Bruno Currie*

Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry: The Special Case of Epinician

https://doi.org/10.1515/tc-2021-0011

Abstract: This paper offers a reappraisal of the role of intertextuality in fifth-century BCE epinician poetry by means of a comparison with the role of intertextuality in all of early Greek hexameter poetry, 'lyric epic', and fifth-century BCE tragedy and comedy. By considering the ways in which performance culture as well as the production of written texts affects the prospects for intertextuality, it challenges a scholarly view that would straightforwardly correlate intertextuality in early Greek poetry with an increasing use and dissemination of written texts. Rather, 'performance rivalry' (a term understood to encompass both intra- and intergeneric competition between poetic works that were performed either on the same occasion or on closely related occasions) is identified as a plausible catalyst of intertextuality in all of the poetic genres considered, from the eighth or seventh century to the fifth century BCE. It is argued that fifth-century epinician poetry displays frequent, fine-grained, and allusive intertextuality with a range of early hexameter poetry: the *Iliad*, the poems of the Epic Cycle, and various 'Hesiodic' poems – poetry that in all probability featured in the sixth-fifth century BCE rhapsodic repertoire. It is also argued that, contrary to what is maintained in some recent Pindaric scholarship, there is no comparable case to be made for a frequent, significant, and allusive intrageneric intertextuality between epinician poems: in this respect, the case of epinician makes a very striking contrast with epic, tragedy, and comedy – poetic genres to which intrageneric intertextuality was absolutely fundamental. It is suggested that the presence or absence of intrageneric intertextuality in the genres in question is likely to be associated with the presence or absence of performance rivalry. A further factor identified as having the potential to inhibit intrageneric intertextuality in epinician is the undesirability of having one poem appear to be 'bettered' by another in a genre were all poems were commissioned to exalt individual patrons. This, again, is a situation that did not arise for epic, tragedy, or comedy, where a kind of competitive or 'zero-sum' intertextuality could be (and was) unproblematically embraced. Intertextuality in epinician thus appears to present a special case vis-à-vis the other major poetic genres of early Greece, whose workings can both be illumi-

***Corresponding author: Bruno Currie**, Oxford University, United Kingdom,
E-Mail: bruno.currie@oriel.ox.ac.uk

nated by consideration of the workings of intertextuality in epic, tragedy, and comedy, and can in turn illuminate something of the workings of intertextuality in those genres.

Keywords: epinician poetry, intertextuality, performance culture, performance rivalry, zero-sum poetic competition, festivals and poetic performances, commonplaces (*gnōmai*), formulas and intertextuality, verbal echoes, rhapsodes, lyric epic, Attic tragedy, Old Comedy.

0 Introduction

Intertextuality "is one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary".[1] The present study will (mis)use the term in the way that it is most commonly (mis)used in Classical scholarship: to refer to "the phenomenon of meaningful connections between texts".[2] Intertextuality thus conceived can be fundamental to the understanding of many Greek and Latin works,[3] in the sense that failure to appreciate the intertextuality must entail an impoverished understanding of a whole given work. This is the case with, for example, the intertextuality (or hypertextuality)[4] of the *Aeneid* with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, of Sophocles' *Ajax* with the *Iliad*, and (more controversially, perhaps) the *Odyssey* with the *Iliad*.[5] There is also a more circumscribed form of intertextuality, with more localized effects and interpretative implications, as, for instance, the quotation of Euripides' *Hippolytus* 612 at Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1471. This study will consider the extent to which intertextuality, of whatever strength, is relevant to the appreciation of Pindar and Bacchylides' epinician poetry. Fundamentally, this study will be about the legitimacy and value of one common way in scholarship of 'reading' epinician poetry. It is also about how epinician relates in this respect to other types of early Greek poetry.

1 Allen 2011, 2.

2 Quotation from Coffee 2013. It is superfluous here to mount a defence of this widespread understanding of the term, and of its departure from the original conception of Kristeva 1980, 36–63 = 1969, 113–142. See e. g. Schmitz 2007, 77–79; Pavlou 2008, 536 and n. 11; Levene 2010, 82–84; Torrance 2013, 4–5; Kynes 2013, 201–206; Wisnom 2020, 2.

3 As well, of course, as those of other ancient cultures: in Mesopotamian poetry, see esp. Wisnom 2020; in the Hebrew Bible, e. g. Kynes 2013.

4 Gennette 1997 (1982), 5–6.

5 *Aeneid* and *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: e. g. Lyne 1987. *Ajax* and *Iliad*: Easterling 1984; Garner 1990, 49–64. *Odyssey* and *Iliad*: e. g. R.B. Rutherford 1991–1993; Currie 2020.

It should not be necessary to offer an apology for fixing on the conception of intertextuality that is most prevalent in Classical studies. Much is at stake here: not just our understanding of the poetics of epinician, but its comparability with the intertextual practices of other poetic genres, and the role of allusive intertextuality in pre-Hellenistic Greek poetry in general. There are, of course, other ways of defining and studying epincian intertextuality. Nigel Nicholson, for instance, has recently explored Pindaric epinician's intertextuality with "informal oral traditions": the legends that attached to some fifth-century BCE athletes – a form of intertextuality that is not to be conceived as a "relationship of allusion".[6] This is a legitimate understanding of intertextuality and a legitimate object of study, but quite distinct from the present study.

The focus of the study is on epinician poetry's most investigable and, surely, most significant intertextual relationships: those with hexameter poetry and with other epinician poetry. It is likely that there was also significant intertextuality between epinician and 'lyric epic' (the genre exemplified by Stesichorus). However, given the latter's poor state of preservation, this is scarcely a topic for investigation. Of epinician's engagement with other earlier lyric poetry, there is even less evidence.[7] One epinician ode in particular, Pindar's *Pythian* 11, has sometimes been argued to have tragic intertexts.[8] However, the case for epinician intertextuality with tragedy is both isolated and in itself doubtful; the epinician narrator's striking weighing of alternative motives for Klytaimestra's crime (*Pythian* 11.24–25) is not especially 'tragically' marked, and has much closer formal analogues in historiography than in tragedy generally or in Aeschylus' *Oresteia* in particular.[9]

Larger questions about intertextuality and Greek poetry are involved in this investigation, including the relationship between intertextuality and performance in early Greece. The earlier fifth century BCE is largely still a performance culture, even if written literary texts were increasingly assuming importance towards the end of the century.[10] Performance culture is generally considered to be innately hostile to intertextuality (works known only or primarily through performance

6 Nicholson 2013, esp. 12, 15, 20–21; cf. 2016, 46–49, 306 "epinician achieved its meaning in relation to such oral narratives, and the intertextual relationship between the two genres was central to their meaning and formation". In the course of his book-length study, Nicholson also assumes intertextuality in the sense that is of interest to this paper: e. g. *O*. 3 and *O*. 10 are taken to allude to *O*. 1 (Nicholson 2016, 124).

7 Compare and contrast Spelman 2018a, 181, 255–278.

8 See especially Herington 1984; Kurke 2013.

9 Cf. Hdt. 1.86.2, 2.181.1, etc.; see Currie 2018, 309–310 with n. 66. *Pace* Herington 1984, 140–141, 144–145; Kurke 2013, 113–114, 124–125.

10 See e. g. Herington 1985; Yunis 2003.

being held to be insufficiently present to their public to enter into elaborate intertextual relationships).[11] It may be mistaken, however, to think of performance culture as intrinsically opposed to the development of intertextual dialogue between particular poetic works, and this study will explore the way in which a key aspect of early Greek performance culture (the Archaic and Greek institution of performing poetry at festivals in competitive contexts) may have provided a spur to intertextuality between poetic works – of certain genres, at least.

This study also attempts to understand intertextuality in epinician in relation to intertextuality in the other major and well-attested early Greek poetic genres: synchronically, in relation to the (near-)contemporary fifth-century genres, tragedy and comedy; and diachronically, in relation to the hexameter poetry of the seventh to sixth centuries and the 'lyric epic' of the sixth century BCE. This investigation of epinician poetry therefore asks to be seen as a chapter in the wider history of intertextuality in early Greek poetry.

We will start by considering epinician's intertextuality with epic (§ 1), and then the question of intertextuality between epinicians (§§ 2–3).

1 Epinician mythical narrative and epic

Ancient and modern scholars have recognized that Pindar and Bacchylides' extensive mythical narratives frequently display intertextuality with canonical hexameter mythological narrative texts: the Homeric poems, the 'Hesiodic' poems, and those of the Epic Cycle.[12] This is anything but surprising from a Greek comparative perspective: the same is found to be the case with both Stesichorus' sixth-century choral lyric mythical narratives[13] and with the tragedians' fifth-century mythological dramas.[14] In what follows, we focus on the some well-known cases.

11 Cf. Pavlou 2008, 536–541. The problems are acuter still when recomposition in performance is involved: cf. Burgess 2006, 153, 164–165.

12 For Pindar's intertextuality with, or dependence on, the Epic Cycle, see Mann 1994; M.L. West 2011; Spelman 2018b; cf. Currie 2016, 247; Spelman 2018a, 103; agnostic is I.C. Rutherford 2015, 456–459. For Pindar's dependence on the (Pseudo-)Hesiodic *Catalogue* and *Megalai Ehoiai*, see esp. D'Alessio 2005b; Stamatopoulou 2017, 63–91.

13 On Stesichorus' interaction with epic (Homer, the Epic Cycle, and [Pseudo-]Hesiod), see Burkert 2001, 208–209; Reece 1988, 7–8; Davies/Finglass 2014, 35–39; Carey 2015, 55–62; Kelly 2015, 21, 34–43; Noussia-Fantuzzi 2015, 430–440; Budelmann 2018, 155.

14 On the tragedians and Homer, see Garner 1990. On the tragedians and the Epic Cycle, see Sommerstein 2015.

1.1 *Iliad* book 15 and Bacchylides 13

One of the clearest illustrations of epinician's intertextuality with epic is the narrative of Hektor firing the Achaean ships that is common to Bacchylides 13.105–167 and *Iliad* book fifteen.[15] Although Pindar and Bacchylides' epinician narratives have been observed in general to avoid extensive intertextuality with the Homeric epics and to prefer, like tragedy, to engage with the Cyclical epics,[16] this Bacchylidean ode forms a notable exception. At one point, there is identity of phrasing: Bacch. 13.151–153 ἐναριζ[ομέν]ων / [δ' ἔρ]ευθε φώτων / [αἵμα]τι γαῖα μέλα[ινα][17] ~ *Il.* 15.715 ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα μέλαινα. The phrase may be formulaic in epic.[18] Still, given the identity of narrative context, Glenn Most had good reason to call this "nothing less than a direct verbal citation of the Homeric text".[19] Bacchylides in lines 121–40 develops an extended sea-and-storm simile plainly modelled on one in the Homeric narrative (*Il.* 15.624–629).[20] There are ironic inversions: Bacchylides uses the simile to convey the Trojans' (short-lived) sense of relief; Homer used it to convey the Achaeans' present sense of panic. More intricately, the Iliadic phrase ἐδαΐζετο θυμός (*Il.* 15.629) is transferred from the tenor of Homer's simile to the vehicle of Bacchylides' (13.124–126 θ[υμὸν] ... δαΐζει). Most observes: "with astonishing subtlety, Bacchylides has in fact completely revised his model ... Bacchylides must presuppose not only Homer's narrative, but also and above all his listeners' familiarity with Homer's narrative".[21]

15 See Carey 1980, 243; Fearn 2007, 127–132; Currie 2010, 223 and n. 50; Cairns 2010, 52–54; Most 2012, 255–259. Differently, Nagy 2015, § 3.

16 Mann 1994; Morrison 2007, 124–125; Currie 2016, 247 with n. 5; Spelman 2018a, 102–103 (Sotiriou 1998, 129–244 presents a lot of doubtful material). For the tragedians' preferential engagement with Cyclical rather than with Homeric epic, see e. g. Fantuzzi 2015, 406–408.

17 Text after Cairns 2010, 190 (Snell/Maehler 1970, 46 refrain from printing the supplement μέλα[ινα] in the text).

18 Cf. *Il.* 20.494 ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα μέλαινα. Also found are the collocations ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα and γαῖα μέλαινα.

19 Most 2012, 256. Similarly, Cairns 2010, 314.

20 Most 2012, 257.

21 Most 2012, 258, 259. Interestingly, though in my view less compellingly, Spelman 2018a, 211 suggests that Pindar's interaction with the *Cypria* and *Iliad* book 16 in *Olympian* 9 "approach[es] an Alexandrian level of intertextual sophistication".

1.2 *Cypria* and *Nemean* 10

Our appreciation of epinician intertextuality with epic other than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is hampered by its very imperfect attestation. This is particularly obvious in the case of Pindar's *Pythian* 4 and early Argonautic epic.[22] But we are able to say something about Pindar's interactions with the Epic Cycle.[23] *Nemean* 10's narrative of the fatal encounter of the Dioskouroi and the Apharetidai is modelled closely on that of the *Cypria* (cf. *Cypria* arg. lines 106–109 Severyns; frr. 8, 15 Bernabé).[24] Pindar is faithful to the cyclical poem's account down to the level of textual detail.[25] It is debated whether Pindar's expression δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει / ἡμένους (61–62) is best understood of Lynkeus decrying the Dioskouroi "sitting *in* the *trunk* of an oak" (thereby echoing the *Cypria*'s phrase, *Cypria* fr. 15.5 Bernabé, ἔσω κοΐλης δρυός, "within a hollow oak") or "sitting *on* the *stump* of an oak" (in that case modifying the *Cypria*'s phrase, in order to play down Lynkeus' magical eyesight).[26] The phrase ἧσθαι ἐν (or ἕζεσθαι ἐν) can mean either "sitting on" (*Iliad* 9.200, 24.597) or "sitting in" (*Iliad* 16.402–403); στέλεχος can designate either a "stump" (Herodotus 8.55) or a hollow "trunk" (Aristotle, *History of Animals* 559a10).[27] On the one hand, Pindar's phrase is too ambiguous to be easily seen as a polemical correction of the *Cypria*'s account; yet on the other, it is striking how Pindar's narrative omits precisely the details that are most fundamental to the narrative *Cypria*: "with his *wondrous eyes* (δεινοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖσιν) he saw them *inside* (ἔσω) a *hollow* (κοΐλης) oak" (*Cypria* fr. 15.5 Bernabé). As a result, what appears to be remarkable in Pindar's account about Lynkeus' eyesight is not that it preternaturally penetrated the bark of a tree, but that it (impressively, though

22 Braswell 1988, 12.

23 See M.L. West 2011; I.C. Rutherford 2015; Spelman 2018b. It is hard to say anything conclusive about Pindar's possible textual interaction with the *Aethiopis*: Currie 2016, 247–253.

24 On the relationship between *Nemean* 10 and the *Cypria*, see Spelman 2018b, 190–912; 2018a, 103 (overcautious is I.C. Rutherford 2015, 459).

25 *Cypria* fr. 15.4–5 Bernabé εἴσι δε κύδιμος ἥρως / ... ἔσω κοΐλης δρυὸς ἄμφω ~ *N.* 10.61–62 ἴδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει / ἡμένους (the reading ἥμενον is preferred by Cannatà Fera 2020, 238, 562 [transmitted is ἥμενος]; this would make Pindar's text slightly less close to the *Cypria*'s, but does not substantially affect the point). *Cypria* fr. 15.5 Bernabé δεινοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ~ *N.* 10.61–62 κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων πάντων γένετ' ὀξύτατον / ὄμμα. *Cypria* fr. 15.1–3 Bernabé Λυγκεὺς / Τηΰγετον προσέβαινε ... / ἀκρότατον δ' ἀναβὰς διεδέρκετο νῆσον ἅπασαν ~ *N.* 10.61 ἀπὸ Ταϋγέτου πεδαυγάζων ... Λυγκεὺς. *Cypria* fr. 15.1–2 Bernabé αἶψα ... / ... ποσὶν ταχέεσσι πεποιθώς ~ *N.* 10.63 λαιψηροῖς δὲ πόδεσσιν ἄφαρ. Compare Spelman 2018b, 191.

26 For the former understanding, see scholl. *N.* 10.114b, c; Slater 1969, 172; Stoneman 1976, 231–232; Henry 2005, 112. For the latter, see Huxley 1975, 20–21; I.C. Rutherford 2015, 458.

27 Differently, Spelman 2018b, 191 n. 65.

not miraculously) picked out the Dioskouroi from a great distance as Lynkeus surveyed his environs from his vantage point on Mt Taÿgetos. Pindar's narrative does not openly contradict the version of the *Cypria*, but taken on its own would most naturally suggest a different view of events from the cyclical poem: the epic source seems to be recalled, but qualified. At all events, the *Cypria* is to be recognized as Pindar's reference point, and the interaction is on a decidedly textualized level.

1.3 *Thebais* and *Olympian* 6

The Theban cycle yields further evidence. The Pindar scholia (schol. *O.* 6.26, citing Asclepiades) indicate that *O.* 6.12–17, recounting a speech of Adrastos at the cremation of the Argive Seven, draws on the *Thebais*; and line 17 of Pindar's poem, ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι, is generally held to be a light reworking of a hexameter line from the cyclical epic, typically reconstructed by modern scholars as ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάχεσθαι (= *Thebais*, fr. 10 Bernabé).[28]

1.4 *Titanomachy* (?) and *Pythian* 1

The account of Zeus' defeat of Typhon in *Pythian* 1 may draw on an early epic, possibly, but not necessarily, the cyclical *Titanomachy*.[29] Adolf von Mess pointed out that Pindar's phrase τόν ποτε / Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον (16–17) is, but for a small prosodic difference, identical to a hexameter line which, in a scholion on the *Prometheus Bound*, is attributed to Hesiod: τόν ποτε Κῑλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον (schol. [Aesch.] *PV* 367 = [Hes.] fr. dub. 388 M-W).[30] It has been argued that the scholiast to (Pseudo-)Aeschylus misreports Pindar's *P.* 1.16–17 as being a line of (Pseudo-)Hesiod.[31] However, as von Mess pointed out, it is striking that the Pindaric phrase attributed to (Pseudo-)Hesiod amounts to a

28 See Kurke 1990, 89 and n. 17; Torres-Guerra 1995, 39–40; Braswell 1998, 28–29; Hutchinson 2001, 381–382; Currie 2010, 217–218 and n. 28; M.L. West 2011, 53; Davies 2014, 91–95; Adorjáni 2014, 137; I.C. Rutherford 2015, 452–453.

29 On the question whether the Typhonomachy was in the *Titanomachy*, see Debiasi 2004, 104–107; Tsagalis 2017, 81–82; D'Alessio 2015, 209 n. 48. On the question of *Pythian* 1 and its putative epic source, see further below, § 3.2.

30 Von Mess 1901, 173–174; Burton 1962, 98.

31 H. Usener 1901, 186; Merkelbach/West 1967, 185; Stamatopoulou 2017, 56 n. 16

near-perfect hexameter: a coincidence that as good as rules out the attribution to (Pseudo-)Hesiod being the result of just a mechanical error.[32] The most economical solution is to take the scholiast at his word. If Pindar's epic source for *Pythian* 1 was the Cyclical *Titanomachy*, then either the Aeschylean scholiast regarded that poem as the work of 'Hesiod' (as did, apparently, Nicander, *Theriaca* 8–12 = [Hes.] fr. spur. 367 M-W);[33] or else the verse τόν ποτε Κῑλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον occurred in both the Cyclical poem and in a poem in the 'Hesiodic' corpus that mentioned Typhon. Another possibility is that Pindar's hexameter source was not the *Titanomachy*, but some other lost 'Hesiodic' poem, to which the Aeschylean scholion would refer.

1.5 *Catalogue of Women* and *Isthmian* 6

Pindar and Bacchylides also have a close relationship with the (Pseudo-)Hesiod of the *Catalogue* and *Megalai Ehoiai*. The mythical narrative of *Isthmian* 6 is indebted to the *Megalai Ehoiai* (Hes. fr. 250 M-W = schol. *I.* 6.53a).[34] According to schol. *I.* 6.53a, the 'Hesiodic' poem featured a scene in which Herakles, being hospitably received by Telamon, stepped on the lionskin and made a prayer, in response to which an eagle was sent by Zeus and caused Aias to be given his name (Αἴας < αἰετός).[35] The scholion claims that the 'Hesiodic' poem was Pindar's source for the myth,[36] but that Pindar innovated in having Telamon ask Herakles to step on the lionskin and make the prayer, rather than having Herakles do so of his own choice.[37] The scholiast appears to have understood Pindar's phrase ἐν ῥινῷ λέοντος στάντα (*I.* 6.37) as "standing on the lionskin", and to have brought it within the scope of the following κελήσατο-clause: "[*sc.* Telamon] requested the son of Amphitryon *to stand on the lionskin* and to make a beginning with libations ...".[38] It is preferable to take ἐν ῥινῷ λέοντος στάντα outside the scope of the κελήσατο-clause, and to mean not "standing *on*", but "standing *in*", i. e. wearing,

32 *Pace* Merkelbach/West 1967, 185 (*in apparatu*).

33 Cazzaniga 1975, esp. 179–180; cf. D'Alessio 2015, 203–204 n. 19.

34 See the discussions of Hirschberger 2004, 448–449; D'Alessio 2005a, 192–194; 2005*b*, 232; Indergaard 2010, 315–316; Stamatopoulou 2017, 112.

35 Drachmann iii.255.20–22. The significance of standing on the lionskin is obscure. For standing on a *ram's* fleece in purificatory rituals, see Hesych. *s. v.* Διὸς κώδιον, with Parker 1983, 230, 284–285, 350, 373.

36 Drachmann iii.255.19–20.

37 Drachmann iii.255.16–19.

38 Compare also schol. *I.* 6.67c (Drachmann iii.257.2–3).

the fleece (so scholl. *I.* 6.53b, c).[39] Then we should translate, "[Telamon] requested the son of Amphitryon, *as he stood there in his lionskin*, to make a beginning with libations …". At any rate, if Pindar follows the version of the 'Hesiodic' poem as closely as the scholion suggests,[40] then Pindar's phrase ἐν ῥινῷ λέοντος στάντα (*I.* 6.37) can be seen as pointedly ambiguous ("standing in", "standing on"), simultaneously recalling the 'Hesiodic' version and denying it.[41] The situation would be very similar to *N.*10.61–62 δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει / ἡμένους, as "sitting in" or "sitting on" the "trunk" or "stump" respectively of an oak.[42]

1.6 *Catalogue of Women* and *Pythian* 3

A similar argument can be made about the interaction of *P.* 3.8–58 with the Koronis-*ehoie* of the 'Hesiodic' *Catalogue*, once again following the lead of the scholia (schol. *P.* 3.52a: Artemon of Pergamon). Pindar follows (Pseudo-) Hesiod in localizing the maiden Koronis near Lake Boibe ([Hes.] fr. 59.4 M-W νίψατο Βοιβιάδος λίμνης πόδα παρθένος ἁδμής, *P.* 3.34 παρὰ Βοιβιάδος κρημνοῖσιν ᾤκει παρθένος) and in placing Apollo at Delphi when he learns of Koronis' transgression ([Hes.] fr. 60.2 M-W Πυθώ, *P.* 3.27 Πυθῶνι). In Hesiod, Apollo learns of that transgression from a crow ([Hes.] fr. 60.1–3 M-W … ἄγγελος ἦλθε κόραξ … / … καί ῥ' ἔφρασεν ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα / Φοίβωι ἀκερσεκόμηι, ὅτι Ἴσχυς γῆμε Κόρωνιν). In Pindar, on the other hand, we hear that Koronis "did not elude her *look-out* (σκοπόν): for, happening to be in Delphi, the destination of the sacrificial flocks, Apollo, lord of the temple, got wind of it, trusting the judgement of his most unerring *confidant* (κοινᾶνι) – his *all-knowing mind* (πάντα ἰσάντι νόῳ)" (*P.* 3.27–29). Here, σκοπόν, "look-out", and κοινᾶνι, "confidant", prime the audience to expect reference to something external to Apollo, to whit, the 'Hesiodic'

39 Schol. *I.* 6.53b τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἄφνω ἐφεστῶτα ἐν τῇ δορᾷ means, "Herakles, suddenly standing before them in [i. e. wearing] the skin" – not "standing *on* the skin"! At *I.* 6.47, Herakles apparently describes the fleece as 'billowing / swirling around him' at the moment of praying (see Rumpel 1883, *s. v.* περιπλανάομαι), which would entail wearing it. But schol. *I.* 6.67b suggests other ways of understanding Pindar's περιπλανᾶται, one gloss being περίκειται, which would be compatible with Herakles standing on a fleece placed on the ground. For criticism of the scholiasts' understanding of the passage, see e. g. Thummer 1969, ii.106. M.L. West 2011, 62, however, follows the scholiasts' (scholl. *I.* 6.53a and 67c) construction of Pindar's sennce.

40 M.L. West 2011, 62 "The prayer, the eagle omen, and the aition of Ajax's name were all there. This nexus of literary motifs is persuasive evidence that Pindar was indeed following the hexameter source".

41 See Dornseiff 1921, 126; D'Alessio 2005a, 194 n. 65.

42 For the similarity between *I.* 6.37 and *N.* 1.62, see again Dornseiff 1921, 126.

crow. The appositional phrase that subsequently identifies the "most unerring confidant" as Apollo's own "all-knowing mind" creates an effect of *paraprosdokian*.[43] Giambattista D'Alessio observes that "Pindar is skillfully playing with the expectation of the audience".[44]

1.7 *Catalogue of Women* and other odes

Broadly similar positions might also be taken with *Pythian* 9 and the Kyrene-*ehoie* ([Hes.] fr. 215–217 M-W),[45] or with *O.* 9.40–79 and the Deukalion myth of the *Catalogue* (fr. 234 M-W).[46] It has been argued that the myth of the Proitides in Bacchylides 11 shows a close dependence, perhaps on a verbal level, on the 'Hesiodic' *Catalogue* (frr. 129–133 M-W).[47] *Pythian* 6 has been held to make 'a specific literary allusion' to the 'Hesiodic' *Precepts of Cheiron*.[48] In these cases, however, the paucity of evidence for the 'Hesiodic' narratives makes firm conclusions impossible.

1.8 Epinician's intertextuality with epic: summary

Epinician allusions to epic are frequently defensible, and they are marked and meaningful. We have focused on examples where extended epinician narratives interact with hexameter narratives.[49] In all cases where a judgement is possible we would have a textualized interaction that is both fine grained and would make interpretative demands on the audience. Awareness of the epic hypotext may produce effects of dramatic irony (Bacchylides 13) or *paraprosdokian* (*Pythian* 3). Changes worked on the epic hypotext may include inversion (Bacchylides 13), or what we may consider either 'rationalizing' corrections (*Nemean* 10, *Isthmian* 6, *Pythian* 3, Bacchylides 11), or innovations to make the canonical epic narra-

43 See Dornseiff 1921, 126; Huxley 1975, 14–15; Gentili 1995a, 75–76 n. 4; D'Alessio 2005b, 234–235.
44 D'Alessio 2005b, 235. Compare Stamatopoulou 2017, 71.
45 M.L. West 2011, 63; Stamatopoulou 2017, 77–91.
46 D'Alessio 2005b, 220–227; Pavlou 2008.
47 Currie 2010, 214–216, 243–246.
48 Kurke 1990, 89–90.
49 Scholarship has of course alleged a large number of supposed cases of smaller-scale epinician intertextuality with epic, many of which are much more questionable; Morgan 2015, 225–231, 234, 238, 243–245, for instance, sets the bar of markedness and meaningfulness much lower in claiming a plethora of epic intertexts (*Il.* 9.97–100, Hes. *Th.* 91–96, 534–613) for Pindar's *Olympian* 1.

tive conform more closely to the circumstances of the epinician commission (Bacchylides 11, again).[50] Such intertextuality with hexameter poetry seems to pervade the epinician genre. The close dependence of Pindar's mythical narratives on those of canonical hexameter texts was commonly remarked by ancient scholars.[51] It makes good sense also in literary historical terms: epinician's pervasive textualized interaction with epic poetry is easily understood as an inheritance from Stesichorean choral lyric.[52]

1.9 Intertextuality and performance rivalry

Pindaric intertextuality can be conceptualized in very literary terms. Thus, Martin West characterized Pindar as a "*poeta doctus*", "a man imbued with literary culture to the highest degree", "accustomed to handling books".[53] Yet Pindar's personal level of learning can only be part of the picture. Pindar's intertextuality with hexameter poetry cannot be regarded as a personal idiosyncrasy. For one thing, it is shared with Bacchylides.[54] For another, it appears as part of a diachronic continuum, flanked by Stesichorean choral lyric on one side and tragedy on the other. It is important, too, to consider not only how the poets were in a position to produce intertextuality, but how it was, predominantly, received by their public; and here a purely writerly model is insufficient.[55] Pindar consistently conceives of the reception of poetry, his own and others, in terms of performance (e. g. *I.* 4.37–45, *P.* 1.92–98, *O.* 11.4–6), never of writing or reading.[56] The contrast with a *poeta doctus* such as Catullus is stark.[57] The question for us is whether the fact that all this poetry was received via institutionalized public performances (as

50 See Huxley 1975, 14–22; Currie 2010, 216–25, 225–238.

51 Schol. *O.* 6.26 (Asclepiades); schol. *P.* 3.52a (Artemon); schol *N.* 10.114a (Aristarchus, Apollodorus); schol. *P.* 9.6a, schol. *I.* 6.53a (no attribution); schol. *P.* 6.16, 22 (no attribution).

52 See above, § 1 (introduction).

53 M.L. West 2011, 64–67.

54 See above, §§ 1.1 and 1.7, and Pfeijffer 1999b.

55 Cf. e. g. Rawles 2018, 29 and see, in general, Ford 2003.

56 M.L. West 2011, 66 states: "[Pindar's] mind turns readily to the metaphorical use of the verb 'to write'". Yet Pindar's (very few) references to writing (cf. Spelman 2018a, 40 n. 91) do not involve poetry or literature. First, *O.* 3.30 refers to a dedicatory inscription (on the neck of the Ceryneian hind: schol. *O.* 3.53e). Second, *O.* 10.1–3 employs the commonplace figurative expression 'the writing-tablets of the mind' (cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 789; Soph. fr. 597 *TrGF*; see schol. *O.* 10.1 f; Yunis 2011, 231). And third, *O.* 7.86–87 refers to a victory inscription.

57 For reading and writing in Catullus, see e. g. 68.33–36, 1.1–10, 22.5–9, 36.6–7, 50.2, 95.2, 8.

well as through the much more exclusive practice of private reading) impacted on its practice of intertextuality.

Let us remind ourselves, first, of what we think we know about the performance of epic poetry in early Greece. Throughout the sixth and fifth centuries BCE, hexameter poetry was performed by rhapsodes at festivals all over the Greek world.[58] The rhapsodic hexameter[59] repertoire included poems that went under the name of 'Homer' (including the Cyclical Epic)[60] and under that of 'Hesiod' (including the *Catalogue* and the *Shield*).[61] The best-documented venue is the Athenian Panathenaia.[62] At an early stage of the festival, performances are likely to have included Cyclic as well as Homeric epic (as we and later Greeks would use those terms); it is unclear when a clear distinction between those two imposed itself both in theory[63] and in Panathanaic practice.[64] At some point, only the poems acknowledged as 'Homer's' (that is, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) were performed

58 Overviews of the venues of rhapsodic performance are offered by M.L. West 2010; Tsagalis 2018, 37–66.

59 The rhapsodic repertoire also included the non-hexameter poet Archilochus (Heracl. 22 B42 D-K; Plat. *Ion* 531a2; Clearchus fr. 92 Wehrli in Athen. 14.620c); the Heraclitus fragment shows that this was the case in the earlier fifth century BCE (*pace* M.L. West 2011 (1981), 139). See Swift 2019, 40–41.

60 Hdt. 5.67.1 mentions rhapsodic contests in 6th-century BCE Sicyon involving 'the Homeric epics' (τῶν Ὁμηρείων ἐπῶν), a rubric probably extending to at least the *Thebaid* (cf. Callinus fr. 6 *IEG*, for this poem as 'Homeric', with the reservations of Sbardella 2012, 7; cf. Hdt. 4.32, for the *Epigoni* as potentially 'Homeric'); see Cingano 1985; Tsagalis 2018, 61–62. Differently, Davies 2014, 30 (but also, inconsistently, 135).

61 For performance of poems of the Hesiodic corpus by rhapsodes at festivals, note Plato, *Laws* 658d6–7, cf. *Ion* 531a1–2. For the arguable presence of performance variants in the text of the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles*, pointing to a tradition of rhapsodic performance, see *e.g.* Janko 1986, 39 and n. 9; Cingano 2009, 110–111. For the hypothesis of rhapsodic performance of the *Catalogue of Women*, see Cingano 2009, 117, 118.

62 See e. g. Shapiro 1992, 72–75; Tsagalis 2018, 46–53; Tsagalis 2020. The Panathenaia are not the only festival in Athens-Attica at which rhapsodic competitions are either attested or conceivable: Tsagalis 2018, 41–46, 53.

63 The gradual development whereby the 'Homeric' epics (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*) became distinguished from the poems of the Epic Cycle in ancient literary critical discourse is traceable for us via Hdt. 2.117, 4.32 and Aristot. *Poet*. 1451a19–30, 1459a29–1459b16. For Pindar as already conceiving of the Homeric and the Cyclical poems as distinct, see Mann 1994, 325; differently, Nagy 2015; Spelman 2018b, 185–189.

64 It is often assumed that when [Plato] *Hipparch*. 228b7–10 speaks of Hipparchus instituting rhapsodic contests in "the epics of Homer" (τὰ Ὁμήρου ἔπη), "Homer" is to be understood in an inclusive sense; the rubric is nearly identical to the inclusive use at Hdt. 5.67.1 τῶν Ὁμηρείων ἐπῶν (including the Theban epics: see above, n. 60). See Burgess 2001a, 14; Burgess 2004, 7–8; Graziosi 2002, 196–197; Nagy 2010, 69–70, cf. 20; Sbardella 2012, 42–45; Fantuzzi/Tsagalis 2015, 14–19; Tsagalis 2018, 47, 49–50, 52; 2020, 188. Differently, M.L. West 2011, 65–66, doubts that

at the festival (Lycurgus *Against Leocrates* 102).[65] Only the penteteric festival (the 'Greater Panathenaia') is specified here; we are left to speculate whether rhapsodes also performed at the annual ('Lesser') festival, and if they did, whether they continued to perform 'non-Homeric' poetry beyond the point when rhapsodic performances at the penteteric festival had been restricted to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; but speculate is all that we can do.[66]

Stesichorean choral lyric (henceforth, 'lyric epic') was also performed at public festivals. This appears from its self-designation as δαμώματα, "communications to the people" (Stesichorus, *Oresteia* fr. 173.1 Davies/Finglass).[67] These public festivals are likely to be the same as those at which rhapsodes also performed hexameter poetry. This is the probable implication of Simonides' statement that "Homer and Stesichorus sang to the populaces" (fr. 564.4 *PMG* Ὅμηρος ἠδὲ Στασίχορος ἄεισε ... λαοῖς).[68] Chris Carey has posited the existence in many city-states of archaic Greece of festivals featuring both competitions between rhapsodes and competitions between lyric epic performers, though not (formal) competitions between the two groups.[69] This may have been the case at the Athenian Panathenaia.[70] However, even if there was no formal competition (with judges and prizes) between hexameter poetry and lyric epic, it is likely that there was strong implicit rivalry between the genres.[71] That rivalry is plausibly seen as fostered by the shared festival performance context.

---

there were (frequent) rhapsodic performanes of the Cyclical Epics or the *Catalogue* and *Megalai Ehoiai*.

65 A (qualitative) distinction between Homer and other (epic) poets, such as we find in Lycurg. *In Leocr*. 102 and Isoc. *Panegyr*. 159, is already presupposed in Plato's *Ion* 530b8–9, 531a3–4, 531d6–7 (dramatic date pre-412 BCE: Murray 1996, 96, 130); cf. *Phaed*. 95a1–2; Ar. *Frogs* 1034.

66 González 2013, 437–438, 472–476.

67 Cf. Burkert 2001, 210, 211 "*polis* festivals"; Carey 2015, 52 "a highly formalized occasion", 53 "a civic festival"; compare Davies/Finglass 2014, 29–30, 495.

68 On the implied circumstances of performance, see Rawles 2018, 33–35. "Homer" and "Stesichorus" may be understood here as labels for epic and lyric epic respectively. Cf. Fantuzzi/Tsagalis 2015, 18 "the term 'Homer' or 'Homeric poetry' was used for *any* kind of epic poetry attributed to Homer, which included ... the Theban epics and Cyclic poetry". Carruesco 2017, 180–181, on Simonides as seeing 'Stesichorus' as "the paramount representative of a poetic tradition".

69 Carey 2015, 47, 53–54.

70 Bowie 2015, 120–122, 124.

71 Burkert 1987, 50 "[epic and choral lyric] were competing forms of performance", esp. 54–56 (on the presentation in *HAp* of the two 'rival form[s]' at the Delia festival); Carey 2015, 62 "generic rivalry".

Epinician poetry is likely to have been performed (at least sometimes, and perhaps regularly) at civic festivals.[72] A good case can be made for the performance of *Nemean* 10 at the Argive Heraia, of *Isthmian* 4 at the Theban Herakleia, and of *Olympian* 7 at the Rhodian Tlapolemeia.[73] These are major epichoric festivals that certainly featured athletic contests, γυμνικοὶ ἀγῶνες (*N*.10.24, *I*. 4.67–72, *O*. 7.80–81); they may also have featured musical contests (μουσικοὶ ἀγῶνες), including for rhapsodes.[74] This, at any rate, is the model attested for the Panathenaia at Athens, the Pythia at Sicyon, and the Asklepieia at Epidauros.[75] Rhapsodic performances of epic poetry are explicitly within Pindar's purview. He draws pointed attention to them twice, at *Nemean* 2.1–3 and *Isthmian* 4.38–39.[76] If lyric epic was performed at the same festivals at which rhapsodes performed hexameter epic, then it is conceivable that epinician – lyric epic's younger choral lyric relative – inherited that festival performance slot. The suggestion made above that epinician's intertextuality with epic should be viewed as an inheritance from Stesichorean choral lyric would hereby gain a performative dimension.

Tragedy was performed preeminently at the Dionysia and Lenaia festivals in Athens, where it can be seen to be in a performance-based rivalry with rhapsodic performances of hexameter poetry at the Athenian Panathenaia. As Gregory Nagy notes: "As two premier media of performance that are highlighted at two premier festivals organized by the State, epos and tragedy ... become complementary forms".[77] We also hear of institutionalized public performances of both epic poetry by rhapsodes and of 'tragic choruses' in sixth-century BCE Sicyon (Herodotus 5.67.1, 5.67.5).[78] It is possible that already here there was some kind of complementarity between the two types of performance. Once again, therefore, the

72 Only epinician premières are at issue here; on epinician reperformances, see below, § 6.

73 On *N*. 10.22–23, see Currie 2011, 270–271. On *I*. 4.61–73, see Krummen 2014, 72, cf. 325. On *O*. 7.77–81, see Currie 2011, 285–286. Further, for *P*. 5.80–81 as performed at the Cyrenean Karneia, see Krummen 2014, 129–138.

74 For the Theban Herakleia a suitable venue for performance of the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Herakles*, see Janko 1986, 48.

75 On the Panathenaia, see *N*. 10.33–36, with scholl. *N*. 10.61, 64ab, 67b = Drachmann iii.173–75 (athletic competitions; see also Kyle 1992); [Plat.] *Hipparch*. 228b7–10 (rhapsodic competitions; see above, this section). Sicyonian Pythia: *N*. 9.9, *I*. 4.26 (athletic competitions); Hdt. 5.67.1, with schol. Pind. *N*. 9 inscr. = Drachmann iii.149.14–15 (rhapsodic competitions). Asklepieia: scholl. *N*. 5.94b, 96 (athletic competitions); Plat. *Ion* 530a1–6 (rhapsodic and other musical competitions); Tsagalis 2018, 58–60.

76 Cf. Spelman 2018b, 181.

77 Nagy 1996, 81. Compare Herington 1985, 91; Burkert 1987, 53; González 2013, 296–297, 309, 476, 648.

78 On these 'tragic choruses' at Sicyon (cf. also Aristot. *De Poetis* F34, *F37b Janko), see Csapo/Wilson 2015, 347, 350–351.

festival performance situation (not now, it should be emphasized, performance at the same festival, but at different festivals of the same *polis*) can be seen as creating a competitive-intertextual dialogue between the two poetic genres.[79] A difficulty must be acknowledged, however: extant Attic tragedy (ranging from 472 BCE to the end of the fifth century) is most notably intertextual with Cyclical epic, yet there is no evidence that Cyclical epic was performed at the Panathenaia (whether penteteric or annual) during that period, or indeed at all. Performance of Cyclical epic at the Panathenaia thus retains the status of a scholarly postulate only.[80]

With all these uncertainties and qualifications, it remains possible that the extensive intertextuality exhibited by all of lyric epic, epinician, and tragedy with hexameter poetry was fostered by what we may call 'performance rivalry'.[81] The suggestion here is that the institutionalized performance of poetry genres at certain festivals encouraged competition, direct or indirect, between them, and that intertextuality was a regular expression of such competition. This is not to imply that such performance rivalry was anything like a necessary condition of intertextuality in fifth-century literature. Historiography, for one thing, would indicate otherwise: Herodotus and Thucydides' histories are both intertextual with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.[82] But there was no performance rivalry, in any comparable sense, between historiography and epic. It is also obvious that tragedy is intertextual with a vast range of works and genres with which there was no performance rivalry: for instance (to scratch merely the surface of the phenomenon): with the elegies of Solon (Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 1–3); with the *Histories* of Herodotus (Sophocles, *Antigone* 908–915); and with the writings of thinkers like Xenophanes (Euripides, *Heracles* 1341–1344), Anaxagoras (Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 658–661), and Prodicus (Euripides, *Bacchae* 275–285).[83] Epinician, too, quotes or

79 Cf. Herington 1985, 139 "[Aeschylus seems] to have challenged Homer, and the Homeric rhapsodes of the Panathenaic festival, on their own ground", cf. 135.

80 For the scholarly postulate, see e. g. Fantuzzi/Tsagalis 2015, 18 "This phenomenon [*sc*. the tragedians' marked interest in Cyclical epic] is easy to account for if Cyclic poetry was indeed included in the relay performance tradition of the Panathenaic festival"; similarly, Carey 2015, 47; compare Pfeiffer 1968, 44. For tragic intertextuality with the Epic Cycle, see esp. Sommerstein 2015.

81 For the term, cf. Revermann 2013, 104 ("performative rivals").

82 E.g. R.B. Rutherford 2012.

83 Soph. *Tr*. 1–3: Kraus 1991, 76, 79, 81. Soph. *Ant*. 908–915, Griffith 1999, 277; S. R. West 1999, 109–110, 129–130. Eur. *Her*. 1341–1344, Biondi 2015, 88. Aesch. *Eum*. 658–661 and Eur. *Ba*. 275–285, Sommerstein 1989, 206–207; Scodel 2010, 62, 69. For tragedy's intertextuality with lyric poetry (typically more generic than specific), see Bagordo 2003; Swift 2010, 2015; Carey 2012. On tragedy's intertextuality with tragedy (and comedy), see below, §§ 5, 6.

alludes to works with which it was not in a relationship of performance rivalry. There are explicitly attributed quotations from Archilochus (*O.* 9.1–4) and Aristodemus (*I.* 2.9–11: antonomastically, "the Argive"),[84] alongside those from Homer (*P.* 4.277–279) and Hesiod (*I.* 6.66–67; Bacchylides 5.191–194);[85] there is also a case for tacit allusion to Parmenides' proem (*O.* 6.22–27).[86] Intertextuality in such cases clearly did not depend on performance. Fifth-century literature, whether verse or prose and whether mainly performed or mainly read, could plainly allude to a wide range of works, likewise whether in verse or prose and whether mainly performed or mainly read. Old Comedy's sophisticated intertextuality with a wide range of texts may envisage and require a reading public for its full appreciation.[87] It nevertheless remains plausible that performance rivalry impacted on the intertextuality of works that were primarily received through performance in specific and closely related performance circumstances. Old Comedy itself, in fact, provides the most suggestive indications of this (see below, § 6). Although tragedy and comedy, in particular, are extremely catholic in their intertextuality, the most prevalent, intensive, and sustained intertextual relationships shown by tragedy, comedy, and epinician appear to be with those poetic genres with which they were, arguably, in such relationships of performance rivalry: epinician with epic,[88] tragedy with epic and tragedy, comedy with tragedy and comedy.[89] Although the intertextuality of fifth-century poetry takes place in an environment where texts could be, and evidently were, read,[90] it remains plausible that the circumstances of institutionalized performances at festivals played a part in catalyzing and intensifying intertextual relationships between certain genres. We will revisit this idea of performance rivalry below (§§ 6, 8).

84 Cf. Rawles 2018, 141–143.

85 For the naming of poets in Simonides, Bacchylides, and Pindar, see Rawles 2018, 25.

86 D'Alessio 1995, 147.

87 Wright 2012, 146–147.

88 *Pace* Spelman 2018a, 181, epician's intertextuality with epic seems to have been quantatively and qualitatively different from its intertextuality with other poetic genres.

89 See further below, §§ 5–6, for these types of intertextuality, and Revermann 2013 and Farmer 2020, on comedy and epic.

90 Cf. Bagordo 2003, 28–31.

2 Intertextuality between epinicians?: the non-narrative sections

It is a widespread view in contemporary Pindaric scholarship that there is frequent intertextuality between one epinician and another.[91] This section and the following ones will attempt to expose the difficulties attendant on this view. The focus of the rest of this section will be the non-narrative parts of epinician, the following section (§ 3) will address the narrative parts.

2.1 'Water is best'

We start with a specific and well-known example. Pindar's first *Olympian* for Hieron of Syracuse begins as follows (1–2):

> ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
> ἄτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου ...
>
> Water is best, and gold, like blazing fire,
> shines distinctly in the night, surpassing all ennobling wealth, ...

The third *Olympian* for Theron of Acragas closes thus (42):

> εἰ δ' ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ
> χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος ...
>
> If water is best, and of possessions
> gold is the most venerable ...

Both poems celebrate Olympic hippic victories of (probably) 476 BCE.[92] A large number of scholars have assumed intertextuality between the two passages.[93] Account should also be taken of the broadly comparable priamels involving water

91 See esp. Morrison 2007, 2010, 2011, 2012; Spelman 2018a, esp. 16–17, 229; Neer/Kurke 2019, 200–203. Other references will be found below, *passim*.

92 For *O.* 1 as composed for a victory of 472 BCE, see Krummen 2014, 188 and n. 14; *contra*, Catenacci 2013d, 9.

93 Jebb 1905, 264; Bowra 1964, 119–20, cf. 204–205; Gerber 1982, 5–6; Verdenius 1987, 35; Molyneaux 1992, 251; Hubbard 2004, 71 and n. 2; Stenger 2004, 98; Morrison 2007, 88; 2012, 122–123; Clay 2011, 341; Catenacci 2013b, 431; Nicholson 2016, 124; Phillips 2016, 143; Spelman 2018a, 16 n. 8. More cautious are Hutchinson 2001, 353; Cairns 2010, 212; Morgan 2015, 358; compare also Maehler 2004, 97; Stamatopoulou 2017, 39 n. 87.

and fire (and truth) that are also found at Bacchylides 3.85–87 and Simonides 541.3–5 *PMG* (a poem of unknown genre). Another significant complication, likewise not always duly recognized, is that we do not know whether a traditional proverbial saying underlies both passages.[94] The introduction of the statement at *O.* 3.42 with εἰ ("if, as is the case", "since") indicates that the proposition commands assent, as if already known; we must weigh the probabilities as to whether it was understood as being known from *O.* 1.1–2 or known as a commonplace idea. In favour of the latter is the fact that ἐπεί ("since") and γάρ ("for"), synonyms of εἰ, "if, as is the case", are unequivocally used to introduce commonplace ideas at *O.* 2.98 and *P.* 1.85 (see below, § 2.2). The baldness and the enigmatic character of the assertion ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ at *O.* 1.1 are also consistent with its being a commonplace. Formally, the statement "water is best" resembles a sympotic γρῖφος of the type "X is most *φ*", answering the question, τί μάλιστα ...;, "what is most *φ*?".[95] The priamel which opens Sappho fr. 16.1–4 Voigt ("Some say that a cavalry force is the finest thing on earth, etc.") are answers to an implied riddling question, τί κάλλιστον ...; "what is the finest thing?", Sappho's indeterminate answer, "whatever a person desires", improving on the concrete answers (cavalry, navy) ascribed to others. Riddles of this type are also found with the addition of a 'next best', as in *Olympian* 1 gold is a next best to water.[96] The point of our riddle would reside in the paradox that water, proverbially the cheapest commodity of all (compare Horace, *Satires* 1.5.88–89 *uilissima rerum* / ... *aqua* and already Plato, *Euthydemus* 304b3–4), is declared superior to gold, the most precious commodity of all (its superlative value is emphasized at *O.* 1.2 μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου, *O.* 3.42 κτεάνων ... / ... αἰδοιέστατος). Thus it is far from clear that one of *Olympian* 1 or *Olympian* 3 must be alluding to the other (the two poems being roughly synchronous); instead, each may allude independently to a familiar piece of wisdom in the form of a sympotic riddle. It would still be possible, of course, to argue that *Olympian* 3 alludes specifically to *Olympian* 1's allusion to a traditional riddle. But it would be necessary to indicate what concrete grounds there are for taking such a view: it is not enough to point to the mere recurrence of the terms of the riddle. The same basic ideas recur at Bacchylides 3.85–87 (another priamel involving a comparison of water and gold). The challenge facing, yet seldom met

94 See Race 1981, 121 n. 10; Gerber 1982, 9.

95 See Burkert 1972, 169. For γρῖφοι in archaic lyric, cf. Slater 1982, 338–339; Schultz 1914, 110.32–111.12. Scholarship has largely failed to recognize the γρῖφος-form that lies behind *O.* 1.1–2 (e. g. Catenacci 2013a, 355–356; Morgan 2015, 220–222).

96 Burkert 1972, 169 n. 22. Cf. Aristot. *Eudemus* = fr. 6 Rose *apud* Plut. *consol. ad Apoll.* 115b-e, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.114; cf. further Athen. 10.448b = Diphilus *PCG* fr. 49; Athen. 10.457d; Sapph. fr. 16 Voigt; [Theogn]. 255–256; Soph. fr. 356 *TrGF*.

by, advocates of intertextuality is to show how our interpretation of *Olympian* 3 is enhanced by recognizing a specific allusion between *Olympian* 3 and *Olympian* 1, but not (or also?) Bacchylides Ode 3. It is unsatisfying and problematic to regard this as a case just of intertextual capping: of *Olympian* 3 for Theron trying to 'go one better' than *Olympian* 1 for Hieron, or vice-versa (see § 7). We could see this an instance of non-allusive reprise, the recycling of a memorable expression without the two specific contexts of its use thereby being allusively associated (see § 2.5). But above all it is necessary to consider this case alongside *prima facie* similar ones involving traditional *gnōmai* where no specific allusion is presumed; for instance, between *O.* 2.98 and *O.* 13.45–46, the 'sand is numberless' commonplace (see immediately below, § 2.2).

2.2 *Gnōmai* in epinician

We may widen out our discussion from one commonplace notion ("water is best, etc.") to commonplace sayings in epinician in general. It needs to be borne in mind that epinician *gnōmai* are not merely home-spun sententious wisdom. They are, typically, traditional commonplaces.[97] Here are some of the better-documented examples.[98]

- "Sand is numberless". *O.* 2.98 ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν. *O.* 13.45–46 ὡς μὰν σαφές / οὐκ ἂν εἰδείην λέγειν ποντιᾶν ψάφων ἀριθμόν. *P.* 9.46–48 χὠπόσαι / ἐν θαλάσσᾳ καὶ ποταμοῖς ψάμαθοι / κύμασιν ῥιπαῖς τ' ἀνέμων κλονέονται. Oracle in Herodotus 1.47.3 οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ ψάμμου τ' ἀριθμὸν καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης. *Iliad* 9.385 ὅσα ψάμαθός τε κόνις τε. Catullus 7.3 *quam magnus numerus Libyssae arenae*.[99]
- 'Envy is preferable to pity'. *P.* 1.85 κρέσσον γὰρ οἰκτιρμοῦ φθόνος. [Thales] D-K i p. 64 l. 9 φθονοῦ μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκτίρου. Herodotus 3.52.5 σὺ δὲ μαθὼν ὅσῳ φθονέεσθαι κρέσσον ἐστὶ ἢ οἰκτίρεσθαι.[100]

97 Cf. Kirkwood 1982, 23; Slater 1977, 199, 1979, 80. The commonplace status of such sayings is sometimes registered in the scholia with the rubric τροπικὸς ὁ λόγος, and similar (see Drachmann iii.361s. v. τροπικός). Compare Dornseiff 1921, 129 ("Gemeinplatz"); Bowra 1964, 229–230, cf. 224–235; Sotiriou 1998, 100 "Allgemeingut"; Bagordo 2003, 234–235. On *gnōmai* in, respectively, Pindaric and Bachylidean epinician (but not emphasizing their traditional aspect), see Stuligrosz 2000 (summary of a Polish dissertation); Stenger 2004.

98 Note also the proverbial background to *O.* 1.81, Slater 1977, 202 and n. 55; Gerber 1982, 124–125.

99 Compare also Callim. *Hy.* 3.253 ψαμάθῳ ἴσον. The proverb ἄμμον μετρεῖν (Zenobius 1.80 *CPG* i.27). The Old Comic coinage ψαμμακόσιοι (as in Ar. *Acharn.* 3 ψαμμακοσιογάργαρα, *et alias*).

100 Compare Epicharm. 267.1–3 *PCG* τίς δέ κα λώιη γενέσθαι μὴ φθονούμενος φίλοις; / δῆλον ὡς ἀνὴρ παρ' οὐδέν ἐσθ' ὁ μὴ φθονούμενος· / τυφλὸν ἠλέησ' ἰδών τις, ἐφθόνησε δ' οὐδὲ εἷς. It is not

– "Time alone shows the truth (or justice)". *O.* 10.53–55 ὅτ' ἐξελέγχων μόνος / ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον / Χρόνος. Pindar fr. 159 Maehler ἀνδρῶν δικαίων Χρόνος σωτὴρ ἄριστος. Bacchylides 13.204–209 ἁ δ' ἀλαθεία φιλεῖ νι- / κᾶν, ὅ τε πανδ[α]μάτω[ρ] / χρόνος τὸ καλῶς / [ἐ]ργμένον αἰὲν ἀ[έξει·] κτλ. Sophocles *OT* 614 χρόνος δίκαιον ἄνδρα δείκνυσιν μόνος. *Tragica adespota* fr. 512 *TrGF* ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν χρόνος / δείξει· μόνος γάρ ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων κριτής.
– "Only the virtuous can endure adversity". *P.* 3.82–83 τὰ μὲν ὤν οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κόσμῳ φέρειν, / ἀλλ' ἀγαθοί. Lysias 3.4 οὗτος δὲ βέλτιστος ἂν εἴη καὶ σωφρονέστατος, ὅστις κοσμιώτατα τὰς συμφορὰς φέρειν δύναται. Euripides fr. 505 *TrGF* τὰ προσπεσόντα δ' ὅστις εὖ φέρει βροτῶν, / ἄριστος εἶναι σωφρονεῖν τ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ. Euripides *Heracles* 1227–1228 ὅστις εὐγενὴς βροτῶν / φέρει †τὰ τῶν θεῶν γε† πτώματ' οὐδ' ἀναίνεται.
– "It is better not to be born (and, being born, to die rather than live)". Bacchylides 5.160–162 θνατοῖσι μὴ φῦναι φέριστον / μηδ' ἀελίου προσιδεῖν / φέγγος. Theognis 425–427 πάντων μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον / μηδ' ἐσιδεῖν αὐγὰς ὀξέος ἠελίου, / φύντα δ' ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας Ἀίδαο περῆσαι, etc. Euripides fr. 285 (*Bellerophon*) 1–2 ἐγὼ τὸ μὲν δὴ πανταχοῦ θρυλούμενον / κράτιστον εἶναι φημὶ μὴ φῦναι βροτῷ. Herodotus 1.31.3 διέδεξέ τε ἐν τούτοισι ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἄμεινον εἴη ἀνθρώπῳ τεθνάναι μᾶλλον ἢ ζώειν.[101]
– "Don't kick against the pricks". *P.* 2.94–96 ποτὶ κέντρον δέ τοι / λακτιζέμεν τελέθει / ὀλισθηρὸς οἶμος. Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1624 πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε. Euripides *Bacchae* 795 πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζοιμι. Euripides fr. 604 *TrGF* πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε. *Iambica adespota* 13 Diehl πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λακτιζέτω. NT *Acts* 26:14 πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν.[102]
– "One's own misfortune affects one deeply, another's only superficially". *N.* 1.53–54 τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον πιέζει πάνθ' ὁμῶς· / εὐθὺς δ' ἀπήμων κραδία / κᾶδος ἀμφ' ἀλλότριον. Compare Theognis 655–656 σὺν τοί, Κύρνε, παθόντι κακῶς ἀνιώμεθα πάντες· / ἀλλὰ τοὶ ἀλλότριον κῆδος

likely (especially given the passages of 'Thales' and Epicharmus) that Hdt. 3.52.5 is an unattributed quotation of *P.* 1.85 (*pace* Morrison 2007, 122).

101 Compare Plat. *Phaed.* 62a4–5 ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν.

102 Cf. schol. *P.* 2.173c. See *BDAG* 539–540s. v. κέντρον 2.

ἐφημέριον. Herodotus 3.14.10 ὦ παῖ Κύρου, τὰ μὲν οἰκήια ἦν μέζω κακὰ ἢ ὥστε ἀνακλαίειν, τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἑταίρου πένθος ἄξιον ἦν δακρύων.[103]

– "We all prefer our own age-mates". *N.* 4.91 ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλικες ἄλλοι. Plato *Phaedrus* 240c1–2 ἥλικα γὰρ δὴ καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος τέρπειν τὸν ἥλικα. Plato *Republic* 329a2–4 πολλάκις γὰρ συνερχόμεθά τινες εἰς ταὐτὸν παραπλησίαν ἡλικίαν ἔχοντες, διασῴζοντες τὴν παλαιὰν παροιμίαν. Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1371b15–16 ὅθεν καὶ αἱ παροιμίαι εἴρηνται, [ὡς] "ἥλιξ ἥλικα τέρπει" κτλ.[104]
– "Mortals must have mortal thoughts". *I.* 5.16 θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει. Euripides *Alcestis* 799 ὄντας δὲ θνητοὺς θνητὰ καὶ φρονεῖν χρεών. Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* 1177b31–33 οὐ χρὴ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς παραινοῦντας ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα οὐδὲ θνητὰ τὸν θνητόν.

The point of providing such fulsome documentation is to illustrate that these *gnōmai* are, for the most part, textualized (even if orally transmitted): the proverbial sentiment is associated with a fixed form of words. It is implausible to see any one of the various instances as specifically referencing one of the others. The point seems rather to be precisely that they reference commonplace wisdom. In several of the non-epinician instances, the traditionality of the sentiment is made explicit ("that which is the subject of gossip everywhere", "the ancient saying", "the ancient proverb", "those who give the advice …").[105] We may recognize a form of intertextuality here, but it is an intertextuality that obtains (in the first place, at least) between an epinician and a popular saying, not between one epinician and another. The intertextual dialogue between the epinician and popular saying may be an important, and complex, one. It is not likely, for instance, that Bacchylides *Ode* 5 straightforwardly endorses the view that it is "better not to be born",[106] nor that *Isthmian* 5 (for instance) simplistically upholds the position that "mortal thoughts befit mortal men".[107]

103 Compare Aesch. *Ag*. 790–792 τῶι δυσπραγοῦντι δ' ἐπιστενάχειν / πᾶς τις ἑτοῖμος, δῆγμα δὲ λύπης / οὐδὲν ἐφ' ἥπαρ προσικνεῖται.

104 Cf. Cannatà Fera 2020, 377.

105 Eur. fr. 285.1–2 τὸ μὲν δὴ πανταχοῦ θρυλούμενον; Plat. *Phaedr*. 240c1–2 ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος, *Rep*. 329a2–4 τὴν παλαιὰν παροιμίαν; Aristot. *Rhet*. 1371b15–16 αἱ παροιμίαι, *EN* 1177b31–32 κατὰ τοὺς παραινοῦντας.

106 Arnson Svarlien 1995, 42–43.

107 Currie 2005, 78–81.

2.3 Choral lyric commonplaces in epinician

Apart from such traditional *gnōmai* (which were the property of the culture at large and evidenced in prose as well as poetic texts), epincian abounds also in distinctively choral lyric, or at least poetic, commonplaces. Here is again a purely illustrative sample.[108]

- "My words speak to those with understanding".[109]
- "There are many roads to praise *x*".[110]
- "I do not covet the lot of the tyrant".[111]
- The poet as an eagle.[112]
- The poet as a spokesman or prophet for the Muses.[113]
- The poet as riding in a chariot.[114]
- The poet as a bee.[115]

It is common for scholars to claim specific allusions between two or more instances of these commonplaces. Thus, Maurice Bowra saw Bacchylides 5.31 as indebted to *I.* 4.1 ('many roads to praise *x*' motif).[116] Andrew Morrison saw an "echo" in Bacchylides 3.85 of, specifically, *O.* 2.85 ("my words speak to those with understanding").[117] Adele-Teresa Cozzoli further saw Bacchylides 5.14–33 as an "allusion" to *O.* 2.87–88 ('poet as eagle').[118] Ilja Pfeijffer has seen a specific allusion in Bacchylides 10.10 to *P.* 10.54 ('poet as bee' motif).[119] Other scholars, however, have seen these as commonplaces, rather than as specific allusions.[120] The widespread distribution in poetry of such commonplace notions makes it

108 See also Bowra 1964, 229–230.

109 *O.* 2.83–85; Pind. fr. 105.1 M. (parodied: Ar. *Birds* 945); Bacch. 3.85; Eur. *IT* 1092. Compare also (in hexameter poetry) Orph. fr. 1a Bernabé (whence perhaps Heracl. 22 B1 DK).

110 Bacch. 5.31–33; *I.* 4.1–3; Bacch. 19.1 (*Dith.* 5); *I.* 6.22. Compare *N.* 6.45–46.

111 *P.* 11.52–54; Archil. fr. 19 *IEG*; Anacr. fr. 361 *PMG*; Aesch. *Ag.* 471–474; Eur. *Med.* 119–130, *HF* 642–644, *Ion* 485–487, *Hipp.* 1013–1020; Isoc. 2.5.

112 *O.* 2.87–88; *N.* 3.80–82; *N.* 5.21; *I.* 1.64–65; Bacch. 5.16–33; Ar. *Av.* 1373–1390.

113 Bacch. 9.3; Pind. *Pae.* 6.6; Pind. fr. 150 M.

114 *I.* 8.67; *P.* 10.65–66; *O.* 9.81; *I.* 2.1–2; Bacch. 5.175–176.

115 *P.* 10.53–54; Pind. fr. 152 M.; Bacch. 10.10; Sim. fr. 593 *PMG*; Ar. *Av.* 748–751 (= Phrynichus *TrGF* 3 F19); cf. Plat. *Ion* 534a7-b3 (identified as a generic poetic image).

116 Bowra 1964, 231; cf. Pohlsander 1963, 139–140.

117 Morrison 2007, 88; 2012, 122–123.

118 Cozzoli 1996, 12: "riprese *ad litteram* di espressioni pindariche". Cf. Gentili 1958, 29.

119 Pfeijffer 1999b, 57 "as good as an explicit reference to Pindar".

120 'Many roads to praise *x*' motif: Maehler 1997, 249 "in der Epinikiendichtung ist der Topos geläufig"; cf. Stenger 2004, 329 and n. 49 ("Topos"); Bundy 1962, 15. "Poet as bee" motif, Bowra 1964, 230. "My words speak to those with understanding", Maehler 2004, 97 ("formula"); Currie

impossible to see their mere recurrence as constituting in itself a case for an allusive intertextuality. Any argument for intertextuality between specific instances of such commonplaces must point to something else of substance that is common to the proposed hypotext and hypertext besides the commonplace idea itself. It is precisely this step, however, that is often hard to take, and is typically omitted, in scholarship.

2.4 Quasi-formulas in epinician: epithet-noun pairings

Although considerable scholarly attention has been dedicated to conventional epinician motifs, such as the χρέος-motif, the κόρος-motif, the *Abbruchsformel* (transitional formula), the *non plus ultra* motif, and others,[121] little attention has been given to the existence and the implications of recurrent noun-epithet pairings in epinician, which resemble hexameter noun-epithet formulas and indeed are in some cases identical with them.[122] Here are some examples.[123]

- "Seven-gated Thebes". (ἐν) ἑπταπύλοισ(ι) (...) Θήβαισ(ι) (*P.* 3.90, *P.* 8.39, *P.* 11.11, *I.* 1.66, *I.* 8.16, Bacch. 19.47), Θήβαις ... ἐν ἑπταπύλοις (*N.* 4.19), ἑπτάπυλοι Θῆβαι (*P.* 9.80), ἐς ἑπταπύλους Θήβας (*N.* 9.18). Similarly, fr. 94b.60, fr. 169.47.
- "Radiant Thebes". λιπαρᾶν ... Θηβᾶν (*P.* 2.3, fr. 196).
- "Radiant Athens". λιπαρᾶν ... Ἀθανᾶν (*N.* 4.18), λιπαραῖς ... Ἀθάναις (*I.* 2.20), λιπαραὶ Ἀθᾶναι (fr. 76).
- "Rocky Athens". κραναᾶις ἐν Ἀθαναισ(ι)(ν) (*O.* 7.82, *O.* 13.38, *N.* 8.11).
- "Most holy Pytho". ἐν Πυθῶνι ... ἀγαθέαι (*P.* 9.71), ἐν ἀγαθέαι ... Πυθῶνι (*N.* 6.34), Πυθῶνι ... ἐν ἀγαθέαι (Bacch. 5.41), ἐς ἀγαθέαν ... Πυθώ (Bacch. 3.62).
- "Wide-eddying Alpheos". παρ' εὐρυδίναν Ἀλφεόν (Bacch. 3.6–7), Ἀλφεὸν παρ' εὐρυδίναν (Bacch. 5.38).

2005, 390 and n. 260. Poet as 'eagle': Morgan 2015, 123–132. 'Poet rides in chariot' / 'chariot of song': D'Alessio 1995, 151–152 and n. 17, 154.

121 Bundy 1962, *passim*; Thummer 1969, esp. i.151–2; cf. also Pavese's study (1997) of the themes and motifs of epinician.

122 For the hexameter epithet-noun formulas in question, note "seven-gated Thebes": Θήβης ... ἑπταπύλοιο (*Il.* 4.406, *Od.* 11.263, cf. Hes. *WD* 162). "Swift ships": νῆες θοαί (*Il.* 10.309, 396). "The grey sea": πολιῆς ἁλός (*Il.* 1.359, *Od.* 2.261). "Golden-crowned Hebe": Ἥβην τε χρυσοστέφανον (Hes. *Th.* 17). For Homeric / epic formulas and phrases in general taken over by Pindar, see Sotiriou 1998, 6–10, 70–99; Hummel 1999, 423–433.

123 Cf. Hummel 1999, 410–17, 483.

- "Golden-crowned Hebe". χρυσοστεφάνοιο ... Ἥβας (*O.* 6.57–58), χρυσοστεφάνου ... Ἥβας (*P.* 9.109).
- "Graces with dress bound low". βαθυζώνοισιν ... Χαρίτεσσι (*P.* 9.2.), Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζώνοις (Bacch. 5.9).
- "Stormy shower". χειμέριον ὄμβρον (*P.* 5.10), χειμέριος ὄμβρος (*P.* 6.10).
- "Sweet-voiced songs". μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι (*O.* 11.4, *P.* 3.64), μελιγάρυας ὕμνους (*I.* 2.3).[124]
- "Glorious island". εὐκλέα νᾶσον (*N.* 5.15), νᾶσον εὐκλέα (*N.* 6.46).
- "Bronze heaven". χάλκεος (...) οὐρανός (*P.* 10.27, *N.* 6.3–4).
- "Bronze arms". χαλκέοις (...) ὅπλοισ(ιν) (*N.* 1.51, *N.* 9.22, *N.* 10.14).
- "Swift ships". θοαὶ νᾶες (*O.* 12.3–4), θοαῖς ... ναυσί (*N.* 7.28–29), ναυσὶ θοαῖς (*P.* 5.87), θοᾶς ... ναός (*O.* 6.101).
- "Swift mares". θοὰς ... ἵππους (Bacch. 3.3–4), ἵππους ... θοάς (*P.* 4.17), θοᾶν ἵππων (Pind. fr. 89a.3).
- "Light feet". κούφοισιν ... ποσίν (*O.* 13.114), ποσσὶ κούφοις (*N.* 8.19).
- "Swift feet". λαιψηροῖς ... πόδεσσιν (*N.* 10.63), [πο]σσὶ λαιψ[η]ρο[ῖ]ς (Bacch. fr. 20c.9), λαιψηρῶν ποδῶν (Bacch. 7.6).
- "Blessed hearth". μάκαιραν (...) ἑστίαν (*O.* 1.11, *P.* 5.11, *I.* 4.18).
- "Grey sea". πολιᾶς ἁλός (*O.* 1.71, *P.* 2.68, *I.* 4.56), πολιᾶς ... θαλάσσης (*O.* 7.61).
- "Golden mares". χρυσέαισι(ν) (...) ἵπποις (*O.* 1.41, fr. 30.2), ἵπποις χρυσέαις (*O.* 8.51).
- "Golden chariot". δίφρον ... χρύσεον (*O.* 1.87), χρυσέωι ... δίφρωι (*P.* 9.6).
- "Godlike heroes". ἥρωες ἀντίθεοι (*P.* 4.58), ἥρωας ἀντιθέους (*P.* 1.53), ἥρωες ... ἀντίθεοι (Bacch. 11.79–81).
- "Splendid glory". κῦδος ἀβρόν (*O.* 5.7, *I.* 1.50).
- "Lovely fame". ἐπήρατον κλέος (*P.* 5.73), ποθεινὸν κλέος (*I.* 5.7), δόξαν ἐπήρατον (*I.* 6.12), ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν (*O.* 8.64), δόξαν ἱμερτάν (*P.* 9.75).
- "Melodious lyre (etc.)". ἁδυμελεῖ ... φόρμιγγι (*O.* 7.11–12), κώμωι ... ἁδυμελεῖ (*P.* 8.70), ἁδυμελεῖ ... φωνᾶι (*N.* 2.25), ἁδυμελεῖ ... ὕμνωι (*I.* 7.20).
- "Sleep, honey-sweet to the mind". μελίφρονος ὕπν[ου (Bacch. 1.50), μελίφρων ὕπνος (Bacch. fr. 4.76).
- "Unwearying sea". πόντου ... ἀκάμαντος (*N.* 6.39), ἁλὸς ἀκαμάτας (Bacch. 5.25).
- "Pytho that receives sheep for sacrifice". μηλοδόκωι Πυθῶνι (*P.* 3.27), Πυθῶνα ... μηλοθύταν (Bacch. 8.39).
- "All-conquering fate". ὦ μοῖρα πολυκρατές (Bacch. 9.15), μοῖρα παγκρατής (Bacch. 17.24).

124 Cf. Spelman 2018a, 16 n. 8.

– "Straight messenger" / "straight reporting of messages". ἄγγελος ὀρθός (*O.* 6.91), ἀγγελίας ὀρθᾶς (*P.* 4.279).
– "Pitiless mind" / "pitiless of mind". νηλεεῖ νόωι (Pind. fr. 177e), νηλέα νόον (*P.* 1.95).

The foregoing list, though lengthy, is illustrative, not exhaustive; it aims to illustrate both the extent of the phenomenon and its flexibility.[125] The phrases in question may exhibit different metrical values, different cases, and different word-orders (epithet preceding noun or noun preceding epithet; epithet and noun may or may not be adjacent).[126] The adjective and noun may be used adjacently and in the same order, yet be in a different syntactical relationship with one another.[127] We may find homonymous substitution of epithet or noun or of both.[128] Thus, ἐπήρατον κλέος and δόξαν ἱμερτάν have neither epithet or noun in common, but the attested permutations illustrate that they are variations on the same quasi-formulaic idea ('lovely fame'). It is important to emphasize that these epinician phrases do not count as 'formulas' on Milman Parry's definition. Parry was in fact adamant that Pindar and Bacchylides did *not* use formulas.[129] Yet they satisfy one crucial condition of the formula on Parry's definition: in their repetition there is no suggestion of debt or homage to one or more earlier specific uses.[130] In this single, but very significant, respect they resemble the hexameter formulas – and were, no doubt, meant to resemble them. The Pindaric tendency to invent new expressions[131] and seek variation has often been noted.[132] We have here an opposite, and less well-publicized, tendency: to recycle certain locutions and to accord them thereby the status of *mots justes*, the optimal or default way of referring to a given object or idea.[133] Whereas with specific allusion we are drawn

125 The extent of the phenomenon is underestimated by Spelman 2018a, 16 and n. 8.
126 Hummel 1999, 357.
127 In Pind. fr. 177e νηλεεῖ νόωι, the adjective agrees with the noun. In *P.* 1.95 νηλέα νόον, the noun is an accusative of specification (or respect) with the adjective, which agrees with καυτῆρα ... Φάλαριν (95–96).
128 Compare Sotiriou 1998, 66–67.
129 Parry 1971a, 166–167; 1971b, 282–285. Compare Sotiriou 1998, 2, 4, 68–69; esp. Hummel 1999, 486–488.
130 Cf. Parry 1971b, 273, excluding from the definition of the formula "the verse which is borrowed because the poet's public knows it and will recall its former use".
131 Sigelman 2016, 19, 171 "Pindar's predilection ... for the hapax epithet coined uniquely for the present occasion".
132 E.g. Thummer 1967, i.151; Race 1990, 187. It is fallacy that Pindar avoids repetition, *pace* Spelman 2018a, 16 and n. 8.
133 For repetitions as encapsulating the optimal way of saying something, cf. Parry 1971b, 291.

to a specific previous use, here we are drawn away from any specific previous use and drawn towards a purely generalized – or generalizable – usage.

It is not in dispute that there are circumstances in which the reprise of an epithet-noun pair would be capable of mobilizing a specific allusion. It is highly plausible, for instance, that Sophocles' use of the phrase "hollow grave" (κοίλην κάπετον) for Aias' burial (*Ajax* 1165) alludes specifically to the *Iliad*'s use of the same phrase for Hektor's burial (24.797).[134] It should be clear that the position articulated in the previous paragraph (that the repetition of such epithet-noun pairings in epinician does not serve, as a rule, to mobilize specific allusions) is advanced *a posteriori*, not *a priori*. It is the overwhelming weight of epinician examples where there is no specific allusion that establishes this as a rule akin to that which is understood to obtain for the constantly recurring noun-epithet formulas of epic. The listener or reader who has been exposed to more than a narrow range of epinicians becomes schooled not to see allusions in the recurrence of such phrases. Arguments for specific allusions through such recurrent noun-epithet pairings must, accordingly, be justified as exceptions to this convention, for instance, by a demonstration that in two given contexts there is particular salience or significance in the repetition. (Such a case might conceivably be made for *I.* 4.22 φάμαν παλαιάν and *I.* 3.16 δόξαν παλαιάν: see below, § 7.)

The implications of this need to be explored. It follows that it cannot be automatically assumed that even unique recurrences such as *P.* 9.31 ἀταρβεῖ … κεφαλᾶι ("with fearless head") and *P.* 5.12 ἀταρβεῖ φρενί ("with fearless mind") are a specific allusion by the later ode (*Pythian* 5) to the earlier (*Pythian* 9).[135] This particular epinician epithet-noun pairing has probable hexameter antecedents (compare *Il.* 3.63 ἀτάρβητος νόος ἐστί, "your mind is fearless").[136] In the absence of arguments to the contrary, it is more reasonably regarded as a recurring quasi-formulaic epithet-noun pairing than as a specifically allusive reprise. The fact that *P.* 5.12 and *P.* 9.31 are the only attested Pindaric occurrences of ἀταρβής does not authorize listener or reader to interpret this unique recurrence as a specific allusion.[137] The concept of the 'unique recurrence' can have had relatively little traction for the contemporary public (how could a fifth-century auditor be confident that Pindar had not already used the epithet in a poem of which they were unaware, or that he did not mean to do so in the near future?), and it may be a treacherous heuristic tool for us. An exactly equivalent situation

134 Easterling 1988, 96–97.
135 *Pace* Neer/Kurke 2019, 201–202 (see further below, § 3.3); cf. Dougherty 1993, 139 and 153 n. 12.
136 Hummel 1999, 421.
137 *Pace* Neer/Kurke 2019, 202.

is presented by *P.* 4.181 θυμῶι γελανεῖ ("with cheerful soul") and *O.* 5.2 καρδίαι γελανεῖ ("with cheerful heart"). These are the only attestations of γελανής in all of Greek. Yet there is nothing to recommend our seeing *Olympian* 5 (the later poem) as alluding to *Pythian* 4. The picture can be filled out by other recurrent epithet-noun pairings with similar meanings: εὐμενεῖ (...) νόωι (*P.* 8.18; fr. 52e.45) or ἐκόντι ... νόωι (*P.* 5.43–44; *P.* 8.67). The following 'rule' may reasonably be formulated: in this kind of poetry, even a *singuläres Iteratum* ('one-off repetition'), when an epithet-noun pair is concerned, creates no automatic presumption of there being an allusive reprise. There is every likelihood that we are dealing with a recurring quasi-formula, a *mot juste* treated as ripe for reuse.[138]

2.5 Larger-scale non-allusive reprises

The discussion can, again, be broadened out. Apart from epithet-noun pairings, Pindar is capable of reusing certain turns of phrase, even distinctive-seeming ones, without mobilizing specific allusions. A case in point is *N.* 5.1 οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' and *I.* 2.46 οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς (*sc.* τούσδ' ὕμνους) ἐργασάμαν. Henry Spelman has called this a Pindaric "auto-allusion".[139] Yet if so, it seems allusively inert, as there is no suggestion of a meaningful, interpretable, intertextual dialogue between *Isthmian* 2 (the later poem) and *Nemean* 5.[140] Pindar, in other words, does not seem here to go beyond using his own oeuvre as "a repository of striking episodes or expressions".[141] The same might be said of *N.* 6.29–30 (whose composition dates perhaps to the early 470s BCE)[142] παροιχομένων γὰρ ἀνέρων /

138 The same considerations problematize attempts to see the recurrence of the phrases 'hundred-headed Typhon' (*P.* 1.16 Τυφὼς ἑκατοντακάρανος, *P.* 8.16 Τυφὼς ... ἑκατόγκρανος, *O.* 4.7 ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶνος) as a specific allusion (see below, § 3.2).

139 Spelman 2018a, 16 n. 8.

140 For the concept of allusive inertia, see Hinds 1998, 39–41 (who, however, is concerned to critique the concept in the context of Latin poetry).

141 Quotation from Kelly 2015, 21 (on the use made by the pre-Stesichorean lyric poets of the epic corpus). Cf. Parry 1971b, 283 "these expressions [*sc.* Homeric phrases replicated by Pindar] were to him [*sc.* Pindar] fine expressions which his mind had kept solely for their beauty". Compare, on Pindar, Morrison 2010, 252: "a storehouse of verbal reminiscence". But Morrison, *ibid.*, also claims that there are Pindaric examples which go beyond this, "by engaging in detail with the intertexts and relying on the audience's knowledge of the original contexts". Compare also Morrison 2007, 110–111 "close verbal reminiscence which seems to operate without reference to the specific context in which the original words were used".

142 On the date, see Gerber 1999, 34–36; cf. Cannatà Fera 2020, 122 and n. 6.

ἀοιδοὶ καὶ λόγιοι[143] τὰ καλά σφιν ἔργ' ἐκόμισαν, "after men's death, singers and chroniclers preserve their achievements", echoed in *P.* 1.92–94 (composed in 474/470 BCE) ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας / οἷον ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει / καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς. The examples might, again, easily be multiplied:

- *O.* 3.44 τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ ... ἄβατον ~ *N.* 3.20–21 οὐκέτι πρόσω / ἀβάταν ἄλα.
- *P.* 10.4 τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν; ~ *O.* 9.38 τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρόν.
- *P.* 1.43–44 ἔλπομαι / μὴ χαλκοπάραον ἄκονθ' ὡσείτ' ἀγῶνος βαλεῖν ἔξω ~ *N.* 7.70–72 ἀπομνύω / μὴ τέρμα προβαὶς ἄκονθ' ὥτε χαλκοπάραον ὄρσαι / θοὰν γλῶσσαν.[144]
- *N.* 3.11–12 ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων (*sc.* νεανιᾶν: compare 5 νεανίαι) τέ νιν ὀάροις / λύραι τε κοινάσομαι ~ *P.* 1.97–98 οὐδέ νιν φόρμιγγες ὑπωρόφιαι κοινανίαν / μαλθακὰν παίδων ὀάροισι δέκονται.
- (etc.).[145]

It is highly doubtful whether any of these seeming 'auto-allusions' can be taken as meaningfully interpretable specific allusions to the poetic context where they were first employed. Rather, in the manner of his treatment of epithet-noun pairings as *mots justes* (see above, § 2.4), Pindar himself fosters a sense of his own locutions and conceits as deserving of a reprise, as being eminently quotable. We may compare, in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Dionysos' admiration of Euripides' capacity to coin the "fine phrase", ῥῆμα γενναῖον (97), the well-turned and quotable sound-bite, where quotability turns out to presuppose the complete detachability of the memorable phrase from the original context of use (see especially 98–102 and 1475–1478).[146] Detachability from the original context of use seems, in fact, to have been the way of much fifth-century poetic quotation, to judge by the practice of characters in Plato's dialogues, or by Herodotus' quotation (3.38.4) of Pindar's tag "*nomos* is king of all" (fr. 169a M).[147] Pindar seems to cultivate a view of

143 For a defence of this reading of the manuscripts and scholia, see Gerber 1999, 64; against, Henry 2005, 61; Itsumi 2009, 306, but the point at issue is not significantly affected if we emend to ἀοιδαὶ καὶ λόγοι (Pauw).

144 Compare also (less close verbally) *N.* 9.54–55.

145 Further examples (the list is quite open-ended, especially if we admit instances of recurring conceits rather than just phraseology) might include e. g. *O.* 8.67–71 ~ *P.* 8.81–87; *O.* 8.77–84 ~ *O.* 14.20–24; *O.* 1.103–5 ~ *O.* 2.92–95 (the last interpreted as intertextuality by Morrison 2007, 85). It might also be possible thus to regard *O.* 1.1–2 ~ *O.* 3.42 (see § 2.1).

146 Cf. Wright 2012, 150–156; cf. Halliwell 2000, 98, with n. 18.

147 Halliwell 2000, 97, on cases of quotations that "characteristically involve striking or pointed turns of phrase, but tend not to require familiarity with the exact origin of the cita-

his own coinages as ῥήματα γενναῖα in a comparable sense: choice expressions that clamour to be repeated, but whose repetition does not ask us to recall the context in which they were used first. (A possible reason for this will be explored below, § 7.)

2.6 The problem of recurrent elements in epinician

The gist of the preceding is that there can be automatic presumption of allusive intent behind repetitions in epinician. Epinician characteristically operates with recurrent elements of imagery, motifs, style, and lexicon.[148] Chris Carey has commented on "[t]he consistency with which Pindar insists on a limited range of concepts", noting that "[t]he impression of coherence is enhanced by Pindar's tendency to work with a limited but consistent range of images", and pointing to "Pindar's emphasis on a narrow range of recurring ideas".[149] Precisely this phenomenon, however, is viewed as intertextuality by Andrew Morrison, who has been the most vigorous advocate of intertextuality between epinician odes: "It seems clear to me that such verbal echoes, similar passages, and recurring imagery and language form obvious ways for Pindar (and Bacchylides) to exploit overlapping (local) audiences in locations such as the Sicilian cities".[150] He adds: "Pindaric intertextuality of this kind can be very extensive, and we find it even in the mythic parts of the odes".[151] The former claim calls for a control: it is likely that this kind of recurring language and imagery is as abundant *across* groups of odes for overlapping audiences (whether Sicilian, Aeginetan, Theban, or Cyrenean)

tion", "quotations where what counts most … is the adaptation of a recognizably poetic piece of wording for a purpose that is both highly localized (a passing touch of emphasis or embellishment) and relatively independent of the original". Asheri 2007, 437 "Herodotus is not interested here in the original meaning of Pindar's text: he isolates the verse from its context and quotes it as a motto for his purposes of ethnological and moral comparison". See also Wright 2016b, for the tendency of quotations from tragedy to become "a decontextualized soundbite or maxim" (607).

148 Dornseiff 1921, 76 "Pindar ist nun in hohem Maß ein Dichter mit Lieblingswörtern". Note Pindar's predilection for striking uses of such words as ἄωτος, γεύεσθαι, μειγνύναι, δρέπειν, etc. Similarly, Thummer 1967, i.140; Bowra 1964, 416–417 (focussing on repeated expressions in *Olympian* 5 and in the rest of Pindaric epinician); Race 1990, 192 and 195 (the *ne plus ultra* motif in Pindar: he uses it ten times; it is barely found elsewhere); cf. Silk 1974, 239 (ἄωτος: used by Pindar twenty times, by Bacchylides and Aeschylus once each).

149 Carey 1995, 89.

150 Morrison 2012, 123. See, in general, Morrison 2007, 2010, 2011, and 2012.

151 Morrison 2012, 123 n. 39.

as within them.[152] Moreover, epinician intertextuality, so conceived, becomes far too extensive and diluted to count as the allusive kind of intertextuality that its advocates have in mind. Weakly-marked repetitions such as *O.* 2.54 μέριμναν and *O.* 1.108 μερίμναισι, *O.* 1.116 ὁμιλεῖν and *P.* 2.96 ὁμιλεῖν, or *P.* 3.27 οὐδ' ἔλαθε and *O.* 6.36 οὐδ' ἔλαθ', invoked by Morrison, provide a very dubious basis on which to build arguments for an allusive intertextuality between odes.[153] The problem in method consists in the arbitrary privileging of a couple of repeated expressions in a poetic environment where repetition is rife: the flaws in such a method were exposed, more than half a century ago, by Hans Pohlsander.[154]

We return here to the slipperiness of the term 'intertextuality' (see above, § 0). There is a fully legitimate understanding of intertextuality which would licence the use of that term for convergences in phraseology that result from the use of traditional *gnōmai*, epinician commonplaces, quasi-formulaic epithet-noun pairings, and non-allusive reprises of striking Pindaric expressions. However, it should be clear that that understanding of intertextuality is a far cry from the allusive intertextuality in which we and the other Pindaric scholars discussed in this paper are interested: an allusive intertextuality in which the meaning of the target text is felt to be significantly enhanced by consideration of its relationship with a specific source text, in a manner comparable to what we find with the *Aeneid*'s allusive intertextuality with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or the allusive intertextuality of Euripides' *Hippolytus* 612 with Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1471.

3 Intertextuality between epinicians?: the narrative sections

To demonstrate intertextuality between mythical narratives in epinician is a similarly problematic undertaking. It is easy to be impressed by parallels in mythological motifs with, for instance, the myths of the incinerated parturient divine consorts Koronis (*P.* 3.8–44) and Semele (*O.* 2.25–28, *P.* 3.99), or those of the eternally punished sinners Tantalos (*O.* 1.54–66) and Ixion (*P.* 2.21–48).[155] One thing that is hard to demonstrate, in these and other cases, is whether these are pointedly constructed poetic parallels or just a reflection of the innate repeti-

152 This study, *passim*, presents many examples.
153 Morrison 2007, 85–86, 95, 107.
154 Pohlsander 1963.
155 On the myths of Koronis and Semele, see Burgess 2001b.

tiveness of Greek myth: Greek mythology is "full of doublets".[156] The problem is well illustrated by the mythical narratives of *Pythian* 9 and *Nemean* 3, which show very striking parallels that do not lend themselves to being interpreted as an allusive intertextuality.[157] In the narratives of both poems, a young heroine (Kyrana) or hero (Achilleus) frequents the wild, hunting animals with her or his bare hands, to the admiration of a pair of onlooking deities of the opposite sex to the hero(ine) (in *Pythian* 9, Apollo and Cheiron; in *Nemean* 3, Artemis and Athena); the centaur Cheiron is also central to both narratives. Both these myths may have epic sources, and it is unclear how much of the parallelism is due to inherited traditional mythology rather than Pindar's manipulation of the narrative.[158] Above all, it is hard to see how a putative intertextual dialogue between *P.* 9.18–28 and *N.* 3.43–52 would bring significant interpretative gain to whichever text we chose to identify as the hypertext (this being a case where the relative chronology between these odes is moot). We encounter similar problems in several other cases, as we shall see.

3.1 *Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 1

The mythical narratives of *Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 1 provide Morrison with his showcase example of intertextuality between epinicians.[159] Both are Sicilian odes, commissioned by associates of Hieron within at most eight years of each other (475–467 BCE), whose mythical sections narrate the birth myths of Iamos and Herakles respectively. There are several suggestive correspondences and contrasts between the narratives. First, a pair of snakes try to kill the infant Herakles, but a pair of snakes save Iamos by suckling him. Second, a prophecy is received about the baby Herakles from Teiresas, and about the baby Iamos from the Delphic oracle. And third, each hero "receives HEBE":[160] Herakles literally, by marrying her (*N.* 1.71 δεξάμενον θαλερὰν Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν); Iamos figuratively, by reaching manhood (*O.* 6.57–58 χρυσοστεφάνοιο λάβεν / καρπὸν Ἥβας).

156 Quotation from Fenik 1968, 237.

157 Cf. Instone 1996, 162; Carey 1981, 72.

158 On *Nemean* 3, see Huxley 1975, 19, comparing Pindar's account (which advertises its dependence on tradition, *N.* 3.52–53 – unless this is a fiction: Pfeijffer 1999a, 350–351) with Philostr. *Her.* 20.2 and Stat. *Achilleis* 2.96–99; see also M.L. West 2011, 60; I.C. Rutherford 2015, 459 and n. 49; cf. Kozák 2012, esp. 84–85.

159 Morrison 2007, 76–78; cf. 2012, 123 n. 39.

160 I have capitalized the noun, since equivocation between the common and the proper noun (the personified divine abstraction) is here at issue.

However, it is not clear which of *Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 1 is more plausibly regarded as hypotext and which as hypertext.[161] Morrison favours the view that *Olympian* 6 alludes to *Nemean* 1 and suggests that Iamos' posterity to Herakles is metapoetically inscribed in *O.* 6.67–70, where we learn that Herakles is first to found the Olympic festival and Iamos is subsequently to establish his oracle at the altar there. Yet it remains unclear how it would enrich our understanding of the putative hypertext to assume an intertextual dialogue between *Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 1 (whichever text is identified as hypotext and which as hypertext). It does not help that we know nothing of the Iamos myth prior to Pindar and cannot as a consequence gauge the extent to which Pindar may or may not have innovated in order to bring the myth of Iamos into line with that of Herakles.[162] As Jacob Stern saw, Pindar's Iamos narrative comprises many conventional mythical motifs: the child threatened by snakes, for instance, recurs with Opheltes-Archemoros (Bacchylides 9.12–13; etc.).[163] As in our earlier example of Kyrana and Achilleus in *Pythian* 9 and *Nemean* 3 respectively, it is hard to see what it is that guarantees that the Iamos narrative of *Olympian* 6 alludes specifically to the Herakliskos narrative of *Nemean* 1 or vice-versa.

Verbal parallels play a key role in Morrison's argument.[164] Here is *N.* 1.35–36:

ὡς, ἐπεὶ σπλάγχνων ὕπο ματέρος αὐ-
τίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διός
ὠδῖνα φεύγων διδύμῳ
σὺν κασιγνήτῳ μόλεν ...

... how, as soon as Zeus' son came down from his mother's womb into the wondrous brightness of day, fleeing her birth pains with his twin brother ...[165]

And here is *O.* 6.43–44:

ἦλθεν δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχνων ὑπ' ὠ-
δίνεσσ' ἐραταῖς Ἴαμος
ἐς φάος αὐτίκα.

161 Morrison 2007, 77, 78. Cf. Adorjáni 2014, 61 n. 26.

162 No extant sources for Pindar's telling of Iamos myth: Stern 1970, 332. On the possibility of a (Pseudo-)Hesiodic source, cf. D'Alessio 2005b, 234 and n. 67.

163 Stern 1970, 332–333 "the myth is of a very common type; almost all of its motifs can be easily paralleled in other Greek myths", "commonplace", "conventional". Cf. Adorjáni 2014, 171.

164 Compare also Adorjáni 2014, 61 n. 26, 181, 192–93; Cannatà Fera 2020, 281.

165 Translation: Race 1997, ii.9.

> ... and from her womb amid the welcome birth pains Iamos came immediately into the light.[166]

However, the recognition of a textualized interaction between these specific passages is hampered by the acknowledgement that it is standard poetic (or choral lyric) expressions and words from the semantic field of childbirth that recur. Thus σπλάγχνα, "womb" is not confined to *N.* 1.35 and *O.* 6.43, but is found also at Pind. *Pae.* 8a.18 = B3.24? Rutherford; Aesch. *Sept.* 1031. ὠδίς, "birthpangs" occurs at *N.* 1.36 and *O.* 6.43, but also *P.* 9.85; Pind. fr. 33d.3; *Pae.* 12 (G1 Rutherford) 16). ἐς φάος ἐλθεῖν or similar appears at *N.* 1.35–36 and *O.* 6.43–44, but also *Pae.* 12 (G1 Rutherford) 15; *HHerm.* 12, compare *Il.* 19.118, *HAp.* 119. The recurrence of these phrases in just these narrative contexts, concerning childbirth, is unremarkable; the diction is unmarked. It is hard to see that any weight can be attached to the recurrence of so colourless a word as αὐτίκα (*N.* 1.35, *O.* 6.44, but also fourteen other times in extant Pindaric epinician).[167]

In short, the parallels, both thematic and verbal, between *Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 1 cannot count as especially striking or significant. The direction of influence can be argued as easily one way as the other. The parallels can be put down to a common typology at least as easily as to specific allusion. This, of course, does not *disprove* intertextuality between *Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 1. It does, however, reveal its assumption to be somewhat arbitrary.

3.2 *Pythian* 8 and *Pythian* 1

Tilman Krischer argued that *Pythian* 8 (an Aeginetan ode for a victory of 450/446 BCE) alludes extensively to *Pythian* 1 (a Sicilian ode for a victory of 474/470 BCE),[168] and his argument has garnered considerable scholarly support.[169] Specifically, Τυφὼς Κίλιξ ἑκατόγκρανος (*P.* 8.16) is held to allude to Τυφὼς ἑκατονταπάρανος· τόν ποτε / Κιλίκιον θρέψεν ... ἄντρον (*P.* 1.16–17). To quote Krischer, "in a poet as concerned with variation as Pindar, that is not a

166 Translation: Race 1997, i.107,109.

167 *Pace* Morrison 2007, 76. Cannatà Fera 2020, 281 points out, moreover, that the syntax of *N.* 1.35–36 ἐπεὶ ... αὐτίκα ... μόλεν is not identical to *O.* 6.43–44 ἦλθεν ... αὐτίκα.

168 Krischer 1985. For the uncertainty attaching to Pythian festival dates (± 4 years), see Currie 2005, 25–26.

169 Robbins 1997, 276; Morrison 2007, 116–117; Morrison 2010, 250–251; compare also Burnett 2005, 227–228.

formulaic mode of expression, but a quotation".[170] Krischer indicates how this intertextuality would be meaningfully interpretable: a theme of hoped-for political stability pervades *Pythian* 1 (especially 67–70), which *Pythian* 8 would answer with a theme of mutability, implying Aeginetan hopes for liberation from Athenian domination.[171]

There are problems, however. The foregoing discussion of recurrent noun-epithet pairings in epinician (above, § 2.4) renders Krischer's insistence that the recurrence Τυφὼς ἑκατοντακάρανος (*P.* 1.16), Τυφὼς ... ἑκατόγκρανος (*P.* 8.16), and ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶνος (*O.* 4.7) "is not a formulaic mode of expression, but quotation" problematic. It is also conceivable that the locution has hexameter antecedent, though none is directly attested.[172] Above all, however, before assuming an allusion of *Pythian* 8 to *Pythian* 1, account must be taken of all the relevant passages concerning Typhon: not just from *Pythians* 1 and 8, but also from *Olympian* 4, the Pindaric fragments 92 and 93, and the (Pseudo-)Aeschylean *Prometheus Bound*.[173] The relevant passages are the following.

- *P.* 1.15–20 ὅς τ' ἐν αἰνᾷ Ταρτάρῳ **κεῖται**, θεῶν πολέμιος, / **Τυφὼς ἑκατοντακάρανος**· τόν ποτε / **Κιλίκιον** θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον· νῦν γε μάν / ταί θ' ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιερκέες ὄχθαι / Σικελία τ' αὐτοῦ πιέζει στέρνα λαχνάεντα· κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει, / νιφόεσσ' **Αἴτνα**.
- *P.*€8.15–18 βία δὲ καὶ μεγάλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῳ. / **Τυφὼς Κίλιξ ἑκατόγκρανος** οὔ νιν ἄλυξεν, / οὐδὲ μὰν βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων· δμᾶθεν δὲ κεραυνῷ / τόξοισί τ' Ἀπόλλωνος.
- *O.*€4.6–7 ἀλλὰ Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς **Αἴτναν** ἔχεις / **ἶπον** ἀνεμόεσσαν **ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶνος** ὀβρίμου.
- Pindar fr. 92.1–2 M. κείνῳ μὲν **Αἴτνα** δεσμὸς ὑπερφίαλος / ἀμφίκειται, fr. 93.1–3 M. ἀλλ' οἷος ἅπλατον κεράϊζε θεῶν / **Τυφῶνα** πεντηκοντοκέφαλον (conjectured is **Τυφῶν' ἑκατοντακάρανον**)[174] ἀνάγκᾳ Ζεὺς πατήρ / ἐν Ἀρίμοις ποτέ.
- (Pseudo-)Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound* 351–354 τὸν γηγενῆ τε **Κιλικίων** οἰκήτορα / ἄ ν τ ρ ω ν ἰδὼν ὤικτιρα, δάιον τέρας, / ἑ κ α τ ο γ κ ά ρ α ν ο ν πρὸς

170 Krischer 1985, 115 (translated from the German); cf. *ibid*. "Pindar's eighth *Pythian* ode shows a series of striking correspondences with [*Pythian* 1], which manifestly cannot be explained by the topicality belonging to choral lyric, but only through the assumption of a direct reference, that is, of what we call a 'quotation'".

171 Krischer 1985, 119, 120.

172 For possible hexametric precedents, see below, § 3.2. Note also Ar. *Clouds* 336 ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶ.

173 For fuller discussion, see Currie (forthcoming, a).

174 Hermann's conjecture is adopted by Turyn 1948, 307; nowhere else is Typhon depicted as having 50 heads (Gerber 1987, 15). Compare Hes. *Th.* 311–312 Κέρβερον ... / πεντηκοντακέφαλον.

βίαν χειρούμενον, / **Τυφῶνα** θοῦρον, 364–65 **κεῖται** στενωποῦ πλησίον θαλασσίου / **ἰπούμενος** ῥίζαισιν **Αἰτναίαις** ὕπο.

There is, indeed, a strong case for intertextuality here; but the wider, profilerating picture (as in our discussion of epinician *gnōmai*, § 2.2) indicates that it is hardly a simple matter of *Pythian* 8 alluding just to *Pythian* 1. Morrison was prepared to see *Pythian* 1 as the hypotext for both *Pythian* 8 and *Olympian* 4, and also, apparently, *Pythian* 1 and *Olympian* 4 as joint hypotexts for the *Prometheus Bound*.[175] This is a good deal messier than our initial starting point; it is an intertextual scenario that requires us to make an uncomfortably large number of mutually dependent unproven assumptions. Neither Morrison nor Krischer acknowledge the possibility that a common source – a hexameter narrative – may underlie some or all of these texts, a possibility favoured by several other scholars.[176] The Typhon myth was evidently told in hexameter poetry before Homer and Hesiod.[177] More than one early hexameter treatment of it is likely.[178] Various elements in our complex may have their origin in hexameter poetry. First, Typhon as "hundred-headed". Typhon has a hundred heads in Hesiod's *Theogony* (825 **ἑκατὸν κεφαλαί**). An epithet such as ἑκατοντακάρηνος or ἑκατοντακέφαλος[179] is also conceivable for Typhon in lost epic. Second, Aitna as the location of Typhon's smouldering body. This again is attested in Hesiod's *Theogony*, if we accept a plausible *uaria lectio* of the indirect tradition: 859–860 φλὸξ δὲ κεραυνωθέντος ἀπέσσυτο τοῖο ἄνακτος / οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃσιν **Ἀΐτνης** παιπαλοέσσης, "flame shot out from the lord [*sc*. Typhon] after he had been struck by lighning, in the glens of the mountain, rugged Aitna".[180] And third, Typhon's birth in the "Cilician cave". This too is attested for an archaic hexameter work ascribed to 'Hesiod' by the scholion to *Prometheus Bound* 351a (= [Hes.] fr. dub. 388 M-W): καὶ Ἡσίοδος τόν ποτε **Κιλίκιον** θρέψεν πολυώνυμον **ἄντρον** (see above, § 1.4).

175 Morrison 2007, 110 with n. 125; cf. Griffith 1978, 119–120, 136. Stamatopoulou 2017, 56 (cf. also *ibid*. 146–148) assumes that *P.* 1 influenced [Aesch.] *PV*, but is agnostic about how to fit *O.* 4 into the picture (56 n. 15), and does not consider *P.* 8 in this connection (but cf. 63 n. 37).

176 Von Mess 1901; Severyns 1928, 170–171; Schroeder 1922, 6–7; Irigoin 1952, 11–12; Burton 1962, 98; Debiasi 2004, 104–107; Currie (forthcoming, a); compare Cingano 1995, 13.

177 Watkins 1995, 448–449; Currie 2016, 203; Currie (forthcoming, c).

178 Von Mess 1901, 170.

179 For the prosody, see M.L. West 1966, 248.

180 At Hes. *Th.* 860, the manuscript tradition has ἀιδνῆς or ἀιδνῃς (a rare adjective meaning, here, something like 'murky'); the reading is obelized by M.L. West 1966. A variant αιτνης is attested in the indirect tradition (two manuscripts of Tzetzes' commentary on Lyc. *Alex*. 688). Hence οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃσιν Ἀΐτνης παιπαλοέσσης is read by some (Debiasi 2008, 79–94). For the conjecture, οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃς, εἰν Αἴτνῃ παιπαλοέσσῃ, see Currie (forthcoming, a).

We must consider where this leaves us. *Pythian* 1 and *Pythian* 8 both employ the mythological figure of Typhon, archetypal challenger to Zeus, as a symbol of violence and of disruption to order and tranquility. However, it does not follow that *Pythian* 8 alludes to *Pythian* 1. Nor does the recurrent phrasing constitute a clear case of 'quotation' of the one epinician by the other. The phrasing that recurs throughout these two Pindaric poems (and, as we have seen, several others: *Olympian* 4, Pindar fr. 92 M., (Pseudo-)Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound*) can plausibly be derived from lost early hexameter poetry on Typhon. On general considerations, dependence of the *Prometheus Bound* on Hesiod's *Theogony* and on the Cyclical *Titanomachy* is plausible.[181] On the other hand, close textual dependence of the *Prometheus Bound* on *Pythian* 1 (and *Olympian* 4) is harder to parallel.[182] It would be a relatively easy assumption in general that Pindar (in *Pythian* 1, *Pythian* 8, *Olympian* 4, fr. 92) depends on a hexameter narrative of the Typhonomachy, especially since *P.* 1.16–17 τόν ποτε / Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον yields, as we have seen (with a small prosodic modification: Κιλίκιον → Κῑλίκιον), a hexameter that is ascribed to 'Hesiod' (fr. dub. 388 M-W, possibly from the *Titanomachy*: above, § 1.4). It is a more economical assumption that both Pindar, in all these poems, and the author of the *Prometheus Bound* are indebted to the same, canonical, hexameter narrative of Typhon's conflict with Zeus, perhaps the Cyclical *Titanomachy*. In that case, this argument for intertextuality between two Pindaric epinicians, *Pythians* 1 and 8, would turn out to be another case of epincian's well-documented intertextuality with epic (see above, § 1).

3.3 *Pythians* 5 and 9 (and 4)

Richard Neer and Leslie Kurke have argued for "significant intertextual echoes" between the Cyrenean odes, *Pythians* 4, 5, and 9.[183] If we are to find inter-epinician intertextuality anywhere, then it is to be expected within such cohesive groups of odes, whether Cyrenean, Sicilian, Aeginetan, Theban, or Cean.[184] Neer

181 E.g. Herington 1985, 128–9, Stamatopoulou 2017, 122–50, with 150 n. 72.

182 Tragedy tends to engage with epinician in generic, rather than textually specific ways: see Swift 2010, 104–72; Carey 2012; cf. Irigoin 1952, 11–12; Bagordo 2003, 234–5. Further, on the question of the relationship of [Aesch.] *PV* 768, 921–25 with *I.* 8.33–35, see Carey 1981, 195–96; Burnett 2005, 114–15; I.C. Rutherford 2015, 455–56. There is no good reason to think that Aesch. *Oresteia* engages with *P.* 11 (Finglass 2007, 15–16), *pace* Kurke 2013.

183 Neer/Kurke 2019, 162.

184 Hence Morrison 2007 focusses on the Sicilian odes, Morrison 2010 on the Aeginetan odes. Spelman 2018a, 229 argues for intertextuality both within and without such groups odes ("The study of connections between poems need not be so circumscribed").

and Kurke attempt to create even greater cohesion between *Pythians* 5 and 4 with the unwarranted claim that these odes were performed on the same or on consecutive days.[185] Of the numerous echoes between these odes claimed by Neer and Kurke many are simply tendentious. Thus, *P.* 4.15 ἀστέων ῥίζαν ("root of cities", *sc*. Cyrene) is linked with *P.* 9.8 ῥίζαν ἀπείρου ('[third] root of the land-mass', *sc*. Libya-Africa).[186] These expressions involve quite different figurative uses of the word ῥίζα, which, as B. K. Braswell had already noted, are not such as to be readily brought into association with one another.[187] Moreover, the polyptotic repetition of χείρ found at *P.* 9.122 χερὶ χειρός and *P.* 4.37 χειρὶ ... χεῖρ' is a very common figure in Greek, whose recurrence cannot plausibly be claimed to constitute a significant echo.[188] Neer and Kurke also attach considerable weight to the fact that – if we can trust the manuscripts – Pindar used the form δύνασιν at *P.* 9.30, *P.* 5.117, and *P.* 4.238, and only there, whereas the parallel form δύναμιν is found nine times in Pindar. This is claimed as an intertextual echo throughout the three Cyrenean odes, meaningfully linking all of Kyrana in *Pythian* 9, Arkesilas in *Pythian* 5, and Iason in *Pythian* 4.[189] The stumbling block is that there is no discernible semantic difference between the forms δύνασις and δύναμις, and no concrete reason to think that Pindar or his contemporaries were especially sensitive to the choice of one over the other.[190] In fact, there is good indication to the con-

185 Neer/Kurke 2019, 200, cf. 193, 203 (cf. already Burton 1962, 135–137). Gentili 1995b, 103–104 offers good reasons not to think that *Pythians* 4 and 5 were performed on the same or consecutive days. The same goes for other epinicians commissioned to celebrate the same victory: *Olympian* 1 and Bacchylides 5; *Olympians* 2 and 3; etc. The only odes for which we have some concrete reason to posit (re-)performance on the same occasion are *Isthmians* 3 and 4, which were composed not merely in celebration of the same patron (but for chronologically discrete victories in different disciplines), but also in the same metre (see further below, §§ 5, 7).

186 Neer/Kurke 2019, 197.

187 Braswell 1988, 81–82 "in spite of a certain superficial similarity of contexts, the use of ῥίζα at *Py*. 9.8 has nothing to do with the present instance [*sc*. *P.* 4.15]". As Braswell (*ibid*.) points out, *P.* 4.15 ῥίζα has a much closer parallel in Bacch. fr. 4.54 ῥίζας. Metaphorical uses of ῥίζα are common (*O.* 2.46, *I.* 8.56, fr. 94b.58; [Aesch.] *PV* 365).

188 *Pace* Neer/Kurke 2019, 201, 351 n. 26. Again, Braswell 1988, 116 calls it a "'natural' figure", citing *Il*. 21.286, Parm. 28 B1.22 D-K, Ar, *Th*. 955, A.R. 4.1663. Braswell's list of parallels is hardly exhaustive (cf. Braswell 1988, VIII); add e. g. Epicharm. fr. 211 *PCG*.

189 Neer/Kurke 2019, 203 "Pindar seems deliberately to have chosen this alternative form of the more common δύναμις to link together the three Cyrenean odes, to flag, as it were, his game of intertextual echoes".

190 On the lack of semantic difference, see Braswell 1988, 326 "Both Pindar and the other writers seem in fact to have used both δύνασις and δύναμις without any difference in meaning". Amphitryon marvels at the δύναμιν of Herakles (*N.* 1.57) just as Apollo and Aietes marvel at the δύνασιν respectively of Kyrana (*P.* 9.30) and Iason (*P.* 4.238).

trary. A marked and meaningful intratextual echo within *Pythian* 5 that Neer and Kurke themselves recognize is τὰν **θεόσ**δοτον **δύναμιν** (13) ~ **θεὸς** δέ οἱ … τελεῖ **δύνασιν** (117).[191] It is virtually inconceivable that Pindar simultaneously relied *both* on the difference between δύνασις and δύναμις being imperceptible within a single ode, i. e. intratextually, *and* on the difference between those two forms being significant so as to create a strongly marked intertextuality between *P.* 5.117 δύνασιν, *P.* 9.30 δύνασιν, and *P.* 4.238 δύνασιν. Moreover, while Neer and Kurke identify the expression μεγάλην δύνασιν (*P.* 9.30) as a significant phrase and intertext for *P.* 5.117 δύνασιν and *P.* 4.238 δύνασιν,[192] they ignore the same phrase, μεγάλην δύνασιν, at Bacchylides 10.49. We surely come closer to the truth in regarding μεγάλην δύνασιν as one of epinician's recurring epithet-noun pairings (see above, § 2.4); and there is little to recommend seeing the simple recurrence of solitary δύνασιν / δύναμιν (no perceptible semantic difference obtaining between the forms), which is far from being a rare word inside or outside epinician, as an intertextual echo across *Pythians* 4, 5, and 9.

Neer and Kurke's strongest case for an allusively intertextual relationship within the Cyrenean odes concerns *Pythian* 9 (for a victory of 478/474 BCE) and *Pythian* 5 (for a victory of 466/462 BCE). The argument centres on *Pythian* 5.49–62, narrating successively Karrhotos' chariot victory at Delphi (49–53) and Battos' arrival in Libya (57–62). Both of these mini-narratives of Karrhotos and Battos in *Pythian* 5 are argued to allude to the Kyrana-narrative of *Pythian* 9. The putative intertextuality would be meaningfully interpretable: the foundation narrative of Cyrene in *Pythian* 5 (featuring Battos and Apollo) is identified as being of a monarchist-historical bent, and hence as in an 'ideological opposition' to the aristocratically-coloured mythological foundation narrative of *Pythian* 9 that featured Kyrana and Apollo.[193]

In its detail, however, the argument again runs into significant problems. Karrhotos is supposedly associated with Kyrana by the echo *P.* 5.51 ἀταρβεῖ φρενί ~ *P.* 9.31 ἀταρβεῖ … κεφαλᾷ.[194] As we have seen, the mere recurrence of this epithet-noun pairing in itself does not constitute a case for intertextuality any more than *O.* 5.2 καρδίαι γελανεῖ and *P.* 4.181 θυμῶι γελανεῖ (above, § 2.4). Arkesilas' charioteer Karrhotos is, moreover, said by Neer and Kurke to resemble Kyrana, who, we are told, is "notably described as [a charioteer]" at *P.* 9.4.[195] In fact, the phrase in question, διωξίππου … Κυράνας (*P.* 9.4), characterizes the city

191 Neer/Kurke 2019, 202.
192 Neer/Kurke 2019, 203.
193 Neer/Kurke 2019, 168, 200–201.
194 Neer/Kurke 2019, 202.
195 Neer/Kurke 2019, 201.

(Cyrene), not the nymph (Kyrana: it is convenient to use transliteration to disambiguate), as notable for its chariot-racing prowess.[196] We are told that "the charioteer of Pythian 5 [*sc*. Karrhotos] appropriates the characteristic fearlessness of 'horse-driving' Cyrene".[197] This is again tendentious: while Karrhotos displays his 'fearlessness' (*P.* 5.51) *qua* charioteer, Kyrana displayed hers (*P.* 9.31) *qua* wrestler of lions, in a quite different narrative context from the spurious reference to her as a charioteer (*P.* 9.4), and removed from it by twenty-eight lines of narrative. The argument thus depends on an assumed motival link between Karrhotos and Kyrana (the latter erroneously being taken to be presented as a 'charioteer') and on a questionable verbal echo (ἀταρβεῖ φρενί ~ ἀταρβεῖ … κεφαλᾷ), which supposedly "cements the connection".[198] It should be emphasized that the verbal echo, even if it were granted, would still fail to link Karrhotos and Kyrana *as charioteers*; the verbal echo and the motival link, each problematic in its own right, do not pull in the same direction.

The argument that the Battos-narrative (*P.* 5.57–62) alludes to the Kyrana-narrative of *Pythian* 9 encounters similar problems. Neer and Kurke identify an intertextual echo in *P.* 5.59 γλῶσσαν … σφιν ἀπένεικεν ὑπερποντίαν ("[*sc*. Battos] returned to them [*sc*. the lions] a tongue from over the sea") and *P.* 9.52–53 μέλλεις ὑπὲρ πόντου / … ἐνεῖκαι ("you [*sc*. Apollo] are destined to carry her [*sc*. Kyrana] over the sea"). In their words, "Battos displaces the mythical [Kyrana] in his power to defeat lions, and Pindar's careful verbal repetitions underscore that transfer or substitution".[199] However, the verbal repetition would, again, not link Battos and Kyrana *qua* vanquishers of lions. The phrasing in question is used of Battos in the context of his lion-encounter in *Pythian* 5, and of Kyrana in *Pythian* 9 in the context of her removal by Apollo to Libya, twenty-one lines after the narration of her lion fight: the motival link and the verbal echo again would not not pull in the same direction. The existence, or at least the salience, of this verbal echo is also open to question. The phrase ὑπὲρ πόντου (*P.* 9.52) is unremarkable (compare also *P.* 2.68 ὑπὲρ … ἁλός, *N.* 7.65 ὑπὲρ ἁλός, just to stick to the epinician comparanda). The adjective ὑπερποντίαν (*P.* 5.59) was also, to

196 Compare *P.* 4.2 εὐίππου … Κυράνας, "Cyrene of splendid horses", and *P.* 4.7–8 εὐάρματον / πόλιν, "the city of splendid chariots", *sc*. Cyrene; see Giannini 1995b, 589; Braswell 1988, 60–61. The glide via relative pronoun from city to eponymous nymph at *P.* 9.4–5 is noted by the scholiast (schol. *P.* 9.6a) and paralleled at *P.* 9.73 and *O.* 6.28. The fact that the Cyreneans' dedicated a statue group at Delphi in the 460s BCE representing Kyrene (the nymph) as charioteer with Battos (Paus. 10.15.6; cf. Neer/Kurke 2019, 185–186) is irrelevant to the philological understanding of *P.* 9.4 διωξίππου … Κυράνας (or *P.* 4.2 εὐίππου … Κυράνας).

197 Neer/Kurke 2019, 202.

198 Neer/Kurke 2019, 201–202.

199 Neer/Kurke 2019, 202.

judge from the tragic evidence, not especially uncommon in fifth-century choral lyric; it is not obviously calculated to prime one to suspect an allusion.[200] More problematic still is the alleged echo ἐνεῖκαι (*P.* 9.53) ~ ἀπένεικεν (*P.* 5.59). In reality, this involves quite divergent linguistic usages (as the supposed echo *P.* 4.15 ἀστέων ῥίζαν ~ *P.* 9.8 ῥίζαν ἀπείρου, discussed above). In the former instance, ἐνεῖκαι denotes a literal act of 'carrying' (in a chariot: compare *P.* 9.6–6a ἔνεικε … δίφρωι). In the latter, with γλῶσσαν as its object, ἀπένεικεν involves a quite different figurative usage, whose meaning is not entirely clear; perhaps the simplest understanding is 'returned', 'answered', after the lions had roared first (implied in *P.* 5.57 βαρύκομποι, "loud-roaring").[201] In this figurative usage, the literal image of 'carrying' can have little prominence. We should compare the similar figurative usage at *O.* 9.41–42 φέροις … γλῶσσαν, "you should speak of" (literally, "you should bear your tongue to"), where no-one would insist on the salience of a literal image of 'carrying' the tongue.[202]

The one incontestable motival link between Battos and Kyrana consists in their encounter with lions (*P.* 5.57–59 and 9.26–28).[203] Yet Battos and Kyrana are far being from the only figures, even in epinician, to do battle with lions. There is also: Achilleus (*N.* 3.46), Herakles (Bacchylides 13.46–54, compare 9.9), and Peleus (with the metamorphosed Thetis: *N.* 4.62). The motif of the encounter with a lion is a prestige myth attached to numerous heroic figures both inside and outside epinician.[204] (Compare above, § 3.1, on the motif of the child threatened by snakes.) It is likely that both the legend of Battos routing lions and the

200 Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 41, *Ag.* 414; Soph. *Ant.* 785 (all lyric). The supposed echo of *P.* 9.52 would be completely elusive if *P.* 5.59 ὑπερποντίαν means not "beyond the sea" (i. e. "outlandish"), but "surpassing the sea" (*sc.* in volume, i. e. "loud"): so schol. *P.* 5.78b; Krummen 2014, 169 n. 5; cf. Paus. 10.15.7, where the sight of the lions causes Battos to "shout *loud and clear*" (βοῆσαι σαφὲς καὶ μέγα).

201 Compare *LSJ s. v.* ἀποφέρω II.1 and 2. For ἀπο- in compound verbs in the sense of 'back', 're-', see *LSJ s. v.* ἀπό D.4, and cf. ἀποκρίνεσθαι ('reply'), ἀποδιδόναι ('return', 'give back'), ἀποτίνειν ('repay'). However, there may well be (additionally / alternatively?) the suggestion that Battos was 'reporting' to the lions a prophecy received at Delphi foretelling his own colonization of Libya, as Didymus argued (in schol. *P.* 5.78a); ἀποφέρειν is almost a technical term for the 'reporting' of a prophecy (ταῦτα ὡς ἀπενειχθέντα ἤκουσαν [*sc.* οἱ δεῖνες] is a recurrent phrase in Herodotus for the reception of an oracle by a citizen body: 1.66.3, 1.158.1, 1.160.1). See also, differently, Slater 1969, 66s. v., translating "delivered himself of"; Race 1997, i.315 "conveyed to".

202 Neer/Kurke's (2019, 202) overliteral translation of *P.* 5.59, "[Battos] bore back a tongue", skates over the difficulty concerning the 'liveness' of the metaphor.

203 Cf. also Dougherty 1993, 147.

204 It was attached to various strong men of myth and history: Samson in the Hebrew Bible (*Judges* 14:5–6); Polydamas of Scotussa (Paus. 6.5.5): M.L. West 1997, 461; Currie 2005, 132.

myth of Kyrana fighting a lion predate Pindar.[205] The interrelationship of these two myths can be variously explained. It may be attributable to polygenesis, two independently-generated versions of a typical prestige myth.[206] Alternatively, the Battos-legend may have been modelled on the Kyrene-myth in pre-Pindaric Cyrenean myth-making.[207] Either way, the myths are likely to have been important in sixth- and fifth-century Cyrene prior to Pindar's adoption of them. It is not surprising if Pindar used them in two Cyrenean odes. His mere adoption of them in these two odes is not to count *eo ipso* as an allusion by the one poem to the other. This, in other words, may be a case where the parallel inheres in the mythology, rather than in the particular poetic shape that Pindar has given it (compare the earlier comments on doublets in Greek myth, § 3.0).[208]

4 The question of arbitrariness and prominence (salience)

The fundamental and recurring question in the foregoing concerns the appropriate weight to attach to particular alleged links. The point is not that it is not possible to make links, motival and/or verbal, between *Pythian* 5 and *Pythian* 9. The point, and the problem, is that it is too easy to do so. The crux is the quality of the links in question. It turns out that there are much stronger links between these poems and a number of other Pindaric epinicians. On the motival level, Kyrana's wrestling with a lion in *Pythian* 9 has a very much closer analogue in Achilleus' wrestling with lions in *Nemean* 3 (see above, § 3.0) than in Battos' routing of lions in *Pythian* 5. And on the verbal level, there are also much stronger echoes between

205 Pindar's elliptical account of Battos' encounter with the lions (*P.* 5.57–62) evidently assumes knowledge of a fuller version, essentially the same as that given by Pausanias (10.15.7). It is not known whether or not Kyrene's lion-fight, whether set in Thessaly or in Libya, featured in the (Pseudo-)Hesiodic' *Catalogue*; see M.L. West 1985, 86 and n. 125; Hirschberger 2004, 389. It is doubtful whether Kyrene's lion-fight was depicted on a limestone frieze of the Cyrenean treasury at Olympia from the first half of the 6th century BCE (*pace* Farnell 1930–1932, i. 138 and Fig. 10; see Köhnken 1985, 103 n. 82; *LIMC* VI.i *s.v.* "Kyrene" no. 14). A late-sixth-century BCE cup from Tarentum may depict Kyrene's lion fight (*LIMC* VI.i *s.v.* "Kyrene" no. 13; Giannini 1995b, 595–596). It is unclear whether a local Cyrenean (oral?) tradition situating Kyrene's lion fight in Libya (Acesander of Cyrene, *BNJ* 469 F4; Callim. *Hy*. 2.91) predated Pindar's *Pythian* 9 (so, M.L. West 1985, 86 and n. 125; Nieto Hernández 2015, 205–206; sceptically, R.L. Fowler 2013, 149).

206 Cf. Parisi Presicce 1998, 143, 147–149.

207 See Cosi 1987, 131–132.

208 Compare the earlier comments on doublets in Greek myth, § 3 (introduction).

Pythian 5 and other odes than *Pythian* 9. We may note, for instance, *P.* 5.10–11 μετὰ χειμέριον ... / ... μάκαιραν ἑστίαν ~ *I.* 4.17b-18 μάκαιραν ἑστίαν / ... μετὰ χειμέριον, which should probably be numbered among Pindaric epinician's non-allusive reprises (see above, § 2.5).[209] It is not clear how an audience or a reader is meant to filter out the interference of those other potential hypotexts in other poems, nor how they are to distinguish the non-allusive from the allusive reprise,[210] nor how they (and we) are to feel justified in privileging links between *Pythian* 5 and *Pythian* 9 over those with any number of other odes. We cannot simply beg the question of there being an intertextual relationship between two Cyrenean odes. The point of looking to this particular geographically cohesive group of odes in the first place was precisely to help establish a case for intertextuality between epinicians by considering the most *prima facie* promising examples (compare above, § 3.3).

The problem we have been facing us is of course a fundamental one for any study of an allusive intertextuality. It is the question of the markedness and meaningfulness, or salience and significance, of the purported echoes.[211] It is a problem that, in one guise or another, has dogged epinician scholarship for a long time. The remarks of Bill Race, made three decades ago, on *intratextual* verbal echoes in Pindar, are still fully relevant:

> ... these studies [*sc.* by Mezger, Fennell, Lefkowitz, and others] succeed in demonstrating the *existence* of numerous and various 'echoes' (Fennell lists over sixty in *Ol.* 1 alone), but the main problem that confronts the critic is determining their *significance*. Are they simply a feature of Pindar's exuberant use of language or are they serious indicators of meaning? Since there are so many instances, how can one determine which ones are significant and which not? Judging from the unconvincing attempts of the above-mentioned scholars (and many others) to discover meaning in such recurrences, one must conclude that the more the reins of rhetoric are slackened, the more easily exclusive concentration on 'echoes' of words, images, or ideas leads to run-away associationism.[212]

One decade ago, Douglas Cairns commented similarly about intratextual verbal echoes in Bacchylides:

> ... many such echoes are indeed of crucial thematic significance. This position is in no way undermined by the fact that there are patently cases for which no such claim can be made, for it is not recurrence *per se* that lends significance, but salient recurrence in a significant

209 Cf. Bundy 1962, 51.

210 Candidates for quasi-formulaic repetitions include *P.* 5.73 ἐπήρατον κλέος ~ *P.* 9.75 δόξαν ἱμερτάν, *P.* 5.12 ἀταρβεῖ φρενί ~ *P.* 9.31 ἀταρβεῖ ... κεφαλᾶι: see above, § 2.4.

211 See e. g. D.P. Fowler 2000, 118, 122–123; Currie 2016, 33–34.

212 Race 1990, 2.

> context (where the significance of the context may be established by the extent of its contribution to the argument of the ode or by its structural prominence or both) … By contrast, where there is no case to be made for salience or for the presence of a crucial idea, an echo is just that – repetition of sounds.[213]

Cairns and Race were talking about intratextual, not intertextual, verbal echoes; but what goes for the former will go *a fortiori* for the latter.[214]

Race's and, especially, Cairns' comments are emphatically not a counsel either of despair or of blanket scepticism towards intratextuality in epinician poetry. And in fact each of *Pythian* 9 and *Pythian* 5 admit strong cases for intratexual verbal echoes. Take, first, *Pythian* 9. Telesikrates' welcome in Cyrene in the here-and-now (71–75) clearly mirrors Kyrana's welcome in Libya in mythical time (55–58, compare 9–13). The motival parallel is strongly underscored by verbal echoes: 56–56a δέξεται … / πρόφρων (of Libya favourably receiving Kyrana, brought as Apollo's bride) ~ 73 εὔφρων δέξεται (of Kyrana herself favourably receiving Telesikrates, bringing his Pythian victory like a bride). These links are concentrated in the central third triad of the ode, spanning its strophe (Libya's reception of Kyrana) and its epode (Kyrana's reception of Telesikrates).[215] We can see something similar in *Pythian* 5. Arkesilas' blessed condition in his lifetime (5–24) is mirrored in the blessed posthumous condition enjoyed by his royal ancestors (107). That motival parallel is likewise underscored by verbal echoes: in particular, 20 μάκαρ ~ 94 μάκαρ and 15–16 βασιλεύς / ἐσσι· μεγαλᾶν ~ 97–98 βασιλέες … / ἐντι· μεγαλᾶν. These are tautometric echoes, spanning the first and last triads of the ode respectively. There is both identity of diction and parallelism in word-order, syntax, and the disposition of words over the metrical cola.[216] In each ode, *Pythian* 9 and *Pythian* 5, we have at least one strong motival link and a strong verbal echo; and in each case both of these pull in the same direction. The technique of ring composition, prevalent in archaic Greek poetry, primes the audience or reader to detect such intratextuality.[217] Detection of these echoes, moreover, conduces significantly to the appreciation and understanding of each ode, aiding the apprehension of the ode as both an aesthetic and a conceptual

213 Cairns 2010, 82.

214 Cf. also Slater 1977, 196 "The concept of cross-references has allowed its practitioners often to find interrelationships, sometimes purely verbal echoes, across poems without any regard at all to the argument", 199 "Echoes, cross references, overtones which cannot be anchored to the themes of argument are speculative and may lead to a subjectivism that thwarts the clear intention of the poet".

215 Dougherty 1993, 137–139; Giannini 1995a, 240.

216 Currie 2005, 247.

217 On Pindaric ring composition, see e. g. Illig 1932, 57–67; Braswell 1988, 35.

unity. Such cases for intratextuality seem compelling. They could very well, in theory, pave the way for the acceptance of comparably compelling cases of intertextuality between epinician odes. At the same time, however, they set the bar for such cases of intertextuality. We should not expect putative intertextual verbal echoes to be weaker (less marked or meaningful) than intratextual ones. Rather, we should expect them to be stronger, in proportion to the greater range at which they are obliged to act. The problem is that the motifs and phrases of *Pythian* 9 that Neer and Kurke would like to see mirrored in *Pythian* 5 must be allowed to have passed through a refracting prism quite unlike what we find in the cases of intratextuality just reviewed in those same odes. In their arguments for intertextuality, motifs and phrases from opposite ends of the Kyrana-narrative of *Pythian* 9 are concentrated in lines 49–62 of *Pythian* 5, but distributed there across two different figures, Karrhotos and Arkesilas; and phrases used literally in *Pythian* 9 (52–53 ὑπὲρ πόντου / … ἐνεῖκαι, *sc*. Κυράναν) reappear in a quite different, figurative, sense in *Pythian* 5 (59 ἀπένεικεν ὑπερποντίαν, *sc*. γλῶσσαν). Of course, there will always be stronger and weaker cases of intra- and intertextuality. But what is disconcerting here is that the cases considered throughout this section (*Olympian* 6 and *Nemean* 1 [§ 3.1], *Pythian* 8 and *Pythian* 1 [§ 3.2], and *Pythian* 5 and *Pythian* 9 [§ 3.3]) must apparently be regarded as among the strongest cases for an allusive intertextuality between epincians.[218]

The identification of allusions can never be an exact science,[219] and there is, inevitably, much subjectivity involved in ruling in or out a case for intra- or intertextuality, based on whether the echo is sufficiently or insufficiently marked and meaningful. At the same time, anyone who cares about intertextuality as "the phenomenon of meaningful connections between texts" (above, § 0) is absolutely required to rule in some connections and to rule out others; the alternative, to see all possible connections as equally meaningful, is effectively to see them all as equally meaningless. Yet it can be hoped that there is somewhat less subjectivity involved in *ranking* cases of intra- or intertextuality, based on their relative level of markedness and meaningfulness, than in ruling them in or out *tout court*. The implications of the preceding sections are that the strongest cases for intertextuality between epinicians should be ranked decidedly lower than the best cases for intertextuality between epinician and epic (above, § 1), as well as decidedly lower than the best cases for intratextuality within epinicians (§ 4). Put simply, the implications of the preceding sections are that epinician poetry seems to have been less invested in making intertextual allusions to other epinician poetry than

218 A further case involving *P*. 8.44–55 and *O*. 6.12–17 is discussed by Currie (forthcoming, b).
219 See e. g. Garner 1990, 1; Levene 2010, 99.

it was in making either intratextual allusions or intertextual allusions to hexameter poetry. This is emphatically not to say that there are *no* significant relationships between epinicians that we should be interested in exploring, for indeed there are (see below, § 8).

5 On (not) telling the same story again: epic, tragedy, comedy, and epinician

There is a macrolevel argument that tends to supplement and support the microlevel arguments of the preceding sections. One of the most obvious and fundamental forms of intertextuality in Greek poetry is to treat the same subject matter as a predecessor, but in a significantly different way.[220] This form of intertextuality appears to have been fundamental to archaic epic.[221] Thus the *Iliad* seems to treat the Achilleus story in a significantly different way to predecessors, if we are entitled to see, for instance, the Cyclical *Aethiopis* as giving an insight into these.[222] The *Odyssey* arguably treats the story of Odysseus' homecoming in a significantly different way to predecessors.[223] The same may also be true for smaller-scale hexameter compositions. The *Hymn to Demeter* may treat the rape of Persephone in a significantly different way to predecessors.[224] And Hesiod narrated Prometheus' deception of Zeus with significant differences in the *Theogony* and in the *Works and Days*, in a manner interpretable as allusion.[225]

This form of intertextuality was certainly fundamental to tragedy.[226] One may point to Aeschylus' *Choephori* and Euripides' and Sophocles' *Electra* plays. Or

220 Contrast, perhaps, historiography, where "[t]he most obvious way of indicating a link with a predecessor is to begin one's history where he had left off", Marincola 1997, 237; cf. Canfora 2011. However, historians, too, often treated the same subject matter as a predecessor (Marincola 1997, 112–117); for analyses of this, too, as 'intertextuality', see Occhipinti 2016, esp. 6–7 (the Oxyrhynchus Historian and Xenophon); Levene 2010, esp. 147–148 (Livy and Polybius).

221 The opposite phenomenon is also found: though arguably intertextual with the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* strenuously avoids narrative overlaps with it ('Monro's law'): e. g. Currie 2016, 71 and n. 198.

222 This position has been made plausible in particular by Homeric neoanalytical scholarship: see e. g. Burgess 2009, *passim*; Currie 2016, 55–72, with references to early scholarship.

223 See Danek 1998, *passim*; Currie 2016, 47–55.

224 Currie 2016, 79–104.

225 Most 1993, 89–90.

226 Ruffell 2011, 373 "within Greek tragedy there is substantial reworking of material within and between poets".

to Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes* and Euripides' *Phoenissae*. Or to the three *Philoctetes* plays (four, including Theodectas', in the fourth century, *TrGF* 72 F 5b). Or to the *Medeas* of Euripides and Neophron (and so on).[227] The tragedians also number themselves among their own illustrious predecessors, ripe for such intertextual engagement: so, for instance, with Sophocles' two *Oedipus* plays, or Euripides' two *Hippolytuses*.[228] The two *Telephus* plays of Sophocles and Iophon (among similar examples) suggest that tragedians' sons, or even their more distant descendants, were likewise given to engage in this way with the work of their illustrious (fore)fathers.[229] Intertextual engagement with the subject matter of one's predecessors is even more obviously a feature of Old Comedy. We may note, for instance, Aristophanes' *Frogs*' intertextual relationship with Eupolis' *Demes* (a comedy featuring a descent to the underworld to bring back a great statesman) and a host of other plays; and, of course, Aristophanes' own two *Clouds*, his two *Peace* plays, and so on.[230]

Fifth-century tragedy and comedy were in this sense cannibalistic, and so too, arguably, was archaic epic. Yet this most natural and obvious form of intertextuality is strikingly absent from epinician. Epinician poets, on the (very abundant) available evidence, strenuously *avoided* treating the same mythological subject matter in their extended narratives as either their epinician predecessors or themselves – even though they made a point of doing just this with their epic predecessors (above, § 1).[231] This is, admittedly, an argument from silence. But it is an argument from silence that carries real weight, since we do find significant overlap of mythical narratives once the non-epinician poems of Pindar and Bacchylides are factored in. Four examples suffice to make the point. First, Pindar's *Nemean* 7 and his *Paean* 6 (D6 Rutherford) both narrate the killing of Neoptolemos in Delphi. Second, Bacchylides' Ode 5 and Pindar's *Dithyramb* 2 (fr. 70b,

227 On Euripides and Neophron, see Wright 2016a, 41–45.

228 Hutchinson 2004, 26–28, esp. 28: "[the homonymous plays] are themselves one subset of a dense intertextuality in Greek tragedy, between an author's plays as well as beyond them". See also Seidensticker 1972; Torrance 2013, 288–292.

229 See Wright 2016a, 91–115, esp. 92.

230 See Wright 2012, 90–102, esp. 95, on *Frogs*: "The whole plot is recycled from a number of recent comedies on a similar theme"; and 97–98, on *Clouds*. See also Ruffell 2011, 361–426, esp. 368 (on "the drive of Old Comedy that leads poets to borrow, twist, and renovate devices from rivals and their own earlier performances"), 398–404, on homonymous plays, including *Peace* and *Clouds*.

231 Cf. e. g. I.C. Rutherford 2011, 112; Spelman 2018a, 16–17. There are pseudo-exceptions, such as the Bellerophon myth in *Olympian* 13 and *Isthmian* 7, and the Typhon myth in *Pythian* 1 and *Pythian* 8 (see above, § 3.2); but the latter of the two in each case does not amount to an extended mythological narrative.

together with fr. 249a and fr. dub. 346 S-M) both narrated Herakles' descent into the underworld and his encounter there with Meleagros' shade.[232] Third, Pindar's *Nemean* 1 and *'Paean'* 20 (S1 Rutherford) both narrate the newborn Herakles strangling the snakes.[233] Fourth, Pindar's *Hymn* 1 (fr. 33c-d) and *Paean* 7b (C2 Rutherford) both narrated how the island of Delos became stationary when Leto gave birth there.[234] Even in these cases, it is not clear that we should speak of intertextuality in the sense of specific allusion between the poems. But at least an obvious basis for an argument for a meaningful intertextual dialogue between, say, *Paean* 6 and *Nemean* 7 or between Pindar *Dithyramb* 2 and Bacchylides Ode 5 is given in a way that it is simply not between any two extant epincians.[235] The distribution seems very telling: we have a large number of well-preserved epinician extended mythical narratives, and only a relatively small number of well-preserved non-epinician extended mythical narratives. Yet we find no (significant) overlaps when the former group is considered in isolation, and several when both groups are considered together.[236] (An explanation for this finding will be suggested below, § 7.)

Whereas tragedy, comedy, and epic were autophagous, feeding voraciously on other works of the same genre, epinician was to all appearances heterophagous, feeding – in that kind of way – only on works of a different genre: epic. When the Pindaric laudator declares at *O.* 1.35, "I shall offer a different account from my predecessors", ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι, we have not the slightest reason to identify these predecessors as *epinician* poets.[237]

If intrageneric intertextuality was, indeed, not an essential feature of epinician poetry, as it apparently was of early hexameter poetry, tragedy, and comedy, then we should attempt to make sense of this finding. An explanation is not immediately apparent. Fifth-century epinicians were presumably sufficiently well known to both poets and public for specific allusion to have been made to

232 Cairns 2010, 84–86.

233 Prodi 2020, 15–19; cf. I.C. Rutherford 2001, 401.

234 I.C. Rutherford 2001, 370–372, cf. 251–252.

235 On the 'apology theory' (the theory that *Nemean* 7 offers a revision of the mythological narrative of *Paean* 6), see Currie 2005, 321–339; Spelman 2018a, 119–130. On Pindar *Dithyramb* 2 and Bacchylides 5, see Maehler 2004, 107–108; Cairns 2010, 86.

236 Spelman 2018a, 16 n. 6: "Genre seems important. The myths of *Nemean* 7 and *Paean* 6 … and also of *Nemean* 1 and fr. 52u … are far more similar than those of any two extant epinicians".

237 See Gerber 1982, 72, 122 (raising the possibility that [Pseudo-]Hesiod, among others, may have been meant); Howie 1983, 278 = 2012, 161–162; Catenacci 2013a, 369–370; cf. Most 2012, 286 and n. 52. The same goes for the identification of the πρό τεροι at *N.* 3.52 (see above, § 3), and of the παλαιό τεροι of *N.* 6.53–54.

them.[238] The poems presumably also had sufficient cultural standing to have been the object of allusion.[239] Epinician had aspirations to canonical status (*O.* 1.116, *I.* 4.40–45), and self-quotation by an epinician poet would have been one natural way of promoting this.[240] There is no blatant asymmetry in any of these respects between epinician, on the one hand, and tragedy and comedy, on the other. There is, however, notable asymmetry in two further respects: first, the presence or absence of performance rivalry; and second, the different consequences of a 'zero-sum' intrageneric poetic competition. It is to the evaluation of these two asymmetries that the next two sections (§§ 6–7) will be dedicated.

6 Performance rivalry and intrageneric intertextuality

Intrageneric performance rivalry constitutes a notable asymmetry between epinician, on the one hand, and tragedy and comedy, on the other.[241] Take Old Comedy first. There are indications of intertextuality between comedies that rubbed shoulders with each other at the same celebration of the same festival: Ameipsias' *Konnos* and Aristophanes' *Clouds* (two plays featuring Sokrates and philosophy) at the Dionysia of 423 BCE; Aristophanes' *Birds* and Phrynichus' *Monotropos* (two escapist plays) at the Dionysia of 414 BCE; Aristophanes' *Frogs* and Phrynichus' *Muses* (two plays featuring a contest of dead poets), at the Lenaia of 405 BCE.[242] Aristophanes and Cratinus also seem to have responded to each another's plays of the preceding year. Thus, to focus on just a segment of their apparent intertextual dialogue, Aristophanes' *Wasps* (Lenaia, 422 BCE) seems to be intertextual with Cratinus' *Pytine* (Dionysia, 423 BCE), which seems to have been intertextual in turn with Aristophanes' *Knights* (Lenaia, 424 BCE).[243] Emmanuela Bakola has described this as "one of the most fascinating cases of intertextual

238 For widespread knowledge of Pindar in the fifth century, see Irigoin 1952, 11–20; Carey 1995, 90; Hubbard 2004, 2011; Morrison 2007, 112, 117; Spelman 2018a, 39–43, 146, 230. Compare the poet's own aspirations: *O.* 9.21–25, *N.* 5.2–3.

239 On the question of epinician's cultural standing, note e. g. Agócs/Carey/Rawles 2012a, 3 "[Simonides and Pindar] became classics in their own lifetimes or only shortly after their death'. Compare also Carey 1995, 85 and n. 2; Currie 2005, 147 and n. 159.

240 Cf. Currie/Rutherford 2020, 4 with n. 9.

241 Cf. Revermann 2013, who speaks of "performance rivals" (similarly, "stage rivals").

242 Ruffell 2011, 396–398. For competition between comic poets at Athenian festivals (Lenaia, Dionysia) as a catalyst for intertextuality, see Biles 2011, 138, 156.

243 Biles 2011, 134–166; Ruffell 2011, 377–385; compare Bakola 2009, 16–29.

dialogue between authors which can be recovered in Greek literature".[244] Such performance rivalry could act either proximally or at a distance, so as to embrace performance of plays at the same iteration of the same festival, performance at a proximate iteration of a closely related dramatic festival (as in the sequence Lenaia 424 BCE – Dionysia 423 BCE – Lenaia 422 BCE), performance at some more remote iteration of a dramatic festival, and so on. Intertextuality here appears as a function of poetic competition, elastically conceived: comedies competed directly (i. e. for prizes) with other comedies that were performed at the same iteration of a festival. But there was also important indirect competition (better: rivalry) between numerous comedies of Aristophanes, Cratinus, and others that were not performed at the same iteration of a dramatic festival.

Performance rivalry is obviously as relevant to intrageneric intertextuality in tragedy as in comedy. We touched earlier (above, § 5) on tragedy's habit of revisiting the same mythological subject matter of previous plays. Let it suffice here to recall just a few striking examples of tragic intrageneric intertextuality.[245] Already our earliest extant tragedy, Aeschylus' *Persians* (first performed at the Dionysia of 472 BCE), exhibits striking intertextuality in its opening line with Phrynichus' *Phoenician Women*, with which it shared the same subject, produced four years earlier (476 BCE, presumably at the Dionysia).[246] The killing of Klytaimestra in Sophocles' *Electra* (1415–1416) alludes to the killing of Agamemnon in (Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1343–1345).[247] Electra's recognition *manqué* of Orestes in Euripides' *Electra* (518–546) is famously intertextual with Electra's recognition of Orestes in Aeschylus' *Choephori* (164–234).[248] There is sustained intertextuality between Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis* and Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*,[249] as there is between the former's *Phoenissae* and the latter's *Seven against Thebes*.[250] Euripides' *Philoctetes* (*TrGF* fr. 792) appropriates a line of Aeschylus' *Philoctetes* (*TrGF* fr. 253) with only a light rewriting.[251] This intertextuality is naturally interpreted

244 Bakola 2009, 4.

245 On intertextuality in Greek tragedy in general, see esp. Torrance 2013, *passim*, esp. 271–275; Wright (forthcoming).

246 Torrance 2013, 271–272; Wright 2016a, 23–24, Wright (forthcoming). That Aesch. *Pers*. was performed at the Dionysia emerges from the twin facts that it was part of a tetralogy (see the *Hypothesis* to the play) and that tragedians competed (perhaps only from *c*. 442 BCE) at the Lenaia with two plays.

247 Parry 1971b, 273; Easterling 2005, 30–31.

248 Gregory 2005, 267; Torrance 2013, 14–31.

249 Easterling 2005, 30; Torrance 2013, 159–161.

250 Gregory 2005, 267; Torrance 2013, 95–130.

251 Parry 1971b, 273 n. 10; Torrance 2013, 131–132.

as a form of diachronic competition, which complemented the literal synchronic competition between tragedies for a prize.[252]

Comedy, especially perhaps Aristophanic comedy, self-styled as τρυγῳδία, saw itself as being in a generically rivalrous relationship with τραγῳδία,[253] with which it was also contiguous in performance at the Athenian Dionysia and Lenaia.[254] That rivalry expressed itself in pervasive intertextuality and paratragedy.[255] The reverse phenomenon, tragic 'paracomedy', though less pervasive, may also be reckoned with.[256]

Performance rivalry, however, does not apply to epinician. Whatever the occasion was, for instance, of the première of *Olympian* 1 (say, a symposium in Syracuse), it was hardly the occasion for much, if indeed any, other epinician poetry.[257] Some odes may have been performed at the site of the games (e. g. *Olympians* 8 and 11 and Bacchylides 6 at Olympia).[258] But that was not the case even for

252 E.g. Scodel 2010, 27 "Sophocles and Euripides composed versions of *Electra* within a few years of each other, probably in direct response to a revival of Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*. They were obviously competing with each other, although scholars debate who was earlier, and both were competing against Aeschylus".

253 Jendza 2020, 72 and n. 110, with references. Aristophanes may have coined the term τρυγῳδία (Jendza, *ibid*.) and may have engaged in paratragedy more than other comic poets (Revermann 2013, 119 and n. 54, with references); for paratragedy in other comic poets, see, however, Farmer 2017, esp. 69, 71, 82, 235.

254 Jendza 2020, 3 "Certainly, the effect of paratragedy was heightened by the audience's sense of the proximity of tragedy, occurring year after year during the same festivals and in the same physical spaces as comedy". Cf. Seidensticker 2005, 49 "since the three genres [*sc*. tragedy, comedy, and satyr-play] were produced for the same festival, there can be no doubt that the writers and choral directors, actors, members of the chorus, and musicians knew one another and not only followed the rehearsals and performances of their immediate competitors with great interest, but also kept an eye on the contiguous genres. It seems to me to go without saying that the great dramatists of the fifth century, who inhabited the same reasonably small space and competed against one another year after year, also discussed playwriting and production with one another. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that mutual influences can occasionally be detected".

255 The phenomenon is studied by esp. Farmer 2017, *passim*.

256 Seidensticker 2005, 51–53; esp. Jendza 2020, *passim*. Perhaps a feature especially of Aristophanes and Euripides, Jendza 2020, 10. Specific allusion was not an essential feature of the interaction of tragedy with comedy, presumably because the higher genre was fastidious about acknowledging its association with the lower: cf. D. L. 4.10 (Jendza 2020, 6–8, 13–14, 266–267). But exceptions must be admitted. So, for instance, Eur. *Antiope* fr. 188.1–4 *TrGF* may have alluded to Ar. *Banqueters* fr. 232 *PCG* (Wright, forthcoming); see Jendza 2020, 220–246 for other possible examples (involving Eur. *Antiope*, among others).

257 For *Olympian* 1 as performed at a symposium in Syracuse, see Krummen 2014, 241, cf. 326. Differently, Currie 2011, 303 n. 140, mooting performance at Olympia.

258 See Currie 2011, 301–305 (with references in 304 n. 142). Eckerman 2012 is sceptical, and Lattman 2017, 135 is dismissive of this possibility.

the majority of odes that celebrated Olympic victories (e. g. *Olympians* 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, Bacchylides 3 and 5), let alone those for victories at other games. Shared occasions of performance are conceivable for victory odes of members of the same family or for members of the same civic community.[259] We can readily suppose that *Isthmians* 3 and 4 (if these are indeed separate poems) for Melissos of Thebes were (re)performed on the same occasion, perhaps with other epinicians for the Kleonymidai.[260] Likewise for *Nemean* 4 for Timasarchos of Aegina and an earlier epinician for Timasarchos' uncle, Kallikles.[261] And we can imagine both *Pythian* 1 for Hieron and *Nemean* 1 for Chromios being (re)performed at the Aitnaia festival.[262] But, in general, occasions for premières and reperformances of epinicians, whether at symposia or public festivals, can only ever have accommodated a tiny proportion of the whole epinician corpus.[263] There are, in other words, no conceivable specific occasions or venues where the whole corpus of epinician poetry,

259 For certain families seeing to the composition and/or performance of epinicians for family members, see Currie 2017, 200 n. 67. For a city-state as taking an interest in the performance of epinicians for its citizens, see Currie 2004, 63–69. Probably Bacch. 6 refers to all epinician odes for Cean Olympic victors (taking 6 Ὀλυμπίᾳ with 7 κρατεῦ[σαν], rather than with 6 ἄεισαν) as being performed publicly at their première in Ceos by a chorus of young men (for 14 προδόμοις ἀοιδαῖς of songs performed 'in public', compare *P.* 2.18–19, with Currie 2005, 268–269, 272); but whether the same festival occasion is envisaged is unclear. Clear 2013 speculates that *P.* 6 was reperformed at the première of *I.* 2.

260 Other epinicians for the Kleonymidai: see *I.* 4.27; cf. Spelman 2018a, 50. *I.* 3 and *I.* 4 as separate poems: e. g. Privitera 1982, 43–45; Krummen 2014, 41 n. 2; Spelman 2018a, 48 n. 13. For their possible performance on same occasion, see Currie 2004, 62–63; †Barrett 2007, 166–167 (more agnostically). See further below, § 7.

261 Currie 2004, 59–62; 2017, 195–200. Morrison 2010, 242 also speculates that *Nemean* 5 and Bacchylides 13 (for Pytheas) were performed at the same occasion.

262 Currie 2005, 17–18; 2011, 274–275. Schol. *N.* 1.7b states that "Hieron's associates [produced and] sang the epinicians that were composed for victories in the stephanitic games at the festival of Zeus Aitnaios". This rather sweeping statement that need be based on no more than the reasonable inference from the texts of *N.* 1 and *P.* 1 that these odes were performed at the Aitnaia. The notion that *P.* 2 was composed for first performance at the Aitnaia (Ferrari 2012, 163–167) is dubious even if one accepts the identification of τὸ Καστόρειον (69) with Pind. fr. 105 Maehler, on which see Currie 2005, 258; Morgan 2015, 174; Wilson 2019, 302–303, 330–331 (the last in favour of the identification). Meister 2019, 378 suggests that "the odes for Hieron [specifying *O.* 1, *O.* 6, *P.* 1, *P.* 2, *P.* 3, *N.* 1, and Bacch. 3] were reperformed back to back at the festival of Zeus Aetnaeus" (cf. Morgan 2015, 114–15, with n. 108); but there is no evidence for this, and no reason to think of only one performance venue for these poems (cf. Wilson 2019, 331). The festival of Demeter and Kore (cf. *O.* 6.95; Wilson 2019, 328–239) is a plausible occasion for the performance of Bacch. 3 (Currie 2005, 386; 2011, 274). However, it would not materially affect the argument of the main text even if all the odes for Hieron were (re)performed at the Aitnaia (though then hardly 'back to back', all on a single occasion).

263 On occasions for epinician reperformance, see Currie 2004, 2017.

or even more than a very small portion of it, was performed, either synchronically or diachronically. There was certainly competition between epinician poets (see *O.* 1.8–11, 115–116; *P.* 1.45; *N.* 9.54–55; *O.* 2.86–88).[264] But it was different in kind from that between epic poets or tragic poets or comic poets: they competed for commissions and for prestige, but did not compete, directly or indirectly, with one another at festival competitions (not *qua* epinician poets, at least: Pindar and Bacchylides did, of course, compete with each other *qua* dithyrambic poets).[265]

This is emphatically not to make performance rivalry into anything like a necessary condition of intrageneric intertextuality in fifth-fourth century BCE Greece (any more than for intergeneric rivalry: see above, § 1.9). That model would founder (again: see § 1.9) on fifth-fourth-century historiography: Thucydides' history shows significant intertextuality with Herodotus',[266] as does in turn Xenophon's *Hellenica* with Thucydides'.[267] However, such historiographical intertextuality is most naturally regarded as a purely writerly phenomenon.[268] (It might just conceivably be related to the fact that the historians are likely to have presented their work orally in the same kind of competitive performative situations.[269]) The aim here, however, is not to account for *all* intrageneric intertextuality as being an expression of performance rivalry. What is being suggested is a much weaker thesis: that, where the literary works of this period were primarily received in performance at circumscribed venues and occasions, performance rivalry can have acted as a significant spur to intertextuality. In the case of epinician, that spur will have been absent.

7 The shared interests of poets and patrons: a possible embargo on epinician intrageneric intertextuality

Another conspicuous asymmetry between tragedy and comedy, on the one hand, and epinician, on the other, is the presence of an individual patron, in whose

264 Cf. Spelman 2018a, 236–243; Molyneaux 1992, 268–270; Catenacci 2013c, 50–53, esp. 52.
265 On schol. *O.* 9.74b (Drachmann i.285), mentioning a "judge" in a contest between Simonides and Pindar, see Molyneaux 1992, 262 (differently, D'Angour 2011, 102–103).
266 E.g. Rood 1999; Stadter 2012.
267 E.g. Rood 2004.
268 E.g. Kapellos 2019, 4–5.
269 See Canfora 2011, 370–375; Stadter 2012, 39, 42–43.

praise epinician poetry was commissioned.[270] This obvious fact is capable of making a large difference to the dynamics of intrageneric intertextuality in the various genres.

In general, intrageneric intertextuality lends itself to being competitively conceived, as a 'zero-sum' game, whereby the hypertext enriches itself at the expense of the hypotext.[271] Intertextuality between tragedies has plausibly been viewed as an exercise in "intertextual capping".[272] Likewise, intertextuality between comedies has been seen as a "capping game", as "going one better", or as a "comparative and competitive" exercise.[273] Paratragedy, comedy's intertextuality with tragedy, which is somehow intermediate between intergeneric and intrageneric intertexuality, has been similarly described as "aggressive", "[seeking] to devalue the object of appropriation".[274] In the context of epinician poetry, intrageneric intertextuality is typically also conceived in such terms. Morrison suggests that "Theron and Hieron were engaged in some form of 'capping' competition, where the grandiose claims of one victory ode had to be matched or surpassed in the next".[275] Neer and Kurke describe the intertextual echoes they find between *Pythian* 5 and *Pythian* 9 as being "competitive" and "contestatory".[276]

270 This statement can be variously qualified, but its essential truth is not in question; for comparison and contrast in the roles played by patronage and poetic commission in epinician, tragedy, and comedy, see Bremer 1991; for sceptical treatment of the issue of the epinician poet's 'commission' and 'fee', see Pelliccia 2009, 241–247; Bowie 2012b; cf. Morgan 2015, 115–119.

271 So e. g. Revermann 2013, 105–106; cf. Marincola 1997, 14–15. Less popular is the conception of intrageneric intertextuality as 'homage' (e. g. Wright 2016a, 17 and n. 59). Exceptional, rather than normal, is the *Anacreontea*'s "continuous cooperation of imitator and model, in which both sides work for the greater glory of Anacreon" (Rosenmeyer 1992, 72). On intrageneric intertextuality in historiography, cf. Moles 1993, 100 "the ancient historian's characteristic stance towards his predecessors is one of disparagement", "Thucydides' imitation of Herodotus … must partly convey homage to an acknowledged master, yet it is obvious that rivalry is also important"; Clarke 2018, 17 "the competitive one-upmanship in which Herodotus engages" (*sc*. with Hecataeus).

272 Torrance 2013, 114, 129–132. Cf. Scodel 2010, 27 "the tragedians competed … to create versions of the old stories that were more exciting, more plausible, more relevant, or more profound".

273 Ruffell 2002, 142,154, cf. 162 "put-down, or come-back".

274 Revermann 2013, 105–106.

275 Morrison 2007, 85. Morrison 2007, 86 argues for "association, rather than contradiction of another ode's content or praise". However, it is hard to imagine epinician patrons appreciating this difference. If Pindar suggests that *Hieron's* ambitions have been realized in fact by *Theron* (Morrison 2007, 86, on *O*. 1.106–110 and *O*. 2.53–54), then that is a zero-sum competition, in which Theron goes one better than Hieron.

276 Neer/Kurke 2019, 200, 201. See above, § 3.3.

This picture of intrageneric epinician intertextuality is, however, far from straightforward. It is one thing for one tragic or comic (or epic) poet to 'cap' the work of another or his own earlier work: we may allow a Euripides or an Aristophanes to do this kind of thing *ad nauseam*. It is another thing for a patron who has commissioned an encomiastic poem to see his praises outdone in a poem for another patron in such a zero-sum competition. Epinician patrons may be taken to have been keenly interested in an ode's afterlife (see e. g. *O.* 11.4–6, *I.* 4.37–45, etc.), where this was a matter of the continuance of the ode in performance or its perpetuation on the lips or in the memory of men.[277] It is hard to imagine their taking much delight in the ode's reception in other epinician poetry, when this was a matter of its being capped, competed with, or contested by newer and brasher compositions. Epinicians could, of course, happily outdo their forerunners in length, complexity, extravagance, and expense (the outsize *Pythian* 4 invites interpretation as an attempt to surpass other epinicians). They could also happily make superlative claims for the virtues and achievements of individual patrons (e. g. *O.* 1.104–105, *O.* 2.91–95, *P.* 1.49, *P.* 2.59–61, Bacchylides 3.63–66). But there is never any suggestion of their doing this to the calculated detriment of certain specific others, who had for their part also commissioned epincian poetry.[278] This would take them, and us, uncomfortably close to the zero-sum conception of envy that is so persistently decried in epinician.[279] The problem is that privately-commissioned epinician differed from publicly-commissioned epic, tragedy, and comedy in that the laudable ἔρις between poets (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 26) – or of a single poet with his own earlier work – here quickly blurs into the reprehensible φθόνος towards a patron to whom, rather, unstinting praise was owed (*I.* 1.41–46, *I.* 5.22–25, *N.* 7.64, *N.* 8.48–49, *N.* 9.6–7). In 422 BCE, the Amphipolitans repurposed their monuments of Hagnon for the ven-

277 Cf. Spelman 2018a, 14, 43.

278 Note, Rawles 2013, 196–197, on the early fifth-century BCE Timocreon, 727 *PMG*: "this is praise as … a zero-sum game, where naming a winner involves rejecting losers", "praising Aristeides and denigrating Themistocles go together". It is hard even to imagine an epinician analogue (including in Simonides' lost epinician output) for this kind of thing (e. g. praising Theron by denigrating Hieron).

279 For the 'zero-sum' conception of envy, see Most 2003, 125–126. For envy decried in epinician, see esp. Bacch. 5.187–190, cf. 3.67–68, 13.199–200; Pind. *I.* 2.43–45, *P.* 2.89–90, *P.* 7.18–19, *N.* 8.21–22, *I.* 1.41–45, *I.* 5.22–25. Note e. g. Goldhill 1990, 139 "Pindar's poetic voice is constituted against the possibility of others' envious slander, and the discourse of gratitude, friendship, hospitality and requirement … forms a context of praise where the positive construction of a community and necessity of praise is in constant tension with the exclusion and deprecation of this *phthonos* of others". There is also the Pindaric insight that envy is the mark of success (Most 2003, 138–139); but this is very far from legitimizing an envious, begrudging attitude towards epinician patrons.

eration of their new patron-hero, Brasidas (Thucydides 5.11.1); for an epinician poet to plunder a victory ode for one patron (a poetic 'monument' supposedly immune to the ravages of time, *P.* 6.7–14) for the greater exaltation of another patron would be an equivalent act of bad faith. The institution of epincian poetry as well as the credentials of the individual commissioned poet were at risk here. Thus the mutual interests and understanding of epinician poets and their patrons could conceivably have led to something like an implicit embargo on (competitive, zero-sum) intertextuality between epinicians. In the light of these considerations, it would make good sense if the recycled expressions of epinician were regarded not as the marked property of an original epinician context from which they were then pilfered[280] in some zero-sum intertextual game, but instead as the generic property of the poetic tradition at large or as the stock-in-trade of the particular poet (compare above, §§ 2.1–2.5). Conversely, it would make sense for that which *was* seen as the distinctive property of a particular poet or patron (for instance, a particular extended mythical narration) to be treated as taboo and to be left well alone by other epinicians – though not, significantly, by poems in *other* genres in which Pindar and Bacchylides composed (paeans, dithyrambs) that were *not* commissioned to the glory of an individual patron (see above, § 5).

These considerations would lose their force if intrageneric intertextuality in epinician were non-competitively conceived: that is, as a positive-sum, rather than a zero-sum, transaction. However, it will not work to suggest that intertextuality between epinicians aimed to present one patron merely as being as good as another (rather than as going one better).[281] Even such to us eirenic-seeming comparisons would be bound to raise the hackles of a typical epinician patron, let alone the more megalomanic (the likes of Hieron or Theron). However, it would be possible to take a positive-sum conception of inter-epinician intertextuality with, for instance, *Isthmians* 3 and 4 (taking these to be two distinct odes).[282] These odes were not merely performed in the same city-state and for the same patron (which is also true for, for instance, *Pythians* 4 and 5); they also share, uniquely within the epinician corpus, the same metre and, conceivably, the same (re)performance context.[283] *Isthmian* 4, demonstrably the earlier poem, states that the "ancient repute" of the Kleonymidai (4) has fallen into oblivion (19–29, especially 22 φάμαν παλαιάν). *Isthmian* 3, the sequel, states, 'but you know of the ancient

280 The standard ancient conception of allusions as 'thefts' is documented by Nelson (forthcoming).

281 Cf. Morrison 2007, 86.

282 For *Isthmians* 3 and 4 as distinct odes, see above, § 6.

283 See above, § 6.

repute of Kleonymos for chariots' (15–16 ἴστε μὰν Κλεωνύμου / δόξαν παλαιὰν ἅρμασιν). The phrase ἴστε μάν, "but you know" occurs in Pindar only in these two odes (*I.* 4.35, *I.* 3.15), and its recurrence can be meaningfully interpreted.[284] In *Isthmian* 4, the phrase ἴστε μάν was used to introduce the story of Aias, made famous by Homer and the rhapsodes. In that poem, the laudator aspired to do the same for his Kleonymid victor, Melissos (43–45). By attaching the same phrase to the laudator's ancestor Kleonymos, *Isthmian* 3 could be argued to imply the realization of that aspiration, intimating that *Isthmian* 4 has by now been successful in bringing the fame of the Kleonymidai out of oblivion.[285] These echoes would not be 'contestatory', but confirmatory of the earlier poem. In other words, the situation would be positive-sum, not zero-sum. We may recognize φάμαν παλαιάν (*I.* 4.22) and δόξαν παλαιάν (*I.* 3.16) as one of epinician's recurrent noun-epithet pairings (see above, § 2.4).[286] But here a case for intertextuality can be made that would not rest on the mere recurrence of the quasi-formulaic phrase. Here the phrase is used with the selfsame reference, of the fame of the descendants of Kleonymos for chariot-racing (*I.* 4.4, 14, 25–29; *I.* 3.15–16). The putative allusive intertextuality would clearly be meaning-enhancing (*sinnstiftend*) for the poem which alludes. This case involving putative intertextuality between *Isthmians* 3 and 4 needs to be acknowledged as exceptional within the epinician corpus: we have here a case both where intertextuality must be conceived as positive-sum, and where the adoption of the same metre indicates with strong probability a relationship between the two poems, and perhaps points to their contiguity in performance. This is an exceptional case, therefore, which still seems to operate within the 'rules' which have been argued in this study to pertain to intertextuality between epincians.

8 Conclusions

The conclusions of this paper pertain both to the understanding of intertextuality in epincian and to the understanding of intertextuality in early Greek poetry more generally. Let us start with the former. Contrary to what is assumed in much recent Pindaric scholarship, we have seen reason to think that epinician poetry was not very much invested in intertextuality with other epinician poetry (§§ 2–3). We have explored certain factors that would be capable of accounting for such

284 The isolated recurrence is not in itself a telling fact; see above, § 2.4.
285 See Spelman 2018a, 50–51, for this as the ambition of *Isthmian* 4.
286 Cf. also *P.* 9.105 παλαιὰν δόξαν ἐῶν προγόνων.

a situation (§§ 6–7). The apparent lack of interest in intrageneric intertextuality between epinicians contrasts with epinician's apparently very strong – and arguably inherited – interest in intergeneric intertextuality with hexameter poetry (§ 1) and with its interest in intratextuality (§ 4). It contrasts, too, with tragedy's and comedy's interest in intrageneric intertextuality, with other tragedy and with other comedy respectively (§§ 5–7).

We have investigated two possible reasons for the apparent dearth of intrageneric intertextuality in epinician. The first consisted in the absence of a strong incentive to intertextuality in early Greek poetry in general: namely, performance rivalry. The second consisted in the presence of a powerful disincentive to intertextuality specifically between epinicians composed for different patrons: the undesirability of making patrons' praises subject to a zero-sum competition. If – counterfactually – it had been the case that epinician poetry had been strongly exposed to a performance rivalry in the way that tragedy and comedy were, then presumably there would have been a certain pressure on epinician poets likewise to engage in intrageneric intertextuality; that not being the case, we may assume they were glad to steer clear of it and of the problems that, for this poetic genre, it would have brought with it.

None of this is to suggest that epinicians were oblivious of one another. On the contrary, epinicians must have been, in important ways, very keenly aware of other epinicians. Yet the consciousness of the wider epinician oeuvre expressed itself typically in something more akin to traditional referentiality than to specific allusion.[287] (Consideration of the fragmentary remains of Simonides' epinician output would not be likely to change the picture.)[288] Thus we find constant repetition of and variation on the numerous 'formulas', 'commonplaces', or standard 'motifs' of the epinician genre.[289] Somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, a keen consciousness of the wider epinician oeuvre must also be recognized precisely in the epinician policy of studied avoidance of the same metrical schemes, of the

287 For the concept of 'traditional referentiality' in connection with early Greek epic poetry, see esp. Foley 1999; Kelly 2007.

288 On the question of possible allusions of Pindar to Simonides (or vice-versa?), see Molyneaux 1992, 271–272; Rawles 2018, 133, 140, 153.

289 See e. g. Bundy 1962, e. g. 39 "This ... shows us how a poet's repertoire of formulae and themes, and hence the tradition in which he employs them, suffers modification and change", 92 "If my analysis is correct, it seems apparent that in this genre the choice involved in composition is mainly a choice of formulae, motives, themes, topics, and set sequences of these that have, by convention, meanings not always easily perceived from the surface denotations of the words themselves" (an excellent description of 'traditional referentiality' *avant la lettre*!).

same subject mythological matter (for extended narratives), and also, often, of the exact same phraseology for the expression of the same ideas.[290]

This still leaves us very much at liberty to see interaction, complementarity, or antagonism between epinician odes in respect of the way in which they respond to the particular circumstances of their commission. Arguably, we find pointedly different conceptions of 'freedom' being championed in the pro-Deinomenid *Pythian* 1 (line 61), performed at Aitna under the rule of Hieron's son Deinomenes in *c*. 474 or 470 BCE, and in the arguably post-Deinomenid composition *Olympian* 12 (lines 1–2), taking this ode to have been performed at 'democratically' governed Himera, in *c*. 466 BCE.[291] *Olympian* 1 and Bacchylides 5 have been argued to take pointedly complementary approaches to the celebration of Hieron's Olympic victory of 476 BCE.[292] The recurrence in odes for Hieron of the motif of rescue from the pyre (*P.* 3.38–46, Bacchylides 3.53–61) and of the Kroisos-exemplum (*P.* 1.94, Bacchylides 3.23–62), and their different deployment in the respective odes, presumably says something about how the different epinician poets chose to respond to Hieron's concerns.[293] The Cyrenean odes *Pythian* 9 (a private aristocratic commission, of the 470s BCE) and *Pythians* 4 and 5 (pro-Battiad / royal commissions of the 460s BCE) take complementary approaches to Cyrene's myth-history.[294] We can, and no doubt should, read these, as well as other, poems against each other. However, our ability to do this does not depend on the detection of fine-grained intertextuality between the odes, arguments for which, as we have seen, tend to mire the interpreter in difficulties of various kinds.

Other arguments of this paper pertain to the understanding of intertextuality in early Greek poetry more generally. In particular, the paper has explored in

290 Race 1990, 187 "in constructing a particular poem, Pindar is also keenly aware of his other poems … while he often says essentially the same thing, he never says it in precisely the same way"; similarly, Spelman 2018a, 16. For qualifications of this point, see above, §§ 2.3, 2.4, 2.5.

291 On 'freedom' in the context of *P.* 1, see Pfeijffer 2005, 37–40; Morgan 2015, 338–340, 346. On 'freedom' in the context of *O.* 12, dated to *c*. 466 BCE, see Barrett 1973, 28–35, where note esp. Diod. 11.72.3 (on the establishment of a cult of Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος at a post-Deinomenid Syracuse in the 460s BCE), and compare Hdt. 3.142.2 (a cult of Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος on a post-Polykrates Samos). Differently, dating *O.* 12 to *c*. 470 BCE and seeing a pro-Hieron reference in both *P.* 1.61 and *O.* 12.1–2, see Catenacci 2013e, 288–289; Nicholson 2016, 240–253.

292 Morgan 2015, 253–259.

293 Thus we are not obliged to see the recurrence of these motifs as allusions (of Bacch. 3 to *P.* 1 and *P.* 3), *pace* Catenacci 2013c, 50–51; cf. Currie 2005, 381; Morgan 2015, 355. In the case of Kroisos, it is hard to see how the interpretation of Bacch. 3 (of *c*. 468 BCE) could be said to gain in significance from a supposed allusion to the exceedingly fleeting reference made to Kroisos in *Pythian* 1 (of *c*. 474/470 BCE).

294 Cf. Neer/Kurke 2019, 168; Agócs 2020, 88.

some detail the possible role played by performance rivalry in catalyzing intertextuality throughout the sixth and fifth centuries BCE. The attempt to understand epinician intertextuality both synchronically and diachronically has also opened up perspectives on intertextuality in the earliest attested Greek poetry, epic. It is unclear what precise occasions we are to envisage for the performance of Homeric and other early epic.[295] However, whatever the occasions were, they must have served for much other epic poetry. This much is implied by the *Hymn to Apollo* 169–170 and 173, where the Delia festival is taken for granted as a venue for multiple poems by multiple epic singers. There will have been direct competition (for prizes) between epic singers performing on the same occasion. This state of affairs is explicitly attested by Hesiod, at the funeral games for Amphidamas (*Works and Days* 657).[296] But there was also indirect competition between singers performing at different iterations of the same festival. This is indicated by *Hymn to Apollo* 169–170, "who in your eyes is the sweetest of the singers who frequents here?" (*sc*. Delos, on the occasion of the Delia festival).[297] The presence and nature of intertextuality in early hexameter poetry are, of course, hotly contested.[298] It can be said, however, that this kind of institutionalized, competitive performative context would have been conducive to intertextuality between early hexameter compositions in the early Archaic period.[299]

It has recently been maintained, by Adrian Kelly and subsequently by Kirk Ormand, that a fully-fledged intertextuality in Greek poetry emerged only in the course of the sixth century BCE, either with Stesichorus' lyric epic (Kelly) or with the (Pseudo-)Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (Ormand).[300] On the one hand, the argument has an *a priori* component: a previously oral Greek poetic culture is argued to need time to become textualized, and hence intertextual.[301] On the other hand, it relies on an argument from silence: the lyric poets before Stesichorus are claimed not to evidence the kind of fine-grained intertextuality with the hexameter corpus that we can see in Stesichorus or the *Catalogue of Women*. This latter

295 On the occasions for the performance of early Greek epic, see e. g. West 2011 (1999), 425–426; Taplin 2000, 18–28; Sbardella 2012, 10–15; Tsgalis 2018.

296 Aristot. fr. 76 Rose[3] (*apud* Ps.-Plut. *On Homer* 1.4) has Homer going to compete in a musical contest at the Kronia festival in Thebes.

297 In verses spuriously ascribed to Hesiod, Hesiod and Homer are apparently envisaged as vying (competing?) with each other in the composition of 'new' hymns to Apollo at the same iteration of the Delia festival ([Hes.] fr. dub. 357 M-W).

298 For discussions of the prospects of intertextuality in early Greek epic, see e. g. Danek 2002; Burgess 2006; Schein 2016; Currie 2016; Kelly 2012.

299 Cf. Martin 1989, 227; Martin 2020 (2001), 207–208, 211 ("performance interaction").

300 Kelly 2015; Ormand 2017.

301 Cf. Burgess 2004, 12–13 and n. 48.

argument from silence is problematic. In the first place, it is not apparent why the negative testimony of the very meagre remains of seventh-sixth century lyric should be accorded more weight than the positive evidence claimed by scholars who would see intertextuality in the much more abundantly-attested hexameter corpus: the Homeric and Hesiodic poems and the *Hymns*.[302] In the second place, the evidence of the lyric poetry of the seventh-sixth century is contestable.[303] Even if it is possible to be sceptical about an intertextual relationship between Alcaeus fr. 44.6–8 Voigt and *Iliad* book 1,[304] it is hard even for the ultra-sceptic or die-hard oralist to explain the relationship between Alcaeus fr. 347 Voigt and Hesiod, *Works and Days* 582–88 otherwise than in terms of a fully-fledged intertextuality.[305]

It is, however, the *a priori* assumption made by Kelly and Ormand that calls particularly for our attention here. The assumption that an increased familiarity with written texts on the part of poets leads to intertextuality has an obvious, but perhaps only specious, plausibility. It is not obvious why Stesichorus or the sixth-century BCE should be a watershed, given that there was no significant reading public for poetry until perhaps some one hundred and fifty years later. Moreover, we do not know how long the process of textualization was under way before our textual record begins. It is unknown how long Greek epic poetry had been written before the composition of the *Iliad*.[306] Likewise unclear is how long before that the Greek epic tradition had been operating with a concept of what we might call oral fixed texts.[307] Above all, an increasing familiarity with written

302 E.g. K. Usener 1990; R.B. Rutherford 1991–1993; Most 1993; Schein 2016; Danek 2002; Richardson 2007; Olson 2012, 16–24, 279–280; Maravela 2015; Currie 2016. See also Thomas 2011 and 2020, esp. 13–20 for important arguments concerning the intertextuality between *HPan* and *HHerm* and *HHerm* and *HAp* (but the alluding works may in these cases date to the fifth century BCE).

303 For possible intertextuality – as early as the mid-seventh century BCE – between Archilochus and the Homeric poems, see Swift 2019, 21–22 (and the Hesiodic poems: *ibid*. 23–24).

304 Kelly 2015, 25–26. Differently, Davies/Finglass 2014, 35 and n. 200.

305 This case is not discussed by Kelly 2015. See R.L. Fowler 1987, 37–38; Bing 2009, 154 n. 12; Bowie 2012a, 118–119; Hunter 2014, 123–126; Budelmann 2018, 18, 110–111; differently, Martin 2020 (1992), 275–276 for Hesiod and Alcaeus as "draw[ing] independently on a store of related phrases and themes".

306 There is no need to place the *Iliad* (and *Odyssey*) at the start of Greek literacy, with e. g. Burkert 1987, 43 "the fact that these compositions apparently come right at the beginning of Greek literacy …". 'Nestor's Cup' (*CEG* no. 454) provides a *terminus ante quem*, placed variously in the range *c*. 740–715 BCE, for written Greek epic texts: see Immerwahr 1990, 19; Wachter 2012, 77. A dating of the *Iliad* in the seventh century BCE increasingly appears more plausible than one in the eighth; see, recently, Finkelberg 2020, 374.

307 Ready 2019, 15–74.

poetic texts (one assumes, in the sixth century BCE, more on the part of poets than their wider public) is not the only significant conceivable catalyst of intertextuality: we have seen that performance rivalry is another. Performance rivalry between epic singers is at least as old as our earliest extant hexameter poetry, given its pithily epigrammatic attestation at Hesiod, *Works and Days* 26 ("singer vies with singer"); compare, too, the competition between singers that Hesiod himself attests at Amphidamas' funeral games, *Works and Days* 654–657).[308]

In sum, we are obliged to recognize the complexity of the picture of intertextuality in early Greek poetry – in particular, the availability of various factors capable of promoting, and others of suppressing, it. We must reckon with a complex interplay between performative and written-literary factors. It cannot simply be taken as a given that an increasing use of written texts supports intertextuality, while a performance culture limits it. Performance rivalry, a notable feature of the performance culture, has the clear potential to promote intertextuality between performed poetic works. Another reason not simply to construct written texts and performance culture as friend and foe respectively of intertextuality is that both are manifestly capable of working together to foster intertextuality. It would be entirely possible to see, for instance, Old Comedy's intertextuality with comedy and tragedy as being both motivated by performance rivalry (see above, § 6) and as being taken to a greater level of sophistication owing to the existence of an elite reading public.[309] Such a scenario would also be conceivable, though likewise unprovable, for epinician poetry.[310] Another complication concerns the relationship between formularity and intertextuality: there can be no crude inverse correlation between these two. On the one hand, although hexameter poetry is typically heavily formulaic, that does not entail that intertextuality must be excluded from it.[311] On the other hand, although epinician is a highly literary poetic form[312] (one that engages in sophisticated and extensive intertextuality with hexameter poetry[313] in a manner that has been compared with Alexandrian poetry),[314] a global intertextuality (encompassing, specifically, intertextuality with other epinician poetry) should not for that reason be written into it.

308 Ercolani 2010, 131.

309 See Wright 2012, 146–147, for Old Comedy's "'target' audience of bibliophiles". Cf. D.P. Fowler 1989, 257–258.

310 See Spelman 2018a, 40–43, for Pindar's elite fifth-century readers.

311 E.g. Bakker 2013, 157–169.

312 As emphasized recently by M.L. West 2011; Maslov 2015; Spelman 2018a.

313 Cf. Most 2012, 258, 259 (cited above, § 1.1).

314 Spelman 2018a, 211; cf. Pfeijffer 1999b, 60; M.L. West 2011, 66.

Although far removed from oral-formulaic composition,[315] epinician constantly recurs to quasi-formulaic and topical expressions that tend to discourage interpretation as specific allusion. If it makes sense at all to speak of there being an "evolution" of intertextual poetic dynamics in extant early Greek poetry,[316] then we can hardly think of it as being steadily linear: there is no inexorable march towards greater textualization and therefore increasing intertextuality in Greek poetry throughout the Archaic and Classical periods. Nor should it occasion great surprise to find the poetic genres behaving differently from one another in the practice of intertextuality. It involves only a mild paradox to suggest that we have reason to be receptive to the possibility of intertextuality between epic poems of the eighth-seventh centuries BCE (when, from a purely chronological point of view, we should have expected it less) and, conversely, to be sceptical of intertextuality between epinicians in the fifth century BCE (when from a chronological perspective we should have expected it more).

Acknowledgements: Versions of this paper were delivered in Cambridge and Nijmegen in 2018; I am grateful to the audiences of those occasions, to the journal's referees, and to Bob Fowler and Henry Spelman for various feedback, suggestions, and corrections.

Abbreviations

BDAG	W. Bauer/F.W. Danker/W.F. Arndt/F.W. Gingrich (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature,* 3rd ed., Chicago 2000.
Bernabé	A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae epici Graeci*, I, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1987, 2nd ed. 1996; II fascc. 1–3, Munich-Leipzig 2004–2007.
CEG	*Carmina epigraphica Graeca*, ed. P.A. Hansen, I–II, Berlin 1983–1989.
CPG	*Corpus paroemiographorum Graeci*. I, *Paroemiographi Graeci: Zenobius, Diogenianus, Plutarchus, Gregorius Cyprius*. *Cum appendice proverbiorum*, ed. E.L. von Leutsch/F.G. Schneidewin, first published Göttingen 1839; reprinted, Cambridge 2010.
Diehl	Diehl, E. (ed.), *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, I–III, Leipzig 1949–1952.
D-K	H. Diels/W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, I–III, 6th ed., Berlin 1951.
Drachmann	A.B. Drachmann (ed.), *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, I–III, Leipzig 1903–1927.
IEG	*Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, ed. M.L. West, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1992.

315 E.g. Parry 1971a, 166–167, see § 2.4.
316 Cf. Kelly 2015, 24.

Janko	R. Janko (ed.), *Philodemus On Poems Books Three and Four With the Fragments Of Aristotle On Poets*, Oxford 2010.
LSJ	H.G. Liddell/R. Scott/H.S. Jones/R. Mackenzie (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., Oxford 1940.
PCG	*Poetae comici Graeci*, I–VIII, ed. R. Kassel/C. Austin, Berlin 1983–2001.
PMG	*Poetae melici Graeci*, ed. D.L. Page, Oxford 1962.
RE	*Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa *et al.*, I–XXIV, Stuttgart 1894–1980.
TrGF	*Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, I–V, ed. B. Snell/S.L. Radt/R. Kannicht, Göttingen 1971–2004.

Bibliography

Adorjáni, Z. (ed.) (2014), *Pindars sechste olympische Siegesode: Text, Einleitung und Kommentar*, Leiden-Boston.

Agócs, P. (2020), "Pindar's *Pythian* 4: Interpreting History in Song", in: C. Constantakopoulou/M. Fragoulaki (eds.), *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (*Histos Suppl.* 11), 87–154.

Agócs, P./Carey, C./Rawles, R. (2012a), "Introduction", in: Agócs/Carey/Rawles (eds.), 1–16.

Agócs, P./Carey, C./Rawles, R. (eds.) (2012b), *Receiving the Komos: Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (*BICS Suppl.* 112), London.

Allen, G. (2011), *Intertextuality*, 2nd ed., London-New York.

Andersen, Ø./Haug, D.T.T. (eds.) (2012), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Cambridge.

Arnson Svarlien, D. (1995), "Reversal of Imagery and Values in Bacchylides 3 and 5", in: *QUCC* 50, 35–45.

Asheri, D. (2007), "Book III", in: D. Asheri/A. Lloyd/A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV*, Oxford, 379–527.

Bagordo, A. (2003), *Reminiszenzen früher Lyrik bei den attischen Tragikern: Beiträge zur Anspielungstechnik und poetischen Tradition. Zetemata 118*, Munich.

Bakker, E.J. (2013), *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey*, Cambridge.

Bakola, E. (2009), *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*, Oxford-New York.

Bakola, E./Prauscello, L./Telò, M. (eds.) (2013), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*, Cambridge.

†Barrett, W.S. (2007), "Two Studies in Pindaric Metre", in: †W.S. Barrett, *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers*, ed. M.L. West, Oxford, 118–206.

Biles, Z.P. (2011), *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition*, Cambridge.

Bing, P. (2009), *The Scroll and the Marble. Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor.

Bing, P. (2012), "A Proto-Epyllion? The Pseudo-Hesiodic Shield and the Poetics of Deferral", in: M. Baumbach/S. Bär (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*, Leiden, 177–197.

Biondi, F (2015), *Teagene di Reggio rapsodo e interprete di Omero*, Pisa-Rome.

Bowie, E.L. (2012a), "Wandering Poets, Archaic Style", in: R.L. Hunter/I.C. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Panhellenism*, Cambridge, 105–136.
Bowie, E.L. (2012b), "Epinicians and 'patrons'", in: P. Agócs/C. Carey/R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge, 83–92.
Bowie, E.L./Athanassaki, L. (eds.) (2011), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (*TCSV* 10), Berlin-Boston.
Bowra, C.M. (1964), *Pindar*, Oxford.
Braswell, B.K. (1988), *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, Berlin-New York.
Braswell, B.K. (1998), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*, Berlin-New York.
Bremer, J.M. (1991), "Poets and their Patrons", in: H. Hofmann/A. Harder (eds.), *Fragmenta dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeshichte*, Göttingen, 39–60.
Budelmann, F. (2018), *Greek Lyric: A Selection*, Cambridge.
Bundy, E. (1962), *Studia Pindarica*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.
Burgess, J.S. (2001a), *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*, Baltimore.
Burgess, J.S. (2001b), "Coronis Aflame: The Gender of Mortality", in: *CPh* 96, 214–227.
Burgess, J.S. (2004), "Performance and the Epic Cycle", in: *CJ* 100, 1–23.
Burgess, J.S. (2006), "Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference", in: *Oral Tradition* 21/1, 148–189.
Burgess, J.S. (2009), *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*, Baltimore.
Burkert, W. (1972), *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge, MA.
Burkert, W. (1987), "The Making of Homer in the 6th Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichorus", in: D. von Bothmer *et al.* (eds.), *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World*, Malibu, 43–62 (Repr. in: *Kleine Schriften*. I, *Homerica*, Göttingen 2001, 198–217).
Burnett, A.P. (2005), *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aegina*, Oxford.
Burton, R.W.B. (1962), *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford.
Cairns, D.L. (ed.) (2010), Bacchylides, *Five Epinician Odes (3, 5, 9, 11 13)*, Cambridge.
Cannatà Fera, M. (ed.) (2020), Pindaro, *Le Nemee*, Milan.
Canfora, L. (2011), "The Historical 'Cycle'", in: J. Marincola (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography*, Oxford, 365–388 (Trans. of Canfora, L. (1971), "Il ciclo storico", in: *Belfagor* 26, 653–670).
Carey, C. (1980), "Bacchylides Experiments: Ode 11", in: *Mnemosyne* ser. IV, 33, 225–243.
Carey, C. (1981), *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, New York.
Carey, C. (1995), "Pindar and the Victory Ode", in: L. Ayres (ed.), *The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical Traditions*, New Brunswick, 85–103.
Carey, C. (2012), "The Victory Ode in the Theatre", in: P. Agócs/C. Carey/R. Rawles (eds.), *Receiving the Komos: Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (*BICS Suppl.* 112), London, 17–36.
Carey, C. (2015), "Stesichorus and the Epic Cycle", in: Finglass/Kelly (eds.), 45–62.
Carruesco, J. (2017), "The Invention of Stesichorus: Hesiod, Helen, and the Muse", in: E.J. Bakker (ed.), *Authorship and Greek Song: Authority, Authenticity, and Performance*, Leiden, 178–196.
Catenacci, C. (2013a), "*Olimpica* prima. Commento", in: B. Gentili/C. Catenacci/P. Giannini/L. Lomiento (eds.), Pindaro, *Le Olimpiche*, Milan, 355–389.
Catenacci, C. (2013b), "*Olimpica* terza. Commento", in: B. Gentili/C. Catenacci/P. Giannini/L. Lomiento (eds.), Pindaro, *Le Olimpiche*, Milan, 415–431.

Catenacci, C. (2013c), "*Olimpica* seconda. Introduzione", in: B. Gentili/C. Catenacci/P. Giannini/L. Lomiento (eds.), Pindaro, *Le Olimpiche*, Milan, 45–59.
Catenacci, C. (2013d), "*Olimpica* prima. Introduzione", in: B. Gentili/C. Catenacci/P. Giannini/L. Lomiento (eds.), Pindaro, *Le Olimpiche*, Milan, 9–21.
Catenacci, C. (2013e), "*Olimpica* dodicesima. Introduzione", in: B. Gentili/C. Catenacci/P. Giannini/L. Lomiento (eds.), Pindaro, *Le Olimpiche*, Milan, 287–291.
Cazzaniga, I. (1975), "Per Nicandro Colofonio la Titanomachia fu opera autentica di Esiodo?", in: *RIL* 109, 173–180.
Cingano, E. (1985), "*Clistene di Sicione*, Erodoto e i poemi del ciclo tebano", in: *QUCC* 20, 31–40.
Cingano, E. (1995), "*Pitica* I. Introduzione", in: B. Gentili/E. Cingano/P. Giannini/P.A. Bernardini (eds.), Pindaro, *Le Pitiche*, Milan, 9–23.
Cingano, E. (2009), "The Hesiodic Corpus", in: F. Montanari/A. Rengakos/C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden, 91–130.
Clarke, K. (2018), *Shaping the Geography of Empire: Man and Nature in Herodotus' Histories*, Oxford.
Clay, J.S. (2011), "*Olympians* 1–3: A Song Cycle?", in: E. Bowie/L. Athanassaki (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (*TCSV* 10), Berlin-Boston, 337–345.
Clear, R. (2013), "Family, Duty, and Expectation: A Case for the Joint Performance of Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 and *Pythian* 6", in: *Mnemosyne* 66, 31–53.
Coffee, N. (2013), "Intertextuality in Latin Poetry", in: *Oxford Bibliographies*. https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195389661/obo-9780195389661-0113.xml. Accessed 20.07.2020.
Cosi, D.M. (1987), "Jammed Communication: Battos, the Founder of Cyrene, Stammering and Castrated", in: M.G. Ciani (ed.), *The Regions of Silence: Studies on the Difficulty of Communicating*, Amsterdam, 116–144.
Cozzoli, A.-T. (1996), "Aspetti intertestuali nelle polemiche letterarie degli antichi: da Pindaro a Persio", in: *QUCC* 54, 7–36.
Csapo, E./Wilson, P. (2015), "Drama Outside Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC", in: *TiC* 7/2, 316–395.
Currie, B.G.F. (2004), "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes", in: C. Mackie (ed.) *Oral Performance and Its Context: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* V, Leiden-Boston-Cologne, 49–69.
Currie, B.G.F. (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford.
Currie, B.G.F. (2010), "L'*Ode* 11 di Bacchilide: il mito delle Pretidi nella lirica corale, nella poesia epica, e nella mitografia", in: E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali. Generi poetici e storiografia*, Alessandria, 211–253.
Currie, B.G.F. (2011), "Epinician *choregia*: Funding a Pindaric Chorus", in: Bowie/Athanassaki (eds.), 269–310.
Currie, B.G.F. (2016), *Homer's Allusive Art*, Oxford.
Currie, B.G.F. (2017), "Festival, Symposium, and Epinician (Re)performance: The Case of *Nemean* 4 and Others", in: R.L. Hunter/A. Uhlig (eds.), *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture: Studies in the Traditions of Drama and Lyric*, Cambridge, 187–208.
Currie, B.G.F. (2018), "Pindar and Bacchylides", in: K. de Temmerman/E. van Emde Boas (eds.), *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume Four*, Leiden-Boston, 293–314.

Currie, B.G.F. (2019), "The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and Narratological Intertextuality", in: S. Bär/A. Maravela (eds.), *Narrative, Narratology and Intertextuality: New Perspectives on Greek Epic from Homer to Nonnus* (*SO* 93), 157–188.
Currie, B.G.F. (forthcoming a), "Typhoeus and Etna in Hesiod, Pindar, and 'Aeschylus'", in: E.E. Prodi/S. Vecchiato (eds.), *Phaidimos Hektor*, Venice.
Currie, B.G.F. (forthcoming b), "Pindar and Bacchylides", in: M. de Bakker/I.J.F. de Jong (eds.), *Speech in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume five*, Leiden-Boston.
Currie, B.G.F. (forthcoming c), "Theogonic Allusions in the *Iliad*".
Currie, B.G.F./Rutherford, I.C. (2020), "The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext", in: B.G.F. Currie/I.C. Rutherford (eds.), *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext. Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song,* V, *Mnemosyne Suppl.* 430, Leiden-Boston, 1–36.
D'Alessio, G.B. (1995), "Una via lontana dal cammino degli uomini (Parm. frr. 1+6 D-K; Pind. *Ol.* VI 22–27, *pae*. VIIb 10–20)", in: *SIFC* 13, 143–181.
D'Alessio, G.B. (2005a), "The *Megalai Ehoiai*: A Survey of the Fragments", in: R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 176–216.
D'Alessio, G.B. (2005b), "Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry", in: R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 217–238.
D'Alessio, G.B. (2015), "Theogony and Titanomachy", in: Fantuzzi/Tsagalis (eds.), 199–212.
D'Angour, A. (2011), *The Greeks and the New: Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience*, Cambridge.
Danek, G. (2002), "Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality", in: F. Montanari/P. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero tremila anni dopo*, Rome, 3–19.
Davies, M. (2014), *The Theban Epics*, Cambridge, MA.
Davies, M./Finglass, P.J. (eds.) (2014), Stesichorus, *The Poems*, Cambridge.
Debiasi, A. (2004), *L'epica perduta: Eumelo, il Ciclo, l'occidente* (*Hesperìa* 20), Rome.
Debiasi, A. (2008), *Esiodo e l'Occidente* (*Hesperìa* 24), Rome.
Dornseiff, F. (1921), *Pindars Stil*, Berlin.
Dougherty, C. (1993), *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*, Oxford-New York.
Easterling, P.E. (1984), "The Tragic Homer", in: *BICS* 31, 1–8.
Easterling, P.E. (1988), "Tragedy and Ritual: "Cry 'Woe, woe', but may the good prevail!'", in: *Métis* 3, 87–109.
Easterling, P.E. (2005), "*Agamemnon* for the Ancients", in: F.P. Michelakis/E. Hall/O. Taplin (eds.), *Agamemon in Performance 458 BC to AD 2004*, Oxford, 23–36.
Eckerman, C. (2012), "Was Epinician Poetry Performed at Panhellenic Sanctuaries?", in: *GRBS* 52, 338–360.
Ercolani, A. (ed.) (2010), Esiodo, *Opere e Giorni*, Rome.
Fantuzzi, M./Tsagalis, C. (2015), "Introduction: *Kyklos*, the Epic Cycle and Cyclic Poetry", in: Fantuzzi/Tsagalis (eds.), 1–40.
Fantuzzi, M./Tsagalis, C. (eds.) (2015), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
Fantuzzi, M. (2015), "The Aesthetics of Sequentiality and its Discontents", in: Fantuzzi/Tsagalis (eds.), 405–429.

Farmer, M.C. (2017), *Tragedy on the Comic Stage*, Oxford.
Farmer, M.C. (2020), "Theopompus' Homer: Paraepic in Old and Middle Comedy", in: *CPh* 115, 339–364.
Farnell, L.R. (1930–1932), *The Works of Pindar*. I, *Translation in Rhythmical Prose with Literary Comments*; II, *Critical Commentary*, London.
Fearn, D. (2007), *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford.
Fenik, B. (1968), *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*, Wiesbaden.
Ferrari, F. (2012), "Representations of Cult in Epinician Poetry", in: P. Agócs/C. Carey/R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge, 158–172.
Finglass, P. (ed.) (2007), Pindar, *Pythian Eleven*, Cambridge.
Finglass, P.J./Kelly, A. (eds.) (2015), *Stesichorus in Context*, Cambridge.
Finkelberg, M. (2020), "Homer at the Panathenaia: Some Possible Scenarios", in: M. Finkelberg, *Homer and Early Greek Epic: Collected Essays* (*TCSV* 89), Berlin 2020, 365–374 (first published in: C. Tsagalis/A. Markantonatos (eds.), *The Winnowing Oar – New Perspectives in Homeric Studies. Studies in Honor of Antonios Rengakos*, Berlin 2017, 29–40).
Foley, J.M. (1999), *Homer's Traditional Art*, University Park, PA.
Ford, A. (2003), "From Letters to Literature: Reading the 'Song Culture' of Classical Greece", in: H. Yunis (ed.), *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge, 15–37.
Fowler, D.P. (1989), "Taplin on Cocks", in: *CQ* 39, 257–259.
Fowler, D.P. (2000), "On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies", in: D.P. Fowler, *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*, Oxford 115–137 (first published in: *MD* 39, 1997, 13–34).
Fowler, R.L. (1987), *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*, Toronto.
Fowler, R.L. (2013), *Early Greek Mythography.* II, *Commentary*, Oxford.
Garner, R. (1990), *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*, London-New York.
Gennette, G. (1997), *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, Lincoln NE-London (Translation of *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*, Paris 1982).
Gentili, B. (1958), *Bacchilide: studi*, Urbino.
Gentili, B. (1995a), "*Pitica* III. Introduzione", in: Gentili/Cingano/Giannini/Bernardini (eds.), 75–84.
Gentili, B. (1995b), "*Pitica* IV. Introduzione", in: Gentili/Cingano/Giannini/Bernardini (eds.), 103–111.
Gentili, B./Cingano, E./Giannini, P./Bernardini, P.A. (eds.) (1995), Pindaro, *Le Pitiche*, Milan.
Gerber, D.E. (1982), *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*, Toronto.
Gerber, D.E. (1987), "Pindar's *Olympian* Four: A Commentary", in: *QUCC* 25.1, 7–24.
Gerber, D.E. (1999), "Pindar, *Nemean* Six: A Commentary", in: *HSCPh* 99, 33–91.
Giannini, P. (1995a), "*Pitica* IX. Introduzione", in: Gentili/Cingano/Giannini/Bernardini (eds.), 233–240.
Giannini, P. (1995b), "*Pitica* nona. Commento", in: Gentili/Cingano/Giannini/Bernardini (eds.), 587–620.
González, J.M. (2013), *The Epic Rhapsode and His Craft: Homeric Performance in a Diachronic Perspective*, Cambridge MA-London.
Graziosi, B. (2002), *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*, Cambridge.
Gregory, J. (2005), "Euripidean Tragedy", in: *J.* Gregory (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Malden, MA, 251–270.

Griffith, M. (1978), "Aeschylus, Sicily, and Prometheus", in: R.D. Dawe/J. Diggle/P.E. Easterling (eds.), *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry Presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday*, Cambridge, 105–139.
Griffith, M. (ed.) (1999), Sophocles, *Antigone*, Cambridge.
Halliwell, S. (2000), "The Subjection of Mythos to Logos: Plato's Citations of the Poets", in: *CQ* 50, 94–112.
Henry, W.B. (ed.) (2005), *Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection*, Munich-Leipzig.
Herington, J. (1984), "Pindar's Eleventh *Pythian* Ode and Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*", in: D.E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, Chico, 137–146.
Herington, J. (1985), *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*, Berkeley.
Hinds, S.E. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
Hirschberger, M. (2004), *Gynaikōn katalogos und Megalai ēhoiai: ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen*, Munich.
Howie, J.G. (1983), "The Revision of Myth in Pindar *Olympian* 1: The Death and Revival of Pelops (25–27, 36–66)", in: *PLLS* 4, 277–313. Reprinted in: J.G. Howie, *Exemplum and Myth, Criticism and Creation: Papers on Early Greek Literature*, Prenton 2012, 161–190.
Hubbard, T.K. (2004), "The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts", in: C. Mackie (ed.) *Oral Performance and Its Context: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* V, Leiden-Boston-Cologne, 71–93.
Hubbard, T.K. (2011), "The Dissemination of Pindar's Non-Epinician Choral Lyric", in: Bowie/Athanassaki (eds.), 347–363.
Hummel, P. (1999), *L'épithète pindarique: Étude historique et philologique*, Bern.
Hunter, R.L. (2014), *Hesiodic Voices. Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days*, Cambridge.
Hutchinson, G.O. (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*, Oxford.
Hutchinson, G.O. (2004), "Euripides' Other *Hippolytus*", in: *ZPE* 149, 15–28.
Huxley, G. (1975), *Pindar's Vision of the Past*, Belfast.
Illig, L. (1932), *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung: Interpretationen und Untersuchungen*, Berlin.
Immerwahr, H.R. (1990), *Attic Script: A Survey*, Oxford.
Indergaard, H. (2010), "Thebes, Aegina and the Temple of Aphaia. A Reading of Pindar's *Isthmian* 6", in: D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry. Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford, 294–322.
Instone, S. (ed.) (1996), Pindar, *Selected Odes*, Warminster.
Irigoin, J. (1952), *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris.
Itsumi, K. (2009), *Pindaric Metre: The Other Half*, Oxford.
Janko, R. (1986), "The *Shield of Heracles* and the Legend of Cycnus", in: *CQ* 36, 38–59.
Jebb, R.C. (ed.) (1905), Bacchylides, *The Poems and Fragments*, Cambridge.
Jendza, C. (2020), *Paracomedy: Appropriations of Comedy in Greek Tragedy*, Oxford.
Kapellos, A. (2019), *Xenophon's Peloponnesian War*, Berlin-Boston.
Kelly, A. (2007), *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII*, Oxford.
Kelly, A. (2012), "The Mourning of Thetis: 'Allusion' and the Future in the *Iliad*", in: F. Montanari/A. Rengakos/C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (*TCSV* 12), Berlin-Boston, 221–265.

Kelly, A. (2015), "Stesichorus' Homer", in: Finglass/Kelly (eds.), 21–44.
Kirkwood, G.M. (1982), *Selections from Pindar*, Chicago.
Köhnken, A. (1985), "*Meilichos orga*. Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der neunten pythischen Ode Pindars", in: A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare*, Geneva, 71–116.
Kozák, D. (2012), "λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος ἔχω (*legomenon de touto proterōn epos echō*): Literary Tradition in Pindar's *Nemean* 3 and Statius' *Achilleid*", in: P. Agócs/C. Carey/R. Rawles, *Receiving the Komos: Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (*BICS Suppl.* 112), London, 73–92.
Kraus, C. S. (1991), "Λόγος μέν ἐστ' ἀρχαῖος (*Logos men est'archaios*): Stories and Story-Telling in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*", in: *TAPA* 121, 75–98.
Krischer, T. (1985), "Pindars achte Pythische Ode in ihrem Verhältnis zur ersten", in: *WS* 98, 115–124.
Kristeva, J. (1980), *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, New York (Translations from *Σημειωτική (Sēmeiōtikē): Recherches pour une sémanalyse*, Paris 1969 and *Polylogue*, Paris 1977).
Krummen, E. (2014), *Cult, Myth, and Occasion in Pindar's Victory Odes: A Study of Isthmian 4, Pythian 5, Olympian 1, and Olympian 3*, Prenton (Translation by J.G. Howie of *Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-traditionelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation*, Berlin-New York 1990).
Kurke, L. (1990), "Pindar's Sixth *Pythian* and the Tradition of Advice Poetry", in: *TAPA* 120, 85–107.
Kurke, L. (2013), "Pindar's *Pythian* 11 and the *Oresteia*: Contestatory Ritual Poetics in the 5th c. BCE", in: *CA* 32, 101–175.
Kyle, D.G. (1992), "The Panathenaic Games: Sacred and Civil Athletics", in: J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Princeton, 77–101.
Kynes, W. (2013), "Intertextuality: Method and Theory in Job and Psalm 119", in: K.J. Dell/P.M. Joyce (eds.), *Biblical Interpretation and Method: Essays in Honour of John Barton*, Oxford, 201–213.
Lattmann, C. (2017), "Pindar's Voice(s): The Epinician Persona Reconsidered", in: N. Slater (ed.), *Voice and Voices in Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston, 123–148.
Levene, D.S. (2010), *Livy on the Hannibalic War*, Oxford.
Lohmann, D. (1970), *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*, Berlin.
Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1987), *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford.
Maehler, H. (ed.) (1997), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*. II, *Die Dithyramben und Fragmente: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Leiden.
Maehler, H. (ed.) (2004), Bacchylides, *A Selection*, Cambridge.
Mann, R. (1994), "Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths", in: *GRBS* 35, 313–337.
Maravela, A. (2015), "Demeter 'Nods' to Aphrodite? Narrative Interactions between the 'Homeric' *Hymn to Aphrodite* and the *Hymn to Demeter*", in: *Gaia* 18, 157–172.
Marincola, J. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge.
Martin, R.P. (1989), *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca, NY.
Martin, R.P. (2020), "Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics", in: R.P. Martin, *Mythologizing Performance*, Ithaca NY-London, 259–284 (first published in: *Ramus* 21.1, 1992, 11–33).
Martin, R.P. (2020), "Rhapsodizing Orpheus", in: R.P. Martin, *Mythologizing Performance*, Ithaca NY-London, 205–216 (first published in: *Kernos* 14, 2001, 23–33).
Maslov, B. (2015), *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature*, Cambridge.
Meister, F.J. (2019), "Hieron and Zeus in Pindar", in: *CPh* 114, 366–382.

Merkelbach, R./West, M.L. (eds.) (1967), *Fragmenta Hesiodea*, Oxford.
Moles, J.L. (1993), "Truth and Untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides", in: C. Gill/T.P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Exeter, 88–121.
Molyneaux, J.H. (1992), *Simonides: A Historical Study*, Wauconda, IL.
Morgan, K.A. (2015), *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford-New York.
Morrison, A.D. (2007), *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*, London.
Morrison, A.D. (2010), "Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality", in: D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*, Oxford, 227–253.
Morrison, A.D. (2011), "Pindar and the Aeginetan *patrai*: Pindar's Intersecting Audiences", in: L. Athanassaki/E.L. Bowie (eds.), *Choral Song*, Berlin-New York, 299–321.
Morrison, A.D. (2012), "Performance, Re-performance and Pindar's Audiences", in: Agócs/Carey/Rawles (eds.), 111–133.
Most, G.W. (1993), "Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality", in: G. Arrighetti/F. Montanari (eds.), *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*, Pisa, 73–92.
Most, G.W. (2003), "Epinician Envies", in: D. Konstan/N.K. Rutter (eds.), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy*, Edinburgh, 123–142.
Most, G.W. (ed.) (2006), Hesiod, *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, Cambridge, MA.
Most, G.W. (2012), "Poet and Public: Communicative Strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides", in: P. Agócs/C. Carey/R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge, 249–276.
Nagy, G. (1996), *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*, New York.
Nagy, G. (2010), *Homer the Preclassic*, Berkeley.
Nagy, G. (2015), "Pindar's Homer Is Not 'Our' Homer", in: *Classical Inquiries*, https://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/pindars-homer-is-not-our-homer/ [accessed 26.10.2020].
Neer, R.T./Kurke, L. (2019), *Pindar, Song, and Space: Towards a Lyric Archaeology*, Baltimore.
Nelson, T.J. (forthcoming), "Vol, larcin / Stealing, theft", in: J.-P. Guez/F. Klein/J. Peigney/É. Prioux (eds.), *Dictionnaire des images du poétique anciennes*, Paris.
Nicholson, N. (2013), "Cultural Studies, Oral Tradition, and the Promise of Intertextuality", in: *AJPh* 134, 9–21.
Nicholson, N. (2016), *The Poetics of Victory in the Greek West: Epinician, Oral Tradition, and the Deinomenid Empire*, Oxford.
Nieto Hernández, P. (2015), "Pindar's Other Sources: Catalogue and Advice Poetry", in: *Gaia* 18, 197–210.
Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. (2015), "The Epic Cycle, Stesichorus, and Ibycus", in: Fantuzzi/Tsagalis (eds.), 430–449.
Occhipinti, E. (2016), *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia and Historiography: New Research Perspectives*, Leiden-Boston.
Olson, S.D. (2012), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts: Text, Translation and Commentary*, Berlin.
Ormand, K. (2017), "Helen's Phantom in Fragments", in: C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Poetry in Fragments: Studies on the Hesiodic Corpus and its Afterlife*, Berlin-Boston, 115–134.
Parisi Presicce, C. (1998), "Eracle e il leone: *paradeigma andreias*", in: C. Bonnet/C. Jourdain-Annequin/V. Pirenne-Delforge (eds.), *Le Bestiaire d'Héraclès: III^e Rencontre héracléenne*. Actes du Colloque organise à l'Université de Liège et aux Facultés Universitaires Notre-Dame de la Paix de Namur, du 14 au 16 novembre 1996 (*Kernos Suppl.* 7), Liège 141–150.
Parker, R.C.T. (1983), *Miasma*, Oxford.

Parry, M. (1971a), "The Traditional Epithet in Homer", in: †Parry 1971, 1–190 (first published as *L'Épithète traditionelle dans Homère; Essai sur un problème de style homérique*, Paris 1928).
Parry, M. (1971b), "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I, Homer and Homeric Style", in: †Parry 1971, 266–324 (first published in: *HSCPh* 41, 1930, 73–147).
†Parry, M. (1971), *The Making of Homeric Verse. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry, Oxford.
Pavese, C.O. (1997), *I temi e i motivi della lirica corale ellenica*, 2nd ed., Pisa-Rome.
Pavlou, M. (2008), "Metapoetics, Poetic Tradition, and Praise in Pindar *Olympian* 9", in: *Mnemosyne* 61, 533–567.
Pelliccia, H. (2009), "Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides", in: F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge, 240–262.
Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
Pfeijffer, I.L. (1999a), *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, and Pythian VIII*, Leiden-Boston-Cologne.
Pfeijffer, I.L. (1999b), "Bacchylides' Homer, his Tragedy, and his Pindar", in: I.L. Pfeijffer/S.R. Slings (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides*, Amsterdam, 43–60.
Pfeijffer, I.L. (2005), "Propaganda in Pindar's First *Pythian* Ode", in: K.A.E. Enenkel/I.L. Pfeijffer (eds.), *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies*, Leiden-Boston, 13–42.
Phillips, T. (2016), *Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts*, Oxford.
Pohlsander, H.A. (1963), "The Dating of Pindaric Odes by Comparison", in: *GRBS* 4, 131–140.
Privitera, G.A. (ed.) (1982), Pindaro, *Le Istmiche*, Milan.
Prodi, E.E. (2020), "Un prosodio pindarico (*Pae*. 20). Introduzione, testo critico e commento", in: *QUCC* 154.2, 11–48.
Race, W.H. (1981), "Pindar's "Best is Water': Best of What?", in: *GRBS* 22, 119–124.
Race, W.H. (1990), *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*, Atlanta.
Race, W.H. (ed.) (1997) *Pindar.* I, *Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*; II, *Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments*, Cambridge MA-London.
Rawles, R. (2013), "Aristophanes' Simonides: Lyric Models for Praise and Blame", in: Bakola/Prauscello/Telò (eds.), 175–201.
Rawles, R. (2018), *Simonides the Poet: Intertextuality and Reception*, Cambridge.
Ready, J.L. (2019), *Orality, Textuality, and the Homeric Epics: An Interdisciplinary Study of Oral Texts, Dictated Texts, and Wild Texts*, Oxford.
Reece, S. (1988), "Homeric Influence in Stesichorus' *Nostoi*", in: *BASP* 25, 1–8.
Revermann, M. (2013), "Parepic Comedy: Point(s) and Practices", in: Bakola/Prauscello/Telò (eds.), 101–128.
Richardson, N.J. (2007), "The *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*", in: P.J. Finglass/C. Collard/N.J. Richardson (eds.), *Hesperos: Studies Presented to M.L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*, Oxford, 83–94.
Robbins, E. (1997), "Public Poetry", in: D.E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, Leiden-New York-Cologne, 221–287.
Rood, T.C.B. (1999), "Thucydides' Persian Wars", in: C.S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, Leiden-Boston, 141–168.
Rood, T.C.B. (2004), "Xenophon and Diodorus: Continuing Thucydides", in: C. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and His World: Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Stuttgart, 341–395.

Rosenmeyer, P.A. (1992), *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*, Cambridge.
Ruffell, I.A. (2002), "A Total Write-Off: Aristophanes, Cratinus, and the Rhetoric of Comic Competition", in: *CQ* 52, 138–163.
Ruffell, I.A. (2011), *Politics and Anti-Realism in Athenian Old Comedy*, Oxford.
Rumpel, J. (1883), *Lexikon Pindaricum*, Leipzig.
Rutherford, I.C. (2001), *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*, Oxford.
Rutherford, I.C. (2011), "Singing Myth: Pindar", in: K. Dowden/N. Livingstone (eds.), *A Companion to Greek Mythology*, Malden, MA, 109–123.
Rutherford, I.C. (2015), "Pindar's Cycle", in: Fantuzzi/Tsagalis (eds.), 450–460.
Rutherford, R.B. (1991–1993), "From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*", in: *BICS* 38, 47–54.
Rutherford, R.B. (2012), "Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography", in: E. Foster/D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 13–38.
Sbardella, L. (2012), *Cucitori di canti: Studi sulla tradizione epico-rapsodica greca e i suoi itinerari nel VI secolo a. C.*, (*SemRom Quaderni* 14), Rome.
Schein, S.L. (2016), "Homeric Intertextuality: Two Examples", in: S. Schein, *Homeric Epic and Its Reception: Interpretive Essays*, Oxford, 81–92 (first published in: J.N. Kazazis/A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart, 1999, 349–356).
Schmitz, T.A. (2007), *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction*, Malden, MA.
Schroeder, O. (ed.) (1922), *Pindars Pythien*, Leipzig-Berlin.
Schultz, W. (1914), "Rätsel", in: *RE* I.A.1, 62–125.
Scodel, R. (2010), *An Introduction to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge.
Seidensticker, B. (1972), "Beziehungen zwischen den beiden Oidipusdramen des Sophokles", in: *Hermes* 100, 255–274.
Seidensticker, B. (2005), "Dithyramb, Comedy, and Satyr-Play", in: J. Gregory (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Malden, MA, 38–54.
Severyns, A. (1928), *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*, Liège.
Shapiro, H.A. (1992), "*Mousikoi Agones*: Music and Poetry at the Panathenaia", in: J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Princeton, 53–75.
Sigelman, A.C. (2016), *Pindar's Poetics of Immortality*, Cambridge.
Silk, M.S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with Special Reference to Greek Poetry*, Cambridge.
Slater, W.J. (1969), *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin.
Slater, W. J. (1977), "Doubts About Pindaric Interpretation", in: *CJ* 72, 193–208.
Slater, W.J. (1979), "Pindar and ὑποθῆκαι", in: J.M. Fossey/A.Schachter (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities (McGill University, Montréal, 2–4.11.1973) = Actes du Deuxième Congrès International sur la Béotie antique*, Montreal, 79–81.
Slater, W.J. (1982), "Aristophanes of Byzantium and Problem-Solving in the Museum", in: *CQ* 32, 336–349.
Snell, B./Maehler, H. (ed.) (1970), *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, 10th ed., Stuttgart-Leipzig.
Sommerstein, A.H. (ed.) (1989), Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, Cambridge.
Sommerstein, A.H. (2015), "Tragedy and the Epic Cycle", in: Fantuzzi/Tsagalis (eds.), 461–486.

Sotiriou, M. (1998), *Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*, Göttingen.
Spelman, H. (2018a), *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence*, Oxford.
Spelman, H. (2018b), "Pindar and the Epic Cycle", in: *JHS* 138, 182–201.
Stadter, P.A. (2012), "Thucydides as 'Reader' of Herodotus", in: E. Foster/D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 39–66.
Stamatopoulou, Z. (2017), *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry: Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE*, Cambridge.
Stenger, J. (2004), *Poetische Argumentation: Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides*, Berlin-New York.
Stern, J. (1970), "The Myth of Pindar's *Olympian 6*", in: *AJPh* 91, 332–340.
Stoneman, R. (1976), "Mythology and Interpretation: Two Notes on Pindar's *Nemeans*", in: *Maia* 28, 227–232.
Stuligrosz, M. (2000), "Maxims in Pindar's Poetry", in: *Eos* 87, 153–162.
Swift, L.A. (2010), *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*, Oxford.
Swift, L.A. (2015), "Stesichorus on Stage", in: Finglass/Kelly (eds.), 125–144.
Swift, L.A. (ed.) (2019), Archilochus, *The Poems: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford.
Taplin, O. (2000), "The Spring of the Muses: Homer and Related Poetry", in: O. Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek World*, Oxford, 4–39.
Thomas, O. (2011), "The *Homeric Hymn to Pan*", in: A. Faulkner (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, Oxford, 151–172.
Thomas, O. (2020), *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, Cambridge.
Thummer, E. (1969), *Die Isthmischen Gedichte* i-ii, Heidelberg.
Torrance, I. (2013), *Metapoetry in Euripides*, Oxford.
Torres-Guerra, J.B. (1995), *La Tebaida homérica como fuente de Ilíada y Odisea*, Madrid.
Tsagalis, C. (2017), *Early Greek Epic Fragments*. I, *Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic*, Berlin.
Tsagalis, C. (2018), "Performance Contexts for Rhapsodic Recitals in the Archaic and Classical Periods", in: J.L. Ready/C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators, and Characters*, Austin, TX, 29–75.
Tsagalis, C. (2020), "Panathenaia", in: C.O. Pache (ed.), (2020), *The Cambridge Guide to Homer*, Cambridge, 187–189.
Turyn, A. (ed.) (1948), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, Cracow.
Usener, H. (1901), "Eine hesiodische Dichtung", in: *RhM* 56, 174–186.
Usener, K. (1990), *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias*, Tübingen.
Verdenius, W.J. (1987), *Commentaries on Pindar*, I, Leiden.
von Mess, A. (1901), "Der Typhonmythus bei Pindar und Aeschylus", in: *RhM* 56, 167–174.
Wachter, R. (2012), "The Other View: Focus on Linguistic Innovations in the Homeric Epics", in: Andersen/Haug (eds.), 65–79.
Watkins, C. (1995), *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, Oxford.
West, M.L. (ed.) (1966), Hesiod, *Theogony*, Oxford.
West, M.L. (1985), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins, Oxford*.
West, M.L. (1997), *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, Oxford.
West, M.L. (2010), "Rhapsodes at Festivals", in: *ZPE* 173, 1–13.
West, M.L. (2011), "Pindar as a Man of Letters", in: D. Obbink/R.B. Rutherford (eds.), *Culture in Pieces. Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*, Oxford, 50–68.

West, M.L. (2011), "The Singing of Homer", in: M.L. West, *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought*. I, *Epic*, Oxford, 128–140 (first published in: *JHS* 101, 1981, 113–129).
West, M.L. (2011), "The Invention of Homer", in: M.L. West, *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought*. I, *Epic*, Oxford, 408–436 (first published in: *CQ* 49, 1999, 364–382).
West, M.L. (2012), "Towards a Chronology of Early Greek Epic", in: Andersen/Haug (eds.), 224–241.
West, M.L. (2015), "Epic, Lyric, and Lyric Epic", in: Finglass/Kelly (eds.), 63–80.
West, S.R. (1999), "Sophocles' *Antigone* and Herodotus Book Three", in: J. Griffin (ed.), *Sophocles Revisited: Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*, Oxford, 109–136.
Wilson, P.J. (2019), "Dancing for Free: Pindar's Kastor Song for Hieron", in: *CA* 38.2, 298–362.
Wisnom, L.S. (2020), *Weapons of Words: Intertextual Competition in Babylonian Poetry: A Study of Anzū, Enūma eliš, and Erra and Išum*, Leiden-Boston.
Wright, M.E. (2010), "The Tragedian as Critic: Euripides and Early Greek Poetics", in: *JHS* 130, 165–184.
Wright, M.E. (2012), *The Comedian as Critic: Greek Old Comedy and Poetics*, London.
Wright, M.E. (2016a), *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy*. I, *Neglected Authors*, London-New York.
Wright, M.E. (2016b), "Euripidean Tragedy and Quotation Culture: The Case of *Stheneboea* F661", in: *AJPh* 137, 601–623.
Wright, M.E. (forthcoming), "Intertextuality, 'cf.' and Fragmentary Drama", in: A. Kelly/H. Spelman (eds.), *Text and Intertext in Early Greece*, Cambridge.
Yunis, H. (ed.) (2003), *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.
Yunis, H. (ed.) (2011), Plato, *Phaedrus*, Cambridge.