

PINDAR'S LIBRARY: PERFORMANCE POETRY AND MATERIAL
TEXTS

TOM PHILLIPS DPhil THESIS

WORD COUNT: 99, 863

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a great pleasure to acknowledge the many debts I have incurred before and during the writing of this thesis. My Classics teachers at Monmouth School, Peter Dennis–Jones and David Jenkins, and later Ben Giles and David Hope, first fostered my interest in the classical languages. During my time at Oxford I have been fortunate to share the company of numerous scholars who have informed and changed the way I approach literature; particular thanks are due to Felix Budelmann, Peta Fowler, Stephen Harrison, Gregory Hutchinson, Francesca Martelli, Dirk Obbink, Scott Scullion, Guy Westwood and Tim Whitmarsh. Oliver Thomas has read much of what I have written over the last few years, and given much exacting advice.

My doctorate was undertaken with the support of funding from the AHRC, for whose assistance I am very grateful. My greatest obligations, personal and academic, are to Tim Rood, my undergraduate tutor, and my doctoral supervisor, Armand D'Angour, who have both provided advice, criticism, and encouragement well beyond the call of duty.

T.R.P

Corpus Christi College, Oxford
December 2012

Contents

Abbreviations	4
---------------	---

Introduction	6
--------------	---

PART I. CONTEXTS: TO ALEXANDRIA AND BEYOND

1. Writing In The Library	45
2. Texts and Metatexts	63
3. Passing on the Garland: Reception and Material Sites	82

PART II. POEMS ON THE PAGE

4. Edited Highlights	110
5. Epinician Archives: <i>Olympians</i> 10 and 13	147
6. Closing the Book: <i>Olympian</i> 14	182
7. <i>Pythians</i> 11 and 12: Materiality, Intertextuality, Closure	203
Conclusions	236
Bibliography	240

ABBREVIATIONS

- AP* *Anthologia Palatina*.
- Chantraine P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris, 1968).
- Cults* R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, I–V (Oxford, 1896–1909).
- DFA* A. Pickard–Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd edition revised by J. Gould and D. Lewis (Oxford, 1988).
- D-K H. Diels and W. Kranz eds., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, I–III (Berlin, 1974).
- EG* D.L. Page ed., *Epigrammata Graeca* (Oxford, 1975).
- FGrH* F. Jacoby et al. eds., *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Leiden, 1923–).
- Fowler R.L. Fowler ed., *Early Greek Mythography I: Texts* (Oxford, 2000).
- GP A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page eds., *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965).
- Hummel P. Hummel, *L'épithète pindarique: étude historique et philologique* (Bern, 1999).
- LIMC* *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, I–VIII (Zurich/Munich, 1981–99)
- K-A R. Kassel and C. Austin eds., *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin, 1983–).
- LfgrE* *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (Göttingen, 1979–).
- LSJ H.G. Liddell, R.Scott, H.S. Jones, and R.Mackenzie eds., *A Greek–English Lexicon* (9th edition, Oxford, 1940).
- Müller C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores* (Paris, 1855–82 [reprinted Hildesheim, 1965]).
- M-W R. Merkelbach and M.L. West eds., *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford, 1967).
- PEG* A Bernabé ed., *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta I* (Leipzig, 1987).
- Pf. R. Pfeiffer ed., *Callimachus*, I–II (Oxford, 1949, 1953).
- Pitiche* *Pindaro Le Pitiche: introduzione, testo critico e traduzione di Bruno Gentili, commento a cura di P. Bernardini, E. Cingano, and P. Giannini* (Milan, 1995).

- PMG* D.L. Page ed., *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962).
- POxy* *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London 1898–.
- Race W.H. Race ed. *Pindar, Olympian, Pythian, Nemean, Isthmian Odes*, I–II (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).
- SH* *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, eds. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (Berlin/New York, 1983).
- SIG* *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, I–IV ed. W. Dittenberger (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1915–24).
- Slater W.J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969).
- SLG* D.L. Page ed., *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* (Oxford, 1974).
- S-M B. Snell and H. Maehler eds., *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Leipzig, 1984, 1989).
- TGrF* R. Kannicht, S. Radt, and B. Snell eds., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, I– (Göttingen, 1971–2004).
- Wendel C. Wendel ed., *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera* (Berlin, 1935).

INTRODUCTION

τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἀνάγνωτέ μοι
Ἀρχεστράτου παῖδα, πόθι φρενός
ἐμᾶς γέγραπται· γλυκὺ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέλος ὀφείλων
ἐπιλέλαθ' ὦ Μοῖσ', ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ
Ἀλάθεια Διός, ὀρθᾶ χερί
ἐρύκετον ψευδέων
ἐνιπὰν ἀλιτόξενον.

Read out to me the name of the son of Arcestratus, the Olympian victor, where it has been inscribed in my mind, for I have forgotten the sweet song owed to him. O Muse, and you Truth daughter of Zeus, with straight hand ward off the reproach of lying and wronging a friend.

So begins Pindar's ode for Hagesidamus of Western Locri, celebrating his victory in the Olympian boys' boxing competition of 476 BC. This is one of several uses of the metaphor of writing in Pindar. At N.6.6-7, Pindar employs inscription to describe the activity of fate in setting down a 'marker' for human life, of which mortals are unaware (καίπερ ἐφαμερίαν οὐκ εἰδότες οὐδὲ μετὰ νύκτας ἄμμε πότμος / ἄντιν' ἔγραψε δραμεῖν ποτὶ στάθμαν). Here, as at O.10.1-3, the act of inscription gives rise to a substrate the permanence of which contrasts with the contingencies of human mental activity. A somewhat different and more diffuse focus on writing emerges at O.6.90-1, where the narrator addresses Aeneas, the chorus-trainer, as a 'message-stick of the Muses' (ἐσσί γὰρ ἄγγελος ὀρθός, / ἠὔκόμων σκυτάλα Μοισᾶν, γλυκὺς κρατῆρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν); Aeneas' responsibilities presumably involved taking a physical copy of the poem to the place of performance and instructing the chorus.¹

The phrase evokes the Spartan method of sending written messages. The σκυτάλη was a staff around which a strip of leather or papyrus would be wound; one was kept in Sparta and the other, of exactly the same size, was given to, for example, the commander of an army. The papyrus would be wound slantwise around the staff and the message written vertically,

¹ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 417.

so that it could only be read correctly when wrapped around its counterpart.² Pindar's metaphor draws on this custom, casting poetic performance as a participation in a shared body of specialist knowledge; like the Spartan users of the σκυτάλη, Aeneas, and by extension the performing chorus, have sufficient skill to be able to understand the poem and translate it into a performance.³ The passage uses the separation of a poetic utterance from its author as an opportunity of celebrating the communality of performance culture and, by implication, writing's power to fix and disseminate texts.⁴ These passages form part of a more general pattern in Pindar's self-referential rhetoric, in which songs are characterized as objects, particularly those which commemorate athletic success such as crowns, fillets, and statues.⁵ These parallels often have an agonistic dimension, as at P.6.10-14 where the poem *qua ὑμνων θησαυρός* is not vulnerable to the elements in the same way as a real building, or N.5.1-5 where song's mobility is contrasted with the fixity of statues. These and other similar passages can be read as insisting on the pragmatic superiority of song to other artforms,⁶ but they also contribute to a metaphorization of the text itself as an object involved in a nexus of social relationships.⁷

In addition to their particular contextual functions, these passages can be seen as responses to and manipulations of the technological changes taking place in Pindar's lifetime. The development of writing during the archaic period is difficult to trace precisely, but it is clear that by the time of Pindar's poetic career writing was an important part of Greek culture and education; contemporary vase paintings testify to the increasing use of various types of writing materials in teaching,⁸ and the Muses are shown carrying papyrus rolls, signalling the connection between writing and poetic composition. Metaphors involving writing become increasingly common from around the 470s,⁹ and although the first half of the fifth century

² This is the explanation of its function given by Σ O.6.154b and f, although a slightly different account is given by d. Cf. e.g. Thuc. 1.131; Xen. *Hist.* 3.3.8; Ar. *Lys.* 991; Plut. *Lys.* 19.

³ For the musical education and understanding which composers and performers brought to bear on the melodization of poems during this period cf. D'Angour (2007).

⁴ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 415. Herington (1985) 45 argues that in the archaic and classical periods 'texts were no part of the performed poem as such, but merely a mechanical means of preserving its wording between performances'. This, however, mistakenly discounts the possibility of readerly engagement with texts. Hubbard (1985) 67 n. 166 thinks that Pindar would have held written dissemination to be even more important than performance: this inference is unjustified, and oversimplifies the relationship between the two modes.

⁵ Cf. Steiner (1994) 92 nn. 107-9.

⁶ Cf. Svenbro (1976) 172-93; Steiner (1994) 95-6; Thomas (2007); Kowalzig (2011).

⁷ Thus Steiner (1994) 96-9. N.b. particularly her comments p. 96: '[t]hrough the presence of the monuments, the poet suggests a resolution to two issues central to his craft: first, his own relation to his patron, second the question of the afterlife of his compositions, their ability to go on sounding the athletes' praise'.

⁸ Immerwahr (1964) and (1973) provide an inventory of depictions of books on vases.

⁹ Cf. e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 179; *PV* 459-62; *TGrF* F 597. For the connection between these passages and the appearance during this period of school scenes on vases see Ford (2003) 24. Hdt. 6.27 tells a story about

cannot be described as fully ‘literate’ in the manner of, say, the Hellenistic period,¹⁰ writing was certainly playing a role in the creative process. Equally, writing influenced other aspects of performance culture; reperformance of epinician odes, for example, probably depended heavily on written texts, and there is some evidence for their preservative function. One such datum is the famous story about Pindar’s epinician for Diagoras of Rhodes, O.7, being inscribed in the temple of Lindian Athena (ταύτην τὴν ᾠδὴν ἀνακεῖσθαι φησι Γόργων ἐν τῷ τῆς Λινδίας Ἀθηναίας ἱερῷ χρυσοῖς γράμμασιν, ‘Gorgo says that this ode was dedicated in the temple of Lindian Athena in golden letters’, Σ O.7 inscr. Drach. I p. 195) which likely represents wider practice; while the ‘golden letters’ are probably apocryphal, the inscription of such poems, or the dedication of written texts in temples and private archives, could well have been widespread.¹¹

Despite these hints, however, our understanding of how written texts of Pindar operated in the 5th and 4th centuries is severely limited by lack of evidence. No papyri survive, and we are in the dark about many of the precise details of textual production; how exactly Pindar made use of writing in the process of composition (or if he did at all – although this seems highly likely),¹² what the texts of his poems looked like, how and how widely they circulated, who read them,¹³ and the precise details of how they served as bases for reperformance are all largely matters of guesswork. What Pindaric books were like before the Hellenistic period, whether they consisted of single poems or small groups, or of larger collections similar to those of later scholarly editions, is equally obscure.¹⁴ Nevertheless, various critics have given

children in Chios being taught writing, an episode which occurs in 496. The evidence for written texts pre-431 is collected by Herington (1985) 201-6.

¹⁰ Although the opposition between ‘oral’ and ‘literate’ is itself problematic, as numerous studies have shown: cf. e.g. Duguid (1996) 66-73. See Scodel (2001) 125 on the intersection of orality and literacy in Pindar.

¹¹ On the possible dedication of a copy of O.7. by Diagoras cf. Carey (2007) 201 n. 13. For the vocabulary of dedication cf. Herington (1985) 46; Rutherford (2001) 175-8. Writing is also used to describe an act of dedication at O.3.30.

¹² Cf. Herington (1985) 46.

¹³ The evidence for the book trade in the classical comes mainly from the late fifth and fourth centuries: cf. Ar. *Ran.* 52-4; Xen. *Anab.* 7.5.14 and Harris (1989) 85 n. 92. Pl. *Ap.* 26d-e has Socrates mention that τὰ Ἀναξαγόρου βιβλία are available for ‘a drachma’ in the agora. Currie (2004) 52 sites the development of the book trade in the late fifth century, but there is no reason to suppose that books were not circulating earlier than this, albeit perhaps on a smaller scale. Hubbard (2004) argues for the importance of written texts in the dissemination of epinician in the fifth century; Carey (2007) 200 n. 5 is more cautious.

¹⁴ Cf. Irigoin (1952) 5-28 for an assessment of the evidence. Particularly interesting are his arguments p. 16 that the allusions to Pindar in Aristophanes are based on an Athenian edition of a selection of the poems: ‘[l]e choix de ces oeuvres correspond sans aucun doute au programme des oeuvres lyriques qu’on enseignait aux jeunes Athéniens entre 450 et 420 ... et donc à une partie du texte édité alors à Athènes’, and p. 21 that regional editions were assembled and edited into larger editions at intellectual centres such as Athens and Rhodes during the late 5th and 4th centuries, editions which served as a basis for Hellenistic scholarship. Both cases are certainly plausible, but the nature of the evidence compels caution. It could, however, be argued that the allusions in comedy (for which see e.g. Eupolis fr. 366, Ar. *Ach.* 637-9, *Birds* 926-45, *Clouds* 1355-62, *Knights* 1323, 1329) need not reflect the contents of a particular edition, but rather the poems which were, for reasons of perceived

accounts of the use of writing, both as medium and metaphor, by Pindar and other poets, and this subject will doubtless continue to be a matter of debate. My chief goal in this study, however, is to explore the function of written texts of Pindar in later antiquity. In part this approach aims to correct a disparity between scholarly focus and textual history. Pindaric scholarship has in the main been concerned to analyse the social and historical conditions which shaped the poems' production and initial reception, and to interpret how the poems operated in their fifth century contexts of performance. While such approaches are obviously important, we should not forget that the vast majority of readers in antiquity encountered Pindaric texts in book form, or in various reperformance scenarios remote from Pindar's own time.

Attempting to understand what was involved in such encounters entails questions about the form of books, the nature of reading practices, and the effects of changing literary and scholarly contexts on readers' approaches to the Pindaric corpus. Yet we should be wary of schematic oppositions between 'performance' and 'books' or 'reading', and between the contexts of Pindar's time and those of later periods. As we have seen, Pindar was acutely aware of the material forms his poems could take, and 'performance' continues to be important, both as a concept with which later authors and scholars reimagined the circumstances of the fifth century poetic economy and as a mode of realizing texts in later periods. Similarly, although Pindar's poems are rooted in specific enunciative situations and respond in particular ways to the demands of individual social and political contexts, they also make generalizing claims which are easily assimilable to a variety of reading contexts. Indeed, the very specificity of features such as deixis, addresses to historical individuals, and references to particular cultic or political situations allows in later contexts for an imaginative recreation of the poem as a performance piece, permitting the poem to impose its own mode of contextualization upon the context(s) in which it is being read.¹⁵ Pindar's poetry both transcends and embodies historical contingency.

Moreover, the textual dissemination of epinicians can also be seen as actualizing the texts' own rhetorical strategies. One of epinician's primary concerns is the construction and

aesthetic quality or relevance to Athenian affairs, best known to the audience; this knowledge could have come from reperformance as well as reading. The comic poets may have had access to considerably more of Pindar's poems than their allusive practices would seem to suggest, and of course we cannot discount the possibility that Pindar was cited or alluded to in works which are no longer extant. The loss of so much of the texts of authors associated with the 'New Music' perhaps also distorts the picture; we might expect to find Pindaric allusions in these authors, and potentially to a wider range of texts than those found in the comic poets.

¹⁵ It should be noted, however, that the poems have little to say about their performance locations, a fact which eases the transition into reperformance and written dissemination: cf. Carey (2007) 199. Deixis in Pindar has received considerable attention: cf. Felson (1999); Athanassaki (2004); Felson (2004); Martin (2004).

perpetuation of the victor's fame, and scholars have become increasingly sensitive in recent years to the Panhellenic nature of these claims; as well as composing for particular contexts, Pindar is also writing for the whole of the Greek world.¹⁶ This study aims to think, among other things, about this fame as an historical actuality as well as a textual projection (the two are obviously interrelated), and about how Pindar's immortalization of a figure such as Hiero of Syracuse operates in relation to changing historical circumstances. I shall therefore present readings of various poems through the lens of fifth-century performance in addition to considering their operations in later contexts; the latter cannot be understood without the former, but I shall also try to show how consideration of interpretative issues central to assessment of Pindaric texts in later periods can enhance our understanding of how the poems worked in Pindar's own time.

The opening of O.10 quoted above is a useful starting point for thinking about these issues. The relationship between narrator and victor is presented through the lens of aristocratic guest friendship;¹⁷ the narrator is in danger of 'wronging his friend' (ἀλιτόξενον) by his tardiness in delivering the poem,¹⁸ and the poem is presented as 'owed' (ὀφείλων) to the victor.¹⁹ The metaphor continues in the antistrophe, where the narrator describes his 'deep debt' which 'shames' him (ἐμὸν καταίσχυνε βαθὺ χρέος, 8) and hopes that the 'interest' (τόκος, 9) accrued by the debt will 'loosen the sharp reproach' (λῦσαι ... ὀξεῖαν ἐπιμομφάν, 9) attendant on it. The metaphorical structure sites the acts of composition and performance in a network of ethical concepts, and in the context of performance hints at the debt owed by the wider community to the victor's achievements. This is balanced by the figuration of the narrator's mind as a substrate that is simultaneously preservative and open to the contingencies of human understanding (ἐπιλέλαθ'), in need of assistance from the Muse and Aletheia in order to fulfil its duty. The use of γέγραπται in the context of the debt metaphor is usually interpreted as suggesting a ledger; the victor's name has been written in the narrator's mind in the same way as a debtor records the amounts he owes.²⁰ But when sung by a chorus, γέγραπται also hints at the distinction between composition and performance,

¹⁶ On Pindar's panhellenism cf. e.g. Athanassaki (2011a) with further references.

¹⁷ Cf. Verdenius (1988) 57.

¹⁸ For the possible historical circumstances of this situation cf. Verdenius (1988) 56 who suggests that the delay was due to Pindar being occupied with 'the more important odes' O.1, O.2, and O.3. Cf. Erbse (1970) 28 for the reading that Pindar is lightheartedly teasing Hagesidamus over his eagerness to have his praises sung. Nassen (1975) 223-4 sees the description of lateness as balancing historical circumstances and poetic exaggeration.

¹⁹ For the topos of the debt owed to victory cf. e.g. O.1.103, O.3.7. Cf. Hubbard (1985) 65-8 for some remarks on the role of writing in this passage.

²⁰ Thus Verdenius (1988) 54.

and between the poet and the chorus.²¹ Read in this way, the name having been ‘inscribed on my mind’ works as a reference to the processes of composition and training the chorus, which doubtless involved (a) written text(s). This connotation playfully, and perhaps humorously, undermines the rhetoric of debt and tardiness by implying that the poem was composed some time before the performance, and hence that the χρέος is not quite as serious as the second stanza makes out. Hagesidamus has (literally) been on the poet’s mind, and the choral enunciation of a victor’s name previously written down replays in miniature the dynamic of composition and performance. This implication is reinforced by the mention of Hagesidamus (Ἀρχεστράτου παῖδα) preceding the rhetoric of debt; the debt has, in the sequential movement of the text, been repaid before it has been constructed. The implied distinction between poet and chorus also opens up another way of understanding πόθι φρενός / ἐμᾶς γέγραπται, namely as a reference to the fact that Hagesidamus’ name has been more generally ‘inscribed’ on people’s minds by the act of victory, the subsequent announcement of his name at Olympia, and the word-of-mouth spread of the news that doubtless followed his success.

All these lines of interpretation would also have been available to a later reader engaging with a written copy of the poem, albeit that the distinction between poet and chorus would have taken place at the level of imaginative recreation rather than through the actualities of performance. But the situation of the poem in a book also opens up other meanings, particularly in view of the interaction between the language of writing and the book itself. The act of writing in the poet’s mind (γέγραπται) is not identical with any individual act of inscription: each physical copying of the text would have replayed this division and reinforced the phrase’s metaphorical force. Together with the description of the poem as a γλυκὺ ... μέλος, the reference to (a metaphorical) writing invokes the difference between performance and reading. Yet the use of γέγραπται also interacts with its material aspect; the metaphor of writing on the mind is converted by the act of inscription into an (almost) literal description of the book itself, or, from another angle, might be read as doubly metaphorical, metaphorizing the book as the poet’s mental substrate. Similarly, there is a difference between the enunciative situation of ἀνάγνωτέ μοι in performance and reading.

²¹ For the debate over monodic v. choral performance of epinicians cf. Heath (1988) and Lefkowitz (1988), both arguing that monodic performance was the norm, with the counter argument of Carey (1989). Currie (2005) 16-18 is a useful overview. A consensus has grown in recent years that choral performance was common, but that performance is a category which subsumes considerable variations in venue and size: cf. e.g. Carey (2001); Hornblower (2004) 33-6, and D’Alessio (1994) on the difficulties of distinguishing authorial and choral first persons. There is no good reason to think that O.10 was not performed at its ‘première’ by a chorus.

In reading the phrase, the reader describes his own activity, but also addresses the text, whereas the narrator, realized by the chorus in performance, uses the imperative ‘absolutely’ without directing it to anyone in particular.²² The reenunciation of ἀνάγνωτέ μοι by the reader as an address to the text highlights another aspect of the book, namely its function in preserving a temporally prior performance and, more generally, as offering a means of access to the past. Unlike the narrator, who dramatizes his mind (albeit ironically) as a somewhat unstable substrate, the reader interacts with the secure material frame of the book. Whereas in performance, φρενός / ἐμᾶς γέγραπται gestured to the process of written composition preceding performance, in the situation of the book the phrase points up the book’s status as a record of performance which ‘has been written’.²³

These lines illustrate Pindar’s dramatic use of the notion of writing. When considered in the light of their place in a book, they also alert us to the additional meanings and resonances that his poems can take on as a result of interactions between the text and its medium. The self-referential characteristics of the passage make it particularly significant in this respect, but in the course of this study I shall demonstrate that similar kinds of arguments can be made about numerous other aspects of Pindar’s corpus.

MATERIAL ISSUES

Scholars have devoted considerable attention to the subject of the book in antiquity. Recent studies have focused on books as aesthetically significant objects expressive of their owners’ status, on their influence on modes of literary composition, and on how they were produced, sold, and read.²⁴ Less attention, however, has been given to how the forms of books interact with the texts they contain, and it is this interaction with which this study is mainly concerned. Central to my analysis is a conception of the book as an aesthetically marked object in its own right, not simply as a neutral purveyor of meanings. Following the lead of contemporary book theorists, I want to reexamine the traditional division between semantic meaning and material form which conceives the latter as an incidental adjunct to the former,

²² Verdenius (1988) 55. Hubbard (1985) 67 sees it as addressed to the audience, which is then put in the position of ‘reading the present ode externalized and objectified into a written text’.

²³ Cf. Edmunds (2001) 79 ‘[t]hese techniques of orally performed poetry, Pindaric and archaic, are already ‘grammatological’, a potential deferral of the voice of the poet or performer(s) to other, later, voice(s)’. Relevant also is Payne (2006), who argues that Pindar’s gnomic maxims have a transhistorical as well as a (temporally and spatially) local force: ‘[g]nomic lyric ... presupposes its own transhistorical reception by addressing abstract formulations to a universal subject created by its own pronominal structures’ (p. 182).

²⁴ Cf. e.g. Houston (2009); White (2009). Lowrie (2009) focuses on how writing is represented in Latin poetry; cf. also Dupont (2009); Farrell (2009).

and emphasise instead the book's status as a part of the processes by which meaning is created and maintained.

This approach runs counter to one of the primary features of Western aesthetic thinking, in which the marginalization of the book as a part of aesthetic processes has been symptomatic of a wider view, derived chiefly from Plato and Aristotle, which privileges the noetic aspects of aesthetic experience over the material.²⁵ The book theorists' emphasis on the material particularity of the book and its cultural significance problematizes this distinction, and also highlights the importance of the wider intellectual and social contexts in which books are produced, disseminated, and read. In tracing the distinction between formalist and materialist tendencies in modern criticism, Peter McDonald highlights the role of scholars such as Jerome McGann and Donald McKenzie in questioning New Critical and poststructuralist reading protocols which abstracted the text from its material context:

They insisted on seeing the text, not as an abstract linguistic form, but as a mediated material artifact, a redescription which, they urged, entailed a significant shift in our understanding of the scene of reading. If this scene was defined for close readers by their critical engagement with what we could call the transcendent 'text-type' — the free-floating, idealized verbal text — *written* by the author, it was structured more immediately for materialist readers by their physical encounter with an immanent 'text-token' — a particular material document — *produced* by various cultural mediators (editors, publishers, printers, etc.) for specific markets.²⁶

McDonald's analysis highlights the way in which the act of material inscription is itself meaningful, not only because the material document reflects a variety of social and institutional factors attendant on its production which are themselves part of the ongoing shaping of meaning,²⁷ but also because it generates interplay, or potential interplay, between meaning and medium. On this reading, the space of the document itself becomes a part of literary form. This position also points towards the tension between the book as a (provisionally) fixed structure and the instability of textual meaning, informed by its multiple

²⁵ On the role of written texts in fostering more abstract ways of thinking about texts during the fourth century BC see Ford (2003). On books more generally see also Hutchinson (2008).

²⁶ McDonald (2003) 231. His analysis builds on that of Chartier (1995) 134, who insists that '[r]eaders never confront abstract, idealized texts detached from any materiality', and opposes a mode of reading which attempts to take account of the material conditions of textuality to the phenomenologies of reading promulgated by e.g. Iser (1980) 'which eras[e] the concrete modality of the act of reading and characteriz[e] it by its effects, postulated as universals'.

²⁷ See e.g. Chartier (1995); McKenzie (1999); (2002).

intertextualities, its potential for indeterminacies and its capacity for dislocating generic and ideological frames, and also by the multiple contexts in which it operates. This tension has been central to book theory and responses to it. In the context of the theoretical debates of the 1980s, the ‘documentalist’ approach to the material particularity of the book was sometimes mobilized to oppose the poststructuralist notion of textuality decoupled from authorial control, even as its insistence on the roles played by extra-authorial and extratextual forces paralleled the anti-Platonizing positions of textualists such as Derrida, Barthes, and Foucault.²⁸

And yet the apparent opposition between the documentalist insistence on the centrality of the material document and the poststructuralist commitment to a thinking of textuality which ‘dislocates the borders, the framing of texts, everything which should preserve their immanence and make possible an internal reading’²⁹ is far from absolute. A central poststructuralist insight has been the potentially infinite variety of contexts and their consequences for textuality; as it is only possible for meaning to emerge in contexts, meaning can never said to be securely finalized. McDonald argues that the poststructuralist approach complements documentalist emphasis on the material text in giving a theoretical framework to deal with the contextual and material variety attendant on the processes of dissemination:

[I]mmanence [does] not entail stability, since, even in material terms, there is no end to the process of dissemination. Proliferation, not fixity, is the norm as texts are successively put to new uses in new forms. This is not, it should be stressed, simply a reassertion of the scholarly editor’s traditional insistence on *textual* variation. It is a matter of recognizing the volatility of material *contexts* and the unpredictability of *readings*. Produced and reproduced by new cultural mediators, in new contexts, and for new readers, the successive versions of texts represent unique episodes in the constitution of meaning.³⁰

Using this model to think about books in the ancient world requires some methodological adjustment. Contemporary book theorists pay considerable attention to bibliographical issues

²⁸ See Derrida (1978) 20 on ‘the theological simultaneity of the book’, which he treats in that discussion as an illusory totality linked to a metaphysical conception of the connection between meaning and presence. Cf. also Derrida (1976) 18-26 on the links between the book as traditionally conceived and metaphysics: ‘[t]he idea of the book is profoundly alien to the sense of writing. It is the encyclopaedic protection ... of logocentrism against the disruption of writing [and] against difference in general’ (p. 18).

²⁹ Derrida (1990) 92.

³⁰ McDonald (2003) 232.

and social analysis of book production in a way precluded for classicists by lack of detailed evidence.³¹ However, McDonald's emphasis on contextual variation is a useful starting point for thinking about the cultural issues which affected the Pindaric corpus in different periods of antiquity, as the texts became sites for scholarly contestation and mediation by individual readers, and were opened up to the influences of literary receptions. Equally, 'the volatility of material contexts' is an apt formulation of the physical variety of ancient books. In antiquity, each book was a physically unique object, written out by a reader or a professional scribe. These inscriptional processes were shaped by economic considerations, by the professionalism of individual scribes, and by changing fashions in the style of bookhands, which were themselves of aesthetic significance.³² Books were consequently idiosyncratic, often produced for and tailored to the needs of specific consumers, as well as modified by individual readers' additions of marginalia. One of the concerns of this study will be to establish a dialogue between these material features (actual or deduced) and the texts themselves.

While the distinction between text-type and text-token is helpful in focusing attention on the materiality of the book, we should resist an overly schematic application of this opposition. Every act of reading produces mental signifieds, and hence involves a certain abstraction of the text from its material instantiation. Reading Pindar is particularly marked in this respect, in that the performance language, self-referential apparatuses, and historical situations of the Pindaric texts prompt the reader to precisely such an abstraction, and encourage a retrojection of the text into a temporally prior situation. This is a mode of reading additionally encouraged by the ancient literary critical discourses and literary receptions which emphasise the connection between poetic utterance and the historical figure of the author and the circumstances of composition. What I want to emphasise here is that this mode of reading, while important, is not a 'natural' approach which should be privileged, but rather one means of reading among others, one which is constructed in advance (in a variety of ways) by the Pindaric corpus itself, and one which historically is always in the process of being renegotiated, and influenced by contextual factors. The above discussion of the text-type/text-token distinction is employed to foreground the mediations of the reading process by particular material factors, and to provide a model for discussing the various kinds of interactions that occur between signified structures and their material frames.

³¹ E.g. McGann (1991); McKenzie (1999). Fundamental also is Genette (1997) on the role of paratexts (titles, prefaces etc.) in presenting literary works and affecting their consumption.

³² On the concept of 'deluxe editions' cf. Johnson (2004) 155-60; for a typology of Pindaric bookrolls in later antiquity cf. Ucciardello (2012) 113-18.

The status of Pindar's texts as performance poems plays an important role in their material resituation. The temporally unique, impermanent form of performance contrasts with the permanence of the material frame, and the gathering and ordering of the poems in editions imposes on them a form of collectedness at variance with the temporally discrete status of performances of individual songs. But as mentioned above, we should be wary of hard-and-fast oppositions in this respect; the materiality of the book is to a certain extent prefigured by Pindar's characterization of his poems as objects, and various poems advertise their connections to others in the corpus even as performance pieces.³³ Despite these continuities, however, there are also important distinctions between the situations of performance and reading, some imposed by material conditions, and others by the strategies of the texts themselves in their altered contexts. References to musical accompaniment, choral singing, and other specific aspects of the performance economy impose on the reader a vivid sense of the difference of (aspects of) the poem's self-projection from the situation in which he himself engages with it, while at the same time influencing the reader's conception of his own activity.

Any account of the reception of a textual corpus in antiquity must take account of ancient reading practices and the various ways in which these were conceptualized by literary critics. It was long a commonplace that reading in antiquity meant reading aloud, even when the reader was alone.³⁴ This position has been challenged by numerous scholars who have pointed out that, although voiced reading was clearly common, there is also much evidence for silent reading, and we should not think that voiced reading was the norm.³⁵ Debates about

³³ See my remarks below pp. 106-20 on relations between poems within an edition. On 'performance intertextuality' cf. Morrison (2011) with further references.

³⁴ Cf. e.g. Balogh (1927); Hendrickson (1929); Rohde (1963); Kenney (1982) 12; Porter (2010) 314-15, 353-4; for further references cf. Gavrilov (1997) 56-8. On Roman reading practices cf. e.g. Quinn (1982); Cavallo (1999). Johnson (2000) examines the social practices in which reading was embedded and argues that whether reading was voiced or silent was dependent on context; cf. further Johnson (2009) on the representation of reading in Aulus Gellius and Johnson (2010) on the social functions of literary reading in the High Empire. The importance of sound to the reading process is demonstrated by the fact that the verb used to denote reading, ἀναγιγνώσκειν, is often synonymized by ἀκούειν, a situation paralleled by the synonymy of *legere* and *audire* in Latin. But whether these synonyms are (partially or wholly) metaphorical is debated: on the meaning of ἀναγιγνώσκειν cf. Chantraine (1950), who argues that the primary meaning is 'recognizing' the letters; Carson (1999) 83 suggests that it is more specifically the recognition of sounds that is at issue, followed by Porter (2010) 351 n. 216. Cf. also Steiner (1994) 16-29.

³⁵ Knox (1968) argues against the view that silent reading was not viewed as 'abnormal' even if it was less common than voiced reading. He cites passages such as Cic. *Tusc.* 5.116, which discusses how one can compensate for the loss hearing, and suggests that a deaf man may still take pleasure in poetry: *deinde multo maiorem percipi posse legendis his quam audiendis uoluptatem*. Gavrilov (1997) sees the *locus classicus* of the evidential debate, August. *Con.* 6.3.3-4, as evidence for the normality of silent reading, and makes the claim that silent reading was normal in fifth century BC Athens as well as in later periods; cf. also Burnyeat (1997). Parker (2009) offers an overview of the Roman evidence and argues for the prevalence of silent reading, contending that public readings at *conuiuia* or readings by *lectores* were 'preparatory, ancillary, or supplementary to private

which form of reading predominated are less important for this study than the variety of reading situations in which texts would have been realized; reading aloud to oneself, to a small group of friends, reading silently on one's own, and engaging in a more dramatic performance before a larger group of a previously memorized poem (or part of a poem) were all possible scenarios, and having slaves read aloud was also a common practice.³⁶ Therefore, while we should be cautious about thinking that reading was usually or predominantly voiced, we need to think about the interpretative consequences of voiced reading and how this practice may have affected how readers orientated themselves towards texts. We also need to bear in mind the effects of literary theoretical discourses about the voice, and the role of poets' voices in literary receptions.³⁷ Given the prominence of the emphasis on the voice in these texts, it is reasonable to assume that even when reading silently, ancient readers would sometimes have conceived of the texts they were engaging with as the 'written voice' of an author, or at least entertained the possibility, as we still do today, of so conceptualizing the text.

The notion of writing as inscribed/written voice (ἐγγράμματος φωνή) is common in ancient theoretical literature.³⁸ Speech as an emitting of 'breath' (πνεῦμα) was transcribed into the written document, which then became a trace not only of meanings but of the physicality of enunciation: 'voice inscribed in letters is the culmination of the breath that is stored within us' (ἐγγράμματος δὲ φωνή ἐστιν ἀποτέλεσμα τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐντεθησαυρισμένου πνεύματος, Σ Dion. Thrax 212.23-4 Hilgard). This physicality could be foregrounded as a central part of the reading experience: Arcesilaus, head of the Middle Academy in the mid-third century BC, is quoted by Diogenes Laertius as describing Pindar as 'terrific at filling out the voice', a power he associates with a more general verbal 'sufficiency' (τόν τε Πίνδαρον ἔφασκε δεινὸν εἶναι φωνῆς ἐμπλήσαι καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων εὐπορίαν παρασχεῖν, Diog. Laer. 4.31). Reading (aloud) is, on these terms, an excavation of the authorial voice which inheres in the text: '[t]he discourse produced by the reader's voice is a reenactment of the writer's voice that was transcribed in the act of writing.'³⁹ The emphasis on the physicality of the voice is part of a wider theoretical concern

reading'. For an assessment of the conceptual underpinings of the silent/voiced reading debate cf. Fowler (forthcoming) 1-16.

³⁶ Cf. Johnson (2000).

³⁷ See below pp. 77-86.

³⁸ For examples further cf. Porter (2010) 350 n. 212.

³⁹ Bakker (2005) 41. Cf. Porter (2010) 310-11 for a characterization of this critical standpoint: 'render[s] the voice audible no matter how many layers of writing, transmission, quotation, or time have intervened ... 'the

in antiquity with issues of aesthetic materiality. Crates of Mallos, for instance, held that the quality of verbal sound was the most important factor in judging the value of a poem,⁴⁰ and Philodemus *On Poems* provides numerous testimonies to similar views held by other Hellenistic literary theorists. *On Poems* 1 fr. 91 records that Pausimachus makes an argument for the valuation of poetry according to sound on the basis of how it is enunciated: its quality does not reside in composition, but ‘fine or inferior verse arises for no other reason than because of the combination of sounds itself’ (δι’[οὐδὲν] ἕτερον φαῦλον [ἢ καλόν] γίνεσθαι ἢ δι’ αὐ[τὸ τὸ συ]νηχεῖσ[θ]αι). This view is contested by Philodemus when he asserts in fr. 184, countering Andromenides, another ‘euphonist’, that ‘everyone’s hearing or mind is pleased not without reason’ (παν[τὶ τῆς ἀκο]ῆς ἢ τῆς δια[νοίας οὐκ ἀλό]γως οἰκειου[μένης]). For Philodemus, ‘hearing’ is not an irrational process separable from ‘rational’ mental processes. What matters most for eliciting readerly reaction, on Philodemus’ account, is διανοία, the noetic structure which underpins formal effects.⁴¹ The propositions that the sound of words has a function distinct from their meaning, that sound could be pleasing to the hearer, and that sound could reinforce meaning, were widely accepted by Hellenistic literary theorists, and form the background to the stylistic analyses of Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The precise nature of linguistic sound and its relations to semantic meaning, however, were contested issues.

The materiality of language is also a problematic figure in these debates; not only is there the primary argument about whether poetry is to be valued according to sound or meaning, but the status of the sound of language itself is in question. Whereas φωνή is often conceptualized as the voice of the author, it can also be employed to mean ‘sound’, and the euphonist thinkers cited by Philodemus often refer to a materiality inherent in language itself rather than a personalized voice.⁴² This distinction will be significant when considering, for instance, the ways in which literary receptions of Pindar depersonalize the poetic utterance by

view that within all linguistic expressions, oral or written, lies buried a voice that animates them.’ Cf. further *ibid.* 351-3.

⁴⁰ Cf. Asmis (1992); (1995b) 152. Cf. further Philod. *On Poems* 5 col. xxv 2 – xxix 18 for Crates’ argument that sound quality is not determined by rules but inheres naturally in an arrangement of words. Crates’ account of sound is not irrationalizing, however; he argues that one ought ‘to judge through the senses the rational propositions present by nature [in the sound structures]’ (col. xxviii 19-33); for explication of this position cf. Jensen (1923) 146-73; Armstrong (1995) 265 n. 47; Asmis (2004) 12-13.

⁴¹ Cf. *On Poems* 5 col. xxxii 6-10, where Philodemus says that an unnamed opponent ‘speaks only about *lexis*, while leaving aside thoughts, which have the far greater importance’ (καὶ περὶ τῆ[ς] λέ|ξεως μόνον λαλεῖ, τὰ νο|ήματα κυριωτέραν δύ|ναμιν ἔχοντα παραπέμ|πουσ[α]), and *PHerc.* 1676 col. xiv (iii) 24-6 where Philodemus argues that the ‘underlying’ (ὑποκείμενα) aspects of a poem, such as subject matter but also the words themselves, ‘have authority over the poetic craft’ (κυρί|ων δὲ τῆς ποιητικῆς ὑπαρχόντων), i.e., exercise a determinative effect over the poem and its reception: cf. Asmis (1995) 158-60.

⁴² Cf. *On Poems* 1 fr. 117.17 for φωνή as explicitly non-authorial sound.

comparing it to other types of sounds which exceed normative human capacities.⁴³ Furthermore, the thinking of the text as ‘inscribed voice’ need not be privileged as a dominant way of conceiving readerly activity; rather, we need to recognize its theoretical shortcomings, as well its limitations as an ‘historical’ description of what reading entailed. First, the conception of authorial φωνή is distinctly problematic as a means of thinking about performance, involving as it does a deformative construction which reduces the complex vocal and musical aspects of performance to an essentialized notion of authorial utterance. Moreover, thinking about the text as a transcription of authorial φωνή glosses over important distinctions between author and narrator, and hence limits the possibility for attention to the specific ways in which narratorial voice is constructed.⁴⁴ Authorial voice should not be conceptualized only as a productive ground which generates the text, but as a figure produced by the processes of textuality.

A distinction needs to be made here between the composition and performance; in the latter, the performing ‘voice’ shows up as something constructed according to generic and contingent influences, although these factors are clearly important in the compositional process as well; no author writes with a ‘voice’ that is entirely ‘his own’. These issues also affect the historical resitings of texts. Even thinking in materialist terms, a later reading is a *reenactment*, a confluence of the reader’s voice with that of the text which presupposes the absence of the ‘actual’ voice of the historical author. This absence raises the question, connected to the constructedness of authorial voice just discussed, of whose ‘voice’ is being reenacted – the voice of Pindar the historical individual, Pindar *qua* constructed narrator, or the voice of the performing chorus. As my readings below will demonstrate, reading Pindaric texts often brings to the fore the impossibility of a complete ‘reenactment’ of the text, not least because of the texts’ dramatizations of the limitations of their own enunciative strategies.⁴⁵ A voiced reading is a transformative encounter which entails the reader’s physical disposition being given over to text’s voice(s) while simultaneously affirming the uniquely contingent status of each recreation of the text; crucially, however, this physical dimension is only an extension of the processes of transformation implicit in any reading encounter.

⁴³ See below pp. 85-6.

⁴⁴ For an overview of the controversial issue of first persons in Pindar cf. Currie (2005) 19-21, and cf. also Fearn (2007) 7-9. The fullest treatment is Lefkowitz (1991), and note her supplementary comments in Lefkowitz (1995). A particularly interesting aspect of this problem is whether certain utterances are felt to be spoken/sung in the persona of the *laudandus*: Σ P. 8.78a, Σ P.9.161, Σ N.10.73b, Σ I.7.55b record judgements to this effect. See further Currie (2005) 20-1.

⁴⁵ See below pp. 187-92 and pp. 213-18.

The transcription-and-revivification model also ignores the considerable distantiations involved in the processes of textual dissemination and their potential to generate new meanings. Epinician's contextual aspect makes it a particularly interesting test case for addressing the operation of this dynamic. As mentioned above, strategies such as addresses to victors, deixis, and references to the environmental and musical settings of the poems prompt imaginative recreation by later readers, but they also impose a sense of the radical difference between the sites of performance and reading, a difference that would have been strengthened in later antiquity by other factors such as the oddities of Pindar's dialect, as well as the growing body of literary and scholarly receptions. When, for example, at the beginning of P.4 the narrator says that the Muse 'must stand today by that dear man [Arcesilas]' (σάμερον μὲν χρῆ σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ / στᾶμεν, 1-2) in order for the activity of praise to take place, the reader is made aware of the temporal specificity of the performance utterance, but also of his own role in continuing the text's project (αὔξεις [sc. the Muse] οὔρου ὕμνων, P.4.3). Moreover, books are not simply transcriptions of a prior body of language but visual and tangible objects. The materialists' stress on the embodied particularity of text-as-voice discounts the role of material factors such as the use of critical signs and the more general visual appearances of and physical forms of books in shaping readers' access to texts.⁴⁶

An examination of Pindar's texts in later antiquity also needs to take account of interpretative and literary receptions, and in this respect the corpus of ancient scholarship represented by the Pindaric scholia is particularly important. Not only are the exegetical and historical questions foregrounded by the scholia remote from the materialist emphasis on the here-and-now of the physicality of language,⁴⁷ but they also implicate the texts they comment on in a series of intertextual, cultural, and historical networks which demand readerly attention to the contexts, both those of Pindar's own time and later, in which meaning arises and is remade, debated, and contested. In short, critical models which conceive of ancient modes of reading, silent or otherwise, either as a passive submission to the text,⁴⁸ or as a make-of-it-what-you-will exercise is postmodern relativism *avant la lettre*⁴⁹ should be treated with caution. I would instead conceptualize the experience of ancient reading, voiced or silent, as a dynamic process wherein the text both imposes its particular economies of meaning on its readers and is reshaped by the contexts in which it is encountered. Reading is

⁴⁶ I examine this aspect of critical signs below pp. 91-104.

⁴⁷ Cf. Porter (2010) 308-64.

⁴⁸ The burden of Svenbro (1993) 187-216.

⁴⁹ Cf. Fowler (forthcoming) 8-10.

an encounter with the other, and this otherness is reinforced by cultural and historical distantiations, as well as being reconfigured by the receptions to which it is subject.

The literary theoretical validation of the voice in antiquity is another episode in what Derrida terms the ‘logocentric’ or ‘phonocentric’ metaphysics of Western thought, in which live utterance is seen as a dominant site where meaning is informed by its co-presence with the intentions of the speaker, and writing is seen as a parasitic copy of speech. Derrida attempted to show that speech no less than writing partook of the deferrals and indeterminacies of meaning operative in language; the broader correlative of this position is that performances should no more be thought as sites of unified self-present meaning than written texts.⁵⁰ In classical scholarship, and particularly in analysis of classical and archaic Greek literature, this dichotomy has often been expressed in the tendency to privilege performance as a dominant site of meaning and significance, and in the concomitant view of books as a secondary medium mechanically reproducing texts which find their fullest meaning in performance. Classical scholarship has often sought to organize oral and written literature around a series of such oppositions, sometimes with a strongly fetishizing stress on the alterity of ancient cultural practices: reading is an individual, playful activity which takes place at a remove from society, whereas performance, as the ultimate expression of oral culture, is socially integrative space for the dramatization of considerations of communal importance.⁵¹

While few scholars nowadays would accept this division and its conceptual apparatuses, even for the classical period, as an historical account of how readers encountered texts, debates over the interrelation of oral and written cultures are still largely structured around these underlying oppositions.⁵² One manifestation of this tendency is the construction of idealized modes of performance reception, which either explicitly posit or implicitly assume a privileged mode of comprehension attendant on the ‘original’ performance or reception of a literary work.⁵³ In a similar way to the construction of authorial/textual voice by the ancient literary theorists, this conceptualization of ‘original’ receptions denies the temporally extended and multiplicitous nature of any (set of) receptive event(s). Don Fowler’s discussion clarifies the issues:

⁵⁰ Foundational are Derrida (1976) 3-93 and (1981) 17-33.

⁵¹ Cf. Fowler (forthcoming) 1-16. I am grateful to Peta Fowler for allowing me to consult this work.

⁵² E.g. Habinek (2005).

⁵³ Cf. Hirsch (1967); Bundy (1962) 4-5. For a counter argument about the temporally extended nature of receptions cf. Fowler (1996).

[T]he reception of a work even in its most primary context cannot be identified with a single aesthetic experience but is constituted by an extended set of acts and events ... in archaic and classical Greece, the meaning of a lyric or dramatic text was not used up on its first performance but is crucially constituted precisely through its reperformance and reuse. This is true whether or not we are looking to empirical data about actual reception or to the various constructs of 'implied' or 'model' audiences, to the figurations, that is, of an audience that a reading of a text constructs as necessary for its interpretation. Even those who are prepared to admit that the reception of a literary work is in fact always extended in time and composed of an indefinite number of different events will often wish to construct a more ideal encounter as the implied moment of reception, and to track the implied audience's interpretation of the text *as if* it took place ... during a first reading.

This analysis is particularly relevant to the fifth century reception of Pindar, informed as it was by a variety of events separate from the first or official performance of a poem. Rehearsals, in which the performers would, in learning the song, have participated in a lengthy contact with the text which would have operated as a powerful conduit for the text's ethical demands; reperformances, whether choral or monodic,⁵⁴ interactions between epinician performances, and other modes of dissemination such as epigraphs, announcements at the games, and general rumour and conversation, are all part of the extended receptive dynamics Fowler outlines.

The recent focus on reperformances in the classical period has somewhat diminished the idealizing tendency Fowler describes, although the essentializing focus on the original performance is still common in Pindaric scholarship, as in Ilja Pfeijffer's argument that '[a]n [epinician] ode had the deepest significance for its first audience attending the official celebration for which it was written'.⁵⁵ Aside from its reductive implications for reperformance scenarios, this position completely neglects the richness and multiplicity of the *Nachleben* of the Pindaric corpus. This type of thinking is in part a response to the localizing rhetoric of Pindaric poems; in the light of the poems' emphasis on the circumstances of their performance and their local ethical and encomiastic aims, it is easy to see why critics have tended to see them as sites for the circulation of socio-political energies

⁵⁴ On reperformance scenarios cf. Currie (2004); Hubbard (2004); Morrison (2007); (2011).

⁵⁵ Pfeijffer (1999) 10. This view is endorsed by Currie (2004) 53-4 in his examination of reperformance scenarios for Pindar's epinicians. Cf. Steiner (1994) 98-9 on performance as a unifying modality.

and for the creation and maintainance of forms of symbolic capital with an occasional function, but, as I suggested above, we should be wary of equating these functions with a unifying dynamic. While acknowledging the importance of performance culture, this study will make an argument almost diametrically opposed to Pfeijffer's essentializing construction. Epinicians, and other types of performance poems, take on additional meanings and significances in their transhistorical journeys, and can in some respects be seen as more richly meaningful and suggestive as a result of their interaction with later literature, scholarship, and socio-cultural developments. As such, my arguments seek to extend Fowler's stress on the multiplicities of the receptive process to the functions of the Pindaric corpus in later antiquity. The study of performance poems as written texts is also an underexplored means of addressing the ongoing interaction of performance and writing, wherein 'performance' is not simply an idealized prior event but a cultural construct which is open to continual reimagining subject to the dynamics of the receptive tradition, and which is frequently put to interpretative and other ends. We shall also see that, in parallel to these developments, the book itself is subject to particular kinds of transformation when it interacts with the Pindaric corpus, a relationship that differs significantly from that which obtains between book and text in later, more 'bookish' literatures. As a prelude to detailed examination of these issues, I now want to analyse further the role of contexts in shaping literary encounters.

DIACHRONIC TEXTS

Our evidence for ancient readers' encounters with texts is highly problematic. The epiphenomenal mental events which constitute the reading process are irrecoverable *per se*, and the traces left by individual readings are generically and contextually mediated to the extent that they can only give us the most partial access to the mental events which preceded them and to which they gave rise. When reading passages in, for example, the poems of Callimachus which interact with Pindar's poems, there are various literary critical tools at our disposal for formulating how the one author might be responding to the other, and how the texts might be functioning in relation to each other, but most modern scholars would be rightly sceptical of using these formulations as a basis for trying to understand what was involved in Callimachus' experiences when reading Pindar. Even ancient scholarship on the Pindaric corpus, which might seem to be a more promising body of evidence for reading practices, is by no means straightforward; quite aside from the difficulties of reconstructing

ancient scholarship on the basis of the scholia preserved in the mediaeval manuscripts,⁵⁶ we cannot be sure of how individual readers interacted with the scholarly comments they read. While the scholia can give us an outline of the kind of interpretative and exegetical questions with which their readers would have been confronted, they also give rise to effects which go beyond their own interpretative frameworks, and even within those frameworks raise questions which they themselves do not answer. I shall explore some of these issues in detail below; for the moment, I simply want to note that the reading protocols formed by such metatextual bodies should not be seen as determinative for individual readings. Readers always have a certain license to form their own judgements and contest those of others, practices encouraged by the openness of ancient scholarly texts, and their juxtaposition of the views of different scholars.

In a seminal article on the book as a literary construct, Roger Chartier comes to grips with the problem of tracing readerly experience by citing Michel de Certeau's description of readers as like voyagers who leave no trace of their activities in the texts they scrutinize.⁵⁷ Although this is not true in every case, as the annotations, marginalia and other such metatextual marks in ancient papyri testify, its descriptive force alerts us to the difficulties of an historical characterization of readerly experience. In order to circumvent these difficulties, Chartier proposes a threefold mode of historical analysis, focused on textuality itself, on books, and on reading and the various protocols and structures by which it is guided. Chartier is also much concerned to navigate between the freedom of the individual reader to construct the texts he reads and the constraints imposed upon this process by cultural conventions; he distinguishes between a history of the book and a history of what is read, arguing that although the reader has a certain 'independence', this 'is not an arbitrary license. It is confined by the codes and conventions that govern the practices of a community.'⁵⁸ His conclusions dwell again on the problematics of moving from cultural contexts to individuated experiences:

[R]eading is never totally constrained and ... cannot be recursively deduced from the texts to which it is applied ... the tactics of readers, infiltrating the 'special space'

⁵⁶ Cf. pp. 63-7.

⁵⁷ Chartier (1995) 134.

⁵⁸ Chartier (1995) 136. His emphasis on the codifications of reading practices is influenced by Fish (1980) on the 'interpretative community' as a force which shapes individual acts of interpretation. Fish's school of thought has exerted considerable influence, but despite its elegance it suffers serious limitations as a critical model, perhaps the most important being that it limits the degree to which texts can reconfigure their readers and give rise to experiences and meanings which rupture the parameters of a given interpretative community.

produce by the strategies of writing obey certain rules ... Thus [it is] the founding paradox of any history of reading, which must postulate the freedom of a practice of which, broadly, it can only grasp the determinations.⁵⁹

Chartier's focus is therefore on tracing how different groups of readers are constructed as interpretative communities, and how these constructions are influenced by material forms and socially differentiated cultural practices, while acknowledging the provisionality of these determinations.

This study is likewise concerned to think about how cultural forces affected readers and readings, and to this end I shall examine various contextual factors such as the development of libraries, the growth of scholarly literature, and specific strands of literary reception as well as literary critical texts which bear on the Pindaric corpus in later antiquity, while also stressing the instability and openness of these 'codes and conventions'. My main focus, however, is somewhat different from Chartier's, in that I am concerned to trace the textual forces Pindaric texts bring to bear on their readers in a variety of contexts. These textual forces are not confined to the denotative and connotative mechanisms of the texts themselves, but also encompass how the texts are affected by the contexts in which they operate. The meanings, and wider cultural significance, of a given passage of Pindar will therefore be affected by its material form, and also by local factors such as the scholarly exegeses that pertain to it, literary receptions related to it, and by wider cultural and historical issues. My object is the diachronic text, understood as a mode of textuality subject to interaction with multiple intellectual, material, and historical contexts.

The shifting meanings of the diachronic text are not primarily located in the consciousness of a particular ancient reader or in the discourses of a given interpretative community, but are the product of my own interpretative construction of the conditions in which Pindar's texts would have been encountered and of the ways in which they might be read in the light of those conditions. In assessing literary and scholarly responses to Pindar, for instance, my concern will not just be with the responses themselves and the socio-historical and generic pressures that informed their creation, but also with what they presuppose, the kind of reading positions they project, and their significance for readings of the Pindaric texts themselves. My interpretations are aimed primarily at elaborating the kind of meanings and cultural resonances to which we as modern readers might want to respond when thinking

⁵⁹ Chartier (1995) 147.

diachronically about the Pindaric corpus. They also, I hope, have an historical significance, in that they try to uncover some of the ways in which Pindar's texts would have shown up to ancient readers and the kind of interpretative potentialities that would have been open to these readers even if they were not always understood by individual readers in the ways I suggest.

In order to examine the diachronic text more closely, we need to elaborate the nature of the contextual influences to which it is subject. Jauss' seminal work on literature as a system of receptions gives useful pointers in this direction, concerned as he is not just with the relationship between texts and history,⁶⁰ but also with the histories of literary forms and their influence on readers. One of Jauss' central and most celebrated theoretical manoeuvres is his stress on the role of the reader in the cultural dialogues in which texts operate; a central task of interpretation is to establish the 'horizon of expectations' against which a work is initially understood, and which allows understanding of a work's 'artistic character'; this horizon consists of the salient cultural and intellectual modalities with which readers understand a work and which orientate their expectations of it.⁶¹ The relationship between works and the horizons in which they are received is a dynamic one; works can only show up within a given set of cultural and interpretative norms, but they also have the power to intervene in and alter these norms by means of their mediation by individual readers: 'it is only through the process of mediation that the artwork enters into the changing horizon-of-experience of a continuity in which the perpetual inversion occurs from simple reception to critical understanding, from passive to active reception, from recognized aesthetic norms to a new production that surpasses them.'⁶²

Jauss' opposition of 'simple reception' and 'critical understanding' assumes a structuring of initial receptions by a prereflective or preinterpretative disposition which is then complicated by later, more critical stages of receptive activity. This dichotomy has a certain force as an empirical characterization of how people respond to texts through repeated encounters, a process which often entails a certain aggregation of knowledge or critical strategies, but we might question the extent to which a prereflective relation is ever possible, particularly in the case of Pindar's epinicians, poems that frequently bring to the reader's attention the interpretative frameworks by which they are to be understood. A related problem with Jauss' formulations is their generic focus; the processes by which particular works project and are

⁶⁰ Jauss (1982) 15 argues that 'the historical essence of the work of art lies not only in its representational or expressive function but also in its influence' and that the artwork is 'a medium capable of forming and altering perception'.

⁶¹ Jauss (1982) 25.

⁶² Jauss (1982) 19. Cf. Martindale (1993) for this methodology.

governed by certain horizons of expectation are governed largely by generic features and by the prevalence of a given genre itself as a frame.⁶³ Literary theorists have been increasingly concerned in recent times to register the openness of genres and generic tropes to reconfiguration,⁶⁴ and the (potential) indeterminacy of genre poses a problem for Jauss' framework. Discussion of receptive dynamics needs to be sensitive to the potential of literary works to disrupt the coherence of genre or to problematize generic norms, both of which strategies I shall suggest Pindar employs. Moreover, when thinking about texts as diachronic entities, we shall also have to consider intertextualities which cross generic boundaries and, at least potentially, give rise to generically multiple interpretative horizons.

A signal strength of Jauss' work is the openness and dynamism that he attributes to the formation of the contexts in which texts operate, but he leaves open the problem of how these contexts are to be delimited and defined for any given period. A similar issue arises in Malcolm Heath's account of the primary poetic and secondary poetic in ancient culture, the former being the actual practice of poetry as embodied in poetic texts, the latter being the theorizing of commentators, rhetoricians, and other types of readers. Heath privileges a culture's secondary poetic as a means of guiding our attempts to understand how that culture related to its texts, but admits that the accounts given by the secondary poetic may only partially capture the meanings and effects of the texts at which they are directed.⁶⁵ We should also recognize that the secondary poetic is an internally conflicted field, subsuming opposed positions or differences of emphasis which demand mediation by individual readers. Just as readers are free to reflect on and disagree with explicitly theorized conceptions of literary function and value, so texts themselves, I will argue, always exceed in various ways the critical determinations to which they are subject. Heath also tends to focus primarily on rhetoricians and literary critics as the sources of the secondary poetic, but in doing so he neglects other important determinants; chief amongst these are the exegetical commentaries, but later literary receptions and material factors also play an important role in shaping readerly orientation to particular texts. Historical factors are likewise operative in the diachronic resituation of texts, as well as in their context of their primary emergence; in their focus on the importance of the histories of specific literary forms for positioning a work, both

⁶³ Jauss (1982) 25-8. Generic concerns are also important in the makeup of interpretative communities as formulated by the neopragmatists: for the classic discussion cf. Fish (1980).

⁶⁴ See the essays in Depew and Obbink (2000).

⁶⁵ Heath (1989) 10. Cf. the remarks of Fowler (2000) 70-1. Heath (2002) 117-27 attempts to deal with these problems, suggesting the (critical) use of ancient literary criticism 'to inform our reconstruction of the assumptions about literary form and function underlying the composition of ... texts' (p. 120). This is problematic in Pindar's case, given the lack of literary criticism contemporary with the poet's lifetime.

Heath and Jauss tend to somewhat neglect the role of historical circumstances in mediating the self-positioning of communities of readers and in reforming the significance of works themselves. This study will attempt to demonstrate that changing forms of political discourse, and changes in the distribution of political, military, and cultural authority play a significant part in mediating the significance of the Pindaric corpus.

Jauss' concern with the relationship between literature and history, and with the unique history of the institution of literature itself, has been shared by many other recent literary and cultural theorists. This connection provides a corrective to ancient modes of literary criticism, where contextual factors are conspicuously absent; from Aristotelian essentialism through to the materialist allegorism of Crates and the formalism of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and [Longinus], ancient literary criticism is resolutely intratextual in its focus, another reason for caution when using these texts as a guide for our own constructions of the contours of ancient textual encounters. One of the most sophisticated and influential models of the relations between literature and wider society was formulated by Pierre Bourdieu, whose work forms part of a particular antiessentializing thinking which, recognizing the instability of the category of 'literature' and the potential for literariness to emerge in any textual site, emphasised the role of cultural mediators in constructing and policing the descriptive categories and interpretative modes which regulated what might be thought of as 'literature'.⁶⁶ Bourdieu emphasises the role of the 'literary field', consisting of editors, publishers, reviewers, academics, and others, in defining modes of valuation and bestowing value on literary works, a capacity defined by agents' accumulation of 'symbolic capital', the aggregated intellectual and social prestige which validates individual judgements.⁶⁷ Crucially for Bourdieu, the field of cultural production had its own logic and modes of power which were subordinate to but separate from those of wider society.⁶⁸ Fields are dynamic, and are constantly being reformed as individual agents intervene to articulate new positions, valuing different works and bringing new modes of valuation to the fore; this creates a relational

⁶⁶ A prominent exponent of this position was Stanley Fish, who promoted the notion of the interpretative community as a space in which meaning was created and regulated: cf. Fish (1980) 97: 'literature ... is the product of a way of reading, of a community agreement about what will count as literature, which leads the members of the community to pay a certain kind of attention and thereby to *create* literature'. For criticisms of this position cf. McDonald (2006) 217. Marxist literary theorists have long been concerned with the relations between literature and history, and particularly with the problem of how to theorize the category of the literary, and individual literary works, as not merely a reflex of historical conditions: for an overview cf. Eagleton (1976). Macherry (2006) 58-61 is a particularly acute Marxist attempt to articulate a case for (a type of) textual autonomy in relation to extratextual realities.

⁶⁷ Bourdieu (1993) 6-14. Cf. McDonald (2006) 218. The notion of symbolic capital has been put to influential use in the field of Pindaric studies by Kurke (1991): see below pp. 33-5.

⁶⁸ Bourdieu (1993) 14, 37-45.

process as a result of which '[t]he meaning of a work ... changes automatically with each change in the field within which it is situated for the spectator or reader'.⁶⁹ Bourdieu's analysis of cultural fields is a useful starting point for thinking about how definitions and constructions of literature and the literary are mediated. It is not difficult, for instance, to see Hellenistic scholarly culture through this lens, as successive scholars and scholar-poets jostle for position within the cultural field by means of the scholarly positions they articulate and the literary practices they engage in. My primary interest, however, is less in the formation of particular cultural fields than in the consequences of these for the Pindaric corpus, and this requires an emphasis on the operation of texts themselves which is largely absent from Bourdieu's sociological model: his account of the dynamism of fields, for instance, focuses on the determinative effects of assumptions of positions by particular agents rather than on the (re)constitutive forces of texts.⁷⁰

Another strand of recent antiessentialist thinking includes theorists who, while acknowledging the importance of contextual factors in literary production and reception, have sought to locate literature's capacity for determination *qua* literature in texts themselves.⁷¹ Theorists such as Maurice Blanchot insisted on the singular demands of literary texts, their capacity to generate particularized encounters and modes of reading particular to them. For Blanchot, what threatens the distinctiveness of the particular text is the reader's insistence on attempting to accommodate the text to interpretative norms. Against this tendency, Blanchot advocated an attention to the irreducible particularity of the text:

Ce qui menace le plus la lecture: la réalité du lecteur, sa personnalité, son immodestie, l'acharnement à vouloir demeurer lui-même en face de ce qu'il lit, à vouloir être un homme qui sait lire en général. Lire un poème, ce n'est pas lire encore un poème, ce n'est même pas entrer, par l'intermédiaire de ce poème, dans l'essence de la poésie ... La lecture du poème, c'est le poème lui-même qui s'affirme oeuvre dans la lecture, qui, dans l'espace tenu ouvert par le lecteur, donne naissance à la lecture qui accueille.⁷²

⁶⁹ Bourdieu (1993) 31.

⁷⁰ McDonald (2006) 226 argues that Bourdieu's model is limited, in that '[b]y privileging the historically specific norms and categories of the field, without which literature as such could not exist, it underestimates the unpredictability of writing, which is always capable of transforming the field by exceeding or subverting its determinations.'

⁷¹ Cf. McDonald (2006) 219-21 for an account of this tradition, and cf. in general Clark (2005).

⁷² Blanchot (1955) 207.

Blanchot's accent on the fragile, particularized space of the literary encounter has the advantage of affirming the uniqueness of individual works and consequently militating against their reductive assimilation into other modes of discourse or, for that matter, their totalizing recuperation by any given interpretation. This focus is particularly helpful, I shall argue below, when thinking about Pindar's poetry in the context of ancient Pindaric scholarship, whose strong emphasis on paraphrasing exegesis both threatens and reinforces the particularity of the texts on which it comments.

Blanchot's thinking of textuality is vulnerable to the twin charges of essentialism and interpretative reductionism. On the one hand, the quasi-sacral particularity of the text and the space of reading projected by it looks rather like an essence in another guise, a formalized state freed from ideological determination. On the other, the insistence on the irreducible nature of this space would seem to commit the critic to an acceptance of the ultimate ineffability of the text, diminishing the potential for concrete interpretations.⁷³ Yet in mapping out literature's capacity to resist interpretative determination, his approach opens a way of putting contextual factors in dialogue with an assertion of the dialogic nature of the literary space and the capacity of this space to transform its reader.⁷⁴ Another possible weakness in Blanchot's argument is the vagueness of his articulation of what counts as literary self-determination: it could be argued that any text, regardless of form, subject matter, genre, or any other local mark, could fulfil the conditions set out in the concluding sentence of the passage cited above. Derrida's meditations on the 'strange institution' of literature provide another means of approaching this problem, one which resists either historical determinism or formalist essentialism while attempting to negotiate between historical and formal demands. Particularly resonant in this respect is Derrida's analysis of Kafka's parable 'Before the Law'. My main concern here is not with the primary thrust of his reading,⁷⁵ but with his remarks on the relations between literary texts and the environments in which they operate. Derrida focuses on the literary' texts deployment of certain 'movements of framing

⁷³ This problem is addressed by Clark (2005) 8, who rightly argues that '[t]oo much of the standard defence of the literary as singular comes down to highlighting our not being able to finally identify or fix the meaning of something ... These arguments should now be treated as truisms, starting places for thought and not conclusions in themselves.'

⁷⁴ Cf. McDonald (2006) 220 on the differences between Blanchot's system and that of Barthes (1973): against Barthes' emphasis on the productive role of class conflicts in the formation of texts Blanchot's thinking of 'literature's inexhaustible capacity to be other, its demanding singularity, made untenable any such epochal unities or hopes of a grand historical synthesis.'

⁷⁵ He argument revolves around reading the parable as instantiating his own concept of *différance*, expressive of the deferral of meaning inherent in the literary encounter and of the relationship between the uniqueness of the individual reader and the opaqueness of a given text. Cf. Foshay (2009) 199 for a succinct account.

and referentiality' which constitute its difference from other such works,⁷⁶ and give it the power to 'make the law', namely to produce a type of reading distinctive to it, but he acknowledges that these alone are not a sufficient condition for a text to be regarded as literary. For this to occur, a text must 'appear *before the law* of another, more powerful text protected by more powerful guardians', namely the critics, archivists, lawyers, and others entrusted with the task of regulating the literary.⁷⁷ Derrida locates the literary at the intersection of different regulatory forces; the literary text 'can exercise the legislative power of linguistic performativity to sidestep existing laws from which, however, it derives its protection'.⁷⁸ Although Derrida is concerned here chiefly with the relationship between literature and the law understood as a legal system, his argument also holds for other kinds of 'law', as implied by his mention of cultural figures such as critics and publishers who contribute to regulating the literary. For Derrida, the site of emergence of literature is constituted by a negotiation between the idioms of individual texts and the modes of categorization which seek to delimit them.⁷⁹

This dynamic is also at work in Derrida's account of the singularity of the literary text. He is committed to the uniqueness of the individual work, but recognizes that this can only come about and be apprehended within a set of cultural norms: '[a]n absolute, absolutely pure singularity, if there were one, would not even show up ... To become readable, it has to be *divided*, to *participate* and *belong*.' Expanding on Derrida's description, Derek Attridge defines the singularity of a work as that which 'consists in its difference from all other such objects, not simply as a particular manifestation of general rules but as a peculiar nexus within the culture that is perceived as resisting or exceeding all pre-existing general determinations',⁸⁰ and that '[t]he experience of singularity involves an apprehension of otherness ... in the mental and emotional opening that it produces'.⁸¹

⁷⁶ Derrida (1992) 213.

⁷⁷ Derrida (1992) 214. Cf. McDonald (2006) 201. Derrida (1992) 73 remarks that '[t]here is no assured essence or existence of literature. If you proceed to analyse all these elements of a literary work, you will never come across literature itself, only some traits which it shares or borrows, which you can find ... in other texts'.

⁷⁸ Derrida (1992) 216.

⁷⁹ Cf. McDonald (2006) 221-2, and Foshay (2009) 201-2: the text is not a stable object but 'a scene of encounter, a mediated, necessarily serial conversation ... a dialectical encounter of subject and object ... by definition ongoing, inherently dynamic, necessarily destined to develop as the reader and the readerly community and their contexts change.' Cf. also Heath (2002) 116 on '[t]he open-endedness of meaning potential' which informs the mediation of generic norms by particular works.

⁸⁰ Attridge (2004) 63. Clarke (2005) 154 sees literature as 'founded' in self-contestation, the tension between necessarily general norms of understanding and behaviour and the simultaneous claim of the singular work, 'impossibly and ineluctably, to be taken as an example of nothing but itself.'

⁸¹ Attridge (2004) 67.

These theoretical accounts are concerned with the instability of the category of the literary and how it might be defined and regulated, and are in large part responses to developments in modern literature and to a specific set of contemporary cultural conditions. As such they cannot be applied in any straightforward way to an analysis of ancient literature. It is a commonplace of classical scholarship that the ancients do not have a word or a conceptual apparatus which corresponds to 'literature' as named and conceptualized today,⁸² and the kind of literary phenomena to which Derrida in particular pays attention are rarely prevalent in ancient texts. Nevertheless, the framework just elaborated has numerous methodological benefits for thinking about Pindar's poems. First, the focus on singularity sharpens sensitivity to the distinctiveness of the poems in their contemporary context and allows for an awareness of the ways in which epinicians make interpretative and ethical demands of their readers, foregrounding the textual specificity of these functions and the impossibility of entirely recuperating or translating them into other modes of discourse. I shall argue that Attridge's formulation of singularity as 'resisting or exceeding all pre-existing general determinations', while avoiding the cultural critical tendency to see literary texts as instances of general norms,⁸³ is less useful than Derrida's more general emphasis of the necessity of negotiating between the idiomatic aspects of a work and the various modes of its historical determination. Of especial importance here is a recognition of texts' capacity to project the readers and readings suitable to them in unique ways, a process which in Pindar's epinicians comes about through a conjunction of specific occasionality and the particular relations devolved by individual poems between mythical narratives and interpretative situations.⁸⁴

Second, the theoretical models just discussed give us a useful set of tools for thinking about texts diachronically. Derrida, followed by Attridge, examines singularity as a general concept, and is not specifically concerned with the dynamics of reception. Consequently, his elaboration of singularity does not aim at an elucidation of how later texts can impact on previous ones. My particular interests here are in how the event of singularity is affected by the diachronicity of the text, and of the intertextual configurations that arise from this situation, and in how the text's own particular economy affects the contexts in which it is read.⁸⁵ We might question, however, whether singularity on this definition is susceptible of

⁸² Cf. Goldhill (1999) with the remarks of Martindale (2005) 32-3.

⁸³ See Clark (2005) 1-2 for a diagnosis of this position's shortcomings.

⁸⁴ Cf. Derrida (1992) 74 on 'the work which produces its reader, a reader who doesn't yet exist ... a reader who would be 'formed', 'trained' ... *invented* by the work ... The work then becomes an institution forming its own readers, giving them a competence which they did not possess before.'

⁸⁵ Cf. Derrida (1972) on the power of writing to 'engender infinitely new contexts in an absolutely non-saturable fashion'.

temporal extension; Attridge stresses that in bringing about the conceptual shifts necessary to apprehend it, a work's singularity works towards compromising its singular status: 'its emergence is the beginning of its erosion'.⁸⁶ On these grounds, it might be thought that the longer a work persists within a culture, the more fully it will be integrated into that culture's norms, and the more tenuous the 'apprehension of [its] otherness' will become. To an extent this is true; scholarship, critical engagements, teaching, and various types of cultural appropriation serve to assimilate a work to interpretative norms and furnish participants in that culture with various means of understanding it. These acculturative practices, however, treated by Attridge as essentially normalizing, can also have the effect of reconfiguring the otherness of a text, of bringing about interpretative situations in which the singularity of a text shows up in different forms from those possible in its previous cultural contexts. This observation also applies to literary receptions of 'classic' texts. Studies of literary reception tend to focus on the uses made by later texts of their models, or on how later texts interact, agonistically, cooperatively, or both, with previous ones.⁸⁷ My method, however, will be (also) to reverse this practice and think about the ways later texts can resituate earlier ones and shift how they might be read. The potentiality for this mode of reading has been noted, in different forms, by various theorists, but its possibilities remain to be explored.⁸⁸

Don Fowler's discussion of intertextuality, and the potential of that concept for enabling new ways of understanding the relations of literary (and other) texts, bears on this issue:

It is the possibility of reversing the directionality of intertextual reference – of accepting the influence of T.S. Eliot on Shakespeare – which is often seen as the worst of the horrors to which intertextuality can lead and even those who would be prepared to accept it tend to work wherever possible within a framework where source-texts precede target texts. Where we do wish to see, for instance, Vergil's *Aeneid* differently in the light of later epic, our criticism will tend to be framed in terms of the later passages 'bringing out' something that was already 'there' in the *Aeneid* ... If we locate

⁸⁶ Attridge (2004) 64. Following Derrida, Attridge stresses singularity's receptive status: 'singularity ... is not a property but an event, the event of singularizing which takes place in reception ... its emergence is the beginning of its erosion, as it brings about the cultural changes necessary to accommodate it' (ibid.).

⁸⁷ Cf. Fowler (1997) 15 for a schematization of differences between 'allusion' and 'intertextuality' as terms for orientating such relations.

⁸⁸ Cf. e.g. Jauss (1982) 35. Bourdieu (1993) 106 addresses the temporality of the cultural field, arguing that it is chiefly the product of ongoing struggles over authoritative legitimacy amongst critics and other cultural producers: the creation of new positions in the field by newcomers is productive of a differentiation that in turn produces a type of cultural temporality which affects how previous works (and positions) within the field are understood and valued.

intertextuality, however, not in any pre-existing textual system but in the reader, there is no reason to feel that it is in some way improper to acknowledge that for most professional classicists today there *are* now traces of Lucan in Vergil, just as our Homer can only ever now be Vergilian ... Are our view of the opposition between rationality and emotion in the *Aeneid* really the same after Captain Kirk and Mr Spock?⁸⁹

What holds for contemporary scholars and students of Latin epic would also have held for Hellenistic readers of Pindar. Just as reading Virgil is a different experience when one has read Lucan from when one has not, so readings of Callimachus and Theocritus, particularly where they are responding to Pindaric models, have the potential to inflect how one subsequently approaches Pindar. Fowler acknowledges that a chronological construction of intertextual reference 'is required for many of the constructions we wish to make about antiquity', and it should be added that such a mode of reference is often inscribed into texts' self-constructions; Theocritus *Id.* 16, which I shall examine below,⁹⁰ is a celebrated instance of a text which uses intertextual connections (with Pindar among others) to dramatize its secondariness and belatedness within the tradition it constructs. As I have previously argued, readings of Pindar which seek to understand texts in terms of their 'original' production and performance, or as formative elements in a chronologically constructed literary history, are always available to readers. But in order to take the measure of some of the influences to which ancient readers would have been subject, and to assess how we might want to construct the cultural position of Pindaric texts in later periods, we need to take account of other texts, and other cultural and historical developments, with which they interacted. Consequently, one of my central focuses will be on the intertextual fields formed at particular times, and which bear on interpretation of a particular text.

Bourdieu's notion of the cultural field provides a model for thinking about intertextual fields, but there are important distinctions to be made between them. First, the cultural field is a structure primarily formed, on Bourdieu's model, by cultural producers and their actions in validating a particular artwork or articulating a particular mode or model of valuation. The chief function of these cultural producers is to bestow value on texts. The intertextual field, on the other hand, is a body of discourses related to the reading of a particular text without any specific role in and of itself. Although later receptions of a text can have the effect of

⁸⁹ Fowler (1997) 27-8.

⁹⁰ Cf. pp. 133-42.

bestowing cultural validation on it, this is by no means a straightforward process, as receptions can also contribute to the texts' resituation and to changes in how they are apprehended by readers. Secondly, the intertextual field is not, or not wholly, structured by the purposes of cultural producers but by the mediations of readers. So both limbs of my above definition, 'body of discourses' and 'related to a particular text' are problematic. With regard to the former, each individual reader will have read different texts and been exposed to different cultural, social, and political experiences, and will hence be a unique cultural aggregate; Attridge defines the reader in these terms as an 'idioculture'.⁹¹ Constructing an intertextual field for a given text will therefore always be an historically conditional exercise in relation to the application of that field to an historical reader. More importantly, just as texts construct implied readers,⁹² contexts also project reader-positions in ways that require negotiation by individual readers.

Here the second limb of my initial formulation, 'related to the reading of a particular text' comes into question. In confronting, for instance, poems by different authors about the same subject, readers have to judge if, and how, they are related to each other. There are established literary-historical methodologies for this practice, focusing on questions of influence, position within a given genre, and other similar author-based criteria. But when thinking about the place of a text within a looser diachronic configuration of intertexts, understood not only to refer to literary texts, but also to scholarly literature and cultural practices, different issues emerge. One such is the relationship that the primary text might itself explicitly or implicitly impose on its intertexts by means of devices such as ethical standpoint, construction of narrative, and its figuration of narrator and reader. Siting a text within an intertextual field, therefore, is not an aggregative exercise of accumulating a set of meanings that might affect a primary text, but requires an attention to the specific relations that might arise between the primary text and its intertexts. The intertextual field is a space of (potential) conflict, differentiation, and tangential association that the reader needs to negotiate. Nor should individual readerly idiocultures be conceived as fixed; like texts themselves, they are dynamic systems open to reconstitution by different textual encounters. How these processes operate in the case of particular poems will be examined below; my point here is that implication in intertextual fields is not an incidental aspect but a constitutive factor of the reading process. Intertextual fields are both prereflectively determinative albeit

⁹¹ Attridge (2004) 21-2, 67, 78.

⁹² Cf. Iser (1980) and the essays in Bennett (1995).

partially, in that they provide the frames through which a particular text is viewed, and interpretatively operative when made the subject of a reader's attention to his activity.

The two halves of my formulation are also mutually implicative, however, in that interpretative decisions about what relatedness consists of will affect the constitution of a particular intertextual matrix. Deciding on what counts and what does not count as a significant intertext for any given text is also problematic, and is connected to the problem of establishing demarcations of particular contexts. In theory, there are no limits to the number of texts, understood in the widest sense of the word, which could bear on a particularly readerly encounter; one might argue that, in the case of a Hellenistic reader's response to O.1, everything that that reader knew about epinician poetry, Hiero's place in Sicilian history and later literature, not to mention different versions of the Pelops myth, would have borne on his reading, in addition to whatever scholarly commentaries on O.1 he happened to have read. Yet this selection of cultural data, even if recoverable, would only represent a part of that reader's intellectual constitution. Even if contexts are, in Derrida's terms, non-saturable, not susceptible of a totalizing empirical description, we may still attempt to sketch out in general terms what some of these contexts may have consisted of, as long as the provisionality of such constructions is borne in mind. In the following chapters, I shall examine the role of the library of Alexandria as a site for the preservation, storage, and study of texts, a series of Pindaric receptions, both in literary texts and other cultural practices, and also the scholarly reception of Pindar in the Hellenistic period. In doing so, I make no claim to exhaustiveness: my aim is to outline some episodes in the history of Pindaric reception with a view to thinking about their relations with the Pindaric corpus itself. These contexts are constructions of my interpretative procedures no less than my readings of individual poems or cultural data, and as historical accounts of influences on ancient reading practices are intended as no more than provisional guides. Establishing what counts as a context and thinking about how that context should be negotiated are always challenges for the individual reader, and my analyses aim as much to reflect these interpretative processes as they do at establishing the conditions under which they occurred.

In view of the preceding remarks, this is a convenient place for explaining my choice of contexts in which to examine Pindaric texts. I shall focus mainly on the Hellenistic period, beginning with the Pindaric (and other) literary and textual scholarship in the third century BC, and taking in a range of receptions down to the final decades of the first century BC. I shall also dwell briefly on the judgement of and allusions to Pindar in [Longinus] *On the Sublime*, despite the likelihood of this text postdating (perhaps quite considerably) the

Hellenistic period. This focus might appear to pose considerable problems for a study of material texts; although a number of Pindaric papyri are extant, there are none which date to the early Hellenistic period. My decision is dictated partly by considerations of space (a detailed literary analysis of Pindaric papyri and their readers would require a study of its own), but it is mainly based on the significance of the Hellenistic period as an epoch in the history of the Pindaric corpus. This period saw the growth of systematic Pindaric scholarship, important changes in the material presentation of texts, as *scriptio continua* was replaced by colometrized texts marked with critical signs, as well as numerous engagements with Pindar by poets such as Callimachus and Theocritus. Attention to a given context is justified, as I have argued, by the specificity of material and cultural conditions which constitute it, and the richness of the Hellenistic period in this respect makes it a prime site for such treatment.

SONGS OF PRAISES

Thinking about the functions and receptions of Pindar's texts in later antiquity brings into play numerous questions more and less remote from those with which Pindaric scholars have traditionally been concerned. The hermeneutic disjunction, however, between treating the texts as performance pieces and written documents need not be overstated; many of the issues prominent in analyses directed at the former continue to be important when thinking about written texts and their receptions, albeit in different ways. Having discussed some of the methodological questions which bear on analyses of the texts in later periods, I want to give a brief overview of recent trends in Pindaric scholarship and outline my approach to some of the issues which bear on analyses of the poetic economy of the fifth century. My intention here is not to present a totalizing interpretative framework, but to raise some questions which have hitherto been neglected and to present a refocused view of issues previously formulated.

Elroy Bundy's contributions to Pindaric scholarship in the early 1960s marked a turning point in the criticism of epinician poetry.⁹³ Pindaric studies had for some time previously been dominated by the biographical approach which reached its acme in Wilamowitz' *Pindaros*,⁹⁴ a methodology which sought to explain apparently obscurities by recourse to the events of the poet's life, and was happy to see Pindar as frequently employing allusions

⁹³ Chiefly Bundy (1962). It should be noted that Bundy's formalist approach was anticipated by Schadewaldt (1928); cf. Kirkwood (1981) 13, 22 n. 4; Currie (2005) 11-12.

⁹⁴ Wilamowitz (1922); Bowra (1953), (1964) are more recent examples of the biographical approach.

which could only be elucidated with reference to contemporary political situations.⁹⁵ As a corrective, Bundy advocated a study of the ‘grammar of choral style’, seeing the poems as ‘the products of poetic and rhetorical conventions’, attention to which allows an understanding of their encomiastic purpose.⁹⁶ While Bundy’s structuralist approach was beneficial in focusing on the functionality of the poems and dispelling the need for reliance on (unreliable) extratextual data to explain the poems’ rhetorical procedures,⁹⁷ his monological conception of the poems’ operation is flawed. For Bundy, epinician is ‘an oral, public, epideictic literature dedicated to the single purpose of eulogizing men and communities’.⁹⁸ This formalism has been extremely influential,⁹⁹ but scholars have also recognized the necessity of putting formal analysis into dialogue with contextual issues. In recent years, this has manifested itself in attempts to relate Pindar’s epinicians to other types of contemporary cultural productions, and to understand the influence of particular social and political issues on the composition and function of individual poems.¹⁰⁰ The notion of a ‘single purpose’ has also been the subject of considerable modification, as scholars have emphasised the role of epinicians in articulating communal identity and asserting local identities in Panhellenic contexts.¹⁰¹

The relations between Pindar’s epinicians and their sociopolitical contexts were the subject of an influential study by Leslie Kurke, who conceptualized epinician performances as spaces of negotiation between poet, victor, and audience. A central generic preoccupation of epinician, on this reading, is the establishment of communal cohesion by means of a symbolic reintegration of the victor back into a society whose stability his outstanding success might

⁹⁵ An approach exemplified by the attempts to read P.11 as a response to Theban politics: cf. below p. 206. Some responses to this historicist approach: Bundy (1962) 35; Young (1970) 39; Lloyd-Jones (1973) 115-16; Carey (1981) 1-11; Kurke (1991) 9; Currie (2005) 12-13.

⁹⁶ Bundy (1962) 32, 35.

⁹⁷ On the structuralist aspects of Bundy’s work cf. Currie (2005) 12-13.

⁹⁸ Bundy (1962) 35.

⁹⁹ Cf. e.g. Race (1990), a study which highlights the benefits and limitations of the formalist approach: Race’s analyses have the virtue of clearly articulating the formal structures of the poems, but have little to say about epinician’s interaction with its historical circumstances and operate within in a limited conception of the poems’ functionality. Thummer (1968) 11 sees the odes as made up of different categories of praise, but this classificatory approach is excessively reductive and fails to account for slippages across categories: for other criticisms cf. Carey (1981) 1-2.

¹⁰⁰ The connections between epinicians and commemorative sculpture is discussed by inter alia Steiner (1994) 91-9; Thomas (2007). For Pindar’s epinicians as in dialogue with contemporary architecture cf. e.g. Pavlou (2010); Athanassaki (2011b); Indergaard (2011). For discussion and further references cf. Athanassaki (2011) 284 n. 82. Burnett (2005); and the essays in Fearn (2011) examine the local issues which shaped Pindar’s poems for Aeginetan victors. Cf. also Carey (2007); Neumann-Hartmann (2009) for more general treatments of contextuality.

¹⁰¹ Cf. e.g. Kowalzig (2007) 226-64 on O.7, which she sees as foregrounding a pan-Rhodian identity which subsumes and connects the individual Rhodian *poleis*.

seem to threaten.¹⁰² For Kurke, the threat of tyranny, actual or imaginary, is a prevalent concern which epinician works to counteract, alongside more general imbalances of power between victor and community:

Within the space of epinikion, the poet negotiates with the community on behalf of the returning victor. To ease the victor's acceptance by various segments of the audience, the poet dramatizes shared representations, portraying the victor as an ideal citizen and ideal aristocrat. The audience, well trained to 'read' the poet's symbolic message, also plays its part in the 'communal drama', signaling approval by its participation in the festivities.¹⁰³

Central to this negotiation is the deployment of various topoi such as 'the loop of *nostos*',¹⁰⁴ the communally beneficial use of private expenditure,¹⁰⁵ and the place of the victor's house within the city. By means of the use of such topoi within the context of the performance as a staging of communal interests, 'the poem enacts the reintegration of the victor into his heterogenous community.'¹⁰⁶ Kurke sees this communal heterogeneity as an important feature of epinician's social space. Pindar composed at a time of social flux, when the premonetary economy was being displaced by the use of money, democracies were flourishing in Athens and Syracuse, and traditional aristocratic values were being challenged by a variety of cultural and political developments. Kurke sees Pindar as mediating between these different challenges, creating a form of poetry which responds to contemporary developments while also asserting traditional values, 'a kind of counterrevolution on the part of the aristocracy'.¹⁰⁷

While I share Kurke's and others' commitment to the conceptualization of epinician as a functional genre, I want in this study to bring other aspects of its operation into focus. One

¹⁰² The staging and reinforcing of communal unity has been a major topos of criticism of archaic and classical Greek poetry: cf. e.g. Stehle (1997) 20. Goldhill (1991) 128-66. sees Pindar's epinicians as meditating on 'the limits of praise' and advocating awareness of human limitations, although his concern is mainly with the intratextual operation of such reflections.

¹⁰³ Kurke (1991) 258. Bourdieu's notion of symbolic capital forms an important part of Kurke's methodology, as that which both victory and its reenactment in performance bestows on individual victors and, by extension, their communities. On the victor as (potential) tyrant cf. also Hubbard (2001) 389-90; Thomas (2007) 143; Carey (2007) 203 n. 20.

¹⁰⁴ Kurke (1991) 15-34.

¹⁰⁵ For the motif of expenditure cf. Carey (2007) 203.

¹⁰⁶ Kurke (1991) 259.

¹⁰⁷ Kurke (1991) 258-9. A particular instance of this is her reading of I.2 (Kurke (1991) 240-56), in which she sees the poem as aiming at the recuperation of *megaloprepeia* in terms of the traditional values of aristocratic guest friendship and gift-exchange. For some criticisms of her position from an historical point of view cf. e.g. Thomas (2007) 141-4, 150.

important move in this respect is an increased attention to the role of readerly response. Cultural critical models tend to neglect the dynamics of the reading process, seeing it as a reflex of cultural and ideological norms. Kurke's emphasis, for instance, is on how 'the poet ... transmitted a coherent message to his audience',¹⁰⁸ rather than on how these 'messages' were actually received. Although we cannot tell how audiences responded to epinician performances, we can examine how interpretative responses are prefigured and demanded by the texts. I argue that Pindar's frequent meditations on the relationship between praise and envy, his idealization of victors, and the exemplary use of mythical narratives should be seen not as messages to be decoded, but rather as open-ended scripts requiring supplementation by readerly response.¹⁰⁹ Of central importance are the various ways in which they prompt the reader to consider his own relation to the concepts deployed, and the wider validity of these concepts. While Pindar's poems often offer universalizing gnomic reflections, these are not simply 'asserted', but put into dialogue with particular ethical challenges which the reader must negotiate on his own terms. In this sense, the reader's role is taken to be a more active one than that implied by Kurke in the above passage. In meditating on the indeterminacies and conflicts raised by epinician rhetoric, the reader undergoes a transformational apprehension of his interpretative, ethical, social status.¹¹⁰

These modes of reading influenced, and were influenced by, the nature of the chorus. Choral identity and authority were crucial factors in how epinician's generalizing claims and mythical narratives were understood by audiences; this issue has received more attention in tragedy than it has in epinician,¹¹¹ although the tragic chorus is in many respects a problematic comparandum. Unlike tragic choruses, the epinician chorus did not wear masks or play characters,¹¹² but appeared *in propria persona*. Consequently, epinician choral

¹⁰⁸ Kurke (1991) 11. Mackie (2003) ch. 2 argues for the importance of audiences for shaping epinician's praise agenda; her analysis of what different groups (the victor's family, the wider public etc.) would want to hear is sensible, although she neglects the idealizing and exemplary aspect of how victors are presented.

¹⁰⁹ I use 'reader' here, for the sake of convenience, to cover audience members as well as readers of books. On *paideia* in lyric poetry cf. Gentili (1988) 55-6. Instructive also are the remarks of Jaeger (1946) 216-19, who highlights P.6 and N.3 as examples of Pindaric *paideia*. It should be noted at this stage that the post-Bundyan focus on praise has often led scholars to diminish the importance of more cautionary aspects of Pindar's epinicians, the common strategy being to see them as forms of praise. Useful reflections on the ethicity of reading are found in Hillis Miller (1995). While the situations of Pindar's readers/listeners would have been very different from the practices Hillis Miller describes, his conception of reading's ethicity as balanced between responding to a demand and exercising responsibility (p. 207) is pertinent for the positioning of Pindar's audiences.

¹¹⁰ Relevant here is Iser (1980) on the readerly negotiation of textual indeterminacies: in the Pindaric corpus, these take the form less of meanings which are not subject to fixing by the text than ongoing conflicts over the application of these concepts. For an overview of reader response theory cf. Bennett (1995) 1-19.

¹¹¹ Gould (1996); Goldhill (1996); Swift (2007). Cf. Fearn (2007) 305-15 for a comparison of Bacch. 15 with the choral dynamics of tragedy.

¹¹² Although cf. Fearn (2007) 307-12 on the mimetic aspects of dithyrambic performance.

utterance is closely linked to the performers' status as members of the community, although the way in which this status is (re)constructed by the processes of rehearsal and performance is by no means straightforward. The authority accrued to an epinician chorus is threefold, deriving partly from intertextual connections with previous literature. Important also, however, are the chorus' status as a public body of selected and trained performers. The processes, largely opaque to modern scholars,¹¹³ by which chorus members were selected and then trained by the poet, in the music and dance routine required by the poem as well as in the words, would in addition to their practical function in preparing the performers have had the additional function of bestowing legitimacy on the performance. At least in some cases, the poet himself would have served as the χορηγός or ἐξάρχων, leading the chorus during the performance.¹¹⁴ As well as being a means of personal self-projection for the poet, this feature of performance would have served as a representation and instantiation of the process of training and rehearsal, the symbolic climax of these previous processes. Part of the chorus' legitimacy, then, derives from an awareness on the part of the audience that a poem's didactic features such as *gnomai* and mythical exempla would have already been absorbed by the performers before the performance itself. In this sense, the chorus can be seen as (an) idealized reader(s) of epinician poetry, of human achievement and vulnerability, and a model for how its utterances should be understood, but the interpretative openness of many of Pindar's epinicians should caution against seeing this thematization as determinative. A crucial aspect of epinician, as argued above, is the participation of the audience in the poem's judgements and asseverations; consequently, choral authority emerges in part from its appeals to the reader as a relational process, gaining force from the reflections it opens up.

The interpretative demands made by epinician take various forms, and my readings are in no way exhaustive of their possibilities, but focus instead on their manifestations in particular forms across a range of poems. One such is the figuration of the *laudandus*. The distinction between the *laudandus* as an historical person and a textual figure has not, I shall argue, been given sufficient weight. Idealizations of the *laudandus* are not simply self-contained responses to achievement, but open constructions which, in holding up the *laudandus* as a variously determined ideal, make ethical and intellectual demands both of the audience and, more and less implicitly, the *laudandus* himself. Paraenetic elements, for instance, which scholars have tended to subordinate to a principle encomiastic function, should be

¹¹³ The evidence is stronger for Athenian tragic choruses, for which cf. *DFA* pp. 87-92 and Wilson (2000), although cf. Currie (2011) on the funding of epinician choruses.

¹¹⁴ Mullen (1982) 12-14, 17-19, 21, 158; Currie (2005) 16. For exceptions cf. O.6.87-92, I.2.47-8.

emphasised on their own terms, not only as exhortations to a particular victor to adhere to a code of behaviour, but also as a challenge to the wider community. Passages such as O.1.30-5, P.2.58-96, N.8.35-9, and N.7.23-4 encourage readers to assume an ethical pose in their reading, but they also foreground the difficulties of doing so by dwelling on the prevalence of envy and other destabilizing modes of behaviour. In this sense, epinicians often function as communal dramatizations not just of ethical ideals but the problems involved in adhering to them. The articulation of these problematics complements other more overtly encomiastic elements such as the articulation of the divine favour bestowed upon the *laudandus* and his community, reminding readers of the necessity of appropriate responses to these interventions.¹¹⁵ A related phenomenon is the deployment of negative exempla, such as Ixion in P.2, Coronis in P.3, and the Apharetidae in N.10: these figures, as has often been remarked, function as illustrations of practices and ways of thinking which should be avoided, and are usually taken as having the encomiastic function of pointing up an opposition with the actual achievements and conduct of the *laudandus*. In combination with the frequent emphasis on φθόνος and other types of human shortcoming, these exempla also articulate the ongoing ethical and moral conflicts to which individuals are subject.¹¹⁶

The ethics of Pindar's poetry can usefully be seen in relation to other modes of commemoration such as epigrams and statues, as well as the epinician poems of his older contemporary Simonides. Late sixth- and early fifth-century epigrams commemorating athletic success are markedly free of the kind of ethical discourses prominent in Pindar, and although the exiguousness of Simonides' extant epinicians does not permit secure generalization, his poetry does not seem to have laid the same emphasis on ethical matters as Pindar's.¹¹⁷ Against this background, the ethical and paraenetic dimensions of Pindar's epinicians emerge as one of the central ways in which Pindar articulates his poetic identity and the distinctiveness of his texts. While political and social changes undoubtedly played a role in informing the deployment of these ethical discourses, I do not see them as primarily embodying an aristocratic reaction to democracy, or as a response to the threat of tyranny, but rather as promoting ethical generalities that are variously applicable to different groups of people in different contexts. Indeed, contextual variety is crucial here; we shall see that the

¹¹⁵ For the importance of which cf. Bremer (2008).

¹¹⁶ On ethnicity as a motivating force in Pindar's structuring of myths cf. Illig (1932); Goldhill (1991); Scodel (2001). Fearn (2007) 312-15 argues for seeing Bacch. 15 in similar terms; the openness of the poem's ending, together with Homeric intertexts and the parallels between the internal and external audiences, prompt audience reflection on the moral issues raised by Menelaus' speech. Although Bacch. 15 is particularly marked in this respect, Pindar's poems often, if more obliquely, pose similar interpretative questions.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Thomas (2007).

ethical implications of poems composed for Hiero are different from those composed for, say, aristocratic victors in oligarchic societies.

A related issue is the function of mythical narratives. These are often taken as articulating a continuity between the present and the mythical past, relating an incident of athletic success to the timeless truths manifested in myth. While I do not disagree *tout court* with this line of thinking, I shall examine some cases in which discontinuity and difference are as important as continuity. I shall argue that O.10, O.13, and P.11 dramatize, albeit in very different ways, the disjunctions between mythical exemplum and encomiastic frame in order to produce an interpretative space in which the reader is drawn into a questioning of the applications of the mythical exempla. I shall also emphasize the plurality of these exempla's operation; as well as fulfilling an encomiastic function, they also encourage a recognition of human limitations and dependencies. A similar approach will be taken to figurations of performance, particularly in the cases of O.14, P.1, and P.12, where I shall argue that the differences between mythical acts of performance and those of the human sphere are central to how Pindar represents the function of his poetry.¹¹⁸

In the cases of O.14 and P.12 especially, I shall emphasize that the poems' metapoetic elements are deployed partly as a means of shaping readerly responses to wider ethical and interpretative issues. Running through these different focuses is a critical commitment to the singularity of the poems, their capacities to project particular modes of reading, to foreground the transformational aspects of the reading situations they demand, and to resist recuperative interpretation. While the intersections between idiom and normativity in epinicians are susceptible of pragmatic readings which focus on their communicative aspect,¹¹⁹ they can also be understood as foregrounding the problematics of negotiating between general claims and their local functions. This negotiation is connected to the process by which any expansion of its meaning involves a displacement of the language of the text into an interpretative space not specified by the text itself, a process the limitations of which, I shall argue, are dramatized in Pindaric epinician's self-representational manoeuvres. As well as stressing the importance of these strategies and effects in the context of fifth-century performance culture, I shall also argue that they are brought to the fore and given new inflections by the material, diachronic statuses of the Pindaric corpus.

¹¹⁸ For the prevailing view cf. e.g. Bakker (1997) 24; Athanassaki (2011a) 263, although note the useful discussion in Mackie (2003) ch. 2. Cf. pp. 124-6 for further discussion of these issues.

¹¹⁹ Good examples of such readings are Athanassaki (2009), (2011b).

PART I. CONTEXTS: TO ALEXANDRIA AND BEYOND

WRITING IN THE LIBRARY

Hellenistic culture can conveniently, if reductively, be described as a culture of the archive. In Rudolf Pfeiffer's description of the situation in the last decades of the fourth century,

the book is one of the characteristic things of the new, the Hellenistic, world. The whole literary past, the heritage of centuries, was in danger of slipping away despite the efforts of Aristotle's pupils; the imaginative enthusiasm of the generation living towards the end of the fourth and the beginning of the third century did everything to keep it alive. The first task was to collect and to store the literary treasures in order to save them forever.¹²⁰

Despite the emergence in recent years of a debate over the role of performance as a mode of literary dissemination during this period,¹²¹ it is clear that the projects of collecting, cataloguing, and explaining the texts of the past were of great importance for how intellectuals in the Hellenistic period conceptualized their relationship with previous literature as well as their own activity, and that these processes developed alongside the growth of reading, rather than performance, as the main mode of literary reception.¹²² It has long been recognized that the development of the Alexandrian library and the intellectual culture that centred on it, as well as similar developments elsewhere in the Greek world, marked a new phase in Greek intellectual life.¹²³ The purpose of this chapter is to examine the effects of this intellectual context on some of the 'classical' texts being collated and criticized, and to explore the relations between the library as an archival system and the texts contained within it. Of particular importance will be an assessment of how the recontextualization of texts within the archive opens them up to new modes of reading.

Central to this relationship is the shifting status of generic conventions in Hellenistic scholarship and poetics. When scholars such as Zenodotus, Callimachus, Aristophanes of Byzantium and others edited the classical lyric poets, they were confronted with a series of genres whose basis in performance had almost completely disappeared; the performance

¹²⁰ Pfeiffer (1968) 102.

¹²¹ Cf. Cameron (1995) with the response of Bing (2009) 106-15. The debate over the relative importance of reading and performance is connected to the question of the extent to which Hellenistic poetry should be seen as breaking with previous poetic traditions. For a stress on change and discontinuity cf. e.g. Pfeiffer (1968) 88; Bulloch (1985); Bing (1988); Goldhill (1991); Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004). Hutchinson (1988) 1-7 emphasises continuity with the past; Cameron (1995) puts a considerably more extreme accent on continuity.

¹²² Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 23 for the dominance of reading in the Hellenistic period.

¹²³ For an overview of this process cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 87-104.

occasions, closely linked to the festivals and state occasions of the *polis*, which had prompted the composition of epinicians, dithyrambs, paeans, prosodia, and other forms of classical and archaic lyric poetry, had by the fourth century largely been displaced by other more restricted modes of performance.¹²⁴ However, the project of classifying such poetry by genre was not a purely antiquarian exercise, in that it led to a heightened awareness of both the concept and practice of genre, as systematic, abstract reflection on generic norms and practices replaced an empirical understanding based on the lived experience of a performance culture. This awareness in turn influenced literary composition. As Marco Fantuzzi and Richard Hunter suggest, '[i]t is tempting to hypothesise that this work of cataloguing and establishing conventional norms in fact fostered a 'reverse normativity' ... that the Alexandrians ended up by composing the laws of the genres 'in order to violate them better''.¹²⁵ This double dynamic of defining and solidifying generic norms, and exceeding them in original compositions arises from a conflicted relation to previous literature, as Fantuzzi and Hunter make clear:

In short, an increased understanding of the nature and contexts of archaic and classical poetry led also to the realisation that such contexts were things of the past; the classification of the genre norms of archaic and classical poetry led almost automatically to an awareness of the impossibility of writing anything else in those genres, at least if the same norms, which included metrical and melodic norms, were to be followed ... What remained was a heritage of linguistic and metrical conventions, which had often lost their functional contact with particular subjects and occasions: thus did the possibility of new combinations appear.¹²⁶

Seen from another angle, this situation reveals a paradox of the archivization process, namely that the very preservation achieved by the archive involves a distancing of what it preserves; Hellenistic scholars were furnished with an abundance of information about classical and archaic culture by the growth of the library at Alexandria, as texts arrived from all over the Greek world, and yet awareness of the specificities of place and performance also served to highlight the differences between the current situation and the past.¹²⁷ The otherness of

¹²⁴ Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 22-3.

¹²⁵ This idea goes back to Kroll (1924) 202-10; cf. also Rossi (1971) 83.

¹²⁶ Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 25-6.

¹²⁷ Little is known of Pindaric scholarship in this period outside Alexandria. For Pergamene scholarship cf. Irigoin (1952) 61-3. Cf. Σ P.3.102b and N.2.17c for evidence of Crates of Mallus' Pindaric criticism.

classical and archaic literature was reinforced by the very processes that enabled its continuance. However, whereas Fantuzzi and Hunter's analysis is aimed at understanding the relationship between scholarly and poetic practice, my object is to explore the kinds of reading experience that may have confronted readers of Pindar's epinicians during this period, and how social, political, and intellectual developments may have shaped contemporary readers' approaches to these texts.

Epinician's own archival aspects fit easily into this scholarly culture. As a body of texts which aims at preserving the memory of various victors and their achievements, and at establishing a fixed record of the transient experience of victory and its celebrations, epinician is a fundamentally archival genre. This characterization also applies to its use of myths and local traditions, and to the common convention of recording victories, those of the victor or of his family, other than the particular victory being celebrated.¹²⁸ Similar considerations apply to the memorialization of the victor's social position and political achievements.¹²⁹ However, we should not oversimplify epinician's archival functions; these are not a matter of simple recording and commemoration, but are connected to its ethical valuation of the victor and his achievements, and its capacity to set these against the wider mythico-historical background of the victor's *polis* and family. Epinician's commemorative project also entails a refiguration of the event of victory into the figurative eventness of textuality. These functions are replicated by the copying, storing, and editing of texts which preserves them as records of a previous era. The inclusion of epinician in the larger archive of the Alexandrian library therefore picks up on an archivality already at work in the texts themselves, and interacts with that archivality in various ways; just as the poem in performance refigures the event of athletic success, or the events of myth, so the textual dissemination of the book refigures performance, a process mediated by the wider intellectual context in which it occurs. This transformational aspect of the archive, its capacity to reconfigure its contents, will be a central part of the following analyses.

THE PLACE OF THE ARCHIVE

The historical circumstances of the foundation of the library of Alexandria are frustratingly obscure; most of the sources are late, and none give a detailed account. We are told that

¹²⁸ Cf. e.g. O.7.83-7, and below pp. 157-60.

¹²⁹ Cf. e.g. the narrative of Hiero's foundation of Aetna and defeat of the Carthaginians at P.1.61-80.

Ptolemy I ‘first brought together the Mouseion’,¹³⁰ which puts the date of its foundation in the late fourth or early third century, that its members had ‘shared property’ (χρήματα κοινὰ) and were supported by the state,¹³¹ and that the person in charge was appointed ‘the priest of the Mouseion’ (ιερεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Μουσεῖῳ).¹³² The foundation of the library and the importation of books on a Panhellenic scale was a signal of Ptolemaic political as well as cultural power, and the ancient sources are alive to this interconnection. Aulus Gellius’ account sees the library of Alexandria as part of tradition that equates autocratic power with the ownership of libraries, reaching back to Peisistratus: these books were in public use (*libros Athenis disciplinarum liberalium publice ad legendum praebendos*, 7.17) and were as such the foundation of Athenian intellectual development, but were then taken to Persia by Xerxes before being appropriated again by Alexander. Similarly at Athenaeus 1.3a, the library serves as a symbol and articulation of a ruler’s power, and he tells a similar story about the Athenian library being appropriated and ‘brought to Alexandria’ (εἰς τὴν καλὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν μετήγαγε) by Ptolemy Philadelphus.

In Yun Lee Too’s reading of Aulus Gellius’ account, it is the process of transfer from one owner to another that authorizes the power of the library: ‘it would appear that there is only one library worth speaking of as the same core body of texts is passed from owner to owner, from past to present.’¹³³ In Gellius in particular, the fate of the library mirrors political developments: ‘the library’s passage is ... a trajectory of power in the ancient world’.¹³⁴ She

¹³⁰ Plut. *Mor.* 1095d: Πτολεμαῖος ὁ πρῶτος συναγαγὼν τὸ μουσεῖον. For accounts of the library’s beginnings see Pfeiffer (1968) 96-9, Blum (1991) 95-123, and cf. MacLeod (2000); Barnes (2000) 63. For the possible role played by Demetrius of Phalerum in the library’s foundation cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 99-102, who is sceptical.

¹³¹ Strabo 17.1.8. Pfeiffer (1968) 97 paints an idyllic picture of the scholars’ situation: ‘[t]hey had a carefree life: free meals, high salaries, no taxes to pay, very pleasant surroundings, good lodgings and servants. There was plenty of opportunity for quarrelling with each other.’ This last comment alludes to the famous fragment from Timon of Phlius’ *Silloi* (*SH* 786): πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολυφύλῳ / βιβλιακοὶ χαρακίται ἀπείριτα δηριώοντες / Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ (‘many cloistered bookworms are fed in Egypt of many tribes, quarrelling ceaselessly in the Muses’ coop’). For interpretation of these lines cf. e.g. Canfora (1989) 37. Cameron (1995) 31-2 objects to the traditional interpretation, that the lines connote scholars living in a rarified atmosphere divorced from real life, but his analysis is strained; for objections cf. Bing (2009) 108-9.

¹³² Strabo 17.1.8. For the library’s organization and hierarchy cf. Fraser (1972) 322-3. Cf. *ibid.* p. 330-4 for an account of the problems with the sequence and dating of the early heads of the library, which he construes as follows: Zenodotus c. 285 – c. 270; Apollonius Rhodius c. 270 – 245; Eratosthenes 245 – 204/1; Aristophanes 204/1 – 189/6; Apollonius ὁ εἰδογράφος c. 189/6 – 175; Aristarchus c. 175 (?) – 145.

¹³³ Too (2010) 20. Cf. also Tertullian 18.5 for the tradition that Ptolemy’s library building was based on Peisistratus’ enthusiasm, and cf. also Isid. *Etym.* 6.3.5.

¹³⁴ Too (2010) 20. N.b. *ibid.* p. 20: ‘[t]he literary text, which in isolation might be helpless, is authorized by the fact of belonging with other texts, which originate in an earlier time, and by the patron of the library’. This reading, however, rather oversimplifies the archival contexts other than libraries in which texts could be stored and accessed; it has been suggested, for instance, that copies of epinicians would have been kept by the victor’s family, and it has also been suggested that paeans were preserved in temples (cf. Rutherford (2001) 144-6). These archival scenarios would have created reading situations very different from those brought about by such

also stresses the fact of a single library's being the subject of such transfers: 'the birth of the library is in many senses the birth of *a* library owned and shared in common by the ancient world'.¹³⁵ Her analysis at this stage focuses on how libraries are described in texts, on the ideational structuring of the library by various authors, rather than how libraries actually operate as institutions or spaces of meaning.¹³⁶ The idea of the ideal unity of the library as figured in the above passages conflicts not only with the tenuousness of textual transmission, but also with the internal multiplicity of the library, which threatens the notion of a dominant interpretation. The above narratives, and others like them, can therefore also be read as an attempt to exercise a metaphorical control over the contingencies and multiplicities of the library's operation, scripting the history of the library as an ordered progression which is the antithesis of the actuality of the processes of textual transmission, and bestowing on it a mode of authority which counterposes the multiple heteronomies which the library (seeks to) contain(s).

These contradictions are exemplified by the Alexandrian library. For Too, this project draws on and extends previous Greek libraries; 'it is the product of a cultural assimilation of previous book collections ... a Greek concept refounded on Egyptian soil'.¹³⁷ This practice of refoundation instantiates and authorizes Ptolemaic power; Ptolemaic Egypt and Alexandria become 'a Greece transformed, albeit by the very authority of the Ptolemies'.¹³⁸ An important aspect of this project is the supposed universality of the library; by aiming to collect and catalogue the literatures of all the world's nations, the Ptolemies constructed a cultural image

texts' inclusion in a large library, linking the archiving of the texts more closely to the circumstances of their original composition and performance. We should also note the stories about private libraries, and those connected to particular schools of thought, the best known of which is the body of narratives surrounding Aristotle's library. Cf. Diog. Laer. 5.12 for Aristotle's will, entrusting his goods to Theophrastus (although books are not specifically mentioned in this account, *Vita Marciana* 43-5 does mention them) and Diog. Laer. 5.51 for Theophrastus passing on Aristotle's books to his nephew Neleus. Cf. also Too (2010) 28-31 for the story of Aristotle's library being transmitted by Neleus to Apellicon of Teos and then finally to Sulla during his sack of Athens. She argues pp. 24-5 that these narratives 'divorc[e the library's] foundation from political power and constitut[e] it instead as the body of privileged knowledge to be passed down in a line of teachers and intellectual leaders'.

¹³⁵ Too (2010) 32. Cf. *ibid.* pp. 22-3 for an analysis of how the library of Alexandria reduplicates the cooperation of cultural and political power already present in the Peisistratid organization of the Panathenaea.

¹³⁶ Although she does later devote considerable attention to the physicality of the library:

¹³⁷ Too (2010) 31. Cf. however Curtis Wright (1977) who recapitulates the argument of de Vleeschauwer (1973) that the antecedents of the Alexandrian library were near-eastern libraries such as Ashurbanipal rather than those of the Greek world, which would have been considerably smaller than their eastern counterparts. The *communis opinio* is the opposite: cf. e.g. Milkau (1952) 17. For connections between Athenian scholarship and the library of Alexandria cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 95 on Aristotle's pupils bringing books to Alexandria, and also Too (2010) 33-4. On library culture in general cf. Canfora (1989); Casson (2001).

¹³⁸ Too (2010) 31.

of their imperial power,¹³⁹ as well as asserting their cultural supremacy over other monarchies.¹⁴⁰ However, this assertion of cultural authority also entails the potential fragmentation of the symbolic power it performs. As mentioned above, the sheer variety of texts held by the library militates against it ever being able to function as a consistent, self-identical totality, in that it is constituted by a body of texts that conflict, or potentially conflict, with each other, and because it gives rise to a space in which all manner of different readings and reconfigurations of these texts are possible. Against the idea of the library as a symbol of political authority we can oppose the notion of it as a space of discontinuity and fragmentation, a potentially infinite labyrinth of texts and textual experiences irreducible to a dominant univocal thematization. One might object to this reading on pragmatic grounds; regardless of the figurations of power available in the library's texts, it was the Ptolemies who exercised concrete political power and controlled the operations of the library, and their position would not have been materially affected by the virtualities of intellectual discourse. Although there is doubtless some truth in this reasoning, such an interpretation fails to account for the complexities of the archival situation, one aspect of which is the relations that emerge between the Ptolemies and the Greek cultural past to which they lay claim. In depending on a process of cultural assimilation, albeit one that they ostensibly control, for the instantiation of their cultural power, the Ptolemies are drawn into a network of power relations in which their cultural authority is partly the result of a symbolic capital bestowed on them by the past. Moreover, their own exercise of power can be seen in relation to other such historical modes, and in relation to theorizations of these. This relationality opens the possibility for the deconstruction of power, and also brings about a potential contradiction between the idea of power as a force numinously residing in an individual and as constituted through a series of cultural relations.

The complexities of these cultural appropriations are manifest in Galen's famous account of Ptolemy Euergetes' theft of the state texts of tragedy (*Comm. In Hipp. Epidem.* 17.1.607-8), which he borrowed on the condition that he gave a deposit. Determined to keep the originals, he had them copied, gave the copies back to the Athenians, and defaulted on the deposit. Too reads this story in terms of the cultural importance of the original texts: '[t]his narrative

¹³⁹ Jacob (1996) 49 sees universality and royal control as the main differences between the library of Alexandria and the state archives at Athens. For him, the Ptolemies' cultural project betray a wish 'compenser sa marginalité géographique par une centralité symbolique.' Too (2010) 36 reads the process of translation and archiving of other nations' texts as an assertion of cultural and political authority. Cf. however Barnes (2000) 63 for doubts over when exactly the project of a universal library was established. The chief source for this is the *Letter of Aristeas* 9-11; cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 99-100. Cf. Josephus 1.10 on the translation commissioned by Ptolemy Philadelphus of the Hebrew scriptures.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Pliny *NH* 35.2.10 (and cf. 13.21.70) for the cultural struggle between the Ptolemies and the Attalids.

demonstrates that having the ancient texts means owning the original texts in so far as this is possible. Athenocentrism is an authorizing move for the Alexandrian empire and originality is a mark of power.¹⁴¹ It is likely that they were not the authors' autographs, but later copies authorized by the state as the official versions of the plays. Lycurgus' point in instituting state texts seems to have been to preserve the original texts from actors' interpolations, but in doing so he also marked these texts with the authority of the state. It is this participation in political authority that the Ptolemaic appropriation actually aims at; what is at issue here is *the way in which* the texts' originality has been constructed and legitimized. This is not to say that the texts' connection with their authors was unimportant; a key part of their legitimacy is their (supposed) freedom from contamination, their claim to represent their authors' original words.

Nevertheless, their authorization by the state introduces into the constitution of the material document a political and institutional aspect additional to a notion of author-centred originality. The Ptolemaic possession of the originals relies on their having been made 'original' before their move to Alexandria, and also on an awareness of the process of transfer itself and the change in the documents' symbolism instituted thereby. Moreover, the recontextualization of the documents in Alexandria also serves to perpetuate, albeit virtually, their Athenian status, which continues to be an important part of their symbolism. Ptolemaic power both co-opts and supersedes that of Athens, instituting a kind of cultural codependency; Ptolemaic appropriation of these texts is dependent on their previous authorization, and hence on a concept of authority prior to their own.

Another phenomenon central to the following analyses is the difference between the library and the single performance as spaces for the construction of political power. As well as the difference between a performance as a one-off event and the temporal fixity of the material document, this difference is constituted by the scale of the library, the variety of texts which it contains, and the modes of reflection it makes possible, allowing for a more extended contemplation of the nature of political power than is possible during a performance. Crucially, this contemplation is in the context of the library opened to the influence of a large number of texts, allowing for the emergence of a space of textual contestation. Again, the preservative nature of the archive gives rise to paradoxical consequences; as well as participating in the commemoration of tyrants such as Hiero of Syracuse, the encounter with

¹⁴¹ Too (2010) 36.

such figures in the form of textual constructs also presupposes an awareness of their mortality, of the limitations of their rule, and of their supersession by later regimes.

Thus far I have stressed the importance of the magnitude of the library's cultural resources and its status as a space for the *potential* fragmentation and contestation of power, as well as a space in which all modes of power are exposed, through the processes of representation and juxtaposition with other such representations, to a certain relativization. I would also suggest that these phenomena, as well as being significant in themselves, are manifested in various texts. One such is Theocritus' *Idyll* 17, an encomium for Ptolemy Philadelphus in which the poet adapts the traditions of encomium, both poetic and scholarly, to the task of representing a modern ruler.¹⁴² The figuration of archivality in *Id.* 17 provides a starting point for thinking about the dynamics of Pindaric reception in the Hellenistic period, and for the types of contextualization that may have influenced Hellenistic readers. A motif of the critical analysis of *Idyll* 17 has been the focus on the poem's tightly-controlled rhetorical structure, which many scholars have seen as deriving from the tradition of fourth century rhetorical handbooks and other theorizations of encomiastic rhetoric.¹⁴³ Yet this careful structural elaboration, moving from the proem, through praise of Philadelphus' father (13-33) and mother (34-57) to an account of his birth (58-76), and onwards to a description of the territories under his control (77-94), his wealth and wise use of it (95-120), before ending with praise for his marriage to Arsinoe (133-7) and a final *envoi*, is balanced by a rhetoric of magnitude and plurality which emphasises the uniqueness of Philadelphus' position. The poem also engages in an extensive generic complication of its encomiastic models by employing the hymnic form; as Richard Hunter argues, 'just as both [Ptolemy] and his forebears move smoothly between levels of existence, so the poem in his honour slips between genres'.¹⁴⁴

This process of generic complication begins in the proem, where the initial invocation of Zeus (ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγεται Μοῖσαι, / ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον, ἐπὴν

¹⁴² The poem refers to Arsinoe II as Ptolemy's wife (αὐτός τ' ἰφθίμα τ' ἄλοχος, τᾶς οὔτις ἀρείων / νυμφίον ἐν μεγάροισι γυνὰ περιβάλλετ' ἄγοστῶ, 'he and his great wife, than whom no better lady ever embraced a groom in her palace' 128-9), and can therefore be dated between their marriage, probably in 278, and her death in July 270. Further precision is impossible; cf. Gow (1950) ii.326; Hunter (2003) 3-8.

¹⁴³ Cf. Hunter (2003) 20: '[t]he very deliberate, formal structure of the poem gestures toward the teaching of rhetorical theory, as one way of marking the relation between encomiast and object of praise through siting that relationship within a familiar tradition. The poem thus emphasizes that Ptolemy is indeed a fit subject for such an *epideixis*. The structure of the poem is itself an encomiastic move.' Cf. Cairns (1972) 100-20.

¹⁴⁴ Hunter (2003) 8. The employment of forms usually used for gods in songs for mortals was not unprecedented however; cf. Plut. *Lys.* 18 (= Douris, *FGrH* 76 F 71, 696 F 33c) for a paean to Lysander (*PMG* 867) written after the Peloponnesian war, with the comments of Hunter (2003) 24-5. Cf. also Hunter (1996) 79-82. On the connection between gods and monarchs in the Hellenistic period cf. Versnel (1990) 72-83 with further references.

αείδωμεν ἀοιδαῖς) gives way to a focus on Ptolemy as the ‘foremost of men’ προφερέστατος ἀνδρῶν (4), the hymnic form of the opening establishing expectations which are overturned by the focus on a mortal subject. This continues in the account of Ptolemy’s birth at 58-76 which distances the poem from its encomiastic models by means of its hymnic intertexts. The story of Ptolemy’s birth on Cos recalls Apollo’s birth on Delos in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.¹⁴⁵ Eileithuia’s role at 60-4 both recalls and reverses the situation in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* where her absence from Delos, engineered by Hera as a result of her anger with Leto, caused a delay in Apollo’s birth (97-116); here she arrives immediately.¹⁴⁶ The island’s cry at 64 (Κόως δ’ ὀλόλυξεν ἰδοῖσα, ‘Cos cried out at the sight and spoke’) is the usual response to a divine epiphany, and closely recalls the reaction of the goddesses at *Hom. h. Ap.* 119 (ἐκ δ’ ἔθορε πρὸ φῶως δέ, θεαὶ δ’ ὀλόλυξαν ἅπασαι, ‘he leapt into the light and all the goddesses cried out’).¹⁴⁷ Furthermore, Cos’ prayer at 66-7 (ὄλβιε κοῦρε γένοιο, τίοις δέ με τόσσον ὅσον περ / Δῆλον ἐτίμησεν κυανάμπυκα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, “‘May you be prosperous child, and may you honour me as much as Phoebus Apollo honours dark-ringed Delos’”) explicitly equates the newborn Ptolemy with his divine antecedent.

The association of Ptolemy with the gods of the *Homeric Hymns* is matched by the exorbitancy of the descriptions of Egypt’s wealth; the rhetoric of 75-6 is picked up by the numeration of 82-5 (τρῆις μὲν οἱ πολίων ἑκατοντάδες ἐνδέδμηνται, / τρῆις δ’ ἄρα χιλιάδες τρισσαῖς ἐπὶ μυριάδεσσι, / δοιαὶ δὲ τριάδες, μετὰ δὲ σφισιν ἐννεάδες τρῆις / τῶν πάντων Πτολεμαῖος ἀγῆνωρ ἐμβασιλεύει, ‘three hundred cities are built there, and three thousand, and again ten thousand three times over, and twice three, and after them three times nine’). The numbers build into a dizzyingly complex structure, the mental gymnastics required of the reader to keep up correlating with the wonder described. There is an implicit parallel here between Ptolemy’s rule over this mass of settlements and the poem’s capacity to state them rhetorically, and yet the numerical precision of the rhetoric is offset by the ineffable vastness of their referents. The complexity of the cities described, with all their myriad inhabitants and buildings and countless social phenomena, contrasts with the contentless simplicity of the numbers used to refer to them.¹⁴⁸ The very exactitude of the numeration engineers the ineffability of the referents. These lines are part of a wider function;

¹⁴⁵ For the importance of Delos and Cos to the Ptolemies cf. Sherwin-White (1978) 90-108; Hunter (2003) 142-4.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Hunter (2003) 142-50 for a detailed exploration of the passage’s intertextuality.

¹⁴⁷ There is also a parallel with Callim. H.4.255-8. For the relationship between *Id.* 17 and Callimachus’ hymns cf. Hunter (2003) 143.

¹⁴⁸ For a humorous take on this catalogic technique cf. Herod. *Mim.* 1.26-33.

in giving an account of Egypt's riches and the plurality of its alliances at 77-94, and of Ptolemy's wealth at 95-99, the poem figures itself as an archival programme, mapping out and containing the political and cultural vastness of Ptolemy's kingdom.¹⁴⁹

This archival rhetoric takes a different turn at 118-20, where the narrator caps the description of Ptolemy's financial and cultural largesse by comparing him favourably to the Atreidae. Following the Pindaric topos of the necessity of using one's wealth to promote one's fame,¹⁵⁰ the narrator describes Ptolemy's generosity towards artists (106-16), before contrasting the renown of the Atreidae with their wealth, which has disappeared (116-20):

τί δὲ κάλλιον ἀνδρὶ κεν εἶη
ὀλβίῳ ἢ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἀρέσθαι;
τοῦτο καὶ Ἀτρεΐδαισι μένει· τὰ δὲ μυρία τῆνα
ὅσσα μέγαν Πριάμοιο δόμον κτεάτισσαν ἐλόντες
ἀέρι πα κέκρυπται, ὅθεν πάλιν οὐκέτι νόστος.

What is there more fair for a prosperous man to grasp than noble fame among men?
This abides for the Atreidae, but the multitudinous treasure they gained in sacking the
great house of Priam is hidden somewhere in gloom, whence there is no return.

We might compare the description of Theron's generosity at O.2.90-100:¹⁵¹

ἐπί τοι
Ἀκράγαντι ταύσαις
αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ,
τεκεῖν μὴ τιν' ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλιν
φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον
εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα

¹⁴⁹ A contemporary hieroglyphic text also records Ptolemy's wealth in terms similar to those of *Id.* 17; cf. Sauneron (1960) 87, with the comments of Hunter (1996) 89.

¹⁵⁰ This theme is particularly important in odes for tyrants: cf. e.g. O.2.92-5; P.1.90-1. Cf. also N.1.31-2 (οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν, / ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων, 'I do not wish to hoard much wealth secretly in a hall, to be successful with what I have and to be well thought for assisting friends'). Cf. N.7.58-63; I.1.47-52 for the superiority of κλέος to ὀλβος, the latter being transient and the former a lasting status bestowed by poetry.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Fantuzzi (2000) 138; Hunter (2003) 95-6 for other parallels between the two poems. Currie (2005) 83-4 narrows the difference between the two poems' rhetorical strategies, pointing out that Theron was also the object of posthumous cult, for which cf. Diod. Sic. 11.53.2.

Θήρωνος. ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος
οὐ δίκᾳ συναντόμενος, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν,
τὸ λαλαγῆσαι θέλον
κρυφὸν τε θέμεν ἐσλῶν καλοῖς
ἔργοις· ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν,
καὶ κεῖνος ὅσα χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν,
τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναίτο;

95

100

Aiming at Acragas, I shall speak a pledged word with true mind, that no city for a hundred years has given birth to a man kinder in heart nor more generous of hand than Theron. But satiety comes after praise, not cleaving to justice, but wishes, driven by greedy men, to babble on and obscure noble men's fair deeds. Since grains of sand escape counting, and all the joys that this man has given to others, who would be able to reckon them?

Whereas Theron's character is constructed against a social backdrop of men eager to diminish others' achievements, Ptolemy's actions take place in a realm isolated from such carping. Although both passages use a rhetoric of magnitude to emphasise their subjects' excellence, their dynamics are very different. Pindar compares the 'delights' (χάρματα) brought about by Theron to grains of sand to articulate their numerousness.¹⁵² Theocritus uses the vastness of the Atreidae's wealth as a foil for their fame, the point of the comparison being that their reputation has outlasted their material prosperity. The Pindaric ψάμμος which, despite its innumerability, is an object of experience accessible to the audience and the poet, contrasts with the wealth of the Atreidae, which lies beyond the access of Theocritus and his readers. The phrasing of 119-20 also recapitulates the unrepresentability of the riches, consigning them to an indeterminate region (ἀέρι πᾶ κέκρυπται) where, unlike those of Ptolemy, they cannot be accurately measured. In relation to the text's archival function, this emergence of the unarchivable as an important comparandum marks the limitations of the archive itself. This passage also participates in the poem's wider problematization of genre, complicating the language of Pindaric encomium by its recourse to the Atreidae, who are never used as exempla in Pindar.¹⁵³ The fact that the corpora of epic and tragic poetry lie

¹⁵² Compare O.13.45-6 for Pindar's use of the topos.

¹⁵³ Agamemnon's murder is recounted at P.11.17-22, and cf. N.7.28 for a reference to Menelaus.

behind the brothers' κλέος sites the Theocritean panegyric in a more self-consciously complex intertextual field than that in which Pindar's poetry operates.

In this poem then, despite the employment of a carefully elaborated rhetorical structure, the act of rupture with previous modes of panegyric is more decisively indicative of Ptolemaic power than existing panegyric modes; this rupture registers the difference of the Ptolemies, defining their power as a force which escapes traditional categories. By foregrounding the importance of generic norms, but also making its own panegyric function emerge as a movement which exceeds previous generic formulations, and by foregrounding its own archival function, intertextually imbricating this with previous genres, while also implicitly acknowledging archival limitations by gesturing to what exceeds the archival, *Id.* 17 stages a meditation on the complexity of the archival situation, and the situation that obtains for literary texts written within this milieu. Ptolemy is both a comparandum in need of other comparanda, and that which exceeds comparison. However, the construction of a text only being able to represent actual power by marking the limitations of its own representational strategies is itself a textual figure. The poem's figuring power by being in excess of itself, being both non-self-identical and refusing straightforward assimilation to the traditions it participates in, interposes a difference between its own exercises of power and those of the political sphere, conspicuously refusing to allow itself the same power of regulation of its own realm as that of which Ptolemy is capable; whereas Ptolemy rules alone (85), the text depends at least in part on its intertextual filiations. Such negotiations can also be seen as informing the text's archival self-figuration; these archival strategies can be read as relating to the idea of the archive more generally and the ideas of cultural totality thereby established. The poem's move of exceeding traditional categories parallels the illimitability of the archive, but is also a means of transmuting the illimitability into a textual strategy and a means of praising a single individual. On this reading, the poem's rupturing of generic categories thus functions paradoxically as a mode of containment, albeit one which variously problematizes its own delimitations.

As I have previously argued, no context is ever saturable or completely determinable; contexts vary from place to place and from reader to reader, and because of the nature of individual readers' personal configurations of the intellectual traditions within which they operate it would be impossible to reconstruct a complete account of such contexts even if we had access to a much more complete set of evidence than we now have. What we can do, however, is to use texts such as *Id.* 17 as a basis for thinking about the different ways in which the processes of recontextualization may have informed approaches to Pindaric texts.

In the following chapters, I want to explore the role of factors such as the constitution of editions, the growth of a corpus of exegetical metatexts, and wider cultural and intellectual changes in shaping possible approaches to Pindaric texts, as well as looking at the role of other literary texts in such processes.

LAWS AND BEGINNINGS

In examining the concept and operations of the archive, I have noted how the totalizing ambitions of the library of Alexandria were offset by the signification multiplicity of the texts it contained, and that its preservational role gives rise to new and unforeseen relations between texts. I have briefly examined the relation between the archive, conceived both as a library and a text, *Id.* 17, which foregrounds its archival status, and that which resists archivization. Jacques Derrida's thinking about the archive provides a useful orientation for the further exploration of these concepts and their significance for a reading of Pindar's epinicians in the context of Alexandrian scholarly culture. Derrida's meditation on the archive begins with a discussion of the concept of ἀρχή, to which ἀρχεῖον is related and which lies at the heart of the archive's function.¹⁵⁴ For Derrida, ἀρχή 'names at once the *commencement* and the *commandment*. This name apparently coordinates two principles in one: the principle according to nature or history, *there* where things *commence* ... but also the principle according to the law, *there* where men and gods *command*'. Thus ἀρχή names 'two orders of order: *sequential* and *jussive*'. However, the relation between the concept of ἀρχή and the archive is a complex one: '[t]he concept of the archive shelters in itself ... this memory of the name ἀρχή. But it also *shelters* itself from this memory which it shelters'.¹⁵⁵ This is because the concept ἀρχή itself resists archivality, incapable of being reduced to a substrate that would completely represent or anchor it, and refers both to the originary and nomological principles of ἀρχή. The space of the archive therefore constitutes a 'privileged topology': archived writings 'inhabit this uncommon place, this place of election where law and singularity intersect in *privilege*. At the intersection of the topological and the nomological ... a scene of domiciliation becomes at once visible and invisible.'¹⁵⁶ This

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Chantraine i.12 for the connection between ἀρχεῖον and ἀρχή.

¹⁵⁵ Derrida (1996) 1, 2.

¹⁵⁶ Derrida (1996) 3. Cf. Foucault (1977) on the library as a heterotopic space, whose structural and symbolic significance exceeds its purely architectural form. Debray (1996) 148 opposes Greek culture's 'anchorage' in holy places and Semitic culture's reliance on texts. For Debray, Greek 'theology is a topology', defined by social participation in spatially sited practices. He overdoes the opposition, neglecting, for instance, the

domiciliation, this sheltering of the text by the archive, and of the archive of itself, also has a profoundly unifying aspect; '[t]he archontic power, which also gathers the functions of unification, of identification, of classification, must be paired with what we will call the power of *consignation*.'¹⁵⁷ This names not only 'the act of assigning residence or entrusting so as to put into reserve ... but [also] the act of *consigning* through *gathering together signs*'. This movement 'aims to coordinate a single corpus, in a system or a synchrony in which all the elements articulate the unity of an ideal configuration'.¹⁵⁸

Yet this movement towards unification also gives rise to the possibility of interrogating the principles upon which the archive is founded and the legality of the laws bestowed upon it, and Derrida's analysis briefly touches on the forces that can emerge to contest the principle of consignation which founds and regulates the archive, mentioning 'whatever secrets and heterogeneities would seem to menace even the principle of consignation'.¹⁵⁹ The generic problematizations of *Id.* 17 examined above, and its precarious staging of its archival capacities in relation to referential totalities that exceed those capacities, are one instance of such 'heterogeneities'. Moreover, the principle of consignation relies on a transpositional and reduplicative dynamic, in which the process of archivization is a matter of giving a text over to its archival substrate without change or alteration, and indeed a pure archivality would do away with the notion of change entirely. This principle is contradicted by the fact that the process of archivization entails putting a text into a series of new relations with other texts, or rather actualizing in archival form relations which were already existent in some way, and thus intervening in the constitution of those relations. Crucially, however, Derrida's focus on the archive as instantiating both the jussive and sequential principles allows us to see that these two functions are mutually implicative; in gathering texts together, the archive cannot help but extending the relationality of these texts, and of complicating its own attempts at instituting 'the unity of an ideal configuration.' As a space for the configuration of relationships between texts and for the constitution, physical and intellectual, of intertextual fields, the archive is both a totalizing hypostasized mark of the intertextual field, and that which exceeds determinative understanding in terms of any of the textual possibilities which it enables.

'theological' importance of textual experience. Nevertheless, his observation is suggestive for the case of the Mouseion, in which spatial and textual orders were conjoined.

¹⁵⁷ Derrida (1996) 3. There is a notable similarity between Derrida's vocabulary of 'consignation' and gathering, and that employed in accounts of the foundation of the library, e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 1095d: Πτολεμαῖος ὁ πρῶτος συναγαγὼν τὸ μουσεῖον, and cf. σύνταξιν at Strabo 13.1.54.

¹⁵⁸ Derrida (1996) 3.

¹⁵⁹ Derrida (1996) 3.

At this point it is worth pointing out that, despite the emphasis of this chapter, the library of Alexandria was not the only important library in antiquity, even if it is often treated as paradigmatic by the sources. One of the reasons for my focus on this library is that it is the most prominent example of a space of literary and intellectual encounter that was prevalent across the ancient world, ranging from large public libraries to small collections. Despite the great variations of size and purpose between these libraries, I suggest that they all, to one degree or another, participate in the functions that I have been exploring under the word ‘archive’. The term ἀρχεῖον is not applied to the Alexandrian library, which is referred to either as the Mouseion or as a βιβλιοθήκη;¹⁶⁰ nevertheless, the logic of Derrida’s analysis of the archive applies equally well to the βιβλιοθήκη, as a space where texts are gathered and submitted to various kinds of laws. I shall continue to use the term ‘archive’ of the Alexandrian library, and of the other types of ‘archives’ under discussion, on the grounds that this term captures more fully than ‘library’ the issues under discussion. One such is the way the processes of archivization allow for a questioning and reconfiguration of its foundational concepts expressed by ἀρχή as ‘commencement and commandment’. Firstly, potential conflicts arise between the ‘law’ of the archive and the ‘laws’ of individual texts. For Derrida, one of literature’s most characteristic features is its capacity to generate its own laws, whether they be formal or generic codes, or the type of readerly responses demanded by these. Simultaneously, however, literature constitutes itself by breaking these laws; each new text, as a singular document, exceeds in various ways the categories instituted by the texts which precede it.¹⁶¹ This mode of operation poses problems for the archive as a space which seeks to regulate the texts it contains. One form this regulation takes is the subordination of the archive’s contents to a system of classification; Callimachus’ *Pinakes* are probably the most famous example of such a process from the Hellenistic period.¹⁶²

Another way in which such regulation might be conceptualized is the symbolic economy to which the archive gives rise, as in the texts discussed above where the archive becomes a symbol of cultural hegemony, implicitly subordinating the texts within it to this unifying symbolic mode. Such modes of regulation, however, open up a disjunction between the way in which they operate and the actual effects of such operations on the actual processes of

¹⁶⁰ Cf. e.g. Strabo 13.1.54 διδάξας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλέας βιβλιοθήκης σύνταξι (‘teaching the Egyptians kings how to organize a library’) and cf. Plut. *Caes.* 49.6-7; Epitaph. *De mens. et pond.* 11. It is notable that ἀρχεῖα is normally used of public records rather than private libraries, as at *SIG* 684.7; cf. Plut. *Lys.* 20.3; Phot. *Lex.* 2925.

¹⁶¹ The fundamental discussion is Derrida (1992) 67-70.

¹⁶² Cf. Pfeiffer (1968).

reading texts. Indeed, it might be said that what occurs here is a deracination and deconstitution of the archive's principle of commandment, in that in terms of its practical empirical application, this principle is shown to be powerless, or more accurately, both powerless and omnipotent; it ensures the duration of the texts under its command by housing them and protecting them from the ravages of history, and consequently acts as the grounds of all possible readings that occur within the archive, but does not concretely realize itself as a *reading* or *actualization* of any one particular text. This mode of power is connected to the library of Alexandria's religious aspect; as we have seen, the library formed part of the Mouseion, a complex presided over, and sacred to, the Muses.¹⁶³ As deities who preside over the archive they link it to the past both in historical terms, as representatives of the literary tradition, and transcendently, representing the divine origins of poetic practice as elaborated in texts such as Hesiod's *Theogony*. As such, the Muses of the Mouseion are the transcendental ground of the archive's function, grounding its laws, and its imposition of those laws, from a point which is beyond the laws' power. Like the power of the archive itself, their authority as overseers of the archival project is at once ubiquitously numinous and non-assertive.

The archive also entails a rethinking and pluralization of the concept of origin. The origin, for instance of a poem in an act of composition or performance, becomes in its archival situation, at least in part, a product of the process of archivization and metatextuality; Hellenistic readers of Pindar, for instance, related to the circumstances of performance in the fifth century through the medium of the scholarly metatexts which give the information necessary to imaginatively reconstruct the relevant scenarios. In doing so the reader implicates himself in scholarly discourse and the modes of its authority; in using the scholia to consider the performance of a particular poem for instance, a thinking of what constitutes a performance is influenced, if not wholly determined, by the information presented by the scholia, and by the mode of its presentation. When, for instance, one reads the words Θήρωνι Ἀκραγαντίων ἄρματι in the introductory scholia to O.2, one is not simply presented with the occasion for the ode's composition, but is also *not* given a whole mass of information about the details of how the poem was composed, where and by whom it was performed and so on, for the obvious reason that these details were not available to the Hellenistic scholars. The absence of such information, and the simplicity of the above notice, encourages a particular kind of focus on the poem's functionality which marginalizes a thinking directed

¹⁶³ Cf. Fraser (1972) for discussion and comparison with other cult sites of the Muses, and cf. also *Cults* v. 5. pp. 469-71.

towards other aspects of the poem's origins and performance scenario. However, the functional focus of such a notice is partly a reflection of the poem's own strategies of self-representation, in which its function as a vehicle of praise play a considerable part. But although readers of the scholia would have been aware of the provisionality of such notices, and that a critical attention to the poem is by no means bounded by them, we should recognise the potential of such metatexts, and the wider contexts in which they emerge, to shape the type of approaches made to the texts. In this sense, we can say that the archive engages in alterations of the constitution of the origins that it preserves, and becomes itself the origin for a series of critical discourses dependent on it. As a consequence, it becomes a site that is both governed by a thinking of ἀρχή as beginning, but also where the notion of any unified or privileged beginning is called into question.

I have already observed the potential of texts, or particular features of texts, to resist archivization. Derrida is particularly sensitive to this, and notes the capacity of Homer's, Shakespeare's, and Joyce's texts to resist and disorder the archive: each 'is potentially incommensurable with any library supposed to house them ... Bigger and stronger than the libraries that act as if they have the capacity to hold them, if only virtually, they derange all the archival and indexing spaces by the disproportion of the potentially infinite memory they condense according to the processes of undecidable writing for which as yet no complete formalisation exists.'¹⁶⁴ A more general aspect of texts' resistance to the archive is what Derrida terms 'the secret'. In his terms, 'literature's secret' is its 'infinite power to keep undecidable and thus forever sealed the secret of what it says',¹⁶⁵ an operation which contradicts the consignment of the archive. This 'infinite power' names literature's capacity to suspend referentiality, or rather a mode of referentiality which is anchored in a particular type of adequation with an extratextual reality, and whose value is determined with reference to this reality. On this account, the text itself remains a singular saying of what it alone can say, irreducible to any realization or demarcation of its semantic function, and it is this non-identity which Derrida designates with his discussion of the secret. A general tension therefore emerges between the text as a singular enunciation and as a subject of a

¹⁶⁴ Derrida (2006) 14-15.

¹⁶⁵ Derrida (2006) 18. Here, however, we must guard against a straightforward application of Derrida's term 'literature' to the ancient literature under discussion, for the reason that Derrida never applies this term to works before late antiquity. We also need to question whether the Hellenistic texts of Pindar constitute 'literature' in the sense employed by Derrida, for which cf. Derrida (1992) 36-7; Vessey (2010). Although it does not have the functions of many of the texts that Derrida examines under this rubric, the process of archivization and scholarship assimilates the Pindaric corpus to many of the features of literature, such as datability and authorship, which Derrida sees as characteristic of the literary.

paraphrasing exegesis designed to render it transparent.¹⁶⁶ Derrida's stress on literature's constitutive secrecy underscores the difficulties of this relationship. However, the notion of the secret as elaborated here may be useful for conceptualizing the capacity of literary texts to resist the contexts into which they are placed, but it is less helpful for thinking about the dynamic interactions opened up by these contexts. In order to bring these more closely into view, I turn now to a concept connected to the secret, that of singularity, which I elaborated in detail above.¹⁶⁷

As I have argued, acculturative practices, treated by Attridge as essentially normalizing, can also have the effect of reconfiguring the otherness of a text, of bringing about interpretative situations where the singularity of a text shows up in different forms from those possible in its previous cultural contexts. Singularity is not an essence or a stable entity but a process, and as such is susceptible of being informed by the two-way interactions of reception. Thus in the scenario treated above, it is possible not only to read the end of *Id.* 17 against the background of Pindar's encomiastic strategies in O.2, but vice versa, allowing for a situation in which Theocritus' realization of the conventions of praise poetry shifts our understanding of the related interpretative norms, a shift which then allows us to perceive Pindar's text in ways not previously available. I mentioned above, for instance, the contrast between the ψάμμος of O.2.98 which connects innumerability with (partial) accessibility to perception, and Theocritus' description of Priam's captured wealth, which is completely inaccessible (ἄερι πρὸ κέρυπται) and can be realized only as a linguistic signification. This contrast could be read, for instance, as retrospectively emphasising the greater implication of the Pindaric text in the environment of its performance. A similar point could be made about the discourses of scholarly metatexts whose paraphrasing exegesis seeks to translate the text out of its particular idiom and into the terms of a normative language. This exegetical project seems to be in solidarity with the process of normalization described above, but these 'translations' can also be understood as highlighting the uniqueness of the text's language by broaching a gap between λέξις and λεγόμενον. The following chapters will pursue a detailed exploration of these dynamics and their consequences for some of Pindaric epinicians.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Daude (2009) on the role of exegetical paraphrase in the Pindar Scholia.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. pp. 26-8.

TEXTS AND METATEXTS

The previous chapter explored the role of a single cultural institution, the archive, in mediating literary encounters. I now want to sharpen my focus by examining the evidence for editions of Pindar in the Hellenistic period, the growth of Pindaric scholarship as recorded by the scholia, and the critical responses to Pindar by authors such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and [Longinus]. I shall address the scholarly approaches underlying the ordering of poems within editions, before considering the methodological problems involved in using the scholia as evidence for Hellenistic scholarship about Pindar. There are marked differences between these three sets of scholarly receptions: the critical aims of Dionysius and [Longinus], for instance, differ considerably from those of the authors responsible for the ancient commentaries on Pindar from which the scholia derive. Nevertheless, examining these strands of Pindaric reception alongside each other will give an impression of the various influences which mediated ancient readers' relations to the epinicians.

HELLENISTIC EDITIONS OF PINDAR

Zenodotus, active in the early third century BC, is the first Pindaric scholar for whom we have evidence of editorial activity. Σ O.2.7a (Drach. I p. 60) reports a Zenodotean reading: ἀκρόθινα πολέμου: Ζηνόδοτος μετὰ τοῦ ι γράφει ἀκροθίνια, ἅπερ κυρίως λέγεται παρὰ τὰς τῶν καρπῶν θῖνας ('firstfruits of war: Zenodotus writes it with ι, which is how the heaps of fruit are properly referred to') as does Σ O.6.92a (Drach. I p. 174), although there his reading is not cited by the scholia. Σ O.3.52a (Drach. I p. 120) reports Zenodotus' correction of the text on the grounds of biological verisimilitude: χρυσοκέρων ἔλαφον: Ζηνόδοτος δὲ μετεποίησεν ἐροέσεως διὰ τὸ ἱστορεῖσθαι τὰς θηλείας κέρατα μὴ ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἄρρενας ('golden-horned doe': Zenodotus substituted 'charming' because it is reported that the females do not have horns, but the males do'). There is also the possibility that some of the marginalia in *POxy* 841 and 2442 reflect Zenodotean readings.¹⁶⁸ Irigoien also sees a hint of Zenodotus' work in Σ O.5 inscr. a (Drach. I p. 138): αὕτη ἢ ᾠδὴ ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἑδαφίοις οὐκ ἦν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Διδύμου ὑπομνήμασιν ἐλέγετο Πινδάρου ('this ode was not in the older editions, as Didymus' commentaries on Pindar record'). He argues that the close study of O.5

¹⁶⁸ See Pfeiffer (1968) 118 n. 4 for Lobel's doubts as to whether the signs Z and Ζη refer to Zenodotean readings; he argues that they are more likely to indicate ζῆται vel sim. Pfeiffer objects that ζῆται 'is never set in front of a simple variant reading' but always 'introduces a question about the subject matter', and thus concurs with Grenfell and Hunt's ascriptions of these variants to Zenodotus.

and its authentication as one of the Olympian odes are the work of later scholars, particularly Aristarchus, and that the ἐδασία ('manuscripts fondamentaux') 'représenteraient ... l'édition de Zénodote'.¹⁶⁹ This is possible, although given the fact that Σ O.5 inscr. a does not designate the ἐδασία as referring to an edition by Zenodotus, it is equally likely that the term refers to the various manuscripts from different parts of the Greek world which Zenodotus drew on in the course of his textual studies. Both Irigoin and Pfeiffer¹⁷⁰ argue that Zenodotus was the first to make a critical edition of Pindar. I would tentatively agree with this thesis, but it is worth noting that all of the readings recorded by the scholia could have come from a list of glosses rather than an edition. Moreover, if we accept that Zenodotus did produce an edition of Pindar, we are not in a position to know what proportion of the corpus this covered. We could say on the basis of the above passages that it included the epinicians and paeans, but about the other poems we are in the dark.

We have considerably more evidence for Aristophanes of Byzantium's activity in the field of Pindaric scholarship.¹⁷¹ The two most important pieces of evidence are the report of an athetization on metrical grounds at Σ O.2.48c (Drach. I p. 73 = 380A Slater), and the notice in the *Vita Thomana* about Aristophanes placing O.1 first in the collection on the basis of its contents, namely because it included an encomium of the Olympian games and because of the narrative of Pelops who 'was the first to compete at Elis' (Drach. I p. 7. 14-15). There is also the testimony in *POxy* 2438.35 about Aristophanes dividing the Pindaric corpus into books in accordance with a system of generic classification. While Irigoin and Nauck both take the above to indicate that Aristophanes produced a critical edition of Pindar, Slater in his commentary on Aristophanes' fragments has called this into question.¹⁷² As part of this argument he cites the two passages from Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *De compositione verborum* which mention Aristophanes' colometrization of lyric poets:

¹⁶⁹ Irigoin (1952) 32-3. For evidence of Aristarchus' work on O.5 see Σ O.5.1b, 20e, 27b, 29e, 54b.

¹⁷⁰ Pfeiffer (1968) 118.

¹⁷¹ See Irigoin (1952) 33 for Callimachus' editorial work. He argues on the basis of Σ P.2 inscr. (where Callimachus is recorded as having classified P.2 as a Nemean) that Callimachus 'avait classé les oeuvres de Pindare avec beaucoup de soin, distinguant les *Epinicies* des autres odes, distinguant aussi, dans le group des *Epinicies*, les Néméennes des odes ... écrites pour d'autres jeux', but the absence of any traces in the scholia of his textual work suggests that he did not produce an edition or work on the text to any great extent. Cf. Currie (2005) 23-4 on the problems caused by the 'Alexandrian filter' for scholars attempting to reconstruct the performance conditions of the fifth century, and Fearn (2007) 205-12 for Alexandrian classifications of Bacchylides' dithyrambs.

¹⁷² See Nauck (1848) 61-2; Irigoin (1952) 35-50.

κῶλα δέ με δέξαι λέγειν οὐχ οἷς Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τις μετρικῶν διεκόσμησε τὰς ᾠδὰς, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡ φύσις ἀξιοῖ διαιρεῖν τὸν λόγον καὶ ῥητόρων παῖδες τὰς περιόδους διαιροῦσι.

You must understand me to refer by 'cola' not to those groups into which Aristophanes or some other metrician arranged the odes, but to the divisions which nature sees fit to bring about, and into which the rhetorical schools divide their periods.

(Ch. 22 = 380B Slater.)

The second reference follows a series of quotations from lyric poets:

ἐκ δὲ τῆς μελικῆς τὰ Σιμωνίδεια ταῦτα· γέγραπται δὲ κατὰ διαστολὰς οὐχ ὧν Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ ἄλλός τις κατεσκεύασε κῶλων ἀλλ' ὧν ὁ πεζὸς λόγος ἀπαιτεῖ.

This comes from the lyric poetry of Simonides. It has been written out in divisions which are those not of the cola arranged by Aristophanes or some other, but those which prose demands.

(Ch. 26 = 380B Slater.)

While Irigoin sees these passages as reinforcing Σ O.2.48c as evidence for a Aristophanic edition of Pindar with new colometry, Slater argues that the passages 'show only that Dionysius did not know who introduced the colometry, but thought that it could have been Aristophanes.'¹⁷³ This reading, however, neglects the argumentational context of the passages. Dionysius is opposing his own critical practice of analysing the rhythms and structures of texts in terms of the πεζὸς λόγος with what he sees as the artificial colometric divisions practiced by the metricians. The vagueness of Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τις μετρικῶν is better seen as faintly derogatory, implying that this editorial intervention should not enjoy any particular authority, rather than expressing a decisive lack of knowledge on the part of Dionysius. The rhetoric of the passage also has a more defensive role: by not attributing the colometrization to a particular scholar, Dionysius also avoids directly opposing his own practices to those of Aristophanes, whose authority in such matters was clearly respected. Moreover, the fact that Dionysius mentions Aristophanes as the paradigm of such

¹⁷³ Slater (1986) 145. For further scepticism about Slater's scepticism cf. D'Alessio (1997) 52 n. 172; cf. also *ibid.* pp. 55-6 for cautious comments on Aristophanes as the originator of the Pindaric colometry.

practices does suggest more strongly than Slater is willing to allow that he felt him to be if not necessarily the originator, then certainly an important figure in the history of colometrization.¹⁷⁴

Slater also seeks to cast doubt on *POxy* 2438.35 as evidence for an Aristophanic edition, claiming that it implies cataloguing, rather than editorial activity. He notes that Aristophanes is not mentioned as part of the controversy over the classification of P.2 by Σ P.2 inscr. (Drach. II p. 31-2), which he thinks implies that Aristophanes did not produce an edition. Furthermore, he suggests that the filling out of the Nemean and Isthmian books with poems which do not strictly belong there, such as N.11, composed to celebrate Aristagoras' assumption of public office, is not indicative of scholarly activity: '[t]he classification we have is ... due primarily to consideration of book length, which suggests the attitude of a book publisher rather than a scholar.'¹⁷⁵ With regard to the *Vita Thomana's* notice about Aristophanes placing O.1 at the head of the collection, he points to the fact that ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ contains the complete vowel spectrum,¹⁷⁶ and says that 'such a beginning could only have been created Pindar himself, not by Aristophanes. Thomas Magister could easily have misunderstood the papyrus observation [sc. *POxy* 2438.35] as a reorganization by Aristophanes', before pointing out that Simonides' poems are classified and organized on different grounds.

None of these arguments have much force. His opposition between book publisher and scholar suggests an unrealistic division between the two roles. Material factors such as the length of bookrolls certainly played a role in the arrangement of collections, in that they provided physical limits, albeit variable, which shaped the potential length, and hence contents, of an edition.¹⁷⁷ Scholars would also have to have borne in mind the exigencies of the book trade if they wanted their editions to serve as the basis of a widely disseminated text. In terms of simple practicalities, it is hardly credible to expect even a scholar such as Aristophanes to take eidographic precision to the kind of lengths which would have required, for example, N.11 to have an edition all to itself as the only example of a Pindaric

¹⁷⁴ Irigoin (1952) 50 suggests that Aristophanes' edition became the basis for the vulgate; if this was the case, and was known to have been so, it would help to account for Dionysius' assumption that the colometric divisions originated with Aristophanes, in that any colometrized text would be seen to owe a debt to his scholarly activity.

¹⁷⁵ Slater (1986) 146.

¹⁷⁶ Noted by Thummer (1968) 139.

¹⁷⁷ See Irigoin (1952) 38; Van Sickle (1980); Lowe (2007) 175 on the influence of the length of book-rolls on editorial and authorial activities. N.b. particular Lowe p. 172 on the practicalities of the book-roll as a factor in editing: 'the form of the book-roll, where poems at the front of a book were far easier and likelier to be consulted, encourages a ranking of poems on a criterion of significance (or consultability) from highest to lowest.'

‘prytaneion’. We should see editorial practice in this period not as conforming to a monolithic model but rather as involving ‘multiple levels of grouping and ordering that implemented different taxonomic criteria at successive levels of a hierarchy.’¹⁷⁸ Importantly, this activity was directed by the nature of the corpus concerned and by the forms of material text available to the editor, not simply by fixed categorizational rules.¹⁷⁹

His argument that ἀριστον μὲν ὕδωρ constitutes ‘a beginning [that] could only have been created by Pindar himself’ is confused and misleading. Of course he is right to point out that the words in the original form must, barring some horrendous (or perhaps felicitous!) accident of transmission, go back to Pindar, but his reading fails to distinguish between the different types of ‘beginning’ at work here. The poet is responsible for the words as beginning the poem in performance, but the editor is responsible for their place at the beginning of an edition.¹⁸⁰ I shall return to the possible significances of this shift below. Slater is right to point out that *POxy* 2438.35 does not necessarily indicate an Aristophanic edition, but it cannot be taken as evidence for classification exclusive of an edition either. His use of the absence of Aristophanes from the debate recorded at Σ P.2 inscr. is answered by Lowe, who argues that it probably indicates that ‘the default classification as a Pythian in the standard edition was taken to represent [Aristophanes’] judgement.’¹⁸¹ Equally, his suggestion that Thomas Magister may have misunderstood the papyrus as referring to ‘a reorganization by Aristophanes’ is rather arbitrary. We have no good reason to assume that a version of the *Life* contained on this papyrus was available to Thomas Magister, and even if it was, it seems unlikely that he would invent on the basis of this the reasons for O.1 being

¹⁷⁸ Lowe (2007) 170.

¹⁷⁹ See Lowe (2007) 170-5 for an analysis of eidographic principles with respect to Pindar, Bacchylides and Simonides. For classification of lyric poetry more generally see Harvey (1955).

¹⁸⁰ It is possible that, in addition to the reasons given by the *Vita Thomana*, Aristophanes’ may have been influenced in his placing of O.1 at the head of the edition by the musical significance of its opening words. Thummer (1968) 138-9 comments on the opening in terms of its wedding of sound and sense: ‘Einzelne Stellen, in denen die Klangwirkung der Sprache besonders deutlich ist, zeigen jedenfalls, dass der Dichter den Eindruck der Wörter durch den Klang zu vertiefen suchte. So lassen die ersten Wörter von O.1 ... in der Folge ihrer Vokale ... dem vollen Aufklang der Leier vernehmen.’ His thesis that the arrangement of vowels would be matched to all the notes of the lyre relies on a speculative connection between vowels and notes; the contour of the melody would rather have been defined by the pitch structure of the words (see D’Angour (2006) 278-80 and (2007) 264-95.) We might suggest instead that the vowel structure of these opening words offered a chorus an opportunity to showcase its talents at the outset of the performance; the unison signing of this combination of vowels would have demanded a high degree of skill and training. Irigoin (1952) 47 suggests that Aristophanes may have had access to some texts with musical notation and ‘qu’il ait tenu compte des indications qu’elles fournissaient pour établir sa colométrie.’ If this were the case, Aristophanes may have seen a papyrus which marked the beginning of O.1 as in some way musically distinctive, or noticed this himself. Even if this were the case, however, I would suggest that this would have been subsidiary to the more contextual influences on editorial strategy mentioned by the *Vita Thomana*. Clay (2011) argues that O.1-3 were originally composed as a ‘song cycle’, and that their placement in the edition responds to this: cf. below p. 121.

¹⁸¹ Lowe (2007) 172.

placed first in the collection and attribute them to Aristophanes. Much more likely is that the *Vita Thomana*'s account of Aristophanes' editorial practice was based on sources now lost.

Although we cannot be absolutely certain about the matter, I would suggest that the combination of Σ O.2.48c, the references made by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the list at *POxy* 2438.35, and the notice in the *Vita Thomana* strongly suggest that Aristophanes produced an edition of Pindar, almost certainly colometrized according to his understanding of Pindaric metre, and very possibly including lectional signs marking athetizations, ends of stanzas and ends of poems.¹⁸² Despite the historical importance of this edition, however, we should not be too rigid in our thinking about how it affected later editions. While the evidence indicates that Aristophanes' ordering of the poems served as the template for later editions, and while he clearly made important contributions to Pindaric scholarship, the nature of text production in the ancient world is such that we must allow for a good deal of variety in the constitution of individual texts; while the order of the poems is likely to have remained unchanged, the appearances of different texts will have varied considerably according to the different hands used by particular scribes, and each text will have had varying marginalia according to the learning and interests of its owner(s).¹⁸³ Regardless of the limitations of the evidence, however, we are justified in saying that the third and second centuries BC were a period of important changes in the constitution of books, as developments such as the formation of editions, and the use of colometry displacing older texts of lyric poetry written in prose, such as the fourth century papyrus of Timotheus' *Persae*, changed the book into an object of scholarly construction, with significant consequences for readers.

SCHOLARLY RECEPTIONS

One of the most important issues for thinking about the diachronic travels of the Pindaric corpus is how the scholarly literature written on Pindar in the Hellenistic period affected and

¹⁸² Cf. Lowe (2007) 169 who, in arguing for the existence of an Aristophanic edition, notes that 'it is hard to see how Aristophanes' arrangement and colometry could have been promoted in a mere ὑπομνήμα.' There may well have been other editions of Pindar made after Aristophanes, although cf. Irigoin (1952) 51-6 and Vassiliki (2009) on Aristarchus' Pindaric criticism. Irigoin notes the absence of Aristarchus' emendations from the manuscript tradition and argues on this basis that it is unlikely that Aristarchus produced an edition of Pindar: '[I]e sort reserve à ces corrections serait surprenant si Aristarque avait établi une édition qui, selon toute vraisemblance, aurait remplacé celle d'Aristophane' (p. 53).

¹⁸³ This variation would also have encompassed the forms of critical signs, particularly coronides: see further pp. 91-104.

interacted with the texts they commented on.¹⁸⁴ Central to this relationship will be the supplementary character of this literature. As well as providing exegesis of the text, the scholia also give the reader historical and mythographical information which expands on that in the texts themselves; as well as opening up new ways of looking at the texts, these supplementations emphasise the status of the Pindaric corpus as a means of accessing and reimagining the past. However, using the scholia as evidence for the scholarly texts of the Hellenistic period poses evidential problems which require discussion. The scholia in the Byzantine manuscripts are a collation of what was available in late antiquity, which was itself a collation of a number of disparate texts from earlier periods, and cannot therefore be treated as if they were all available to any individual reader.¹⁸⁵ Similarly, we must be wary of over-privileging the extant scholia and of thinking of them as a complete representation of ancient responses to Pindar, since the totality of Pindaric criticism in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods was far more voluminous than is represented by the scholia as we have them.¹⁸⁶ We also need to acknowledge the virtual impossibility of precisely dating scholia which do not refer to particular authors, and the differences that would have obtained between different hypomnemata and editions;¹⁸⁷ scholarly paratexts were open documents, subject to additions and alterations by any given reader or author, although it is clear from the remarks about Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus that these and other scholars had a canonical place in the corpus.

There are various ways in which the above problems can be negotiated. Firstly, the question of dating and textual specificity. It is likely that there was little in the way of original scholarship on Pindar after the Augustan period, and that most of the scholarship that postdated this period was concerned with redactions of previous commentaries, with an emphasis on the type of exegesis suitable for use by schoolteachers.¹⁸⁸ This is indicated partly

¹⁸⁴ For a definition and discussion of hypomnemata cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 29. The term refers to a collection of glosses and interpretative comments on particular words and passages

¹⁸⁵ Still the best general account of the scholia's transmission is Deas (1931), who argues that the Didymus' commentary, which collected much of the previous material, was the main source for the scholia (p. 22). Useful also are his remarks about the use of commentaries in schools (p. 28), which must have involved much abbreviation and compression. Cf. Irigoin (1952) 31-75 for an overview of early Pindaric scholarship.

¹⁸⁶ The differences between the surviving scholia to P.12 and the fragment of Theon's commentary on that poem (= *POxy* 2536) are a salutary reminder of the variations in the metatextual corpus: cf. below pp. 225-7. Cf. also Deas (1931) 55-7 on the Byzantine manuscripts as imperfect representations of previous scholarly work; he points to phenomena such as the substitution of past tenses for the present tenses used in ancient scholarship to refer to customs and rituals; e.g. Σ P.4.338.

¹⁸⁷ For a definition and discussion of hypomnemata cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 29. The term refers to a collection of glosses and interpretative comments on particular words and passages, usually in the form of a separate book rather than marginalia; see further Deas (1931) 76-8 with bibliography, and more generally on the form of scholia Wilson (1967).

¹⁸⁸ Thus Deas (1931) 28.

by the number of the scholia which provided exegetical paraphrases, and also by the fact that the vast majority of the sources cited in the scholia date from the Hellenistic period and before; it is notable that none of the major Second Sophistic authors are cited by the scholia vetera. The latter is not a conclusive demonstration of early dating of the material which comprise the scholia, since it is perfectly possible for a late commentator to cite earlier authors, but it is suggestive when combined with the firmer evidence that most of the scholars named in the scholia and known to have worked specifically on Pindar date from the Hellenistic period down to the middle of the first century AD. Theon certainly wrote a commentary on Pindar, and it is likely that Aristonicus did also,¹⁸⁹ but there is little to suggest that Hephaestion or Herodian did so, and Amyntianus certainly did not.¹⁹⁰ Deas and others are surely correct to argue for the role of an anonymous second century AD redactor, who slimmed down the commentaries of Didymus, Theon, and others into a more condensed form, after which point little new material entered the corpus.¹⁹¹ On these grounds we can be reasonably confident that most of the material in the scholia, excluding the paraphrasing exegesis, would have been available in some form to readers of the later Hellenistic and early imperial periods, and that passages containing extensive contextual, mythical, or literary-

¹⁸⁹ The Suda does not mention a work on Pindar by Aristonicus, focusing instead on his Homeric and Hesiodic scholarship, but this does not mean that he did not produce such a work; his Homeric scholarship was probably known to the compiler of the Suda through the so-called ‘Four-Men Commentary’, consisting of excerpts from Aristonicus, Didymus, Nicanor and Herodian, but his work on Pindar was probably lost by late antiquity. Σ N.1.37 (Drach. III p. 17) (χρή δ’ ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς· Ἀριστόνικος· χρή καθ’ ἣν γεγέννηται τις φύσιν, ταύτη ἀκολουθεῖν καὶ μὴ βιάζεσθαι αὐτήν εἰς ἄλλα τρέποντα, μηδὲ τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖν ἅ τις ἔχει ἐκ φύσεως ‘one must on straight roads’: Aristonicus: one must follow the nature which one was born with and not force it into turning in a different direction, nor rage enviously against good men, but work with what one possesses by nature’) suggests a commentary, as does the specifically literary nature of the comment recorded at Σ O.3.31a (Drach. I p. 113: οὐ θαυμαστὸν εἰ τὸ μήπω πεφυτευμένον ἄλλος εἶπεν. Ἀριστόνικος προληπτικῶς φησιν εἰρησθαι· οἱ δὲ ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἱερά, κἂν μήπω πεφυτευμένα ἦ, ἄλση ἐκάλουν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι: ‘it is no wonder if he says that the grove had not yet been planted. Aristonicus says that he speaks proleptically’). Less decisive are the comments recorded by Σ O.1.35c (Drach. I p. 28), O.7.154a (Drach. I p. 232), and N.1 inscr. (Drach. III p. 7), all of which could have another provenance; the first two, for instance, could come from a response to Didymus rather than an independent commentary. Overall, however, a commentary seems the likely source. On Aristonicus in general Cf. e.g. Pfeiffer (1968) 267-70; Montanari (1993) 279.

¹⁹⁰ Σ O.3.52a (Drach. I p. 120) refers to Amyntianus’ *περὶ ἐλεφάντων* as the source of the citation. Both the citations of Herodian (Σ O.1.18a (Drach. I p. 23); P.3.65 (Drach. II p. 72-3) concern accentuation and probably come from one of the grammatical treatises for which he was celebrated. Σ I. 5 inscr.a. (Drach. III p. 240) records Hephaestion’s views on the placing of the poem (ταύτην τὴν ᾠδὴν Ἡφαιστίων μετὰ τὴν ἐξῆς φησι γεγράφθαι τὴν Θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν, καὶ αὐτὴν Πυθέα γεγράφθαι ἐχρῆν οὖν καὶ προτετάχθαι, ‘Hephaestion says that this ode was written after the one which follows it, which begins Θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν [I.6.], and that it was written for Pytheas, so it should also be placed before it’), but this comment need not be taken from a commentary, and given the absence of any other references to Hephaestion in the scholia, such a work seems improbable (Cf. Deas (1931) 29 for the identification of this author with the famous grammarian). The Suda does not mention a Pindaric commentary among his works, although it does refer to unnamed ἄλλα πλεῖστα among his oeuvre.

¹⁹¹ Deas (1931) 27-9; Lefkowitz (1986) 270-1, and cf. McNamee (2007) 98 for the paring away of scholarly material from later codices.

historical information would have been considerably more lengthy in the earlier commentaries. This observation brings with it an additional caveat; we should not think of the extant scholia, even in places where their comments are particularly extensive, as reflecting the dominant or prevailing ancient views of the passage in question, still less as reflecting the sum total of scholarship on a particular point. Awareness of this lends a certain provisionality to the readings offered below: our awareness of the scholia's archival dimension, for instance, would doubtless be enhanced by greater knowledge of scholars such as Artemon and Didymus, who were particularly interested in historical exegesis.¹⁹² Nonetheless, we should not allow excessive scepticism to preclude uses of the scholia; for all their evidential limitations, they remain important witnesses of the debate that surrounded the Pindaric corpus, and as such are worthy of critical attention.

Another factor to be borne in mind is the variousness of the metatexts that the scholia reflect. As well as commentaries and collections of glosses, there would also have been individual readers' marginalia, no doubt often influenced by or copied from commentaries to which they had access. Quite aside from the usual insecurities of textual transmission, we are confronted with a corpus subject to a process of constant modification which precludes pinning down any particular scholium's availability to a certain time and place. Moreover, it should also be recognized that numerous differences would have obtained between different hypomnemata and editions; scholarly paratexts were open documents, subject to additions and alterations by any given writer or author. They were also open to excerption by individual readers: the extant papyri show how readers drew on commentaries to form their own marginalia.¹⁹³ Consequently, the aim of the following readings is a diachronic sketching of some of the interpretative situations that arise from the scholarly texts of which the extant scholia are the descendants. Reading a text with a metatextual apparatus is a particular kind of reading situation, one which differs in various ways from hearing a performance or reading the text alone, and my analyses aim to articulate the kind of problems and questions that may have confronted ancient readers approaching the Pindaric corpus in this way. In doing so, I am dealing with a set of interpretative potentialities, the kind of formal questions and

¹⁹² Artemon wrote a commentary on the Sicilian odes: cf. Σ I.2.inscr.a (Drach. III p. 212), and for his other Pindaric work cf. Σ O.5.1b (Drach. I p. 139-40) and P.3.52b (Drach. II p. 70-1), with Irigoien (1952) 62. Σ P.1.31c records that he participated in the debate over the location of Typhon, and he also discussed Gela's history and myth (Σ O.2.16b (Drach. I p. 63-4)). Didymus is frequently cited as the source of historical discussions, as at Σ O.2.29d (Drach. I p. 68-70): cf. Irigoien (1952) 67-75, and in general Pfeiffer (1968) 274-9. Theon would also have been an important source for later school texts and private commentaries: cf. McNamee (2007) 33-5, Ucciardello (2012) 119-26.

¹⁹³ Cf. e.g. the marginalia in *POxy* 841. For a full inventory of Pindaric papyri cf. Ucciardello (2012) 109-10, and for comment on annotations in Pindaric papyri cf. McNamee (2007) 305-49.

intertextual connections that the scholia prompt; in some cases these entail a certain amount of readerly elaboration, but in others the scholia push us quite firmly towards certain ways of construing the text and the data in question.¹⁹⁴ What is at issue is not just what the scholia themselves say, but what is presupposed by such statements, and the kind of potential readings and readerly engagements opened up, and ususally not articulated, by such commentaries. In this sense, the scholia should not be seen only as interpretative corpora, but rather as repositories of information which bears on the poems they gloss in a variety of ways.¹⁹⁵ My readings will also serve to demonstrate that, while we should not privilege the scholia as guides to interpretation, they do offer precious insights into the interpretative climate surrounding the Pindaric texts, and form an important adjunct to epinician's status as an archival corpus.

AUSTERITY AND SUBLIMITY

Dionysius of Halicarnassus is one of the most prominent representatives of this tradition. In *On Literary Composition*, he gives definitions and examples of various compositional styles as part of a didactic programme ostensibly directed at the rhetorical training of his addressee Rufus Metilius (*De comp. verb.* 1).¹⁹⁶ As with much ancient 'literary criticism', *On Literary Composition* is designed primarily to offer instruction in the process of writing, and the question of how it may have affected reading practices is consequently by no means straightforward: teaching the reader to write is not the same as teaching the reader to read. Pindar, alongside authors such as Aeschylus, Antimachus, Empedocles, and Thucydides, is one of the representatives of the severe or harsh style (ἀσθηρὸς), which Dionysius describes in the following terms (ch. 22):

¹⁹⁴ Enquiring into readerly experiences of texts where those readings have not, as in the vast majority of cases, left evidential traces is difficult, and we have to extrapolate from the scholia's formal features and argumentational strategies the kind of experiences they could have induced. It is notable, however, that the practice of juxtaposing the views of different scholars and the use of the ἄλλως ... ἄλλως structure encourages deconstruction of the commentator's authority and readerly adjudication; these structures were certainly common in later commentaries (2nd century AD onwards), and there is evidence that they formed part of earlier commentaries as well; cf. e.g. Σ N.1.3 (Drach. III pp. 9-10). We should not discount the possibility that the critical and comparative approach encouraged by such structures carried over into other aspects of readers' approaches to commentaries.

¹⁹⁵ The scholia's interpretative shortcomings are well understood: see in general Lefkowitz (1985). Muckensturm-Pouille (2009) 91 argues that the scholia's citational practices are primarily 'scientifique et pédagogique'; such an exegetical conclusion should not, however, be allowed to obscure their more general supplementary functions.

¹⁹⁶ For an overview of Dionysius' accounts of different textual effects cf. Bonner (1939); Damon (1991).

τῆς μὲν οὖν αὐστηρᾶς ἁρμονίας τοιόσδε ὁ χαρακτήρ· ἐρείδεσθαι βούλεται τὰ ὀνόματα ἀσφαλῶς καὶ στάσεις λαμβάνειν ἰσχυράς, ὥστ' ἐκ περιφανείας ἕκαστον ὄνομα ὀρθᾶσθαι, ἀπέχειν τε ἀπ' ἀλλήλων τὰ μόρια διαστάσεις ἀξιολόγους αἰσθητοῖς χρόνοις διειργόμενα· τραχείαις τε χρῆσθαι πολλαχῆ καὶ ἀντιτύποις ταῖς συμβολαῖς οὐδὲν αὐτῇ διαφέρει, οἷα γίνονται τῶν λογάδην συντιθεμένων ἐν οἰκοδομαῖαις λίθων αἱ μὴ εὐγώνιοι καὶ μὴ συνεξεσμένοι βάσεις, ἀργαὶ δέ τινες καὶ αὐτοσχέδιοι· μεγάλοις τε καὶ διαβεβηκόσιν εἰς πλάτος ὀνόμασιν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ μῆκύνεσθαι φιλεῖ· τὸ γὰρ εἰς βραχείας συλλαβὰς συνάγεσθαι πολέμιον αὐτῇ, πλήν εἴ ποτε ἀνάγκη βιάζοιτο.

The character of the harsh style is as follows: it wishes for words to be firmly fixed and take strong positions, so that each word may be seen clearly, and that the parts of the sentence should be distant from each other by considerable distances and separated by perceptible intervals. It makes use everywhere of harsh and dissonant collocations, such as those of picked blocks of stone laid together in building, not squared off and well polished, but unwrought and rough hewn. In general, it tends towards extension by means of long words which extend over a wide space, and being restricted to short syllables is hostile to it, except when necessity compels.

He then goes on to characterize various other aspects of the austere style: its rhythms are 'dignified and grand' (ἀξιωματικούς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς), its arrangement of clauses 'noble, bright, and free' (εὐγενῆ καὶ λαμπρὰ καὶ ἐλεύθερα); it 'wishes them to seem more like nature than art' (φύσει τ' εἰκέναι μᾶλλον αὐτὰ βούλεται ἢ τέχνη), and is directed more at the expression of emotion than at character (κατὰ πάθος λέγεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ κατ' ἦθος). Its periodic structures are not ornamented, but aim rather to give an impression of simplicity and absence of ornament (τὸ ἀνεπιτήδευτον ἐμφαίνειν θέλει καὶ ἀφελές), and its overall stylistic effect is one which generates beauty through a 'patina of antiquity' (τὸν ἀρχαϊσμόν καὶ τὸν πίνον ἔχουσα κάλλος).¹⁹⁷ Dionysius' first example of the austere style is the opening passage of Pindar's *Dith.* 1, which he subjects to a microscopic stylistic analysis focussed almost exclusively on the sound structures of the words and their sonic relations to each other. For instance, his analysis of the poem's opening line (δεῦτ' ἐν χορὸν Ὀλύμπιοι) focuses on the juxtaposition of ἐν and χορὸν, and the sonic effect thus created. Dionysius points out that the letters ν and χ form an unnatural union (ἀσύμμικτα δὲ τῇ φύσει ταῦτα τὰ

¹⁹⁷ Cf. τὸν ἀρχαῖον ... πίνον used of Pindar's *Partheneia* at *Dem.* 39.

στοιχεῖα καὶ ἀκόλλητα), because ν never precedes χ in the same syllable; their juxtaposition therefore produces a pause between the letters and keeps the sonic structures of the two words separated (ἀνάγκη σιωπὴν τινὰ γενέσθαι μέσην ἀμφοῖν τὴν διορίζουσαν ἐκατέρου τῶν γραμμάτων τὰς δυνάμεις).¹⁹⁸

In his definition of the austere style, as elsewhere in his critical discourse, Dionysius is drawing on an extensive tradition, which I examined above,¹⁹⁹ of conceptualizing literary texts in terms of their materiality, whether as buildings or other types of objects, or as sound structures.²⁰⁰ The above passage extends the rhetoric of *De comp. verb.* 6, where he compares writing to building, and develops the concern with euphonious sound structures that was important in Hellenistic criticism.²⁰¹ Although the definition and empirical account of literary styles in this passage works primarily as part of a didaxis of the reader-as-writer, the detailed verbal anatomizing of Dionysius' account also acts as a commentary on the process of voiced reading, drawing the reader's attention to the stylistic force of the sounds produced by this act. In common with numerous other ancient critics, Dionysius conceptualizes the process of reading as an uncovering of the (authorial) voice that is inscribed within it,²⁰² but there are passages where he acknowledges the historical specificity of such readerly recreations. At *Dem.* 22, he meditates on Demosthenes' greatness in terms of an opposition between performance and reperformance:

εἰ δὴ τὸ διὰ τοσοῦτων <ἐτῶν> ἐγκαταμισγόμενον τοῖς βιβλίοις πνεῦμα τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει καὶ οὕτως ἀγωγόν ἐστὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἧ που τότε ὑπερφυές τι καὶ δεινὸν χρῆμα ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκείνου λόγων.

If the spirit with which his pages are imbued after so many years has such strength and moves men so much, how overwhelming and awesome a thing it must have been to have been present at the time when he delivered his speeches.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Vaahtera (1997) for a critique of this critical practice.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. pp. 11-15.

²⁰⁰ Cf. Porter (2010) 490-509 for an account of this tradition with further references. For the connection between this passage and [Long.] *De subl.* 40.4 cf. Porter (2001) 81. On Dionysius' metaphorical vocabulary in general cf. Lockwood (1937).

²⁰¹ Phld. *De mus.* 4 col. 22.25-6 N refers to critics for whom euphony was particularly important: cf. Porter (2010) 494-5. Euphonism is a common critical motif in critics such as Quintilian, Cicero, and Plutarch, and is also frequent in the scholia: cf. Richardson (1980) 283-7; Meijering (1987) 42-3; Nünlist (2009) 215-17. For the importance of this mode of analysis in *De comp. verb.* cf. Damon (1991) 52-8.

²⁰² Cf. Porter (2010) 310-11.

This passage tacitly acknowledges the non-identity of Demosthenes' performances (ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκείνου λόγων) and those readings of the present day which attempt to revivify the text's πνεῦμα. Nevertheless, the book is here imagined as an almost magical object, a receptacle for a spirit which is mixed into it (ἐγκαταμισγόμενον); the passage registers the historicity of the book (διὰ τοσοῦτων <ἐτῶν> ... τότε), and its capacity to give the reader access to a πνεῦμα that is both a transhistorical remainder of the past, preserved intact and awaiting readerly excavation, and something dependent on the medium of its transmission.²⁰³

The vocabulary with which Dionysius describes the severe style and the monumental experiences to which it gives rise (e.g. μεγαλοπρεπεῖς, ὑπερφυές, δεινόν) is common in critical assessments of Pindar, as in Quintilian's famous pronouncement (10.1.61):

nouem uero lyricorum longe Pindarus princeps spiritus magnificentia, sentiis, figuris, beatissima rerum uerborumque copia et uelut quodam eloquentiae flumine; propter quae Horatius eum merito credidit nemini imitabilem.

Pindar is truly by far the preeminent figure among the lyric poets in his magnificence of inspiration, in his maxims, in his use of figures, in the happy wealth of his subjects and language, and in his torrent of eloquence. On account of these things Horace rightly believed him to be unsusceptible of imitation by anyone.²⁰⁴

Longinus' *On the Sublime* is the most thoroughgoing extant critical treatment of the sublime (ὑψος) in literature,²⁰⁵ and provides extensive analysis of the qualities dwelt on by Dionysius in his treatment of the severe style and mentioned by Quintilian in relation to Pindar. Somewhat surprisingly, Pindar does not feature much in *On the Sublime*,²⁰⁶ although he is mentioned at 33.5 alongside Sophocles as authors praised for their inconsistent but overwhelming genius, who 'as it were set everything ablaze in their movement, but are often extinguished without reason and fall flat in complete failure' (ὅτ' ἐμὲν οἶον πάντα ἐπιφλέγουσι τῇ φορᾷ, σβέννυνται δ' ἀλόγως πολλάκις καὶ πίπτουσι ἀτυχεστάτα), and

²⁰³ Cf. Porter (2001) 79-80 on the historicity of the Longinian sublime, which 'exists in a present experience of the past – or in its projection into the past ... the sublime exists only in a chain of citations'.

²⁰⁴ Quintilian's *eloquentiae flumine* recalls Hor. *Od.* 4.2.5-8.

²⁰⁵ The date of the treatise and the identity of the author are uncertain: some place him in the mid-third century AD (cf. Russell (1964) xxii-xxx), but a first century AD date has found general favour: cf. e.g. Segal (1959); Russell (1964). For further references cf. Porter (2001) 63 n. 1. Discussion of sublimity is not confined to Longinus however: cf. Porter (2001) 67-76.

²⁰⁶ Pindar may, however, have featured more extensively in the lost passages of *On the Sublime*. For Longinus on Bacchylides cf. Fearn (2007) 213-14.

who stand in contrast to the smooth perfection of, respectively, Ion of Chios and Bacchylides. However, [Long.] 35.4-5 includes a reminiscence of Pindar as part of a description of the sublime in nature (35.4):²⁰⁷

οὐδέ γε τὸ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τουτὶ φλογίον ἀνακαιόμενον, ἐπεὶ καθαρὸν σώζει τὸ φέγγος,
ἐκπληττόμεθα τῶν οὐρανίων μᾶλλον, καίτοι πολλάκις ἐπισκοτούμενων, οὐδὲ
τῶν τῆς Αἴτνης κρατήρων ἀξιοθαυμαστότερον νομίζομεν, ἧς αἱ ἀναχοαὶ πέτρους
τε ἐκ βυθοῦ καὶ ὄλους ὄχθους ἀναφέρουσι καὶ ποταμοὺς ἐνίοτε τοῦ γηγενοῦς
ἐκείνου καὶ αὐτομάτου προχέουσι πυρός.

We are not astonished more by the little fire that we have lit for ourselves, which keeps a steady light, than at the lights of heaven, even though they are often darkened, not do we think it more wonderous than the craters of Etna, whose outpourings hurl rocks up from the depths and whole hills, and sometimes pour forth rivers of that earthborn and spontaneous fire.

The description of Aetna recalls, inter alia, Pindar's vignette at P.1.21-4:²⁰⁸

τᾶς ἐρεύγονται μὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἀγνόταται
ἐκ μυχῶν παγαί· ποταμοὶ δ' ἀμέραισιν
μὲν προχέοντι ῥόον καπνοῦ
αἴθων'· ἀλλ' ἐν ὄρφναισιν πέτρας
φοίνισσα κυλινδομένα φλόξ ἐς βαθεῖ-
αν φέρει πόντου πλάκα σὺν πατάγῳ.

From its depths, purest springs of unapproachable fire belch forth; rivers pour forth by day a blazing stream of smoke, but in the darkness a reddening flame rolls rocks to the sea's deep plain with a crash.

Longinus' phrasing replays the Pindaric rocks (πέτρους), rivers of flame (ποταμοὺς ... πυρός), the depths of the mountain (ἐκ βυθοῦ), and the 'pouring forth' (προχέουσι). The interplay between text and referent forms an important part of the rhetoric of Longinus'

²⁰⁷ As noted by e.g. Russell (1964) ad loc. Cf. Segal (1987) for the representation of the writer as hero in this and other passages.

²⁰⁸ Description of Aetna was a popular topos in ancient literature: cf. e.g. Aesch. *PV* 367-72. Cf. Aul. Gell. 17.10 for a stylistic comparison between Pindar's description and Vir. *Aen.* 3.570-6.

passage: although the primary object of man's instinct to admire the sublime is the great marvels of nature, the pointed allusion to literary treatments of Aetna such as Pindar's blur the distinction between text and object, and suggests the extent to which perception of nature is in part shaped by engagement with literature.²⁰⁹ As well as drawing on the equation between sublime texts and sublime subject matter, the Pindaric appropriations also (attempt to) instantiate Longinus' paedeutic theories: a central facet of his argument in *On the Sublime* is that exposure to and communion with sublime authors is the only means of achieving sublimity in one's own work. Here, the Pindaric intertexts enact this process, as the sublime force of the Pindaric passage spills over into Longinus' own writing, while Longinus' departures from the Pindaric model (e.g. τοῦ γηγενοῦς ἐκείνου καὶ αὐτομάτου ... πυρός) also instantiate the competitive nature of imitative engagement.²¹⁰

Longinus repeatedly stresses the psychological effects of the sublime as part of his conception of reading as a dialogic process. After an initial loose definition of sublimity as a property of discourses at 1.3 (ὡς ἀκρότης καὶ ἐξοχή τις λόγων ἐστὶ τὰ ὕψη, 'the sublime is a consummate excellence and outstanding aspect of language'), he moves on at 1.4 to stress the transformational effects of great works: οὐ γὰρ εἰς πειθῶ τοὺς ἀκροωμένους ἀλλ' εἰς ἔκστασιν ἄγει τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ πάντα δέ γε σὺν ἐκπλήξει τοῦ πιθανοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸς χάριν αἰεὶ κρατεῖ τὸ θαυμάσιον ('the outstanding works move listeners not to being persuaded but to ecstasy; always that which is wondrous, with its power of amazement, prevails over the convincing and pleasing'). The experience of the sublime is uplifting (7.2-3), and occurs at the site of an informative dialogue with past authors; it is intimately connected to the greatness of an individual intellect (ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα, 'sublimity is the echo of a noble spirit' 9.2),²¹¹ and 'imitation and emulation of past authors' (<ή> τῶν ἔμπροσθεν μεγάλων συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν μίμησις τε καὶ ζήλωσις, 13.2) is necessary in order for an author to achieve sublimity in his own work. At 13.2, Longinus employs the simile of the Pythia's inspiration by Apollo to characterize how one may be influenced by previous

²⁰⁹ For similar vocabulary used of Demosthenes cf. *De subl.* 12.4.

²¹⁰ Cf. Walsh (1988) for the argument that *On the Sublime* both describes and embodies sublimity. Cf. particularly p. 252 n. 1 for his comments on 22.1, where in describing how emotion disturbs normal word order, the word for 'word arrangement' (τάξις) is placed in hyperbaton at the end of its clause (τῆδε κάκεισε ἀγχιστρόφως ἀντισπῶμενοι τὰς λέξεις τὰς νοήσεις τὴν ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἰρμοῦ παντοίως πρὸς μυρίας τροπὰς ἐναλλάττουσι τάξιν).

²¹¹ Cf. Walsh (1988) 260 for an assessment of the relation between this phrase and sublimity as a feature of texts: he argues that for Longinus 'there is no gap between thought and expression', and that the latter is an unmediated expression of the former. 35.4 can be seen in this light: the echoes of P.1 function as a textual correlative of the μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα experienced when reading Pindar.

authors, and follows this at 13.3-4 with an account of authors such as Stesichorus, Herodotus, and Plato being inspired by and engaging with Homer.²¹²

In the passages cited above, Pindar emerges as a distant and somewhat forbidding figure, an impression enhanced by the infrequency with which he is mentioned or alluded to. At 33.5 both Pindar and Sophocles are figured by an assimilation to powerful natural forces which evade personalizing conception,²¹³ a mode of representation which seems to limit the possibilities for thoughtful engagement with these authors by foregrounding precisely how their work makes such engagement difficult or even impossible; the expression πάντα ἐπιφλέγουσι, for instance, indicates such an effect.²¹⁴ Yet this imagery may also be read as pointing up the force of the paradox whereby the sublime is both an excessive, supra-rational experience and something that can be captured, however provisionally, by critical comment and reproduced in one's own writing. The figurations thus attempt to stretch what is meant by engagement with previous authors by subsuming within it an experiential element beyond the terms of semantic, or indeed semiotic, analysis. Reading becomes a mode of experience involving an openness to, and more detailed awareness of, the means by which sublimity overwhelms the subject.²¹⁵

Assessing the possible effects of such critical models on ancient readers and their efficacy for explicating the functions of Pindaric texts, however, raises a different set of questions. For all their conceptual power and literary-historical interest, the critical positions articulated by Dionysius and Longinus should not be taken either as exhausting the potentialities of meaning and significance opened up by Pindaric texts in their diachronic situations, nor as providing a determinate critical horizon for readers. With regard to the latter point, a pointed contrast emerges between the affective materialism of these two critics, with their focus on

²¹² On the pervasiveness of *imitatio* in ancient literary culture cf. Russell (1979). Cf. Whitmarsh (2001) 60-2 on the agonistic aspects of imitation in Longinus.

²¹³ Cf. the figuration of Homer as the Ocean at 9.13.

²¹⁴ Cf. particularly *De subl.* 1.4, where the sublime is correlated with the production of wonder and amazement, with Porter (2001) 79-80; Hunter (2009) 130, 141-2. Later in the same passage Longinus uses the image of the thunderbolt to describe the effects of Demosthenes' writing. Porter (2001) 81-2 argues that the experience of the sublime is intimately connected to the (potential) loss, disjunction, fragmentation, and failure of the objects from which it arises, and cf. *ibid.* p. 83 on the sublime as a force which emerges in particular sites and fragments the literary work of which it is part (an effect imitated by the textuality of *On the Sublime* itself in its tissues of citations): cf. also Whitmarsh (2001) 61 with further references. Cf. *De subl.* 20.3 on the complex relationship between order and disorder in sublime works, and Innes (1995) on the structural unity of *On the Sublime* itself, which she sees as illustrative of the organic unity which Longinus attributes to the sublime; cf. also Whitmarsh (2001) 64-6 on the interplay between (stylistic and conceptual) order and transgression. On the politicality of the treatise cf. Too (1998) 188-207; Whitmarsh (2001) 66-71.

²¹⁵ Cf. Porter (2001) 78: *On the Sublime* as 'a pragmatic manual in identifying sublime literature, in reading the signs of sublimity, and in reproducing the effects of sublimity in one's responses to the great canonical works of the past'. At p. 79 he suggests that 'the Longinian sublime captures the intensity of *the experience of canonicity itself*'.

the emotive effects of stylistic devices, and the modes of analysis found in the scholia, which focus almost exclusively on questions of meaning and interpretation and frequently cite literary and historical comparanda. This is partly due to the fact that Dionysius and Longinus have writerly *paideia* and stylistic exemplification rather than interpretation or exegesis of Pindar as their primary goals, with the result that contextual, structural, and functional issues arising from his poetry are largely neglected. One possible effect of Longinus' elevation of the sublime over other formal features is a legitimization of a readerly fracturing of Pindaric texts in a way which duplicates Longinian citational and appropriative practices; the allusions to P.1.21-4 at *De subl.* 35.5, for instance, could be read as licensing a mode of reading which takes the sublime effect of this passage as the most striking and meaningful part of the poem.

Another approach to the possible influence of these critics on reading practices is to think about their potential interactions with the scholarly tradition represented by the scholia. Their influence on this branch of criticism seems to have been minimal; there are no passages in the scholia which reflect the kind of detailed euphonic analysis practiced by Dionysius in the passage cited above, and despite the frequent use of ὕψος and its cognates,²¹⁶ the Longinian sublime does not seem to have made much of an impression either. A possible exception to this is Σ N.3.143 (Drach. III p. 62), which explains the phrase κραγέται δὲ κολοιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται ('chattering crows ply dwell below') and the opposition between jackdaws and the eagle, in terms of the common theme of Pindar's poetic rivalry with Bacchylides:

οἱ δὲ ἀντίτεχνοί μου κολοιοῖς εἰκόασι, κραυγάζοντες μόνον καὶ ταπεινὰ νεμόμενοι, οὐ δύνανται δὲ διαίρεσθαι εἰς ὕψος. δοκεῖ δὲ ταῦτα τείνειν εἰς Βακχυλίδην· ἦν γὰρ ὑφόρασις αὐτοῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους. παραβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸν μὲν ἀετῶ, κολοιῶ δὲ Βακχυλίδην.

My rivals are like jackdaws, only chattering and 'staying close to the ground', and they are not able to rise to the heights. It seems that this is directed at Bacchylides, for there was mutual suspicion between these two. He compares himself to an eagle, and Bacchylides to a jackdaw.

In this metapoetic context, it might be possible to read οὐ δύνανται δὲ διαίρεσθαι εἰς ὕψος as reflecting the critical tradition surrounding ὕψος, but the absence of any specific

²¹⁶ These are often used non-technically as synonyms for 'raise up' vel sim; cf. e.g. Σ O.9.31 where ὑψοῦσι glosses ἐπαείροντι.

articulation of such an argument urges caution: the phrase could simply be deploying ὕψος in its non-technical sense.²¹⁷ We should also note that cognates of ὕψος are relatively common in Pindar,²¹⁸ and the scholium’s phrasing may be influenced by pronouncements such as O.1.115, where the poet prays for Hiero to ‘walk on high’ (εἶη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑποῦ χρόνον πατεῖν) in a passage which correlates the achievements of poet and *laudandus*.²¹⁹ While it is difficult to make a case for Σ N.3.143 as being written under the influence of ὕψος–criticism,²²⁰ still less that of any individual critic, both that scholium and O.1.115 are interesting test cases for thinking about how critical discourse may have inflected readings of Pindaric texts and engagements with Pindaric scholarship.

A reader familiar with Longinus might be tempted to see in εἶη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑποῦ χρόνον πατεῖν a foreshadowing of the critical topos of sublimity and a marker of Pindar’s own stylistic grandeur; similarly οὐ δύνανται δὲ διαίρεσθαι εἰς ὕψος at Σ N.3.143 might touch off a connection with sublimity-criticism, even if it was not written with such a connection in mind. Given Longinus’ approbation of Pindar, it is not unrealistic to think that use of ὕψος vocabularily in texts such as the ending of O.1 and in scholarly metatexts might prompt a reader to see such passages in a Longinian light, although both present problems for such a viewpoint. O.1.115 refers to Hiero’s past and future achievements rather than to poetry, and the sublime resonance of the passage cannot be readily divorced from its encomiastic specificity and its moralizing implications, both of which take on additional meanings in the context of written editions.²²¹ Similarly, Σ N.3.143 gives us a picture of Pindar’s fraught and ‘suspicious’ relationship with Bacchylides which, although not completely incompatible with Longinus’ picture of poetic activity (we might see a connection here between the two feuding poets and the φιλοτιμοτάτους ἀγωνιστάς of 35.2), points the reader towards the concrete socio-political contexts of such competition in a way that Longinus does not. Ancient readers

²¹⁷ For ὕψος used with prepositions to indicate ‘on high’ vel sim. cf. e.g. Hdt. 2.13; Eur. *Pho.* 404.

²¹⁸ The vocabulary of ὕψος also occurs in Σ I.5.56a-c (Drach. III pp. 246-7), which gloss the description of Aegina as a πύργος for ‘high virtues to ascend’ at I.5.44-5 (τετείχιστα δὲ πάλαι / πύργος ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν); the scholia take ὑψηλαῖς as a transferred epithet referring to the tower, the fullest explanation given by 56c: οἷον ὑποῦται αὐτῶν ἢ ἀρετὴ ὡσπερ τεῖχος· οὗτος γὰρ τὴν αὔξησιν πύργον καὶ τεῖχος εἶωθε λέγειν, ἀφ’ οὗ πυργοῦν τὸ αὔξειν καὶ ὑποῦν λέγεται (‘so their virtue is to be raised high like a wall. For he tends to speak of growth in terms of a tower or a wall, whence ‘to grow’ is called ‘to build’ and ‘to raise high’). Here, however, there is no sense that ὕψος is being used in a technical, critical sense; the scholia’s rhetoric expands on its use in the poem.

²¹⁹ Cf. pp. 114-15.

²²⁰ Cf. Russell (1964) xxi-xlii for the use of ὕψος vocabulary in critical texts, where it does not occur commonly until the late first century BC; Caecilius of Caleacte, against whom Longinus’ treatise was directed, was clearly an important figure in the development of this critical emphasis. For ὕψος used of Aeschylus cf. *AP* 7.411.

²²¹ Cf. pp. 114-15. It should be noted that there is no trace of a sublimity-inflected interpretation in Σ O.1.185, which takes the line to refer simply to ‘happiness’ (τῶ μὲν ὑποῦ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἠνίξατο).

of Pindar would have been taken in different directions by their encounters with these bodies of critical literature.

The limitations of Dionysius' and Longinus' critical perspectives are particularly marked in relation to contextual issues. At *Dem.* 26, Dionysius cites Pindar fr. 121 S-M as part of an argument about Plato being more concerned with the manner of his expression rather than the content (πλείονι κέχρηται φιλοτιμία περὶ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ὁ φιλόσοφος ἢ περὶ τὰ πράγματα, *Dem.* 25), picking up on his expression of the common topos that praise of noble deeds can lead to their immortalization. There is nothing inherently unusual about this idea, and therefore in order to make it striking, Plato is forced to express it in an unusual way, and Dionysius suggests that this was true of Pindar as well: 'Pindar composed this [fr. 121 S-M] ... with more thought for melody and rhythm than for expression' (Πίνδαρος τοῦτο πεποίηκεν εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Μακεδόνα, περὶ τὰ μέλη καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμούς μᾶλλον ἢ περὶ τὴν λέξιν ἐσπουδακώς).²²² Aside from the questionable retrojection of authorial intent, such an approach diminishes the possibility for sensitivity to contextual variation in the use of such topoi. While Dionysius' analysis of sonic structures implicitly draw attention to the specificities of the reading process understood as a production of sound, the wider interpretative issues which emerge from Pindaric texts' configurations of ethicity, and the interplay between contextual specificity and diachronic dissemination, are largely elided in this account. Attention to the materiality of texts, whether conceived as a document or as a structure of sound, has to be balanced by awareness of these more general issues in an assessment of the functionality of Pindaric texts in this period.

In addition to their minimal interest in the interpretative questions often privileged by the scholia, Dionysius and Longinus are also notable for their lack of attention to the book as a medium, a tendency shared with most other ancient critics: both work within the conceptual economy of the text-type, thinking the text as a verbal entity freed from the conditions of its material instantiations, this despite their attention to the materiality of language itself. The book becomes in these critical practices the effaced other of the very strategies of close reading its preservative function enables. In what follows, however, I shall examine some aspects of Pindaric reception, and of books themselves, which bring the materiality of the document and the interpretative issues surrounding it into the foreground.

²²² Cf. Porter (2010) 310-11.

PASSING ON THE GARLAND: RECEPTIONS AND MATERIAL SITES

In this chapter I shall examine a range of texts which bear on the reception of Pindar in the Hellenistic period (and beyond). I begin by looking at how epigrams represent books, and how Pindar is characterized in epigrams about the canonized lyric poets. I then focus on the *Lives* of Pindar and aspects of Pindar's commemoration at Thebes and Delphi, and the role played by these texts and practices in constructing the poet's cultural significance. I shall also analyse the significance of the use of critical signs to provide visual articulations of textual structure. This survey is not intended to be exhaustive: my aim is rather to analyse some salient receptions of Pindar and to assess the different ways in which they may have affected readers' approaches to his texts.

BOOKS IN EPIGRAMS

The epigrammatic corpus is a particularly rich source for how ancient poets conceptualized and represented their forebears, and forms an important part of the cultural field within which readers of the later Hellenistic and Imperial periods would have encountered Pindaric texts. A central element of the representation of previous poems and poetry in this corpus is the interaction between the language of performance and references to the book, often mobilized in order to highlight the contextual and aesthetic differences between ancient and modern realizations of texts. Unlike in the case of the critical literature I have examined, it will become clear that these poems prompt attention to the book as a specific site of meaning, as well as reimagining the literary past. This conjunction of performance lexis and references to the book goes back to the early Hellenistic period. At Posidippus 17.5-6, the narrator references Sappho's 'speaking pages' (Σαπφῶραι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν / ᾠδῆς αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες) in lines which figure the book as a conjunction of materiality and performance, with φθεγγόμεναι in conjunction with ᾠδῆς hinting both at the trace of the living voice of the poetess contained within the book and the act of reading the poems aloud. The polyptoton μένουσι ... ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν also highlights the book's preservational and archival function, and registers the interaction between text and material form; the σελίδες 'remain and will remain' because of the quality of the poetry they contain, but their physical stability is also a condition of the poetry's survival. Notable also is the stress on the book's appearance given by λευκαί, which again gives rise to a slippage between material form and the aesthetic value of the text, suggesting both the visual beauty of

the newly-inscribed papyrus and the way in which the loveliness of the poetry contributes to its visual manifestation. The ‘pages’ are subordinated to the ‘song’ (ὥδῆς) by functioning as its receptacle, but their status as an object of attention in themselves is strengthened by the application of Σαπφῶραι to them, which creates a strong connection between the author and the documents that represent her. The figuration of Sappho’s λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες captures the duality of the book as an object transformed by inscription into a trace of performance culture and something whose material specificity is also of importance. Moreover, the lines’ redescription of the book, centring on the transformation of the mutely material σελίδες into things capable of being ‘voiced’, is itself mimetic of how texts are subject to change in different contexts.

The interrelation of performance and textual materiality which occurs in Posidippus 17 is a common generic topos in later authors. One notable example is Simias’ epigram on Sophocles (5 GP = AP 7.21):²²³

τόν σε χοροῖς μέλψαντα Σοφοκλέα, παῖδα Σοφίλλου,
 τὸν τραγικῆς Μούσης ἀστέρα Κεκρόπιον,
 πολλάκις ὄν θυμέλῃσι καὶ ἐν σκηνῆσι τεθελῶς
 βλαισὸς Ἀχαρνίτης κισσὸς ἔρεψε κόμην,
 τύμβος ἔχει καὶ γῆς ὀλίγον μέρος, ἀλλ’ ὁ περισσὸς
 αἰῶν ἀθανάτοις δέσκεται ἐν σελίσιν.

Sophocles, son of Sophillus, you who sang with choruses, the Cecropian star of the tragic Muse, whose hair the flourishing, twisted ivy of Acharnae often crowned in the orchestra and on the stage, a tomb holds you, and a little measure of earth, but an immortal life is glimpsed in your immortal pages.

Whereas 3-4 figure Sophocles as part of the performance culture of classical Athens, the end of the poem highlights the book as a space of meaning (ἀλλ’ ὁ περισσὸς / αἰῶν ἀθανάτοις δέσκεται ἐν σελίσιν).²²⁴ The meaning of this clause is disputed: Paton follows Ellis in taking δέσκεται as meaning ‘shines forth’, and translates ‘thy exquisite life shines yet in your immortal pages’. Others suggest taking the σε of the opening line as the object of δέσκεται and translating ὁ περισσὸς αἰῶν as ‘the ages after your death’. It may be the case, however,

²²³ Cf. Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007) 432-3.

²²⁴ We might contrast the different focus of AP 7.22, which focuses exclusively on Sophocles as a performance poet.

that the ambiguity is intentional, figuring the double function of reception and reading in both bestowing value on its subjects and being exposed to their singular economy. Here we may compare *AP* 7.46, an anonymous epitaphic epigram on Euripides wherein the value of the monument, and implicitly the poem itself, derives from Euripides' 'reputation': οὐ σὸν μνημα τόδ' ἔστ', Εὐριπίδη, ἀλλὰ σὺ τοῦδε· / τῇ σῆ γὰρ δόξῃ μνημα τόδ' ἀμπέχεται ('this is not your memorial, Euripides, but you are its; for this memorial is clothed with your repute') However the final lines of Simias' epigram are construed, the poem as a whole can be seen to articulate a contrast between the performance economy and the material context in which contemporary readers are involved, in a way not dissimilar to Dionysius' description of reading Demosthenes.

Another epigram that raises the opposition of writing and performance is Antipater of Sidon 14 GP (= *AP* 7.26) on Anacreon.²²⁵

Ξεῖνε, τάφον παρὰ λιτὸν Ἀνακρείοντος ἀμείβων,
 εἴ τί τοι ἐκ βίβλων ἦλθεν ἐμῶν ὄφελος,
 σπεῖσον ἐμῇ σποδιῇ, σπεῖσον γάνος, ὄφρα κεν οἴνω
 ὀστέα γηθήσῃ τὰμὰ νοτιζόμενα,
 ὡς ὁ Διωνύσου μεμελημένος εὐάσι κώμοις,
 ὡς ὁ φιλακρήτου σύντροφος ἀρμονίης
 μηδὲ καταφθίμενος Βάκχου δίχα τοῦτον ὑποίσω
 τὸν γενεῆ μερόπων χῶρον ὀφειλόμενον.

Stranger, passing Anacreon's simple tomb, if any benefit every came to you from my books, pour an offering on my ashes, so that my bones may feel joy refreshed with wine, so that I who sang in Dionysus' well-voiced revels, I who was at home with wine-loving music, might not endure without Bacchus, even in death, the land which awaits all the generations of men.

While the poem's opening line draws on the conventions of funerary epigram in addressing a passing stranger, the second sites the contemporary reader in relation to books (εἴ τί τοι ἐκ βίβλων ἦλθεν ἐμῶν ὄφελος), in contrast to Anacreon's status as a performer, strongly marked by repeated use of performance lexis (μεμελημένος εὐάσι κώμοις ... σύντροφος

²²⁵ On representations of Anacreon in epigram cf. Rosenmeyer (1992) 24-7; Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007) 442-5.

ἀρμονίης).²²⁶ This contrast again imposes a differentiation between present and past, but it also shapes the imaginative response of the reader to Anacreon's poetry.²²⁷ By remarking on the book's mediatory role, the poem encourages the reader to see Anacreon's books as a space of transformation which both allows for an imaginative engagement with the past and is also itself affected by that engagement.

Epigrams also participated more concretely in the processes of textual dissemination, as in the case of *AP* 9.186 by Antipater of Thessalonica, which was apparently written as an epigraph for an edition of Aristophanes.²²⁸

βίβλοι Ἀριστοφάνευσ, θεῖος πόνος, αἴσιν Ἀχαρνεὺς
 κισσὸς ἐπὶ χλοερὴν πουλὺς ἔσεισε κόμην·
 ἠνίδ' ὅσον Διόνυσον ἔχει σελίς, οἷα δὲ μῦθοι
 ἠχεῦσιν φοβερῶν πληθόμενοι χαρίτων.
 ὦ καὶ θυμὸν ἄριστε καὶ Ἑλλάδος ἤθεσιν ἴσε,
 κωμικέ, καὶ στύξας ἄξια καὶ γελάσας.

Books of Aristophanes, divine labour, on which the profuse ivy of Acharnae shook its green locks. As much as this page contains much of Dionysus, so much the stories sound out, filled with an awesome grace. O comic poet, best in heart and truly Greek in character, you hated and laughed at what deserved such treatment.

At 3-4 the book(s) are transformed by the cultural and performance heritage whose traces they bear (1-2); as in the Posidippus passage analysed above, the book's archival capacities are at issue (ἠνίδ' ὅσον Διόνυσον ἔχει σελίς), and a contrast emerges between the grandiloquently synecdochic use of Διόνυσον to connote drama, as well as dramatic effects and inspiration,²²⁹ and the relatively simplicity of the documentary medium. The description

²²⁶ Cf. *AP* 7.27 for Anacreon's revels in the underworld, and cf. 7.29, 30.

²²⁷ This is not to say that such a response, seeing Anacreon as a particular type of performance poet concerned with wine and love, would not have occurred to readers independently, or as a result of reading critical literature, where such an assessment was common: cf. e.g. Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 4.33.71. The poem does point the reader towards reading Anacreon with a particular conception of his poetry in mind, and given that much of Anacreon's poetry cannot be reduced to the stereotype of the drunken sympotic poet, the epigram can be seen as a deformational reading, but one which nevertheless leaves open the nature of the ὄφελος that might come from his poetry. On the artistic reception of Anacreon see Rosenmeyer (1992) 12-49.

²²⁸ Although it should be noted that it would also have had resituational functions similar to those analysed here as a free-standing poem.

²²⁹ Gow and Page (1968) 101-2 suggest 'dramatic inspiration' as the primary meaning of Διόνυσον, but note that 'wine as the source of that inspiration need not be excluded'. I would suggest that the vagueness of the

of the ‘stories’ (οἷα δὲ μῦθοι / ἤχεῦσιν φοβερῶν πληθόμενοι χαρίτων) references the specifically sonic qualities of performance, but the double meaning of ἤχεῦσιν as ‘sound’ and ‘echo’ brings into play the idea of the μῦθοι in documentary form as an ‘echo’ of performance, as well as hinting at the role of books in various kinds of reperformances of the plays. If the poem was used as an epigraph to an edition, this dynamic would be strengthened by the role of the poem itself as positioning the texts as part of a specific material form.

Moreover, the poem also plays on the continuity between epigraphic function and the materiality of the document; the phrasing of ἡνίδ’ ὅσον Διόνυσον ἔχει σελῖς references the book’s status as containing (ἔχει) its texts, but the poem itself, in marking the beginning of the edition and directing the reader’s attention in a particular way, also participates in this containment. *AP* 9.188, an anonymous epigram on Plato, also dramatizes the conjunction of book and performance, although here the latter element is less marked, perhaps reflecting the lesser generic importance of performance to the Platonic corpus: Ἀτθίδος εὐγλώσσου στόμα φέρτατον, οὐ σέο μείζον / φθέγμα Πανελλήνων πᾶσα κέκευθε σελῖς (‘best voice of fair-speaking Attic, the whole page of all the Greeks hides no greater voice than yours’, 1-2). Here as elsewhere, σελῖς is used synecdochically for books in general, and the document is made to contain Plato’s voice (στόμα, φθέγμα) in terms not dissimilar from those we have seen deployed in relation to poets. The use of κέκευθε is also significant for the relationship between the book and its contents; the verb used in the perfect means ‘contains’,²³⁰ playing on the archival dynamic common to the conceptualization of the book, but given the contrast between the document and a live reading, the verb’s primary meaning of ‘hides’ is probably also to be felt, and imputes a double meaning to φθέγμα as both the unique, originary voice of the author himself and the voice of the reader who revivifies the text. The book both contains and hides Plato’s φθέγμα, marking the disappearance of the author’s voice, but also representing the text it contains as a material substrate (φθέγμα) open to recreation.

Several broad conclusions emerge from this brief survey. One is that epigrammatists were keenly aware of and interested in the materiality of the book, and in the process of relating to and reimagining past poetry through this medium. All of the above poems can, in different ways, be read as dramatizing the negotiations between material form and performance, understood as both the live events that took place in the past and the representation of

synecdoche should be preserved to give as wide a referential field as possible, particularly in view of the multifaceted focus of the final line.

²³⁰ Cf. LSJ *s.v.* a; n.b. particularly Eur. *IA* 122 for its use of a book. Cf. also *AP* 9.192.1, where containment is more prominent.

performance within classical and archaic poetry. A correlative of the rhetorical strategies deployed in these epigrams is a readerly awareness of the negotiations just mentioned; unlike the critical literature examined above, the epigrams encourage attention to the book itself as a significant object. Although Pindar is not mentioned in relation to books in any of the extant epigrams, it does not follow that the figurations of the book in the poems just analysed would have been irrelevant to how readers of the period approached Pindaric texts, in that they would have played a role in constituting the broader cultural field by which such approaches would have been mediated, particularly when taken in conjunction with critical discourses where writing was at issue; the scholia, for instance, often use ‘writing’ as a term for poetic composition, and occasionally highlight the importance of writing for the preservation of texts.²³¹ Nonetheless, we also need to be aware of the particular ways in which Pindar is represented in this corpus.

OTOBIOGRAPHIES: PINDAR’S EAR

When we come to epigrams specifically about Pindar,²³² we find that they focus on his relationship with the divine and his status as an ideal citizen, an aspect central to Leonidas 99 GP (= AP 7.35): Ἄρμενος ἦν ξείνοισιν ἀνήρ ὄδε καὶ φίλος ἀστοῖς, / Πίνδαρος, εὐφώνων Περιίδων πρόπολος. A funerary epigram by Antipater of Sidon 18 GP (= AP 7.34) focuses more on the stylistic aspects of his poetry.

πικρικὰν σάλπιγγα, τὸν εὐαγέων βαρὺν ὕμνων
χαλκευτάν, κατέχει Πίνδαρον ἄδε κόνις,
οὗ μέλος εἰσαΐων φθέγξαιό κεν, ὥς ἀπὸ Μουσῶν
ἐν Κάδμου θαλάμοις σμῆνος ἀπεπλάσατο.

This dust holds Pindar, the Pierian trumpet, the heavily-smiting smith of well made hymns. If you were to hear his song you would say that a swarm of bees from the Muses fashioned it in Cadmus’ bridal chambers.

²³¹ Cf. e.g. Σ N.4.10a (Drach. III p. 65). The phrase γέγραπται + *laudandus*’ name in the dative is the standard phrase used to mark the context of an epinician.

²³² For an overview see Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007) 435-8. Cf. Bergemann (1991) on the representation of Pindar in sculpture, which constructs a highly conservative image: ‘[d]as Bildnis zeigte den Dichter demnach als einen älteren Mann mit Denkerstirn und in dezidiert konservativem Habitus. Der Eindruck den die Barttracht Pindars bei den Zeitgenossen des Porträts hervorrufen müsste, war der eines altertümlichen, ja geradezu aristokratischen Wohlstandes’ (p. 182).

The epigram's descriptive rhetoric plays on images from the Pindaric corpus:²³³ the characterization of Pindar as a 'smith' (χαλκευτάν) recalls P.1.86 and P.3.113, while the image of the swarm of bees expands on Pindar's famous description of his own poetry as like a bee at P.10.53-4 (ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων / ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον). Antipater's metaphor pluralizes the Pindaric model, and the odd conjunction of ἀπὸ Μουσῶν ... συμῆνος, with no intervening information about how they are related, creates a sense of the miraculousness of the Pindaric μέλος.²³⁴ This sense is heightened by the cross-graining of the city and the natural world in ἐν Κάδμου θαλάμοις συμῆνος, in which Pindar's μέλος is made to seem like a strange, if beautiful, irruption of one discursive order into another. Although the epigram does not dwell on the materiality of the book, a similar separation of present and past to those explored above is at work in οὗ μέλος εισαίω φθέγγαιό κεν, where the conditional optative puts the μέλος doubly at issue, figuring it both as a unique and irrecoverable musico-poetic event of the distant past, and as an idealized form of the Pindaric poetic idiom open to partial recreation by individual voiced readings. This turns the emphasis towards the construction of Pindar's μέλος in the epigram's semantic medium, which is presented as a means of reimagining the lost past of performance.

Pindar also appears in two anonymous epigrams which present catalogues of the nine canonized lyric poets. Both poems present miniaturized versions of the critical and archival culture which produced the canon, employing accepted critical judgments and forming an analogy between their own catalogic mapping and the wider archival processes upon which canonization depended. This strategy is signalled in *AP* 9.184 by the end of the poem coinciding with an enunciation of the 'limit' marked out by the lyric poets themselves (πέρασ ἐστάσατε); the poem participates in this delimitation by restating the poets' canonized status. Pindar is mentioned first in both poems, befitting his status as the pre-eminent representative of lyric poetry (*AP* 9.184):

Πίνδαρε, Μουσάων ἱερὸν στόμα, καὶ λάλε Σειρήν
 Βακχυλίδη Σαπφοῦς τ' Αἰολίδες χάριτες
 γράμμα τ' Ἀνακρείοντος, Ὀμηρικὸν ὅς τ' ἀπὸ ρέϋμα
 ἔσπασας οἰκείοις, Στησίχορ', ἐν καμάτοις,

²³³ Cf. Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007) 436-7. Similar figurations are at work in Antipater of Thessalonica 75 GP (=AP 16.305), for which see Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007) 437.

²³⁴ The image also picks up on the story of the bee settling on Pindar's mouth in the *Lives* (below p. 87).

ἢ τε Σιμωνίδεω γλυκερὴ σελὶς ἠδὺ τε Πειθοῦς
 Ἴβυκε καὶ παίδων ἄνθος ἀμησάμενε
 καὶ ξίφος Ἀλκαίου, τὸ πολλάκις αἶμα τυράννων
 ἔσπεισεν πάτρης θέσμια ρύομενον,
 θηλυμελεῖς τ' Ἀλκμᾶνος ἀηδόνες, ἴλατε, πάσης
 ἀρχὴν οἷ λυρικῆς καὶ πέρας ἐστάσατε.

Pindar, holy mouth of the Muses, and garrulous Siren Bacchylides, and the Aeolian graces of Sappho, and script of Anacreon, and Stesichorus, you who drew the Homeric stream into your native labours; sweet page of Simonides, and you Ibycus, who culled the sweet flowers of persuasion and love of boys, Alcaeus' sword, which often spilled the blood of tyrants in defending the ordinances of his country, and Alcman's nightingales which sing of young women, be kindly, you who set down the beginning and the limit of lyric song.

As with the epigrams analysed above, this piece is notable for its conjunction of different types of poetological diction. The opening opposition of Pindar and Bacchylides employs evaluative and stylistic terms (ἱερὸν στόμα and λάλε Σειρῆν) which both reference the performance economy,²³⁵ but Anacreon and Simonides are both described in terms of the materiality of the book (γράμμα, γλυκερὴ σελὶς). These may reflect a stylistic appreciation through the language of materiality, figuring them as more 'writerly', and equating this with their well known stylistic clarity and polish. *AP* 9.571 is shorter, and less descriptive and accomplished, but ends with a climactic stress on Sappho as the tenth Muse:

ἔκλαγεν ἐκ Θηβῶν μέγα Πίνδαρος· ἔπνεε τερπνὰ
 ἠδυμελεῖ φθόγγω μοῦσα Σιμωνίδεω·
 λάμπει Στησίχορος τε καὶ Ἴβυκος· ἦν γλυκὺς Ἀλκμάν·
 λαρὰ δ' ἀπὸ στομάτων φθέγγατο Βακχυλίδης·
 Πειθῶ Ἀνακρείοντι συνέσπετο· ποικίλα δ' αὐδᾶ
 Ἀλκαῖος, κύκνος Λέσβιος, Αἰολίδι.
 ἀνδρῶν δ' οὐκ ἐνάτη Σαπφῶ πέλεν, ἀλλ' ἐρατειναῖς
 ἐν Μούσαις δεκάτη Μοῦσα καταγράφεται.

²³⁵ For ἱερὸν στόμα cf. *AP* 7.75.1.

Pindar cried out loudly from Thebes; joyously breathed Simonides' muse with sweetly melodious voice. Stesichorus and Ibycus shine out; Alcman was sweet; Bacchylides' lips spoke softly; persuasion attended Anacreon; Alcaeus, the Lesbian swan, uttered varied songs in the Aeolian mode. Sappho was not the ninth of men, but is counted as the tenth among the lovely Muses.

Again, the poem constructs a critical opposition between Pindar and Bacchylides, with the Pindaric sublime being contrasted with Bacchylides' lighter style. In *AP* 9.571 in particular, the exorbitancy of Pindar's 'cry' (ἔκλαγεν ... μέγα), which recalls the trumpet metaphor at Antipater of Sidon 18.1 GP, contrasts with both the material form and the catalogic containment to which 'Pindar' is subject.

All three poems subject Pindar to a form of cultural translation which emphasizes his elevated status, but also his cultural otherness. The poems insistently deploy the proper name Πίνδαρος with all its literary-historical weight, and Antipater of Sidon's epigram focuses on the human life (and death) behind the name (κατέχει Πίνδαρον ἄδε κόνις). However, 'Pindar' is also represented with metaphors that reduce the historical figure to a poetic function (περικὴν σάλπιγγα, ἱερὸν στόμα), a process that indirectly replays the conventionalized self-figurations of the epinicians, which likewise erase the actuality of the individual in order to project an authorial persona. Even at *AP* 9.571.1, where Pindar himself is made to 'cry out', the construction of the authorial figure is complex. The use of ἔκλαγεν plays on the verb's occurrences in the Pindaric corpus: it is used at *Pa.* 8a.10 (= fr. 52iA S-M) of mantic utterance, and at P.4.22-3 of Zeus' thunder.²³⁶ The phrasing of ἔκλαγεν ἐκ Θηβῶν μέγα Πίνδαρος redirects Pindaric idiom, making a comparatively rare Pindaric usage into a synecdoche of his whole corpus and figuring 'Pindar' as the source of an utterance that verges on the superhuman.²³⁷ The intertextual situation of ἔκλαγεν grounds the

²³⁶ Cf. also fr. 169a.34 πικρο[τά]τα κλάγεν ἄγγε[λία]ν.

²³⁷ This sense is reinforced by other uses of κλάζω, which usually denotes sounds made by animals, objects, or inanimate forces: cf. LSJ s.v. 1-3. Its uses of human utterance tend to involve emotive situations; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 2.222; Aesch. *Ag.* 48. There is an important conflict between this mode of representation and the tradition that Pindar was 'weak-voiced' as recorded by Σ O.6.148a, which explains his sending of Aeneas as χοροδιδάσκαλος with the datum that Pindar could not sing properly. This notice is best interpreted as a means of explaining the particular detail of the narrator's calling on Aeneas, and is historically implausible: Pindar was clearly an accomplished musical composer and would have been highly trained in the musical techniques of his day, even if he did not 'sing' in the sense of performing his poems himself. Related, and perhaps dependent, is an apophthegm attributed to Pindar: ἐρωτηθεὶς πάλιν ὑπὸ τινος διὰ τί μέλη γράφων ἄδειν οὐκ ἐπίσταται, εἶπε: καὶ γὰρ οἱ ναυπηγοὶ πηδάλια κατασκευάζοντες κυβερνᾶν οὐκ ἐπίστανται ('on another occasion he was asked by someone why, as someone who wrote lyric poems, he did not know how to sing, and he replied 'Just as shipbuilders who make rudders do not know how to steer'). This is probably a post-classical text; the

critical articulation in Pindar's texts, but also entails relation to Pindaric language that is both deformational (κλάζω is never used by Pindar of authorial utterance) and aggregative, as the force of the Pindaric uses of the verb carries over into the present passage. This double relation lexically enacts the two-way dynamics of the receptive process.

The authorial figuration of ἔκλαγεν ἐκ Θηβῶν μέγα Πίνδαρος is typical of the process by which 'Pindar' is presented in these epigrams as a figure of otherness at a distant cultural and temporal remove from the present day, but also a figure with whom a certain cultural continuity can be achieved by means of various types of literary and scholarly appropriations. Thus in the two catalogues cited, the descriptions of 'Pindar' mark him off, to a degree, from the other authors as a more difficult, less approachable figure, and we have seen how Antipater of Sidon 18 GP dramatizes the otherness of its subject. And yet the very process of writing (and reading) these epigrams is an act of cultural translation which makes its subject(s) available, which rehearses the cultural appropriations to which the authors have been exposed, and marks the extent of their inclusion within the Hellenic cultural tradition and their status as sources of cultural authority.²³⁸ The othering of 'Pindar' that takes place in these epigrams is in part a response to the particular demands of the Pindaric corpus,²³⁹ but it is also the creation of *virtualized* otherness which metaphorizes (the) Pindaric textual encounter(s).²⁴⁰

This dynamic of othering and appropriation is also at work in the *Lives* and in the biographical accounts in authors such as Pausanias, which likewise emphasise his qualities as a citizen and his close relations with the divine. Similarly, the *Lives* in the Byzantine manuscripts are ultimately dependent on fourth century biographies by scholars such as Istrus and Chamaeleon, and this biographical tradition, like the epigrams, formed an important part of the metatextual economy which would have mediated ancient readers' approaches to the Pindaric corpus. Although it is likely that the biographies on which this account is based were

division between song (μέλη) and written composition (γράφω) reflects the post-classical conception of writing as central to the creative process.

²³⁸ A similar dynamic may be detected in Hor. *Od.* 4.2, for which cf. e.g. Harrison (1995).

²³⁹ These should not be underestimated: linguistically Pindar would have been a challenging read, particularly for non-native speakers, and Hor. *Od.* 4.2.10-12 (*seu per audacis nova dithyrambos / verba devolvit numerisque fertur / lege solutis*) and Stat. *Sil.* 5.3.151-2 (*qua lege recurrat / Pindaricae uox flexa lyrae*) attest to the metrical as well as verbal difficulties he posed.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Porter (2001) 64 n. 4, who emphasises the self-effacement of authors such as Longinus and Pausanias in their constructions of the past: they are constituted as viewers, for Porter, by what they behold: 'the monumental gaze ... is ... a gaze of (i.e., possessed by) the Other'. I would stress, however, that this otherness is to an extent a textual (re)production, and this is more markedly the case in the epigrams under examination here.

longer and somewhat more detailed than the extant *Lives*,²⁴¹ they are unlikely to have contained much more ‘factual’ information, and we can still get a sense of the kind of narratives with which readers in Hellenistic and Imperial periods would have been confronted. Scholarship on biographies of the ancient poets has tended to focus, rightly, on their fictional elements, and on the various insights they can provide into how the poets were understood in particular contexts.²⁴² Here, however, I want briefly to examine the image of Pindar which emerges from biographical accounts and cult practices, and the potential effects of these for orientating readers in relation to his poetry.

Particularly important in this respect is the account of the *Dichterweihe* which follows the account of Pindar’s genealogy:²⁴³

παῖς δὲ ὢν ὁ Πίνδαρος, ὡς Χαμαιλέων καὶ Ἰστρος φασί, περὶ τὸν Ἑλικῶνα θηρῶντα αὐτὸν ὑπὸ πολλοῦ καμάτου εἰς ὕπνον κατενεχθῆναι, κοιμωμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ μέλισσαν τῷ στόματι προσκαθίσασαν κηρία ποιῆσαι. οἱ δὲ φασιν ὅτι ὄναρ εἶδεν ὡς μέλιτος καὶ κηροῦ πλήρες εἶναι αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα, καὶ ἐπὶ ποιητικὴν ἐτρέπη.

According to Chamaeleon and Istrus, Pindar, when he was a child went hunting on Helicon and lay down to sleep, worn out by his exertions. While he was sleeping a bee landed on his mouth and made wax. Others say that he saw a dream vision in which his mouth was full of honey and wax, and he took up the path of poetry.

Unlike the narrative at Paus. 9.23.2 which sets the event at Thespieae, the *Life*’s siting of the *Dichterweihe* on Helicon recalls the famous passage in Hesiod’s *Theogony* where the poet describes his encounter with the Muses. But whereas Hesiod was ‘tending his sheep on holy Helicon’ (ἄρνᾱς ποιμαίνονθ’ Ἑλικῶνος ὑπο ζαθέοιο, Hes. *Th.* 23), Pindar is engaging in the aristocratic pursuit of hunting (θηρῶντα), and the language of ‘toil’ (ὑπὸ πολλοῦ καμάτου) can be read as reflecting, and being made proleptic of, the importance given in the

²⁴¹ Pausanias’ account of Demeter’s appearance to Pindar (9.23.3-4) is considerably longer and more detailed than that found in the *Vita Thomana*, and includes the episode, not reported in the *Life*, of Pindar’s posthumous appearance to an old woman in a dream, and his recitation therein of his song for Demeter. It is likely that Pausanias was drawing on earlier versions of the *Lives* for this narrative. Similarly, the *Vita Thomana*’s account of Pindar setting up cult statues outside his house is a much shortened version of the narrative found at *FGrH F* 13 (= Σ P.3.137b (Drach. III p. 80-1)).

²⁴² For the former mode of criticism cf. e.g. Fairweather (1974); Lefkowitz (1981); for the latter, Graziosi (2002) is seminal.

²⁴³ On the topos in general cf. Kambylis (1965).

epinicians to various types of labour and effort as prerequisites of athletic success.²⁴⁴ The Muses' appearance and conversation with Hesiod is replaced by a purely symbolic event, which combines 'realistic' and 'mythical' elements by making the vision experienced by the poet (μέλιτος καὶ κηροῦ πλήρες εἶναι αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα) an expansion of the real-world event of the bee settling on his mouth. Pindar's poetic career is thus rooted in an event which straddles the quotidian and the symbolic, and dramatizes Pindar's intuitive relation to his world by making the decision to compose poetry immediately succeed the dream experience.

The *Lives* register a similar dynamic of distancing and cultural continuity in their accounts of specific events in Pindar's life and of his continued historical significance. The *Vita Thomana*'s accounts of Pan being seen singing one of Pindar's paeans, and Pindar writing a song for him in recompense, and of Demeter's complaint to the poet leading to him composing a poem for her, both accentuate Pindar's semi-supernatural contact with the divine in a similar fashion to the *Dichterweihe*; Demeter's appearance in a dream (ἡ Δημήτηρ ὄναρ ἐπιστάσα αὐτῷ ἐμέμψατο, 'Demeter stood by him in a dream and reproved him') recalls the significance of the *Dichterweihe*'s dream vision. The stories about the Spartans and Alexander the Great sparing Pindar's house during their respective sacks of Thebes serve to index Pindar's diachronic importance, as does the anecdote, also reported by Pausanias, of Pindar's memorialization and cultic honours at Delphi (*Vita Thomana* = Drach. I p. 5):

ἐτιμήθη δὲ σφόδρα ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος φιλεῖσθαι οὕτως, ὡς καὶ μερίδα λαμβάνειν ἀπὸ τῶν προσφερομένων τῷ θεῷ, καὶ τὸν ἱερέα βοᾶν ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις· Πίνδαρον ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ θεοῦ.

He was so greatly honoured by all the Greeks on account of Apollo's affection for him that he is given his share of the offerings brought to the god, and the priest cries out during the sacrifice, 'Pindar comes to the god's repast.'

This account and the practice it describes situate Pindar within ongoing Greek customs and draw attention to his privileged status within them. Pausanias adds another detail of Pindar's

²⁴⁴ N.7.74, of athletic success: εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται.

position at Delphi, describing the dedication of ‘Pindar’s chair’ in the temple of Apollo (10.24.5):²⁴⁵

ἀνάκειται δὲ οὐ πόρρω τῆς ἐστίας θρόνος Πινδάρου· σιδήρου μὲν ἐστὶν ὁ θρόνος, ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτῷ φασιν, ὅποτε ἀφίκοιτο ἐς Δελφοὺς, καθέζεσθαι τε τὸν Πίνδαρον καὶ ᾄδειν ὅποσα τῶν ἁσμάτων ἐς Ἀπόλλωνά ἐστιν.

Pindar’s chair has been dedicated not far from the hearth. The chair is made of iron, and they say that whenever he came to Delphi Pindar would sit on it and sing whatever songs he had for Apollo.

These cult honours are paralleled at Thebes; Paus. 9.23.2 describes Pindar’s intramural burial in the stadium at Thebes, next to Iolaus’ *heroon* and gymnasium.²⁴⁶ The cultic practices surrounding Pindar and the biographical accounts have in common a relative absence of focus on the specifics of Pindar’s individual personality, knowledge of which doubtless did not long outlast his lifetime, and a corresponding idealization of him as a semi-divine figure.

The generic variety of the representations I have examined, epigrams, biographies, and cult honours, alert us to the different ways in which the image(s) of Pindar were constructed and purveyed, and their correspondingly different demands on readers. The relations between these representations and readers’ encounters with Pindar’s texts themselves would have been correspondingly diverse, something which cultic honours exemplify particularly clearly. Going to Delphi and hearing the priest announce Πίνδαρον ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ θεοῦ and seeing Pindar’s chair would have put the ‘reader’ into an intimate contact with traces of Pindar’s cultural heritage, but at the same time the very concreteness of the chair and the priest’s announcement is likely to have induced a sense of the absence of the poet himself and the distance between the present and the past. More important for my analysis, however, is that while these practices, and the textual accounts of them, serve to enact and sustain Pindar’s cultural valuation, they also give rise to experiences which are in many ways remote from the practice of reading Pindaric texts. These memorializations and the stories told about them gesture to, and partially preserve, albeit in stylized form, the circumstances of Pindar’s own time, requiring the individual ‘reader’ to reimagine the past, and imposing an awareness of that past’s alterity in the act of commemorating it.

²⁴⁵ On Pindar’s cultic honours in general cf. Clay (2004) 76-7, 147-9 ; Currie (2005) 147 n. 159, 302. N.b. *ibid.* pp. 77-8 for artistic representations of Pindar.

²⁴⁶ Cf. Clay (2004) 77. For Pausanias’ as a guide to particular types of viewing practice cf. Elsner (2004).

Pausanias' and the *Lives*' localizing accounts of Pindar can also be seen in the light of the wider dynamic between local and panhellenic identities: although this interaction is represented as happening during the classical period, it may well have resonated strongly with later readers, given, for instance, the cultural importance of the negotiation between individual cities and Panhellenic notions of Greek identity, and of Greek relations with the Roman empire.²⁴⁷ Pindar is a panhellenic figure (ἐτιμήθη δὲ σφόδρα ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων) but his cultural endurance is also connected to experiences and practices sited in and informed by particular locations. Such issues are particularly important in the *Lives*' anecdotes about the sparing of Pindar's house. Both record that the Spartans' decision not to burn Pindar's house, and in the case of the *Vita Thomana* Alexander's decision as well, was prompted by an injunction written on the building (Πινδάρου τοῦ μουσοποιοῦ τὴν στέγην μὴ καίετε, 'do not burn the house of Pindar the lyric poet') the writing of which is described in slightly differently by the two *Lives* (ἐπέγραψέ τις τῇ οἰκίᾳ, 'someone wrote on the house', *VA* (Drach. I p. 2) ἐπιγεγραμμένον τὸν στίχον τοῦτον, 'this line was written', *VT* (Drach. I p. 5)). The building's location makes it specifically Theban, and yet the command's implicit valuation of the building is expressive of Pindar's international importance (the house is τοῦ μουσοποιοῦ, not 'Theban' poet), and relies on an understanding of this by its intended reader in order to achieve its aim. The act of inscription is empowered by the cultural value of its subject, but also necessary for the survival of the building, which without the inscription or similar mediation by someone with local knowledge would, to the eye of a conquering Spartan, be just another house awaiting destruction. It is not much of a metaphorical stretch to see this anecdote as a kind of allegory for relations between poetry and history, Pindar's house standing for the cultural inheritance that outlives the uncertainties of historical processes, while also registering its fragilities: the anecdote in the *Vita Ambrosiana* gives this survival a political spin by recording that the house is now used as the Theban πρυτανεῖον. In making the survival of a Theban building dependent on its panhellenic aspect and on the dynamics of its reception, the anecdotes stage in miniature the complexity of the relations between local and international cultures.

INTERPRETING CRITICAL SIGNS

²⁴⁷ Cf. Elsner (1992); (1994); Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner (2001); Hutton (2005) for Pausanias' role in the articulation of Greek cultural identity, and on Pausanias' localism cf. Whitmarsh (2010) 1-3; Goldhill (2010) 57-68. Theban medism during the Persian wars undoubtedly forms the backdrop to the (non-historical) variant of the Spartan sack.

Hitherto I have examined some aspects of Pindar's cultural reception in the Imperial period, focusing on some of the ways in which readers' encounters with Pindar may have been mediated by critical receptions of Pindar and his poetry in epigrams and biographical texts. We have seen that the book and the figuration of writing plays a varied role in these constructions, sometimes the object of considerable emphasis as in the scholia and the wider epigrammatic corpus, but mostly glossed over in critical discourses. I now want to look in more detail some of the specific material factors involved in the form of ancient books, and their interpretative significance. Prominent among these factors are critical signs, the marks that began to be appended to texts during the Hellenistic period, and which continued to be used throughout antiquity: in what follows, I shall argue that critical signs and other aspects of the materiality of the book are of considerable importance for thinking about the general function of books in this period and for gauging their interpretative demands.

Critical signs fall into two broad categories. One group includes marks to do with accentuation, pronunciation, and sentence structure, and the other are those such as coronides, asteriskoi, and paragraphoi which serve to articulate the structures of poems.²⁴⁸ I shall focus here on the latter, partly because little attention has been paid to these signs' interpretative significance, and partly because they are of particular importance in providing visual articulation of the rhythmically and structurally complex texts of the lyric poets. It has recently been argued that the accentual signs facilitated voiced reading of texts, and were a means of visually articulating the 'voice' within the text itself.²⁴⁹ It will become clear in the course of this analysis that although the structural signs function differently, they too are an important locus for thinking about the relations between reading practices and the performance culture from which the texts of the lyric poets arose. The main sources for critical signs are the papyri themselves, the scholia, particularly to the tragic and comic poets, which often mention the signs used at particular points in the text, and Hephaestion's treatise *On Signs*, which is the only extant systematic account of the signs used in editions of the tragic, comic, and lyric poets.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁸ On the distinction, not always accepted (cf. e.g. Tanzi-Mira (1920), between coronides and paragraphoi cf. Schironi (2010) 10: 'the coronis, with its characteristic sinuous shape, is definitely a different sign from the paragraphos', and *ibid.* 78-9. Cf. Stephen (1959) 4 for the possible common origin of the two signs. It should be noted, however, that paragraphoi and coronides were frequently combined at the end of texts: cf. Schironi (2010) 70-2. On coronides in general cf. Turner (1987) 12-13.

²⁴⁹ Porter (2010) 350-2.

²⁵⁰ Numerous other treatises dealing with critical signs were written, however: cf. e.g. Pfeiffer (1968) 115 on Zenodotus' use of critical signs as part of his editing of Homer, and 212-20 on signs used by Aristophanes,

The treatise opens with a marker the limitations of its systematizing project, pointing out the variety of the signs discussed (τὰ σημεῖα τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἄλλως παρ' ἄλλοις κεῖται): this statement is true not only of the different ways in which such signs were deployed, but of the various graphic forms they took, although Hephaestion is not concerned with the latter aspect.²⁵¹ Following this acknowledgment, Hephaestion goes on to give a brief account of the various different sign systems (*De sign.* 2-4):

2 παρὰ μὲν τοῖς λυρικοῖς, ἂν μὲν μονόστροφον τὸ ᾄσμα ἦ, καθ' ἐκάστην τίθεται στροφὴν ἢ παράγραφος, εἶτα ἐπὶ τέλους τοῦ ᾄσματος ἢ κορωνίς. ἐὰν δὲ κατὰ περικοπὴν τὰ ᾄσματα ἦ γεγραμμένα, ὥστε εἶναι στροφὴν καὶ ἀντίστροφον καὶ ἐπωδόν, ἢ παράγραφος ἐπὶ μὲν τῷ τέλει τῆς τε στροφῆς καὶ ἀντιστρόφου κεῖται, ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ἐπωδῷ ἢ κορωνίς. — καὶ οὕτως ἢ παράγραφος, ἢ διορίζει τὰ τε ὅμοια καὶ τὰ ἀνόμοια. — ἐπὶ μέντοι τῷ τέλει ὁ ἀστερίσκος τίθεται, γνῶρισμα τοῦ τετελέσθαι τὸ ᾄσμα, ἐπεὶ ἢ κορωνίς ἐπὶ πασῶν τίθεται τῶν ἐπωδῶν. 3 καὶ μάλιστα εἶωθεν ὁ ἀστερίσκος τίθεσθαι, ἐὰν ἑτερόμετρον ἦ τὸ ᾄσμα τὸ ἐξῆς· ὁ καὶ [μᾶλλον] ἐπὶ τῶν ποιημάτων τῶν μονοστροφικῶν γίνεται Σαπφοῦς τε καὶ Ἀνακρέοντος καὶ Ἀλκαίου· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Ἀλκαίου ἰδίως κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἀριστοφάνειον ἔκδοσιν ἀστερίσκος ἐπὶ ἑτερομετρίας ἐτίθετο μόνης, κατὰ δὲ τὴν νῦν τὴν Ἀριστάρχειον καὶ ἐπὶ ποιημάτων μεταβολῆς. 4 ἢ δὲ διπλῆ ἢ ἕξω βλέπουσα παρὰ μὲν τοῖς κωμικοῖς καὶ τοῖς τραγικοῖς ἐστὶ πολλή, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς λυρικοῖς σπανία· παρὰ Ἀλκμᾶνι γοῦν εὐρίσκεται· γράψας γὰρ ἐκεῖνος δεκατεσσάρων στροφῶν ᾄσματα [ῶν] τὸ μὲν ἥμισυ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρου ἐποίησεν ἐπτάστροφον, τὸ δὲ ἥμισυ ἑτέρου· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐπτὰ στροφαῖς ταῖς ἑτέραις τίθεται ἢ διπλῆ σημαίνουσα τὸ μεταβολικῶς τὸ ᾄσμα γεγράφθαι.

In the lyric poets, if a song is monostrophic the paragraphos is placed by each strophe, and the coronis at the end of the song. If the pieces are written in sections so that they consist of a strophe, an antistrophe and an epode, the paragraphos falls at the end of both the strophe and the antistrophe, and the coronis at the end of the epode. Thus the paragraphos divides both the like and the unlike. The asteriskos, however, is placed at

Aristarchus, and Aristonicus in their work on Homer and the lyric poets. Diog. Laer. 3.65-6 discusses the use of critical signs in Platonic texts.

²⁵¹ Hephaestion, however, is only concerned with their pragmatic effects and uses, rather than their aesthetic forms or interpretative significance. On the variation to which signs were subject cf. McNamee (1982) 130: '[t]he evidence of the papyri indicates that the use of text-critical signs in non-Homeric and non-Christian texts of the Roman period was in large part idiosyncratic if not actually capricious in many cases.' She notes p. 131 that the ancora and antisigma are the only signs whose function seems not to have been subject to substantial variation.

the end, marking the fact that the song has come to an end, since the coronis is placed by all the epodes. The asteriskos is most commonly employed when the following song is in a different metre. This is common in the monostrophic poems of Sappho, Anacreon, and Alcaeus. In Aristophanes' edition of Alcaeus, the asteriskos is used to mark a difference in metre, but in the edition current today based on Aristarchus it is also used to mark a change in poems. The outward facing *diplē* is common in comedy and tragedy, but rare in the lyric poets. It is found in Alcman, though, because he wrote songs in fourteen strophes, writing one seven strophe half in the same metre, and the second half in another. Because of this the *diplē* is placed against the seven strophes written in the second metre, indicating that the song has been written with a change of metre.

Several important historical points emerge from this synopsis. Firstly, the sign systems used are dependent on the metre and structure of the poems to which they are attached. The account also testifies to the importance of the Hellenistic scholars in establishing the sign systems on which later ones were based, or from which they diverged: he regards the present edition as 'based on' that of Aristarchus (κατὰ δὲ τὴν νῦν τὴν Ἀριστάρχειον), a comment which points to a relative conservatism in the use of a particular system, however much variation there may have been between systems marking different types of poetic structures.²⁵² However, the extant papyri follow the system outlined in § 2, rather than those attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus in § 3.²⁵³ It seems that Hephaestion mentions these latter systems because of their unusualness, as well as because they derive from two seminal figures in the scholarly tradition. Hephaestion does not mention Pindar, but

²⁵² For discussion of this reference see Slater (1986) 146-7, who doubts the existence of an Aristophanic ἐκδοσις and suggests that the information about his practice related here may ultimately derive from a hypomnema rather than an edition, although this is probably excessively sceptical; see pp. 58-63 above. It is unclear whether in his edition of Alcaeus Aristophanes also followed the procedure outlined in § 2, using a paragraphos to mark each strophe, a coronis at the end of each poem, and an asteriskos in addition to the coronis to mark a difference of metre. It is notable that none of the extant papyri of monostrophic poems of Sappho adheres to the Aristarchean model, but follows the system of paragraphos and coronis; see e.g. *POxy* 1231 fr. 1 col. i 12-13 and Lobel 1925: xvi-xvii.

²⁵³ Cf. Slater (1986) 147, who cites as an example *SLG* S 295 (= *POxy* 2878 fr. 10), tentatively attributed to Sappho or Alcaeus, which has remains of a coronis and asteriskos together. *SLG* S 232 (= *POxy* 2637 fr. 30) has paragraphoi after vv. 1 and 3 and what seems to be a small coronis as well as a paragraphos after v. 6. Lobel ad fr. 30.1-2 remarks that 'there is an upright rising at a right-angle from the inner end of the *paragraphos*, for which I cannot account.' This may be no more than a scribal peculiarity; the paragraphos below v. 6 has a downward stroke descending in a leftward diagonal from just inside the outer end of the horizontal. Other instances of such critical marks in lyric poetry include *SLG* S 209 (= *POxy* 2735 fr. 45), although the traces here are very slight. N.b. also *SLG* S 133 (= *POxy* 2803 fr. 1 col. ii 12-13), where Lobel identified two antisigmas; Barrett proposed that they were traces of a coronis. It is unclear whether the poems from which these fragments come were monostrophic.

on the basis of this account we would expect the signs employed for Pindar's poems to follow the models outlined in § 2, and the system for triadic poems described here is indeed attested in the prefatory *scholia recentiora* to Pind. O.1, O.3, O.4, O.6, O.7, P.1 and P.2; the monostrophic system at Σ P.6.metr.b also follows the pattern described in § 2. The extant papyri, however, show that there was variation: in *Pa.* 5 (= *POxy* 841 col. 19-22), a monostrophic piece, coronis is used as well as paragraphos to mark strophe end, and an asteriskos is used between *Pa.* 5 and 6.²⁵⁴ There are, however, numerous instances in Pindaric papyri of a coronis marking the end of a strophic system in the manner described by Hephaestion.²⁵⁵

The existence of *On Signs* testifies to the importance of critical signs for readers. There is an pointer to their potential significance and usefulness in Diogenes Laertius' account of the critical signs used in editions of Plato, citing Antigonus of Carystus for the information that when editions of Plato with critical signs were first produced, their owners charged readers to view them (ἄπερ [sc. the editions] Ἀντίγονός φησιν ὁ Καρύστιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ζήνωνος νεωστὶ ἐκδοθέντα εἴ τις ἤθελε διαναγνῶναι, μισθὸν ἐτέλει τοῖς κεκτημένοις, Diog. Laer. *Vit. Phil.* 3.66). If true, this anecdote sheds interesting light on the intellectual value these signs had for readers.²⁵⁶ We might deduce from its relatively specialized subject that *On Signs* was written chiefly for the attention of a highly educated audience, but we should be cautious about this. The treatise is notable, as mentioned above, for its acknowledgement of the variousness of critical signs and for its attempt to impose a certain order on the field by specifying the normative systems used for particular types of poetry and in its quasi-canonization of Aristophanes and Aristarchus. In setting out these normative systems, in marking generic distinctions between different types of signs, and in recording, however minimally, their historical genealogy, the treatise functions as an empirical account of actual practices, but could also have been read as a model of correct, or at least prevailing, usage. It may therefore have been employed as a reference point for scribes seeking to use the 'correct' systems in their copying, or by readers in making their own copies of a text or in giving directions to a scribe relating to the type of critical signs they wanted them to employ.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Rutherford (2001) 139-40 for the debate over whether this marks the end of the preceding poem or the beginning of the next.

²⁵⁵ Pind. *Parth.* 2 in *POxy* 659 (= *P.Lond.Lit.* 44) i 5-6; ii 35-6; iii 57-8; iv 64-5; 79-80; similar signs are also found in the *Paeans*: *POxy* 841 e.g. vi 73-4; xvii 31-2. Cf. Schironi (2010) 17 n. 43 for further examples.

²⁵⁶ Their wider intellectual significance is particularly important in the case of Plato: Diog. Laer. 3.65-6 makes clear that as well as having the textual critical and stylistic functions common in other authors, signs were also used in Platonic texts to draw attention to specific philosophical issues: cf. e.g. διπλῆ πρὸς τὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰ ἀρέσκοντα Πλάτῳ ... ἀστερίσκος πρὸς [ie., 'indicates'] τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν δογμάτων (3.65-6).

Hephaestion's systematizing approach goes hand in glove with a disregard for the particular visual forms critical signs took, and apart from the opening phrase there is not even a hint at this variety. Rather, his account abstracts a set of functional operations that signs carry out from the mass of particular forms; as well as having pedagogic and systematizing point, this strategy also reflects something of the formulaic ideality of critical signs, which combined functional standardization with considerable visual individuality and variation.

The negotiations between particular form and standardized function are at work in the epigram of Meleager placed at the end of his *Garland* collection. The epigram describes the coronis' form and closural function, and is a pointer towards the importance of the sign's visuality, and offers hints about its interrelation with texts (*AP* 12.257):

ἄ πύματον καμπτήρα καταγγέλλουσα κορωνίς,
οἰκουρὸς γραπταῖς πιστοτάτα σελίσιν,
φαμί τὸν ἐκ πάντων ἠθροισμένον εἰς ἓνα μόχθον
ὑμνοθετᾶν βύβλω τᾶδ' ἐνελιξάμενον
ἐκτελέσαι Μελέαγρον, ἀείμνηστον δὲ Διοκλεῖ
ἄνθεσι συμπλέξαι μουσοπόλον στέφανον.
οὔλα δ' ἐγὼ καμφθεῖσα δρακοντείοις ἴσα νώτοις,
σύνθρονος ἴδρυμαι τέρμασιν εὐμαθίας.

I, the coronis that announces the final turn, a most trustworthy guardian of written pages, declare that Meleager has drawn to a close, having gathered the labour of all poets rolled up into one in this book, and has woven from flowers a garland guarded by the Muses, ensuring Diocles' permanent memory. I sit enthroned at the limit of his learning, curled tightly like a snake's back.

The metaphor of the coronis as a coiled snake (οὔλα ... καμφθεῖσα) is connected to the book's form as a 'rolled up' (ἐνελιξάμενον) object,²⁵⁷ as the visuality of the coronis comes to metaphorize the process of gathering and rolling up involved in the constitution of the book. This institutes a two-way movement of meaning, in which the visual appearance of the coronis is marked by the form of the book, and the coronis as a unifying mark signals the closural function of the poem itself. As such, the metaphoricity of the coronis is an instance

²⁵⁷ For this and other metaphors cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 281. Gigante (1978) proposed οἰκουρὸς, which if correct induces a connection with the snake which guarded Athena's house on the Acropolis, of which οἰκουρὸς was the standard epithet (cf. *Ar. Lys.* 759). The coronis' 'guarding' thus takes on a quasi-sacral function.

of a wider interrelation between visibility and textuality, and can be read as a generalizing comment on coronides' literary role(s). The description of the coronis as resembling a snake (δρακοντείσις ἴσα νώτοις) points to the visual status of this sign as being somewhere between the non-representational signs such as diplai and obeloi and the illustrations often found in papyri.²⁵⁸ The poem exploits this indeterminate status by referencing both the coronis' (semi)representational and signficatory aspects.

The very act of placing a poem about a visual sign beside (an instance of) that visual sign inscribes this interrelation and prompts further interrogation of it, and this coupling of text and critical sign responds to and instantiates the duality of the coronis' role as both independent of and dependent on the text it marks. By having the coronis 'announce' (καταγγέλλουσα) the end of the collection and Meleager's authorship (ἐκτελέσαι Μελέαγρον), the speaker imputes a certain functional independence to the coronis, a sense strengthened by its function as a 'most trustworthy guardian' (οἰκουρὸς ... πιστοτάτα), a phrase which figures its role of signalling the completion of the book as extraneous to the contents of the texts to which it relates.²⁵⁹ At this point we might compare Hephaestion's description of the paragraphos, ἧ διορίζει τὰ τε ὅμοια καὶ τὰ ἀνόμοια; according to this formulation, the paragraphos not (only) *marks* a metrical division, but *performs* it (διορίζει). Similarly in the poem, the coronis does not simply mark a independent closure, contained in the text itself, but plays a part in instituting that closure. Yet this reading is complicated by the fact that the coronis' putative independence is being constructed by the poem itself; while this does not preclude coronides having, and being felt to have, an independent function, it does draw attention to the complexities of the (textual) relations in which they are involved. In its closural role, the poem blurs referentiality and function, itself operating as a kind of coronis in closing the book, while also drawing out various meanings from the visual sign it stands besides. The poem and the coronis are also functionally interrelated, in that the poem's description of the sign intervenes in its operation; by drawing out its signficational potentiality, as in the connection between the coronis and the book described above, the poem makes *this particular* coronis operate at a specific intersection of text and visibility.

These considerations are also relevant when we think about the diachronic situation of copying and reproduction to which Meleager's book was subject. In this situation, an

²⁵⁸ For the ornamental function of the coronis cf. Schironi (2010) 83.

²⁵⁹ Its role as a 'guardian' also has the practical aspect of preventing, or at least making more difficult, non-authorial additions to the collection. Cf. *P.Lit.Lond.* 11.136, where a similar coronis poem has been appended to an Homeric papyrus; here the coronis is called 'guard of letters' (γραμματῶν φύλαξ); cf. Wifstrand (1933) 468 for comment.

interaction emerges between the text and the multiplicity of forms that coronides could take.²⁶⁰ In describing the coronis as a coiled snake, the epigrammatic speaker imposes his authorial authority on the processes of textual reproduction. The poem may have encouraged copyists to fashion a coronis in imitation of the description, and even if this did not happen the specifying figuration of the poem would still have been operative, marking in advance the poem's reproduction: regardless of the precise form of the coronis in subsequent texts, the reader would have been prompted to 'read' the coronis' appearance in the light of the poem.²⁶¹ Against this contextual background, the description can also be seen as an attempt on the part of the speaker to impose a standardizing control on the potential plurality of visual forms by which the text could be articulated, by specifying the functionality which any coronis would have in this position regardless of its particular visuality. The coronis' status as an οἰκουρὸς ... πιστοτάτα derives from the conventionality with which such signs were employed, but also from the text's (re)description of its role.

Meleager's coronis epigram is a useful starting point for thinking about the more general issues involved in the function of critical signs, and its dramatization of the intra- and extratextual duality of the coronis can be read as a generalizing comment on the role of coronides and other structural markers. In order to explore this duality more fully, it should be recognized that such critical signs are not merely extraneous appendages, but that they intervene in the ontology of the books on which they are inscribed. When a reader comes across a line in a poem marked with an obelus (–) in order to indicate its spuriousness, he is involved in a series of interpretative situations which affect the constitution of the text to which he relates. First, in addition to its primary signification function, the mark sites the text as an object produced in a particular way, and as the outcome of processes of aesthetic valuation and scholarly judgement. Furthermore, the notion of spuriousness at work in this case situates the text in a relation to an ideal original text or utterance, which in turn implies a criterion of judgement capable of assessing this relation. More importantly, there is at stake in the use of the critical sign a conceptual system which grounds such a relation, based on notions of authorial intention, textual authenticity, and wider canons of stylistic and historical understanding of textuality. The use of critical signs assumes readerly competence in these areas, and brings the conceptual apparatus of scholarly debate into the reading processes; the

²⁶⁰ For a selection of images cf. Tanzi-Mira (1920).

²⁶¹ This would not have been the case in a coronis which was in no way snake-like, but by the Imperial period most coronides took a form which would approximate to Meleager's description, which is sufficiently generalizing to admit of considerable visual variation in the signs it describes. My analysis here is confined to coronides in book rolls: for coronides in codices cf. Schironi (2010) 80.

text thus becomes, in part, a space of critical debate where the reader is invited to think about and potentially contest the judgements marked by the critical signs. Signs having to do with authenticity mark the text with the concept of an author as the ultimate source of meaning and authenticity, pointing back to an presupposing a text's point of origin in authorial utterance or composition, but they also mark the absolute division of (a particular material instantiation of) the text from its authoredness, which can only now be figured as the grounding principle of editorial activity. These signs implicate the text in a signification economy of presence and origin, while simultaneously attesting to the text's status as the scene of a radical break with the systems of presence and intention which presided over its inception.

Hephaestion's account of the critical signs used of the lyric poets focuses on signs which articulate the structures of poems. As such, these signs implicitly mark aspects of performance; the signs demarcating a triadic structure, for instance, form a kind of visual correlative for the structuring effects of dance movements and the positioning of the chorus which would have articulated such a performance's scenic aspect. They do so, however, in a way which marks an abstract structure rather than referring explicitly to the specificities of performance, which the reader is left to imagine according to his own knowledge, and which were in any case only dimly understood in later antiquity.²⁶² This conceptualization is clear in Hephaestion's account of the outward facing *diplē* used to mark Alcman's fourteen stanza poems; its role is to indicate change of metre alone (διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ταῖς ἑπτὰ στροφαῖς ταῖς ἑτέραις τίθεται ἡ διπλῆ σημαίνουσα τὸ μεταβολικῶς τὸ ἄσμα γεγράφθαι) rather than any changes in the musical setting or choreography that such changes may have entailed. The structural articulation which these critical signs mobilize is also inflected by their physical form; it has been noted that coronides in particular, because of the variations that could be practiced on the basic form, operated as signatures for the scribe, marking the particular copyist's craftsmanship.²⁶³ As such, they are instances of a general feature of book production in the ancient world, whereby each copy of a text was a unique instantiation of it, realizing the text in a material idiom according to conventionalized parameters. But the visual forms of coronides are not simply an ornamental feature of texts; in working as a scribal signature, and as a stylistic marker of the text's provenance, coronides participate in a visual economy which is separate from textuality, even though the *functionality* of individual coronides is closely involved with the texts they mark.

²⁶² I refer especially to the music and choreography of Pindar's performances, of which little detailed understanding is shown in the scholia and other critical texts.

²⁶³ Cf. Stephen (1959).

Having considered some aspects of how critical signs are distinguished as outside the processes of textuality, I want to consider their signification operations in more detail, focussing particularly on the structural signs discussed by Hephaestion. Coronides and paragraphoi mark structures internal to the text itself, but are also connected, as we have seen, to extratextual scholarly discourses, as well as partaking of conventions of visuality strictly extraneous to the texts themselves.²⁶⁴ When thinking about the particular modes of closure and separation that paragraphoi, asteriskoi, and coronides instantiate, we might be tempted to say that they simply signal structural features without taking part in them, features inherent in the text itself and independent of institution by any extratextual mark (γνώρισμα τοῦ τετελέσθαι τὸ ἄσμα, Heph. *De sign.* 2). However, while there is a degree of truth in this position, it does not take account of the distinction between the functional ideality of the critical signs, and closural and separative modes implied by the paragraphos, asteriskos, and coronis, and the particularities of individual endings of poems and movements within them: this might be provisionally formulated as a distinction between a marking of *the fact that* a poem ends (τοῦ τετελέσθαι τὸ ἄσμα) and the actualities of *how* a poem ends.

This can be illustrated by thinking about the sign system described in the Pindaric *scholia recentiora* for, e.g., O.1: ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει ἐκάστης ἐπώδοῦ κορωνὶς καὶ παράγραφος, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ τέλει τοῦ ἄσματος ἀστερίσκος. If we assume that the rest of the poems in most ancient editions of Pindar's Olympians followed this system, as outlined by Hephaestion in § 2, we face a situation where the identical forms of the asteriskoi which mark the end of each poem contrast with the texts' verbally different endings. The asteriskoi and coronides perform the practical function of assisting the reader's navigation of the text, as well as ornamenting the text, but they also draw attention to the signification and thematic variation at work in the collection, and to the differences between closural movements within poems at the ends of strophic systems and the ends of poems as a whole. Similarly, the closural articulation of poems within the book also shapes how we might view the ending of the book as whole, which is assimilated to other closures in being marked by an asteriskos, but also

²⁶⁴ Coronides and paragraphoi were also frequently combined with end-titles: cf. Schironi (2010) 61-70. The interrogation of the differences between σημεῖα and λόγοι go back at least to Heraclitus' fragment about the Delphic oracle (DK B 93): ὁ ἄναξ, οὗ τὸ μαντεῖόν ἐστι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει, ('the lord whose shrine is at Delpho neither speaks nor conceals but gives signs') on which see Kahn (1979) 123 '[g]iving a sign' means uttering one thing that in turn signifies another'. He notes that in the rhetoric of the Delphic oracle the sign can take various forms, for instance image, metaphor or ambiguous wording. Heraclitus' use, where the act of giving a σημεῖον confronts the interpreter with a confusing multiplicity which they need to negotiate in order to work out the true meaning contrasts with other uses where the σημεῖον conveys information directly and clearly, for which see *Il.* 23. 358; *Od.* 12.26; *Hdt.* 2.38; *Pl. Rep.* 614c.

differentiated by its position. Such effects are particularly noticeable in the case of tonally different endings. At O.6.103-5 the narrator calls on Poseidon to favour his project:

δέσποτα ποντόμεδον, εὐθὺν δὲ πλόον καμάτων
ἐκτὸς ἐόντα δίδοι, χρυσαλακάτοιο πόσις
Ἀμφιτρίτας, ἐμῶν δ' ὕ-
μνων ἄεξ' εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος.

Lordly ruler of the sea, husband of Amphitrite of the golden spindle, may you give a direct voyage free from hardships, and make burgeon the pleasurable flower of my songs.

Somewhat different in tone is the end of O.7, which concludes with a request for Diagoras' family's continuing renown, followed by a gnomic statement about the instability of human fortune (O.7.92-5):

μὴ κρύπτε κοινόν
σπέρμ' ἀπὸ Καλλιάνακτος·
Ἐρατιδᾶν τοι σὺν χαρίτεσσιν ἔχει
θαλίας καὶ πόλις· ἐν δὲ μιᾷ μοίρᾳ χρόνου
ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοῖαι διαιθύσσοισιν αὔραι.

Do not conceal the common seed which hails from Callianax: the city also holds festivals at the celebrations of the Eratidae. But in a single portion of time, the winds blow now here, now there.

Marking these two passages with an asteriskos points up their tonal and signification differences by contrast the formulaic, contentless identity of the critical sign, the closural function of which draws attention to the differences of the two passages specifically as endings, as well in relation to the rest of the poems of which they form part.

POxy 841, which contains an edition of Pindar's *Paeans*, is marked with numerous critical signs and gives us the opportunity of examining some concrete examples of the effects to which they can give rise. One striking instance occurs in *Pa.* 5, a paean written for an

Athenian procession to Delos, of which only the last two stanzas survive intact.²⁶⁵ A coronis occurs beside the end of each:

ἰήϊε Δάλι' Ἄπολλον·
καὶ σποράδας φερεμήλους
ἔκτισαν νάσους ἐρικυδέα τ' ἔσχον
Δᾶλον, ἐπεὶ σφιν Ἀπόλλων 40
δῶκεν ὁ χρυσοκόμας
Ἄστερίας δέμας οἰκεῖν·

ἰήϊε Δάλι' Ἄπολλον·
Λατόος ἔνθα με παῖδες
εὐμενεῖ δέξασθε νόῳ θεράποντα 45
ὑμέτερον κελαδεννᾶ
σὺν μελιγάρυϊ παι-
ᾶνος ἀγακλέος ὀμφᾶ.

Ieie Delian Apollo. And they founded homes in the scattered islands rich in flocks, and they held Delos of wide fame, when golden-haired Apollo gave them the body of Asperia to dwell in. *Ieie* Delian Apollo. There may Leto's children receive me, your servant, with kindly thoughts, with the honey-sounding, ringing voice of a glorious paean.

The poem seems to have described the Ionian colonization of the Aegean: 35 describes the 'taking' and settling of Euboea, the penultimate stanza the settlement of various other islands, and the final stanza the settlement of Delos.²⁶⁶ It is structurally and metrically straightforward, consisting of monstrophic dactylo-epitrites. In such a setting, the coronides are not so obviously required as a guide to structure, but their role in articulating the poem as a material construct is all the more noticable as a result. The coronides at strophe end balance the repeated ἰήϊε Δάλι' Ἄπολλον in the strophe's first line, creating a congruence between visual and verbal structures. This is an instance of a more general pattern in which paeanic

²⁶⁵ Wilamowitz (1922) 327-8 argues that the singers were Euboeans on the basis of the scholium to 45, which glosses with θεράποντα 'Pandorus, son of Erectheus, Aiclus'; he suggests that the scholiast may have interpreted the final stanzas as spoken by the original colonists. Rutherford (2001) 297 suggests an Athenian chorus.

²⁶⁶ Cf. Rutherford (2001) 295.

refrains and visual markers often coincide; we may compare *Pa.* 2.35-6, 71-2, and 107-8 where the epode ending refrain ἠ ἰὲ Παιάν, ἠ ἰέ· Παιάν / δὲ μήποτε λείποι coincides with coronides marking the end of the strophe system. At *Pa.* 6.121-2 the coronis marking epode end falls beside a similar refrain (<ἠ> ἦτε νῦν, μέτρα πρῆτό- / ν]ων ἦτε, νέοι).²⁶⁷ In each case, the conventionality and repetition of the signs emphasises the particular stylistic force of the cited invocations and refrains.²⁶⁸ This is particularly marked at *Pa.* 6.121-2 where the coronis interacts with μέτρα πρῆτό- / ν]ων ἦτε to reinforce the distinction between the ἦτε cry as a performance marker and as a part of a material text. Not only are the coronides themselves a form of μέτρα, punctuating the space of the text on the page, and hence analogous to the role 121-2 as a structural marker, but they also serve to bring out the specifically visual sense in which the poem's μέτρα are now structured in the document.²⁶⁹ The presence of coronides articulates the process of reading as an imbrication of visuality and verbal signification.

Also observable in *Pa.* 5 is a visual articulation by the critical signs of the text's thematic structure. As mentioned above, the poem maps out the processes of colonization, and may well have been performed processionaly.²⁷⁰ The coronides reinforce this process of mapping by acting as visual points on the page between which the poem moves. The linearity of the poem's movement, given a specifically spatial aspect by the coronides, contrasts with the more complex movements of the colonizations, which take in Euboea (35-6), and then various unnamed islands (38-9), before concluding at Delos (40-2). The description of these islands as 'scattered' (σποράδας) emphasises the migration's reach, but also the force of subordination and collection implicit in the text's linear narrative, a feature reinforced by the coronides' spatial articulation. The coronides beside 35-6 (Εὔ-] / βοιαν ἔλον καὶ ἔνασσαν) and 41-2 (δῶκεν ὁ χρυσοκόμας / Ἄστερίας δέμας οἰκεῖν) stress the connection between Euboea and Delos as points within the onward movement of colonization, but the the visual and functional identity of the coronides also highlight the signification differences between the lines. This interplay extends to how we might 'read' the coronides themselves, allowing them to be marked by a different closural sense in the case of each stanza despite their visual identity. This distinction is particularly important at the end of the poem, as the ideal, contentless structural mark given by the coronis contrasts as a closural feature with the

²⁶⁷ This invocation is not used to end all the epodes however: cf. *Pa.* 6.60-1 and Rutherford (2001) 70.

²⁶⁸ For the closural and transitional functions of paeanic refrains cf. Rutherford (2001) 71-2 with further examples, and for refrains more generally cf. e.g. Cannatà Fera (1990) 124-9.

²⁶⁹ For μέτρα used of spatial distances cf. LSJ s.v. § 3.

²⁷⁰ So Rutherford (2001) 294.

specificity of the paeanic signature, linked as it is to a particular performance location and voiced by a particular choral speaker.²⁷¹ Genre is also at issue here: the visuality of coronides was not dependent on the genre of the poem of which they were used, and they therefore allow for a generically inflected awareness of closural constructions in relation to their own transgeneric and purely structural operation.

From these examples we can see something of the multiplicity of how critical signs function. Asteriskoi and coronides articulate the constructedness of the collection and the book, but they also draw attention to its internal differentiation by marking poems off from each other and heightening the reader's sensitivity to thematic differences between poems, drawing attention to generic specificities, and inviting the kind of comparisons I elaborated above between O.6 and O.7. Moreover, critical signs are also of consequence for the relations I have explored between performance referentiality and the written text: in drawing attention to the material specificity of the document and providing a structural articulation supplementary to that of the text itself, critical signs encourage a recognition of the interactions between this materiality and references to performance and other ways in which narratorial identity is constructed. A relation, or sets of relations, also emerges between the functionality of the structural signs and the intratextual networks which arise in the book, as the contentless ideality of the signs is opened up to being marked by individual poem (and strophe system) ends, and by the relations between them. As such, asteriskoi and coronides can be seen to have a variety of interpretative implications in addition to their practical and ornamental functions.

²⁷¹ Rutherford (2001) 296 suggests that the end of the poem gives a relatively weak sense of closure on the grounds that appeals to the gods can also be used at the beginnings of paeans (cf. e.g. *Pa.* 6.1), and wonders whether this may be to allow for the chorus 'to sing the song over again from the beginning, as might have been required if they were performing it while processing along the Sacred Way from the harbour at Delos to the sanctuary'.

PART II. POEMS ON THE PAGE

EDITED HIGHLIGHTS

This chapter will explore some of the interactions between individual poems and the book as a whole, and how the placing of poems within a book can affect their meaning: in addition to these small-scale issues, I shall also consider how some of Pindar's poems for tyrants may have appeared in the light of changing structures of governance in the Greek world, and how Pindaric texts interacted with some of the Hellenistic poetry for which they served as models. I shall also look in detail at how some specific passages of Pindar's poems for Hiero of Syracuse interact with their material setting. Although my analyses are directed specifically at Pindar, they also have resonance for the situations of other classical poets and their readers during this decisive period in the history of the book.

OLYMPIAN 1: AETIOLOGY AND EXEMPLARITY

The opening of O.1 was celebrated in antiquity: Lucian has Micyllus, while praising gold, refer to the opening of O.1, which is described as 'the most beautiful of all his songs' (ἐν ἀρχῇ εὐθύς τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν ἀσμάτων ἀπάντων, Luc. 19.7). As discussed above, however, O.1 seems not always to have been the first poem in editions of the Olympians, having been placed there by Aristophanes of Byzantium. The notice from the *Vita Thomana* is a helpful insight into Aristophanes' editorial policies, and also raises a series of questions about the influence of the structures of editions, and the thinking behind them, on reading practices (Drach. I p. 7):

ὁ δὲ ἐπινίκιος οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, προτέτακται ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνους τοῦ συντάξαντος τὰ Πινδαρικά διὰ τὸ περιέχειν τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐγκώμιον καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ Πέλοπος, ὃς πρῶτος ἐν Ἥλιδι ἠγωνίσαστο.

The epinician which begins 'Water is best' was placed first [in the collection] by Aristophanes when he edited Pindar's poems, on account of its containing an encomium of the games, and because of the matter relating to Pelops, who was the first to compete at Elis.

There are various contexts in which the argument recorded here could have affected a reading of Aristophanes' edition of the epinicians, and of the texts in wider circulation based on his

edition.²⁷² We do not know the source for the above notice, and several possibilities are conceivable. The comment could have formed part of a marginal note in Aristophanes' autograph, although such marginalia were unlikely to be copied into commercial texts.²⁷³ More likely sources for the wider dissemination of this critical comment are its place in a ὑπόμνημα and oral dissemination. Significantly, the comment draws attention to the status of the text as a material document, and opens up a new way of seeing O.1 in relation to its material context. Now, the 'praise of the games' has become a reason for placing the poem at the head of the collection, indicating the paradigmatic quality not just of the Olympian festival but of this particular poem and its 'encomium of the games' (τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐγκώμιον). The comment also suggests that the edition of the Olympian odes is similarly paradigmatic for the epinician project as a whole.²⁷⁴ Pelops, because of his status as the first competitor at Elis, now becomes a paradigm not only for the games but for the edition which describes them. Aristophanes' reading broaches a certain parallelism between the games and the edition; just as Pelops began the games, so the poem which memorializes him begins the collection. Although the nature of the contents of the other poems prevent this from becoming a totalizing editorial or reading strategy, in the light of the gloss reading O.1 becomes, however provisionally, a means of simultaneously beginning the collection and returning to the origins of the games.²⁷⁵

By referring to the constitution of the book, the Aristophanic comment draws attention to the document as itself as a meaningful construct, something dictated by its contents which also shapes how the reader approaches them. Taking this comment as a starting point, I shall now explore how the material document interactions with the text's enunciative situations in relation to the passages of O.1 which are of particular importance to the Aristophanic reading. I begin at the beginning:

ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
 ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου·
 εἰ δ' ἄεθλα γαρεύει
 ἔλδεται, φίλον ἦτορ,
 μηκέτ' ἀελίου σκόπει
 ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἀμέρᾳ φαι-

5

²⁷² For the evidence for editions prior to Aristophanes, cf. pp. 58-9.

²⁷³ Cf. Irigoien (1952) 53.

²⁷⁴ Cf. Negri (2004) 27-43

²⁷⁵ This does not mean, however, that we should see Pelops as the *founder* of the games: for the historical problems with such a position cf. McLaughlin (2004).

νὸν ἄστρον ἐρήμας δι' αἰθέρος,
 μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν·
 ὅθεν ὁ πολύφατος ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται
 σοφῶν μητίεσσι, κελαδεῖν
 Κρόνου παῖδ' ἐς ἀφνεῖαν ἰκομένους
 μάκαιραν Ἰέρωνος ἐστίαν

Water is best, and gold like fire shining at night is pre-eminent among lordly wealth. If you wish to sing the games, my dear heart, do not look for any star shining more warmly than the sun in the empty heavens, nor shall we declare any contest superior to Olympia. From there the renowned song encompasses the wits of the wise, so that they sing the son of Cronus when they arrive at Hiero's rich and blessed hearth.

In the context of a material document, 8-9 ὁ πολύφατος ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται / σοφῶν μητίεσσι involve the reader in a division between the projected enunciative situation, whether conceived as a chorus or a monodist performing before an audience, and the experience of reading. The material text draws out and expands on the denotational vagueness implicit in the reference to the σοφῶν.²⁷⁶ Can the reference be restricted to 'poets', or is it more generally applicable, for instance to the visitors to Hiero's court whose happy revels are described at 10-17, or to people watching the performance (who are at least metaphorically 'coming to Hiero's blessed hearth'), or more broadly to readers or people encountering the poem in other types of performance scenarios, such as symposia?²⁷⁷ While the primary reference in the projected enunciation is doubtless to the visitors of 10-17, the rhetoric is deliberately capacious, gesturing to the possibility, and indeed the desirability, of the poem's wider impact.²⁷⁸ The reading context replays and extends this construction of poetic

²⁷⁶ Gerber (1982) 28-9 sees in σοφῶν a generic reference to poets: for a discussion of the use of this terminology see Gianotti (1975) 85-109. This reading, however, is too restrictive. σοφῶν μητίεσσι literally means 'the divisings of wise men', and although Pindar undoubtedly uses σοφός and its cognates to refer to poets and poetry (cf. e.g. O.2.86), we should allow the double resonance of both specific and literal meanings here. Gerber's interpretation of σοφῶν μητίεσσι relies on his reading as 'not so much 'song' as 'subject for song'' (ibid. p. 26, citing P.6.7-8 and N.6.33 as parallels), but this again is too restrictive and elides the literal meaning of ὕμνος. The lines refer both to Olympia as a subject of song for poets and more literally to the effect of song on listeners more generally. For a summary of the debate about the possible metaphoricity of ἀμφιβάλλεται see Gerber (1982) 26-8 and e.g. Nisetich (1975), and for ambiguity in Pindar more generally see Renehan (1969); Hummel (1992) 289-90, (2001); Pfeijffer (1999a) 23-34; Griffith (1999).

²⁷⁷ Vetta (1983) xxv-xxviii suggested that the performances at Hiero's court could have taken the form of large symposia; cf. also Krummen (1990) 155-216. For performances of epinicians at symposia cf. also Currie (2004); Athanassaki (2009) 244 n. 12.

²⁷⁸ Cf. Goldhill (1991) 144-5; Athanassaki (2009) 271-3.

dissemination; in the context of the book, the verses are also indirectly applicable to the reader, who finds himself incorporated in the text's self-figuration.

The poetic self-references at 3-4 and 7 can also be read differently depending on whether they are seen in terms of performance or a later reading situation. The apostrophe εἰ δ' ἄεθλα γαρεύεν / ἔλδεαι, φίλον ἦτορ is self-referential in the projected enunciation, but at the beginning of a poem which begins a collection which will be all about ἄεθλα, wherein we have anticipated and acceded in advance to the conditional 'wish' (ἔλδεαι) by opening the roll and beginning to read, there is a connection, albeit indirect, between the situation referenced by these lines and the reading experience. This dynamic is picked up in 7; the first person plural of αὐδάσομεν draws the reader towards the narrator, broaching an enunciation wherein the individual reader is subsumed within a wider communality. Simultaneously, however, the reader's awareness of the distinction between his situation and that of the poem in performance complicates this appropriation, serving to distance the reader from the text in the same movement as he is drawn towards it. The material document is a space of mutual appropriation, the reader being appropriated by the text, being metaphorically elided into a wider enunciative situation, while also recreating its enunciative strategies.²⁷⁹

The contextual shift in the sense of the adjective πολύφατος ('much-spoken'/ 'renowned') focuses this dynamic, indicating the text's capacity for multiple reinscription. The history of the text, its diachronic exposure to a variety of readers, instantiates the rhetoric of the enunciation; in being widely read and studied, the text is literally πολύφατος.²⁸⁰ The divided situation of reading is refocused in 10-11(ἰκομένους / μάκαιραν ἱέρωνος ἐστίαν) in terms of an opposition between signified spatiality and text space. Here the image of 'arriving' might point up a distinction between the solitary, cerebral experience of reading and the sensuous, communal experience of performance. At this point, however, we need to be wary of a straightforward opposition between performance and solitary, silent reading. Reading aloud to oneself, solo declamation, or singing, to a small group, or a sympotic performance before a larger audience are all possible modes of realizing the text, each of which would have different consequences for the enunciative situations generated thereby. A solo performance before a small group, for example, would have the effect of indirectly applying ἰκομένους /

²⁷⁹ On the poem's use of prepositions see Griffith (1991).

²⁸⁰ On the meaning of πολύφατος see Gerber (1982) 25-6 and Hummel p. 651. He argues that only the passive meaning should be felt here, citing P.11.47 and N.7.81. Cf. however Wüst (1967) who argues that only P.11.47 is passive and that in the other instances it means 'vielpreisend'. Renehan (1969) argues for a double meaning, seeing both the usual sense and an alternative division πολ-ύφατος from ύφαίνω, giving a *figura etymologica*. Cf. Hummel (1992) for the etymological doubleness of πολύφατος as derived from both φημί and φαίνω, and n.b. *ibid.* pp. 296-7 for her reading of O.1.8-10 and her rebuttal of Renehan's argument.

μάκαιραν ἱέρωνος ἐστίαν to the audience, drawing a connection between the empirical audience of the reperformance and the implied audience of the projected enunciation.²⁸¹

Moreover, this is not a matter of a simple opposition between two empirical situations. Even in the projected enunciation, ἰκομένους / μάκαιραν ἱέρωνος ἐστίαν is not straightforwardly denotational, in that it metaphorizes, in terms of the broader referentiality described above, the position of an audience who are being figuratively welcomed to Hiero's hearth.²⁸² These lines, together with 14-17, can be interpreted as a nod to future reperformance, and as constructing Hiero as an idealized symposiastic figure.²⁸³ But they also construct a *virtualized* sympotic space which marks the text's reception. The performance and the sympotic songs of 14-17 are not identical, and while the reference does invite the reader to see the performance of O.1 as a space in which the whole of Syracuse is transformed into a symposiastic domain with Hiero as implicit *arbiter bibendi*, the poem's ethical and narrative complexity imposes the impossibility of a radical equation in these terms. Later readers are also drawn into this metaphorical system. The reader, or the audience of the reperformance, finds his approach to the text metaphorized in terms of a metaphor that has already been applied, enforcing both his displacement from the scene of his reading and their filiation with previous audiences (and readers) appropriated by the metaphor.²⁸⁴

The capacity of performance references such as those at 10-11 to generate a multiple applicability depending on the context of their enunciation is something which should be borne in mind throughout the following reading. Another example of this is the mention of the jealous neighbours at O.1.47-51 as the source of the story about Pelops' dismemberment; in a performance context, the specification of the neighbours as 'grudging' 'jealous' (ἔννεπε κρυφᾶ τις αὐτίκα φθονερῶν γειτόνων, 47) makes them a negative paradigm for citizens who do not share in the *laudandus'* success, a figuration which is extended by textual dissemination.²⁸⁵ Much attention has been devoted to the myth of O.1, and specifically to the ways in which Pindar (may have) revised the better-known account(s) of Tantalus feeding

²⁸¹ For the citation of Pindar's poetry in a symposium and its capacity to rearticulate that context cf. p. 234.

²⁸² Our lack of knowledge of the original performance scenario, which would have been shared by a Hellenistic reader, complicates matters here. There are various different performance scenarios which might be conceived for this poem, and we cannot dismiss the possibility of a public performance space being metaphorized by the text as μάκαιραν ἱέρωνος ἐστίαν; the phrase could have referred metaphorically to the city as a whole. For possible performance and reperformance scenarios see Morrison (2007) 57-65.

²⁸³ Cf. Athanassaki (2009) 261-2. The symposiastic element is commented on by Σ O.1.24d (Drach. I pp. 25-6).

²⁸⁴ Felson (2004) 388 argues that deixis (in P.9) encourages readers to identify with the earliest audience, but deixis also has the effect of inscribing spatial differentiation, and hence of accenting the imaginative effort necessary to make such identifications.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Scodel (2001) 128.

Pelops to the gods.²⁸⁶ Scholars have rightly pointed out that replacing this story with Poseidon’s love and consequent assistance for Pelops has considerable encomiastic force.²⁸⁷ I would suggest in addition that the act of revision is itself ethically programmatic, projecting a mode of interpreting myths, and more generally of viewing the world, which foregrounds the narrator himself and his intellectual comportment as exemplary. The poem’s readers are assisted in negotiating a world full of deceptive stories (30-2) and deceptive speakers (28-9).²⁸⁸

Similarly, Aristophanes’ use of Pelops’ status as the first competitor at Olympia to justify O.1’s place at the head of the edition forms a connection between the commemoration of Pelops at Olympia at 90-6 and the monumentalizing function of the text:

νῦν δ’ ἐν αἵμακουρίαις	90
ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται,	
Ἄλφειοῦ πόρω κλιθεῖς,	
τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων πολυξενω-	
τάτῳ παρὰ βωμῶ· τὸ δὲ κλέος	
τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις	
Πέλοπος, ἵνα ταχυτᾶς ποδῶν ἐρίζεται	95
ἄκμαί τ’ ἰσχύος θρασύπονοι·	

²⁸⁶ On the myth of O.1 cf. Köhnken (1974); Sicking (1980); Howie (1984); Griffith (1989). Cf. Cairns (1977) 129 for the parallelism between Hiero and Pelops. Nagy (1990) 116-35 argues that Pindar’s version is also traditional, but this relies on a forced interpretation of O.1.36.

²⁸⁷ E.g. Howie (1984) 281-6.

²⁸⁸ The famously disputed lines 25-7 about Clotho taking Pelops from the ‘pure cauldron’ (ἐπεὶ νιν καθαροῦ λέβητος ἔξελε Κλωθῶ) ‘equipped with his shoulder shining with ivory’ (ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον ὦμον κεκαδμένον) undoubtedly bear on this issue, in that they flag up Pindar’s intervention into the myth, even if the nature of this intervention is problematic. For some interpretations, cf. e.g. Dissen (1830) 10, who argues that the mention of Clotho refers to Pelops’ birth rather than to his revival after dismemberment, and Howie (1984) 284 for criticism of this position, with further references. Kakridis (1930) 475 takes ἐπεὶ (26) as causal, followed by e.g. Lloyd-Jones (1973) 133 n.125, and hence interprets Poseidon as falling in love with Pelops as a result of his ivory shoulder: for objections cf. Gerber (1982) 55. Howie (1984) 285 argues that the lines ‘are intended to resemble a summary of the traditional story and be mistaken for it’. This relies on an ambiguity between the λέβης as implement for cooking or bathing after birth, which is then resolved by Clotho’s role, which makes clear that Pindar has revised the story to make it an account of Pelops’ birth (Cf. however Gerber (1982) 56-7 for the argument that λέβης is unlikely to mean ‘birth vessel’). On this reading, the ivory shoulder then becomes ‘a special sign’, either to be understood as actually made of ivory, or merely appearing similar to it (pp. 286-7). He compares other revisions of myths where figural and literal meanings are at issue, and in which a literal meaning has displaced a figurative (e.g. Hecataeus, *FGrH* 1 F 27, Hdt. 1.122, Pl. *Phae.* 229b-d, pp. 287-9). Paus. 5.13.4-6 records the story that Pelops’ shoulderblade was recovered at sea, identified by the Delphic Oracle, and kept at Olympia where it had sacral status. Parke (1933) suggests that the relic was on display during Pindar’s lifetime. For a different approach cf. Griffith (2000).

Now he has a share in the splendid blood-sacrifices, leaning at rest beside the ford of the Alpheus, and having there an attendant tomb beside a much-visited altar. Pelops' fame has shone from afar in the racetrack of Olympia, where there are contests in swiftness of foot and the heights of boldly-toiling strength.

The stress on the cultural importance of Pelops' cult site (τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων πολυξενωτάτῳ παρὰ βωμῶ) inscribes a contrast between the signified space, with its emphasis on the physicality of the rites (αἰμακουρίαίς) and pilgrimage, and the scene of reading. Aristophanes' critical comment, however, involves a redescription of Pelops' exemplarity in the poetics of the edition; just as he was the hero ὃς πρῶτος ἐν Ἡλιδι ἠγωνίσσατο, and thus is figured by the poem as exemplary not only for Hiero but for competition at Olympia generally, so the inscription of the Pelops narrative at the beginning of the edition adds the notion of Pelops as exemplary for the reader's engagement with the rest of the poems in the collection, as he becomes a paradigmatic model against which other heroes can be read. The material context of reading prompts a rethinking of exemplarity and of the parallelism and differences between reading and cultic pilgrimage as ways of performing and perpetuating cultural memory.

The rhetoric of the expression of Pelops' fame at 93-5 (τὸ δὲ κλέος / τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις / Πέλοπος) is also picked up and expanded by the material context of reading. The scholia on this passage preserve what may very well be a trace of the Aristophanic reading; Σ O.1.151b comments τὸ τηλόθεν χρονικῶς ἀκουστέον. As it stands this is a rather odd reading, given that firstly, Pindar never elsewhere uses τηλόθεν to denote temporality, and secondly that the spatial reading makes perfectly good sense.²⁸⁹ This reading would be perfectly comprehensible, however, in terms of the Aristophanic stress on Pelops' temporal priority. I would suggest that the temporal interpretation of τηλόθεν derives from a reading, either that of Aristophanes himself or of someone responding to his comments at

²⁸⁹ Σ O.1.151d and f (Drach. I p. 50) both take the phrase in a spatial sense (e.g. 151f τουτέστι πανταχῇ βλέπεται καὶ βοᾶται ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἀγών, 'that is, the Olympian competition is noticed and talked about everywhere'), as do modern commentators, e.g. Gerber (1982) 146-7. τηλόθε(ν) is also found at N.2.12, N.3.81 and N.6.48, each time with a purely spatial sense. In its uses in other literature it is always spatial; see e.g. *Il.* 5.651 (and cf. 1.30 τηλόθι πάτρης); *Soph. Aj.* 1318 (n.b. that other adverbs from the τηλ- root are normally spatial, although see τηλοῦ used temporally at POxy 1015.13; *IG* 5 (2) 173.1, and perhaps also *Od.* 17.253). It is notable that the scholia do not gloss τηλόθεν in its other Pindaric occurrences, which suggests that the word's meaning was uncontroversial. This contrasts with the extensive exegesis at Σ O.1.151a-f (Drach. I p. 50), where the glosses probably reflect a debate over the meaning of τηλόθεν precipitated by the Aristophanic reading; the stress placed on the spatial sense of τηλόθεν suggests an attempt to rebut the temporal reading. Cf. n. 19 below.

some stage in the exegetical process, which stresses the temporal structure of Olympia's fame, stressing its glory as something which emanates from an event in the distant past.²⁹⁰

The phrase *τηλόθεν δέδορκε* connotes both the brightness of Olympia and its being seen, picking up the imagery of brightness in the first stanza.²⁹¹ The action of looking implied by *δέδορκε*, as a figural projection of the action of the verb, is not focalized in terms of the viewing position of any one determinate individual, projecting instead a generalized viewing position. The generality of this projection also subsumes the reader of the material text, who also 'looks' at Olympia, or rather a particular textual figuration of Olympia, from far away. The rhetoric of the text again stresses the reader's distance from the signified space, but this distancing involves the reader in a metaphorical redescription of his activity by which he is preceded. The text's rhetoric, both context-bound and context-transcendent, interacts with new contexts of meaning with the result that the reader is confronted by a textual situation which involves a series of imaginative dislocations. The passage as a whole becomes a site for the interaction between the poem's rhetoric and its material condition: the concept of distancing in *τηλόθεν* inscribes one of the conditions of fame, the necessity of its travelling and diffusion, and whereas the perfects *μέμικται* and *δέδορκε* connote endurance and continuity, naming something whose establishment has continued into the present, the material context draws attention to *κλέος* as something still being disseminated and added to by readerly activity.²⁹²

The closing lines of the poem also acquire a changed and expanded force from their place in the material document:

τὸ δ' ἔ-
σχατον κορυφῶται
βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον.

²⁹⁰ Another possible trace of the Aristophanic reading may be Σ O.1.142a (Drach. I p. 47) *ἔλεν δ' Οἰνομάου: ἐνίκησεν* ('he took Oenomaus': he defeated him'), where the gloss is not exactly synonymous with the lemma. Given the obvious epinician connotations of *ἐνίκησεν*, the gloss may reflect a reading which stresses Pelops as the first Olympian victor.

²⁹¹ Cf. Snell (1953) 2-3 who shows that *δέρκεσθαι* 'refers not so much to the function of the eye as to its gleam as noticed by someone else.' The scholia emphasise the passive force of *δέδορκεν*: see e.g. Σ O.1.151c *τὸ δὲ δέδορκεν, ἀντὶ παθητικοῦ τοῦ δέρκεται ἴν' ἧ, ὁράται* ('shines out' is used instead of the passive 'is viewed', so as to mean 'is seen') Σ O.1. 151d *τουτέστι πανταχῆ βλέπεται καὶ ὁράται ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἀγών. ἰδίως δὲ τὸ δέδορκεν ἐξενήνοχεν ἀντὶ παθητικοῦ τοῦ βλέπεται* ('that is, the Olympian competition is noticed and talked about everywhere. He employs 'shines out' idiomatically instead of the passive 'is seen').

²⁹² See Gerber (1982) 142 on *μέμικται*: 'Pelops' worship is viewed as continuous from the time of his death to the present.' See *ibid.* 145-6 on the debate over whether *τὸ κλέος* should be taken with *Ὀλυμπιάδων* or *Πέλοπος* and the weak personification connoted by *δέδορκε*. He suggests that that the syntax is purposively opaque, connoting the elision of Pelops with Olympia as a whole.

εἴη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν,
ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις
ὀμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ καθ' Ἑλ-
λανας ἐόντα παντᾶ.

115

The peak of the farthest limit is for kings. Do not look beyond it. May you walk on high for this time's course, and may I likewise associate with victors, conspicuous for skill among Hellenes everywhere.

O.1 was composed for a performance in 476. Ten years later, Hiero was dead, his son Thrasybulus had been deposed, and after a brief period of civil strife, the Syracusans instituted a democracy which was to last into the fourth century. Hiero became a figure of debate for later authors seeking to interrogate the nature of absolute rule and explore its problems. Xenophon's *Hiero*, for instance, is a fictional account of a conversation between the tyrant and the poet Simonides, wherein the former complains about the problems, political and personal, that beset him.²⁹³ For an educated Hellenistic reader, reading the end of O.1 could well have involved a negotiation between the text's idealizing and laudatory strategies and the historical events which succeeded it, and its representation of tyranny could have been read in the light of ongoing debates about the nature of monarchic authority and its intellectual implications.

The wider historical and literary context points up the conditionality of the wish expressed in εἴη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν. It could be argued that in maintaining his rule until the end of his life, not to mention winning further success at the games, Hiero succeeded in fulfilling this hope, a reading strengthened by taking τοῦτον ... χρόνον as referring to Hiero's lifetime,²⁹⁴ but this reading is offset by knowledge of the disease that afflicted him in his final years, and of the failure of the political system which he set up. This historical perspective mediates the text's celebration of kingship as the ultimate state of human achievement (τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται / βασιλεῦσι). Furthermore, one might wonder about the disjunction between the idealized image of kingship expressed here and its attempted instantiations by individual rulers; reflection on the problems encountered by Hiero

²⁹³ Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 5.1313b11-15 which records a tradition of Hiero's use of female informants at public meetings as a means of consolidating his power. For later accounts of Hiero, see the negative judgement of Diod. Sic. 11.67.4, who says that he was φιλάργυρος καὶ βίαιος καὶ καθόλου τῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ καλοκάγαθίας ἀλλοτριώτατος ('avaricious and violent and a complete stranger to sincerity and gentlemanly behavior'). Plut. *Mor.* 551f is more positive, comparing Hiero with Peisistratus as promoters of civic virtue.

²⁹⁴ So Gerber (1982) 176.

during the course of his reign might incline a reader to see a certain irony in these lines, particularly in relation to the more problematizing discussions of tyranny in P.1 and P.2. The complication of the poem's rhetorical strategies by the historical perspective also affects the injunction μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον which, in the context of the material document, is also addressed directly to the reader. The situation of this address emphasises the transcontextual nature of the paraenesis, and the exhortation to observe the limits of human endeavour gains additional point from the reader's awareness of the qualified nature of Hiero's success.²⁹⁵ Read in the light of these historical changes and the reader's wider knowledge, the text reflects human frailties and limitations as well as celebrating success.²⁹⁶

The metapoetic aspect of the poem's conclusion is also highlighted by its place in the edition. The poem ends by orienting itself outwards, towards a future which it attempts to delimit by means of a wish for the author's future success. But this openness to the future also entails the text's exposure to a future it cannot control, to the contingencies of its reception and of the various critical and intellectual contexts by which it can be appropriated. Again, this situation instantiates the text's rhetoric, functioning as a realization of the statement at 33-4 ἀμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι / μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι. In the context of the projected enunciation, this appeal to 'future days' acts as a bulwark against false and exaggerated stories, specifically those about Pelops which Pindar rejects in favour of his own version (28-32 and 47-51).²⁹⁷ But the statement also suggests the reliance of the text itself on such judgements; 33-4 combine with the ending of the poem to defer judgement of the poem and its subject to the future, while also framing the ethical terms in which those judgements should be couched. A similar dynamic is at work in the divided addressee of εἴη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑποῦ χρόνον πατεῖν. In the projected enunciation, this remark is addressed to Hiero, albeit in a public context. In a context of reading, the reader, as it were, overhears this address, as well as literally being addressed himself. This divided address again emphasizes the reader's distance from the space of the projected enunciation, but the programmatic context also licenses an application of the phrase to the reader's activity. Reading epinician poetry is a way, albeit in secondary and indirect terms, of 'walking on high', of sharing in the glory that epinician poetry bestows on great achievements. This resonance replays the

²⁹⁵ Cf. Payne (2006) on the transcontextual nature of Pindaric gnomai.

²⁹⁶ A similar point might be made about a reader's experience of odes for Aeginetan victors in the light of that island's subsequent defeat at the hands of Athens, and about the status of Orchomenus in O.14. for which cf. below p. 178.

²⁹⁷ For discussion cf. Gerber (1982) 68-9; Scodel (2001) 127-8, who suggests that the phrase implies that 'time provides evidence the audience should use to recognize that [the rejected story of Pelops] is false'. For a different view, cf. Fisker (1990) 40-1.

application in a performance scenario of 116-17 to the chorus, and the wider citizen body which they represent, who like the poet participate in Hiero's success.

The final lines yoke poet and *laudandus* together, but the exact nature of this relationship is complex, and becomes more so in light of a reading of the poem in terms of a wider historical and literary context. The problem of the relationship hinges on the meaning of τoσσάδε, which can be taken in either a quantitative ('and may I, as much as you ...') or a temporal sense ('and may I, for as long as you ...').²⁹⁸ The word can bear both meanings, and deciding between them has consequences for the way we see the relationship between poet and his patron. The quantitative reading would seem to draw a connection between the poet's achievement and the nature of the *laudandus*' continuing success, although this is couched in terms of the maintenance of a general social status (νικαφόροις / ὀμιλεῖν, 'to associate with victors', 116-17) as well as a broader reputation for poetic and intellectual excellence (πρόφαντον σοφία καθ' Ἑλλανας ἐόντα παντᾶ, 117). The temporal reading, on the other hand, would make the poet's social and intellectual success temporally coextensive with that of the *laudandus*.

Yet neither of these readings clarifies the dynamics of power involved in praising, leaving vague the precise nature of interdependency of victor and poem; does the latter derive its authority from the former, or vice versa?²⁹⁹ The structure of the sentence implies that the poet is dependent on the victor, his secondariness indicated by a qualifying adverb antecedent to the noun (χρόνον) applied to the tyrant. The grammatical structure, however, disguises problematic questions as to how this relationship is played out. These questions are sharpened by the material context of reading, in which the enunciative situation is altered; instead of being performed in the presence of its (primary) addressee and pointing up its relation to a living man with many potential glories, athletic and military, awaiting him, the text now names, in naming 'Hiero', a temporally diffuse space of conflicting meanings and narratives gathered under the sign of the proper name. The text's naming of Hiero (μάκαιραν ἱέρωνος ἐστῖαν, 11) is a paradoxical gesture; the proper name is destined to outlive the individual it names, and thus inscribes the finitude (and death) of that individual in the same movement as it bestows an identity. Inscribed within this bestowal of identity is a depropriation of the 'self'

²⁹⁸ Gerber (1982) 176 reads τoσσάδε as temporal, while Slater p. 509 interprets it as qualitative. For the temporal sense cf. Aech. *Ag.* 860; Soph. *OT* 1212; for the quantitative cf. *Od.* 21.253; Soph. *El.* 403.

²⁹⁹ See Goldhill (1991) 116-19 for an examination of this problem with regard to the disputed ending of Ibycus' poem for Polycrates (fr.1.46-8).

that it announces, and, more important for our purposes, the possibility of its reconstitutive iteration.³⁰⁰

The reader again confronts a doubled discursive frame; the text's diachronicity instantiates the wish of the narrator to 'be conspicuous for wisdom among Hellenes everywhere', and thus reconfigures the projected temporality of the utterance. If we read τοσσάδε as temporal, it now comes to refer to the diachronicity of the text and the various readings and receptions that have guaranteed the author his status as πρόφαντον; correlatively, the τοῦτον ... χρόνον would now name not Hiero's lifetime, but likewise his role as a figure in the history of the text. This scenario reverses the rhetoric of the projected enunciation; the grammatical structure may indicate the poet's dependency on the victor, but in the diachronic situation of the text's dissemination, the victor is dependent on his textual realization. A quantitative reading of the phrase would have similar implications, and in the context of the edition the phrase has a strong programmatic force. This is picked up by the comments recorded by Σ O.1.186 (Drach. I p. 86), which reads the phrase as assimilating other possible victors to Hiero: τοσσάδε νικαφόροις: ἀντὶ τοῦ, τοσοῦτοις νικηφόροις ὀμιλεῖν, οἷος εἶ σύ. χαίρω δὲ γράφων τοιάδε, καὶ ἔσται τοιαῦτα οἷα ἐπὶ σοῦ ('likewise with victors': instead of 'to associate with so many victors as you. I salute you writing these things, and such things will be as they are with you'). This reading sees the text as figuring Hiero as a paradigmatic victor. There is no hint that the scholiast sees this paradigm as functioning in terms of the edition; instead, the reading is retrojected onto the historical situation of the poem's origin and performance, and Hiero's paradigmatic quality is imagined as applying to the poet's future writings (γράφων τοιάδε, καὶ ἔσται τοιαῦτα οἷα ἐπὶ σοῦ). Nevertheless, the movement from the unspecific mode of paradigmatic function broached by the scholiast and a specific paradigmatic function within the edition is suggested by the role of the opening poem in shaping our generic expectations of the rest of the collection; at the very least, the poem's placement obliges us to mediate between the specific and the general paradigmatic functions attributable to Hiero, and to the poet.³⁰¹ Reading O.1 in the light of its place in the edition and in relation to the Aristophanes' editorial comments involves a series of questions about aetiology and exemplarity and the relations that obtain between them, about the nature and sources of poetic authority, and about the role of the reader in negotiating the various frames of reference devolved by the material transcription of a performance text, and multiple

³⁰⁰ Cf. Derrida (1985) 3-38.

³⁰¹ For the poet as exemplum see e.g. Lefkowitz (1980) 34, 38; Goldhill (1991) 141-2 discussing N.8.35-9.

levels of exemplarity.³⁰² Hiero functions as a historical exemplum for other victors within the collection, Pelops as a mythical exemplum both for Hiero, and for other victors. Similarly, the self-construction at 117 is also mediated by its *Nachleben*: the process of canonization fulfils the narrator's claim while also participating in the processes by which its operation is altered.

It could be argued that the approach to the text explored above, in terms of the problematic receptions of tyranny, is inherently unfaithful to epinician poetry's demands. By reinscribing Pindar's Hiero in a network of debates about tyranny, and by underwriting it with a historicity in which tyranny emerges as a problematic figure, exposed to historical vicissitudes and literary contestation, the above reading would be disregarding the way in which the text seeks to shape its reception. My approach, in effect, would be taking the position of the envious neighbours of O.1.47 who tell false tales about Pelops, rather than responding to the text under the constraints of *φιλία*.³⁰³ The diachronic mode of reading, however, should not be seen as displacing or rendering defunct the text's modes of self-figuration, still less of making, for instance, the end of O.1 into an ironically charged and denigratory reflection on the shortcomings of tyranny. Rather, my readings have sought to acknowledge the multiple resonances of the diachronic text, as the poem's strategies are realigned against the background of a series of contexts into which they intervene but over which they cannot exert more than a partial control. The mode of reading broached by the *φιλία* / *φθόνος* opposition does not lose its force, but is complicated by other modes of authorization, such as editorial activity, specifically its role of mediating access to the text, and the expanded intertextual relations to which the text is exposed. The nature of the reader's engagement with these figurations of *φιλία* and *φθόνος* is also of importance. Figurations such as that of Hiero's guests at O.1.9-17 and the envious neighbours at 47 are, in terms of the reader's experience, purely textual figures, gesturing to an historically remote situation which the reader is required to reanimate imaginatively. This process involves a certain submission to the text's ethical laws; reading epinician is a process of learning, or relearning, how to read it. The relearning and rewriting of these ethical laws highlights the multiple temporality of the material document. The text's ethical figurations are both rooted in its multiple histories, in the histories of its composition and reception, and the historicities it itself projects, but also reach, or attempt to reach, beyond history, by means of the

³⁰² Goldhill (1991) 149.

³⁰³ Goldhill (1991) 161 argues that reading epinician 'against the grain' is a violation of the principles of *φιλία* and works in accordance with *φθόνος*. Such a mode of reading not only goes against the ethical model of epinician, but also denies the possibility of the poem's efficacy.

signification of transhistorical and multiply applicable ethical modalities. Writing does not function simply to extend, in a neutral and purely reproductive manner, the space of the utterance, but involves it in a series of dislocations which extend and recontextualize its meanings.³⁰⁴

My reading also prompts attention to the role of an editor in shaping the reader's approaches to a poem and to an edition. I have argued that such a comment opens up various ways of seeing the text in relation to its material context, but the interpretative efficacy of this approach also requires examination. Was Aristophanes right to place O.1 first?³⁰⁵ To what extent is the attribution to Pelops of the role of first Olympian competitor compromised by Heracles' role as founder of the games, e.g. in the narratives in O.3 and O.10? What is at stake in seeing Pelops as the exemplary exemplum for the victor rather than Heracles? There are numerous answers to these questions. We could say, for instance, in response to the second and third questions that the structure of the book enjoins a redescription of Pelops' role as exemplum in terms of a multiple exemplarity.³⁰⁶ Seeing Pelops as the first competitor at Olympia does not exclude seeing Heracles as the founder, and the traditions about the latter do not invalidate the former position; rather, the two figures are made to emphasize different aspects of the games, and to dramatize our approaches to the games in different ways. Whether or not we find Aristophanes' reasons satisfying is less important than the extent to which the process of relating the *Vita Thomana* notice to O.1 prompts us to take note of and question editorial authority. In shaping the form and contents of a book, the editor reauthors the text, opening up new modes of intertextual and connections between poems.³⁰⁷ His

³⁰⁴ Cf. Derrida (1978) 18-21.

³⁰⁵ Cf. Negri (2004) 32-4 on the programmatic qualities of O.2.

³⁰⁶ For the first and second questions cf. the arguments of Negri (2004) 36-8. For the narrativization of exemplarity see e.g. Goldhill (1991) 149, and on an exemplary figure (Clytemnestra in the *Odyssey*) as situationally modified across a text cf. Goldhill (1994). The situation in the epinician collection is different, because the situational differences between victories commemorated by individual poems, and the contingency of the connections between them, limit the sense in which Pelops can be taken as having a paradigmatic relationship with other poems based on similarity or congruity.

³⁰⁷ For the significance of the poetry book as an aesthetic form in the Hellenistic period see e.g. Kerkhecker (1999) 282-90 arguing for Callimachus editing his *Iambi*; n.b. particularly pp. 288-9 for Callimachus' editorial activity as a scholar as a probable influence on his poetic activities, and cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 183-5. Hunter and Fuhrer (2002) 145 argue that the order of Callimachus' *Hymns* is also attributable to the author. There are possible connections between the order of Callimachus' *Hymns* and that of the *Homeric Hymns*; see e.g. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 367-8 on Callim. *H.3* expanding on and rewriting *H.2*; this relationship may be mimetic of that between *Hom.h.Ap.* and *Hom.h.Her.*, for which cf. Thomas (2010) 250-9. If we can hypothesise that the order of the Homeric Hymns in the manuscripts reflects that of the editions of the Hellenistic period, this argument would be strengthened by the order of Callimachus' hymns to 2) Apollo and 3) Artemis reflecting that of the Homeric Hymns: 3) Apollo 4) Hermes. Thus the intertextual relationship would function in terms of the structures of the respective editions as well as in terms of particular passages. Cf. further Hunter and Fuhrer (2002) 172-3 on the parallels between the openings of Callim. *H. 1* and the *Hom.h.Dion.* Hopkinson (1984) 13-

authority, however, is open to being questioned by the reader, a process which in its turn entails a reflection on the reader's own relation to the text. In order to explore these issues further, I shall now move on to a consideration of some other aspects of the poetics of the edition.

BEGINNINGS AND ENDINGS: SHAPING EDITIONS

The questions raised above about the programmatic functions of O.1 and its relation *qua* opening poem to the rest of the Olympian odes and to the epinician collection as a whole require us to think about what actually constituted an 'edition' of Pindar's epinicians in antiquity.³⁰⁸ It has often been assumed that the list of Pindar's works in the *Vita Ambrosiana* reflected an order which derived ultimately from the Hellenistic editors, and that all editions of Pindar would have followed this order.³⁰⁹ The scholars who hold this view seem to assume that an edition of Pindar would have contained all of his works, on the model of the modern *Complete Poems* volume. This position, however, makes no sense in terms of the concrete circumstances of book production in the ancient world. No single papyrus would have been long enough to accommodate all of Pindar's poetry; what we are dealing with when thinking about the dissemination of Pindaric texts is rather a collection of individual rolls, each one probably containing a single 'book' of poetry, such as the Olympian odes or one book of the *Partheneia*. This allows for a situation in which, as William Race points out, 'the rolls ... must have been freely rearranged' by different editors and readers.³¹⁰ Although this general observation does not affect my above remarks about the internal organization of particular books, it does require us to rethink what is meant by a programmatic function when considering how that function might span different books. Moreover, we must also consider the extent to which modes of storage, cataloguing, and titling may have mediated access to the texts and hence helped to shape the reader's experience of them. There is no *a priori* reason, for example, for a reader to pick up the Olympians before the Pythians, and hence be drawn into the programmatic dynamics that I have been exploring. If, however, the reader came to the text in a library wherein the epinician books had been ordered in such a way as to

17 on extensive parallels between Callim. *H.5* and 6, and the place of these poems within the collection of the *Hymns*.

³⁰⁸ For the programmatic functions of the openings of poetry books see e.g. Van Sickle (1980) 13; Rutherford (2001) 159; Negri (2004) 31; D'Alessio (2007) 101-2.

³⁰⁹ See e.g. Bowra (1964).

³¹⁰ Race (1987) 409; see *ibid* for a doxography of the debate about the order of Pindaric books and the attempts to square the competing claims of the order in the *Vita Ambrosiana* with that given by POxy 2438.35. Race's position is anticipated by Deas (1931) 49.

place the Olympians first, or if he had found the epinicians with the help of a catalogue which listed the Olympians first, his decision to start his reading (or not) with that book would be shaped in large part by the institutional and critical context of his activity. This is of course only one of a potentially innumerable series of different reading contexts which could have framed an individual's approach to the texts; the point of the example is to bring into focus the importance of material, institutional and socio-historical frames for the reading experience.

The formation of editions also opens up the possibility of comparing different poems and seeing them in relation to each other, and of seeing groups of poems as thematically connected. O.1-3 and P.1-3 are particularly promising candidates in this respect because of their positions in their respective books, their shared *laudandi*, and the various thematic connections between them. It has been plausibly argued, for example, that O.1-3, all composed for victories in 476 for victories by Hiero and Theron, were designed to be performed as a 'song cycle' attended by overlapping audiences who would have picked up on connections between the poems.³¹¹ Whatever the historical truth of this argument, it is certainly the case that the grouping of the poems in the edition, and the 'ring composition' of O.3.42 (εἰ δ' ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος, 'if water is best and gold the most revered of possessions') recalling O.1.1 (ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ), encourages attention to them as a configuration. Similarly, P.1-3, all composed for Hiero, can be approached as a self-contained group, articulating a particular poet-patron relationship. In this section, however, I shall focus on the relationship between O.1 and P.1 as documentary texts. Despite their numerous formal and structural differences, there are numerous parallels between the poems. Both poems are written for and addressed to Hiero. Both have openings with strong idealizing elements, elements which can be read both in terms of their implications for the individual poem and for the collection as a whole, and both poems end with figurations of tyranny. The envious neighbours at O.1.47 parallel Zeus' enemies at P.1.13-14 as negative paradigms for response to poetry, while the Phalaris/Croesus dyad at the end of P.1 can be read, as I shall argue below, as interacting in various ways with the end of O.1. On the other hand, the opening of P.1 is more overtly concerned with performance than anything in O.1, and this, together with its marked position at the beginning of the Pythian book, makes the opening of P.1 a prime site for exploring the intersection of

³¹¹ Cf. Clay (2011), who argues that O.1-3 are designed to connect the achievements of Hiero and Theron, and that the editor who ordered the poems as they stand in the edition 'showed a sensitivity to Pindar's design and ... preserved what the Theban poet had conceived of as a Sicilian triptych.' On the issue of overlapping audiences for these poems cf. Morrison (2007).

performance rhetoric and documentary textuality. I shall focus first on this issue, before returning to relationship between O.1 and P.1.

Signs that ancient scholars were concerned with connections between these groups of poems are few and far between; it is somewhat surprising, for instance, that the scholia preserve no explicit recognition of or comment on the echo of O.1.1 at O.3.42, nor on the similarity of phrasing at O.1.114 and P.3.22.³¹² An exception is the comparison between the openings of O.2 and P.1 made at Σ O.2.1a (Drach. I p. 58-9):

ἀναξιφόρμιγγες· ἦτοι <οί> τῶν φορμίγγων ἀνάσσοντες· ἔπονται γὰρ τοῖς ὕμνοις καὶ φόρμιγγες, δι' οὓς καὶ ἀπεδείχθησαν· ἢ οἱ ἀνασσόμενοι ὑπὸ φορμίγγων ὕμνοι· πρότερον γὰρ ἐνδίδωσι <τὸ> μέλος ὁ κιθαριστής, ἔπειτα ἢ ᾠδὴ λέγεται· ὡς καὶ ἐν Πυθιονίκαις· χρυσέα φόρμιγξ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον.

‘Lyre-ruling’: ie., ‘those which rule over lyres’; lyres follow hymns, by means of which they are exhibited. Or, ‘hymns which are commanded by lyres’; for when the citharist strikes up the melody, the poem is then spoken. So also in the Pythians: ‘Apollo’s golden lyre and just possession of the Muses’.

The extant reference to P.1.1 is somewhat elliptical, as it is P.1.2-4 which provide the parallel for ‘the citharist striking up the melody’ and the song following. Although no extended appreciation of the link between the two openings is extant, we cannot discount the possibility that scholars and readers dwelt further on the the interpretative possibilities marked by the elliptical ὡς καὶ ἐν Πυθιονίκαις. At the very least, the comment demonstrates an awareness of the role played by the image of the φόρμιγξ in two openings. Neither this scholium nor those on the opening of P.1 make explicit the connection between the φόρμιγξ as opening a song and the image of the φόρμιγξ opening the poem, although this connection is implicit in Σ P.1.3c (Drach. II p. 8), which offers an alternate explanation of why the *cithara* is said to be Apollo’s possession: ἢ Ἀπόλλωνος, διὰ τὸ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα προκατάρχειν τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν Μουσῶν (‘Or it is Apollo’s because he leads the Muses in

³¹² μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον (O.1.114), ἔστι δὲ φῦλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισι ματαιότατον, / ὅστις αἰσχύνων ἐπιχώρια παπτάνει τὰ πόρσω (‘there is a most fruitless tribe among men who scorning what lies close gazes on distant things’, P.3.21-2). The latter passage dwells on Coronis’ misdeed in sleeping with Ischys when pregnant by Apollo.

the dance’).³¹³ This reading is expanded in P.1.3d (Drach. II p. 8), according to which ὁ μὲν Ἀπόλλων τῇ κιθάρα τῶν ᾠδῶν προκαθηγεῖται τῶν Μουσῶν, αὐταὶ δὲ χορεύουσιν (‘Apollo leads the Muses in their singing with the *cithara*, and they dance in a chorus’).³¹⁴ These explications encourage attention to the parallel between Apollo’s role in leading off the Muses and the poet guiding his chorus, and to the apertural role of the description itself within the poem.

As in the case of O.1, the vocabulary of performance can take on new resonances as part of a material text: the description of the βάσις ἀγλαΐας ἀρχά ‘hearing’ the lyre (2) has a double application to the beginning of a signified performance and, metaphorically, to the beginning of a reading. The mention at 3 of ἀγησιχόρων ὁπότεν προοιμίῶν is also assimilable to its material context, figuring P.1 as the προοιμίον of the book as a whole:

χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων
 σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον· τᾶς ἀκούει
 μὲν βάσις ἀγλαΐας ἀρχά,
 πείθονται δ’ ᾠδοὶ σάμασιν
 ἀγησιχόρων ὁπότεν προοιμίῶν
 ἀμβολὰς τεύχης ἐλελιζομένα.
 καὶ τὸν αἰχματὰν κεραυνὸν σβεννύεις 5
 αἰενάου πυρός. εὔδει δ’ ἀνὰ σκά-
 πτω Διὸς αἰετός, ὦκεϊ-
 αν πτέρυγ’ ἀμφοτέρωθεν χαλάξαις,

ἀρχὸς οἰωνῶν, κελαινῶπιν δ’ ἐπὶ οἱ νεφέλαν
 ἀγκύλω κρατί, γλεφάρων ἀδὺ κλάι-
 θρον, κατέχευας· ὁ δὲ κνώσσων
 ὑγρὸν νῶτον αἰωρεῖ, τεαῖς
 ῥιπαῖσι κατασχόμενος. καὶ γὰρ βια-
 τὰς Ἄρης, τραχεῖαν ἄνευθε λιπῶν 10
 ἐγχείων ἀκμάν, ἰαίνει καρδίαν
 κώματι, κῆλα δὲ καὶ δαιμόνων θέλ-
 γει φρένας ἀμφί τε Λατοί-
 δα σοφία βαθυκόλπων τε Μοισᾶν.

³¹³ At Σ P.1.3b (Drach. II p. 8) Pindar is argued to be countering the notion that Hermes invented the instrument.

³¹⁴ Cf. Σ P.1.5a. (Drach. II p. 9).

Golden *phorminx*, just possession of Apollo and the violet-coiffed Muses, to which the footstep listens, the beginning of splendour. The singers obey the signs whenever you strum and strike up the openings of chorus-leading preludes. You douse the spearing lightning of ever-flowing fire. Zeus' eagle sleeps on the sceptre, slackening his wings on both sides, the lord of birds; you pour a dark cloud over his curved head, a sweet seal of the eyelids. Slumbering, he raises his rippling back, caught by your notes. And violent Ares, leaving behind his harsh spearpoint, delights his heart in drowsing, and the darts bewitch the gods' minds with the skill of Apollo and the deep-girdled Muses.

The opening lines ground the utterance in a relation to the physicalities of performance. The invocation of the χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, the description of the 'step listening' (ἀκούει μὲν βάσις), the vivid 'striking up' (ἐλελιζομένα) of the φόρμιγξ, followed by the detailed description of music's bewitching effects, all emphasise the poem's place in a performance economy. In describing an idealized mode of performance on Olympus in which Apollo and the φόρμιγξ represent and embody music's enchanting and ordering effects, the narrator creates an analogue for (the) historical performance(s) which functions at several levels, and which has numerous consequences for interpretation of the poem in a book.

Apollo and the Muses in this passage form an idealized analogy for the activities of the poet and his chorus, and as such are part of a wider system of analogies; critics have noted, for instance, the parallelism between Zeus' suppression of Typhos and Hiero's victory over the Carthaginians and Etruscans (71-2).³¹⁵ Both actions involve forces of disorder being subordinated and controlled. I argue, however, that the opening passage also exemplifies the interpretative challenges posed by Pindar's epinicians. In a performance setting, these challenges project the listener as a particular type of interpretative agent, and in the context of the book have the additional effect of being programmatic for the reader's engagement with the rest of the collection. Central to these dynamics are the relations and differences between the human and divine choruses. As Lucia Athanassaki has pointed out, Hiero and the human chorus finds themselves in a situation of greater social and political complexity than those of their divine counterparts. Unlike Apollo, the human singer has to contend with the contingencies of particular concrete situations when deciding what and how to compose,

³¹⁵ Cf. e.g. Too (1997) 19-22.

issues which are to the fore in the fourth and fifth triads (61-100).³¹⁶ Connected to this is the disparity between the origins and subjects of the respective songs; while Apollo's music seems to arise spontaneously, the Pindaric narrator emphasises the situation of his performance in an environment of poetic competition (45) and social negotiation (81-6). The absence of any reference to the semantic content (if there is any) of Apollo's performance further emphasises this difference. While there is certainly an agonistic and self-validating element in the poet/Apollo, chorus/Muses, Hiero/Zeus diptychs, each of which serves as a validation of poetic practice,³¹⁷ the comparisons also have a paraenetic force in emphasising the greater difficulties facing the human singer and, by extension, the *laudandus* and his citizens. I shall return to this theme below.

For the moment, I want to emphasise how the very fact of the performing chorus being put into relation with an idealized precedent is significant for shaping response to the poem as a whole. In addition to the functions just mentioned, this feature dramatizes the poem as a relational mode in which referential categories are connected with each other in ways different from those prevalent in ordinary speech. This relationality pertains to language as well as to the group of performers who take on some of their identity from their connection with the performing Muses. The χρυσέα φόρμιγγις invoked in the opening line, for instance, is simultaneously a signifier and concrete referent to which the human audience gains only a mediated access, but which also operates as an idealized symbol of performance practice.³¹⁸ This figuration makes the audience aware of a break between signifier and referent which is reinforced by the extended specification of the instrument's role on Olympus. Yet this differentiation grounds both the force of the analogy and the language used to convey it: without the differentiation, neither the symbolism of the φόρμιγγις nor the mediatory role of language would come about. As a consequence, response to the poem calls for a negotiation of various interpretative complexities, and as such is very different from the somnambulant response of Ares and Zeus' eagle to Apollo's music (εὔδει, ιαίνει καρδίαν / κώματι) and the 'bewitching' (θέλγει φρένας) effect it has on the unnamed other gods.³¹⁹ The reference at 97-8 to songs commemorating tyrants has a similar effect. The idealizing reference to (sympotic)

³¹⁶ Athanassaki (2009) 252: 'unlike the impact of divine song, the appeal of human song is not unconditional. It is neither universally nor eternally irresistible nor inescapable.' Cf. also *ibid.* pp. 258-9

³¹⁷ Poetic competition is more directly referenced at P.1.45, where the javelin simile ends with the request that Pindar may outshoot his rivals (μακρὰ δὲ ῥίψαις ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους, 'casting far surpass my opponents').

³¹⁸ Cf. Krischer (1985) for the representation of divine performance here and in previous texts. For the debate over whether the instrument should be seen as referred to one realm or the other cf. Athanassaki (2009) 246 nn. 19-20. Segal (1998) 13 sees the two performances as blended together.

³¹⁹ For this effect cf. *Pitiche* pp. 332-3.

performance culture in general and a nod to future reperformances of the poem combine to underscore the poem's place within, and dependence on, a wider culture of performance and critical judgement.

Another relation emerges in this passage between language as the substrate for a transcendental ideality and the provisionality and momentariness of that language's realization in a given performance or reading. The use of present tenses in the opening strophe and antistrophe (e.g. ἀκούει, πείθονται, and ὁπότεν ... τεύχης) signify the continual nature of the event described.³²⁰ Consequently, there is a conflict between the transcendental, continuous nature of the present as experienced by the gods and the temporality of its signification, which occurs as part of a chain of discrete significations. In registering the permanence of the Olympian scene, the language of the opening stanzas dramatizes its status as an archival medium, while the fact that this function is a reflex of the referent's distinctive temporality (the language can only register the gods' experience as such because of the nature of that experience) points up the interdependency of referent and sign. This issue can in turn be connected to performance and writing. No easy opposition of the two is possible, in that the opening of the poem dramatizes itself as a rhetorical archive; unlike in passages which record factual details, such as athletic victories or political successes (e.g. P.1.32, 71-2), here the archival function is instantiated by the text's temporal structure.³²¹

The formation of an historical Pindaric archive through collections of the texts and the supplementary scholarship devoted to them extends this structuring. But while the opposition between the text written and performed may not be absolute, there are ways in which apprehension of the two modes differs. On the one hand, a comparison can be made between the particularity of a performance and that of the material document. Practices of copying in the ancient world meant that, like a performance, each book was a unique, non-reduplicable entity, notwithstanding the conventional use of certain writing styles, and the standardized deployment of lectional signs. The text's idealizing description of performance, however, highlights the supplementarity of writing as a something absent from what the text itself

³²⁰ Cf. *Dith.* 2.1-17 with Furley and Bremer (2001) ad loc, and Athanassaki (2009) 248.

³²¹ This structure is modelled on the description of the Muses at Hes. *Th.* 2-4, where present tenses are used in a similar way to denote continuous activity (αἵ θ' Ἑλικῶνος ἔχουσιν ὄρος μέγα τε ζάθεόν τε, / καί τε περὶ κρήνην ἰοειδέα πόσσ' ἀπαλοῖσιν / ὀρχεῦνται καὶ βωμὸν ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος, 'who hold the great and holy mountain of Helicon and dance around the dark spring with tender feet, and the altar of Cronus' mighty son') thereafter, however, there is a switch to aorists and imperfects (χοροὺς ἐνεποιήσαντο 7, ἐπερρώσαντο δὲ ποσσίν 8, ἐννύχια στεῖχον, 10). Eschewing such a temporal shift, the opening of P.1 emphasises the continuousness of its referents to a greater extent.

describes. In order to clarify this issue, we may compare the figuration of writing in texts written specifically for inclusion within a book, where a self-consciousness often emerges about the interaction between writing and text. One example of this is Propertius 1.18, where the narrator mobilizes the conceits of pastoral poetry in order to mourn Cynthia's harshness. At 19-22, the narrator describes himself as writing Cynthia's name on trees. This internal figuration of writing is reduplicated by the dissemination of the text, as each copying of the text both cites and replays the fictional inscription of Cynthia's name; the process of copying the book therefore continues, albeit in an ironised fashion, the project of the text itself.³²²

When thinking about P.1 as a documentary poem, we are faced with a different interpretative situation. Because writing is not mentioned by the text, the documentary medium is extrinsic to the text's referential economy, and functions in relation to it as a purely supplementary and external mode. The references to performance and the descriptions of the instrument's sound also have the effect of situating writing as the other of the text, as a medium radically different from performance, or the performance of this particular text. Moreover, unlike in the case of Prop. 1.18, where the interplay of text and medium brought about at 19-22 is the result of authorial design and narratorial self-figuration, the similar interplay in P.1 emerges from the conjunction of text and medium, unmediated by any explicit textual formulation and therefore not articulated by authorial control. The unlocalizability of the point at which the relation between writing and text emerges is important: whereas Prop. 1.18 attempts to assert a measure of control over its medium by dramatizing (a mode of) writing as a fictional construct the fictionalization of which precedes and marks its concrete material dissemination, in P.1 writing appears to intrude onto the text as the ground of the reader's access to it, but as a medium ungrounded in the strategies of the text itself. Yet this approach to writing as the text's supplementary other is only made possible by the text's existence in written form, and it might be suggested that the supplementary relation can be reversed, so that the notion of the text as a performance piece becomes the supplement to the written text, as the latter forms the basis of an imaginative engagement with the text as realized in performance.³²³ The text's capacity to cause its written medium to appear as its supplementary other, and the simultaneous necessity of the written medium to the book's function is emblematic of the other interactions I have discussed. In bringing about an *othering of the written itself* by exposing the documentary medium to a textual construct whose rhetoric excludes it, P.1 evinces the transformational

³²² For an extended analysis and further references cf. Phillips (2011) 106-15.

³²³ This is the position taken by the scholiasts, who habitually refer to Pindar 'writing' his poems.

aspect of the literary text even as it is itself resited by its material aspect. The material text of P.1 is a space where the discontinuities between language and its materiality take on interpretative significance.

Another passage which bears on the relation between the performed and the written text is 25-6, where the narrator rounds off the description of Typhos buried under Aetna with a description of how the mountain and its hidden villain appear:

κεῖνο δ' Ἀφαίστοιο κρουνοὺς ἔρπετόν
δεινοτάτους ἀναπέμπει· τέρας μὲν
θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι,
θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι ...

This creature sends out Hephaestus' most terrible springs, a marvellous portent to behold, and a wonder even to hear of from those present ...

These lines dramatize the importance of the notions of immediacy and immediate experience (τέρας μὲν θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι), but stress that hearing about Etna second hand is also a θαῦμα. There is likely to be a difference in meaning between τέρας and θαῦμα, the former referring to the visual process of interpreting a sign, in this case inferring from the Ἀφαίστοιο κρουνοὺς the presence of the creature hidden beneath the mountain, and the latter more neutrally to the sense of 'wonder' felt on hearing the description.³²⁴ This difference, however, is not registered by Σ P.1.47c (Drach. II pp. 14-15), the only extant ancient interpretation of the line, which equates the two experiences: ὁ δὲ νοῦς· ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ τοῦ Ἥφαίστου ἔρπετόν κρουνοὺς πυρὸς δεινοτάτους ἀναδίδωσι, θαυμαστόν μὲν ἰδεῖν, θαυμαστόν δὲ καὶ τῶν παρόντων καὶ ἑωρακότων ἀκοῦσαι ('the meaning: this creature of Hephaestus sends up most terrible streams of fire, a wondrous thing to see, and a wondrous thing to hear about from those who were present and have seen it').

As well as describing the marvellousness of the mountain and the spread of its fame, these lines also implicitly refer to the circumstances of the performance. In this sense, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι references the situation of the audience, who are hearing about the eruptions second hand. Many of the audience at the first performance, and indeed the chorus, living near the volcano, would doubtless have seen the eruptions for themselves, although visitors from beyond the immediate area may not have done. Audiences at later

³²⁴ Cf. *Pitiche* p. 338.

reperformances elsewhere in the Greek world may likewise have only heard about Etna. Regardless of the precise resonance of the phrase for a given individual or group, however, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι describes the force of the poem itself; its verbal recreation of Etna is a θαῦμα to be admired. Similarly, the use of προσιδέσθαι carries a secondary reference to the visuality of the description at 21-4, with its vivid pictures of belching flames and rocks rolling to the sea; reading the text is a (re)creative moment of *enargeia*.³²⁵ Engagement with choral performance is represented in these lines not as a purely immediate experience, but rather as entailing fictive recreation and the intervention of the various subjective experiences of individual listeners. These lines also apply to the experience of reading, wherein παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι takes on the added resonance of ‘hearing about’/(re)imagining a performance by people who had been ‘present’ to see the eruptions. Significantly for the poem’s documentary status, the line legitimizes second-hand dissemination as a means of access to the text.

The poem ends with a passage which highlights the importance of ethics as a constituent part of readerly response to epinician, a feature thematically programmatic for the rest of the collection. The mention of ‘witnesses’ for Hiero’s deeds at 87-8 is important for setting up the ode’s paraenetic finale:

εἴ τι καὶ φλαῦρον παραιθύσσει, μέγα τοι φέρεται,
 παρ σέθεν. πολλῶν ταμίας ἐσσί· πολλοὶ
 μάρτυρες ἀμφοτέροις πιστοί.

If something unimportant leaps out from you, it is taken as important. You are steward of many things. There are many faithful witnesses of both.

Ancient and modern commentators have debated what ἀμφοτέροις refers to. The scholium on the second line interprets ἀμφοτέροις alternatively as referencing ‘the true and the false’ (presumably things done by Hiero, with the previous ἀψευδεῖ δὲ πρὸς ἄκμονι (86) in mind) or ‘you and your son’, and records Dionysius Sidonius’ interpretation of the phrase as referring to ‘you and your associates’. None of these readings is particularly convincing; it is

³²⁵ The visual ‘realism’ of the poem is registered at Σ P.1.17b (Drach. II p. 11), glossing the description of the eagle: ὑγρὸν νῶτον: τὸν εὐδιάχυτον ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς. γραφικώτατα δὲ συνδιατιθέμενον τῇ ᾠδῇ καὶ θελγόμενον τὸν ἀετὸν ὑπετύπωσεν. ‘Rippling back’: made fluid by pleasure. He produces a most vivid impression of the eagle’s bewitchment and its disposition to the song.’

preferable rather to take it as referring both to good and bad deeds, a sense which looks forward to the dichotomy of Phalaris and Croesus in the final passage.³²⁶

Such a reading is paralleled in Σ P.1.169 (Drach. II p. 27), which comments that ‘rulers’ errors are great’ because of their social position:

εἴ τι καὶ φλαῦρον παραιθύσσει: λείπει ὁ γάρ· ἐὰν γάρ τι καὶ εὐτελὲς παρὰ σοῦ
λεχθῆ καὶ ὀρμήση, καὶ τοῦτο μέγα καὶ διὰ πάντων φέρεται. φησὶ δὲ μεγάλα εἶναι
τὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀμαρτήματα, κἂν εὐτελῆ τυγχάνη. εἰ καὶ τι οὖν εὐτελὲς
ἀμάρτης, τοῦτο μέγιστον ἔσται.

‘If something unimportant leaps out’: He leaves out something like the following: for if something small is spoken by you and you drive it on, it will be taken as important by everyone. He says that rulers’ errors are great, even when they do something small. If you err in something small, it will be important.

In modern scholarship, however, 87-8 have usually, like the ending of O.1, been interpreted encomiastically, their implication being that Hiero’s deeds are to be assessed positively.³²⁷ Although such an encomiastic element is at work, the lines’ paraenetic force should also be registered. This passage dramatizes the audience, and the wider citizen body, as ‘witnesses’ who hold their ruler to account. The specification of the witnesses as ‘faithful’ demands that they respond in a way which fits the nature of what is being responded to, and concomitantly the ability to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate forms of behaviour. Hiero emerges from these lines as a figure overseen by his audience. The passage validates his power by constructing it as the outcome of popular co-operation and legitimization; like the chorus at the beginning of the poem, his position is relational, in part dependent on how he is perceived. Within the poem, 87-8 anticipate the Phalaris/Croesus dyad, both of whom are subjects for the kind of judgement referenced here. Within the collection, the lines also recall O.1.33-4 and the dynamic at work there between the poem’s own judgement and the open future to which it will be exposed. Later readers are also put in the position of μάρτυρες, weighing, from different vantage points from those open to the poem’s first audiences, the *laudandus*’ achievements and thereby participating in the construction of his fame.

³²⁶ So *Pitiche* p. 360.

³²⁷ Cf. Race (1986) 48.

The end of the poem continues this ethicizing thrust, and also gains programmatic force from its place in the book:

μη δολωθῆς,
ὦ φίλε, κέρδεσιν ἐντραπέ-
λοις· ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας

οἷον ἀποικομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει
καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς. οὐ φθίνει Κροί-
σου φιλόφρων ἀρετά.

τὸν δὲ ταύρω χαλκῆε καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον 95

ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντᾶ φάτις,
οὐδέ νιν φόρμιγγες ὑπωρόφαι κοινανίαν
μαλθακὰν παίδων ὀάροισι δέκονται.

τὸ δὲ παθεῖν εὔπρωτον ἀέθλων·

εὔδ' ἀκούειν δευτέρα μοῖρ'· ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀνήρ
ὅς ἂν ἐγκύρση καὶ ἔλη, στέφανον ὕψιστον δέδεκται. 100

Do not be deceived, my friend, by glib gains. The loud acclaim of renown that survives a man is all that reveals the way of life of departed men to chroniclers and singers. The kindly excellence of Croesus does not perish, but Phalaris, with his pitiless mind, who burned men in a bronze bull, is encompassed everywhere by a hateful reputation; lyres that resound beneath the roof do not welcome him as a theme in gentle unity with the voices of boys. Successfulness is the first of prizes, being well spoken of the second; but a man who encounters and wins both has received the highest garland.

Within a reading process dictated by the hierarchy of the epinician books, reading the Pythians after the Olympians, this passage works as a recapitulation and expansion of the programmatic and exemplary functions of O.1. The deployment of Croesus and Phalaris as a double exemplum of the positive and negative aspects of tyranny expands on the reflection on tyranny's benefits and limitations at O.1.114. In O.1 the transgressive potentialities of monarchic rule remain largely implicit; the stress of the Tantalus narrative, for instance, falls on his relations with the gods, and his inability 'to digest his great good fortune' (καταπέψαι / μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, 55-6) rather than on his political position within his kingdom. In the final passage of P.1, however, relations between tyrant and community are to the fore.

Croesus is praised for his φιλόφρων ἀρετά, a phrase which, given the poem's Delphic connections, probably connotes his renowned gifts to Apollo as well as his kindness as a ruler. Phalaris, on the other hand, is figured as a paradigm of cruelty, his burning of men in a bronze bull (τὸν δὲ ταύρω χαλκῆς καυτῆρα) emblematic of a transgressiveness that denatures both the natural world, by using the image of an animal as an instrument of torture, and the laws of human communities. Hiero's position relative to these two exempla is marked by a difference in temporal figuration. Whereas Croesus and Phalaris are described using present tenses (οὐ φθίνει 94, κατέχει 96, δέκονται, 98), Hiero is addressed with an optative (καιρὸν εἰ φθέγξαιο, 81), imperatives at 86 (μὴ παρίει καλά. νόμα δικάω πηδαλίω στρατόν· ἀψευδεῖ δὲ πρὸς ἄκμονι χάλκευε γλῶσσαν, 'do not put aside good deeds. Guide your people with a just rudder. Forge your tongue on an anvil free of falsehood'), a conditional followed by an imperative at 90 (εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοᾶν ἀδεῖαν αἰεὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις, 'if you wish always to hear pleasant reports, do not weary of too much expenditure') and a hortatory subjunctive at 92 (μὴ δολωθῆς). This creates a contrast between the fixed, determined state of Croesus and Phalaris, and the figuration of Hiero, whose conduct is still in the process of being defined. The shift to the perfect tense in the final line (στέφανον ὑψιστον δέδεκται) complicates this opposition; the grammatical subject of this verb is the indefinite ἀνὴρ / ὅς, but Hiero is clearly the implied subject, as a victor who has earned both success at the games, and good repute through the poem. While the perfect tense connotes a completed process, the indefiniteness of its subject and the conditionality implied by the preceding imperatives and subjunctives imply a figuration which is still uncompleted.³²⁸

So while Croesus and Phalaris are denoted as completed figures who have assumed a fixed place in the poem's projected system of values, Hiero as a textual figure remains in the process of being constructed, his finitude deferred by the nature of the demands made on him by the text's moral imperatives; these remain resistant to textual closure in that they point beyond the text to the horizon of an empirical history. Hiero as a textual figure connotes, by

³²⁸ Race (1986) 47-8 comments on the encomiastic function of paraenetic speech, following Arist. *Rhet.* 1367b37 (cf. also Pernot (1993) 710-24). I differ from Race in seeing Hiero as a textual figure as well as an historical individual, with the effect that the text creates a simulacrum of real-world power relations. Cf. Athanassaki (2009) 254-59: she argues (p. 259) that '[p]osthumous inclusion in the sympotic repertoire was ... the ultimate challenge for tyrants', and sees this passage as 'portraying the human side of the tyrant' so as to win him aristocratic favour (cf. *ibid.* p. 272). While sympotic reperformance was doubtless important, her focus on this as a means of posthumous dissemination is rather narrow; other types of 'performances', such as private readings, would doubtless have played a part. For 97-8 as potentially anticipating reperformance cf. Budelmann (2012) 178-9, and 179 n. 18 for the suggestion that it may anticipate the performance of Bacch. fr. 20c, an encomium composed for the same victory.

means of an oscillation between the negative and positive courses exemplified by Phalaris and Croesus, the challenge of respecting and maintaining the laws of human conduct and avoiding excess. Alongside, and in co-operation with, the poem's celebration of success, the unforclosed nature of Hiero's textual figuration acts as a reminder of the difficulties of correct social conduct. As with O.1, we see the material document recapitulating the text's rhetoric: the diachronicity of the material document participates in Hiero's fame, enshrining the celebration of his success in a transhistorical form, while also enforcing his suspended figuration. Reading P.1 as programmatic for the Pythians as a whole, then, involves the reader in an intertextual relation with O.1, from which emerges a juxtaposition of different figurations of a single character, and hence a reconfiguration of the exemplary modality. Moreover, as with O.1, reading P.1 entails an encounter with a series of ethical imperatives to which the reader is also subject. The openness of these formulations stresses their continuing importance.

RECEPTION AND REREADING

So far I have focussed on the role of material and metatextual factors in shaping approaches to the book, and tried to account for the potential impact on readings of Pindar of changing historical circumstances. I want now to consider the consequences of Hellenistic literary reception of Pindar for readerly engagement with these poems. Earlier, I touched on the potential for a poem such as Theocritus *Idyll* 17 to affect readings of the 'classic' texts on which it is modelled, and I want now to expand on some of the issues raised there by considering the possible relations between another Theocritean poem, *Idyll* 16, written for Hiero II, and Pindar's poems for the tyrants.³²⁹ As has often been noted, Theocritus' description of the difficulties of the contemporary poet contains a tissue of Pindaric references which position Theocritus in relation to his epinician predecessor.³³⁰ Theocritus'

³²⁹ On the dating of Theoc. 16 cf. Gow (1950).

³³⁰ Cf. e.g. Clapp (1913); Perrotta (1925); Hunter (1996) 82-90. González (2010) stresses the importance of civic elegy as a model. Hunter (1996) 87 points out the possibility of a connection between P.1 as written to celebrate Hiero's founding of Aetna and *Id.* 16's celebration of Hiero II having recently come to power. This, however, depends on a date for *Id.* 16 early in Hiero's reign, which is by no means certain. González (2010) 69 finds difficulties with the notion of P.1 as a model for *Id.* 16 but overstates the case, particularly in his view that Theocritus' sarcasm has no Pindaric precedent (cf. P.2.72-96); while it is true that *Id.* 16 departs from its Pindaric models in various ways, his assessment (pp. 70-1) of *Id.* 16 as an ethicizing intervention into Syracusan society could equally well describe, with the requisite historical and generic adjustments, Pindar's own poetry.

critique of miserly patrons at 5-21 depends in part on Pindar's figuration of the ideal relation between patron and poet, as at P.1.89-92.³³¹

εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργᾷ παρμένων,
εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοᾶν ἀδεῖαν αἰ-
εὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις· 90
ἐξίει δ' ὥσπερ κυβερνάτας ἀνήρ
ἰστίον ἀνεμόεν πετάσαις. μὴ δολωθῆς,
ὦ φίλε, κέρδεσιν ἐντραπέλοις·

Abiding in a flourishing temper, if you wish always to hear pleasant reports, do not weary of too much expenditure; go forward as a helmsman spreading the windy sail. Do not be deceived, my friend, by glib gains.

Theocritus' complaint at 15 about patrons who 'have been vanquished by acquisitiveness' (νενίκηνται δ' ὑπὸ κερδέων) is also modelled on a common Pindaric topos,³³² and the repeated injunction not to hoard wealth recalls, for instance, I.1.67-8:

εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον,
ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ, ψυχὰν Αἴδα τελέων
οὐ φράζεται δόξας ἀνευθεν.

If someone hoards secret wealth within, and attacks others with laughter, he does not consider that he is readying his soul for Hades without reputation.

But there are also important differences between the rhetorical stances of Theocritus' complaint at 5-21 and Pindar's advice to Hiero in P.1. As argued above, Pindar's imperatives and subjunctives construct the poem as a dialogue whose subject is in the process of being constructed, whereas Theocritus' questions meet with a glum answer (14), and 14-21 consist of a description of a fixed state of affairs. There are also structural differences; unlike Pindar, Theocritus never addresses his (prospective) patron directly. Theocritus' treatment of Pindar in *Id.* 16 is complicated further by the fact that the latter is one of three main models, the more important, at least ostensibly, being Homer, directly referenced at 20 as the miserly

³³¹ Hunter (1996) 86 n. 26 notes that ὡς πάρος at 14 signals the reworking of a previous passage.

³³² Cf. P.3.54, N.9.33.

patron's catch-all poet of choice, and the subject of the exemplum of the bestowal of poetic fame on Odysseus at 51-7,³³³ and Simonides, the poet responsible at 34-47 for the immortalization of the Thessalian nobles.³³⁴ With regard to our perception of Pindar, a certain relativization is at work, as Pindaric texts are constructed as one set of positions among others within the encomiastic corpus.

There are also crucial differences of tone and lexis which help to mark Theocritus' poem off from his precursors. Important here are the details of 16.90-7, where the spiders spinning webs over armour and the pastoral scenes are very different from anything found in Pindar's prayer for peace at P.1.67-75, which is one of the models for the passage.³³⁵

ἀγρούς δ' ἐργάζονται τεθαλότας· αἱ δ' ἀνάριθμοι	90
μήλων χιλιάδες βοτάνᾳ διαπιανθεῖσαι	
ἄμ πεδίον βληχῶντο, βόες δ' ἀγεληδὸν ἐς αὖλιν	
ἐρχόμεναι σκνιφαῖον ἐπισπεύδοιεν ὀδίταν·	
νειοὶ δ' ἐκπονέοιντο ποτὶ σπόρον, ἀνίκα τέττιξ	
ποιμένας ἐνδίοις πεφυλαγμένος ὑψόθι δένδρων	95
ἄχει ἐν ἀκρεμόνεσσι· ἀράχνια δ' εἰς ὄπλ' ἀράχναι	
λεπτὰ διαστήσαιντο, βοᾶς δ' ἔτι μηδ' ὄνομ' εἶη.	

May they work fertile fields. Unnumbered thousands of sheep fattened with grazing bleat on the plain, and cattle in herds return to the stall hastening a darkened traveller. May fallows be worked for seed, when the cicada watches over the midday shepherds, echoing from on high in the trees' branches. May spiders spin their delicate webs over armour, and the war-cry not even be named.

The inclusion of the pastoral scene at 90-3 exemplifies the poem's generic complexity,³³⁶ and provides a means of marking Theocritus' panegyric treatment as distinct from Pindar's. Also, the stylistically marked λεπτὰ turns the cobwebs into a figure for Theocritus' own treatment, with the arms standing for Hiero's putative achievements, and the webs for

³³³ Cf. also 74-5, and Hunter (1996) 90-7.

³³⁴ Cf. Hunter (1996) 97-109; Acosta-Hughes (2010) 179-86.

³³⁵ Cf. e.g. the echo of P.1.72 in βοᾶς δ' ἔτι μηδ' ὄνομ' εἶη.

³³⁶ A point sharpened by the spondaic ending of 91. Cf. Hunter (1996) 89 on the poem as 'a brilliant and challenging experiment' subsuming a wide variety of generic forms. Acosta-Hughes (2010) 183-4 reads 40-7 as presenting a catalogue of Simonidean genres (threnoi, musical compositions, epinicians); I would further suggest that this passage stands for the wider generic inclusivity of the poem itself.

O Graces, Eteoclus' goddesses, O you who love Minyan Orchomenos that is hated by Thebes, if unsummoned I shall stand fast, but I shall go to those that call on me heartened by the presence of our Muses. I shall not leave you behind. For what is desirable to men without the Graces? May I always be with the Graces.

Theocritus signals his relationship with Pindar by siting the Graces at Orchomenus (105), alluding to that city's prominence as a cult centre of the Graces but also to Pindar's depiction of Orchomenus in O.14. A more specific echo occurs at 108-9, where τί γὰρ Χαρίτων ἀγαπητόν / ἀνθρώποις ἀπάνευθεν; recalls O.14.5-7, where Pindar describes the Graces' role in human civilization (σὺν γὰρ ὑμῖν τά τε τερπνὰ καὶ / τὰ γλυκὲ' ἀνεταί πάντα βροτοῖς, / εἰ σοφός, εἰ καλός, εἴ τις ἀγλαὸς ἀνήρ, 'with your favour all sweet and pleasant things are accomplished by mortals, if a man is wise, or fair, or famous'). The final phrase of the poem also echoes Pindar, as the Theocritean narrator's wish to be 'always with the Graces' recalls Pindar's wish to associate with victors and be conspicuous for his wisdom at O.1.116-17 (ἐμέ τε ποσσάδε νικαφόροις / ὀμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφία καθ' Ἑλ- / λανας ἔόντα παντῶ). But the Theocritean narrator's claims are strikingly different from those of his model; whereas Pindar claims the right to associate on equal terms with victors, and is unabashed about making claims for intellectual respect, the Theocritean speaker, in the straightened circumstances described through the poem, eschews Pindar's grand social claims, and instead claims a more direct relationship with the Graces, picking up on the proximity signalled by Μοῖσαισι σὺν ἀμετέραισιν ἴοιμ' ἄν.³³⁸

Generic differentiation may also be at issue if we detect in ἀνίκα τέττιξ ... ἀχεῖ ἐν ἀκρεμόνεσσιν (94-6) an allusion to Pindar's use of Echo in O.14. Although ἠχή is a common word for 'sound'/'echo', the poem's general engagement with Pindar and the close relations between O.14 and the ending, as well as the metapoetic dimensions of Theocritus' τέττιξ and Pindar's Echo, strengthen the connection. On this reading, the intervention of the bucolic τέττιξ into the higher genres of hymn/encomium is emphasized by its displacement of Pindar's Echo.³³⁹ The mention of Eteoclus at 104, and the close association formed between him and the Graces (ὦ Ἐτεόκλειοι Χάριτες θεαί) caps O.14 by including a detail not found in Pindar's version, and also prefigures the close relationship between the poet and the

³³⁸ The Muses and the Graces are equated here, unlike in Pindar; cf. Hunter (1996) 84.

³³⁹ See below pp. 182-92 for Echo as a metapoetic figure in O.14 and Germany (2005) on Echo in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* as (possibly) a symbol of intertextuality.

Graces elaborated in the final line.³⁴⁰ One might also read ἀπεχθόμενον ποτε Θήβαις as metonymically signalling an agonistic relationship with the Theban Pindar via the vehicle of Theocritus' rewritten Orchomenus: the exaggerated hostility of the metapoetic ἀπεχθόμενον conflicts ironically with the narrator's pose of powerlessness earlier in the poem.³⁴¹

As Richard Hunter has pointed out, however, the meaning of Χάριτες is put into question by the intertextual networks in which the poem involves itself.³⁴² The word itself can refer to 'pay', 'honour', 'favour', and poems themselves, and the conceptualization of the Χάριτες is complicated by the relationship with Simonides and the traditions surrounding him. At 16.8-12 Theocritus envisages his Graces as papyrus rolls trapped in a chest:

αἶ δὲ σκυζόμεναι γυμνοῖς ποσὶν οἴκαδ' ἴασι,
πολλὰ με τωθάζοισαι, ὅτ' ἀλιθίην ὁδὸν ἦλθον,
ὀκηραὶ δὲ πάλιν κενεᾶς ἐν πυθμένι χηλοῦ 10
ψυχροῖς ἐν γονάτεσσι κάρη μίμνοντι βαλοῖσαι,
ἔνθ' αἰεὶ σφισιν ἔδρη, ἐπὴν ἄπρακτοὶ ἴκωνται.

They go home complaining on naked feet, and reproach me heavily for their vain journey. Timid, they rest again in the bottom of an empty coffer, bending their heads over their cold knees. Their seat is always there when they return unsuccessful.

It has long been recognized that this passage alludes to a well known anecdote which forms part of the tradition about Simonides' avaricious personality, recorded by Stobaeus 3.10.38:

Σιμωνίδην παρακαλοῦντος τινὸς ἐγκώμιον ποιῆσαι καὶ χάριν ἔξειν λέγοντος.
ἀργύριον δὲ μὴ διδόντος 'δύο' εἶπεν οὗτος 'ἔχω κιβωτούς, τὴν μὲν χαρίτων, τὴν δὲ
ἀργυρίου· καὶ πρὸς τὰς χρείας τὴν μὲν τῶν χαρίτων κενὴν εὐρίσκω, ὅταν ἀνοίξω,
τὴν δὲ χρησίμην μόνην'.

³⁴⁰ For the story of Eteoclus cf. Paus. 9.38.1, who says that the three stones representing the Graces fell from heaven 'for Eteoclus', and Σ O.14.inscr.c, which cites Hesiod for the story.

³⁴¹ The historical reference is to Thebes' sack of Orchomenos in 364 BC.

³⁴² Hunter (1996) 105. A similar negotiation is at work in the use of κέρδος and ὄνασις and their cognates; at 15, the former refers to the purely monetary and material 'gains' to which misers are in thrall (νενίκηνηται δ' ὑπὸ κερδέων), but at 22 it is used to question the value of the 'gain' which comes from stored wealth; the polyvalent meanings of ὄνασις as both 'benefit' and 'profit' are at issue at 23, and again at 57 where the Ionian bards 'benefit/profit' their subjects (εἰ μὴ σφεας ὤνασαν ἰάονος ἀνδρὸς ἀοιδαί).

Someone asked Simonides to compose an encomium and said that they would compensate him. When they did not give him money he said ‘I have two coffers, one for graces, the other for silver. I find the one empty of graces for practical purposes whenever I open it, and only the other is of any use.’

Gow comments that whereas in the anecdote χάριτες means ‘thanks’, in Theocritus ‘the symbolism is less clear. His χηλός is apparently a receptacle for books and money alike’.³⁴³ In using a poet as a means to criticise the miserliness of patrons, Theocritus deploys Simonides ‘as both a positive and a negative exemplum for both poet and patron’.³⁴⁴ But this passage also has consequences for how we might read Theocritus’ engagement with Pindar in the poem’s concluding passage. The sense of Χάριτες as documents in 8-12 carries over into the final passage as well, creating a polyvalent set of meanings wherein the Graces are both personifications, material rewards, and material documents. This gives rise to the possibility of reading ἀεὶ Χαρίτεσσιν ἄμ’ εἶην as ‘may I always be with my [Graces in the form of] documents’, realizing the image of the poet who is bound up absolutely with his compositions, and hence a disjunction between the flesh and blood author and the literary identity inscribed within the material document; on this reading, ἐς δὲ καλεύντων / θαρσῆσας Μοῖσαισι σὺν ἀμετέραισιν ἴοιμ’ ἄν points not to the wandering poet arriving at his patron’s home but to the book-based manifestation of a purely textual figure. The final lines of the poem therefore stage a conflict between the figuration of a close personal relationship between the poet and the personalized Graces, and that of the author as a disembodied adjunct to the material manifestations of his texts. The conflicted implications of these two figurations of poetical activity testify to the complexity of the poet’s role in mediating competing models of poetic activity.

The multiplicity of Theocritus’ Χάριτες extends to their generic aspect as well; Reinhold Merkelbach has shown that they are fashioned to represent a band of children going from house to house, who would sing songs in exchange for food or small gifts.³⁴⁵ As such, they provide an index for the generic complexity of the poem as a whole; this process highlights the constructedness of the literary discourses in which the negotiations of patronage is played

³⁴³ Gow (1950) 308. The Graces also multivalent in epinician: cf. MacLachlan (1993) 87-123, Currie (2011) 283.

³⁴⁴ Hunter (1996) 105.

³⁴⁵ Merkelbach (1952). González (2010) 85-7 sees the Graces as also metaphorizing the figure of the poet travelling from performance to performance, but the symbolism also encompasses the peripatations of material documents.

out, forming part of what Hunter terms Theocritus' project of 'expos[ing] the realities of poetic patronage'.³⁴⁶ These various strategies turn up different ways of rereading the Pindaric texts on which they draw. On one level, the criticism of contemporary patrons at 5-21, and the validation of Simonides at 34-47, implicitly constructs Pindaric and Simonidean past as an idealized locus wherein the relations between poets and patrons were played out according to the demands of reciprocal *φιλία*. Similarly, the generic and conceptual complexity of Theocritus' *Χάριτες* raises the possibility of an opposition between a generically complex, text-based, Theocritean poetics and a relatively more simple Pindaric model. The self-consciousness with which Theocritus explores the realities of patronage and the constructedness of its discourses could be read as retrospectively undermining Pindar's discourse by exposing its fictionality and inscribing a multiplicity of meanings into the Pindaric model, or as doing the opposite, emphasizing the intimacy of Pindar's relations with the tyrants by highlighting the conversational directness of his paraenetic discourses. But these oppositions, and the modes of reading predicated on them, quickly break down, partly in the light of the complexities of Pindar's construction of praise I considered in my readings of O.1 and P.1, and partly because the Theocritean situation (re)alerts the reader to these complexities. The treatment of *τιμή* at 66-7, for example, (*αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τιμὴν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων φιλότητα / πολλῶν ἡμιόνων τε καὶ ἵππων πρόσθεν ἐλοίμαν*, 'I would have honour and men's love before many mules and horses') which refers to both the 'honour' and 'pay' demanded by the poet,³⁴⁷ plays on the complexity of the relation between material and symbolic capital already explored by Pindar, whose injunction to Hiero at P.1.90 to spend money on self-glorification (*εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοὰν ἀδεῖαν αἰεὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις*) cannot be divorced from the ethical imperatives that follow; no amount of songs would save a tyrant who behaved like Phalaris from infamy.

Much of the above analysis of O.1 and P.1 focussed on the effects created by the diachronic recontextualization of poems written for specific occasions, one aspect of which was the recalibration of elements such as addresses and advice to the victor, which in the diachronic situation operate as virtualized discourses rather than stylized dialogues with a living person. This situation shifts the terms of the interaction between poet and patron, both of whom become purely textual figures, and whose power relations are no longer anchored in a real set

³⁴⁶ Hunter (1996) 109.

³⁴⁷ Cf. Hunter (1996) 105, who reads the lines as playing on the double sense of *in* order to represent 'the doubleness of the patronage relationship, both its 'theory' and its reality'. For González (2010) 88-90, the rejection suffered by the Theocritean narrator at the outset of the poem is indicative of a breakdown in the social order and reciprocity represented by the Graces.

of historical circumstances. The invocation of the Graces at *Id.* 16.104-9, with its absence of any address to Hiero and its implicit emphasis on the materiality of the book, dramatizes precisely such a break with the conditions of patronage as is brought about by the text's diachronicity. It may also be possible to detect a more specific material aspect of this passage, namely a connection between the closural role of the invocation of the Graces in *Id.* 16 and the place of O.14 at the end of the Olympian book. In the light of our patchy knowledge of Pindaric editions in the 270s-60s this must remain speculative, but it is probable that at least some early Hellenistic books of the Olympians, or another similar grouping, had O.14 as their final poem, allowing the end of *Id.* 16 to be read as an allusion to a particularly material form of closure which expands on the conceptualization of the Graces as books at 8-12. And whatever the situation of Pindaric editions in Theocritus' time, we can certainly say that the editions of the late third and second century, and indeed later antiquity, would have opened up the possibility of such a reading whether or not Theocritus originally intended such an allusion.

The construction of the Graces in *Id.* 16 as both personifications and documents, and the poem's recycling and problematization of the terms of panegyric poetry, are part of the way the poem constitutes itself as a reading of the panegyric tradition. The contextuality of this reading, so strongly emphasised in, for example, the critique at 5-21, prompts a consideration of the contextuality of the reading practices more generally. Certainly, a model of reading epinician which privileges the context of the original performance as a site of meaning, and which focuses on the text as authorially constructed, is an important tool for enabling some of the critical discourses we wish to construct about Pindar, but it is important to acknowledge that these are not the only nor necessarily the most important readings possible. Awareness of this issue is strengthened by the strategies of *Id.* 16. In probing the discourses of patronage and in juxtaposing different registers (hymn, epinician, children's song), *Id.* 16 participates in the possibility, also manifest in the editorial realizations of the texts described above, of a shift in perceptions of Pindaric texts, away from seeing them as performance pieces, and towards (also) seeing them as formalized diachronic structures capable of serving as generic models. In this sense, for example, the Theocritean reinterrogation of what it means to be a good patron can be read as picking up on the openness of the paraenesis in P.1, continuing the negotiations dramatized in that poem.

The belatedness which forms such an important part of Theocritus' narratorial stance in *Id.* 16, albeit mediated by other factors, also has consequences for perceptions of Pindar. Richard Hunter argues that the poem stages an 'ironic acknowledgement that the language of

patronage has been preserved, but its meaning irretrievably altered in the march of time and circumstance: the attempt to recreate the archaic relationship of Pindar and Hiero I must always remain an imaginative, literary *mimesis*.³⁴⁸ But the gap that Hunter points to here between present and past also applies to Pindar's poetry itself in a Hellenistic context, where the depiction of poet/patron relations serves as an index for historical changes as well as a record of previous times; Theocritus' ironized attempt 'to recreate the archaic relationship of Pindar and Hiero I' prompts consideration of the secondariness of the epinician text as constituted by the material document which, although it is born out of 'the archaic relationship of Pindar and Hiero I', can also be viewed as a *mimesis* or trace of an original performance. Moreover, the use of Pindar's poetry as a generic model also affects our reading of it, instantiating its claims of authority by means of a supplementation that highlights the texts' dependence on reception and reading for their efficacy.

Pindar's status as both a privileged model and as a corpus open to contestation leads, as we have already seen, to a complex intertextual situation where later receptions can be variously, and simultaneously, understood as co-operating with strategies already at work in the texts, as shifting our understanding of concepts important to the Pindaric corpus, as both validating and relativizing Pindar's status as a generic and stylistic exemplum, and as accentuating the specifically diachronic aspects of the text as a material document. We are also now in a position to see more clearly that some of the most distinctive features of Hellenistic poetics, such as the dramatization of the tensions between present and past, song and writing, socially embedded and disembedded poetic modes, were also at work in the encounters that Hellenistic authors (and readers generally) would have had with texts of the classical period. From this angle, the Graces of *Id.* 16, simultaneously goddesses and books, singers and simulacra, can be seen as an allegory of the experience of confronting a material instantiation of a performance poem. I shall return to some of these phenomena when reading O.14 in the context of the Hellenistic edition, but in my next chapter I want to look more closely at the archival qualities of O.10 and O.13 and their accompanying scholia.

³⁴⁸ Hunter (2003) 45.

EPINICIAN ARCHIVES: OLYMPIANS 10 AND 13

Having already touched on epinician's archival aspects, I now want to explore these further in relation to the scholarly projects of the Hellenistic period, and analyse some of the interactions between text and metatexts made possible by scholarly commentaries. My readings will also focus on the differences and continuities between poems in performance and on the page, focussing on O.10 and O.13. I shall argue that, in the case of the former, the scholia can be seen as continuing the text's archival project, and examine some of the potential effects of this scholarly supplementation on readers. In the case of O.13 I shall take a somewhat broader view of the relations between text and scholia. In addition to offering a reading of the poem's mythical narrative(s) and encomiastic functions, I shall explore the scholia's deployment of Corinthian myth and history, their interpretative significance, and the methodological problems they raise for a history of Pindaric textuality.

AETIOLOGIES

O.10 is perhaps the most extensively archival of the epinicians. The poem gives an aetiological account of Heracles' founding of the Olympian games in much more detail than O.3, whose main focus is the aetiology of the olive crowns worn by the Hellanodikai, and includes a catalogue of the first Olympian victors. As a narrative of the festival's foundations, it is significant that it falls in the middle rather than at the beginning of the book, and is preceded by O.1, wherein Pelops assumes the role of an archetypal Olympian competitor, and by O.3.³⁴⁹ As has often been remarked, Pindar makes Heracles' foundation of Olympia the action of a culture hero imposing order on disharmonious and lawless people.³⁵⁰ The foundation is linked to the story of the Augean stables, and to the killing of the Moliones, Cteatus and Eurytus (O.10.24-38):³⁵¹

³⁴⁹ Cf. Eckermann (2008) on the Panhellenic resonance of the O.10 myth. For the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* as prefiguring the Hermes cult at Olympia cf. Thomas (2010) 251 and (forthcoming). He argues that there are playful allusions in that poem to the tradition of Heracles founding the festival; at 101, for instance, Hermes is called Διὸς ἄλκιμος υἱός, a common formula for Heracles, instead of the formulas more commonly applied to him. He also notes a possible allusion at 118, where Hermes wrestles two cows (ἀμφοτέρως δ' ἐπὶ νῶτα χαμαὶ βάλει φυσιοώσας), to 'cults of Heracles where ephebes had to imitate him by lifting up the sacrificial cow', for which cf. Theophr. *Charac.* 25.7 with Diggle (2004) ad loc.

³⁵⁰ Nassen (1975) 229-30. Cf. Bernardini (1982) 58 for whom Heracles is defined by his 'giusta rivendicazione ... e della giusta vendetta verso quanti non hanno mantenuto gli impegni presi'.

³⁵¹ Cf. Hom. *Il.* 11.750-2 (καὶ νύ κεν Ἄκτοριῶνε Μολίονε παῖδ' ἀλάπαξα, / εἰ μὴ σφῶε πατὴρ εὐρὺ κρείων ἐνοσίχθων / ἐκ πολέμου ἐσάωσε καλύψας ἠέρι πολλῆ, 'I should have slain the Moliones, of Actor's blood, if their father the wide-ruling earthshaker had not brought them safe from the war and wrapped them in thick mist'), Paus. 5.2.1, and Diod. Sic. 4.33.3-6.

ἀγῶνα δ' ἐξαίρετον ἀεῖσαι θέμιτες ὤρσαν
Διός, ὃν ἀρχαίῳ σάματι παρ Πέλοπος
βωμῶν ἐξάριθμον ἐκτίσσατο, 25
ἐπεὶ Ποσειδάνιον
πέφνε Κτέατον ἀμύμονα,

πέφνε δ' Εὐρυτον, ὡς Αὐγέαν λάτριον
ἀέκονθ' ἐκὼν μισθὸν ὑπέρβιον
πράσσοιτο, λόχμασι δὲ δοκεύσαις ὑπὸ Κλεωνᾶν 30
δάμασε καὶ κείνους Ἡρακλέης ἐφ' ὀδῶ,
ὅτι πρόσθε ποτὲ Τιρύνθιον
ἔπερσαν αὐτῶ στρατόν
μυχοῖς ἤμενον Ἄλιδος

Μολιόνες ὑπερφίαλοι. καὶ μὰν ξεναπάτας
Ἐπειῶν βασιλεὺς ὄπιθεν 35
οὐ πολλὸν ἶδε πατρίδα πολυ-
κτέανον ὑπὸ στερεῶ πυρί
πλαγαῖς τε σιδάρου βαθὺν εἰς ὄχετον ἄτας
ἴζοισαν ἐὰν πόλιν.

Zeus' ordinances prompt me to sing of the chosen contest, which Heracles founded by Pelops' ancient tomb with its six altars, when he slew excellent Cteatus, Poseidon's son, and slew Eurytus, so that he might readily exact from mighty Augeas the wage for his labour that he was unwilling to give. Hiding in a thicket below Cleonae, he overcame them too on the road, because before the arrogant Moliones had destroyed his Tirynthian army when it camped in Elis' valleys. And indeed, not long thereafter, the Epeians' king, deceiver of guests, saw his rich country, his own city, sink into a deep trench of ruin under ravaging fire and blows of iron.

The scholia supplement this narrative in various ways. An expansion on the details given by Pindar is found at Σ O.10.32 (Drach. I p. 319), which reports that Heracles killed Cteatus and Eurytus, who were allies of Augeas, in order that he might more easily claim his rightful

payment for cleaning the stables.³⁵² The brief account of the Moliones' destruction of Heracles' army at 31-2 is expanded by Σ O.10.39a (Drach. I p. 321), which gives details of the Tirynthians involved in the battle against the Moliones: πολλοὺς συστρατεύσαντας αὐτῷ ἀπέκτειναν. οἱ δὲ ἀποθανόντες ἐν τῇ μάχῃ Τελαμῶν, Χαλκῶδων καὶ Ἴφικλῆς ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτοῦ ἀδελφός ('they killed many who fought with him. Telamon, Chalcodon and his eldest brother Iphicles died in the battle'). These supplements fill out our understanding of the myths and underscore the brevity of Pindar's treatment.

There follows the account of Heracles' foundation of Olympia (43-59). Pindar then presents a catalogue of the victors at the first Olympian games (60-75):

τίς δὴ ποταίνιον ἔλαχε στέφανον χείρεσσι ποσίν τε καὶ ἄρματι, ἀγώνιον ἐν δόξῃ θέμενος εὖχος, ἔργῳ καθελών;	60
στάδιον μὲν ἀρίστευσεν, εὐθὺν τόνον ποσσί τρέχων, παῖς ὁ Λικυμνίου Οἰωνός· ἴκεν δὲ Μιδέαθεν στρατὸν ἐλαύνων· ὁ δὲ πάλα κυδαίνων Ἔχεμος Τεγέαν· Δόρυκλος δ' ἔφερε πυγμαῖς τέλος, Τίρυνθα ναίων πόλιν· ἀν' ἵπποισι δὲ τέτρασιν	65
ἀπὸ Μαντινέας Σᾶμος ὁ Ἄλιροθίου· ἄκοντι {δὲ} Φράστῳρ ἔλασε σκοπὸν· μᾶκος δὲ Νικεὺς ἔδике πέτρῳ χέρα κυκλώσας ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων, καὶ συμμαχία θόρυβον παραίθυξε μέγαν· ἐν δ' ἔσπερον ἔφλεξεν εὐώπιδος σελάνας ἐρατὸν φάος.	70 75

³⁵² Σ O.10.33 and 34a-f (Drach. I pp. 319-20) present abridged versions of the narrative given in 32. Σ O.10.34g (Drach. I p. 320) gives similar information, but is datable, being a fragment of the geographer Mnaseas of Patara, active around 200 BC: ὅτι ἐν τῷ πρὸς Αὐγέα πολέμῳ Ἡρακλῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Μολιονιδῶν ἀλοῦς ἔφυγε, διὸ μνήσας αὐτοῖς τὸν περὶ Κλεωνᾶς συνεστήσατο λόχον, φησὶ Μνασέας ὁ Παταρεύς ('Mnaseas of Patara says that in the war against Augeas, Heracles was taken by the Molionidae and then fled, and on this account was angry with them and set an ambush for them in the region of Cleonae', = fr. 9 Müller). This is further supplemented by Σ 37f which reports that the brothers were killed on their way to the Isthmian games.

Who won the new crown with hands or feet or chariot, fixing in his mind a triumph in the contest and achieving it with action? Licymnius' son Oeonus triumphed in the stadion, rushing the straight stretch with his feet, who came leading his army from Midea. Echemus won for Tegea in the wrestling. Doryclus, who lived in Tiryns, won the prize for boxing. Samus the son of Halirothius from Mantinea won in the four-horsed chariot race. Phrastor hit the mark with the javelin. Niceus, with a sweep of his hand, cast the stone a distance beyond the others, and the alliance let fly with a great din. The lovely light of the moon's fair face glistened in the evening.

Again, the text's archival function in recording the names of the victors is extended by the scholia.³⁵³ At Σ O.10.78a-h (Drach. I pp. 329-30) various traditions are recorded about Oeonus son of Licymnius which extend and differ from Pindar's account; Σ 78a relays a version in which Oeonus is killed by Hippocoon, and also gives an etymology of his name:

τὸν Οἰωνὸν ὁ Πίνδαρος ἤδη ἠνδρωμένον νικῆσαι στάδιον περὶ τὴν πρώτην θέσιν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων, ἔνιοι δὲ φασιν αὐτὸν διεσπαράχθαι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἴπποκόωντος κυνῶν. ἐκλήθη δὲ οὕτως ὑφ' Ἡρακλέους διὰ τὸ ὀξέως αὐτὸν τρέχειν ὡς πτηνὸν καὶ μὴ καταλαμβάνεσθαι.

Pindar says that Oeonus was victorious in the stadion on the occasion of the first Olympian games, but others say that he was torn apart by Hippocoon's dogs. He was called thus by Heracles because he ran swiftly like a bird and was not caught.³⁵⁴

A slightly different version is given in Σ 78b: τὸν δὲ Οἰωνὸν Πίνδαρος ὡς ἤδη ἠνδρωμένον νικῆσαί φησι στάδιον περὶ τὴν πρώτην θέσιν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων· ἔνιοι δὲ παῖδα ὄντα αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἴπποκοωντιδῶν διεργάσθαι ('Pindar says that Oeonus was victorious in the stadion on the occasion of the first Olympian games, but some say that as a child he was killed by the Hippocoontidae').³⁵⁵ Like the glosses on the Moliones and the

³⁵³ Cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 223-4; Farnell (1932) 84 for the plausible suggestion that Pindar was making use of local records in composing this catalogue.

³⁵⁴ Cf. Paus. 3.15.3; Apollod. 2.7.3.

³⁵⁵ The latter scholium is clearly an abbreviated version of the first, and as such is a useful example of the details that can be lost during the processes of redaction. Cf. Σ O.10.79b (Drach. I p. 330-1) for the story of Echemus' killing of Hyllus, and Σ O.10.80 (Drach. I p. 331) for the citation of Hes. fr. 114 M-W reporting his marriage to Timandre. Also interesting are Σ O.10.83a-84d (Drach. I p. 331-3), a long and varied discussion based on

Tiryinthians, these comments on Oeonus are impossible to date with any precision. The mention of Oeonus' death in Σ 78b looks like a simplified version of the more detailed account in Σ 78a, which mentions Hippocoon's dogs and gives a more specific rendering of his death (διεσπάραχθαι). It might accordingly be hypothesised that the source for Σ 78b was a set of marginalia designed for use in schools or another simplified redaction of a more detailed commentary.³⁵⁶ Given the fluidity of how commentaries were formed, however, other sources, including the commentaries of the Hellenistic period, cannot be ruled out.³⁵⁷

The narration of these alternative versions reiterates the distinctiveness of Pindar's narrative, and also underlines the agonistic aspect of his poetics. At 51-5, the narrator describes the story he is narrating as being borne out by Time, a passage to which I shall return below, implicitly insisting on the factual correctness of his narrative. The alternative versions elaborated by the scholia encourage a questioning of whether the narrative is necessarily 'factually' true, or whether the question of its value should be apprehended in terms of its ethical significance or of its fitting application to the *laudandus*. However such questions are approached, we notice that the archival activity of the commentators does not simply duplicate that of the text but contributes to resituating the text within a broader cultural framework.

INTERTEXTS AND TEMPORALITIES

This resituation is particularly marked in Σ O.10.87c (Drach. I p. 334) which compares the reaction of the crowd to Niceus' cast (συμμαχία θόρυβον / παραίθυξε μέγαν, 'the alliance let fly a great din') with that of the Phaeacians to Odysseus at *Od.* 8.190-1:

τὸ δὲ καὶ συμμαχία θόρυβον, καὶ τοῖς παρεστῶσιν αὐτοῖς συμμάχοις ἔκπληξιν καὶ
 τάραχον ἐκίνησε μέγαν διὰ τὸ ὑπερβεβλημένον τῆς βολῆς θαῦμα. καὶ τοῦτο παρὰ
 τὸ Ὀμηρικόν·

κατὰ δ' ἔπτηξαν ποτὶ γαίῃ

Φαίηκες δολιχῆρετμοι, ναυσίκλυτοι ἄνδρες.

the text σᾶμ' Ἀλιφοθίου, combining a succinct assessment of the textual problem with a citation from the comic poet Diphilus (342-291 BC) for the tradition that a certain Semus was the first to win a chariot race at Olympia.

³⁵⁶ For Pindar in schools cf. Cribbiore (2001) 201-2; Ucciardello (2012) 117-18.

³⁵⁷ Cf. Ucciardello (2012) 119-26 on the excerpts from Theon's commentary on the Pythians represented by *POxy* 2536 with p. 225 n. 55 below.

‘Alliance ... din’; he even moved the allies who stood around with a great amazement and disturbance because of their overwhelming wonder at his throw. This is what Homer says: ‘They cowered down onto the earth, the Phaeaceans with their long oars, men famed for ships’.

Variations on this exegesis are recorded in Σ O.10.88b-d (Drach. I p. 334), 88d incorrectly glossing Niceus as the subject of παραίθυξε (ἀνήγειρε δὲ νικήσας ταραχὴν τοῖς συνοῦσιν· ἐβόησαν γὰρ θαυμάσαντες τῆς βολῆς τὸ μῆκος, ‘he stirred up a disturbance in those who were present when he won, for they cried out in wonder at the distance of his throw’). What is particularly interesting in this set of scholia is their emphasis on the shock and wonder of the crowd. At Σ O.10.87c (Drach. I p. 334) ἔκπληξι καὶ τάραχον ... μέγαν (‘amazement and great disturbance’) are mentioned, vocabulary which also occurs in Σ 88a (θαυμάσαν ἀνεβόησεν, ‘they cried out in wonder’), 88c (διὰ τὸ προβάλλειν τοὺς ἄλλους τῷ δίσκῳ διαταραχθῆναι εἰς τὸ πλῆθος ἀποθαυμάσαντας, ‘because of his throw the others wondered and were thrown into shock by the length of the discus cast’) and 88d. These readings are somewhat surprising given that θόρυβος does not necessarily have to connote shock or wonder but may indicate a more neutral ‘noise’.³⁵⁸ It seems likely that an early commentator, perhaps one of the great Hellenistic scholars, made the comparison with the passage in the *Odyssey*, reading Pindar’s crowd’s reaction as one of shock under the influence of this comparison, and that this reading held sway over later writers.

The comparison with the *Odyssey* is rather strained. Odysseus’ cast of the discus takes place in a particular context of display and competition, as he responds to being goaded by Euryalus about his (apparent) lack of athletic prowess (*Od.* 8.159-64). Moreover, the scholia as they stand do not quote the full sentence from the *Odyssey*, missing out the phrase which specifies that the Phaeacians were ‘cowering on the ground ... under his cast of the rock’ (ἔπτηξαν ποτὶ γαίῃ / ... λᾶος ὑπὸ ρίπτῃς), thus giving the misleading impression that their ‘cowering’ (ἔπτηξαν) is solely a consequence of their shock at Odysseus’ throw, when in fact they are avoiding the discus. There is no hint in Pindar’s narrative of the kind of conflicted atmosphere that prevails in the games of *Od.* 8, and there are no particularly close verbal echoes between the passages. Furthermore, the scholia do not make explicit the reasons for the comparison, and it could be argued that the relation between the passages is arbitrary and should not be given interpretative significance. Such a response, however,

³⁵⁸ Slater p. 239 gives ‘applause’, for which cf. LSJ s.v. § 2a; Race translates ‘a great shout’.

would overlook the importance of this set of scholia, however questionable their readings, for the ancient reception of the passage; the large number of scholia on this line indicates that its exegesis was felt to be important, and that the assembled scholia probably derive from a number of different commentaries. Even if individual readers did not accept the scholia's views, their responses to the passage would have at least in part been shaped by their awareness of them: contesting the intertextual connection is itself a critically significant gesture.

From another angle, the scholia can be seen as opening up a potentially significant intertextual/allusive dimension, inviting the reader to see Pindar as reworking the *Odyssey* passage and lending Niceus a further glory by means of the comparison with Odysseus. This relation heightens the reader's sense of the aetiological boldness of the poem, involving as it does a comparison which makes a mythologically prior figure (Niceus) relate to a more recent one (Odysseus) in an older text; the Niceus – Odysseus comparison could be read as inverting the chronological relationship between Homer and Pindar, with Pindar's poem retrojecting the dynamics of the *Odyssey* passage onto a pre-odyssean mythological period.³⁵⁹ The scholium's phrasing of the relationship (καὶ τοῦτο παρὰ τὸ Ὀμηρικόν) is also significant, consisting of a bald statement which does not seek to ground the connection between the passages in a specific verbal relationship or in the intentions of the author. We do not know whether this precise phrasing dates back to the Hellenistic period, and it is certainly possible that this statement is an abbreviation of a fuller treatment.³⁶⁰ As it stands, however, the phrase prompts a consideration of the mode of the connection between the two passages, particularly in view of the problems with the comparison just discussed. Aside from being, on the above interpretation, an example of how a particular reading can affect those that follow it, Σ 87c encourages a self-consciousness on the part of the reader about his role in the diacritical construction of meaning.

Pindar follows his account of the inaugural games by connecting them with the present performance, mentioning the victory songs sung at the first games as the precursor of his own composition (76-9):

αἶδετο δὲ πᾶν τέμενος τερπναῖσι θαλίαις
τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον.
ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι

³⁵⁹ For such 'fracturing of time' in Hellenistic poetry, cf. Hunter (1993) 165-6.

³⁶⁰ For a fuller treatment of citational practices in the scholia cf. Phillips (forthcoming a).

καί νυν ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν
νίκας ἀγερώχου κελαδησόμεθα

The whole sanctuary sounded with pleasant celebrations in the fashion of celebratory song. Following these former beginnings we shall sing now a grace named for proud victory ...

The figure of the present enunciation ‘following the ancient beginnings’ (ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι) is of particular importance for a reading of the poem’s archival dynamics. In performance terms, the above passage creates a connection between Pindar’s poem and the first performances, although we should not be misled into seeing too direct a parallel between the two.³⁶¹ The songs are contextually different, and it is notable that the narrator does not elaborate on the content of these first songs, the emphasis falling rather on their celebratory aspect (ἀείδετο δὲ πᾶν τέμενος τερπναῖσι θαλίαις).³⁶² The passive ἀείδετο connotes the music’s depersonalized manifestation in a way which separates it from the present composition, rooted as the latter is in the enunciative strategies of a particular authorial figure.³⁶³ Moreover, as scholars have pointed out, Pindar’s poem also serves as an encomium of Heracles, thus supplementing the absence of a celebratory song for him within the story.³⁶⁴ This supplementation interposes a difference of subject matter and significance between the first songs and Pindar’s poem, a difference strengthened by an awareness of the dynamic relation between the two performances; the temporal priority of the inaugural encomiastic singing lends it authority, but it is also an event which depends on Pindar’s recreation for its existence.

The ‘following’ (ἐπόμενοι) of Pindar’s chorus is therefore both a pursuit of the paths of song laid down by the archetypal performance, and a pursuit which brings them to (a virtualized) realization. This is underscored by the iconic ordering of ἀρχαῖς ... ἐπόμενοι which enacts the linear movement from ‘beginnings’ to the current performance, while also drawing attention to the text’s verbal imitation of the historical continuum. Similarly, both senses of ἀρχή discussed above are in play; the first celebrations at Olympia are both a commandment to be followed and the beginning of a sequence. However, the fact that the

³⁶¹ Cf. Bernardini (1982) 55: ‘l’encomio del poeta continua la tradizione del canto che già da allora accompagnava i festeggiamenti in onore degli atleti vincitori’. Cf. Burgess (1990) 277.

³⁶² We might compare the ‘Archilochus song’ at O.9.1-3, where the narrator contrasts the ‘Archilochus song’ (for which cf. Σ O.9.1a-k) with his own more complex and elaborated composition; cf. Pavlou (2008).

³⁶³ ἀείδετο occurs only here, in the scholia on this passage, and at Erinna EG 647.

³⁶⁴ Burgess (1990) 277.

poem differentiates itself from these performances in the ways just described highlights the provisionality of this ‘commandment’; the generic regulations referenced here are highly generalized (τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον), and as such point to a dynamic of innovation and conformity in which the singular status of the work is as important as its generic filiations. The force of these lines is altered and expanded by their recontextualization in the edition, wherein they script the response of the reader who also ‘follows the beginnings’, but in a different way from the narrator; the text becomes a new type of ‘beginning’, a basis for scholarly enquiry and readerly engagement as well as an encomiastic document. In relation to the wider function of the edition, the account of the first Olympian games, as a narrative of the foundation upon which the whole of the rest of the collection depends, can also be read as paradigmatic of epinician’s archival project in general, although this is complicated by the retrospective aspect it assumes from its position in the collection.³⁶⁵

These temporal complexities also bear on the role of Time at 51-5:

ταῦτα δ’ ἐν πρωτογόνῳ τελετᾷ
 παρέεσταν μὲν ἄρα Μοῖραι σχεδόν
 ὅ τ’ ἐξελέγχων μόνος
 ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον

Χρόνος. τὸ δὲ σαφανὲς ἰὼν πόρσω κατέφρασεν

The Fates stood nearby at that founding rite, as did Time who alone puts genuine truth to the test. Moving onwards he revealed clearly ...

Here, Time as an independent authority ‘putting genuine truth to the test’ (ἐξελέγχων ... ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον) and ‘moving onwards telling the clear [story]’ (τὸ δὲ σαφανὲς ἰὼν πόρσω κατέφρασεν) is a parallel for the narrator, acting as an idealized storyteller who grounds Pindar’s own account, although the aorist of κατέφρασεν might seem to obstruct such a connection, siting Time’s narrative as a one-off event in the distant past. Time stands for the incidence of ‘narrating’ and the occurrence of the events narrated, a figure for a perfectly performative language which is at odds with the non-performativity of the poet’s language, which as an archival recording is predicated on the fact of its referents pre-existing

³⁶⁵ For a slightly different type of archival writing we may compare O.13, which follows a catalogue of Corinthian inventions (18-22) with a catalogue of previous victories by the *laudandus*’ family (29-45): cf. below pp. 162-5.

their enunciation. Here we might compare O.10.7-8 (ἔκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθῶν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος / ἔμῳ καταίσχυνε βαθὺ χρέος, ‘coming towards me from afar the future time shamed my deep debt’) where time is an abstract force which *brings something about*, namely a sense of shame and obligation. The narrator implicitly claims a truth-value for his telling of the events through his association with Time, but his language is also temporally distanced from what it signifies by this move.³⁶⁶

The relation between Time’s narrative and that of the narrator is shifted somewhat by its reinscription in the context of the book, one aspect of which is elision by the capitalized script of the graphic distinction between personified and non-personified time/Time.³⁶⁷ It could be argued that the personification at 55 is obvious from the context. But the process of identifying the personified Time by means of his contextual situation is itself significant, replicating the process of seeing time as emerging from a series of connected entities and events, and reversing the notion of seeing time as an abstract force apart from the events it contains and brings about. However, understanding Time as personified causes us to identify him more with the second of these two constructions. In this situation, concrete aspects of the scene of reading participate in the reader’s conceptual construction of the text. Further, the interaction between Time and the narrator is open to reconfiguration by the diachronic context, wherein for instance ὄ τ’ ἐξελέγχων μόνος / ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον also suggests the dissemination of epinician and the poem’s capacity to convey its narrative to a wider set of audiences. The codependency of Time’s narrative and that of the poem, whereby the narrator’s enunciation both legitimizes itself, by figuring Time as a legitimizing force, and is legitimized by something outside itself, by relying on Time’s legitimization, similarly recalls the interplay between the poem and the historical conditions of poetic dissemination.³⁶⁸ Simultaneously, however, there is a distinction to be made between the time conceptualized by the poem and these historical conditions. Traces of the future of the epinician project can be read as already contained within it, albeit in a manner which, by differing from the

³⁶⁶ Kromer (1976) attempts to read the poem in terms of the interaction of two different modes of truth, Atrekeia and Aletheia, the former being objective and empirical, having to do with calculation and measurement, and the latter subjective, capable of bestowing value (cf. pp. 434-5). She draws a connection between Aletheia and Heidegger’s *Unverborgenheit* (p. 433), but misunderstands the nature of this concept, which she sees this as referring primarily to the ‘perceiving individual’, when in fact for Heidegger truth-as-unconcealedness is an ontological state, prior to empirical determinations, which grounds or enables perception; cf. Heidegger (1992) 6-10, 45-9. A Heideggerian reading of the poem’s realization of these two figures would thus see Atrekeia as an ontic adjunct dependent on the prior unconcealedness manifested by Aletheia. Cf. also Mullen (1982) 197-200

³⁶⁷ S-M have χρόνος 7, Χρόνος 55; for comments on personified and non-personified ‘Charis’ cf. Fisker (1990) 38.

³⁶⁸ Cf. Kromer (1976) 423 on the poem’s ‘implied contrast between reading a name and naming.’ Heracles names places, bringing them into the tradition, whereas the narrator reads them.

material and interpretative conditions of the text's dissemination, marks the limits of the text's control over its own future.

VICTORY AND EXEMPLARITY

Scholars have tended to read the myth of O.10 as performing a loose connection between Heracles and the *laudandus*, in which praise of the former redounds to the credit of the latter,³⁶⁹ and have drawn various parallels between their respective situations.³⁷⁰ However, the complexities of Pindar's mythical exempla should not be oversimplified by a critical determination to reduce the poem's function to a bestowal of praise, without considering what 'praise' might mean in this particular context.³⁷¹ Emphasis on glorification needs to be balanced by a sensitivity to the ways in which the poem's laudatory aspect might be complicated by other factors. In the case of O.10, the disparity between Heracles, as the most important Greek culture hero and here the founder of the Olympian games, and Hagesidamus, a young boy winning his first victory at the games, influences the type of glorification that emerges from the poem. The contrasting statuses of the two figures is reinforced by the difference between the violence in which Heracles has to engage in order to defeat his enemies (27-38), particularly in the episode of the all-encompassing destruction of Augeas and his city (34-8), and the controlled, civilized, and sublimated violence of the games.³⁷² The non-identity of Heracles and Hagesidamus may have been reinforced by the thematic parallel between Heracles' founding the games, and the victor setting out on his athletic career, wherein again the differences between the two events are as significant as the similarities.³⁷³ As well as associating Hagesidamus with the glory of the Olympian games as a whole, the indirectness of the relation between the myth and the frame is implicitly paraenetic, emphasizing both the glory that comes from success and the need for a realistic understanding of one's mortal limitations. Nor should this paraenesis be read as applying only to the victor, as its possible effects on other audience members or readers also require

³⁶⁹ Bernardini (1982) 56.

³⁷⁰ Bernardini (1982) 67 notes the various non-correspondences between the myth and the frame; the poet pays his debt, whereas Augeas refuses to; the poet's relationship with the victor culminates in celebration, Augeas' with Heracles in war. Burgess (1990) 274-5 sees a parallel between Pindar and Ilas, Hagesidamus' trainer; both are responsible for assisting the victor, and his debts to them reverse the poet's debt to the victor.

³⁷¹ Cf. the cautionary note sounded by Boeke (2007) 138 n. 108.

³⁷² Cf. Kromer (1976) 481 on the temporal construction of the Heracles narrative.

³⁷³ Burgess (1990) 275-6 sees the Heracles and Augeas myth as both laudatory and paraenetic, with Augeas playing the role of the negative exemplum. This is plausible, but does not account for the differences between Heracles and the victor.

consideration. Formal and ethical issues converge: the indirectness of the relations brought about by the myth encourage comparative manoeuvres, which in turn foster a self-consciousness in the reader about his own ethical situation.³⁷⁴

The complexity of the relation between myth and frame is particularly apparent in the series of erotic pairs that critics have sought to juxtapose, beginning with Patroclus and Achilles (19), and continuing with Zeus and Ganymede's relation to the narrator and the victor (105). Some critics have objected on the grounds of propriety to an overt eroticizing of the latter relationship,³⁷⁵ while others have seen the relation thus broached as central to the ode's laudatory strategies. Dana Burgess, for instance, argues that in the last triad Pindar is figured as an ἐραστής and Hagesidamus an ἐρώμενος, a relationship which recalibrates the earlier situations in which the narrator was figured as in debt to the *laudandus* (1-12), and as a wife (86). The ἐραστής – ἐρώμενος relationship distributes power to both parties, the former as the older, wiser man, the latter as a figure of enchanting beauty. For Burgess, the parallel with Zeus and Ganymede works by presenting Zeus not as omnipotent, but love-struck like the poet.³⁷⁶ Furthermore, he emphasises the self-legitimizing nature of the narrator's perception of Hagesidamus in the moment of his triumph (99-104):

παῖδ' ἐρατὸν <δ> Ἀρχεστράτου
 αἴνησα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾶ 100
 βωμὸν παρ' Ὀλύμπιον
 κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον
 ἰδέα τε καλόν
 ὥρα τε κεκραμένον

I praised Archestratus' lovely son, whom I saw victorious with the force of his hand by the Olympian altar at that time, beautiful in form and seasoned with youth ...

His analysis, however, over-personalizes the relation, which is not simply a private declaration of affection.³⁷⁷ The relationality of the comparison with Ganymede is as important as the 'autopsy' for establishing the victor's status. The victor's beauty does not

³⁷⁴ A similar dynamic is at work in P.11; see below pp. 207-8.

³⁷⁵ Verdenius (1988) 84.

³⁷⁶ Burgess (1990) 280.

³⁷⁷ Burgess (1990) 280: the autopsy 'allows Pindar to praise with authority ... [and] guarantee the truth of the poem. What Pindar saw was a pretty young boy (103-4); what he verifies is that the boy was indeed pretty.' For the eroticism of athletes and athletic spectatorship cf. Steiner (1998).

exist in and of itself, but is realized as part of a system of relations and differences wherein the non-identity of the victor and Ganymede plays an important role. Unlike Ganymede, the victor will not be borne away to Olympus; rather, the poet bestows poetic rather than literal immortality, as Zeus' sexual desire is substituted for an aesthetically sublimated engagement which includes the erotic without being reducible to it. The narrator's perception (τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἄλκᾳ) is not that of a single person, but stands for (and idealizes) a communal perception, as the public context (βωμὸν παρ' Ὀλύμπιον) makes clear. The dynamics of choral performance also contribute to the force of this utterance: by voicing a communal sentiment in the first person singular, the passage evokes the processes by which poet and chorus are connected in rehearsal and performance. The communal use of the singular instantiates the imposition on a group of an individual perception (the poet training the chorus), and also the channeling of communal perspective through the individual voice. Both meanings would have been given a physical correlative by the figure of the poet leading the chorus in performance. The act of perception signified by εἶδον, together with the references to his beauty, also signal a generic multiplicity, figuring the victor as the subject of an eroticized sympotic discourse which is subsumed into the epincian frame.³⁷⁸ The position of the victor 'by the Olympian altar' also serves to situate the perception of beauty in an elevatingly social and religious setting.

This move translates into generic terms the tension between single act of perception and the wider systems in which it partakes and from which it gains significance. The relation between the narrator and the victor is not simply a direct erotic association, but stands for a communal utterance, the emphasis of which is less on an individual expression of aesthetic and erotic appreciation than a publicly sanctioned approbation, which again further shifts the tenor of the statement away from the situation that obtained between Zeus and Ganymede. The connection between the immortality bestowed by Zeus and poetic immortality also relies on a play of similarity and difference.³⁷⁹ The reader is put in the position of potentially sanctioning an hubristic equation of Pindar with Zeus; a crucial aspect of reading the poem is an

³⁷⁸ The use of εἶδον and the praise of Hagesidamus' beauty recalls the act of perception in the erotically charged encomium for Theoxenus of Tenedos (fr. 123.10-11): εὔτ' ἄν ἴδω / παίδων νεόγυιον ἐς ἦβαν, and ἐρατός is common in erotic contexts; cf. e.g. Sappho fr. 16.17 (τᾶ|ς <κ>ε βολλοίμαν ἐρατόν τε βᾶμα). The phrasing of ὥρᾳ τε κεκραμένον recalls the frequent use of κεράννυμι of mixing wine (LSJ s.v. a1) and hence the symposium, but may also function metapoetically as a signal of the 'blending' of genres. Cf. also O.8.19-20 for the conjunction of beauty and physical prowess in the depiction of Timosthenes. For the relationship between encomium and epincian cf. Budelmann (2012), who, following Clay (1999), notes that the boundaries between the two were porous: epincians could be performed at symposia, as well as at other types of celebratory occasion. For the relationship between 'erotic' and encomiastic elements in archaic poetry cf. Rawles (2011), and on the 'generic indeterminacy' of epincian more generally cf. Currie (2005) 21-4.

³⁷⁹ Cf. Burgess (1990) 280.

acknowledgement of the comparison's limitations, and the passage from one to another, the movement by which this comparison is made, is as much the subject of the text as the comparison itself.

The juxtaposition at 78-81 highlights this difference:

καί νυν ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν
νίκας ἀγερῶχου κελαδησόμεθα βροντάν
καί πυρπάλαιμον βέλος 80
ὄρσικτύπου Διός

... we shall sing now a grace named for proud victory, for the thunder and fire-forged³⁸⁰ dart of thunder-rousing Zeus ...

Here, the βροντάν / καί πυρπάλαιμον βέλος are the subject of poetry, and the vividness of the terms in which they are described prompts an awareness of the difference between Zeus and the poet who praises him, and hence of the differences between the respective immortalizations of Ganymede and the victor. In the final lines, it is not simply the young man's beauty and youthful bloom (ιδέα τε καλόν / ὥρα τε κεκραμένον) which is compared to 'that [bloom] which once warded shameless death from Ganymede' (105), but rather his beauty as an object of a retrospective perception. The description in 103-4 is markedly abstract; it is Hagesidamus' 'form' (ιδέα) and 'age/time of life' (ὥρα) which are the objects of praise, lexis which differs from the more sensuous language common in sympotic lyric.³⁸¹ This abstraction figures a process of generalization and idealization at work in the way Hagesidamus is perceived. The textual process of making Hagesidamus into a *figure* in order to represent him as a model victor and as exemplifying youthful beauty, are shown to be already at work in the act of 'seeing' him (εἶδον). The final comparison with Ganymede enlarges the passage's generic multiplicity by gesturing towards a story with epic and hymnic provenance.³⁸² The generic aspect of the description strengthens the sense in which it is Hagesidamus' status as a textual figure which immortalizes him.³⁸³

³⁸⁰ For the meaning of πυρπάλαιμος cf. Hummel p. 609.

³⁸¹ Cf. fr. 123.10-11.

³⁸² Cf. *Hom. h. Aph.* 202-17.

³⁸³ The fluidity of generic distinctions in the classical period (for which cf. e.g. Currie (2005) 21-4) should urge caution about positing too hard-and-fast a distinction between 'sympotic' and 'epinician' poetry. Nonetheless, I suggest that the character of the description here is marked enough to cue an awareness that different registers are being combined. For epinician generic poetics, cf. the remarks of Budelmann (2012) 189-90.

In the context of written dissemination, the scholarly operations of the O.10 scholia participate in the text's archival project by expanding on the information given in the poem, but also emphasise the paraenetic dimension just discussed by furnishing the reader with information that is only tangentially relevant to the *laudandus*, hence drawing the reader's attention towards the mythical past. The difference between Heracles and the victor emerges more sharply as a result of this recontextualization, heightening the importance of the hermeneutic challenges described above. This difference may also have been reinforced by O.10's place in the book; the poem comes later in the book than poems composed for more prominent victors in more prestigious events, and by allowing comparison between Hagesidamus and these other victors its placement reinforces the meiotic aspect of his comparison to Heracles. These effects are furthered by the realization prompted by the diachronic context of the mortality of the victor, which shows up strongly in relation to the historical continuity of the games, and which imparts a certain pathos to the description of his beauty in the final lines.

A related but different archival passage occurs in O.7 for Diagoras of Rhodes, where at 83-7 the narrator takes the reader on a tour around the various testimonies to the victor's superlative achievements:

ὄ τ' ἐν Ἄργει χαλκὸς ἔγνω νιν, τὰ τ' ἐν Ἄρκαδίᾳ
 ἔργα καὶ Θήβαις, ἀγῶνές τ' ἔννομοι
 Βοιωτίων,
 Πέλλανά τ' Αἰγίνα τε νικῶνθ'
 ἑξάκις· ἐν Μεγάροισιν τ' οὐχ ἕτερον λιθίνα
 ψᾶφος ἔχει λόγον.

The bronze in Argos knew him, as did the works of art in Arcadia and Thebes, and the Boeotians' well-instituted games, and Pellana, and Aegina knew him six times victorious. The record in stone in Megara holds no other story.

Here the text co-opts other modes of memorialization to further its own archival project, exemplifying Derrida's principle of consignation in gathering into one textual scene the various different archival traces left by Diagoras' success. The inscriptions at Megara commemorating Diagoras' success (οὐχ ἕτερον λιθίνα / ψᾶφος ἔχει λόγον) perform an independent archival function which the text supplements and in turn subordinates to its own

project.³⁸⁴ The phrasing of ἔχει λόγον points up the durability of the archival substrate; it literally ‘holds’ the ‘text’ / ‘record’ in place, securing it against alteration and diminution, prompting a comparison with the materiality of the book, which also fixes the text in a permanent form (at least ideally) but which unlike the inscriptions is not bound to one particular location. The book’s capacity for geographically extended dissemination is matched by the geographical expansiveness of the catalogue, which again marks the the text’s subordination of the individual records it collects.

The passage also becomes the occasion for a sprawling meta-archival archive, as the scholia pile up a mass of details pertaining to the places mentioned in the catalogue. The scholia gloss first by specifying the games in which the prize was won (the Argive Heraea, Σ O.7.152a (Drach. I p. 230), and then pointing out the form of the prizes: ‘they take from there not unworked bronze but tripods and cauldrons and shields and bowls’. There follows an explanation of the sense of χαλκὸς ἔγνω νιν; ἐγνώρισε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ Ἄργει διδόμενος χαλκὸς ἄθλον τῷ νικήσαντι (‘the bronze given in Argos as a prize to the victor also knew him’, Σ O.7.152a), and in Σ O.7.152d (Drach. I p. 231) an aetion is given for the award of the bronze shield as a prize: χαλκὸς τὸ ἄθλον δίδεται, ὅτι Ἀρχίνος Ἀργείων γενόμενος βασιλεὺς, ὃς καὶ ἀγῶνα πρῶτος συνεστήσατο, ταχθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν ὀπλῶν κατασκευῆς, ἀπὸ τούτων καὶ τὴν τῶν ὀπλῶν δόσιν ἐποίησατο (‘bronze is given as a prize, because Archinus, having become king of the Argives, who first instituted the contest, having been appointed to supervise the construction of weapons, also made the gift of the arms from these’).³⁸⁵ Two different explanations are then given of τὰ ἔργα won in the Arcadian and Theban games: τὰ δὲ ἔργα τινὲς οὕτως ἀκούουσιν· ἐπειδὴ οἱ αὐτόθι νικῶντες σκεύεσι τιμῶνται (‘some understand ‘the deeds’ thus: when they are victorious there they are honoured with vessels’, Σ O.7.153c (Drach. I p. 231)).³⁸⁶ At Σ 153d the historian Polemon is cited for the explanation that a bronze tripod was given as a prize at the Lycaea, as it was at the Thebaean Heracleia.³⁸⁷ As well as allowing the reader to site

³⁸⁴ The information recorded by the scholia probably derives ultimately from treatises about the athletic contests, for which cf. Callimachus 403 Pf., a work ‘On Contests’. Hellenistic scholarship on the subject had Peripatetic antecedents, such as the work of Duris of Samos.

³⁸⁵ The scholium is anachronistic, as Archinus belongs to the 3rd century BC: cf. Polyæn. *Strat.* 3.8.

³⁸⁶ The vagueness of σκεύεσι, which can refer to a variety of objects (cf. LSJ *s.v.* a), suggests that this is a guess.

³⁸⁷ Σ O.7.153e (Drach. I p. 232) lists more games both in Arcadia and Boeotia, and gives Ioleia as an alternate name for the Heracleia. Σ 154a gives an insight into the process of accretion by which the scholia were constructed, citing Aristonicus as a source for the Erotia in Thespia and the Eleutheria at Plataea, and Didymus for Βασίλεια καὶ Ἀμφιάρεια καὶ Δήλια ἐπὶ Δηλίῳ καὶ Τροφώνεια ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ. Σ O.7.154c (Drach. I p. 232) adds to this list, mentioning ἐν δὲ Ὠρωπῷ τὰ Ἀμφιάρεια. Σ O.7.156a (*ibid.*) specifies that the contest at Pellana was the Theoxenia, and that the prize given there was a cloak, information reduplicated by Σ O.7.156c (*ibid.*), although with the additional report of games in honour of Hermes at Pellana. This latter scholium also

Diagoras' achievements in a wider historical context, these scholarly exegeses simultaneously expand and relativize the text's archival function, their supplementation highlighting the fact that the text is only one archive amongst others.

The rhetoric of ἔγνω νιν and the scholia's understanding of it also play a part in the figuration of the archival function. They correctly point out that it is to be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with all the nouns in the sentence (e.g. Σ O.7.153a, 154b); the *schema Pindaricum* can thus be read as a rhetorical correlative for the gathering function of the archive. The archival function here is grounded in part metaphorically; ἔγνω νιν has the double meaning of referring to the works themselves as 'recognitions' of Diagoras, but the objects are also made the subject of actions which in reality they enable. The bronze, the artworks and the other objects 'recognizing him' stands for the process in which they participate of making Diagoras known and increasing his fame; it is rather individual travellers or spectators (or scholars) who will 'recognize' Diagoras by means of the monuments. The phrasing of ἔγνω νιν naturalizes the process of dissemination, making it inherent in its (supplementary) substrate, contrasting with the text's supplementation of the 'natural' archival function, and the scholia's supplementation of the text.

These two poems and their accompanying metatexts highlight some of the reconfigurative effects attendant on the processes of editing and scholarly comment. In their supplementations of information given by the texts themselves, the commentaries expand on Pindar's own commemorative strategies while also resituating these in a different reading environment; here, access to information about the past takes on a particular significance, as the commentaries draw on, and implicitly link the primary texts to historiographical and other 'commemorative' projects. This supplementation also interacts in various ways with the texts' laudatory strategies. In the scholia to O.10, most of the archival comment is concerned with the victors at the first games and with Heracles, rather than with the victor's (hitherto modest) achievements. In this case, the archival parts of the commentaries have the effect of highlighting the paraenetic disjunction between myth and frame by further emphasising the greatness of Heracles' achievements and the glory of the games themselves. In O.7, however, the scholia's archival material pertains more directly to Diagoras, expanding as it does on the

gives information about the games on Aegina, reporting variant names (the Aeaceia ad the Oeonaea), and adding the information that amphora-carrying was part of these games, referring to Callimachus' *Iambi* for this information: ἐν δ' Αἰγίνῃ τὰ Αἰάκεια· οἱ δὲ Οἰνώναια· ἀμφορίτης ἄγων, οὗ Καλλίμαχος μέμνηται ἐν τοῖς ἰάμβοις ('the contest in Aegina is called the Aeaceia and the Oeonaea. It is an amphora-carrying contest, as Callimachus records in his *Iambi*', fr. 198 Pf.).

catalogue of his victories, and is therefore more easily assimilable to his commemoration and praise.

The variety of possible interactions between texts and metatexts is also particularly marked in the case of O.13, composed for Xenophon of Corinth in Pindar's *annus mirabilis* 476. Like O.10, O.13's recording of Corinthian achievements, as well as those of the *laudandus* and his family, give it a strongly archival aspect which is picked up by the scholia in their recording of various details about Corinthian cult, myth, and history. The following reading examines the interpretative limitations of the scholia's strategies and their implications for readers, as well as the scholia's role in the poem's diachronic situation(s).

ENCOMIASTIC FUNCTIONS: CORINTH AND THE OLIGAETHIDAE

O.13 easily lends itself to a reading which sees athletic success as a continuation of mythical deeds, and the latter as an exemplification of the former; the Oligaethidae can be read as emblematic of Corinth's wider success, and their athletic triumphs are prefigured by Bellerophon's mythical achievements (63-90). The scholia, however, do not offer such an interpretation, despite their emphasis on the poem's encomiastic function. In this section, I shall examine how the scholia reconstitute the poem's encomiastic discourses, and how the incomplete formulation of these discourses prompts attention to their construction.

At Σ O.13.69a-b (Drach. I p. 371) the narrator's articulation of his task at 50-1 (ἐγὼ δὲ ἴδιος ἐν κοινῷ σταλαίς / μῆτιν τε γαρύων παλαιγόνων / πόλεμόν τ', 'I, a private individual dispatched on a public mission, announcing their ancestors' wisdom and warfare ...') is glossed with the following comment:

a. ἐγὼ δὲ οὖν, οὐχ ὡς ἀλλότριός τις, ἀλλ' ὡς ἴδιος καὶ κοινὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, παρ' οἷς καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν προγόνων ὑμῶν λέγων καὶ τὰ ἀνδραγαθήματα τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν ἡρώων τὰ κατὰ πόλεμον καὶ αὐτὰ λέγων, οὐδὲν ἀλλότριον διαψεύσομαι τῆς Κορίνθου. **b.** ἄλλως· ὡς ἴδιος, τουτέστιν ὡς εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀποσταλαίς καὶ προκριθεὶς τὴν βούλησιν τῶν ὑμετέρων προγόνων καὶ τὸν ἥρωικὸν πόλεμον οὐ ψεύσομαι περὶ τῆς Κορίνθου γαρύων, τουτέστι φωνῶν καὶ λέγων.

a. I indeed shall tell no extraneous falsehoods about Corinth, not as a stranger, but as a private individual and a man connected to you, and telling among you the intelligence of your ancestors and telling also of the great deeds of your heroes in war and also in

general. **b.** Or: as a private individual, that is as someone dispatched and chosen by you, I shall tell no lie about the councils of your ancestors nor about their heroic war in my song about Corinth, that is in speaking and declaring.

Here the construction of the Corinthian past is seen as pertaining more to the poet's self-construction than to encomiastic function (οὐχ, ὡς ἀλλότριός τις, ἀλλ' ὡς ἴδιος καὶ κοινὸς ἐν ὑμῖν), and the formulation of the text's archival function in recording the great deeds of Corinth's past does not explicitly connect this mode of narration with the poem's praise of the Oligaethidae.³⁸⁸ On the other hand, Σ O.13.136 (Drach. I p. 383) glosses Μοίσαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοις ἐκῶν ('willingly for the Muses on their shining thrones', 96) with an emphasis on the specifically encomiastic nature of the poem:

οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον δι' ἄλλο τι, ἀλλὰ ταῖς Μούσαις ἐπίκουρος καὶ ὑπηρέτης ἦλθον, ἵνα τῆς Κορίνθου τούτους τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς φατρίας τῆς Ὀλιγαίθιδος καλουμένης ὄντας ἐπαινέσω καὶ τὰ πραχθέντα ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ Ἴσθμῳ καὶ τῇ Νεμέῃ.

I did not come for any other reason but as the Muses' helper and your servant, so that I might praise those men from the tribe known as the Oligaethidae and their deeds at the Isthmus and Nemea.

This picks up on the reading at Σ O.13.133b (Drach. I p. 383), where 93-5 (ἐμὲ δ' εὐθὺν ἀκόντων / ἴεντα ῥόμβον παρὰ σκοπὸν οὐ χρῆ / τὰ πολλὰ βέλεα καρτύνειν χεροῖν, 'I, casting the whirling javelin on its straight path, must not hurl with my hand my many darts beyond the target') are interpreted ἀλληγορικῶς: ὅτι οὐ χρῆ με περὶ ἄλλων πολυλογεῖν, ἐάσαντα τὸν προκείμενον ἔπαινον ('allegorical: I must not talk overmuch about other things, neglecting the appointed praise').³⁸⁹ The scholia insist on the priority of the poem's encomiastic function without specifying its particularities. The different focuses of these two sets of comments, the insistence in Σ O.13.133b and 136 (ibid.) on the directedness of praise, and stress on the role of the Corinthian past in Σ 69a-b without any explicit connection to the *laudandus*, encourages the reader to test how the mythical section might be read in

³⁸⁸ A slightly different explanation of the phrase is given at Σ O.13.69e (Drach. I p. 371): κοινῶς ὄντος τοῦ ἐγκωμιάζειν οὐκ ἐχρησάμην τῇ κοινότητι ('although the singing of praise is a general activity I did not make use of generality [i.e. 'topoi of a general nature' rather than praise specifically directed at the *laudandus*]').

³⁸⁹ Cf. Lefkowitz (1985) 273-5; Nünlist (2009) 64-6 on the Pindar scholia's tendency to treat myths as digressions; cf. e.g. Σ P.11.58a-b (Drach. II p. 259-60) and below pp. 207-8. For the rhetorical structure of the passage see Race (1990) 51-2 and Kurke (1991) 54 n. 45

conjunction with the sections that focus on the Oligaethidae, to see how one could read the myth as οὐ ... περὶ ἄλλων πολυλογεῖν.

The connection between the Oligaethidae and Corinth is established at the outset, when the narrator refers to an οἶκον ἡμέρον ἄστοις, / ξένοισι δὲ θεράποντα (2-3), and the process of ‘praising’ (ἐπαινέων, 2) the Oligaethidae is co-ordinated with ‘understanding’ Corinth (γνώσομαι / τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον, ‘I shall know prosperous Corinth’, 3-4). The blurring of the Oligaethidae and the rest of Corinth continues at 14-15, where ‘sons of Aletes’ denotes the whole population, and is reinforced by the coupling of the *laudandus* Xenophon with the Corinthian λαός in the address to Zeus at 27-8 (τόνδε λαὸν ἀβλαβῆ νέμων / Ξενοφῶντος εὖθυνε δαίμονος οὔρον, ‘direct the breeze of Xenophon’s fate while guiding this people unharmed’).³⁹⁰ Unfortunately no scholia survive for verses 2-4, and Σ O.13.38a-b (Drach. I p. 365) do not comment on the connection between Xenophon and the λαός, and it is possible that early commentaries contained remarks on this issue. However, the connection between the Oligaethidae and the Corinthian population as a whole is subordinate to the relations between myth and frame mentioned above. While we can certainly see Bellerophon as prefiguring the Oligaethidae’s success, the gaps in the scholia’s analysis of these relations alert us to potential discontinuities between the present and the mythical past, and the various ways in which these can be negotiated.³⁹¹ Bellerophon’s status as an exemplary figure is complicated by the narrator’s mention of his fate, which I shall discuss further below. For the moment, it suffices to note the function of these lines in producing differentiation between Bellerophon and the *laudandus*. The brevity of the reference (διασωπάσομαί οἱ μόρον ἐγώ, ‘I shall keep silent about his fate’, 91) is such as not excessively to darken the mood of the poem, but its implied prolepsis is nonetheless opposed to the happy future wished for the Oligaethidae at 103-6. This difference cues awareness of another; whereas Xenophon and the Oligaethidae are presented as fully socialized figures, their house ‘gentle to townfolk’ (2), Bellerophon acts individually, the recipient of assistance from Athena and Polyidus’ prophecies (76-82), but otherwise unrelated to wider society.³⁹² These discontinuities constitute a relation between myth and frame that is one of negotiation. Bellerophon is

³⁹⁰ Cf. Kurke (1991) 197-8. For a reading of Xenophon in relation to the rest of the Oligaethidae, cf. Boeke (2007) 131-38, who argues that ‘the poem’s primary objective [is] the glorification of the Oligaethidae’ and as such ‘is an expression of the priority of the social group over its individual members’ (p. 138).

³⁹¹ For Bellerophon used as a marker of Corinthian identity cf. Theoc. 15.91-2.

³⁹² Bellerophon’s isolation is picked up in the striking phrasing of 88, where he fires at the Amazons ‘from the cold folds of the empty air’ (αιθέρος ψυχρῶν ἀπὸ κόλπων ἐρήμου). This characterization of the sky is generic (cf. O.1.6), but here it underscores Bellerophon’s individualism.

simultaneously an emblem of divinely bestowed success, and a somewhat problematic figure who by means of contrast emphasises the Oligaethidae's more integrated sociality.³⁹³

While the gaps in the scholia's analysis of mythical function invite interrogation by the reader, there are also ways in which the scholia co-opt and extend the text's strategies. Particularly notable in this respect is the scholia's gathering of contextual information about Corinthian cult and history and the Oligaethidae's victories, a process which extends and participates in the commemorative strategies of the text itself, as the text becomes the ground of, and is subsumed into, a larger archive.³⁹⁴ The text implicitly comments on this process of self-transformation at 112-13, where the addressee is told of the numerous traces of the Oligaethidae's victories that he will find throughout all Greece: καὶ πᾶσαν κάτα / Ἑλλάδ' εὐρήσεις ἐρευνῶν μάσσον' ἢ ὡς ἰδέμεν ('and through all Greece you will find as you seek more than can be seen'). The use of εὐρήσεις reprises the language of discovery used earlier in the poem, as at 17 (ἅπαν δ' εὐρόντος ἔργον, 'every deed belongs to its inventor') and serves to associate the act of 'finding' traces of the Oligaethidae's successes with the various inventions for which Corinth is famous. Both stem from divine favour and bestow fame on the wider community, but there is also a differentiation between the act of inventing something which did not exist prior to the act of invention, such as Bellerophon/Athena's invention of the bridle, and a 'finding' which is constituted by an uncovering of something which pre-exists its being revealed.³⁹⁵ Both, however, entail an uncovering which opens up and makes its object permanent, as indicated by the language of revelation applied both to the poetic realization of athletic victories (θήσω φανέρ', 'I shall make [them] clear', 98) and the invention of the dithyramb (ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανε / σὺν βοηλάτῃ χάριτες διθυράμβῳ;, 'whence did Dionysus' graces appear with the ox-driving dithyramb?', 18-19).³⁹⁶

Similarly, εὐρήσεις ἐρευνῶν scripts the reader's response to the text's archiving of victories, as the text itself becomes a source for 'finding' its referents. This application is reinforced by

³⁹³ Boeke (2007) 149-56 focuses on Bellerophon's function as demonstrating human limitations and the necessity of the correct use of divine gifts. Cf. Hubbard (1986) 36-43 on 'a balance between achievement and restraint' (p. 40) as central to the poem's ethical calculus.

³⁹⁴ Cf. the aetiologies of the Corinthian Hellotia at Σ O.13.56a-d (Drach. I pp. 367-9), and the glosses on the contests at which the Oligaethidae were victorious at e.g. Σ O.13.152, 156a, 159a-b (Drach. I pp. 385-7). On the Oligaethidae's previous victories and the genealogy elaborated by Σ O.13.58b-c (Drach. I p. 369) cf. Barrett (1978).

³⁹⁵ For a detailed reading of the significance of the bridle cf. Dickson (1986), who sees it simultaneously as a mode of restraint, and as something which 'discloses [Pegasus'] proper form' (p. 131); cf. also Hubbard (1986) 33-6.

³⁹⁶ For the use of light imagery in discourses of invention cf. D'Angour (2011) 33. Cf. Dickson (1986) 124-5 on the 'aetiological' character of O.13.

the referential indeterminacy of the use of τὰ at 98, 101, 103 and 106; this refers primarily to victories (e.g. Ἴσθμοῖ τὰ τ' ἐν Νεμέῃ, 98), but it also subsumes reference to types of commemoration such as inscriptions, and indeed to the generality of events surrounding and constituting the victories themselves. This referential openness assists the process of textual transformation, allowing for the neuter plural to reference both the actualities referred to and, metaphorically, their textual form. A similar referentiality is also at work in μάσσον' ἢ ὥς ἰδέμεν, which signals the nature of the Oligaethidae's success as in excess of its physical remains, implicitly referencing textual dissemination and its non-visual bestowal of fame.³⁹⁷ This wider referentiality is particularly applicable in the case of the situation of reading, where the text's status as a record of the past and the scholia's archival supplementation draw attention to the specifically textual dimension of the catalogue's subjects. The literal and metaphorical modes of reference function simultaneously; the text refers to both its groundedness in external realia, and to its own listing of contests and victories as a verbal correlative of this reality, as πᾶσαν κάτα / Ἑλλάδ' points to the extensiveness of the text's archival process and also, in combination with the future tense of εὐρήσεις, its Panhellenic disseminatory reach.

The metapoetic application of εὐρήσεις ἐρευνῶν works for both performance and the book, as does the self-referentiality of γνῶσομαι / τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον (3-4). This phrase functions in performance as a signal of the narrator's subject matter, but in the situation of written dissemination it also connotes the archival nature of the text, connoting the reader's experience of discovering the Corinthian past. In the context of the book and its metatextual apparatuses, the referentiality of εὐρήσεις ἐρευνῶν is also subject to alteration. As well as fulfilling the disseminatory potentiality mentioned above, the textual space to which this phrase refers is altered by its interaction with its metatexts, which in supplementing the text's contextual references reconfigure it as part of a wider archival culture. As I shall explore further below, these metatextual processes cannot be definitively consigned to an 'outside' of the text, but shift and intervene in the ways the text is read. This process extends the metaphorical transformation already at work in the text itself; just as the final triad functions both as a set of external references and a textual archive, so the scholia's repositioning of the text extends and alters its archival dynamics.

³⁹⁷ Σ O.13.162 (Drach. I pp. 387) glosses this phrase with τὸ πλῆθος τῶν στεφάνων, φησὶν, ἐκπέφυγε τὴν τῆς ὀράσεως μετάληψιν ('the number of crowns, he says, evades perception by sight'). The reduction of the text's rhetoric to a single referent (τὸ πλῆθος τῶν στεφάνων) is an oversimplification.

OLYMPIAN 13 AND THE *CORINTHIACA*

It has been suggested that Olympian 13 draws on the early epic poem the *Corinthiaca*, attributed to Eumelos, for its narrative of Corinthian myths.³⁹⁸ In this section I shall attempt to specify the nature of these interactions and their significance for the poem's original reception, before considering how useful the scholia are in elaborating this relationship, and how the scholia's use of material from the *Corinthiaca* might affect a reading of the poem in the context of the book.³⁹⁹

At 52-4, the narrator mentions Sisyphus and Medea as distinguished figures in Corinthian history; both featured in the *Corinthiaca*, and it is reasonable to think that this poem would have been well-known in Corinth in the fifth century and would hence have constituted an important intertext for O.13's performance in 464. O.13.52 refers to Sisyphus' well-known cleverness (Σίσυφον μὲν πικνότερον παλάμαις ὡς θεόν, 'Sisyphus most subtle in his devisings like a god') and doubtless the *Corinthiaca* included some episodes focussed on this. A possible case is *PEG* fr. 6 (= Paus. 2.2.2), which attributes to Eumelus the story of Sisyphus refusing to disclose to Nestor the location of Neleus' grave. Sisyphus' intellectual subtlety was proverbial, however; Σ O.13.69b cites *Il.* 6.153 as exemplifying this quality. In the absence of more details from the *Corinthiaca* we cannot say whether O.13.52 is anything more than a generic reference to a well-known mythological datum, and the absence of extensive comment in the scholia might suggest that commentators took this view. Pindar's figuration of Medea, on the other hand, is rather more distinctive; καὶ τὰν πατρός ἀντία Μήδειαν θεμένην γάμον αὐτῆ / ναὶ σώτειραν Ἄργοι καὶ προπόλοις ('and Medea who made her own marriage in opposition to her father, saviour of the Argo and its servants', 53-4). This brisk reference homes in on her 'heroic' aspect, her potentially troubling defiance of her father counterbalanced by her status as the Argonauts' saviour (ναὶ σώτειραν Ἄργοι).⁴⁰⁰ The stress on Medea as opposing Aeetes and helping the Argonauts seems to presuppose the narrative in the *Corinthiaca* in which she returned to Iolcus with Jason before coming to rule

³⁹⁸ West (2002) 109-33, 124, with further references; he suggests that Pindar may have used the *Corinthiaca* as a model for his Bellerophon narrative; although none of the sources connect Bellerophon with the *Corinthiaca*, it seems likely that he would have played a part in the poem. Hubbard (1986) 30-1 considers it unlikely that the *Corinthiaca* treated the story of Bellerophon and the bridle, in view of the fact that neither the scholia to O.13 nor Paus. 2.4.1 mention the story. This is not, however, a sound inference; we cannot assume that scholia which cited the *Corinthiaca* as a source for the story have not dropped out over time, and Pausanias' silence is not compelling.

³⁹⁹ On the *Corinthiaca* in general cf. Barigazzi (1966); West (2002).

⁴⁰⁰ This phrase seems to be a metaphorical way of indicating the assistance she rendered the Argonauts by helping in the capture of the Golden Fleece; it may reference an episode in which she saved the ship itself, but there are no traces of such an episode in the *Corinthiaca*. No scholia on the phrase survive.

Corinth at the request of the Corinthians when Marathon died childless,⁴⁰¹ as there would be little point in including her in a poem about Corinth without a definite Corinthian connection. The rest of the passage whence our information about the *Corinthiaca* narrative is drawn goes on to describe how Medea was cheated by Hera of her desire to immortalize her children (*PEG* fr. 5 = Paus. 2.3.11):

βασιλεύειν μὲν δὴ δι' αὐτὴν Ἰάσονα ἐν Κορίνθῳ, Μηδεία δὲ παῖδας μὲν γίνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ αἰὲν τικτόμενον κατακρύπτειν αὐτὸ ἐς τὸ ἱερόν φέρουσαν τῆς Ἥρας, κατακρύπτειν δὲ ἀθανάτους ἕσσεσθαι νομίζουσαν· τέλος δὲ αὐτὴν τε μαθεῖν ὡς ἡμαρτήκοι τῆς ἐλπίδος καὶ ἅμα ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰάσονος φωραθεῖσαν—οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχειν δεομένη συγγνώμην, ἀποπλέοντα <δὲ> ἐς ἰωλκὸν οἴχεσθαι—, τούτων δὲ ἔνεκα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ Μήδειαν παραδοῦσαν Σισύφῳ τὴν ἀρχήν.

When Jason ruled through her in Corinth, Medea had children, and once she had given birth always took them to the temple of Hera and concealed them, thinking that if she concealed them they would be immortal. Eventually she realized that she had erred in her hope and at the same time was discovered by Jason; he did not grant her forgiveness when she asked it, and sailed away to Iolcus. Because of these things Medea departed and gave the rule of the city of Sisyphus.

Although Medea was clearly not as unsettling a figure in the *Corinthiaca* as she was in, for instance, Euripides' play, several details in Pausanias' account suggest that the *Corinthiaca*'s narrative was fraught and emotive; the discovery of Medea's deception of Jason (ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰάσονος φωραθεῖσαν) suggests her deceitfulness,⁴⁰² and the account of him refusing her forgiveness (οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχειν δεομένη συγγνώμην) indicates a scene of some emotional charge. I suggest that Pindar's description at 53-4 can be read as a deproblematizing reference, focusing on her heroic aspect to the exclusion of the problems that beset her later in the *Corinthiaca*.⁴⁰³ For a Corinthian audience familiar with her role in that poem, there may also have been a certain pathos in the contrast between the 'heroic' Medea of 53-4 and the suffering figure of whom they had foreknowledge.

⁴⁰¹ *PEG* fr. 5 (= Paus. 2.3.10-11).

⁴⁰² φωράω is often used of catching thieves, or the exposure of deceit; cf. e.g. Pl. *Lg.* 954a; Dem. 45.19.

⁴⁰³ For other such deproblematizing characterizations cf. the narrative of Poseidon's love for Pelops at O.1.25-51. O.13.53-4 is a simpler case, in that Medea's role in the *Corinthiaca* was not in need of the kind of moralizing rehabilitation required for Pelops, where the focus is as much on the deceitful tales told about the gods as on the events of the myth.

The scholia's comments on this passage are instructive of the evidential limitations we face when evaluating the corpus. There are two strands detectable in the explanation of Medea. Simple functional explanations of her connection with Corinth are recorded in Σ O.13.74a-b (Drach. I p. 372):

a. καὶ τὴν Μήδειαν ὑμνῶ τὴν παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς γαμηθεῖσαν· ἐγαμήθη δὲ τῷ Ἴάσονι σοφὴ οὔσα· τὴν γενομένην σώτειραν καὶ βοηθὸν τῇ Ἄργοϊ. ἐβούλετο γὰρ ὁ Αἰήτης ἀνελεῖν τοὺς Ἄργοναύτας. **b.** ἄλλως· πατρὸς ἀντία ἠναντιώθη κατὰ τὸν γάμον τῷ πατρὶ ἢ Μήδεια· ὄν γὰρ ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἐβούλετο Ἴάσονα, τούτῳ ἐγήματο καὶ συναπῆρεν αὐτῷ.

a. And I sing of Medea, she who married against her father's wishes. She, being a clever woman, married Jason, and she became the Argo's saviour and helper, as Aetes wished to destroy the Argonauts. **b.** Alternatively: 'against her father' means that Medea was opposed to her father concerning her marriage, for he did not want her to marry Jason, but she married and sailed away with him.

Σ 74d and f offer more detail about the mythical background, citing *PEG* fr. 3 of the *Corinthiaca* to explain that Aetes and Aloeus were the sons of Helios and Antiope, and hence that τὴν Κόρινθον πατρῶον εἶναι κτῆμα Μηδείας ('Corinth was Medea's paternal possession', Σ 74d).⁴⁰⁴ Her role in Corinthian cult is elaborated by Σ 74g, which tells of Medea's saving Corinth from a plague, and provides an aetiology for the Corinthian cult of the 'Mixobarbaroi', Medea's children; this latter narrative is clearly a telescoped version of the story related by Pausanias at 2.3.11, omitting Medea's deception of Jason and her departure from Corinth. The more straightforward explanations in Σ 74a-b may derive from commentaries designed for use in schools, and Σ 74d and f from longer, more academic treatments, but we cannot rule out the possibility that a and b are scaled down versions of more detailed exegesis.⁴⁰⁵ The scholia as we have them focus on explaining Medea's links to Corinth rather than the specific details of Pindar's phrasing;⁴⁰⁶ we might expect the scholia to

⁴⁰⁴ West (2002) 121, following Jacoby, favours attributing Σ 74d to the *Corinthiaca*. There is also a possibility that the information in Σ 74g derives from that poem.

⁴⁰⁵ An impression of how much might have been lost in such a process can be gleaned from the difference between the scholia preserved in the Ambrosian manuscript (A) and those of the Vatican recension (V), the latter being considerably more detailed; cf. Deas (1931) 57-65; Lefkowitz (1985) 269-71.

⁴⁰⁶ N.b. Σ 74c: ζητεῖται δὲ τί δήποτε τὴν Μήδειαν Κολχίδα οὔσαν εἰς τοὺς περὶ Κορινθίων λόγους προσάγεται; the use of ζητεῖται indicates that Medea's Corinthian connections

allude more precisely to the *Corinthiaca*'s narrative of Medea helping the Argonauts, and it could be the case that such a passage has dropped out of the scholia over time. Similarly, if Bellerophon did figure in the *Corinthiaca*, we might expect the scholia to comment on the connection; the reference to *Il.* 6.201 at Σ 130c to explain his fate perhaps suggests simplification, with a fuller account being shortened to include only the more basic supplementary information.

The scholia's comments on Medea, then, exemplify some of the problems raised earlier with regard to the scholia as a body of evidence. There is a high probability that some information, and potentially a lot, has dropped out of the scholia, and that earlier commentaries would have contained more explicit connections between O.13 and the *Corinthiaca*. On these grounds, we must be cautious in attempting to assess how ancient Pindaric scholarship in general construed these relations, and the possible interpretative consequences of this scholarship. We can, however, say that the citation of the *Corinthiaca* in Σ 74f prompts a consideration of the relations between the two poems, even if further elaboration of this relationship is absent from the scholia as we have them. The information given about Medea, and the awareness of her role in the *Corinthiaca* triggered thereby, allows for a contrast between the brevity of Pindar's reference and the complexity of her involvement with Corinth; it also enhances awareness of the pathos arising from the contrast between Medea's heroic rendering at 53-4 and the loss of her children. More generally, the exegesis of Medea's role in O.13 can be read as another instance of the scholia co-opting and extending the text's archival project (γνώσομαι / τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον). As in the case of the Oligaethidae and their victories, reading the scholia entails an exploration of Corinthian myth and history.

HISTORICIZATION

The scholia's historicizing readings have frequently been attacked by modern scholars; Mary Lefkowitz, among others, has shown that these readings are usually based on guesswork rather than on definite historical information, that they are influenced by Hellenistic aesthetic preoccupations and demonstrate an inadequate understanding of Pindar's poetics, and are insufficiently integrated into wider interpretation of the poems.⁴⁰⁷ In this

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. Lefkowitz (1975) 174-6 on Σ P.8.1a (Drach. II p. 206), which interprets the opening reference to Hesychia as a reference to political disturbances in the period of Aristomenes' victory; she argues that the existence of the 'Persian wars' explanation in Σ P.8.1b (ibid.) shows that the scholia did not have definitive historical information on which to base their first interpretation, and that both interpretations were formulated according to a criterion of probability (εἰκός). N.b. also ibid. p. 177 on the 'introversion' of Σ N.7.1a. (Drach. III

section I shall argue that although we should be wary of seeing the historicizations of the scholia as valid interpretations, we should also be alert to functions they might have beyond the straightforwardly exegetical and interpretative.

The scholia's explanation of O.13.23 (ἐν δ' Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ νέων οὐλίαις αἰχμαῖσιν ἀνδρῶν, 'there Ares blooms in the deadly spears of young men') is a notable instance of the historicization Lefkowitz criticises. Σ 32b (Drach. I pp. 364-5) interprets ἐν δ' Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ as a reference to events of the Persian war, citing Theopompus for the story that the women of Corinth prayed to Aphrodite to inspire their men with martial lust against the Persians:

τὸν Ἄρην φησὶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ λάμπειν τείνων εἰς τὰ περὶ Περσίδα, ἐν οἷς ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας ἠνδραγάθησαν οἱ Κορίνθιοι. Θεόπομπος δὲ φησὶ καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν εὐξασθαι τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ ἔρωτα ἐμπεσεῖν τοῖς ἀνδράσι αὐτῶν μάχεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τοῖς Μήδοις, εἰσελθούσας εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, ὅπερ ἰδρύσασθαι τὴν Μήδειαν λέγουσιν Ἥρας προσταξάσης.⁴⁰⁸

He says that Ares shines in Corinth alluding to the events of the Persian wars, in which the Corinthians conducted themselves nobly on behalf of Greece's freedom. Theopompus says that their women, going to the temple of Aphrodite which they say Medea set up at Hera's behest, prayed to Aphrodite that a desire might fall upon the men to do battle with the Medes on behalf of Greece.

The scholia then cite an epigram of Simonides which was written on the temple to commemorate the event:

αἶδ' ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάνων τε καὶ ἀγχεμάχων πολιητᾶν
ἔστασαν εὐχόμεναι Κύπριδι δαιμονία.
οὐ γὰρ τοξοφόροισιν ἐβούλετο δῖ' Ἀφροδίτα
Μήδοις Ἑλλάνων ἀκρόπολιν δόμεναι.

pp. 116-17), and the absence of any attempt to connect this passage with the rest of the ode, or to compare it with other similar passages, which she argues was the result of line-by-line reading. Cf. Young (1971) 29-30 n. 99.

⁴⁰⁸ Cf. Kurke (1996) 64-5 and n. 38 for an analysis of the dedication and its context; Athen. 573c cites the dedication as made by the sacred prostitutes of the temple of Aphrodite; she sees the citation in the Pindar scholia (and cf. Plut. *de mal. Her.* 39.871a-b) as airbrushing the prostitutes out of the story in order to simplify it. This may well be right, but my reading here focuses on the reading situation as opened up by the scholia rather than on the actual events of the historical situation. Cf. *ibid.* for her reading of fr. 122, the skolion commemorating Xenophon's dedication of temple prostitutes that was probably performed contemporaneously with O.13.

These women stood and prayed to the Cyprian goddess on behalf of the Greeks and their citizens who fight at close quarters. Noble Aphrodite did not wish to surrender a Greek acropolis to the bow-bearing Medes.

This interpretation is tendentious. There is no reason to see ἐν δ' Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ νέων οὐλίαις αἰχμαῖσις ἀνδρῶν as a reference to a specific military situation; if Pindar had wanted to refer to the Persian wars and the Corinthian women's prayer to Aphrodite, he could have done so in more specific terms.⁴⁰⁹ The interpretation misunderstands the generalizing nature of the rhetoric, and moreover fails to apprehend the connection between Corinth's military prowess and her athletic successes.⁴¹⁰ The scholium also exemplifies Lefkowitz' criticism of the commentators' failure to integrate interpretation of a particular line or phrase with a reading of the poem as a whole.

On these grounds, we would be justified in dismissing these scholia as irrelevant to the interpretation of the poem, and we certainly should not see their comments as an adequate exegesis of Pindar's compositional practice, as there is no reason to think that he is 'alluding to the Persian wars' (τείνων εἰς τὰ περὶ Περσίδα). Such an outright dismissal, however, would obscure several points of interest. Unlike Σ P.8.1a-b, which Lefkowitz rightly criticises as based on surmise, Σ O.13.32b cites a datum contemporary with the poem's original performance, the Simonides epigram, which, together with the supplication story, may have played a part in the poem's original reception. Given the generality of the reference in O.13.23 we need not suppose that the line would have been understood by a Corinthian audience as referring to the Persian wars rather than any other engagement, but Corinth's role in that conflict and its Simonidean commemoration will have formed part of the general understanding of the past which would have contextualized the reference.⁴¹¹

Awareness of the exegetical shortcomings of Σ 32a-b opens the way to a reading of their more general supplementary functions. As in the case of the supplementary information given in the scholia to O.10, Σ 32a-b can be understood not only as exegetical documents but as a corpus which puts into play metatextual associations parallel and strictly extraneous to the text itself, but which nonetheless affect and enhance the reader's experience. Discarding Σ

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. the references to Himera and Salamis at P.1.71-80. For τείνειν used of allusion, cf. Σ I.2.1b (Drach. III p. 213), where it is used of Pindar's reference to the practice of previous lyric poets composing for money.

⁴¹⁰ For the connection between war and athletics, where the latter is seen as mimetic of the former cf. e.g. Young (1971) 39-40.

⁴¹¹ Cf. Salmon (1984) 253-6 for Corinth's importance in the Persian wars.

32b's value as an exegesis of authorial intention or as a totalizing description of the poem's fifth-century reception, we can read it in terms of a co-operation with the text on which it comments. Thus O.13.23 can be understood as a typological generality exemplified by the historical events related by the scholium, which can in turn be read as participating in the text's project of glorification. A similar reading can be applied to Σ 32b's information about Medea. There is no strictly exegetical reason to include the reference to Medea founding the temple of Aphrodite (τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, ὅπερ ἰδρύσασθαι τὴν Μήδειαν λέγουσιν Ἡρας προσταξάσης), a datum extraneous to the account of the Corinthian women's supplication.⁴¹² However, when read as part of the nexus of associations raised by the totality of text and metatext, the detail of Medea's founding the temple of Aphrodite connects her with the women's supplication at that temple during the Persian wars, and hence opens the possibility of seeing the actions of the Corinthian women in assisting the city as reflecting those of Medea in saving the Argonauts at O.13.53-4. Their use of Aphrodite to engender martial lust in the men of Corinth (εὐξασθαι τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ ἔρωτα ἐμπεσεῖν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν αὐτῶν μάχεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος), shifting the goddess' normal function into the realm of warfare, parallels Medea's communally beneficial transgression of gender roles. This association is not licensed by the text alone, and as the text does not mention the supplication of Aphrodite we might not wish to see the association as underlying the poet's portrayal of Medea. Nevertheless, by raising the possibility of reading an historical episode, and (a version of) Theopompus' narrative of it, as illuminated by the poem, the scholium instantiates the text's exemplifying strategies, further elaborating Medea's status as a Corinthian 'hero'.

METATEXTUAL INTERVENTIONS

The connection between Medea and the women of Σ 32b results in a reading of the Corinthian women in the light of Medea's role in the poem, a reversal of the normal direction of influence which neatly illustrates the complexities of the mutual implicativeness of text and metatext. More common, however, are instances where the scholia's strategies of explanation have a bearing on the reader's construal of the text and its significance. One such is the account of the mention of Bellerophon's 'fate' (διασωπάσομαί οἱ μόρον ἐγώ, 91) at Σ 130b-c (Drach. I p. 382):

⁴¹² This detail may reflect an attempt on the part of early commentators to link the mythical past with historical events in connection with the details of Medea's role in Corinthian cult in Σ 74d and f.

She bore three children to subtle-minded Bellerophon, Isander and Hippolochus and Laodameia. Zeus the counsellor lay with Laodameia, and she bore godlike Sarpedon of the bronze armour. But when he became hated by all the gods, then he wandered alone on the Alean plain, gnawing at his heart, shunning the ways of men. Ares, unglutted with war, slew his son Isander when he was fighting with the noble Solymi, and in her wrath Artemis of the golden reins slew his daughter.

Σ 130c's citation of Glaucus also gives rise to possible tension between his heroic portrayal at O.13.60 (ἐκ Λυκίας δὲ Γλαῦκον ἐλθόντα τρόμεον Δαναοί, 'the Danaans trembled at Glaucus when he came from Lycia') and his depiction in the *Iliad*, where he is a considerably less successful figure.⁴¹⁴ This contrast might be read as ironizing or problematizing Pindar's treatment by confronting it with the authority of the Homeric poems.

Such a conclusion would be complicated, however, by the wider dynamics of Glaucus' earlier portrayal. The description of the Greeks' reaction to him is followed by an account of his vaunting of his ancestry, which leads into the central narrative of Bellerophon's invention of the bridle (60-4):

τοῖσι μὲν
ἐξεύχεται ἔν ἄστεϊ Πει-
ράνας σφετέρου πατρὸς ἀρχάν
καὶ βαθὺν κλᾶρον ἔμμεν καὶ μέγαρον·

ὃς τᾶς ὀφιδέος υἱ-
ὄν ποτε Γοργόνος ἦ πόλλ' ἀμφὶ κρουνοῖς
Πάγασον ζεῦξαι ποθέων ἔπαθεν ...

He boasted to them that his father's rulership was in the town of Peirene, and his rich inheritance and hall, he who once suffered much in desiring to yoke Pegasus, son of the snaky Gorgon, beside the spring ...

⁴¹⁴ His mistake in exchanging gold for bronze armour with Diomedes (*Il.* 6.232-6) is a humiliating one, as marked by Zeus 'robbing him of his wits' (ἐνθ' αὖτε Γλαύκῳ Κρονίδης φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς, 234); for ancient and modern scholarly reaction to this scene cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 143-4. He later fails to rescue Sarpedon's armour at *Il.* 16.508-12 and 663-5; cf. further *ibid.* pp. 37-8.

The context of Glaucus speaking to the Greeks and his stress on his ancestry at 61-2 signals engagement with his speech at *Il.* 6.145-211, where he responds to Diomedes' inquiry about his ancestry.⁴¹⁵ With regard to Glaucus' position within the poem as a whole, it is significant that he is presented as a *social* figure, one who is realized by means of a speech to his peers in which his relations with his family are emphasised. As such, Glaucus mediates between the communally embedded *laudandus* and the more isolated Bellerophon.

The narrative of Bellerophon's invention of the bridle can be read as an agonistic engagement with the *Iliad* speech, where the invention is not mentioned. This interaction is foregrounded by shared details; mention of Bellerophon's killing of the Amazons, the Chimaera and the Solymi (τοξόταν βάλλων γυναικεῖον στρατόν / καὶ Χίμαιραν πῦρ πνέοισαν καὶ Σολύμους ἔπεφνεν, 'he slew the female army of archers, and the Chimaera breathing flame, and the Solymi, 89-90) recalls Glaucus' narration of these events at *Il.* 6.179-86. The mention of Bellerophon's fate (O.13.91) both references the *Iliad* narrative and differentiates Pindar's account, a differentiation also achieved by the location of Glaucus' home in Corinth (ἐν ἄστει Πειράνας).⁴¹⁶ The agonistic relation between O.13.60-90 and *Il.* 6.145-211 is figured by the metalepsis of Glaucus and the Pindaric narrator.⁴¹⁷ The absence of articulation of the shift between Glaucus' indirect speech at 61-2 and the narrative at 63-90, together with the correspondences just mentioned between O.13's narrative and Glaucus' speech in the *Iliad*, brings about a blurring of Glaucus' speaker position as an embedded narrator at 61-2 with that of the primary narratory in 63-92. This blurring of speakers, however, is complicated by the metrical shift at 62-3, where the aeolic cola of the antistrophe give way to the dactylo-epitrites of the epode,⁴¹⁸ highlighting the difference between the speakers of 61-2 and 63-92. Glaucus can thus be read simultaneously as subsumed into and differentiated from the narrator's voice. This trope figures in miniature the intertextual relations between O.13 and *Il.* 6, in which the latter is simultaneously put under erasure and necessary for O.13's contrasting operation. This textual relationship is significant in a poem which highlights the *laudandus*' relation to his family and wider community. In

⁴¹⁵ ἐξεύχεται also has Homeric overtones, picking up on the frequent use of εὐχομαι in accounts of parentage, as by Glaucus at *Il.* 6.211 (ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἵματος εὐχομαι εἶναι, 'I claim that I am of this family and blood').

⁴¹⁶ Similarly the change of genealogy: Glaucus is Bellerophon's son in Pindar, whereas in Homer the line runs Bellerophon – Hippolochus – Glaucus. N.b. also that Homer does not mention Pegasus' catasterism. The Homeric narrative likewise omits reference to the story of Bellerophon's attempt to fly to Olympus and his fall from Pegasus (cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 120); O.13.91 thus picks up and extends the Homeric omission.

⁴¹⁷ For a definition of metalepsis and a treatment of the phenomenon in early Greek poetry cf. de Jong (2009) 87-115, who argues that metalepsis in Greek literature is primarily aimed at establishing continuity between present and past speakers: for criticisms of this position cf. Phillips (2010) 6-7.

⁴¹⁸ For the poem's metrical structure cf. Itsumi (2009) 199-204.

foregrounding the text's dependence on and transformation of the *Iliad*'s narrative, a relation also at work in that of O.13's choral narrator to that of the *Iliad*, the above passage makes intertextual relations parallel the dynamics of interdependence at work in Xenophon's connection to his family, and Corinth's to its great inventions.

The scholia's comments on Glaucus are another revealing instance of both their shortcomings and their potentially wider interpretative significance. It is notable that despite their Homeric citations (Σ 82e = *Il.* 6.191; Σ 130b = *Il.* 6.201) they do not explore the relations between the Pindaric and Homeric realizations of Glaucus. Their comments at Σ 82a-e and 86b are concerned with Glaucus' lineage and his connections to Corinth rather than his wider role in the poem, although as in the case of connections with the *Corinthiaca* we cannot be sure that a more extensive treatment of the Homeric model has not been lost. Despite these interpretative limitations, however, the scholia's citations of the *Iliad* do serve the role of prompting a more detailed examination of the relations between the two texts, serving as a mnemonic ground for the kind of reading I have just engaged in. This is not to say that the scholia are necessary for such an intertextual confrontation to be apprehended by a particular reader, and it could be argued that their narrow focus on Glaucus' lineage actually obscures the structural connections between O.13.60-92 and *Il.* 6.145-211. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that the scholia's intertextual cues are more explicit than and supplementary to those of the text, and that the kind of interpretative situation entailed by reading the scholia and the text together allows for a perusal of such cues which would enable a reader to interrogate the weaknesses of the scholia's comments and to think further about their associations.

There also arises in Σ 130a-b a tension between the text's refusal to narrate Bellerophon's fate and the scholia's short but detailed articulation of these events. The emphasis on Bellerophon's thoughtless risk-taking (κούφως παρακινδυνεύσας), the repeated specification of his lameness (ἐκπίπτει καὶ χωλοῦται· καὶ ἐπλανᾶτο ... χωλός), and the stress on the gods' opposition to Bellerophon's actions (κατὰ βούλησιν τοῦ Διὸς ... ἐκπίπτει) bring to the fore the very details that Pindar's narrative suppresses. Apprehension of Bellerophon's unhappy fate is also sharpened by the contrast with the account of Pegasus' catasterism in Σ 130d.⁴¹⁹ I suggest that the scholia's supplementation has the effect of

⁴¹⁹ Although from another angle this also serves to soften the reference to Bellerophon's fate; one might see the catasterism as analogous to the fame of the victor, and hence as balancing the negative exemplarity of the previous line. Compare the narrative given by Σ N.5.25a-c (Drach. III pp. 92-3) of the killing of Phocus.

focusing readerly attention on the function and significance of O.13.91.⁴²⁰ I have argued above that the line can be read as implying a contrast between Bellerophon and the *laudandus*, opposing the former's fate to the hope of the latter's continued success, and as part of an agonistic relation with *Il.* 6.145-211. While they might initially appear to spoil the effect of the line, the scholia's comments strengthen both of these effects by detailing the mythical events which constitute Bellerophon as (in part) a negative exemplum,⁴²¹ and, by means of the *Iliad* citation, implicitly contrasting Pindar's account with Homer's. By filling the gap left by the text, the scholia's comments highlight the way in which O.13.91 foregrounds the act of erasure from which the text is constructed. As such, Σ 130a-b exemplifies the complexities of the interactions between text and metatext that I have discussed, functioning not simply as an exegesis which can be separated from the text on which it comments, but rather participating in and affecting that text's function.

My readings have emphasised the openness of the exemplum-frame relations in both O.10 and O.13: each poem, in their different ways, demands interpretative negotiation from the reader that is simultaneously an act of ethical positioning. I would also suggest that the narrator's treatment of these exemplum-frame relations is part of an ethical projection. Not claiming by means of declarative statements complete authority over the relations between past and present and between different types of behaviour, but instead prompting the reader to negotiate the poems' parallelisms and inversions, is itself an act of moderation on the narrator's part. The Pindaric narrator 'has fair things to speak of' (ἔχω καλά τε φράσαι, O.13.11), but he presents them in ways which require the reader to expand on their wider significance. These interpretative issues are resituated by the scholarly commentaries represented by the scholia, which, as we have seen, have the potential to affect readings of the primary texts in various ways. The scholia's supplementations have the effect of both shortening and affirming the distance between the reader's situation and that of the texts' realization in performance. The citations of the *Corinthiaca*, Theopompus, and Simonides, for instance, in the commentaries on O.13 recreate, at least to some extent, the interpretative

⁴²⁰ This process could occur without the scholia; a reader, reading without metatexts, who knows (something of) the myth might well pause to consider the events being alluded to. But the scholia's comments give rise to a particular reading situation; recalling a story from one's own memory alone is different from reading a version of that story. Moreover, the scholia also allow for a contrast between different types of discourses, namely the poem's terse allusion and their own narrative,

⁴²¹ Cf. Bulman (1992) 33; Boeke (2007) 146; Finglass (2007) 108: 'we are ... encouraged to look forward to the bleakness of Bellerophon's future'. Cf. also the fuller elaboration of Bellerophon as a negative exemplum at I.7.43-7, with Σ I.7.63a-b (Drach. III pp. 268). For a moralizing interpretation of O.13 cf. Boeke (2007) 159, who stresses that 'Bellerophon's story makes it clear that ... mortals are ... held accountable for their use of the divine gift'. Gentili (1988) 135 suggests that the 'episode would not have pleased a Corinthian audience', but this implies a simplistic mode of spectatorship.

background against which the poem would originally have been received, but also enforce an awareness of their constructedness as a modern scholarly response.⁴²² As such, the scholia I have examined can also serve to sensitize readers to the contingency and historical sitedness of their own interpretative and supplementary manoeuvres.

⁴²² Cf. Billings (2010) on the ‘erotics of reception’, ‘a dialectic of lack and resource that leads to a productive relation with antiquity’ (p. 22). The circumstances of the reception on which Billings focuses (Hölderlin’s *Hyperion*) are very different from those of the Hellenistic commentators; most obviously, there is a much greater cultural continuity between the Hellenistic and classical periods than between antiquity and modernity. Nevertheless, the commentators’ projects can to a certain extent be seen as attempting to overcome the interpretative obstacles posed by historical and social changes, and the loss of the performance culture of the classical period.

OLYMPIAN 14: CLOSING THE BOOK

My above reading of Theocritus *Id.* 16, and particularly of use of the Graces at the end of the poem, provides a useful starting point for thinking about O.14 as a book poem. As I argued above, Theocritus' appropriation foregrounds the oppositions between text and choral performance, between the Graces as personifications and documents, and its focus on materiality encourages a focus on the book as a distinctive space of meaning. The following analysis will explore some of these phenomena in detail. Composed for Asopichus' of Orchomenos victory in (probably) 488 BC,⁴²³ a short poem for a relatively unimportant victor in a minor event, O.14 exemplifies the practice of placing the less socially weighty poems towards the end of the book.⁴²⁴ I shall argue here, however, that it is also a brilliant poem with which to close the Olympian edition, with Echo's journey to the underworld assuming a striking closural function. I argue below that in the performance economy of the fifth century Echo would have acted as a metaphor for reperformance, and in the context of written dissemination in later years, this role doubles as a metaphor for dissemination more generally, providing a memorable vignette with which to end the book, while also gesturing towards the transcendental claims of poetic discourse. This is balanced by the role of the Graces, discussion of which has dominated criticism of the poem, with scholars attempting to balance the poem's hymnic form with its function as an epinician.⁴²⁵ In the context of the poetry book the invocation of the Graces and the account of their importance makes for an appropriate closural gesture, capping previous references to poetic inspiration and forming a coda which implicitly restates the book's claims of importance and authority.

The extent of the Graces' authority on Olympus (πάντων ταμίαι / ἔργων ἐν οὐρανῶ, 'stewards of all works in heaven', 9-10) and their participation in all the positive facets of

⁴²³ For the date cf. Del Grande (1956) 115.

⁴²⁴ O.14 is a particularly good example of the pathos potentially attendant on the diachronic process, as the reader confronts the juxtaposition of the splendour of Pindar's commemoration and the town's subsequent bleak history. It was sacked by the Thebans in 364 BC (Diod. Sic. 15.79) and again after the Sacred War (Dem. 19.112). It was later rebuilt (cf. Paus. 9.37.8, Arr. *An.* 1.9.10), but was not again to thrive as an independent political force. Although we cannot be certain that O.14 always came last in post-Aristophanic editions, it is likely that this order was the norm: Theon's commentary on P.12, for instance, shows that P.12 was the last poem in the edition he used.

⁴²⁵ The most recent discussions are Ford (2011) 97-104 and Athanassaki (2003) 4, who sees the poem as a fusion of hymn and epinician, an 'artistic experiment' which leads to 'the creation of a setting where the Graces and Echo make up a most exclusive audience for poet and victor alike.' On the predominance of the hymnic element cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 151: '[h]ier ist alles ein Gebet an die Chariten, und das ist nicht nur durch den Ort geboten, sondern kommt ihm von Herzen'; cf. also Kakridis (1979) 145: '[d]er Kult der orchomenischen Chariten muss dem böotischen Dichter schon früher vertraut gewesen sein. Diese Vertrautheit gab ihm die Eingebung, das Siegeslied so zu gestalten, dass er die Form eines Gebets an die Chariten annahm.' This less orthodox form fits well with the practice of ending a book with less orthodox examples of the genre, for which cf. e.g. Haslam (1993) 115 on Callim. *Iambi*.

human culture (5-7) connotes in the performance scenario the poem's Panhellenic aspirations.⁴²⁶ In the situation of reading, however, the Graces function somewhat differently, although the Panhellenic claims are still in play. It has often been noted that O.14 directs itself towards two audiences, the divine, composed of the Graces, and the human.⁴²⁷ This is recapitulated by the situation of reading, where the reader partially assumes the situation of the projected audience. The relationship between the human and divine choruses is of crucial importance here. Critics have often argued for seeing a close continuity between these choral groups,⁴²⁸ but the former is not merely a reflection of the latter. While the Graces' role in overseeing the celebrations on Olympus (8-9) provides a clear parallel with the performing chorus, Echo's role interposes an important distinction between the two. While it is possible, following Segal, to see Echo as paralleling the Graces, and the poem as moving both upwards to Olympus and downwards to Hades,⁴²⁹ the function of Echo as an adjunct to the human chorus also differentiates it, as the Graces have no need of such recourse; Echo's function points up the fact that the human chorus needs to deal with mortality, in a way which the divine does not. Similarly, Cleodamus' role as an addressee is distinguished from Thalia's by his mortality.

The performance of the human chorus arises partly out of a need to deal with and (attempt to) transcend mortality, and is therefore context dependent, whereas the Graces' celebrations on Olympus are bound by no such restraints. This differentiation is expanded by the diachronic context, where the reader assimilates Thalia's role as an internal reader/spectator: ἐπακοοῖτε νῦν, Θαλία τε / ἐρασίμολπε, ἰδοῖσα τόνδε κῶμον ('listen now Thalia lover of song, looking on this revel ...', 15-16). We might question whether the Graces are to be seen as an idealized personification of the performance itself, and whether it is possible to see them as figurations of an idealized reading, a reading which bestows value on the text by participating in it, and which comprehends the performance from a transcendental perspective. Unfortunately there is no evidence to suggest the latter, although the Graces' role is certainly suggestive of such a figuration. What can be conceived with more certainty is the process by which the text's historical readers partially displace the Graces in bestowing value on the poem. The phrasing of the invocation refers to the Graces' role in overseeing the

⁴²⁶ *Cults* p. 403 argues that the Graces of Orchomenos were the 'original' Graces from which those in the rest of Greece developed. If this is correct, it would be possible to see a parallel between O.1's return to the origins of the games, recapitulated in O.10, and O.14's return to the original site of the Graces. Pausanias' account of the Orchomenian Graces is a testament to their Panhellenic status.

⁴²⁷ C.g. Segal (1985); Athanassaki (2003) 4.

⁴²⁸ Cf. Sevieri (1997) 80.

⁴²⁹ Segal (1985) 205.

performance (ἰδοῖσα τόνδε κῶμον) enforces a separation of performance from the act of reading the poem, emphasising the reader's role in recreating the Graces' patronage. The rhetoric of the poem thus enjoins upon the reader an awareness of the secondariness of his activity, and implies a meiotic comparison between his role and the transcendental power of the Graces. This is offset, however, by the productive aspect of reading, as the performance rhetoric gives rise to an awareness of the fleetingness of the moment of performance, and its dependence on the material document for its recreation. These tensions restage the differences between the human and divine choruses, refiguring them into the situation of reading, and prepare for the meditation on poetic value staged through the figure of Echo.⁴³⁰

Before exploring Echo's role in more detail, however, I want to focus briefly on an aspect of potential interaction between the text and its performance context. In common with other scholars I think processional performance likely.⁴³¹ Moreover, I suggest that the description of the underworld as Persephone's 'black-walled house' (μελαντειχέα δόμον) serves as an inverse of the famous temple of the Graces at Orchomenus, the probable destination of the performing chorus, and substitutes for the house of the victor's father, towards which a celebratory revel would normally have been directed.⁴³² This hypothesis cannot be tested as we have no way of knowing the form of the original performance, but it seems reasonable in view of the importance of the Graces' temple at Orchomenus, and of the structural feature of directing a celebratory revel to the father's house.⁴³³ In the context of processional performance, a parallel would obtain between two moving entities, rather than a static entity and a moving one as would be the case if we were to hypothesise performance outside the temple. The structural parallel between the μελαντειχέα δόμον and the temple of the Graces would create a tension between different semantic levels, with the earth and the underworld

⁴³⁰ As with other texts we have examined, the process of commentary is an important aspect of the text's material transformation. The information given about the Minyae and Orchomenus in Σ O.14 inscr., and Σ O.14.26a's bee etymology, unrelated to poem, both exemplify this archival aspect.

⁴³¹ Cf. Athanassaki (2003) 4. Verdenius (1987) ad O.14.16 argues against the processional performance thesis, on the grounds that in such circumstances '[the poem] could hardly have been understood and appreciated by the public', but this objection has no weight. For the κῶμος as a procession cf. Bundy (1962) 23; Goldhill (1991) 135-6; Heath (1988) 183; for criticisms of this position cf. Eckerman (2010) 308-9.

⁴³² For the temple cf. Paus. 9.38.1. The project of connecting Pindaric epinicia to architecture has gathered pace lately: cf. Shapiro (1988); for reading of P.6 in relation to the Siphnian treasury at Delphi, and Pavlou (2010) for possible connections between O.3 and the temple of Zeus Olympius at Acragas. Cf. also Athanassaki (2011b) on the architectural intertexts in P.7. Cf. *ibid.* 316 n. 19 for further references. The relation suggested here is more general than those outlined by these scholars. For the victor's father's house as the destination of the revel cf. I.8.1-4: Κλεάνδρω τις ἀλικία τε λύτρον εὐδοξον, ὦ νέοι, καμάτων / πατρός ἀγλαὸν Τελεσάρχου παρὰ πρόθυρον / ἰὼν ἀνεγειρέτω / κῶμον ('Go, one of you young men, for the sake of Cleandrus and his youth, to the gleaming doorway of Telesarchus his father, and awake the revel, glorious recompense for his labours').

⁴³³ Cf. Segal (1985) 205 for the structural patterns in which the chorus' performance is opposed to that of Echo, and Echo and Persephone are associated as figures who travel between earth and the underworld.

being both separated and drawn together. The μελαντειχέα δόμον is operative as a verbal signifier, whereas the Graces' temple is not. The latter would be gestured to by the performance itself, and recontextualized by the movement of the chorus towards it, while being held outside the realm of the text.⁴³⁴ This recontextualization juxtaposes the temple of the Graces with the underworld, drawing on the contrast between the two realms and also referencing the performance as a means of mediating them, and balances the association between the performance and the Graces' singing on Olympus (8-12). The encompassing of μελαντειχέα δόμον by the text contrasts with the chorus' physical inability to journey to Hades, and acts as a formal reversal of Echo's journey.

The Graces are given multiple and generalized spatial associations by their connection with the waters of the Cephisus (Καφισίων ὑδάτων / λαχοῖσαι, 'owners of Cephisus' waters', 1-2) and because their 'seat' (ἔδραν) is Orchomenus as a whole; similarly, they have a dual role as overseers of the festivities on Olympus (9-12) and the revel on earth (13-20). This correlates with their temporal extension, as their status as παλαιγόνων Μινυᾶν ἐπίσκοποι ('guardians of the Minyans born in ancient times', 4) looks back to the heroic age. The (non)presence of the temple of the Graces in O.14 would be, on my reading, a particular example of the strategy by means of which Pindar omits to tie a poem too strongly to the specific features of a particular place in order to allow a poem to appeal to as wide an audience as possible.⁴³⁵ In this case, the audience of a performance in Orchomenus would obviously have been well aware of the temple and would have been able to fill in the details, but the generality with which the Graces are localized also allows for their transposability in reperformance and eases the shift from the Graces as specifically Orchomenian deities in 1-4 to their panhellenic Olympian status in 6-12. The μελαντειχέα δόμον would also substitute for the house of the victor's father, adding a note of pathos by reminding the audience of the κῶμος that might have been. However, the substitution of Echo's journey for this never-performed κῶμος is also a celebratory move, replacing a human performance with an event which transcends the mortal sphere, and which, as we shall see below, gestures towards the poem's immortalizing power. The poem can thus be read as a formal and conceptual

⁴³⁴ We note the difference from e.g. Sappho fr. 2, where Aphrodite's grove is described in detail, as well e.g. P.7 which alludes specifically to the temple of the Alcmaeonids; see e.g. τεόν / δόμον Πυθῶνι δίᾳ θαητὸν ἔτευξαν, ('they made your dwelling in divine Pytho a marvel to see', 10-11).

⁴³⁵ Cf. Carey (2007) 199 on the absence from Pindar's poetry of overly specific descriptions of particular places, a strategy which 'facilitates the process of projecting the song and its honorands beyond their polis into the larger performative context of Greece in fulfilment of the boast/promise of the panegyrist that their song provides a fame which transcends the boundaries of space and time'. This style of writing does not completely preclude the possibility of allusions to particular local features: see e.g. Pavlou (2010).

aggregation; both Echo's journey to the underworld and the κῶμος of the performance directed towards the Graces replace the κῶμος that would have taken place had Cleodamus still been alive.

A (RE)PERFORMANCE TEXT

Before thinking in detail about Olympian 14's as part of an edition, it will be useful to think about an aspect of the poem's performance function which is of importance for these considerations. I suggest that Echo, as a figure of reduplication, of the poem/performance going beyond itself, operates as a metaphor for reperformance.⁴³⁶ Thus the fact of Cleodamus' death and the need to include him in some way in the performance is coupled with an implicit meditation on poetry's immortalizing power. In order to understand the dynamics of this figuration, we need first to consider how Echo's role is conceived, and how the content of her utterance is likely to have been understood by fifth century audiences (22-4):

πατρὶ κλυτὰν φέροισ' ἀγγελίαν,
Κλεόδαμον ὄφρ' ἰδοῖσ', υἱὸν εἴπησ' ὅτι οἱ νέαν
κόλποις παρ' εὐδόξοις Πίσας
ἔστεφάνωσε κυδίμων ἀέθλων πτεροῖσι χαίταν.

... carrying this glorious message to his father so that when you see Cleodamus you may tell him that his son crowned his hair with the wings of the famous games, in the renowned folds of Pisa.

The first point to make is that Echo's figuration of reperformance is indirect; Echo is intratextual, whereas the reperformer is extratextual, and the former's journey to the underworld is obviously different from a reperformance's echoing of the original. More importantly, we need to recognize that Echo's speaking is a deferred action, existing in a hypothetical future, given by the indefinite subjunctive εἴπησ', which is always in advance of the text. Echo's journey to the underworld is both a part of the text and that which the text

⁴³⁶ Probably the clearest reference to reperformance is N.4.13-16 (εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἀλίω / σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων / θαμά κε, τῶδε μέλει κλιθεῖς / ὕμνον κελάδησε καλλίνικον, 'and if your father Timocritus had still been warmed by the mighty sun, often playing subtly the cithara he would have celebrated his victorious son, inclining to this melody'), for which cf. Morrison (2011) 232. The connection between Echo and reperformance is briefly suggested by Ford (2011) 104.

cannot circumscribe. There have been various attempts to formulate the content of Echo's utterance, ranging from seeing her loosely as a personification of fame, to thinking that she conveyed a precise message to Cleodamus, or that she repeated the whole poem verbatim.⁴³⁷ These readings are based on later depictions of Echo, such as that of Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*, where she repeats the last words of Inlaw's and the Guard's speeches to comic effect (1056-96), and Ovid's famous treatment of the Echo and Narcissus myth (*Met.* 3.334ff.). In the absence of any solid contemporary evidence which might indicate how Echo was conceived by Pindar's contemporary audiences, however, we should be wary of retrojecting these later realizations of Echo onto the performance scenario of O.14, and of attributing too specific a function to Echo, or an expectation of such a function to her audience.⁴³⁸ In Homer ἤχη means 'noise',⁴³⁹ and it is unclear when the more specific meaning of 'echo' developed. A possible contemporary comparandum is *Hom.h.Pan.* 21, where Echo is mentioned as one of the nymphs who accompany Pan in his revels. Here, Echo 'moans around' the mountains (κορυφήν δὲ περιστένει οὔρεος Ἠχώ), but it is unclear whether this involves the kind of specific repetition that Aristophanes' character engages in.⁴⁴⁰ If this kind of repetition was associated with Echo in the early fifth century, Pindar has presented her in a way which draws generally on the idea of echo-as-repetition but also given her a specific function as a conveyor of meaning.

It is significant that we are not told the content of Echo's utterance. We might reasonably assume that her statement to Cleodamus involves a version of the indirect statement of 22-4, telling him of his son's victory, but the precise nature of her utterance is withheld. We might

⁴³⁷ Cf. Wilamowitz (1922) 151-2 '[ü]berraschend wendet sich die Anrede an Echo, die hier für [fama] eintritt, weil von den Klängen der Oberwelt höchstens ein Widerhall in den Hades dringt; durch diesen soll der Vater erfahren, dass Thaleia seinem Erben den Kranz aufs Haupt gedrückt hat'; it should be noted, however, that his notion of an echo of the noise of the celebrations reaching Hades is speculative, and not implied by the text; this may be a metaphorical resonance, but the main focus falls on Echo as a messenger. Cf. Gianotti (1975) 74 n. 121 characterizes Echo as 'in sostanza la voce di *Fama*, che diffonde la notizia della vittoria'. Carne-Ross (1975) 192 thinks 'Pindar bids Echo take the news, the actual sound of the celebration to him'. Segal (1985) gives a more detailed analysis of the thematics of communication with the underworld, but does not analyse the contents of Echo's perspective utterance. Alden Smith (1999) 259 argues for verbatim repetition, but this cannot be right, since it would entail Echo repeating the poet's command to her, as well as the invocation of the Graces, which would make little sense in the context of the underworld. For remarks on personification in Pindar generally, cf. Dornseiff (1921) 53-4.

⁴³⁸ Equally, there is no evidence that the myth of Narcissus and Echo, at least in the form told by Ovid, even existed by this point in the fifth century. Even if the story existed, it is just as likely that Echo would have played the role of a generic mourner, perhaps repeating Narcissus' name, as that she would have engaged in the kind of specific repetition found in Ovid.

⁴³⁹ Cf. e.g. *Il.* 2.209; 13.389.

⁴⁴⁰ For the capitalization cf. Germany (2005) 188; Thomas (2011) 157 n. 19. The dating of the poem is uncertain, although it may well be contemporary with or slightly later than Pindar: cf. Thomas (2011) 169-71. Germany (2005) reads Echo as a figure of intra- and intertextual repetition; *Hom.h.Pan.* 16-18 recalls *Od.* 19.518-21, 'producing a literal mimesis of Echo' (p. 201), who herself metaphorizes the poem's allusive strategies and internal structure.

compare the episode at O.8.81-4, where the personified Angelia, daughter of Hermes, is depicted in a similar role:

Ἑρμᾶ δὲ θυγατρὸς ἀκούσαις Ἴφίων
Ἀγγελίας, ἐνέποι κεν Καλλιμάχῳ λιπαρόν
κόσμον Ὀλυμπία, ὅν σφι Ζεὺς γένει
ᾧπασεν.

Iphion, hearing from Angelia, daughter of Hermes, could tell Callimachus of the shining adornment at Olympia, which Zeus granted to their family.

Again, there is in this passage a combination of clear communication (ἀκούσαις ... ἐνέποι ... λιπαρόν / κόσμον) without the precise articulation of the form or content of that communication; we are not told, for instance whether Iphion duplicated Angelia's message exactly, or whether all of the Blepsiads' victories were mentioned as part of the λιπαρόν κόσμον, or only the latest one. In a sense, these details do not matter; the fact of the communication is what is important, rather than its mode or content. But from another perspective, the fact that these communications are not explicitly articulated is a means of foregrounding both poetry's immortalizing power but also its limitations in the face of mortality. Not attempting to make an empirical claim for a mode of communication that is necessarily beyond evidential substantiation is a way of signalling the limits of men's accomplishments and their claims on the world.⁴⁴¹ Similarly here, Echo operates opaquely, and her utterance can only ever be imagined, a deferral which balances the structural position of the temple of the Graces in the above reading as the destination towards which the poem moves, but which is never realized in the text. The paradox of her role as a messenger, a figure defined by her capacity to vocalize an utterance, who does not have a speaking role within the poem, underscores the alterity of her mode of communication.

Echo, then, is imagined as transmitting to Cleodamus a message based on 22-4, but her utterance is constituted by its deferral and lies beyond human appropriation, and this scenario has consequences for how we might read Echo as a metaphor for reperformance and the poem's wider dissemination. In each reperformance the singer places himself in the position of Echo *qua* figural representation of song by 'echoing' previous performances, but in doing

⁴⁴¹ Miller (1977) 234 n. 35 compares O.8.77-84 as functionally identical to Echo's role and argues that in each case the poet 'seeks to encompass the dead within the spirit of the occasion'; this vague formulation overlooks the way in which Cleodamus both is and is not part of the performance.

so, he also addresses Echo, and reruns the deferral of Echo's task. This scenario maps on to the intratextual situation; a monodic reperformance of an original choral performance would replicate the structure of Echo as a solo messenger carrying a message for the chorus.⁴⁴² Echo is not, however, an exact metaphor for reperformance, which, although it conveys the message (φέρεισ' ἀγγελίαν) of the victor's achievements, replicates the whole poem in a way Echo does not. Furthermore, Echo's mode of communication also plays on the circumstances of the poem's dissemination; in giving Cleodamus the message, she does not reduplicate the poem, but rather engages in a version of the poem's function as a transmission of fame. Echo functions as a metaphor for the non-identity and iterability of the text, figuring the variability of reperformances as a part of the text's function: the text has already figured its own future as a part of itself, a future which belongs by not belonging, constituted by differing from the text. This differing is realized both through Echo's non-reduplicative message and the contextual variations of reperformance.

Furthermore, Echo's doubleness as both messenger and metaphor encourages an attention to the wider dynamics of differentiation entailed by the processes of reperformance, playing on the openness to transformation of the concepts manifested in the text. Thus Λυδῶ γὰρ Ἀσώπιχον ἐν τρόπῳ / ἐν μελέταις τ' αἰείδων ἔμολον ('I came singing of Asopichus in a Lydian mode and with care') would have a different resonance in a reperformance scenario, particularly one different in form from the original; a monodic performance at a symposium would constitute a metaphorical transposition of the context signified by τόνδε κῶμον, a transposition that picks up on the polyvalent signification of κῶμος.⁴⁴³ Such a performance scenario would have involved not only the recontextualization of the poem in a new context, but also a recontextualization of the context by the poem, as the former comes to be marked by the audience's understanding of the circumstances of the poem and its performance rhetoric. These transformations also apply to the reperformer, who in taking on the role of the speaker is both assimilated to and distinguished from the implied author of the poem. The aorist ἔμολον, for instance, might be read as inscribing the temporal priority of the original performance, referencing the role of the original speaker by indicating his singular action by means of the aspect of the verb, as well as referring to the present performer. The Graces are also linked to the poem's reperformance; their role in bestowing benefits on mortals (σὺν γὰρ ὑμῖν τά <τε> τερπνὰ καί / τὰ γλυκέ' ἄνεται πάντα βροτοῖς, 'with your favour all

⁴⁴² For monodic reperformance cf. Morrison (2011) 232.

⁴⁴³ For anticipation of sympotic reperformance cf. Theognis 237-40; Bacch. 20b.5; Pind. O.1.14-18, and cf. Clay (1999).

sweet and pleasant things are accomplished by mortals', 5-6) and their supervision of the festivities on Olympus (οὐδὲ γὰρ θεοὶ σεμνᾶν Χαρίτων ἄτερ / κοιρανέοντι χορούς οὔτε δαΐτας· ἀλλὰ πάντων ταμίαι / ἔργων ἐν οὐρανῶ, 'for the gods do not arrange choruses or banquets without the hallowed Graces, but they are stewards of all works in heaven', 8-10) both resonate with the poem's wider dissemination across the Greek world. The 'pleasures' given by the Graces (τά <τε> τερπνὰ καί / τὰ γλυκέ'... πάντα) implicitly include the repute bestowed by the poem's dissemination, and the comprehensive inclusivity of πάντων ταμίαι / ἔργων ἐν οὐρανῶ becomes metaphorical of the poem's panhellenic reach, as each reperformance replicates the Graces' role in listening to, and implicitly favouring, the poem.

The complexities of the disseminatory process are anticipated by the temporal structure of 22-4, which point to a moment in the past (ἔστεφάνωσε), but also anticipate the utterance of these words (or a version of them) in a future context by Echo. Equally, the time signified by the participles ἰδοῖσ' and φέροισ' also pertains to this deferred future, and hence differs from the present of the utterance. This articulation of the temporal structure of the performance results in a temporality that is constituted by elements of present, past and future without being reducible to any of them. There is also a distinction between the signified moment of Echo's meeting with Cleodamus, conceived as a particular moment of time, and the endless deferral practised by the (non-performative) signification of that moment within the text. The text's capacity to project itself into a/the future is linked to its figuration of a particular textual temporality; in this sense Echo's journey spans the distinction between the future projected by the text, namely the fact of its being reperformed, read, and participating in the circulation of the *laudandus'* fame, and an unforeseeable future, in the form of the particularities of contexts and readings to which it is exposed and which participate in its meaning. In the light of the wider performance economy, then, the Echo episode reads as both a transcendence of the immediate circumstances of performance, and a pointer towards how these circumstances are exceeded by the text's capacity to structure a distinctive temporality and to project a context of reading for itself. As a figure of reperformance, Echo stands for the ways in which the poem participates in the constitution of its context, and in doing so moves beyond it and destabilizes its borders, and also for the mutually contextualizing interplay of the text and the circumstances in which it is performed. Cleodamus' death is resituated as the site for a meditation on the immortalizing power of poetry, in which the speaker anticipates the text's future as an index of its power, but also the arbitrariness of the future beyond the text's control.

ECHO AND THE POETICS OF THE BOOK

In the context of the book, Echo's journey to the underworld works more generally as a figure for epinician's immortalizing power, its capacity to operate beyond the confines of a particular context. Echo's journey balances closure and aperture: Hades' operation as a limit beyond which mortal life cannot pass invokes a sense of closure that is reinforced by the material ending of the collection, but Echo's role in conveying (a version of) the poem is also apertural gesture, pointing as I have argued to reperformance and the *Nachleben* of the poem.⁴⁴⁴ In this section I shall explore in detail how this closure operates in the context of the book, and how this recontextualization adds to Echo's significance.

The difference just articulated between the text's projected control and lack of control over its future is sharpened by the situation of the material document, where the reader is confronted by the illusion of Echo moving over the border of the book as the document and the space beyond it, a division which replays the distinction between earth and Hades. Echo's mediatory role also has a temporal aspect; read diachronically, she is both a symbolic figure partaking of the world of the performance, and a metaphor for, and grounded in, the diachronicity of the text. The performance contains within itself a symbol of that which reaches beyond it. The text cannot perform its 'whole' function by itself; consequently, the performance is internally divided between the earthly performance and Echo's performance in the underworld, a division which is further recapitulated by the articulation of the text across multiple recontextualizations. Echo's supplementary character is also significant for her closural role: as a replication of an originary utterance, she is radically secondary, and yet dramatized as necessary for the text to function. The collection ends with a highlighting of poetry's diachronic aspect, and also prompts a reconsideration of the supplementary dynamics of reading. Hers is a paradoxical position, both in some sense dependent on the narrator or performer for the content of her message, but also able to communicate in a way that the performers cannot. In this sense, she is symbolic of both the power and the limitations of the epinician project, and, more importantly, of the interdependency of reader and text, and of the text and the context(s) that shape its dissemination. But the wider context of the Hellenistic archive also informs perception of Echo, as the written document's role in

⁴⁴⁴ On the dynamic of closure and aperture cf. e.g. Fowler (2000) 237-307.

recording a past text and acting as a written trace of performance culture emphasises Echo's status as that which cannot be assimilated to this archival function.

Another passage where such resistance is at issue is P.5.96-103, where Arcesilas' ancestors are imagined as participating in epinician performance:

ἄτερθε δὲ πρὸς δωμάτων ἕτεροι λαχόντες Αἴδαν
βασιλέες ἱεροί
ἐντί· μεγαλᾶν δ' ἀρετᾶν
δρόσῳ μαλθακᾶ
ῥανθειςᾶν κώμων ὑπὸ χεύμασιν,
ἀκούοντί ποι χθονίᾳ φρενί,
σφὸν ὄλβον υἱῶ τε κοινᾶν χάριν
ἔνδικόν τ' Ἄρκεσίλα·

Apart from him there are other sacred kings, who have Hades for their lot, before the palace. And they hear in some way, with their minds of earth, of great virtues soaked by soft dew under outpourings of revels, their own prosperity and a blessing justly held in common with Arcesilas, their son.

As in O.14, the precise nature of the contact between the underworld and the world of the living is left obscure: the ancestors are described as 'hearing in some way' (ἀκούοντί ποῖ).⁴⁴⁵ The text thus construes within itself the possibility of an experience of reading irreducible to its own textuality, and which consequently cannot be archived. The connection between the dead in the underworld and the performance (δρόσῳ μαλθακᾶ / ῥανθειςᾶν κώμων) contrasts with the connection enabled by the archive between the poem as a physical document and generations of readers. However, we must be wary of a schematic opposition of the performance economy to the material documents of the archive, since the former functions as the oral equivalent of an archive, preserving and disseminating the text. Equally, as in the case of Echo, the kings in the underworld prefigure the role of readers in participating in the text, as well as paralleling the activities of the performing chorus. Both of these passages engage in an imbrication of repeatability and the ineffable, as the unknowable scene of the underworld comes by a metonymical slippage to stand for later rereadings. In the Hellenistic context, Echo therefore marks simultaneously the preservative functions of textual

⁴⁴⁵ Cf. Slater *s.v.* for other uses of ποῖ.

dissemination and the elements in it which exceed the archivable: Echo's utterance as a virtual projection of the text can only be a virtual property of the archive.⁴⁴⁶

The imbrication of activeness and passivity in Echo's role also figures the interdependency of text and context. On the one hand, she is commanded by the text, and the text aggregates power to itself by naming her as one of its functions, but the text's total function is also passively given over to Echo's reduplicative function. This doubleness marks another aspect of Echo's function: in the context of written dissemination, I argue that Echo can be read as an indirect metaphor both for the book and the reader. Like the reader, she too 'reads' the poem and partakes in its dissemination, carrying the text's message beyond its original context; by being addressed as Echo the reader is figuratively transformed into an echo of the text, again prompting an awareness of the dynamic of dependency and authority at work in the relations between text and reader. Likewise, the book enables the poem('s message) to travel, and reduplicates an utterance which precedes it. A contrast emerges between Echo's status as a figure of mobility and the material fixity of the document, offset by the book also being a mobile object whose disseminatory power relies on its capacity to be transported. Echo's journey, in the context of the book, is always suspended, and takes place only figurally within the text itself, creating a future moment of enunciation which is always deferred. Echo's metaphorical status oscillates between standing for the book, the text's diachronicity, and its readership: her symbolic multiplicity itself forms a comment on the interrelatedness of these different aspects of the disseminatory process.

Each individual reading of the text is a kind of fulfilment of Echo's journey, in that it enacts the poem's transcendence of its original context, but it also reruns the text's deferral of Echo's message. The text therefore fulfils itself by means of a (series of) transfiguration(s), as no individual reading is ever identical to Echo's function, but acts as a mediated realization of it. Significant for this mediation is the interaction between Echo and voiced readings of the text: Echo's unenunciated message acts as that which cannot be voiced by a reader, inscribing a signification resistance into the act of reading. We have seen that the conceptualization of authorial voice is an important part of Pindaric reception; the epigrams frequently point up the force of Pindar's voice, and the critic Arcesilaus described Pindar as 'terrific at filling out the voice' (δεινὸν εἶναι φωνῆς ἐμπλήσαι).⁴⁴⁷ This maxim refers to the sonic force of the Pindar's poetry, analysed in detail by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and its impact on the reader's vocalization. Yet Echo's role in O.14 also highlights the processes of differentiation

⁴⁴⁶ For the significance of the relation between event and archive cf. Derrida (1995); Orrells (2010).

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. p. 12 above.

at work in (voiced) reading. In her resistance to vocal reduplication, Echo thematizes what cannot be included within voiced recreations of the text. Receptive mediation also takes the form of concrete interpretations, an instance of which can be seen at Σ O.14.28a (Drach. I p. 394), which equates Φήμη and Echo: παραγενοῦ πρὸς τὸν σκοτεινὸν οἶκον, ᾧ Φήμη καὶ Ἠχώ, διηγησομένη καὶ ἀγγελοῦσα τὴν καλλίστην ἀγγελίαν τῷ πατρὶ Ἀσωπίχου Κλεοδάμῳ ('go to the dark house, O Rumour and Echo, and describe and announce the fairest message to Cleodamus, Asopichus' father').⁴⁴⁸ This doubling actually shifts the operation of the text, assimilating Echo's role to another personification not mentioned by the poem. As outlined above, there are potential problems with expanding Echo into a more generalized 'rumour' or 'repute', and the scholia's equation glosses over these, leading to a figuration of Echo potentially quite different from that implied by the figure of Echo alone. While there is a distinction to be drawn between the transfiguration of Echo brought about by this concretized exegetical reading, and the transfiguration that occurs as a structural aspect of the interaction between any reader and Echo, the scholium nonetheless neatly illustrates the role of metatexts in displacing the texts they comment on into a new interpretative space.

The unenunciated nature of Echo's message also has significance for the recontextualization of her role in the book. Echo stages the limits of readerly control, in that the content as well as the means of her utterance remains opaque. Hitherto, I have argued that Echo reduplicates the message of the final lines; this reading entails seeing the text as doubled, narrated both by the speaker or chorus and as representing in advance what Echo will say in the underworld. On this reading, the text would contain Echo's version within itself, but her version of the message would necessarily be contextually different, even if comprised of the same words. Thus the 'containment' just mentioned is in a sense false, or only provisional. This situation creates an uncertainty over the status of the text, oscillating between these two modes, which resonates with the wider uncertainties of the processes of reception. Are we as readers simply reduplicating the text, which has always been reduplicated in advance, withholding the possibility of a pure reduplication, or are we also fundamentally engaged in a transformation of the text we encounter? Paradoxically, the text includes its own 'reading' within itself, but does so by means of not making that reading explicit, by not including the reading itself. Echo's unreadable reading is closurally dramatic as a reminder of the provisionality of the textual encounter. Despite the stress above on the resistance of the text to the archiving process, we should avoid sacralizing this remainder as an excess which is always in advance

⁴⁴⁸ Cf. Daude (2009) on paraphrase in the scholia.

above, the exact grounds of the relation are not made explicit, and because Echo's role refigures what reading the text will have meant, thus intervening into that which she ostensibly only stands for. The closural position of the poem also gives this reading of the effects of metaphor a resonance for the collection as a whole: like Echo, the collection transforms what it addresses, and is given over to further transformations in its journey across the centuries.⁴⁴⁹

OTHER ECHOES INHABIT THE GARDEN: THE LIMITS OF INTERTEXTUALITY

One of the central moves of intertextualist theorizing has been to foreground the intertextual determinations that underpin all acts of reading, which are redescribed as bringing into play a potentially endless range of texts in addition to any one particular text on which a reader might focus; this wider intertextual background, not comprising only literary texts but the whole resources of the language user, is essential for the reader to be able to make sense of the text at all. A correlative of this has been an increased awareness of modes of reference not dependent on authorial intentions. As well as consciously formulated allusions, texts also allow for the operation of intertextual resonances that may not have been intended by an author, and for interactions with later texts that an author could not have foreseen.⁴⁵⁰ In this section, I shall examine part of the intertextual background that emerges in the Hellenistic period for O.14 by focussing on post-Pindaric literary representations of Echo, and attempt to understand the kind of effects this may have had for a Hellenistic reader.

O.14 is the first extant occurrence of Echo as a personified figure;⁴⁵¹ the next extant occurrence is Soph. *Phil.* 188-90:

ἄ δ' ἄθυρόστομος
Ἄχῶ τηλεφανῆς πικραῖς
οἰμωγαῖς ὑπακούει

Echo, she of the unbarred mouth, appearing far off responds to his bitter cries of grief.

The primary reference here is to the garrulity of Philoctetes' lamentations.⁴⁵² The use of ὑπακούει leads to a coincidence of signification and referential function, the

⁴⁴⁹ On the transformational effects of Pindar's language cf. Silk (2007).

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. e.g. Hinds (1997) for a detailed discussion of the distinction between allusion and intertextuality.

⁴⁵¹ Cf. (possibly) Aesch. *Per.* 391.

verbs two meanings of ‘listen to’⁴⁵³ and ‘respond’⁴⁵⁴ exactly map onto Echo’s dual role. But the word’s doubleness also marks her futility, and the futility of Philoctetes’s situation; her ‘listening’ adds nothing to her ‘response’, which simply reduplicates Philoctetes’ laments, connoting the frustrated circularity of his utterances.⁴⁵⁵ The visibility of -φανής seems at odds with Echo’s auditory and vocal role, but the word accents her distance from Philoctetes, implying the distance travelled by his cries before she echoes them: the visibility of the adjective enhances the sense of Philoctetes’ isolation.

Echo plays a slightly more active role at Eur. *Hec.* 1109-13, where Agamemnon describes returning to the Greek camp after hearing a disturbance among the soldiers:

κραυγῆς ἀκούσας ἦλθον· οὐ γὰρ ἤσυχος
πέτρας ὀρείας παῖς λέλακ’ ἀνὰ στρατὸν
Ἦχῶ διδοῦσα θόρυβον· εἰ δὲ μὴ Φρυγῶν
πύργους πεσόντας ἤισμεν Ἑλλήνων δορί,
φόβον παρέσχ’ ἂν οὐ μέσῳ ὄδε κτύπος.

I came upon hearing the uproar. For Echo, the unquiet child of the mountain rocks, cries out among the army, raising a din. Did I not know that the towers of the Phrygians were fallen to the Greek spear, this noise would bring no little fear.

Her two actions (λέλακ’ ... διδοῦσα θόρυβον) are not explicitly marked as derivative, although we are presumably meant to think of Agamemnon understanding her actions as reduplicating and further inciting the noise already being made by the men. Agamemnon is slightly uneasy in 1112-13; Troy has fallen, therefore the noise, whose cause he does not yet know, cannot have anything to do with military matters, and therefore does not cause him any fear, and yet it was enough to cause him to come and find out the nature of the events. We might therefore read his use of Echo to describe the noise as an attempt to downplay a potentially threatening situation by subordinating it to a diminutive metaphorical realization, using Echo to cast the crowd as an unruly child (πέτρας ὀρείας παῖς) shrieking stupidly; her association with the wilderness of the mountains underscoring her (and their) lack of

⁴⁵² For the meaning of ἀθυρόστομος as ἀθυρόγλωττος cf. LSJ s.v.

⁴⁵³ *Il.* 8.4; *Od.* 14.485.

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. *Od.* 4.283.

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. Alexiou (1974) for the repetitiveness of lamentations.

sociality. Notable also in this respect are the multiple synonyms (κραυγῆς, θόρυβον, κτύπος).

As in the *Philoctetes*, Echo's conceptual aspect has an impact on the semantics of the passage. Her nature as a coterminous listener and speaker mobilizes the two different senses of the verb λάσκω, which can refer to things 'ringing' when struck, where the subject of the verb makes a sound as a result of being the object of an action,⁴⁵⁶ but also to creatures making noise independently.⁴⁵⁷ Both of these sense are appropriate to Echo, who can be read here as acting independently and registering sound made by others, and the imbrication of these senses, together with the context of the disorder of the crowd, connotes Echo's status as a figure who obstructs normal modes of communication. Both passages involve indeterminate and unregulated sound, and in both Echo's appearance marks a threat to comprehensibility. In the *Philoctetes* passage, the interminability of Philoctetes' lamentation, bolstered by the closed circuit of Echo's repetitions, defies readability and mirrors the character's isolation. In the *Hecuba*, the κτύπος unnerves Agamemnon by preceding from an unknown cause. Euripides' use of Echo in the *Andromeda* parallels the *Philoctetes* passage; at fr. 118 Andromeda tells Echo to depart in order that she may lament together with the chorus. As in the *Philoctetes*, Echo symbolizes Andromeda's loneliness, and the mourning that she participates in is distinguished from communal lamentation.

Euripides' use of Echo in the *Andromeda* is parodied by Aristophanes in the *Thesmophoriazusae* in a scene where 'Euripides' dresses up as Echo in order to attempt to befuddle the Guard and free Inlaw. Here Echo's capacity for reduplicating discourse is given a comic spin, again acting as a bar to clear communication. 'Euripides' characterizes (himself as) Echo as λόγων ἀντρωδὸς ἐπικοκκάστρια (1059). The meaning of ἐπικοκκάστρια is obscure. It is glossed by the scholia as εἰωθυῖα γελᾶν, γελάστρια. ἐπεὶ εἰσήγαγε κακοστένακτον τὴν Ἥχῶ ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἐν τῇ Ἀνδρομέδᾳ, εἰς τοῦτο παίζει ('given to laughter, a mocker. Since Euripides in his *Andromeda* used Echo as a mourner, he [sc. Aristophanes] makes a joke of this'). However, this looks like a speculation, and on the basis that 'Echo's' 'main characteristic [in this scene] is her relentless, annoying loquacity'⁴⁵⁸, and that 'Echo' is not referred to as laughing, ἐπικοκκάστρια is more likely to mean something like 'babbling', 'chattering'. In what follows, Aristophanes traduces Euripides' use of Echo;

⁴⁵⁶ E.g. *Il.* 14.25 of bronze, *Il.* 20.277 of a shield.

⁴⁵⁷ E.g. *Hom.h.Her.* 145.

⁴⁵⁸ Austin and Olson (2004) ad loc.

instead of assisting his ‘Andromeda’ in her mourning, her repetitiousness quickly frustrates Inlaw (1070-80):

Later, once Inlaw has grown tired of the dialogue, Echo’s repetitions also bewilder the Scythian Archer. Paradoxically, it is the very precision of Echo’s replies that precludes both the possibility of a meaningful dialogue and of Inlaw getting on with his lamentations by himself (ὤγάθ’, ἕασόν με μονωδῆσαι ...). Also of interest for the concept of Echo as a metapoetic figure is the decontextualizing nature of her utterances. Her repetitions separate individual words from their original enunciative context, and either make them almost meaningless, as with λίαν (1076), where the adverb is detached from its verb, or humorously alter their meaning. We see this in παῦσαι / παῦσαι, where the very fact of Echo’s speaking contradicts Inlaw’s command, and the main burden of the word is in its effect, transgressing Inlaw’s wishes, rather than its semantic value. Part of this effect has to do with the absence of motivation or intent from Echo’s utterances; because she can only repeat what she hears, her utterances cannot be analysed normatively as proceeding from a subject who is attempting to give voice to internal thoughts. Her language is pure exteriority, and cannot be correlated with any kind of projected psychological ground. Thus when ‘Echo’ repeats Inlaw’s ληρεῖς, there is a shift of meaning; whereas his accusation is a result of his frustration, her utterance is simply an empty reflection of his, as well as a confirmation of his comment. Ironically, however, Inlaw himself is babbling at this point. The scene has resonances for the relations between comedy and tragedy,⁴⁵⁹ but taken in more general terms, it also reads as a comment on the complications of repetition, which language requires in order to function, but which can also threaten language’s capacity to make sense.

Echo also occurs as a mourner in the context of pastoral poetry, a trope doubtless influenced by her role in texts such as the *Philoctetes* and the *Andromeda*.⁴⁶⁰ Particularly relevant to an assessment of O.14 in the Hellenistic period are the use made of Echo by Bion and [Moschus]. The former uses Echo as part of the *Epitaphius Adonis* 37-8:

‘αἰαῖ τὰν Κυθήρειαν· ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις’
Ἄχὼ δ’ ἀντεβόασεν, ‘ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις’

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. e.g. Rau (1967) 79-85; Silk (1993).

⁴⁶⁰ She also occurs in an eponymous play by Eubulus (fr. 35 = Athen. 7.300b, for which cf. Hunter (1983) ad loc.), and her relationship with Pan is exploited in Moschus fr. 2.

‘Alas Cytherea! Fair Adonis is dead,’ and Echo cried out response, ‘Fair Adonis is dead.’

This use is picked up by [Mosch.] *Epit. Bion.* 30-1, which neatly inverts Echo’s usual loquaciousness, making her mourn the fact that she must remain silent without Bion’s songs to repeat:

Ἀχὼ δ’ ἐν πέτραισιν ὀδύρεται ὅττι σιωπῇ
κούκέτι μιμεῖται τὰ σὰ χεῖλεα ...

Echo grieved among the rocks, so that she, in silence, no longer imitated your lips ...

Echo’s association with the mountainous wilderness (ἐν πέτραισιν) is again, as in the *Philoctetes*, mobilized to enhance her sense of isolation. These pastoral depictions of Echo may be redirecting in ways now obscure associations built up around Echo as a figure in comedies such as Eubulus’; if that play, and perhaps others like it, involved some tragicomic or pathetic depiction of Echo based around the restricted repetitiousness of her speech, the pastoral topos of Echo as mourner may have taken over some of the pathos of the comic treatments.

In the late Hellenistic period, Echo is also depicted by Archias 33 GP (= *A.P.* 16.154), whose representation plays on the conventions of ephrastic and dedicatory epigram:⁴⁶¹

Ἦχῶ πετρήεσσαν ὄρας, φίλε, Πανὸς ἑταίρην,
ἀντίτυπον φθογγὴν ἔμπαλιν ἀδομένην,
παντοίων στομάτων λάλον εἰκόνα, ποιμέσιν ἠδὺ
παίγνιον. ὅσσα λέγεις, ταῦτα κλύων ἄπιθι.

You see rocky Echo, friend, Pan’s girlfriend, who sings back a voice shaped after your own, the babbling image of all types of tongues, the shepherds’ sweet plaything. Leave, hearing just as much as you say.

Here, Echo’s repetitiousness is used to ironize formal conventions; such epigrams are normally based on the fiction of the speaking monument, whereas here Echo can only speak

⁴⁶¹ Cf. also Call. *Ep.* 28.5-6.

as a result of being spoken to, an irony pressed home by the double meaning of *λάλον εικόνα* as speaking statue or image. The erasure of Echo's capacity for independent vocalization is here presented as playful (*ποιμέσιν ἠδὺ / παίγνιον*), and the shepherds speaking to Echo are subjected to the same erasure. This is complicated by the ambivalence of the speaker, which could be conceived as either an epigram written on the statue or as one shepherd speaking to another, or as a shepherd reading the inscribed epigram. The second alternative would presumably involve Echo (the statue) simultaneously echoing the utterance, meaning that the text would contain an unenunciated double of itself. Internal vocalization is signified by *ὄσσα λέγεις, ταῦτα κλύων ἄπιθι*; thus whether we conceive the epigram as read aloud in its fictional context, or if we read the epigram aloud ourselves, then we are effectively playing Echo's role in echoing an utterance. Consequently, the poem dramatizes the secondariness of the reader's role; like Echo, the reader is doomed to be an *ἀντίτυπον φθογγήν*, replicating another's discourse.⁴⁶²

Despite their significant generic and contextual differences, all of these treatments have in common a problematization, whether ironic or pathetic, of communication through its exposure to the differently realized types of repetition to which Echo can give rise. Pindar's treatment of Echo is notably different in that she enables communication, albeit of a complex kind. Consequently, the intertextual field against which an educated Hellenistic reader is likely to have experienced O.14 complicates fidelity to O.14's particular realization of Echo by bringing into play a number of other different models by means of which Pindar's Echo's might be understood.⁴⁶³ The intertextual field just outlined opens up the possibility of consciously allowing one's engagement with O.14 to be coloured by later texts; we might, for instance, see the capacity of Pindar's Echo to travel to Hades as prefiguring her connection with death and mourning in the pastoral texts. Equally, we might privilege the original context of O.14 to the extent of holding the later texts of no account in a reading. This position, however, would neglect the determinative impact that later texts will inevitably have on a reading of O.14, even if this impact is only subconscious; moreover, such a position fails to recognize the extent to which the move of privileging an 'originary' reading of the poem is not a neutral or necessary move, but itself a construction of various critical discourses and

⁴⁶² The most famous Echo narrative is *Ov. Met.* 3.356-99, in which Ovid yokes together Echo and Narcissus. He also adduces an aetiology for Echo being reduced to a voice without a body; this state is a punishment from Juno for assisting Jupiter in his adulteries: *fecerat hoc Iuno quia cum deprendere posset / sub Ioue saepe suo nymphas in monte iacentes, / illa deam longo prudens sermone tenebat / dum fugerent nymphae* (3.362-5).

⁴⁶³ Symptomatic of this is some modern scholars' (e.g. Alden Smith (1999) 259-60) unwarranted desire to see hints of the Narcissus and Echo connection in O.14; there is no evidence that this myth was even in existence during the fifth century, and there is no reference to it in the poem.

presuppositions. A more productive position, I suggest, is to recognise the extent to which fidelity to the particular demands of O.14 requires a kind of negative intertextuality, a resistance to the possible connections that could be made between O.14's Echo and those of later texts, and an erasure of the intertextual networks within which the text could be understood.

This move is not purely negative, however: it alerts the reader to the particular features of Pindar's treatment, and allows Pindar's text to be viewed in a different light. Both O.14's emphasis on the communication that Echo allows, and its untextualizable nature, are clarified by the intertextual nexus in which O.14 is situated in the Hellenistic period, which allows for a changed understanding of Pindar's Echo in terms of its differences from other treatments. As in the case of the poems examined above, the diachronic situation has a resingularizing dimension: O.14 not only confronts the conceptual categories of its own time with its singularizing force, but also differs from the prevailing representations of Echo in later periods. Broader questions are also at stake: the combination of Echo's metapoetic resonances and the marked differences between Pindar's treatment of Echo and others mean that O.14 becomes the site of a potential questioning of what is involved in the construction of a context of reading. Given Pindar's privileged status within the canon, the possibility arises of reading the later texts' Echoes as indirect or distortive echoes of Pindar's Echo, thus both validating Pindar's Echo as a symbol of a privileged mode of communication, and buttressing their own figurations of echoing as distortion, displacement, and transfiguration. From another angle, the differences between the later Echoes and Pindar's Echo can also be read as prefigured by the differentiated repetition which Pindar's Echo represents. But this privileging of O.14 is problematic: as suggested above, representations of Echo as a pastoral mourner seem to be drawing on the tragic poets' uses of Echo, and perhaps that of the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, rather than Pindar's. In negotiating possible literary filiations and the importance of generic considerations in shaping particular representations of a figure, the reader finds himself confronted with various means of constructing the context in which Pindar's Echo can be (re)read, and impelled to dwell on what fidelity to Pindar's text might mean, whether such fidelity is even possible given that it itself is subject to diachronic variations, and the implications of this for a reading of the rest of the collection.

PYTHIANS 11 AND 12: MATERIALITY, INTERTEXTUALITY, CLOSURE

P.12, for Midas of Acragas, combines the stories of Perseus killing Medusa and Athena inventing the music of the *aulos*. This section examines how Pythian 12 operates in the context of the book, and how its aetiological narrative functions in relation to the exegetical comments to which it gives rise and in relation to its intertextual background. There are numerous parallels between P.12 and O.14; both are short and monostrophic, and both were composed for victors geographically and personally much less important than the tyrants and other major political figures, and P.12 is the only extant epinician written for a victor in the musical contests.⁴⁶⁴ Both poems exemplify thus the categorizational principle of putting poems for lesser victors and events towards the end of the book, but both poems contain closural elements which suit them for and are emphasized by their position in their respective books. Another formal similarity between the poems is that neither dwell much on the achievements of the victors or their families, unlike the odes for the tyrants, or indeed other odes for more well-known figures. This could be read in the context of the book as producing a certain focus on the narrative and metapoetic elements at the expense of the laudatory programme, or rather as subsuming the laudatory programme by means of the these, as the *laudandus* recedes somewhat into the background and other elements come into the foreground. This elision of the *laudandus*, the diminution of direct praise, combines with both poems' emphasis on mortality, and is thrown into sharp relief by the contrast with the poems earlier in the book. This contrast is particularly strong in the case of P.12, where Midas is only mentioned in 5-6, and is presented as conveyor/practicer of his craft rather than an individual notable in and of himself.⁴⁶⁵

There are also important differences between the poems: O.14's hymn to the Graces is generalizing and, despite the Graces' strong connections with Orchomenus, has a Panhellenic resonance which lends itself to being read as capping the poetic concerns of the book; P.12's aetiological narrative is more explicitly local, dealing with one particular mode of performance rather than with poetry generally. Similarly, Echo as a metapoetic figure functions rather differently from the closing gnome in P.12; although I shall argue that the latter also has a metapoetic dimension, and although both passages dwell on the fragility of

⁴⁶⁴ The reference to Cephisus and in P.12.27 might put the reader in mind of O.14's depiction of Orchomenos as a privileged poetic site; Orchomenos is a source of poetic and musical inspiration in both poems.

⁴⁶⁵ Compositionally, this may have to do with reasons of social etiquette; if Midas was a foreigner as some scholars have suggested (e.g. Gentili and Luisi (1995)), extended focus on him may have been seen as improper, a problem potentially compounded by his humble social status as a musician. Nevertheless, this strategy has a marked effect as a divergence from the generic norm established by the poems earlier in the book.

mortal life, they emphasise different aspects of how mortality can be confronted. The intertextual backgrounds of the two poems are also notably at odds. Consequently, there are significant differences between the closural and archival functions of the two poems which will emerge in the course of the following reading. I begin, however, with an assesment of the relation between Pythians 11 and 12 as a means of exploring its place in the book.

P.11 AND P.12 AS A CLOSURAL PAIR

The structure of the book encourages intertextual connections between poems, a reading strategy particularly prompted by the various links between P.11 and P.12. The narratives of both poems involve ephobic triumphs, where young men kill oppressive older figures. In both, the heroes are recipients of divine aid which enables their actions: at P.11.36-7 describes Ares' assistance to Orestes (ἀλλὰ χρονίῳ σὺν Ἄρει / πέφνεν τε ματέρα θῆκ' ἄϊσθον ἐν φοναῖς, 'but in time, with Ares' help, he slew his mother and encompassed Aegisthus with murder'), while Athena aids Perseus at P.12.18-19. Deviant sexual relationships and the consequent disorder within the family unit at issue in both poems. P.11.22-7 stress the importance of adultery as part of Clytemnestra's motivation in addition to the killing of Iphigeneia:

πότερόν νιν ἄρ' Ἰφιγένει' ἐπ' Εὐρίπῳ
σφαχθεῖσα τῆλε πάτρας
ἔκνισεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον;
ἢ ἑτέρῳ λέχει δαμαζομέναν
ἔννουχοι πάραγον κοῖται; τὸ δὲ νέαις ἀλόχοις
ἔχθιστον ἀμπλάκιον καλύψαι τ' ἀμάχανον

ἄλλοτρίαισι γλώσσαις.

Did Iphigeneia's slaughter by the Euripus, far from her homeland, goad her to stir up her heavy-handed rage? Or did nightly couplings lead her astray, overcome in another's bed? This lapse is most hated in young wives and impossible to hide because of others' tongues.

The juxtaposition of the two poems opens the possibility of reading Danae and Clytemnestra together, leading to a strong contrast between the two. Whereas Danae is forced into a relationship she does not want (τ' ἔμπεδον / δουλοσύναν τό τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος, 'fixed slavery and a forced bed', 14-15) it is suggested that Clytemnestra is impelled into adultery by her desires (ἢ ἐτέρω λέχεϊ δαμαζομέναν / ἔννουχοι πάραγον κοῖται;). The contrast between the more abstract, political δουλοσύναν and the animalistic δαμαζομέναν retrospectively points up the bestiality of Clytemnestra, and implies Danae's virtue.⁴⁶⁶ Similarly, the greater detail of ἔννουχοι πάραγον κοῖται puts Clytemnestra's illicitness in the spotlight, contrasting again with the more neutral, desexualized ἀναγκαῖον λέχος, whose emphasis is squarely on the compulsion Danae suffers. The contrast, then, brings about a mutually reinforcing emphasis on Clytemnestra's depravity and Danae's suffering.

An obvious contrast between the poems is the difference between Perseus rescuing his mother and Orestes killing his mother in order to avenge his father. This comparison strengthens the conflictedness of Orestes, and likewise highlights Perseus as a relatively more straightforward figure.⁴⁶⁷ A full exploration of this relation requires an analysis of P.11, which has been one of the most debated poems in the Pindaric corpus, and whose argumentational and intertextual aspects are of particular interest for a reading of the Hellenistic edition of the Pythians. Previous interpreters have fallen roughly into two camps, those who have argued for seeing the myth as negative exemplum, and those who have seen it as positive, with Orestes as a praiseworthy figure whose actions redound to the credit of Thrasydaeus.⁴⁶⁸ I shall argue that both these critical strategies, and the theoretical assumptions that underlie them, are misguided, and that a more productive approach is to emphasise the non-identity of the victor and the exemplum, and the hermeneutic problematics thus created. Furthermore, I suggest that these problematics are enhanced by the poem's diachronic situation.

Proponents of the positive exemplum thesis have often pointed out that seeing Orestes as a problematic, tragic figure gives too much weight to the image of him we have inherited from

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. Illig (1932) 95 on the ethnicity of Perseus' act; he compares Heracles' destruction of Augeas in O.10.

⁴⁶⁷ For the parallel cf. Crotty (1982) 111, 119, and cf. more generally Köhnken (1971) 134-5.

⁴⁶⁸ For a more balanced analysis cf. Most (1985) 25-6: 'Orest spielt in diesem Gedicht zwei verschiedene Rollen. Bei seiner Reise, beim delphischen Empfang und bei der Rückkehr gleicht er Thrasydaos und ist ein positives Beispiel; aber in seiner Verstrickung ins Unheil seiner Familie, in seinem Muttermord, gehört er durchaus zu den übrigen Atreiden und funktioniert zusammen mit ihnen als ein negatives Gegenbeispiel.' It could be objected that 'seiner Verstrickung ins Unheil seiner Familie' is not Orestes' fault, and therefore pertains more to the limitations of the application of the poem's ethical constructs; I would read this as foregrounding the difficulties of the exemplum relation rather than as making Orestes 'ein negatives Gegenbeispiel'. For objections to Most's parallels between Orestes and Thrasydaeus, cf. Finglass (2007a) 45-7.

tragedy, and point out that in the *Odyssey* Orestes serves as a positive exemplum for Telemachus. This view, however, neglects an important facet of the interaction of the two texts, namely that P.11 puts the matricide to the fore by explicitly mentioning it, and focuses more than does the *Odyssey* on Clytemnestra's immorality. This has the effect of foregrounding the disturbing nature of Orestes' action, transferring it out of the sphere of homosocial violence and into the domestic space. In the *Odyssey*'s accounts of Agamemnon's death, Clytemnestra is almost completely absent, as in Zeus' programmatic account (Hom. *Od.* 1.32-43). Clytemnestra's role here is minimal, and Aegisthus is the active partner in their attack (ὥς καὶ νῦν Αἴγισθος ὑπὲρ μόρον Ἀτρείδαο / γῆμ' ἄλοχον μνηστήν, τὸν δ' ἔκτανε νοστήσαντα, 'as even now Aegisthus beyond what was ordained took the son of Atreus' legitimate wife in marriage, and killed him on his return', 35-6). It is he who marries Clytemnestra and kills Agamemnon, to whom Hermes speaks (38-9), and to whom Orestes' vengeance is principally directed (ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταιο τίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρείδαο, 'from Orestes will vengeance come for the son of Atreus', 40).

Similarly at *Od.* 1.298-302 Clytemnestra is nowhere to be seen, and the emphasis falls on the killing of Aegisthus (ἐπεὶ ἔκτανε πατροφονῆα, / Αἴγισθον δολόμητιν, ὃ οἱ πατέρα κλυτὸν ἔκτα, 'when he killed the killer of his father, cunning Aegisthus, who slew his famous father', 299-300). Aegisthus also takes centre-stage in Nestor's speech at *Od.* 3.301-10. Although Clytemnestra is mentioned at 310 (μητρός τε στυγερῆς, 'hateful mother'), the actual act of matricide is not dwelt upon, and the main emphasis again falls on the killing of Aegisthus (306-7), who as at *Od.* 1.35-6 bears the weight of responsibility for the killing and the usurpation (303-5). There is a rhetorical aspect to this narrative, as eliding Clytemnestra's role equates to a tactful avoidance of the sensitive issue of Penelope's conduct, thus avoiding the possibility of giving offence to Telemachus. But we are aware of the matricide nonetheless; the structuring of the narrative allows us to interrogate the process by which arguments and exempla are constructed, and hence participates in the poem's wider meditation on the deceptiveness, positive and negative, of speech. A similar emphasis occurs in Menelaus' narrative at *Od.* 4.514-37, where Aegisthus and his men do the killing, and again Clytemnestra is not mentioned. It is notable, however, that Agamemnon equates Aegisthus and Clytemnestra in his brief account of the events at 24.96-7 (ἐν νόστῳ γάρ μοι Ζεὺς μήσατο λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον / Αἰγίσθου ὑπὸ χερσὶ καὶ οὐλομένης ἀλόχοιο, 'Zeus devised bitter destruction for me on my return at the hands of Aegisthus and my accursed wife').

This situation is almost completely reversed by P.11, where the main emphasis of the narrative at 17-37 falls on Clytemnestra's actions, and where Aegisthus is not mentioned until the end (37).⁴⁶⁹ This raises a problem for critics who want to see Orestes as a purely positive, unproblematic figure who avenges his father and brings order to his household. Although Clytemnestra's depravity can be read as exculpating Orestes from criticism for her killing, the focus on her also highlights the simple fact of Orestes having to kill his mother.⁴⁷⁰ Such readings have to elide the inherently disturbing action of matricide, and indeed Roberta Sevieri even goes so far as to say that 'Pindaro abbia inteso qui presentare non Oreste il matricida, ma Oreste il restauratore della casa paterna.'⁴⁷¹ This neglects the phrasing of P.11.37 πέφνεν τε μητέρα θῆκέ τ' Αἴγισθον ἐν φοναῖς; had the poet wanted to de-emphasize the matricide, he could easily have phrased this line differently, but the fact that he refers to Clytemnestra as a 'mother' stresses the horror of the action. The separation of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus is also important, in that it encourages us to view them as individuals as well as a unity. This does not mean, however, that Orestes is simply a negative exemplum, as the matricide does not negate the positive aspects of Orestes' presentation.⁴⁷² Rather, we should see the matricide as a both a horrifying action, and a deed necessitated by Orestes' situation, irreducible to either a purely positive or purely negative presentation.

Another difficulty for the relation between myth and frame comes with 55 ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἄκρον ἐλὼν ἠσυχᾶ τε νεμόμενος αἰνὰν ὕβριν / ἀπέφυγεν ('but if a man gains the peak and there dwells peacefully, avoiding dread *hybris*') The injunction to avoid 'dread *hybris*' sits uneasily with the mythical narrative. We might read Orestes' action as unhubristic, but we are not told whether he lived 'peacefully' after his revenge on Clytemnestra, as the gnome encourages,⁴⁷³ and we might wonder whether such an outcome would be possible given the nature of his actions.⁴⁷⁴ Similarly, the use of *hybris* vocabulary here prompts a questioning of

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. Robbins (1986) 3; Sevieri (1999) 101-2; Finglass (2007a) 107-8.

⁴⁷⁰ Finglass (2007a) 108 compares 'the brevity of the reference to the matricide' to *Od.* 3.309-10, but Pindar's πέφνεν τε μητέρα is a more direct reference than the Homeric lines, where the genitive *μητρός τε στυγερῆς* is dependent on *τάφον*, and the focus on killing (*πέφνεν*) is more explicit than the Homeric *δαίνυ τάφον*.

⁴⁷¹ Sevieri (1999) 85.

⁴⁷² Cf. e.g. Robbins (1986) 4; Instone (1987) 87; Sevieri (1999) 83-5; Finglass (2007a) 44-5.

⁴⁷³ The use of the present participle with gnomic aorist denotes an action continuous with the main verb, with the aorist participle describing an action anterior to both. For *νέμομαι* as 'live', 'dwell' cf. Slater *s.v.*, who compares I.9.4. Cf. Dickie (1984) 86-7, who argues that leaving a fair reputation to one's descendants depends on avoidance of *hubris* and 'enjoying ... success with *ἠσυχία*, that is, with restraint'. Finglass (2007a) 121 compares N.1.70 for the peace that results from toil (*ἠσυχίαν καμάτων μεγάλων ποιῶν λαχόντ' ἐξάρετον*).

⁴⁷⁴ Nothing is known of Stesichorus' treatment of the aftermath of Orestes' matricide, which is subject to various treatments in the tragedians. Eur. *Andr.* tells the story of his marriage to Hermione (cf. particularly 881-1008) and his killing of Neoptolemus at Delphi (1067-1165, and cf. Pind. N.7.34). Cf. also Eur. *Or.* 1658-90 for

whether or not Orestes' action was hubristic. The fact that the poem does not explicitly answer these questions prompts the reader to reassess of the ethical concepts deployed in making sense of the narrative. Orestes does not map easily on to the figuration of the ethical ideal, prompting an interrogation of the contingent aspects of such ideals; it would, one might argue, have been impossible for Orestes to live up to such an ideal given the situation he found himself in. The differences between Orestes and the *laudandus* are also at issue in the apodosis which follows $\leq\alpha\lambda\lambda'\geq$ εἴ τις ... ἀπέφυγεν, where the narrator comments on the good reputation bestowed by such a man on his descendants (56-8):

μέλανος $\{\delta'\}$ ἄν ἐσχατιὰν
καλλίονα θανάτου $\leq\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\iota\geq$ γλυκυτάτα γενεᾶ
εὐώνυμον κτεάνων κρατίσταν χάριν πορώων·

... he would go to a fairer border of black death, beestowing on his sweetest offspring the grace of good repute, strongest of possessions.

The narrator does not comment on whether Orestes bequeaths a εὐώνυμον ... χάριν to his descendants. This silence might be read positively, but the absence of explicit comment draws attention to the difference between the event of athletic success and Orestes' actions; even if we see Orestes as a largely positive figure, we are made aware of the less controversial nature of the athlete's achievement. Hellenistic readers are also confronted by the contrast between the reputation of the idealized figure of 56-8 and the literary history of Orestes, whose representation by the tragedians as a figure of conflict precludes him being a straightforward purveyor of a εὐώνυμον χάριν. In the Hellenistic context, the difference between the athlete and his posterity, and Orestes, understood as an 'historical' figure, and his later literary realizations, also alerts the reader to a formal difference between the poem's praise of Thrasydaeus, which effectively accomplishes the ambitions of 56-8, and its mode of interaction with other representations of Orestes. The greater complexity of the latter, which I shall explore below, further highlights the difference between Orestes and the *laudandus*.

his marriage to Erigone. Paus. 2.18.6 says that he had a son Tisamenus by Hermione, who succeeded him as king of Sparta. Σ Eur. *Or.* 1645 and Apollod. *Ep.* 6.28 record that he was killed by the bite of a snake at Oresteum in Arcadia. For further references cf. Frazer's notes on Apollod. *Epit.* 6.28.

The famous passage in which the narrator criticises tyranny also bears a relation to the presentation of Orestes (P.11.50-3):

θεόθεν ἐραίμαν καλῶν,

δυνατὰ μαιόμενος ἐν ἀλικία.

τῶν γὰρ ἀνὰ πόλιν εὐρίσκων τὰ μέσα μακροτέρῳ
{σύν} ὄλβῳ τεθαλότα, μέφομ' αἴσαν τυραννίδων·

ξυναῖσι δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖς τέταμαι· φθονεροὶ δ' ἀμύνονται.

May I desire fair things from the gods, striving after what is possible for my age. I reprove the condition of tyrannies, finding as I do in the city the middle way flourishing with the longer prosperity. I strive for shared achievements: the grudging are warded off.

Champions of the negative exemplum thesis have tended to read this passage as condemning the monarchical structures of the heroic age, whose horrors and instabilities are illustrated by the myth, in favour of the more stable oligarchy of present day Thebes.⁴⁷⁵ Those who see Orestes as a positive figure tend to dissociate him from the criticism levelled at tyrants; Sevieri, for instance, reads Orestes as an antityrannical killer in the sense of restoring legitimate governance.⁴⁷⁶ Patrick Finglass subordinates the warnings against tyranny to the poem's laudatory function: 'Pindar's purpose is to praise the victor: any warnings against tyranny contribute to this, and are not an end in themselves'.⁴⁷⁷ This is an overly rigid reading, relying on a limited and *a priori* conception of the poem's functionality, without taking into account the possibility that what 'praising the victor' might mean on a given occasion might be shaped by precisely such local factors as engagement with tyranny, as well as neglecting the more general paraenetic force of the *sententia*, which has ethical relevance for listeners and readers beyond the *laudandus*.

When read in conjunction with the exhortation to moderation discussed above (ἡσυχᾶ ... νεμόμενος), the reference to tyranny has both an encomiastic resonance, pointing up the difference between tyrants and the victor, and a generalized paraenetic function, warning

⁴⁷⁵ Cf. Young (1968). For an inventory of political readings cf. Finglass (2007a). Sevieri (1997) attempts to reconstruct aspects of the poem's first performance, with questionable success: cf. Finglass (2007a) 74.

⁴⁷⁶ Sevieri (1999) 104.

⁴⁷⁷ Finglass (2007a) 118.

against the kind of excessive behaviour connected with the tyrant's life which implicitly balances the moderation referenced in the previous line.⁴⁷⁸ This double function also emphasises the distinction between the exemplum and the frame; Orestes is the son of a monarchical ruler, with aspirations towards continuing the dynasty, and the problems and challenges of his life are an extreme example of the negative aspects of the αἴσα τυραννίδων which Thrasydaeus will not have to face. The context of the book also gives rise to a potential conflict between this passage and earlier poems in praise of tyrants. The criticism of the tyrant's life recalls the end of P.1, recalling the stress there on the tyrant's conduct and retrospectively highlighting the difficulties of the idealization broached in that passage, and might also prompt a recollection of P.3 and its depiction of Hiero's illness. In conjunction with the inverse parallel described above between Clytemnestra and Danae, we can also read this passage as anticipating the depiction of Polydectes as a negative ruler in P.12. Reading the poetry book thus involves a confrontation with differing representations of tyranny, and the attempt to balance their competing claims involves an interrogation of the ethical concepts on which such claims are based.

One of the most controversial passages in the poem is the poet's about-face at 38-40, responses to which have ranged from taking the apology at face value to seeing it as a purely rhetorical gesture.⁴⁷⁹

ἦρ', ὧ φίλοι, κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην,
ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰῶν
τὸ πρὶν· ἢ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου
ἔβαλεν, ὡς ὅτ' ἄκατον ἐνναλίαν;

Was I indeed whirled away where the path divided, having travelled a straight road previously, or did some wind cast me from my course, like a small boat at sea?

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. Pavese (1975) 249. Nagy (1990) 187 and Kurke (1991) 215 see such references as warning against the formation of actual tyrannies, or as diffusing the threat of them. For another type of historicizing reading cf. Gentili (1979). I would see such passages more as figurative ethical constructions. The emphasis on moderation (τὰ μέσσα μακροτέρω / {σὺν} ὄλβω τεθαλόττα) connects with the diminishing stress on victor in the final poems and anticipates the minimal role on Midas in P.12. For the myth's accent on moderation cf. Bernardini (1993) 416.

⁴⁷⁹ See below for the scholia, and cf. Finglass (2007a) 109-10 for a rhetorical interpretation. On the pragmatic effects of such self-corrections, giving a sense of spontaneity and improvisation, cf. Carey (1981) 5; Mackie (2003) 10-11; Currie (2005) 79.

Finglass provides an argument for reading the passage rhetorically: ‘Pindar presents himself as so keen to get back to explicit praise of the victor and his family that he presents his preceding material as the result of a wrong turning. His aim is not to denigrate the myth, but to exalt the section which follows it. But he also implicitly challenges the audience to see if it can improve on the ill-judged (or perhaps over-modest) condemnation of the myth given by the poem’s narrator.’⁴⁸⁰ Finglass is right to reject the interpretation which sees the change of tack as an outright rejection of the myth, but his translation of ἐδιβάθην as ‘confused’ rather begs the question. The image contrasts with the physical stylization and the control exerted by the poet during the performance as ἐξάρχων (if he fulfilled the role in this case), a connection prompted with the verb’s connection with dancing.⁴⁸¹ This contrast opens the possibility of seeing the narrator’s assertion as contradicted by the actualities of performance, or of seeing it as genuine description, and hence the physicalities of performance as the outcome and representation of the narrator’s mental confusion.

The verb also invokes the image of the eddy or whirlpool, and hence of a static, circling movement in contrast with the complex momentum of the verbal narrative. Both strands of meaning invite analysis of the poem’s function in relation to the physicalities of performance, and both involve a testing of the limits of the metaphor and the image’s application to physical realities. The polyvalence of the image and its various interpretative implications lend an additional weight to the question of which it forms part. On this point, it is important to note that Finglass’ analysis, and indeed the readings of those who see it as a straight rejection, rather diminish the force of the question and its wider interpretative significance. What is voiced is not a declarative statement, but a presentation of alternatives which are held in suspense, compelling the reader to supplement the narrator’s indecision. In the context of the problematic relation between myth and frame, the force of this suspense also prompts a more general questioning of the relation between exemplum and *laudandus*, exemplum and the reader, and the wider nature of exemplarity. Here, in addition to its role within the enunciative situation of the poem, the exemplum also constitutes a starting point for readerly reflection on their own ethical position.

The scholia on the passage take the questions at face value. The interpretation given at Σ P.11.58a (Drach. II p. 259-60) sees the digression as functionally inopportune, and the narrator as upbraiding himself for ‘using an inopportune digression’ (αὐτὸς ἀκαίρῳ

⁴⁸⁰ Finglass (2007a) 109.

⁴⁸¹ The verb is used of dancing at e.g. *Il.* 18.494 (κοῦροι δ’ ὀρχηστῆρες ἐδίβειον) and 606: cf. *Lfgre s.v.* δινέω** B2.

παρεκβάσει κεχρημένος), although its following comment on the nature of the narrator's 'wandering' (ἄρα, ὦ φίλοι, ἐπλανήθην τῆς ὁδοῦ τὸ πρότερον ὀρθὴν πορευόμενος [ὁδὸν], 'indeed, friends, I wandered from the road having previously travelled straight') does not imply confusion on his part.⁴⁸² However, the interpretation recorded in Σ 58a goes on to connect the self-address with an encomiastic commitment: εἰ συνέθου καὶ μισθὸν ἔλαβες, ἴν' ἐγκωμιάσης τὸν νικηφόρον, δέον ἐστὶ τὸν ὕμνον ἄλλοτε ἄλλη μετάγειν, ἢ περὶ τοῦ Θρασυδαίου τι λέγοντας ἢ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πυθιονίκου ('if you agreed to compose an encomium for the victor and took money for it, you must take the hymn either in one direction or another, either saying something about Thrasylus or about his father the Pythian victor'). We might wonder whether Σ P.11.58c (Drach. II p. 260), and specifically the phrase ἀκάρῳ παρεκβάσει κεχρημένος can be read as a trace of a negative exemplum-style reading on the part of ancient critics. The phrase does not necessarily justify such a reading, because ἀκάρῳ does not imply the perception of an ethical disparity between exemplum and frame, and the criterion of relevance might be conceived as without an ethical dimension. However, the criticism does open up the possibility of such a debate.

The scholia illustrate the difficulty and elusiveness of the phrase κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην, and it is hard to resist the conclusion that this obscurity is meant to be to some degree performative, the confusion of the narrator scripting readerly response. The reader's hermeneutic problem, however, is somewhat more wide ranging; the narrator appears only to be concerned with the efficacy of his story, whereas the reader also questions the reasons for the narrator's decision. The questioning also leads, I suggest, to a self-consciousness about the constructedness of the myth, as a result of which the reader is asked to participate in the process of constructing Orestes *qua* exemplum. Like the critics mentioned above, the scholia neglect the force of the question, and consequently miss the relation between the narrator's uncertainty and the wider interpretative tension over the role of the exemplum. This is clear from the way in which the scholia reduplicate the poem's rhetoric; referring to the myth as a παρεκβάσις presupposes a certain tangentiality in the exemplum without commenting on what the consequences of this distance between exemplum and frame might be.

The scholia's treatment of P.11.38-40 is part of a wider pattern of commentators either ignoring or seeking to minimize the lack of fit between the exemplum and the situation. There are certainly ways in which Orestes can be construed as a positive foil for Thrasylus,

⁴⁸² Cf. also Σ P.11. 23b and also the censorious comments about digressions at Σ P.10.46b and Σ N.6.94a with the comments of Instone (1986) 90.

but critics who have emphasised these factors have neglected the simple but important fact of Orestes as matricidal avenger being very different from Thrasydaeus the Pythian victor, and, more broadly, the way in which his actions exceed the ethical norms of Pindar's time, a facet emphasised by his difference from the Orestes of the *Odyssey*. Acknowledgement of this difference points towards another, more fruitful way of looking at the poem, one in which the interpretative challenge of reconciling the exemplum to the situation, or of finding points of reconciliation and balancing them with the differences, is itself important ethically and intellectually, both for the reader and for Thrasydaeus himself as an internal reader of the poem. In other words, the whole process of exemplarity is at issue in this poem; it is not simply a matter of reading the exemplum and drawing the 'right' or best thought-out conclusion, but rather of questioning the nature of exemplarity itself, and the degree to which Orestes, or any other figure can function in such a role.⁴⁸³ The poem's ethical demands are articulated both by the declarative moralizing statement at 55-8, but also by its staging of an encounter with a figure, Orestes, who as we have seen exceeds the behavioural norms of Pindar's own time, and whose ethical significance is not explicitly stated by the narrator. In refusing to explicitly interpret its own exemplum, the poem articulates both the imperative of readerly engagement and the challenge of such a negotiation.

The interpretative tensions foregrounded by the poem are sharpened by the diachronic context, which allows, for instance, for a reconceptualization of the question of the relation between P.11 and the *Oresteia*, which has traditionally been approached with a view to arguing for the relative dates of the two texts and for their mutual influence.⁴⁸⁴ In the context of the Hellenistic period, however, these questions can be reformulated in terms of the relations of the texts to each other as part of an intertextual continuum which also includes Euripides' and Sophocles' tragedies about Orestes.⁴⁸⁵ As with Echo in Olympian 14, an awareness of these accounts serves to highlight the distinctiveness of Pindar's own

⁴⁸³ For acknowledgement of the limitations of the frame/exemplum relation cf. Instone (1986); Sevieri (1999) 107, and Finglass (2007a) 46: '[r]ather than seek a one-to-one correspondence, Pindar instead points to a likeness between the two which does not depend on similarity in every detail'. They do not consider the hermeneutic significance of these limitations, however.

⁴⁸⁴ For some treatments of this question cf. e.g. Herington (1984); Robbins (1986); Finglass (2007a) 11-17. The question of dating is significant here; cf. Finglass (2007a) 5-11 for an assessment of the scholia which date the poem.

⁴⁸⁵ It is notable that the scholia to P.11 do not mention the *Oresteia*, although this does not mean that the (possible) relationship between the two works was not an issue for Hellenistic readers and scholars; such scholarly comment may not have survived into later redactions of the scholia, and general meditations on the two works may not have been recorded. Moreover, absence of references to the *Oresteia* does not mean that this and other treatments of the Orestes myth would not have influenced Hellenistic readers' reception of P.11, but that such influences were not given critical attention. We may however contrast the attention paid by modern scholars to the relations between the *Oresteia* and P.11; cf. Σ P.11.25b, where Pherecydes and Herodorus are cited for alternative stories involving Orestes' nurse.

treatment of the story; his Orestes is clearly a long way from the half psychotic Orestes of Euripides' eponymous play, and indeed from Sophocles' character. Such a contextual situation also affects smaller-scale issues, such as the interpretation of the questions about Clytemnestra's motives at 22-5:

πότερον νιν ἄρ' Ἰφιγένει' ἐπ' Εὐρίπω
 σφαχθεῖσα τῆλε πάτρας
 ἔκνισεν βαρυτάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον;
 ἢ ἑτέρω λέχει δαμαζομέναν
 ἔννουχοι πάραγον κοῖται; 25

Did Iphigeneia's slaughter by the Euripus, far from her homeland, goad her to stir up her heavy-handed rage? Or did nightly couplings lead her astray, overcome in another's bed?

Some scholars have attempted to see these lines as a response to Aeschylus' interrogation of Clytemnestra's motivations in the *Oresteia*, or even as the inspiration for Aeschylus' treatment.⁴⁸⁶ The diachronic context allows for a reorientation of these questions. Finglass explains the lines as follows: 'Pindar presents the narrator as so overcome by the crime that he must search for motives to account for it. Instead of authoritatively stating a single cause, he clutches at possibilities that might go some way towards an explanation. His questioning thus underlines the gravity of the killings.'⁴⁸⁷ But the questions also specifically dramatize Clytemnestra's unknowability, a facet underlined by the formal contrast between P.11, where no 'Clytemnestra' is present to be the subject of an interrogation, and the plays, where the staged character can explain her actions, albeit in problematic ways. This formal aspect is also strengthened by the complexity of the question of Clytemnestra's motivation in the tragedians, awareness of which heightens the reader's sense of the difficulty of answering Pindar's questions.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸⁶ Cf. Herington (1984); Finglass (2007a).

⁴⁸⁷ Finglass (2007a) 13-14.

⁴⁸⁸ Herington (1984) sees P.11.23-5 as a response to the *Oresteia*'s use of the killing of Iphigeneia and the adultery as motives for Clytemnestra's killing of Agamemnon. But Finglass (2007a) 13 rightly points out that Herington's argument that there is a progression in the *Oresteia* from the Iphigeneia's sacrifice to the adultery as the chief reason for Clytemnestra's behaviour is faulty; the sacrifice is mentioned at e.g. *Ag.* 1521-9, and Agamemnon's adultery with Chryseis at *Ag.* 1437-47. Finglass is therefore rightly sceptical about the necessity of seeing P.11.23-5 as influenced by the *Oresteia*. The sacrifice is also mentioned at *Soph. El.* 530-3 and *Eur. El.*

Additionally, the problematizing treatments of the tragedians emphasise the difficulties of the exemplum-frame relation. Hellenistic readers' experiences of P.11 would have been shaped to some degree, as are those of contemporary readers, by their knowledge of the tragedies, and such experiences are likely to have given rise at least initially to a sense of confusion over appropriateness of the narrative to an epinician context.⁴⁸⁹ How different readers may have responded to this situation is beyond our capacity to say; my argument here is simply that the intertextual situation of the poem sharpens the problematization of reading that is already at work within the text.⁴⁹⁰ Of course readers are free to leave aside such intertexts and attempt to focus on the poem in and of itself as a free-standing entity, but such a process will only ever be provisional, and we cannot entirely free our encounter with one text from its intertextual determinations by others. In foregrounding the difficulties of such a process, P.11 also influences how readers relate to P.12; as argued above, Clytemnestra contrasts with Danae, and the *sententia* on tyranny contextualizes the actions of Polydectes. Most importantly, however, the conflictedness of Orestes as an ethical exemplum points up the absence of such issues surrounding Perseus.

PERFORMANCE AND TEXT

Before focussing further on Pythian 12 as part of the book, I want to analyse some aspects of how its musical and textual aspects may have worked together in order to better grasp how the poem may have operated in performance, and to foreground both the differences and the continuities between performance and the text as a material document. I argue elsewhere on the grounds of metre and contextual probability that Pindar used the 'many-headed *nomos*' as the melodic basis of the music, vocal and instrumental, that accompanied the performance of the poem. On my reading, the *nomos* would have served as a melodic frame which Pindar and his performers would have applied to the words of the poem and their rhythmical structure according to the melodizational practices current during the classical period.⁴⁹¹ Whether or not this was the case, however, it is clear from the scholia that the scholars of the Hellenistic period had no knowledge of the poem's musical accompaniment, and so this scenario is not relevant to how readers of the Hellenistic period may have related to the poem. I shall make

1018-29. See further Finglass (2007b) 251-3 for a concise assessment of the analysis of motivations in Aesch. *Ag.*, *Soph. El.* And *Eur. El.*, and *ibid.* 257 for Clytemnestra's motivation in the *Choephoroi*.

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. Finglass (2007a) 15-16 for the intertextual influence of the *Oresteia* on modern arguments over dating.

⁴⁹⁰ It is possible that the scholia's criticisms of the myth reflect an influence by the tragedians.

⁴⁹¹ Cf. Phillips (forthcoming b).

reference to this scenario in the following treatment in order to press the case for a particular reading of the poem's performance dynamics, but my reading of the text in the context of its Hellenistic readership should not be taken to rely on readerly knowledge of a particular mode of musical performance.

The *aetion* narrated in P.12 is not the only one related to the invention of the *aulos* and *aulos* playing. Perhaps the better known story is that of Athena and Marsyas, in which Athena, having invented the instrument, rejects it on account of the distortion of her facial features caused by playing it, whereupon it is taken up by Marsyas.⁴⁹² P.12 is our first source for the 'Athena and the Gorgons' *aetion*, but we cannot know how original his mythopoeia was.⁴⁹³ Crucially, Pindar describes the origin of *aulos* playing not only as the invention of an instrument and of an art in general, as is the case in the other *aetion*, but as the origin of a particular piece, the 'many-headed *nomos*'. One motivation for the mythological grounding of this piece could be that it was the very piece with which Midas was victorious in his performance at the Delphic contests.⁴⁹⁴ Whether or not this was the case, the paradigmatic association of a single piece with the origins of *aulos* playing as a whole has the effect of marking the whole art with the characteristics of a particular moment of divine invention. By means of this totalizing redescription, Pindar validates his composition (and Midas' victory, if it was indeed the 'many-headed *nomos*' with which he won) by associating it with the paradigmatic moment of ἀύλητική *par excellence*. This also has the effect of juxtaposing the musical and circumstantial individuality of Pindar's use of the *nomos* with its general cultural importance.

While recent readings of the poem have analysed the text's sociological implications with regard to the disputed place of the *aulos* in Greek musical culture of the time, and in relation to contemporary debates about musicopoetic style,⁴⁹⁵ I want to focus here on the role of the poem's interrelations of text and music, and their reflections on mimesis. The complexity of these interrelations emerges from the fact that the accompanying instrument is the subject of the discourse. This involves an audience in a mimetically double structure, wherein the *aulos*, both as a concept and as a concrete part of the performance, is redescrbed by the verbal

⁴⁹² Cf. PMG 758 and 805 for 5th C. versions of the Athena/Marsyas narrative. Paus. 1.24.1 describes the famous statue group depicting the myth by Myron on the Athenian Acropolis. For analysis, see Leclercq-Neveu (1989); Wilson (1999). Papadopoulou and Pirenne-Delforge (2001) 44-45 explore possible echoes of the Marsyas story in P.12.

⁴⁹³ See e.g. Landels (1999) 154-59; Papadopoulou and Pirenne-Delforge (2001) 38.

⁴⁹⁴ This is assumed by West (1995) 214 and followed by Porter (2007) 17, but we are not told that this was the case. Cf. Köhnken (1971) 121 n. 19.

⁴⁹⁵ E.g. Frontisi-Ducroux (1994); Papadopoulou and Pirenne-Delforge (2001); Martin (2003). For disputes about the *aulos* see generally Wilson (1999) with Martin (2003).

narrative, while simultaneously providing a frame in the light of which the words of the text are understood. This doubleness is particularly notable given the explicit redescription of the musicality of the *aulos* at 6-11 and 19-21. These descriptions mark both the originary moment of creation, in implicit opposition to the Athena and Marsyas narrative, and the musicality of the present performance. The music to which the audience listens during the performance is subjected to a transformation which reaches back into the mythical past and simultaneously acts on the present.

The poem's multiple mimeticity (Pindar imitating Athena imitating the Gorgons, to which we may also add the musical and rhythmical mimesis and reconfiguration by P.12 of the 'many-headed *nomos*') has often been noted by scholars,⁴⁹⁶ but what has been less appreciated is the dual status of the poem's mimetics staged as both production and imitation. Given that the mythical episode narrated in P.12 must predate Pindar in some form, as does the *nomos* upon which the poem's music draws, we recognise that P.12 does not dramatize itself as a purely originary production of what it imitates, but as a reconfigurative intervention into the tradition. This dynamic is reflected in the blurring of figure and ground enacted by the text's mimetic structure.⁴⁹⁷ Thus at the lexical level the Gorgons' οὐλιος θρηῆνος is both the ground which makes Athena's foundational mimesis possible, and a figuration of the present performance. As a musical texture it functions as an echo heard through the redescribed *aulos* music of the performance, and as its mythical antecedent. The Gorgon's lament is figured as unapproachable (ἀπλάτοις ὀφίων κεφαλαῖς, 'from [their] unapproachable snaky heads', 9), as something which requires Athena's technological intervention to become assimilable to human experience. This is furthered by the semantics of οὐλιος, which in addition to 'baneful' or 'destructive' can also mean 'frequently repeated'.⁴⁹⁸ The oscillation of these meanings contributes to a sense of the Gorgons' *Unheimlichkeit*, semantic polyvalence enacting uncanniness.⁴⁹⁹

This process is reinforced musically by the *aulos*, the sound of which is a mediated, partial representation of its mythical antecedent; there is obviously a difference, as well as a similarity, between the *aulos* the audience listens to and the Gorgons' lament. If we accept the argument that Athena's 'weaving' (8) of the Gorgons' *threnos* also combines it with the

⁴⁹⁶ E.g. Schlesinger (1968); Segal (1998) 99.

⁴⁹⁷ One might compare the performative 'reinvention' of the 'original' dithyrambic circular chorus at *Dith.*2.1-5.

⁴⁹⁸ The former sense is usually favoured by commentators (e.g. Köhnken 1971: 136: 'in seiner Wirkung auf Perseus gleicht der Threnos der Gorgonen einem furchteinflössenden und verderbenbringenden Kriegsgeschrei'). Gerber (1986) 248 follows Greppin (1976) in seeing P.12.8 as echoing e.g. *Il.* 17.756 οὐλον κεκλήγοντες and drawing on the repetitiveness of ritual lament.

⁴⁹⁹ For a classic analysis of the Gorgons as other see Vernant (1985) 12, and further Segal (1994) 86-88.

cry of victory uttered by Perseus at 11,⁵⁰⁰ then Athena's mimesis is dramatized as a mode of combination and reconfiguration, wherein each of the elements, the lament and the victory cry, contribute to a whole that is different from either of them individually. Understood in these terms, the narrative also formulates the *nomos*' music as a particular type of phenomenon, a substrate which bears the imprint of the two expressions which were woven together to create it. The sonic warp and weft of the *nomos* is made by implication to reflect the emotional states of Perseus and the Gorgons in their respective vaunt and lament. As such, the narrative makes the *nomos* into a phenomenal correlative of the emotional effects that music was felt to have and Athena's act of creation as a proleptic allegory of the text's reception(s).⁵⁰¹ At the same time, however, the simultaneity of text and music dramatizes their different effects; hearing the *aulos*' music alongside the description of Athena 'weaving' the Gorgons' lament (οὔλιον θρηνον διαπλέξαισ' Ἀθάννα, 8) in order to create the *nomos* cues an awareness of the difference between the signifier διαπλέξαισ' and the sound of the *nomos*. This in turn highlights the provisionality of the poem's description of the foundational event, a description which can only be accomplished via the metaphorical διαπλέξαισ'. At the point where the text comes nearest to denoting 'what happened', it has recourse to indirection, a blurring of signification realms which represents Athena's action by means of an imperfect analogy with human activities. At the same time, however, the use of 'weaving' to describe Athena's action also constructs it as a mythical forerunner, and legitimization, of Pindar's use of weaving vocabulary to describe his own poetry elsewhere.⁵⁰² Something that was an actual event in the mythical fabula serves as the basis for a metaphorical system.

The poem therefore enacts mimesis as simultaneously a presencing and a displacement, as a practice which makes a cultural event available and also dramatizes its otherness,⁵⁰³ but there

⁵⁰⁰ Clay (1992) 523, who argues that διαπλέξαισ' must refer to the 'weaving' of more than one 'object', followed by Martin (2003) 163. For Clay, Perseus bringing Medusa's head to Seriphus, rather than the decapitation, forms the focal point of the mythical narrative (p. 522).

⁵⁰¹ Theory which described the emotional and ethical effects of music is common in the fourth century BC and thereafter; cf. e.g. Pl. *Rep.* 397-401b with further passages in Barker (1984) s.v. 'ethos'. P.12 can be seen as prefiguring these theorizations.

⁵⁰² Pindar uses πλέκω metaphorically of composing songs at O.6.86, N.4.94. διαπλέκω is used of Hermes making sandals at *Hom.h.Herm.* 79-80 (σάνδαλα δ' αὐτίκα ῥιψὶν ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις ἀλήησιν / ἄφραστ' ἠδ' ἀνόητα διέπλεκε, θαυματὰ ἔργα). Whereas Hermes' action is precisely delineated and διέπλεκε used literally, as made clear by the next line (συμμίσγων μυρικής καὶ μυρσινοειδέας ὄζους, 81), albeit to make things 'unthought of, unimagined' (ἄφραστ' ἠδ' ἀνόητα), Pindar uses the verb metaphorically to denote a process the constituent aspects of which remain undefined. The shared features of the two passages, the use of διαπλέκω, the creation by a god of something extraordinary, suggest an intertextual connection: the greater complexity of Athena's 'weaving' is used to trump the *Hermes* passage, while also suggesting the limitations of his metaphor for conveying Athena's action. For the dating of the *Hom.h.Herm.* cf. Thomas (2010).

⁵⁰³ Cf. Segal (1994) 90-93, who stresses the transformation of the Gorgons' cry from a shriek of primordial pain into a culturally contained and sanctioned practice.

is a strong stress on continuity as well as on difference and distance. At 22, for instance, the narrator emphasises precisely the continuity between Athena's foundational act and the current conditions of auletic performance: εὔρεν θεός· ἀλλὰ νιν εὐροῖσ' ἀνδράσι θνατοῖς ἔχειν ('the goddess discovered it, but discovered it for mortals to have'). The auletic art is envisioned here as an embodying continuity of Athena's practice, in which the physical contingencies of performance assume a symbolic value by means of their connection with their mythical precursor.⁵⁰⁴ This physical detailing is continued by the description at 25 λεπτοῦ διανισόμενον χαλκοῦ θαμά καὶ δονάκων, ('... often through the slender bronze and the reeds') which some scholars have read as referring to contemporary developments in the design and construction of *auloi*.⁵⁰⁵ The personification of the reeds at as πιστοὶ χορευτᾶν μάρτυρες ('dancers' faithful witnesses', 27) reinforces the rhetoric of embodiment; the reeds' 'witnessing' gives them an anthropomorphic character. The use of θαμά also marks P.12 as part of a continuity of performances.

Yet the dynamic by which performance functions as an embodiment of the foundational act is not one of a simple ascription to the present contingencies of performance of the energies and value attendant on their precursor. As suggested above, mimesis is presented musically, through the use of the Athena *nomos*, as an appropriation by means of which the *nomos* is reinscribed into a discourse that reconfigures its significance, and textually as a double practice of presencing and distancing, reflected in the description of how the *nomos* is perpetuated. At 23 the narrator dramatizes the act of naming (ὠνούμασεν κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον, 'she gave it the name of the tune with many heads'), and the act of linguistic mediation is made vital to the perpetuation of the specified musical practice. This deployment of naming, as well as invoking the bestowal of a name as an act of empowerment, proleptically metaphorizes the appropriation in which P.12 engages by utilizing the melodic frame of the Athena *nomos* in a new rhythmical (and linguistic) structure. Athena's act of

⁵⁰⁴ On embodiment see Habinek (2005) 4-6 with references.

⁵⁰⁵ Gentili and Luisi (1995); Papadopoulou and Pirenne-Delforge (2001) 47-51. Cf. also Chuvin (1995). This use of λεπτός could well have influenced Callimachus' famous formulation of the Μοῦσαν ... λεπταλέην (*Aetia* fr. 1.24) and other self-referential uses of the adjective in Hellenistic poetry (cf. further Harder (2012) ad loc). Given the focus of the Pindaric passage, the intertext with *Aetia* fr. 1.24 is a particularly marked site for the interaction of performance rhetoric and material texts. In P.12, the λεπτοῦ ... χαλκοῦ has a specific role in the instrument, and the bronze's 'slenderness' is a practical property which allows sound to be produced in a particular way, whereas Callimachus' λεπταλέην connotes a more generalized, conceptual poetic (and purely verbal) quality. Seen together with P.12.25, the specifically conceptual stress of Callimachus' adjective highlights his appropriative modernity. As in the case of Theoc. *Id.* 16 (above pp. 133-42), however, later appropriation has consequences for how we might read Pindar. In this case, the Callimachean intertext stresses Pindar's status as an aesthetic model for the Hellenistic poets, and raises (or strengthens) the possibility of seeing P.12's λεπτός as a marker of the subtlety and sophistication of Pindar's poetics.

naming is figured as the precursor of the (re)naming in which the poet engages; again, this gesture is both mimetic and productive. Moreover, the use of θαμά, together with the physical details of 25, stress the individuality of the performance, and thus the singular nature of each performance as a transient, unrepeatable event, whose precise contingencies cannot be replicated. The embodied continuity of cultural practice is set off against the singular instantiations which mediate it.

It might seem paradoxical that P.12 should dramatize the discovery of αὐλητική by means of a mimetic action (Athena's) which imitates an event (the Gorgons' lament) which is only partially appropriable by human activity, of which a performance can only be an indirect echo. But such a strategy serves to glorify the *aulos* by stressing its strangeness, and in turn emphasises the power of the art, and of the individuals capable of utilizing it. The narrative's foregrounding of alterity, and of the singularity both of Athena's foundational act, and, by implication, of the performance itself, provide an indirect correlative to the power of fate and the divine, invoked at 29-32, as a force incapable of being comprehended or anticipated by mortals (30) and capable of unforeseen and transformational interventions into men's lives (ἀελπίτια βάλων / ἔμπαλιν γνώμας, 'striking with surprise unexpectedly', 31-32). The performance maintains and enacts the dual status of the mythical founding, and the mythical fabula in general, as both other and culturally assimilated. This thematic connection is reinforced by the musical accompaniment, which enacts the embodiment of the Gorgons' lament, while also stressing, by means of its place within the reconfigured structure of the *nomos*, its constructedness, and the human arts – technical, compositional, and performance-related – needed to realize it.⁵⁰⁶

The conjunction of the extensive description of the *aulos* with a written document gives rise to a general tension between these two modes. In particular, the description of the physicality of the instrument at 20-6 brings about a contrast with the medium of writing; the mention of the reeds used to make the *auloi* as πιστοὶ χορευτᾶν μάρτυρες (27), for instance, highlights the fact that it is now the written words that perform this memorializing function, and points up the differences between the two media. The *aulos* is a 'witness' in part because it records the sound created by Athena's mimetic invention, and primarily because it oversees the dancers' performance.⁵⁰⁷ The book, however, can only signify these effects indirectly, and the materiality of the document enforces the contrast between music and the verbal signifiers that

⁵⁰⁶ Cf. Clay (1992) 524-5 on the thematic connections between the concluding passage and the doubleness of the *nomos* as recording suffering and celebration.

⁵⁰⁷ Cf. *Pitiche* p. 682.

have to stand in for it. These differences are strengthened by the poet's accenting the melodic range of the *aulos* (παρθένος ἀυλῶν τεῦχε πάμφωνον μέλος, 'the maiden created a melody of every sound for the *auloi*', 19) and the specifically mimetic character of Athena's creation (ὄφρα τὸν Εὐρύαλας ἐκ καρπαλιμᾶν γενύων / χριμφθέντα σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ' ἐρικλάγκταν γόον, so that she might imitate with instruments the loud-sounding wail that was pushed from Euryale's swiftly moving cheeks', 20-1), neither of which are susceptible to reduplication by the book.⁵⁰⁸ Similarly, the *aulos*' role as εὐκλεᾶ λαοσσόων μναστῆρ' ἀγώνων ('famous reminder of people-stirring contests', 24) points to the secondariness of the book text and the situation of reading in which it operates, removed from the performance context the poem describes.⁵⁰⁹ The *nomos* is a form of archive, recording as it does (a version of) the mythical event, albeit one the book cannot reduplicate. Athena's act of invention, on the other hand, functions here as the unarchivable, that which escapes totalizing signification.

As in the case of O.14, these interpretative issues bear on the constitution of a voiced reading of the poem. In O.14 Echo's unenunciated narrative marked the limits of the text's archival force by not being repeatable, whereas in P.12 what the speaking voice cannot recapture (alone) is the relationship between music and text that marked the poem in performance. Yet we should not read the poem's diachronic movement as a juxtaposition of an idealized performance mimesis with the secondary, parasitic mimeticity of the book. As we have seen above, the performance is itself an indirect echo of the foundational mimesis, and combines textuality and music in ways which implicate the concept of mimesis itself. Furthermore, the situation of the material document recapitulates the poem's construction of the interaction between singularity and cultural continuity. Whereas in the performance context, the playing of the *aulos* recorded Athena's invention, now it is the book which plays this role, and the uniqueness of individual texts and readings subsitutes for the unique performance events. It is notable that the book archives (and fails to archive) both the signified events of the poem, and the performance itself as an event. Reading P.12 as an archive therefore involves an acknowledgement of both the limitations of its archival

⁵⁰⁸ There are several possibilities for how Athena's imitation relates to the sounds she heard. If one follows Gentili and Luisi (1995) in thinking that the *aulos* being referred to is made of double pipes, which is the most natural way of taking the plural of σὺν ἔντεσι, then the two pipes could be imitating the two Gorgons. Alternatively, the drone pipe might be imitating the Gorgons' wailing, while the pipe on which the melody was played Perseus' victory cry.

⁵⁰⁹ The use of λαοσσόων is an intertextual pointer to the dynamic of violence and civilization; in Homer, the epithet is frequently applied to deities such as Ares and Athena, and used to refer to their role of 'stirring up' warriors in battle (cf. *Lfgre s.v.* and Sotiriou (1998) 45). Its application here to non-military 'contests' enacts intertextually the movement from violence to its civilized containment. The fact that this is achieved via an epic intertext hints at the place of P.12 and ἀλητική within a wider cultural continuum. For a differently-focussed interpretation, cf. Clay (1992) 523-4.

function, specifically its inability to record the music referenced by the text, and its capacity to shift the text's connotations, to expand its meanings, and broaden the significance of its mediation on artistic creativity.

ARCHIVALITY AND CLOSURE

I shall now examine P.12 in its intertextual and metatextual contexts. As argued above, these readings are not meant to be explications of an ideal grouping of text and scholarly exegesis, but a series of provisional explorations of potential relations that could have emerged between these in different contexts. Following the above discussion of the etymology of the πολυκέφαλος νόμος it is interesting to note how the scholia explain the mimeticity of Athena's creation and the function of the etymology, and how their exegesis affects further readings. The first explanation is given at Σ P.12.15b (Drach. II p. 265):

τὸν παρθενίοις: μυθεύεται τι τοιοῦτον, ὅτι ὅτε ὁ Περσεὺς ἐκαρπτόμησε τὴν Μέδουσαν, αἱ δύο ἀδελφαὶ ἐθρήνουν τὴν ἀδελφὴν, καὶ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ὄφεων τῶν περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν συριγμός τις ἀνεδίδοτο. τούτου τοῦ συριγμοῦ κατακούσασα ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ τοῦ ἐκ τῶν ὄφεων πρὸς μίμησιν τοῦ θρήνου καὶ τοῦ γινομένου συριγμοῦ ἐκ τῶν ὄφεων ἐπενόησε τὴν ἀλύητικὴν, ἣν καὶ ὠνόμασε πολυκέφαλον νόμον διὰ τοῦτο· ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν κεφαλῶν τῶν ὄφεων εἷς τις ἀνεδίδοτο συριγμός, πολλὰς δὲ κεφαλὰς εἰκότως εἶχον οἱ ὄφεις, διὰ τοῦτο πολυκέφαλον νόμον τὴν κατὰ μίμησιν ἀλύητικὴν συνθεῖσα ὠνόμασεν.

‘Which from the maidenly ...’: there is a story that when Perseus cut off Medusa's head, the two sisters sang a lament for their sister, and a hissing arose from their heads and from the snakes around them. Athena, on hearing this hissing, created the art of *aulos* playing as an imitation of the lament and of the hissing that occurred, and she also named it for that reason ‘the many-headed *nomos*’. For since a single hissing arose from the snakes' many heads, and because the snakes in all likelihood had many heads, for this reason she named the imitative art of *aulos* playing that she had constructed ‘the many-headed *nomos*’.

A variety of explanations are then put forward at Σ P.12.39a-c (Drach. II p.):)

a. ἀλλά νιν εὐροῖσα: ἀλλ' εὐροῦσα τὸ τοῦ ἀύλου μέλος μετέδωκε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἔχειν, καὶ ὠνόμασε τὸ μέλος πολυκέφαλον νόμον· ἐπεὶ καὶ αἱ τῶν δρακόντων πλείους ἦσαν κεφαλαὶ αἱ συρίζασαι· ὦν κατὰ μίμησιν συνέθηκε. **b.** τινὲς δὲ πολυκέφαλον, φασίν, εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ πεντήκοντα ἦσαν ἄνδρες, ἐξ ὧν ὁ χορὸς συνεστῶς προκαταρχομένου τοῦ ἀύλητοῦ τὸ μέλος προεφέρετο. **c.** οἱ δὲ κεφαλὰς ἀκούουσι τὰ προοίμια. ὧδὴ οὖν διὰ πολλῶν προοιμίων συνεστῶσα, ἦν λέγουσι τὸν Ὀλυμπον πρῶτον εὐρηκέναι.

a. “but inventing it”: but having invented the *aulos* melody she gave it to men for them to possess, and she named the melody ‘the many-headed *nomos*’, for there were many snakes’ heads that made the hissing, and she constructed the melody in imitation of them. **b.** Some say that he called it ‘many-headed’ because the chorus, which presented the melody under the leadership of the aulete, was composed of fifty men. **c.** Others understand the heads to be the preludes. The ode is composed with many preludes, which they say Olympus was the first to invent.

The alternatives listed in Σ 39b-c are not to be preferred, and certainly the explanation proposed by 39b cannot be right because the piece was for solo performance by the *aulos*, and the last seems equally fanciful. The fact that the exegesis which links the πολυκέφαλος νόμος to the snakes’ heads is mentioned twice probably indicates that it was the more common thesis; regardless of whether or not this reading is historically correct, it preserves a connection between the phrase πολυκέφαλος νόμος and the mythological event itself, rather than in the other cases where it is connected to modes of performance.

This reading recapitulates the connection between language and mythological event described above, albeit in an untheorized form; consequently, a tension arises between the apparently direct connection between the phrase and its origin, and the process of scholarly debate out of which this meaning emerges for the reader. This interplay in turn replays and extends the process described above in which meaning emerges both from the relation of word and object, and from the circulation of signifiers, a process which the varying explanations extend. A similar phenomenon is detectable in the debate over the cry at 11 (Σ P.11.19a-b, Drach. II p. 266):

a. Περσεὺς ὁπότε τρίτον ἄυσε κασιγνητᾶν: τουτέστι τὴν μίαν· τρεῖς γὰρ ἦσαν. τὸ δὲ ἄυσεν ἦτοι ἐπὶ τῆς μιᾶς τῶν Γοργόνων ἀκουστέον, ὡς ἄυσε κατατομυμένη διὰ τὴν ἀλγηδόνα, καὶ τότε ἄϊεν ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ τὸν θρῆνον τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῆς· ἢ ἄυσεν ὁ θρῆνος κατατομήσαντος τοῦ Περσέως. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐσχηματίσθαι θέλουσι, τῆς μάχης· οἷον κατεπολέμησε τὸ τρίτον μέρος αὐτῶν. **b.** ἄυσε διχῶς· ἄνυσεν, ἀνυσθῆναι ἐποίησεν· ἢ ἄυσεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκράύγασεν.

a. ‘When Perseus cried aloud ... the third of the sisters’ [or, according to the reading of **a** ‘... Perseus, when the third of the sisters cried out’]: that is, one of them, for there were three. ‘Cried out’ should be understood as coming from one of the Gorgons, since she cried out in pain when her head was being cut off, and then Athena heard the sisters’ lament for her. Or, the lament ‘cried out’ when Perseus cut off her head. Some wish to it to be taken figuratively from ‘cry’, i.e., of battle; thus the sisters’ ‘third part’ engaged in battle. **b.** ‘Cried out’ [can be taken] doubly, [as meaning] achieved, cause to be achieved, or ‘cried out’ instead of screamed.

The attribution of the cry to all or one of the Gorgons seems improbable.⁵¹⁰ What is of more interest from an interpretative point of view, however, is the ironic contrast between the event described and the process of debate surrounding it, between Perseus’s single cry as a marker of his triumph, a univocal signification, and the contortions of the hermeneutic debate. The juxtaposition of text and metatext shapes readerly understanding by suggesting new interpretations and varying exegesis that individual readers may not have considered. But it also draws attention to the singular nature of the text; the text is open to paraphrase, and yet always resists exact assimilation to such paraphrases, which never precisely reduplicate the precise nature, lexical, rhythmical, contextual, of the text’s utterance. Moreover, reading the scholia is not simply a matter of adjudicating on the correctness of various exegeses; it also implicates our conceptual stances as readers, and necessitates a certain self-reflexiveness about our reading practices. Thus relating to the comment οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐσχηματίσθαι θέλουσι, τῆς μάχης involves thinking about why one might read ἄυσε figuratively as a ‘battle cry’ instead of as a cry of triumph, or whether the battle cry reading would equate to seeing the cry as triumphal. The boundaries between text and exegesis are

⁵¹⁰ Cf. *Pitiche* 674-5 for the textual argument, and Clay (1992) 522-3. I follow Race in reading ἄυσεν and taking τρίτον ... κασιγνητᾶν μέρος as the object of ἄγων.

also at issue here; this comment could be taken as opening up a potentiality of meaning hitherto unforeseen, given that at least some readers will not have thought to read ἄσπε figuratively before reading this scholium.

Intertextual considerations are raised by Σ P.11.24b (Drach. II p. 266-7) glossing εὐπάρραον: διὸ καὶ περὶ κάλλους τῆ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐφιλονείκησεν, ‘‘fair-cheeked’’: wherefore because of her beauty she competed with Athena’). This scholium alludes to the separate myth in which Medusa challenged Athena to a beauty contest, and the reference to beauty might also recall the alternative version of the invention of the *aulos*, where Athena rejected her new creation because it distorted her facial features.⁵¹¹ It is notable that the scholium explains why Medusa competed with Athena (διὸ καὶ - ‘wherefore’, and note the aorist denoting a completed past action), rather than the reason why the author used the word here, and they do not give any reason for why this connection should be read as obtaining. Nevertheless, the validity of the claim is less important for this analysis than the mode of textuality it presupposes, and which is realized in the interaction of scholia and text. This is not to say that such a reading is only possible in this context; such a connection may well have suggested itself to a spectator at a performance, or indeed in a reading without metatextual accompaniment. What is distinctive about the interaction between text and scholia is that it opens up this potentiality in a new way, as part of an explicitly archival and intertextual situation. A particular mode of reference is implied here without being explicitly theorized, one which sees the text as a weave of the signified and the non-signified, which in turn gives rise to the possibility of the reader rethinking his views not only of this passage but of the processes of (inter)textuality more generally. The intertext also pointedly substantiates the polyvalence of εὐπάρραον, lending it ironic or perhaps pathetic tone, and might be taken as imputing a possible subsidiary motivation to Athena.⁵¹²

Intertextuality is also at issue in Σ P.12.31 (Drach. II p. 267), which glosses ἐρρύσατο and expands on τούτων ... πόνων by referencing the story of the Gorgons’ pursuit of Perseus: ἐπεδίωξαν γὰρ τὸν Περσέα μέχρι Βοιωτίας (‘for they pursued Perseus up to the realm of the North Wind’). Here, Perseus’ ‘troubles’ (τούτων ... πόνων) are made to include unnarrated as well as narrated events. Again, the ontology of the text is subject to alteration

⁵¹¹ Cf. Papadopoulou and Pirenne-Delforge (2001) for other possible echoes of the Marsyas myth in P.12.

⁵¹² *Pitiche* ad loc. argues, on the basis that Medusa is not represented as beautiful in archaic and early classical art, that εὐπάρραον here refers to ‘la forza e il gonfiore delle guanche di Medusa ... che conferiscono al viso l’aspetto rigido di una maschera’, and compares P.9.17 where he thinks that εὐώλεον refers to Cyrene’s strong arms. For the later tradition of Medusa’s beauty cf. e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 4.56.124; Ov. *Met.* 4.794.

by the critical intervention, as the gloss opens up the unenunciated as a subject of scholarly discourse and readerly attention, hence potentially involving the reader in a rethinking of the workings of narrative and the concepts that orient it. There is, however, a contrast between the semantic modes of εὐπάρραον and the expansion required here; the former is a semantic polyvalence arising from a specific intertextual connection, the latter a gap simultaneously opened up and supplemented by the scholium. We might simply dismiss the scholium as flawed by saying that one cannot interpret a text on the basis of things which it does not mention, but such an objection relies on an overly simplistic division on what can be considered ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ a text.

This is particularly problematic in the case of the Perseus narrative, which Hellenistic readers are likely to have known from treatments in fifth-century tragedy and Pherecydes. Versions of the pursuit story occur at [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 2.4.3, where his invisibility cap saves Perseus (αἱ δὲ Γοργόνες ἐκ τῆς κοίτης ἀναπτᾶσαι τὸν Περσέα ἐδίωκον, καὶ συνιδεῖν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἠδύναντο διὰ τὴν κυνήην· ἀπεκρύπτετο γὰρ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς, ‘the Gorgons, flying up from their bed, pursued Perseus, but were not able to see him because of his cap, by which he was concealed’), and at Σ Ap. Rh. 1515a (319.9 Wendel = Pherecydes fr. 11 Fowler): αἱ δὲ αἰσθόμενοι διώκουσι καὶ αὐτὸν οὐχ ὁρῶσι (‘perceiving him they go in pursuit, but do not see him’). It is likely that the comment at Σ P.12.31 is based on Pherecydes’ account.⁵¹³ The remains of plays involving Perseus are too exiguous to provide much specific evidence for how they may have affected a reader’s approach to P.12,⁵¹⁴ but in conjunction with the mythographical evidence we can certainly say that most readers would have been aware of the compression of Pindar’s account. The scholia’s supplementation is also interpretatively

⁵¹³ For the Gorgons as capable of flight cf. e.g. *LIMC* 4.2.293, 301, 331, 338. Cf. also the versions at Σ Lyc. 838; Σ Hom. *Il.* 14.319.

⁵¹⁴ Perseus occurs in several plays of Aeschylus, such as *Dictyulci*, a satyr play describing the aftermath of Perseus and Danae being washed ashore at Seriphos. This may or may not have been part of a tetralogy which included *Phorcides* and *Polydectes*. Of the latter we know nothing (cf. Sommerstein (2008) 194-5). For the former, cf. Eratosthenes *Catasterisms* 22 (= *TGrF* 3 F 262 Radt = Sommerstein (2008) 260-3). This gives a version of the story apparently told by Aeschylus, in which the Graeae served as ‘sentinels’ (προφύλακας) for the Gorgons; by tricking them into giving them their eye, which he then throws into Lake Triton, Perseus is able to evade them and attack the Gorgons. Sophocles wrote a *Danae* and an *Acrisius*, but it has been suggested that they are the same play. For the *Danae* cf. *TGrF* 4 F 165-70. Little can be guessed about the subject matter of this play. For the *Acrisius* cf. *TGrF* 4 F 60-76. Note also the *Men of Larissa* *TGrF* 4 F 378-83, which Jacoby argued to be identical with the *Acrisius* (followed by Lloyd-Jones (1996) 29). It is unclear whether any of these plays dealt with Perseus’ killing of Medusa. Euripides also wrote a *Danae*, which relates the episode of Perseus’ birth (*TGrF* 5.1 F 316-30a). More relevant to an assessment of P.12 is the *Dictys* (*TGrF* 5.1 F 330b-48), produced with *Medea* in 431, which tells the story of Danae and Perseus after they have come to Seriphos. Dictys is a fisherman, half-brother of Polydectes, who takes care of Danae and Perseus. As in the other stories, Polydectes forms a design on Danae, and sends Perseus to bring back the Gorgon’s head. Polydectes is turned to stone, and Dictys becomes king. Danae may perhaps have become his queen. How the Medusa episode was handled is unclear.

significant in that the very fact of its addition highlights the gaps in Pindar's account. It also draws attention to the spatial indeterminacy of the Gorgons whose unanchoredness, in the absence of a link to a defined space, registers their alterity, and contrasts with the spatial definition given to Perseus' killing of Polydectes and his supporters, specifically located in Seriphus (12).⁵¹⁵ The unenunciated pursuit correlates with this non-location, recapitulating the text's spatiality, constituted by both places (Seriphus, the Cephisus) and the non-place of the Gorgons' abode, in terms of the interaction of the enunciated and unenunciated events of the fabula.

The scholia's strategy of explaining the final gnomic comment by recourse to the story about Midas' *aulos* breaking during the performance is interestingly parasitic on the aetiological strategy of the poem as a whole:⁵¹⁶

(inscr.) γέγραπται ἡ ᾠδὴ Μίδα Ἀκραγαντίνῳ. οὗτος ἐνίκησε τὴν κδ' Πυθιάδα καὶ κε'· φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Παναθήναια νενικηκέναι. ἱστοροῦσι δὲ τι ἴδιον σύμπτωμα συμβεβηκέναι περὶ τὸν ἀύλητὴν τοῦτον· ἀγωνιζομένου γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἀνακλασθείσης τῆς γλωσσίδος ἀκουσίως καὶ προσκολληθείσης τῷ οὐρανίσκῳ, μόνοις τοῖς καλάμοις τρόπῳ σύριγγος ἀύλησαι, τοὺς δὲ θεατὰς ξενισθέντας τῷ ἤχῳ τερφθῆναι, καὶ οὕτω νικῆσαι αὐτόν.

The ode was written for Midas of Acragas. This man won at the Pythian games in the 24th and 25th festivals. They say that he had also won at the Panathanaea. It is recorded that a particular misfortune befell this aulete; while he was competing, his mouth piece broke against his will and was stuck to the roof of his mouth, and he was only able to play his *aulos* with the reeds, in the manner of a *syrix*, but the spectators, surprised by this, took pleasure in the sound, and he was thus victorious (Drach. II pp. 263-4).

This mode of explanation is picked up by Σ P.11.52 (Drach. II p. 269, and cf. 54b):

⁵¹⁵ Hes. *Th.* 274-5 describes the Gorgons' location at the edges of the earth: Γοργούς θ', αἱ ναίουσι πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο / ἔσχατιῇ πρὸς νυκτός. They are located on the island of Sarpedon by *Cypria* fr. 32 B. Pherecydes fr. 11 gives an unspecified location 'near the Ocean' somewhere near Seriphus. Cf. further *Pitiche* 685.

⁵¹⁶ Cf. the story of Heracles and Cynus at Σ O.10.21a.

ἢ τοι σήμερον δαίμων ἢ ὕστερον· τουτέστιν, ἐὰν μὴ παραχρῆμά τις εὐτυχῆσῃ, μὴ ἀδημονεῖτω· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τὸ εἰμαρμένον ἢ σήμερον τελέσει ἢ αὔριον. τοῦτο δὲ φησιν, ἐπεὶ ἀπροσδοκῆτως ἐνίκησε κλασθέντος τοῦ καλάμου.

“indeed fate either tomorrow or today”: that is, if a man does not meet with immediate success, he should not be downcast, for the god will bring his allotted portion to fruition either today or tomorrow. He says this because he won unexpectedly when his reed was broken.

Whereas the poem documents a singular moment of creativity that gave birth to a multiplicitous tradition, the scholia explain a general truth in terms of a particular event, translating concepts into physical realia. It is also notable that the scholia’s explanation, for which the poem itself gives no evidence,⁵¹⁷ deproblematizes the unexpectedness of fate by limiting it to a particular event, replacing Pindar’s wide canvas with a specific situation. As interpreted by the scholia, the final gnome refers exclusively to Midas and his victory, and is hence retrospective, diminishing the instability of the future, but the gnome literally refers to events yet to come, with a concomitant emphasis on unpredictability which the retrospective reading softens. As I shall argue further below, the lines also have a metapoetic aspect; the unexpected treatment of the myth exemplifies the unpredictability of divine interventions in mortal affairs, and the scholia’s stress on definite endings is ironic in the light of not only this structural feature, but also of the unforeseeable processes of textual diachronicity, such as the poem’s closural role in the book. The scholia’s participation in these processes itself undermines their delimitative strategy by supplementing the text in a way not explicitly licensed by any narratorial statement.

The processes of dissemination, collection in an edition, and scholarly comment rerun the poem’s aetiological strategies in different forms. But the poem also has a metapoetic dimension, arising partly from the correlation mentioned above between the unexpectedness of the myth, which I shall discuss further below, and the unpredictability of fate, and from the poem’s musical subject matter. We might expect these factors to be accentuated by its place in the edition, although it is clearly different from the more explicit meditations on poetic craft found elsewhere in Pindar, such as the famous reflections at O.2.86-90 or the comparison of encomiastic song with the bee at P.10.54. Moreover, it also contrasts with the

⁵¹⁷ Cf. Gentili and Luisi (1995).

explicitly metapoetic statements of contemporary Hellenistic poetry. Nevertheless, the potentially metapoetic context, as well as the contemporary development of such tropes, encourage the reader at least to reflect on the possibility of seeing P.12 in these terms, and this approach finds support from a comment in a second century AD papyrus fragment of a hypomnema on the Pythians by the late Hellenistic scholar Theon son of Artemidorus.⁵¹⁸ At POxy 2536 col ii 35 we find the comment τοῦ[τ]ο δὲ ὡσπ(ερ) ἐπισφραγίζων [π]οῖ (‘he creates this as if setting a seal’), a comment which provides important evidence for the sensitivity of ancient critics to the interaction between poems and their place in books, even when this was not an issue of authorial control.⁵¹⁹ This comment is not paralleled in the scholia given by the manuscripts, and is likely to originate with Theon himself.⁵²⁰

The lemma referred to is not extant in the papyrus, but the fact that the next lemma cited is τὸ δὲ μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτόν shows that the comment on the sphragis must be an interpretation of the gnome in 28-30 (εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου / οὐ φαίνεται· ἐκ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν ἦτοι σάμερον / δαίμων, ‘if some prosperity appears among men, it does not do so without toil; and indeed fate will bring it about either today ...’), Eric Turner comments that ἐπισφραγίζων [π]οῖ could either refer to the poet ‘affixing his sphragis’ or to χρόνος or the δαίμων ‘bringing things to their end’, but while this latter reading is possible, the importance of the σφραγίς as a literary topos makes the former much more likely.⁵²¹ The ὡσπ(ερ) should probably be read as signalling the implicitness of the trope, referencing the fact that the author does not use σφραγίς or its cognates. This prompts the question of what sort of σφραγίς these lines constituted according to Theon’s reading,

⁵¹⁸ For Theon’s role in Pindaric scholarship cf. Deas (1931); McNamee (2007) 33-5. Detailed analyses of the papyrus have been carried out by McNamee (2007) 95-9 and Ucciardello (2012) 119-26. The papyrus is written in two hands; from this McNamee concludes that multiple versions of Theon’s commentary must have been circulating in order to be the basis for two separate copyings (p. 95), whereas Ucciardello suggests that the papyrus was ‘a scholarly product of a reading circle’, the members of which had different interests and levels of reading competence, leading to the different kinds of glosses found in the two hands (p. 125).

⁵¹⁹ For the use of ἐπισφραγίζειν cf. Σ Aesch. *Sept.* 166-72a αὕτη γὰρ ἐπισφραγίζει τὰ κατὰ σχέσις ἀδόμ[ενα] ἄσμα[τα], where the coronis ‘ratifies’ or ‘sets a seal on’ the preceding song.

⁵²⁰ It is notable that σφραγίς vocabulary is found in the Pindar scholia only at Σ O.6.154h where it is used of the Spartan message-sending system, and Σ I.1.90b; the latter uses ἐπισφραγίζειν ‘als Bestätigung für die Wahrheit einer einzelnen Aussage’ (Treu (1974) 82).

⁵²¹ Cf. Σ P.12.51 (Drach. II p. 269): ἐκτελευτήσει δὲ, φησὶ, τὸν ὄλβον ὁ δαίμων, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τέλος ἄξει, ἦτοι σήμερον ἢ ὕστερον (‘he says that fate will bring about prosperity, that is, will bring it to fruition, either today or the next’), and cf. also Σ 54a. Treu (1974) 82-3 reads Theon’s comment as elucidating the activity of the δαίμων, partly on the basis of the scholia, but the scholia’s readings may be based on a misunderstanding of Theon’s exegesis. He is sceptical about Theon’s reading: ‘[s]o hübsch aber nun auch durch den Vergleich mit einem aufgedrückten Siegel Pindars Gnome gekennzeichnet ist; dass Theons Paraphrase ihrem ... Inhalt gerecht wird, finde ich nicht. Bei Pindar ist hier eine zweimalige Scheidung durchgeführt: einmal scheidet er die heutige Erfüllung von der künftigen Zeit, zum anderen in der künftigen Zeit eine teilweise Erfüllung der Erwartung von einem ‘Noch nicht’’. This interpretative infelicity, however, can be explained by the literary interpretation of Theon’s phrase.

and whether it should be read as applying to this poem alone, or to the whole Pythian collection. The former question centres on whether the σφραγίς function of the lines should be interpreted as pertaining to authorial identity, as the kind of comment felt to typify the Pindaric narrator, or whether it should be seen as more broadly thematic, as a paradigm of the ethical tone of Pindaric epinician. Given the generalizing force of the lines and the absence of any narratorial self-reference, the latter reading might seem more plausible, and with regard to the applicability of the σφραγίς its position at the end of the book implies that the remark was intended to apply to the whole collection. Even if it were not, it could have suggested such an interpretation to an individual reader given the poem's climactic position. It could be objected that the σφραγίς function of the lines is entirely arbitrary, but as I suggested above the subject matter of the poem and its closural position allow for a certain metapoetic resonance. Theon could have been attempting to read the lines as metapoetic, connoting something like the hard work that Pindar put into his writing and his expectation of both divine and human reward, in order to see them as a generic σφραγίς. Indeed, there is no reason why the specifically narratorial σφραγίς function and the more general ethical one should not be read as mutually reinforcing.

We might also wonder whether the σφραγίς was linked to the materiality of the book, with ὡςπ(ερ) pointing to the fact that in performance the lines would not have had a σφραγίς function, which was only necessitated by the book's capacity to go beyond the author's control. This question raises the problem of how the literary σφραγίς was conceived as functioning, and of the precise dynamics of its symbolism. The first and most influential occurrence of the topos is Theognis 18-22:

Κύρνε, σοφιζομένωι μὲν ἐμοὶ σφρηγίς ἐπικείσθω
 τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, λήσει δ' οὔποτε κλεπτόμενα,
 οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοῦσθλοῦ παρεόντος·
 ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ· Ἐεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη
 τοῦ Μεγαρέως· πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός·

For me, Cyrnus, a skilled man, let a seal be set on these words, and their theft will not escape notice, nor will anyone ever take something inferior when the good is at hand. Thus everyone will say, 'These are the verses of Theognis of Megara, and he is known among all men.'

These lines have given rise to much scholarly debate, which has revolved around questions about the exact nature of the σφραγίς, and how exactly it is supposed to function.⁵²² As numerous critics have pointed out, the mere inclusion of the name of the author within a corpus of poems does not guard against the interpolation of substandard verses (20).⁵²³ It has recently been argued that the passage references the fixing in writing of the Theognidean corpus; the author, by setting his name on the written text, asserts his ownership of and authority over the poems collected therein.⁵²⁴ But this argument leads to another set of problems; the fixing of a written text is only provisional and can still be subject to interpolations, losses and damage. Furthermore, Pratt's argument does not address the specific kind of authorial or narratorial identity constructed by the σφραγίς. In Theognis, the σφραγίς has to be both repeatable in order to make the author known (πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός) and a marker of the author's distinctive skill (σοφιζομένω μὲν ἐμοί).

As such, we may compare it to the signature, which in Derrida's analysis is both the unique mark of the presence of the individual whose name it bears, the signifier of a unique event, and a repeatable trace. In Geoffery Bennington's neat formulation: '[a] signature marking the uniqueness of an event must be repeatable as the signature that it is in order validly to mark the singularity of an event that it marks.' We can see from this analysis that the σφραγίς and the signature are not identical; the latter has to be both repeatable and a unique mark; the former is a conjunction of verbal signifiers, and as such is repeatable, but its uniqueness arises from its disposition of non-unique lexical units. The signature marks the indisputable presence of an individual; the σφραγίς marks rather the performativity of literary discourse, its capacity to construct itself as such, although it is notable that this self-construction takes place by means of a reference to a non-literary mode of activity.⁵²⁵ Whereas the signature marks the physical presence of the only person capable of making exactly that mark in exactly that way, the σφραγίς marks the figuration of the individual *qua* author or narrator, a figuration which divides the individual by exposing him to the mechanics of textuality, where identity is mediated by a variety of generic and intertextual factors. Therefore Theognis'

⁵²² Cf. Cerri (1991), who thinks that the lines refer to the depositing of an authenticated copy of the text in a temple. One important issue here is whether the poem as a whole or just the name 'Theognis' has spragidical value.

⁵²³ Pratt (1995) 171-2.

⁵²⁴ Pratt (1995). Edmunds (1997) argues that the name Theognis refers not to an individual author but is a mark of a particular mode of writing.

⁵²⁵ For the sphragis as a seal cf. e.g. Cerri (1991).

σφραγίς does not do what it says it will, but rather attempts to bestow a certain authoritative force on its own language, and on the name it uses of itself. But like the signature, this manoeuvre also presupposes the repeatability of the text, and consequently entails an exposure of the author's name and the associated narratorial identity to a multiplicity of rereadings and recontextualizations. The σφραγίς is constituted by its exposure to such repetition.

The concept of the σφραγίς also gives rise to a particular interaction with the written dissemination of the text. Each copying of the text is a unique event based on a repeatable practice, writing, and therefore structurally replays the σφραγίς' conjunction of individuality and repeatability, but simultaneously each copying shapes the text into a new physical form; in this sense, individual material copies of the poem are more like signatures, each written in a uniquely distinctive hand although without the signature's claim to express the presence of an individual. The uniqueness of these individual copyings fracture the σφραγίς' attempt at mastering its text by instantiating the text's differential repeatability. Theon's reading of P.12.29-30 neatly captures some of the problematics of the function of the σφραγίς; by, on a sceptical reading, imposing the σφραγίς on the text, or, on a more sympathetic reading, identifying a σφραγίς function not explicitly flagged as such by the author, Theon highlights the force of the σφραγίς' constitutive repetition and the transferability of the concept, which is such as to shape readings of poems even in the absence of an obvious deployment of the topos. It also focuses attention on the interaction between the text and its documentary situation; Theon's σφραγίς exemplifies the conjunction of generic topos and material context in framing critical readings.

I want to conclude with a discussion of the relationship between metapoetics and intertextuality, a relation which I will argue is central to P.12's closural function. As has already been noted, P.12's aetiology of the *aulos* contrasts with the more common version in which Marsyas discovered the *aulos* after Athena cast it aside. The form of the book and its place in the archive encourages us to see this version of the narrative not only in terms of a particular performance context but in terms of a wider debate about the nature of the *aulos*. Moreover, the poem's closural position and metapoetic elements point us towards taking the myth as a wider comment on Pindar's mythopoeia, exemplifying his determination to select or invent myths with a cogent moral structure, or which make a particular ethical point.⁵²⁶ These two points then combine; as noted above when discussing the scholia, the archival and

⁵²⁶ Cf. above p. 124.

intertextual form of the poem encourages a certain relativizing, seeing Pindar's telling of the story as only one of several, and the story itself as contested and contestable. The poem's place within an intertextual continuum informed by later versions of the myth gives these considerations particular point. We know that the Athena and Marsyas narrative was important to the so-called New Musicians of the later fifth century, as well as being of wider cultural significance,⁵²⁷ from two fragments of the period. The first comes from a version by Melanippides, according to which Athena cast the *aulos* away (PMG 758):

ἀ μὲν Ἀθάννα
 τῶργαν' ἔρριψέν θ' ἱερᾶς ἀπὸ χειρὸς
 εἶπέ τ' ἔρρετ' αἴσχεα, σώματι λύμα·
 ὕμμε δ' ἐγὼ κακότητι δίδωμι.

Athena cast the instrument from her holy hand and said, 'Perish, disgraceful thing, pollution of the body. I give you over to wickedness.

This account is contradicted by a fragment of another New Musical poet, Telestes, who argues instead that the *aulos* was a clever invention which Athena would not have discarded (PMG 805):

τὸντ σοφὸν σοφὰν λαβοῦσαν οὐκ ἐπέλπομαι νόωι
 δρυμοῖς ὀρείοις ὄργανον
 δῖαν Ἀθάναν δυσόφθαλμον αἴσχος ἐκφοβή-
 θεῖσαν αὖθις χερῶν ἐκβαλεῖν
 νυμφαγενεῖ χειροκτύπῳ φηρὶ Μαρσύαι κλέος·
 τί γάρ νιν εὐηράτοιο κάλλεος ὀξὺς ἔρωσ ἔτειρεν,
 ἄι παρθενίαν ἄγαμον καὶ ἄπαιδ' ἀπένειμε Κλωθῶ;

I do not believe in my mind that Athena, the clever, divine Athena, took the clever instrument in the mountain thicks and immediately, terrified by ugliness offensive to

⁵²⁷ The frequency with which the Athena and Marsyas myth is represented shows that it was much the commoner version. Cf. Paus. 1.24.1 on the statues on the Athenian Acropolis representing Athena casting the *aulos* away. Cf. also e.g. Ov. *Ars Am.* 3.505ff.; *Fasti* 6.697ff.; Hyg. *Fab.* 165; Athen. 14.616e-f.

the eyes, cast it from her hands to be the fame of that nymph-born, handclapping beast Marsyas. Why should a sharp desire for lovely beauty distress her to whom Clotho has assigned maidenhood without marriage and children?

This fragment is notable for its rationalistic rebuttal of the usual narrative, in arguing (with a rather crude functionalism!) that concern for her own beauty would have been no motivation to the virgin Athena. Unfortunately, we do not know how Telestes continued the story, but presumably his version had Athena exercising some form of patronage over the *aulos*. My interest here lies not in the place of these poems in the musico-poetic debates of the fifth century,⁵²⁸ but in their potential importance for a reading of P.12 in the Hellenistic period. It is clear from these and other sources that by this time the Athena and Marsyas narrative was more common than Pindar's form of the story, although we must be cautious about making such a claim about the poem in its original performance scenario due to our lack of evidence for the early history of the myth; we do not have any proof that the Athena-invention story was not widely known in early times, or that it was not a version peculiar to Sicily and considered to be of local importance. It seems likely, however, that Hellenistic readers would have been more familiar with the versions involving Athena and Marsyas.⁵²⁹ There is consequently a case for claiming that a Hellenistic reader would have been encompassed by a hermeneutic version of the kind of instability described in the final lines, and, as claimed above, we might see the final lines as a comment on Pindar's own handling of the myth, surprising his readers with an unexpected version, with the δαίμων as that which gives or not unexpectedly (ὃ καὶ τιν' ἀελπίτια βαλῶν / ἔμπαλιν γνώμας τὸ μὲν δώσει) becomes a correlative for Pindar's storytelling. We can therefore observe a collusion of contextual cultural factors with the text's rhetorical strategies, as the intertextual background reinforces the unexpectedness of Pindar's version of the story, which in turn exemplifies the closing gnome about the unexpectedness of divine action. This collusion in turn impacts on the poem's closural force, juxtaposing the generalizing force of the statement with an implicit openness to the reconfigurative effects of diachronicity.

The end of the poem, then, provides an opportunity to reflect not only on its singular disposition of cultural materials, but also on the transfigurative effect of the archive, and of textual dissemination. There is a certain paradox about the intertextual scenario described

⁵²⁸ For which cf. Wilson (1999); Martin (2003).

⁵²⁹ Again, the state of the evidence precludes an awareness of the kind of variations between different versions which may have further influenced readers.

above, which reinforces the text's unexpectedness by means of just the kind of unpredictability that the final gnome predicts, and hence tries to control. Recontextualization both reinforces and undermines the text's claims by underscoring its arguments and pointing up the extent of its porousness and its exposure to the very uncertainties it documents. We can also observe a contrast between the collusive intertextual background of P.12 and the intertextual situation that obtained in my analysis of O.14, where intertextuality threatened to occlude a reading of Echo, as later depictions blurred the distinctiveness of Pindar's depiction. Taken together then, these two poems exemplify the variety of recontextualizing and receptive effects to which poems are subject in their diachronic situations.

CONCLUSIONS

Looking at receptions of Pindar in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* takes us somewhat beyond the temporal frames of reference within which I have hitherto been working, yet this movement is perhaps not out place in a study which has frequently grappled with the unstable non-saturability of interpretative contexts. The *Deipnosophistae* is also a text which bears on the methodological framework of this study in numerous ways. Its omnivorous coverage of literary genres encourages reflection on its creation of a meta-archival archive, both containing and creatively fragmenting the literary traditions it feeds off.⁵³⁰ As a metasymposiastic text in which a group of self-consciously learned men wittily joust for intellectual and discursive status, and compete with each other in establishing different and often competing identities, it is a convenient starting point for thinking about literary receptive one-upmanship and creative engagement, about the dynamic relations between 'past' and 'present' texts, as well as a space in which these issues are played out.⁵³¹

At 1.3b, O.1.14-17 is cited as part of a eulogy of Larensis, the symposium's host, praising his cultural sophistication. This quotation comes at the end of a catalogue of men who had possessed large book collections, beginning with the archaic tyrants Polycrates of Samos and Pisistratus, and moves on through Ptolemy Philadelphus and others to Larensis, who is made a modern equivalent of these earlier models, and indeed is made to outdo them in the number of books he owns (1.3a). The passage describes the transfer of culture authority across the ages, and is programmatic of the *Deipnosophistae*'s own archival qualities. The quotation's application to Hiero is deemphasised by the process of citation and the lines made to illustrate a transhistorical ideal. The emphasis on music (ἀγλαίζεται δὲ καὶ / μουσικᾶς ἐν ἁώτῳ, 'he is glorified by the best flower of music') serves as a reminder, in its application to Larensis, of the continuing importance of performance culture, while also marking a difference between performance-based and reading-based cultures. Yet the citation also re-describes the situation in which it is placed: the reader is encouraged to see a connection between the unmentioned Hiero and the idealized rulers mentioned in the previous passage, and between Pindar's symposiastic image and *Deipnosophistae*'s own virtualized symposium. This interplay between a citational depropriation which enables the cited text to be recontextualized within the strategies of the main text, and the situational force of the cited

⁵³⁰ Cf. Too (2011) 111-13 on *Deipnosophistae* as an archival text.

⁵³¹ For identity politics in *Deipnosophistae* cf. McClure (2003) 260-1, and for the significance of the sympotic form cf. Lukinovich (1990). See Milanezi (2000) 401; McClure (2003) 261 on metasymposiastic discourse.

text which spills over into the situation in which it is cited, reproduces in miniature the dynamics of the wider literary economy.

At 11.503f-4a, a Pindaric quotation is integrated into the characterization of an individual symposiast:

τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Πλούταρχος καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων κροταλισθεὶς ἤτησε φιάλην, ἀφ’ ἧς σπέσας ταῖς Μούσαις καὶ τῇ τούτων Μνημοσύνη μητρὶ προὔπιε πᾶσι φιλοτησίαν. ἐπειπὼν <δέ> (O.7.1-3):

φιάλαν ὡς εἴ τις ἀφνεᾶς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐλών

ἔνδον ἀμπέλου καχλάζοισαν <δρόσῳ>

δωρήσεται,

οὐ μόνον ‘νεανία γαμβρῶ προπίνων’, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς φιλτάτοις ἔδωκε τῶ παιδί περισοβεῖν [ἐν κύκλῳ] κελεύσας ...

Having said these things and been applauded by everyone, Plutarch asked for a drinking cup, from which he poured a libation to the Muses and to Mnemosyne their mother. He then toasted everyone with a friendship-cup, saying ‘Just as if someone, taking from his rich hand a drinking cup plashing within with the dew of the vine, and gives it’ (O.7.1-3), not only ‘drinking to his young son in law’, but also all his closest friends, he gave the cup to the slave bidding him to ‘chase it around’ ...

Plutarch then explains the meaning of περισοβεῖν as ‘to drink in a circle’ with a quotation from Menander. As well as being a pointer to how Pindaric quotations may have been used in real symposia, the passage shows Plutarch integrating a Pindaric quotation into his discourse and his physical comportment. Recontextualization is central, as Plutarch turns Pindar’s sympotic imagery into an ‘actual’ sympotic utterance, a transformation given further point by the narrator’s differentiation of the different enunciatory positions of Plutarch and the Pindaric narrator (οὐ μόνον ‘νεανία γαμβρῶ προπίνων’, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς φιλτάτοις). Again, the specific context of the cited passage is deemphasized, and the quotation’s transfiguration of Plutarch’s gesture arises from the speaker’s particularizing appropriation, his skill in using the quotation in a certain way, as well as from the cultural cachet of the poetry itself.

Many of the leitmotifs of this study, then, can be seen at work in these two passages. They testify to the importance of the book and of the library as a cultural institution, to the

reconstitutive force of literary and cultural receptions, and to the capacity for ‘classic’ texts to impose their own economies of meaning on the contexts in which they operate. Both passages evince the complexity of the opposition between performance and writing, and mark the fact that no simple opposition of the two is possible. Reading Pindar on the page is not a matter of reading ‘only’ a material text or a trace of performance, but a negotiation between the two which is further complicated by the virtualities of ‘performance’ generated by the poems themselves and by readerly awareness of performance as a continually changing cultural institution. In both passages, the celebratory and idealizing force of the cited poems is appropriated and put to new ends, grounding the citational strategy while also being (partially) displaced by it. In addition to their role within the *Deipnosophistae*, these textually self-consciousness citations invite readings which are sensitive to the modes of recontextualization that might be at work in readers’ own encounters with Pindaric (and other) texts.

This study has likewise sought to foster an attention to the various contexts in which readers encounter Pindaric epinicians. In thinking about these poems as diachronic texts, mediated by material instantiation as well as by changing literary, cultural, and socio-political frames, I have tried to explicate some of the influences which would have affected how ancient readers approached this corpus, and have sought to understand some of the ways in which the meanings and significances of the texts themselves can be variously interpreted in relation to their contexts. Consideration of the poems in performance, however, has also played a crucial role in my analyses. In part this is because of the intrinsic importance of this textual mode, and I have argued for new ways of approaching some of Pindar’s poems as performance pieces. In this respect, the poems’ ethical challenges to their readers, and the multiplicitous function of mythological narratives and poetological discourses have emerged as central to the poems’ operation. Moreover, no study of Pindaric textuality in later antiquity can neglect the modalities of performance projected by the texts, and readers’ imaginative projections of such modalities. One result of dwelling on Pindar’s poems specifically as material texts is that it allows for a heightened sense of the *virtuality* of the images of performance projected by the texts, and consequently the complexity of the interactions that would have arisen in concrete performance scenarios between these textual projections and the historical circumstances of the performance itself.

I have examined numerous aspects of literary culture, such as the physical characteristics of books, scholarly literature, literary receptions, biography, and cultic practice, which scholars have not traditionally sought to connect with the practice of reading the author with whom

these cultural data are concerned. Such an expanded approach is open to the twin charges of coincidence and irrelevancy; it might be objected that much of the material I have assessed in this respect bears either not at all or only minimally and contingently on concrete acts of Pindaric interpretation. My response to such an objection would be to argue that one of the concepts that this study has attempted to complicate is that of what counts as a 'literary' experience; at stake in considering the textual and cultural relations which I have examined is the status of the 'literary' itself (or at least the 'literariness' or particular textuality of an author), how it is experienced, regulated, and contested, how it is influenced and potentially reconfigured by the various influences that bear on it. Defining what is coincidental or irrelevant to the operation of a particular text at a given historical moment, and how that operation might itself be conceived, is an important, and necessarily non-saturable, critical move, and one to which epinician, with its multivalent relations to history and contexts, incessantly impels us. I have argued that various types of receptions are part of the ongoing (re)construction of the epinician corpus, and that the varied resonances of Pindar's epinicians during their unpredictable voyages are necessarily implicated in a series of wider cultural discourses and influenced by the strategies, literary and exegetical, of a variety of other texts. But what has also emerged is the continuing force and wonder of these poems, their capacity for regrafting and for imposing their distinctive textuality on later readers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2010) *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*, Princeton.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Barbantani, S. (2007) 'Inscribing Lyric', in P. Bing and J.S. Bruss (eds.), 429–57.
- Agócs, P. (2012) 'Performance and Genre: Reading Pindar's κῶμοι', in Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. (eds.) (2012a), 191–223.
- Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. (eds.) (2012a) *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge.
– (2012b) *Receiving the Komos*, London.
- Alcock, S. Cherry, J. and Elsner, J. (2001) *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, Oxford.
- Alden Smith, R. (1999) 'Pindar's Ol. 14: A Literal and Literary Homecoming', *Hermes* 127, 257–62.
- Alexiou, M. (1974) *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Armstrong, D. (1995) Translation of Philodemus *On Poems* 5, in D. Obbink (ed.) *Philodemus and Poetry*, Oxford, 255–69.
- Arrigoni, G. (1999) 'Perseo contro Dionisio a Lerna', in F. Conca (ed.) *Ricordando Raffaele Cantarella: Miscellanea di studi*, Milan, 9–70.
- Asmis, E. (1992) 'Crates on Poetic Criticism', *Phoenix* 46, 138–69.
– (1995) 'Philodemus on Censorship, Moral Utility, and Formalism in Poetry', in D. Obbink (ed.), 148–77.
– (2004) 'Philodemus on the Sound and Sense in Poetry', *Cron. Erc.* 34, 5–28.
- Athanassaki, L. (2003) 'A Divine Audience for the Celebration of Asopichus' Victory in Pindar's Fourteenth Olympian Ode', in G. Bakewell and J. Sickinger (eds.), 3–15.
– (2004) 'Deixis, Performance, and Poetics in Pindar's *First Olympian Ode*', *Arethusa* 37.3, 317–41.
– (2009) 'Narratology, Deixis, and the Performance of Choral Lyric: On Pindar's *First Pythian Ode*', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.), 241–73.
– (2011a) 'Giving Wings to the Aeginetan Sculptures: The Panhellenic Aspirations of Pindar's *Eighth Olympian*', in D. Fearn (ed.), 257–93.
– (2011b) 'Song, Politics, and Cultural Memory: Pindar's *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmeonid Temple of Apollo', in ead. and E. Bowie (eds.), 235–67.
- Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. (eds.) (2011) *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination*, Berlin.
- Attridge, D. (2004) *The Singularity of Literature*, London/New York.
- Austin, C. and Olson, D. (2004) *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*, Oxford.

Bakewell, G. and Sickinger, J. (eds.) (2003) *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold*, Oxford.

Bakker, E. (1997) *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*, Ithaca.
– (2005) *Pointing to the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*, Washington DC/Cambridge Mass.

Balogh, J. (1927) ‘Voces Paginarum’: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Lauten Lesens und Schreibens’, *Philologus* 82, 84–109, 202–40.

Barnes, R. (2000) ‘Cloistered Bookworms in the Chicken Coop of the Muses: The Ancient Library of Alexandria’, in R. Macleod (ed.), 61–77.

Barrett, W.S. (1978) ‘The Oligaethidae And Their Victories (Pindar, Olympian 13; *SLG* 339, 340)’, in R. Dawe, J. Diggle, and P. Easterling (eds.). 1-20.

Barthes, R. (1973) *Mythologies*, London.

Bell, S. and Davies, G. (eds.) (2004) *Games and Festivals in Classical Antiquity: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Edinburgh 10–12 July 2000*, Oxford.

Bennett, A. (1995) *Readers and Reading*, London.

Bergemann, J. (1991) ‘Pindar: das Bildnis eines konservativen Dichters’, *MDAI(A)* 106, 157–189.

Bernardini, P. (1982) ‘Eracle, i Molioni, e Augia nell’ *Olimpica* 10 di Pindaro’, *QUCC* 11, 55-68.

- (1993) ‘Il mito di Oreste nella *Pitica* 11 di Pindaro’, in R. Pretagostini (ed.), 413–26.

Billings, J. (2010) ‘Hyperion’s Symposium: An Erotics of Reception’, *CRJ* 2.1, 4-24.

Bing, P. (1988) *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Göttingen.

– (2009) *The Scroll and the Marble*, Ann Arbor.

Bing, P. and Bruss, J.S. (eds.) (2007) *Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden.

Blanchot, M. (1955) *L’espace littéraire*, Paris.

Blum, R. (1991) *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, (translated by H. Wellisch), Wisconsin.

Boeke, H. (2007) *The Value of Victory in Pindar’s Odes: Gnomai, Cosmology, and the Role of the Poet*, Leiden.

Bonner, S.F. (1939) *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: A Study in the Development of Critical Method*, Cambridge.

- Bowra, C. M. (1953) 'Pindar, *Pythian II*', in id. *Problems in Greek Poetry*, Oxford, 66–92.
 – (1964) *Pindar*, Oxford.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, New York
- Bradshaw, D. (ed.) (2003) *A Concise Companion to Modernism*, London.
- Braund, D. and J. Wilkins (eds.) (2000) *Athenaeus and his World*, Exeter.
- Bremer, J. (2008) 'Traces of the Hymn in the *Epinikion*', *Mnemosyne* 61, 1–17.
- Brulé, P. and Vendries, C. (eds.) (2001) *Chanter les dieux: musique et religion dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine*, Rennes.
- Budelmann, F. (2012) 'Epinician and the symposion: a comparison with the epinicia', in P. Agocs, C. Carey, and R. Rawles (eds.), 173–90.
- Bulloch, A. (1985) *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*, Cambridge.
- Bulman, P. (1992) *Phthonos in Pindar*, Berkeley.
- Bundy, E., (1962), *Studia Pindarica* (2nd edition 1986), California.
- Burnett, A.–P. (2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*, Oxford.
- Burnyeat, M.F. (1997) 'A Postscript on Silent Reading', *CQ* 47, 74–6.
- Cairns, F. (1977) 'ἔρκως in Pindar's First Olympian Ode', *Hermes* 105, 129–32.
- Calder, W. and Stern, J. (eds.) (1970) *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, Darmstadt.
- Cameron, A. (1995) *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton.
- Canfora, L. (1989). *The Vanished Library: A Wonder of the Ancient World*, Berkeley/Los Angeles.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (1990) *Pindari Threnorum Fragmenta*, Rome.
 – (ead. and G.–B. D'Alessio (eds.)) (2001) *I lirici greci: forma di comunicazione e storia del testo*, Messina.
- Carey, C. (1981) *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, Salem.
 – (1989) 'The Performance of the Victory Ode', *AJP* 110, 545–65.
 – (2001) 'Poesia pubblica in performance', M. Cannatà Fera (ed.), 11–26.
 – (2007) 'Pindar, Place, and Performance' S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), 199–210.
- Carne–Ross, D. (1975) 'Three Preludes for Pindar', *Arion* 2, 160–93.
- Carson, A. (1999) *Economy of the Unlost: Reading Simonides of Keos with Paul Celan*, Princeton.

- Casson, L. (2001) *Libraries in the Ancient World*, New Haven.
- Cavallo, G. (1999) 'Between *Volumen* and Codex: Reading in the Roman World', in ed. and R. Chartier (eds.) *A History of Reading in the West: Studies in Print culture and the History of the Book*, Boston, 64–89.
- Cavarzere, A., Aloni, A. and Barchiesi, A. (eds.) (2001) *Iambic Ideas: essays on a poetic tradition from archaic Greece to the late Roman empire*, Lanham.
- Cerri, G. (1991) 'Il significato di sphregis in Teognide e la salvaguardia dell' autenticità testuale nel mondo antico', *QS* 17.33, 21–40.
- Chantraine, P. (1950) 'Les verbes grecs signifiant 'lire': ἀναγιγνώσκω, ἐπιλέγομαι, ἐντυγχάνω, ἀναλέγομαι' *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 10, 115–26.
- Chartier, R. (1995) 'Labourers and Voyagers: From the Text to the Reader', in A. Bennett (ed.) (1995), 132–49.
- Chuvin, P. (1995) 'Un éloge paradoxal de l'*aulos* dans la deuxième *Pythique*', in C. Meillier and L. Dubois (eds.), 119–27.
- Clapp, E.B. (1913) 'Two Pindaric Poems by Theocritus', *CP* 8, 310–16.
- Clark, T. (2005), *The Poetics of Singularity: The Counter-Culturalist Turn in Heidegger, Derrida, Blanchot and the Later Gadamer*, Edinburgh.
- Clay, D. (2004) *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*, Washington.
- Clay, J.S. (1992) 'Pindar's Twelfth Pythian: Reed and Bronze', *AJP* 113, 519–25.
– (2011) 'Olympians 1–3: A Song Cycle?', in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie (eds.), 337–45.
- Cooper, C. (ed.) (2007) *The Politics of Orality*, Leiden.
- Cribbiore, R. (2001) *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton/ Oxford.
- Cropp, M., Fantham, E. and Scully, S. (eds.) (1986) *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D.J. Conacher*, Calgary.
- Crotty, K. (1982) *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar*, Baltimore.
- Currie, B. (2004) 'Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes' in C. Mackie (ed.) *Oral Performance and its Context*, Leiden/Boston, 51–69.
– (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford.
– (2011) 'Epinician *Choregia*: Funding a Pindaric Chorus', in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie (eds.), 269–310.
- Curtis Wright, H. (1977) *The Oral Antecedents of Greek Librarianship*, Utah.

- D'Alessio, G.B. (1994) 'First Person Problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39, 117–39.
 – (1997) 'Pindar's *Prosodia* And The Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments', *ZPE* 118, 23–60.
 – (2007) 'Per una ricostruzione del "Primo Inno" di Pindaro: la "Teogonia" tebana e la nascita di Apollo', *Sem. Rom.* 10, 101–17.
- Damon, C. (1991) 'Aesthetic response and technical analysis in the rhetorical writings of Dionysius of Halicarnassus', *MH* 48, 33–58.
- D'Angour, A. (2006) 'The 'new music': so what's new?' in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.) *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.
 – (2007) 'The Sound of μουσική: Reflections on Aural Change in Ancient Greece', in R. Osborne (ed.), 288–300.
 – (2011) *The Greeks and the New*, Cambridge.
- Daude, C. (2009) 'Problèmes de traduction liés à la reformulation du texte pindarique par les scholiastes', in S. David, ead., E. Geny, and C. Muckensturm-Pouille (eds.), 19–57.
- Daude, C., David, S., Geny, E. and Muckensturm-Pouille, C. (eds.) (2009) *Traduire les scholies de Pindare ... I: De la traduction au commentaire: problèmes de méthode*, Besançon.
- Davies, M. (1988) 'Monody, Choral Lyric, and the Tyranny of the Hand Book', *CQ* 38, 52–64.
- de Jong, I. (2007) 'Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature' in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.), 87–115.
- Davis, G. (2012) *A Companion to Horace*, Oxford.
- de Vleeschauwer, H.J. (1973) 'Origins of the Mouseion of Alexandria', in C. Rawski (ed.) *Toward a Theory of Librarianship: Papers in Honour of Jesse Hauk Shera*, New Jersey: reprinted in H. Curtis Wright (1977) *The Oral Antecedents of Greek Librarianship*, Utah, 175–201.
- Deas, H.T., (1931) 'The Scholia Vetera To Pindar', *HSCP* 42, 1–78.
- Debray, R. (1996) 'The Book as Symbolic Object', in G. Nunberg (ed.), 139–51.
- Del Grande, C. (1956) 'Lettura Della Quattordicesima Olimpica', *Filologia Minore*, Milan, 115–20.
- Depew, M. and Obbink, D. (2000) *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge Mass.
- Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*, Baltimore.
 – (1978) *Writing and Difference*, London.
 – (1981) *Positions*, Chicago.
 – (1985) *The Ear of the Other*, Nebraska.

- (1990) ‘Some Statements and Truisms about Neo–logisms, Newisms, Postisms, Parasitisms, and other Small Seismisms’, in D. Carroll (ed.) *The States of ‘Theory’*, Oxford/New York, 63–94.
 - (1992) *Acts of Literature* (ed. D. Attridge), London/New York.
 - (1996) *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, Chicago.
 - (2006) *Geneses, Genealogies, Genres and Genius: The Secrets of the Archive*, Edinburgh.
- Dickie, M. (1984) ‘*Hêsychia* and *hybris* in Pindar’, in Gerber (ed.) (1984) 83–109.
- Dickson, K. (1986) ‘Damasiphron Khrusos: Act, Implement, and Tekhnē in Pindar’, *Ramus* 15.2, 122–42.
- Dissen, L. (1830) *Pindari Carmina II*, Gotha and Erfurt.
- Dornseiff, F. (1921) *Pindars Still*, Berlin.
- Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (eds.) (2003) *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaborations*, Cambridge
- Duguid, P. (1996) ‘Material Matters’ in G. Nunberg (ed.) *The Future of the Book*, Berkeley, 63–101.
- Dunn, L. and Jones, N. (eds.) (1994) *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality In Western Culture*, Cambridge / New York.
- Dupont, F. (2009) ‘The Corrupted Boy and the Crowned Poet: or, The Material Reality and the Symbolic Status of the Literary Book at Rome’, in W. Johnson and H. Parker (eds.), 143–63.
- Eagleton, T. (1976) *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*, London.
- Eckermann, (2008) ‘Pindar’s κοινὸς λόγος and Panhellenism in Olympian 10’, *RhM* 151, 37–48.
- (2010) ‘The κῶμος of Pindar and Bacchylides and the Semantics of Celebration’, *CQ* 60, 302–12.
- Edmunds, L. (1997) ‘The Seal of Theognis’, in id and R. Wallace (eds.) *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore, 29–48.
- (2001) ‘Callimachus *Iamb.* 4: From Performance to Writing’, in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (eds.), 77–98.
- Elsner, J. (1992) ‘Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World’, *P&P* 135, 2–29.
- Erbse, H. (1970) ‘Bermerkungen zu Pindars 10 Olympischer Ode’, in *Silvae: Festschrift für Ernst Zinn*, Tübingen, 21–34 (reprinted in id. *Ausgewählte Schriften zur Klassischen Philologie*, Berlin (1979) 92–103.
- Fairweather, J. (1974) ‘Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers’, *AncSoc* 5, 231–275.

- Fantuzzi, M. (2000) 'Theocritus and the "Demythologizing" of Poetry', in M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), 135–51.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Farrell, J. (2009) 'The Impermanent Text in Catullus and Other Roman Poets' in W. Johnson and H. Parker (eds.), 164–85.
- Faulkner, A. (ed.) (2011) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, Oxford.
- Fearn, D. (2007) *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford.
 – (2011) (ed.) *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*, Oxford.
 – (2011) 'Introduction: Aegina in Contexts' in id. (ed.), 1–37.
- Felson, N. (1999) 'Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's *Pythian Four*', *HSCP* 99, 1–31.
 – (2004) 'The Poetic Effects of Deixis in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian Ode*', *Arethusa* 37.3, 365–89.
- Finglass, P.J. (2007a) *Pindar Pythian 11*, Cambridge.
 – (2007b) *Sophocles Electra*, Cambridge.
- Fish, S. (1980) *Is There A Text In This Class?*, Cambridge Mass.
- Fisker, D. (1990) *Pindars Erste Olympische Ode*, Odense.
- Ford, A. (2003) 'From Letters to Literature: Reading the 'Song Culture' of Classical Greece', in H. Yunis (ed.), 15–37.
 – (2011) *Aristotle as Poet: The Song for Hermias and its Contexts*, New York/Oxford.
- Foshay, R. (2009) 'Derrida on Kafka's "Before the Law"', *Rocky Mountain Review* 63.2, 194–206.
- Foucault, M. (1977) 'Fantasia of the Library', in id. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Ithaca, 87–109.
- Fowler, D. (1996) 'Moderne Literaturtheorie und lateinische Dichtung', *Anregung* 42, 311–18.
 – (1997) 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', in id. and S. Hinds (eds.) *Memoria, arte, allusiva, intertestualità / Memory, Allusion, Intertextuality*, Pisa: reprinted in id. (2000) 284–308.
 – (2000) *Roman Constructions*, Oxford.
 – (forthcoming) *Unrolling the Text*.
- Fuhrmann, F. (1988) *Plutarque, Oeuvres morales, III: Apophtegmes de Rois et de généraux and Apophtegmes Laconiens*, Paris.
- Furley, P. and Bremer, J. (2001) *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period, I–II*, Tübingen.

- Fraser, P. (1972) *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F., (1994), 'Athéna et l'invention de la flûte', *Musica e storia* 2, 239–57.
- Gavrilov, A.K. (1997) 'Techniques of Reading in Classical Antiquity', *CQ* 47, 56–73.
- Genette, G. (1997) *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge.
- Gentili, B. (1979) 'Polemica antitirannica (Pind. *Pyth.* 11; Aesch. *Prom.*; Herodt. 3.80–1; Thuc. 2.65.9', *QUCC* 32.2, 153–6.
– (1988) *Poetry and Public in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore.
- Gentili, B. and Luisi, F. (1995), 'La *Pitica* 12 di Pindaro e l'aulo di Mida', *QUCC* 49, 7–31.
- Gerber, D. (1982), *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*, Toronto.
– (1984) (ed.) *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, Chico.
– (1986) 'The Gorgons' Lament in Pindar Pythian 12', *MH* 43, 247–49.
- Gildersleeve, B. (1890), *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York.
- Genette, G. (1997) *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge.
- Germany, R. (2005) 'The role of Echo in the 'Homeric Hymn to Pan'', *AJP* 126, 187–208
- Gianotti, G.F. (1975) *Per Una Poetica Pindarica*, Paravia.
- Gigante, P. (1978) 'Meleagro, *A.P.* XII 257,2', *PP* 33, 58–9.
- Gloy, K. and Rudolph E. (1985) (eds.) *Einheit als Grundfrage der Philosophie*, Darmstadt.
- Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice*, Cambridge.
– (1994) 'The Failure of Exemplarity', in de Jong and Sullivan (1994), 51–73.
– (1996) 'Collectivity and Otherness – The Authority of the Tragic Chorus: Response to Gould', in Silk (1996), 244–56.
– (1999) 'Literary History Without Literature: Reading Practices in the Ancient World', *Substance* 88, 57–89.
– (2010) 'What is Local Identity? The Politics of Cultural Mapping', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.).
- Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. (eds.) (1999) *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge
– (eds.) (2006) *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.
- González, J. (2010) 'Theokritos' *Idyll* 16: The Χάρπιτες and Civic Poetry', *HSCP* 105, 65–116.
- Gould, J. (1996) 'Tragedy and Collective Experience', in M. Silk (ed.) (1996), 217–43.
- Gow, A.S. (1950) *Theocritus, Vol. I and II*, Cambridge.

- Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D. (1968) *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip, and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, Cambridge.
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer*, Cambridge.
- Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2010) *Homer Iliad VI*, Cambridge.
- Greppin, J., (1976), ‘*Oulos*, “Baneful”’, *TAPA* 106, 177–86.
- Grethlein, J. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2009) *Narratology and Interpretation*, Berlin/New York.
- Griffith, R. D. (1989) ‘Pelops and Sicily: The Myth of Pindar Ol. I’, *JHS* 109, 171–173
 – (1991) ‘Person and Presence in Pindar (*Olympian* 1.24–53)’, *Arethusa* 24, 31–42.
 – (1999) ‘Leaves in Pindar’, *Eranos* 97, 54–58.
 – (2000) ‘Pelops and the speal–bone (Pindar *Olympian* 1.27)’, *Hermathena* 168, 21–24.
- Gutzwiller, K. (1998) *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley.
- Habinek, T. (2005) *The World of Roman Song*, Oxford.
- Harder, M.A. (2012) *Callimachus Aetia Vol. I-II*, Oxford.
- Harder, M.A. Regtuit, R.F. and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) (1993) *Callimachus*, Groningen.
- Harrison, S. (1995) ‘Horace, Pindar, Iullus Antonius, and Augustus: Odes 4. 2’, in id. (ed.) *Homage to Horace*, Oxford, 108–27.
- Harvey, A. (1955) ‘The Classification of Lyric Poetry’, *CQ* 5, 159–75.
- Haslam, M. (1993) ‘Callimachus’ Hymns’, in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker (eds.), 111–25.
- Heath, M. (1988) ‘Receiving the κῶμος’: The Context and Performance of Epinician’, *AJP* 109, 180–95.
 – (1989) *Unity In Greek Poetics*, Oxford.
 – (2002) *Interpreting Classical Texts*, London.
- Heidegger, M. (1992) *Parmenides*, Bloomington/Indianapolis.
- Heller, J. L. and Newman, J. K. (eds.) (1974) *Serta Turyniana: Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in Honour of Alexander Turyn*, Urbana.
- Henderson, C. (ed.) (1964) *Classical, Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies in Honour of B. L. Ullman, Vol. I*, Rome.
- Hendrickson, G. (1929) ‘Ancient Reading’, *CJ* 25.3, 182–96.

- Herington, C.J. (1984) 'Pindar's Eleventh Pythian Ode and Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*', in D. Gerber (ed.), 137–46.
 – (1985) *Poetry into Drama*, Los Angeles/London.
- Hillis Miller, J. (1995) 'Reading Unreadability: de Man', in A. Bennett (ed.) (1995), 205–21.
- Hinds, S. (1997) *Allusion and Intertext*, Cambridge.
- Hirsch, E.D. (1967) *Validity in Interpretation*, New Haven/London.
- Hitch, S.S. and Rutherford, I. (eds.) (forthcoming), *Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World*, Cambridge.
- Hopkinson, N. (1984) *Callimachus Hymn to Demeter*, Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S. (2004) *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*, Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C. (eds.) (2007) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, Oxford.
- Houston, G. (2009) 'Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries in the Roman Empire', in W. Johnson and H. Parker (eds.), 233–67.
- Howie, J.G. (1984) 'The Revision of Myth in Pindar *Olympian* I: The Death and Revival of Pelops (25–27; 36–66)', *Liverpool Lat. Semin. IV*, 277–313.
 – (1991) 'Pindar's Account of Pelops's Contest With Oenomaus', *Nikephoros* 4, 55–120.
- Hubbard, T.K. (1985) *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry*, Leiden.
 – (1986) 'Pegasus' Bridle and the Poetics of Pindar's *Thirteenth Olympian*', *HSCP* 90, 27–48.
 – (2001) 'Pindar and Athens After the Persian Wars', in D. Papenfuss and V. Strocka (eds.), 387–97.
 – (2004) 'The Dissemination of Epinikian Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts', in C. Mackie (ed.), 71–93.
- Hummel, P. (1992) 'Poluphatos/poluphantos: morphologie étymologique et morphologie formulaire', *RPh* 66.2, 289–299.
 – (2001), 'Polysyntaxe et polysémie dans la poésie de Pindare', *QUCC* 68, 41–48.
- Hunter, R. (1983) *Eubulus: The Fragments*, Cambridge.
 – (1993) *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*, Cambridge.
 – (1996) *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge.
 – (2003) *Theocritus Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Berkeley/London.
 – (2009) *Critical Moments in Classical Literature: Studies in the Ancient View of Literature and its Uses*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. and Fuhrer, T. (2002) 'Imaginary gods? Poetic theology in the *Hymns* of Callimachus', in F. Montanari and L. Lehnus (eds.), 143–175.

- Hutchinson, G. (1988) *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford.
 – (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford.
 – (2008) *Talking Books*, Oxford.
- Hutton, W. (2005) *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the 'Periegesis' of Pausanias*, Cambridge.
- Illig, L. (1932) *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung*, Berlin.
- Immerwahr, H.R. (1964) 'Book Rolls on Attic vases', in C. Henderson (ed.), 17–48.
 – (1973) 'More Book Rolls on Attic Vases', *AK* 16, 143–147.
- Indergaard, H. (2011) 'Thebes, Aegina, and the Temple of Aphaia', in D. Fearn (ed.), 294–322.
- Innes, D. (1995) 'Longinus, Sublimity, and Low Emotions', in ead., H. Hine and C. Pelling (eds.) *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, Oxford.
- Instone, S. (1986) 'Pythian 11: Did Pindar Err?', *CQ* 36, 86–94.
- Irigoien, J. (1952) *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris.
- Iser, W. (1978) *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, Baltimore.
- Itsumi, K. (2009) *Pindaric Metre: 'The Other Half'*, Oxford.
- Jacob, C. (1996) 'Lire pour écrire: navigations alexandrines', in M. Baratin and id. eds. *Le pouvoir des bibliothèques*, Paris, 47–83.
- Jaeger, W. (1946) *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, Vol. I*, Oxford.
- Jauss, H.R. (1982) *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, Mineapolis.
- Johnson, W.A. (2000) 'Towards a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity', *AJP* 121, 593–627.
 – (2004) *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto.
 – (2009) 'Constructing Elite Reading Communities in the High Empire' in id. and H. Parker (eds.), 320–330.
 – (2010) *Readers and Reading Culture among the Greeks and Romans: A Study of Elite Reading Communities in the High Empire*, Oxford.
- Johnson, W.A. and Parker, H. (eds.) (2009) *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford.
- Jensen, C. (1923) *Philodemus Über die Gedichte, Fünftes Buch*, Berlin.
- Kahn, C. (1979) *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: An Edition of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary*, Cambridge.

- Kakridis, J.T. (1930) 'Die Pelopssage bei Pindar', *Philologus* 463–77.
- Kambylis, A. (1965) *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius*, Heidelberg.
- Kenney, E.J. (1982) 'Books and Readers in the Roman World', *CHCL* 2.1, *The Roman Republic*, 3–32.
- Kerkhecker, A. (1999) *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, Oxford.
- Kirkwood, G. (1981) 'Pythian 5.72–6, 9.90–2, and the Voice of Pindar', *ICS* 6.1, 12–23.
- Knox, B. (1968) 'Silent Reading in Antiquity', *GRBS* 9, 421–35.
- Köhnken, A., (1971) *Die Funktion der Mythos bei Pindar*, Berlin.
 – (1974) 'Olympian I: Pindar as Innovator', *CQ* 27, 199–206.
- König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K., Woolf, G. (eds.) (2013) *Ancient Libraries*, Cambridge.
- Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Oxford.
 – (2011) 'Musical Merchandise 'on every vessel': Religion and Trade on Aegina', in D. Fearn (ed.), 129–71.
- Krischer, T. (1985) 'Pindars erste Pythische Ode und ihre Vorlage', *Hermes* 113, 491–4.
- Kroll, W. (1924) *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart.
- Kromer, G. (1976) 'The Value Of Time In Pindar's Olympian 10', *Hermes* 104.4, 420–36.
- Krummen, E. (1990) *Pyrros Hymnos: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch–rituelle Tradition also Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)*, Berlin.
- Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic In Praise*, Princeton.
 - (1996) 'Pindar and the Prostitutes, or Reading Ancient Pornography', *Arion* 4.2, 49–75.
- Landels, J. (1999) *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*, London.
- Lavecchia, S. (2000) *Pindaro I Ditirambi*, Rome.
- Leclercq-Neveu, B. (1989) 'Marsyas, le martyr de l'aulos', *Metis* 4, 251–68.
- Leonard, M. (ed.) (2010) *Derrida and Antiquity*, Oxford.
- Lefkowitz, M. (1975) 'The Influential Fictions in the Scholia to Pindar's Pythian 8', *CP* 70.3, 173–85.
 – (1976), *The Victory Ode*, Park Ridge.
 – (1980) 'Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar', *HSCP* 84, 29–49.
 – (1981) *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London.
 – (1985) 'The Pindar Scholia', *AJP* 106, 269–82.

- (1988) ‘Who Sang Pindar’s Victory Odes?’, *AJP* 109, 1–11.
 - (1991) *First Person Fictions: Pindar’s Poetic ‘I’*, Oxford.
 - (1995) ‘The First Person Reconsidered - Again’, *BICS* 40, 139–50.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1973) ‘Modern Interpretation of Pindar: The second Pythian and seventh Nemean Odes’, *JHS* 93, 109–37.
- (1996) *Sophocles*, Cambridge. Mass.
- Lowe, N. (2007) ‘Epinikian Eidography’, in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), 167–76.
- Lowrie, W. (2009) *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*, Oxford.
- Lucas, J.–M. (1993) ‘La mythe de Danaé et Persée’ in A. Machin and L. Pernée (eds.) 37–48.
- Lukinovich, A. (1990) ‘The play of reflections between literary form and the sympotic theme in the Deipnosophistae of Athenaeus’, in O. Murray (ed.), 263–71.
- Mackie, C. (ed.) (2004) *Oral Performance and its Context*, Leiden/Boston.
- MacLeod, R. (2000) *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World*, London.
- McClure, L.K. (2003) ‘Subversive Laughter: The Sayings of Courtesans in Book 13 of Athenaeus’ ‘Deipnosophistae’’, *AJP* 124, 259–294.
- McDonald, P. (2003) ‘Modernist Publishing: “Nomads and Mapmakers”’, in D. Bradshaw (ed.), 221–42.
- (2006) ‘Ideas of the Book and Histories of Literature: After Theory?’, *PMLA* 121, 214–28.
- McGann, J. (1991) *The Textual Condition*, Princeton.
- McKenzie, D.M. (1999) *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, Oxford.
- (2002) ‘Typography and Meaning’ in id., P. McDonald and M. Suarez (eds.) “*Printers of the Mind*” and *Other Essays*, Amherst, 198–236.
- McLaughlin, G. (2004) ‘Professional Foul: Persona in Pindar’, in S. Bell and G. Davies (eds.), 25–32.
- McNamee, K. (1982) *Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri*, Ph.D. Thesis, Duke University.
- (2007) *Annotations in Greek and Latin texts from Egypt*, Oakville, CT.
- Macherry, P. (2006) *A Theory of Literary Production*, London.
- Mackie, H. (2003) *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise*, Ann Arbor.
- Martin, R. (2003) ‘The Pipes are Brawling: Conceptualizing Musical Performance in Athens’, in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.), 153–80.
- (2004) ‘Home is the Hero: Deixis and Semantics in Pindar *Pythian* 8’, *Arethusa* 37.3, 343–63.

- Martindale, C. (1993) *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*, Cambridge.
 – (2005) *Latin Poetry and the Judgement of Taste*, Oxford.
- Meijering, R. (1987) *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*, Groningen.
- Meillier, C., and Dubois, L. (eds.) (1995) *Poésie et lyrique antiques*, Villeneuve d'Ascq.
- Merkelbach, R. (1952) 'Bettelgedichte', *RhM* 95, 312–27.
- Meyer, D. (2007) 'The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram', in P. Bing and J. Bruss (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden, 187–210.
- Milanezi, S. (2000) 'Laughter as Dessert: On Athenaeus' Book 14, 613–16 in D. Braund and J. Wilkins (eds.), 400–12.
- Milkau, F. (1952) (ed.) *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft III*, Wiesbaden.
- Miller, A. (1977) 'Thalia Erasimolpos: Consolation in Pindar's Fourteenth Olympian', *TAPA* 107, 225–34.
- Montanari, F. (1993) 'L'erudizione, la filologia, la grammatica', in *Lo spazio letterario della Greca antica*, Rome, 235–81.
- Montanari, F. and Lehnus, L. (eds.) (2002) *Callimaque: sept exposés suivis de discussions*, Vandœuvres–Genève.
- Morrison, A. (2007) *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*, London.
 – (2011) 'Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality', in D. Fearn (ed.) (2011), 227–53.
 – (2012) 'Performance, Re-performance, and Pindar's Audiences' in Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. (eds., 2012a), 111–33.
- Most, G. (1985) 'Der verschieden gesinnten Sinnesverbindung: zur poetischen Einheit der Alten' in K. Gloy and E. Rudolph (eds.), 1–29.
- Muckensturm-Pouille, C. (2009) 'L'énonciation dans les scholies de la Sixième Olympique', in S. David, C. Daude, E. Geny, and ead. (eds.), 77–91.
- Mullen, W. (1982) *Choreia: Pindar and Dance*, Princeton.
- Murray, O. (1990) *Symptica*, Oxford.
- Nagy, G. (1990) *Pindar's Homer*, Baltimore.
- Nassen, P.J. (1975) 'A Literary Study of Pindar's Olympian 10', *TAPA* 105, 219–40.
- Nauck, A. (1848) *Aristophanis Byzantii Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta*, Hildesheim.

- Negri, M. (2004) *Pindaro ad Alessandria: le edizioni e gli editori*, Brescia.
- Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2009) *Epinikien und ihr Aufführungsrahmen*, Hildesheim.
- Nisetich, F. (1975) 'Olympian 1.8–11. An epinician metaphor', *HSCP* 79, 55–68
- Nunberg, G. (ed.) (1996) *The Future of the Book*, Berkeley.
- Nünlist, R. (2009) *The Ancient Critic at Work*, Cambridge.
- Obbink, D. (ed.) (1995) *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory & Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, & Horace*, Oxford.
- Orrells, D. (2010) 'Derrida's Impression of Gradiva: Archive Fever and Antiquity', in M. Leonard (ed.) (2010), 161–84.
- Osborne, R. (ed.) (2007) *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics 430–380 BC*, Cambridge.
- Papadopoulou, Z. and Pirenne-Delforge, V. (2001) 'Inventer et réinventer l'*aulos*: autour de la XIIe Pythique de Pindare' in P. Brulé and C. Vendries eds. *Chanter les dieux: musique et religion dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine*, Rennes, 37–58.
- Papenfuss, D. and Strocka, V. (eds.) (2001) *Gab es das Griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Mainz.
- Parke, H. (1933) 'The Bones of Pelops and the Siege of Troy', *Hermathena* 48, 153–62.
- Parker, H.N. (2009) 'Books and Reading in Latin Poetry' in W. Johnson and id. (eds.), 186–229.
- Pavlou, M. (2008) 'Metapoetics, Poetic Tradition, and Praise in Pindar *Olympian* 9', *Mnemosyne* 61, 533–567.
– (2010) 'Pindar *Olympian* 3: Mapping Acragas on the Periphery of the Earth', *CQ* 60, 313–26.
- Payne, M. (2006) 'On Being Vatic: Pindar, Pragmatism, and Historicism', *AJP* 127, 159–184.
- Pernot, L. (1993) *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde Gréco-romain: Tome II: Les valeurs*, Paris
- Perrotta, G. (1925) 'Teocrito imitatore di Pindaro', *SIFC* 4, 5–29.
- Pfeiffer, R., (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship Volume I*, Oxford.
- Pfeijffer, I. (1999a) *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar*, Leiden.
– (1999b) *First Person Futures in Pindar*, Stuttgart.
- Phillips, T. (2010) Review of J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (2009), *Ancient Narrative* 10.

- (2011) Propertius and the Poetics of the Book: 1.18 and 3.15-17, *CCJ* 57, 105-35.
 - (forthcoming a) ‘Callimachus in the Pindar Scholia’, *CCJ* 59, 152–77.
 - (forthcoming b) ‘Epinician Variations: Music and Text in Pindar Pythians 2 and 12’, *CQ* 63.1, 37–56.
- Porter, J. (2001) ‘Ideals and ruins : Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic’, in S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and Jas Elsner (eds.), 63–92.
- (2007) ‘Lasus of Hermione, Pindar and the Riddle of S’, *CQ* 57, 1–21.
 - (2010) *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.
- Pratt, L. (1995) ‘The Seal of Theognis, Writing, and Oral Poetry’, *AJP* 116, 171–84.
- Pretagostini, R. (ed.) (1993) *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all’età ellenistica*, Rome
- Quinn, K. (1982) ‘The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age’, *ANRW* 30.1, 75–180.
- Race, W. (1986) *Pindar*, Boston.
- (1987) ‘P. Oxy. 2438 and the Order of Pindar’s Works’, *RhM* 130, 407–410.
 - (1990) *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar’s Odes*, Atlanta.
- Rau, P. (1967) *Paratragodia: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*, Munich.
- Rawles, R. (2011) ‘Eros and Praise in Early Greek Lyric’, in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie (eds.) 139-59.
- Renehan, R. (1969) ‘Conscious Ambiguities in Pindar and Bacchylides’, *GRBS* 10, 217–28.
- Richardson, N. (1980) ‘Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*: A Sketch’, *CQ* 30, 265–287.
- Robbins, E. (1986) ‘Pindar’s *Oresteia* and the tragedians’, in M. Cropp, E. Fantham, and S. Scully (eds.), 1–11.
- Rohde, G. (1963) ‘Über das Lesen im Altertum’, in id. *Studien und Interpretationen zur antiken Literatur, Religion, und Geschichte*, Berlin, 290–303.
- Rosenmeyer, P. (1992) *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Rossi, L. (1971) ‘I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche’, *BICS* 18, 69–94.
- Russell, D. (1964) *Longinus On the Sublime*, Oxford.
- (1979) ‘De imitatione’, in D. West and A. Woodman (eds.).
- Rutherford, I. (1997) ‘Closure in Greek Lyrik’ in D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, and D. Fowler, (eds.), 43–61.
- (2001) *Pindar’s Paeans*, Oxford.

- Salmon, J.B. (1984) *Wealthy Corinth*, Oxford.
- Sauneron, S. (1960) 'Un document Égyptien relatif à la divinisation de la reine Arsinoé II', *BIAO* 60, 83-109.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1928) *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle–Saale) = *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 5. Jahr, heft 3*, 259–343.
- Schironi, F. (2010) *To Mega Biblion: Book–Ends, End–Titles, and Coronides in Papyri with Hexametric Poetry*, Durham, N.C.
- Schlesinger, E., (1968), 'Pindar Pyth. 12', *Hermes* 96, 275–86.
- Scodel, R. (2001) 'Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar', in J. Watson (ed.), 109–37.
- Segal, C., (1959) 'ἄψος and the problem of cultural decline in the De sublimate', *HSCP* 64, 121–146.
- (1985) 'Messages to the Underworld: an Aspect of Poetic Immortalization in Pindar', *AJP* 106, 199–212.
- (1987) 'Writer as Hero: The Heroic Ethos in Longinus, *On the Sublime*', in J. Servais, T. Hackens, and B. Servais–Soyez (eds.), 207–17
- (1994), 'The Gorgon and the Nightingale: The Voice of Female Lament and Pindar's Twelfth *Pythian Ode*' in L. Dunn and N. Jones (eds.), 17–34: reprinted in id. (1998) 85–104.
- (1998) *Aglaia: The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna*, Langham.
- Servais, J., Hackens, T., and Servais–Soyez, B. (eds.) (1987) *Stemmata: Mélanges de philologie, d'histoire et d'archéologie grecques offerts à Jules Labarbe*, Liège.
- Sevieri, R. (1997) 'Un canto sul far della sera: autoreferenzialità e mimesi culturale nella *Pitica XI* di Pindaro per Trasideo di Tebe', *Aevum Antiquum* 10, 83–100.
- (1999) 'Un eroe in cerca di una identità', *MD* 43, 77–110.
- Shapiro, K. D. (1988) 'Ἑμνων θεσσαυρὸς: Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode and the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi', *MH* 45, 1–5.
- Sherwin–White, S. (1978) *Ancient Cos*, Göttingen.
- Sicking, C. (1980) 'Pindar's First Olympian: An Interpretation', *Mnemosyne* 36, 60–70.
- Silk, M. (1993) 'Aristophanic Paratragedy' in A. Sommerstein (ed.) *Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis*, Bari, 477–504.
- (ed.) (1996) *Tragedy and the Tragic*, Oxford.
- (2007) 'Pindar's Poetry as Poetry: A Literary Commentary on *Olympian 12*', in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), 177–97.
- Slater, W. (1986) *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, Berlin/New York.

- Snell, B. (1953) *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*,
- Sommerstein, A. (2008) *Aeschylus Fragments*, Cambridge Mass.
- Sotiriou, M. (1998) *Pindarus Homericus: Homer–Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*, Göttingen.
- Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*, Princeton.
- Steiner, D. (1986) *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*, London.
 – (1994) *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece*, Princeton.
 – (1998) 'Moving Images: Fifth–Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure', *CA* 17, 123–53.
- Stephen, G. (1959) 'The Coronis', *Scriptorium* 13, 1–14.
- Svenbro, J. (1976) *La parole et le marbre*, Lund.
- Swift, L. (2007) *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*, Oxford.
- Tanzi–Mira, G. (1920) 'Paragraphoi ornate in papiri letterari greco–egizi', *Aegyptus* 1, 224–227.
- Thomas, O. (2010) *A Commentary on the Homeric Hymn to Hermes 184–396*, Oxford DPhil Thesis.
 – (2011) 'The Homeric Hymn to Pan' in A. Faulkner (ed.), 152–73.
 – (forthcoming) 'Sacrifice and the Homeric Hymn to Hermes 112–41', in S. S. Hitch & I. C. Rutherford (eds.).
- Thomas, R. (2007) 'Fame, Memorial, and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinikian Poetry – an Historical Study', in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), 141–66.
- Thummer, E. (1968) *Die Isthmischen Gedichte I*, Heidelberg.
- Too, Y.L. (1997) *The Idea of Ancient Literary Criticism*, Oxford.
 – (2010) *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World*, Oxford.
- Treu, M. (1974) 'Theons Pindarkommentar (Pap. Oxy. 2536)', in J.L. Heller and J.K. Newman (eds.), 62–85.
- Tuplin (ed.) (2004) *Xenophon and His World*, Stuttgart.
- Turner, E. (1987) *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2nd edn. ed. P. Parsons), Oxford.
- Ucciardello, G. (2012) 'Ancient Readers of Pindar's *Epinicians* In Egypt: Evidence From Papyri', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, and R. Rawles (eds.) (2012b), 105–40.
- Vaahtera, J. (1997) 'Phonetics and euphony in Dionysius of Halicarnassus', *Mnemosyne* 1997 50, 586–595.

- Van Sickle, J. (1980) 'The Book–Roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Book', *Arethusa* 13, 5–42.
- Vassilaki, E. (2009) 'Aristarque interprète des odes siciliennes de Pindare: explication interne et explication externe', in S. David, C. Daude, E. Geny, and C. Muckensturm-Pouille (eds.), 121–45.
- Verdenius, W. (1987) *Commentaries on Pindar, Volume I*, Leiden.
– (1988) *Commentaries on Pindar, Volume II*, Leiden.
- Vernant, J–P. (1985) *La mort dans les yeux*, Paris.
- Versnel, H. (1990) *Ter Unus: Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion, I*, Leiden.
- Vessey, M. (2010) 'Writing Before Literature: Derrida's Confessions and the Latin Christian World', in M. Leonard (ed.) (2010), 290–318.
- Vetta, M. (1983) *Poesia e simposia nella Grecia antica*, Rome.
- Walsh, G. (1988) 'Sublime Method: Longinus on Language and Imitation', *CA* 7, 252–69.
- Watson, J. (ed.) (2001) *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, Leiden.
- West, D. and Woodman, A. (eds.) (1979) *Creative Imitation in Latin Literature*, Cambridge.
- West, M.L. (1992) *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford.
– (2002) 'Eumelus: A Corinthian Epic Cycle?', *JHS* 122, 109–33.
- White, H. (1999) *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect*, Baltimore.
- White, P. (2009) 'Bookshops in the Literary Culture of Ancient Rome', in *Ancient Literacies*, 268–87.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2001) *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford.
– (2010) 'Thinking Local', in id. (ed.).
– (ed.) (2010) *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, Cambridge.
- Wilamowitz, U. (1922) *Pindaros*, Berlin.
- Wilson, N.G. (1967) 'A Chapter in the History of Scholia', *CQ* 17, 244–56.
- Wilson, P. (1999) 'The *aulos* in Athens', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), 58–75.
– (2000) *The Athenian institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, The City, and The Stage*, Cambridge.
- Wüst, E. (1967) *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter*, Tübingen.

- Young, D.C. (1968) *Three Odes of Pindar*, Leiden.
– (1970) ‘Pindaric Criticism’ in W. Calder and J. Stern (eds.), 1–95.
– (1971) *Pindar, Isthmian 7, Myth and Exempla*, Leiden.

Yunis, H. (ed.) (2003) *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge/New York.