* (Berlin).

Cavallini, E. (1993) ‘Ibyc. Fr. S 166 Dav.’, *AION* 15: 37-67.

Cerri, G. (1976) ‘A proposito del futuro e della litote in Pindaro: *Nem.* 7, 102 sgg.’, *QUCC* 22: 83-90.

Chapel, M. (2011) ‘The Homeric Hymn to Apollo’, in Faulkner (2011): 59-82.

Christ, W. von ed. (1896) *Pindari Carmina cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis* (Leipzig).

Ciani, M. G. (1974) *φάος e termini affini nella poesia greca. Introduzione a una fenomenologia della luce* (Florence).

Cingano, E. (1989) ‘Tra epos e storia: la genealogia di Cianippo e dei Biantidi in Ibico (Suppl.Lyr.Gr. 151 Page), e nelle fonti mitografiche greche’, *ZPE* 79: 27-38.

—. (1991) ‘L’epinicio 4 di Bacchilide e la data della *Pitica* 3 di Pindaro’, *QUCC* 39: 97-104.

—. (1993) ‘Indizi di esecuzione corale in Stesicoro’, in Pretagostini (1993): i.347-61.

—. (2003) ‘Entre skolion et enkomion : réflexions sur le “genre” et la performance de la lyrique chorale grecque’, in Jouanna and Leclaut: 17-45.

Citroni, M. (2009) ‘Occasion and levels of address in Horatian lyric’, in Lowrie (2009): 72-106.

Clark, M. J., Currie, B. G. F., and Lyne, R. O. A. M. edd. (2006) *Epic Interactions. Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the epic tradition. Presented to Jasper Griffin by former pupils* (Oxford).

Clay, J. S. (1982) 'AKPA ΓΥΠΕΩΝ: geography, allegory, and allusion (Archilochus fragment 105 West)', *AJP* 103: 201-4.

—. (1989) *The Politics of Olympus. Form and meaning in the major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton).

—. (1991) 'Alcman's *Partheneion*', *QUCC* 39: 47-67.

—. (1999) 'Pindar's sympotic epinicians', *QUCC* 62: 25-34.

—. (2011a) 'Olympians 1-3: a song cycle?', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 337-46.

—. (2011b) 'The Homeric Hymns as genre', in Faulkner (2011): 231-53.

Clear, R. (2013) 'Family, duty, and expectation: a case for the joint performance of Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 and *Pythian* 6', *Mnemosyne* 66: 31-53.

Cole, P. and Morgan, J. edd. (1975) *Syntax and Semantics. 3. Speech acts* (New York).

Cole, T. (1987) '1 + 1 = 3: studies in Pindar's arithmetic', *AJP* 108: 553-68.

—. (1992) *Pindar's Feasts or The Music of Power* (Filologia e critica 69; Rome).

—. (2003) 'Pindar's two odes for Melissos of Thebes', in Benedetti and Grandolini (2003): 241-52.

Collins, B. J. et al. edd. (2008) *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks, and their neighbours* (Oxford).

Croiset, A. (1880) *La Poésie de Pindare et les lois du lyrisme grec* (Paris).

Crotty, K. (1982) *Song and Action. The victory odes of Pindar* (Baltimore).

Currie, B. (2004) 'Reperformance scenarios for Pindar's odes', in C. J. Mackie (2004): 49-69.

—. (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).

—. (2006) 'Homer and the early epic tradition', in Clark et al. (2006): 1-45.

—. (2010) 'L'Ode 11 di Bacchilide: il mito delle Pretidi nella lirica corale, nella poesia epica, e nella mitografia', in Aloni and Ornaghi (2010): 211-53.

—. (2011) 'Epinician *choregia*: funding a Pindaric chorus', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 269-310.

—. (2012) 'Choral lyric: Pindar and Bacchylides', in de Jong (2012): 285-303.

- . (2013) 'The Pindaric first person in flux', *CA* 32: 243-82.
- Dalby, A. (2009) 'Homer's enemies', in Fisher and van Wees (2009): 195-211.
- D'Alessio, G. B. (1992) 'Pindaro, peana VIIb (fr.52 h Sn.M.)', in El-Mosalamy (1992): 353-72.
- . (1994) 'First-person problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39: 117-39.
- . (1995) 'Una via lontana dal cammino degli uomini (Parm. Frr. 1+6 D.-K.; Pind. *Ol.* VI 22-7; *Pae.* VIIb 10-20)', *SIFC* 13: 143-81.
- . (1997) 'Pindar's *prosodia* and the classification of Pindaric papyrus fragments', *ZPE* 118: 23-60.
- . (2004) 'Past future and present past: temporal deixis in Greek archaic lyric', *Arethusa* 37: 267-94.
- . (2005) 'Ordered from the catalogue: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic genealogical poetry', in Hunter (2005): 217-38.
- . (2006) 'Note al nuovo Archiloco (POxy LXIX 4708)', *ZPE* 156: 19-22.
- . (2007) 'ἐν ἰδοῦ: ecce satyri (Pratina, *PMG* 708= *TrGF* 4 F 3). Alcune considerazioni sull'uso della deissi nei testi lirici e teatrali', in Perusino and Colantonio (2007): 95-128.
- . (2009a) 'Pragmatics', in Budelmann (2009a): 114-29.
- . (2009b) 'Defining local identities in Greek lyric poetry', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009): 137-67.
- . (2012) 'The lost *Isthmian* odes of Pindar', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 28-57.
- . (2013) "'The name of the dithyramb": diachronic and diatopic variations', in Kowalzig and Wilson (2013): 113-32.
- D'Alessio, G. B. and Ferrari, F. (1988) 'Pindaro, Peana 6, 175-83: una ricostruzione', *SCO* 38: 159-79.
- D'Alton, J. F. (1931) *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism. A study in tendencies* (London).
- D'Angour, A. (1997) 'How the dithyramb got its shape', *CQ* 47: 331-51.
- . (2011) *The Greeks and the New. Novelty in ancient Greek imagination and experience* (Cambridge).
- Danielewicz, J. (1990) 'Deixis in Greek choral lyric', *QUCC* 63: 7-17.

- . (2001) 'Metatext and its functions in Greek lyric poetry', in Harrison (2001): 46–61.
- . (2006) 'Bacchylides fr. 20A, 12 S.-M. and Sappho, P. Köln fr. I-II, 12', *ZPE* 155: 19-21.
- Darnton, R. (1990) *The Kiss of Lamourette. Reflections in cultural history* (New York).
- Davison, J. A. (1955) 'Quotations and allusions in early Greek literature', *Eranos* 53: 125–40. [= (1968) 70-85]
- . (1961) 'Notes on Alcman', in Amundsen and Skånland (1961): 30-48. [(1968) 173-96]
- . (1968) *From Archilochus to Pindar. Papers on Greek literature of the archaic period* (London).
- Davies, J. A. (2007) 'The origins of the festivals, especially Delphi and the Pythia', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 47-70.
- Davies, M. (1986a) 'Alcman and the lover as suppliant', *ZPE* 64: 13-14.
- . (1986b) 'The motif of the *πρῶτος εὐρετής* in Alcman', *ZPE* 65: 25-7.
- . (1988) 'Monody, choral lyric, and the tyranny of the hand-book', *CQ* 38: 52-64.
- . (2015) *The Theban Epics* (Cambridge, MA).
- Davies, M. and Finglass, P. J. (2014) *Stesichorus. The poems* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 54; Cambridge).
- Davis, G. (1991) *Polyhymnia. The rhetoric of Horatian lyric discourse* (Berkeley).
- Dawe, R. D. et al. edd. (1978) *Dionysiaca. Nine studies in Greek poetry by former pupils presented to Sir Denys Page on his seventieth birthday* (Cambridge).
- Day, J. W. (1994) 'Interactive offerings: early Greek dedicatory epigrams and ritual', *HSCP* 96: 37-74.
- . (2010) *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication. Representation and reperformance* (Cambridge).
- . (2013) 'Epigraphic literacy in fifth-century epinician and its audiences', in Liddel and Low (2013): 217-30.
- Dennett, D. C. (1995) *Darwin's Dangerous Idea. Evolution and the meanings of life* (London).
- Denniston, J. D. *Euripides. Electra* (Oxford 1939).

- Denniston, J. D. and Page, D. L. (1957) *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford).
- Depew, M. (2000) 'Enacted and represented dedications: genre and Greek hymn', in Depew and Obbink (2000): 59-79.
- Depew, M. and Obbink, D. edd. (2000) *Matrices of Genre. Authors, canons, and society* (Cambridge, MA).
- Des Places, E. (1947) *Le Pronom chez Pindare : recherches philologiques et critiques* (Etudes et commentaires 3; Paris).
- Detienne, M. (1967) *Les Maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque* (Paris).
- . (1996) *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece* (transl. J. Lloyd; New York).
- Di Benedetto, V. (1991) 'Pindaro, *Pae.* 7b, 11-14', *RFIC* 119: 164-76.
- . (2003) 'Da Pindaro a Callimaco: *Peana* 7b, vv. 11-14', *Prometheus* 29: 269-82.
- . (2005) 'La nuova Saffo e dintorni', *ZPE* 153: 7-20.
- Dickie, M. W. (1984) 'Hesychia and hybris in Pindar', in Gerber (1984): 83-109.
- Dicks, D. R. (1970) *Early Greek Astronomy to Aristotle* (London).
- Diggle, J. (1970) *Euripides. Phaethon* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 12; Cambridge).
- Dissen, L. (1843-7) *Pindari Carmina quae supersunt cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis ex recensione Boeckhii*² (rev. F. G. Schneidewin; Gotha).
- Dodds, E. R. (1960) *Euripides. Bacchae*² (Oxford).
- Dönt, E. (1985) 'Pindars siebente nemeische Ode', *WS* 19: 104-14.
- Dornseiff, F. (1921) *Pindars Stil* (Berlin).
- Dover, K. J. (1968) *Aristophanes. Clouds* (Oxford).
- . (1974) *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford).
- . ed. (1980) *Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford).
- . (1993) *Aristophanes. Frogs* (Oxford).

- Dougherty, C. (1994) 'Pindar's *Second Paean*: civic identity on parade', *CP* 89: 205-18.
- . (2001) *The Raft of Odysseus. The ethnographic imagination of Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford).
- Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. edd. (1993) *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, performance, politics* (Cambridge).
- Dubel, S. and Rabau, S. edd. (2001) *Fiction d'auteur ? Le discours biographique sur l'auteur de l'Antiquité à nos jours* (Colloques, congrès et conférences sur la littérature comparée 4; Paris).
- Duchemin, J. (1953) *Pindare. Poète et prophète* (Paris).
- . (1967) *Pindare. Pythiques* (III, IX, IV, V) (Erasme 11; Paris).
- Dunbar, N. V. (1995) *Aristophanes. Birds* (Oxford).
- Easterling, P. (1982) *Sophocles. Trachinae* (Cambridge).
- Ebert, J. (1972) *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 63; Berlin).
- Eckerman, C. (2008) 'Pindar's *koinos logos* and Panhellenism in *Olympian* 10', *RhM* 151: 37-48.
- . (2010) 'The ΚΩΜΟC of Pindar and Bacchylides and the semantics of celebration', *CQ* 60: 302-12.
- . (2011a) 'Pindar's *Pythian* 6: on the place of performance and an interpretive crux', *RhM* 153: 1-8.
- . (2011b) 'Pindar's *Olympian* 1.17 and solo vs. choral epinician performance', *Mnemosyne* 64: 83-5.
- . (2012) 'Was epinician poetry performed at panhellenic sanctuaries?', *GRBS* 52: 338-60.
- . (2014) 'On the performance of Pindar's *Nemean* 3', *Mnemosyne* 67: 289-92.
- . (2015) Review of Krummen (2014), *BMCR*.
- El-Mosalamy, A. H. S. edd. (1992) *Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of Papyrology, Cairo, 2-9 September 1989*, 2 vols. (Cairo).
- Else, G. F. (1957) *Aristotle's Poetics. The argument* (Cambridge, MA).

Enenkel, K. A. E., and Pfeijffer, I.L. edd. (2005) *The Manipulative Mode. Political propaganda in antiquity. A Collection of case studies* (Mnem. Suppl. 261; Leiden).

Erbse, H. (1979) *Ausgewählte Schriften zur klassischen Philologie* (Berlin).

—. (1999) 'Über Pindars Umgang mit dem Mythos', *Hermes* 127: 13-32.

Fairweather, J. (1974) 'Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers', *Ancient Society* 5: 231-75.

Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).

Farnell, L. R. (1930-2) *The Works of Pindar*, 3 vols. (London).

Faulkner, A. ed. (2011a) *The Homeric Hymns. Interpretative essays* (Oxford).

—. (2011b) 'The collection of *Homeric Hymns*: from the seventh to the third centuries BC', in Faulkner (2011a): 175-205.

Fearn, D. (2003) 'Mapping Phleious: politics and myth-making in Bacchylides 9', *CQ* 53: 347-67.

—. (2007) *Bacchylides. Politics, performance, poetic tradition* (Oxford).

—. ed. (2011a) *Aegina. Contexts for choral lyric poetry. Myth, history, and identity in the fifth century BC* (Oxford).

—. (2011b) 'Aeginetan epinician culture: naming, ritual, and politics', in Fearn (2011a): 175-226.

—. (2011c) 'The Keians and their choral lyric: Athenian, epichoric, and Panhellenic perspectives', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 207-34.

—. (2012) 'Bacchylides' myths', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 321-43.

—. (2013) 'Kleos versus stone? Lyric poetry and contexts for memorialization', in Liddel and Low (2013): 231-54.

Feeney, D. C. (1998) *Literature and Religion at Rome. Cultures, contexts, and beliefs* (Cambridge).

—. (2009) 'Becoming an authority: Horace on his own reception', in Houghton and Wyke (2009): 16-38.

Felson, N. (2004a) 'Introduction', *Arethusa* 37: 253-66.

—. (2004b) 'The poetic effects of deixis in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian Ode*', *Arethusa* 37: 365-89.

- Fennell, C. A. M. (1899) *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge).
- Fenno, J. (2003) 'Praxidamas' crown and the omission at Pindar, *Nemean* 6.18', *CQ* 53: 338-46.
- Ferrari, F. (1990) 'Restauri testuali a P. Yale 18 (Pindaro, fr. 140A e fr. 140B Maehler)', *Maia* 42: 229-34.
- . (1991a) 'Tre papiri pindarici: in margine ai fr. 52n (a), 94a, 169a Maehler', *RFIC* 119: 389-405.
- . (1991b) 'Dileggio e rispetto dei νόμιμα nel fr. 215 M. di Pindaro', *AAPel* 67: 71-82.
- . (1999) 'Sul prosodio pindarico per gli Egineti (= 'Peana' 6, 123-183)', *SCO* 47: 149-58.
- . (2000a) 'Intorno all'ombelico del mondo: le prospettive del rito nelle *Pitiche* di Pindaro', *SemRom* 3: 217-42.
- . (2000b) 'Minima pindarica II', in Pizzani and Cannatà Fera (2000): 311-20.
- . (2002) 'La carraia di Omero e la via degli dei: sul *Peana* VIIb di Pindaro', *SemRom* 5: 197-212.
- . (2005) 'Contro Andromeda: recupero di un'ode di Saffo', *MD* 55: 13-30.
- . (2006) 'Molto rumore per nulla? L'inscriptio A all'*Olimpica* 5 e l'autenticità dell'ode', *Eikasmos* 17: 75-8.
- . (2007) *Una mitra per Kleis. Saffo e il suo pubblico* (Pisa).
- . (2010) *Sappho's Gift* (transl. B. Acosta-Hughes and L. Prauscello; Ann Arbor).
- Ferrari, G. (2008) *Alcman and the Cosmos of Sparta* (Chicago).
- Figuiera, T. J. and Nagy, G. edd. (1985) *Theognis of Megara. Poetry and the polis* (Baltimore).
- Fileni, M. G. (1987) *Senocrito di Locri e Pindaro* (Biblioteca di Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica 2; Rome).
- 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).

- . (2013) 'How Stesichorus began his *Sack of Troy*', *ZPE* 185: 1-17.
- Finglass, P. J. and Kelly, A. ed. (2015) *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge).
- Finkelberg, M. (1986) 'Is ΚΛΕΟC ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ a Homeric formula?', *CQ* 36: 1-5.
- . (1998) *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).
- . (2000) 'The *Cypria*, the *Iliad*, and the problem of multiformity in oral and written tradition', *CP* 95: 1-11.
- . (2007) 'More on ΚΛΕΟC ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ', *CQ* 57: 341-50.
- . ed. (2011) *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Oxford).
- . (2014) 'Boreas and Oreithyia: a case-study in multichannel transmission of myth', in Scodel (2014): 87-100.
- Finkelberg, M. and Stroumsa, G. edd. (2003) *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond. Literary and religious canons in the ancient world* (Leiden).
- Finley, J. H. (1951) 'The date of *Paean* 6 and *Nemean* 7', *HSCP* 60: 61-80.
- Finnegan, R. H. (1977) *Oral Poetry. Its nature, significance, and social context* (Cambridge).
- . (1988) *Literacy and Orality. Studies in the technology of communication* (Oxford).
- Fisher, N. and van Wees, H. edd. (1998) *Archaic Greece. New approaches and new evidence* (London).
- Fitch, E. (1924) 'Pindar and Homer', *CP* 19: 57-65.
- Fogelmark, S. (1972) *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII* (Lund).
- Fontenrose, J. E. (1960) *The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi* (Univ. Cal. Publ. in Cl. Phil. 4.3; Berkeley).
- Ford, A. (1985) 'The seal of Theognis: the politics of authorship in archaic Greece', in Figuiera and Nagy (1985): 82-95.
- . (1992) *Homer. The poetry of the past* (Ithaca, NY).
- . (1998) 'The inland ship: problems in the performance and reception of Homeric epic', in Bakker and Kahane (1998): 83-109.

- . (2002) *The Origins of Criticism. Literary culture and poetic theory in classical Greece* (Princeton).
- . (2003) 'From letters to literature: reading the "song culture" of classical Greece', in Yunis (2003): 15-37.
- . (2006) 'The genre of genres: paeans and *paian* in early Greek poetry', *Poetica* 38: 277-96.
- Fossey, J. M. and Schachter, A. edd. (1979) *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities* (Teiresias Suppl. 2; Montreal).
- Fowler, B. H. (1986) 'Constellations in Pindar', *C&M* 37: 21-46.
- Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News. Discourse and ideology in the press* (London).
- Fowler, R. L. (1984) 'Gildersleeve's Pindaric criticism', in Gerber (1984): 55-63.
- . (1987) *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric* (Phoenix Suppl. 21; Toronto).
- . (1996) 'Herodotus and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116: 62-87.
- . (1998) 'Genealogical thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the creation of the Hellenes', *PCPS* 44: 1-19.
- Foxhall, L., Gehrke, H.-J., and Luraghi, N. edd. (2010) *Intentional History. Spinning time in ancient Greece* (Stuttgart).
- Fraenkel, E. D. M. (1950) *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- . (1957) *Horace* (Oxford).
- Fränkel, H. F. (1924) 'Eine Stileigenheit in der frühgriechischen Literatur', *NGG*: 63-103. [= (1955) 40-96]
- . (1955) *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens: literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Studien* (ed. F. Tietze; Munich).
- . (1961) 'Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars *Nemeen* 7 und *Olympien* 3', *Hermes* 89: 385-97.
- . (1962) *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (Munich).
- . (1968) *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich).
- . (1975) *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy* (transl. M. Hadas and J. Willis; Oxford).

- Friedländer, P. (1931) 'Vorklassisch und nachklassisch', in Jaeger (1931) 33-46.
- Führer, R. (1967) *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik* (Zetemata 44; Munich).
- . (1971) Review of Davison (1968), *Gnomon* 43: 231-5.
- Fuhrer, Th. (1992) *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 23; Basel).
- Furley, W. D. (2011) 'Homeric and un-Homeric hexameter hymns. A question of type', in Faulkner (2011): 206-31.
- Furley, W. D. and Bremer, J. M. (2002) *Greek Hymns*, 2 vols. (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 9-10; Tübingen).
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1979) *Truth and Method*² (transl. G. Barden and J. Cumming; London).
- Gardiner, E. N. (1905) 'Wrestling', *JHS* 25: 14-31, 263-95.
- Garner, R. S. (2011) 'Oral tradition and Sappho', *Oral Tradition* 26: 413-44.
- Garvie, A. F. (1986) *Aeschylus. Choephoroi* (Oxford).
- . (2009) *Aeschylus. Persae* (Oxford).
- Gavins, J. (2007) *Text World Theory. An introduction* (Edinburgh).
- Gelzer, T. (1985) 'Mousa Authigenes: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien', *MH* 42: 95-120.
- Gentili, B. (1979) 'Trittico pindarico', *QUCC* 2: 7-33.
- . (1981) 'Verità e accordo contrattuale (cónθεσις) in Pindaro, fr. 205 Sn.-Maehl.', *ICS* 6: 215-20.
- . (1984) *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica da Omero al V secolo* (Rome and Bari).
- . (1988) *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece* (transl. T. Cole; Baltimore).
- . (1990) 'Die pragmatischen Aspekte der archaischen griechischen Dichtung', *A&A* 36: 1-17.
- Gentili, B. et al. (1995) *Pindaro. Le pitiche* (Milan).
- . (2013) *Pindaro. Le olimpiche* (Milan).

- Gerber, D. E. (1960) 'Pindar, *Pythian* 2.56', *TAPA* 91: 100-8.
- . (1970) *Euterpe. An anthology of early Greek lyric, elegiac, and iambic poetry* (Amsterdam).
- . (1976) *Emendations in Pindar. 1513-1972* (Amsterdam).
- . (1982) *Pindar's Olympian One. A Commentary* (Phoenix Suppl. 15; Toronto).
- . ed. (1984) *Greek Poetry and Philosophy. Studies in honor of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico, CA).
- . (1987) 'Pindar's *Olympian Four*: a commentary', *QUCC* 25: 7-24.
- . ed. (1997a) *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Mnem. Suppl. 173; Leiden).
- . (1997b) 'Introduction', in Gerber (1997a): 1-10.
- . (1999) 'Pindar, *Nemean Six*: a commentary', *HSCP* 99: 33-91.
- . (2002) *A Commentary on Pindar Olympian Nine* (Hermes Einzelschriften 87; Stuttgart).
- Gianotti, G. F. (1966) 'La Nemea Settima di Pindaro', *RFIC* 94: 385-406.
- . (1973) 'Mito ed encomio. Il carme di Ibico in onore di Policrate', *RFIC* 101: 401-10.
- Gigante M. (1977) 'La cultura a Locri', in Bagnasco (1977): 619-98.
- Gildersleeve, B. L. (1885) *Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (London).
- . (1900-10) *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*, 2 vols. (New York).
- . (1910) 'The *Seventh Nemean* revisited', *AJP* 31: 125-53.
- Gladigow, B. (1965) *Sophia und Kosmos. Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte von sophos und sophie* (Spudasmata 1; Hildesheim).
- Goldie, P. (2007) 'Towards a virtue theory of art', *British Journal of Aesthetics* 47: 372-87.
- Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice. Essays on poetics and Greek literature* (Cambridge).
- Goldhill, S and Osborne, R. edd. (1999) *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge).
- Gonis, N. et al. (2005) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Vol. LXIX* (London).

- Goodwin, W. W. (1879) *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*⁶ (London).
- Gostoli, A. (1990) *Terpandro* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 8; Rome).
- Gow, A. S. F. (1950) *Theocritus*, 2 vols. (Cambridge).
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer. The early reception of epic* (Cambridge).
- Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2005) *Homer. The resonance of epic* (London).
- Greene, E. ed. (1996) *Reading Sappho. Contemporary approaches* (Berkeley).
- Greene, E. and Skinner, M. edd. (2009) *The New Sappho on Old Age. Textual and philosophical issues* (Hellenic Studies 38; Cambridge, MA).
- Greengard, C. (1980) *The Structure of Pindar's Epinician Odes* (Amsterdam).
- Greindl, M. (1938) ΚΛΕΟC, ΚΥΔΟC, ΕΥΧΟC, ΤΙΜΗ, ΦΑΤΙC, ΔΟΞΑ: *eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung epischen und lyrischen Sprachgebrauches* (Diss. Munich).
- Grenfell, B. and Hunt, A. S. edd. (1908) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part V* (London).
- Grethlein, J. (2010) *The Greeks and Their Past. Poetry, history, and oratory in the fifth century BCE* (Cambridge).
- Grethlein, J. and Rengakos, A. edd. (2009) *Narratology and Interpretation. The content of narrative form in ancient literature* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 4; Berlin).
- Grice, H. P. (1957) 'Meaning', *PhR* 66: 377–88.
- . (1975) 'Logic and conversation', in Cole and Morgan (1975): 41–58.
- Griffin, J. (1977) 'The epic cycle and the uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97: 39–53.
- . (1980) *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
- Griffith, M. (1983) 'Personality in Hesiod', *CA* 2: 37–65.
- . (1990) 'Contest and contradiction in early Greek poetry', in Griffith and Mastronarde (1990): 185–207.
- . (1999) *Sophocles. Antigone* (Cambridge).
- . (2009) 'Greek lyric and the place of humans in the world', in Budelmann (2009a): 72–94.

- . (2011) 'Twelve principles for reading Greek tragedy', in Carter (2011): 1-7.
- Griffith, M. and Mastronarde, D. edd. (1990) *Cabinet of the Muses. Essays on classical and comparative literature in honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer* (Atlanta).
- Griffith, R. D. (1993) 'In the dark backward: time in Pindaric narrative', *Poetics Today* 14: 607-23.
- . (1999) 'Leaves in Pindar', *Eranos* 97: 54-8.
- Groeneboom, P. (1938) *Aeschylus' Zeven tegen Thebe* (Groningen).
- Groningen, B. A. van (1958) *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque : procédés et réalisations* (Amsterdam).
- . (1960) *Pindare au banquet : les fragments des scolies* (Leiden).
- Gundert, H. (1935) *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurter Studien zur Religion und Kultur der Antike 10; Frankfurt).
- Gzella, S. (1969) 'The competition among the Greek choral poets', *Eos* 58: 19-32.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English* (London).
- Hamilton, J. T. (2003) *Soliciting Darkness. Pindar, obscurity, and the classical tradition* (Cambridge, MA).
- Hamilton, R. (1974) *Epinikion. General form in the odes of Pindar* (The Hague).
- Hammer, D. (2004) 'Ideology, the symposium, and archaic politics', *AJP* 125: 479-512.
- Hardie, A. (2005) 'Sappho, the Muses, and life after death', *ZPE* 154: 13-32.
- Hardie, R. and Moore, H. edd. (2010) *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception* (Cambridge).
- Harris, W. V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA).
- Harrison, S. J. ed. (2001) *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics. Scholarship, theory, and classical literature* (Oxford).
- . (2007) *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford).
- Haslam, M. W. (1977) 'Alcman, Μέλη, vi', in Bowman *et al.* (1977): 1-5.

- Häusle, H. (1980) *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Thematik eines Motivs in lateinischen Inschriften* (Zetemata 75; Munich).
- Harvey, A. E. (1955) 'The classification of Greek lyric poetry', *CQ* 5: 157–75.
- Havelock, E. A. (1982) *The Literate Revolution in Greece and its Cultural Consequences* (Princeton).
- Headlam, W. G. (1910) *Walter Headlam. His letters and poems with a memoir* (ed. C. Headlam; London).
- . (1922) *Herodas. The mimes and fragments* (Cambridge).
- Heath, M. (1988) 'Receiving the *komos*: the context and performance of epinician', *AJP* 109: 180–95.
- . (1993) 'Ancient interpretations of Pindar's *Nemean* 7', *PLLS* 7: 169–99.
- . (2011) 'Response', in Carter (2011): 163–74.
- Heath, M. and Lefkowitz, K. (1991) 'Epinician performance', *CP* 86: 173–92.
- Hedreen, G. (2011) 'The Trojan War, *theoxenia*, and Aegina in Pindar's *Paeon* 6 and the Aphaia sculptures', in Fearn (2011): 323–69.
- Heitsch, E. (2008) 'Neoanalytische Antikritik. Zum Verhältnis *Ilias* – *Aithiopsis*', *RhM* 151: 2–12.
- Hermann, G. (1828) *Opuscula* III (Lipsiae).
- de Heer, C. (1968) *Makar, eudaimōn, olbios, eutychēs. A study of the semantic field denoting happiness in ancient Greek to the end of the 5th century B.C.* (Utrecht).
- Held, G. F. (2003) 'Archilochos' Ἀμαχανία: Pindar, *Pythian* 2.52–56 and *Isthmian* 4.1–3', *Eranos* 101: 30–48.
- Henderson, J. (1987) *Aristophanes. Lysistrata* (Oxford).
- Henderson, W. J. (1992) 'Pindar Fr. 140B Snell-Maehler: the chariot and the dolphin', *Hermes* 120: 148–58.
- Henry, W. B. (2003) 'Notes on Pindar's *Paeans* (P. Oxy. 841)', *ZPE* 145: 7–10.
- . (2005) *Pindar's Nemeans. A Selection* (Leipzig).
- Herington, J. (1985) *Poetry into Drama. Early tragedy and the Greek poetic tradition* (Sather Classical Lectures 49; Berkeley).

- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hinge, G. (2006) *Die Sprache Alkmans: Textgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte* (Serta Graeca 24; Wiesbaden).
- . (2009) ‘Cultic persona and the transmission of the *Partheneions*’, in Jensen *et al.* (2009): 215-36.
- Hoekstra, A. (1962) ‘The absence of the Aeginetans: on the interpretation of Pindar’s sixth *Paean*’, *Mnemosyne* 14: 1-14.
- Hollis, A. S. (2007) *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c.60 BC-AD 20* (Oxford).
- Hooker, J. T. (1977) *The Language and Text of the Lesbian Poets* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 26; Innsbruck).
- Hopkinson, N. (1984) *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 27; Cambridge).
- Hornblower, S. (2004) *Pindar and Thucydides* (Oxford).
- . (2007) ‘“Dolphins in the sea” (*Isthmian* 9.7): Pindar and the Aeginetans’, in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 287-308.
- Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C. edd. (2007) *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals* (Oxford).
- Houghton, L. and Wyke, M. edd. (2009) *Perceptions of Horace. A poet and his readers* (Cambridge).
- Howie, J. G. (1998) ‘Thucydides and Pindar: the *Archaeology* and *Nemean* 7’, *PLLS* 10: 75-130. [= (2012) 265-306]
- . (2012) *Exemplum and Myth, Criticism and Creation. Papers on early Greek literature* (Pren-ton).
- Hubbard, T. K. (1985) *The Pindaric Mind* (Mnem. Suppl. 85; Leiden).
- . (1986) ‘Pegasus’ bridle and the poetics of Pindar’s *Olympian Thirteen*’, *HSCP* 90: 28-48.
- . (1989) ‘Pindar’s *kukneia macha*: subtext and allusion in *Olympian* 10.15-16’, *MD* 23: 137-43.
- . (1991) *The Mask of Comedy. Aristophanes and the intertextual parabasis* (Ithaca, NY).

- . (2001) 'Pindar and Athens after the Persian War', in Papenfuss *et al.* (2001): 387-400.
- . (2004) 'The dissemination of epinician lyric: pan-Hellenism, reperformance, written texts', in C. J. Mackie (2004): 71-93.
- . (2011) 'The dissemination of Pindar's non-epinician choral lyrics', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 333-49.
- Hudson-Williams, T. (1910) *The Elegies of Theognis and Other Elegies included in the Theognidean Sylloge* (London).
- Hummel, P. (1992) 'πολύφατος/πολύφαντος: morphologie étymologique et morphologie formulaire', *RPhil* 66: 289-99.
- . (1993) *La Syntaxe de Pindare* (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale 24; Louvain).
- Hunter, R. L. ed. (2005) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and reconstructions* (Cambridge).
- . (2009) *Critical Moments in Classical Literature. Studies in the ancient view of literature and its uses* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. and Rutherford, I. edd. (2009) *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge).
- Hurst, A. ed. (1985) *Pindare* (Entretiens Fondation Hardt 31; Geneva).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1988) *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).
- . (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry. A commentary on selected larger pieces* (Oxford).
- . (2012) 'Image and world in epinician poetry', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 277-302.
- . (2013a) *Greek to Latin. Frameworks and contexts for intertextuality* (Oxford).
- . (2013b) 'Genre and super-genre', in Papanghelis *et al.* (2013): 19-34.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (2008) *Conversation Analysis*² (Oxford).
- Huxley, G. (1975) *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast).
- Illig, L. (1932) *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung: Interpretationen und Untersuchungen* (Kiel).
- Immerwahr, (1990) *Attic Script. A survey* (Oxford).

- Imperio, O. (2000) 'Pindaro e la pietra di paragone: una metafora poetologica', *Eikasmos* 11: 59-70.
- Indergaard, H. (2011) 'Thebes, Aegina, and the temple of Aphaia: a reading of Pindar's *Isthmian* 6', in Fearn (2011): 294-322.
- Instone, S. (2007) 'Origins of the Olympics', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 71-82.
- Irigoin, J. (1952) *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Etudes et commentaires 13; Paris).
- Itsumi, K. (2009) *Pindaric Metre. The other half* (Oxford).
- Jaeger, W. ed. (1931) *Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike* (Leipzig).
- Janko, R. (1998) 'The Homeric poems as oral dictated texts', *CQ* 48: 1-13.
- . (1991) 'Another path of song: Pindar, *Nemean* 7.51', *AJP* 112: 301-2.
- . (2014) 'The new epitaph for the fallen at Marathon (*SEG* 56.420)', *ZPE* 190: 11-12.
- Jebb, R. C. (1893) *Sophocles. The plays and fragments. Part IV: The Oedipus Tyrannus*³ (Cambridge).
- . (1898) *Sophocles. The plays and fragments. Part IV: The Philoctetes*² (Cambridge).
- . (1900) *Sophocles. The plays and fragments. Part III: The Antigone*³ (Cambridge).
- . (1906) *Bacchylides* (Cambridge).
- Jensen, J. T. et al. edd. (2009) *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult. Context, ritual and iconography* (Aarhus).
- Jocelyn, H. D. ed. (1993) *Tria lustra. Essays and notes presented to John Pinsent* (Liverpool).
- Johnson, W. A. and Parker, H. N. edd. (2009) *Ancient Literacies. The culture of reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford).
- Jong, I. de (1987) 'The voice of anonymity: *tis*-speeches in the *Iliad*', *Eranos* 85: 70-84.
- . (1993) 'Studies in Homeric denomination', *Mnemosyne* 46: 289-306.
- . (2006) 'The Homeric narrator and his own KΛEOC', *Mnemosyne* 59: 188-207.
- . (2009) 'Metalepsis in Greek literature', in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009): 87-115.
- . ed. (2012) *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (Mnem. Suppl. 339; Leiden).

Jong, I. de, Nünlist, R., and Bowie, A. M. edd. (2004) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Mnem. Suppl. 257; Leiden).

Jong, I. de and Sullivan, J. P. edd. (1994) *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Mnem. Suppl. 130; Leiden).

Jouanna, J. and Leclaut, J. edd. (2003) *La Poésie grecque antique. Actes du 13^e colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer les 18 & 19 octobre 2002* (Paris).

Kabierisch, J. (1999) 'Humor bei Pindar: ein Deutungsversuch zu τόκος (Pind. Ol. X, 9)', *Hermes* 127: 368-71.

Kaimio, M. (1977) *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 53; Helsinki).

Kakridis, T. J. (1966) 'Zu Sappho 44 LP', *WS* 79: 21-6.

Kambylis, A. (1964) 'Anredeformen bei Pindar', in Anastasiou *et al.* (1964): 95-199.

—. (1965) *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik. Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius* (Heidelberg).

Kampakoglou, A. (2013) *Studies in the Reception of Pindar in Hellenistic Poetry* (Diss. Oxford).

Kantzios, I. (2003) 'Pindar's Muses', *CB* 79: 5-34.

—. (2005) 'Tyranny and the symposion of Anacreon', *CJ* 100: 227-45.

Käppel, L. (1992) *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 37; Berlin).

Kassel, R. (1983) 'Dialoge mit Statuen', *ZPE* 51: 1-12.

Kelly, A. D. (2006) 'Neoanalysis and the Nestorbedrängnis: a test case', *Hermes* 134: 1-25.

—. (2008) 'Performance and rivalry: Homer, Odysseus and Hesiod', in Revermann and Wilson (2008): 177-203.

—. (2015) 'Stesichorus' Homer', in Finglass and Kelly (2015): 21-44.

Kemmer, E. (1903) *Die polare Ausdrucksweise in der griechischen Literatur* (Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache 14; Würzburg).

Kerkhecker, A. (1999) *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford).

- Kidd, D. A. (1997) *Aratus. Phaenomena* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 34; Cambridge).
- Kienzle, E. (1936) *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (Diss. Kallmünz).
- Kierdorf, W. (1966) *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege. Studien zu Pindar, Aischylos und den attischen Rednern* (Hypomnemata 16; Cologne).
- Kiessling, A. and Heinze, R. (1966) *Horaz. Oden und Epoden*¹² (Dublin).
- Kirk, G. S. (1985) *The Iliad. A Commentary. Volume 1. Books 1-4* (Cambridge).
- Kirkwood, G. ed. (1975a) *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance. Studies in honor of James Hutton* (Ithaca, NY).
- . (1975b) 'Nemean 7 and the theme of vicissitude in Pindar', in Kirkwood (1975a): 56-90.
- . (1981) 'Pindar's Ravens (*Olymp.* 2. 87)', *CQ* 31: 240-3.
- . (1982) *Selections from Pindar. Edited with an introduction and commentary* (APA Textbook Series 7; Chico).
- . (1989) 'Nemean 4, 93 and "Eris" in Pindar', *QUCC* 31: 7-12.
- Kivilo, M. (2010) *Early Greek Poets' Lives. The shaping of the tradition* (Mnem. Suppl. 322; Leiden).
- Kleingünther, A. (1933) *Prōtos heuretēs: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* (Philologus Suppl. 26; Leipzig).
- Köhnken, A. (1970) 'Hieron und Deinomenes in Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht', *Hermes* 98: 1-13.
- . (1971) *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 12; Berlin).
- . (1975) 'Gods and descendants of Aiakos in Pindar's *Eighth Isthmian Ode*', *BICS* 22: 25-36.
- . (1976) 'Gebrauch und Funktion der Litotes bei Pindar', *Glotta* 54: 62-7.
- . (1977) Review of Gerber (1976), *Phoenix* 31: 265-8.
- . (1978) 'Two notes on Pindar', *BICS* 25: 92-6.

- . (1983) 'Mythical chronology and thematic coherence in Pindar's *Third Olympian Ode*', *HSCP* 87: 49-63.
- . (1985) "'Meilichos Orga": Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der neunten pythischen Ode Pindars', in Hurst (1985) 71-116.
- . (2005) Review of Hamilton (2003), *IJCT* 11: 602-6.
- . (2007) 'Epinician epigram', in Bing and Bruss (2007): 295-312.
- Koller, H. (1965) 'Melos', *Glotta* 43: 24-38.
- Konstan, D. and Rutter, N. K. edd. (2003) *Envy, Spite, and Jealousy. The rivalrous emotions in ancient Greece* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 2; Edinburgh).
- Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods. Performances of myth and ritual in archaic and classical Greece* (Oxford).
- . (2011) 'Musical merchandise "on every vessel": religion and trade on Aegina', in Fearn (2011): 129-71.
- Kowalzig, B. and Wilson, P. edd. (2012) *Dithyramb in Context* (Oxford).
- Kowerski, L. M. (2005) *Simonides on the Persian Wars. A study of the elegiac verses of the 'New Simonides'* (New York).
- Kramer, B. et al. edd. (1997) *Akten der 21. internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.-19.8. 1995* (Stuttgart).
- Kranz, W. (1961) 'Sphragis: Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlußmotiv antiker Dichtung', *RhM* 104: 3-46, 97-124.
- Kraus, C. et al. edd. (2007) *Visualizing the Tragic. Drama, myth, and ritual in Greek art and literature. Essays in honour of Froma Zeitlin* (Cambridge).
- Krauss, W. (1955) 'Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum', *WS* 68: 65-87.
- Krevans, N. (1983) 'Geography and the literary tradition in Theocritus 7', *TAPA* 113: 201-20.
- Kromer, G. (1975) 'Homer and Odysseus in *Nemean* 7.20-27', *CW* 68: 437-8.
- . (1976) 'The value of time in Pindar's *Olympian* 10', *Hermes* 104: 420-36.
- Krummen, E. (1990) *Pyrros Hymnon. Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 35; Berlin).

—. (2014) *Cult, myth, and occasion in Pindar's Victory Odes. A study of Isthmian 4, Pythian 5, Olympian 1, and Olympian 3* (transl. J. G. Howie; Prenton).

Kugelmeier, C. (1996) *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der alten attischen Komödie* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 80; Berlin).

Kullman, W. and Reichel, M. edd. (1990) *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen* (Script-Oralia 30; Tübingen).

Kurke, L. (1988) 'The poet's pentathlon: genre in Pindar's first *Isthmian*', *GRBS* 29: 97-112.

—. (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).

—. (1993) 'The economy of *kudos*', in Dougherty and Kurke (1993): 131-68.

—. (2000) 'The strangeness of "song culture": archaic Greek poetry', in Taplin (2000): 58-87.

—. (2005) 'Choral lyric as "ritualization": poetic sacrifice and poetic ego in Pindar's *Sixth Paian*', *CA* 24: 81-130.

—. (2007) 'Visualizing the choral: epichoric poetry, ritual, and elite negotiation in fifth-century Thebes', in Kraus *et al.* (2007): 63-104.

Kyriakou, P. (1996) 'A variation of the Pindaric break-off in *Nemean 4*', *AJP* 117: 17-35.

Lamarque, P. and Olsen, S. H. (1994) *Truth, Fiction, and Literature. A philosophical perspective* (Oxford).

Lanata, G. (1963) *Poetica pre-platonica. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori 43; Florence).

Landels, J. G. (1999) *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome* (London).

Landy, J. (2012) *How to Do Things with Fictions* (Oxford).

Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (1996) 'Who sang Sappho's songs?', in Greene (1996): 150-72.

—. (2008) 'Someone, I say, will remember us': oral memory in Sappho's poetry', in Mackay (2008): 79-96.

Lardinois, A. P. M. H., Blok, J. H., and van der Poel, M. G. M. edd. (2011) *Sacred Words. Orality, literacy, and religion* (Mnem. Suppl. 322; Leiden).

Latacz, J. (1977) *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios* (Zetemata 66; Munich).

—. (1990) 'Die Funktion des Symposiums für die entstehende griechische Literatur', in Kullmann and Reichel (1990): 227-64.

Lattimore, R. (1942) *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 28; Urbana).

—. (1945) 'Pindar *Olympian* 9. 100-112', *CP* 41: 230-2.

Lattmann, C. (2010) *Das Gleiche im Verschiedenen* (Untersuchungen zur Antiken Literatur und Geschichte 102; Berlin).

Lawler, L. B. (1948) 'Orchêsis Kallinikos', *TAPA* 79: 254-67.

Lavecchia, S. (1997) 'Pindaro fr. 70b Snell-Maehler, 1-2 e la polemica contra la χοινοτένεια ἄοιδά', *SIFC* 15: 3-16.

—. (2000a) *Pindari dithyramborum fragmenta* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 13; Rome).

—. (2000b) 'Pindaro ἐρμανεὺς σοφός', *Hermes* 128: 369-72.

Ledbetter, G. M. (2003) *Poetics before Plato* (Oxford).

Lee, H. M. (1978) 'The "historical" Bundy and encomiastic relevance in Pindar', *CW* 72: 65-70.

Lefkowitz, M. (1976) *The Victory Ode. An introduction* (Park Ridge, NJ).

—. (1981) *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London).

—. (1991) *First Person Fictions. Pindar's poetic 'I'* (Oxford).

—. (1995) 'The first person in Pindar reconsidered— again', *BICS* 40: 139-50.

Lazzarini, M. L. (1976) *Le formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica* (Rome).

Lehnus, L. (1979) *L'inno a Pan di Pindaro* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 64; Milan).

Lennartz, K. (1997) 'Zu Bakchylides 3, 94-98', *RhM* 140: 90-1.

Leeuwen, J. van (1964) *Pindarus' Tweede Olympische Ode*, 2 vols. (Leiden).

LeVen, P. (2013) 'The colours of sound: *poikilia* in its aesthetic contexts', *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* 1: 229-42.

- Lewis, S. (1997) *News and Society in the Greek Polis* (Chapel Hill, NC).
- Liberman, G. (1988) 'Alcée 384 LP, Voigt', *RPhil* 62: 291-8.
- . (1999) *Alcée : texte établie, traduit et annoté*, 2 vols. (Paris).
- Liddel, P. P. and Low, P. edd. (2013) *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford).
- Lidov, J. (1974) 'The poems and performances of *Isthmians* 3 and 4', *CSCA* 7: 175-85.
- . (forthcoming) *Form and Measure. Sappho, Book I*.
- Livrea, E. and Privitera, G. A. edd. (1978) *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni*, 2 vols. (Rome).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1973) 'Modern interpretation of Pindar: the *Second Pythian* and *Seventh Nemean odes*', *JHS* 93: 109-37. [= (1990) 110-53]
- . (1983) 'Pindar', *PBA* 68: 139-62.
- . (1990) *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy. The academic papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- . (1995) 'Lykaon and Kyknos', *ZPE* 108: 38-44 (with a revision in *ZPE* 134 (2001) 23). [= (2005) 51-60]
- . (2005) *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- Lobel, E. et al. edd. (1957) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXIV* (London).
- Lobel, E. and Turner, E. G. edd. (1959) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXV* (London).
- Lobel, E. (1957a) 'Alcman, Παρθένια', in Lobel et al. (1957): 8-21.
- . (1957b) 'Alcman', in Lobel et al. (1957): 22-8.
- . (1957c) 'Commentary on Alcman', in Lobel et al. (1957): 28-49.
- . (1959) 'Choral lyric in the Doric dialect (? Simonides)', in Lobel and Turner (1959): 45-86.
- . ed. (1961a) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXVI* (London).
- . (1961b) 'Pindar, Ὑμνοί, Παιᾶνες, ? other pieces', in Lobel (1961a): 31-77.
- Lolos, Y. (2003) 'Greek roads: a commentary on the ancient terms', *Glotta* 79: 137-74.

- Lonsdale, S. (1994/5) 'Homeric Hymn to Apollo: prototype and paradigm of choral performance', *Arion* 3: 25-40.
- Loraux, N. (1986) *The Invention of Athens. The funeral oration in the classical city* (transl. A. Sheridan; Cambridge, MA).
- Loscalzo, D. (2000) *La Nemea settima di Pindaro* (Daidalos 2; Viterbo).
- . (2003) *La parola inestinguibile. Studi sull'epinicio pindarico* (Filologia e critica 90; Rome).
- Lowe, N. J. (2007) 'Epinikian eidography', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 167-76.
- Lowrie, M. (1997) *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford).
- . ed. (2009) *Oxford Readings in Horace. Odes and Epodes* (Oxford).
- Luginbill, R. D. (2009) 'The occasion and purpose of Alcman's *Partheneion* (1 PMGF)', *QUCC* 121: 27-54.
- Luppe, W. (1994) 'Die Korinther in der Schlacht von Plataiai bei Simonides nach Plutarch (Simon. fr. 15 und 16 W²; P. Oxy. fr. 5)', *APF* 40: 21-4.
- Luppino, A. (1959) 'Divagazioni e precisazioni sulla *Pitica* III di Pindaro', *RFIC* 37: 225-36.
- . (1967) 'Una formula omerica in Saffo', *PP* 22 : 286-91.
- Luraghi, N. ed. (2001) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Lyde, L. W. (1935) *Contexts in Pindar. With reference to the meaning of φέγγος* (Cambridge).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (2005) 'Structure and allusion in Horace's book of *Epodes*', *JRS* 55: 542-58. [= (2007) 314-40]
- . (2007) *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry* (Oxford).
- Maas, M. and Snyder, J. M. (1989) *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* (New Haven, CT).
- Mace, S. (1993) 'Amour, Encore! The development of δηῦτε in archaic lyric', *GRBS* 34: 335-64.
- Machemer, G. A. (1993) 'Medicine, music, and magic: the healing grace of Pindar's *Fourth Nemean*', *HSCP* 95: 113-41.
- Mackay, E. A. ed. (2008) *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World* (Mnem. Suppl. 298; Leiden).

- Mackie, C. J. ed. (2004) *Oral Performance and its Context* (Mnem. Suppl. 248; Leiden).
- Mackie, H. S. (2003) *Graceful Errors. Pindar and the performance of praise* (Ann Arbor).
- MacLachlan, B. (1992) 'Feasting with Ethiopians: life on the fringe', *QUCC* 40: 15-33.
- . (1993) *The Age of Grace. Charis in early Greek poetry* (Princeton).
- Macleod, C. W. (1974) 'Two comparisons in Sappho', *ZPE* 15: 217-20. [= (1983) 16-19]
- . (1981) 'The comic encomium and Aristophanes *Clouds* 1201-1211', *Phoenix* 35: 142-4. [= (1983) 49-51]
- . (1983) *Collected Essays* (Oxford).
- . (1986) *Horace's Epistles* (Instrumentum litterarum 3; Rome).
- . (2001) 'Homer on poetry and the poetry of Homer', in D. L. Cairns (2001): 294-310. [= (1983) 1-15]
- Mader, W. (1990) *Die Psalms-Oden Pindars (O. 4 und O. 5): ein Kommentar* (Commentationes Aenipontanae 29; Innsbruck).
- Maehler, H. (1963) *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (Hypomnemata 3; Göttingen).
- . (1982-97) *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, 2 vols. (Mnem. Suppl. 62, 167; Leiden).
- . (2000) 'Beobachtungen zum Gebrauch des Satz-Asyndetons bei Backchylides und Pindar', in Pizzani and Cannatà Fera (2000): 421-30.
- . (2004) *Bacchylides. A selection* (Cambridge).
- Mann, R. (1994) 'Pindar's Homer and Pindar's myths', *GRBS* 35: 313-37.
- Maravela, A. (2011) 'The athlete's "happiness": *eudaimonia* in archaic Greek epinicians', *SO* 85: 33-51.
- Marincola, J., Llewellyn-Jones, L., and Maciver, C. edd. (2012) *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras. History without historians* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6; Edinburgh).
- Martin, R. P. (2004) 'Home is the hero: deixis and semantics in Pindar *Pythian* 8', *Arethusa* 37: 343-63.

- Maslov, B. (2013) 'The dialect basis of choral lyric and the history of poetic languages in archaic Greece', *SO* 87: 1-29.
- Mastronarde, D. J. (1994) *Euripides. Phoenissae* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29; Cambridge).
- . (2002) *Euripides. Medea* (Cambridge).
- Mayer, R. (1994) *Horace. Epistles Book 1* (Cambridge).
- McNeal, R. A. (1978) 'Structure and metaphor in Pindar's *Fourth Isthmian*', *QUCC* 28: 136-56.
- Merkelbach, R. (1957) 'Sappho und ihr Kreis', *Philologus* 101: 1-29.
- Metcalf, C. (2013) *Aspects of Early Greek and Babylonian Hymnic Poetry* (Diss. Oxford).
- Mezger, F. (1880) *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig).
- Minton, W. W. (1960) 'Homer's invocations of the Muses: traditional patterns', *TAPA* 91: 292-309.
- . (1962) 'Invocation and catalogue in Hesiod and Homer', *TAPA* 93: 188-212.
- Miller, A. M. (1979) 'The "Address to the Delian Maidens" in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo: epilogue or transition?', *TAPA* 109: 173-86.
- . (1981) 'Pindar, Archilochus and Hieron in *P.* 2.52-56', *TAPA* 111: 135-43.
- . (1982) '*Phthonos* and *parphasis*: the argument of *Nemean* 8.19-34', *GRBS* 23: 111-20.
- . (1983) '*N.* 4.33-43 and the defence of digressive leisure', *CJ* 78: 202-20.
- . (1989) 'Apolline ethics and Olympian victory in Pindar's *Eighth Pythian*', *GRBS* 30: 461-84.
- . (1993a) '*Inventa componere*: rhetorical process and poetic composition in Pindar's *Ninth Olympian Ode*', *TAPA* 123: 109-47.
- . (1993b) 'Pindaric mimesis: the associative mode', *CJ* 89: 21-53.
- . (1994) 'Sarpedon and Nestor in Pindar, *Pythian* 3 (again)', *RhM* 137: 383-6.
- Molyneux, J. H. (1972) 'Two problems concerning Heracles in Pindar *Olympian* 9.28-41', *TAPA* 103: 301-27.
- . (1992) *Simonides. A historical study* (Wauconda, IL).

- Momigliano, A. (1971) *The Development of Greek Biography. Four lectures* (Cambridge, MA).
- Monro, D. B. (1892) 'On Pindar, *Nem.* II 14', *CR* 6: 3-4.
- 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 ΚΩΜΟC', *CP* 88: 1-15.
- . (2012) 'A prolegomenon to performance in the West', in Bosher (2012): 35-55.
- Morris, I. (1996) 'The strong principle of equality and the archaic origins of Greek democracy', in Ober and Hedrick (1996): 19-48.
- Morrison, A. D. (2007a) *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Odes* (BICS Suppl. 95; London).
- . (2007b) *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).
- . (2010) 'Aeginetan odes, reperformance, and Pindaric intertextuality', in Fearn (2010): 228-53.
- . (2011) 'Pindar and the Aeginetan *patrai*: Pindar's intersecting audiences', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 311-36.
- . (2012) 'Performance, re-performances, and Pindar's audiences', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 111-33.
- Morson, G. (2011) *The Words of Others. From quotations to culture* (New Haven).
- Most, G. W. (1985a) *The Measures of Praise. Structure and function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes* (Hypomnemata 83; Göttingen).
- . (1985b) 'Pindar, *Nemean* 7.64-67', *GRBS* 26: 315-31.
- . (1986a) 'Pindar, *O.* 2.83-90', *CQ* 36: 304-16.
- . (1986b) 'Pindar *Nem.* 7, 31-36', *Hermes* 114: 262-71.
- . (1994) 'Simonides' ode to Scopas in contexts', in de Jong and Sullivan (1994): 127-52.
- . (1987) 'Two leaden metaphors in Pindar *P.* 2', *AJP* 108: 569-84.
- . (2003) 'Epinician envies', in Konstan and Rutter (2003): 123-42.

- . (2012) 'Poet and public: communicative strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 249-76.
- Moulton, C. (1977) *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Hypomnemata 49; Göttingen).
- Mugler, C. (1960) 'La Lumière et la vision dans la poésie grecque', *REG* 73: 40-72.
- Mullen, W. (1982) *Choreia. Pindar and dance* (Princeton).
- Murray, P. (1981) 'Poetic inspiration in early Greece', *JHS* 101: 87-100.
- Murray, O. ed. (1990a) *Symptica. A symposium on the symposion* (Oxford).
- . (1990b) 'Symptotic history', in Murray (1990a): 3-13.
- Nagel, T. (1979) *Mortal Questions* (Cambridge).
- Nagy, G. (1974) *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge, MA).
- . (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the hero in archaic Greek poetry* (Baltimore).
- . (1989) 'The "professional Muse" and models of prestige in ancient Greece', *Cultural Critique* 12: 133-43.
- . (1990) *Pindar's Homer. The lyric possession of an epic past* (Baltimore).
- . (1994) 'Genre and occasion', *Metis* 9-10: 11-25.
- Nash, L. L. (1982) 'The Theban Myth at *Pythian* 9, 79-103', *QUCC* 11: 77-99.
- Nassen, P. J. (1975) 'A literary study of Pindar's *Olympian* 10', *TAPA* 105: 219-40.
- Neri, C. (2014) 'Una festa auspicata? (Sapph. fr. 17 V. e P. GC. inv. 105 fr. 2 c. II rr. 9-28)', *Eikasmos* 25: 11-24.
- Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2005) 'Wenn Pindar "wir" sagt – Überlegungen zur 1. Person Plural bei Pindar', *AE* 5: 131-48.
- . (2009a) *Epinikien und ihr Aufführungsrahmen* (Nikephoros Beihefte 17; Hildesheim).
- . (2009b) 'The dedication of victory crowns and the performance of epinikian odes', *BICS* 52: 1-13.
- Nicholson, N. J. (2000) 'Pederastic poets and adult patrons in late archaic lyric', *CW* 93: 235-59.
- . (2001) 'Pindar *Nemean* 4.57-58 and the arts of poets, trainers, and wrestlers', *Arethusa*

34: 31-59.

—. (2005) *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge).

—. (2011) 'Pindar's *Olympian* 4: Psauis and Camarina after the Deinomenids', *CP* 106: 93-114.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1970) *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book I* (Oxford).

—. (1978) *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book II* (Oxford).

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Rudd, N. (2004) *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book III* (Oxford).

Nisetich, F. J. (1975) '*Olympian* 1.8.11: an epinician metaphor', *HSCP* 79: 55-68.

—. (1977a) 'Convention and occasion in *Isthmian* 2', *CSCA* 10: 133-56.

—. (1977b) 'The leaves of triumph and mortality: transformation of a traditional image in Pindar's *Olympian* 12', *TAPA* 107: 235-64.

—. (1988) 'Immortality in Acragas: poetry and religion in Pindar's second *Olympian Ode*', *CP* 83: 1-19.

—. (1989) *Pindar and Homer* (AJP Monographs in Classical Philology 4; Baltimore).

Norden, E. (1913) *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig).

Norwood, G. (1945) *Pindar* (Sather Classical Lectures 19; Berkeley).

Nunan, D. (1993) *Introducing Discourse Analysis* (London).

Nünlist, R. (1998) *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 101; Basel).

Obbink, D. (2001) 'The genre of Plataea: generic unity in the new Simonides', in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 65-85.

—. (2005) 'Archilochus, *Elegies*', in Gonis *et al.* (2005): 18-42.

—. (2006) 'A new Archilochus poem', *ZPE* 156: 1-9.

—. (2014) 'Two new poems by Sappho', *ZPE* 189: 32-49.

Obbink, D. and Rutherford, R. edd. (2011) *Culture in Pieces. Essays on ancient texts in honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford).

Ober, J. and Hedrick, C. edd. (1996) *Demokratia. A conversation on democracies, ancient and modern* (Princeton).

O'Higgins, D. M. (1987) 'Epinician elegy: death, strife and competition in Pindar's *Eighth Nemean*', *C&M* 40: 115-32.

Olivieri, O. (2011) *Miti e culti tebani nella poesia di Pindaro* (Filologia e critica 89; Pisa).

Olson, S. D. (1995) *Blood and Iron. Story and storytelling in Homer's Odyssey* (Mnem. Suppl. 148; Leiden).

—. (2002) *Aristophanes. Acharnians* (Oxford).

—. (2007) *Broken Laughter. Select fragments of Greek comedy* (Oxford).

Ostwald, M. (1969) *Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy* (Oxford).

O'Sullivan, P. (2003) 'Victory statue, victory song: Pindar's agonistic poetics and its legacy', in Phillips and Pritchard (2003): 75-100.

Page, D.L. (1951) *Alcman. The Partheneion* (Oxford).

—. (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus. An introduction to the study of ancient Lesbian poetry* (Oxford).

—. (1970) 'Fragments of Greek lyric poetry: P. Oxy. 2637', *PCPS* 196: 91-6.

Palaiogeorgou, A. K. (2003) 'Pindar's *Nemean* 4.33-43: the case of the break-off', *Hellenika* 53: 257-67.

Palmisciano, R. (1998) 'Lamento funebre, culto delle Muse e attese escatologiche in Saffo (con una verifica su Archiloco)', *SemRom* 1: 183-205.

Papangelis, T. D. et al. edd. (2013) *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature. Encounters, interactions, and transformations* (Trends in Classics Suppl. 20; Berlin).

Papenfuss, D. et al. edd. (2001) *Gab es das griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Mainz).

Park, A. (2013) 'Truth and genre in Pindar', *CQ* 63: 17-36.

Parker, H. N. (1993) 'Sappho Schoolmistress', *TAPA* 123: 309-51.

—. (2009) 'Books and reading in Rome', in Johnson and Parker (2009): 186-232.

Parker, R. (1986) 'Greek Religion', in Boardman et al. (1986): 254-74.

—. (2001) *On Greek Religion* (Ithaca).

Pasquali, G. (1920) *Orazio lirico* (Florence).

Patten, G. (2009) *Pindar's Metaphors. A study in the rhetoric of meaning* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften 124; Heidelberg).

Pavese, C. (1966) 'XPHMATA, XPHMAT' ANHP ed il motivo della liberalità nella seconda *Istmica* di Pindaro', *QUCC* 2: 103-12.

—. (1978) 'La settima Nemea di Pindaro. A Sogenes di Aigina, nel pentathlon dei ragazzi', in Livrea and Privitera (1978): 661-88.

—. (1972) *Tradizioni e generi poetici della Grecia arcaica* (Rome).

—. (1993) 'Il coro nel sesto *Peano* di Pindaro', in Pretagostini (1993): ii.469-79.

—. (1997) *I temi e i motivi della lirica corale ellenica. Introduzione, analisi e indice semantematici. Alcmene, Simonide, Pindaro, Bacchilide* (Rome).

—. (1995) 'Elegia di Simonide agli Spartiati per Platea', *ZPE* 107: 1-26.

Pavlou, M. (2008) 'Metapoetics, poetic tradition, and praise in Pindar *Olympian* 9', *Mnemosyne* 61: 533-67.

—. (2010a) 'Pindar *Olympian* 3: mapping Acragas on the periphery of the earth. Grasping the pillars of Heracles from home', *CQ* 60: 313-26.

—. (2010b) 'Pindar *Nemean* 5: real and poetic statues', *Phoenix* 64: 1-18.

—. (2011) 'Past and present in Pindar's religious poetry', in Lardinois *et al.* (2011): 59-78.

—. (2012a) 'Bacchylides 17: singing and usurping the paeon', *GRBS* 52: 510-39.

—. (2012b) 'Pindar and the reconstruction of the past', in Marincola *et al.* (2012): 95-112.

Pearson, A. C. (1917) *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 3 vols. (Cambridge).

Pelliccia, H. (1987) 'Pindarus Homericus: *Pythian* 3.1-80', *HSCP* 91: 39-63.

—. (1989) 'Pindar, *Nemean* 7.31-36 and the syntax of aetiology', *HSCP* 92: 71-101.

—. (1995) *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Plato* (Hypomnemata 107; Göttingen).

—. (2003) 'Two points about rhapsodes', in Finkelberg and Stroumsa (2003): 98-116.

- . (2009) 'Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides', in Budelmann (2009a): 204-26.
- Peponi, A. E. (2004) 'Initiating the viewer: deixis and visual perception in Alcman's lyric drama', *Arethusa* 37: 295-316.
- . (2007) 'Sparta's prima ballerina: *choreia* in Alcman's second *partheneion* (3 PMGF)', *CQ* 57: 351-62.
- . (2012) *Frontiers of Pleasure. Models of aesthetic response in archaic and classical Greek thought* (Oxford).
- Perkins, D. (1992) *Is Literary History Possible?* (Baltimore).
- Péron, J. (1974) *Les Images maritimes de Pindare* (Études et commentaires 87; Paris).
- . (1982) 'Le Poème à Polycrate : une " Palinodie " d'Ibycus?', *RPh* 56: 33-56.
- Perusino, F. and Colantonio, M. edd. (2007) *Dalla lirica corale alla poesia drammatica: forme e funzioni del canto corale nella tragedia e nella commedia greca* (Testimonianze sulla cultura greca 5; Rome).
- Petrovic, A. (2007) *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften* (Mnem. Suppl. 282; Leiden).
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship. From the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age* (Oxford).
- Pfeijffer, I. L. (1994) 'The image of the eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CP* 89: 305-17.
- . (1999a) *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, and Pythian VIII* (Mnem. Suppl. 197; Leiden).
- . (1999b) *First Person Futures in Pindar* (Hermes Einzelschriften 81; Stuttgart).
- . (1999c) 'Bacchylides' Homer, his tragedy, and his Pindar', in Pfeijffer and Slings (1999): 43-60.
- . (2000) 'Shifting Helen: an interpretation of Sappho, fragment 16', *CQ* 50: 1-6.
- . (2004) 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in de Jong *et al.* (2004): 213-32.
- . (2005) 'Propaganda in Pindar's *First Pythian Ode*', in Enenkel and Pfeijffer (2004): 13-42.
- Pfeijffer, I. L. and Slings, S. edd. (1999) *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of a colloquium held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* (Amsterdam).

- Phillips, D. and Pritchard, D. edd. (2003) *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea).
- Phillips, T. (2013) 'Epinician variations: music and text in Pindar, *Pythians* 2 and 12', *CQ* 63: 37-57.
- . (forthcoming) 'Intertextuality and explanation: Pindar, *Paean* 9'.
- Pizzani, U. and Cannatà Fera, M. edd. (2000) *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*, 2 vols. (Perugia).
- Pöhlmann, E. (1990) 'Zur Überlieferung griechischer Literatur vom 8. bis zum 4. Jh', in Kullman and Reichel (1990) 11-30.
- Pöhlmann, E. and West, M. L. (2012) 'The oldest Greek papyrus and writing tablets. Fifth-century documents from the "Tomb of the Musician" in Attica', *ZPE* 180: 1-16.
- Poiss, T. (1993) *Momente der Einheit: Interpretationen zu Pindars Epinikion und Hölderlins Andenken* (Wiener Studien Beiheft 18; Vienna).
- Poliakoff, M. B. (1980) 'Nectar, springs, and the sea: critical terminology in Pindar and Callimachus', *ZPE* 39: 41-7.
- . (1986) *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*² (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 146; Frankfurt).
- Poltera, O. (2008) *Simonides lyricus. Testimonia und Fragmente. Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 35; Basel).
- Porter, J. I. (2007) 'Lasus of Hermione, Pindar and the Riddle of S', *CQ* 57: 1-21.
- Pòrtulas, J. (2012) 'Cult poetry in archaic Greece', in Riu and Pòrtulas (2012): 221-48.
- Poultney, J. W. (1987) 'Non-concinnity in Pindar', *AJP* 108: 1-8.
- Powell, A. ed. (1995) *The Greek World* (London).
- Power, T. (2000) 'The *parthenoi* of Bacchylides 13', *HSCP* 100: 67-81.
- . (2010) *The Culture of Kitharôidia* (Hellenic Studies 15; Washington DC).
- . (2011) 'Cyberchorus: Pindar's Κηληδόνες and the aura of the artificial', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 67-114.

Pratt, L. H. (1993) *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar. Falsehood and deception in archaic Greek poetics* (Ann Arbor).

—. (1995) 'The seal of Theognis, writing, and oral poetry', *AJP* 116: 171-84.

Prauscello, L. (2006) *Singing Alexandria. Music between practice and textual transmission* (Mnem. Suppl. 274; Leiden).

—. (2012) 'Epinician sounds: Pindar and musical innovation', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 58-82.

Pretagostini, R. ed. (1993) *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*, 3 vols. (Rome).

Priestly, J. M. (2007) 'The $\phi\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$ of Alcman's *Parthenion* 1', *Mnemosyne* 60: 175-95.

Privitera, G. A. (1977) 'Eracle e gli Eacidi nella terza *Nemea*', *GIF* 8: 249-73.

—. (1978) 'Lettura della prima *Istmica* di Pindaro', *QUCC* 28: 97-134.

—. (1982) *Pindaro. Le istmiche* (Milan).

—. (1988) 'Pindaro *Nem.* 3.1-5 e l'acqua di Egina', *QUCC* 29: 63-70.

Prodi, E. (2013) *Pindar's prosodia. Introduction, text, and commentary to selected fragments* (Diss. Oxford).

Puelma, M. (1977) 'Die Selbstbeschreibung des Chores in Alkmans grossem Partheneion-Fragment', *MH* 34: 1-55.

Race, W. H. (1976) 'The end of *Olympian* 2: Pindar and the "vulgus"', *CSCA* 12: 251-67.

—. (1980) 'Some digressions and returns in Greek authors', *CJ* 76: 1-8.

—. (1982a) *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Mnem. Suppl. 74; Leiden).

—. (1982b) 'Two Pindaric passages: *Pyth.* 5.55 and *Pyth.* 10.21-22', *AJP* 104: 178-88.

—. (1985) 'Pindar's heroic ideal at *Pyth.* 4.186-187', *AJP* 106: 350-6.

—. (1986) *Pindar* (Twayne's World Authors Series 773; Boston).

—. (1990) *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta).

—. (1992) 'How Greek poems begin', *YCS* 29: 13-38.

—. (1997) *Pindar*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA).

- . (2004) 'Pindar's *Olympian* 11 revisited post Bundy', *HSCP* 102: 69-96.
- Radt, S. L. (1958) *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian. Text, Scholien und Kommentar* (Amsterdam).
- . (1966) 'Pindars erste nemeische Ode. Versuch einer Interpretation', *Mnemosyne* 19: 148-74.
- Rawles, R. (2006a) 'Notes on the interpretation of the "New Sappho"', *ZPE* 157: 1-7.
- . (2006b) Review of Kowerski (2005), *JHS* 126: 154-5.
- . (2012) 'Early epinician: Ibycus and Simonides', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 3-27.
- . (2013) 'Aristophanes' Simonides: lyric models for praise and blame', in Bakola *et al.* (2013): 175-201.
- Redfield, J. M. (1994) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*³ (Durham, NC).
- Reichel, M. and Rengakos, A. edd. (2002) *Epea pteroenta: Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart).
- Renehan, R. (1969) *Greek Textual Criticism. A reader* (Cambridge).
- Rengakos, A. (2000) 'Zu Bakchylides' Erzähltechnik', in Bagordo and Zimmerman (2000): 101-12.
- Revermann, M. (2006) 'The competence of theatre audiences in fifth- and fourth-century Athens', *JHS* 126: 99-124.
- Revermann, M. and Wilson, P. ed. (2008) *Performance, iconography, reception. Studies in honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford).
- Richardson, N. (1979) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*² (Oxford).
- . (2010) *Three Homeric hymns. To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite* (Cambridge).
- . (2011) 'Reflections of choral song in early hexameter poetry', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 15-32.
- Rissman, L. (1983) *Love as War. Homeric allusion in the poetry of Sappho* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 147; Königstein).
- Riu, X. and Pòrtulas, J. edd. (2012) *Approaches to Archaic Greek Poetry* (Orione 5; Messina).
- Robb, K. (1994) *Literacy and paideia in Ancient Greece* (New York).

- Robbins, E. (1984) 'Intimations of immortality: Pindar, *Ol.* 3.34-5', in Gerber (1984): 219-28. [= (2013) 157-66]
- . (1990) 'The gifts of the gods: Pindar's *Third Pythian*', *CQ* 40: 307-18. [= (2013) 175-91]
- . (1994) 'Alcman's *Partheneion*: legend and choral ceremony', *CQ* 44: 7-16. [= (2013) 88-101]
- . (1997) 'Public poetry: Alcman, Stesichorus, Simonides, Pindar, Bacchylides', in Gerber (1997) 253-77. [= (2013) 1-57]
- . (2013) *Thalia Delighting in Song. Essays on Ancient Greek Poetry* (ed. B. MacLachlan; Phoenix Suppl. 53; Toronto).
- Roberts, D. H., Dunn, F., and Fowler, D. P. ed. (1997) *Classical Closure. Reading the end in Greek and Latin literature* (Princeton).
- Römer, C. ed. (2013) *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta (CLGP). Pars I. Vol. 1 Fasc. 2.1: Alcman* (Munich).
- Ronconi, A. ed. (1970) *Studia Florentina Alessandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata* (Rome).
- Rose, H. J. (1957) 'Herakles and Kyknos (Pindar, *O.* X. 15)', *Mnemosyne* 10: 110-16.
- Rose, P. W. (1974) 'The myth of Pindar's *First Nemean*: sportsmen, poetry, and *paideia*', *HSCP* 78: 145-75.
- Rosen, R. M. (2007) *Making Mockery. The poetics of ancient satire* (Oxford).
- Rösler, W. (1980a) *Dichter und Gruppe: eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios* (Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der schönen Künste. Texte und Abhandlungen 50; Munich).
- . (1980b) 'Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität in der Antike', *Poetica* 12: 283-319.
- . (1983) 'Über Deixis und einige Aspekte mündlichen und schriftlichen Stils in antiker Lyrik', *WJA* 9: 7-28.
- . (1984) 'Die frühe griechische Lyrik und ihre Interpretation: Versuch einer Situationsbeschreibung', *Poetica* 16: 179-205.
- . (1990) 'Realitätsbezug und Imagination in Sapphos Gedicht φαίνεται μοι κῆνος', in Kullman and Reichel (1990) 271-87.

- Ross, D. O. (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry. Gallus, elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge).
- Rotstein, A. (2007) 'Critias' invective against Archilochus', *CP* 102: 139-54.
- Ruffa, M. (2001) 'La questione dell'autenticità dell'*Olympica* 5 di Pindaro', in Cannatà-Fera and D'Alessio (2001): 27-35.
- Russell, D. A. (1981) *Criticism in Antiquity* (London).
- Rutherford, I. C. (1988) 'Pindar on the birth of Apollo', *CQ* 38: 65-75.
- . (1991) 'Neoptolemus and the Paeon-cry: an echo of a sacred aetiology in Pindar', *ZPE* 8: 1-10.
- . (1992) 'Two heroic prosodia: a study of Pindar, "Paeans XIV-V"', *ZPE* 92: 59-72.
- . (1997) 'Odes and ends: closure in Greek lyric', in Roberts *et al.* (1997): 43-61.
- . (2000) 'Keos or Delos? State pilgrimage and the performance of Pindar, *Paeon* 4', in Pizzani and Cannatà Fera (2000): 605-12.
- . (2001a) *Pindar's Paeans. A reading of the fragments with a survey of the genre* (Oxford).
- . (2001b) 'The New Simonides: towards a commentary', in Boedeker and Sider (2005): 33-54.
- . (2008) 'The songs of the Zintuhis: chorus and ritual in Anatolia and Greece', in Collins *et al.* (2008): 73-84.
- . (2013) *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece. A Study of theoria and the-oroï* (Cambridge).
- . (forthcoming) 'Pindar's cycle'.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012) *Greek Tragic Style. Form, language and interpretation* (Cambridge).
- Salvador Castillo, J. A. (1996) *ΘΑΛΙΑ. Un estudio del léxico vegetal en Pindaro* (Zaragoza).
- Sandgren, F. (1966) 'Pindars 6. Pythisches Gedicht, V. 19', *Eranos* 64: 80-2.
- Sansone, D. (1975) *Aeschylean Metaphors for Intellectual Activity* (Hermes Einzelschriften 35; Stuttgart).
- Sbardella, L. (2000) 'Achille e gli eroi di Platea. Simonide, fr. 10-11 W²', *ZPE* 129: 1-11.
- . (2012) *Cucitori di canti: studi sulla tradizione epico-rapsodica greca e i suoi itinerari nel VI secolo a.C.* (Quaderni dei Seminari romani di cultura greca 14; Rome).

- Schachter, A. (1998) 'Simonides' Elegy on Plataia: the occasion of its performance', *ZPE* 123: 25-30.
- Schade, G. (2006) 'Die Oden von Pindar und Bakchylides auf Hieron', *Hermes* 134: 373-78.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1928) *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 5.3; Halle).
- Scheffler, S. (2010) *Equality and Tradition. Questions of value in moral and political theory* (Oxford).
- . (2013) *Death and the Afterlife* (Oxford).
- Schein, S. L. (1988) 'Unity and meaning in Pindar's *Sixth Pythian Ode*', *Metis* 2: 235-47.
- . (2011) 'Hector', in Finkelberg (2011): s.v.
- Schmid, M. J. (1998) 'SKYTÁLA MOISAN: song and writing in Pindar', *Minerva* 12: 57-81.
- . (1998) 'Speaking personae in Pindar's epinikia', *CFG* 8: 147-84.
- Schmidt, D. (1999) 'An unusual victory list from Keos: *IG XII*, 5, 608 and the dating of Bakchylides', *JHS* 119: 67-85.
- Schmidt, E. G. ed. (1981) *Aischylos und Pindar. Studien zu Werk und Nachwirkung* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur der Antike 19; Berlin).
- Schmitz, T. A. (1994) 'Noch einmal zum Mythos in Pindars vierter olympischer Ode', *RhM* 137: 209-17.
- . (1999) "'I hate all common things": the reader's role in Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue', *HSCP* 99: 161-78.
- . (2010) 'Speaker and addressee in early Greek epigram and lyric', in Baumbach *et al.* (2010): 25-41.
- Schroeder, O. (1922) *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig).
- Schwyzler, E. (1934-71) *Griechische Grammatik. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik*, 4 vols. (rev. A. Debrunner; Munich).
- Scodel, R. (1992) 'Absence, memory, and inscription: epic and the early Greek epitaph', *SIFC* 85: 57-76.

- . (1996) 'Self-correction, pseudo-spontaneity, and orality in archaic poetry', in Worthington (1996): 59-79.
- . (2001) 'Poetic authority and oral tradition in Hesiod and Pindar', in Watson (2001): 109-37.
- . (2002) *Listening to Homer. Tradition, narrative, and audience* (Ann Arbor).
- . ed. (2014) *Between Orality and Literacy. Communication and adaptation in antiquity* (Mnem. Suppl. 367).
- Scullion, S. (2002) "'Nothing to do with Dionysus": tragedy misconceived as ritual', *CQ* 52: 102-37.
- Segal, C. (1967) 'Pindar's *Seventh Nemean*', *TAPA* 98: 431-80.
- . (1981) 'Myth, cult and memory in Pindar's *Third* and *Fourth Isthmian Odes*', *Ramus* 10: 69-86.
- . (1985) 'Messages to the underworld: an aspect of poetic immortalization in Pindar', *AJP* 106: 199-212.
- Selle, H. (2008) *Theognis und die Theognidea* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 95; Berlin).
- Setti, A. (1970) 'Persona e "poetica" nella VII *Nemea*', in Ronconi (1970): 405-29.
- Sevieri, R. (1997) 'Un canto sul far della sera. Autoreferenzialità e mimesi culturale nella *Pitica* XI di Pindaro per Trasideo di Tebe', *AE* 10: 93-100.
- Shaw, P.-J. (2001) 'Lords of Hellas, old men of the sea: the occasion of Simonides' *Elegy* on Plataea', in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 164-81.
- Shelmerdine, S. C. (1987) 'Pindaric praise and the *Third Olympian*', *HSCP* 91: 65-81.
- Sider, D. (1991) 'Sarpedon and Nestor in Pindar, *Pythian* 3', *RhM* 134: 110-11.
- . (1996) 'As is the generation of leaves in Homer, Simonides, Horace, and Stobaios', *Arethusa* 29: 263-83.
- . (2006) 'The New Simonides and the question of historical elegy', *AJP* 127: 327-46.
- . (2007) 'Sylloge Simonidea', in Bing and Bruss (2007): 113-30.
- Silk, M. (1974) *Interaction in Poetic Imagery. With special reference to early Greek poetry* (Cambridge).

- . (1980) 'Aristophanes as a lyric poet', *YCS* 26: 99-151.
- . (1998) 'Pindar's poetry and the obligatory crux: *Isthmian* 5.56-63. Text and interpretation', *TAPA* 128: 25-88.
- . (2012) 'Reading Pindar', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 347-64.
- Simpson, M. (1969a) 'The chariot and the bow as metaphors for poetry in Pindar's odes', *TAPA* 100: 437-73.
- . (1969b) 'Pindar's *Ninth Olympian*', *GRBS* 10: 113-24.
- Slater, W. J. (1969) 'Futures in Pindar', *CQ* 19: 86-94.
- . (1971) 'Pindar's house', *GRBS* 12: 141-52.
- . (1977) 'Doubts about Pindaric interpretation', *CJ* 72: 193-208.
- . (1979) 'Pindar and *Hypothekai*', in Fossey and Schachter (1979) 79-82.
- . (1979) 'Pindar's myths: two pragmatic explanations', in Bowersock *et al.* (1979): 63-70.
- . (1981) 'Peace, the symposium and the poet', *ICS* 6: 205-14.
- . (1983) 'Lyric narrative: structure and principle', *CA* 2: 117-32.
- . (1984) '*Nemean One*. The victor's return in poetry and politics', in Gerber (1984): 241-64.
- . (1988) 'Pindar's *Pythian* 3: structure and purpose', *QUCC* 29: 51-61.
- . (1989) 'Pelops at *Olympia*', *GRBS* 30: 485-501.
- . (2001) 'Pindar, *Nemean* 7.102—past and present', *CQ* 51: 360-7.
- Slings, S. R. ed. (1990) *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Amsterdam).
- Smith, O. L. (1967) 'An interpretation of Pindar's *Seventh Olympian Ode*', *C&M* 28: 172-85.
- . (1984) 'Pindar's seventh *Nemean* ode', *C&M* 35: 5-17.
- Smith, R. R. R. (2007) 'Pindar, athletes, and the early Greek statue habit', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 83-140.
- Smyth, H. W. (1900) *Greek Melic Poets* (London).
- Snell, B. (1961) *Poetry and Society. The role of poetry in ancient Greece* (Bloomington, IN).

—. (1965) *Dichtung und Gesellschaft: Studien zum Einfluß der Dichter auf das soziale Denken und Verhalten im alten Griechenland* (Hamburg).

Sotiriou, M. (1998) *Pindarus Homericus* (Hypomnemata 119; Göttingen).

—. (2000) ‘Ἐκτὼρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν (Pindar, *Nem.* 2.14)’, *Hermes* 144: 134-8.

—. (2013) ‘Visual aspects of performance in Bacchylides’ epinician odes’, *QUCC* 102: 29-42.

Spelman, H. L. (2014a) ‘Placing Aphrodite: Alcaeus fr. 296b and Horace *C.* 4.1’, *ZPE* 189: 53–63.

—. (2014b) ‘Alcman 3 *PMGF* and Horace *C.* 2.9’, *ZPE* 192: 23-8.

—. (2014c) ‘Zeus and the Maidens: Pindar fr. 94b.31-7’, *ZPE* 192: 31-3.

—. (2015a) ‘Alcaeus fr. 140’, *CP*.

—. (2015b) ‘Borrowing Sappho’s Napkins: Sappho 101, Catullus 12, Theocritus 28’, *HSCP*.

—. (forthcoming in *Mnemosyne*) ‘Sappho 44, Trojan myth, and literary history’.

Stamatopoulou, Z. (2014) ‘Inscribing performances in Pindar’s *Olympian* 6’, *TAPA* 144: 1-17.

Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece. Nondramatic poetry in its setting* (Princeton).

—. (2009) ‘“Once” and “now”: temporal markers and Sappho’s self-presentation’, in Greene and Skinner (2009): 118-30.

Stein, E. (1990) *Autorbewusstsein in der frühen griechischen Literatur* (Script Oralia 17; Tübingen).

Steiner, D. (1986) *The Crown of Song. Metaphor in Pindar* (Oxford).

—. (1993) ‘Pindar’s “oggetti parlanti”’, *HSCP* 95: 159-80.

—. (2001) ‘Slander’s bite: *Nemean* 7.102-5 and the language of invective’, *JHS* 121: 154-8.

—. (2002) ‘Indecorous dining, indecorous speech: Pindar’s *First Olympian* and the poetics of consumption’, *Arethusa* 35: 297-314.

—. (2005) ‘Nautical matters: Hesiod’s *Nautilia* and Ibycus fragment 282 *PMG*’, *CP* 100: 347-55.

- . (2007) 'Feathers flying: avian poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus', *AJP* 128: 177-208.
- Stenger, J. (2004) *Poetische Argumentation. Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 69; Berlin).
- Stern, J. (1970) 'The myth of Pindar's *Olympian* 6', *AJP* 91: 332-40.
- Stinton, T. W. (1976) "'Si credere dignum est": expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others', *PCPS* 22: 60-89. [= (1990) 236-64]
- . (1990) *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Stoneman, R. (1976) 'The "Theban eagle"', *CQ* 26: 188-97.
- . (1981) 'Pindar and the mythological tradition', *Philologus* 125: 44-63.
- Susini, G. (1973) *The Roman Stonecutter. An introduction to Latin epigraphy* (ed. E. Badian; transl. A. M. Dabrowski; Oxford).
- Svenbro, J. (1976) *La Parole et le marbre. Aux origines de la poésie grecque* (Lund).
- Svennson, A. (1930) *Zum Gebrauch der erzählenden Tempora im Griechischen* (Lund).
- Swift, L. A. (2010) *The Hidden Chorus. Echoes of genre in tragic lyric* (Oxford).
- Syndikus, H. P. (2001) *Die Lyrik des Horaz: eine Interpretation der Oden*³, 2 vols. (Darmstadt).
- Szastynska-Siemion, A. (1981) 'dapana und ponos bei Pindar', in E. G. Schmidt (1981): 90-2.
- Tanskanen, S.-K. (2006) *Collaborating towards Coherence. Lexical cohesion in English discourse* (Amsterdam).
- Taplin, O. (1978) *Greek Tragedy in Action* (London).
- . (1999) 'Spreading the word through performance', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999): 33-57.
- . ed. (2000) *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds. A new perspective* (Oxford).
- Tarán, S. L. (1985) 'EICI TPIXEC: an erotic motif in the *Greek Anthology*', *JHS* 105: 90-107.
- Tarrant, D. (1960) 'Greek metaphors of light', *CQ* 10: 181-7.
- Tedeschi, A. (1985) 'L'invio del carne nella poesia lirica arcaica', *SIFC* 78: 29-54.

Teffeteller, A. (2005) 'Pindar's three words: the role of Apollo in the *Seventh Nemean*', *CQ* 55: 77-95.

Thalmann, W. G. (1984) *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore).

Thomas, R. (1992) *Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).

—. (1995) 'The place of the poet in archaic society', in Powell (1995): 104-29.

—. (2007) 'Fame, memorial, and choral poetry: the origins of epinikian poetry— an historical study', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 141-66.

—. (2012) 'Pindar's "difficulty" and the performance of epinician poetry: some suggestions from ethnography', in Agócs *et al.* (2012a): 224-45.

Thomas, R. F. (2001) *Virgil and the Augustan Reception* (Cambridge).

—. (2011) *Horace. Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare* (Cambridge).

Thummer, E. (1968-9) *Die isthmischen Gedichte*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg).

—. (1972) 'Die zweite pythische Ode Pindars', *RhM* 115: 293-307.

Tigerstedt, E. N. (1970) 'Furor poeticus: poetic inspiration in Greek literature before Democritus and Plato', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31: 163-78.

Tillotson, G. (1961) *Augustan Studies* (London).

Todorov, T. (1981) *Introduction to Poetics* (transl. R. Howard; Brighton).

Treu, M. (1949) 'Una testimonianza di Alceo sulla sua vocazione di poeta', *Maia* 2: 232-55.

—. (1965) 'Licht und Leuchtendes in der archaischen griechischen Poesie', *Studium Generale* 18: 97-116.

Trombetta, D. (1999) 'L'invito a bere in Simonide (fr. 512 Page): alle origini dell'epinicio?', *ARF*: 5-8.

Trümpy, C. (1986) *Vergleich des Mykenischen mit der Sprache der Chorlyrik: Bewahrt die Chorlyrik eine von Homer unabhängige alte Sprachtradition?* (Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe XV, Klassische Sprachen und Literaturen 32).

Tsagalis, C. (2011) 'Towards an oral, intertextual neoanalysis', *Trends in Classics* 3: 209-44.

Tsagarakis, O. (1977) *Self-Expression in Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*

(*Palingenesia* 11; Wiesbaden).

Tsomis, G. (2001) *Zusammenschau der frühgriechischen monodischen Melik (Alkaïos, Sappho, Anakreon)* (*Palingenesia* 70; Stuttgart).

Tueller, M. A. (2008) *Look Who's Talking. Innovations in voice and identity in Hellenistic epigram* (*Hellenistica Groningana* 13; Leuven).

—. (2010) 'The passer-by in archaic and classical epigram', in Baumbach *et al.* (2010): 42-60.

Tugenhat, E. (1960) 'Zum Rechtfertigungsproblem in Pindars 7. nemeischen Gedicht', *Hermes* 88: 385-409.

Tuyn, A. (1952) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*² (Oxford).

Tzamali, E. (1996) *Syntax und Stil bei Sappho* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 16; Munich).

Vahtikari, V. (2014) *Tragedy Performances outside Athens in the Late Fifth and the Fourth Centuries BC* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 20; Helsinki).

Verdenius, W. J. (1987-88) *Commentaries on Pindar*, 2 vols. (Mnem. Suppl. 97, 101; Leiden).

—. (1983) 'The principles of Greek literary criticism', *Mnemosyne* 36: 14-59.

Vestheim, G. (2004) 'Alcman fr. 23: a wish for fame', *GRBS* 44: 5-18.

Vetta, M. (1979) 'La "gioinezza giusta" di Trasibulo: Pind. *Pyth.* VI 48', *QUCC* 2: 87-90.

—. (1982) 'Il P. Oxy. 2506 fr. 77 e la poesia pederotica di Alceo', *QUCC* 10: 7-20.

Von der Mühl, P. (1964a) 'Weitere pindarische Notizen V', *MH* 21: 50-7. [= (1976) 216-23]

—. (1964b) 'Weitere pindarische Notizen VIII', *MH* 21: 168-72. [= (1976) 231-7]

—. (1976) *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 12; ed. B. Wyss; Basel).

Von Reden, S. (1995) 'Deceptive readings: poetry and its value reconsidered', *CQ* 45: 30-50.

Wade-Gery, H. T. (1933) 'Classical epigrams and epitaphs: a study of the Kimonian age', *JHS* 53: 71-104.

Walsh, G. B. (1984) *The Varieties of Enchantment. Early Greek views of the nature and function of poetry* (Chapel Hill, NC).

- . (1990) 'Surprised by self: audible thought in Hellenistic poetry', *CP* 85: 1-21.
- . (1991) 'Callimachean passages: the rhetoric of epitaph in epigram', *Arethusa* 24: 77-105.
- Wallace, P. W. (1974) 'Hesiod and the valley of the Muses', *GRBS* 15: 5-24.
- Watson, J. ed. (2001) *Speaking Volumes. Orality and literacy in the Greek and Roman world* (Mnem. Suppl. 218; Leiden).
- . (2011) 'Rethinking the Sanctuary of Aphaia', in Fearn (2011) 78-113.
- Webster, T. L. B. (1970) *The Greek Chorus* (London).
- Weiden, M. J. H. van der (1991) *The Dithyrambs of Pindar. Introduction, text and commentary* (Amsterdam).
- Wells, J. B. (2009) *Pindar's Verbal Art. An ethnographic study of epinician style* (Hellenic Studies 40; Cambridge, MA).
- Werth, P. (1999) *Text Worlds. Representing conceptual space in discourse* (New York).
- West, M. L. (1965) 'Alcmanica', *CQ* 15: 188-202.
- . (1966) *Hesiod. Theogony* (Oxford).
- . (1970) 'Burning Sappho', *Maia* 22: 307-330. [= (2011-13) ii.28-52]
- . (1974) *Studies in Elegy and Iambus* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14; Berlin).
- . (1975) 'Cynaethus' Hymn to Apollo', *CQ* 21: 161-70. [= (2011-13) i.329-43]
- . (1977) 'Is the *Works and Days* an oral poem?', in Brillante *et al.* (1977): 53-67.
- . (1978) *Hesiod. Works and Days* (Oxford).
- . (1980) 'Other early poetry', in Dover (1980): 29-49.
- . (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Its nature, structure, and origins* (Oxford).
- . (1990) 'Archaische Heldendichtung: Singen und Schreiben', in Kullmann and Reichel (1990): 33-50. [= English translation at (2011-13) i.159-175]
- . (1992) *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).

- . (1993) 'Simonides redivivus', *ZPE* 98: 1-14. [= (2011-13) ii.111-28]
- . (1997) *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Early Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- . (1999) 'The invention of Homer', *CQ* 49: 364-82. [= (2011-13) i.408-36]
- . (2002) 'The view from Lesbos', in Reichel and Rengakos (2002): 207-19. [= (2011-13) i.392-407]
- . (2005) 'The New Sappho', *ZPE* 151: 1-9. [= (2011-13) ii.53-66]
- . (2006) 'Archilochus and Telephus', *ZPE* 156: 11-17. [= (2011-13) ii.6-16]
- . (2007) *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- . (2011) 'Pindar as a man of letters', in Obbink and Rutherford (2011): 50-68. [= (2011-13) ii.129-50]
- . (2011-13) *Hellenica. Selected papers on Greek literature and thought*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- . (2013) *The Epic Cycle. A Commentary on the lost Troy epics* (Oxford).
- West, S. R. (1990) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume 1: Books 1-4* (Oxford).
- . (2004) 'Herodotus and lyric poetry', *Letras Clássicas* 8: 79-91.
- White, H. (1987) *The Content of the Form. Narrative discourse and historical representation* (Baltimore).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1886) *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Philologische Untersuchungen 9; Berlin).
- . (1900) *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker* (Berlin).
- . (1908) 'Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht', *SitzBer. Königl. Preuß. Akad.* 15: 328-52. [= Calder and Stern (1970): 127-58]
- . (1913) *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker* (Berlin).
- . (1921) *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin).
- . (1922) *Pindaros* (Berlin).
- Wilkins, J. (1993) *Euripides. Heraclidae* (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).
- Williams, B.A.O. (1993) *Shame and Necessity* (Sather Classical Lectures 57; Berkeley).
- . (2002) *Truth and Truthfulness. An essay in genealogy* (Princeton).
- Wilson, J. R. (1979) ‘καί κέ τις ὦδ’ ἐρεεῖ: an Homeric device in Greek literature’, *ICS* 4: 1-15.
- . (1988) ‘Adherescent negative compounds with φημί and the infinitive’, *Glotta*, 66: 88-92.
- Wilson, P. (1980) ‘Pindar and his reputation in antiquity’, *PCPS* 26: 97-114.
- Woodbury, L. (1947) ‘Pindar, *Isthmian* 4.19f’, *TAPA* 78: 368-75. [= (1991) 19-25]
- . (1968) ‘Pindar and the mercenary Muse: *Isthm.* 2.1-13’, *TAPA* 99: 527-42. [= (1991) 271-85]
- . (1969) ‘Truth and the song: Bacchylides 3.96-98’, *Phoenix* 23: 331-5. [= (1991) 201-05]
- . (1978) ‘The gratitude of the Locrian maiden: Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.18-20’, *TAPA* 108: 285-299. [= (1991) 271-285]
- . (1979) ‘Neoptolemus at Delphi: Pindar *Nem.* 7.30ff’, *Phoenix* 33: 95-133. [= (1991) 286-324]
- . (1981) ‘The victor’s virtues: Pindar, *Isth.* 1.32 ff’, *TAPA* 111: 237-56.
- . (1985) ‘Ibycus and Polycrates’, *Phoenix* 39: 193-220. [= (1991) 410-38]
- . (1991) *Collected Writings* (edd. C. G. Brown *et al.*; Atlanta).
- Woodman, A. J. and Feeney, D. C. edd. (2002) *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge).
- Worthington, I. ed. (1996) *Voice into Text. Orality and literacy in ancient Greece* (Mnem. Suppl. 157; Leiden).
- Wright, M. (2012) *The Comedian as Critic. Greek old comedy and poetics* (London).
- Wüst, E. (1967) *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter: Interpretationen der 12 vorsizilischen Siegeslieder, des sechsten Paians und der zehnten olympischen Ode* (Tübingen).
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2007) *Sappho in the Making. The early reception* (Cambridge, MA).

Young, D. C. (1964) 'Pindaric criticism', *The Minnesota Review* 4: 584-641. [= Calder and Stern (1970) 1-95]

—. (1968) *Three Odes of Pindar. A Literary study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7* (Mnem. Suppl. 9; Leiden).

—. (1971) *Pindar Isthmian 7. Myth and exempla* (Mnem. Suppl. 15; Leiden).

—. (1979) 'Pindar's style at *Pythian* 9.87f.', *GRBS* 20: 133-43.

—. (1983a) 'Pindar *Pythians* 2 and 3: inscriptional ποτέ and the "poetic epistle"', *HSCP* 87: 31-48.

—. (1983b) 'Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: a study in ancient criticism', *CA* 2: 156-70.

—. (1987) 'Pindar and Horace against the Telchines (*Ol.* 7.53 and *Carm.* 4.4.33)', *AJP* 108: 152-7.

—. (1993) "'Something like the gods": a Pindaric theme and the myth of *Nemean* 10', *GRBS* 34: 123-132.

Yunis, H. ed. (2003) *Written Text and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).

Zardini, F. (2009) *The Myth of Herakles and Kyknos. A study in Greek vase-painting and literature* (Verona).

Zellner, H. (2006) 'Sappho's supra-superlatives', *CQ* 56: 292-7.

Zimmermann, B. (1992) *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung* (Hypomnemata 98; Göttingen).

Zink, N. (1962) *Griechische Ausdrucksweisen für warm und kalt im seelischen Bereich* (Diss. Mainz).

Zwaan, R. A. (1993) *Aspects of Literary Comprehension. A cognitive approach* (Utrecht Publications in General and Comparative Literature 29; Amsterdam).

Appendix

Key to Abbreviations

Argumentative

Gen: Generalisation
ProGen: Prospective generalisation
Inst: Instantiation
En: Enactment
Inf: Inference
Ju: Justification
Recap: Recapitulation
Recap [Pol]: Polarization
Exp: Explanation
Adv: Adversative

Narrative

S: Sequence
Sb: Sequence backwards
Ex: Expansion
Re: Relative expansion
Ex [Par]: Parallel
Ex [Cat]: Catalogue
Ex [Desc]: Description
Priamel
Cap
Ds: Direct speech
Sf: Speech frame
Is: Indirect speech
Q: Question
A: Answer

Transitional

Authin: Authorial intervention
Imp: Imperative
RecapImp: Recapitulating imperative
Imp [Pr]: Prayer

An Annotated Text of Pindar's Victory Odes

Olympian 1

Priamel (Ju [of Pindar's song])

Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὃ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μέγανος ἑξοχα πλούτου·

(Cap, Ex [Par]; Ἄριστον→φέρτερον; αἰθόμενον→φαεννόν; πῦρ→θαλπνότερον; νυκτὶ≠ἀμέραι)

εἰ δ' ἄεθλα γαρύνει ἔλδαι, φίλον ἦτορ, μηκέτ' ἀελίου σκόπει (5) ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἀμέραι φαεννὸν ἄστρον ἐρήμας δι' αἰθέρος, μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν·

(En; αὐδάσομεν≈κελαδεῖν; ἦτορ→μητίεσσι; ἄεθλα<ἀρετῶν)

ὅθεν ὁ πολύφατος ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται σοφῶν μητίεσσι, κελαδεῖν Κρόνου παῖδ' ἐς ἀφνεῶν ἰκομένους (10) μάκαιραν Ἰέρωνος ἐστὶν, θεμιτεῖον ὃς ἀμφέπει σκάπτων ἐν πολυμήλῳ Σικελίᾳ, δρέπων μὲν κορυφὰς ἀρετῶν ἀπο πασῶν, ἀγλαΐζεται δὲ καὶ μουσικῶς ἐν αὐτῷ, (15) οἷα παίζομεν φίλαν ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν.

(Authin [description of poetry], Inst; ὕμνος→φόρμιγγα; ἐστὶν→πασσάλου; ἀρετῶν>κράτει; ὅθεν≈Πίσας; Σικελία>Συρακόσιον; μητίεσσι→φροντίσιν; σκάπτων→βασιλῆα)

ἀλλὰ Δωρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου λάμβαν', εἴ τί τοι Πίσας τε καὶ Φερενίκου χάρις νόον ὑπὸ γλυκυτάταις ἔθηκε φροντίσιν, ὅτε παρ' Ἀλφεῶι κύτο δέμας (20) ἀκέντητον ἐν δρόμοις παρέχων, κράτει δὲ προσέμειξε δεσπότην, Συρακόσιον ἵπποχάρμαν βασιλῆα·

(En, S; success/comemoration; Πίσας≈ἀποικίαι; κράτει→κλέος)

λάμπει δὲ οἱ κλέος ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίαι·

(Re, Exp [Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίαι]; now/then)

τοῦ μεγαθενῆς ἐράσσατο Γαῖαοχος (25) Ποσειδᾶν, ἐπεὶ νιν καθαροῦ λέβητος ἔξελε Κλωθῶ, ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον ὦμον κεκαδμένον.

(Gen; φαίδιμον ὦμον<θαύματα)

ἦ θαύματα πολλά, καὶ πού τι καὶ βροτῶν φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι. ||

(Exp [ἐξαπατῶντι]; ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον≈ἄπιστον; δεδαιδαλμένοι<τὰ μείλιχα)

Χάρις δ', ἅπερ ἅπαντα τεύχει τὰ μείλιχα θνατοῖς, (30) ἐπιφέρουσα τιμὰν καὶ ἄπιστον ἐμήσατο πιστόν ἔμμεναι τὸ πολλάκις·

(Adv, S; falsity/truth; ἄπιστον≠μάρτυρες)

ἀμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι.

(Inf)

ἔστι δ' ἀνδρὶ φάμεν εἰκότως ἀμφὶ δαιμόνων καλά·

(Exp [εἰκότως])

μείων γὰρ αἰτία. (35)

(En; φάμεν>φθέγξομαι; καλά>τὸν εὐνομώτατον ἐς ἔρανον; δαιμόνων≈θεοῖσι)
 υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι, ὅπότε' ἐκάλεσε πατὴρ τὸν εὐνομώτατον ἐς
 ἔρανον φίλαν τε Κίπυλον, ἀμοιβαῖα θεοῖσι δεῖπνα παρέχων, τότε' Ἀγλαοτρίαιναν ἀρπάσαι, (40)
 δαμέντα φρένας ἱμέρωι, χρυσέαισι τ' ἂν' ἵπποισι ὕπατον εὐρυτίμου ποτὶ δῶμα Διὸς μεταβάσαι·

(Ex [Par], S)

ἐνθα δευτέρωι χρόνῳ ἦλθε καὶ Γανυμήδης Ζηνὶ τῷτ' ἐπὶ χρέος. (45)

(S; ἀρπάσαι→ἄφαντος; δεῖπνα→φάγον)

ὥς δ' ἄφαντος ἔπελες, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολλὰ μαιόμενοι φῶτες ἄγαγον, ἔννεπε κρυφαῖ τις αὐτίκα
 φθονερῶν γειτόνων, ὕδατος ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν μαχαίραι τάμον κατὰ μέλη,
 τραπέζαισι τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν (50) σέθεν διεδάσαντο καὶ φάγον.

(Authin [disgust], Adv; someone/me; φάγον→γαστρίμαργον)

ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν·

(Recap)

ἀφίσταμαι·

(Ju; γαστρίμαργον→κακαγόρους)

ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους.

(En [rejecting traditional story])

εἰ δὲ δὴ τιν' ἄνδρα θνατὸν Ὀλύμπου σκοποὶ ἐτίμασαν, ἦν Τάνταλος οὗτος·

(S, Adv; positive/negative, god/men; ἐτίμασαν→ὄλβον)

ἀλλὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι (55) μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, κόρῳ δ' ἔλεν ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, ἅν τοι
 πατὴρ ὑπὲρ κρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον, τὸν αἰεὶ μενοιῶν κεφαλᾷς βαλεῖν εὐφροσύνας
 ἀλᾷται. ||

(Recap; ἄταν≈ἀπάλαμον βίον; κόρῳ→κλέψαις; ἐτίμασαν≈θέν; θνατὸν≠ἄφθιτον)

ἔχει δ' ἀπάλαμον βίον τοῦτον ἐμπεδόμοχθον μετὰ τριῶν τέταρτον πόνον, ἀθανάτους ὅτι
 κλέψαις (60) ἀλίκεσσι κυμπόταις νέκταρ ἀμβροσίαν τε δῶκεν, οἷσιν ἄφθιτον θέν νιν.

(Gen; κλέψαις<ἔρδων; ἀθανάτους≈θεὸν)

εἰ δὲ θεὸν ἀνὴρ τις ἔλπεταί <τι> λαθόμεν ἔρδων, ἀμαρτάνει.

(S; θεὸν→ἄθάνατοί; ἀνὴρ→ἀνέρων ἔθνος)

τοῦνεκα προῆκαν υἱὸν ἀθάνατοί οἱ πάλιν (65) μετὰ τὸ ταχύποτμον αὖτις ἀνέρων ἔθνος.

(S; ταχύποτμον→εὐάνθεμον ... φυάν)

πρὸς εὐάνθεμον δ' ὅτε φυάν λάχνη νιν μέλαν γένειον ἔρεφον, ἐτοῖμον ἀνεφρόντισεν γάμον
 Πισάτα παρὰ πατρὸς εὐδοξον Ἴπποδάμειαν (70) σχεθέμεν.

(S)

ἐγγυς ἐλθὼν πολιᾷς ἀλὸς οἶος ἐν ὄρφναι ἄπυεν βαρύκτυπον Εὐτρίαιναν·

(S)

ὁ δ' αὐτῶι παρ ποδὶ χεδὸν φάνη.

(S)

τῶι μὲν εἶπε· (75)

(Ds)

“Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας ἄγ' εἴ τι, Ποσειδάων, ἐς χάριν τέλλεται, πέδαςον ἔγχος Οἰνομάου
 χάλκεον, ἐμὲ δ' ἐπὶ ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἀρμάτων ἐς Ἄλιν, κράτει δὲ πέλασον.

(Ju; ἔγχος→ὀλέσαιο)

ἐπεὶ τρεῖς τε καὶ δέκ' ἄνδρας ὀλέσαιο μνακτῆρας ἀναβάλλεται γάμον (80) θυγατρός.

(PolGen [from request]; ὀλέσαιο→κίνδυνος)

ὁ μέγας δὲ κίνδυνος ἄναλκιν οὐ φῶτα λαμβάνει.

(Adv [question functions like a statement: since men must die, they should not be idle but
 seek glory]; difficult/easy; κίνδυνος→θανεῖν; ἄναλκιν→καλῶν ἄμμορος)

θανεῖν δ' οἷσιν ἀνάγκα, τά κέ τις ἀνώνυμον γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος ἔψοι μάταν, ἀπάντων
 καλῶν ἄμμορος;

(PolInst; idle/brave, someone/me; καλῶν>ἄεθλος; κίνδυνος>ἄεθλος)

ἄλλ' ἐμοὶ μὲν οὗτος ἄεθλος ὑποκείται· (85)

(Inf [Imp]; effort/success)

τὸ δὲ πράξιν φίλαν δίδοι.”

(Sf)

ὥς ἔννεπεν·

(Recap; ἔννεπεν→ἔπεσι)

οὐδ' ἀκράντοισι ἐφάψατο ἔπεσι.

(S, Exp [οὐδ' ἀκράντοισι])

τὸν μὲν ἀγάλλων θεός ἔδωκεν δίφρον τε χρύσειον πτεροῖσιν τ' ἀκάμαντας ἵππους. ||

(S)

ἔλεν δ' Οἰνομάου βίαν παρθένον τε σύνευνον·

(S; σύνευνον→ἔτεκε)

ἔτεκε λαγέτας ἐξ ἀρεταῖσι μεμαότας υἱούς.

(S; then/now)

νῦν δ' ἐν αἵμακουρίαις (90) ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται, Ἀλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθεῖς, τύμβον ἀμφίπολον
 ἔχων πολυξενωτάτῳ παρὰ βωμῶι·

(Ex [Pelop's glory]; Ἀλφειοῦ→Ὀλυμπιάδων)

τὸ δὲ κλέος τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις Πέλοπος, ἵνα ταχυτὰς ποδῶν ἐρίζεται (95) ἀκμαί τ' ἰσχύος θρασύπονοι·

(S; effort/success; ἐρίζεται→νικῶν; κλέος→εὐδίαν)

ὁ νικῶν δὲ λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίον ἔχει μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν ἀέθλων γ' ἔνεκεν·

(Adv; constancy/instability, far/near; εὐδίαν→ἐκλόν; βίον≠παράμερον; ὁ νικῶν<βροτῶν)
τὸ δ' αἰεὶ παράμερον ἐκλόν ὕπατον ἔρχεται παντὶ βροτῶν.

(Authin [present task], En [παράμερον ἐκλόν]; βροτῶν>κεῖνον; ἐκλόν→μολπᾷ)

ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι (100) κεῖνον ἱππῶι νόμῳ Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ χρή·

(En, Exp [χρή]; athletics/ethics; μολπᾷ≈ὕμνων)

πέποιθα δὲ ξένον μὴ τιν' ἀμφοτέρω καλῶν τε ἴδριν ἴαμα καὶ δύναμιν κυριώτερον τῶν γε νῦν κλυταῖσι δαιδαλωσέμεν ὕμνων πτυχαῖς. (105)

(Inf [from Hieron's success]; καλῶν→μερίμναισιν)

θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν τεαῖσι μῆδετα ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος, Ἰέρων, μερίμναισιν·

(S; now/future; μερίμναισιν>ἄρματι)

εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχὺ λίποι, ἔτι γλυκυτέραν κεν ἔλπομαι σὺν ἄρματι θοῶι κλείζειν ἐπίκουρον εὐρὼν ὁδὸν λόγων (110) παρ' εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν Κρόνιον.

(Authin [poetic task], Adv; potential/actual, future/now; λόγων→Μοῖσα; ἐπίκουρον→βέλος;
γλυκυτέραν→καρτερώτατον)

ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει·

Priamel (En)

ἐν ἄλλοις δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι·

(Cap, Inst; many/one; καρτερώτατον→ἔσχατον ... κορυφοῦται)

τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται βασιλεῦσι.

(Inf [Imp]; *ne plus ultra*/further; ἔσχατον≠πόρσιον)

μηκέτι πάπτεινε πόρσιον.

(En [by wishing for continued success, not greater achievement], Imp [Pr])

εἴη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν, (115) ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις ὁμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφία καθ' Ἑλλανας ἐόντα παντᾷ.

Olympian 2

(Q)

Ἀναξιοφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι, τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδέχομεν;

(Aa; θεόν→Διός)

ἦτοι Πίσα μὲν Διός·

(Ab; gods/men; ἥρωα→Ἡρακλῆς; Πίσα→Ὀλυμπιάδα)

Ὀλυμπιάδα δ' ἔτασεν Ἡρακλῆς ἀκρόθινα πολέμου· (5)

(Ac, Car; heroes/contemporaries; ἄνδρα→Θήρωνα; κελαδήσομεν≈γεγωνητέον;
Ὀλυμπιάδα→τετραορίας)

Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἔνεκα νικαφόρου γεγωνητέον, ὅπι δίκαιον ξένων, ἔρειμ'
Ἀκράγαντος, εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν·

(En; Ἀκράγαντος≈οἶκημα ποταμοῦ; εὐωνύμων→ὀφθαλμός; πατέρων→γνησίαις)

καμώντες οἱ πολλὰ θυμῷ ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἶκημα ποταμοῦ, Σικελίας τ' ἔσαν ὀφθαλμός, αἰὼν δ'
ἔφεπε μόρσιμος, (10) πλοῦτόν τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων γνησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς.

(Imp [Pr] [success], S; then/future; οἶκημα≈ἄρουραν; γνησίαις→πατρίαν; ἀρεταῖς→ἀέθλων)

ἀλλ' ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας, ἔδος Ὀλύμπου νέμων ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν πόρον τ' Ἀλφειοῦ, ἱανθεὶς
ἁοιδαῖς εὐφρων ἄρουραν ἔτι πατρίαν σφίσιν κόμισον λοιπῷ γένει.

(Exp; λοιπῷ≠πεπραγμένων)

τῶν δὲ πεπραγμένων (15) ἐν δίκαι τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν ἀποίητον οὐδ' ἂν Χρόνος ὁ πάντων
πατήρ δύναίτο θέμεν ἔργων τέλος·

(Adv; impossible/possible, undo/forget; κόμισον>πότμωι σὺν εὐδαίμονι)

λάθα δὲ πότμωι σὺν εὐδαίμονι γένοιτ' ἂν.

(Exp [λάθα]; πότμωι→Μοῖρα; εὐδαίμονι→ὄλβον; λάθα≈θνάσκει)

ἐσλῶν γὰρ ὑπὸ χαρμάτων πῆμα θνάσκει παλίγκοτον δαμασθέν, (20) || ὅταν θεοῦ Μοῖρα
πέμπῃ ἀνεκὰς ὄλβον ὑψηλόν.

(Inst; πῆμα→ἔπαθον)

ἔπεται δὲ λόγος εὐθρόνοις Κάδμοιο κούραις, ἔπαθον αἱ μεγάλα·

(Adv, S; negative/positive; ἔπαθον→πένθος; ὄλβον→ἀγαθῶν)

πένθος δὲ πίτνει βαρὺ κρεσσόνων πρὸς ἀγαθῶν.

(ExpA; ἀγαθῶν>ζῶει; πένθος→ἀποθανοῖς)

ζῶει μὲν ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις ἀποθανοῖς βρόμωι (25) κεραυνοῦ τανυέθαιρα Σεμέλα, φιλεῖ δὲ νιν
Παλλὰς αἰεὶ καὶ Ζεὺς πατήρ, μάλα φιλεῖ δὲ παῖς ὁ κισσοφόρος.

(ExpB; ἀγαθῶν>βίοντον ἄφθιτον; αἰεὶ→ὄλον ἀμφὶ χρόνον)

λέγοντι δ' ἐν καὶ θαλάσσαι μετὰ κόραισι Νηρῆος ἀλίαις βίοντον ἄφθιτον Ἴνοϊ τετάχθαι τὸν
ὄλον ἀμφὶ χρόνον.

(Gen; ἄφθιτον≠θανάτου; Ἴνοϊ<βροτῶν)

ἦτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται (30) πείρας οὐ τι θανάτου, οὐδ' ἠκύχιμον ἀμέραν ὁπότε παῖδ' ἀελίου
ἀτειρεῖ σὺν ἀγαθῷ τελευτάσομεν·

(Recap [Pol]; constancy/instability; ἀγαθῷ→εὐθυμῖαν; ἀτειρεῖ σὺν ἀγαθῷ≠πόνων)

ῥοαὶ δ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι εὐθυμῖαν τε μέτα καὶ πόνων ἐς ἄνδρας ἔβαν.

(Inst; εὐθυμῖαν→ὄλβωι; πόνων>πῆμ'; ἄλλοτ'→ἄλλωι ... χρόνωι)

οὕτω δὲ Μοῖρ', ἃ τε πατρώιον (35) τῶνδ' ἔχει τὸν εὐφρονα πότμον, θεόρτωι σὺν ὄλβωι ἐπὶ τι
καὶ πῆμ' ἄγει, παλιντράπελον ἄλλωι χρόνωι·

(Inst; πῆμ' > ἔκτεινε; Μοῖρ' → μόριμος; χρόνῳ → ἐξ οὐ̐περ)
ἐξ οὐ̐περ ἔκτεινε Λαῖον μόριμος υἱός συναντόμενος, ἐν δὲ Πυθῶνι χρησθέν παλαίφατον
τέλεσεν. (40) ||

(S; ἔκτεινε → ἔπεφνέ)
ἰδοῖσα δ' ὅξει' Ἐρινύς ἔπεφνέ οἱ σὺν ἀλλαλοφονίαι γένος ἀρήιον·

(S; negative/positive; ἀλλαλοφονίαι → ἐριπέντ; ἀρήιον → μάχαις)
λείφθη δὲ Θέρσανδρος ἐριπέντι Πολυνείκει, νέοις ἐν ἀέθλοισι ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου
τιμώμενος, Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἀρωγὸν δόμοι· (45)

(Par; then/now, heroes/contemporaries; ἀέθλοισι → ἐγκωμίων; τιμώμενος → λυρᾶν ...
τυγχανέμεν)
ὅθεν σπέρματος ἔχοντα ρίζαν πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε
τυγχανέμεν.

(Exp [πρέπει], En; celebration/success; ἐγκωμίων → Ὀλυμπίαι; μελέων → Χάριτες)
Ὀλυμπίαι μὲν γὰρ αὐτός γέρας ἔδεκτο, Πυθῶνι δ' ὁμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεόν Ἴσθμοι τε κοιναὶ
Χάριτες ἄνθεα τεθρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων (50) ἄγαγον·

(Gen; γέρας < τυχεῖν; Ἴσθμοι < ἀγωνίας; αὐτός < πειρώμενον)
τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν πειρώμενον ἀγωνίας δυσφρονᾶν παραλύει.

(Gen; success/preparation, athletics/wealth; τυχεῖν < τῶν τε καὶ τῶν καιρὸν)
ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν καιρὸν βαθεῖαν ὑπέχων μέριμναν
ἀγροτέραν, ἀστήρ ἀρίζηλος, ἐτυμώτατος (55) ἀνδρὶ φέγγος·

(Exp [how wealth is a saving light? What follows is not a complete thought]; μέριμναν → τὸ
μέλλον)
εἰ δέ νιν ἔχων τις οἶδεν τὸ μέλλον, ὅτι θανόντων μὲν ἐνθάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες ποινὰς
ἔτεισαν

(Exp [ποινὰς ἔτεισαν], Sb; ποινὰς → ἀλιτρά; ἐνθάδ' ≈ ἐν ταῖδε Διὸς ἀρχᾷ;
ἀπάλαμνοι → ἀνάγκαι)
— τὰ δ' ἐν ταῖδε Διὸς ἀρχᾷ ἀλιτρά κατὰ γὰρ δικάζει τις ἐχθρᾷ λόγον φράσαις ἀνάγκαι· (60)
||

(S, Ex [Desc]; negative/positive; ἀλιτρά ≠ ἐκλοῖ)
ἴσαις δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεὶ, ἴσαις δ' ἀμέραις ἄλιον ἔχοντες, ἀπονέστερον ἐκλοῖ δέκονται βίοντες, οὐ
χθόνα ταράσσοντες ἐν χερσὶ ἀκμᾷ οὐδὲ πόντιον ὕδωρ κεινὰν παρὰ δίαίταν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μὲν
τιμίῳις (65) θεῶν οἵτινες ἔχαιρον εὐορκίαις ἄδακρυν νέμονται αἰῶνα, τοῖ δ' ἀπρόσδοτον
ὀκχέοντι πόνον.

(S; negative/positive; ἐκλοῖ → ἀδίκων ἔχειν ψυχάν; παρὰ ... τιμίῳις θεῶν < ἐκατέρωθι)
ὅσοι δ' ἐτόλμασαν ἐστρίς ἐκατέρωθι μείναντες ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων ἔχειν ψυχάν, ἔτειλαν Διὸς
ὁδὸν παρὰ Κρόνου τύρσιν·

(ExA [Desc])

ἔνθα μακάρων (70) νᾶσον ὠκεανίδες αὔραι περιπνέουσιν·

(ExB [Desc]; νᾶσον→χερσόθεν; μακάρων→στεφάνους)

ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ φλέγει, τὰ μὲν χερσόθεν ἀπ' ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων, ὕδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρβει, ὄρμοις τῶν χέρας ἀναπλέκοντι καὶ στεφάνους βουλαῖς ἐν ὀρθαῖσι Ῥαδαμάνθυος, (75) ὃν πατήρ ἔχει μέγας ἐτοῖμον αὐτῷ πάρεδρον, πόσις ὁ πάντων Ῥέας ὑπέρτατον ἐχόϊας θρόνον.

(Inst [inhabitants])

Πηλεὺς τε καὶ Κάδμος ἐν τοῖσιν ἀλέγονται·

(Ex [Cat], S)

Ἀχιλλεὺς τ' ἔνικ', ἐπεὶ Ζηνὸς ἦτορ λιταῖς ἔπεισε, μάτηρ· (80) ||

(Re, Sb)

ὃς Ἴκτορα σφᾶλε, Τροίας ἄμαχον ἀτραβῆ κίονα, Κύκνον τε θανάτῳ πόρεν, Ἀοῦς τε παῖδ' Αἰθίοπα.

(Authin [vast topic of the underworld])

πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν·

(Adv [but as regards the whole subject, my arrows require interpreters, i.e. are obscure];

singular details/whole; πολλά≠τὸ πᾶν; συνετοῖσιν→ἐρμάνεων)

ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐρμάνεων (85) χατίζει.

(Adv; learning/nature; ἐρμάνεων→σοφός; ἐρμάνεων≠φυᾶι)

σοφός ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾶι·

(Adv; nature/learning, positive/negative; εἰδὼς φυᾶι≠μαθόντες; σοφός>ὄρνιχα θεῖον;

φυᾶι→θεῖον)

μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι παγγλωσσίαι κόρακες ὥς ἄκραντα γαρύετον Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον·

(Authin [poetic task], PolEn [concision, not verbosity]; ὄρνιχα θεῖον→θυμέ;

παγγλωσσίαι≠σκοπῶι)

ἔπεχε νῦν σκοπῶι τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ·

(En, Q; τόξον→βάλλομεν; σκοπῶι≈τίνα; θυμέ→φρενός)

τίνα βάλλομεν ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὐτε φρενός εὐκλέας οἰκτοὺς ἰέντες;

(A; βάλλομεν≈αὐδάσομαι; οἰκτοὺς→τανύσαις; φρενός→νόωι)

ἐπὶ τοι (90) Ἀκράγαντι τανύσαις αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόωι, τεκεῖν μὴ τιν' ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλιν φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον εὐεργέταν πρᾶπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα Θήρωνος.

(Authin [huge topic; possibility of excessive praise provides a reason for curtailing the

theme]; ἐνόρκιον λόγον>αἶνον; Θήρωνος<ἐκλῶν; εὐεργέταν<καλοῖς ἔργοις)

ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος (95) οὐ δίκαι συναντόμενος, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν, τὸ λαλαγῆσαι θέλων κρυφόν τε θέμεν ἐκλῶν καλοῖς ἔργοις·

(Exp [κρυφόν ... θέμεν]; καλοῖς ἔργοις>χάρματ'; λαλαγῆσαι≠φράσαι; ἐκλῶν>κεῖνος)
ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν, καὶ κεῖνος ὅσα χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν, τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο; (100)

Olympian 3

(Authin)

Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξείνοις ἀδεῖν καλλιπλοκάμῳ θ' Ἑλέναι κλεινὰν Ἀκράγαντα γεραίρων εὖχομαι, Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον ὀρθώσας, ἀκαμαντοπόδων ἵππων ἄωτον.

(Exp [song dedicated to the Dioscouri and Helen (οὕτω); cf. 38-41], Sb; Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον≈φωνὰν ... ἀγλαόκωμον)
Μοῖσα δ' οὕτω ποι παρέστα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι τρόπον Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ (5) ἀγλαόκωμον·

(Exp [composing a victory song]; φωνὰν ... ἀγλαόκωμον≈ἐπέων ... θέσιν;
ἐναρμόξαι→συμμεῖξαι)
ἐπεὶ χαίταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἐπὶ στέφανοι πράσσοντί με τοῦτο θεόδοματον χρέος, φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοᾶν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, ἃ τε Πίσα με γεγωνεῖν·

(Gen, Exp [Pisa and garland call for song], En; Οὐλυμπίαι≈Πίσα; ἐπέων ... θέσιν<ᾠοιδαί;
θεόδοματον→θεόμοροι; Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ<ᾧ τινι; στέφανοι≈κόσμον ἐλαίας)
τᾶς ἅπο θεόμοροι νίκοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ᾠοιδαί, (10) ᾧ τινι κραίνων ἐφετμάς Ἡρακλέος προτέρας ἀτρεκῆς Ἑλλανοδίκας γλεφάρων Αἰτωλὸς ἀνὴρ ὑψόθεν ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάλλῃ γλαυκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας, τάν ποτε Ἴκτρον ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν παγᾶν ἔνεικεν Ἀμφιτρωνιάδας, μνᾶμα τῶν Οὐλυμπίαι κάλλιστον ἀέθλων, (15) || δᾶμον Ὑπερβορέων πείσαις Ἀπόλλωνος θεράποντα λόγῳ·

(Sb, Ex [πείσαις]; ἐλαίας≈φύτευμα; Οὐλυμπίαι≈ἄλσει; ἀέθλων→ἀρετᾶν)
πιστὰ φρονέων Διὸς αἵτει πανδόκῳ ἄλσει σκιαρὸν τε φύτευμα ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις στέφανόν τ' ἀρετᾶν.

(Exp [he asked], Sb; ἄλσει→βωμῶν; ἀρετᾶν→ἀέθλων)
ἦδη γὰρ αὐτῷ, πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἀγισθέντων, διχόμηνις ὅλον χρυσάρματος ἐσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντέφλεξε Μῆνα, (20) καὶ μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἀγνὰν κρίσιν καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ἀμᾶ θῆκε ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημοῖς Ἀλφειοῦ·
(Adv; done/undone; ἐπὶ κρημοῖς Ἀλφειοῦ≈ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος; φύτευμα→δένδρε')
ἀλλ' οὐ καλὰ δένδρε' ἔθαλλεν χῶρος ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος.
(Recap; δένδρε'→κᾶπος)
τούτων ἔδοξεν γυμνὸς αὐτῷ κᾶπος ὀξεῖαις ὑπακουέμεν ἀυγαῖς ἀελίου.

(S; ἔδοξεν→θυμὸς)
δὴ τότε ἔς γαῖαν πορεύεν θυμὸς ὄρμα (25) Ἴκτριαν νιν·

(Exp [he thought to go there], Sb; θυμὸς≠ἀνάγκα)

ἔνθα Λατοῦς ἵπποσά θυγάτηρ δέξατ' ἐλθόντ' Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν καὶ πολυγνάμπτων
μυχῶν, εὐτέ νιν ἀγγελίαις Εὐρυκθέος ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα πατρόθεν χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον θήλειαν
ἄξονθ', ἄν ποτε Ταῦγέτα ἀντιθεῖς Ὀρθωσίαι ἔγραψεν ἱεράν. (30) ||

(Recap; ἔνθα→κεῖναν χθόνα)

τὰν μεθέπων ἴδε καὶ κεῖναν χθόνα πνοιαῖς ὀπιθεν Βορέα ψυχροῦ·

(Recap; ἴδε→θάμβαινε)

τόθι δένδρεα θάμβαινε σταθείς.

(Recap; θυμὸς→ἥμερος; δένδρεα→φυτεῦσαι)

τῶν νιν γλυκὺς ἥμερος ἔσχεν δωδεκάγναμpton περὶ τέρμα δρόμου ἵππων φυτεῦσαι.

(S; then/now; δρόμου→ἐορτὰν)

καὶ νυν ἐς ταύταν ἐορτὰν ἴλαος ἀντιθείοισιν νίκεται σὺν βαθυζώνοιο διδύμοις παισὶ Λήδας.
(35)

(Exp [with the Tyndaridae], Sb; ἐορτὰν→ἀγῶνα)

τοῖς γὰρ ἐπέτραπεν Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἰὼν θαητὸν ἀγῶνα νέμειν ἀνδρῶν τ' ἀρετᾶς περὶ καὶ
ῥίμφορμάτου διφρηλασίας.

(Inf [from the role in games of the Tyndaridae], Inst [διφρηλασίας]; effort/success;

ἀρετᾶς→κῦδος; διφρηλασίας→εὐίππων)

ἐμὲ δ' ὦν παι θυμὸς ὀτρύνει φάμεν Ἑμμενίδαις Θήρωνί τ' ἐλθεῖν κῦδος εὐίππων διδόντων
Τυνδαριδᾶν, ὅτι πλείστασι βροτῶν ξεινίαις αὐτοὺς ἐποίχονται τραπέζαις, (40) εὐσεβεῖ γνῶμαι
φυλάσσοντες μακάρων τελετάς.

(Ex [success], Recap; success/*ne plus ultra*; κῦδος→ἀρεταῖσιν)

εἰ δ' ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος, νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν Θήρων
ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἄπτεται οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν.

(Adv; *ne plus ultra*/further, possible/impossible; ἐσχατιὰν≠πόρῳ)

τὸ πόρῳ δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον κἀκόφοις.

(Inf)

οὗ νιν διώξω·

(Ju)

κείνους εἶην. (45)

Olympian 4

(Address)

Ἐλατῆρ ὑπέρτατε βροντᾶς ἀκαμαντόποδος Ζεῦ·

(Exp [calling on Zeus])

τεαὶ γὰρ Ὠραι ὑπὸ ποικιλοφόρμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς ἐλίσσόμεναί μ' ἔπεμψαν ὑψηλοτάτων μάρτυρ·

ἀέθλων·

(Exp [of journey to perform], Gen; ἀέθλων→εὖ πρασσόντων; ἀοιδᾶς→ἔσαναν; μ' <ἐςλοί;
ἽΩραι→αὐτίκ')

ξείνων δ' εὖ πρασσόντων ἔσαναν αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαν ποτὶ γλυκεῖαν ἐςλοί· (5)

(ImpA [Pr] [success], S; celebration/immortality; εὖ πρασσόντων>Οὐλυμπιονίκαν)
ἀλλὰ Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς Αἴτναν ἔχεις ἵπον ἀνεμόεσσαν ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶνος ὀβρίμου,
Οὐλυμπιονίκαν δέξαι Χαρίτων θ' ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον, χρονιώτατον φάος εὐρυςθενέων ἀρετῶν.

(Ju; Οὐλυμπιονίκαν≈Ψαύμιος; φάος≈κῦδος; Οὐλυμπιονίκαν→ἐλαίαι ... Πισάτιδι)

Ψαύμιος γὰρ ἵκει (10) ὀχέων, ὃς ἐλαίαι στεφανωθεὶς Πισάτιδι κῦδος ὄρσαι σπεύδει

Καμαρίναι.

(ImpB [Pr] [success]; now/future)

θεὸς εὖφρων εἴη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς·

(Ju; εὐχαῖς→ἵππων; κῦδος ... Καμαρίναι→φιλόπολιν)

ἐπεὶ νιν αἰνέω, μάλα μὲν τροφαῖς ἐτοῖμον ἵππων, χαίροντά τε ξενίαις πανδόκοις, (15) καὶ
πρὸς Ἑκυχίαν φιλόπολιν καθαρᾷ γνῶμαι τετραμμένον.

(Authin [verification]; αἰνέω→λόγον)

οὐ ψεύδει τέγξω λόγον·

(Exp [Psaumis' actions prove praise]; word/deed; λόγον≠διάπειρά)

διάπειρά τοι βροτῶν ἔλεγχος·

(Inst)

ἅπερ Κλυμένοιο παῖδα Λαμνιάδων γυναικῶν ἔλυσεν ἐξ ἀτιμίας. (20)

(Exp; ἅπερ→νικῶν)

χαλκείοι δ' ἐν ἔντεσι νικῶν δρόμον ἔειπεν Ὑψιπυλείαι μετὰ στέφανον ἰών·

(Ds)

“οὗτος ἐγὼ ταχυτάτι·

(Ex [Par])

χεῖρες δὲ καὶ ἦτορ ἴσον.

(Adv, Gen; truth/appearance; ἦτορ≠πολιαί)

φύονται δὲ καὶ νέοις (25) ἐν ἀνδράσιν πολιαί θαμάκι παρὰ τὸν ἀλικίας ἐοικότα χρόνον.”

Olympian 5

(Imp [Pr])

Ὑψηλᾶν ἀρετῶν καὶ στεφάνων ἅωτον γλυκύν τῶν Οὐλυμπίαι, Ὠκεανοῦ θύγατερ, καρδίαι
γελανεῖ ἀκαμαντόποδος τ' ἀπήνας δέκευ Ψαύμιός τε δῶρα·

(Ju; Οὐλυμπίαι→ἐορταῖς; ἀπήνας→ἡμίονοις)

ὃς τὰν σὰν πόλιν αὖξων, Καμάρινα, λαοτρόφον, βωμοὺς ἐξ διδύμους ἐγέραρεν ἑορταῖς θεῶν
μεγίσταις (5) ὑπὸ βουθυαῖαις ἀέθλων τε πεμπαμέροις ἀμίλλαις, ἵπποις ἡμιόνοις τε
μοναμπυκίαι τε.

(S; effort/success; ἀμίλλαις→νικάσας; πόλιν≈ἔδραν; αὖξων→κῦδος ... ἀνέθηκε)
τὴν δὲ κῦδος ἀβρόν νικάσας ἀνέθηκε, καὶ ὄν πατέρ' Ἀκρων' ἐκάρυξε καὶ τὰν νέοικον ἔδραν. ||

(S; success/commemoration, games/home; ἔδραν→ἄλκος)
ἴκων δ' Οἰνομάου καὶ Πέλοπος παρ' εὐηράτων σταθμῶν, ὃ πολιάοχε Παλλάς, ἀεῖδει μὲν
ἄλκος ἀγνόν (10) τὸ τεδὸν ποταμόν τε Ὡανον ἐγχωρίαν τε λίμναν καὶ σεμνοὺς ὄχετους,
Ἴππαρις οἷσιν ἄρδει στρατόν, κολλᾷ τε σταδίων θαλάμων ταχέως ὑψίγυιον ἄλκος, ὑπ'
ἀμαχανίας ἄγων ἐς φάος τόνδε δᾶμον ἀκτῶν·

(Gen [from victory]; commemoration/effort; Πέλοπος παρ' εὐηράτων σταθμῶν→ἀρεταῖσι)
αἰεὶ δ' ἄμφ' ἀρεταῖσι πόνος δαπάνη τε μάρναται πρὸς ἔργον (15) κινδύνῳ κεκαλυμμένον·

(S; effort/success; ἔργον→τυχόντες)
εὖ δὲ τυχόντες σοφοὶ καὶ πολίταις ἔδοξαν ἔμμεν. ||

(Imp [Pr] [success]; success/commemoration, men/gods; πολίταις→πόλιν; εὖ ...
τυχόντες>Ψαῦμι)

Σωτήρ ὑψινεφὲς Ζεῦ, Κρόνιον τε ναίων λόφον τιμῶν τ' Ἀλφεὸν εὐρὺ ρέοντα Ἰδαῖον τε
σεμνὸν ἄντρον, ἱκέτας κέθεν ἔρχομαι Λυδίοις ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς, αἰτήσων πόλιν εὐανορίαῖσι
τάνδε κλυταῖς (20) δαιδάλλειν, σέ τ', Ὀλυμπιόνικε, Ποσειδανίοισιν ἵπποις ἐπιτερπόμενον
φέρειν γῆρας εὐθυμον ἐς τελευτὰν υἱῶν, Ψαῦμι, παρισταμένων.

(Exp [why pray for this: Psauis has all], Inf [Imp]; *ne plus ultra*/further;
εὐθυμον→ἐξαρκέων κτεάτεσσι; ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς→εὐλογίαν; γῆρας≠θεὸς γενέσθαι)
ὕγιεντα δ' εἴ τις ὄλβον ἄρδει, ἐξαρκέων κτεάτεσσι καὶ εὐλογίαν προσιθείς, μὴ ματεύσει θεὸς
γενέσθαι.

Olympian 6

(Authin)

Χρυεᾶς ὑποστάσαντες εὐτειχεῖ προθύρῳ θαλάμου κίονας ὥς ὅτε θαητὸν μέγαρον πάξομεν·

(Ju, Gen; Χρυεᾶς→τηλαυγές; προθύρῳ→ἀρχομένου; μέγαρον<ἔργου)
ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόσωπον χρηθίμεν τηλαυγές.

(Inst [*a fortiori* of a deed needing an impressive beginning], En [πρόσωπον ... τηλαυγές];
ἔργου>ᾠδαῖς)

εἰ δ' εἴη μὲν Ὀλυμπιονίκας, βωμῶν τε μαντείῳ ταμίης Διὸς ἐν Πίσαι, (5) συνοικιστὴρ τε τῶν
κλεινῶν Κυρακοσσῶν, τίνα κεν φύγοι ὕμνον κεῖνος ἀνὴρ, ἐπικύρσαις ἀφθόνων ἀκτῶν ἐν
ἡμερταῖς ᾠδαῖς;

(Exp [posing question], Inst)

ἴτω γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ πεδίλῳ δαιμόνιον πόδ' ἔχων Σωστράτου υἱός.

(PolGen; ὕμνον→τίμῃ; Ὀλυμπιονίκας≠ἀκίνδουνοι ... ἀρεταί)
 ἀκίνδουνοι δ' ἀρεταί οὔτε παρ' ἀνδράσιν οὔτ' ἐν ναυσὶ κοίλαις (10) τίμῃ·
 (Recap [Pol]; forget/remember, easy/difficult; τίμῃ→μέμνανται; ἀκίνδουνοι≠ποναθῇ;
 Ὀλυμπιονίκας<καλὸν)
 πολλοὶ δὲ μέμνανται, καλὸν εἴ τι ποναθῇ.

(Inst)
 Ἀγχιῶ, τὴν δ' αἴνος ἐτοῖμος, ὃν ἐν δίκαι ἀπὸ γλώσσης Ἄδρακτος μάντιν Οἰκλείδαν ποτ' ἐς
 Ἀμφιάρηον φθέγγατ', ἐπεὶ κατὰ γαῖ' αὐτόν τέ νιν καὶ φαιδίμας ἵππους ἔμαρψεν.

(Ex [φθέγγατ']; αἴνος→ἔπος)
 ἐπτα δ' ἔπειτα πυρᾶν νεκρῶν τελεσθειῶν Ταλαϊονίδας (15) εἶπεν ἐν Θήβαισι τοιοῦτόν τι
 ἔπος·

(Ds)
 “Ποθέω στρατιᾶς ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς ἀμφοτέρων μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι.”

(Ex [Par]; heroes/contemporaries)
 τὸ καὶ ἀνδρὶ κώμου δεσπότηι πάρεστι Κυρακοσίῳ.

(Authin [verification])
 οὔτε δύσηρις ἐὼν οὔτ' ὦν φιλόνηκος ἄγαν, καὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμόσσαις τοῦτό γέ οἱ καφέως (20)
 μαρτυρήσω·

(Ex [oath])
 μελίφθογγοι δ' ἐπιτρέψοντι Μοῖσαι. ||

(Imp [new subject])
 ὦ Φίνις, ἀλλὰ ξεῦξον ἤδη μοι σθένος ἡμιόνων, αἱ τάχος, ὄφρα κελεύθῃ τ' ἐν καθαράῃ
 βάσομεν ὄκχον, ἵκωμαι τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν καὶ γένος·

(Ju; κελεύθῃ≈ὁδόν)

κεῖναι γὰρ ἐξ ἁλλᾶν ὁδὸν ἀγεμονεῦσαι (25) ταύταν ἐπίστανται, στεφάνους ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι
 ἐπεὶ δέξαντο·

(RecapImp; Ὀλυμπίαι→πύλας ... ἀναπιτνάμεν)
 χρὴ τοίνυν πύλας ὕμνων ἀναπιτνάμεν αὐταῖς·

(Ju)
 πρὸς Πιτάναν δὲ παρ' Εὐρώτα πόρον δεῖ κάμερον ἐλθεῖν ἐν ὥραι·

(En; now/then)
 ἅ τοι Ποσειδάωνι μιχθεῖσα Κρονίῳ λέγεται παῖδα ἰόπλοκον Εὐάδναν τεκέμεν. (30)

(Sb; τεκέμεν→ὠδῖνα)
 κρύψε δὲ παρθενίαν ὠδῖνα κόλποις·

(S; ὠδῖνα→βρέφος)

κυρίῳ δ' ἐν μηνὶ πέμπουσ' ἀμφιπόλους ἐκέλευεν ἥρῳ πορσαίνειν δόμεν Εἰλατίδαι βρέφος,
ὃς ἀνδρῶν Ἀρκάδων ἄνασσε Φαισάναι, λάχε τ' Ἀλφεὸν οἰκεῖν·

(S)

ἐνθα τραφεῖς' ὑπ' Απόλλωνι γλυκείας πρῶτον ἔψαυς' Ἀφροδίτας. (35)

(S; Ἀφροδίτας→γόνον)

οὐδ' ἔλαθ' Αἴπυτον ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ κλέπτοισα θεοῖο γόνον.

(Recap [Pol], S; θεοῖο→Πυθῶνάδ'; γόνον≈πάθας; ἔλαθ'≠χόλον)

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Πυθῶνάδ', ἐν θυμῷ πῖσαις χόλον οὐ φατὸν ὀξείαι μελέται, ὥχετ' ἰὼν
μαντευόμενος ταύτας περ' ἀτλάτου πάθας.

(S)

ἃ δὲ φοινικόκροκον ζῶναν καταθηκαμένα κάλπιδά τ' ἀργυρέαν λόχμας ὑπὸ κυανέας (40)
τίκτε θεόφρονα κοῦρον.

(S; τίκτε→Ἐλείθυιαν; θεόφρονα→ὁ χρυσοκόμας)

ταῖ μὲν ὁ χρυσοκόμας πρᾶυμητὶν τ' Ἐλείθυιαν παρέτασεν τε Μοίρας· ||

(S; Ἐλείθυιαν→αὐτίκα)

ἦλθεν δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχων ὑπ' ὠδῖνός τ' ἐρατᾶς Ἴαμος ἐς φάος αὐτίκα.

(S; ἐρατᾶς≠κνιζομένα)

τὸν μὲν κνιζομένα λεῖπε χαμαί·

(S)

δύο δὲ γλαυκῶπες αὐτόν (45) δαιμόνων βουλαῖσιν ἐθρέψαντο δράκοντες ἀμεμφεῖ ἰῶι
μελισσᾶν καδόμενοι.

(S)

βασιλεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ πετραέσσας ἐλαύνων ἵκετ' ἐκ Πυθῶνος, ἅπαντας ἐν οἴκῳ εἴρετο παῖδα, τὸν
Εὐάδνα τέκοι·

(Exp [request], Is; Πυθῶνος→Φοίβου)

Φοίβου γὰρ αὐτὸν φᾶ γεγάκειν πατρός, περὶ θνατῶν δ' ἔσεσθαι μάντιν ἐπιχθονίοις (50)
ἔξοχον, οὐδέ ποτ' ἐκλείψειν γενεάν.

(Sf)

ὥς ἄρα μάνυε.

(S)

τοὶ δ' οὐτ' ὦν ἀκοῦσαι οὐτ' ἰδεῖν εὖχοντο πεμπταῖον γεγενημένον.

(Exp [they did not see him]; ἰδεῖν≠κέκρυπτο)

ἀλλ' ἐν κέκρυπτο γὰρ σχοίνῳ βατῖαι τ' ἐν ἀπειρίτῳ, ἴων ξανθαῖσι καὶ παμπορφύροις ἀκτῖσι

βεβρεγμένος ἄβρόν (55) cῶμα·

(S; ἴων→ὄνυμ' ἄθάνατον)

τὸ καὶ κατεφάμιξεν καλεῖσθαι νιν χρόνῳ κύμπαντι μάτηρ τοῦτ' ὄνυμ' ἄθάνατον.

(S)

τερπνᾶς δ' ἐπεὶ χρυσοστεφάνοιο λάβεν καρπὸν Ἥβας, Ἀλφεῶι μέσσωι καταβαῖς ἐκάλεσσε Ποσειδᾶν' εὐρυβίαν, ὃν πρόγονον, καὶ τοξοφόρον Δάλου θεοδμάτας σκοπόν, αἰτέων λαοτρόφον τιμάν τιν' ἔαι κεφαλαῖ, (60) νυκτὸς ὑπαίθριος.

(S; σκοπόν→πατρία)

ἀντεφθέγγατο δ' ἀρτιεπὴς πατρία ὄσσα, μετάλλασεν τέ νιν.

(Ds; πατρία→τέκνον; ὄσσα≈φάμας)

“Ὅρσο, τέκνον, δεῦρο πάγκοινον ἐς χώραν ἵμεν φάμας ὅπιςθεν.” ||

(S; χώραν→πέτραν; πάγκοινον→πλειστόμβροτον; φάμας≈φωνὰν)

ἴκοντο δ' ὑψηλοῖο πέτραν ἀλίβατον Κρονίου ἔνθα οἱ ὥπασε θησαυρὸν δίδυμον (65) μαντοσύνας, τόκα μὲν φωνὰν ἀκούειν ψευδέων ἄγνωτον, εὗτ' ἂν δὲ θρασυμάχανος ἐλθὼν Ἡρακλῆς, σεμνὸν θάλος Ἀλκαῖδᾶν, πατρί ἐορτάν τε κτίσῃ πλειστόμβροτον τεθμόν τε μέγιστον ἀέθλων, Ζηνὸς ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ βωμῶι τότε αὖ χρηστήριον θέσθαι κέλευσεν. (70)

(S; εὗτ'≈ἐξ οὗ)

ἐξ οὗ πολὺκλειτον καθ' Ἑλλανας γένος Ἰαμιδᾶν·

(S)

ὄλβος ἅμ' ἔσπετο·

(S; wealth/athletics)

τιμῶντες δ' ἀρετάς ἐς φανεράν ὁδὸν ἔρχονται·

(Ju)

τεκμαίρει χρῆμ' ἕκαστον·

(Inst; ἕκαστον>μῶμος)

μῶμος ἐξ ἄλλων κρέμαται φθονεόντων τοῖς, οἷς ποτε πρώτοις περὶ δωδέκατον δρόμον (75) ἐλαυνόντεσιν αἰδοῖα ποτιστάξῃ Χάρις εὐκλέα μορφάν.

(Inst [winners in race], Adv; blame/honour, men/gods; δρόμον→ἀγῶνας)

εἰ δ' ἐτύμως ὑπὸ Κυλλάνας ὄρος, Ἀγησία, μάτρωες ἄνδρες ναιετάοντες ἐδώρησαν θεῶν κάρυκα λιταῖς θυσίαις πολλὰ δὴ πολλαῖσιν Ἑρμᾶν εὐσεβέως, ὃς ἀγῶνας ἔχει μοῖραν τ' ἀέθλων, Ἀρκαδίαν τ' εὐάνορα τιμαῖ· (80)

(Apodosis; πρώτοις→εὐτυχίαν; μοῖραν ... ἀέθλων→εὐτυχίαν; οἷς>κέθεν)

κεῖνος, ὃ παῖ Ὠστράτου, σὺν βαρυγδούπῳ πατρὶ κραίνει κέθεν εὐτυχίαν.

(Authin [reacting to praise: 'I have a certain sensation of a clear-sounding whetsone on my

tongue, i.e. I am eager and inspired to continue praising in a new vein'];
success/commemoration)

δόξαν ἔχω τιν' ἐπὶ γλώσσαι λιγυρᾷς ἀκόνας, ἃ μ' ἐθέλοντα προσέρπει καλλιρόαισι πνοαῖς.

(En; γλώσσαι→ῥυμον)

ματρομάτωρ ἐμὰ Cτυμφαλίς, εὐανθῆς Μετώπα, || πλάξιππον ἃ Θήβαν ἔτικτεν, τᾶς ἐρατεινὸν ὕδωρ (85) πίομαι, ἀνδράσιν αἰχματαῖσι πλέκων ποικίλον ῥυμον.

(En [Theban theme], ImpA; Θήβαν→Βοιωτίαν; ῥυμον→ἀλαθέσιν λόγοις)

ὄτρυνον νῦν ἐταίρους, Αἰνέα, πρῶτον μὲν Ἥραν Παρθενίαν κελαδεῖν, γυνῶναί τ' ἔπειτ', ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος ἀλαθέσιν λόγοις εἰ φεύγομεν, Βοιωτίαν ὕν. (90)

(Ju; ἀλαθέσιν→ὀρθός; λόγοις→ἀοιδᾶν)

ἔσσι γὰρ ἄγγελος ὀρθός, ἠυκόμων σκυτάλα Μοικᾶν, γλυκὺς κρατὴρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν.

(ImpB)

εἶπον δὲ μεμνᾶσθαι Κυρακοσσᾶν τε καὶ Ὀρτυγίας.

(EnA)

τὰν Ἰέρων καθαρῶι σκάπτωι διέπων, ἄρτια μηδόμενος, φοινικόπεζαν ἀμφέπει Δάματρα λευκίππου τε θυγατρὸς ἐορτάν (95) καὶ Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου κράτος.

(EnB)

ἀδύλογοι δὲ νιν λύραι μολπαί τε γινώσκοντι.

(ImpA [Pr] [praise]; now/future; μολπαί→κῶμον; σκάπτωι→ὄλβον)

μὴ θράσσοι χρόνος ὄλβον ἐφέρπων, σὺν δὲ φιλοφροσύναις εὐηράτοις Ἀγῆσια δέξαιτο κῶμον οἴκοθεν οἴκαδ' ἀπὸ Cτυμφαλίων τειχέων ποτινισόμενον, ματέρ' εὐμήλοιο λείποντ' Ἀρκαδίας. (100)

(Gen [Hagesias' ties to Sicily and Arcadia]; οἴκοθεν οἴκαδ'→δύ' ἄγκυραι)

ἀγαθαὶ δὲ πέλοντ' ἐν χειμερίαι νυκτὶ θεᾷς ἐκ ναδὸς ἀπεσκήμφθαι δύ' ἄγκυραι.

(PolRecapImp [of μὴ θράσσοι χρόνος ὄλβον ἐφέρπων]; δύ' ἄγκυραι≈τῶνδε κείνων τε)

θεός τῶνδε κείνων τε κλυτὰν αἴσαν παρέχοι φιλέων.

(ImpB; θεός→δέσποτα; φιλέων→καμάτων ἐκτός; ναδὸς→πλόον; χειμερίαι→καμάτων)

δέσποτα ποντόμεδον, εὐθὺν δὲ πλόον καμάτων ἐκτός ἐόντα δίδοι, χρυσαλακάτοιο πόσις Ἀμφιτρίτας, ἐμῶν δ' ῥυμων ἄεξ' εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος. (105)

Olympian 7

(Authin)

Φιάλαν ὥς εἴ τις ἀφνειᾷς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐλών ἔνδον ἀμπέλου καχλάζοισαν δρόσῳ δωρήσεται νεανίαί γαμβρῶι προπίνων οἴκοθεν οἴκαδε, πάγχρυσον, κορυφὰν κτεάνων, συμποσίῳ τε χάριν κᾶδός τε τιμάσαις ἐόν, ἐν δὲ φίλων (5) παρεόντων θῆκε νιν ζαλωτὸν ὁμόφρονος εὐνᾶς.

(Ex [Par] [vehicle]; ἀμπέλου ... δρόσῳ→νέκταρ; νεανίαί γαμβρῶι→ἀεθλοφόροις ἀνδράσιν; δωρήσεται→δόσιν; τις→ἐγὼ)

καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοικᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, ἱλάσκομαι, Ὀλυμπίαι Πυθοῖ τε νικῶντεςσιν· (10)

(Gen; νικῶντεςσιν<ὁ; Μοικᾶν δόσιν→φᾶμαι; ζαλωτὸν≈ὄλβιος)

ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχοντ' ἀγαθαί.

Priamel (Inst; ὄν→ἄλλον; φᾶμαι→Χάρις)

ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος ἀδυμελεῖ θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοις τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν.

(Cap, Inst; ἄλλοτε>νυν; ἄλλον>Διαγόραι; φόρμιγγι<ἀμφοτέρων)

καὶ νυν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων σὺν Διαγόραι κατέβαν, τὰν ποντίαν ὑμνέων παῖδ' Ἀφροδίτας Ἀελίοιο τε νύμφαν, Ῥόδον, εὐθυμάχαν ὄφρα πελώριον ἄνδρα παρ' Ἀλφειῷ στεφανώσασθαι (15) αἰνέσω πυγμαῖς ἅποινα καὶ παρὰ Κασταλαίαι, πατέρα τε Δαμάγητον ἀδόντα Δίκαι, Ἀσίας εὐρυχόρου τρίπολιν νᾶσον πέλας ἐμβόλῳ ναίοντα Ἀργεῖαι σὺν αἰχμᾷ. ||

(En [singing Rhodes]; ὑμνέων→ἀγγέλλων; Ῥόδον→γένναι; Ἀργεῖαι σὺν αἰχμᾷ→Ἡρακλῆος) ἐθελήσῃ τοῖσιν ἐξ ἀρχᾶς ἀπὸ Τλαπολέμου (20) ξυνὸν ἀγγέλλων διορθῶσαι λόγον, Ἡρακλῆος εὐρυςθενεῖ γένναι.

(ExpA [Ἡρακλῆος ... γένναι]; γένναι→πατρόθεν; Ἡρακλῆος→ἐκ Διὸς)

τὸ μὲν γὰρ πατρόθεν ἐκ Διὸς εὐχονται·

(ExpB; father/mother; πατρόθεν≠ματρόθεν)

τὸ δ' Ἀμυντορίδαι ματρόθεν Ἀστυδαμείας.

(En [ξυνὸν ... λόγον])

ἀμφὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων φρασὶν ἀμπλακίαι ἀναρίθμητοι κρέμονται·

(Ex [human frailty]; ἀμπλακίαι≠φέρτατον)

τοῦτο δ' ἀμάχανον εὐρεῖν, (25) ὃ τι νῦν ἐν καὶ τελευτᾷ φέρτατον ἀνδρὶ τυχεῖν.

(Inst; ἀμπλακίαι>ἔκτανεν; Τλαπολέμου→οἰκιστὴρ)

καὶ γὰρ Ἀλκμήνας κασίγνητον νόθον σκάπτῳ θεῶν σκληρᾶς ἐλαίας ἔκτανεν Τίρυνθι Λικύμνιον ἐλθόντ' ἐκ θαλάμων Μιδέας τᾶςδὲ ποτε χθονὸς οἰκιστὴρ χολωθείς.

(Gen; οἰκιστὴρ<σοφόν; χολωθείς<ταραχαί)

αἱ δὲ φρενῶν ταραχαί (30) παρέπλαγξαν καὶ σοφόν.

(S)

μαντεύσατο δ' ἐς θεὸν ἐλθών.

(S; θεὸν≈ὁ χρυσοκόμας)

τῷ μὲν ὁ χρυσοκόμας εὐώδεις ἐξ ἀδύτου ναῶν πλόον εἶπε Λερναίας ἀπ' ἀκτᾶς εὐθὺν ἐς ἀμφιθάλασσαν νομόν, ἔνθα ποτὲ βρέχε θεῶν βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας χρυσέαις νιφάδεσσι πόλιν, ἀνίχ' Ἀφαιστοῦ τέχναισιν (35) χαλκελάτῳ πελέκει πατέρος Ἀθαναία κορυφὰν κατ' ἄκραν ἀνορούσαις ἀλάλαξεν ὑπερμάκει βοᾷ.

(S; ἀλάλαξεν→ἔφριξέ)

Οὐρανὸς δ' ἔφριξέ νιν καὶ Γαῖα μάτηρ. ||

(Sb)

τότε καὶ φαυσίμβροτος δαίμων Ὑπεριονίδας μέλλον ἐντείλεν φυλάσασθαι χρέος (40) παισὶν φίλοις, ὥς ἂν θεᾷ πρῶτοι κτίσκειν βωμὸν ἐναργέα, καὶ σεμνὰν θυσίαν θέμενοι πατρὶ τε θυμὸν

ιάναιεν κόραι τ' ἐγγειβρόμωι.

(Gen [‘reverence derived from foresight produces in men excellence and delights’];

ιάναιεν→αἰδώς; μέλλον ... χρέος→προμαθέος)

ἐν δ' ἀρετάν ἔβαλεν καὶ χάρματ' ἀνθρώποισι προμαθέος αἰδώς·

(Adv; foresight/forgetting, positive/negative; προμαθέος≠λάθας)

ἐπὶ μὲν βαίνει τι καὶ λάθας ἀτέκμαρτα νέφος, (45) καὶ παρέλκει πραγμάτων ὀρθὰν ὁδὸν
ἔξω φρενῶν.

(Inst; λάθας>φλογὸς οὓ)

καὶ τοὶ γὰρ αἰθοίcas ἔχοντες σπέρμ' ἀνέβαν φλογὸς οὓ·

(S; negative/positive; φλογὸς οὓ→ἀπύροις; ἀνέβαν→ἀκροπόλει)

τεῦξαν δ' ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς ἄλcos ἐν ἀκροπόλει.

(S)

κείνοισ ὁ μὲν ξανθὰν ἀγαγὼν νεφέλαν πολλὴν ἔce χρυσόν·

(S; he/she)

αὐτὰ δέ cφισιν ὥπαce τέχναν (50) πᾶσαν ἐπιχθονίων Γλαυκῶπις ἀριστοπόνοισ χειρὶ κρατεῖν.

(S; τέχναν→ἔργα)

ἔργα δέ cωϊcιν ἐρπόντεccί θ' ὁμοῖα κέλευθοι φέρον·

(S; success/comemoration)

ἦν δέ κλέος βαθύ.

(Gen [Rhodians' skill: ‘when one is learned, even native wisdom becomes greater’])

δαέντι δέ καὶ cοφία μείζων ἄδολος τελέθει.

(Authin [suggested by the transitional *dicitur* motif; cf. *N.* 3.52-3])

φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ ῥήcιe, οὓπω, ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεὺc τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι, (55)

φανερὰν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίωι, ἄλμυροῖc δ' ἐν βένθεcιν νᾶcon κεκρύφθαι. ||

(S; δατέοντο→λάχος)

ἀπεόντοc δ' οὓτιc ἐνδειξεν λάχοc Ἀελίου·

(Recap [incredulous]; λάχοc≠ἀκλάρωτον)

καὶ ῥά νιν χώραc ἀκλάρωτον λίπον, ἀγνὸν θεόν. (60)

(S; ἀκλάρωτον→ἄμπαλον)

μναcθέντι δέ Ζεὺc ἄμπαλον μέλλεν θέμεν.

(Adv, S; intention/result)

ἀλλά νιν οὐκ εἴαcεν·

(Exp, Is)

ἐπεὶ πολιᾶς εἶπέ τιν' αὐτὸς ὄρᾱν ἔνδον θαλάσσης αὐξομένην πεδόθεν πολύβοσκον γαῖαν
ἀνθρώποισι καὶ εὖφρονα μήλοισι.

(Is)

ἐκέλευεν δ' αὐτίκα χρυσάμπυκα μὲν Λάχεσιν χειράς ἀντεῖναι, θεῶν δ' ὄρκον μέγαν (65) μὴ
παρφάμεν, ἀλλὰ Κρόνου σὺν παιδὶ νεῦσαι, φαεινὸν ἐς αἰθέρα νιν πεμφθεῖσαν ἑᾷ κεφαλᾷ
ἐξοπίσω γέρας ἔσσεσθαι.

(S)

τελεύταθεν δὲ λόγων κορυφαί ἐν ἀλαθείαι πετοῖσαι·

(Exp [words fulfilled])

βλάστε μὲν ἐξ ἄλλος ὕγρας νᾶκος, ἔχει τέ νιν ὀξειᾶν ὁ γενέθλιος ἀκτίνων πατήρ, (70) πῦρ
πνεόντων ἀρχὸς ἵππων ἔνθα Ῥόδωι ποτὲ μιχθεὶς τέκεν ἑπτὰ σοφώτατα νοήματ' ἐπὶ προτέρων
ἀνδρῶν παραδεξαμένους παῖδας, ὧν εἷς μὲν Κάμιρον πρεσβυτάτον τε Ἰάλυσον ἔτεκεν Λίνδον
τ'.

(S; νᾶκος→γαῖαν; πατήρ→πατρώϊαν)

ἀπάτερθε δ' ἔχον, διὰ γαῖαν τρίχα δασσάμενοι πατρώϊαν, (75) ἀκτέων μοῖραν, κέκληνται δέ
σφιν ἔδραι. ||

(S)

τόθι λύτρον συμφορᾶς οἰκτρᾶς γλυκὺ Τλαπολέμωι ἵσταται Τιρυνθίων ἀρχαγέται, ὥσπερ θεῶι,
μήλων τε κνισάεσσα πομπὰ καὶ κρίσις ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισι.

(Inst [contests]; ἀέθλοισι→ἄνθεσι)

τῶν ἄνθεσι Διαγόρας (80) ἐστεφανώσατο δῖς, κλεινᾷ τ' ἐν Ἴσθμῳι τετράκις εὐτυχέων, Νεμέαι
τ' ἄλλαν ἐπ' ἄλλαι, καὶ κρανααῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις.

(ExA [Cat])

ὃ τ' ἐν Ἀργεὶ χαλκὸς ἔγνω νιν, τά τ' ἐν Ἀρκαδίαι ἔργα καὶ Θήβαις, ἀγῶνές τ' ἔννομοι
Βοιωτίων, (85) Πέλλανά τ' Αἰγινά τε νικῶνθ' ἐξάκις·

(ExB [Cat])

ἐν Μεγάροισιν τ' οὐχ ἕτερον λιθίνα ψᾶφος ἔχει λόγον.

(Imp [Pr] [success], ExC [Cat]; success/celebration)

ἀλλ' ὃ Ζεῦ πάτερ, νώτοισιν Ἀταβυρίου μεδέων, τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν, ἄνδρα
τε πύξ ἀρετὰν εὐρόντα, δίδοι τέ οἱ αἰδοίαν χάριν καὶ ποτ' ἀκτῶν καὶ ποτὶ ξείνων·

(Ju)

ἐπεὶ ὕβριος ἐχθρὰν ὁδὸν (90) εὐθυπορεῖ, κάφα δαεὶς ἃ τε οἱ πατέρων ὀρθαὶ φρένες ἐξ
ἀγαθῶν ἔχρεον.

(RecapImp; victor/family; αἰδοίαν χάριν≠κρύπτε; πατέρων>Καλλιάνακτος)

μὴ κρύπτε κοινόν σπέρμ' ἀπὸ Καλλιάνακτος·

(Ju; Καλλιάνακτος<Ἐρατιδᾶν)

Ἐρατιδᾶν τοι σὺν χαρίτεσσιν ἔχει θαλίας καὶ πόλις·

(Adv; positive/negative, now/future)

ἐν δὲ μῇ μοίρῃ χρόνου ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοιαι διαιθύσσοιεν αὔραι. (95)

Olympian 8

(Address)

Μᾶτερ ὦ χρυσοστεφάνων ἀέθλων, Οὐλυμπία, δέσποιν' ἀλαθείας, ἵνα μάντιες ἄνδρες ἐμπύροις τεκμαιρόμενοι παραπειρῶνται Διὸς ἀργικεραύνου, εἴ τιν' ἔχει λόγον ἀνθρώπων πέρι μαιομένων μεγάλην (5) ἀρετὰν θυμῷ λαβεῖν, τῶν δὲ μόχθων ἀμνησθῆναι·

(Adv; effort/success; λαβεῖν~ἄνεται)

ἄνεται δὲ πρὸς χάριν εὐσεβίας ἀνδρῶν λιταῖς·

(Imp [Pr]; success/celebration; ἄνεται→στεφαναφορίαν)

ἀλλ' ὦ Πίτας εὐδενδρον ἐπ' Ἀλφεῷ ἄλκος, τόνδε κῶμον καὶ στεφαναφορίαν δέξαι·

(Ju [by precedent], Gen; τόνδε κῶμον→κλέος; στεφαναφορίαν→γέρας)

μέγα τοι κλέος αἰεὶ, (10) ὧτινι σὺν γέρας ἔσπετ' ἀγλαόν.

Priamel (En [κλέος], Inst [Olympic victor]; unity/diversity; ὧτινι<ἄλλον; γέρας<εὐπραγίας)

ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἔβαν ἀγαθῶν, πολλαὶ δ' ὁδοὶ σὺν θεοῖς εὐπραγίας.

(Cap, Inst; many/one; θεοῖς>Ζηνί; ὁδοί>πότμος; ἄλλον>ὑμμε)

Τιμόκθενες, ὕμμε δ' ἐκλάρωσεν πότμος (15) Ζηνὶ γενεθλίῳ·

(Exp; γενεθλίῳ→Ἀλκιμέδοντα; εὐπραγίας>Ὀλυμπιονίκαν)

ὅς σέ μὲν Νεμέαι πρόφατον, Ἀλκιμέδοντα δὲ παρ Κρόνου λóφωι θῆκεν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν.

(Ex [victory])

ἦν δ' ἐσορᾶν καλός, ἔργωι τ' οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων ἐξένεπε κρατέων πάλαι δολιχήρετμον Αἴγιναν πάτραν· (20)

(Re)

ἐνθα σῶτειρα Διὸς ξενίου πάρεδρος ἀσκεῖται Θέμις || ἔξοχ' ἀνθρώπων.

(Exp [ἔξοχ' ἀνθρώπων]; Θέμις→ὀρθᾷ διακρίνειν φρενὶ)

ὅ τι γὰρ πολὺ καὶ πολλᾷ ρέπῃ, ὀρθᾷ διακρίναι φρενὶ μὴ παρὰ καιρόν δυσπαλές·

(Adv; instability/constancy, negative/positive, men/gods; ξενίου→ξένοις)

τεθμὸς δέ τις ἀθανάτων καὶ τάνδ' ἀλιερκέα χώραν (25) παντοδαποῖσιν ὑπέστασε ξένοις κίονα δαιμονίαν

(Imp [Pr] [praise])

—ὁ δ' ἐπαντέλλων χρόνος τοῦτο πράσσων μὴ κάμοι—

Δωριεὶ λαῶι ταμεινομένην ἐξ Αἰακοῦ· (30)

(Re)

τὸν παῖς ὁ Λατοῦς εὐρυμέδων τε Ποσειδάν, Ἰλίοι μέλλοντες ἐπὶ στέφανον τεῦξαι, καλέσαντο συνεργόν τείχεος, ἦν ὅτι νιν πεπρωμένον ὀρνυμένων πολέμων πτολιπόρθοις ἐν μάχαις (35)

λάβρον ἀμνηεῦσαι καπνόν.

(S; τείχεος≈πύργον)

γλαυκοὶ δὲ δράκοντες, ἐπεὶ κτίσθη νέον, πύργον ἐσαλλόμενοι τρεῖς, οἱ δύο μὲν κάπετον, αὖθι δ' ἀτυζόμενοι ψυχὰς βάλλον, εἷς δ' ἐνόρουσε βοάσαις. (40)

(S; δράκοντες≈τέρας)

ἔννεπε δ' ἀντίον ὀρμαίνων τέρας εὐθὺς Ἀπόλλων·

(Ds)

“Πέργαμος ἀμφὶ τεαῖς, ἦρως, χερὸς ἐργασίαις ἀλίσκεται·

(Ju)

ὥς ἐμοὶ φάσμα λέγει Κρονίδα πεμφθὲν βαρυγδούπου Διός· ||

(Ex [sacking]; τεαῖς→céθεν)

οὐκ ἄτερ παίδων céθεν, ἀλλ' ἅμα πρώτοις ἄρξεται (45) καὶ τετράτοις.”

(S, Sf)

ὥς ἦρα θεὸς κάφα εἶπαις Ξάνθον ἤπειγεν καὶ Ἀμαζόνας εὐίππους καὶ ἐς Ἴκτρον ἐλαύνων.

(S, Ex [Par])

Ὅρσοτρίαινα δ' ἐπ' Ἴσθμῳ ποντῖαι ἄρμα θοὸν τάνυεν, ἀποπέμπων Αἰακόν (50) δεῦρ' ἀν' ἵπποις χρυσεαῖς καὶ Κορίνθου δειράδ' ἐποψόμενος δαιτικλυτάν.

(ProGen [‘nothing will be equally pleasing to everyone’?]; δαιτικλυτάν→τερπνόν)

τερπνὸν δ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἥϊον ἔσσεται ἢ οὐδέν.

(Inst [unequal pleasure]; τερπνόν≠φθόνος; δαιτικλυτάν→κῦδος)

εἰ δ' ἐγὼ Μελησία ἐξ ἀγενείων κῦδος ἀνέδραμον ὕμνῳ, μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος· (55)

(Ju [for the envious not attacking the poet: he will not relent]; κῦδος≈ταύταν χάριν;

ἀγενείων≠ἀνδρῶν)

καὶ Νεμέαι γὰρ ὁμῶς ἐρέω ταύταν χάριν, τὰν δ' ἔπειτ' ἀνδρῶν μάχας ἐκ παγκρατίου.

(Gen [from trainer's success])

τὸ διδάσασθαι δέ τοι εἰδότε ράϊτερον·

(Recap [Pol]; understanding/ignorance, negative/positive; εἰδότε≠τὸ μὴ προμαθεῖν)

ἄγνωμον δὲ τὸ μὴ προμαθεῖν· (60)

(Exp [ἄγνωμον]; τὸ μὴ προμαθεῖν→ἀπειράτων)

κουφότεραι γὰρ ἀπειράτων φρένες.

(PolInst; negative/positive; κουφότεραι≠περαιότερον ἄλλων)

κεῖνα δὲ κεῖνος ἂν εἴποι ἔργα περαιότερον ἄλλων, τίς τρόπος ἄνδρα προβάσει ἐξ ἱερῶν ἀέθλων μέλλοντα ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν φέρειν.

(Exp [Melesias is supremely qualified], Inst; ἄνδρα>Ἀλκιμέδων; δόξαν→νίκαν)
νῦν μὲν αὐτῷ γέρας Ἀλκιμέδων (65) νίκαν τριακοστὰν ἐλών· ||

(Sb, Ex [νίκαν]; success/effort)

ὃς τύχαι μὲν δαίμονος, ἀνορέας δ' οὐκ ἀμπλακών ἐν τέτρασιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοις
νόστον ἔχθιστον καὶ ἀτιμότεραν γλῶσσαν καὶ ἐπικρυφον οἶμον, πατρὶ δὲ πατρὸς ἐνέπνευεν
μένος (70) γήραος ἀντίπαλον·

(Gen, Exp [effect on grandfather]; πατρὶ<ἀνὴρ; μένος→Αἶδα ... λάθεται; γήραος→Αἶδα)
Αἶδα τοι λάθεται ἄρμενα πράξαις ἀνὴρ.

(Authin [mention of glory]; success/commemoration, forget/remember; λάθεται≠μνημοσύνην;
ἄρμενα→στέφανος)

ἀλλ' ἐμὲ χρὴ μνημοσύνην ἀνεγείροντα φράσαι χειρῶν ἄωτον Βλεψιάδαις ἐπίνικον, (75) ἔκτος
οἷς ἤδη στέφανος περικείται φυλλοφόρων ἀπ' ἀγώνων.

(Gen, Ex [praise for the Βλεψιάδαις, including the dead]; ἐπίνικον<κὰν νόμον ἐρδομένων)
ἔστι δὲ καὶ τι θανόντεσσιν μέρος κὰν νόμον ἐρδομένων·

(Recap [Pol]; θανόντεσσιν→κόνις; στέφανος≈κεδνὰν χάριν; Βλεψιάδαις→συγγόνων)
κατακρύπτει δ' οὐ κόνις συγγόνων κεδνὰν χάριν. (80)

(Inst [potential]; συγγόνων→γένει; χάριν≈κόσμον)

Ἑρμῆ δὲ θυγατρὸς ἀκούσαις Ἰφίων Ἀγγελίας, ἐνέποι κεν Καλλιμάχῳ λιπαρόν κόσμον
Ὀλυμπίαι, ὃν σφί Ζεὺς γένει ὥπασεν.

(Imp [Pr] [success]; now/future; κόσμον→ἐπ' ἐκλοῖς)

ἐσλὰ δ' ἐπ' ἐκλοῖς ἔργα θέλοι δόμεν, ὀξεῖας δὲ νόσους ἀπαλάλκοι. (85)

(PolRecapImp; ἔργα≈καλῶν)

εὐχομαι ἀμφὶ καλῶν μοίραι νέμεσιν διχόβουλον μὴ θέμεν·

(PolRecapImp; νόσους≠ἀπήμαντον; καλῶν→ἀέξοι)

ἀλλ' ἀπήμαντον ἄγων βίον αὐτοῦς τ' ἀέξοι καὶ πόλιν.

Olympian 9

(Authin)

Τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνᾷεν Ὀλυμπίαι, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδός, ἄρκεσε
Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστῳ σὺν ἐταίροις·

(Adv, ImpA; then/now; μέλος→Μοικᾶν; Κρόνιον ... ὄχθον≈ἀκρωτήριον Ἄλιδος)

ἀλλὰ νῦν ἐκαταβόλων Μοικᾶν ἀπὸ τόξων (5) Δία τε φοινικοστερόπαν σεμνόν τ' ἐπίνειμαι
ἀκρωτήριον Ἄλιδος τοιοῖδε βέλεσσιν, τὸ δὴ ποτε Λυδὸς ἦρως Πέλοψ ἐξάρατο κάλλιστον
ἔδνον Ἴπποδαμείας· (10)

(Ex [Par], ImpB; βέλεσσιν→οἰκτόν)

πετρόεντα δ' ἱεὶ γλυκύν Πυθῶνάδ' οἰκτόν·

(Ju; πετρόεντα≠χαιμαίπετέων; Πυθῶνάδ'→παλαίεσσι)

οὔτοι χαιμαίπετέων λόγων ἐφάνηαι, ἀνδρὸς ἀμφὶ παλαίεσσι φόρμιγγ' ἐλελίζων κλεινᾶς
ἐξ Ὀπόμεντος·

(RecapImp; athletics/culture; λόγων→αινήσαις; ἀνδρὸς→υἰόν; κλεινᾶς→μεγαλόδοξος)
αἰνήσαις ἔ και υἰόν, ἂν Θέμις θυγάτηρ τέ οἱ σώτειρα λέλογχεν (15) μεγαλόδοξος Εὐνομία.

(En, Ju; culture/athletics, home/games; Πυθῶνάδ'→Κακταλία)
θάλλει δ' ἀρεταῖσιν κόν τε, Κακταλία, πάρα Ἀλφεοῦ τε ῥέεθρον·
(Recap; games/home, success/commemoration; Ὀπόεντος≈Λοκρῶν ... ματέρ')
ὄθεν στεφάνων ἄωτοι κλυτὰν Λοκρῶν ἐπαείροντι ματέρ' ἀγλαόδεδρον. (20)

(Authin [glory], Inst [athletic success]; Λοκρῶν ... ματέρ'≈πόλιν; στεφάνων→ἀγγελίαν)
ἐγὼ δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων αἰοιδαῖς, καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου θᾶσσαν καὶ ναὸς
ὑποπτέρου παντῶι ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν, εἰ σὺν τινι μοιριδίῳι παλάμαι (25) ἐξαίρετον
Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον·

(Exp [dissemination depends upon Charites]; παλάμαι→τὰ τέρπν')
κεῖναι γὰρ ὥπασαν τὰ τέρπν'·

(Gen; κεῖναι<δαίμον'; τὰ τέρπν'→σοφοί)
ἀγαθοὶ δὲ καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμον' ἄνδρες || ἐγένοντ'·

(Inst; ἀγαθοὶ>Ἡρακλῆς)
ἐπεὶ ἀντίον πῶς ἂν τριόδοντος Ἡρακλῆς σκύταλον τίναξε χερσίν, (30) ἀνίκ' ἀμφὶ Πύλον
σταθεὶς ἥρειδε Ποσειδάν, ἥρειδεν δὲ νιν ἀργυρέῳ τόξῳ πολεμίζων Φοῖβος, οὐδ' Αἶδας
ἀκινήταν ἔχε ῥάβδον, βρότεια σώμαθ' αἱ κατάγει κοίλαν πρὸς ἄγυιαν θναϊσκόντων;

(Authin [impiety], Imp)
ἀπό μοι λόγον (35) τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον·
(Ju; λόγον τοῦτον<λοιδορῆσαι θεούς)
ἐπεὶ τό γε λοιδορῆσαι θεούς ἐχθρὰ σοφία, καὶ τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρόν μανίαισιν
ὑποκρέκει.
(RecapImp; καυχᾶσθαι→λαλάγει)
μὴ νῦν λαλάγει τὰ τοιαῦτ'·
(PolRecapImp; τὰ τοιαῦτ'>μάχαν; θεούς≈ἀθανάτων)
ἔα πόλεμον μάχαν τε πᾶσαν (40) χωρὶς ἀθανάτων·

(En, Inf [Imp]; negative/positive; ἀθανάτων>Διὸς; λαλάγει→γλῶσσαν)
φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας ἄτει γλῶσσαν, ἴν' αἰολοβρόντα Διὸς αἶσαι Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε
Παρνασσοῦ καταβάντε δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον, ἄτερ δ' εὐνᾶς ὁμόδαμον κτισσάσθαι λίθινον
γόνον· (45)

(S; λίθινον→λαοὶ)
λαοὶ δ' ὀνόμασθεν.
(RecapImp; γλῶσσαν→οἶμον λιγύν)
ἔγειρ' ἐπέων σφιν οἶμον λιγύν, αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων νεωτέρων.

(En)
λέγοντι μάν χθόνα μὲν κατακλύσαι μέλαιναν (50) ὕδατος χθένος, ἀλλὰ Ζηνὸς τέχναις
ἀνάπωτιν ἐξαίφνας ἄντλον ἐλεῖν.

(S)

κείνων δ' ἔσαν χαλκάσπιδες ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι ἀρχᾶθεν, Ἰαπετιονίδος φύτλας (55) κοῦροι κορᾶν καὶ φερτάτων Κρονιδᾶν, ἐγγώριοι βασιλῆες αἰεὶ, || πρὶν Ὀλύμπιος ἀγεμὼν θύγατρ' ἀπὸ γᾶς Ἐπειῶν Ὀπόντος ἀναρπάσαις, ἔκαλος μίχθη Μαιναλῖαισιν ἐν δειραῖς, καὶ ἔνεικεν Λοκρῶι, μὴ καθέλοι νιν αἰὼν πότμον ἐφάψαις (60) ὀρφανὸν γενεᾶς.

(Exp [childlessness avoided]; γενεᾶς→υἰόν)

ἔχεν δὲ σπέρμα μέγιστον ἄλοχος, εὐφράνθη τε ἰδὼν ἥρως θετὸν υἰόν, μάτρωος δ' ἐκάλεσσε νιν ἰσώνυμον ἔμμεν, ὑπέρφατον ἄνδρα μορφᾷ τε καὶ (65) ἔργοις.

(S)

πόλιν δ' ὥπασεν λαόν τε διαιτᾶν.

(S; locals/non-local)

ἀφίκοντο δέ οἱ ξένοι ἐκ τ' Ἄργεος ἐκ τε Θηβᾶν, οἱ δ' Ἀρκάδες, οἱ δὲ καὶ Πικῆται·

(Cap, Inst; ξένοι≈ἐποίκων)

υἷὸν δ' Ἄκτορος ἐξόχως τίμασεν ἐποίκων Αἰγίνας τε Μενότιον·

(S)

τοῦ παῖς ἄμ' Ἀτρεΐδαις (70) Τεύθραντος πεδίον μολὼν ἔστα σὺν Ἀχιλλεῖ μόνος, ὅτ' ἀλκάντας Δαναοὺς τρέψαις ἀλῖαισιν πρύμναις Τήλεφος ἔμβαλεν·

(Result; ἔστα→βιατὰν νόον)

ὥστ' ἔμφορον δειῖξαι μαθεῖν Πατρόκλου βιατὰν νόον· (75)

(S; βιατὰν νόον→Ἄρει)

ἐξ οὗ Θετίος ἱγόνος οὐλίῳ νιν ἐν Ἄρει παραγορεῖτο μὴ ποτε σφετέρως ἄτερθε ταξιοῦσθαι δαμασιμβρότου αἰχμᾶς.

(Authin [hint of inappropriate subject in foreshadowing of Patroclus' death (cf. πρόσφορος)], ImpA [Pr])

εἶην εὐρησιεπὴς ἀναγεῖσθαι (80) πρόσφορος ἐν Μοικᾶν δίφρῳ·

(ImpB [Pr])

τόλμα δὲ καὶ ἀμφιλαφὴς δύναμις ἔσποιτο.

(Ju, En)

προξενίαι δ' ἀρετᾷ τ' ἤλθον τιμάορος Ἰσθμῖαισι Λαμπρομάχου μίτραις, ὅτ' ἀμφοτέρωι κράτησαν || μίαν ἔργον ἄν' ἀμέραν. (85)

(ExA [Cat])

ἄλλαι δὲ δύο ἐν Κορίνθου πύλαις ἐγένοντο· ἔπειτα χάρμαι, ταὶ δὲ καὶ Νεμέας Ἐφαρμόστωι κατὰ κόλπον·

(ExB [Cat])

Ἄργει τ' ἔσχεθε κῦδος ἀνδρῶν, παῖς δ' ἐν Ἀθάναις, οἷον δ' ἐν Μαραθῶνι κυλαθεὶς ἀγενεῖων μένεν ἀγῶνα πρεσβυτέρων ἀμφ' ἀργυρίδεσσιν· (90)

(Ex [victory]; ἀγενείων≠φῶτας)

φῶτας δ' ὄξυρεπεῖ δόλῳ ἀπῳτὶ δαμάσσαις διήρχετο κύκλον ὄσαι βοᾷ, ὥραϊος ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς κάλλιτά τε ῥέξαις.

(ExC [Cat]; ὥραϊος→θαυμαστὸς)

τὰ δὲ Παρρασίῳ στρατῷ (95) θαυμαστὸς ἐὼν φάνη Ζηνὸς ἀμφὶ πανάγυριν Λυκαίου, καὶ ψυχρᾷ ὅπῳ εὐδιανὸν φάρμακον αὐρᾷ Πελλάναι φέρε·

(ExD [Cat])

κύνδικος δ' αὐτῷ Ἰολάου τύμβος ἐνναλία τ' Ἐλευσίς ἀγλαΐαισιν.

(Gen)

τὸ δὲ φυᾷ κράτιστον ἅπαν·

(Adv; one/many, nature/learning, negative/positive; φυᾷ≠διδασκαίς)

πολλοὶ δὲ διδασκαίς (100) ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταίς κλέος ὄρουσαν ἀρέσθαι·

(Adv; effort/celebration, men/gods, many/one; διδασκαίς~ἄνευ ... θεοῦ; κλέος≠κεσιγαμένον)

ἄνευ δὲ θεοῦ, κεσιγαμένον οὐ σκαιότερον χρῆμ' ἕκαστον·

(Exp [why the divine is necessary: some paths do not lead to success; no single rational regimen will lead invariably to success]; one/many)

ἐντὶ γὰρ ἄλλαι ὁδῶν ὁδοὶ περαιτέραι, (105) μία δ' οὐχ ἅπαντας ἄμμε θρέψει μελέτα·

(Gen; μελέτα<σοφαί; περαιτέραι→αἰπειναί)

σοφαί μὲν αἰπειναί·

(Adv, PolInst [simple, unstudied praise]; learning/nature; σοφαί≠δαιμονίαι;

αἰπειναί≠θαρσέων)

τοῦτο δὲ προσφέρων ἄεθλον, ὀρθιον ὄρυσαι θαρσέων, τόνδ' ἀνέρα δαιμονίαι γεγάμεν (110)

εὐχειρα, δεξιόγυιον, ὀρῶντ' ἀλκάν, Αἴαν, τεόν τ' ἐν δαιτί, Ἰλιάδα, νικῶν ἐπεστεφάνωσε βωμόν.

Olympian 10

(ImpA)

Τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἀνάγνωτέ μοι Ἀρχεστράτου παῖδα, πόθι φρενός ἐμᾶς γέγραπται·

(Ju; γέγραπται≠ἐπιλέλαθ')

γλυκὺ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέλος ὀφείλων ἐπιλέλαθ'·

(ImpB; ὀφείλων~ἐνιπᾶν)

ὦ Μοῖς, ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἀλάθεια Διός, ὀρθᾷ χερὶ ἐρύκετον ψευδέων (5) ἐνιπᾶν ἀλιτόξενον.

(Ju; ἐνιπᾶν→καταίσχυνε)

ἕκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος ἐμὸν καταίσχυνε βαθὺ χρέος.

(Adv; debt/interest; χρέος→τόκος; καταίσχυνε→ἐπιμομφάν)

ὅμως δὲ λῦσαι δυνατὸς ὀξεῖαν ἐπιμομφάν τόκος.

(Inst, Inf [Imp]; τόκος→τείκομεν)

ὁράτω νῦν ψᾶφον ἐλικομέναν ὅπῃ κῦμα κατακλύσσει ῥέον, (10) ὅπῃ τε κοινὸν λόγον φίλαν τείκομεν ἐς χάριν.

(Exp [κοινὸν λόγον ... τείκομεν]; κοινὸν λόγον→Καλλιόπα)

νέμει γὰρ Ἀτρέκεια πόλιν Λοκρῶν Ζεφυρίων, μέλει τέ σφισι Καλλιόπα καὶ χάλκεος Ἄρης.

(Inst [Locrian valor]; contemporaries/heroes; Ἄρης→μάχα)

τράπε δὲ Κύκνεια μάχα καὶ ὑπέρβιον (15) Ἡρακλέα·

(Ex [Par]; heroes/contemporaries; μάχα→πύκτας; τράπε→νικῶν)

πύκτας δ' ἐν Ὀλυμπιάδι νικῶν Ἴλαι φερέτω χάριν Ἀηκίδαμος, ὥς Ἀχιλεῖ Πάτροκλος.

(Gen; Ἀηκίδαμος<φύντ'; Ἴλαι<ἀνὴρ; νικῶν→κλέος)

θάξαις δέ κε φύντ' ἀρετᾷ ποτί (20) πελώριον ὁρμάσαι κλέος ἀνὴρ θεοῦ σὺν παλάμαις. ||

(Recap [Pol], Adv; difficult/easy; θάξαις≠ἄπονον; κλέος→φάος)

ἄπονον δ' ἔλαβον χάρμα παῦροί τινες, ἔργων πρὸ πάντων βίότῳ φάος.

(Authin [fame], PolInst [Heracles did not win ἄπονον ... χάρμα]; ἄπονον≠μικθὸν ὑπέρβιον πράσσοιτο; ἔργων→ἀγῶνα)

ἀγῶνα δ' ἐξαίρετον ἀεῖσαι θέμιτες ὄρσαν Διός, ὃν ἀρχαῖοι κάματι παρ Πέλοπος ἱβωμῶι ἐξάριθμον ἐκτίσσατο, (25) ἐπεὶ Ποσειδάνιον πέφνε Κτέατον ἀμύμονα, πέφνε δ' Εὐρυτον, ὥς Αὐγέαν λάτριον ἀέκονθ' ἐκὼν μικθὸν ὑπέρβιον πράσσοιτο, λόχμαισι δὲ δοκεύσαις ὑπὸ Κλεωνᾶν δάμασε καὶ κείνου· Ἡρακλῆς ἐφ' ὁδῶι, (30) ὅτι πρόσθε ποτὲ Τιρύνθιον ἔπερσαν αὐτῶι στρατὸν μυχοῖς ἤμενον Ἄλιδος Μολίονες ὑπερφίαλοι.

(S; μικθὸν→πολυκτέανον; ἔπερσαν→ὀχετὸν ἄτας)

καὶ μὲν ξεναπάτας Ἐπειῶν βασιλεὺς ὀπιθεν (35) οὐ πολλὸν ἶδε πατρίδα πολυκτέανον ὑπὸ στερεῶι πυρὶ πλαγαῖς τε σιδάρου βαθὺν εἰς ὀχετὸν ἄτας ἵζοιεν ἐὰν πόλιν.

(Gen; ἄτας→νεῖκος)

νεῖκος δὲ κρεσσόνων ἀποθέσθ' ἄπορον. (40)

(Inst; νεῖκος→άλώσιος)

καὶ κεῖνος ἀβουλίαι ὕστατος ἀλώσιος ἀντάσαις θάνατον αἰπὺν οὐκ ἐξέφυγεν. ||

(S; ἀλώσιος→στρατόν)

ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἐν Πίσαι ἔλκαις ὄλον τε στρατὸν λάϊαν τε πᾶσαν Διὸς ἄλκιμος υἱὸς σταθμᾶτο ζάθεον ἄλκος πατρὶ μεγίστωι· (45)

(S; ἄλκος≈Ἄλτιν; σταθμᾶτο→πάξαις)

περὶ δὲ πάξαις Ἄλτιν μὲν ὅγ' ἐν καθαρῶι διέκρινε, τὸ δὲ κύκλῳ πέδον ἔθηκε δόρπου λύειν, τιμάσαις πόρον Ἀλφειοῦ μετὰ δώδεκ' ἀνάκτων θεῶν·

(S)

καὶ πάγον Κρόνου προσεφθέγγετο·

(Exr, Sb; προσεφθέγγατο≠νώνυμος)

πρόσθε γάρ (50) νώνυμος, ἄς Οἰνόμαος ἄρχε, βρέχετο πολλὰ νιφάδι.

(S; πρόσθε→Χρόνος)

ταῦται δ' ἐν πρωτογόνῳ τελετᾷ παρέσταν μὲν ἄρα Μοῖραι σχεδὸν ὅ τ' ἐξελέγγων μόνος ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον Χρόνος.

(S; πρωτογόνῳ→πρώται; τελετᾷ→ἐορτὰν)

τὸ δὲ σαφανὲς ἰὼν πόρῳ κατέφρασεν, (55) ὅπῃ τὰν πολέμοιο δόσιν ἀκρόθινα διελὼν ἔθυε καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ὅπως ἄρα ἔσταςεν ἐορτὰν σὺν Ὀλυμπιάδι πρώται νικαφορίαίσι τε·

(Q [prompted by mention of victories]; νικαφορίαίσι→στεφάνον; πρώται→ποταίνιον)

τίς δὴ ποταίνιον (60) ἔλαχε στεφάνον χεῖρεσσι ποσὶν τε καὶ ἄρματι, ἀγώνιον ἐν δόξαι θέμενος εὖχος, ἔργῳ καθελὼν; ||

(A, ExA [Cat]; ποσὶν→ποσσί; στεφάνον→ἀρίστευσεν)

στάδιον μὲν ἀρίστευσεν, εὐθὺν τόνον ποσὶ τρέχων, παῖς ὁ Λικυμνίου (65) Οἰωνός·

(Sb)

ἴκεν δὲ Μιδέαθεν στρατὸν ἐλαύνων·

(ExB [Cat])

ὁ δὲ πάλαι κυδαίνων Ἔχεμος Τεγέαν·

(ExC [Cat])

Δόρυκλος δ' ἔφερε πυγμᾶς τέλος, Τίρυνθα ναίων πόλιν·

(ExD [Cat])

ἀν' ἵπποισι δὲ τέτρασιν ἀπὸ Μαντινέας Σᾶμος ὁ Ἀλιροθίου· (70)

(ExE [Cat])

ἄκοντι Φράκτωρ ἔλασε σκοπόν·

(ExF [Cat])

μᾶκος δὲ Νικεὺς ἔδике πέτρῳ χέρα κυκλώσας ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων, καὶ συμμαχία θόρυβον παραιθύξε μέγαν·

(S)

ἐν δ' ἔσπερον ἔφλεξεν εὐώπιδος κελάνας ἐρατὸν φάος. (75)

(S)

αἰείδετο δὲ πᾶν τέμενος τερπναῖσι θαλίαις τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον.

(Ex [Par], S, Imp; then/how; ἐγκώμιον ... τρόπον→ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν νίκας;

αἰείδετο→κελαδησόμεθα; τέμενος→Διός)

ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι καὶ νυν ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν νίκας ἀγερώχου κελαδησόμεθα βροντὰν καὶ πυρπάλαμον βέλος (80) ὀρσικτύπου Διός, ἐν ᾧ παντὶ κράτει αἰθωνα κεραυνὸν ἀραρότα·

(Recap; κελαδησόμεθα→μελέων)

χλιδῶσα δὲ μολπὰ πρὸς κάλαμον ἀντιάξει μελέων, || τὰ παρ' εὐκλείη Δίρκαί χρόνῳ μὲν φάνεν· (85)

(Adv; late/dear; χρόνῳ→νεότατος τὸ πάλιν)

ἀλλ' ὅτε παῖς ἐξ ἀλόχου πατρί ποθεινὸς ἵκοντι νεότατος τὸ πάλιν ἤδη, μάλα δέ οἱ θερμαίνει φιλότατι νόον·

(Exp [θερμαίνει φιλότατι νόον], PolGen; πατρί<θνάσκοντι; θερμαίνει≠κυγερώτατος; παῖς ἐξ ἀλόχου≠ἐπακτὸν)

ἐπεὶ πλοῦτος ὁ λαχὼν ποιμένα ἐπακτὸν ἀλλότριον θνάσκοντι κυγερώτατος· (90)

(PolEx [Par] [vehicle]; θνάσκοντι→εἰς Αἶδα; θερμαίνει φιλότατι νόον→τερπνόν; πλοῦτος→μόχθῳ)

καὶ ὅταν καλὰ ἔρξαις ἀοιδᾶς ἄτερ, Ἀηγίδαμ', εἰς Αἶδα σταθμόν ἀνὴρ ἵκηται, κενεὰ πνεύσαις ἔπορε μόχθῳ βραχὺ τι τερπνόν.

(PolInst; someone/you; ἀοιδᾶς ἄτερ≠λύρα; τερπνόν→χάριν)

τὴν δ' ἀδυεπὴς τε λύρα γλυκύς τ' αὐλὸς ἀναπάσσει χάριν·

(S, Gen; now/future, celebration/immortality; λύρα→κόραι Πιερίδες)

τρέφοντι δ' εὐρὺ κλέος (95) κόραι Πιερίδες Διός.

(Adv; god/men, immortality/celebration; κόραι Πιερίδες→μέλιτι ... καταβρέχων)

ἐγὼ δὲ συνεφαπτόμενος σπουδαί, κλυτὸν ἔθνος Λοκρῶν ἀμφέπεσον, μέλιτι εὐάνορα πόλιν καταβρέχων·

(Ex [completed task]; city/victor; μέλιτι ... καταβρέχων≈αἶνησα; εὐάνορα→κρατέοντα)

παῖδ' ἐρατὸν <δ'> Ἀρχεστράτου αἶνησα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾷ (100) βωμόν παρ' Ὀλύμπιον κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον ιδέαι τε καλὸν ὥραι τε κεκραμένον, ἃ ποτε ἀναιδέα Γανυμήδει μόρον ἄλαλκε σὺν Κυπρογενεῖ.

Olympian 11

Priamel (Ju [song])

Ἦστιν ἀνθρώποις ἀνέμων ὅτε πλείστα χρῆσις·

(Ex [Par]; ἀνέμων→οὐρανίων ὑδάτων)

ἔστιν δ' οὐρανίων ὑδάτων, ὀμβρίων παίδων νεφέλας·

(Cap, Ex [Par])

εἰ δὲ σὺν πόνῳ τις εὖ πράσσοι, μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι ὑστέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων (5) τέλλεται καὶ πιστὸν ὄρκιον μεγάλας ἀρεταῖς.

(Inst [*a fortiori*]; τις>Ὀλυμπιονίκαις; ὕμνοι→αἶνος)

ἀφθόνητος δ' αἶνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαις οὗτος ἄγκειται.

(Authin [huge subject, poetic task], PolInst [pithy, not abundant praise]; αἶνος→γλῶσσα)

τὰ μὲν ἀμετέρα γλῶσσα ποιμαίνειν ἐθέλει, ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἀνὴρ σοφαῖς ἀνθεῖ πραπίδεσσιν ὁμοίως. (10)

(Inst [praise ἐκ θεοῦ]; γλῶσσα→κελαδήσω)

ἴσθι νῦν, Ἀρχεστράτου παῖ, τεᾶς, Ἀηγίδαμε, πυγμαχίας ἔνεκεν κόσμον ἐπὶ στεφάνῳ χρυσέας ἐλαίας ἀδυμελῆ κελαδήσω, Ζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν γενεὰν ἀλέγων. (15)

(En [Λοκρῶν γενεὰν ἀλέγων], Inf [Imp]; Ζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν→ἐνθα)
ἐνθα συγκωμάζατ'·

(Ju; ἐνθα→μιν; συγκωμάζατ'≈ἀφίξεσθαι)
ἐγγυάσομαι μὴ μιν, ὃ Μοῖσαι, φυγόμενον στρατόν μηδ' ἀπείρατον καλῶν ἀκρόσοφόν τε καὶ
αἰχματὰν ἀφίξεσθαι.

(Exp [ἐγγυάσομαι], Ex [Par]; φυγόμενον<ἦθος; ἀκρόσοφόν→ἀλώπηξ; αἰχματὰν→λέοντες)
τὸ γὰρ ἐμφυὲς οὐτ' αἰθῶν ἀλώπηξ οὐτ' ἐρίβρομοιλέοντες διαλλάσσιντο ἦθος. (20)

Olympian 12

(Imp [Pr])
Λίσσομαι, παῖ Ζηνὸς Ἐλευθερίου, Ἰμέραν εὐρυςθενέ' ἀμφιπόλει, σῶτειρα Τύχα.

(Ju; εὐρυςθενέ'→πόλεμοι)
τὴν γὰρ ἐν πόντῳ κυβερνῶνται θοαὶ νᾶες, ἐν χέρσῳ τε λαιψηροὶ πόλεμοι κάγοραι
βουλαφόροι.

(Adv; gods/men, positive/negative; κυβερνῶνται≠κυλίνδοντ')
αἶ γε μὲν ἀνδρῶν (5) πόλλ' ἄνω, τὰ δ' αὖ κάτω ψεύδη μεταμόνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ'
ἐλπίδες·

(Exp [disappointed hopes]; ἐλπίδες→πράξιος ἐκκομέναις; ἀνδρῶν≠θεόθεν)
σύμβολον δ' οὐ πῶ τις ἐπιχθονίων πικτὸν ἀμφὶ πράξιος ἐκκομέναις εὗρεν θεόθεν, τῶν δὲ
μελλόντων τετύφλωνται φραδαί·

(Pol [Recap]; σύμβολον ... πικτὸν≠παρὰ γνώμαν; τῶν ... μελλόντων→μικρῶι ... χρόνῳ)
πολλὰ δ' ἀνθρώποις παρὰ γνώμαν ἔπεσεν, (10) ἔμπαλιν μὲν τέρψιος, οἱ δ' ἀνιαραῖς
ἀντικύρσαντες ζάλαις ἐκλὸν βαθὺ πῆματος ἐν μικρῶι πεδάμειψαν χρόνῳ.

(Inst; πῆματος>ἄμερσε)
υἱὲ Φιλάνορος, ἦτοι καὶ τεὰ κεν ἐνδομάχας ἄτ' ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ' ἐστία ἀκλεῆς τιμὰ
κατεφυλλορόησε(ν) ποδῶν, (15) εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ' ἄμερσε πάτρας.
(Adv, S; contrafactual/reality; ἐκλὸν βαθὺ>στεφανωσάμενος; πάτρας→οἰκείαις ἀρούραις)
νῦν δ' Ὀλυμπίαι στεφανωσάμενος καὶ δις ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἰσθμοῖ τ', Ἐργότελες, θερμὰ Νυμφᾶν
λουτρὰ βασιτάζεις ὀμιλέων παρ' οἰκείαις ἀρούραις.

Olympian 13

(Authin)
Τρισολυμπιονίκαν ἐπαινέων οἶκον ἡμερον ἄστοις, ξένοισι δὲ θεράποντα, γινώσκει τὰν ὀλβίαν
Κόρινθον, Ἰσθμίου πρόθυρον Ποτειδᾶνος, ἀγλαόκουρον. (5)

(Exp [get to know Corinth by praising household: it is representative]; ξένοισι ...
θεράποντα→Δίκα; ἡμερον ἄστοις→Εὐνομία; ὀλβίαν→πλούτου)
ἐν ταῖς γὰρ Εὐνομία ναίει κασιγνήτα τε, βάθρον πολίων ἀσφαλές, Δίκα καὶ ὁμότροφος Εἰρήνη,
τάμει' ἀνδράσι πλούτου, χρύσει παῖδες εὐβούλου Θέμιτος·

(Ex [παῖδες ... Θέμιτος]; Δίκη≠Υβριν; εὐβούλου≠θρασύμυθον)
ἐθέλοντι δ' ἀλέξειν Ὑβριν, Κόρου ματέρα θρασύμυθον. (10)

(Authin [hesitation before huge subject]; θρασύμυθον→τόλμα; ἀλέξειν Ὑβριν<καλά)
ἔχω καλά τε φράσαι, τόλμα τέ μοι εὐθεῖα γλῶσσαν ὀρνύει λέγειν, ἄμαχον δὲ κρύψαι τὸ
συγγενὲς ἦθος.

(En; καλά>νικαφόρον ἀγλαίαν; ἦθος>ἀρεταῖς)
ὑμῖν δέ, παῖδες Ἀλάτα, πολλὰ μὲν νικαφόρον ἀγλαίαν ὥπασαν ἄκραις ἀρεταῖς
ὑπερελθόντων ἱεροῖς ἐν ἀέθλοις, (15) πολλὰ δ' ἐν καρδίαις ἀνδρῶν ἔβαλον ὦραι
πολύανθεμοι ἀρχαῖα σοφίσμαθ'.

(Gen; σοφίσμαθ'<ἔργον; ὑμῖν<εὐρόντος)
ἅπαν δ' εὐρόντος ἔργον.

(Inst; σοφίσμαθ'>χάριτες; εὐρόντος→ἐξέφανεν)
ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανεν σὺν βοηλάται χάριτες διθυράμβωι;
(Ex [Cat])
τίς γὰρ ἱππεῖοις ἐν ἔντεσσι μέτρα, (20) ἢ θεῶν ναοῖσιν οἰωνῶν βασιλέα δίδυμον ἐπέθηκ';

(Ex [praise of Corinth]; χάριτες→Μοῖς')
ἐν δὲ Μοῖς' ἀδύπνοος, ἐν δ' Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ νέων οὐλίαις αἰχμαῖσιν ἀνδρῶν. ||

(ImpA [Pr] [praise]; now/future; Μοῖς'→ἔπεσσι)
ὑπατ' εὐρὺ ἀνάσσων Ὀλυμπίας, ἀφθόνητος ἔπεσσι (25) γένοιο χρόνον ἅπαντα, Ζεῦ πάτερ,
καὶ τόνδε λαὸν ἀβλαβῇ νέμων Ξενοφώντος εὐθύνε δαίμονος οὐρον·
(ImpB; ἔπεσσι→ἐγκώμιον τεθμόν)
δέξαι τέ οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμόν, τὸν ἄγει πεδίων ἐκ Πίτας, πενταέθλωι ἅμα σταδίου
νικῶν δρόμον·

(Ju; πενταέθλωι ἅμα σταδίου νικῶν δρόμον~ἀντεβόλησεν)
ἀντεβόλησεν (30) τῶν ἀνὴρ θνατὸς οὐπὼ τις πρότερον.

(ExA [Cat])
δύο δ' αὐτὸν ἔρεψαν πλόκοι κελίνων ἐν Ἰσθμιάδεσσι φανέντα·

(ExB [Cat])

Νέμεά τ' οὐκ ἀντιζοεῖ·

(ExC [Cat]; victor/family)

πατρὸς δὲ Θεσσαλοῦ ἐπ' Ἀλφειοῦ (35) ῥεέθροισιν αἶγλα ποδῶν ἀνάκειται, Πυθοῖ τ' ἔχει
σταδίου τιμὰν διαύλου θ' ἀλίωι ἀμφ' ἐνί, μηνός τέ οἱ τωῦτοῦ κρανααῖς ἐν Ἀθάναισι τρία ἔργα
ποδαρκῆς ἀμέρα θῆκε κάλλιστ' ἀμφὶ κόμαις, Ἑλλώτια δ' ἐπτάκις·

(ExD [Cat])

ἐν δ' ἀμφιάλοις Ποτειδᾶνος τεθμοῖσιν (40) Πτοιοδώρῳ σὺν πατρὶ μακρότεραι Τερψίαι θ'
ἔψοντ' Ἐριτίμῳ τ' αἰοδαί·

(ExE [Cat])

ὅσσα τ' ἐν Δελφοῖσιν ἀριστεύετε, ἡδὲ χόρτοισ ἐν λέοντος, δηρίομαι πολέσιν περὶ πλήθει καλῶν·

(Exp [disagreement]; πλήθει καλῶν→ψάφων ἀριθμόν)

ὥς μὰν καφές (45) οὐκ ἂν εἰδείην λέγειν ποντιᾶν ψάφων ἀριθμόν. ||

(Authin [huge subject], Adv; limitless/limit; ψάφων ἀριθμόν≠μέτρον)

ἔπεται δ' ἐν ἐκάστῳ μέτρον·

(Recap; μέτρον→καιρὸς)

νοῆσαι δὲ καιρὸς ἄριστος.

(En [recognizing due measure by shift to new topic])

ἐγὼ δὲ ἴδιος ἐν κοινῷ σταλείς μῆτιν τε γαρύων παλαιγόνων (50) πόλεμόν τ' ἐν ἡρώϊαις ἀρεταῖσιν οὐ ψεύσομαι ἀμφὶ Κορίνθῳ, Cίκυφον μὲν πυκνότατον παλάμαις ὥς θεόν, καὶ τὰν πατρὸς ἀντία Μήδειαν θεμέναν γάμον αὐτᾷ, ναὶ σῴτειραν Ἀργοῖ καὶ προπόλοισ·

(En; πόλεμόν→ἀλκᾷ; παλαιγόνων>τοῖ; ἀρεταῖσιν>ἐδόκησαν)

τὰ δὲ καὶ ποτ' ἐν ἀλκᾷ (55) πρὸ Δαρδάνου τειχέων ἐδόκησαν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρω μαχᾶν τάμνειν τέλος, τοῖ μὲν γένει φίλῳι σὺν Ἀτρέος Ἑλέναν κομίζοντες, οἱ δ' ἀπὸ πάμπαν εἵργοντες·

(Inst; οἱ ... εἵργοντες>Γλαῦκον; τοῖ ... Ἑλέναν κομίζοντες≈Δαναοί)

ἐκ Λυκίας δὲ Γλαῦκον ἐλθόντα τρώμεον Δαναοί.

(Ex [praise of Glaucus])

τοῖσι μὲν (60) ἐξεύχετ' ἐν ἄσπεϊ Πειράνας σφετέρου πατρὸς ἀρχάν καὶ βαθὺν κλᾶρον ἔμμεν καὶ μέγαρον·

(Re, Is?; πατρὸς→ὄς; Πειράνας≈κρουνοῖς)

ὄς τᾶς ὀφιώδεος υἱόν ποτε Γοργόνος ἢ πόλλ' ἀμφὶ κρουνοῖς Πάγασον ζεῦξαι ποθέων ἔπαθεν, πρὶν γέ οἱ χρυσάμπυκα κούρα χαλινόν (65) Παλλὰς ἤνεγκ', ἐξ ὀνείρου δ' αὐτίκα ἦν ὕπαρ, φώνασε δ'·

(Ds)

“Εὐδεις Αἰολίδα βασιλεῦ;

(Imp)

ἄγε φίλτρον τόδ' ἵππειον δέκευ, καὶ Δαμαίῳ νιν θύων ταῦρον ἀργάεντα πατρὶ δεῖξον.” ||

(Sf)

κυάναιγις ἐν ὄρφναι (70) κνώσσαντί οἱ παρθένος τόσα εἰπεῖν ἔδοξεν·

(S; κνώσσαντί≠ἔπαλτ')

ἀνὰ δ' ἔπαλτ' ὀρθῶι ποδί.

(S; ἔπαλτ'≠κοιτάξατο)

παρκεῖμενον δὲ συλλαβὼν τέρας, ἐπιχώριον μάντιν ἄσμενος εὗρεν, δεῖξέν τε Κοιρανίδα

παῖσαν τελευτὰν πράγματος, ὥς τ' ἀνὰ βωμῶι θεᾶς (75) κοιτάξατο νύκτ' ἀπὸ κείνου χρήσιος, ὥς τέ οἱ αὐτὰ Ζηνὸς ἐγχεικεραύνου παῖς ἔπορεν δαμασίφρονα χρυσόν.

(S; κοιτάξατο→ἐνυπνίωι; βωμῶι→βωμόν)

ἐνυπνίωι δ' αἱ τάχιστα πιθέσθαι κελήσατό νιν, ὅταν δ' εὐρυςθενεῖ (80) καρταίποδ' ἀναρύηι Γαιαόχωι, θέμεν Ἰππίαι βωμόν εὐθὺς Ἀθάναι.

(ProGen; Ἀθάναι<θεῶν)

τελεῖ δὲ θεῶν δύναμις καὶ τὰν παρ' ὄρκον καὶ παρὰ ἐλπίδα κούφαν κτίσιν.

(Inst, S; τελεῖ→ἔλε; θεῶν δύναμις→φάρμακον πραῦ; Ἰππίαι→ἵππον)

ἦτοι καὶ ὁ καρτερός ὁρμαίνων ἔλε Βελλεροφόντας, φάρμακον πραῦ τείνων ἀμφὶ γέννι, (85) ἵππον πτερόεντ'.

(S)

ἀναβαῖς δ' εὐθὺς ἐνόπλια χαλκωθεὶς ἔπαιζεν.

(Inst; ἐνόπλια<ἔπεφνεν)

σὺν δὲ κείνωι καὶ ποτ' Ἀμαζονίδων αἰθέρος ψυχρῶν ἀπὸ κόλπων ἐρήμου τοξόταν βάλλων γυναικεῖον στρατόν καὶ Χίμαιραν πῦρ πνέοισαν καὶ Κολύμους ἔπεφνεν. (90)

(Authin [shameful next step], S [*praeteritio*]; positive/negative; ἔπεφνεν→μόρον)

διασωπάσομαι οἱ μόρον ἐγώ.

(En, S; death/immortality, negative/positive; μόρον≠ἐν Οὐλύμπωι)

τὸν δ' ἐν Οὐλύμπωι φάτναι Ζηνὸς ἀρχαῖαι δέκονται. ||

(Authin [comparative irrelevance (παρὰ σκοπὸν)])

ἐμὲ δ' εὐθὺν ἀκόντων ἰέντα ρόμβον παρὰ σκοπὸν οὐ χρή τὰ πολλὰ βέλεα καρτύνειν χερσὶν. (95)

(Ju; σκοπὸν→Ὀλγαιθίδαισιν; βέλεα→ἐπίκουρος)

Μοίαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοισ ἐκὼν Ὀλγαιθίδαισιν τ' ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος.

(En)

Ἴσθμοι τά τ' ἐν Νεμέαι παύρωι ἔπει θήσω φανέρ' ἀθρό', ἀλαθής τέ μοι ἔξορκος ἐπέσσεται ἐξηκοντάκι δὴ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἀδύγλωστος βοὰ κάρυκος ἐκλοῦ. (100)

(ExA [Cat]; θήσω φανέρ'→λελέχθαι)

τὰ δ' Ὀλυμπίαι αὐτῶν ἔοικεν ἤδη πάροιθε λελέχθαι.

(Adv; then/future; λελέχθαι→φαίην)

τά τ' ἐκκόμενα τότε ἂν φαίην καφές.

(Adv; future/now, result/hope, men/gods)

νῦν δ' ἔλπομαι μὲν, ἐν θεῶι γε μάν τέλος.

(Recap; now/future; θεῶι→Δι; τέλος→πράσσειν)

εἰ δὲ δαίμων γενέθλιος ἔρποι, (105) Δι τοῦτ' Ἐνυαλίῳ τ' ἐκδώσομεν πράσσειν.

(ExB [Cat]; future/then)

τὰ δ' ὑπ' ὀφρύϊ Παρνασσίαι ἔξ·

(ExC [Cat])

Ἄργεϊ θ' ὄσσα καὶ ἐν Θήβαις·

(ExD [Cat])

ὄσα τ' Ἀρκάειν ἱεράων μαρτυρήσει Λυκαίου βωμὸς ἄναξ·

(ExE [Cat])

Πέλλανά τε καὶ Κικυὼν καὶ Μέγαρ' Αἰακιδᾶν τ' εὐερκὲς ἄλκος ἃ τ' Ἐλευσίς καὶ λιπαρὰ
Μαραθῶν (110) ταί θ' ὑπ' Αἴτνας ὑψιλόφου καλλίπλουτοι πόλιες ἃ τ' Εὐβοία·

(Gen, ExF [Cat]; Εὐβοία<Ελλάδ')

καὶ πᾶσαν κἀτα Ἑλλάδ' εὐρήσεις ἐρευνῶν μάσσον' ἢ ὥς ἰδέμεν.

(Authin [huge subject])

ἄγε κούφοισιν ἔκνευσον ποσίν·

(En, Imp [Pr]; ἔκνευσον→τέλει')

Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰδῶ δίδοι καὶ τύχαν τερπνῶν γλυκεῖαν. (115)

Olympian 14

(Imp [Pr])

Καφισίων ὑδάτων λαχοῖσαι αἶτε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἔδραν, ὃ λιπαρᾶς ἀοίδιμοι βασιλείαι
Χάριτες Ἐρχομενοῦ, παλαιγόνων Μινυᾶν ἐπίσκοποι, κλυτ', ἐπεὶ εὖχομαι·

(Exp [address])

σὺν γὰρ ὑμῖν τά <τε> τερπνὰ καὶ (5) τὰ γλυκὲ' ἄνεται πάντα βροτοῖς, εἰ σοφός, εἰ καλός, εἴ τις
ἀγλαὸς ἀνὴρ.

(Ex [Par]; men/gods; τερπνὰ>χοροῦς; σὺν ... ὑμῖν≠Χαρίτων ἄτερ)

οὐδὲ γὰρ θεοὶ σεμνᾶν Χαρίτων ἄτερ κοιρανέοντι χοροῦς οὔτε δαῖτας·

(Recap [Pol]; χοροῦς→céβοντι; θεοὶ>Ἀπόλλωνα; δαῖτας<ἔργων)

ἀλλὰ πάντων ταμίαι ἔργων ἐν οὐρανῶι, χρυσότοξον θέμεναι πάρα (10) Πύθιον Ἀπόλλωνα
θρόνους, αἰένανον céβοντι πατρὸς Ὀλυμπίοιο τιμάν. ||

(ImpA [Pr]; gods/men; πατρὸς≈θεῶν κρατίστου)

<ὦ> πότνι' Ἀγλαΐα φιλησίμολπέ τ' Εὐφροσύνα, θεῶν κρατίστου παῖδες, ἐπακοοῖτε νῦν, Θαλία
τε (15) ἐρασίμολπε, ἰδοῖσα τόνδε κῶμον ἐπ' εὐμενεῖ τύχαι κοῦφα βιβῶντα·

(Ju; εὐμενεῖ→σεῦ ἕκατι; κῶμον→ἔμολον; τύχαι→Ὀλυμπιόνικος)

Λυδῶι γὰρ Ἀσώπιχον ἐν τρόπῳ ἐν μελέταις τ' ἀείδων ἔμολον, οὐνεκ' Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἅ
Μινύεια σεῦ ἕκατι.

(ImpB; Ὀλυμπιόνικος≈ἔστεφάνωσε)

μελαντειχέα νῦν δόμον (20) Φερσεφόνας ἔλθ', Ἀχοῖ, πατρὶ κλυτὰν φέροις' ἀγγελίαν,
Κλεόδαμον ὄφρ' ἰδοῖς', υἱὸν εἵπηις ὅτι οἱ νέαν κόλποισ παρ' εὐδόξοις Πίσας ἔστεφάνωσε
κυδίμων ἀέθλων πτεροῖσι χαίταν.

Pythian 1

(Address)

Χρυσεά φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον·

(ExA [powers of lyre]; φόρμιγξ→ᾠοῖδοι)

τᾶς ἀκούει μὲν βάσις ἀγλαΐας ἀρχά, πείθονται δ' ᾠοῖδοι κάμασιν ἀγχιχώρων ὅποταν προοιμίων ἀμβολὰς τεύχῃς ἐλελιζομένα.

(ExB)

καὶ τὸν αἰχματὰν κεραυνὸν σβεννύεις (5) αἰενάου πυρός.

(ExA [Desc], ExA [Par]; σβεννύεις→εὐδαι; κεραυνὸν→Διὸς)

εὐδαι δ' ἀνὰ σκάπτῳ Διὸς αἰετός, ὠκεῖαν πτέρυγ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν χαλάξαις, ἀρχὸς οἰωνῶν, κελαινῶπιν δ' ἐπὶ οἱ νεφέλαν ἀγκύλῳ κρατὶ, γλεφάρων ἀδὺ κλαίθρον, κατέχευας·

(Recap; εὐδαι≈κνώσων)

ὁ δὲ κνώσων ὕγρὸν νῶτον αἰωρεῖ, τεαῖς ῥιπαῖσι κατασχόμενος.

(ExB [Desc], ExB [Par]; κνώσων→κώματι)

καὶ γὰρ βιατὰς Ἄρης, τραχεῖαν ἀνευθε λιπὼν (10) ἐγγέων ἀκμάν, ἰαίνει καρδίαν κώματι, κῆλα δὲ καὶ δαιμόνων θέλγει φρένας ἀμφὶ τε Λατοίδα σοφαί βαθυκόλπων τε Μοισᾶν.

(Adv; friends/enemies, positive/negative; κῆλα≈βοάν; κώματι≈ἀτύζονται; Ἄρης→πολέμιος)

ἄσχα δὲ μὴ πεφίληκε Ζεὺς, ἀτύζονται βοάν Πιερίδων αἶοντα, γᾶν τε καὶ πόντον κατ' ἀμαιμάκετον, ὅς τ' ἐν αἰνᾷ Ταρτάρῳ κεῖται, θεῶν πολέμιος, (15) Τυφῶς ἑκατοντακάρανος·

(Re, Sb; now/then)

τόν ποτε Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον·

(S; then/now)

νῦν γε μάν ταί θ' ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιερκέες ὄχθαι Κυκελία τ' αὐτοῦ πιέζει στέρνα λαχνάεντα·

(Recap; Κυκελία>Αἴτνα; ὄχθαι→κίων)

κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει, νιφόεσσ' Αἴτνα, πάνετες χιόνος ὀξείας τιθήνα· (20) ||

(ExA [Desc]; νιφόεσσ'≈πυρός)

τᾶς ἐρεῦγονται μὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἀγνόταται ἐκ μυχῶν παγαί·

(ExB [Desc]; πυρὸς→καπνοῦ; παγαί→ποταμοὶ)

ποταμοὶ δ' ἀμέραισιν μὲν προχέοντι ῥόον καπνοῦ αἶθων·

(ExC [Desc], Adv; day/night; καπνοῦ→φλῶξ; ἀμέραισιν≈ἐν ὄρφναισιν)

ἀλλ' ἐν ὄρφναισιν πέτρας φοίνισσα κυλινδομένα φλῶξ ἐς βαθεῖαν φέρει πόντου πλάκα σὺν πατάγῳ.

(Recap; φλῶξ≈Ἀφαιστόιο)

κεῖνο δ' Ἀφαιστόιο κρουνοὺς ἐρπετόν (25) δεινοτάτους ἀναπέμπει·

(ExD [Desc]; δεινοτάτους→τέρας)

τέρας μὲν θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι, οἷον Αἴτνας ἐν μελαμφύλλοις δέδετα κορυφαῖς καὶ πέδῳ, στρωμνὰ δὲ χαράσσοις ἅπαν νῶτον ποτικεκλιμένον κεντεῖ.

(Imp [Pr] [reacting to the example of Typhos]; Αἴτνας≈τοῦτ' ... ὄρος)
 εἶη, Ζεῦ, τὴν εἶη ἀνδάνειν, ὃς τοῦτ' ἐφέπεις ὄρος, εὐκάρποιο γαίης μέτωπον, τοῦ μὲν
 ἐπωνυμίαν (30) κλεινὸς οἰκιστὴρ ἐκύδανεν πόλιν γείτονα, Πυθιάδος δ' ἐν δρόμῳ κάρυξ
 ἀνέειπέ νιν ἀγγέλλων Ἰέρωνος ὑπὲρ καλλινίκου ἄρμασι.

(Ex [Par]; οἰκιστὴρ→ἀρχομένοις; καλλινίκου→χάρις)
 ναυσιφορήτοισ δ' ἀνδράσι πρῶτα χάρις ἐς πλοὸν ἀρχομένοις πομπαῖον ἐλθεῖν οὔρον·

(Exp [χάρις]; beginning/end; ἀρχομένοις≠νόστου; πρῶτα≠τελευτᾷ)
 εὐοκίῳτά γάρ καὶ τελευτᾷ φερτέρου νόστου τυχεῖν.

(Ex [Par]; τελευτᾷ→λοιπὸν; εὐοκίῳτά→δόξαν)
 ὁ δὲ λόγος (35) ταύταις ἐπὶ συντυχίαις δόξαν φέρει λοιπὸν ἔσσεσθαι στεφάνοις νιν ἵπποις τε
 κλυτὰν καὶ σὺν εὐφώνοις θαλίαις ὄνυμαστάν.

(Imp [Pr] [mention of future]; κλυτὰν→εὐανδρόν)
 Λύκιε καὶ Δάλοι' ἀνάσσων Φοῖβε Παρνακκοῦ τε κράναν Κασταλίαν φιλέων, ἐθελήσας ταῦτα
 νόῳ τιθέμεν εὐανδρόν τε χώραν. (40) ||

(Exp [prayer]; Φοῖβε<θεῶν; εὐανδρόν→ἀρεταῖς)
 ἐκ θεῶν γὰρ μαχαναὶ πᾶσαι βροταῖς ἀρεταῖς, καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ χερσὶ βιαταὶ περίγλωσσοί τ' ἔφυν.

(Authin [poetic task], Inst; περίγλωσσοί>ἐγὼ; χερσὶ βιαταὶ>κεῖνον; βιαταὶ→παλάμαι δονέων)
 ἄνδρα δ' ἐγὼ κεῖνον αἰνῆσαι μενοινῶν ἔλπομαι μὴ χαλκοπάραιον ἄκονθ' ὥσειτ' ἀγῶνος βαλεῖν
 ἔξω παλάμαις δονέων, μακρὰ δὲ ῥίψαις ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους. (45)

(Imp [Pr] [implicit praise]; now/future)
 εἰ γὰρ ὁ πᾶς χρόνος ὄλβον μὲν οὕτω καὶ κτεάνων δόσιν εὐθύνοι, καμάτων δ' ἐπίλασιν
 παράσχοι·

(Ju [request for forgetting]; forget/remember, future/past; ἐπίλασιν≠ἀμνάσειεν;
 καμάτων>πολέμοισι; κτεάνων δόσιν≈πλούτου; ὄλβον→τιμάν)
 ἢ κεν ἀμνάσειεν, οἷαις ἐν πολέμοισι μάχαις τλάμονι ψυχᾷ παρέμειν', ἀνίχ' εὐρίσκοντο θεῶν
 παλάμαις τιμάν οἷαν οὔτις Ἑλλάνων δρέπει πλούτου στεφάνωμ' ἀγέρωχον.

(S, Inst [war]; then/now; πολέμοισι→ἐστρατεύθη)
 νῦν γε μὰν τὰν Φιλοκτήταο δίκαν ἐφέπων (50) ἐστρατεύθη·

(Exp [like Philoctetes])
 σὺν δ' ἀνάγκαι νιν φίλον καὶ τις ἐὼν μεγαλάνωρ ἔσανεν.

(Ex [Par]; ἔσανεν→μεταβάσσοντας; μεγαλάνωρ→ἥρωας ἀντιθέους)
 φαντὶ δὲ Λαμνόθεν ἔλκει τειρόμενον μεταβάσσοντας ἐλθεῖν ἥρωας ἀντιθέους Ποϊάντος υἱὸν
 τοξόταν·

(Exp [of their journey: they needed him to sack Troy], S; τοξόταν→πέρσεν; ἔλκει≈ἀσθενεῖ ...

χρωτὶ; ἥροας ἀντιθέους<Δαναοῖς)

ὃς Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρσεν, τελεύτασέν τε πόνους Δαναοῖς, ἀσθενεῖ μὲν χρωτὶ βαίνων, ἀλλὰ μοιρίδιον ἦν. (55)

(Ex [Par] [wished for], Imp [Pr]; πέρσεν→καιρὸν; μοιρίδιον→θεὸς)

οὕτω δ' Ἰέρωνι θεὸς ὀρθωτὴρ πέλοι τὸν προσέρποντα χρόνον, ὧν ἔραται καιρὸν διδούς.

(Imp [new theme]; victor/family, future/now; καιρὸν→τεθρίππων)

Μοῖσα, καὶ παρ Δεινομένει κελαδῆσαι πίθεό μοι ποινὰν τεθρίππων·

(Ju; τεθρίππων→νικαφορία)

χάρμα δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος.

(RecapImp; Δεινομένει≈Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ)

ἄγ' ἔπειτ' Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ φίλιον ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον· (60) ||

(En, Expr [Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ])

τῷ πόλιν κείναν θεοδμάτῳ σὺν ἐλευθερίαι Ὑλλίδος στάθμας Ἰέρων ἐν νόμοις ἔκτισσε·

(Expr [Ὑλλίδος στάθμας ... ἐν νόμοις]; Ὑλλίδος στάθμας ... ἐν νόμοις→τεθμοῖσιν ἐν Αἰγυμιοῦ)

θέλοντι δὲ Παμφύλου καὶ μὰν Ἡρακλειδᾶν ἔκγονοι ὄχθαις ὑπο Ταῦγέτου ναίοντες αἰεὶ μένειν τεθμοῖσιν ἐν Αἰγυμιοῦ Δωριεῖς.

(Expr [ὄχθαις ὑπο Ταῦγέτου], Sb; now/then; ὄχθαις ὑπο Ταῦγέτου→Ἀμύκλας)

ἔσχον δ' Ἀμύκλας ὄλβιοι (65) Πινδόθεν ὀρνύμενοι, λευκοπῶλων Τυνδαριδᾶν βαθύδοξοι γείτονες, ὧν κλέος ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς.

(ImpA [Pr], Ex [Par] [potential], S; then/future; κλέος→λόγον)

Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰεὶ δὲ τοιαύταν Ἀμένα παρ' ὕδωρ αἴσαν ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλεῦσιν διακρίνειν ἔτυμον λόγον ἀνθρώπων.

(Ju; ἀστοῖς≈δᾶμον; βασιλεῦσιν>ἀγητὴρ ... υἱῷ)

σύν τοι τίν κεν ἀγητὴρ ἀνὴρ, υἱῷ τ' ἐπιτελλόμενος, δᾶμον γεραίρων τράποι κύμφωνον ἐς ἡκυχίαν. (70)

(ImpB [Pr]; internal/external peace; ἡκυχίαν→ἡμερον; ἀγητὴρ>ἀρχῷ)

λίσσομαι νεῦσον, Κρονίων, ἡμερον ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοῖνιξ ὁ Τυρσανῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸς ἔχη, ναυσίστονον ὕβριν ἰδὼν τὰν πρὸ Κύμας, οἷα Κυρακοσίῳ ἀρχῷ δαμασθέντες πάθον, ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὃ σφιν ἐν πόντῳ βάλεθ' ἀλικίαν, Ἑλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας.

(Authin [reacting to Ἑλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας]; δαμασθέντες→μάχαν;

Φοῖνιξ≈πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν; ἐξέλκων≈ἀρετᾷ)

ἀρέομαι (75) παρ μὲν Καλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δ' ἐρέω πρὸ Κιθαιρῶνος μάχαν, ταῖσι Μήδαιοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι, παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὐυδρον ἀκτὰν Ἰμέρα παῖδεςσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσας, τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἀρετᾷ, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμώντων. (80) ||

(Authin [huge subject of battle]; ὕμνον→φθέγγαιο)

καιρὸν εἰ φθέγγαιο, πολλῶν πείρατα συντανύσας ἐν βραχεῖ, μείων ἔπεται μῶμος ἀνθρώπων·

(Exp [μείων ... μῶμος]; μῶμος→βαρύνει; ἐν βραχεῖ≠κόρος; ἀνθρώπων>ἄκτων)
 ἀπὸ γὰρ κόρος ἀμβλύνει αἰαντὸς ταχέας ἐλπίδας, ἄκτων δ' ἀκοὰ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει
 μάλιστ' ἐκλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίοις.

(PolEn [stop/continue], Adv; βαρύνει→φθόνος; ἐκλοῖσιν≈καλά)
 ἀλλ' ὅμως, κρέσσον γὰρ οἰκτιρμοῦ φθόνος, (85) μὴ παρίει καλά.

(EnA, Imp; καλά→δικαίῳ)
 νόμα δικαίῳ πηδαλίῳ στρατόν·
 (EnB, Imp; δικαίῳ→ἄψευδεῖ)
 ἄψευδεῖ δὲ πρὸς ἄκμονι χάλκευε γλῶσσαν.

(Ju [for being judicious in speech: even a trivial word carries great importance when it comes from the king])
 εἴ τι καὶ φλαῦρον παραιθύσσει, μέγα τοι φέρεται, παρ' ἐθέεν.

(ExpA [word carries weight]; μέγα→πολλῶν)
 πολλῶν ταμίας ἐσσί·
 (ExpB; μέγα→πολλοί; ἄψευδεῖ<ἀμφοτέροις)
 πολλοὶ μάρτυρες ἀμφοτέροις πιστοί.

(EnC, Imp; μάρτυρες→ἀκοὰν)
 εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργαῖ παρμένων, εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοὰν ἀδεῖαν αἰεὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν
 δαπάναις· (90)
 (PolRecapImp)
 ἐξίει δ' ὥσπερ κυβερνάτας ἀνὴρ ἰστίον ἀνεμόεν.
 (PolRecapImp; spend/profit; δαπάναις≠κέρδεσιν)
 μὴ δολωθῆς, ὦ φίλε, κέρδεσιν ἐντραπέλοισ·

(Ju; κέρδεσιν ἐντραπέλοισ [‘shameful profits’]→δίαιταν)
 ὀπιθόμβροτον αὐχμηρὰ δόξας οἶον ἀποικομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει καὶ λογίοις καὶ
 αἰδοῖς.

(InstA; δίαιταν>φιλόφρων; ὀπιθόμβροτον→οὐ φθίνει)
 οὐ φθίνει Κροίσου φιλόφρων ἀρετά.
 (InstB, Adv; positive/negative; φιλόφρων≠νηλέα; λογίοις→φάτις; αἰδοῖς→φόρμιγγες)
 τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκῆν καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον (95) ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντῶ φάτις, οὐδέ
 νιν φόρμιγγες ὑπωρόφια κοινανίαν μαλθακὰν παίδων ὁάροις δέκονται.

Priamel (PolGen [from Phalaris]; negative/positive)
 τὸ δὲ παθεῖν εὖ πρῶτον ἀέθλων·
 (S; success/commemoration; πρῶτον→δευτέρα; ἐχθρὰ ... φάτις≠εὖ ... ἀκούειν)
 εὖ δ' ἀκούειν δευτέρα μοῖρ··
 (Cap; δευτέρα>ἀμφοτέροις)
 ἀμφοτέροις δ' ἀνὴρ ὅς ἂν ἐγκύρῃ καὶ ἔλῃ, στέφανον ὕψιστον δέδεκται. (100)

Pythian 2

(Authin)

Μεγαλοπόλεις ὦ Κυράκοι, βαθυπολέμου τέμενος Ἄρεος, ἀνδρῶν ἵππων τε σιδαροχαρμῶν
δαιμόνιαι τροφοί, ὕμνιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρῶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν
τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος, εὐάρματος Ἰέρων ἐν αἷ κρατέων (5) τηλαυγέσιν ἀνέδichen Ὀρτυγίαν
στεφάνοις, ποταμίας ἔδος Ἀρτέμιδος, ἃς οὐκ ἄτερ κείνας ἀγαναΐσιν ἐν χερσὶ ποικιλανίους
ἐδάμασσε πώλους.

(Recap [Pol]; δίφρον→τετραορίας; ποικιλανίους→κόσμον; ἵππων≈σθένος ἵππιον)

ἐπὶ γὰρ ἰοχέαιρα παρθένος χερσὶ διδύμαι ὃ τ' ἐναγώνιος Ἑρμᾶς αἰγλάεντα τίθησι κόσμον,
ξεστὸν ὅταν δίφρον (10) ἐν θ' ἄρματα πεισιχάλινα καταζευγνύη σθένος ἵππιον,
ὀρσοτρίαιναν εὐρυβίαν καλέων θεόν.

(Gen [from present song]; Ἰέρων<βασιλεῦσιν; μέλος<ὕμνον; στεφάνοις<ἀρετᾶς)
ἄλλοις δέ τις ἐτέλεσεν ἄλλος ἀνήρ εὐαχέα βασιλεῦσιν ὕμνον ἄποιν' ἀρετᾶς.

(Inst; βασιλεῦσιν>Κινύραν; ὕμνον>φᾶμαι)

κελαδέοντι μὲν ἀμφὶ Κινύραν πολλάκις (15) φᾶμαι Κυπρίων, τὸν ὁ χρυσοχαῖτα προφρόνως
ἐφίλησ' Ἀπόλλων, ἱερέα κτίλον Ἀφροδίτας.

(Gen [‘somehow or other gratitude goes forth showing reverence in return for someone’s
friendly deeds’]; φᾶμαι<χάρις; τινος<Κινύραν)

ἄγει δὲ χάρις φίλων ποί τινος ἀντὶ ἔργων ὀπιζομένα.

(Inst; χάρις>ἀπύει; ἔργων>δύναμιν; τινος>σὲ)

σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει, πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ
ἀμαχάνων διὰ τεὰν δύναμιν δρακεῖς' ἀσφαλές. (20)

(Gen [in Ixion's words]; negative/positive)

θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖς Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ταῦτα βροτοῖς λέγειν ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῷ παντῇ
κυλινδόμενον.

(Is; σὲ<τὸν εὐεργέταν; ἀπύει<ἀμοιβαῖς; πρὸ δόμων→ἐποιχομένους)

τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς ἀμοιβαῖς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι. ||

(Sb, PolInst)

ἔμαθε δὲ σαφές.

(Exp)

εὐμενέσσι γὰρ παρὰ Κρονίδαις (25) γλυκὺν ἐλὼν βίοτον, μακρὸν οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν ὄλβον,
μαιομένας φρασὶν Ἥρας ὅτ' ἐράσσατο, τὰν Διὸς εὖναι λάχον πολυγαθέας.

(Recap [Pol]; hope/result; ἐράσσατο≈ὕβρις)

ἀλλά νιν ὕβρις εἰς ἀνάταν ὑπεράφανον ὥρσεν.

(S)

τάχα δὲ παθὼν εἰκότ' ἀνήρ ἐξαίρετον ἔλε μόχθον.

(Ex [μόχθον]; μόχθον→φερέπονι)

αἱ δύο δ' ἀμπλακίαι (30) φερέπονι τελέθοντι·

(Exp [ἀμπλακίαι], Sb; δύο ... ἀμπλακίαι≈ἐμφύλιον αἷμα ... ἐπειρᾶτο)
τὸ μὲν ἦρως ὅτι ἐμφύλιον αἷμα πρῶτιστος οὐκ ἄτερ τέχνας ἐπέμειξε θνατοῖς, ὅτι τε
μεγαλοκευθέεσσιν ἔν ποτε θαλάμοις Διὸς ἄκοιτιν ἐπειρᾶτο.

(PolGen; negative/positive; Διὸς ἄκοιτιν≠κατ' αὐτὸν)
χρὴ δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν αἰεὶ παντὸς ὀρᾶν μέτρον.
(Gen [from Ixion]; negative/positive; ἐπειρᾶτο→εὖναι)
εὖναι δὲ παράτροποι ἐς κακότεατ' ἀθρόαν (35) ἔβαλον·

(Inst)
ποτὶ καὶ τὸν ἵκοντ'·

(Exp)
ἐπεὶ νεφέλαι παρελέξατο ψεῦδος γλυκὺ μεθέπων αἰδρις ἀνὴρ·

(Exp [slept with cloud]; γλυκὺ→εἶδος; ψεῦδος→πρέπεν)
εἶδος γὰρ ὑπεροχωτάται πρέπεν Οὐρανιᾶν θυγατέρι Κρόνου·

(Adv; falsity/truth; εἶδος→καλὸν; πρέπεν→δόλον)
ἄντε δόλον αὐτῷ θέσαν Ζηνὸς παλάμαι, καλὸν πῆμα.

(S; πῆμα→ὄλεθρον)
τὸν δὲ τετράκναμον ἔπραξε δεσμὸν (40) ἐὸν ὄλεθρον ὄγ'·

(S; δεσμὸν→γυιοπέδαις)
ἐν δ' ἀφύκτοις γυιοπέδαις πεσὼν τὰν πολύκοινον ἀνδέξατ' ἀγγελίαν.

(S)
ἄνευ οἱ Χαρίτων τέκεν γόνον ὑπερφίαλον μόνα καὶ μόνον οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσι γερασφόρον οὔτ' ἐν
θεῶν νόμοις·

(S; μόνον→θαυμαστός)
τὸν ὀνύμαζε τράφοις Κένταυρον, ὃς ἵπποισι Μαγνητίδεσσιν ἐμείγνυτ' ἐν Παλίου (45)
σφυροῖς, ἐκ δ' ἐγένοντο στρατός θαυμαστός, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμοῖοι τοκεῦσι, τὰ ματρόθεν μὲν
κάτω, τὰ δ' ὑπερθε πατρός. ||

(Gen; θαυμαστός<ἅπαν)
θεὸς ἅπαν ἐπὶ ἐλπίδεσσιν τέκμαρ ἀνύεται, θεός, ὃ καὶ πτερόεντ' αἰετὸν κίχῃ, καὶ θαλασσαιὸν
παραμείβεται (50) δελφίνα, καὶ ὑψιφρόνων τιν' ἔκαμψε βροτῶν, ἑτέροις δὲ κῦδος ἀγήραον
παρέδωκ'.

(Authin [poetic task of providing glory]; κῦδος ἀγήραον≠κακαγοριᾶν)
ἐμὲ δὲ χρεὼν φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν·

(Ju; positive/negative; κακαγοριᾶν>ψογερόν; δάκος→παινόμενον)
εἶδον γὰρ ἐκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίαι ψογερόν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν (55)
παινόμενον·

(PolGen; negative/positive, rich/poor; ἀμαχανίαι≠πλουτεῖν; βαρυλόγοις→σοφίας)
τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχαι πότμου σοφίας ἄριστον.

(Inst; πλουτεῖν→ἐλευθέραι; πότμου→πρύτανι)
τὸ δὲ κάφα νιν ἔχεις ἐλευθέραι φρενὶ πεπαρεῖν, πρύτανι κύριε πολλῶν μὲν εὐστεφάνων ἀγυιᾶν
καὶ στρατοῦ.

(Exp [τὸ ... νιν ἔχεις]; positive/negative; ἐλευθέραι→κτηάτεσσι; πρύτανι→τιμαῖ)
εἰ δὲ τις ἤδη κτηάτεσσι τε καὶ περὶ τιμαῖ λέγει ἕτερόν τιν' ἂν' Ἑλλάδα τῶν πάροιθε γενέσθαι
ὑπέρτερον, (60) χαύναι πρᾶπίδι παλαιμονεῖ κενεά.

(PolEn, Authin [poetic task]; negative/positive, someone/me; τιμαῖ→ἀρεταῖ; χαύναι≠εὐανθέα)
εὐανθέα δ' ἀναβάσομαι στόλον ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖ κελαδέων.

(EnA; ἀρεταῖ>θράκος)
νεότατι μὲν ἀρήγει θράκος δεινῶν πολέμων·
(Inst; πολέμων→μαρνάμενον)
ὅθεν φαμί καὶ σὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὐρεῖν, τὰ μὲν ἐν ἵπποκόαισιν ἄνδρεςσι μαρνάμενον,
τὰ δ' ἐν πεζομάχαισι·

(EnB; war/ethics, young/old; ἀρεταῖ>βουλαί; νεότατι≠πρεσβύτεραι; κελαδέων→ἐπαινεῖν)
βουλαὶ δὲ πρεσβύτεραι (65) ἀκίνδυνον ἐμοὶ ἔπος <σὲ> ποτὶ πάντα λόγον ἐπαινεῖν παρέχοντι.

(Imp [clausal, prompted by πάντα λόγον])
χαῖρε·

(Ju)
τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἀλὸς πέμπεται·

(Adv, S; send/receive, merchandise/free; ἐμπολάν≠χάριν; μέλος→Κακτόρειον)
τὸ Κακτόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς θέλων ἄθρησκον χάριν ἐπτακτύπου (70) φόρμιγγος
ἀντόμενος.

(Inf [Imp] [desired effect of reception], En [τὸ Κακτόρειον]; ἄθρησκον→μαθῶν)
γένοι', οἷος ἐκκὶ μαθῶν.

(Ju [of ethical action by appeal to consequences as exemplified in case of Rhadymanthus];
positive/negative, intelligent/unintelligent; μαθῶν≠παισίν)
καλὸς τοι πίθων παρὰ παισίν, αἰεὶ || καλός.

(Adv; childish/mature, ignorant/intelligent, negative/positive, appearance/truth;
παισίν≠Ραδάμανθος; καλός→τέρπεται; οἷος ἐκκὶ→ἔλαχε)
ὁ δὲ Ραδάμανθος εὖ πέπραγεν, ὅτι φρενῶν ἔλαχε καρπὸν ἀμώμητον, οὐδ' ἀπάταισι θυμὸν
τέρπεται ἔνδοθεν, οἷα ψιθύρων παλάμαις ἔπετ' αἰεὶ βροτῶι. (75)

(Exp [οὐδ' ἀπάταισι θυμὸν τέρεται: deceit would harm him]; positive/negative; ἀπάταισι→διαβολιᾶν; Ῥαδάμανθυς<ἀμφοτέροις; εὖ πέπραγεν≠κακὸν; φρενῶν ... καρπὸν ἀμώμητον≠ὀργαῖς ... ἄλωπέκων)
ἄμαχον κακὸν ἀμφοτέροις διαβολιᾶν ὑποφάτιες, ὀργαῖς ἀτενὲς ἄλωπέκων ἵκελοι.

(Exp [κακὸν ἀμφοτέροις: deceit does not pay off], Q; hope/result; ἄλωπέκων→κερδαλέον; κακὸν≠κέρδει)
κέρδει δὲ τί μάλα τοῦτο κερδαλέον τελέθει;

(A, Exp [trickery does not profit; the honest man benefits, the deceitful man is harmed]; negative/positive, dishonest/honest; κέρδει≠πόνον)
ἄτε γὰρ ἐννάλιον πόνον ἐχοίcas βαθύν cκευᾶς ἐτέρας, ἀβάπτictos εἶμι φελλὸς ὥc ὑπὲρ ἔρκoc ἄλmac. (80)

(Exp [πόνον for dishonest man]; honest/dishonest, positive/negative; πόνον→ἀδύνατα; cκευᾶς ἐτέρας→δόλιον ἀctόν)
ἀδύνατα δ' ἔπος ἐκβαλεῖν κραταιὸν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς δόλιον ἀctόν·

(Adv; result/hope; ἀγαθοῖς<πάντας)
ὅμωc μὰν cαίνων ποτὶ πάντας ἄταν πάγχυ διαπλέκει.

(Inf; negative/positive)
οὐ οἱ μετέχω θράceoc.

(EnA [speaker will not dote on all], Imp [Pr])
φίλον εἶη φιλεῖν·
(EnB, Adv; friend/enemy; φίλον≠ἐχθρόν)
ποτὶ δ' ἐχθρόν ἄτ' ἐχθρὸς ἐὼν λύκοιο δίκαν ὑποθεύcoμαι, ἄλλ' ἄλλοτε πατέων ὁδοῖς cκολιαῖς. (85)

(Ju [straightforward conduct]; cκολιαῖς≠εὐθύγλωccoc)
ἐν πάντα δὲ νόμον εὐθύγλωccoc ἀνὴρ προφέρει, παρὰ τυραννίδι, χῶπόταν ὁ λάβρος cτρατός, χῶταν πόλιν οἱ coφοὶ τηρέωντι.

(Inf [Imp] [from fact that straightforward conduct is profitable]; προφέρει→ἀνέχει)
χρὴ δὲ πρὸς θεὸν οὐκ ἐρίζειν, ὃc ἀνέχει τοτὲ μὲν τὰ κείνων, τότε αὖθ' ἐτέροις ἔδωκεν μέγα κῦdoc.

(Adv, PolInst; acceptance/stubbornness, positive/negative)
ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ταῦτα νόον ιαίνει φθονερῶν·

(S [result of mental state]; νόον ιαίνει≠ἔλκοc ... καρδίαι)
cτάθmac δὲ τινoc ἐλκόμενοι (90) περιccᾶc ἐνέπαξαν ἔλκοc ὀδυναρὸν ἐᾶι πρὸcθε καρδίαι, πρὶν ὅca φροντίδι μητίονται τυχεῖν.

(PolGen; negative/positive; ἐλκόμενοι≠φέρειν ... ἐλαφρῶς; ἀρήγει≠ἔλκος)
 φέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς ἐπαυχένιον λαβόντα ζυγόν ἀρήγει·
 (Recp [Pol]; positive/negative, passive/active, acceptance/stubbornness; ἀρήγει≠ὀλιςθηρὸς;
 ζυγόν→κέντρον; φέρειν ... ἐλαφρῶς≠λακτιζέμεν)
 ποτὶ κέντρον δέ τοι λακτιζέμεν τελέθει (95) ὀλιςθηρὸς οἶμος·

(Inf [Imp] [Pr], PolEn [not kicking against the goad of necessity, acting in a straightforward way]; negative/positive)
 ἀδόντα δ' εἶη με τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὀμιλεῖν.

Pythian 3

(Imp [Pr])
 Ἦθελον Χίρωνά κε Φιλλυρίδαν, εἰ χρεὼν τοῦθ' ἀμετέρας ἀπὸ γλώσσας κοινὸν εὖξασθαι ἔπος,
 ζῶειν τὸν ἀποιχόμενον, Οὐρανίδα γόνον εὐρυμέδοντα Κρόνου, βάσσαις τ' ἄρχειν Παλίου
 φῆρ' ἀγρότερον νόον ἔχοντ' ἀνδρῶν φίλον·

(Re, Exp [of wish]; now/then; νόον ... ἀνδρῶν φίλον→τέκτονα νωδυνίας ἡμερον)
 οἶος ἐὼν θρέψεν ποτέ (5) τέκτονα νωδυνίας ἡμερον γυιαρκέος Ἀσκληπιόν, ἥροα παντοδαπᾶν
 ἀλκτῆρα νούσων.

(Re, Sb, Exp [θρέψεν ... Ἀσκληπιόν])
 τὸν μὲν εὐίππου Φλεγύα θυγάτηρ πρὶν τελέσσαι ματροπόλῳ σὺν Ἑλειθυίᾳ, δαμεῖσα χρυσεοῖς
 τόξοισιν ὕπ' Ἀρτέμιδος (10) εἰς Αἶδα δόμον ἐν θαλάμῳ κατέβα, τέχναις Ἀπόλλωνος.

(Gen; δαμεῖσα→χόλος; Ἀπόλλωνος<παιδων Διός)
 χόλος δ' οὐκ ἀλίθιος γίνεται παιδων Διός.

(Inst; παιδων Διός>Φοίβῳ)
 ἃ δ' ἀποφλαυρίζαις νιν ἀμπλακίαισι φρενῶν, ἄλλον αἶνῃσεν γάμον κρύβδαν πατρός, πρόσθεν
 ἀκερσεκόμῃ μιχθεῖσα Φοίβῳ, καὶ φέροισα σπέρμα θεοῦ καθαρὸν· (15)

(Ex [marriage]; γάμον→τράπεζαν νυμφίαν)
 οὐκ ἔμειν' ἐλθεῖν τράπεζαν νυμφίαν, οὐδὲ παμφώνων ἰαχὰν ὕμεναίων, ἄλικες οἷα παρθένοι
 φιλέοισιν ἐταῖραι ἐσπερίαις ὑποκουρίζεσθ' ἀοιδαῖς·

(Recap [Pol])
 ἀλλὰ τοι ἦρατο τῶν ἀπεόντων·

(Gen)
 οἷα καὶ πολλοὶ πάθον· (20)

(Exp [why many suffer, what they suffer]; πολλοὶ≈φῶλον)
 ἔστι δὲ φῶλον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ματαιότατον, ὅστις αἰσχύνων ἐπιχώρια παπταίνει τὰ πόρῳ,
 μεταμῶνια θηρεύων ἀκράντοισι ἐλπίσιν. ||

(Inst; μεταμῶνια θηρεύων≈ἀνάταν)
 ἔσχε τοι ταύταν μεγάλην ἀνάταν καλλιπέπλου λῆμα Κορωνίδος·

(Exp [ἀυάταν])

ἐλθόντος γὰρ εὐνάσθη ξένου (25) λέκτροισιν ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας.

(S)

οὐδ' ἔλαθε σκοπόν·

(Recap [Pol]; ἔλαθε≠ἄιεν)

ἐν δ' ἄρα μηλοδόκῳ Πυθῶνι τόσσαις ἄιεν ναοῦ βασιλεύς Λοξίας, κοινᾷ παρ' εὐθυτάτῳ γνῶμαν πιθών, πάντα ἰσάντι νόῳ·

(Gen; ἰσάντι≠κλέπτει)

ψευδέων δ' οὐχ ἄπτεται, κλέπτει τέ μιν οὐ θεὸς οὐ βροτὸς ἔργοις οὔτε βουλαῖς. (30)

(Inst; κλέπτει≠γνοῦς; βροτὸς>παρθένος)

καὶ τότε γνοῦς Ἰσχυὸς Εἰλατίδα ξεινίαν κοίταν ἄθεμιν τε δόλον, πέμψεν κασιγνήταν μένει θυίῳσαν ἀμαιομακέτῳ ἐς Λακέρειαν, ἐπεὶ παρὰ Βοιβιάδος κρημνοῖσιν ὄκει παρθένος·

(S; μένει→ἐδαμάσκατό)

δαίμων δ' ἕτερος ἐς κακὸν τρέψαις ἐδαμάσκατό νιν, καὶ γειτόνων (35) πολλοὶ ἐπαῦρον, ἀμὰ δ' ἔφθαρεν·

(Exp [many also died], Ex [Par]; πολλοὶ→πολλὰν; ἔφθαρεν→αἰστώσεν)

πολλὰν δ' ὄρει πῦρ ἐξ ἑνός σπέρματος ἐνθορόν αἰστώσεν ὕλαν.

(S; πῦρ→κέλας)

ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τείχει θέσαν ἐν ξυλίνῳ κύγγονοι κούραν, κέλας δ' ἀμφέδραμεν λάβρον Ἀφαιστοῦ, τότε ἔειπεν Ἀπόλλων·

(Ds; κούραν≈ματρός)

“Οὐκέτι (40) τλάσσομαι ψυχᾷ γένος ἀμὸν ὀλέσσαι οἰκτροτάτῳ θανάτῳ ματρός βαρεῖαι σὺν πάθαι.”

(Sf)

ὥς φάτο·

(S)

βάματι δ' ἐν πρώτῳ κιχὼν παῖδ' ἐκ νεκροῦ ἄρπασε·

(Ex [Desc], Sb)

καιομένα δ' αὐτῷ διέφαινε πυρά.

(S)

καὶ ῥά νιν Μάγνητι φέρων πόρε Κενταύρῳ διδάξαι (45) πολυπήμονας ἀνθρώποισιν ἰᾶσθαι νόσους. ||

(S; ἰᾶσθαι≈ἔξαγεν; νόσους≈ἀχέων)

τοὺς μὲν ὧν, ὅσσοι μόλον αὐτοφύτων ἐλκῶν ζυνάονες, ἢ πολιῶι χαλκῶι μέλη τετρωμένοι ἢ χερμάδι τηλεβόλῳι, ἢ θερινῶι πυρὶ περθόμενοι δέμας ἢ χειμῶνι, λύκαις ἄλλον ἀλλοίων ἀχέων (50) ἔξαγεν, τοὺς μὲν μαλακαῖς ἐπαιδαῖς ἀμφέπων, τοὺς δὲ προσανέα πίνοντας, ἢ γυίοις περάπτων πάντοθεν φάρμακα, τοὺς δὲ τομαῖς ἔστασεν ὀρθούς.

(Adv, ProGen; positive/negative; ἀχέων ἔξαγεν<σοφία)

ἀλλὰ κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεται.

(Inst; σοφία→κεῖνον; κέρδει→μικθῶι)

ἔτραπεν καὶ κεῖνον ἀγάνορι μικθῶι χρυσὸς ἐν χερσὶν φανείς (55) ἄνδρ' ἐκ θανάτου κομίσαι ἤδη ἄλωκότα·

(S; θανάτου→μόρον)

χερσὶ δ' ἄρα Κρονίων ῥίψαις δι' ἀμφοῖν ἀμπνοᾶν στέρνων κάθελεν ὠκέως, αἶθων δὲ κεραυνὸς ἐνέσκιμψεν μόρον.

(PolGen [from Asclepius]; Κρονίων→δαιμόνων; μόρον→αἵας)

χρὴ τὰ εὐκότα παρ δαιμόνων μαστευέμεν θναταῖς φρασὶν γνόντα τὸ παρ ποδός, οἷας εἰμὲν αἵας. (60)

(En, Inf [Imp]; εὐκότα>ἐμπρακτον; οἷας ... αἵας≠βίον ἀθάνατον; θναταῖς φρασὶν→φίλα ψυχά)

μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον σπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἐμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν.

(En; possible/impossible; μαχανάν→ὕμνοι)

εἰ δὲ σώφρων ἄντρον ἔναι ἔτι Χίρων, καὶ τί οἱ φίλτρον <ἐν> θυμῶι μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι ἀμέτεροι τίθεν, ἱατῆρά τοί κέν νιν πίθον (65) καὶ νυν ἐκλοῖσι παρασχεῖν ἀνδράσιν θερμᾶν νόσων ἢ τινα Λατοῖδα κεκλημένον ἢ πατέρος.

(S [imaginary]; ἐκλοῖσι>Αἰτναῖον ξένον)

καὶ κεν ἐν ναυσὶν μόλον Ἰονίαν τάμνων θάλασσαν Ἀρέθοισαν ἐπὶ κράναν παρ' Αἰτναῖον ξένον, || ὃς Κυρακόσσαις νέμει βασιλεύς, (70) πρᾶν ἀστοῖς, οὐ φθονέων ἀγαθοῖς, ξείνοις δὲ θαυμαστὸς πατήρ.

(Recap; μόλον≈ἐξικόμαν)

τῶι μὲν διδύμας χάριτας εἰ κατέβαν ὑγίειαν ἄγων χρυσέαν κῶμόν τ' ἀέθλων Πυθίων αἶγλαν στεφάνοις, τοὺς ἀριστεύων Φερένικος ἔλεν Κίρραι ποτέ, ἀστέρος οὐρανόφωτος φαμὶ τηλαυγέστερον κείνῳ φάος (75) ἐξικόμαν κε βαθὺν πόντον περάσαις.

(Adv, Imp [Pr]; counterfactual/reality, far/near, impossible/possible; ἀστέρος≠ἐννύχαι;

κῶμόν→μέλπονται; πόντον περάσαις≠παρ' ἐμὸν πρόθυρον)

ἀλλ' ἐπεύξασθαι μὲν ἐγὼν ἐθέλω Μαρτί, τὰν κοῦραι παρ' ἐμὸν πρόθυρον σὺν Πανὶ μέλπονται θαμὰ σεμνὰν θεὸν ἐννύχαι.

(Gen [from Hieron's illness]; Μαρτί<ἀθάνατοι)

εἰ δὲ λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, Ἰέρων, ὀρθὰν ἐπίσται, μανθάνων οἷσθα προτέρων (80) ἐν παρ' ἐκλόν πῆματα σὺνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς ἀθάνατοι.

(S; ἐκλὸν≈καλὰ; Ἰέρων<ἀγαθοί)

τὰ μὲν ὧν οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κόσμῳ φέρειν, ἀλλ' ἀγαθοί, τὰ καλὰ τρέψαντες ἔξω.

(Inst; ἀγαθοί>τὶν; καλὰ≈εὐδαιμονίας)

τὶν δὲ μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίας ἔπεται.

(Exp, Gen; τὶν<τύραννον; εὐδαιμονίας→πότμος)

λαγέταν γάρ τοι τύραννον δέρκεται, (85) εἴ τιν' ἀνθρώπων, ὁ μέγας πότμος.

(Adv, PolGen [via *a fortiori* examples: no one has totally stable happiness]; positive/negative; τύραννον>Κάδμοι)

αἰὼν δ' ἀσφαλῆς οὐκ ἔγεντ' οὐτ' Αἰακίδαι παρὰ Πηλεΐ οὔτε παρ' ἀντιθέῳ Κάδμοι.

(Exp [οὐκ ... ἀσφαλῆς]; negative/positive)

λέγονται μὰν βροτῶν ὄλβον ὑπέρτατον οἱ χρεῖν, οἷτε καὶ χρυσαμπύκων μελπομενῶν ἐν ὄρει Μοικῶν καὶ ἐν ἐπταπύλοισι (90) αἶον Θήβαις, ὁπόθ' Ἀρμονίαν γᾶμεν βοῶπιν, ὁ δὲ Νηρέος εὐβούλου Θέτιν παῖδα κλυτάν, || καὶ θεοὶ δαΐσαντο παρ' ἀμφοτέροισι, καὶ Κρόνου παῖδας βασιλῆας ἴδον χρυσέαις ἐν ἔδραις, ἔδνα τε δέξαντο.

(Recap; ἔδνα→χάριν; ἀσφαλῆς≠καμάτων)

Διὸς δὲ χάριν (95) ἐκ προτέρων μεταμειψάμενοι καμάτων ἔστασαν ὀρθὰν καρδίαν.

(Sa; positive/negative; καμάτων→πάθαις; χάριν→εὐφροσύνας; γᾶμεν→θύγατρες)

ἐν δ' αὖτε χρόνῳ τὸν μὲν ὀξείαισι θύγατρες ἐρήμωσαν πάθαις εὐφροσύνας μέρος αἱ τρεῖς.

(Adv, S; negative/positive; θύγατρες>Θυῶναι; εὐφροσύνας→ἐς λέχος)

ἀτὰρ λευκωλένῳ γε Ζεὺς πατήρ ἤλυθεν ἐς λέχος ἱμερτὸν Θυῶναι.

(Sb; positive/negative; πάθαις→ψυχὰν λιπών; θύγατρες→παῖς)

τοῦ δὲ παῖς, ὄνπερ μόνον ἀθανάτα (100) τίκτεν ἐν Φθίῃ Θέτις, ἐν πολέμῳ τόξοις ἀπὸ ψυχὰν λιπὼν ὥρσεν πυρὶ καίόμενος ἐκ Δαναῶν γόνον.

(Inf [Imp]; negative/positive)

εἰ δὲ νόῳ τις ἔχει θανατῶν ἀλαθείας ὁδόν, χρὴ πρὸς μακάρων τυγχάνοντ' εὖ πασχεῖν.

(Ju [of *carpe diem* ethic])

ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλοιαι πνοαὶ ὑψιπετῶν ἀνέμων. (105)

(Ex [Par]; ἄλλοτε≠ἐς μακρὸν; εὖ πασχεῖν→ὄλβος)

ὄλβος οὐκ ἐς μακρὸν ἀνδρῶν ἔρχεται κάος, πολὺς εὖτ' ἂν ἐπιβρίσαις ἔπηται.

(Inf; πολὺς≠σμικρὸς; ἄλλοτε→ τὸν ... ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ ... δαίμον')

σμικρὸς ἐν σμικροῖς, μέγας ἐν μεγάλοις ἔσσομαι, τὸν δ' ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ φρασίν δαίμον'

ἀσκήσω κατ' ἐμὰν θεραπεύων μηχανάν.

(Adv; near/far, now/future; μεγάλοις>πλουτὸν; ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ≠πρόσω; δαίμον'→θεὸς)

εἰ δέ μοι πλουτὸν θεὸς ἀβρὸν ὀρέξαι, (110) ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέος εὐρέσθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόσω.

(Ju [of hope], Inst [κλέος ... ὑψηλὸν]; κλέος→ἐπέων)

Νέστορα καὶ Λύκιον Καρπηδόν', ἀνθρώπων φάτις, ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί

ἄρμοςαν, γινώσκομεν·

(Gen; ἐπέων→ᾠοιδαῖς; σοφοί→κλειναῖς; Νέστορα→ἀρετὰ)
 ἃ δ' ἀρετὰ κλειναῖς ᾠοιδαῖς χρονία τελέθει·

(Adv; immortality/success; ἀρετὰ→πράξαθ')
 παύροις δὲ πράξαθ' εὐμαρές. (115)

Pythian 4

(Imp)

Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳι στᾶμεν, βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας, ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλῳι, Μοῖσᾳ, Λατοῖδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυθῶνι τ' αὖξῆς οὖρον ὕμνων, ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος οὐκ ἀποδάμου Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἰέρα (5) χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττον καρποφόρου Λιβύας, ἱεράν νᾶσον ὥς ἤδη λιπὼν κτίσσειεν εὐάρματον πόλιν ἐν ἀργινόνετι μαστῶι, καὶ τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσει ἐβδόμῳι καὶ σὺν δεκάτῳι γενεᾷ Θήρῳι, Αἰήτῳ τὸ ποτὲ ζαμενῆς (10) παῖς ἀπέπνευς' ἀθανάτου στόματος, δέσποινα Κόλχων.

(Ex [ἔπος]; στόματος→εἶπε)
 εἶπε δ' οὕτως ἡμιθέοισιν Ἰάκωνος αἰχματᾶο ναύταις·

(Ds; ἡμιθέοισιν≈παῖδες ὑπερθύμων τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν)
 “Κέκλυτε, παῖδες ὑπερθύμων τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν·

(Ju)

φαμί γὰρ τᾶςδ' ἐξ ἀλιπλάκτου ποτὲ γὰρ Ἐπάφοιο κόραν ἀστεῶν ρίζαν φυτεύεσθαι μελησιμβρότων (15) Διὸς ἐν Ἄμμωνος θεμέθλοισι.

(S; ἀλιπλάκτου→δελφίνων)

ἀντὶ δελφίνων δ' ἐλαχυπτερύγων ἵππους ἀμείψαντες θοάς, ἀνία τ' ἀντ' ἐρετμῶν δίφρους τε νομάοισιν ἀελλόποδας.

(Recap; ἀστεῶν ... μελησιμβρότων→μεγαλᾶν πολίων; τᾶςδ' ... γὰρ→Θήραν)
 κεῖνος ὄρνις ἐκτελευτάσει μεγαλᾶν πολίων ματρόπολιν Θήραν γενέσθαι, τὸν ποτὲ Τριτωνίδος ἐν προχοᾷς (20) λίμνας θεῶι ἀνέρι εἰδομένῳι γαῖαν διδόντι ξείνια πρῶιραθεν Εὐφάμος καταβαίς δέξατ'— αἰσίαν δ' ἐπὶ οἱ Κρονίων Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἔκλαγξε βροντάν— || ἀνίκ' ἄγκυραν ποτὶ χαλκόγενυν ναὶ κριμνάντων ἐπέτοσσε, θοᾷς Ἀργοῦς χαλινόν·

(Ex, Sb; ναὶ→ἐννάλιον δόρυ)
 δώδεκα δὲ πρότερον (25) ἀμέρας ἐξ Ὠκεανοῦ φέρομεν νώτων ὕπερ γαίας ἐρήμων ἐννάλιον δόρυ, μήδεσιν ἀνσπᾶσαντες ἀμοῖς.

(S)

τουτάκι δ' οἰοπόλος δαίμων ἐπῆλθεν, φαιδίμαν ἀνδρὸς αἰδοίου πρόσοψιν θηκόμενος·

(S; αἰδοίου→φιλίων)

φιλίων δ' ἐπέων ἄρχετο, ξείνοισι ἅτ' ἐλθόντεσσιν εὐεργέται (30) δεῖπν' ἐπαγγέλλοντι πρῶτον.

(Is)

ἀλλὰ γὰρ νόστου πρόφασις γλυκεροῦ κώλυνεν μεῖναι.

(S)

φάτο δ' Εὐρύπυλος Γαῖαόχου παῖς ἀφθίτου Ἐννοσίδα ἔμμεναι·

(Is)

γίνωσκε δ' ἐπειγομένους·

(S; ἐπειγομένους→προτυχόν)

ἄν δ' εὐθὺς ἀρπάξαις ἀρούρας δεξιτερῇ προτυχόν ξένιον μάστευσε δοῦναι. (35)

(S; ἀρούρας≈βώλακα)

οὐδ' ἀπίθησέ νιν, ἀλλ' ἦρωε ἐπ' ἀκταῖσιν θορών, χειρὶ οἱ χεῖρ' ἀντερείσαις δέξατο βώλακα δαιμονίαν.

(S; βώλακα≠πελάγει)

πεύθομαι δ' αὐτὰν κατακλυθεῖσαν ἐκ δούρατος ἐναλίαν βᾶμεν σὺν ἄλμαι ἐσπέρας ὕγρῳι πελάγει σπομέναν.

(Adv, Sb; result/intention; κατακλυθεῖσαν≠φυλάξαι)

ἧ μάν νιν ὥτρυνον θαμὰ (40) λυσιπόνοις θεραπόντεσσιν φυλάξαι·

(S, Adv; foresight/forgetting)

τῶν δ' ἐλάθοντο φρένες·

(S)

καί νυν ἐν ταῖδ' ἀφθιτον νάσσει κέχυται Λιβύας εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα πρὶν ὥρας.

(Exp [πρὶν ὥρας]; reality/counterfactual; νάσσει≠οἴκοι)

εἰ γὰρ οἴκοι νιν βάλε παρ' χθόνιον Αἶδα στόμα, Ταίναρον εἰς ἱερὰν Εὐφάμος ἐλθὼν, υἱὸς ἱπάρχου Ποσειδάωνος ἄναξ, (45) τὸν ποτ' Εὐρώπα Τιτυοῦ θυγάτηρ τίκτε Καφικοῦ παρ' ὄχθαις, || τετράτων παίδων κ' ἐπιγεινομένων αἵμα οἱ κείναν λάβε σὺν Δαναοῖς εὐρεῖαν ἄπειρον.

(Exp [λάβε ... εὐρεῖαν ἄπειρον]; τετράτων παίδων→τότε; Ταίναρον→Λακεδαίμονος)
τότε γὰρ μεγάλας ἐξανίστανται Λακεδαίμονος Ἀργεῖου τε κόλπου καὶ Μυκηναῖν.

(Adv; counterfactual/reality; home/abroad; οἴκοι≠ἄλλοδαπᾶν; αἷμα→γένος)

νῦν γε μὲν ἄλλοδαπᾶν κριτὸν εὐρήσει γυναικῶν (50) ἐν λέχεσιν γένος, οἳ κεν τάνδε σὺν τιμαῖ θεῶν νᾶσον ἐλθόντες τέκωνται φῶτα κελαινεφέων πεδίων δεσπότεαν·

(S, Exp [πεδίων δεσπότεαν]; κελαινεφέων πεδίων→πῖον τέμενος)

τὸν μὲν πολυχρύσει ποτ' ἐν δώματι Φοῖβος ἀμνάσει θέμιςσιν Πύθιον ναὸν καταβάντα χρόνῳ (55) ὑστέρῳ, νάεσσι πολεῖς ἀγαγὲν Νεῖλοιο πρὸς πῖον τέμενος Κρονίδα.”

(Sf)

ἦ ῥα Μηδείας ἐπέων κτίχες.

(S; ἐπέων κτίχες→πυκινὰν μῆτιν)

ἔπταξαν δ' ἀκίνητοι κίωπαι ἥροες ἀντίθεοι πυκινὰν μῆτιν κλύοντες.

(Ex [prophecy]; Φοῖβος ἀμνάσει→χρησιμὸς)

ὦ μάκαρ υἱὲ Πολυμνάστου, σὲ δ' ἐν τούτῳ λόγῳ χρησιμὸς ὄρθωσεν μελίσσας Δελφίδος αὐτομάτῳ κελάδῳ· (60)

(Recap; ὄρθωσεν→ἄμφανεν)

ἄ σὲ χαίρειν ἐστρίς αὐδάσασα πεπρωμένον βασιλέ' ἄμφανεν Κυράναι, δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ἀνακρινόμενον ποινὰ τίς ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν.

(Inst [ποινα], S; then/now, family/victor; πεπρωμένον βασιλέ'→παισὶ τούτοις)

ἦ μάλα δὴ μετὰ καὶ νῦν, ὅτε φοινικανθέμου ἥρος ἀκμᾷ, παισὶ τούτοις ὄγδοον θάλλει μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας· (65)

(Exp [θάλλει]; θάλλει≈κῦδος)

τῷ μὲν Ἀπόλλων ἅ τε Πυθῶ κῦδος ἐξ Ἀμφικτιόνων ἔπορεν ἵπποδρομίας.

(Authin [success]; success/celebration, him/me)

ἀπὸ δ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ Μοίαισι δώσω καὶ τὸ πάγχρυον νάκος κριοῦ·

(Exp [including Argonauts]; Μοίαισι→τιμαὶ)

μετὰ γὰρ κεῖνο πλευσάντων Μινυᾶν, θεόπομποί σφισιν τιμαὶ φύτευθεν. ||

(En, Q [epic-style exordium], Sb; πλευσάντων→ναυτιλίας)

τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας, (70) τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος διῆκεν ἄλοις;

(A, Sb)

θέσφατον ἦν Πελίαν ἐξ ἀγαυῶν Αἰολιδᾶν θανέμεν χεῖρεσσιν ἢ βουλαῖς ἀκνάμπτοις.

(Ex [θέσφατον]; θέσφατον→μάντευμα)

ἦλθε δὲ οἱ κρυόεν πυκινῷ μάντευμα θυμῷ, πὰρ μέσον ὀμφαλὸν εὐδένδροιο ῥηθὲν ματέρος τὸν μονοκρήπιδα πάντως ἐν φυλακᾷ σθεθέμεν μεγάλοι, (75) εὖτ' ἂν αἰπεινῶν ἀπὸ σταθμῶν ἐς εὐδείελον χθόνα μόλῃ κλειτᾶς Ἰαολκοῦ, ξεῖνος αἶτ' ὦν ἀστός.

(S)

ὁ δ' ἦρα χρόνῳ ἵκετ' αἰχμαῖσιν διδύμαισιν ἀνὴρ ἔκπαγλος·

(ExA [Desc]; ἔκπαγλος→θαητοῖσι γυίοις)

ἐσθὰς δ' ἀμφοτέρω νιν ἔχεν, ἅ τε Μαγνήτων ἐπιχώριος ἀρμόζοισα θαητοῖσι γυίοις, (80) ἀμφὶ δὲ παρδαλέαι στέγετο φρίσσοντας ὄμβρους·

(ExB [Desc])

οὐδὲ κομᾶν πλόκαμοι κερθέντες ὄχοντ' ἀγλαοί, ἀλλ' ἅπαν νῶτον καταίθυsson.

(S)

τάχα δ' εὐθὺς ἰὼν σφετέρας ἐστάθη γνώμας ἀταρβάκτοιο πειρώμενος ἐν ἀγορᾷ πλήθοντος ὄχλου. (85)

(S)

τὸν μὲν οὐ γίνωσκον·

(Recap [Pol])

ὀπιζομένων δ' ἔμπας τις εἶπεν καὶ τόδε·

(Ds)

“Οὐ τί που οὗτος Ἀπόλλων, οὐδὲ μὲν χαλκάρματός ἐστι πόσις Ἀφροδίτας·

(ExA [Cat] [candidates ruled out])

ἐν δὲ Νάξῳ φαντὶ θανεῖν λιπαρᾷ Ἰφιμεδείας παῖδας, ὧτον καὶ σέ, τολμαίεις Ἐπιάλτα ἄναξ.

(ExB [Cat])

καὶ μὲν Τίτυδον βέλος Ἀρτέμιδος θήρευσε κραιπνόν, (90) ἐξ ἀνικάτου φαρέτρας ὀρνύμενον, ὅφρα τις τᾶν ἐν δυνατῶι φιλοτάτων ἐπισαύειν ἔραται.” ||

(Sf)

τοὶ μὲν ἀλλάλοισιν ἀμειβόμενοι γάρυον τοιαῦτ'·

(S)

ἄνα δ' ἡμίονοις ξεστᾷ τ' ἀπῆναι προτροπάδαν Πελίας ἵκετο σπεύδων·

(S)

τάφε δ' αὐτίκα παπτάναις ἀρίγνωτον πέδιλον (95) δεξιτερῶι μόνον ἀμφὶ ποδί.

(S; τάφε→δεῖμα)

κλέπτων δὲ θυμῶι δεῖμα προσήνεπε·

(Ds, Qa)

“Ποίαν γαῖαν, ὦ ξεῖν', εὖχεαι πατρίδ' ἔμμεν;

(Qb)

καὶ τίς ἀνθρώπων σε χαμαιγενέων πολιᾶς ἐξανῆκεν γαστρός;

(Inf [Imp]; γαστρός→γένναν)

ἐχθίστοις μὴ ψεύδεσιν καταμῖάναις εἰπὲ γένναν.” (100)

(S; ψεύδεσιν≠ἀγανοῖς λόγοις)

τὸν δὲ θαρσύναις ἀγανοῖς λόγοις ὧδ' ἀμείφθη·

(Ds)

“Φαμὶ διδασκαλίαν Χίρωνος οἶσιν.

(Exp; Χίρωνος≈Κενταύρου)

ἀντρόθε γὰρ νέομαι παρ Χαρίκλοῦς καὶ Φιλύρας, ἵνα Κενταύρου με κοῦραι θρέψαν ἀγναί.

(Recap; νέομαι≈ἰκόμαν; διδασκαλίαν≠ἔπος ἐκτράπελον)

εἴκοσι δ' ἐκτελέσαις ἐνιαυτοὺς οὔτε ἔργον οὔτ' ἔπος ἐκτράπελον κείνοισιν εἰπὼν ἰκόμαν (105)
οἴκαδ', ἀρχαίαν κομίζων πατρὸς ἐμοῦ, βασιλευομένην οὐ κατ' αἴσαν, τάν ποτε Ζεὺς ὤπασεν
λαγέται Αἰόλῳ καὶ παισὶ τιμάν.

(Exp [οὐ κατ' αἴσαν]; οὐ κατ' αἴσαν→ἄθεμιν; Αἰόλῳ καὶ παισὶ>τοκέων)
πεύθομαι γάρ νιν Πελίαν ἄθεμιν λευκαῖς πιθήσαντα φρασὶν ἀμετέρων ἀποσυλᾶσαι βιαίως
ἀρχεδικᾶν τοκέων· (110)

(S; ἀποσυλᾶσαι→ὕβριν)
τοί μ', ἐπεὶ πάμπρωτον εἶδον φέγγος, ὑπερφιάλου ἀγεμόνος δείξαντες ὕβριν, κᾶδος ὥσειτε
φθιμένου δνοφερόν ἐν δώμασι θηκάμενοι μίγα κωκυτῶι γυναικῶν, κρύβδα πέμπον
σπαργάνοις ἐν πορφυρέοις, νυκτὶ κοινάσαντες ὁδόν, Κρονίδαι δὲ τράφεν Χίρωνι δῶκαν. (115)
||

(Imp, Adv; irrelevant/relevant)
ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν κεφάλαια λόγων ἴστε.

(En [κεφάλαια λόγων], Imp)
λευκίππων δὲ δόμους πατέρων, κεδνοὶ πολῖται, φράσσετε μοι σαφέως·

(Ju; πατέρων>Αἴσονος; πολῖται→ἐπιχώριος)
Αἴσονος γὰρ παῖς ἐπιχώριος οὐ ξείναν ἰκάνω γαῖαν ἄλλων.

(Ex [identity])
φήρ δέ με θεῖος Ἰάκωνα κυκλήϊσκων προσαύδα.”

(Sf)
ὥς φάτο·

(S)
τὸν μὲν ἐσελθόντ' ἔγνον ὀφθαλμοὶ πατρός· (120)

(S; ὀφθαλμοὶ≈γλεφάρων)
ἐκ δ' ἄρ' αὐτοῦ πομφόλυξαν δάκρυα γηραλέων γλεφάρων, ἂν περὶ ψυχὰν ἐπεὶ γάθησεν
ἐξαίρετον γόνον ἰδὼν κάλλιστον ἀνδρῶν.

(S)
καὶ κασίγνητοὶ σφισιν ἀμφοτέρωι ἦλυνον κείνου γε κατὰ κλέος·

(RecapA; κασίγνητοὶ>Φέρης; ἦλυνον→λιπών)
ἐγγὺς μὲν Φέρης κράναν Ὑπερῆϊδα λιπών, (125) ἐκ δὲ Μεσσανίας Ἀμυθάν·

(RecapB; κασίγνητοὶ>Ἄδματος; ἦλυνον→ἵκεν)
ταχέως δ' Ἄδματος ἵκεν καὶ Μέλαμπος εὐμενέοντες ἀνεψιόν.

(S)
ἐν δαιτὸς δὲ μοίραι μειλιχίοισι λόγοις αὐτοὺς Ἰάκων δέγμενος ξείνι' ἀρμόζοντα τεύχων πᾶσαν

ἐυφροσύναν τάνυεν ἀθρόαις πέντε δραπὼν νύκτεσσιν ἔν θ' ἀμέραις (130) ἱερὸν εὐζοΐας ἄωτον.

(Adv, S; playful/serious; ἐυφροσύναν≠σπουδαῖον)

ἀλλ' ἐν ἔκται πάντα λόγον θέμενος σπουδαῖον ἐξ ἀρχᾶς ἀνὴρ συγγενέσιν παρεκοινᾷθ'.

(S)

οἱ δ' ἐπέσποντ'.

(S)

αἶψα δ' ἀπὸ κλιειᾶν ὄρτο σὺν κείνοισι.

(S; ὄρτο→ἦλθον)

καί ῥ' ἦλθον Πελία μέγαρον.

(S; ἦλθον→ἐσσύμενοι)

ἐσσύμενοι δ' εἴσω κατέεσαν.

(S)

τῶν δ' ἀκούσας αὐτὸς ὑπαντίεσεν (135) Τυροῦς ἐρασιπλοκάμου γενεά.

(S)

πραῦν δ' Ἰάκων μαλθακᾷ φωνᾷ ποτιστάζων ὄαρὸν βάλλετο κρηπῖδα σοφῶν ἐπέων.

(Ds)

“Παῖ Ποσειδᾶνος Πετραίου, || ἐντὶ μὲν θνατῶν φρένες ὠκύτεραι κέρδος αἰνῆσαι πρὸ δίκας δόλιον τραχεῖαν ἐρπόντων πρὸς ἔπιβδαν ὅμως· (140)

(Inf [Imp], PolInst [potential]; φρένες→ὀργὰς; ἔπιβδαν≠ὄλβον; πρὸ δίκας≠θεμισκαμένους)

ἀλλ' ἐμὲ χρῆ καὶ σὲ θεμισκαμένους ὀργὰς ὑφαίνειν λοιπὸν ὄλβον.

(En)

εἰδότε τοι ἐρέω.

(En)

μία βοῦς Κρηθεῖ τε μάτηρ καὶ θρακυμήδεϊ Καλμωνεῖ.

(S)

τρίταισιν δ' ἐν γοναῖς ἄμμες αὖ κείνων φυτευθέντες σθένος ἀελίου χρύσειον λεύσσομεν.

(Gen [from familial relation]; γοναῖς→ὁμογόνους)

Μοῖραι δ' ἀφίσταντ', εἴ τις ἔχθρα πέλει (145) ὁμογόνους αἰδῶ καλύψαι.

(Inf; ὁμογόνους>νῶν; ἔχθρα→ξίφεσιν)

οὐ πρέπει νῶν χαλκοτόροις ξίφεσιν οὐδ' ἀκόντεσσιν μεγάλην προγόνων τιμὰν δάσασθαι.

(Exp, En [avoiding conflict]; τιμάν>ἀγέλας; προγόνων→τοκέων)
 μῆλ' αὖτε γάρ τοι ἐγὼ καὶ βοῶν ξανθὰς ἀγέλας ἀφίημι' ἀγρούς τε πάντας, τοὺς ἀπούρας
 ἀμετέρων τοκέων νέμει πλοῦτον παίων· (150)

(Exp [gives up possessions]; πλοῦτον παίων≈οἶκον ... πορσύνοντ')
 κοῦ με πονεῖ τεδὸν οἶκον ταῦτα πορσύνοντ' ἄγαν·

(Adv, Inf [Imp] [*do ut des*]; private/public, unimportant/important; οἶκον≠θρόνος)
 ἀλλὰ καὶ κᾶπτον μόναρχον καὶ θρόνος, ὅτι ποτε Κρηθείδας ἐγκαθίζων ἱππόταις εὐθύνε λαοῖς
 δίκας— τὰ μὲν ἄνευ ξυνᾶς ἀνίας λῦσον, ἅμιν μὴ τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀναστάηι κακόν.”
 (155)

(Sf)
 ὥς ἄρ' ἔειπεν, ἀκᾶϊ δ' ἀνταγόρευεν καὶ Πελίας·

(Ds)
 “Ἔσομαι τοῖος·

(Justification looking forward to implicit request to fetch fleece)
 ἀλλ' ἤδη με γηραιὸν μέρος ἀλικίας ἀμφιπολεῖ·

(Adv; me/you, old/young; γηραιὸν≠ἥβας)
 σὸν δ' ἄνθος ἥβας ἄρτι κυμαίνει·

(Inf)
 δύναισι δ' ἀφελεῖν μᾶνιν χθονίων.

(Exp [implicit request to ἀφελεῖν μᾶνιν χθονίων]; χθονίων>Φρίξος)
 κέλεται γὰρ ἐὰν ψυχὰν κομίζῃ (160) Φρίξος ἐλθόντας πρὸς Αἰήτα θαλάμους δέρμα τε κριοῦ
 βαθύμαλλον ἄγειν, τῷ ποτ' ἐκ πόντου σάωθῃ || ἔκ τε ματρὸς ἀθέων βελέων.

(Exp [why he knows this])
 ταῦτά μοι θαυμαστὸς ὄνειρος ἰὼν φωνεῖ.

(S)
 μεμάντευμαι δ' ἐπὶ Κασταλίας, εἰ μετάλλατόν τι·

(S)
 καὶ ὥς τάχος ὀτρύνει με τεύχειν νᾶϊ πομπάν.

(Inf [Imp]; πομπάν≈ἄεθλον)
 τοῦτον ἄεθλον ἐκὼν τέλεσον·

(Ju)
 καὶ τοι μοναρχεῖν (165) καὶ βασιλευμένον ὄμνυμι προήκειν.

(Ex [oath], En [ὄμνυμι]; ὄμνυμι→ὄρκος)

καρτερός ὄρκος ἄμμιν μάρτυς ἔστω Ζεὺς ὁ γενέθλιος ἀμφοτέροισι.”

(S)

κύθησιν ταύταν ἐπαινέσαντες οἱ μὲν κρίθεν·

(S)

ἀτὰρ Ἰάκων αὐτὸς ἤδη ὄρνυεν κάρυκας ἐόντα πλόον (170) φαινέμεν παντῶι.

(S; παντῶι>Πύλου)

τάχα δὲ Κρονίδαο Ζηνὸς υἱοὶ τρεῖς ἀκαμαντομάχαι ἦλθον Ἀλκμήνας θ’ ἐλικογλεφάρου
Λήδας τε, δοιοὶ δ’ ὑψιχαῖται ἀνέρες, Ἐννοσίδα γένος, αἰδεσθέντες ἀλκάν, ἔκ τε Πύλου καὶ ἀπ’
ἄκρας Ταινάρου·

(ExA [Cat])

τῶν μὲν κλέος ἐκλὸν Εὐφάμου τ’ ἐκράνθη σύν τε, Περικλύμεν’ εὐρυβία. (175)

(ExB [Cat])

ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος δὲ φορμικτὰς αἰοιδᾶν πατὴρ ἔμολεν, εὐαῖνητος Ὀρφεύς.

(ExC [Cat])

πέμπε δ’ Ἑρμᾶς χρυσόραπις διδύμους υἱοὺς ἐπ’ ἄρτυτον πόνον, τὸν μὲν Ἑχίονα, κεχλάδοντας
ἦβαι, τὸν δ’ Ἑρυντον.

(ExD [Cat])

ταχέες ἀμφὶ Παγγαίου θεμέθλοισι ναιετάοντες ἔβαν, (180) καὶ γὰρ ἐκὼν θυμῶι γελανεῖ θᾶσσαν
ἔντυεν βασιλεὺς ἀνέμων Ζήταν Κάλαιν τε πατὴρ Βορέας, ἄνδρας πτεροῖσιν νῶτα
πεφρίκοντας ἄμφω πορφυρέοις.

(Exp [the heroes came], Sb; ἔβαν≠λειπόμενον; Κάλαιν<ἡμιθέοισιν)

τὸν δὲ παμπειθῇ γλυκὴν ἡμιθέοισιν πόθον ἔνδαιεν Ἥρα || ναδὸς Ἀργοῦς, μὴ τινα λειπόμενον
(185) τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰῶνα πέσσαντ’, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ καὶ θανάτῳ φάρμακον
κάλλιστον ἕως ἀρετᾶς ἄλιξιν εὐρέσθαι σὺν ἄλλοις.

(S; ἡμιθέοισιν≈πάντας; λειπόμενον≠κατέβα)

ἐς δ’ Ἰαολκὸν ἐπεὶ κατέβα ναυτῶν ἄωτος, λέξατο πάντας ἐπαινέσας Ἰάκων.

(S; πάντας≈στρατὸν)

καὶ ῥά οἱ μάντις ὀρνίχεσσι καὶ κλάροισι θεοπροπέων ἱεροῖς (190) Μόψος ἄμβασε στρατὸν
πρόφρων·

(S)

ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐμβόλου κρέμασαν ἀγκύρας ὑπερθεν, χρυσέαν χεῖρεσσι λαβὼν φιάλαν ἀρχὸς ἐν
πρύμναι πατέρ’ Οὐρανιδᾶν ἐγχεικέραυνον Ζῆνα, καὶ ὠκυπόρους κυμάτων ῥιπὰς ἀνέμους τ’
ἐκάλει νύκτας τε καὶ πόντου κελεύθους (195) ἅματά τ’ εὖφρονα καὶ φιλίαν νόστοιο μοῖραν·

(S; ἐγχεικέραυνον→βροντᾶς)

ἐκ νεφέων δὲ οἱ ἀντάυσε βροντᾶς αἴσιον φθέγμα·

(Ex [Desc]; βροντᾶς→στεροπᾶς)
λαμπραὶ δ' ἦλθον ἀκτῖνες στεροπᾶς ἀπορηγνύμεναι.

(S; ἀκτῖνες≈κάμασιν)
ἀμπνοᾶν δ' ἦρωες ἔστασαν θεοῦ κάμασιν πιθόμενοι·

(S; κάμασιν→τερασκόπος)
κάρυξε δ' αὐτοῖς (200) ἐμβαλεῖν κώπαισι τερασκόπος ἀδείας ἐνίπτων ἐλπίδας·

(S; κώπαισι→εἰρεσία)
εἰρεσία δ' ὑπεχώρησεν ταχειᾶν ἐκ παλαμᾶν ἄκορος.

(S; rowing/wind)
σὺν Νότου δ' αὔραις ἐπ' Ἀξείνου στόμα πεμπόμενοι ἦλυθον·

(S)
ἐνθ' ἄγνόν Ποσειδάωνος ἔσσαντ' ἐνναλίου τέμενος, φοίνισσα δὲ Θρηϊκίων ἀγέλα ταύρων
ὑπᾶρχεν, (205) καὶ νεόκτιστον λίθων βωμοῖο θέναρ.

(S; τέμενος→λίσسونτο; Ποσειδάωνος≈δεσπότην)
ἐς δὲ κίνδυνον βαθὺν ἰέμενοι δεσπότην λίσسونτο ναῶν, || συνδρόμων κινήθμον ἀμαιμάκετον
ἐκφυγεῖν πετρᾶν.

(Exp; κινήθμον→κυλινδέσκοντό)
δίδυμαι γὰρ ἔσαν ζωαί, κυλινδέσκοντό τε κραιπνότεραι ἢ βαρυγδούπων ἀνέμων κτίχες·

(S)
ἀλλ' ἤδη τελευτὰν κεῖνος αὐταῖς (210) ἡμιθέων πλόος ἄγαγεν.

(S)
ἐς Φᾶσιν δ' ἔπειτεν ἦλυθον, ἐνθα κελαινώπεσσι Κόλχοισιν βίαν μεῖζαν Αἰήται παρ' αὐτῶι.

(S; Αἰήται<τοκέων)
πότνια δ' ὀξυτάτων βελέων ποικίλαν ἵγγα τετράκναμον Οὐλυμπόθεν ἐν ἀλύτῳι ζεύξαισα
κύκλωι (215) μαινάδ' ὄρνιν Κυπρογένεια φέρεν πρῶτον ἀνθρώποισι λιτάς τ' ἐπαοιδὰς
ἐκδιδάσκησεν σοφὸν Αἰσονίδα, ὅφρα Μηδείας τοκέων ἀφέλοιτ' αἰδῶ, ποθρινὰ δ' Ἑλλάς
αὐτὰν ἐν φρασί καιομέναν δονέοι μάστιγι Πειθοῦς.

(S; τοκέων→πατρώϊων)
καὶ τάχα πείρατ' ἀέθλων δείκνυεν πατρώϊων· (220)

(S; ἀέθλων→ὀδυνᾶν)
σὺν δ' ἐλαίῳι φαρμακώσαις ἀντίτομα στερεᾶν ὀδυνᾶν δῶκε χρίεσθαι.

(S)
καταίνηςάν τε κοινὸν γάμον γλυκὺν ἐν ἀλλάλοισι μεῖζαι.

(S, Adv [peak of interest])

ἀλλ' ὅτ' Αἰήτας ἀδαμάντινον ἐν μέσσοις ἄροτρον κίμψατο καὶ βόας, οἳ φλόγ' ἀπὸ ξανθᾶν γενύων πνέον καιομένοιο πυρός, (225) χαλκείαις δ' ὀπλαῖς ἀράσσεσκον χθόν' ἀμειβόμενοι·

(S; ἄροτρον→ζεύγλαι)

τοὺς ἀγαγὼν ζεύγλαι πέλασσαν μοῦνος.

(S; ζεύγλαι→ἤλαυν')

ὀρθὰς δ' αὖλακας ἐντανύσαις ἤλαυν', ἀνὰ βωλακίας δ' ὀρόγυιαν χρίζε νῶτον γᾶς.

(S)

ἔειπεν δ' ὧδε·

(Ds)

“Τοῦτ' ἔργον βασιλεύς, ὅστις ἄρχει ναός, ἐμοὶ τελέσαις ἄφθιτον στρωμνὴν ἀγέσθω, (230) || κῶας αἰγλᾶν χρυσέωι θυράνωι.”

(Sf; ἔργον→ἔργου)

ὥς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος ἀπὸ κρόκεον ρίψαις Ἰάσων εἷμα θεῶι πίκυνος εἶχετ' ἔργου·

(S)

πῦρ δέ νιν οὐκ ἐόλει παμφαρμάκου ξείνας ἐφετμαῖς.

(Recap [Pol]; ἐόλει≠ἐξεπόνης'; ἔργου≈μέτρον)

σπασσάμενος δ' ἄροτρον, βοέους δήσαις ἀνάγκαι ἐντεσιν αὐχένας ἐμβάλλων τ' ἐριπλεύρῳι φυᾷ (235) κέντρον αἰανὲς βιατὰς ἐξεπόνης' ἐπιτακτὸν ἀνὴρ μέτρον.

(S; βιατὰς→δύνασιν)

ἵυξεν δ' ἀφωνήτῳ περ ἔμπαρ ἄχει δύνασιν Αἰήτας ἀγασθεῖς.

(S; δύνασιν→καρτερὸν)

πρὸς δ' ἐταῖροι καρτερὸν ἄνδρα φίλας ὥρεγον χεῖρας, στεφάνοις τέ νιν ποίας ἔρεπτον, μειλίχοις τε λόγοις (240) ἀγαπάζοντ'.

(S)

αὐτίκα δ' Ἀελίου θαυμαστὸς υἱὸς δέρμα λαμπρὸν ἔννεπεν, ἔνθα νιν ἐκτάνυσαν Φρίξου μάχαιραι·

(Adv; δέρμα→πόνον)

ἔλπετο δ' οὐκέτι οἱ κεῖνόν γε πράξασθαι πόνον.

(Exp; πόνον→δράκοντος)

κεῖτο γὰρ λόχμαι, δράκοντος δ' εἶχετο λαβροτατᾶν γενύων, ὃς πάχει μάκει τε πεντηκόντερον ναῦν κράτει, (245) τέλεσεν ἂν πλαγαὶ σιδάρου.

(Authin [huge subject]; μάκει→μακρά)

μακρά μοι νεῖσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν·

(Exp [μακρά])
ὥρα γὰρ συνάπτει·

(Ju [for abandoning long path]; μακρά≠βραχύν; ἀμαξιτόν≠οἶμον)
καί τινα οἶμον ἴαμι βραχύν·

(Gen; ἴαμι<σοφίας)
πολλοῖσι δ' ἄγῃμαι σοφίας ἐτέροις.

(En [οἶμον ... βραχύν])
κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχνας ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν, ὃ Ἀρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐτᾷ,
τὰν Πελαιοφόνον· (250)

(S)
ἐν τ' Ὠκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι μίγεν πόντῳ τ' ἐρυθρῷ Λαμνιάν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων·

(S)
ἐνθα καὶ γυίων ἀέθλοισι ἐπεδείξαντο ἱν' ἐσθλὸς ἀμφίς, || καὶ συνεύνασθεν.
(Recap; συνεύνασθεν→σπέρμ')
καὶ ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖς σπέρμ' ἀρούραις τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου δέξατο μοιρίδιον (255)
ἄμαρ ἢ νύκτες·

(Exp [ὑμετέρας]; σπέρμ'→γένος; ἀρούραις→φυτευθέν; τουτάκις≠αἰεῖ)
τόθι γὰρ γένος Εὐφάμου φυτευθέν λοιπὸν αἰεῖ τέλλετο·

(S)
καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων μιχθέντες ἀνδρῶν ἦθες ἐν ποτε Καλλίσταν ἀπώικησαν χρόνῳ νᾶσον·

(S)
ἐνθεν δ' ὕμμι Λατοίδας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον σὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἅς τε χρυσοθρόνου
(260) διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις.

(Inf [Imp] [enact wisdom]; then/now; μῆτιν→σοφίαν)
γνῶθι νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν·

(Exp [of request by posing a riddle])
εἰ γὰρ τις ὄζους ὄξυτόμῳ πελέκει ἐξερεῖψειεν μεγάλας δρυός, αἰσχύνοι δέ οἱ θαητὸν εἶδος,
καὶ φθινόκαρπος ἐοῖσα διδοῖ ψᾶφον περ' αὐτᾶς, (265) εἴ ποτε χειμέριον πῦρ ἐξίκηται
λοίσθιον, ἢ σὺν ὀρθαῖς κινέεσσι δεσπούναισιν ἐρειδομένα μόχθον ἄλλοις ἀμφίπει δύστανον
ἐν τείχεσιν, ἐὼν ἐρημώσαια χῶρον.

(Adv; negative/positive, wound/healing; μόχθον→ιατῆρ)
ἐσσι δ' ἱατῆρ ἐπικαιρότατος, Παιάν τέ σοι τιμᾷ φάος. (270)

(Inf [Imp]; ιατὴρ→ἔλκεος)

χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλλοντα τρώμαν ἔλκεος ἀμφοιπολεῖν.

(Exp [gentle hand of skilled doctor is needed]; ἔλκεος→σεῖσαι)

ῥάιδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν σεῖσαι καὶ ἀφαιροτέρους·

(Recap [Pol]; hard/easy; ῥάιδιον≠δυσπαλὲς; σεῖσαι≠αὐτίς ἔσσει)

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χώρας αὐτίς ἔσσει δυσπαλὲς δὴ γίνεται, ἐξαπίνας εἰ μὴ θεὸς ἀγεμόνεσσι κυβερνατὴρ γένηται.

(Inst; ἀγεμόνεσσι>τὶν)

τὶν δὲ τούτων ἐξυφαίνονται χάριτες. (275)

(InfA [Imp])

τλᾷθι τᾷς εὐδαίμονος ἀμφὶ Κυράνας θέμεν σπουδὰν ἅπασαν. ||

(InfB [Imp], En [Arcesilas shows civic zeal by listening to Pindar's entreaty];

σπουδὰν→πόρυν')

τῶν δ' Ὀμήρου καὶ τόδε συνθέμενος ῥῆμα πόρυν·

(Ex [ῥῆμα]; ῥῆμα→ἔφα)

ἄγγελον ἐκλὸν ἔφα τιμὰν μεγίσταν πράγματι παντὶ φέρειν·

(Inst, Ex [Par]; ἄγγελον→ἀγγελίας; τιμὰν μεγίσταν→αὔξεται; πράγματι παντὶ>Μοῖσα)

αὔξεται καὶ Μοῖσα δι' ἀγγελίας ὀρθᾶς.

(En [ἀγγελίας ὀρθᾶς])

ἐπέγνω μὲν Κυράνα καὶ τὸ κλεονότατον μέγαρον Βάττου δικαῖαν (280) Δημοφίλου πραπίδων.

(Exp; Κυράνα>παισιν; δικαῖαν ... πραπίδων>ὕβριζοντα μισεῖν)

κεῖνος γὰρ ἐν παισὶν νέος, ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρέσβυς ἐγκύρσαις ἑκατονταετῇ βιοτᾷ, ὀρφανίζει μὲν κακὰν γλῶσσαν φαεινᾶς ὁπός, ἔμαθε δ' ὕβριζοντα μισεῖν, οὐκ ἐρίζων ἀντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, (285) οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν.

(Exp [μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν]; μακύνων≠βραχὺ)

ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει.

(Ex [δικαῖαν ... πραπίδων])

εὖ νιν ἔγνωκεν·

(Recap)

θεράπων δέ οἱ, οὐ δράστας ὀπαδεῖ.

(Adv, Gen; positive/negative, merits/result; ἔγνωκεν→γινώσκοντ')

φαντὶ δ' ἔμμεν τοῦτ' ἀνιαρότατον, καλὰ γινώσκοντ' ἀνάγκαι ἐκτὸς ἔχειν πόδα.

(Inst, ἐκτὸς ἔχειν πόδα→ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπὸ τε κτεάνων; ἀνιαρότατον→οὐρανῶι προσπαλαίει)

καὶ μὰν κεῖνος Ἄτλας οὐρανῶι προσπαλαίει νῦν γε πατρώϊας ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπὸ τε κτεάνων· (290)

(Ex [Par]; negative/positive; Ἄτλας<Τιτᾶνας)
 λῦσε δὲ Ζεὺς ἄφθιτος Τιτᾶνας.

(Gen; λῦσε<μεταβολαί)
 ἐν δὲ χρόνῳ μεταβολαί λήξαντος οὐρου ἰστίων.

(Inst [potential]; χρόνῳ→ποτέ; μεταβολαί>οἶκον ἰδεῖν)
 ἀλλ' εὖχεται οὐλομένην νοῦσον διαντλήσας ποτέ οἶκον ἰδεῖν, ἐπ' Ἀπόλλωνός τε κρᾶναι
 συμποσίας ἐφέπων θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν πολλάκις, ἐν τε σοφοῖς (295) δαιδαλέαν
 φόρμιγγα βασιτάζων πολίταις ἡσυχίαι θιγέμεν, μήτ' ὦν τι πῆμα πορών, ἀπαθὴς δ' αὐτὸς πρὸς
 ἁστῶν·

(Ex [imagined homecoming scene]; φόρμιγγα→ἐπέων; οἶκον≠ξενωθεῖς)
 καὶ κε μυθήσασθαι, ὅποιαν, Ἀρκεσίλα, εὔρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων, πρόσφατον Θήβαι
 ξενωθεῖς.

Pythian 5

(Gen)
 Ὁ πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής, ὅταν τις ἀρετᾷ κεκραμένον καθαράι βροτήσιος ἀνὴρ πότμου
 παραδόντος αὐτὸν ἀνάγηι πολύφιλον ἐπέταν.

(Inst; πότμου παραδόντος→θεόμορ'; ἀρετᾷ→εὐδοξίαι)
 ὦ θεόμορ' Ἀρκεσίλα, (5) κύ τοί νιν κλυτὰς αἰῶνος ἀκρᾶν βαθμίδων ἀπο σὺν εὐδοξίαι
 μετανίσει ἕκατι χρυσαρμάτου Κάστορος·

(Inst [Castor's influence], S; κλυτὰς→μάκαιραν)
 εὐδίαν ὅς μετὰ χειμέριον ὄμβρον τεάν (10) καταθύσσει μάκαιραν ἐστίαν.

(Gen; ὅς→θεόδοτον; εὐδίαν→δύναμιν)
 σοφοὶ δὲ τοι κάλλιον φέροντι καὶ τὰν θεόδοτον δύναμιν.

(Inst; κάλλιον→ἐν δίκαι; δύναμιν→ὄλβος)
 σὲ δ' ἐρχόμενον ἐν δίκαι πολὺς ὄλβος ἀμφινέμεται·

(ExpA [ὄλβος]; ὄλβος>βασιλεύς)
 τὸ μὲν, ὅτι βασιλεύς (15) ἐσσι μεγαλᾶν πολιῶν·

(Exp [βασιλεύς]; βασιλεύς≈γέρας; δίκαι→φρενί)

ἐπεὶ συγγενὴς ὀφθαλμοῖς αἰδοιότατον γέρας τεῶι τοῦτο μειγνύμενον φρενί·

(ExpB [ὄλβος]; ethics/athletics; ὄλβος>τόνδε κῶμον; ὄλβος→μάκαρ)
 μάκαρ δὲ καὶ νῦν, κλεεννᾶς ὅτι (20) εὖχος ἤδη παρὰ Πυθιάδος ἵπποισι ἐλὼν δέδεξαι τόνδε
 κῶμον ἀνέρων, Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα·

(Inf [Imp]; Ἀπολλώνιον→θεὸν; κῶμον→ἀειδόμενον)
 τῷ σε μὴ λαθέτω, Κυράναι γλυκὺν ἀμφὶ κᾶπον Ἀφροδίτας ἀειδόμενον, παντὶ μὲν θεὸν αἴτιον
 ὑπερτιθέμεν, (25) φιλεῖν δὲ Κάρρωτον ἔξοχ' ἐταίρων·

(Ju [φιλεῖν ... Κάρρωτον])

ὃς οὐ τὰν Ἐπιμαθέος ἄγων ὀψινόου θυγατέρα Πρόφασιν Βαττιδᾶν ἀφίκετο δόμους
θεμικρεόντων·

(Recap [Pol]; Βαττιδᾶν>τεαῖσιν; Πρόφασιν≠γέρας)

ἀλλ' ἀριθάρματον (30) ὕδατι Κασταλίας ξενωθεὶς γέρας ἀμφέβαλε τεαῖσιν κόμαις, ||
ἀκηράτοις ἀνίαις ποδαρκέων δώδεκ' ἂν δρόμων τέμενος.

(Exp [ἀκηράτοις ἀνίαις]; ἀνίαις<ἐντέων)

κατέκλασε γὰρ ἐντέων θένος οὐδέν·

(Recap [Pol], S; ἐντέων≈δαίδαλ')

ἀλλὰ κρέμαται ὅποσα χεριαρᾶν (35) τεκτόνων δαίδαλ' ἄγων Κρισαῖον λόφον ἄμειψεν ἐν
κοιλόπεδον νάπος θεοῦ·

(Exp [κρέμαται]; κρέμαται≈ἔχει)

τό σφ' ἔχει κυπαρίσσινον μέλαθρον ἀμφ' ἀνδριάντι σχεδόν, (40) Κρήτες δὲ τοξοφόροι τέγει
Παρνασσίῳ καθέσσαντο μονόδροπον φυτόν.

(Inf [Imp] [from charioteer's success], Gen)

ἐκόντι τοῖνυν πρέπει νόῳ τὸν εὐεργέταν ὑπαντιάσαι.

(En, Inst; εὐεργέταν>Ἀλεξιβιάδα)

Ἀλεξιβιάδα, σὲ δ' ἠύκομοι φλέγοντι Χάριτες. (45)

(En; Χάριτες→λόγων)

μακάριος, ὃς ἔχεις καὶ πεδᾶ μέγαν κάματον λόγων φερτάτων μναμήι'·

(Exp; κάματον→πετόντεσσιν)

ἐν τεσσαράκοντα γὰρ πετόντεσσιν ἀνιόχοις ὅλον (50) δίφρον κομίζεις ἀταρβεῖ φρενί, ἦλθε
ἦδη Λιβύας πεδίον ἐξ ἀγλαῶν ἀέθλων καὶ πατρώϊαν πόλιν.

(Gen; πετόντεσσιν<πόνων)

πόνων δ' οὐ τις ἀπόκλαρός ἐστιν οὐτ' ἔσεται·

(Adv; negative/positive; πόνων≠ὄλβος)

ὁ Βάττου δ' ἔπεται παλαιὸς ὄλβος ἔμπαν τὰ καὶ τὰ νέμων, (55) πύργος ἄστεος ὅμμα τε
φαεννότατον ξένοισι.

(Inst [παλαιὸς ὄλβος], Sb)

κεῖνόν γε καὶ βαρύκομποιλέοντες περὶ δείματι φύγον, γλῶσσαν ἐπεὶ σφιν ἀπένεικεν
ὑπερποντίαν·

(Recap; θῆρας≈λέοντες; δείματι≈φόβωι; ὑπερποντίαν→ἀρχαγέτας)

ὁ δ' ἀρχαγέτας ἔδωκ' Ἀπόλλων (60) θῆρας αἰνῶι φόβωι, ὄφρα μὴ ταμίαι Κυράνας ἀτελεῖς
γένοιτο μαντεύμασιν. ||

(Gen [Apollo's powers]; μαντεύμασιν→μαντήιον; ταμίαι Κυράνας→νόσων ἀκέσματ')

ὃ καὶ βαρεῖαν νόων ἀκέσματ' ἄνδρεςσι καὶ γυναιξὶ νέμει, πόρεν τε κίθαριν, δίδωσί τε Μοῖσαν
οἷς ἂν ἐθέλῃ, (65) ἀπόλεμον ἀγαγὼν ἐς πρᾶπιδας εὐνομίαν, μυχόν τ' ἀμφέπει μαντήιον·

(Inst [Apollo's powers])

τῷ Λακεδαίμονι ἐν Ἄργει τε καὶ ζαθέαι Πύλῳ (70) ἔνασεν ἀλκάντας Ἡρακλῆος ἐκγόνους
Αἰγίμιον τε.

(Cap, Ex [Par], S; Λακεδαίμονι≈Cπάρτας)

τὸ δ' ἐμὸν γαρύειν ἀπὸ Cπάρτας ἐπήρατον κλέος, ὅθεν γεγενναμένοι ἵκοντο Θήρανδε φῶτες
Αἰγεῖδαι, (75) ἐμοὶ πατέρες, οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, ἀλλὰ Μοῖρά τις ἄγεν·

(En, S)

πολύθυτον ἔρανον ἔνθεν ἀναδεξάμενοι, Ἄπολλον, τεῖαι, Καρνήι', ἐν δαιτὶ σεβίζομεν (80)
Κυράνας ἀγακτιμέναν πόλιν·

(Re, En [σεβίζομεν ... πόλιν]; settlers/previous inhabitants)

ἔχοντι τὰν χαλκοχάρμαι ξένοι Τρῶες Ἀντανορίδαι·

(Exp; Τρῶες→πάτραι; χαλκοχάρμαι→Ἄρει)

σὺν Ἐλέναι γὰρ μόλον, καπνωθεῖσαν πάτραι ἐπεὶ ἴδον ἐν Ἄρει·

(S; previous inhabitants/settlers; μόλον→δέκονται)

τὸ δ' ἐλάσιππον ἔθνος ἐνδυκέως (85) δέκονται θυσιάειν ἄνδρες οἰχνέοντές σφε δωροφόροι,
τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλης ἄγαγε ναυὶ θαοῖς ἀλὸς βαθεῖαν κέλευθον ἀνοίγων.

(S; ἄγαγε→κτίσεν)

κτίσεν δ' ἄλσεα μείζονα θεῶν, εὐθύτομόν τε κατέθηκεν Ἀπολλωνίαις (90) ἀλεξιμβρότοις
πεδιάδα πομπαῖς ἔμμεν ἱππόκροτον σκυρωτὰν ὁδόν, ἔνθα πρυμνοῖς ἀγορᾶς ἐπὶ δίχα κεῖται
θανών· ||

(Recap; θανών→ἔπειτα; κτίσεν→μάκαρ)

μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα ἔναιεν, ἥρως δ' ἔπειτα λαοσεβής. (95)

(Ex [Par] [to Battus]; λαοσεβής→ἱεροί)

ἄτερθε δὲ πρὸ δωμάτων ἕτεροι λαχόντες Αἶδαν βασιλέες ἱεροὶ ἐντί·

(Ex [royal dead], Inf; Αἶδαν→χθονίαι; βασιλέες→Ἀρκεσίλαι)

μεγαλὰν δ' ἀρετὰν δρόσῳ μαλθακᾷ ῥανθεικᾷ κόμων ὑπὸ χεύμασιν, (100) ἀκούοντί ποι
χθονίαι φρενί, σφὸν ὄλβον υἷδι τε κοινὰν χάριν ἔνδικόν τ' Ἀρκεσίλαι·

(Inf [Imp]; δρόσῳ≈ἁοιδᾷ; ὄλβον→καλλίνικον)

τὸν ἐν ἁοιδᾷ νέων πρέπει χρυσάορα Φοῖβον ἀπύειν, ἔχοντα Πυθωνόθεν (105) τὸ καλλίνικον
λυτήριον δαπανᾷν μέλος χάριν.

(En [καλλίνικον ... μέλος], Gen [from present song]; μέλος→ἐπαινέοντι)

ἄνδρα κεῖνον ἐπαινέοντι σὺν τοῖς·

(Inst, En; ἐπαινέοντι≈λεγόμενον)
λεγόμενον ἐρέω·

(EnA)
κρέσσονα μὲν ἀλικίας νόον φέρβεται (110) γλῶσσαν τε·
(EnB; wisdom/daring)
θάρος δὲ τανύπτερος ἐν ὄρνιξιν αἰετὸς ἔπλετο·
(EnC; ethics/athletics, preparation/success)
ἀγωνίας δ', ἔρκος οἶον, σθένος·
(EnD; success/commemoration, athletics/culture; ἀγωνίας→ἀρματηλάτας)
ἐν τε Μοίαισι ποτανὸς ἀπὸ ματρὸς φίλας, πέφανταί θ' ἀρματηλάτας σοφός· (115)

(Exp [ἀρματηλάτας σοφός]; ἀρματηλάτας→καλῶν)
ὅσαι τ' εἰς ἐπιχωρίων καλῶν ἔσοδοι, τετόλμακε.

(Ex [Cat] [present victory]; then/future, local/non-local; καλῶν→ἔργοισιν)
θεὸς τέ οἱ τὸ νῦν τε πρόφρων τελεῖ δύνασιν, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ὁμοῖα, Κρονίδαι μάκαρες, διδοῖτ'
ἐπ' ἔργοισιν ἀμφὶ τε βουλαῖς ἔχειν, μὴ φθινοπωρὶς ἀνέμων (120) χειμερία κατὰ πνοὰ
δαμαλίζοι χρόνον.

(Ju [prayer]; Κρονίδαι>Διός; οἱ<ἀνδρῶν φίλων)
Διός τοι νόος μέγας κυβερνᾷ δαίμον' ἀνδρῶν φίλων.
(RecapImp [Pr]; ἀνδρῶν φίλων>Βάττου γένει; ὁμοῖα→τοῦτο ... γέρας)
εὐχομαί νιν Ὀλυμπίαι τοῦτο δόμεν γέρας ἔπι Βάττου γένει.

Pythian 6

(Imp)
Ἀκούσατ'·

(Ju)
ἧ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας ἄρουραν ἡ Χαρίτων ἀναπολίζομεν, ὁμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου χθονὸς
ἐς νάιον προκοιχόμενοι·

(En, Exp [journey to Delphi]; Χαρίτων→ὕμνων; νάιον→Ἀπολλωνίαί ... νάπαι)
Πυθιονίκος ἐνθ' ὀλβίοισιν Ἑμμενίδαις (5) ποταμίαι τ' Ἀκράγαντι καὶ μὰν Ξενοκράτει ἐτοῖμος
ὕμνων θησαυρὸς ἐν πολυχρύσῳ Ἀπολλωνίαί τετείχιστα νάπαι· (10) ||

(Ex [Desc])
τὸν οὔτε χειμέριος ὄμβρος, ἐπακτὸς ἐλθὼν ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος, οὔτ'
ἄνεμος ἐς μυχοῦς ἄλδος ἄξιοι παμόφρῳ χεράδει τυπτόμενον.
(Recap [Pol]; ὄμβρος≠φάει ... ἐν καθαρῷ; Ἑμμενίδαις≈γενεᾷ)
φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ πατρὶ τεῶι, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾷ (15) λόγοισι θνατῶν
εὐδοξον ἄρματι νίκαν Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς ἀπαγγελεῖ. ||

(En [proclaiming victory as a shared family possession]; ἄρματι→ἄγεις; γενεᾷ>κύ)
κύ τοι σχεθὼν νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χεῖρὸς, ὀρθὰν ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν, (20) τὰ ποτ' ἐν οὔρεσι φαντὶ
μεγαλοσθενεῖ Φιλύρας υἱὸν ὀρφανίζομένῳ Πηλείδαι παραινεῖν·

(IsA)

μάλιστα μὲν Κρονίδαν, βαρυόπαν στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν, θεῶν céβεσθαι·

(IsB, Ex [Par]; céβεσθαι→τιμᾶς; god/men)

ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς (25) ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον. ||

(Inst; γονέων>πατρός; βίον≠ὑπερέφθιτο)

ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντίλοχος βιατὰς νόημα τοῦτο φέρων, ὃς ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός, ἐναρίμβροτον (30) ἀναμείναις στράταρχον Αἰθιοπῶν Μέμνονα.

(Exp, Sb; πατρός→Νεστόρειον)

Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἄρμ' ἐπέδα Πάριος ἐκ βελέων δαΐχθεις·

(S)

ὁ δ' ἔφεπεν κραταιὸν ἔγχος·

(S; ἔγχος→ἀπέριψεν)

Μεσσανίου δὲ γέροντος (35) δονηθεῖσα φρήν βόασε παῖδα ὄν, || χαμαιπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριψεν·

(S; παῖδα≈ὁ θεῖος ἀνὴρ; γέροντος≈πατρός)

αὐτοῦ μένων δ' ὁ θεῖος ἀνὴρ πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός, ἐδόκησέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾷ (40) ὀπλοτέροισιν ἔργον πελώριον τελέσαις ὕπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν.

(Ex [Par], S; πάλαι→παρίκει)

τὰ μὲν παρίκει·

(Cap; then/now, heroes/contemporaries; ἀρετάν→ἀγλαίαν; τοκεῦσιν→πατρώϊαν)

τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος πατρώϊαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα, (45) || πάτρῳι τ' ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαίαν ἅπασαν.

(ExpA [ἀγλαίαν ἅπασαν]; ἀγλαίαν>πλοῦτον)

νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει, ἄδικον οὐθ' ὑπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων, σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων·

(ExpB; ethics/athletics; πλοῦτον→ἱππιᾶν ἐσόδων)

τίν τ', Ἐλέλιχθον, ἄρχεις ὃς ἱππιᾶν ἐσόδων, (50) μάλα ἀδόντι νόῳ, Ποσειδάν, προσέχεται.

(ExpC; athletics/ethics; νόῳ→φρήν)

γλυκεῖα δὲ φρήν καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον.

Pythian 7

(Direct praise)

Κάλλιστον αἱ μεγαλοπόλιες Ἀθᾶναι προοίμιον Ἀλκμανιδᾶν εὐρυςθενεῖ γενεᾷ κρηπὶδ' αἰοιδᾶν ἵπποισι βαλέσθαι.

(Exp; Ἀθᾶναι<πάτραν; Ἀλκμανιδᾶν<οἶκον; Κάλλιστον→ἐπιφανέστερον)

ἐπεὶ τίνα πάτραν, τίνα οἶκον ναίων ὀνυμάξαι (5/6) ἐπιφανέστερον Ἑλλάδι πυθέσθαι;

(Exp [city and family most illustrious]; Ἑλλάδι→πολίει; πάτραν>Ἐρεχθέος ἀκτῶν;

οἶκον>οἶ)

πάσαισι γὰρ πολίεσι λόγος ὁμιλεῖ Ἐρεχθέος ἀκτῶν, Ἄπολλον, οἱ τεόν (10) δόμον Πυθῶνι δῖαι
θαητὸν ἔτευξαν.

(Ex [praise of family]; culture/athletics; Πυθῶνι→Κίρρας; οἶ<προγόνων)

ἄγοντι δέ με πέντε μὲν Ἴσθμοι νῖκαι, μία δ' ἐκπρεπὴς Διὸς Ὀλυμπίας, (15) δύο δ' ἀπὸ Κίρρας,
ὦ Μεγάκλεες, ὑμαί τε καὶ προγόνων.

(Ex [reaction to victory]; success/celebration; νῖκαι→εὐπραγίαι)

νέαι δ' εὐπραγίαι χαίρω τι

(Adv; positive/negative, joy/pain; χαίρω≠ἄχνυμαι; εὐπραγίαι<καλὰ ἔργα)

τὸ δ' ἄχνυμαι, φθόνον ἀμειβόμενον τὰ καλὰ ἔργα.

(Gen, Adv; φθόνον ... τὰ καλὰ ἔργα<τὰ καὶ τὰ)

φαντί γε μάν οὕτω κ' ἀνδρὶ παρμονίμαν (20) θάλλοισαν εὐδαιμονίαν τὰ καὶ τὰ φέρεσθαι.

Pythian 8

(Imp [Pr])

Φιλόφρον Ἥκυχίᾱ, Δίκας ὦ μεγιστόπολι θύγατερ, βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολέμων ἔχοισα κλαδας
ὑπερτάτας Πυθιονικὸν τιμὰν Ἀριστομένει δέκευ. (5)

(Ju, Gen; δέκευ<τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξαι)

τὸ γὰρ τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξαι τε καὶ παθεῖν ὁμῶς ἐπίσταςαι καιρῷ σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ.

(Adv; positive/negative; μαλθακὸν≠ἀμείλιχον)

τὸ δ' ὅποταν τις ἀμείλιχον καρδίᾱ κότον ἐνελάσῃ, τραχεῖα δυσμενέων (10) ὑπαντιάζαισα
κράτει τιθεῖς ὕβριν ἐν ἄντλῳ, τὰν οὐδὲ Πορφυρίων μάθεν παρ' αἴσαν ἐξερεθίζων.

(Gen; negative/positive; κράτει≠ἐκόντος)

κέρδος δὲ φίλτατον, ἐκόντος εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων φέροι.

(Adv; positive/negative, force/persuasion; Πορφυρίων<μεγάλαυχον; ἐξερεθίζων→βία;

τιθεῖς ... ἐν ἄντλῳ→ἔσφαλεν; κέρδος≠ἔσφαλεν; ἐκόντος≠βία)

βία δὲ καὶ μεγάλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῳ. (15)

(Inst; μεγάλαυχον>Τυφῶς)

Τυφῶς Κίλιξ ἐκατόγκρανος οὗ νιν ἄλυξεν, οὐδὲ μὲν βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων.

(Recap [Pol]; ἔσφαλεν→δμᾶθεν; ἄλυξεν≠δμᾶθεν)

δμᾶθεν δὲ κεραυνῷ τόξοις τ' Ἀπόλλωνος.

(PolEx [Par]; negative/positive, then/now; δμᾶθεν≠ἔδεκτο)

ὅς εὐμενεῖ νόῳ Ξενάρκειον ἔδεκτο Κίρραθεν ἑστεφανωμένον υἱὸν ποῖαι Παρνακκίδι Δωριεῖ
τε κώμῳ. (20) ||

(Gen [from revel at the games]; κώμῳ<Χαρίτων; ἑστεφανωμένον<ἀρεταῖς;

Ξενάρκειον<νᾶκος)

ἔπεσε δ' οὐ Χαρίτων ἐκάς ἃ δικαιόπολις ἀρεταῖς κλειναῖσιν Αἰακιδᾶν θιγοῖσα νᾶρος·
(Recap [Pol]; Χαρίτων→δόξαν; Αἰακιδᾶν→ἀρχᾶς)
τελέαν δ' ἔχει δόξαν ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς.

(Exp; δόξαν→ἀείδεται; τελέαν→πολλοῖσι; ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς→ἥρωας)
πολλοῖσι μὲν γὰρ ἀείδεται (25) νικαφόροις ἐν ἀέθλοισι θρέψαισα καὶ θοαῖς ὑπερτάτους ἥρωας
ἐν μάχαις·
(Ex [Par]; heroes/contemporaries)
τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἐμπρέπει.

(Authin [huge subject]; ἀνδράσιν→μακραγορίαν)
εἰμὶ δ' ἄσυχολος ἀναθέμεν πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν (30) λύραι τε καὶ φθέγματι μαλθακῶι, μὴ κόρος
ἐλθὼν κνίχηι.

(Inf [Imp]; many/one; μακραγορίαν→καλῶν; πᾶσαν≠νεώτατον; ἄσυχολος→χρέος)
ὃ δ' ἐν ποσί μοι τράχον ἴτω τεδὸν χρέος, ὃ παῖ, νεώτατον καλῶν, ἐμᾷ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾷ.

(Ju; καλῶν>παλαισμάτεσσι)
παλαισμάτεσσι γὰρ ἰχνεύων ματραδελφεούς (35) Οὐλυμπίαι τε Θεόγνητον οὐ κατελέγχεις,
οὐδὲ Κλειτομάχοιο νίκαν Ἴσθμοῖ θρασύγυιον·
(Recap [Pol]; κατελέγχεις≠αὔξων; Θεόγνητον<Μειδυλιδᾶν)
αὔξων δὲ πάτραν Μειδυλιδᾶν λόγον φέρεις, τὸν ὄνπερ ποτ' Ὀικλέος παῖς ἐν ἐπταπύλοισι ἰδὼν
υἱοὺς Θήβαις αἰνίζατο παρμένοντας αἰχμᾷ, (40) || ὅπότε' ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἤλυθον δευτέραν ὁδὸν
Ἐπίγονοι.

(Ex [λόγον]; λόγον→εἶπε; παρμένοντας αἰχμᾷ≈μαρναμένων)
ὥδ' εἶπε μαρναμένων·

(Ds)
“φῦαί τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει ἐκ πατέρων παισὶ λῆμα.

(Inst; λῆμα→πρῶτον)
θαέομαι σαφές (45) δράκοντα ποικίλον αἰθᾶς Ἀλκμᾶν' ἐπ' ἀσπίδος νωμῶντα πρῶτον ἐν
Κάδμου πύλαις.

(Ex [battle of the Epigoni])
ὁ δὲ καμὼν προτέραι πάθαι νῦν ἀρείονος ἐνέχεται ὄρνιχος ἀγγελίαι (50) Ἄδρακτος ἥρωος·

(Adv; now/future, positive/negative)
τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν ἀντία πράξει.

(Exp; ἀντία≈θανόντος ... υἱοῦ; οἴκοθεν→ἀγυιάς)
μόνος γὰρ ἐκ Δαναῶν στρατοῦ θανόντος ὁστέα λέξαις υἱοῦ, τύχαι θεῶν ἀφίξεται λαῶι σὺν
ἀβλαβεῖ Ἄβαντος εὐρυχόρους ἀγυιάς.”

(Sf)

τοιαῦτα μὲν (55) ἐφθέγγεσθαι Ἀμφιάρεος.

(Ex [Par]; he/me, then/now; ἐφθέγγεσθαι → ῥαίνω ... ὕμνῳ)
χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀλκμῆνα στεφάνοις βάλλων, ῥαίνων δὲ καὶ ὕμνῳ, γείτων ὅτι μοι καὶ
κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν ὑπάντασεν ἰόντι γὰρ ὀμφαλὸν παρ' αἰοίδιμον, μαντευμάτων τ' ἐφάπατο
συγγόνοις τέχναις. (60) ||

(Adv, S; he/you, hope/result; ὀμφαλὸν ≈ ναὸν; χαίρων → μέγιστον ... χαρμάτων)
τὸ δ', Ἐκαταβόλε, πάνδοκον ναὸν εὐκλέα διανεμῶν Πυθῶνος ἐν γυάλοις, τὸ μὲν μέγιστον
τόθι χαρμάτων ὥπασας, οἴκοι δὲ πρόσθεν ἀρπαλέαν δόσιν (65) πενταεθλίου σὺν ἑορταῖς ὑμαῖς
ἐπάγαγε·

(Imp [Pr] [praise], S; then/now, success/celebration)
ὦναξ, ἐκόντι δ' εὐχομαι νόμῳ κατὰ τιν' ἀρμονίαν βλέπειν ἀμφ' ἕκαστον, ὅσα νέομαι.

(JuA; ἀρμονίαν → ἀδυμελεῖ)
κώμῳ μὲν ἀδυμελεῖ (70) Δίκα παρέστακε·
(JuB, Imp [Pr]; now/future; ὦναξ > θεῶν; κώμῳ → τύχαις; βλέπειν → ὅπιν)
θεῶν δ' ὅπιν ἄφθονον αἰτέω, Ξέναρκες, ὑμετέραις τύχαις.

(Exp [prayer to gods]; τύχαις < ἐκλὰ; Ξέναρκες < τις)
εἰ γάρ τις ἐκλὰ πέπαται μὴ σὺν μακρῶι πόνῳ, πολλοῖς σοφὸς δοκεῖ πεδ' ἀφρόνων βίον
κορυσσεμένῳ ὀρθοβούλοις μαχαναῖς· (75)
(Adv; falsity/truth; ὀρθοβούλοις μαχαναῖς → ἐπ' ἀνδράσι)
τὰ δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κεῖται·
(Recap [Pol]; men/gods; ἐπ' ἀνδράσι ≠ δαίμων ... παρίσχει)
δαίμων δὲ παρίσχει·

(Exp [god provides success])
ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὑπερθε βάλλον, ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χειρῶν, μέτρῳ κατάβαινει·

(Inst [success granted by the gods]; ὑπερθε → γέρας; ἄλλον > Ἀριστόμενες)
{ἐν} Μεγάροις δ' ἔχεις γέρας, μυχῶι τ' ἐν Μαραθῶνος, Ἥρας τ' ἀγῶν' ἐπιχώριον νίκαις
τρικαῖς, ὃ Ἀριστόμενες, δάμασσε ἔργῳ· (80) ||

(Ex [Cat]; ἔργῳ → ἔμπετες)
τέτρασι δ' ἔμπετες ὑπόθεν σωματέσσι κακὰ φρονέων, τοῖς οὔτε νόστος ὁμῶς ἑπαλπνος ἐν
Πυθιάδι κρίθῃ, οὐδὲ μολόντων παρ' ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλῳς γλυκύς (85) ὥρσεν χάριν·
(Recap [Pol]; positive/negative; μολόντων → πτώσονται; νόστος ... ἑπαλπνος ≠ συμφορᾷ;
ματέρ' ≠ ἐχθρῶν)
κατὰ λαύρας δ' ἐχθρῶν ἀπάοροι πτώσονται, συμφορᾷ δεδαγμένοι.

(PolGen; negative/positive; συμφορᾷ ≠ καλόν; πτώσονται ≠ πέταται)
ὁ δὲ καλόν τι νέον λαχὼν ἀβρότατος ἐπὶ μεγάλας ἐξ ἐλπίδος πέταται (90) ὑποπτέροις
ἀνορέαις, ἔχων κρέσσονα πλούτου μέριμναν.

(Gen; πέταται → αὔξεται; καλόν → τερπνόν)

ἐν δ' ὀλίγωι βροτῶν τὸ τερπνὸν αὖξεται·

(Adv; success/failure, positive/negative; αὖξεται≠πίτνει; τερπνὸν≠ἀποτρόπαι γνώμαι)
οὕτω δὲ καὶ πίτνει χαμαί, ἀποτρόπαι γνώμαι σεσεισμένον.

(Inf)
ἐπάμεροι·

(ExpA [ἐπάμεροι], Qa)
τί δέ τις;
(ExpB, Qb; positive/negative)
τί δ' οὐ τις;

(A; τις→ἄνθρωπος)
скиѣс ѓнар (95) ἄνθρωπος.

(Adv; instability/constancy, near/far, negative/positive; скиѣс ѓнар≠φέγγος)
ἀλλ' ὅταν αἶγλα διόδοτος ἔλθῃ, λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μείλιχος αἰών.

(Imp [Pr] [mention of the future]; διόδοτος→Δι)
Αἶγίνα φίλα μᾶτερ, ἐλευθέρῳι στόλῳι πόλιν τάνδε κόμιζε Δι καὶ κρέοντι σὺν Αἰακῶι Πηλεΐ τε
κάγαθῶι Τελαμῶνι σὺν τ' Ἀχιλλεΐ. (100)

Pythian 9

(Authin)
Ἐθέλω χαλκάσπιδα Πυθιονίκαν σὺν βαθυζώνοισιν ἀγγέλλων Τελεσικράτη Χαρίτεσσι γεγωνεῖν
ὄλβιον ἄνδρα διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας·

(En [στεφάνωμα Κυράνας])
τὰν ὁ χαιτάεις ἀνεμοσφάραγων ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων ποτὲ Λατοΐδας (5) ἄρπας', ἐνείκε τε
χρυσέῳι παρθένον ἀγροτέραν δίφρῳι, τόθι νιν πολυμήλου καὶ πολυκαρποτάτας θῆκε
δέσποιναν χθονός ρίζαν ἀπείρου τρίταν εὐήρατον θάλλοισαν οἰκεῖν.

(S; δίφρῳι→ὀχέων)
ὑπέδεκτο δ' ἀργυρόπεζ' Ἀφροδίτα Δάλιον ξεῖνον θεοδμάτων (10) ὀχέων ἐφαπτομένα χερσὶ
κούφαι·

(S; Ἀφροδίτα→γάμον)
καί σφιν ἐπὶ γλυκεραῖς εὐναῖς ἐρατὰν βάλεν αἰδῶ, ξυνὸν ἀρμόζοισα θεῶι τε γάμον μιχθέντα
κούραι θ' Ὑψέος εὐρυβία·

(Re)
ὃς Λαπιθᾶν ὑπερόπλων τουτάκις ἦν βασιλεύς, ἐξ Ὠκεανοῦ γένος ἥρως δεύτερος·

(Sb)
ὃν ποτε Πίνδου κλεενναῖς ἐν πτυχαῖς (15) Ναῖς εὐφρανθεῖσα Πηνειοῦ λέχει Κρέοις' ἔτικτεν,

Γαίας θυγάτηρ.

(S)

ὁ δὲ τὰν εὐώλενον θρέψατο παῖδα Κυράναν·

(S)

ἂ μὲν οὐθ' ἰκτῶν παλιμβάμους ἐφίλησεν ὁδοῦς, οὔτε δειπνῶν ῥοῖκουριᾶν μεθ' ἑταιρᾶν
τέρψιας, ἀλλ' ἀκόντεσσιν τε χαλκείοις (20) φασγάνῳ τε μαρναμένα κεραίζεν ἀγρίους θήρας, ἣ
πολλὰν τε καὶ ἡσύχιον βουσὶν εἰρήναν παρέχοισα πατρώϊαις, τὸν δὲ κύγκοιτον γλυκύν παῦρον
ἐπὶ γλεφάροις ὕπνον ἀναλίσκοισα ῥέποντα πρὸς ἁῶ. (25) ||

(S; ἀγρίους θήρας>λέοντί; ἀκόντεσσιν≠ἄτερ ἐγγέων)

κίχε νιν λέοντί ποτ' εὐρυφαρέτρας ὀβρίμῳ μούναν παλαίοισαν ἄτερ ἐγγέων ἐκάεργος
Ἀπόλλων.

(S)

αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ μεγάρων Χίρωνα προσήνεπε φωνᾷ·

(Ds; μεγάρων≈ἄντρον)

“σεμνὸν ἄντρον, Φιλλυρίδα, προλιπὼν θυμὸν γυναικὸς καὶ μεγάλην δύνασιν (30) θαύμασον,
οἷον ἀταρβεῖ νεῖκος ἄγει κεφαλαῖ, μόχθου καθύπερθε νεᾶνις ἦτορ ἔχοισα·

(Recap [Pol]; ἦτορ≈φρένες; μόχθου καθύπερθε→οὐ κεχεύονται)

φόβῳ δ' οὐ κεχεύονται φρένες.

(Qa [motivated by description])

τίς νιν ἀνθρώπων τέκεν;

(Recap; τίς→φύτλας; φρένες→ἀλκᾶς)

ποίας δ' ἀποσπασθεῖσα φύτλας ὀρέων κευθμῶνας ἔχει σκιοέντων, γεύεται δ' ἀλκᾶς
ἀπειράντου; (35)

(Qb; φύτλας→ποίαν)

ὅσια κλυτὰν χέρα οἱ προσεγεγκεῖν ἦρα καὶ ἐκ λεχέων κεῖραι μελιαδέα ποίαν;”

(S)

τὸν δὲ Κένταυρος ζαμενής, ἀγανᾷ χλοαρὸν γελάσσαις ὀφρύι, μῆτιν ἐάν εὐθὺς ἀμείβετο·

(Ds)

“κρυπαὶ κλαῖδες ἐντὶ σοφᾶς Πειθοῦς ἱερᾶν φιλοτάτων, Φοῖβε, καὶ ἔν τε θεοῖς τοῦτο
κάνθρωποις ὁμῶς (40) αἰδέοντ', ἀμφανδὸν ἀδείας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶς.

(Inst; θεοῖς>cé; αἰδέοντ'→ὀργᾶ)

καὶ γὰρ cé, τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψεύδει θιγεῖν, ἔτραπε μείλιχος ὀργὰ παρφάμεν τοῦτον λόγον.

(Exp [παρφάμεν]; τοῦτον λόγον≈ἐξερωτᾷς)

κούρας δ' ὁπόθεν γενεάν ἐξερωτᾷς, ᾧ ἄνα;

(Re; ἐξερωτᾷς≠οἶσθα)

κύριον ὃς πάντων τέλος οἶσθα καὶ πάσας κελεύθους· (45)

(Ex [powers]; οἷσθα≈εὖ καθορᾷς; πάντων τέλος≈χῶτι μέλλει)
 ὅσσα τε χθὼν ἥρινά φύλλ' ἀναπέμπει, χῶπόσαι ἐν θαλάσσαι καὶ ποταμοῖς ψάμαθοι κύμασιν
 ῥιπαῖς τ' ἀνέμων κλονέονται, χῶτι μέλλει, χῶπόθεν ἔσσεται, εὖ καθορᾷς.

(Inf [from Apollo's question]; καθορᾷς→σοφὸν)
 εἰ δὲ χρὴ καὶ παρ σοφὸν ἀντιφερίζαι, (50) || ἐρέω·

(En)
 ταῦται πόσις ἴκεο βᾶσσαν τάνδε, καὶ μέλλεις ὑπὲρ πόντου Διὸς ἔξοχον ποτὶ κᾶπον ἐνεῖκαι·

(S; Διὸς ἔξοχον ποτὶ κᾶπον>ὄχθον ἐς ἀμφίπεδον)
 ἔνθα νιν ἀρχέπολιν θήσεις, ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀγείραις νασιώταν ὄχθον ἐς ἀμφίπεδον· (55)

(Sb; then/now; ὄχθον<Λιβύα)
 νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότνια σοὶ Λιβύα δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσεοῖς πρόφρων·

(S; Λιβύα>χθονὸς αἴσαν)
 ἵνα οἱ χθονὸς αἴσαν αὐτίκα συντελέθῃ ἐννομον δωρήσεται, οὔτε παγκάρπων φυτῶν νάποινον
 οὔτ' ἀγνώτα θηρῶν.

(S)
 τόθι παῖδα τέξεται, ὃν κλυτὸς Ἑρμᾶς εὐθρόνοισι Ὀραιοὶ καὶ Γαίαι (60) ἀνελὼν φίλας ὑπὸ
 ματέρος οἶσει.

(S; παῖδα≈βρέφος)
 ταῖ δ' ἐπιγουνίδιον θαηράμεναι βρέφος αὐταῖς, νέκταρ ἐν χεῖλεσσι καὶ ἀμβροσίαν στάξοις,
 θήσονται τέ νιν ἀθάνατον, Ζῆνα καὶ ἀγνὸν Ἀπόλλων', ἀνδράσι χάρμα φίλοις ἄγχιστον ὁπάονα
 μήλων, Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον, τοῖς δ' Ἀρισταῖον καλεῖν.” (65)

(Sf; βρέφος→γάμου)
 ὥς ἄρ' εἰπὼν ἔντυεν τερπνὰν γάμου κραίνειν τελευτάν.

(ProGen; τελευτάν<πρᾶξις)
 ὥκεῖα δ' ἐπειγομένων ἤδη θεῶν πρᾶξις ὁδοὶ τε βραχεῖαι.

(Inst; πρᾶξις>διαίτασεν; ὥκεῖα→ἄμαρ)
 κεῖνο κεῖν' ἄμαρ διαίτασεν·

(Recap; διαίτασεν≈μίγεν)
 θαλάμῳ δὲ μίγεν ἐν πολυχρύσῳ Λιβύας·

(S)
 ἵνα καλλίσταν πόλιν ἀμφέπει κλεινὰν τ' ἀέθλοισι. (70)

(Inst [success in athletics]; ἀέθλοισι>Πυθῶνι)
 καὶ νῦν ἐν Πυθῶνι νιν ἀγαθεία Καρνειάδα υἱὸς εὐθαλεῖ συνέμειξε τύχαι·

(Recap; games/home; τύχαι≈νικάσαις; Πυθῶνι≈Δελφῶν)
 ἔνθα νικάσαις ἀνέφανε Κυράναν, ἧ νιν εὐφρων δέξεται καλλιγύναικι πάτραι δόξαν ἱμερτὰν

ἀγαγόντ' ἀπὸ Δελφῶν. (75) ||

(Gen; νικάσαι<ἀρεταί; δόξαν→πολύμυθοι)

ἀρεταί δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι·

(Adv; long/short; ἀρεταί≈μακροῖσι; πολύμυθοι≠βαιά)

βαιὰ δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς·

(Exp [discerning audiences prefer this approach]; βαιὰ→καιρὸς; μακροῖσι→παντὸς)

ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν.

(En [βαιὰ ... ποικίλλειν: Pindar embellishes one particular victory])

ἔγνον ποτὲ καὶ Ἰόλαον οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντά νιν ἐπτάπυλοι Θῆβαι·

(Re, Sb; Θῆβαι≈Καδμείων ... ἀγνιᾶς)

τόν, Εὐρυκθῆος ἐπεὶ κεφαλάν (80) ἔπραθε φαργάνου ἀκμᾶι, κρύψαν ἔνερθ' ὑπὸ γᾶν
διφρηλάτα Ἀμφιτρύωνος κάματι, πατροπάτωρ ἔνθα οἱ Σπαρτῶν ξένος κείτο, λευκίπποισι
Καδμείων μετοικήσαις ἀγνιᾶς.

(Exp [πατροπάτωρ])

τέκε οἱ καὶ Ζηνὶ μιγεῖσα δαΐφρων ἐν μόνασι ὠδῖσιν Ἀλκμήνα (85) διδύμων κρατησίμαχον
κθένος υἱῶν.

(PolGen [from present praise]; υἱῶν≈Ἡρακλεῖ ... Ἰφικλέα)

κωφὸς ἀνὴρ τις, ὃς Ἡρακλεῖ στόμα μὴ περιβάλλει, μηδὲ Διρκαίων ὑδάτων ἀεὶ μέμνεται, τὰ
νιν θρέψαντο καὶ Ἰφικλέα·

(PolEn; στόμα μὴ περιβάλλει≠κωμάσομαί)

τοῖσι τέλειον ἐπ' εὐχᾷ κωμάσομαί τι παθῶν ἐκλόν.

(Inf [Imp] [Pr] [for success of poem]; κωμάσομαί→Χαρίτων)

Χαρίτων κελαδενῶν μὴ με λίποι καθαρὸν φέγγος.

(Ju [of prayer for help by citing topics to be treated]; celebration/success;

κελαδενῶν≠κιγαλόν)

Αἰγίνοι τε γάρ (90) φامي Νίκου τ' ἐν λόφῳ τρις δὴ πόλιν τάνδ' εὐκλείξας, κιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν
ἔργῳ φυγῶν·

(Inf [Imp]; success/celebration; πόλιν τάνδ' εὐκλείξας<ἐν ξυνῶι πεποναμένον; πόλιν→ἀκτῶν)

οὐνεκεν, εἰ φίλος ἀκτῶν, εἴ τις ἀντάεις, τό γ' ἐν ξυνῶι πεποναμένον εὖ μὴ λόγον βλάπτων
άλιοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω·

(Ex [λόγον]; ἀντάεις→ἐχθρόν; κρυπτέτω≠αἰνεῖν; πεποναμένον<καλὰ ῥέζοντ')

κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν (95) παντὶ θυμῶι σύν τε δίκαι καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν.

(En; καλὰ ῥέζοντ'>νικάσαντά)

πλεῖστα νικάσαντά σε καὶ τελεταῖς ὥριαις ἐν Παλλάδος εἶδον ἄφωνοί θ' ὥς ἕκασται φίλτατον
παρθενικαὶ πόσιν ἢ υἱὸν εὖχοντ', ὃ Τελεσίκρατες, ἔμμεν, (100) || ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις τε καὶ
βαθυκόλπου Γᾶς ἀέθλοισι ἐν τε καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπιχωρίοις.

(Authin; victor/family, you/I, recent/old; Τελεσίκρατες≈τις)

ἐμὲ δ' οὖν τις ἀοιδᾶν δῖψαν ἀκείομενον πρᾶσσει χρέος, αὐτίς ἐγεῖραι καὶ παλαιὰν δόξαν ἐῶν
προγόνων· (105)

(En)

οἷοι Λιβύσσης ἀμφὶ γυναικὸς ἔβαν Ἰρασα πρὸς πόλιν, Ἀνταίου μετὰ καλλίκομον μναστῆρες
ἀγακλέα κούραν·

(Gen; μναστῆρες<πολλοὶ ... ξείνων)

τὰν μάλα πολλοὶ ἀριστῆες ἀνδρῶν αἵτεον κύγγονοι, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ξείνων.

(ExpA)

ἐπεὶ θαητὸν εἶδος ἔπλετο·

(ExpB; εἶδος→ἦβας καρπὸν; αἵτεον→ἔθελον)

χρυσοστεφάνου δέ οἱ ἦβας καρπὸν ἀνθήσαντ' ἀποδρέψαι (110) ἔθελον.

(S)

πατὴρ δὲ θυγατρὶ φυτεύων κλεινότερον γάμον, ἄκουσεν Δαναὸν ποτ' ἐν Ἄργει οἷον εὗρεν
τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ παρθένοις, πρὶν μέσον ἄμαρ, ἐλεῖν ὠκύτατον γάμον·

(Exp [ὠκύτατον γάμον]; παρθένοις≈χορόν; ὠκύτατον→ἀγῶνος)

ἔστασεν γὰρ ἅπαντα χορόν ἐν τέρμασιν αὐτίκ' ἀγῶνος·

(S; ἀγῶνος→ἀέθλοισι)

σὺν δ' ἀέθλοισι ἐκέλευσεν διακρῖναι ποδῶν, (115) ἄντινα cήχοι τις ἡρώων, ὅσοι γαμβροὶ cφιν
ἦλθον.

(Ex [Par]; γαμβροὶ→νυμφίον ἄνδρα)

οὕτω δ' ἐδίδου Λίβυς ἀρμόζων κόραι νυμφίον ἄνδρα·

(Exp [οὕτω]; νυμφίον ἄνδρα≈ὸς)

ποτὶ γραμμᾶι μὲν αὐτὰν cτᾶσε κοcμήσαις, τέλος ἔμμεν ἄκρον, εἶπε δ' ἐν μέcκοις ἀπάγεσθαι,
ὃς ἂν πρῶτος θορών ἀμφὶ οἱ ψαύσειε πέπλοισι. (120)

(S; θορών≈φύγε; ἀπάγεσθαι≈ἄγεν; πρῶτος≈Ἀλεξίδαμος)

ἐνθ' Ἀλεξίδαμος, ἐπεὶ φύγε λαιψηρὸν δρόμον, παρθένον κεδνὰν χερὶ χειρὸς ἐλών ἄγεν
ἱπευτᾶν Νομάδων δι' ὄμιλον.

(S)

πολλὰ μὲν κεῖνοι δίκον φύλλ' ἔπι καὶ cτεφάνους·

(Ex [Par], Sb; cτεφάνους≈πτερὰ ... νικᾶν)

πολλά δὲ πρόσθεν πτερὰ δέξατο νικᾶν. (125)

Pythian 10

(Direct praise)

Ὀλβία Λακεδαίμων, μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία.

(Exp [the excellence of both cities]; μάκαιρα→ἀριστομάχου)

πατρὸς δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύει.

(Authin [irrelevance]; ἀριστομάχου→κομπέω)

τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν;

(Adv; irrelevant/relevant; κομπέω→ἐπικωμίαν ... ὅπα)

ἀλλὰ με Πυθώ τε καὶ τὸ Περινναῖον ἀπύει Ἀλεύα τε παῖδες, Ἴπποκλέαι θέλοντες (5) ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὅπα·

(Exp [epinician required], En; celebration/effort; Πυθώ<ἀέθλων)

γεύεται γὰρ ἀέθλων·

(Inst; effort/success; Πυθώ≈Παρνάσσιος ... μυχός; ἀέθλων>διαυλοδρομῶν)

στρατῶι τ' ἀμφικτιόνων ὁ Παρνάσσιος αὐτὸν μυχός διαυλοδρομῶν ὕπατον παίδων ἀνέειπεν.

(Gen; ὕπατον<τέλος; παίδων→ἀρχά)

Ἀπολλων, γλυκὺ δ' ἀνθρώπων τέλος ἀρχά τε δαίμονος ὀρνύντος αὔξεται· (10)

(Inst; τέλος>ἔπραξεν; δαίμονος ὀρνύντος>τεοῖς ... μήδεσι)

ὁ μὲν που τεοῖς τε μήδεσι τοῦτ' ἔπραξεν, τὸ δὲ συγγενὲς ἐμβέβακεν ἵχνεσιν πατρός
Ὀλυμπιονίκα δις ἐν πολεμαδόκοις Ἄρεος ὅπλοισ·

(Ex [father's success])

ἔθηκε καὶ βαθυλείμων ὑπὸ Κίρρας πετρᾶν (15) ἀγὼν κρατησίποδα Φρικίαν.

(Imp [Pr] [praise]; then/future; κρατησίποδα→πλοῦτον ἀνθεῖν)

ἔποιτο μοῖρα καὶ ὑτέραισιν ἐν ἀμέραις ἀγάνορα πλοῦτον ἀνθεῖν σφίσιν· ||

(PolRecapImp; πλοῦτον ἀνθεῖν<τερπνῶν ... δόσιν; μοῖρα→ἐκ θεῶν)

τῶν δ' ἐν Ἑλλάδι τερπνῶν λαχόντες οὐκ ὀλίγαν δόσιν, μὴ φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν (20)
μετατροπίαις ἐπικύρσαιεν.

(PolRecapImp; φθονεραῖς≠ἀπήμων; ἐκ θεῶν≈θεός)

θεὸς εἶη ἀπήμων κέαρ.

(Gen [from the case of the victor's father]; gods/men; τερπνῶν→ἀρεταῖ κρατήσαις)

εὐδαίμων δὲ καὶ ὑμνητὸς οὗτος ἀνὴρ γίνεται σοφοῖς, ὃς ἂν χερσὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρεταῖ κρατήσαις
τὰ μέγιστ' ἀέθλων ἔλῃ τόλμαι τε καὶ θένει, καὶ ζῶων ἔτι νεαρόν (25) κατ' αἶσαν υἱὸν ἴδι
τυχόντα στεφάνων Πυθίων.

(Adv; possible/impossible, men/gods)

ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτ' ἀμβατὸς αὐτῶι·

(Adv; further/*ne plus ultra*, gods/men, impossible/possible; ἀμπατός≠περαίνει)
ὅσαις δὲ βροτὸν ἔθνος ἀγλαΐαις ἀπτόμεσθα, περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον πλόον·

(Exp [this is most distant]; human/super-human, *ne plus ultra*/further; πλόον→ναυσι)
ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰών <κεν> εὖροις ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν. (30)

(PolInst; now/then, heroes/contemporaries; ἀγῶνα→ἐκατόμβας)
παρ' οἷς ποτε Περσεὺς ἐδαίκατο λαγέτας, δώματ' ἐσελθὼν, κλειτὰς ὄνων ἐκατόμβας
ἐπιτόσσαις θεῶι ῥέζοντας·

(ExA [Desc]; then/now; θεῶι≈Ἀπόλλων; ῥέζοντας≈ἐκατόμβας; ὄνων≈κνωδάλων)
ὧν θαλίαις ἔμπεδον εὐφαιμίας τε μάλιστ' Ἀπόλλων (35) χαίρει, γελᾷ θ' ὀρῶν ὕβριν
ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων. ||

(ExB [Desc])

Μοῖσα δ' οὐκ ἀποδαμεῖ τρόποις ἐπὶ σφετέροισι·

(Recap [Pol]; Μοῖσα→χοροί; ἀποδαμεῖ≠παντῇ)

παντῇ δὲ χοροὶ παρθένων λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν δονέονται·

(ExC [Desc])

δάφναι τε χρυσέαι κόμας ἀναδήσαντες εἰλαπινάζουσιν εὐφρόνως. (40)

(ExD [Desc])

νόκοι δ' οὔτε γῆρας οὐλόμενον κέκραται ἱερᾷ γενεᾷ·

(ExE [Desc]; νόκοι<πόνων)

πόνων δὲ καὶ μαχῶν ἄτερ οἰκέοισι φηγόντες ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν.

(Recap; now/then; πόνων δὲ καὶ μαχῶν ἄτερ→μακάρων)

θρασεῖαι δὲ πνέων καρδίαι μόλεν Δανάας ποτὲ παῖς, ἀγεῖτο δ' Ἀθήνα, (45) ἐς ἀνδρῶν
μακάρων ὄμιλον·

(S)

ἔπεφνεν τε Γοργόνα, καὶ ποικίλον κάρα δρακόντων φόβαισιν ἤλυθε νασιώταις λίθινον
θάνατον φέρων.

(Authin [verification]; λίθινον θάνατον→ἄπιστον)

ἐμοὶ δὲ θαυμάσαι θεῶν τελεσάντων οὐδέν ποτε φαίνεται ἔμμεν ἄπιστον. (50)

(Authin [irrelevance])

κώπαν χῆαρον, ταχὺ δ' ἄγκυραν ἔρεισον χθονὶ πρῶιραθε, χοιράδος ἄλκαρ πέτρας.

(Ju; χῆαρον≠θύνει)

ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλιττα θύνει λόγον. ||

(En [by change to new topic], Authin; ἐγκωμίων>ᾠοιδαῖς; μέλιττα→γλυκεῖαν)

ἔλπομαι δ' Ἐφυραίων (55) ὅπ' ἀμφὶ Πηγεῖδον γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἐμάν τὸν Ἴπποκλέαν ἔτι
καὶ μᾶλλον σὺν ᾠοιδαῖς ἑκατὶ στεφάνων θαητὸν ἐν ἄλιξι θησέμεν ἐν καὶ παλαιτέροις, νέαισιν
τε παρθένοισι μέλημα.

(Gen; μέλημα<ἔρωτες; παρθένοι<έτέροις)
καὶ γὰρ έτέροις έτέρων ἔρωτες ἔκνιζαν φρένας· (60)

(Adv, S; diversity/unity, hope/result; ἔρωτες→όρούει)
τῶν δ' ἕκαστος όρούει, τυχόν κεν ἄρπαλέαν σχέθοι φροντίδα τὰν παρ ποδός·

(Adv; near/far, possible/impossible; παρ ποδός≠εις ένιαυτὸν; φροντίδα→προνοῆσαι)
τὰ δ' εἰς ένιαυτὸν ἀτέκμαρτον προνοῆσαι.

(Adv, Authin; far/near, future/now, uncertain/certain; ἀτέκμαρτον≠πέποιθα)
πέποιθα ξενίαι προσανεί Θώρακος, όσπερ ἐμὰν ποιπνύων χάριν τόδ' ἔξευξεν ἄρμα Πιερίδων
τετράορον, (65) φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων ἄγοντα προφρόνως.

(Ju [of confidence], Gen; ξενίαι→νόος όρθός; φιλέοντ'<πειρῶντι)
πειρῶντι δὲ καὶ χρυςός ἐν βασάνωι πρέπει καὶ νόος όρθός.

(Inst; νόος όρθός>φέροντι νόμον Θεσσαλῶν)
ἀδελφεοῖσι τ' ἐπαινέχομεν ἐςλοῖς, ότι ὑψοῦ φέροντι νόμον Θεσσαλῶν (70) αὖξοντες·

(En; ἐςλοῖς≈ἀγαθοῖσι; ὑψοῦ φέροντι→κυβερνάσεις; νόμον Θεσσαλῶν→πολίων)
ἐν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι κεῖται πατρώϊαι κεδναὶ πολίων κυβερνάσεις.

Pythian 11

(Imp)
Κάδμου κόραι, Σεμέλα μὲν Όλυμπιάδων ἀγνιᾷτι, Ίνῳ δὲ Λευκοθέα ποντιᾷν όμοθάλαμῳ
Νηρηίδων, ἴτε σὺν Ήρακλέος ἀριστογόνωι ματρὶ παρ Μελίαν χρυσέων ἐς ἄδυτον τριπόδων
θησαυρόν, ὃν περιάλλ' ἐτίμασε Λοξίας, (5) Ίςμῆνιον δ' ὀνύμαξεν, ἀλαθέα μαντίων θῶκον, ὃ
παῖδες Ἀρμονίας, ἔνθα καὶ νυν ἐπίνομον ἡρώϊδων στρατὸν όμαγερέα καλεῖ συνίμεν, ὄφρα
Θέμιν ἱερὰν Πυθῶνά τε καὶ όρθοδίκαν γᾶς όμφαλὸν κελαθήσεται ἄκραι σὺν ἐσπέραι (10)
ἐπταπύλοισι Θήβαις χάριν ἀγῶνι τε Κίρρας, ἐν τῷ Θρακυδᾷος ἔμνασεν ἐστίαν τρίτον ἔπι
στέφανον πατρώϊαν βαλὼν, ἐν ἀφνεαῖς ἀρούραισι Πυλάδα (15) νικῶν ξένου Λάκωνος
Όρέστα. ||

(Re, Exp [ξένου Λάκωνος Όρέστα]; πατρώϊαν→πατρός)
τὸν δὴ φονευομένου πατρός Ἀρσινόα Κλυταιμῆστρας χειρῶν ὑπο κρατερᾶν ἐκ δόλου τροφός
ἄνελε δυσπενθέος, όπότε Δαρδανίδα κόραν Πριάμου Κασσάνδραν πολιῷ χαλκῷ σὺν
Ἀγαμεμνονίαι (20) ψυχᾷ πόρευ' Ἀχέροντος ἀκτὰν παρ' εὖσκιον νηλῆς γυνά.

(Qa [shocked]; χειρῶν ὑπο κρατερᾶν→βαρυπάλαμον χόλον)
πότερόν νιν ἄρ' Ίφιγένει' ἐπ' Εὐρίπῳ σφαχθεῖσα τῆλε πάτρας ἔκνισεν βαρυπάλαμον όρσαι
χόλον;

(Qb)
ἢ έτέρωι λέχει δαμαζομένην έννυχοι πάραγον κοῖται;

(Exp [why a plausible motive: she could not hope to hide her misdeed]; έτέρωι

λέχεῖ~ἀμπλάκιον)

τὸ δὲ νέαις ἀλόχοις (25) ἔχθιστον ἀμπλάκιον καλύψαι τ' ἀμάχανον ἀλλοτρίαισι γλώσσαις·

(Exp [impossible to hide]; γλώσσαις→κακολόγοι; ἀλλοτρίαισι→πολιται)

κακολόγοι δὲ πολιται.

(Exp; κακολόγοι→φθόνον)

ἴσχει τε γὰρ ὄλβος οὐ μείονα φθόνον·

(Recap [Pol]; conspicuos/obscure; φθόνον≠ἄφαντον; ὄλβος≠χαμηλὰ πνέων)

ὁ δὲ χαμηλὰ πνέων ἄφαντον βρέμει. (30)

(Recap [βαρυπάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον])

θάνεν μὲν αὐτὸς ἥρως Ἀτρεΐδης ἴκων χρόνῳ κλυταῖς ἐν Ἀμύκλαις, || μάντιν τ' ὄλεσσε κόραν, ἐπεὶ ἀμφ' Ἑλένην πυρωθέντας Τρώων ἔλυσσε δόμους ἀβρότατος.

(S; father/son)

ὁ δ' ἄρα γέροντα ξένον Στροφίον ἐξίκετο, νέα κεφαλά, (35) Παρνακκοῦ πόδα ναίοντ'·

(S, Adv [peak of interest]; νέα κεφαλά→χρονίῳ)

ἀλλὰ χρονίῳ σὺν Ἄρει πέφνεν τε ματέρα θῆκε τ' Αἴγιον ἐν φοναίῃ.

(Authin [irrelevance], Qa)

ἦρ', ὦ φίλοι, κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην, ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρὶν·

(Recap, Qb; τρίοδον→πλόου; ἐδινάθην→ἔξω πλόου)

ἦ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου ἔβαλεν, ὥς ὅτ' ἄκατον ἐνναλίαν; (40)

(Inf [Imp] [from stray into the irrelevant]; me/you, irrelevant/relevant)

Μοῖσα, τὸ δὲ τεόν, εἰ μισθοῖο συνέθου παρέχειν φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι ταρασσέμεν ἢ πατρὶ Πυθονίῳ τό γέ νυν ἢ Θρακυδαίῳ, τῶν εὐφροσύνα τε καὶ δόξ' ἐπιφλέγει. (45)

(En; δόξ'→καλλίνικοι πάλαι; ἐπιφλέγει→ἀκτῖνα)

τὰ μὲν <ἐν> ἄρμασι καλλίνικοι πάλαι Ὀλυμπία τ' ἀγώνων πολυφάτων ἔσχον θοὰν ἀκτῖνα σὺν ἵπποις, || Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ στάδιον καταβάντες ἤλεγξαν Ἑλλανίδα στρατιὰν ὠκύτατι.

(Gen [expressed through an exemplary wish]; καλλίνικοι<καλῶν; ὠκύτατι→ἐν ἀλικίαι)

θεόθεν ἐραίμαν καλῶν, (50) δυνατὰ μαιόμενος ἐν ἀλικίαι.

(Exp [this desire]; desire/reject; καλῶν→ὄλβῳ; δυνατὰ→τὰ μέγα; ἐραίμαν≠μέμφομ')

τῶν γὰρ ἀνὰ πόλιν εὐρίσκων τὰ μέγα μακροτέρῳ ὄλβῳ τεθαλότα, μέμφομ' αἴσαν τυραννίδων·

(Recap [Pol]; reject/embrace, private/public; αἴσαν τυραννίδων≠ξυναῖσι; ἀρεταῖς→καλῶν)

ξυναῖσι δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖς τέταμαι·

(Exp [strive for ξυναῖσι ... ἀρεταῖς]; positive/negative; ξυναῖσι≠φθονεροῖ)

φθονεροὶ δ' ἀμύνονται.

(Recap [Pol]; negative/positive, failure/success; ἀμύνονται≠ἄκρον ἐλὼν)

ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἄκρον ἔλων ἡκυχαῖ τε νεμόμενος αἰνὰν ὕβριν (55) ἀπέφυγεν, μέλανος ἂν ἐσχατίαν καλλίονα θανάτου <στείχου> γλυκυτάται γενεᾷ εὐώνυμον κτεάνων κρατίστην χάριν πορών·

(Inst; εὐώνυμον→ὕμνητον)

ἅ τε τὸν Ἰφικλείδαν διαφέρει Ἰόλαον (60) ὕμνητον ἔοντα, καὶ Κάκτορος βίαν, σέ τε, ἄναξ Πολύδευκες, υἱοὶ θεῶν, τὸ μὲν παρ' ἅμαρ ἔδρασι Θεράπνας, τὸ δ' οἰκέοντας ἔνδον Ὀλύμπου.

Pythian 12

(Imp [Pr])

Αἰτέω σε, φιλάγλαε, καλλίστα βροτεᾶν πολίων, Φερσεφόνας ἔδος, ἅ τ' ὄχθαις ἐπὶ μηλοβότου ναίεις Ἀκράγαντος εὐδματον κολώναν, ὃ ἄνα, ἴλαος ἀθανάτων ἀνδρῶν τε σὺν εὐμενίαι δέξαι στεφάνωμα τόδ' ἐκ Πυθῶνος εὐδόξωι Μίδαι (5) αὐτόν τε νιν Ἑλλάδα νικάσαντα τέχνη, τάν ποτε Παλλὰς ἐφεῦρε θρασειᾶν <Γοργόνων> οὐλίον θρηῖνον διαπλέξαις Ἀθάνᾳ· ||

(Exp [ἐφεῦρε]; <Γοργόνων>→παρθενίοις; θρηῖνον→ἅϊε)

τὸν παρθενίοις ὑπὸ τ' ἀπλάτοις ὀφίων κεφαλαῖς ἅϊε λειβόμενον δυσπενθεί σὺν καμάτῳ, (10) Περσεὺς ὁπότε τρίτον ἄσεν κασιγνητῶν μέρος ἐνναλίας Σερίφῳι λαοῖσι τε μοῖραν ἄγων.

(Recap; παρθενίοις≈Φόρκοι' ... γένος; μοῖραν→ἀμαύρωσεν; Σερίφῳι>Πολυδέκται)

ἦτοι τό τε θεσπέσιον Φόρκοι' ἀμαύρωσεν γένος, λυγρόν τ' ἔρανον Πολυδέκται θῆκε ματρός τ' ἔμπεδον δουλοσύναν τό τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος, (15) εὐπαράου κρᾶτα συλάσαις Μεδοίσις || υἱὸς Δανάας, τὸν ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ φαμέν αὐτορύτου ἔμμεναι.

(Sb, Adv [peak of interest]; men/gods; συλάσαις<πόνων; Φόρκοι' ... γένος>Εὐρυάλας)

ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ τούτων φίλον ἄνδρα πόνων ἐρρύκατο παρθένος αὐλῶν τεῦχε πάμφωνον μέλος, ὄφρα τὸν Εὐρυάλας ἐκ καρπαλιμῶν γενύων (20) χριμφθέντα σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσται' ἐρικλάγκταν γόον.

(Recap; τεῦχε≈εὔρεν)

εὔρεν θεός·

(Adv; finding/use, gods/men; εὔρεν→εὐροῖς'; γενύων→κεφαλᾶν; γόον→νόμον)

ἀλλὰ νιν εὐροῖς' ἀνδράσι θνατοῖς ἔχειν, ὠνύμασεν κεφαλᾶν πολλῶν νόμον, εὐκλεᾶ λαοσκόων μναστῆρ' ἀγώνων, || λεπτοῦ διανικόμενον χαλκοῦ θαμὰ καὶ δονάκων, (25) τοὶ παρὰ καλλίχορον ναίοισι πόλιν Χαρίτων Καφισίδος ἐν τεμένει, πιστοὶ χορευτῶν μάρτυρες.

(Gen [from victory implicit in previous description]; ἀγώνων→ὄλβος)

εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἄνευ καμάτου οὐ φαίνεται·

(Exp [success requires toil: success may not come immediately; persistent toil is necessary]; men/gods; φαίνεται≈τελευτάσει)

ἐκ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν ἦτοι κάμερον δαίμων

(Exp, Gen; δαίμων→μόρσιμον; τελευτάσει≈παρφυκτόν)

—τὸ δὲ μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτόν—

(Adv; success/failure, now/future, certainty/uncertainty; τελευτάσει≈δώσει; κάμερον≈χρόνος) ἀλλ' ἔσται χρόνος (30) οὗτος, ὃ καὶ τιν' ἀελπίται βαλὼν ἔμπαλιν γνώμας τὸ μὲν δώσει, τὸ δ' οὐπω.

Nemean 1

(Authin)

Ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφεοῦ, κλεινᾶν Κυρακοσσᾶν θάλος Ὀρτυγία, δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος, Δάλου
κασιγνήτα, cέθεν ἀδυεπής ὕμνος ὀρμᾶται θέμεν (5) αἶνον ἀελλοπόδων μέγαν ἵππων Ζηνὸς
Αἰτναίου χάριν·

(Exp [epinician]; ὕμνος≈μέλος; ἵππων→νικαφόροις)

ἄρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου Νεμέα τ' ἔργμασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος.

(En [ἐγκώμιον ... μέλος]; celebration/preparation; ἔργμασιν→ἀρεταῖς)

ἀρχαὶ δὲ βέβληνται θεῶν κείνου σὺν ἀνδρὸς δαιμονίαις ἀρεταῖς·

(Adv, S; preparation/success, beginning/end; ἀρχαὶ≠ἄκρον)

ἔστι δ' ἐν εὐτυχίαι (10) πανδοξίας ἄκρον·

(S; success/celebration; εὐτυχίαι→ἀέθλων)

μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ.

(Inf [Imp], En; Μοῖσα→ἀγλαίαν)

σπεῖρέ νυν ἀγλαίαν τινὰ νάσσει, τὰν Ὀλύμπου δεσπότης Ζεὺς ἔδωκεν Φερσεφόνοι, κατένευσεν
τέ οἱ χαίταις ἀριστεύουσιν εὐκάρπου χθονός Κυκελίαν πείραν ὀρθώσιν κορυφαῖς πολίων
ἀφνεαῖς· (15)

(En, S; wealth/war)

ὥπασε δὲ Κρονίων πολέμου μναστῆρά οἱ χαλκεντέος λαὸν ἵππαιχμον, θαμὰ δὴ καὶ
Ὀλυμπιάδων φύλλοις ἐλαιᾶν χρυσέοις μιχθέντα.

(Authin [huge theme, verification]; θαμὰ→πολλῶν)

πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλῶν. ||

(Ex [speaker's theme]; ἐπέβαν→ἔσταν; πολλῶν→καλὰ)

ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου καλὰ μελπόμενος, (20) ἔνθα μοι ἀρμόδιον
δεῖπνον κεκόσμηται, θαμὰ δ' ἄλλοδαπῶν οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι ἐντί·

(En [καλὰ μελπόμενος] ['he has it as his lot to bring good men against detractors like water
against smoke'], Gen [from present performance]; ἄλλοδαπῶν→ἐσλοῦς; καλὰ>λέλογχε)
λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐσλοῦς ὕδωρ καπνῶι φέρειν ἀντίον.

Priamel (Gen)

τέχνη δ' ἐτέρων ἕτεραι· (25)

(Adv; learning/nature, many/one; φέρειν ἀντίον→μάρνασθαι; τέχνη≠φυᾶι; ἐσλοῦς→φυᾶι)

χρὴ δ' ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φυᾶι.

(Exp [one must rely on φυᾶι]; φυᾶι>συγγενὲς)

πράσσει γὰρ ἔργωι μὲν σθένος, βουλαῖσι δὲ φρήν, ἐσκόμενον προῖδεῖν συγγενὲς οἷς ἔπεται.

(Inst; οἷς>céo; φρήν<τῶν τε καὶ τῶν; συγγενὲς→τρόπῳ)
Ἀγχιιδάμου παῖ, céo δ' ἀμφὶ τρόπῳ τῶν τε καὶ τῶν χρήσις. (30)

(Gen [about uses of virtues, expressed as first-person preference];
preparation/commemoration; ethics/wealth; χρήσις→εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι)
οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ
ἀκοῦσαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων.

(Exp [desire to help friends], Gen; ἔραμαι→ἐλπίδες; φίλοις ἐξαρκέων→κοινὰ; εὖ ... φίλοις
ἐξαρκέων→πολυπόνων)
κοινὰ γὰρ ἔρχοντ' ἐλπίδες πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν.

(Authin [selecting one case of a theme], Inst [Heracles]; πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν>Ἡρακλέος;
πολυπόνων→ἀρετῶν)
ἐγὼ δ' Ἡρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετῶν μεγάλαις, ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων
λόγον, ὥς, ἐπεὶ σπλάγγων ὕπο ματέρος αὐτίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διός (35) ὠδῖνα
φεύγων διδύμῳ σὺν κασιγνήτῳ μόλῃ, || ὥς οὐ λαθὼν χρυσόθρονον Ἥραν κροκωτὸν
σπάργανον ἐγκατέβη·
(Recap [Pol]; λαθὼν≠σπερχθεῖσα)
ἀλλὰ θεῶν βασίλεια σπερχθεῖσα θυμῷ πέμπε δράκοντας ἄφαρ. (40)

(S)
τοὶ μὲν οἰχθεῖσιν πυλᾶν ἐς θαλάμου μυχὸν εὐρὺν ἔβαν, τέκνοισιν ὠκείας γνάθους
ἀμφελίξασθαι μεμαῶτες·

(S; τέκνοισιν>ὁ)
ὁ δ' ὀρθὸν μὲν ἀντεινεν κάρα, πειρᾶτο δὲ πρῶτον μάχας, δις αἰδοιοὺς αὐχένων μάρψαις
ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν ἑαῖς ὄφιας. (45)

(S; ὄφιας→μελέων ἀφάτων)
ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόνος ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν μελέων ἀφάτων.

(S)
ἐκ δ' ἄρ' ἄτλατον δέος πλᾶξε γυναῖκας, ὅσαι τύχον Ἀλκμήνας ἀρήγοισαι λέχει·

(Ex [Par]; λέχει≈στροφῶν)
καὶ γὰρ αὐτὰ ποσσὶν ἄπεπλος ὀρούσαις ἀπὸ στροφῶν ὁμῶς ἄμυνεν ὕβριν κνωδάλων. (50)

(S; women/men)
ταχὺ δὲ Καδμείων ἀγοὶ χαλκείοις σὺν ὅπλοις ἔδραμον ἀθρόοι, ἐν χερσὶ δ' Ἀμφιτρύων κολεοῦ
γυμνὸν τινάσσων «φάσγανον» ἵκετ', ὀξείαις ἀνίαισι τυπεῖς.

(Exp [ἀνίαισι], Gen; ὀξείαις ἀνίαισι τυπεῖς→πιέζει)
τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον πιέζει πάνθ' ὁμῶς·
(Recap [Pol]; own/others; οἰκεῖον≠ἀλλότριον; πιέζει≠ἀπήμων)
εὐθὺς δ' ἀπήμων κραδία κᾶδος ἀμφ' ἀλλότριον. ||

(PolInst; ἀπήμων≠θάμβει δυσφόρῳ)
ἔστα δὲ θάμβει δυσφόρῳ (55) τερπνῶι τε μιχθείς.

(ExpA; τερπνῶι→δύναμιν)
εἶδε γὰρ ἐκνόμιον λῆμά τε καὶ δύναμιν υἱοῦ·
(ExpB; θάμβει→παλίγλωσσον)
παλίγλωσσον δὲ οἱ ἀθάνατοι ἀγγέλων ῥῆσιν θέσαν.

(S; ἀθάνατοι>Διὸς)
γείτονα δ' ἐκκάλεσεν Διὸς ὑψίστου προφάταν ἔξοχον, (60) ὀρθόμαντιν Τειρεσίαν·

(S; ὀρθόμαντιν→ὁμιλήσει)
ὁ δὲ οἱ φράζε καὶ παντὶ στρατῶι, ποίαις ὁμιλήσει τύχαις, ὅσους μὲν ἐν χέρσῳ κτανών,
ὅσους δὲ πόντῳ θήρας ἀιδροδίκας·

(Is; beasts/men; κτανών→μόρον)
καὶ τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ κτείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον (65) φᾶσέ νιν δώσειν μόρον.

(Is; men/gods; μόρον→μάχαν)
καὶ γὰρ ὅταν θεοὶ ἐν πεδίῳ Φλέγρας Γιγάντεσσιν μάχαν ἀντιάζωσιν, βελέων ὑπὸ ῥίπαϊσι
κείνου φαιδίμαν γαίαι πεφύρκεσθαι κόμαν ἔνεπεν·

(Is, S; success/immorality, war/peace; μάχαν≠εἰρήνη; βελέων<καμάτων)
αὐτὸν μὲν ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον <ἐν> σχερῶι ἡσυχίαν καμάτων μεγάλων ποινὰν
λαχόντ' ἐξαίρετον (70) ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμασι, δεξάμενον θαλερὰν Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν καὶ γάμον
δαίσαντα παρ Διὶ Κρονίδαι, σεμνὸν αἰνήσειν νόμον.

Nemean 2

(Direct praise)
Ὅθεν περ καὶ Ὀμηρίδαι ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ' αἰδοὶ ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου, καὶ ὃδ'
ἀνὴρ καταβολὰν ἱερῶν ἀγώνων νικαφορίας δέδεκται πρῶτον Νεμεαίου ἐν πολυμνήτῳ Διὸς
ἄλσει. (5) ||

(Adv, S; now/future, actual/potential; καταβολὰν→ὀφείλει; ἱερῶν ἀγώνων>Ἰσθμιάδων)
ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι, πατρίαν εἶπερ καθ' ὁδὸν νιν εὐθυπομπὸς αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλας δέδωκε κόσμον
Ἀθάναις, θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον ἐν Πυθίοις τε νικᾶν Τιμονόου
παῖδ'·

(Ex [future victories]; Ἰσθμιάδων<Πελειάδων)
ἔστι δ' εἰκός (10) || ὀρεῖαν γε Πελειάδων μὴ τηλόθεν Ὠαρίωνα νεῖσθαι.

(Exp [εἰκός])
καὶ μὲν ἅ Καλαμὶς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατὰν δυνατός.

(InstA; φῶτα μαχατὰν>Αἴαντος)

ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἴκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν·
(InstB, Cap, Ex [Par]; then/now, heroes/contemporaries; φῶτα μαχατάν>Τιμόδημε)
ὦ Τιμόδημε, σὲ δ' ἀλκά παγκρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει. (15) ||

(Gen; ἀλκά→εὐάνορες; Τιμόδημε<Αχάρναι)
Αχάρναι δὲ παλαίφατον εὐάνορες·

(Inst; εὐάνορες→ἀέθλοισ; παλαίφατον→προλέγονται; Αχάρναι>Τιμοδημίδαι)
ὅσσα δ' ἄμφ' ἀέθλοισ, Τιμοδημίδαι ἐξοχώτατοι προλέγονται.

(Inst; ἀέθλοισ>ἀέθλων)
παρὰ μὲν ὑψιμέδοντι Παρνασσῷ τέσσαρας ἐξ ἀέθλων νίκας ἐκόμιζαν·
(ExA [Cat])
ἀλλὰ Κορινθίων ὑπὸ φωτῶν (20) || ἐν ἐκλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς ὀκτὼ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν ἤδη·
(ExB [Cat])
ἐπτά δ' ἐν Νεμέαι, τὰ δ' οἴκοι μάσσον' ἀριθμοῦ, Διὸς ἀγῶνι.

(Inf [Imp] [hymn of thanks]; then/now, games/home, success/celebration; οἴκοι→πολῖται)
τόν, ὦ πολῖται, κωμάξατε Τιμοδήμωι σὺν εὐκλεί νόστωι·
(RecapImp; κωμάξατε→ἐξάρχετε)
ἀδυμελεῖ δ' ἐξάρχετε φωνᾷ. (25) ||

Nemean 3

(Imp [Pr])
ὦ πότνια Μοῖσα, μᾶτερ ἀμετέρα, λίσσομαι, τὰν πολυξέναν ἐν ἱερομηνίαι Νεμεάδι ἵκεο
Δωρίδα νᾶσον Αἴγιναν·

(Ju; Αἴγιναν>Ἀσωπίωι; Μοῖσα→κώμων)
ὔδατι γάρ μένοντ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπίωι μελιγαρύων τέκτονες κώμων νεανίαι, σέθεν ὅπα μαιόμενοι.
(5)

(Exp [ὅπα μαιόμενοι], Gen; μαιόμενοι<διψῆι; κώμων<ᾠοιδᾶν; ὔδατι→διψῆι)
διψῆι δὲ πρᾶγος ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου, ἀθλονικία δὲ μάλιστ' ᾠοιδᾶν φιλεῖ, στεφάνων ἀρετᾶν τε
δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν·

(Inf [Imp]; ᾠοιδᾶν→μήτιος)
τᾶς ἀφθονίαν ὀπαξε μήτιος ἀμᾶς ἄπο·
(RecapImp; ἀφθονίαν→δόκιμον)
ἄρχε δ' οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ, (10) δόκιμον ὕμνον·

(JuA, S; you/me)
ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὀάροις λύραι τε κοινάσομαι.
(JuB [‘the adornment (i.e. the praise) of this land will be a labour of pleasure’];
κοινάσομαι→πόνον)
χαρίεντα δ' ἔξει πόνον χώρας ἄγαλμα, Μυρμιδόνες ἵνα πρότεροι ᾤκησαν, ὧν παλαίφατον
ἀγοράν οὐκ ἐλεγγέεσσιν Ἀριστοκλείδας τεάν (15) ἐμίανε κατ' αἴσαν ἐν περισθενεῖ μαλαχθεῖς

παγκρατίου στόλῳ·

(S, En [χώρας ἄγαλμα]; effort/celebration; ἐμίανε≠τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει; παγκρατίου στόλῳ→πλαγᾶν; ἄγαλμα→ἄκος; πόνον→πλαγᾶν)
καματωδέων δὲ πλαγᾶν ἄκος ὑγιηρὸν ἐν βαθυπεδίῳ Νεμέαι τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει.

(Adv; celebration/*ne plus ultra*; τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει<ἔρδων ... ἐοικότα; καματωδέων ... πλαγᾶν→ἀνορέαις)
εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' ἐοικότα μορφᾷ ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος, οὐκέτι πρόσω (20) ἀβάταν ἄλλα κιόνων ὕπερ Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές, || ἦρως θεὸς ᾧς ἔθηκε ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας μάρτυρας κλυτάς·

(Sb; ἐσχάτας→τέλος; ἄλλα≈πελάγει)
δάμασε δὲ θῆρας ἐν πελάγει ὑπερόχους, ἰδία τ' ἐρεύνασε τεναγέων ῥοάς, ὅπῃ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος, (25) καὶ γᾶν φράδασε.

(Authin [irrelevance]; γᾶν→ἄκραν; πελάγει→πλόον)
θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπὴν ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβει;

(Inf [Imp] [from stay into the irrelevant]; non-local/local, irrelevant/relevant;
ἀλλοδαπὴν≠Αἰακῶι ... γένει)
Αἰακῶι σε φαμί γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν.

(Ju, Gen; local/non-local; Μοῖσαν φέρειν≈αἰνεῖν; Αἰακῶι<ἐκλὸν; Αἰακῶι ... γένει≠ἀλλοτρίων)
ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, “ἐκλὸν αἰνεῖν,” οὐδ' ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες· (30)

(RecapImp; non-local/local; ἀλλοτρίων≠οἴκοθεν)
οἴκοθεν μάτευε.

(Ju)
ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον ἔλαχεσ γλυκύ τι γαρυμένον.

(En, InstA; κόσμον>Πηλεὺς)
παλαιαῖσι δ' ἐν ἀρεταῖς γέγαθε Πηλεὺς ἄναξ, ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών·

(S; ἀρεταῖς>εἶλε)
ὃς καὶ Ἰαολκὸν εἶλε μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς, καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν (35) ἐγκονητί.

(InstB; κόσμον>Τελαμῶν)
Λαομέδοντα δ' εὐρυςθενῆς Τελαμῶν Ἴόλαι παραστάτας ἐὼν ἔπερσεν καὶ ποτε χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων μετ' ἀλκὰν ἔπετό οἱ, οὐδέ νῖν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας ἔπαυσεν ἀκμὰν φρενῶν.

(Gen; Τελαμῶν<τις)
συγγενεῖ δέ τις εὐδοξίαι μέγα βρίθει. (40)
(Recap [Pol]; nature/learning, success/failure, positive/negative; εὐδοξίαι≠ψεφεννός; συγγενεῖ≠διδάκτ')
ὃς δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει, ψεφεννὸς ἀνὴρ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων οὐ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ κατέβα ποδί, μυριᾶν δ' ἀρετᾶν ἀτελεῖ νόῳ γεύεται. ||

(PollInst; negative/positive, failure/success, learning/nature; ἀρετᾶν→ἔργα; διδάκτ'≠παῖς; ψεφεννός≠Ἀχιλεὺς)

ξανθὸς δ' Ἀχιλεὺς τὰ μὲν μένων Φιλύρακ ἐν δόμοις, παῖς ἐὼν ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα·

(Inst [μεγάλα ἔργα]; ἔργα>μάχαι)

χερσὶ θαμινὰ βραχυσίδαρον ἄκοντα πάλλων ἴσα τ' ἀνέμοις, (45) μάχαι λεόντεσσιν ἀγροτέροις ἔπραττεν φόνον, κάπρους τ' ἔναιρε·

(S; κάπρους<σώματα)

σώματα δὲ παρὰ Κρονίδακ Κένταυρον ἀσθμαίνοντα κόμιζεν, ἐξέτης τὸ πρῶτον, ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἂν χρόνον·

(Ex [Desc]; σώματα>ἐλάφους)

τὸν ἐθάμβεον Ἄρτεμῖς τε καὶ θρασεῖ Ἀθάνα, (50) κτείνοντ' ἐλάφους ἄνευ κυνῶν δολίων θ' ἐρκέων·

(Exp [ἄνευ κυνῶν δολίων θ' ἐρκέων]; ἐρκέων≠ποσσί)

ποσσί γὰρ κράτεσκε.

(Authin [asserting truth of forthcoming narrative])

λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος ἔχω·

(En)

βαθυμῆτα Χείρων τράφε λιθίνωι Ἰάσον' ἔνδον τέγει, καὶ ἔπειτεν Ἀσκληπιόν, τὸν φαρμάκων δίδαξε μαλακόχειρα νόμον· (55)

(S, Cap, Ex [Par]; τράφε→ἀτίταλλεν)

νύμφευσε δ' αὖτις ἀγλαόκολπον Νηρέος θύγατρα, γόνον τέ οἱ φέρτατον ἀτίταλλεν <έν> ἄρμένοις πᾶσι θυμὸν αὖξων, ὅφρα θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι πεμφθεῖς ὑπὸ Τροίαν δορίκτυπον ἀλαλὰν Λυκίων τε προσμένοι καὶ Φρυγῶν (60) Δαρδάνων τε, καὶ ἐγγεσφόροις ἐπιμείζαις Αἰθιοπέεσσι χεῖρας ἐν φρασί πάξαιθ', ὅπως σφίσι μὴ κοίρανος ὀπίσω πάλιν οἴκαδ' ἀνεψιὸς ζαμενῆς Ἐλένοιο Μένων μόλοι. ||

(S; γόνον<Αἰακιδᾶν; success/immortality)

τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν·

(Address, En [glory of Aeacidae]; Αἰακιδᾶν≈τεὸν ... αἶμα)

Ζεῦ, τεὸν γὰρ αἶμα, σέο δ' ἄγων, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν (65) ὅπῃ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων.

(En [ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων]; ἐπιχώριον χάρμα≈τάνδε νᾶσον εὐκλεί προσέθηκε λόγῳ; ἐπιχώριον→νᾶσον; κελαδέων→βοᾶ; ἄγων→νικαφόρῳ)

βοᾶ δὲ νικαφόρῳ σὺν Ἀριστοκλείδαι πρέπει, ὅς τάνδε νᾶσον εὐκλεί προσέθηκε λόγῳ καὶ σεμνὸν ἀγλααῖσι μερίμναις Πυθίου Θεάριον.

(Adv; hope/result; μερίμναις≠πείραι; νικαφόρῳ→τέλος; Ἀριστοκλείδαι<παιδί)

ἐν δὲ πείραι τέλος (70) διαφαίνεται, ὧν τις ἐξοχώτερος γένηται, ἐν παισὶ νέοις παῖς, ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἀνὴρ, τρίτον ἐν παλαιτέροισι, μέρος ἕκαστον οἷον ἔχομεν βρότεον ἔθνος·

(Ex [mortal excellence]; τρίτον→τέσσαρας; μέρος ἕκαστον→τὸ παρκεείμενον; βρότεον ἔθνος→<ὁ> θνατὸς αἰὼν)

ἐλαῖ δὲ καὶ τέσσαρας ἀρετάς <ὁ> θνατὸς αἰὼν, φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκεείμενον. (75)

(Inst)

τῶν οὐκ ἄπεσσι·

(Imp [closure])

χαῖρε, φίλος·

(Ju; you/I)

ἐγὼ τόδε τοι πέμπω μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῶι σὺν γάλακτι, κίρναμένα δ' ἕερς' ἀμφέπει, πόμ' αἰοίδιμον Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν, ὅψέ περ.

(Adv; slow/quick, late/excellent; ὅψε≠αῖψα; πέμπω→τηλόθε; ἐγὼ→αἰετὸς)

ἔστι δ' αἰετὸς ὥκς ἐν ποτανοῖς, (80) ὃς ἔλαβεν αῖψα, τηλόθε μεταμαιόμενος, δαφοινὸν ἄγραν ποσίν·

(Adv; success/failure, positive/negative; ποτανοῖς>κολοιοῖ)

κραγέται δὲ κολοιοῖ ταπεινὰ νέμονται.

(PolInst [bad poets fail; Pindar has succeeded]; negative/positive, failure/success; ταπεινὰ νέμονται≠δέδορκεν φάος)

τίν γε μὲν, εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοΐας, ἀεθλοφόρου λήματος ἔνεκεν Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος.

Nemean 4

(Gen)

Ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων ἱατρός·

(Exp [best doctor]; celebration/song; εὐφροσύνα>αοιδαῖ; ἱατρός→σοφαί)

αἱ δὲ σοφαί Μοικᾶν θύγατρες αοιδαὶ θέλξαν νιν ἀπτόμεναι.

(Ex [θέλξαν]; θέλξαν→μαλθακὰ; αοιδαὶ→εὐλογία)

οὐδὲ θερμὸν ὕδωρ τόσον γε μαλθακὰ τεύχει γυῖα, τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος. (5)

(Exp [poetry has this power]; commemoration/immortality; εὐλογία≈ῥῆμα)

ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, ὃ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι γλῶσσαι φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας. ||

(ImpA [Pr] [future of song], Inst [wished for]; ῥῆμα>ὕμνου; ἐργμάτων>πάλαι)

τό μοι θέμεν Κρονίδαί τε Διὶ καὶ Νεμέαι Τιμαράρχου τε πάλαι (10) ὕμνου προκώμιον εἶη·

(ImpB, S; victor/city)

δέξαιτο δ' Αἰακιδᾶν εὐρύπυργον ἔδος, δίκαι ξεναρκεῖ κοινόν φέγγος.

(Ex [reception of song]; city/family; Αἰακιδᾶν εὐρύπυργον ἔδος>ὁς πατήρ; ὕμνου~τῶιδε μέλει)

εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἀλίῳι ὁς πατήρ ἐθάλπετο, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων θαμά κε, τῶιδε μέλει κλιθεῖς, (15) υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον || Κλεωναίου τ' ἀπ' ἀγῶνος ὄρμον στεφάνων πέμψαντα καὶ λιπαρᾶν εὐωνύμων ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν, Θήβαις τ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι οὔνεκ' Ἀμφιτρύωνος ἀγλαὸν παρὰ τύμβον (20) Καδμεῖοι νιν οὐκ ἀέκοντες ἄνθεσι μείγνουν, Αἰγίνας ἕκατι.

(Exp [οὐκ ἀέκοντες], Sb; τύμβον→αὐλάν; οὐκ ἀέκοντες→φίλοις)

φίλοις γὰρ φίλος ἐλθὼν ξένιον ἄττυ κατέδρακεν Ἡρακλέος ὀλβίαν πρὸς αὐλάν. ||

(Re, Sb, Exp [Aeginetan-Theban friendship])

ὅν ὅι ποτε Τροίαν κραταῖος Τελαμών (25) πόρθησε καὶ Μέροπας καὶ τὸν μέγαν πολεμιστὰν ἔκπαγλον Ἀλκυονῆ, οὐ τετραορίας γε πρὶν δυνώδεκα πέτρῳ ἥροας τ' ἐπεμβεβαῶτας ἵπποδάμους ἔλεν δις τόσους.

(Gen [in the next unit]; πολεμιστὰν≠ἀπειρομάχας)

ἀπειρομάχας ἐὼν κε φανείη (30) λόγον ὃ μὴ συνιεί·

(Exp [experienced understand]; πόρθησε<ῥέζοντά; ἔλεν<παθεῖν)

ἐπεὶ ῥέζοντά τι καὶ παθεῖν ἔοικεν. ||

(AuthinA [long mythological theme])

τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός ὥραϊ τ' ἐπειγόμεναι·

(AuthinB [further reason for curtailing theme]; ὥραϊ→νεομηνίαι; τεθμός≠ἦτορ)

ἵυγγι δ' ἔλκομαι ἦτορ νεομηνίαι θιγέμεν. (35)

(Adv, Imp; ἔλκομαι→ἔχει ... μέσσον; μακρὰ→βαθεῖα ... ἄλμα)

ἔμπα, καίπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντιάς ἄλμα μέσσον, ἀντίτειν' ἐπιβουλία·

(Ju; ἀντίτειν'→δαΐων)

ὁφόδρα δόξομεν δαΐων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν·

(Exp [δαΐων ὑπέρτεροι]; positive/negative, success/failure; φάει≠σκότῳ; δαΐων>ἄλλος ἀνὴρ)

φθονερά δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλίνδει (40) || χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν.

(Adv; negative/positive, someone/me, failure/success; γνώμαν κενεὰν≠ἀρετάν; χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν≠πεπρωμέναν τελέσει)

ἐμοὶ δ' ὅποιαν ἀρετάν ἔδωκε Πότμος ἀναξ, εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι χρόνος ἔρπων πεπρωμέναν τελέσει.

(En [resist urge to curtail myth], RecapImp)

ἐξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, φόρμιγγξ, Λυδίαι σὺν ἀρμονίᾳ μέλος πεφιλημένον (45)

Οἰνῶναι τε καὶ Κύπρῳ, ἔνθα Τεῦκρος ἀπάρχει ὁ Τελαμωνιάδας·

(En, ExA [Cat])

ἄτάρ Αἴας Καλαμῖν' ἔχει πατρώϊαν· ||

(ExB [Cat])

ἐν δ' Εὐξείνῳ πελάγει φαεννὰν Ἀχιλεὺς νᾶσον·

(ExC [Cat])

Θέτις δὲ κρατεῖ (50) Φθίαι·

(ExD [Cat])

Νεοπτόλεμος δ' ἀπείρῳ διαπρυαίαι, βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἔξοχοι κατάκεινται Δωδώνῃθεν ἀρχόμενοι πρὸς Ἴόνιον πόρον.

(ExE [Cat])

Παλίου δὲ παρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαολκὸν πολεμίαι χερὶ προστραπὼν (55) Πηλεὺς παρέδωκεν Αἰμόνεσσι || δάμαρτος Ἱπολύτας Ἀκάστου δολίαις τέχναισι χρηράμενος·

(Sb; δολίαις→λόχου)

ταῖ Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίραι φύτευέ οἱ θάνατον ἐκ λόχου Πελῖαι παῖς·

(S, Adv; hope/result; θάνατον≠ἄλαλκε)

ἄλαλκε δὲ Χείρων, (60) καὶ τὸ μόρσιμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένον ἔκφερεν·

(S)

πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲς θρασυμαχάνων τε λεόντων ὄνυχας ὀξύτατους ἀκμάν τε δεινοτάτων σκάσαις ὀδόντων ἔγαμεν ὑψηθρόνων μίαν Νηρείδων. (65)

(Ex [marriage]; ἔγαμεν→δῶρα)

εἶδεν δ' εὐκυκλον ἔδραν, τὰς οὐρανοῦ βασιλῆες πόντου τ' ἐφεζόμενοι δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξέφραναν ἐγγενὲς αὐτῷ.

(Authin [huge subject, i.e. the whole story of the Aeacidae (κράτος ... ἐγγενὲς)])

Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν·

(Inf [Imp]; Γαδείρων≠Εὐρώπαν)

ἀπότερεπε αὐτίς Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός· (70)

(Ju)

ἄπορα γὰρ λόγον Αἰακοῦ παίδων τὸν ἅπαντά μοι διελθεῖν. ||

(Exp [impossible to treat whole theme: he must attend to his encomiastic purpose], En [return to main theme]; heroes/contemporaries, impossible/possible, past/present)

Θεανδρίδαισι δ' ἀξιγυῖων ἀέθλων κάρυξ ἑτοῖμος ἔβαν Οὐλυμπία τε καὶ Ἴσθμοι Νεμέαι τε συνθέμενος, (75) ἔνθα πεῖραν ἔχοντες οἴκαδε κλυτοκάρπων οὐ νέοντ' ἄνευ στεφάνων, πάτραν ἴν' ἀκούομεν, Τιμάρχα, τεὰν ἐπινικίαις ἀοιδαῖς πρόπολον ἔμμεναι.

(Adv [victory vs. additional topic], Ex [ἐπινικίαις ἀοιδαῖς πρόπολον];

Θεανδρίδαισι>Καλλικλεῖ; ἐπινικίαις ἀοιδαῖς→στάλαν; συνθέμενος→κελεύεις)

εἰ δέ τοι μάτρῳ μ' ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύεις (80) || στάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν·

(Exp [victor's request], Gen; Παρίου λίθου→χρυσὸς; λευκοτέραν→αὐγὰς;

Καλλικλεῖ<φῶτα)

ὁ χρυσοῦς ἐνψόμενος αὐτὰς ἔδειξεν ἀπάσας, ὕμνος δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐργμάτων βασιλεῦσιν
ἰσοδαίμονα τεύχει φῶτα·

(En, Inf [Imp]; ὕμνος>γλῶσσαν; ἐργμάτων>θάλας)
κεῖνος ἀμφ’ Ἀχέροντι ναιετάων ἐμάν (85) γλῶσσαν εὐρέτω κελαδῆτιν, Ὀρκοτριάνα ἴν’ ἐν
ἀγῶνι βαρυκτύπου θάλας Κορινθίοις κελίνοις· ||

(Ex [Par]; me/him; γλῶσσαν→ἀείκεται)
τὸν Εὐφάνης ἐθέλων γεραιὸς προπάτωρ ἀείκεται, παῖ, ὁ κός. (90)

Priamel (Exp [ἐθέλων ... ἀείκεται]; γεραιὸς→ἄλικες; τὸν ... Εὐφάνης<ἄλλοις ... ἄλλοι)
ἄλλοις δ’ ἄλικες ἄλλοι·
(Cap; diversity/unity; ἀείκεται<φάσθαι; ἐθέλων<ἔλπεταί; τὸν<τὰ; Εὐφάνης<ἕκαστος)
τὰ δ’ αὐτὸς ἀντιτύχηι, ἔλπεταί τις ἕκαστος ἐξοχώτατα φάσθαι.

(Inst [hypothetical]; family/trainer; φάσθαι>αἰνέων; ἐξοχώτατα→ἔριδα; τὰ>Μελισίαν)
οἷον αἰνέων κε Μελισίαν ἔριδα στρέφοι, ῥήματα πλέκων, ἀπάλαιστος ἐν λόγῳ ἔλκειν,
μαλακὰ μὲν φρονέων ἐκλοῖς, (95) τραχὺς δὲ παλιγκότοις ἔφεδρος.

Nemean 5

(Authin)
Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ’, ὥς τ’ ἐλινύσοντα ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγάματ’ ἐπ’ αὐτὰς βαθμίδος ἐσταότ’·
(Recap [Pol], Imp; ἐλινύσοντα≠στεῖχ’; αὐτὰς≠πάσας)
ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ πάσας ὀλκάδος ἐν τ’ ἀκάτωι, γλυκεῖ’ αἰοιδά, στεῖχ’ ἀπ’ Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοις, ὅτι
Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυςθενῆς νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον, (5) οὐπω γένυσι
φαίνων τερεῖνας ματέρ’ οἰνάνθας ὁπώραν, ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς
φυτευθέντας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεῶν Νηρηίδων Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν ματρώπολιν τε, φίλαν ξένων
ἄρουραν·

(Re, Sb; now/then; ὀλκάδος→ναυκυκλυτάν; εὐρυςθενῆς→εὐανδρόν; Ζηνὸς≈πατέρος
Ἑλλανίου)
τάν ποτ’ εὐανδρόν τε καὶ ναυκυκλυτάν θέσσαντο, παρ βωμόν πατέρος Ἑλλανίου (10) στάντες,
πίτναν τ’ ἐς αἰθέρα χεῖρας ἀμᾶ Ἐνδαΐδος ἀριγνώτες υἱοὶ καὶ βία Φώκου κρέοντος, ὁ τὰς θεοῦ,
ὄν Ψαμάθεια τίκτ’ ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου.

(Authin [inappropriate next step]; positive/negative)
αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκαι τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον, πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον, (15) καὶ τίς
ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους δαίμων ἀπ’ Οἰνῶνας ἔλασεν.

(Recap)
στάσομαι·

(Ju, Gen; εἰπεῖν→φαίνοισα πρόσωπον)
οὐ τοι ἅπανα κερδίων φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει’ ἀτρεκής·
(Recap [Pol]; φαίνοισα πρόσωπον≠τὸ σιγᾶν; ἅπανα≠πολλάκις; κερδίων→σοφώτατον)
καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώτατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι. ||

(Adv, En [of silence by change of topic]; silence/praise; τὸ σιγᾶν≠ἐπαινῆσαι)
εἰ δ' ὄλβον ἢ χειρῶν βίαν ἢ σιδαρίταν ἐπαινῆσαι πόλεμον δεδόκηται, μακρά μοι αὐτόθεν
ἄλμαθ' ὑποσκάπτοι τις·

(JuA; ἄλμαθ'→ἐλαφράν)

ἔχω γονάτων ὀρμὰν ἐλαφράν· (20)

(JuB, Ex [Par]; ὀρμὰν→πάλλοντ'; μακρά→πέραν πόντοιο; μοι→αἰετοί)

καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί.

(JuC [by precedent]; πέραν πόντοιο→ἐν Παλίῳ; ἐπαινῆσαι→ᾄδ'; ὄλβον>κείνοισ ᾄδ')
πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοισ ᾄδ' ἐν Παλίῳ Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός, ἐν δὲ μέσσις φόρμιγγ'
Ἀπόλλων ἐπτάγλωσσαν χρυσεῷ πλάκτρῳ διώκων ἀγέϊτο παντοίων νόμων·

(Is; ᾄδ'≈ὕμνησαν; κείνοισ>Πηλέα)

αἱ δὲ πρώτιστον μὲν ὕμνησαν Διὸς ἀρχόμενοι σεμνὰν Θέτιν (25) Πηλέα θ', ὥς τέ νιν ἄβρᾶ
Κρηγεῖς Ἴππολύτα δόλῳ πεδᾶσαι ἤθελε ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπὸν πείσαις' ἀκοίταν ποικίλοις
βουλεύμασιν, ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον, ὥς ἦρα νυμφείας ἐπεῖρα κείνος ἐν
λέκτροις Ἀκάστου (30) εὐνᾶς·

(Adv, Is?; falsity/truth)

τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν·

(Exp)

πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν.

(S; λιτάνευεν→αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι)

τοῖο δ' ὄργαν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι·

(S; ὄργαν→ἀπανάνατο)

εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν, ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον δείσαις·

(S; πατρὸς→Ζεὺς; νύμφαν≠ἄκοιτιν)

ὁ δ' εὖ φράσθη κατένευσεν τέ οἱ ὀρσινεφῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς, ὥς τ' ἐν
τάχει (35) ποντίαν χρυσαλακάτων τινὰ Νηρεΐδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν, || γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα
πείσαις, ὃς Αἰγᾶθεν ποτὶ κλειτὰν θαμὰ νίκεται Ἴσθμὸν Δωρίαν·

(Exp [frequent trips to Isthmus], S; then/now; νίκεται→δέκονται)

ἔνθα νιν εὐφρονες ἴλαι σὺν καλάμοιο βοᾷ θεὸν δέκονται, καὶ σθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θρασεῖ.

(Gen [springs from mention of athletics]; effort/success; σθένει<ἔργων; ἐρίζοντι→κρίνει)

Πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενῆς ἔργων πέρι (40) πάντων.

(InstA; ἔργων>Νίκας)

τὸ δ' Αἰγίναθε δῖς, Εὐθύμενες, Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.

(InstB; then/now; συγγενῆς→ὁμόςπορον ἔθνος)

ἦτοι μετὰίξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεδὸς μάρτως ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόςπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.

(Exp [he glorifies the family])

Ἄ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν μείς τ' ἐπιχώριος, ὃν φίλης' Ἀπόλλων·

(Ex [Cat]; ἐπιχώριος→οἱκοί)

ἄλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἱκοί τ' ἐκράτει (45) Νίκου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεῖ λόφῳ.

(Gen [from family's victories]; ἐκράτει→μάρναται; οἱκοί→πόλις)

χαίρω δ' ὅτι ἐκλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις.

(Inst; local/non-local, effort/success; μάρναται→μόχθων; πόλις≠Μενάνδρου)

ἴσθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι Μενάνδρου σὺν τύχαι μόχθων ἀμοιβάν ἐπαύρεο.

(Gen [from success of trainer]; Μενάνδρου<τέκτον')

χρὴ δ' ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον' ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν·

(Adv, Imp; trainer/family, non-local/local; ἀεθληταῖσιν>Θεμίσιον)

εἰ δὲ Θεμίσιον ἴκεις ὥστ' ἀείδειν, μηκέτι ῥίγει·

(PolRecapImp, En; ῥίγει≠τεῖνον; ἀείδειν≈φθέγγει)

δίδου (50) φωνάν, ἀνὰ δ' ἰκτῖα τεῖνον πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου, πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου φθέγγει ἐλεῖν Ἐπιδαύρῳ διπλόαν νικῶντ' ἀρετάν, προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ ἀνθέων ποιᾶεντα φέρε στεφανώματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν.

Nemean 6

(Gen)

Ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θεῶν γένος·

(Exp [one race]; ἐν→μῖα; γένος→ματρὸς)

ἐκ μῖα δὲ πνέομεν ματρὸς ἀμφοτέρου·

(Adv; unity/diversity; μῖα≠διείργει)

διείργει δὲ πᾶσα κεκριμένα δύναμις, ὥς τὸ μὲν οὐδέν, ὃ δὲ χάλκεος ἀσφαλὲς αἰὲν ἔδος μένει οὐρανός.

(Adv; diversity/unity; δύναμις>φύσιν; διείργει≠προσφέρομεν)

ἀλλὰ τι προσφέρομεν ἔμπαν ἢ μέγαν νόον ἥτοι φύσιν ἀθανάτοισι, (5) καίπερ ἐφαμερίαν οὐκ εἰδότες οὐδὲ μετὰ νύκτας ἄμμε πότμος ἄντιν' ἔγραψε δραμεῖν ποτὶ στάθμαν.

(Inst [uncertain destiny, exceptional φύσιν]; πότμος→τὸ συγγενές; φύσιν→σθένος)

τεκμαίρει καὶ νῦν Ἀλκιμίδας τὸ συγγενές ἰδεῖν ἄγχι καρποφόροις ἀρούραισιν, αἷτ' ἀμειβόμεναι τόκα μὲν ὧν βίον ἀνδράσιν ἐπηετανὸν ἐκ πεδίων ἔδοσαν, (10) τόκα δ' αὖτ' ἀναπαυσάμεναι σθένος ἔμαρψαν.

(Exp; σθένος→ἐναγώνιος; βίον→κυναγέτας; τὸ συγγενές→πατροπάτορος)

ἦλθέ τοι Νεμέας ἐξ ἐρατῶν ἀέθλων παῖς ἐναγώνιος, ὃς ταύταν μεθέπων Διόθεν αἶσαν νῦν πέφανται οὐκ ἄμμορος ἀμφὶ πάλαι κυναγέτας, ἵχνεσιν ἐν Πραξιδάμαντος ἐὼν πόδα νέμων (15) πατροπάτορος ὁμαιμίῳ.

(Exp [ἵχνεσιν ἐν Πραξιδάμαντος]; οὐκ ἄμμορος→ἔρνεα)
 κεῖνος γὰρ Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἐὼν Αἰακίδαις ἔρνεα πρῶτος ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ ἀγαγεν, καὶ πεντάκις
 Ἴσθμοι στεφανώσαμενος, Νεμέαι δὲ τρεῖς, ἔπαυσε λάθαν (20) Σαοκλείδα, ὃς ὑπέρτατος
 Ἀγχιμαχοῖ ὑέων γένετο. ||

(Exp [ὑπέρτατος]; κεῖνος<τρεῖς; ἔρνεα<πρὸς ἄκρον ἀρετᾶς)
 ἐπεὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἀεθλοφόροι πρὸς ἄκρον ἀρετᾶς ἦλθον, οἱ τε πόνων ἐγεύσαντο.

(Ex [family's athletic success]; τρεῖς<οἶκον; πρὸς ἄκρον ἀρετᾶς ἦλθον<στεφάνων)
 σὺν θεοῦ δὲ τύχαι ἕτερον οὐ τίνα οἶκον ἀπεφάνατο πυγμαχία «πλεόνων» (25) ταμίαν στεφάνων
 μυχῶι Ἑλλάδος ἀπάσας.

(Authin [verification]; οὐ τίνα οἶκον≈μέγα)
 ἔλπομαι μέγα εἰπὼν σκοποῦ ἅντα τυχεῖν ὅτ' ἀπὸ τόξου ἰεῖς.

(Imp [reacting to praise]; τόξου→εὐθύν')
 εὐθύν' ἐπὶ τοῦτον, ἄγε, Μοῖσα, οὐρον ἐπέων εὐκλέα.

(Ju; ἐπέων<ᾠοῖδαι; εὐκλέα→ἐκόμικαν)
 παροιχομένων γὰρ ἀνέρων ᾠοῖδαι καὶ λόγοι τὰ καλά σφιν ἔργ' ἐκόμικαν, (30) Βακκίδαισιν ἅ τ'
 οὐ σπανίζει.

(Recap [Pol] [οὐ σπανίζει]; ἔργ'>ἐργμάτων; ᾠοῖδαι>ὕμνον; σπανίζει≠πολὺν ὕμνον)
 παλαίφατος γενεά, ἴδια ναυστολέοντες ἐπικώμια, Πιερίδων ἀρόταις δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολὺν
 ὕμνον ἀγερῶχων ἐργμάτων ἔνεκεν.

(Inst; ἐργμάτων>κράτησεν; ἐπικώμια>Χαρίτων; γενεά≈πάτρας)
 καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἀγαθείᾳ χειρὸς ἱμάντι δεθεὶς Πυθῶνι κράτησεν ἀπὸ ταύτας (35) αἶμα πάτρας
 χρυσαλακάτου ποτὲ Καλλίας ἀδὼν ἔρνεσι Λατοῦς, παρὰ Κασταλίαν τε Χαρίτων ἐσπέριος
 ὁμάδωι φλέγεν.

(ExA [Cat])
 πόντου τε γέφυρ' ἀκάμαντος ἐν ἀμφικτιόνων ταυροφόνωι τριετηρίδι Κρεοντίδαν (40) τίμασε
 Ποσειδάνιον ἄν τέμενος.

(ExB [Cat])
 βοτάνᾳ τέ νῖν ποθ' ἀλέοντος νικάσαντ' ἥρεφε δασκίοις Φλειοῦντος ὑπ' ὠγυγίοις ὄρεσιν. ||

(Gen; ἥρεφε<πρόκοδοι)
 πλατεῖται πάντοθεν λογίοισιν ἐντὶ πρόκοδοι (45) νᾶσον εὐκλέα τάνδε κοσμεῖν.

(Exp [countless great paths of praise]; πρόκοδοι→ἔξοχον αἶσαν; εὐκλέα→πέταται)
 ἐπεὶ σφιν Αἰακίδαι ἐπορον ἔξοχον αἶσαν ἀρετὰς ἀποδεικνύμενοι μεγάλας, πέταται δ' ἐπὶ τε
 χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσας τηλόθεν ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν.

(Inst [ἀρετὰς], En [glory], Sb; χθόνα>Αἰθίοπας; πέταται→ἔπαλτο; ἀρετὰς>Μέμνωνος οὐκ
 ἀπονοστήσαντος)

καὶ ἐς Αἰθίοπας Μέμονος οὐκ ἀπονοστήσαντος ἔπαλτο·

(Expr, Sb; ἔπαλτο→ἔμπεσε; οὐκ ἀπονοστήσαντος→ἐνάριξεν)
 βαρὺ δέ σφιν (50) νεῖκος Ἀχιλεὺς ἔμπεσε χαμαὶ καταβαῖς ἀφ' ἁρμάτων, φαιενῶς υἱὸν εὖτ'
 ἐνάριξεν Ἀόος ἀκμᾷ ἔγχεος ζακότοιο.

(Authin [verification], S; ἁρμάτων→ἀμαξιτὸν)
 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὕρον·
 (Ex [Par], S; others/me; ἀμαξιτὸν→ἔπομαι; παλαιότεροι≠αὐτὸς)
 ἔπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων μελέταν·

(Adv; far/near, heroes/contemporaries; παλαιότεροι≠πᾶρ ποδὶ; μελέταν≠δονεῖν θυμόν)
 τὸ δὲ πᾶρ ποδὶ ναὸς ἐλισσόμενον αἰεὶ κυμάτων (55) λέγεται παντὶ μάλιστα δονεῖν θυμόν.

(Inst, Authin; δονεῖν θυμόν→ἐκόντι; τὸ ... πᾶρ ποδὶ>τοῦτο ... εὗχος)
 ἐκόντι δ' ἐγὼ νώτῳ μεθέπων δίδυμον ἄχθος ἄγγελος ἔβαν, πέμπτον ἐπὶ εἴκοσι τοῦτο γαρύων
 εὗχος ἀγώνων ἄπο, τοὺς ἐνέποισιν ἱεροῦς, Ἀλκίμιδα, σέ γ' ἐπαρκέσαι (60) κλειτᾷ γενεᾷ·

(Adv; success/failure, actual/potential; γενεᾷ>Πολυτιμίδαν; εὗχος→ἄνθε';
 ἀγώνων>Ὀλυμπιάδος)
 δύο μὲν Κρονίου πᾶρ τεμένει, παῖ, σέ τ' ἐνόσφισε καὶ Πολυτιμίδαν κλᾶρος προπετιῆς ἄνθε'
 Ὀλυμπιάδος.

(Ex [praise of athletics], Authin; family/trainer; Ὀλυμπιάδος→χειρῶν; family/trainer)
 δελφῖνι καὶ τάχος δι' ἄλμας ἵσον <κ'> εἵποιμι Μεληρίαν (65) χειρῶν τε καὶ ἰσχύος ἀνίοχον.

Nemean 7

(Address)
 Ἐλείθια, πάρεδρε Μοιρᾶν βαθυφρόνων, παῖ μεγαλοσθενέος, ἄκουσον, Ἥρας, γενέτειρα
 τέκνων·

(Ex [on powers]; τέκνων→Ἥβαν; γενέτειρα→φάος ... δρακέντες)
 ἄνευ σέθεν οὐ φάος, οὐ μέλαιναν δρακέντες εὐφρόναν τεὰν ἀδελφεὰν ἐλάχομεν ἀγλαόγυιον
 Ἥβαν.

(Adv; unity/diversity)
 ἀναπνέομεν δ' οὐχ ἅπαντες ἐπὶ ἴσα· (5)
 (Recap [Pol]; ἴσα≠ἕτερα)
 εἵργει δὲ πότμῳ ζυγένθ' ἕτερον ἕτερα.

(Inst)
 σὺν δὲ τίν καὶ παῖς ὁ Θεαρίωνος ἀρετᾷ κριθεὶς εὐδοξος ἀείδεται Ὠγένης μετὰ πενταέθλοις.

(ExprA [ἀείδεται]; ἀείδεται→φιλόμολπον)
 πόλιν γὰρ φιλόμολπον οἰκεῖ δορικτύπων Αἰακιδᾶν·

(ExpB [ἀρεταῖ κριθεῖς ... μετὰ πενταέθλοισι]; commemoration/effort, culture/athletics;
 πενταέθλοισι→ἀγωνίαι)
 μάλα δ' ἐθέλοντι κύμπερον ἀγωνίαι θυμὸν ἀμφέπειν. (10)

(Gen; effort/success; ἀγωνίαι→ἔρδων; φιλόμολπον→Μοικᾶν)
 εἰ δὲ τύχηι τις ἔρδων, μελίφρον' αἰτίαν ῥοαῖσι Μοικᾶν ἐνέβαλε·

(ExpA [one commissions song]; positive/negative; ἔρδων→ἀλκαί; Μοικᾶν→ὕμνων)
 ταῖ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαί σκότον πολλὸν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι·
 (Recap [Pol], Exp; negative/positive; ἀλκαί→ἔργοις; σκότον≠ἔσοπτρον)
 ἔργοις δὲ καλοῖς ἔσοπτρον ἵσαμεν ἐνὶ σὺν τρόπῳ, εἰ Μναμοσύνας ἕκατι λιπαράμπτυκος (15)
 εὔρηται ἄποινα μόχθων κλυταῖς ἐπέων ἀοιδαῖς.
 (ExpB; ἵσαμεν→σοφοῖ; ἄποινα→κέρδει)
 σοφοὶ δὲ μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον ἔμαθον, οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβεν·

(Exp [wise men do not concentrate on amassing profit]; κέρδει→ἀφνεὸς)
 ἀφνεὸς πενιχρὸς τε θανάτου παρὰ σῆμα νέονται.

(Authin [selecting one (negative) example of poetic fame]; ἔσοπτρον≠πλέον'; ἔργοις→πάθαν;
 ἀοιδαῖς→Ὅμηρον)
 ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι (20) λόγον Ὀδυσσεὸς ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἀδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὅμηρον· ||

(Exp [διὰ τὸν ἀδυεπῆ ... Ὅμηρον]; πλέον'→ψεύδεσι; ἀδυεπῆ→μαχανᾷ)
 ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσι οἱ ποτανᾷ <τε> μαχανᾷ σεμνὸν ἔπεσσι τι·

(Gen; μαχανᾷ→σοφία; ψεύδεσι→παράγοισι)
 σοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισι μύθοισι.

(Exp [men can be misled]; κλέπτει→τυφλὸν)
 τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει ἥτορ ὁμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος.

(Inst)
 εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἔ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ιδέμεν, οὐ κεν ὅπλων χολωθεῖς (25) ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ
 φρενῶν λευρὸν ξίφος·

(Exp [Ajax would have received the arms if men recognized the truth]; negative/positive,
 results/merits; καρτερὸς→κράτιστον; ὅπλων→Ἀχιλῆος)
 ὃν κράτιστον Ἀχιλῆος ἄτερ μάχαι ξανθῶι Μενέλαι δάμαρτα κομίσει θοαῖς ἂν ναυσὶ
 πόρευσαν εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο πομπαί πρὸς Ἴλου πόλιν.

(Gen [from death of Ajax], Adv; positive/negative, exceptional merits/common end;
 κράτιστον→δοκέοντα; ναυσὶ→κῦμ')
 ἀλλὰ κοινὸν γὰρ ἔρχεται (30) κῦμ' Αἶδα, πέσε δ' ἀδόκητον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα·

(Adv, S; negative/positive, death/afterlife, men/gods; Αἶδα→τεθνακότων; δοκέοντα→λόγον)
 τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται ὧν θεὸς ἀβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων.

(Authin [mention of poetic afterlife: ‘as a helper I have come’], En; θεὸς→ὀμφαλὸν)
βοαθοῶν τοι παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου μόλον χθονός.

(Exp [poet’s journey to Delphi], En [βοαθοῶν]; ὀμφαλὸν≈Πυθίοισι)
ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις κεῖται Πριάμου πόλιν Νεοπτόλεμος ἐπεὶ πράθεν, (35) ταῖ καὶ Δαναοὶ
πόνησαν·

(Sb, Exp)
ὁ δ’ ἀποπλέων Κυρίου μὲν ἄμαρτε, πλαγχθέντες δ’ εἰς Ἑφύραν ἵκοντο.

(S)
Μολοσσίαι δ’ ἐμβασίλευεν ὀλίγον χρόνον·

(Adv; short time/always; ἐμβασίλευεν→γέρας; ὀλίγον χρόνον≠αἰεὶ)
ἀτὰρ γένος αἰεὶ φέρει τοῦτό οἱ γέρας.

(Exp [ὀλίγον χρόνον], S)
ᾧχετο δὲ πρὸς θεόν, (40) κτέατ’ ἄγων Τροίαθεν ἀκροθινίων·

(S)
ἵνα κρεῶν νιν ὑπὲρ μάχας ἔλασεν ἀντιτυχόντ’ ἀνὴρ μαχαίραι. ||

(S; ἔλασεν→βάρυνθεν)
βάρυνθεν δὲ περιεὶ Δελφοὶ ξεναγέται.

(Adv; negative/positive)
ἀλλὰ τὸ μόρσιμον ἀπέδωκεν·

(Exp [τὸ μόρσιμον]; μόρσιμον→ἐχρῆν)
ἐχρῆν δέ τιν’ ἔνδον ἄλσει παλαιτάτῳ Αἰακιδᾷ κρεόντων τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι (45) θεοῦ παρ’
εὐτειχέα δόμον, ἥροϊαις δὲ πομπαῖς θεμικόπον οἰκεῖν ἔοντα πολυθύτοις.

(Authin [verification])
εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει·
(Ex [τρία ἔπεα])
οὐ ψεῦδις ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ.

(En; μάρτυς>μοι; οὐ ψεῦδις→θρασύ; ἔργμασιν>ἀρεταῖς)
Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διός τ’ ἐκγόνων θρασύ μοι τόδ’ εἶπεν (50) φαενναῖς ἀρεταῖς ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων
οἴκοθεν·

(Authin [huge theme])
ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀνάπαυσις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργωι·
(Recap [Pol] [by a *fortiori* examples: one can have too much of anything]; ἔργωι>ἄνθε’
Ἀφροδίτῃ; γλυκεῖα→μέλι; ἀνάπαυσις≠κόρον)

κόρον δ' ἔχει καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίτια.

Priamel (En [of break-off by embarking on new theme])

φυαῖ δ' ἕκαστος διαφέρομεν βιοτὰν λαχόντες ὁ μὲν τά, τὰ δ' ἄλλοι·

(Adv; diversity/unity; $\tau\acute{\alpha}\neq\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$)

τυχεῖν δ' ἔν' ἀδύνατον (55) εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπασαν ἀνελόμενον·

(Ju; ἔν' → τίνι)

οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, τίνι τοῦτο Μοῖρα τέλος ἔμπεδον ὦρεξε.

(Inst; all/some; εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπασαν ≠ εὐοικία καὶ χρόνον ὄλβου)

Θεαρίων, τὴν δ' εὐοικία καὶ χρόνον ὄλβου δίδωσι, τόλμαν τε καλῶν ἀρομένωι κύνεσιν οὐκ ἀποβλάπτει φρενῶν. (60)

(Authin [verification])

ξεῖνός εἰμι·

(Ex [role as guestfriend]; ξεῖνός → φίλον)

σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον, ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω·

(Ju; φίλον ... ἄνδρ' < ἀγαθοῖσι)

ποτίφορος δ' ἀγαθοῖσι μισθὸς οὗτος. ||

(Ex [ἐτήτυμον]; ἐτήτυμον ≠ ὑπερβαλὼν; φίλον → προξενία)

ἔων δ' ἐγγὺς Ἀχαιοὺς οὐ μέμψεται μ' ἄνθρωπος Ἰονίης ὑπὲρ ἄλλος οἰκέων, καὶ προξενία πέποιθ', ἔν τε δαμόταίς (65) ὄμματι δέσκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλὼν, βίαία πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις·

(Imp [Pr] [description of poetic task]; now/future)

ὁ δὲ λοιπὸς εὐφρων ποτὶ χρόνος ἔρποι.

(Adv [felicitous vs. infelicitous future])

μαθὼν δέ τις ἀνερεῖ, εἰ πὰρ μέλος ἔρχομαι ψάγιον ὄαρρον ἐννέπων.

(Authin [poetic task]; future/now; ὄαρρον → γλῶσσαν)

Εὐξένην δα πάτραθε Κώγενες, ἀπομνύω (70) μὴ τέρμα προβαίς ἄκονθ' ὥτε χαλκοπάραον ὄρσαι θοὰν γλῶσσαν, ὅς ἐξέπεμψεν παλαιεμάτων ἀνέχονα καὶ κθένοιο ἀδιδαντόν, αἶθωνι πρὶν ἀλίωι γυῖον ἐμπεσεῖν.

(Gen [from poet's song], Exp [poet will not stop]; ἀδιδαντόν ≠ πόνος)

εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τέρπον πλεονέχεται.

(Imp [looking back to promise not to stint victor])

ἔα με·

(Ju)

νικῶντί γε χάριν, εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθεῖς (75) ἀνέκραγον, οὐ τραχύς εἰμι καταθέμεν.

(En; νικῶντί→στεφάνους; χάριν ... καταθέμεν→ἀναβάλεο)
εἴρειν στεφάνους ἐλαφρόν, ἀναβάλεο·

(Gen, Ju; easy/difficult; ἀναβάλεο→Μοῖσά; εἴρειν→κολλᾷ)
Μοῖσά τοι κολλᾷ χρυσὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ' ἀμὰ καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίας ὑφελοῖς·
ἐέρσας.

(En [victory ode, variety of subjects], Inst, Imp; Μοῖσά→ὕμνων)
Διὸς δὲ μεμναμένος ἀμφὶ Νεμέαι (80) πολύφατον θρόον ὕμνων δόνει ἡσυχαῖ.

(Ju)
βασιλῆα δὲ θεῶν πρέπει δάπεδον ἂν τόδε γαρυέμεν ἡμέραι ὀπί·

(Exp [πρέπει], En; δάπεδον→πάτραι)
λέγοντι γὰρ Αἰακὸν νιν ὑπὸ ματροδόκοις γοναῖς φυτεῦσαι, || ἐμᾷ μὲν πολίαρχον εὐωνύμωι
πάτραι, (85) Ἡράκλεες, σέο δὲ προπράον' ἔμμεν ξεῖνον ἀδελφεόν τ'.

(Adv; friend/neighbour; ξεῖνον→γεύεται ἀνδρὸς ἀνὴρ)
εἰ δὲ γεύεται ἀνδρὸς ἀνὴρ τι, φαῖμέν κε γείτον' ἔμμεναι νόωι φιλήσαντ' ἀτενέι γείτονι χάρμα
πάντων ἐπάξιον·

(Inst [*a fortiori*, potential]; men/gods; θεὸς≠ἀνδρὸς; γείτον'→τίν; γείτονι→Cωγένης;
χάρμα→εὐτυχῶς)
εἰ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ θεὸς ἀνέχοι, ἐν τίν κ' ἐθέλοι, Γίγαντας ὃς ἐδάμασας, εὐτυχῶς (90) ναίειν πατρὶ
Cωγένης ἀταλὸν ἀμφέπων θυμὸν προγόνων εὐκτῆμονα ζαθέαν ἄγυιαν·

(Exp [gnome applies to Heracles and Sogenes]; ἄγυιαν→δόμον)
ἐπεὶ τετραόροισιν ὧθ' ἀρμάτων ζυγοῖς ἐν τεμένεσσι δόμον ἔχει τεοῖς, ἀμφοτέρας ἰὼν
χειρός.

(JuA [implicit prayer to Heracles])
ὦ μάκαρ, τὴν δ' ἐπέοικεν Ἥρας πόσιν τε πειθέμεν (95) κόραν τε γλαυκώπιδα·

(JuB)
δύνασαι δὲ βροτοῖσιν ἀλκὰν ἀμαχανιᾶν δυσβάτων θαμὰ διδόμεν.

(Imp [Pr] [recapitulation of implicit prayer to Heracles to be a good neighbor];
ἀλκὰν→εὐδαίμον·)
εἰ γὰρ σφισιν ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίοντον ἀρμόσαις ἦβαι λιπαρῶι τε γήραϊ διαπλέκοις εὐδαίμον·
έόντα, παίδων δὲ παῖδες ἔχοιεν αἰεὶ (100) γέρας τό περ νῦν καὶ ἄρειον ὄπιθεν.

(Adv; you/me, future/now, gods/men)
τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ ποτε φάσει κέαρ ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἐλκύσαι ἔπει·

(Adv [repetition vs. simple statement]; οὐ ποτε→τρίς τετράκι τ'; φάσει→μαψυλάκας)
ταυτὰ δὲ τρίς τετράκι τ' ἀμπολεῖν ἀπορία τελέθει, τέκνοισιν ἄτε μαψυλάκας “Διὸς Κόρινθος.”
(105)

Nemean 8

(Address)

ὦρα πότνια, κάρυξ Ἀφροδίτας ἀμβροσιᾶν φιλοτάτων, ἃ τε παρθενηίοις παίδων τ' ἐφίζοις
γλεφάροις, τὸν μὲν ἡμέροις ἀνάγκας χερσὶ βαστάζεις, ἕτερον δ' ἐτέραις.

(Gen; gods/men; φιλοτάτων<ἔργον; ἐτέραις≠καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα; φιλοτάτων→ἐρώτων)
ἀγαπατὰ δὲ καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων ἐπικρατεῖν
δύνασθαι. (5)

(Inst; ἐρώτων→λέκτρον)

οἷοι καὶ Διὸς Αἰγίνας τε λέκτρον ποιμένες ἀμφεπόλησαν Κυπρίας δώρων·

(S)

ἔβλασεν δ' υἱὸς Οἰνῶνας βασιλεὺς χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος.

(S)

πολλά νιν πολλοὶ λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν·

(Exp [many sought an audience with Aeacus])

ἀβοατὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἄωτοι περιναιεταόντων ἤθελον κείνου γε πείθεσθ' ἀναξίαις ἐκόντες, (10)
οἱ τε κρανααῖς ἐν Ἀθάναισιν ἄρμοζον στρατόν, οἱ τ' ἀνὰ Σπάρταν Πελοπηιάδα.

(Authin [speaker pays homage to Aeacus as others did in the past]; then/now)

ἰκέτας Αἰακοῦ σεμνῶν γονάτων πόλιός θ' ὑπὲρ φίλας ἀκτῶν θ' ὑπὲρ τῶνδ' ἄπτομαι φέρων
Λυδῖαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν, (15) Δείνιος διςσῶν σταδίων καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα
Νεμεῶν ἄγαλμα.

(Exp [ἰκέτας], Gen; Αἰακοῦ<θεῶι; σταδίων<ὄλβος; Δείνιος<ἀνθρώποις)

σὺν θεῶι γὰρ τοι φυτευθεὶς ὄλβος ἀνθρώποις παρμονώτερος· ||

(Inst; ὄλβος→πλούτῳ)

ὅσπερ καὶ Κινύραν ἔβρισε πλούτῳ ποντίαι ἐν ποτε Κύπρῳ.

(Authin [hesitation]; then/now)

ἵσταμαι δὴ ποσσὶ κούφοις, ἀμπνέων τε πρὶν τι φάμεν.

(Exp [speaker gathers his strength: his task is dangerous]; τι φάμεν≈νεαρά ... ἐξευρόντα)

πολλά γὰρ πολλὰι λέλεκται, νεαρά δ' ἐξευρόντα δόμεν βασιάνῳ (20) ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας
κίνδυνος·

(Exp [κίνδυνος]; νεαρά→λόγοι)

ὅσων δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν, ἅπτεται δ' ἐκλῶν ἀεὶ, χειρόνεσσι δ' οὐκ ἐρίζει.

(Inst; ἅπτεται>δάψεν; ἐκλῶν>Τελαμῶνος ... υἱόν)

κεῖνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν, φαργάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις.

(Gen; Τελαμῶνος ... υἱόν<ἄγλωσσαν)
 ἢ τιν' ἄγλωσσαν μὲν, ἦτορ δ' ἄλκιμον, λάθα κατέχει ἐν λυγρῷ νείκει·
 (Recap [Pol]; failure/success; λάθα≠γέρας; ἄγλωσσαν≠αἰόλωι ψεύδει)
 μέγιστον δ' αἰόλωι ψεύδει γέρας ἀντέταται. (25)

(InstA; γέρας>θεράπευσαν; ψεύδει→Ὀδυσσῆ)
 κρυφαίαι γὰρ ἐν ψάφοις Ὀδυσσῆ Δαναοὶ θεράπευσαν·
 (InstB; ἄγλωσσαν>Αἴας; γέρας>ὄπλων)
 χρυσεὼν δ' Αἴας στερηθεὶς ὄπλων φόνωι πάλαισεν.

(Exp [robbed (στερηθεὶς) of arms], Sb; result/merits; φόνωι πάλαισεν→ἔλκεα ῥῆξαν)
 ἢ μὰν ἀνόμοιά γε δάιοισιν ἐν θερμῷ χροὶ ἔλκεα ῥῆξαν πελεμιζόμενοι ὑπ' ἀλεξιμβρότῳ
 λόγχῃ, τὰ μὲν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλεὶ νεοκτόνῳ, (30) ἄλλων τε μόχθων ἐν πολυφθόροις ἀμέραις.

(Inf; deeds/words)
 ἐχθρὰ δ' ἄρα πάρφασις ἦν καὶ πάλαι, αἰμύλων μύθων ὁμόφοιτος, δολοφραδῆς, κακοποιὸν
 ὄνειδος·

(Exp [κακοποιὸν])
 ἃ τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιάται, τῶν δ' ἀφάντων κῦδος ἀντείνει καθρόν. ||

(Imp [Pr] [reacting to description of πάρφασις]; κῦδος→κλέος)
 εἴη μὴ ποτέ μοι τοιοῦτον ἦθος, Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἀλλὰ κελεύθοις (35) ἀπλόαις ζωῆς ἐφαπτοίμαν,
 θανῶν ὥς παισὶ κλέος μὴ τὸ δύσφραμον προσάψω.
 (RecapImp [Pr]; θανῶν≈χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι; κλέος μὴ τὸ δύσφραμον→ἄστοις ἀδῶν; κελεύθοις
 ἀπλόαις>αἰνέων αἰνητά)
 χρυσεὼν εὐχονται, πεδίον δ' ἕτεροι ἀπέραντον, ἐγὼ δ' ἄστοις ἀδῶν καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι,
 αἰνέων αἰνητά, μομφὰν δ' ἐπιπείρων ἀλιτροῖς.

(Gen, S; celebration/immortality; αἰνέων→ἀερθεῖς; αἰνητά→ἀρετά; ἐγὼ<σοφοῖς; ἄστοις
 ἀδῶν→δικαίοις)
 αὖξεται δ' ἀρετά, γλῶραῖς ἐέρσαις ὥς ὅτε δένδρεον αἰσσει, (40) «ἐν» σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀερθεῖς
 ἐν δικαίοις τε πρὸς ὑγρὸν αἰθέρα.

Priamel (Exp [poets exalt achievement]; σοφοῖς<φίλων; ἀερθεῖς<χρεῖαι)
 χρεῖαι δὲ παντοῖαι φίλων ἀνδρῶν·
 (Cap, Inst; ἀρετά→πόνοις; αὖξεται ... ἀρετά→ἐν ὄμμασι θέσθαι πιστόν)
 τὰ μὲν ἀμφὶ πόνοις ὑπερώτατα, μαστεύει δὲ καὶ τέρψις ἐν ὄμμασι θέσθαι πιστόν.

(En [ἐν ὄμμασι θέσθαι πιστόν], Inst; πιστόν≠οὐ ... δυνατόν; φίλων>μοι)
 ὦ Μέγα, τὸ δ' αὖτις τεὰν ψυχὰν κομίζαι οὐ μοι δυνατόν·
 (Exp [οὐ ... δυνατόν])
 κενεᾷν δ' ἐλπίδων χαῦνον τέλος· (45)
 (Adv; impossible/possible; πιστόν→λίθον Μοιραῖον; πόνοις→ποδῶν; οὐ ...
 δυνατόν≠ἐλαφρόν)

σεῦ δὲ πάτραι Χαριάδαις τ' ἐλαφρόν ὑπερεῖσαι λίθον Μοικαῖον ἑκατὶ ποδῶν εὐωνύμων δις δὴ δυοῖν.

(Exp [possible]; οὐ μοι δυνατόν≠πρόσφορον; λίθον Μοικαῖον<κόμπον; ποδῶν<ἔργωι)
χαίρω δὲ πρόσφορον ἐν μὲν ἔργωι κόμπον ἰεῖς, ἐπαοιδᾶς δ' ἀνήρ νώδυνον καὶ τις κάματον
θῆκεν·

(Exp [many have healed with song]; πρόσφορον ... κόμπον≈ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος)
ἦν γε μὰν ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος (50) δὴ πάλαι καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι τὰν Ἀδράστου τὰν τε Καδμείων
ἔριν.

Nemean 9

(Imp)

Κωμάσομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος Κυκωνόθε, Μοῖσαι, τὰν νεοκτίσταν ἐς Αἵτναν, ἔνθ'
ἀναπεπταμέναι ξείνων νενίκανται θύραι, ὄλβιον ἐς Χρομίου δῶμ'.

(RecapImp; Μοῖσαι→ὕμνον)

ἀλλ' ἐπέων γλυκὺν ὕμνον πράσσετε.

(JuA; ὕμνον≈αὐδάν)

τὸ κρατήσιππον γὰρ ἐς ἄρμ' ἀναβαίνων ματέρι καὶ διδύμοις παῖδεσσιν αὐδάν μανύει Πυθῶνος
αἰπεινᾶς ὁμοκλάρους ἐπόπταις. (5) ||

(JuB, Gen; αὐδάν≠σιγαῖ; κρατήσιππον ... ἄρμ'<τετελεσμένον ἐσλόν)

ἔστι δὲ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἐσλόν μὴ χαμαὶ σιγαῖ καλύψαι·

(Recap [Pol]; σιγαῖ≠καύχας)

θεσπεσία δ' ἐπέων καύχας ἀοιδὰ πρόσφορος.

(Inf [Imp], En; ἀοιδὰ→φόρμιγγ'; κρατήσιππον ... ἄρμ'→ἵππιων ἀέθλων)

ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίαν φόρμιγγ', ἀνὰ δ' αὐλὸν ἐπ' αὐτὰν ὄρσομεν ἵππιων ἀέθλων κορυφάν, ἧ
τε Φοῖβωι θῆκεν Ἀδραστός ἐπ' Ἀσωποῦ ρεέθροις·

(En; ὄρσομεν≈μνασθεῖς; ἀέθλων≈ἀμίλλαις)

ὦν ἐγὼ μνασθεῖς ἐπασκῆσω κλυταῖς ἥρωα τιμαῖς, (10) || ὃς τότε μὲν βασιλεύων κεῖθι νέαισι θ'
ἑορταῖς ἰσχύος τ' ἀνδρῶν ἀμίλλαις ἄρμασί τε γλαφυροῖς ἄμφαινε κυδαίνων πόλιν.

(Exp [βασιλεύων κεῖθι], En)

φεῦγε γὰρ Ἀμφιαρῇ ποτε θρασυμήδεα καὶ δεινὰν στάσιν πατρίων οἴκων ἀπὸ τ' Ἄργεος·

(Recap [Pol]; στάσιν≈λύαι; πατρίων→Ταλαοῦ παῖδες)

ἀρχοὶ δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἔσαν Ταλαοῦ παῖδες, βιασθέντες λύαι.

(ProGen; negative/positive; λύαι→δίκαν; Ταλαοῦ παῖδες<κρέσσων ... ἀνήρ)

κρέσσων δὲ καππαύει δίκαν τὰν πρόσθεν ἀνήρ. (15) ||

(Inst)

ἀνδροδάμαντ' Ἐριφύλαν, ὄρκιον ὥς ὅτε πιετόν, δόντες Οἰκλείδαι γυναῖκα, ξανθοκομᾶν
Δαναῶν ἦσαν μέγιστοι <- ~ ->

(S; peace/war; success/failure, positive/negative)

καί ποτ' ἐς ἑπταπύλους Θήβας ἄγαγον στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰσιᾶν οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν·

(Exp [αἰσιᾶν οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων], Sb; ὀρνίχων~ἄστεροπὰν; ἄγαγον~στείχειν)
οὐδὲ Κρονίων ἄστεροπὰν ἐλελίξαις οἰκοθεν μαργουμένους στείχειν ἐπώτρυν', ἀλλὰ φείσασθαι
κελεύθου. (20) ||

(S; warning/result; στείχειν→σπεῦδεν; ἄστεροπὰν→φαινομένην)
φαινομένην δ' ἄρ' ἐς ἅταν σπεῦδεν ὄμιλος ἰκέσθαι χαλκείοις ὅπλοισιν ἱππέοις τε σὺν ἔντεσιν·

(S; ἅταν→σώμασι πίαναν καπνόν)
Ἴσμηνοῦ δ' ἐπ' ὄχθαισι γλυκύν νόστον ἐρεικάμενοι λευκανθέα σώμασι πίαναν καπνόν·

(Exp; καπνόν→πυραὶ)
ἐπὶ γὰρ δαΐσαντο πυραὶ νεογυῖους φῶτας·

(Adv, Cap; many/one, pyre/burial)
ὁ δ' Ἀμφιαρεῖ χρίσσειν κεραυνῶι παμβίαι Ζεὺς τὰν βαθύστερνον χθόνα, κρύψεν δ' ἅμ' ἵπποις,
(25) || δουρὶ Περικλυμένου πρὶν νῶτα τυπέντα μαχατὰν θυμὸν αἰσχυνθῆμεν.

(Exp [*a fortiori*]; νῶτα→φεύγοντι)
ἐν γὰρ δαιμονίοις φόβοις φεύγοντι καὶ παῖδες θεῶν.

(Imp [Pr] [reacting to possible defeat from the gods (δαιμονίοις)]; θεῶν>Κρονίων)
εἰ δυνατόν, Κρονίων, πεῖραν μὲν ἀγάνορα Φοινικοστόλων ἐγγέων ταύταν θανάτου πέρι καὶ
ζωᾶς ἀναβάλλομαι ὥς πόρσιστα, μοῖραν δ' εὖνομον αἰτέω σε παισὶν δαρὸν Αἰτναίων ὀπάξειν,
(30) || Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἀγλαΐαισιν δ' ἄστυνόμοις ἐπιμεῖξαι λαόν.

(Ju; ἀγλαΐαισιν→φίλιπποί)
ἐντί τοι φίλιπποί τ' αὐτόθι καὶ κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας ἄνδρες.

(Authin [introduces verification]; κτεάνων ψυχὰς ... κρέσσονας→ἄπιστον)
ἄπιστον ἔειπ'·

(Exp [ἄπιστον])
αἰδῶς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα κέρδει κλέπτεται, ἃ φέρει δόξαν.

(PolInst)
Χρομίωι κεν ὑπασπίζων παρὰ πεζοβόαις ἵπποις τε ναῶν τ' ἐν μάχαις ἔκρινας, ἂν κίνδυνον
ὀξείας αὐτᾶς, (35) || οὐνεκεν ἐν πολέμῳ κείνα θεὸς ἔντυεν αὐτοῦ θυμὸν αἰχματὰν ἀμύνειν
λοιγὸν Ἐνυαλίου.

(Gen; Χρομίωι<παῦροι; ἀμύνειν λοιγὸν~νεφέλαν τρέψαι; θυμὸν→ψυχᾷ; χερσὶ→μάχαις)
παῦροι δὲ βουλεῦσαι φόνου παρποδίου νεφέλαν τρέψαι ποτὶ δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν στίχας χερσὶ
καὶ ψυχᾷ δυνατοί·

(Inst; παῦροι>Ἑκτορι)

λέγεται μὰν Ἑκτορι μὲν κλέος ἀνθῆσαι Σκαμάνδρου χεύμασιν ἀγχοῦ, βαθυκρήμνοισι δ' ἀμφ' ἀκταῖς Ἐλώρου, (40) || ἐνθ' Ἀρείας πόρον ἄνθρωποι καλέοισι, δέδορκεν παιδί τοῦθ' Ἀγχιιδάμου φέγγος ἐν ἀλικίαι πρώται·

Priamel (Gen; youth/maturity; ἐν ἀλικίαι πρώται≠ἄλλαις ἀμέραις; ἀκταῖς≠χέρσῳ)
τὰ δ' ἄλλαις ἀμέραις πολλὰ μὲν ἐν κονίαι χέρσῳ, τὰ δὲ γείτονι πόντῳ φάσσομαι.
(Cap, Adv; maturity/youth; πολλὰ>πόνων; ἄλλαις ἀμέραις≠νεότατι; ἐν ἀλικίαι πρώται≈cὺν νεότατι)
ἐκ πόνων δ', οἱ cὺν νεότατι γένωνται cὺν τε δίκαι, τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἡμέρα.

(Inst; αἰὼν ἡμέρα→ὄλβον)
ἵτω λαχὼν πρὸς δαιμόνων θαυμαστὸν ὄλβον. (45) ||

(Exp [θαυμαστὸν ὄλβον], Gen; ὄλβον→κῦδος)
εἰ γὰρ ἅμα κτεάνοις πολλοῖς ἐπίδοξον ἄρηται κῦδος, οὐκ ἔστι πρόσωθεν θνατὸν ἔτι σκοπιᾶς ἄλλας ἐφάψασθαι ποδοῖν.

(Adv; striving/contentment, *ne plus ultra*/celebration)
ἡκυχία δὲ φιλεῖ μὲν συμπόσιον·
(Ex [Par]; κῦδος→νικαφορία)
νεοθαλῆς δ' αὖξεται μαλθακᾷ νικαφορία cὺν ἀοιδᾷ·

(Ex [Desc] [symposium with song]; ἀοιδᾷ→φωνά; συμπόσιον→κρατῆρα)
θαρσαλέα δὲ παρὰ κρατῆρα φωνά γίνεται.

(En, Inst, Inf [Imp]; κρατῆρα→ἀμπέλου παῖδ'; φωνά→κώμου)
ἐγκρινάτω τίς νιν, γλυκὺν κώμου προφάταν, (50) || ἀργυρέαισι δὲ νομάτῳ φιάλαισι βιατάν ἀμπέλου παῖδ', ἅς ποθ' ἵπποι κτηράμεναι Χρομίῳ πέμψαν θεμιπλέκτοισι ἀμᾶ Λατοῖδα στεφάνοις ἐκ τᾶς ἱερᾶς Κυκλῶνος.

(Imp [Pr] [success in forthcoming performance], S; κώμου→κελαδῆσαι; στεφάνοις≈ταύταν ἀρετάν)
Ζεῦ πάτερ, εὐχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὴν κελαδῆσαι cὺν Χαρίτεσσιν, ὑπὲρ πολλῶν τε τιμαλφεῖν λόγοις νίκαν, ἀκοντίζων σκοποῖ' ἄγχιστα Μοικᾶν. (55)

Nemean 10

(Imp)
Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρόνων τε πεντήκοντα κορᾶν, Χάριτες, Ἄργος Ἥρας δῶμα θεοπρεπὲς ὕμνεϊτε·

(Ju; ὕμνεϊτε→φλέγεται)
φλέγεται δ' ἀρεταῖς μυρίαῖς ἔργων θρασέων ἔνεκεν.

(En, Inst; ἔργων θρασέων>τὰ Περσέος)
μακρὰ μὲν τὰ Περσέος ἀμφὶ Μεδοίσας Γοργόνος, πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ καταοίκισεν ἄστη ταῖς Ἐπάφου παλάμαις· (5)

(ExA [Cat])

οὐδ' Ὑπερμήστρα παρεπλάγχθη, μονόψαφον ἐν κολεῶι κατασχοῖσα ξίφος.

(ExB [Cat])

Διομήδεα δ' ἄμβροτον ξανθά ποτε Γλαυκῶπις ἔθηκε θεόν·

(ExC [Cat])

γαῖα δ' ἐν Θήβαις ὑπέδεκτο κεραυνωθεῖσα Διὸς βέλεσιν μάντιν Οἰκλείδαν, πολέμοιο νέφος·

(ExD [Cat])

καὶ γυναιξὶν καλλικόμοισιν ἀριστεύει πάλαι· (10)

(Inst, Ju; γυναιξὶν>Ἀλκμήναν)

Ζεὺς ἐπ' Ἀλκμήναν Δανάαν τε μολὼν τοῦτον κατέφανε λόγον·

(ExE [Cat])

πατρὶ δ' Ἀδράστοιο Λυγκεῖ τε φρενῶν καρπὸν εὐθείαι συνάρμοξεν δίκαι·

(ExF [Cat])

θρέψε δ' αἰχμὰν Ἀμφιτρύωνος.

(S; αἰχμὰν→ἔναρεν)

ὁ δ' ὄλβωι φέρτατος ἵκετ' ἐς κείνου γενεάν, ἐπεὶ ἐν χαλκείοις ὅπλοις Τηλεβόας ἔναρεν·

(Exp [ἵκετ' ἐς κείνου γενεάν], Sb; γενεάν→σπέρμ')

τῷ ὄψιν ἐειδόμενος (15) ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς αὐτὰν ἐσῆλθεν, σπέρμ' ἀδείμαντον φέρον Ἡρακλέος·

(S, Re; ἀθανάτων→κατ' Ὀλυμπον)

οὗ κατ' Ὀλυμπον ἄλοχος Ἥβα τελείαι παρὰ μητέρι βαίνοισ' ἔστι, καλλίστα θεῶν. ||

(AuthinB [huge topic])

βραχύ μοι στόμα πάντ' ἀναγῆσθ', ὅσων Ἀργεῖον ἔχει τέμενος μοῖραν ἐσλῶν·

(AuthinB [further reason for curtailing theme]; πάντ' ἀναγῆσθ'→κόρος)

ἔστι δὲ καὶ κόρος ἀνθρώπων βαρὺς ἀντίσθαι· (20)

(Adv [curtail vs. further praise], Authin [selecting one theme])

ἀλλ' ὅμως εὐχορδὸν ἔγειρε λύραν, καὶ παλαισμάτων λάβε φροντίδ'·

(Ju; παλαισμάτων<ἀέθλων)

ἀγὼν τοι χάλκεος δᾶμον ὀτρύνει ποτὶ βουθυσίαν Ἥρας ἀέθλων τε κρίειν·

(En; παλαισμάτων→νικάσας)

Οὐλία παῖς ἔνθα νικάσας δις ἔσχεν Θεαῖος εὐφόρων λάθαν πόνων.

(Ex [Cat], Sb; local/non-local; νικάσας→ἐκράτησε)

ἐκράτησε δὲ καὶ ποθ' Ἑλλανα στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, τύχαι τε μολῶν (25) καὶ τὸν Ἴσθμοϊ καὶ Νεμέαι στέφανον, Μοῖσαι δ' ἔδωκ' ἀρόσαι, τρὶς μὲν ἐν πόντοιο πύλαισι λαχόν, τρὶς δὲ καὶ σεμνοῖς δαπέδοις ἐν Ἀδραστείῳ νόμῳι.

(Adv; then/now, actual/potential)

Ζεῦ πάτερ, τῶν μὲν ἔραται φρενί, σιγαῖ οἱ στόμα·

(Adv; men/gods, hope/result; τῶν<ἔργων)

πάν δὲ τέλος ἐν τὴν ἔργων·

(Ju [of implicit prayer for Olympic victory]; success/effort, god/men; τέλος>χάριν)

οὐδ' ἀμόχθωι καρδίαι προσφέρων τόλμαν παραιτεῖται χάριν. (30)

(Authin [comment on riddling expression]; χάριν<ἐσχάτων ἀέθλων κορυφαῖς)

γνώτ' ἀεῖδω θεῶι τε καὶ ὅστις ἀμιλλᾶται περὶ ἐσχάτων ἀέθλων κορυφαῖς·

(Exp [athletes understand the riddle]; ἀέθλων>Ἡρακλέος τεθμόν; κορυφαῖς→ὑπατον)

ὑπατον δ' ἔσχευ Πίσα Ἡρακλέος τεθμόν.

(Adv; potential/actual; τεθμόν→τελεταῖς)

ἀδεῖαί γε μὲν ἀμβολάδαν ἐν τελεταῖς δις Ἀθηναίων νιν ὁμφαί κόμασαν·

(S; games/home, success/commemoration)

γαῖαι δὲ καυθεῖσαι πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας (35) ἔμολεν Ἥρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν ἀγγέων
ἔρκεσιν παμποικίλοις. ||

(Gen; καρπὸς ἐλαίας→εὐάγων τιμὰ; εὐάνορα λαὸν>γένος)

ἔπεται δέ, Θεαῖε, ματρώων πολύγωντον γένος ὑμετέρων εὐάγων τιμὰ Χαρίτεσσι τε καὶ σὺν
Τυνδαρίδασι θαμάκις.

(Inf [from honour enjoyed by family]; γένος>κύγονος)

ἄξιωθειν κεν, ἐὼν Θρασύκλου Ἀντία τε κύγονος, Ἄργεϊ μὴ κρύπτειν φάος (40) ὀμμάτων.

(Exp [hold head high in Thebes]; Ἄργεϊ~ἄκτυ)

νικαφορίαῖς γὰρ ὅσαις Προίτιο τόδ' ἵπποτρόφον ἄκτυ θάλησεν Κορίνθου τ' ἐν μυχοῖς, καὶ
Κλεωναίων πρὸς ἀνδρῶν τετράκις·

(ExA [Cat]; νικαφορίαῖς→ἀργυρωθέντες)

Σικωνόθε δ' ἀργυρωθέντες σὺν οἰνηραῖς φιάλαις ἀπέβαν, ἐκ δὲ Πελλάνας ἐπιεσκάμενοι
νῶτον μαλακαῖσι κρόκαις·

(ExB [Cat], Adv)

ἀλλὰ χαλκὸν μυρίον οὐ δυνατόν (45) ἐξελέγχειν

(Exp [οὐ δυνατόν]; μυρίον→μακροτέρας; ἐξελέγχειν~ἀριθμῆσαι)

—μακροτέρας γὰρ ἀριθμῆσαι σκολᾶς—

ὄν τε Κλείτωρ καὶ Τεγέα καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ὑψίβατοι πόλιες καὶ Λύκαιον παρ Διὸς θῆκε δρόμωι, σὺν
ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶσαι σθένει.

(Exp [family's success], Gen; νικᾶσαι→ἀεθληταῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν)

Κάστορος δ' ἐλθόντος ἐπὶ ξενίαν παρ Παμφάη καὶ κασιγνήτου Πολυδεύκεος, οὐ θαῦμα σφίσιν
(50) ἐγγενὲς ἔμμεν ἀεθληταῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν·

(Exp [*xenia* translates into athletic success]; ἀθληταῖς→ἀγώνων; Παμφάη<ἀνδρῶν δικαίων)
ἐπεὶ εὐρυχόρου ταμίαι Σπάρτας ἀγώνων μοῖραν Ἑρμῆι καὶ σὺν Ἡρακλεῖ διέποντι θάλειαν,
μάλα μὲν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων περικαδόμενοι.

(Gen; ταμίαι Σπάρτας<θεῶν ... γένος; περικαδόμενοι→πιττὸν)
καὶ μὲν θεῶν πιττὸν γένος. ||

(Inst [story shows Tyndaridae to be πιττὸν])
μεταμειβόμενοι δ' ἐναλλάξ ἀμέραν τὰν μὲν παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳι (55) Δὶ νέμονται, τὰν δ' ὑπὸ
κεῦθεσι γαίᾳ ἐν γυάλοισι Θεράπνας, πότμον ἀμπιπλάντες ὁμοῖον·

(Exp [double fate], Sb; πότμον≈αἰῶνα; παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳι≈οἰκεῖν ... οὐρανῳι)
ἐπεὶ τοῦτον, ἣ πάμπαν θεὸς ἔμμεναι οἰκεῖν τ' οὐρανῳι, εἴλετ' αἰῶνα φθιμένου Πολυδεύκης
Κάστορος ἐν πολέμῳι.

(Exp, Sb; φθιμένου→ἔτρωσεν)
τὸν γὰρ Ἴδας ἀμφὶ βουσίῳ πως χολωθεὶς ἔτρωσεν χαλκέας λόγχας ἀκμῆι. (60)

(Sb)
ἀπὸ Ταῦγέτου πεδονγάζων ἶδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει ἡμένους.

(Exp [he was able to see from afar]; ἶδεν→ὄμμα)
κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων πάντων γένετ' ὀξύτατον ὄμμα.

(S)
λαιψηροῖς δὲ πόδεσσιν ἄφαρ ἐξικέσθαι, καὶ μέγα ἔργον ἐμήσαντ' ὠκέως καὶ πάθον δεινὸν
παλάμασι Ἀφαρητίδαι Διός·

(Exp [πάθον δεινόν])
αὐτίκα γάρ (65) ἦλθε Λήδας παῖς διώκων·

(S)
τοὶ δ' ἔναντα στάθεν τύμβῳι σχεδὸν πατρώϊῳ·

(S; τύμβῳι≈ἄγαλμ')
ἐνθεν ἀρπάξαντες ἄγαλμ' Αἶδα, ξεστὸν πέτρον, ἔμβalon στέρνῳι Πολυδεύκεος·

(S; ἔμβalon→φλάσαν)
ἀλλ' οὐ νῖν φλάσαν οὐδ' ἀνέχασαν·
(Recap [Pol]; ἀνέχασαν≠ἐφορμαθεῖς)
ἐφορμαθεῖς δ' ἄρ' ἄκοντι θοῶι, ἦλασε Λυγκέος ἐν πλευραῖσι χαλκόν. (70)

(S, Ex [Par]; men/gods; ἦλασε→πλᾶξε)
Ζεὺς δ' ἐπ' Ἴδα πυρφόρον πλᾶξε ψολόεντα κεραυνόν·

(S; κεραυνόν→ἐκαίοντ')

ἄμα δ' ἐκαίοντ' ἐρήμοι.

(Gen)

χαλεπὰ δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώποισι ὁμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων. ||

(S)

ταχέως δ' ἐπ' ἀδελφεοῦ βίαν πάλιν χώρησεν ὁ Τυνδαρίδας, καὶ νιν οὐπω τεθναότ', ἄσθματι δὲ φρίσσοντα πνοὰς ἔκιχεν.

(S)

θερμὰ δὴ τέγγων δάκρυα στοναχαῖς (75) ὄρθιον φώνασε·

(Ds; στοναχαῖς → πενθέων)

“Πάτερ Κρονίων, τίς δὴ λύσις ἔσσεται πενθέων;

(Inf [Imp] [from impossibility of λύσις]; πενθέων → θάνατον)

καὶ ἔμοι θάνατον σὺν τῷιδ' ἐπίτειλον, ἄναξ.

(JuA; τῷιδ' < φίλων; ἔμοι < τατωμένωι φωτί)

οἴχεται τιμὰ φίλων τατωμένωι φωτί·

(JuB; τῷιδ' < παῦροι; τιμὰ → πόνωι)

παῦροι δ' ἐν πόνωι πιστοὶ βροτῶν καμάτου μεταλαμβάνειν.”

(Sf)

ὥς ἤνεπε·

(S)

Ζεὺς δ' ἀντίος ἤλυθέ οἱ, καὶ τόδ' ἐξαύδας' ἔπος·

(Ds)

“Εccί μοι υἱός· (80)

(Inf [Imp] [from parentage]; you/him)

τόνδε δ' ἔπειτα πόσις σπέρμα θνατὸν ματρὶ τεῶι πελάσσει στάξεν ἥρως, ἀλλ' ἄγε τῶνδέ τοι ἔμπαν αἴρεσιν παρδίδωμ'·

(En; αἴρεσιν → θέλεις)

εἰ μὲν θάνατόν τε φυγὼν καὶ γῆρας ἀπεχθόμενον αὐτὸς Οὐλύμπων θέλεις <ναίειν ἔμοι> σὺν τ' Ἀθαναΐαι κελαινεγχεῖ τ' Ἄρει, ἔστι σοι τούτων λάχος·

(Adv; self/brother; Οὐλύμπων ≈ οὐρανοῦ ἐν χρυσεοῖς δόμοισιν)

εἰ δὲ κασιγνήτου πέρι (85) μάρνασαι, πάντων δὲ νοεῖς ἀποδάσσεσθαι ἴσον, ἡμῖν μὲν κε πνέοις γαίης ὑπένερθεν ἐών, ἡμῖν δ' οὐρανοῦ ἐν χρυσεοῖς δόμοισιν.”

(S; κασιγνήτου ≈ Κάστορος)

ὥς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος οὐ γνῶμαι διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν, ἀνὰ δ' ἔλυσεν μὲν ὀφθαλμόν, ἔπειτα δὲ

φωνὰν χαλκομίτρα Κάστορος. (90)

Nemean 11

(ImpA [Pr])

Παῖ Ῥέας, ἃ τε πρυτανεῖα λέλογχας, Ἑκτία, Ζηγὸς ὑψίστου κασιγνήτα καὶ ὁμοθρόνου Ἥρας,
εὖ μὲν Ἀρισταγόραν δέξαι τεδὸν ἐς θάλαμον, εὖ δ' ἐταίρους ἀγλαῶι σκάπτῳ πέλας οἷ σε
γεραίροντες ὀρθὰν φυλάσσοισιν Τένεδον, (5) πολλὰ μὲν λοιβαῖσιν ἀγαζόμενοι πρῶταν θεῶν,
πολλὰ δὲ κνίαι·

(JuA; ἀγαζόμενοι>βρέμεται)

λύρα δέ σφι βρέμεται καὶ ἀοιδά·

(JuB; κνίαι→τραπέζαις)

καὶ ξενίου Διὸς ἀσκειῖται θέμις αἰενάοις ἐν τραπέζαις·

(ImpB [Pr], S; beginning/end; δέξαι→περᾶσαι)

ἀλλὰ σὺν δόξαι τέλος δωδεκάμηνον περᾶσαι νιν ἀτρώτῳ κραδίαι. (10)

(Authin [mention of reputation (δόξαι)]; you/I, future/now)

ἄνδρα δ' ἐγὼ μακαρίζω μὲν πατέρ' Ἀρκεσίλαν, καὶ τὸ θαητὸν δέμας ἀτρεμίαν τε σύγγονον·

(Adv [assets/limits], Gen, Inf [Imp]; ἄνδρα<τις; τὸ θαητὸν δέμας≈μορφᾷ; ἀτρεμίαν→ἐν τ'
ἀέθλοισιν ἀριστεύων)

εἰ δέ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφᾷ παραμεύεται ἄλλους, ἐν τ' ἀέθλοισιν ἀριστεύων ἐπέδειξεν βίαν,
θνατὰ μεμνάσθω περιτέλλων μέλη, (15) καὶ τελευτὰν ἀπάντων γὰρ ἐπιεσσόμενος. ||

(Inf [Imp] [from achievement]; *ne plus ultra*/celebration)

ἐν λόγοις δ' ἀκτῶν ἀγαθοῖσιν ἐπαινέσθαι χρεῶν, καὶ μελιγδούποισι δαιδαλθέντα μελίζεν
ἀοιδᾶς.

(Inst, En [μελίζεν ἀοιδᾶς]; ἀκτῶν→πάτρων)

ἐκ δὲ περικτιόνων ἐκκαίδεκ' Ἀρισταγόραν ἀγλααὶ νῖκαι πάτρων τ' εὐώνυμον (20)

ἐστεφάνωσαν πάλαι καὶ μεγαυχεῖ παγκρατίῳ.

(Adv; positive/negative, local/non-local, actual/potential; νῖκαι→ἀέθλων)

ἐλπίδες δ' ὀκνηρότεραι γονέων παιδὸς βίαν ἔσχον ἐν Πυθῶνι πειρᾶσθαι καὶ Ὀλυμπίαι ἀέθλων.

(Exp [ὀκνηρότεραι]; hope/result; reality/counterfactual, fear/confidence, negative/positive,
effort/success; ἐν Πυθῶνι≈παρὰ Κασταλίαι; Ὀλυμπίαι≈ὄχθῳ Κρόνου; ἐλπίδες→δόξαν)

ναὶ μὰ γὰρ ὄρκον, ἐμὴν δόξαν παρὰ Κασταλίαι καὶ παρ' εὐδένδρῳ μολῶν ὄχθῳ Κρόνου (25)
κάλλιον ἂν δηριώντων ἐνόστης' ἀντιπάλων, πενταετηρίδ' ἐορτὰν Ἡρακλέος τέθμιον
κωμάσας ἀνδραγαθὸς τε κόμαν ἐν πορφυρέοις ἔρνεσιν.

(Adv, Gen [from case of the victor]; confidence/excessive confidence, success/failure,
positive/negative; ἔρνεσιν<ἀγαθῶν; ἐμὴν δόξαν→αὐχαι)

ἀλλὰ βροτῶν τὸν μὲν κενεόφρονες αὐχαι ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔβαλον·

(Ex [Par], Adv; excessive confidence/excessive timidity; καλῶν≈ἀγαθῶν; αὐχαι≠ἄτολμος; ἐξ
ἀγαθῶν ἔβαλον≈παρέσφαλεν)

τὸν δ' αὖ καταμεμφθέντ' ἄγαν (30) ἰσχὺν οἰκείων παρέσφαλεν καλῶν χειρὸς ἔλκων ὁπίσσω

θυμὸς ἄτολμος ἐών. ||

(Adv; lack of confidence/reasons for confidence [in past victories suggested by past-tense ἦν], negative/positive; $\text{ισχὺν} \rightarrow \text{αἶμ'}$; $\text{ἄτολμος} \neq \text{στρατιάν}$)

συμβαλεῖν μὰν εὐμαρὲς ἦν τό τε Πεισάνδρου πάλαι αἶμ' ἀπὸ Σπάρτας

(Exp [ἀπὸ Σπάρτας])

—Ἀμύκλαθεν γὰρ ἔβα σὺν Ὀρέσται, Αἰολέων στρατιὰν χαλκεντέα δεῦρ' ἀνάγων—

(35) καὶ παρ' Ἴκμηνοῦ ῥοᾶν κεκραμένον ἐκ Μελανίπποιο μάτρωος·

(Adv; constancy/instability, reasons for confidence/reasons for doubt; πάλαι αἶμ' $\rightarrow$ ἀρχαῖαι ... ἀρεταί; $\text{μάτρωος} \rightarrow$ γενεαῖς)

ἀρχαῖαι δ' ἀρεταί ἀμφέροντ' ἀλλασσόμεναι γενεαῖς ἀνδρῶν χθένος·

(Ex [Par]; $\text{ἀλλασσόμεναι} \neq \text{ἐν χερσῶι}$)

ἐν χερσῶι δ' οὐτ' ὦν μέλαιναι καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι, δένδρεά τ' οὐκ ἐθέλει πάσαις ἐτέων περόδοις (40) ἄνθος εὐῶδες φέρειν πλούτῳ ἴσον, ἀλλ' ἐναμείβοντι.

(Ex [Par])

καὶ θνατὸν οὕτως ἔθνος ἄγει μοῖρα.

(Ex [uncertain course of events]; $\text{θνατὸν} \rightarrow \text{ἀνθρώποις}$; $\text{μοῖρα} \rightarrow \text{ἐκ Διὸς}$)

τὸ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἀνθρώποις καφεὲς οὐχ ἔπεται τέκμαρ·

(Adv; ignorance/hope)

ἀλλ' ἔμπαν μεγαλανορίαις ἐμβαίνομεν, ἔργα τε πολλὰ μενοινῶντες·

(Exp; $\text{μενοινῶντες} \rightarrow \text{ἐλπίδι}$)

δέδεται γὰρ ἀναιδεῖ (45) ἐλπίδι γυῖα·

(Exp [men are bound to hope: they do not know the future]; hope/foreknowledge;

$\text{ἐλπίδι} \neq \text{προμαθείας}$; $\text{δέδεται} \neq \text{ἀπόκεινται}$)

προμαθείας δ' ἀπόκεινται ῥοαί.

(Inf [Imp])

κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν·

(Ju; positive/negative; $\text{μέτρον} \neq \text{ἀπρόσικτων} \dots \text{ἐρώτων}$)

ἀπρόσικτων δ' ἐρώτων ὀξύτεραι μανίαι.

Isthmian 1

(Authin)

Μᾶτερ ἐμά, τὸ τεόν, χρύσαςπι Θήβα, πρᾶγμα καὶ ἀσχολίας ὑπέρτερον θήσομαι.

(Inf [Imp]; $\text{ἀσχολίας} \approx \text{κέχυμαι}$)

μή μοι κραναὰ νεμεσάσαι Δᾶλος, ἐν αἷ κέχυμαι.

(Ju; $\text{μοι} < \text{ἀγαθοῖς}$; $\text{Μᾶτερ} < \text{τοκέων}$)

τί φίλτερον κεδνῶν τοκέων ἀγαθοῖς; (5)
(RecapImp; τοκέων>Ἀπολλωνιάς)
εἶξον, ὦ Ἀπολλωνιάς·

(Ju; Ἀπολλωνιάς→Φοῖβον·)
ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος, καὶ τὸν ἀκερσεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων ἐν
Κέῳ ἀμφιρῦται σὺν ποντίοις ἀνδράσιν, καὶ τὰν ἀλιερκέα Ἴσθμοῦ δειράδ·

(Exp [Isthmus celebrated], En; celebration/success)
ἐπεὶ στεφάνους (10) ἐξ ὧπασεν Κάδμου στρατῶι ἐξ ἀέθλων, καλλίνικον πατρίδι κῦδος.

(Re; now/then, contemporaries/heroes)
ἐν αἷ καὶ τὸν ἀδείμαντον Ἀλκμήνα τέκεν παῖδα, θραεῖαι τὸν ποτε Γηρυόνα φρῖξαν κύνες.

(Authin [irrelevance]; then/now, heroes/contemporaries)
ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Ἡροδότῳ τεύχων τὸ μὲν ἄρματι τεθρίπῳι γέρας, ἀνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ
νωμάσαντ' ἐθέλω (15) ἢ Καστορεῖωι ἢ Ἰολάοι' ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὕμνῳι.

(Exp [these heroes], En; ἄρματι→διφρηλάται)
κεῖνοι γὰρ ἡρώων διφρηλάται Λακεδαιμόνι καὶ Θήβαις ἐτέκνωθεν κράτιστοι· ||

(Ex [athletic prowess]; διφρηλάται>πλείετων ἀγώνων)
ἐν τ' ἀέθλοισι θίγον πλείετων ἀγώνων, καὶ τριπόδεσσιν ἐκόσμησαν δόμον καὶ λεβήτεσσιν
φιάλαις τε χρυσοῦ, (20) γευόμενοι στεφάνων νικαφόρων·

(Ex [πλείετων ἀγώνων]; home/games; ἀγώνων>σταδίοις)
λάμπει δὲ σαφὲς ἀρετὰ ἐν τε γυμνοῖσι σταδίοις σφίσις ἐν τ' ἀσπιδοδούποισιν ὀπλίταις δρόμοις,
οἷά τε χερσὶν ἀκοντίζοντες αἰχμαῖς καὶ λιθίνοις ὀπότη' ἐν δίσκοις ἱέν· (25)

(Exp [separate events]; σταδίοις<ἐκάστῳ ἔργματι)
οὐ γὰρ ἦν πενταέθλιον, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ ἔργματι κεῖτο τέλος.

(S; effort/celebration; τέλος≈ἔρνεσιν)
τῶν ἀθρόοις ἀνδρᾶμενοι θαμάκις ἔρνεσιν χαίτας ῥέεθροισί τε Δίρκας ἔφανεσιν καὶ παρ'
Εὐρώπῃ πέλας, Ἰφικλέος μὲν παῖς ὁμόδαμος ἐὼν Σπαρτῶν γένει, (30) Τυνδαρίδας δ' ἐν
Ἀχαιοῖς ὑψίπεδον Θεράπναις οἰκέων ἔδος.

(Imp [closure])
χαίρετ·

(Authin [new topic]; you/I, heroes/contemporaries)
ἐγὼ δὲ Ποσειδάωνι Ἴσθμῳι τε ζαθέαι Ὀγχηρτίαισιν τ' αἰόνεσσιν περιτέλλων αἰοιδᾶν
γαρύσομαι τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν τιμαῖσιν ἀγακλέα τὰν Ἀσωποδώρου πατρὸς αἴσαν || Ἐρχομενοῖό τε
πατρώϊαν ἄρουραν, (35) ἃ νιν ἐρειδόμενον ναυαγίαις ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἀλὸς ἐν κρυοέσσῃ δέξατο
συντυχίαι·

(Adv; then/now, negative/positive; κρυοέσσαι ... συντυχίαι≠εὐαμερίας; τὰν Ἀσωποδώρου πατρὸς αἴσαν→ἀρχαίας ... εὐαμερίας)
νῦν δ' αὖτις ἀρχαίας ἐπέβατο Πότμος συγγενὴς εὐαμερίας·

(Gen [from experience of Herodotus])
ὁ πονήσας δὲ νόωι καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει. (40)

(S; preparation/success; νόωι→ὀργάν)
εἰ δ' ἀρετῇ κατάκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν, ἀμφοτέρων δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις, χρή νιν εὐρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπων μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν γνώμας·

(Ju; κόμπων≈ἔπος; πόνοις≈μόχθων)
ἐπεὶ κούφα δόσις ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ (45) ἀντὶ μόχθων παντοδαπῶν ἔπος εἰπόντ' ἀγαθὸν ζυγὸν ὀρθῶσαι καλόν.

Priamel (Exp [praise is appropriate tribute to victor]; δόσις<μισθός)
μισθός γάρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις γλυκύς, μηλοβόται τ' ἀρόται τ' ὀρνιθολόχοι τε καὶ ὄν πόντος τράφει·
(Adv, Gen; diversity/unity; τράφει≠λιμὸν; ἔργμασιν→τέταται)
γαστρὶ δὲ πᾶς τις ἀμύνων λιμὸν αἰανῇ τέταται·
(Cap, Adv; many/one; μισθός>κέρδος; λιμὸν≠κῦδος ἀβρόν)
ὅς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισι ἢ πολεμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἀβρόν, (50) εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιστον δέκεται, πολιατᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον. ||

(En [praise of victor by praise of victories], Inst; ἀέθλοισι>ἀρμάτων; κέρδος→ἀμειβομένοις)
ἄμμι δ' εἴοικε Κρόνου κειρίχθον' υἱὸν γείτον' ἀμειβομένοις εὐεργέταν ἀρμάτων ἵπποδρόμιον κελαδεῖν, καὶ σέθεν, Ἀμφιτρύων, (55) παῖδας προσειπεῖν τὸν Μινύα τε μυχόν καὶ τὸ Δάματρος κλυτὸν ἄλλος Ἐλευσῖνα καὶ Εὐβοίαν ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις·

(Ex [Cat])
Πρωτεσίλα, τὸ τεδὸν δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐν Φυλάκαι τέμενος συμβάλλομαι.

(Authin [huge subject])
πάντα δ' ἐξειπεῖν, ὅς' ἀγώνιος Ἑρμᾶς (60) Ἡροδότῳ ἔπορεν ἵπποις, ἀφαιρεῖται βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχων ὕμνος.

(Ju [of move to new topic]; βραχὺ≠μεῖζω; ἐξειπεῖν≠τὸ σεσωπαμένον)
ἢ μὰν πολλάκι καὶ τὸ σεσωπαμένον εὐθυμίαν μεῖζω φέρει.

(En [move to new theme], Imp [Pr])
εἴη νιν εὐφώνων περύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ' ἀγλααῖς Πιερίδων, ἔτι καὶ Πυθῶθεν Ὀλυμπιάδων τ' ἐξαιρέτοις (65) Ἀλφειοῦ ἔρνεσι φράζει χεῖρα τιμὰν ἐπταπύλοισι Θήβαισι τεύχοντ'.

(PolGen, Ju [wish for further glory]; public/private, positive/negative; τιμὰν≈δόξας; τιμὰν ἐπταπύλοισι Θήβαισι τεύχοντ'≠πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον)
εἰ δὲ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον, ἄλλοις δ' ἐμπίπτων γελαῖ, ψυχὰν Αἶδαι τελέων οὐ

φράζεται δόξας ἄνευθεν.

Isthmian 2

(Description of the past)

Οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὧ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες, οἱ χρυσαμπύκων ἐς δίφρον Μοικᾶν ἔβαινον κλυτᾷ
φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι, ρίμφα παιδεῖους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους, ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν
Ἀφροδίτας εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὁπώραν. (5)

(Exp [of their subject and approach]; Μοικᾶν→Μοῖσα; Ἀφροδίτας→φιλοκερδής)

ἃ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής πω τότε ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·

(Recap; φιλοκερδής→ἐπέρναντο; Μοῖσα→Τερψιχόρας; ὕμνους→ᾠοῖδαί)

οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖται μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα
μαλθακόφωνοι ᾠοῖδαί.

(Adv, S; then/now; ἐπέρναντο→χρήματα)

νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τῷργείου φυλάξαι ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας < ~ ~ > ἄγχιςτα βαῖνον, (10) “χρήματα
χρήματ' ἀνήρ” ὅς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεῖς καὶ φίλων.

(Authin [you know all this; I need say no more])

ἔσσι γὰρ ὧν σοφός·

(Authin [new topic]; I/you)

οὐκ ἄγνῳτ' αἰεῖδω Ἴσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν, τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὁπάσαις, Δωρίων αὐτῷ
στεφάνωμα κόμαι (15) πέμπεν ἀναδείχθαι κελίνων, || εὐάρματον ἄνδρα γεραίρων,
Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος.

(ExA [Cat]; στεφάνωμα→ἀγλαίαν)

ἐν Κρίαι δ' εὐρυςθενής εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαίαν καὶ τόθι κλειναῖς <τ'> Ἐρεχθειδᾶν
χαρίτεσσιν ἀραρώς ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθήναις, οὐκ ἐμέμφθη (20) ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο
φωτός, τὰν Νικόμαχος κατὰ καιρὸν νεῖμ' ὁπάσαις ἀνίαις·

(ExB [Cat])

ὄν τε καὶ κάρυκες ὥρᾶν ἀνέγνον, σπονδοφόροι Κρονίδα Ζηνὸς Ἀλεῖοι, παθόντες πού τι
φιλόξενον ἔργον·

(S)

ἀδυπνόωι τέ νιν ἀσπάζοντο φωνᾷ (25) χρυσεᾶς ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας γαῖαν ἀνὰ
σφετέραν, τὰν δὴ καλέοισιν Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς ἄλκος·

(S; success/immortality)

ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι Αἰνησιδάμου παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν.

(Ex [ἀθανάτοισι ... τιμαῖς]; immortality/celebration, games/home; τιμαῖς→ᾠοῖδᾶν)

καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἄγνῳτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι (30) οὔτε κώμων, ὧ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν, οὔτε
μελικόμπων ᾠοῖδᾶν. ||

(Exp [οὐκ ἄγνῳτες], Gen; ᾠοῖδᾶν→Ἑλικωνιάδων; ὑμῖν<εὐδόξων ... ἀνδρῶν)

οὐ γὰρ πάγος οὐδὲ προκάντης ἃ κέλευθος γίνεται, εἴ τις εὐδόξων ἐς ἀνδρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰς

Ἑλικωνιάδων.

(Authin [poetic task], En, Inst; easy/hard; εὐδόξων ... ἀνδρῶν>Ξεινοκράτης; ἄγοι τιμὰς Ἑλικωνιάδων>ἀκοντίσσαιμι)
μακρὰ δισκῆσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ', ὅσον ὀργάν (35) Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν ἔσχευ.

(EnA; ὀργάν>αἰδοῖος)
αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὀμιλεῖν, ἵπποτροφίας τε νομίζων ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ·
(EnB; men/gods)
καὶ θεῶν δαῖτας προσέπτυκτο πάσας·
(EnC; gods/men; δαῖτας→τράπεζαν)
οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν οὔρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ' ἱκτίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν· (40)
(Recap [Pol])
ἀλλ' ἐπέρα ποτὶ μὲν Φᾶσιν θερείαις, ἐν δὲ χειμῶνι πλέων Νείλου πρὸς ἀκτάν.

(Inf [Imp] [reacting to praise]; ἐπέρα<ἀρετάν)
μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες, μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρώϊαν, μηδὲ τοῦδ' ὕμνου·

(Ju)
ἐπεὶ τοι (45) οὐκ ἐλινύκοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν.

(Inf [Imp] [thought of completed song reaching patron]; οὐκ ἐλινύκοντας→ἔλθῃς)
ταῦτα, Νικάσιπ', ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἠθαῖον ἔλθῃς.

Isthmian 3

(Imp)
Εἴ τις ἀνδρῶν εὐτυχῆσαις ἢ σὺν εὐδόξοις ἀέθλοισι ἢ σθένει πλούτου κατέχει φρασὶν αἰαντὴ κόρον, ἄξιός ἐστι λόγῳ ἀκτῶν μεμῖχθαι.
(Gen; men/god; εὐτυχῆσαις<ἀρεταῖ)
Ζεῦ, μεγάλα δ' ἀρεταὶ θνατοῖς ἔπονται ἐκ σθένος·
(Adv, S; gods/men, attainment/enjoyment; ἀρεταὶ→ὄλβος; κόρον→πλαγίαις ... φρένεσσιν)
ζῶει δὲ μάσσων ὄλβος ὀπιζομένων, πλαγίαις δὲ φρένεσσιν (5) οὐχ ὁμῶς πάντα χρόνον θάλλων ὀμιλεῖ.
(RecapImp; κατέχει ... κόρον→τὸν ἐκλόν; εὐτυχῆσαις→ἔργων; εὐλογίαις→ὑμνῆσαι)
εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἅποινα χρὴ μὲν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐκλόν, χρὴ δὲ κωμάζοντ' ἀγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν βαστάσαι.

(Inst, En; κωμάζοντ'→εὐφροσύναν; ἔργων>ἀέθλων; τὸν ἐκλόν>Μελίσσῳ)
ἔστι δὲ καὶ διδύμων ἀέθλων Μελίσσῳ μοῖρα πρὸς εὐφροσύναν τρέψαι γλυκεῖαν (10) ἥτορ, ἐν βάσσαισιν Ἴσθμοῦ δεξαμένῳ στεφάνους, τὰ δὲ κοῖλαι λέοντος ἐν βαθυστέρνου νάπαι κάρυξε Θῆβαν ἵπποδρομίαι κρατέων·
(Recap [Pol]; victor/family; δεξαμένῳ στεφάνους≈οὐ κατελέγει)
ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετάν σύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγει.

(ExpA [ἀρετάν κύμφυτον]; ἵπποδρομιαί→ἄρμασιν; ἀρετάν→δόξαν; ἀνδρῶν>Κλεωνύμου)
 ἴστε μὲν Κλεωνύμου (15) δόξαν παλαιὰν ἄρμασιν·
 (ExpB [ἀρετάν κύμφυτον]; father/mother; ἀρετάν→πόνοις; ἄρμασιν→τετραοριᾶν)
 καὶ ματρώθε Λαβδακίδαισιν σύννομοι πλούτου διέττειχον τετραοριᾶν πόνοις.

(Adv, Exp [implicit lack of success]; constancy/instability, effort/result)
 αἰῶν δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἀμέραις ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξ ἄλλαξεν.

(Adv; instability/constancy, men/gods; ἄλλαξεν≠ἄτρωτοί)
 ἄτρωτοί γε μὲν παῖδες θεῶν.

Isthmian 4

(Authin)
 Ἦστι μοι θεῶν ἕκατι μυρία παντᾷ κέλευθος, ᾧ Μέλισσ', εὐμαχανίαν γὰρ ἔφανας Ἴσθμίοις,
 ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς ὕμνοι διώκειν·

(En, Ex [ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς]; Μέλισσ'<Κλεωνυμίδαι)
 αἷσι Κλεωνυμίδαι θάλλοντες αἰεὶ σὺν θεῷ θνατὸν διέρχονται βιότου τέλος.

(Adv; positive/negative, constancy/instability, family/individuals; αἰεὶ≠ἄλλοτε;
 Κλεωνυμίδαι<πάντας ἀνθρώπους)
 ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλοιός οὗρος (5) πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπαίσιων ἐλαύνει.

(Adv; instability/constancy, negative/positive)
 τοὶ μὲν ὧν Θήβαισι τιμάνεντες ἀρχᾶθεν λέγονται πρόξενοί τ' ἀμφικτιόνων κελαδεννᾶς τ'
 ὄρφανοί ὕβριος·

(Ex [family's reputation]; τιμάνεντες→δόξας; λέγονται→ἄηται)
 ὅσσα δ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἄηται μαρτύρια φθιμένων ζωῶν τε φωτῶν (10) ἀπλέτου δόξας,
 ἐπέψαυσαν κατὰ πᾶν τέλος·
 (Recap; δόξας→ἀνορέαις; κατὰ πᾶν τέλος→ἐσχάταισιν)
 ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἄπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις·

(Inf [Imp]; *ne plus ultra*/further; ἐσχάταισιν≠μακροτέραν; ἀνορέαις→ἀρετάν)
 καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν.

(Inst [ἀνορέαις]; ἀνορέαις→Ἄρει)
 ἵπποτρόφοι τ' ἐγένοντο, χαλκέωι τ' Ἄρει ἄδον. (15)

(Adv; success/failure, positive/negative; Ἄρει→πολέμοιο; ἵπποτρόφοι→μάκαιραν)
 ἀλλ' ἀμέραι γὰρ ἐν μιᾷ τραχεῖᾳ νιφὰς πολέμοιο τεσσάρων ἀνδρῶν ἐρήμωσεν μάκαιραν
 ἐστίαν·

(Adv; then/now, failure/success, negative/positive; νιφὰς→χειμέριον; ἀμέραι→μηνῶν;
 ἐρήμωσεν≠ἄνθησεν)
 νῦν δ' αὖ μετὰ χειμέριον ποικίλα μηνῶν ζόφον χθὼν ὥτε φοινικέοισιν ἄνθησεν ῥόδοις ||

δαιμόνων βουλαῖς.

(Recap; δαιμόνων>κινητήρ; ἄνθηεν→ὕμνον)

ὁ κινητήρ δὲ γὰρ Ὀγχηστὸν οἰκέων καὶ γέφυραν ποντιάδα πρὸ Κορίνθου τειχέων, (20) τόνδε πορὼν γενεᾷ θαυμαστὸν ὕμνον ἐκ λεχέων ἀνάγει φάμαν παλαιάν εὐκλέων ἔργων·

(Exp [ἐκ λεχέων], Sb; now/then, positive/negative; λεχέων→ὕπνῳ)

ἐν ὕπνῳ γὰρ πέσεν·

(Adv, S; dark/light, then/now, negative/positive, asleep/awake; ὕπνῳ≠ἀνεγειρομένα)

ἀλλ' ἀνεγειρομένα χρωτὰ λάμπει, Ἀοσφόρος θαητὸς ὥς ἄστροις ἐν ἄλλοις·

(En [family's fame], Inst [ancient fame], Sb; now/then)

ἅ τε κὰν γουνοῖς Ἀθανᾶν ἄρμα καρύξαισα νικᾶν (25) ἐν τ' Ἀδραστείοις ἀέθλοισι Κυκλῶνος ὥπασεν τοιάδε τῶν τότε ἑόντων φύλλ' αἰοιδᾶν.

(Ex [Cat]; local/non-local, success/effort; ἄρμα→ἵππων)

οὐδὲ παναγυρίων ξυνᾶν ἀπείχον καμπύλον δίφρον, Πανελλάνεσσι δ' ἐριζόμενοι δαπάναι χαῖρον ἵππων·

(Exp [they competed], PolGen; οὐδὲ ... ἀπείχον≠ἀπειράτων)

τῶν ἀπειράτων γὰρ ἄγνωτοι κιωπαί. (30)

(Adv; effort/success, merits/result; ἀπειράτων≠μαρναμένων)

ἔστιν δ' ἀφάνεια τύχας καὶ μαρναμένων, πρὶν τέλος ἄκρον ἰκέσθαι·

(ExpA [success is uncertain]; ἀφάνεια→τῶν τε ... καὶ τῶν)

τῶν τε γὰρ καὶ τῶν διδοῖ·

(ExpB)

καὶ κρέσσον' ἀνδρῶν χειρόνων ἔσφαλε τέχνα καταμάρψαις·

(Inst; κρέσσον'>Αἴαντος)

ἵστε μάν (35) Αἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον, τὰν ὀψίαί ἐν νυκτὶ ταμῶν περὶ ᾧ φαργάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει παίδεσσι Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν. ||

(Adv, S; negative/positive, death/afterlife; ἀλκὰν→ἀρετὰν)

ἀλλ' Ὀμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὃς αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.

(Exp [λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν], Gen; ἔφρασεν<εἶπη; λοιποῖς→ἀθάνατον)

τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἔρπει, (40) εἴ τις εὔ εἶπη τι·

(Recap; ἔρπει≈βέβακεν; ἀθάνατον≈ἄσβεστος αἰεῖ)

καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεῖ.

(Imp [Pr] [future of song], Inst [wished for]; ἀκτὶς→πυρρὸν; ἐργμάτων>παγκρατίου)

προφρόνων Μοιρᾶν τύχοιμεν, κείνον ἄσαι πυρρὸν ὕμνων καὶ Μελίσσῳ, παγκρατίου στεφάνωμ' ἐπάξιον, ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιάδα.

(Ju, En; παγκρατίου→πόνωι)

τόλμαι γὰρ εἰκώς (45) θυμὸν ἐριβρεμετᾶν θηρῶν λεόντων ἐν πόνωι, μῆτιν δ' ἀλώπηξ, αἰετοῦ ἅ τ' ἀναπιτναμένα ρόμβον ἴχει·

(Exp [he uses clever strategy], Gen; ἀναπιτναμένα<πᾶν ἔρδοντ')

χρὴ δὲ πᾶν ἔρδοντ' ἀμαυρῶσαι τὸν ἐχθρόν.

(Exp [why this applies to victor])

οὐ γὰρ φύσιν Ὀαριωνείαν ἔλαχεν·

(Recap [Pol]; body/mind; φύσιν Ὀαριωνείαν≠ὄνοτοδς ... ἰδέσθαι)

ἀλλ' ὄνοτοδς μὲν ἰδέσθαι, (50) συμπεσεῖν δ' ἄκμῃ βαρύς.

(Ex [Par]; contemporaries/heroes, now/then; ὄνοτοδς ... ἰδέσθαι→μορφὰν βραχύς;

βαρύς→ἄκαμπτος; συμπεσεῖν→προσπαλαίσιων)

καὶ τοί ποτ' Ἀνταίου δόμους Θηβᾶν ἅπο Καδμεῖαν μορφὰν βραχύς, ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτος, προσπαλαίσιων ἦλθ' ἀνὴρ τὰν πυροφόρον Λιβύαν, κρανίοις ὄφρα ξένων ναὸν Ποσειδάωνος ἐρέφοντα χεῖθοι, || υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνας·

(S; Λιβύαν<γαίᾳς ... πάσας)

ὃς Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἔβα, γαίᾳς τε πάσας (55) καὶ βαθύκρημνον πολιᾶς ἀλὸς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ, ναυτιλίαί τε πορθμὸν ἡμερώσας.

(S; then/now)

νῦν δὲ παρ' Αἰγίόχῳ κάλλιστον ὄλβον ἀμφέπων ναίει, τετίματαί τε πρὸς ἀθανάτων φίλος, Ἦβαν τ' ὀπυῖει, χρυσέων οἴκων ἄναξ καὶ γαμβρὸς Ἦρας. (60)

(Ex [Heracles' honors]; gods/men; τετίματαί→δαῖτα πορσύνοντες)

τῷ μὲν Ἀλεκτρᾶν ὑπερθεὺς δαῖτα πορσύνοντες ἄστοι καὶ νεόδματα στεφανώματα βωμῶν αὔξομεν ἔμπυρα χαλκοαρᾶν ὀκτὼ θανόντων, τοὺς Μεγάρα τέκε οἱ Κρεοντίς υἱός·

(S [of festival]; ἔμπυρα→φλόξ)

τοῖσιν ἐν δυθμαῖσιν αὐγὰν φλόξ ἀνατελλομένα συνεχὲς παννυχίζει, (65) αἰθέρα κνικάεντι λακτίζοις καπνῷ, καὶ δεύτερον ἄμαρ ἐτείων τέρμ' ἀέθλων γίνεται, ἰσχύος ἔργον.

(Inst [of athletics]; ἀέθλων→νίκαν)

ἔνθα λευκωθεὶς κᾶρα μύρτοισι ὃδ' ἀνὴρ διπλόαν (70) νίκαν ἀνεφάνατο παίδων <τε> τρίταν πρόσθεν, κυβερνατῆρος οἰακοστρόφου γνῶμαι πεπιθὼν πολυβούλῳ·

(Authin [victory]; success/celebration; κυβερνατῆρος≈Ὀρσεῖ)

σὺν Ὀρσεῖ δὲ νῖν κωμάζομαι τερπνὰν ἐπιστάζων χάριν.

Isthmian 5

(Address)

Μᾶτερ Ἀελίου πολυώνυμε Θεία, σέο ἕκατι καὶ μεγαθενῇ νόμικαν χρυσὸν ἄνθρωποι περιώσιον ἄλλων·

(ExA [powers]; wealth/war; νόμικαν ... περιώσιον ἄλλων→θαυμασται πέλονται)
καὶ γὰρ ἐριζόμεναι νῆες ἐν πόντῳ καὶ <ὕφ' > ἄρμασιν ἵπποι (5) διὰ τεάν, ὄνασσα, τιμὰν
ὠκυδινάτοισι ἐν ἀμίλλαισι θαυμασται πέλονται·

(ExB; war/athletics; ἀμίλλαισι→ἀέθλοισι; θαυμασται→κλέος)
ἐν τ' ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοισι ποθεινόν κλέος ἔπραξεν, ὅντιν' ἀθρόοι στέφανοι χερσὶ νικάσαντ'
ἀνέδησαν ἔθειραν ἢ ταχυτάτι ποδῶν. (10)

(Gen; men/gods; χερσὶ>ἀλκὰ; νικάσαντ'>κρίνεται; ὅντιν'>ἀνδρῶν; διὰ τεάν, ὄνασσα,
τιμὰν→διὰ δαίμονας)
κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.

(Adv, S; success/celebration, god/men; κρίνεται→εὖ πάσχω)
δύο δέ τοι ζωῶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ, εἴ τις εὖ πάσχω
λόγον ἐκλὸν ἀκούῃ.

(Inf [Imp]; celebration/*ne plus ultra*)
μὴ μάτευσεν Ζεὺς γενέσθαι·

(JuA)
πάντ' ἔχεις, εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν. (15)

(JuB)
θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.

(Inst; εὖ πάσχω→ἀρετά)
τὴν δ' ἐν Ἰσθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοις ἀρετά, Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέαι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν Πυθέαι τε,
παγκρατίου.

(Authin [reacting to mention of victory], Adv; you/me, success/celebration;
Φυλακίδα<Αἰακιδᾶν)
τὸ δ' ἐμόν οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται· (20)
(Recap; ὕμνων→Χάρις; Αἰακιδᾶν>Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς)
σὺν Χάρις δ' ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς || τάνδ' ἐς εὖνομον πόλιν.

(Inf [Imp], Gen; σὺν Χάρις→ἀοιδᾶι)
εἰ δὲ τέτραπται θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἂν καθάραν, μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ' ἀοιδᾶι
κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων. (25)

(Ju [from precedent]; contemporaries/heroes; ἀοιδᾶι→λόγον)
καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ λόγον ἐκέρδαναν·

(Exp [λόγον ἐκέρδαναν], S; λόγον→κλέονται)
κλέονται δ' ἐν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὁμοκλαῖς μυρίον χρόνον·
(Recap; κλέονται→σεβιζόμενοι)
μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς Διὸς ἑκατὶ πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι·

(InstA; *κεβιζόμενοι*→*θυεΐαι*)

ἐν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν θυεΐαι φαενναῖς (30) Οἰνεΐδαι κρατεροί, ἐν δὲ Θήβαις ἵπποσάας Ἰόλαος γέρας ἔχει, Περσεὺς δ' ἐν Ἄργει, Κάστορος δ' αἰχμὰ Πολυδεύκεός τ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτῃ ρέεθροις.

(InstB, Cap)

ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνῶναι μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε·

(En [honour these heroes on Aegina])

τοὶ καὶ σὺν μάχαις (35) δις πόλιν Τρώων πράθον, ἐσπόμενοι Ἡρακλῆϊ πρότερον, καὶ σὺν Ἀτρεΐδαις.

(Imp [reacting to mention of Trojan expedition]; success/comemmmoration)

ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν·

(En, Qa)

λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἴκτορα πέφνον, καὶ στρατάρχον Αἰθιοπῶν ἄφοβον (40) Μέμνονα χαλκοόραν·

(Qb)

τίς ἄρ' ἐκλὼν Τήλεφον τρῶσεν ἐὼι δορὶ Καΐκου παρ' ὄχθαις; ||

(A)

τοῖσιν Αἴγιναν προφέρει στόμα πάτρην, διαπρεπέα νῆσον·

(Gen; *διαπρεπέα*→*πύργος*)

τετείχισται δὲ πάλαι πύργος ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν. (45)

(Authin [huge subject]; *ἀρεταῖς*→*τοξεύματ'*)

πολλὰ μὲν ἀρτιεπὴς γλῶσσά μοι τοξεύματ' ἔχει περὶ κείνων κελαδέσαι·

(En, Inst; *κείνων*>*ναύταις*; *πολλὰ*>*ὀρθωθεῖσα*)

καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἄρει μαρτυρῆσαι κεν πόλις Αἴαντος ὀρθωθεῖσα ναύταις ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Καλαμῖς Διὸς ὄμβρῳ ἀναρίθμων ἀνδρῶν χαλαζᾷ φόνῳ. (50)

(Authin, Adv; *ἀναρίθμων*→*καύχαι*; *ὄμβρῳ*→*κατάβρεχε*)

ἀλλ' ὅμως καύχαι κατάβρεχε σιγαῖ·

(Ju [halting this theme, transition to another])

Ζεὺς τὰ τε καὶ τὰ νέμει, Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος.

(Inst [τὰ τε καὶ τὰ]; τὰ τε καὶ τὰ>*τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ*; *καύχαι*→*καλλίνικον χάρι*)

ἐν δ' ἐρατεινῷ μέλιτι καὶ τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ καλλίνικον χάρι ἀγαπάζοντι.

(En [praise of *τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ*]; athletics/war; *τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ*≈*ἀέθλοισιν*)

μαρνάσθω τις ἔρδων ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου (55) ἐκμαθών·

(Ju; *ἀέθλοισιν*→*μόχθος*)

οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρὸς μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὀπόσαι δαπάναι ἐλπίδων ἔκνις ὅπιν.

(Inst; μόχθος→γυιοδάμαις; ἀνδρῶν>Πυθέαν)

αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις, Φυλακίδα, πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι (60) χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόωι ἀντίπαλον.

(Inf [Imp]; αἰνέω→ὕμνον; γυιοδάμαις→στεφάνον)

λάμβανέ οἱ στεφάνον, φέρε δ' εὖμαλλον μίτραν, καὶ πετρόεντα νέον κύμπεμνον ὕμνον.

Isthmian 6

(Authin)

Θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν ὥς ὅτε κυποσίου δεύτερον κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων κίρναμεν
Λάμπωνος εὐαέθλου γενεᾶς ὕπερ, ἐν Νεμέαι μὲν πρῶτον, ὃ Ζεῦ, τὴν ἄωτον δεξάμενοι
στεφάνων, νῦν αὖτε Ἴσθμοῦ δεσπότης (5) Νηρείδεσσι τε πεντήκοντα παίδων ὀπλοτάτου
Φυλακίδα νικῶντος.

(Imp [Pr], Ex [Par] [potential]; πρῶτον→τρίτον; μελέων→ᾠοῖδαις; κρατῆρα→σπένδειν)

εἷη δὲ τρίτον σπητῆρι πορσαίνοντας Ὀλυμπίῳ Αἰγῖναν κάτα σπένδειν μελιφθόγοις ᾠοῖδαις.

(Exp [this prayer, not another]; ᾠοῖδαις→δόξαν; σπητῆρι→δαίμων)

εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάναι τε χαρεῖς (10) καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτων ἀρετάς σὺν τέ οἱ
δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον, ἐσχατιαῖς ἤδη πρὸς ὄλβου βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν θεότιμος ἑών.

(Inf [Imp] [Pr], Inst [wished for]; τις>ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς)

τοιαῖσιν ὀργαῖς εὐχεται ἀντιάσαις Αἶδαν γῆράς τε δέξασθαι πολίον (15) ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς·
(Recap Imp [Pr]; he/I; εὐχεται≈ἐφετμαῖς)

ἐγὼ δ' ὑψίθρονον Κλωθὴ κασιγνήτας τε προσεννέπω ἐσπέσθαι κλυταῖς ἀνδρὸς φίλου Μοίρας
ἐφετμαῖς.

(Authin, Adv; I/you, contemporaries/heroes)

ὕμμε τ', ὃ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαι, τέθμιόν μοι φαμί καφέστατον ἔμμεν (20) τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα
νᾶσον ραινέμεν εὐλογίαις.

(En, Ex [τέθμιόν ... καφέστατον]; εὐλογίαις→καλῶν; καφέστατον→ἐκατόμπεδοι;

ἐπιστείχοντα→κέλευθοι)

μυρία δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέτμανθ' ἐκατόμπεδοι ἐν σπητῶι κέλευθοι καὶ πέραν Νεῖλοιο παγᾶν
καὶ δι' Ὑπερβορέους·

(Recap [Pol]; ἔργων→κλέος; Νεῖλοιο→βάρβαρος)

οὐδ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος οὔτε παλίγγλωστος πόλις, ἅτις οὐ Πηλέος αἰεὶ κλέος ἥρωος,
εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν, (25) || οὐδ' ἅτις Αἴαντος Τελαμωνιάδα καὶ πατρός·

(En [κλέος]; βάρβαρος ... πόλις→Τροίαν)

τὸν χαλκοχάρμαν ἐς πόλεμον ἄγε σὺν Τιτυνθίοισιν πρόφρονά σὺμμαχον ἐς Τροίαν, ἥρωσι
μόχθον, Λαομεδοντιᾶν ὑπὲρ ἀμπλακιᾶν ἐν ναυσὶν Ἀλκμήνας τέκος. (30)

(S; πόλεμον→εἶλε)

εἶλε δὲ Περγαμίαν, πέφνε δὲ σὺν κείνῳι Μερόπων ἔθνεα καὶ τὸν βουβόταν οὐρεὶ ἴσον
Φλέγραισιν εὐρὼν Ἀλκυονῇ, σφετέρᾳ δ' οὐ φείατο χερσὶν βαρυφθόγοιο νευρᾶς Ἡρακλῆς.

(Sb, Adv [peak of interest]; Περγαμίαν→πλόον)
 ἀλλ' Αἰακίδαν καλέων (35) ἐς πλόον <—> κύρησεν δαινυμένων.

(S; δαινυμένων→σπονδαῖσιν)
 τὸν μὲν ἐν ῥίνῳι λέοντος στάντα κελήσατο νεκταρέαις σπονδαῖσιν ἄρξαι καρτεραίχμαν
 Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδαν, ἄνδωκε δ' αὐτῷι φέρτατος οἰνοδόκον φιάλαν χρυσῷι πεφρικυῖαν Τελαμών.
 (40)

(S)
 ὁ δ' ἀνατείναις οὐρανῷι χεῖρας ἀμάχους αὖδασε τοιοῦτον ἔπος·

(Ds)
 “Εἴ ποτ' ἐμῶν, ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, θυμῷι θέλων ἀρᾶν ἄκουσας, νῦν σε, νῦν εὐχαῖς ὑπὸ θεσπεσίαις
 λίσσομαι παῖδα θρασὺν ἐξ Ἑριβοίας (45) ἀνδρὶ τῷιδε ξεῖνον ἀμὸν μοιρίδιον τελέσαι·

(Ex [description of son])
 τὸν μὲν ἄρρηκτον φυάν, ὥσπερ τόδε δέρμα με νῦν περιπλανᾶται θηρός, ὃν πάμπρωτον
 ἀέθλων κτεῖνά ποτ' ἐν Νεμέαι·

(Ex [Par])
 θυμὸς δ' ἐπέσθω.”

(S)
 ταῦτ' ἄρα οἱ φαμένωι πέμψεν θεὸς ἀρχὸν οἰωνῶν μέγαν αἰετόν·

(S)
 ἀδεῖα δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις, (50) || εἶπέν τε φωνήσας ἄτε μάντις ἀνήρ

(Ds)
 “”Εσσεταί τοι παῖς, ὃν αἰτεῖς, ὦ Τελαμών·

(Inf [Imp])
 καί νιν ὄρνιχος φανέντος κέκλευ ἐπώνυμον εὐρυβίαν Αἴαντα, λαῶν ἐν πόνοις ἔκπαγλον
 Ἐνυαλίου.”

(Sf)
 ὥς ἦρα εἰπὼν αὐτίκα (55) ἔξετ'.

(Authin [endless subject suggested by career of Ajax])
 ἐμοὶ δὲ μακρὸν πάσας ἀν'αγήσασθ' ἀρετάς·

(Exp [μακρὸν]; heroes/contemporaries)
 Φυλακίδαι γὰρ ἦλθον, ὦ Μοῖσα, ταμίαις Πυθέαι τε κόμων Εὐθυμένει τε·

(En)

τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον εἰρήσεται που κὰν βραχύτοις.

(En)

ἄρα νίκα ἀπὸ παγκρατίου (60) τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας, ἀγλαοὶ παῖδες τε καὶ μάτρως.

(S; success/celebration)

ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς φάος οἶαν μοῖραν ὕμνων·

(Recap; ὕμνων→Χαρίτων)

τὰν Ψαλυχιαδᾶν δὲ ἀάτραν Χαρίτων ἄρδοντι καλλίσται δρόσῳ, τὸν τε Θεμιστίου ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον τάνδε πόλιν (65) θεοφιλεῖ ναίεισι.

(Ex [Θεμιστίου ... οἶκον]; victors/family; οἶκον>Λάμπων; πόλιν→ἄσται; Χαρίτων→Ἡσιόδου)
Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾷ τοῦτ' ἔπος, υἱοῖσί τε φράζων
παραίνει, ξυγόν ἄσται κόσμον ἔδωκεν προσάγων καὶ ξένων εὐεργεσίαις ἀγαπᾶται, (70) μέτρα μὲν
γνώμαι διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων·

(ExA [Lampon's character]; μέτρα≠ἔξω φρενῶν)

γλῶσσαι δ' οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν·

(ExB; ethics/athletics)

φαίης κέ νιν ἄνδρ' ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν Ναξίαν πέτραις ἐν ἄλλαις χαλκοδάμαντ' ἀκόναν.

(Authin [praise]; success/commemoration)

πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἀγνὸν ὕδωρ, τὸ βαθύζωνοι κόραι χρυσοπέπλου Μναμοσύνας ἀνέτειλαν παρ' εὐτειχέσιν Κάδμου πόλιν. (75)

Isthmian 7

(Q)

Τίνι τῶν πάρος, ὦ μάκαιρα Θήβα, καλῶν ἐπιχωρίων μάλιστα θυμὸν τεόν εὐφραναι;

(ExA [Cat] [possible answers]; καλῶν>Διόνυσον)

ἦρα χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον Δαμάτερος ἀνίκ' εὐρυχαίταν ἀντίλας Διόνυσον, ἢ χρυσῶι μεσονύκτιον νείφοντα δεξαμένα τὸν φέρτατον θεῶν, (5) ὅπότ' Ἀμφιτρύωνος ἐν θυρέτροις σταθεῖς ἄλοχον μετῆλθεν Ἡρακλείοις γοναῖς;

(ExB [Cat])

ἦ ἀμφὶ πυκναῖς Τειρεσίαι βουλαῖς;

(ExC [Cat])

ἦ ἀμφ' Ἰόλαον ἱππόμητιν;

(ExD [Cat])

ἦ Σπαρτῶν ἀκαμαντολογχᾶν;

(ExE [Cat])

ἦ ὅτε καρτερᾶς Ἄδραστον ἐξ ἀλαλᾶς ἄμπεμψας ὀρφανόν (10) μυρίων ἐτάρων ἐς Ἄργος ἵππιον;

(ExF [Cat])

ἦ Δωρίδ' ἀποικίαν οὐνεκεν ὀρθῶι ἔστασας ἐπὶ σφυρῶι Λακεδαιμονίων, ἔλον δ' Ἀμύκλας Αἰγείδαι σέθεν ἔκγονοι, μαντεύμασι Πυθίοις; (15)

(Adv; ἀποικίαν<παλαιὰ ... χάρις)

ἀλλὰ παλαιὰ γὰρ εὔδει χάρις, ἀμνάμονες δὲ βροτοί, || ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκεται ζυγόν·

(Inf [Imp]; old/new; ἐπέων→ῥυμνοι)

κώμαζ' ἔπειτεν ἀδυμελεῖ σὺν ῥυμνῳ (20) καὶ Στρεψιάδαι·

(Ju, En; celebration/success; χάρις→νίκαν)

φέρει γὰρ Ἴσθμοι νίκαν παγκρατίου, σθένει τ' ἔκπαγλος ἰδεῖν τε μορφάεις, ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἰσχίον φυᾶς.

(Ex [praise of victor]; success/celebration, victor/family)

φλέγεται δὲ ἰοπλόκοις Μοῖσαις, μᾶτρώϊ θ' ὁμωνύμῳ δέδωκε κοινὸν θάλος, χάλκαςπις ὦι πότμον μὲν Ἄρης ἔμειξεν· (25)

(Exp [the victor honours his uncle], Gen; θάλος→τιμὰ; μᾶτρωι<ἀγαθοῖσιν)

τιμὰ δ' ἀγαθοῖσιν ἀντίκειται.

(Exp [τιμὰ], Inst; ἀγαθοῖσιν>ὅστις; τιμὰ→κλέος)

ἴστω γὰρ σαρξὶς ὅστις ἐν ταύτῃ νεφέλῃ χαλάσαν αἵματος πρὸ φίλας πάτρας ἀμύνεται, λοιγὸν ἄντα φέρον ἐναντίῳ στρατῷ, ἀσπὸν γενεᾷ μέγιστον κλέος αὖξων ζώων τ' ἀπὸ καὶ θανάτων. (30)

(Inst, En [κλέος]; ὅστις>τὸ; θανάτων→ἀπέπνευσε)

τὸ δέ, Διοδότοιο παῖ, μαχατὰν αἰνέων Μελέαγρον, αἰνέων δὲ καὶ Ἴκτορα Ἀμφιάραόν τε, εὐανθέ' ἀπέπνευσε ἀλικίαν || προμάχων ἀν' ὁμίλον, ἐνθ' ἄριστοι (35) ἔσχον πολέμοιο νεῖκος ἐσχάταις ἐλπίσιν.

(S; ἀπέπνευσε→πένθος)

ἔτλαν δὲ πένθος οὐ φατόν·

(Adv, S; then/now, pain/joy, negative/positive; πένθος≈χειμῶνος)

ἀλλὰ νῦν μοι Γαῖόχορ εὐδίαν ὅπασσεν ἐκ χειμῶνος.

(S; success/celebration)

ἀείσομαι χαίταν στεφάνοισιν ἀρμόζων·

(Imp [Pr] [success]; now/future)

ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος.

(Ex [plans for future], Inf [from calm future provided by the gods]; gods/men;

φθόνος≠ἔκαλος)

ὅ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων (40) ἔκαλος ἔπειμι γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον αἰῶνα.

(ExpA [pursuing this course of life]; αἰῶνα→θνήσκομεν)

θνήσκομεν γὰρ ὁμῶς ἅπαντες·

(Adv; unity/diversity; μόρσιμον→δαίμων; ἅπαντες≠ἅϊκος)

δαίμων δ' ἅϊκος·

(ExpB; near/far; τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον≠τὰ μακρὰ; θνάσκομεν≠χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἔδραν)

τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τις παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἔδραν·

(Inst; χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἔδραν≈οὐρανοῦ σταθμούς)

ὃ τοι πτερόεις ἔρριψε Πάγασος δεσπότην ἐθέλοντ' ἐς οὐρανοῦ σταθμούς (45) ἐλθεῖν μεθ' ὁμάγυριν Βελλεροφόνταν Ζηνός.

(Gen; ἔρριψε→πικροτάτα; ἐλθεῖν<τὸ ... πὰρ δίκαν)

τὸ δὲ πὰρ δίκαν γλυκὺ πικροτάτα μένει τελευτά.

(PolInst [potential], Imp [Pr] [mention of future]; unjust/just, negative/positive;

τελευτά→στεφάνον)

ἄμμι δ', ὃ χρυσεὶ κόμαι θάλλων, πόρε, Λοξία, τεαῖσιν ἀμίλλαισιν (50) εὐανθέα καὶ Πυθόι στεφάνον.

Isthmian 8

(Imp)

Κλεάνδρῳι τις ἀλικία τε λύτρον εὐδοξον, ὃ νέοι, καμάτων πατρὸς ἀγλαὸν Τελεσάρχου παρὰ πρόθυρον ἰὼν ἀνεγειρέτω κῶμον, Ἴσθμιάδος τε νίκας ἄποινα, καὶ Νεμέαι ἀέθλων ὅτι κράτος ἐξεῦρε·

(Ex [Par]; someone/me; κῶμον→Μοῖσαν)

τῷ καὶ ἐγώ, καίπερ ἀχνύμενος (5) θυμόν, αἰτέομαι χρυσεὴν καλέσαι Μοῖσαν.

(Inf [Imp]; ἀχνύμενος→πενθέων; καλέσαι Μοῖσαν≠κάδεα θεράπευε)

ἐκ μεγάλων δὲ πενθέων λυθέντες μήτ' ἐν ὀρφανίαι πέσωμεν στεφάνων, μήτε κάδεα θεράπευε·

(PolRecapImp; πενθέων→κακῶν; κάδεα θεράπευε≠δαμωσόμεθα)

παυσάμενοι δ' ἀπράκτων κακῶν γλυκὺ τι δαμωσόμεθα καὶ μετὰ πόνον·

(Ju; πόνον→μόχθον)

ἐπειδὴ τὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλᾶς λίθον γε Ταντάλου παρὰ τις ἔτρεψεν ἄμμι θεός, (10) || ἀτόλματον Ἑλλάδι μόχθον.

(Adv, S; Ἑλλάδι>ἐμοί; μόχθον→δεῖμα; ἔτρεψεν→παροιχόμενον)

ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δεῖμα μὲν παροιχόμενον καρτερὰν ἔπαυσε μέριμναν·

(Exp [anxiety ceased], Gen; near/far; παροιχόμενον≠τὸ ... πρὸ ποδός; μέριμναν→βλέπειν)

τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδός ἄρειον αἰεὶ βλέπειν χρῆμα πάν·

(Exp; near/far; τὸ ... πρὸ ποδός≠βίου πόρον)

δόλιος γὰρ αἰὼν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κρέμαται, ἐλίccων βίου πόρον·

(Adv; negative/positive)

ἱατὰ δ' ἐστὶ βροτοῖς cύν γ' ἐλευθερίαι (15) καὶ τά.

(Inf [Imp]; ιατὰ→ἐλπίδ')
 χρῆ δ' ἀγαθὰν ἐλπίδ' ἀνδρὶ μέλειν.

(En [of hopefulness by turn from gloom to celebration], Inf [Imp]; ἀνδρὶ>τραφέντα)
 χρῆ δ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι Θῆβαις τραφέντα Αἰγίνοι Χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν, πατρὸς οὐνεκα
 δίδυμαι γέγοντο θύγατρες Ἀσωπίδων ὀπλόταται, Ζηνὶ τε ἄδον βασιλεί.

(En; θύγατρες>τὰν)
 ὃ τὰν μὲν παρὰ καλλιρόωι Δίρῃ φιλαρμάτου πόλιος ὤικισεν ἀγεμόνα· (20) ||
 (Cap, Ex [Par]; θύγατρες>εἰς)
 εἰ δ' ἐς νῆσον Οἰνοπίαν ἐνεγκὼν κοιμᾶτο, δῖον ἔνθα τέκεσσι Αἰακὸν βαρυφάραγῳ πατρὶ
 κεδνότατον ἐπιχθονίων·

(S, Ex [βαρυφάραγῳ πατρὶ κεδνότατον])
 ὃ καὶ δαιμόνεσσι δίκας ἐπεΐραινεν·

(S)
 τοῦ μὲν ἀντίθεοι ἀρίστευον υἱέες υἱέων τ' ἀρηίφιλοι παῖδες ἀνορέαι (25) χάλκεον στονόεντ'
 ἀμφέπειν ὄμαδον, σῶφρονές τ' ἐγένοντο πινυτοὶ τε θυμόν.

(S; ἐγένοντο→ταῦτα)
 ταῦτα καὶ μακάρων ἐμέναντ' ἀγοραί, Ζεὺς δ' ἄμφι Θέτιος ἀγλαός τ' ἔρικαν Ποσειδᾶν
 γάμῳ, ἄλοχον εὐειδέα θέλων ἐκάτερος ἐὼν ἔμμεν·

(Exp [desire to wed]; εὐειδέα→ἔρω)
 ἔρω γὰρ ἔχεν.

(Adv; ἔρω→εὐνᾶν; hope/result)
 ἀλλ' οὐ σφιν ἄμβροτοι τέλεσαν εὐνᾶν θεῶν πραπίδες, (30) || ἐπεὶ θεσφάτων ἐπ' ἀκούσαν·
 (Recap; θεσφάτων→πεπρωμένον; εὐνᾶν→τεκεῖν; θεῶν>Ζηνὶ)
 εἶπε δ' εὐβουλος ἐν μέσοισι Θέμις, εἵνεκεν πεπρωμένον ἦν, φέρτερον πατέρος ἄνακτα γόνον
 τεκεῖν ποντίαν θεόν, ὃς κεραυνοῦ τε κρέσσον ἄλλο βέλος διώξει χερὶ τριόδοντός τ'
 ἀμαιομακέτου, Ζηνὶ μισγομένην (35) ἢ Διὸς παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσιν.

(Ds)
 “ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν παύσατε·

(Inf [Imp], S)
 βροτέων δὲ λεχέων τυχοῖσα υἱὸν εἰσιδέτω θανόντ' ἐν πολέμῳ, χεῖρας Ἄρεϊ <τ'> ἐναλίγκιον
 στεροπαΐει τ' ἀκμὴν ποδῶν.

(Sb, Ex [mortal wedding]; λεχέων≈γάμου; υἱὸν→γάμου)
 τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν, Πηλεὶ γέρας θεόμορον ὀπάσσει γάμου Αἰακίδαι, ὃν τ' εὐσεβέστατον φάτις
 Ἰαολκοῦ τράφειν πεδίον· (40) ||

(InfA [Imp])

ιόντων δ' ἐς ἄφθιτον ἄντρον εὐθὺς Χείρωνος αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαι μηδὲ Νηρέος θυγάτηρ νεικέων
πέταλα δις ἐγγυαλιζέτω ἄμμιν·

(InfB [Imp], S)

ἐν διχομηνίδεσσιν δὲ ἐσπέραις ἐρατόν λυοὶ κεν χαλινὸν ὑφ' ἥρῳι παρθενίας.”

(Sf)

ὥς φάτο Κρονίδαις (45) ἐννέποισα θεά·

(S)

τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ γλεφάροις νεῦσαν ἀθανάτοισιν·

(S)

ἐπέων δὲ καρπὸς οὐ κατέφθινε.

(Exp [words accomplished])

φαντὶ γὰρ ξὺν' ἀλέγειν καὶ γάμον Θέτιος ἄνακτα, καὶ νεαρὰν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν στόματ'
ἀπείροισιν ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλεός·

(Inst [νεαρὰν ... ἀρετὰν]; ἀρετὰν→αἵμαξε)

ὃ καὶ Μύσιον ἀμπελόεν αἵμαξε Τηλέφου μέλανι ῥαίνων φόνῳ πεδίον (50) || γεφύρωσέ τ'
Ἀτρεΐδαισι νόστον, Ἑλέναν τ' ἐλύσατο, Τροίᾳς ἵνας ἐκταμὼν δορί, ταί νιν ῥύοντό ποτε μάχας
ἐναριμβρότου ἔργον ἐν πεδίῳ κορύσσοντα, Μέμνονός τε βίαν ὑπέρθυμον Ἑκτορά τ' ἄλλους
τ' ἀριστεάς·

(Recap)

οἷς δῶμα Φερσεφόνας (55) μανύων Ἀχιλεός, οὗρος Αἰακιδᾶν, Αἴγιναν σφετέραν τε ρίζαν
πρόφαινε.

(S; δῶμα Φερσεφόνας→θανόντ')

τὸν μὲν οὐδὲ θανόντ' αἰοδαί γ' ἔλιπον, ἀλλὰ οἱ παρά τε πυρὰν τάφον θ' Ἑλικώνια παρθένοι
στάν, ἐπὶ θρηῖνόν τε πολύφαμον ἔχσαν.

(Inf; θανόντ'→φθίμενον; θρηῖνόν→ὕμνοισ)

ἔδοξ' ἦρα καὶ ἀθανάτοισ, ἐκλόν γε φῶτα καὶ φθίμενον ὕμνοισ θεᾶν διδόμεν. (60) ||

(Ex [Par]; then/now, heroes/contemporaries; ἐκλόν ... φῶτα>Νικοκλέος; φθίμενον→μνᾶμα;

θεᾶν→Μοισαῖον; ὕμνοισ→κελαδῆσαι; ἔδοξ'→φέρει λόγον)

τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον, ἔστυται τε Μοισαῖον ἄρμα Νικοκλέος μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι.

(En, Inf [Imp]; κελαδῆσαι→γεραίρετέ; πυγμάχου→Δωρίων ἔλαχεν κελίνων)

γεραίρετέ νιν, ὃς Ἴσθμιον ἂν νάπος Δωρίων ἔλαχεν κελίνων·

(Ju; ἔλαχεν→ἐνίκαε)

ἐπεὶ περικτίονας ἐνίκαε δὴ ποτε καὶ κεῖνος ἄνδρας ἀφύκτωι χερὶ κλονέων. (65)

(Ex [Par]; then/now, family/victor; ἐνίκαε≈οὐ κατελέγχει)

τὸν μὲν οὐ κατελέγχει κριτοῦ γενεά πατραδελφεοῦ·

(Inf [Imp]; success/celebration; οὐ κατελέγχει→παγκρατίου)
 ἀλίκων τῷ τις ἄβρόν ἀμφὶ παγκρατίου Κλεάνδρῳ πλεκέτω μυρσίνας στέφανον, ἐπεὶ νιν
 Ἀλκαθόου τ' ἀγὼν σὺν τύχαι ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ τε νεότας δέκετο πρὶν·

(Ju, Gen; success/celebration; ἀγὼν<τὸν αἰνεῖν)
 τὸν αἰνεῖν ἀγαθῷ παρέχει·

(Exp; celebration/success; τὸν αἰνεῖν→καλῶν)
 ἦβαν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειρον ὑπὸ χειρὶ καλῶν δάμασεν. (70)