UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
Emergent Genre: Innovation and Experimentation in the Victory Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2r83836k

Author
Waldo, Christopher Jinwoo

Publication Date
2019

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Emergent Genre: Innovation and Experimentation in the Victory Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides

By

Christopher J Waldo

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Classics

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in Charge:

Professor Leslie Kurke
Professor Mark Griffith
Professor James Porter
Professor Mario Telò

Spring 2019

@ Christopher J Waldo
May 2019

Abstract

Emergent Genre: Innovation and Experimentation in the Victory Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides

by

Christopher J Waldo

Doctor of Philosophy in Classics

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Leslie Kurke, Chair

This dissertation argues that the victory ode was a genre characterized by formal innovation and experimentation. While much scholarship over the last half century has stressed the existence of rhetorical continuities between the victory ode and other genres of Greek poetry, I emphasize the ways in which these poems set themselves apart. The victory ode came into being late in the life of archaic Greek poetry, and there may have been initial uncertainty on the part of both poets and their patrons as to the generic expectations of these commissions. Examining the surviving victory odes of Pindar and Bacchylides, I explore the innovative and experimental formal approaches employed by the poets to meet the demands of an emergent genre.

The first chapter discusses the victory ode's presentation of itself as transgressive. Pindar and Bacchylides often bring their mythological accounts to a close with statements marking them as inappropriate. I contend that these moments, rather than representing genuine confessions of transgression, serve to define the boundaries of the genre. Starting with Pythian 4, I argue that Pindar evokes the opposed images of a highway and a shortcut to modulate between the distinct narrative approaches of hexameter epic and symposiastic song. Moving to Pythian 11, I assert that Pindar's voicing of various tragic speakers throughout the mythological account belies his use of a metonymic crossroads to construe the narrative as an unfortunate deviation in the direction of tragedy. I conclude with Nemean 3, suggesting that the presentation of Herakles' travels as a digression overlooks the hero's entanglement in the rhetoric of this individual victory ode and the genre as a whole.

The second chapter examines the effect of direct speech delivered in the voice of a hero or god. I argue that the poets encode interpretive approaches in these passages. Beginning with the exchange between Herakles and Meleager from Bacchylides 5, I suggest that Herakles' tearful reaction to Meleager's narrative models an embodied affective response that is meant to be reproduced by the audience, which realizes that Deianeira eventually kills Herakles in the mythological tradition. Moving to Pythian 9, I contend that Chiron's response to Apollo, which ignores the surface meaning of Apollo's address, hits instead upon its latent significance, modeling an interpretive mode that the audience might apply in turn to the victory ode.

The third chapter explores the open ending, that is, the phenomenon of victory odes terminating within the mythological narration without returning to the voice of the poet. Beginning with Olympian 4, I demonstrate that by devoting the lone epode to an account of Erginos' mythological victory in the race in armor, Pindar upends all expectations about how a victory ode should close. Turning to Nemean 1, I assert that he calibrates the metrical structures of the victory ode to counterbalance the disorientation caused by the open ending, which imagines Herakles' immortal existence on Olympos. I finish with Nemean 10, contending that the poem, which is obsessed with endings, ultimately subverts the very notion of closure by concluding with the promise of speech.

The fourth chapter looks at the cases in which multiple victory odes were commissioned to celebrate the same victory. I argue that, in addition to functioning on their own, these poems should be thought of as forming larger composites. Beginning with Pythian 4 and Pythian 5, I assert that Pindar presents the charioteer Karrhotos in Pythian 5 as a model for the exile Damophilos in Pythian 4. Moving to Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13, I demonstrate that Pindar and Bacchylides construct between the two poems a multigenerational comparative framework equating Pytheas' family with the Aiakidai. Concluding with Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5, I scrutinize the close verbal likenesses between Pindar's poem and a brief passage from Bacchylides 5, contending that the effect of Bacchylides' allusion is to reproduce Olympian 1 in miniature.

DEDICATION

For my mother, who told me to pursue my passions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	**1**
Dedication	**i**
Table of Contents	**ii**
Acknowledgments	**iii**
Introduction	**1**
Chapter One	
Break-off Formulas of Spatial Transgression	**10**
Pythian 4	**12**
Pythian 11	**25**
Nemean 3	**32**
Chapter Two	**38**
Direct Speech in the Mythological Narration	
Bacchylides 5	**40**
Pythian 9	**58**
Chapter Three	
The Open Ending	**73**
Olympian 4	**76**
Nemean 1	**79**
Nemean 10	**90**
Chapter Four	
Interlocking Victory Odes	**103**
Pythian 4 and Pythian 5	**107**
Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13	**116**
Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5	**126**
Bibliography	**132**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Before commencing this study of genre, I would like to acknowledge the formal expectations of that in which I am writing by recognizing the various teachers, colleagues, friends, and family members whose support has made this dissertation possible. First and foremost, I am immensely grateful to the members of my committee, who have all demonstrated remarkable generosity and care in their regard for my work. Mark Griffith has fostered me as both a scholar and a person throughout my time at UC Berkeley, and his invaluable feedback has pointed me in a number of useful directions and prevented many mistakes. Jim Porter has always displayed a prescient understanding of the directions in which my thinking was heading, pushing me to explore the boldest and most sophisticated extensions of my arguments. I have also benefited from the boundless enthusiasm and infectious energy of Mario Telò, whose keen eye for clarity of expression has helped me in structuring several of these chapters. Lastly, I am forever indebted to Leslie Kurke, who lavished her tireless support and thoughtful mentorship upon me these past seven years. She has taught me what it means to be a scholar, and the completion of this project would be unimaginable without the benefit of her astute guidance.

Secondly, I would like to thank my undergraduate advisors in the Classics department at the University of Vermont. Angeline Chiu has been a precious resource, reading through several of my seminar papers and dissertation chapters. I have been the fortunate recipient of her sage advice throughout this process. John Franklin was the professor who introduced me to Pindar, and his eager encouragement of my fascination with one of the hardest authors in Greek literature has culminated in this dissertation. I do not believe that I would have become a classicist without the two of them and their wonderful colleagues in Vermont.

Thirdly, I would like to express my gratitude to the many friends who have contributed to the development of my research. I am especially beholden to Michael Hardin, Claire Healy, Marissa Henry, Alex Kilman, Priya Kothari, Virginia Lewis, Rachel Lim, Cecily Manson, Kelly Nguyen, Joanna Oh, Sarah Olsen, Talia Prussin, Esther Ramer, Emma Remsberg, Jonas Sese, Ashley Simone, and Andrew Wein. Finally, I thank my parents for their unending love and belief in me.

Introduction

The Roman writer Marcus Tullius Cicero relates a remarkable anecdote about the archaic Greek poet Simonides and the Thessalian nobleman Scopas. In *De Oratore*, he describes Simonides' role in the circumstances surrounding Scopas' death:

> Dicunt enim, cum cenaret Crannone in Thessalia Simonides apud Scopam fortunatum hominem et nobilem cecinissetque id carmen, quod in eum scripsisset, in quo multa ornandi causa poetarum more in Castorem scripta et Pollucem fuissent, nimis illum sordide Simonidi dixisse se dimidium eius ei, quod pactus esset, pro illo carmine daturum; reliquum a suis Tyndaridis, quos aeque laudasset, peteret, si ei videretur. Paulo post esse ferunt nuntiatum Simonidi, ut prodiret; iuvenis stare ad ianuam duo quosdam, qui eum magno opere evocarent; surrexisse illum, prodisse, vidisse neminem: hoc interim spatio conclave illud, ubi epularetur Scopas, concidisse; ea ruina ipsum cum cognatis oppressum suis interisse: quos cum humare vellent sui neque possent obtritos internoscere ullo modo, Simonides dicitur ex eo, quod meminisset quo eorum loco quisque cubuisset, demonstrator unius cuiusque sepeliendi fuisse; hac tum re admonitus invenisse fertur ordinem esse maxime, qui memoriae lumen adferret.
>
> For they say that, when Simonides was dining in Crannon in Thessaly with Scopas, a man of prosperity and renown, and he had sung the song that he had written for him, in which for the sake of ornamentation in the manner of poets many things had been written about Castor and Pollux, that man had very meanly said that he would give him half of the promised fee for that poem, and that he might seek the rest from his Tyndaridai, whom he had praised equally, if it seemed fit to him. They say that a little while later it was reported to Simonides that he should go outside, since two young men were standing at the door, who were urgently calling for him. He stood up, went outside, and saw no one. In the meantime the hall where Scopas was dining collapsed. Crushed in the disaster, he and his relatives perished. When their friends and family members wanted to bury them and were unable to recognize the crushed corpses in any way, Simonides, because he had remembered the positions in which each of them had sat, is said to have made identifications for burying them. Prompted

> in this way, he is said to have discovered that it is order above all else that provides the light of memory.[1]

While Cicero and others have traditionally cited this narrative in discussions of Simonides' famous mnemonic technique and other contexts, I view the exchange between poet and aristocrat as a valuable window into the reception of the victory ode in antiquity.[2] Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, who also recounts this anecdote, articulates the source of Scopas' displeasure in aesthetic terms: abnegatam ei pecuniae partem, quod more poetis frequentissimo degressus in laudes Castoris ac Pollucis exierat, "a part of the money was denied to him, because, in the manner most frequent of poets, having digressed, he sang the praises of Castor and Pollux."[3] The content of the poet's indiscretion is articulated by the participle degressus, "having digressed." Scopas views Simonides' celebration of the divine twins as a departure from the primary theme of the poem, that is, his own victory as a boxer.

Simonides, who flourished in the generation before Pindar and Bacchylides, was probably among the earliest composers of victory odes.[4] This anecdote suggests that there may have been initial uncertainty on the part of both poets and their patrons as to the generic expectations of these commissions. The genre of the victory ode appeared late in the life of archaic Greek poetry, which had encompassed a broad range of discursive registers, including epic poems composed in dactylic hexameter, the invective iamboi of Archilochus and Hipponax, the symposiastic songs of Sappho and Alcaeus, and, perhaps the closest antecedent to the victory ode itself, the choral compositions of Alcman and Stesichorus.[5] The victory ode bridged the distance between this course of development spanning centuries and the flowering of tragedy.

Some scholars have suggested that the victory ode and tragedy might have been rival genres.[6] Athens, the city most closely associated with tragedy, was famously democratic in the 5th-century BCE, while, as Laura Swift observes, the victory ode was "not just another segment of elite poetic culture; by its nature it runs counter to democratic ideals in a way that other lyric genres do not. A form of poetry whose purpose is to celebrate the deeds of an individual aristocrat does not sit easily with fifth-century Athenian ideology."[7] I would add that both tragedy and the victory ode were immense public spectacles with characteristic

---

[1] Cicero *De Oratore* 2.352-53. All translations from Latin and Greek are my own.

[2] See Callimachus fr. 64, Cicero *De Oratore* 2.351-53, Ovid *Ibis* 511-12, Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.11-16, Phaedrus 4.26, Valerius Maximus 1.8 ext. 7, Aelius Aristides 50.36, Aelian frr. 60, 78, Alciphron 3.32.3, Libanius *Orationes* 5.53, and Stobaeus 4.41.62. For scholarly discussion of this anecdote, see Molyneux (1971) and Slater (1972).

[3] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 11.2.11.

[4] Simonides wrote victory odes that date to the last quarter of the sixth century BCE. Maslov (2015) 277 notes that "We know that Simonides composed epinikia for different patrons, most of whom (if our sample is at all representative) were tyrants and aristocrats from the periphery of the Greek world." Barron (1984) 20-22 argues that a papyrus fragment originally attributed to Stesichorus should be assigned to Ibykus and considered a victory ode, which would establish the existence of the genre as early as the 560s BCE; cf. Rawles (2012). The earliest securely datable instance of the genre is Pythian 10, which celebrates the victory of Hippokleas of Thessaly in the boys' double foot race at the Pythian festival in 498 BCE.

[5] For discussion of the victory ode's incorporation of older genres and discursive categories, see Kurke (1988), Kurke (1991) 259, Robbins (1997), and Maslov (2015) 246-317.

[6] See Swift (2010) 104-72 and Kurke (2013).

[7] Swift (2010) 106.

approaches to representing the mythological past, and that the principal poets associated with the two genres were the most famous in all of classical Greece. It is perhaps natural that these genres would butt heads as prominent representations of competing ideological discourses.

We should note that the victory ode emerged in an unprecedented literary environment, in which individual poets were first making claims for themselves as voices worthy of consideration.[8] In the 8th and 7th centuries BCE, anonymous authors had composed poems in both oral and literate contexts, to which the subsequent tradition assigned the names of poets. Scholars have reconstructed this process in the case of Homer, arguing that the name of the poet was a back-formation from that of the clan of the Homeridai.[9] The situation changes somewhat in the 6th century BCE with the appearance of poets like Sappho, Alcaeus, and Alcman, for whom civically situated biographical narratives survive both in the testimonia concerning them and sometimes in the texts of their poems.[10] Pindar and Bacchylides represent another radical stage in the development of authorship in the Greek literary tradition, arriving, similarly to the tragedians, as genuine historical figures with inextricable positions in the social and cultural history of the time.

This dissertation articulates an understanding of the victory ode as a newcomer genre shaped by the ambitions of its principal practitioners, Pindar and Bacchylides, to establish themselves among the premier poets of their generation. The orientation of this study is largely synchronic.[11] Following a recent characterization of the victory ode as "a form that welcomed experimentation," I assert that Pindar and Bacchylides, following Simonides' model, used the genre as a space within which to explore the boundaries of poetic form.[12] I focus on a handful of distinctive formal features that I presume either to have been invented or elaborated upon by these poets.

The words "innovation" and "experimentation" in the title of my dissertation map onto the respective ideas of invention and elaboration. I contend that the genre of the victory ode represented a productive site for the generation of novel formal structures and also for the expansion of inherited structures in manners transcending their uses in earlier contexts. A striking example of the former phenomenon is the fact, discussed in chapter four, that some patrons commissioned multiple victory odes to celebrate the same athletic achievement. I argue that the poets viewed these commissions as opportunities to construct an elaborate architecture of praise spanning the two poems. As for the latter phenomenon, I focus in chapter three upon examples of the "open ending," that is, the cases in which a victory ode terminates within the frame of the mythological narration without returning to the voice of the poet. The "open ending" also occurs in the symposiastic songs of Sappho and Alcaeus, but the considerably larger scope of the victory ode, marked by choral performance and the

---

[8] See Maslov (2015) 36-116 for a full discussion of Pindar's position in the development of authorship in the Greek literary tradition.

[9] See West (1999) and Maslov (2015) 53.

[10] Sappho's newly discovered "Brothers Poem" provides an instructive example of a poem that might hint at biographical events in the life of the poet, although we should certainly avoid assuming the authenticity of what could be a largely fictionalized invocation of reality. For discussion of these issues in this poem, see Kurke (2016a), Lardinois (2016), Obbink (2016), Peponi (2016), and Stehle (2016).

[11] For diachronic accounts of the emergence of the victory ode in the context of archaic Greek poetry, see Rawles (2012), and Maslov (2015).

[12] Maslov (2015) 147, who is talking about Pindar's distinctive penchant for genre hybridization.

prevalence of triadic metrical structures, presents a transformative new context in which to experiment with such formal structures. The genre of the victory ode abounds in these extremities of form, and scholars have also commented, for instance, upon the exceptional vitality of the first person in Pindar.[13] My dissertation spotlights these moments in which victory odes draw attention to their own formal extravagance.

This emphasis upon innovation and experimentation has led me to elaborate an account of the genre based on peripheral phenomena. While most explorations of the formal properties of a genre would work from its most prevalent attributes, this study pursues the premise that it is possible to understand a genre by examining its less common characteristics. Most of the formal features that I discuss in this dissertation are confined to a handful of exceptional victory odes, including the break-off formulas articulating a "topography of genre" from chapter one and the instances of mythological dialogue from chapter two. Approaching the genre from this perspective, I argue that the axiomatic virtues of formal innovation and experimentation, while instantiated by peripheral phenomena, served as structuring principles for the distinctive poetics of the victory ode.

Let me situate the contributions of this study within a narrative of the 20th century development of scholarly conceptions of the victory ode as a genre. In 1955, A. E. Harvey articulated a set of priorities that would come to define the study of archaic Greek poetry during the rest of the century with the publication of his seminal article "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry."[14] Harvey noted the insufficiency for modern scholars of the classification system designed in Alexandria for the genres of Greek lyric poetry, asserting that "The interest of the Alexandrians was the practical one of classification; our interest is the more searching one of detecting formal conditions governing the composition of the poems."[15] This emphasis on the detection of "formal conditions" would have a lasting influence on the study of Pindar.

The modern era of Pindaric scholarship began in earnest in 1962 with *Studia Pindarica* by Elroy Bundy, who, in opposition to the earlier biographical criticism that viewed Pindar's victory odes as chaotic expressions of the digressive fancies of a capricious mind, asserted that "there is no passage in Pindar and Bacchylides that is not in its primary intent encomiastic—that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron."[16] He regarded each victory ode as a unified composition, arguing that "apparent irrelevancy (e.g., lines 12 f.) is only comparative and is deliberately contrived in the interest of variety and as foil for a point of commanding interest."[17] Although Bundy died in 1975, he left behind to Pindaric scholarship the mandate that "The study of Pindar must become a study of genre.

---

[13] Kurke (2007) 158 claims that "In all of archaic poetry, there is no more prominent and assertive 'I' than that of Pindar's *epinikia*." For further discussion of the first person in Pindar, see Lefkowitz (1991), D'Alessio (1994), and Maslov (2015) 36-116.

[14] For two influential discussions that predate Harvey (1955), see Schadewaldt (1928) and Färber (1936).

[15] Harvey (1955) 164.

[16] Bundy (1986) 3. *Studia Pindarica*, originally published in 1962, was reprinted in 1986 and 2006 (in digital form). For representative examples of biographical scholarship on Pindar, see Wilamowitz (1922) and Bowra (1964). Maslov (2015) 123 notes that "up until the linguistic turn in the humanities, Pindaric scholarship favored a biographical approach and the conflation of art and personality particularly impeded a constructive discussion of transitional qualities in Pindar's concept formation, since it was often mixed up with Pindar's putative religious views."

[17] Bundy (1962) 91, who is discussing I. 1 in this passage.

No longer can we view the odes as the production of an errant genius whose personal interests cause him to violate the ordinary canons of sense and relevance."[18] Bundy's successors set the agenda for Pindaric scholarship throughout the decades of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, focusing on the formal and rhetorical conventions of the genre.[19]

A new orientation in the study of Pindar began in 1991 with the appearance of Leslie Kurke's *The Traffic in Praise*. Informed by the "New Historicism," a theoretical approach that viewed literary and non-literary texts alike as deeply embedded documents of social discourse, Kurke stressed the social function of archaic Greek poetry:

> In ancient Greek society, all poetry was composed for public performance—whether at a symposium before a small select group or at a religious festival before the entire city. Thus, the lyrics of Alcaeus were performed at symposia before the members of a single aristocratic *hetaireia*, or political club, in sixth-century Mytilene, and Attic tragedy and comedy played before an estimated fifteen thousand citizens and visitors at the Great Dionysia. For such a milieu, we must crucially modify the terms in which we conceptualize poetry. To begin with, we must correlate genre with performance: if we define genre as the set of audience expectations which shapes and constrains each individual composition, we must take into account the nature of the audience *and* the occasion that informed their expectations. This reorientation implicates genre in a whole set of social, political, and religious issues, since different occasions were designed for audiences of different classes and different political persuasions, and often the occasions were specifically religious in nature. We must also orient our notion of poetics, the "making" of poetry, the conception that underlies its production, and the function for which it is made. Just as genre depends upon performance, poetics depends upon the broader social context, for given its setting, we must believe that such poetry fulfilled a social function.[20]

While there were several notable antecedents to the idea that "we must correlate genre with performance," Kurke's emphasis on the implication of performance in the larger social world has proven instrumental to the broader study of archaic Greek poetry.[21] A generation of scholars has set about searching for traces of the social ideology in the cultural productions of the archaic Greeks.[22]

The "New Historicist" orientation in Pindaric scholarship has maintained its prevalence in the last decade. Two recent monographs attest to a special interest in the relationship between the victory ode and the Deinomenid tyranny of Syracuse: Kathryn Morgan's *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* and

---

[18] Bundy (1962) 92.

[19] See Young (1971), Carey (1981), Slater (1983), and Race (1986).

[20] Kurke (1991) 1. For two of the most influential articulations of the "New Historicism," see Greenblatt (1980) and Gallagher (1985).

[21] Kurke (2013) 103, citing Calame (1977), Rösler (1980), Herington (1985), Martin (1989), Krummen (1990), and Winkler (1990), remarks that "In a turn to performance dating back to at least the 1970s, scholars have come to recognize that it is essential to locate all our preserved Greek poetic texts in their specific, local performative contexts—religious, social, political, and economic."

[22] For representative scholarship implicating performance in the larger social world, see Stehle (1997), Wilson (2003), Kowalzig (2007), Peponi (2007), and Ferrari (2008).

Nigel Nicholson's *The Poetics of Victory in the Greek West*. Morgan and Nicholson both elaborate conceptions of the victory ode's aesthetic role in the legitimation of the Deinomenids.[23] I would also draw attention to one recent monograph that breaks from the "New Historicist" model: Boris Maslov's *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature*. Maslov argues that Pindar's victory odes demonstrate the emergence of several formal and conceptual characteristics that later came to define the western conception of literature:

> I foreground four aspects of what has come to constitute the literary in the West and discuss their historical ontology in Archaic Greece: (1) the principle of individual authorship; (2) the use of ad hoc, original imagery, particularly as a conceptual tool; (3) extensive appropriation of social discourses as resources for poetic authority; and (4) genre hybridization. Within these four domains, I seek to bring to light the transformation of preliterary structures that tend to inform oral tradition and socially embedded genres of folklore into constructive principles that operate in later periods of western literary history.[24]

His historical stratigraphy of the victory ode has several aims in common with this dissertation, although our methodologies differ.[25] Maslov and I are both invested in the "emergence" of the victory ode, although he focuses on the sedimentation of social and cultural discourses in these poems, while I view them as demonstrating substantial innovation and experimentation of form.[26]

Broadening our scope to the humanities as a whole, several scholars have noted the advent of a "New Formalism" in the field of literary studies.[27] For many of these "new formalists," the imperative has been to articulate a formalism that incorporates the "new historicist" understanding of the literary text as a social artefact inextricable from the material conditions of its cultural production.[28] Colleen Lye, for instance, describes the potential of a "new formalism" to reveal the interdependence of the aesthetic and the social in Asian American literature:

> If there is evidence of a "new formalism" afoot in the discipline of English, or at least rhetorical reference to one, this much might at first also be said of ethnic studies. In the latter case, however, the significance of this development within a field that was from its very inception interdisciplinary means that the call to attend more carefully to matters of literary form can never quite shake off the heteronomy of the aesthetic. The more we open our minds to this truth the better, as what it promises to reveal is

---

[23] Morgan (2015) and Nicholson (2015). Lewis (forthcoming), a revision of her dissertation, Lewis (2014), is set to contribute to the conversation on the victory ode's entrenchment in Sicilian politics.
[24] Maslov (2015) 12.
[25] Maslov (2015) 25 draws upon Alexander Veselovsky's Historical Poetics, arguing that "One way of capturing this vision of historical stratification is through a metaphor of geological *sedimentation*, which Veselovsky frequently uses to evoke strata of meaning accumulated during cultural evolution."
[26] Maslov (2015) 12 adds that "I speak of a historical ontology or of emergence rather than of the 'origin,' 'invention,' or 'evolution' of the literary to avoid the implications of a singular moment of origination, of self-willed creation, or of distinct phases in the later development of these aspects of literary praxis."
[27] See Levinson (2007), Lye (2008), Best and Marcus (2009) 13-14, Felski (2015) 11, and Levine (2015) 12.
[28] Best and Marcus (2009) 13-14 discuss "New Formalism" in the context of "surface reading."

> the continuing historical potential of the ethnic text to demand a critical practice adequate to the contradictory and peculiar nature of literature as a kind of social fact.[29]

One prominent critic, Caroline Levine, has pushed the relationship between the aesthetic and the social even further, advocating in her book *Forms*: *Whole*, *Rhythm*, *Hierarchy*, *Network* for a universalizing formalism that reads literary form and the formal structures that shape society together:

> The first major goal of this book is to show that forms are everywhere structuring and patterning experience, and that this carries serious implications for understanding political communities. This starting-point entails a *Gestalt* shift for literary studies. It calls for a new account of politics and of the relations between politics and literature. In theory, political forms impose their order on our lives, putting us in our places. But in practice, we encounter so many forms that even in the most daily experience they add up to a complex environment composed of multiple and conflicting modes of organization—forms arranging and containing us, yes, but also competing and colliding and rerouting one another. I will make the case here that no form, however seemingly powerful, causes, dominates, or organizes all others. This means that literary forms can lay claim to an efficacy of their own. They do not simply reflect or contain prior political realities. As different forms struggle to impose their order on our experience, working at different scales of our experience, aesthetic and political forms emerge as comparable patterns that operate on a common plane. I will show in this book that aesthetic and political forms may be nested inside one another, and that each is capable of disturbing the other's organizing power.[30]

Levine draws upon the concept of "affordance" from design theory, arguing that "a specific form can be put to use in unexpected ways that expand our general sense of that form's affordances. Rather than asking what artists intend or even what forms *do*, we can ask instead what potentialities lie latent—though not always obvious—in aesthetic and social arrangements."[31] For Levine and the other "new formalists," this renewed attention to formal structures represents a promising approach to understanding the complex interrelation of the various forces that shape human experience.

Victoria Wohl's *Euripides and the Politics of Form* represents the first overt assertion of a "new formalist" approach in the field of Classics. Wohl, like Lye, discusses the challenge of articulating a formalism that retains the insights of "New Historicism":

> there has been a call across the humanities for a return to formalism. But the question now is how to stage such a return without losing the gains of historicism: how to study the aesthetic qualities of these literary texts without forgetting that they were the product of a specific historical moment with its own specific political concerns; or

[29] Lye (2008) 92.
[30] Levine (2015) 16-17.
[31] Levine (2015) 6, who cites Gibson (1977) and Norman (1990).

> alternatively, how to speak about a text's politics without losing sight of its formal aesthetic qualities. The challenge is not just to keep these two sets of issues—the aesthetic and the political—in focus simultaneously, but to theorize their interconnection within the text itself, to identify the ideological work being done in and *by* tragedy's aesthetic form.[32]

Her solution, following Adorno, is to formulate an "immanent critique" that "moots the historicist-formalist debate by seeing the work of art as most thoroughly historical where it seems most purely formal, and displaces questions about the conscious intention (the 'political message') of the author, whose aesthetic choices, whether he intends so or not, inevitably enact ideological assumptions and entail ideological commitments."[33] Wohl articulates a "politics of form," in which "dramatic form is a kind of political content."[34] In describing this "politics of form," she argues that Euripides "offers merely a specific instance of a general phenomenon, but a particularly good one, because his self-conscious formal experimentation and ostentatious formal innovation call attention to form itself. They force us to notice form and demand that we think about it."[35] While my own approach centers less on the immanent entanglement of politics and form, I would argue that Wohl's final observation is equally true of the "self-conscious formal experimentation and ostentatious formal innovation" demonstrated by Pindar and Bacchylides.

This dissertation, which draws upon the insights of the "new formalists" in theorizing the genre of the victory ode, is organized into four chapters. The first chapter discusses the victory ode's presentation of itself as transgressive. Pindar and Bacchylides often bring their mythological accounts to a close with statements marking them as inappropriate. I contend that these moments, rather than representing genuine confessions of transgression, serve to define the boundaries of the genre. Starting with Pythian 4, I argue that Pindar evokes the opposed images of a highway and a shortcut to modulate between the distinct narrative approaches of hexameter epic and symposiastic song. Moving to Pythian 11, I assert that Pindar's voicing of various tragic speakers throughout the mythological account belies his use of a metonymic crossroads to construe the narrative as an unfortunate deviation in the direction of tragedy. I conclude with Nemean 3, suggesting that the presentation of Herakles' travels as a digression overlooks the hero's entanglement in the rhetoric of this individual victory ode and the genre as a whole.

The second chapter examines the effect of direct speech delivered in the voice of a hero or god. I argue that the poets encode interpretive approaches in these passages. Beginning with the exchange between Herakles and Meleager from Bacchylides 5, I suggest that Herakles' tearful reaction to Meleager's somber narrative models an embodied affective response that is meant to be reproduced by the audience, which realizes that Deianeira eventually kills Herakles in the mythological tradition. Moving to Pythian 9, I contend that Chiron's response to Apollo, which ignores the surface meaning of Apollo's address, hits

---

[32] Wohl (2015) 4.
[33] Wohl (2015) 5, who cites Adorno (1997) for "immanent critique."
[34] Wohl (2015) 1.
[35] Wohl (2015) 5.

instead upon its latent significance, modeling an interpretive mode that the audience might apply in turn to the victory ode.

The third chapter explores the open ending. Beginning with Olympian 4, I demonstrate that by devoting the lone epode to an account of Erginos' mythological victory in the race in armor, Pindar upends all expectations about how a victory ode should close. Turning to Nemean 1, I assert that he calibrates the metrical structures of the victory ode to counterbalance the disorientation caused by the open ending, which imagines Herakles' immortal existence on Olympos. I finish with Nemean 10, contending that the poem, which is obsessed with endings, ultimately subverts the very notion of closure by concluding with the promise of speech.

The fourth chapter looks at the cases in which multiple victory odes were commissioned to celebrate the same victory. I argue that, in addition to functioning on their own, these victory odes should be thought of as forming larger composites. Beginning with Pythian 4 and Pythian 5, I assert that Pindar presents the charioteer Karrhotos in Pythian 5 as a model for the exile Damophilos in Pythian 4. Moving to Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13, I demonstrate that Pindar and Bacchylides construct between the two poems a multigenerational comparative framework equating Pytheas' family with the Aiakidai. Concluding with Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5, I scrutinize the close verbal likenesses between Pindar's poem and a brief passage from Bacchylides 5, contending that the effect of Bacchylides' allusion is to reproduce Olympian 1 in miniature.

Pindar and Bacchylides composed victory odes on commission to celebrate the athletic accomplishments of aristocrats and tyrants. Previous scholarship has attended to the continuities between these compositions and other registers of archaic Greek discourse, arguing for sedimentation and hybridity. While acknowledging the merits of those earlier studies, this dissertation emphasizes originality, exploring the innovative and experimental formal structures developed by the poets to meet the demands of an emergent genre.

Chapter One

Break-off Formulas of Spatial Transgression

It is a curious fact that Pindar takes back his first statement in the historical record. Pythian 10, his earliest datable victory ode, composed to honor the victory of Hippokleas of Thessaly in the boys' diaulos at the Pythian festival in 498 BCE, begins with an apparent misstep (1-6):

> Ὀλβία Λακεδαίμων,
> μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία. πατρὸς δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνός
> ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλ<έο>ς βασιλεύει.
> τί κομπ<έω> παρὰ καιρόν; ἀλλά με Πυθώ
> τε καὶ τὸ Πελινναῖον ἀπύει
> Ἀλεύα τε παῖδες, Ἱπποκλέᾳ θέλοντες 5
> ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα.
>
> Fortunate is Lakedaimon, and blessed is Thessaly. The lineage of one father, Herakles, preeminent in battle, rules over both. Why do I boast inappropriately? But rather Pytho and Pelinna and the sons of Aleuas are calling me, wishing to bring the famous voices of men in celebration to Hippokleas.

The poet begins with a declaration that Lakedaimon and Thessaly are both prosperous, since Herakles' mythological descendants reign over both, but he immediately censures this statement, asking why he is boasting παρὰ καιρόν (4), "inappropriately."[36] He turns instead to direct praise of the victor Hippokleas, which is manifestly the most appropriate theme for this poem. These lines provide an oddly fitting opening to Pindar's career as a composer of victory odes, which often include moments of this sort, in which the poets mark their own statements as somehow problematic or transgressive.

Pindaric scholarship, dating back to Jebb and Schadewaldt, has demonstrated a keen interest in these break-off formulas.[37] Hilary Mackie has observed that

[36] Bundy (1986) 38 interprets lines 1-3 as foil to the celebration of Hippokleas. Cf. Race (1980) 5-6.
[37] See Jebb (1905) and Schadewaldt (1928). Cf. Carey (1980a), Race (1980), and Mackie (2003).

> Break-off is a striking and frequent feature of the Pindaric epinician idiom. Break-off is a rhetorical device whereby the poet interrupts himself with an exclamation like ἀφίσταμαι, "I stand aside!" or στάσομαι, "I will stop!" or a command like κώπαν σχάσον, "Hold the oar!" With some comment of this kind he abruptly breaks off the narrative or theme on which he was previously engaged, and changes the subject. He announces that it would not be right, for one reason or another, to pursue the original topic any further. Then he embarks on a new topic.[38]

It is perhaps the persistent impression of these moments that caused scholars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to develop a number of misconceptions about the structural characteristics, or lack thereof, underlying the victory odes of Pindar. Elroy Bundy enumerates several of these erroneous beliefs: "the odes do not have a linear unity; the transitions are abrupt; the poet devotes much time to his personal preoccupations, triumphs, and embarrassments, as well as to irrelevancies of other kinds."[39] Martin West formulates, in particular, a conception of the irrelevance of the mythological narrative to most victory odes:

> Any myth can be used, and on the slightest pretext. It may have some connection with the victor's ancestry, or his home town, or the games at which he has been successful; it may have no particular relevance, its presence being ostensibly justified as an illustration of some commonplace such as "there is a time and place for everything." Pindar's attitude to myth is flexible. He is prepared to adapt it to suit his patrons or his own moral sense.[40]

The feigned naïveté of these break-off formulas helped to encourage a view of the poet as an assembler at random.

In contrast to these opinions, several scholars have suggested that Pindar cultivates the impression of naïveté for a reason. William Race has argued that the purpose of these passages is to lend the performances a sense of spontaneity, noting that the poet appears "to react to his own statements, as if he were hearing them—like a listener—for the first time."[41] While accepting Race's argument about spontaneity, Mackie offers a more nuanced articulation of the function of the break-off formula:

> Break-off passages of the type I have been considering in this section, then, are directed at the victory, and designed to avoid excess in one of two different ways. Some of them are designed to assuage any resentment that might be provoked in the victor by what he sees as excessive praise of his ancestors and other heroes. Others

---

[38] Mackie (2003) 9. Carey (1980a) 143 contends that the break-off formula "remains essentially Pindar's property. Bacchylides uses this device only twice (5.176ff., 10.51f.), while Pindar, who seems to have created a stylized form of his own within the conventions of the epinician genre, is forever recasting the break-off." For extended discussion of the intricate break-off formula in Bacchylides 5, see Chapter Four.

[39] Bundy (1986) 2, who cites Drachmann (1891) and Perrotta (1935) as scholars who "despair of finding sense in the odes."

[40] West (1997) 46, who adds that "He does not follow any fixed pattern in constructing an ode, and one is often left with the impression of a suitcase filled rather at random."

[41] Race (1990) 42. Cf. Race (1980), Carey (1981) 5, Dickson (1990) 124, Miller (1993) 21, Pelliccia (1995) 305, and Mackie (2003) 10-11.

> are intended to curb the dangerously excessive behavior he might manifest should he make the mistake of thinking himself a hero or a god.[42]

I would suggest that Mackie's interpretation takes Pindar too much at his word. The easiest way for him to please his audience is to avoid inappropriate statements in the first place. These break-off moments, rather than simply negating the threat of excess, exist to perform a positive function of their own.

In this chapter, I examine a number of specific passages in which Pindar terminates his mythological narratives, characterizing them as transgressions in spatial terms.[43] I contend that these passages, rather than representing genuine admissions of error or oversight, are actually constitutive moments of generic self-definition. Victory odes were written in elaborate choral meters. In meeting the demands of dactylo-epitrite and the other metrical schemes used for these poems, Pindar would surely have refrained from saying anything that is truly inappropriate.[44] These moments of apparent transgression are not what they purport to be. The poet assumes a posture of misconduct in order to reorganize the normative boundaries of the genre.

When we assemble together the corpus of these passages that articulate transgression in spatial terms, we begin to observe what Leslie Kurke has termed "a generic topography."[45] Pindar uses a number of geographical images to demarcate what is considered acceptable speech within the genre of the victory ode, but I would argue that these imagined points, rather than representing violations of decorum, work to establish the limits of decorum. The purpose of these passages is not, then, to exclude the preceding mythological narratives, but rather, to incorporate them into the discursive body of the victory ode as a coherent genre.[46]

In this chapter I examine three case studies of poems in which Pindar abruptly terminates his mythological account, claiming that it is transgressive or excessive: Nemean 3, Pythian 4, and Pythian 11. All three of these victory odes present their mythological narratives as problematic to the rhetorical development of the poem as a whole, but I would argue that, in each case, this posture of repudiation works to incorporate the improper element. These are moments in which the genre extends its boundaries.

Pythian 4

Pythian 4, written to honor the chariot victory of Arkesilas of Kyrene in the Pythian festival in 462 BCE, stages an unorthodox return from its extended presentation of the mythological expedition of Jason and the Argonauts. After eleven triads of narration, Pindar

---

[42] Mackie (2003) 35.

[43] This chapter might have included discussions of Bacchylides 5 and Bacchylides 10, but I interpret the break-off formula (176-86) in Bacchylides 5 at length in Chapter Four, and the passage immediately preceding the break-off formula in Bacchylides 10 is a gnomic statement rather than a mythological narration.

[44] For discussion of the other metrical schemes used in Pindar's victory odes, see Itsumi (2009).

[45] Kurke (2013) 120.

[46] For discussion of the synthetic nature of Pindar's victory odes, see Maslov (2015) 246-317.

interrupts his account at the moment of Jason's encounter with the dragon that protects the Golden Fleece, declaring that it is time to come to a conclusion. In the break-off formula, the poet concedes that he cannot continue to traverse the highway, asserting his special knowledge of a shortcut through the mythological account. He concludes this narrative in dramatically truncated fashion, compressing the Argonauts' subsequent misadventures and the historical rise of the Battidai into less than a triad. The modulation between the highway and a shortcut maps onto a shift between generic forms. The highway represents the distinctive narrative approach of epic, and the shortcut that Pindar takes in this victory ode mirrors the narrative compression of symposiastic song.

The break-off formula in Pythian 4 conceives of the mythological narrative in spatial terms (247-48):

> μακρά μοι νεῖσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν· ὥρα
> γὰρ συνάπτει καί τινα
> οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν· πολ-
> λοῖσι δ' ἄγημαι σοφίας ἑτέροις.
>
> It is a long way for me to travel along the highway, for the hour is pressing, and I know a short path. I lead the way in skill for many others.

Pindar articulates a distinction between ἀμαξιτόν (247), "the highway," and τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48), "a short path." R.W.B. Burton regards ἀμαξιτόν (247) and τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48) as alternative approaches to the task of concluding the mythological account, suggesting that

> The high-road which he rejects for being too long would no doubt lead him past such signposts in the saga as the details of Jason's slaying of the dragon and the sowing of its teeth, his rejuvenation by Medea, the pursuit by Absyrtus and other adventures on the return-journey. By choosing a certain short cut (τινα οἶμον βραχύν, v. 248), he omits most of these incidents and recalls others in the briefest terms.[47]

Advancing a different understanding of this passage, I would argue that Pindar has been travelling κατ' ἀμαξιτόν (247) throughout the course of the poem to this point, and that τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48) represents a modulation in his narrative approach.

Both ἀμαξιτόν (247) and τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48) figure particular genres of archaic Greek poetry. The adjective ἀμαξιτός, often combined with the noun ὁδός, "road," signifies a path traversed by wagons, that is, a thoroughfare of considerable width. Pindar uses ἀμαξιτός twice elsewhere. He concludes his account of Achilles' slaughter of Memnon in Nemean 6 by mentioning that this was a theme popular with previous generations of poets (53-54):

> καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι
> ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὗρον· ἕπο-
> μαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων μελέταν·

[47] Burton (1962) 166.

> And older poets found these things to be a highway, and I myself also follow, making it my concern.

There is also a passage in Paean fragment 52h that features ἀμαξιτός (11-12):

> Ὁμήρου [δὲ μὴ τρι]πτὸν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν
> ἰόντες, ἀ[λλ' ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις,
>
> and not going on the trodden highway of Homer, but on the horses of another.

These three passages point to a correspondence in Pindar's usage between ἀμαξιτός and the tradition of Greek epic poetry.[48] The most notable earlier poem that treated the death of Memnon was the *Aethiopis*, one of the installments of the Epic Cycle, and Paean fragment 52h uses the phrase Ὁμήρου τριπτὸν ἀμαξιτόν (11), "the trodden highway of Homer," to articulate a particular conception of Homeric poetry. As for Pythian 4, scholars have long opined that the victory ode, with its extraordinarily long mythological account, recalls epic, and Pindar even cites Homer in the thirteenth strophe (277-78), paraphrasing a maxim about the importance of messengers.[49] I would also suggest that an epic treatment of the Argonautica might have existed in Pindar's time.[50] The evidence of these three passages points to a correspondence between the image of a path traversed by wagons and the narrative conventions of Greek hexameter epic.

The connection between τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48) and a distinct category of poetic discourse is harder to establish. There is no equivalent association in Pindar's diction between this phrase and a particular genre of archaic Greek poetry.[51] I propose that the poet insinuates an understated connection between his shortcut and symposiastic song, which offers the strongest available contrast to the protracted narratives of hexameter epic. Kathryn Morgan has observed that Pindar elsewhere develops a rhetorical contrast between his own victory odes, which were choral performances composed in a professional capacity, and symposiastic song, which, as the performance of an individual singer, was "essentially non-professional."[52] Morgan notes that Pindar vacillates between rebuffing and incorporating symposiastic song into his own discursive orbit, arguing that "Pindar thus seems to want to have it both ways: sometimes the κῶμος is a foil for his poetry, sometimes it is an aspect of

---

[48] Braswell (1988) 341 has observed that "The metaphorical use of the image in the (three) Pindaric passages may have suggested Call. Fr. 1. 25-28 Pf." Callimachus' intertextual engagement is especially with P. 4.247-49. Both passages articulate a metaphorical opposition between the wider roads traversed by wagons and shorter or narrower ones. Callimachus also echoes Pindar's diction, borrowing οἶμον (27), "road," which he modifies with πλατύν (27), "wide," rather than the similar sounding βραχύν (248). The noun οἶμος (or οἶμος) appears nowhere else in Callimachus' corpus.

[49] Gildersleeve (1885) noted that "As this poem, among all the Pindaric odes, approaches the epos most closely, so the rhythmical composition reminds one of the simplicity of an hexametrical hymn."

[50] Mastronarde (2002) 45 notes that "the tale must be as old as the oral tradition from which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* grew."

[51] Pindar also uses the noun οἶμος, "path," of poetry at O. 9.47, but there the phrase οἶμον λιγύν (47), "a shrill path of song," refers to the victory ode.

[52] Morgan (1993) 3.

it."[53] She contends that in appropriating symposiastic song the poet acquires for himself "A sense of its spontaneity and festivity."[54]

Pindar emphasizes spontaneity at a number of crucial points throughout Pythian 4. He begins the victory ode with a temporal marker that stresses the fixed position of the performance in the present moment (1-2):

> Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ
> στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας,
> ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ,
> Μοῖσα, Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυ-
> θῶνί τ' αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων,
>
> Muse, it is necessary today to stand beside a man who is a friend, the king of Kyrene, which is famed for its horses, in order that while Arkesilas celebrates you might swell the breeze of songs owed to the children of Leto and to Pytho.

The adverb Σάμερον (1), "today," marks the poem with an uncommon immediacy from its initial word.[55] Pindar directs the nameless Muse to demonstrate her affection for Arkesilas in the here and now. The prepositional phrase κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ (2), "while Arkesilas celebrates," stresses the impermanence of the situation. The occasion of Arkesilas' chariot victory provides the ideal circumstance in which to stir up οὖρον ὕμνων (3), "the breeze of songs," but the moment certainly might pass.

After the copious articulation of Jason's adventures in Thessaly and Kolchis, the break-off formula signals a return to the concern with temporal exigencies. The assertion ὥρα συνάπτει (247), "the hour is pressing," articulates the sudden contraction of time.[56] It is no longer possible to continue κατ' ἀμαξιτόν (247), but rather, accommodation must be made for these temporal constraints. This fictional presentation of a situation in which there is insufficient time, which maps onto the metaphorical distinction between the highway and a shortcut, facilitates Pindar's modulation between categories of generic discourse. In addition to the associations developed elsewhere in his victory odes between symposiastic song and spontaneity, there are other reasons to believe that symposiastic compositions would have matched the image conveyed by τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48). In contrast to the imposing scale of choral poetry, the surviving symposiastic fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus are comparatively diminutive.[57] The poems were written in monostrophic meters as opposed to

---

[53] Morgan (1993) 5.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Pindar uses σάμερον twice elsewhere at O. 6.28 and P. 12.29. The use of σάμερον (28) in O. 6 lends a similar sense of vivid immediacy to Pindar's positioning of himself in relation to Peloponnesian geography, but σάμερον (29) appears in a gnomic statement in P. 12.
[56] Cf. N. 4.33-34 (τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός ὧραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι, "The law of song and the hastening hours prevent me from telling a long story"), which also presents the flight of time as a reason for Pindar to draw a mythological account to a close.
[57] The longest surviving fragment of Sappho is 96, which boasts thirty-seven lines and is incomplete. The longest surviving fragment of Alcaeus is 298 (P. Oxy. 2303 fr. 1(a) [vv. 15-28] + P. Colon. 2021 [vv. 1-49]), which consists of forty-nine lines, although the text of the poem becomes extremely fragmented after line twenty-seven. The overwhelming multitude of these compositions seem to have been under twenty-nine lines

the intricate triadic structures of choral poetry, and the reality of monody would have ensured that performances of symposiastic songs remained relatively unassuming. I would also argue that these poems evince a characteristic narrative compression, which Pindar emulates after the break-off formula. The combination of these factors attests to the βραχύς nature of symposiastic song.

Pindar frames his ability to shift between the distinct generic registers figured by ἀμαξιτόν (247) and τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48) as a form of specialized knowledge. The verb ἴσαμι (248), "I know," communicates his familiarity with the narrative terrain, and the use of this rare alternative to οἶδα reinforces the extent of his expertise.[58] The poet expresses his unusual knowledge of narrative topography using similarly unusual language. Within the figurative logic of the break-off formula the suggestion that Pindar knows a shortcut presents him as a local to the landscape of poetry. He relies upon his specialized knowledge of the area to uncover a hidden passage through its intricate narrative environment.

The statement πολλοῖσι δ' ἄγημαι σοφίας ἑτέροις (248) exposes the metapoetic content of the break-off formula as a whole. The meaning of this sentence seems to shift after the verb ἄγημαι (248). Through this point in the sentence, Pindar is assumed to be continuing the metaphor of travel through a landscape of narrative, but the appearance of the noun σοφίας (248) alters the respect in which the poet is a leader. He begins the sentence leading the audience through the complexities of the narrative, but he concludes it as a leader in the art of poetic composition.[59] The assumed referent of πολλοῖσι (248) also shifts during the course of the sentence. The initial supposition is that πολλοῖσι (248) denotes the audience of the victory ode, but, by the end of the sentence, the completed phrase πολλοῖσι ἑτέροις (248) most likely refers to other poets. The late arriving modifier ἑτέροις (248) suggests the distinctions between Pindar and his numerous peers. Burton remarks that "Pindar may have been thinking of his epic sources, his lyric predecessors such as Stesichorus, or of contemporaries such as Bacchylides."[60] All of the above are included in the phrase πολλοῖσι ἑτέροις (248), and that one element of Pindar's leadership consists in his ability to synthesize and modulate between their various narrative approaches.

We should delve into the substance of the mythological account that consumes much of Pythian 4, in order to determine the extent to which Pindar emulates the aforementioned categories of generic discourse. There are a number of respects in which this narrative bears a conscious resemblance to hexameter epic.[61] I focus here on one of the most conspicuous: the length and frequency of its direct speeches. Richard Martin has demonstrated the redundant centrality of direct speech to the poetic texture of Homer's *Iliad*, arguing that the epic poem "takes shape as a poetic composition in precisely the same 'speaking culture' that we see foregrounded in the stylized words of the poem's heroic speakers."[62] Pindar likewise affords direct speech a central position in this most epic of victory odes, relating speeches by Medea (13-56), an anonymous citizen of Iolkos (87-92), Pelias (97-100 and 156-67), Jason

---

in length. Cf. Alc. 306A(h) (P. Oxy 2506 frr. 84 + 108), which Campbell (1982) 341 regards as a comment upon Alc. 298.

[58] Pindar also uses these forms at P. 3.29 (ἰσάντι) and N. 7.14 (ἴσαμεν). Cf. Theocritus 5.119 (τοῦτό γ' ἴσαμι).

[59] Braswell (1988) 341, noting the former significance, infers that "The image of the journey might seem to have suggested the verb."

[60] Burton (1962) 167.

[61] For a full discussion of similarities between Pythian 4 and hexameter epic, see Longley-Cook (1989) 130-58.

[62] Martin (1989) xiv.

(102-19 and 138-55), and Aietes (229-31).[63] He structures several of these speeches in combination as dialogues between characters.[64] As far as narrative is concerned, we should observe that direct speech is by its very nature the slowest narrative mode, because the report of direct speech occurs at the same speed as the speech reported. While there are several other victory odes that feature direct speeches, the lavish elaboration of the speeches in Pythian 4 accounts for much of the poem's excessive span.[65]

It is notable that Pindar introduces and otherwise refers to several of these speeches using forms cognate with the noun ἔπος, which he employs elsewhere of Homer's epic poems.[66] Pindar introduces Medea's speech with εἶπε δ' οὕτως (11), "thus she spoke," later referring to it as Μηδείας ἐπέων στίχες (57), "the verses of Medea." He also uses forms of the verb εἶπον in reference to speeches by the anonymous citizen of Iolkos (86), Jason (156), and Aietes (229). Pindar, then, construes the speech of the mythological participants in his narrative as a form of discourse closely related to hexameter epic.[67]

The initial exchange between Pelias and Jason, which reflects the influence of several corresponding Homeric passages, offers an apt location from which to start this investigation. Pelias opens the exchange by asking Jason about his homeland and lineage (97-100):

> Ποίαν γαῖαν, ὦ ξεῖν', εὔχεαι
> πατρίδ' ἔμμεν; καὶ τίς ἀνθρώ-
> πων σε χαμαιγενέων πολιᾶς
> ἐξανῆκεν γαστρός; ἐχθίστοισι μὴ ψεύδεσιν
> καταμιάναις εἰπὲ γένναν. 100
>
> What sort of country, stranger, do you boast to be your fatherland? And who among earth-born women bore you from her hoary womb? Tell me your lineage, but do not befoul it with hateful lies.

Braswell has observed that "The two questions of Pelias correspond to the basic Homeric formula τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες (*Od*. 1. 170 + 5X)."[68] He further notes the similarities between Pindar's phrases Ποίαν γαῖαν εὔχεαι πατρίδ' ἔμμεν (97-98), "What sort of country do you boast to be your fatherland," and τίς ἀνθρώπων χαμαιγενέων (98), "who among earth-born women," and *Od*yssey 1.406-07 (ποίης δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι γαίης) and *Il*iad 6.123 (τίς δὲ σύ ἐσσι φέριστε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων) respectively.[69] These intertextual resonances set the exchange between Pelias and Jason squarely in the realm of epic heroic discourse. Eurymachos questions Telemachos in the first book of the *Odyssey* about the identity of Mentes, the disguise assumed by the goddess Athena, asking ποίης δ' ἐξ

---

[63] Sandgren (1972), Gigante (1974/75), and Segal (1986) 33 all note the unprecedented amount of direct speech in P. 4.
[64] Longley-Cook (1989) 139 notes that dialogue occurs only twice elsewhere in Pindar's victory odes (P. 9.30-65 and N. 10.76-88).
[65] For further discussion of direct speech by mythological figures in the victory odes of Pindar and Bacchylides, see Chapter Two.
[66] Pindar uses the plural noun ἔπεα of Homer's epic poems at N. 2.2 and I. 4.39.
[67] Pindar also introduces Pelias' first speech with προσήνεπε (97) and Jason's second speech with βάλλετο κρηπῖδα σοφῶν ἐπέων (138), "he cast a foundation of wise words."
[68] Braswell (1988) 189. Cf. Longley-Cook (1989) 140.
[69] Braswell (1988) 190.

εὔχεται εἶναι γαίης (406-07), "from what country does he boast that he is?" Pindar retains the adjective ποῖος, the noun γαῖα, and the verbs εὔχομαι and εἰμί, inserting the noun πατρίδ' (98). He emulates the basic structure of the Homeric question, in which εὔχεται (406) is the main verb upon which the infinitive εἶναι (406) depends, but he alters the Homeric prepositional phrase ποίης ἐξ γαίης (406-07), making Ποίαν γαῖαν (97) the accusative subject of ἔμμεν (98) and πατρίδ' (98) the predicate. The transformation of Diomedes' phrase τίς καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων (123) into Pelias' expression τίς ἀνθρώπων χαμαιγενέων (98) also attests to a careful engagement on Pindar's part with his epic predecessor. The adjectives καταθνητῶν (123), "mortal," and χαμαιγενέων (98), "earth-born," have roughly the same meaning. Rather than repeat a fairly common Homeric epithet, Pindar opts for one that appears elsewhere in hexameter epic but never in Homer.[70] The most subtle change comes as a result of what Pelias is asking. He wants to know who Jason's mother is, and, therefore, ἀνθρώπων (98) takes on the significance of "women" rather than "men." These subtle intertexts situate Pelias' address in the rich literary environment of epic conversation.

Jason's uncompromising response emulates the hostile and competitive speeches frequently modelled in the *Iliad*.[71] The hero refrains from addressing the substance of Pelias' inquest, insisting upon the impudence of Pelias' treatment of his beloved parents (102-19):

> Φαμὶ διδασκαλίαν Χί-
> ρωνος οἴσειν. ἀντρόθε γὰρ νέομαι
> πὰρ Χαρικλοῦς καὶ Φιλύρας, ἵνα Κενταύ-
> ρου με κοῦραι θρέψαν ἀγναί.
> εἴκοσι δ' ἐκτελέσαις ἐνιαυτοὺς οὔτε ἔργον
> οὔτ' ἔπος ἐντράπελον κείνοισιν εἰπὼν ἱκόμαν 105
> οἴκαδ', ἀρχαίαν κομίζων
> πατρὸς ἐμοῦ, βασιλευομέναν
> οὐ κατ' αἶσαν, τάν ποτε Ζεὺς ὤπασεν λαγέτᾳ
> Αἰόλῳ καὶ παισὶ τιμάν.
>
> πεύθομαι γάρ νιν Πελίαν ἄθεμιν λευ-
> καῖς πιθήσαντα φρασίν
> ἁμετέρων ἀποσυλᾶσαι βιαίως ἀρχεδικᾶν τοκέων· 110
> τοί μ', ἐπεὶ πάμπρωτον εἶδον φέγγος, ὑπερφιάλου
> ἁγεμόνος δείσαντες ὕβριν, κᾶδος ὡς-
> είτε φθιμένου δνοφερόν
> ἐν δώμασι θηκάμενοι μίγα κωκυτῷ γυναικῶν,
> κρύβδα πέμπον σπαργάνοις ἐν πορφυρέοις,
> νυκτὶ κοινάσαντες ὁδόν, Κρονίδᾳ 115
> δὲ τράφεν Χίρωνι δῶκαν.

[70] The epithet χαμαιγενής appears at Hesiod *Theogony* 879, Homeric Hymn to Demeter 352, and Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 108.

[71] Beck (2005) notes that "From a social standpoint, the genres of speech in which the *Iliad* is most interested highlight conflicts in power relations and group dynamics. These conflicts or tensions have central importance in different ways for the speeches that enemies make to each other on the battlefield; the competition of peers in athletic games; and the way that members of the same side figure out what to do during an assembly."

ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν κεφάλαια λόγων
ἴστε. λευκίππων δὲ δόμους πατέρων, κε-
δνοὶ πολῖται, φράσσατέ μοι σαφέως·
Αἴσονος γὰρ παῖς ἐπιχώριος οὐ ξεί-
ναν ἱκάνω γαῖαν ἄλλων.
φὴρ δέ με θεῖος Ἰάσονα κικλήσκων προσαύδα.

I declare that I will display the teaching of Chiron. For I come from the side of Chariklo and Philyra and from the cave where the holy daughters of the Centaur raised me. And having completed twenty years without doing or saying anything untoward to them I have come home, in order that I might preserve the ancient honor of my father, now being administered unjustly, which Zeus once granted to Aiolos, leader of the people, and to his sons. For I have learned that lawless Pelias, obeying his white wits, took it forcibly away from my justly ruling parents. When I saw my first light, they, fearing the insolence of the arrogant ruler, making a dark funeral in the house mixed with the wailing of women as if I had died, secretly sent me away in my purple swaddling clothes, entrusting my journey to the night, and gave me to Chiron, the son of Kronos, to raise. But you know the chief points of these words. Noble citizens, show me clearly the home of my ancestors, who rode white horses. For I, the son of Aison, a native, have not come to a foreign land belonging to others. But the divine centaur, calling me by name, addressed me as Jason.

I would note that Jason begins his response with an oblique reference to hexameter poetry. The phrase διδασκαλίαν Χίρωνος (102), "the teaching of Chiron," mirrors the title of Hesiod's lost Χείρωνος ὑποθῆκαι, "Instructions of Chiron" Braswell has observed that "Pindar is the first to mention the Hesiodic 'Precepts of Chiron' (Χείρωνος ὑποθῆκαι: fr. 283-85 M.-W.), which began by prescribing the worship of the gods, especially Zeus, and reverence of one's parents."[72] Jason's speech manages to lionize both Zeus and his parents while simultaneously avoiding the answer to Pelias' question about his maternity.[73] He mentions Chariklo, the wife of Chiron, and Philyra, the centaur's mother, adding that Κενταύρου με κοῦραι θρέψαν ἁγναί (103), "the holy daughters of the Centaur raised me." These responses elide the crucial components of the hero's own identity in favor of Chiron's.

Jason's initial coyness makes the subsequent revelations and accusations even more impactful. He announces ἱκόμαν οἴκαδ' (105-06), "I have come home," averring that Iolkos is his true homeland. Jason dismisses the issue of his maternal ancestry, focusing instead upon his filial duty to his father with the participial phrase ἀρχαίαν κομίζων πατρὸς ἐμοῦ τιμάν (106-08), "in order that I might preserve the ancient honor of my father," which indicates the purpose of his return to Iolkos. He recounts Zeus' granting of τιμάν (108) to Aiolos, his great-grandfather, and the subsequent generations born from him.[74] The fifth epode consists of Jason's specific allegation that Pelias stole the kingship in Iolkos from Aeson. He refers to Pelias as ἄθεμιν (109), "lawless," denying the ruler's claim to

[72] Braswell (1988) 192. See Schwartz (1960) 228-44 for further discussion of the Hesiodic "Precepts of Chiron."
[73] The mythological identity of Jason's mother is a thorny topic. There is massive disagreement among ancient sources on this issue.
[74] The line of paternity is Aiolos, Kretheus, Aeson, and Jason.

legitimacy, and relates the narrative of his parents' bestowal of him upon Chiron. The hero mentions ὑπερφιάλου ἀγεμόνος ὕβριν (111-12), "the insolence of the arrogant ruler," which forced his parents to remove him from Pelias' overweening influence.

Jason concludes his account at the beginning of the sixth strophe with the simple assertion ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν κεφάλαια λόγων ἴστε (116-17), "But you know the chief points of these words." Braswell notes that this is the first use of the noun κεφάλαια in this sense, although the proclamation recalls Hesiod's transition from the creation of Pandora to the races of men at the beginning of *Works and Days* (106-07): Εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις, ἕτερόν τοι ἐγὼ λόγον ἐκκορυφώσω εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως, "But if you wish, I will state the chief points of another tale well and skillfully."[75] Pindar substitutes κεφάλαια (116), for ἐκκορυφόω, "I state the chief points," or the derivative noun κορυφά, "chief point," but the substance of the statement remains the same.[76] This moment of narrative resolution, inserted into Jason's address to Pelias, anticipates the break-off formula, which also insists that the elaboration of a full account is sometimes inappropriate. The hero concludes his speech with a series of clear articulations concerning his identity: he names his father, Aeson (118), he specifies Iolkos as οὐ ξείναν ἱκάνω γαῖαν ἄλλων (118), "not a foreign land belonging to others," repeating the earlier claim ἱκόμαν οἴκαδ' (105-06), and he reveals the name that Chiron used in addressing him, Jason (119).

Pindar interrupts his outsize mythological narrative after a description of the enormous snake that guards the Golden Fleece (241-46):

> αὐτίκα δ' Ἀελίου θαυ-
> μαστὸς υἱὸς δέρμα λαμπρόν
> ἔννεπεν, ἔνθα νιν ἐκτάνυσαν Φρίξου μάχαιραι·
> ἔλπετο δ' οὐκέτι οἱ κεῖνόν γε πράξασθαι πόνον.
> κεῖτο γὰρ λόχμᾳ, δράκοντος
> δ' εἴχετο λαβροτατᾶν γενύων,
> ὃς πάχει μάκει τε πεντηκόντερον ναῦν κράτει, 245
> τέλεσεν ἂν πλαγαὶ σιδάρου.
>
> The marvelous son of Helios told him at once about the shining hide, where the knives of Phrixos had stretched it out, but he no longer expected him to accomplish that labor at least. For it lay in a thicket, and it was held in the greediest jaws of a snake, which exceeded in thickness and length a ship of fifty oars, which strokes of iron had fashioned.

Scholars have speculated about the possible sources of influence for this illustration.[77] Isobel Longley-Cook notes that "Whether Pindar derived the idea of using a ship for comparison of size in the simile describing the dragon from an earlier source or invented it, we do not know, but the use of the simile to add epic flavour to the myth cannot be doubted."[78] Charles Segal has suggested that "Pindar is probably echoing the description of the Cyclops' olive stake in *Odyssey* 9.319-24. This too is described in nautical terms; it is compared to the mast of a

---

[75] Braswell (1988) 205.
[76] Cf. O. 7.68, P. 3.80, and Paean fragment 8a.13 for Pindar's uses of the noun κορυφά.
[77] See Burton (1962) 166 and Longley-Cook (1989) 34.
[78] Longley-Cook (1989) 34.

black twenty-oared ship."[79] The Homeric depiction of Polyphemos' staff is worth examining here, both as a source of inspiration for Pindar's characterization of the serpent and for the crucial points of differentiation between the two passages.

Homer's Odysseus recounts his discovery of an olive stake in the cave of Polyphemos (319-24):

> Κύκλωπος γὰρ ἔκειτο μέγα ῥόπαλον παρὰ σηκῷ,
> χλωρὸν ἐλαΐνεον· τὸ μὲν ἔκταμεν, ὄφρα φοροίη 320
> αὐανθέν. τὸ μὲν ἄμμες ἐΐσκομεν εἰσορόωντες
> ὅσσον θ' ἱστὸν νηὸς ἐεικοσόροιο μελαίνης,
> φορτίδος εὐρείης, ἥ τ' ἐκπεράᾳ μέγα λαῖτμα·
> τόσσον ἔην μῆκος, τόσσον πάχος εἰσοράασθαι.
>
> For lying beside a pen was the Cyclops' massive club, of green olive, which he had hewn in order that he might bear it with him when dry, and, beholding it, we deemed it as large as the mast of a black ship of twenty oars, a wide merchantman, which crosses over the great gulf; so great was it in length and width to behold.

Odysseus uses the image of the mast of a twenty-oared ship to offer an approximate sense of the club's size. The correlative adjectives ὅσσον (322), "as large as," and τόσσον (324), "so great," establish an equivalence between the hypothetical vessel and Polyphemos' cudgel. Pindar borrows the basic conception of comparison to a ship from this Homeric passage, echoing the words μῆκος (324), "length," and πάχος (324), "width," but he diverges in a handful of substantial respects from the earlier description. In addition to increasing the number of the ship's oars, he eschews mere equivalence, stressing that the serpent κράτει (245), "exceeded," the dimensions of such a craft. It is impossible to ascertain the size of the snake itself. We can only know that it was larger than a fifty-oared ship. The monster, then, serves as an abstract representation of immensity, conceivable only in relative terms.

The sole physical detail provided by the poet is the phrase λαβροτατᾶν γενύων (244), "greediest jaws," which communicates the preternatural voraciousness of the beast. I would argue that the qualities of this monstrous serpent reflect those of the mythological narrative itself, which flaunts its own descriptive voracity over the course of eleven triads. The immediate placement of this illustration before the break-off formula suggests a metapoetic correspondence between these two expansive entities. The massive snake eludes precise measurement, gaping its fearful maw in the hope of further consumption, while the interminable narrative of Jason's travels threatens to overrun the boundaries of a victory ode, extending into the territory of epic.

After the intervening break-off formula, Pindar models a markedly different mode of narration in the "shortcut," condensing a vast temporal span into a compressed amount of space. I would argue that this mode of narrative compression emulates the structural conventions of symposiastic song. Alcaeus fr. 42 manifests a narrative approach remarkably similar to the one used by Pindar after the break-off formula (1-16):

> ὡς λόγος, κάκων ἀ[χος ἐννεκ' ἔργων

[79] Segal (1986) 6-7 n. 7; cf. Braswell (1988) 336.

Περράμῳ καὶ παῖσ[ί ποτ', Ἴλεν', ἦλθεν
ἐκ σέθεν πίκρον, π[ύρι δ' ὤλεσε Ζεῦς
Ἴλιον ἴραν.

οὐ τεαύταν Αἰακίδαι[ς ἄγαυος 5
πάντας ἐς γάμον μάκ[αρας καλέσσαις
ἄγετ' ἐκ Νή[ρ]ηος ἔλων [μελάθρων
πάρθενον ἄβραν

ἐς δόμον Χέρρωνος· ἔλ[υσε δ' ἄγνας
ζῶμα παρθένω· φιλό[τας δ' ἔθαλε 10
Πήλεος καὶ Νηρεΐδων ἀρίστ[ας.
ἐς δ' ἐνίαυτον

παῖδα γένατ' αἰμιθέων [φέριστον,
ὄλβιον ξάνθαν ἐλάτη[ρα πώλων·
οἱ δ' ἀπώλοντ' ἀμφ' Ἐ[λένᾳ Φρύγες τε 15
καὶ πόλις αὔτων.

So the story goes. Sharp pain once came to Priam and his sons on account of evil deeds, Helen, because of you, and Zeus destroyed holy Ilion with fire. Not such a delicate maiden did the noble son of Aiakos lead to marriage, having invited all of the blessed gods to the wedding, having taken her from the halls of Nereus to the house of Chiron. He loosened the girdle of the chaste maiden, and the love of Peleus and the best of the daughters of Nereus blossomed, and within a year she gave birth to a son, supreme among the demigods, fortunate driver of fair-haired horses. But the Phrygians and their city perished for the sake of Helen.

This poem condenses the entire Epic Cycle, from the marriage of Peleus and Thetis to the destruction of the city of Troy, into a mere sixteen lines. Anne Pippen Burnett describes the force of this intricate miniaturization:

> Here are four four-line stanzas almost innocent of verbal decoration, their narrative proceeding by a series of child-like statements that are joined paratactically. And here also are two brilliant and populous epic scenes. The implicit cast of characters is beyond count, since it includes all the citizens of Troy and all the guests mortal and divine, who attended the marriage of Peleus and Thetis. And in spite of its apparent simplicity the song is like a miniature wrought under a lens, for its organization is almost as complex as its materials.[80]

Alcaeus constructs a highly elliptical account of the Trojan War strophe by strophe.

While roughly half of the first strophe consists of restorations, the surviving text communicates the basic catastrophe suffered by Priam and his sons, who appear in the dative as recipients of a force characterized as πίκρον (3), "sharp." The contention that these

[80] Burnett (1983) 191-92.

circumstances came about ἐκ σέθεν (2), "because of you," indicates that Helen is the addressee of the poem. The second strophe uses a pair of participial phrases to recount the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. The aorist participle ἕλων (7), "having taken," combined with the prepositional phrase ἐκ Νήρηος μελάθρων (7), "from the halls of Nereus," relates the hero's capture of his Nereid bride. The participial phrase πάντας ἐς γάμον μάκαρας καλέσσαις (6), "having invited all of the blessed gods to the wedding," describes the divinely attended event at which the Judgment of Paris occurred. Alcaeus consolidates reams of narrative in these four and a half lines, eliding, for instance, the backstory of Zeus' role in allowing Peleus to marry Thetis and the immediate consequences of Paris' display of favoritism toward Aphrodite.[81] The accumulative structure of the sentence, composed around the verb ἄγετ' (7), "lead," allows these unstated narratives to persist behind the actual words of the sentence itself.[82] The third strophe also features a number of reconstructions, but it is clear that the phrase ζῶμα παρθένω (10), "the girdle of the maiden," corresponds to the loss of Thetis' virginity. The surviving contents of lines 10 and 11 point to a rosy depiction of the connubial relationship between Peleus and Thetis. The fourth strophe narrates the birth of Achilles, whom Alcaeus refrains from naming, referring to him as αἰμιθέων φέριστον, ὄλβιον ξάνθαν ἐλάτηρα πώλων (13-14), "supreme among the demigods, fortunate driver of fair-haired horses." These two appositional phrases reveal Achilles' exalted stature among the heroic participants in the Trojan War, many of whom were children of deities. Alcaeus returns in the poem's final lines to the destruction of the city inhabited by Priam and his sons. The phrase ἀμφ' Ἐλένᾳ (15), "for the sake of Helen," which reasserts Helen's position as the singular cause of the conflict, also activates the broader account of her abduction by Paris. As in the second strophe, the poem concludes with a window onto the larger complex of mythological narratives underlying these sixteen lines.

The passage following the break-off formula recounts Jason's murder of the snake, the abduction of Medea, the union of the Argonauts and the Lemnian women, and the eventual rule of the Battidai in Kyrene (249-62):

> κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχναις ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν,

---

[81] For the decision by Zeus and Poseidon to offer Thetis to Peleus, cf. Isthmian 8.27-58.

[82] Sappho fr. 16 achieves a comparable measure of narrative compression at times (5-12):

> πά]γχυ δ' εὔμαρες σύνετον πόησαι
> π]άντι τ[ο]ῦτ', ἀ γὰρ πόλυ περσκέθοισα
> κάλλος [ἀνθ]ρώπων Ἐλένα [τὸ]ν ἄνδρα
> τὸν [πανάρ]ιστον
>
> καλλ[ίποι]σ' ἔβα 'ς Τροΐαν πλέοι[σα
> κωὐδ[ὲ πα]ῖδος οὐδὲ φίλων το[κ]ήων
> πά[μπαν] ἐμνάσθη, ἀλλὰ παράγαγ' αὔταν
>]σαν
>
> It is entirely easy to make this understood by everyone, since Helen, who far surpassed the beauty of mortals, went sailing to Troy, abandoning her most excellent husband, and not at all did she take thought of her child or dear parents, but…misled her.

The participial phrase πόλυ περσκέθοισα κάλλος ἀνθρώπων (6-7), "who far surpassed the beauty of mortals," alludes to the Judgment of Paris by referring to the stipulation according to which the prince would marry the most beautiful woman in the world. The third strophe focalizes an abbreviated account of the abduction around Helen's actions and decisions, emphasizing her disregard for a number of ties of kinship.

<ὦ Ἀ>ρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐ- 250
τᾷ, τὰν Πελίαο φονόν·
ἔν τ' Ὠκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι μίγεν πόντῳ τ' ἐρυθρῷ
Λαμνιᾶν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων·
ἔνθα καὶ γυίων ἀέθλοις ἐπεδεί-
ξαντο κρίσιν ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς,

καὶ συνεύνασθεν. καὶ ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖς
σπέρμ' ἀρούραις τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀ- 255
κτῖνος ὄλβου δέξατο μοιρίδιον
ἆμαρ ἢ νύκτες· τόθι γὰρ γένος Εὐφά-
μου φυτευθὲν λοιπὸν αἰεί
τέλλετο· καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων μιχθέντες ἀνδρῶν
ἤθεσιν ἔν ποτε Καλλίσταν ἀπῴκησαν χρόνῳ
νᾶσον· ἔνθεν δ' ὕμμι Λατοί-
δας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον
σὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἄστυ χρυσοθρόνου 260
διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας

ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις.

He killed the gleaming-eyed serpent with spotted back using his wiles, Arkesilas, and he stole Medeia with her own help, the murderer of Pelias. They came into contact with the expanse of Okeanos, the Red Sea, and the race of man-slaying Lemnian women. There they also displayed the strength of their limbs in contests for the prize of a cloak, and they slept with the women. And in foreign fields at that time the fated day or nights received the seed of your radiant prosperity. For there the race of Euphamos was planted and continued forever, and having come to the houses of the Lakedaimonian men in time they inhabited the island once called Kalliste, and there the son of Leto gave to your family the plain of Libya to make prosper through the gods' honors, and the divine city of golden-throned Kyrene to administer, for you who have devised right counsel.

In contrast to the lavish manner in which Pindar introduces the snake, he recounts Jason's slaughter of the creature in a mere six words: κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχναις ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν (249), "He killed the gleaming-eyed serpent with spotted back using his wiles." We should note that the poet's newfound concision does not preclude the detailed refinement of his earlier descriptions. Whereas the previous illustration had stressed the beast's enormous size, the epithets γλαυκῶπα (249), "gleaming-eyed," and ποικιλόνωτον (249), "with spotted back," emphasize its terrifying appearance.[83] The narration of the hero's abduction of

[83] The form γλαυκῶπα (249), whose nominative is γλαυκώψ, is a variant of the more common γλαυκῶπις, which Homer often uses of Athena; e.g. *Iliad* 1.206, 2.166, *Odyssey* 3.13, 7.19, etc. The compound adjective ποικιλόνωτον (249) appears for the first time here, but Euripides later uses it at *Herakles* 376 and *Iphigeneia at Tauris* 1245, in the latter passage modifying the strikingly similar phrase οἰνωπὸς δράκων (1245), "wine-complexioned serpent." Watkins (1995) 365 also notes that the noun ὄφιν (249) is cognate with the noun expected in the Indo-European dragon-slaying formula *g^{u}hen- (slay) *og^{u}hi- (serpent). This combination of

Medeia and her murder of Pelias is even more economical. The aorist verb κλέψεν (250), "he stole," and the accusative proper noun Μήδειαν (250), "Medeia," combine to communicate the skeletal structure of the narrative, and the propositional phrase σὺν αὐτᾷ (250), "with her own help," clarifies Medeia's role in the venture. The poet appends a reference to her murder of Pelias with the appositional phrase τὰν Πελίαο φονόν (250), "the murderer of Pelias."[84]

Pindar next alludes to their trip to Corinth, listing Ὠκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι (251), "the expanse of Okeanos," πόντῳ τ' ἐρυθρῷ (251), "the Red Sea," and Λαμνιᾶν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων (252), "the race of man-slaying Lemnian women." The reference to the Lemnian women prompts a transition from the mythological past to the contemporary rule of the Battidai. The poet recounts the athletic contests staged on Lemnos (253) and the acts of sexual congress between the heroes and the Lemnian women (254), which resulted in γένος Εὐφάμου (256), "the race of Euphamos," that is, the Battidai.[85] He returns to the present moment with a mention of Apollo's role in the foundation of the city of Kyrene (259-62), which now benefits from the thoughtful administration of Arkesilas and his relatives (262). The image of athletic competitions between the Argonauts also helps to reorient the poem in the contemporary reality, functioning as a subtle reminder of the occasion for the victory ode, namely, Arkesilas' victory in the chariot race at Delphi.

Pythian 4 ultimately represents a complex generic hybrid, combining the characteristics of hexameter epic and symposiastic song within the structure of a victory ode. The contrast between ἀμαξιτόν (247), a term associated with the tradition of hexameter poetry, and τινα οἶμον βραχύν (247-48), which figures the diminutive stature of symposiastic compositions, is particularly illustrative for an understanding of Pindar's narrative practice in this poem. The poet offers the prevailing mythological account as a highway and the hurried conclusion to his narrative as a shortcut. The opposition between these two images presents him as an expert tour guide who has mastered the various pathways of song. The ability to shift between narrative registers and perhaps even generic ones makes Pindar a remarkable poet and the victory ode an eminently malleable genre.

Pythian 11

Pythian 11, composed to celebrate the victory of Thrasydaios of Thebes at the Pythian festival in either the boys' stadion in 474 BCE or the men's diaulos in 454 BCE, concludes its mythological account of atrocities within the house of Atreus with an apology for the

---

elements invests the serpent with considerably greater significance than one would expect from a mention consisting of three words.

[84] Braswell (1988) 344-35 reads Πελιαοφόνον for Πελίαο φονόν (250), arguing that "Pindar has modelled his compound on the Homeric epithet ἀνδροφόνος." The use of this compound epithet would even further stress the compression of Pindar's account.

[85] Medea's prophecy (13-56) predicts the birth of Battos, a descendent of Euphamos, who would found the city of Kyrene.

digressive nature of the narrative.[86] Previous scholarship has puzzled over the relevance and appropriateness of this account to the victory ode as a whole, debating the extent and direction of influence between Pindar and Aeschylus.[87] The break-off formula imagines Pindar's depiction of Orestes' murder of Klytemnestra as a moment of disorientation, in which the poet loses himself at a crossroads. I argue that throughout the mythological account and break-off formula Pindar assumes discursive positions modelled on characters in a tragedy. He takes on the roles of the chorus and multiple actors at various points, ultimately framing his seeming disavowal of the tragic content that occupies the mythological narrative as the utterance of an archetypal tragic protagonist.

Pindar commences the mythological narrative in a manner that recalls the opening of a tragedy. The account begins in a blur of names, transitioning from Pylades' fields to Arsinoe's abduction of the infant Orestes (15-18):

> ἐν ἀφνεαῖς ἀρούραισι Πυλάδα 15
> νικῶν ξένου Λάκωνος Ὀρέστα.
>
> τὸν δὴ φονευομένου πατρὸς Ἀρσινόα Κλυταιμήστρας
> χειρῶν ὕπο κρατερᾶν
> ἐκ δόλου τροφὸς ἄνελε δυσπενθέος,
>
> victorious in the rich fields of Pylades, the host of Lakonian Orestes, whom his nurse Arsinoe, when his father was being murdered, snatched from the strong hands and from the direful treachery of Klytemnestra.

Pindar constructs the sequence Πυλάδα ξένου Λάκωνος Ὀρέστα (15-16), "of Pylades, the host of Lakonian Orestes," entirely in the genitive, muddling the differentiation between the two figures. The diversity of genitive forms, in which Πυλάδα (15) and Ὀρέστα (16) are Doric genitives of the first declesion, ξένου (16), "host," is second declension, and Λάκωνος (16), "Lakonian," is third declension, contributes to this confusion. The poet provides no morphological clues as to which names correspond to which modifiers. The grammatical hinge of the sequence is the noun ξένου (16), upon which Λάκωνος Ὀρέστα (16) depends, but the term ξένος applies equally to both Pylades and Orestes, since the relationship between them is reciprocal. The ultimate consequence of this morphological ambiguity is to emphasize the close relationship between Pylades and Orestes, who occupy the final positions in their respective lines.

The first line of the second strophe introduces a number of additional mythological figures. Pindar composes this line almost entirely of words referring to individual people. The antecedent of the relative pronoun τὸν (17), "whom," is Orestes, the genitive absolute φονευομένου πατρὸς (17), "when his father was being murdered," recounts the death of

---

[86] For the earlier date, see Wilamowitz (1922) 159-63, Burton (1962) 61, 72-73, Young (1968) 2 n. 2, Slater (1979) 68, Robbins (1986), and Finglass (2007) 11-17. For the later date, see Farnell (1932) 222-24, Herington (1984), Hubbard (1990), Hubbard (2010), Kurke (1998), and Kurke (2013).

[87] For discussion of the relationship between Pythian 11 and Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, see Farnell (1932), Bowra (1936), Düring (1943), Finley (1955), Herington (1984), Hubbard (1990), and Kurke (2013).

Agamemnon, and the line concludes with the names Ἀρσινόα (17) and Κλυταιμήστρας (17). The scrambled procession of these words provides a broad sketch of the forthcoming narrative, but the poet uses hyperbaton to delay the consolidation of the sentence into sense, inserting the prepositional phrases Κλυταιμήστρας χειρῶν ὕπο κρατερᾶν (17-18), "from the strong hands of Klytemnestra," and ἐκ δόλου (18), "from the treachery," between the name Ἀρσινόα (17), the noun τροφὸς (18), "nurse," and the verb ἄνελε (18), "snatched."

These lines, which consist primarily of a series of names, emulate the initial moments of a tragedy. Niall Slater reports that "The usual view of the prologue in ancient drama has been that its function is informative. It exists primarily to give information about, or necessary to the understanding of, the play the audience is about to see—the ancient equivalent of the modern program with its indications of time and place or even a synopsis of the action."[88] The introductory speeches in the tragedies of Aeschylus, Pindar's nearest contemporary, serve to acclimate the audience to the imminent action of the drama. The opening lines of *Persians*, for instance, provide crucial information about the setting and characters of the play (1-7):

> Τάδε μὲν Περσῶν τῶν οἰχομένων
> Ἑλλάδ' ἐς αἶαν πιστὰ καλεῖται,
> καὶ τῶν ἀφνεῶν καὶ πολυχρύσων
> ἑδράνων φύλακες, κατὰ πρεσβείαν
> οὓς αὐτὸς ἄναξ Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς 5
> Δαρειογενὴς
> εἵλετο χώρας ἐφορεύειν.

> These are called the trusted of the Persians, who have gone to the land of Greece, and the guardians of the royal abode that is wealthy and rich in gold, whom king Xerxes himself, the son of Darius, chose on account of their seniority to oversee the land.

Aeschylus uses the participial phrase Περσῶν τῶν οἰχομένων Ἑλλάδ' ἐς αἶαν (1-2), "of the Persians, who have gone to the land of Greece," to communicate the essential context of a Persian expedition to Greece, although the audience is unable to discern at this point whether the chorus means that of Darius or of Xerxes.[89] The tragedian confirms that this play concerns the latter expedition with a reference to αὐτὸς ἄναξ Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς Δαρειογενὴς (5-6), "king Xerxes himself, the son of Darius." The other extant tragedies of Aeschylus also provide this kind of contextual information in the opening lines, although the initial speakers differ.[90] Pindar similarly collocates Πυλάδα (15), Ὀρέστα (16), φονευομένου πατρὸς (17),

---

[88] Slater (1985) 149.

[89] The expedition of Darius was defeated at the battle of Marathon in 490 BCE, and the expedition of Xerxes was defeated at the battle of Salamis in 480 BCE and at the battle of Plataea in 479 BCE.

[90] In *Seven Against Thebes*, the initial appearance of Eteocles, who addresses the Κάδμου πολῖται (1), "citizens of Kadmos," and refers to himself (6), provides the context. In *Suppliant Women*, the chorus of suppliant women mentions προστομίων λεπτοψαμάθων Νείλου (3-4), "the mouths with fine sand of the Nile," and γάμον Αἰγύπτου παίδων (9), "marriage with the sons of Aigyptos." In *Agamemnon*, the palace guard refers to Ἀτρειδῶν (3), "the sons of Atreus," αὐγὴν πυρὸς φέρουσαν ἐκ Τροίας φάτιν (9), "the light of fire bearing a report from Troy," and Ἀγαμέμνονος γυναικὶ (26), "the wife of Agamemnon." The opening lines of *Libation Bearers* are fragmentary, but Orestes mentions Ἠλέκτραν (16) and addresses Πυλάδη (20). The opening speech of *Eumenides* does not offer this sort of contextual information, but the audience would have experienced it as a continuation of the narrative of *Agamemnon* and *Libation Bearers*. We should also remember that *Eumenides*

Ἀρσινόα (17), and Κλυταιμήστρας (17) in the opening lines of this mythological account, foreshadowing the murderous events that unfold.

Previous scholarship has noted a sequence of gnomic statements communicated during the mythological narrative that recalls the rhetoric of an Aeschylean choral ode.[91] Pindar follows the speculative articulation of alternative motives for Klytemnestra's slaughter of her husband with four gnomic statements (25-30):

> τὸ δὲ νέαις ἀλόχοις 25
> ἔχθιστον ἀμπλάκιον καλύψαι τ' ἀμάχανον
>
> ἀλλοτρίαισι γλώσσαις·
> κακολόγοι δὲ πολῖται.
> ἴσχει τε γὰρ ὄλβος οὐ μείονα φθόνον·
> ὁ δὲ χαμηλὰ πνέων ἄφαντον βρέμει. 30
>
> This is the most hateful error for young wives and impossible to hide because of the tongues of strangers. Citizens are slanderous. For prosperity involves no lesser envy, and the one breathing on the ground roars invisibly.

Leslie Kurke asserts that these gnomic statements are "modeled on the peculiar kind of ambiguity and referential complexity we associate with Aischylean choruses—especially those of the simultaneously befuddled and visionary Argive elders of the *Agamemnon*."[92] She explains that the sequence of them

> boldly and brilliantly reenacts in compacted form the whole lyric development of the first stasimon of the *Agamemnon*, which starts with the chorus' victory cheer (*Ag*. 355-402), only to modulate through their lyric remembrance of Helen flitting off to Troy and the emptying of her "beautiful images" of erotic χάρις, to the grim image of "Ares, gold-changer of corpses" and all that follows from that.[93]

I find Kurke's argument for a specific intertextual relationship between this passage and the first stasimon of the *Agamemnon* persuasive, and I would also add that these gnomic statements emulate the associative logic of a tragic chorus in a broader sense by becoming progressively unmoored from the immediate narrative context.[94]

The lines that precede these gnomic statements offer two possible explanations for Klytemnestra's betrayal of Agamemnon: anger at his sacrifice of Iphigeneia (22-23) and the influence of passionate lust (24-25). The first gnomic statement builds directly upon the

---

provides an unusual twist on Orestes' fate, staging the chorus of Furies and the ghost of Klytemnestra as shocking surprises.

[91] See Düring (1943), Hubbard (1990), and Kurke (2013) 113 n. 38 and 122.

[92] Kurke (2013) 122.

[93] Kurke (2013) 123.

[94] Aristotle refers to ἐμβόλιμα (1456a29), that is, choral odes having no obvious relevance to the surrounding action of the dramatic narrative, in connection with Agathon, who composed tragedies near the end of the 5th century BCE, but I would argue that the phenomena observed by Aristotle might represent the culmination of a tendency toward associative logic in choral odes already discernible in Aeschylus. For further discussion of ἐμβόλιμα, see Golann (1945) and Nikolaidou-Arabatzi (2015).

latter explanation. The demonstrative τὸ (25), "this," refers to the idea that lust drove Klytemnestra to slaughter her husband, and Pindar declares that adultery is νέαις ἀλόχοις ἔχθιστον ἀμπλάκιον (25-26), "the most hateful error for young wives."[95] The second gnomic statement, which consists of the assertion that κακολόγοι δὲ πολῖται (28), "Citizens are slanderous," departs from the immediate context of Klytemnestra's crimes. Klytemnestra is never herself the obvious victim of rumormongering, since Agamemnon does not learn of the affair until it is too late. Kurke observes that

> κακολόγοι δὲ πολῖται, initially refers to Klytemnestra's adultery, but then, over the next two lines (pivoting on the ideas of ὄλβος and φθόνος) the focus of civic hostility wavers and shifts, until with lines 31-34, the ominous patronymic and the elaboration of the ruthless destruction of Troy for its wealth attach this weirdly free-floating citizen resentment to the conquering Agamemnon himself.[96]

The last two gnomic statements are more appropriate as warnings for the victor Thrasydaios than as direct references to members of the house of Atreus. Even Agamemnon survives the φθόνον (29), "envy," of his compatriots, eventually succumbing to his wife's designs.[97] These gnomic ideas anticipate the poet's eventual recommendation of a middle course in civic life (52-53):

> τῶν γὰρ ἀνὰ πόλιν εὑρίσκων τὰ μέσα μακροτέρῳ
> {σὺν} ὄλβῳ τεθαλότα, μέμφομ' αἶσαν τυραννίδων·
>
> For finding the middle course in a city flourishing with longer lasting prosperity, I blame the lot of tyrannies.

Much like a tragic chorus, Pindar begins this sequence of gnomic statements in reference to the immediate mythological context, but he soon commences a chain of associations that returns him to the victor Thrasydaios.

The break-off formula is another point at which Pindar assumes a voice associated with tragedy. He exits the mythological narrative with an unusual pair of geographical images (38-40):

> ἦρ', ὦ φίλοι, κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην,
> ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν
> τὸ πρίν; ἤ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου
> ἔβαλεν, ὡς ὅτ' ἄκατον ἐνναλίαν; 40

[95] Kurke (2013) 124 notes that this sentiment also evokes Helen.
[96] Kurke (2013) 122-23.
[97] While I follow Kurke's argument that these gnomic statements reproduce the first stasimon of the *Agamemnon*, I would note that, whereas the chorus of Argive elders in Aeschylus' tragedy contextualizes the bitter resentment of the Greek army toward the sons of Atreus, there is no indication from the minimal characterization of Agamemnon in this victory ode that he has been the victim of φθόνος.

> Indeed, friends, was I whirled along a path-shifting crossroads, although going on a straight road before? Or did some wind toss me outside my sailing, like a light boat on the sea?[98]

The poet utters a vocative address, ὦ φίλοι (38), "friends," abandoning an opening apostrophe to the daughters of Kadmos (1-7). Finglass argues that "the address (not found elsewhere in Pindar) is probably aimed at the Theban audience."[99] Instone takes ὦ φίλοι (38) "as addressed to Thrasydaios and his father."[100] Contrary to these more literal interpretations, I would suggest that this address, especially formulated in the plural, invokes the relationship between a tragic protagonist and chorus. The closest equivalent to Pindar's appropriation of this tragic mannerism is Elektra's address to the chorus of slave women during her initial appearance in Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers* (100-105):

> τῆσδ' ἔστε βουλῆς, ὦ φίλαι, μεταίτιαι· 100
> κοινὸν γὰρ ἔχθος ἐν δόμοις νομίζομεν.
> μὴ κεύθετ' ἔνδον καρδίας φόβῳ τινός.
> τὸ μόρσιμον γὰρ τόν τ' ἐλεύθερον μένει
> καὶ τὸν πρὸς ἄλλης δεσποτούμενον χερός.
> λέγοις ἄν, εἴ τι τῶνδ' ἔχεις ὑπέρτερον. 105
>
> Friends, be my accessories in the formation of this plan. For we cherish a common hatred in this house. Do not hide it within your heart for fear of anyone. For fate awaits both the free man and the man enslaved by the hand of another. Speak, if you know a better course of action.

Elektra addresses these women as ὦ φίλαι (110), "Friends," seeking assistance from them in offering a libation to her father Agamemnon. Elsewhere in Aeschylus, Atossa invokes the chorus of Persian elders six times in *Persians* with the vocative φίλοι.[101] Pindar's address similarly presents him as a sort of tragic protagonist, interacting with an implied chorus.[102]

The passage directly preceding the break-off formula relates Orestes' murder of his mother Klytemnestra (34-37):

---

[98] I follow, Instone (1986) 89, Finglass (2007) 66, 110-11, and Kurke (2013) 115 n. 41 in construing and punctuating this passage as two separate questions.
[99] Finglass (2007) 110.
[100] Instone (1986) 89.
[101] See *Persians* 162, 206, 231, 445, 598, and 619. Cf. Aeschylus *Suppliant Women* 710.
[102] We should also remember that the victory ode was performed by a chorus. In crafting the violent narrative of Orestes' murder of Klytemnestra, Pindar momentarily invokes the presence of a second chorus that functions as his imagined co-conspirator. This invocation of an implied chorus is reminiscent of "choral projection," a concept that Henrichs (1996) 49 describes as "when Sophoklean and Euripidean choruses locate their own dancing in the past or future, in contrast to the here and now of their immediate performance, or when choruses project their collective identity onto groups of dancers distant from the concrete space of the orchestra and dancing in the allusive realm of the dramatic imagination." The chorus that performed Pythian 11 speaks in Pindar's voice, who, framing himself as an archetypal tragic protagonist, engages with the chorus that a tragic protagonist would naturally be addressing. I would suggest that this projection is even more extreme than in tragedy, because Pindar has imagined an entire tragic scenario, featuring himself as an actor and an understood chorus.

ὁ δ' ἄρα γέροντα ξένον
Στροφίον ἐξίκετο, νέα κεφαλά, 35
Παρνασσοῦ πόδα ναίοντ'· ἀλλὰ χρονίῳ σὺν Ἄρει
πέφνεν τε ματέρα θῆκέ τ' Αἴγισθον ἐν φοναῖς.

And the young man arrived at his old friend Strophios, who inhabited the foot of Parnassos, but with the eventual help of Ares he killed his mother and set Aigisthos in slaughter.

Scholars have long struggled with the problem of integrating such a grisly mythological account into a poem praising Thrasydaios for his athletic achievement. David Young influentially argued that this presentation of crimes perpetrated by the house of Atreus serves to exemplify what is blameworthy about the αἶσαν τυραννίδων (53), "lot of tyrannies," which Pindar later condemns.[103] A number of subsequent scholars, following Young, have offered more positive readings of this narrative, suggesting that Klytemnestra and Aigisthos function as the tyrannical models, while Orestes provides a laudable paradigm of filial piety by avenging his father's murder.[104] Leslie Kurke, who contends that Pindar's rendition of the myth engages at a number of crucial points with the ideas and plot of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, has rightly observed that these interpretations fail to account for the explicit mention of Orestes' slaughter of his mother, that is, the pivotal moment with which the account suddenly concludes.[105] I agree that the unambiguous depiction of this murder, articulated with the aorist indicative verb πέφνεν (37), "he killed," and the accusative noun ματέρα (37), "his mother," occludes the possibility of a preponderantly positive reading of this passage.

The placement of the break-off formula in the immediate wake of this matricidal episode creates the impression that Pindar is apologizing for, or at least explaining away, a moment of narrative impropriety. He constructs both break-off images as questions, emphasizing his own disorientation. The aorist passive verb ἐδινάθην (38), "was I whirled," stresses his helplessness, and the second image presents him as a feeble skiff vulnerable to the force of the wind. The phrase ὀρθὰν κέλευθον (39), "straight road," and the noun πλόου (39), "my sailing," both suggest, perhaps disingenuously, an earlier period of normative discourse from which Pindar has deviated. He now situates himself in an unfamiliar landscape, wondering how he arrived there in the first place.

Pindar evokes his new environment with exceptional descriptive specificity. The epithet ἀμευσίπορον (38), "path-shifting," is a hapax legomenon, and Kurke has drawn attention to the complex web of associations attached to the noun τρίοδον (38), "crossroads":

> I would suggest that the image of the crossroads is another gesture toward tragedy. For it is worth noting the precise moment in the myth at which this highly emotional and abrupt break-off occurs: the poet has just mentioned Orestes' killing of his mother and Aigisthos. It is almost as if the mention of a child's murderous violence against a parent conjures up reflexively, inevitably that most famous crossroads of all—the τρίοδος somewhere in the neighborhood of Thebes or Delphi where Oidipous met and unknowingly slew his own father. And, of course, this story of the

[103] See Young (1968) 1-26.
[104] See Instone (1986) 88-89, Robbins (1986) 2, Sevieri (1999) 86-89, and Finglass (2007) 108.
[105] See Kurke (2013) 110-25.

> doomed Oidipous within the house of Laios was a staple of the Athenian tragic stage, so we need not suppose a specific allusion to any particular play that treated the Theban saga.[106]

Staging himself as a tragic protagonist with the address to an implied chorus, Pindar sets himself in a location that is a virtual metonym for the genre of tragedy. Perhaps the most obvious interpretation is that the poet's invocation of tragedy functions as a tactic deflecting blame for the mention of Orestes' matricide, but I would argue that this reading overlooks the complex interweaving of this victory ode with the discursive modes of the rival genre. In locating himself at a crossroads, Pindar casts himself as an Oedipus whose crime is not murdering his father and marrying his mother, but rather, the metapoetic transgression of mingling with his "sister" genre, that is, tragedy.

The image of a crossroads offers an appropriate figure for the relationship between this victory ode and tragedy. Paths leading to and from one another converge at a point that binds them all together. Pindar presents his account of strife within the house of Atreus as an elaborate detour in the direction of tragedy, but this is an illusion; Pythian 11 has been entangled with tragedy throughout the mythological narrative, which begins in a manner that evokes the introductory moments of a tragedy. The sequence of gnomic statements following Pindar's articulation of explanations for Klytemnestra's murder of Agamemnon emulates the associative logic of a choral ode. Finally, the break-off formula assumes the voice of an archetypal tragic protagonist, locating the poet at a crossroads. Despite the protestations to the contrary, Pindar never escapes the echo chamber of tragedy.

Nemean 3

Nemean 3 celebrates Aristokleidas of Aigina, a victor in the pancration at Nemea. While the central mythological narrative of the victory ode concerns the adolescence of Achilles, Pindar offers a brief account of Herakles' foundation of the Pillars of Herakles, which he marks as a digression. The poet uses a break-off formula to figure his narration of Herakles' achievements as the leading astray of his seafaring, which he contrasts to the local theme of the Aiakidai. I would argue that in appropriating the image of Herakles' maritime explorations for the break-off formula, Pindar undercuts this delineation of foreign and local themes. As a son of Zeus, Herakles is ultimately inseparable from Pindar's celebration of the Aiakidai, who themselves descend from Zeus.

In recounting the establishment of the Pillars of Herakles, Pindar formulates a digression about Herakles' digressive adventures (20-31):

> εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' ἐοικότα μορφᾷ 20
> ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα
> παῖς Ἀριστοφάν<εο>ς, οὐκέτι πρόσω

[106] Kurke (2013) 116.

ἀβάταν ἅλα κιόνων ὕπερ Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές,

ἥρως θεὸς ἃς ἔθηκε ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας
μάρτυρας κλυτάς· δάμασε δὲ θῆρας ἐν πελάγεϊ
ὑπερόχους, ἰδίᾳ τ' ἐρεύνασε τεναγέων
ῥοάς, ὁπᾷ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος, 25
καὶ γᾶν φράδασε. θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπάν
ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβ<εαι>;
Αἰακῷ σε φαμὶ γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν.
ἕπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, 'ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν',

οὐδ' ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες· 30
οἴκοθεν μάτευε. ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον ἔλαχες
γλυκύ τι γαρυέμεν.

If being beautiful and performing acts that suit his form, the son of Aristophanes has embarked upon the highest deeds of manliness, it is not easy to pass still further across the untrodden sea beyond the pillars of Herakles, which that hero god founded as famous witnesses of the furthest voyage by sea, and he overcame mighty beasts in the sea, and on his own he explored the streams of the shallows, where he reached the escorting end of his return, and he made known the land. My heart, to what foreign headland are you leading astray my sailing? I say that you should bring the Muse to Aiakos and to his lineage. The choicest part of justice attends the saying "praise the good," and longings for foreign themes are not better for a man to bear. Search at home. You have been allotted a fitting adornment to celebrate in sweet song.

The Pillars of Herakles, which refer to the twin promontories located at the entrance to the Straits of Gibraltar, stand in a number of Pindar's victory odes as markers of the furthest point of human achievement.[107] Hanna Boeke observes that "On the one hand they are a desirable destination symbolic of the highest achievement, but on the other hand they constitute an absolute boundary beyond which lies transgression. They are an image of both the danger and the reward involved in seeking excellence."[108] Olympian 3 concludes with a warning for the victor Theron against excessive ambition (43-45):

νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν
Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται
οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος
σταλᾶν. τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον
κἀσόφοις. οὔ νιν διώξω· κεινὸς εἴην. 45

[107] The northern pillar is the Rock of Gibraltar, known to the Romans as *mons calpe*. The identity of the southern Pillar has been debated since antiquity (Strabo *Geography* 3.5.5). The two most likely contenders are Monte Hacho in Ceuta and Jebel Musa in Morocco. For modern discussion of the location of the Pillars of Herakles, see Schulten (1927) 177 n. 12 and Carpenter (1966) 3-28.
[108] Boeke (2007) 62-63. For further discussion of the Pillars of Herakles in Pindar, see Péron (1974) 72-84, Hubbard (1985) 11-16, Kurke (1991) 21-24, and Romm (1992) 17-18.

> But now Theron, reaching the limit with his achievements, fastens onto the Pillars of Herakles from home. What lies beyond is impassable for wise men and for fools. I will not pursue it. I would be vain.

Isthmian 4 describes the valorous deeds of the Kleonymidai (11-13):

> ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν
> οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις·
>
> καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν·
>
> and by their uttermost deeds of manliness they have fastened onto the Pillars of Herakles from home. Let no one strive after further excellence.

The Pillars of Herakles similarly function as an endpoint for the athletic accomplishments of Aristokleidas in this victory ode, but instead of simply mentioning them, the poet rehearses a brief mythological account of their foundation by Herakles.

In contrast to the passages cited above Pindar marks as literal this reference to the Pillars of Herakles, associating them with ἀβάταν ἅλα (21), "the untrodden sea." Whereas Theron and the Kleonymidai boast achievements that merit comparison to reaching this geographical monument, the poet stresses that Herakles actually set them up.[109] The description of the sea as ἀβάταν (21) reinforces the unprecedented nature of this accomplishment, and the reference to Herakles as both ἥρως (22), "hero," and θεὸς (22), "god," highlights his unique status.[110] Pindar also draws attention to the Pillars, personifying them as ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας μάρτυρας κλυτάς (23), "famous witnesses of the furthest voyage by sea." This image construes the relationship between Herakles and the Pillars as bidirectional. Herakles erects them in the course of his expedition to fetch the cattle of Geryon, and they serve as authoritative observers of his travels.[111]

The scope of the digression widens at this point to encompass Herakles' conquests of various sea creatures during the course of his expedition to capture the cattle of Geryon.[112] Pindar describes Herakles' maritime adversaries as θῆρας ἐν πελάγεϊ ὑπερόχους (23-24), "monstrous beasts in the sea," continuing the emphasis on the exceptional nature of his accomplishments with the epithet ὑπερόχους (24), "monstrous."[113] The poet also recounts

---

[109] Diodorus Siculus (4.18.5) offers two accounts of Herakles' formation of the Pillars of Herakles. The first states that the space between the promontories used to be wider, but Herakles narrowed the strait, hoping to prevent the incursion of sea monsters into the Mediterranean. The second account, which other ancient authors (Seneca *Herakles Furens* 235-38, Seneca *Herakles Oetaeus* 1240, and Pliny the Elder *Natural History* 3.4) affirm, reports that an isthmus previously connected the two continents, but Herakles cut through the isthmus, producing the Pillars of Herakles.

[110] Pfeijffer (1999) 203 notes that "Usually Pindar distinguishes carefully between gods, heroes, and men. Especially the boundaries between mortal and immortal—i.e. between men and heroes on the one hand and gods on the other—are closely heeded."

[111] The noun μάρτυς attaches to a number of authoritative figures in Pindar's victory odes, including the poet himself (O. 4.3) and Zeus (P.4.167).

[112] Cf. N. 1.62-63.

[113] Pseudo-Apollodorus (2.5.10) mentions that Herakles slaughtered ἄγρια πολλὰ ζῷα, "many wild animals," in the course of obtaining the cattle of Geryon.

Herakles' investigation of τεναγέων ῥοάς (25-25), "the streams of the shallows," which the hero undertook ἰδίᾳ (24), "on his own."[114] Bury notes that "this was a significant characteristic of Herakles' achievements, and that Pindar wished to insist on it in this ode is clear from the emphatic prominence given to the fact that Peleus was single-handed when he captured Iolcos, μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς, l. 34."[115] The phrase πόμπιμον νόστου τέλος (25), "the escorting end of his return," refers back to the Pillars of Herakles as the furthest point of the hero's exploration.[116] Pindar concludes the digression with the verb φράδασε (26), "made known," a *hapax legomenon*, highlighting the unprecedented nature of Herakles' adventure with his own linguistic invention.

The break-off formula that follows these narratives establishes the theme of Herakles' travels as foreign to the primary concerns of the present victory ode. Pindar addresses himself with the vocative θυμέ (26), "My heart," and inquires as to the direction in which his mythological account is heading (26-27).[117] The prepositional phrase τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπάν ἄκραν (26-27), "to what foreign headland," figures the preceding report of Herakles' achievements as a distant shore, which the poet contrasts to the most fitting topic in honoring an Aiginetan victor, the Aiakidai (28). Pindar concludes this passage by restating the distinction between foreign and local topics, declaring that οὐδ' ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες (30), "longings for foreign themes are not better for a man to bear," and commanding himself οἴκοθεν μάτευε (31), "Search at home." He reminds his heart that it has been allotted ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον γλυκύ τι γαρυέμεν (31-32), "a fitting adornment to celebrate in sweet song," that is, the valorous deeds of the Aiakidai.

This delineation of themes, which regards Herakles as foreign and the Aiakidai as local and apropos, is less clean than Pindar suggests. Ilja Pfeijffer has observed that the poet makes Herakles a precondition for Aiginetan fame in this victory ode:

> Heracles 'made known the earth', while Achilles made himself known to the limits of the known earth. Heracles defined the world in order to allow the Aeacids to fill it with their fame. The implicit references to Heracles in the Telamon story (36-39) have the same function. They illustrate the principle of an Aeacid gaining fame and glory in cooperation with Heracles. The idea of Heracles creating the conditions for Aeginetans to flourish also holds true for the victor himself: he won at Games founded by Heracles.[118]

I would also note that Herakles, as a child of Zeus, is Aiakos' half-brother. Peleus and Telamon represent the following generation and Achilles the one thereafter. In celebrating Herakles, Telamon, and Achilles in this victory ode, the poet honors three successive generations in the line of Zeus, the patron deity of the contest at Nemea.[119]

---

[114] Pseudo-Scylax (112) describes the shallows located near the Pillars of Herakles.
[115] Bury (1890) 50. Cf. Carey (1980a) 157.
[116] Carey (1980a) 158, connecting Herakles to the rest of the victory ode, contrasts the hero to "The ψεφεννὸς ἀνήρ who can never reach the goal of his voyage."
[117] For discussion of passages in which Pindar addresses his θυμός, "heart," see Pelliccia (1995) 305.
[118] Pfeijffer (1999) 228.
[119] Carey (1980a) 156-57 makes a somewhat different, but complementary, case for the relevance of Herakles to Nemean 3, arguing that "The Herakles-myth is carefully distinguished from the following Aeginetan myths by the break-off which intervenes. It is however closely linked, both syntactically and in theme, with the preceding

In addition to the familial connection between Herakles and the Aiakidai, the hero is inextricable from the genre of the victory ode. It is a remarkable fact that the name Ἡρακλέης appears twenty-three times in Pindar's victory odes.[120] This is only two fewer occurrences than the name Ἀπόλλων.[121] There are also two attestations of the epithet Ἡράκλειος and a single reference to the Ἡρακλεῖδαι.[122] Herakles ranges throughout the genre, two instantiations of which, Nemean 1 and Bacchylides 5, situate him at the center of the mythological narratives that occupy the lion's share of their length. It is difficult to imagine a more appropriate topic for a brief digression in Nemean 3 than Herakles' famed adventures.

Pindar insinuates Herakles even further into the structure of this victory ode by articulating a formal correspondence between himself and the hero in the break-off formula. The poet's own figurative itinerary echoes the hero's voyage to the Pillars of Herakles, which tracks the familiar "loop of *nostos*."[123] Herakles sallies forth to the ends of the earth in setting up his eponymous monument, and begins his return with his exploration of the shoals, which Pindar describes as ὁπᾷ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος (25), "where he reached the escorting end of his return." The poet's own journey follows a similar trajectory. He sets himself adrift toward an unknown peninsula with the prepositional phrase τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπάν ἄκραν (26-27), "to what foreign headland," but he relocates himself with the adverb οἴκοθεν (31), "at home."[124] Both Pindar and Herakles travel to foreign destinations before returning home safe and sound.

Pindar's attempt to cordon off the account of Herakles' maritime adventures is ultimately unsuccessful, but this is the point. Firstly, the achievements of the Aiakidai are inseparable from Herakles, who is a recurring figure in the genre of the victory ode, and secondly, the narrative of his travels is hardly an isolated digression, but rather, shapes the subsequent rhetoric of the break-off formula. Pindar mirrors Herakles' movement outward and back, traveling to the foreign bourne that is the hero's noble achievements and returning to the local theme of the Aiakidai. In labelling this narrative a digression, the poet masks its essential function in the larger structure of the victory ode as a whole.

Pindar's rhetorical strategy is a clever one. The break-off formula appears to indicate the realization that he has overstepped the bounds of decorum, but a simple consideration of how these poems were composed reveals that this cannot be. Victory odes were written to fit

---

praise of the victor. I would suggest that this myth is another example of the substitution of myth for direct praise."

[120] O. 2.3, 3.11, 3.44, 6.68, 7.22, 9.30, 10.16, 10.30, P. 1.63, 5.71, 9.87, 10.3, 11.3, N. 1.33, 3.21, 4.24, 7.86, 10.17, 10.33, 10.53, 11.27, I.. 5.37, 6.35.

[121] O. 3.16, 6.35, 8.41, 14.11, P. 1.1, 2.16, 3.11, 3.40, 4.5, 4.66, 4.87, 4.176, 4.294, 5.60, 5.79, 7.10, 8.18, 9.28, 9.64, 10.10, 10.35, N. 5.24, 5.44, 9.1, I. 2.18.

[122] See I. 4.12 and 7.7 for Ἡράκλειος, and P. 1.63 for Ἡρακλεῖδαι.

[123] For "the loop of *nostos*," see Kurke (1991) 15-34, whose discussion complements that of Crotty (1982) 104-38.

[124] Pfeijffer (1999) claims that the phrase ἀλλοδαπὰν ἄκραν (26-27) "literally refers to the preceding theme, the 'digression' about Herakles, which started and ended with a reference to the Pillars of Herakles. This explains the choice of the word ἄκρα, 'cape, headland,' being especially suitable to refer to Caple and Abyla." While I maintain that there is considerable slippage between the description of Herakles' exploration and the break-off image, I do not believe that ἀλλοδαπὰν ἄκραν (26-27) is a literal reference to the Pillars of Herakles. Pindar's heart has carried him in the direction of a figurative headland located nowhere in the geography of the Mediterranean.

elaborate metrical structures, and most scholars assume that the poet himself was not the one performing the poem, but rather, a chorus that he had rehearsed.[125] Nothing in a victory ode is said in the impromptu manner that Pindar suggests. The poems discussed in this chapter reveal the tendency for these moments to bridge the distance between diverse generic forms.

Pythian 4 harnesses the opposed images of a highway and a shortcut as figures for Pindar's modulation between the characteristic narrative approaches of hexameter epic and symposiastic song. The first eleven triads of the poem elaborate a richly embellished narrative of the expedition of the Argo. Jason, Pelias, and the other central figures in the victory ode voice a number of lengthy speeches, slowing the narration to a crawl. Were the account to continue at this pace, Pythian 4 might reach the length of an epic poem, but Pindar compresses the narrative after the break-off formula, emulating the concision of symposiastic song. The break-off formula represents a hinge between discursive modes reflecting two genres of archaic Greek poetry. In navigating this topography, Pindar demonstrates his mastery of the poetic tradition encompassing both Homer and Alcaeus.

Pythian 11 uses the image of a crossroads to deflect blame for its depiction of Orestes' murder of his mother Klytemnestra. Pindar addresses an unspecified group of his friends, illustrating his sense of disorientation with two geographical metaphors. Scholars have long noted the dense intertextual connections between this victory ode and Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. I have tried to show that throughout the mythological account and break-off formula Pindar assumes the positions of various archetypal speakers in a tragedy, defeating the claim that the troubling content of the narrative belongs exclusively to the foreign genre. He stages the victory ode as a miniature drama, layering his narration with multiple currents of polyvocality.

Nemean 3 briefly recounts Herakles' foundation of the Pillars of Herakles. Pindar frames this account as a digression from the appropriate development of the victory ode, which should celebrate the Aiakidai, but the break off-formula reproduces the hero's exploration of the furthest limits of the known world with the image of a foreign headland. Both Herakles and Pindar travel toward distant shores, the one in the literal course of his adventures, and the other in relating an account of those same adventures. The break-off formula ultimately proves disingenuous, because the genre of the victory ode cannot be disentangled from Herakles, who recurs throughout these poems.

I hope to have demonstrated that we cannot trust the surface claims of these break-off passages, which perform subtle and valuable work. Rather than excluding the mythological narratives to which they refer, these passages actually incorporate them into the texture of the genre. The catalogue of foreign shores, crossroads, highways, and shortcuts constitutes a generic topography. Pindar does not locate these spaces beyond the fixed boundaries of the genre, but uses them to construct its outer limits, the points of demarcation that denote the subsumption of a discourse purported to be foreign into the dominant one of the victory ode.

---

[125] For discussion of the respective arguments for monodic and choral performance of victory odes, see Davies (1988), Heath (1988), Burnett (1989), Carey (1989), Bremer (1990), Carey (1991), Heath and Lefkowitz (1991), Lefkowitz (1991), Morgan (1993), Anzai (1994), D'Alessio (1994), and Lefkowitz (1995). Most contemporary scholars believe that the victory odes of Pindar and Bacchylides were performed by choruses.

Chapter Two

Direct Speech in the Mythological Narration

In most victory odes, as we have seen, the chorus ventriloquizes the voice of the poetic ego, but there are a number of instances in which the chorus assumes the persona of a mythological figure.[126] Some of these passages are quite prolonged, opening up internal frames of their own with inset narration of events. I would argue that, during these speeches, the chorus shifts to a different register of "choral mimesis," which provides its own opportunities for the poet to steer the interpretation of the audience in specific directions.

We might start by asking what happened when the chorus spoke in the voice of an Apollo or Medea. Anne Pippin Burnett suggests that these were moments of transformation:

> The spectator saw dancers whom he knew, wearing costumes that he had perhaps seen before; they were a part of his life, but he heard them describe themselves and their performance with the same music that described matters from another world and another time, and meanwhile in the dance these neighbors were instantaneously heroes or monsters or even gods. Such a spectator watched while his own familiar and tangible present became indistinguishable from a world that was strange and timeless.[127]

The chorus, singing in the poet's voice, begins the transformative process by recounting a mythological narrative of relevance to the victory ode as a whole. The level of specification at which these accounts are related varies from poem to poem, but in some cases the narrative lingers on a particular moment in time. Take Isthmian 6, for instance, which introduces its myth at the level of Herakles' various expeditions, including the first sack of Troy and the conquest of Pergamon, but zooms in on his meeting with Telamon. In relating the speeches of Herakles, the narrative slows to the speed of the conversation itself. The audience experiences Herakles' prophecy in real time alongside Telamon, as the narrator moves aside, allowing Herakles to describe the bravery of Aias.

Such moments transport the audience to a foreign time and place. If the experience of seeing and hearing one's neighbors intone the words of a renowned poet was already disconcerting, then these mythological speeches must have seemed miraculous. The poetic

---

[126] See Uhlig (2011) 37-66 for further discussion of direct mythological speech in Pindar's victory odes.
[127] Burnett (1985) 8. This description applies to the fragments of Bacchylides' dithyrambs in addition to his victory odes.

ego typically reflects the present temporality and location of the chorus that performs the victory ode, but a mythological speaker might sing from a remote setting in the distant past.[128] The aim is to merge these two realities.[129] I would add that the chorus, in its multiplicity, bears a natural advantage over any individual singer or actor, who, as in drama, assumes the voice of a hero or divinity.[130] The sheer wall of sound created by a chorus would produce a tremendous sense of awe. Imagine how the audience would have felt as they listened to a sea of voices declaring to Zeus and Poseidon that a child born from Thetis would be greater than his father.

Another consequence of direct mythological speech is the establishment of a degree of critical distance. Direct speech introduces an independent voice that can be interrogated and criticized by the poet himself—speaking through the chorus—or by other characters in the mythological account. In bringing a particular character's speech to a close and providing outside reactions to that speech, the poet might suggest certain interpretive frameworks that would not have occurred to the audience otherwise. Poets might even radically recontextualize the words of their speakers by suggesting ulterior motives or other indications of an untrustworthy narrator. I would argue that these moments of external commentary offer poets a crucial measure of control over the interpretation of their poems. By steering the ways in which the audience thinks about a moment of direct mythological speech, the poet begins to dictate the interpretation of the poem as a whole.

The poet can also leverage the gap between his own knowledge and that of the mythological speaker to establish critical distance. In Pindar, these speeches often take the form of elaborate prophecies, but we should remember that the poet is the true seer, since he knows the consequences of characters' actions and understands the long trajectory of mythological events.[131] The poet assumes the position of an oracle or Muse vis-à-vis his characters, breathing into them a foreknowledge of future events, but even more powerful in some respects, as his is a creative force. The mythological tradition is sufficiently various that the poet's personal conception of how events unfold and the cognizance of them that he instills in his characters are factors with significant potential to drive interpretation. No character fully comprehends his own position in the mythological tradition as formulated by the poet; it does not matter whether he possesses prophetic abilities or not. The poet's existence, as both arbiter and shaper of events, creates an element of critical distance in and of itself, even if no external commentary follows a given speech. The poet is the architect of his own poetic world, the rules and realities of which he signals to the audience through his creative choices. In laying out a specific understanding of mythological reality and situating his characters within that reality as individuals who possess varying degrees of cognizance, he produces a form of irony akin to dramatic irony between the audience and the characters in his narrative.

---

[128] The poet sometimes seems to comment upon his absence from the occasion of the victory ode, expressing a wish that he could be there.

[129] Uhlig (2011) 44 argues that "The poet's diegetic present must find space for a mimetic voice from the past, and the conflation of the two spatio-temporal realities recalibrates the properties of both voices."

[130] In the genre of Attic tragedy, Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* features both of these performance types, as the chorus, in describing the events at Aulis that resulted in the sacrifice of Iphigenia, voices first person speeches by Kalchas (126-138 and 140-155) and Agamemnon (206-217).

[131] See Uhlig (2011) 61-66 for further discussion of prophetic speech in Pindar's victory odes.

I contend that the combination and interplay of these two factors, transformation through "choral mimesis" and the establishment of critical distance, make direct mythological speech a powerful tool for the production of meaning. The audience experiences the mesmerizing spectacle of a local chorus singing in the voice of a famous hero or divinity, which signals a profound transformation of everyday existence, but in this transformation lies an opportunity for the poet to assert his authority over the interpretation of the poem. The conclusion of direct speech marks the return to a discursive frame through which the speech is experienced alongside the audience in real time. From this external frame, the poet, in his own voice or that of another mythological figure, might suggest ways in which the speech should be understood. At the same time, the critical distance that necessarily exists between the poet and his mythological speakers is itself a source of interpretive potential.

In this chapter, I focus on two sets of speeches in particular: Meleager's conversation with Herakles in Bacchylides 5 and the exchange between Apollo and Chiron in Pythian 9.

Bacchylides 5

Bacchylides composed his fifth victory ode in celebration of Hieron's victory in the single-horse race at Olympia in 476 BCE.[132] The poem takes as its mythological exemplum the famous story of Herakles' descent into the underworld in search of Kerberos. According to Bacchylides' account, Herakles meets the hero Meleager, who, in explaining how he ended up among the dead, describes the events of the Kalydonian boar hunt and his own murder at the hands of his mother Althaia. Herakles responds emotionally to Meleager's tale, shedding tears, and asks whether he left a sister at home. Meleager answers by naming Deianeira, at which point Bacchylides brings the narrative to a sudden close. The uses of direct speech in this mythological exemplum illustrate several of the points that I made above. Herakles' lachrymose reaction to Meleager's narrative models an embodied affective response that is intended to be reproduced by the audience of the victory ode, and the mention of Deianeira creates a measure of dramatic irony between the characters in the narrative and the members of the audience, who realize that Deianeira eventually kills Herakles in the mythological tradition. I further contend that these instances of direct speech allow Bacchylides to suggest an understanding of his victory ode that resembles the aesthetics of melodrama, a modern narrative mode that leverages the victimization of innocence toward the production of heightened emotion.

Bacchylides begins his narrative of Herakles' descent into the underworld in indirect discourse (56-62):

---

[132] This is the same victory for which Pindar composed Olympian 1. Chapter three discusses the relationship between these two poems. Bowra (1964) 124 and Brannan (1972) 203-04 contend that Bacchylides composed this victory ode as a "poetic epistle" to Hieron, and Steffen (1961) argues that the first strophe, divorced from the rest of the poem, functioned as a letter of introduction. Schmidt (1987) convincingly refutes these arguments, returning Bacchylides 5 to its rightful status as a victory ode.

Δῦναί π]οτ' ἐρειψιπύλαν
ἄνδρ' ἀνίκ]ατον λέγουσιν
ἔρνος Διὸς] ἀργικεραύ-
νου δώματα Φερσεφόνας τανισφύρου,
καρχαρόδοντα κύν' ἄξον- 60
τ' ἐς φάος ἐξ Ἀΐδα,
υἱὸν ἀπλάτοι' Ἐχίδνας·

They say that the scion of Zeus of the vivid lightning, that gate-destroying unconquerable man, once went down to the house of slender-ankled Persephone, in order to bring into the light from Hades the dog with saw-like teeth, son of the unapproachable Echidna.

The verb λέγουσιν (57), "they say," lends this passage the sense of a traditional and authoritative account, and the adverb π]οτ' (56), "once," locates it in the timeless past.[133] The poet never explicitly names Herakles. He refers to him as ἔρνος Διὸς] (58), "the scion of Zeus," and uses the epithets ἐρειψιπύλαν (56), "gate-destroying," and ἀνίκ]ατον (57), "unconquerable," to modify the noun ἄνδρ' (57), "man."[134] The phrase κύν' ἄξοντ' (60-61), "in order to bring back the dog," in echoing the language and construction used by Herakles in the *Odyssey* to describe his retrieval of Kerberos (11.623, καί **ποτέ** μ' ἐνθάδ' ἔπεμψε **κύν' ἄξοντ'**, "and he once sent me here to bring back the dog"), serves to identify both the protagonist and the present situation.

Bacchylides shifts to direct speech in line 63, marking an increase in the vividness of the account (63-78):

ἔνθα δυστάνων βροτῶν
ψυχὰς ἐδάη παρὰ Κωκυτοῦ ῥεέ-
θροις, οἷά τε φύλλ' ἄνεμος 65
Ἴδας ἀνὰ μηλοβότους
πρῶνας ἀργηστὰς δονεῖ.
Ταῖσιν δὲ μετέπρεπεν εἴ-
δωλον θρασυμέμνονος ἐγ-
χεσπάλου Πορθανίδα· 70

τὸν δ' ὡς ἴδεν Ἀλκμή<ν>ιος θαυμαστὸς ἥρως
τ[ε]ύχεσι λαμπόμενον,
νευρὰν ἐπέβασε λιγυκλαγγῆ κορώνας,
χαλκεόκρανον δ' ἔπειτ' ἐξ
εἵλετο ἰὸν ἀναπτύ- 75

[133] Indirect speech is an unusual way to introduce a mythological narrative in a victory ode. Young (1971) 38 and Carey (1981) 67 note that a mythological exemplum is more often commenced with a relative pronoun. Lefkowitz (1969) 64 argues that "the indirect approach and leisurely pace seem modeled on the epic manner." Cairns (1997) 46 adds that the form of this narrative "is closer to the epic or Stesichorean than to the typical epinician narrative style."

[134] The noun ἔρνος (58), which literally means "a shoot," contributes to the abundance of vegetal images in this poem. For discussion of this imagery, see Svarlien (1995) and Resinski (2000).

ξας φαρέτρας πῶμα· τῷ δ' ἐναντία
ψυχὰ προφάνη Μελεάγρου,
καί νιν εὖ εἰδὼς προσεῖπεν·

There he perceived the souls of wretched men beside the streams of Kokytos, like the sort of leaves that the wind whirls along the shining sheep-grazed headlands of Ida. And among them the specter of the brave-spirited spear-wielding son of Porthaon stood out. And when the hero, marvelous son of Alkmene, saw him shining in his armor, he stretched the clear-voiced bowstring upon the tip of his bow, and then, opening up the lid of his quiver, he drew out a bronze-tipped arrow. And the soul of Meleager appeared before him, and addressed him in recognition.

Whereas the infinitive Δῦναί (56), "went down," in referring to the entirety of Herakles' descent, expresses a broader verbal idea, ἐδάη (64), "he perceived," specifies an individual moment of perception.[135] The verb μετέπρεπεν (68), "stood out," tightens the focus even further, centering upon a single εἴδωλον (68-69), "specter." The subordinate phrase ὡς ἴδεν (71), "when he saw," to which ἐπέβασε (73), "he stretched," forms the main verb, specifies the beginning of the encounter between these two heroes, which the use of rarified diction marks as notable; the epithets λιγυκλαγγῆ (73), "clear-voiced," and χαλκεόκρανον (74), "bronze-tipped," appear here for the first time in extant Greek literature.[136]

The first instance of direct mythological speech comes from Meleager, who urges Herakles to set aside his weapons (79-84):

»Υἱὲ Διὸς μεγάλου,
στᾶθί τ' ἐν χώρᾳ, γελανώσας τε θυμὸν 80

μὴ ταῦσιον προΐει
τραχὺν ἐκ χειρῶν ὀϊστὸν
ψυχαῖσιν ἔπι φθιμένων·
οὔ τοι δέος.»

"Son of mighty Zeus, stay in place, and calming your spirit do not send forth a rough arrow in vain from your hands against the souls of those who have died. There is no fear."

The vocative Υἱέ (79), "son," and the imperative verbs στᾶθί (80), "stay," and μὴ προΐει (81), "do not fire," contribute to the vividness of the encounter.[137] The chorus, voicing Meleager, establishes a series of spatial relationships, with the prepositional phrase ἐν χώρᾳ (80), "in place," specifying a location for στᾶθί and ψυχαῖσιν ἔπι φθιμένων (83), "against the souls of those who have died," offering a target for προΐει. The description of the ὀϊστόν (82),

[135] Lefkowitz (1969) 65 contends that ἐδάη (64) means "he learned": "Herakles here *learns* the souls of miserable men, i.e. his own mortality." Brannan (1972) 233, deferring to Lefkowitz, adds that "Bacchylides certainly means that Herakles sees the souls, but he also means more as the unfolding myth will show."
[136] The adjective λιγυκλαγγής also appears at Bacchylides 14.14.
[137] Lefkowitz (1969) 70 argues that this scene characterizes Herakles as rash and violent and Meleager as "controlled and unaffected by ordinary concerns."

"arrow," as both ταῦσιον (81), "ineffectual," and τραχύν (82), "rough," is a seeming contradiction, which actually points to the complicated metaphysics of the situation. These two adjectives refer to the divergent physical realities represented by Meleager and Herakles respectively. The arrow is ineffectual from Meleager's spectral perspective, but rough to Herakles, who remains embodied, as the prepositional phrase ἐκ χειρῶν (82), "from your hands," serves to remind us.

Herakles responds to Meleager by asking about his lineage and the circumstances of his death (84-92):

> Ὣς φάτο· θάμβησεν δ' ἄναξ
> Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας, εἶ-
> πέν τε· «Τίς ἀθανάτων
> ἢ βροτῶν τοιοῦτον ἔρνος
> θρέψεν ἐν ποίᾳ χθονί;
> Τίς δ' ἔκτανεν; Ἦ τάχα καλλίζωνος Ἥ-
> ρα κεῖνον ἐφ' ἁμετέρᾳ
> πέμψει κεφαλᾷ· τὰ δέ που
> Παλλάδι ξανθᾷ μέλει.»

> Thus he spoke, and the lord, son of Amphitryon, marveled, and said, "Who among the immortals or mortals raised such a shoot, and in what land? And who killed you? Surely Hera of the beautiful girdle will soon send that man against my head, but these things, I suppose, are a concern for fair Pallas."

Bacchylides calls Herakles Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας (85), "the son of Amphitryon," which complicates the earlier reference to him as "the scion of Zeus" (58).[138] This overdetermination of parentage keeps the complexity of Herakles' identity in mind as he asks about Meleager's father (86-88).[139] As for his inquiry concerning the killer, the masculine demonstrative κεῖνον (90), "that man," reflects his assumption that the killer was a man.[140] The audience, on the other hand, is surely aware that Althaia murdered her son, as Phoenix's speech in *Iliad* 9 famously alludes to the enmity between mother and child.[141] Herakles' questioning, then, works to establish a degree of "dramatic irony." The audience assumes a position of superior knowledge in relation to Herakles, which is maintained throughout the mythological narrative.

In response to Herakles, Meleager begins an account of the Kalydonian boar hunt and his own eventual death at his mother's hands that refocuses the narrative axis of the victory ode (93-104):

> Τὸν δὲ προσέφα Μελέα-

---

[138] Wind (1964) 29 asserts that the shift from Zeus to Amphitryon marks a "depreciation of Herakles' heroism."
[139] Lefkowitz (1969) 67 notes that the formal character of these patronymic expressions works to maintain the epic tone of Bacchylides' narration.
[140] See Karachalios (2009) 7 for discussion of κεῖνον (90) and of Herakles' assumptions as "formulated on the base of what is the norm in the world of heroes."
[141] There is an alternate tradition according to which Apollo kills Meleager. For discussion of this tradition, see Jebb (1905) 469-470 and Burnett (1985) 142.

γρος δακρυόεις· «Χαλεπὸν
θεῶν παρατρέψαι νόον 95

ἄνδρεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοις.
Καὶ γὰρ ἂν πλάξιππος Οἰνεὺς
παῦσεν καλυκοστεφάνου
σεμνᾶς χόλον Ἀρτέμιδος λευκωλένου
λισσόμενος πολέων τ' αἰ- 100
γῶν θυσίαισι πατὴρ
καὶ βοῶν φοινικονώτων·
ἀλλ' ἀνίκατον θεὰ
ἔσχεν χόλον·

And Meleager addressed him in tears: "It is a difficult thing for mortal men to turn aside the purpose of the gods. For in fact horse-driving Oineus would have ended the wrath of holy white-armed Artemis, who wears a crown of flowers, beseeching her with sacrifices of many goats and red-backed cows, but the goddess maintained her wrath unconquered.

Both Meleager's narrative and the one that frames it begin with gnomic statements. Bacchylides uses an aphorism about the flawed nature of human life to introduce the encounter of Herakles and Meleager in the underworld (50-55):

Ὄλβιος ᾧτινι θεὸς 50
μοῖράν τε καλῶν ἔπορεν
σύν τ' ἐπιζήλῳ τύχᾳ
ἀφνεὸν βιοτὰν διάγειν· οὐ
γά⌊ρ τις⌋ ἐπιχθονίων
π⌊άντ⌋α γ' εὐδαίμων ἔφυ. 55

Happy is he to whom a god has given a share of beautiful things and to lead a rich life with enviable fortune; for no one of mortal men is born blessed in all things.[142]

Bacchylides' decision to have Meleager follow suit facilitates the transition into the inset narration. The idea that "it is a difficult thing for mortal men to turn aside the purpose of the gods" is applicable both backward to Hera's relentless pursuit of Herakles (89-91) and forward to the wrath of Artemis (99).

In exemplifying this maxim, Meleager recounts his father Oineus' futile attempts to relieve the anger of the goddess, which he frames as a past counterfactual condition.[143] I would argue that, following the description of a tearful Meleager at the outset of his account

[142] There has been much scholarly disagreement about the relationship between the two clauses of this gnomic statement. Rossi (1903) 480-82 argues that the first praises Hieron and the second introduces the myth. Wind (1964) 25 contends that the second contradicts the first. Brannan (1972) 230 insists that the force of γά⌊ρ (54) is explanatory.

[143] Goldhill (1983) 74 notes that a reason for the anger of Artemis is never offerred.

(93-94, Τὸν δὲ προσέφα Μελέαγρος δακρυόεις, "And Meleager addressed him in tears"), this choice of grammatical construction invests the beginning of his narrative with strong emotionality. A counterfactual condition imagines an alternate state of affairs that cannot be brought about, a different reality. Meleager briefly envisions what his father might have accomplished under different circumstances, but returns to the events that occurred.[144] Artemis persisted in her χόλον (104), "wrath," to which the epithet ἀνίκατον (103), "unconquerable," is applied with striking effect: Artemis herself might be called unconquerable, but to refer to her wrath as such is to ascribe an unusual degree of autonomy to an emotion. We should remember that Herakles is also said to be ἀνίκ]ατον (57).[145] The transference of this epithet from Artemis to her wrath depicts the emotion as an independent actor, contributing to the larger sense at the beginning of Meleager's account that emotions are unruly forces that refuse to be constrained.

Artemis sends a boar to destroy the city of Kalydon, which an elite band of fighters, including Meleager and his uncles, eventually manage to slay (104-20):

εὐρυβίαν δ' ἔσσευε κού
ρα κάπρον ἀναιδομάχαν 105
ἐς καλλίχορον Καλυδῶν',
ἔνθα πλημύρων σθένει
ὄρχους ἐπέκειρεν ὀδόν
τι, σφάζε τε μῆλα, βροτῶν
θ' ὅστις εἰσάνταν μόλοι. 110

Τῷ δὲ στυγερὰν δῆριν Ἑλλάνων ἄριστοι
στασάμεθ' ἐνδυκέως
ἓξ ἄματα συνεχέως· ἐπεὶ δὲ δαίμων
κάρτος Αἰτωλοῖς ὄρεξεν,
θάπτομεν οὓς κατέπεφνε<ν> 115
σῦς ἐριβρύχας ἐπαΐσσων βίᾳ,
Ἀ[γκ]αῖον ἐμῶν τ' Ἀγέλαον
φ[έρτ]ατον κεδνῶν ἀδελφεῶν
οὓς τέ]κεν ἐν μεγάροις
πατρὸ]ς Ἀλθαία περικλειτοῖσιν Οἰνέος· 120

But the maiden drove a mighty boar, ruthless in fight, upon Kalydon of lovely dancing places; there overflowing with strength it would cut down rows of vines with its teeth, and slaughter sheep, and kill whomever of mortal men came opposite. But we, the best of the Hellenes, made hateful battle against it steadfastly for six days continuously, and when the divinity offered supremacy to the Aitolians, we were burying those whom the loud-roaring boar, rushing with strength, had killed, Ankaios

[144] Lefkowitz (1969) 73 sees in Meleager's contrafactual description of a better world an expression of the view that his actual world is irrational.
[145] Adding to the slipperiness of possible parallels and identifications, Tarkow (1978) 383 draws a comparison between Artemis and Eurystheus.

and Agelaos, the bravest of my cherished brothers, whom Althaia bore in the far-famed halls of my father Oineus.[146]

The construction of lines 104-110 mirrors that of lines 56-69, in which Bacchylides begins the narrative of Herakles' descent into the underworld.[147] In each case the first clause is governed by a verb implying motion (104, ἔσσευε, "she drove," and 56, Δῦναί, "went down"), which allows for the specification of a setting for the scene (106, ἐς καλλίχορον Καλυδῶν', "upon Kalydon of lovely dancing places," and 58-59, δώματα Φερσεφόνας τανισφύρου, "to the house of slender-ankled Persephone"), while the second clause picks up that setting with the adverb ἔνθα (107 and 63), "there," and describes the scene in further detail, making use of a relative construction (109-10, βροτῶν θ' ὅστις εἰσάνταν μόλοι, "whoever of mortal men came opposite," and 65-67, οἷά τε φύλλ' ἄνεμος Ἴδας ἀνὰ μηλοβότους πρῶνας ἀργηστὰς δονεῖ, "like the sort of leaves that the wind whirls along the shining sheep-grazed headlands of Ida"). At the same time, the frame narrative demonstrates a tighter level of temporal focus, as Bacchylides expresses an individual verbal action in the aorist (64, ἐδάη, "he perceived"), whereas the boar's actions are characterized as habitual with imperfect verbs (108, ἐπέκειρεν, "it would cut down," and 109, σφάζε, "it would slaughter"). In following similar structural principles, the inset narrative almost seems to reset the frame narrative, suggesting to the audience that Meleager's voice is a continuation of Bacchylides' as neutral narrator.

Meleager describes the boar in lavish language designed to convey the animal's terrifying magnificence.[148] The adjective εὐρυβίαν (104), "mighty," is a rare word, used of Triton in Hesiod's *Theogony* and of Keleos in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.[149] The choice of an epithet that traditionally modifies divinities and kings highlights the special nature of the beast, which represents a legitimate threat to the warriors of Kalydon.[150] The adjective ἀναιδομάχαν (105), "ruthless in fight," is a *hapax legomenon*, and the participle πλημύρων (107), "overflowing," in evoking a river surmounting its banks, equates the boar with a force of nature.[151] Most extravagantly, the epithet ἐριβρύχας (116), "loud-roaring," appears only once elsewhere in Greek literature, in a passage from Hesiod's *Theogony* concerning the hundred-headed Typhoeus. Hesiod describes the many terrible sounds that the monster emitted from its heads (829-32):

φωναὶ δ' ἐν πάσῃσιν ἔσαν δεινῇς κεφαλῇσι,
παντοίην ὄπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον· ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ 830
φθέγγονθ' ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ταύρου ἐριβρύχεω μένος ἀσχέτου ὄσσαν ἀγαύρου,

[146] I add the supplement πατρό]ς in line 120.
[147] Tarkow (1978) 383 points to the structural similarities between Kerberos and the boar as monsters to be overcome by heroes.
[148] Karachalios (2009) 11 notes that the boar, in contrast to the human fighters, who are rendered anonymous by the use of plural verbs, is heroized as hyper-masculine.
[149] *Theogony* 931 and *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 294.
[150] Svarlien (1995) 36 observes that the boar "causes continued war even after its death."
[151] Stern (1967) 39 associates πλημύρων (107) and ἐπαΐσσων (116) with the theme of "continuous motion."

And there were voices in all of its terrible heads, releasing every sort of awful sound. For at one moment they made sounds that the gods understand, and at another moment the sound of a lordly bull, bellowing loudly, ungovernable in its strength.

The "loud-roaring" bull mentioned in line 832 is actually an aural simulation produced by Typhoeus. In borrowing the epithet from a description of the primordial adversary defeated by Zeus, Bacchylides invests this monstrous animal with a hint of cosmic destruction.[152] These allusions to hexameter poetry serve to inform both Herakles and the audience of the victory ode about the stakes involved in the encounter between the Kalydonians and the boar sent by Artemis.

Meleager, maintaining the voice of a neutral narrator, largely elides himself from his account of the Aitolian victory over the boar. The use of first-person plural verbs (112, στασάμεθ', "we made," and 115, θάπτομεν, "we were burying") is the sole indicator that he even participated in these events. The actual slaughter of the animal is ascribed to divine favor rather than an act of individual heroism or skill. The identity of the δαίμων (113), "divinity," is left unclear: Artemis is the source of the boar, but another divinity offers supremacy to the Aitolians. Meleager leaves no room for celebration; the next clause transitions to the burying of those killed by the beast. His language has the curious effect of merging the boar and its victims in a repetition of similar sounds: **οὓς** κατέπεφνε<ν> **σῦς** (115-16), "those whom the boar had killed." He clarifies the broader idea of casualties into the names of his brothers (117), and mentions Althaia for the first time as their mother (120).

Meleager describes the internecine strife that broke out over the boar's hide as a continuation of the violence that culminated in its death (121-135):

τῶν δ' ὤ]λεσε μοῖρ' ὀλοὰ
πλεῦνα]ς· οὐ γάρ πω δαΐφρων
παῦσεν] χόλον ἀγροτέρα
Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ· περὶ δ' αἴθωνος δορᾶς
μαρνάμεθ' ἐνδυκέως Κου 125
ρῆσι μενεπτολέμοις·
ἔνθ' ἐγὼ πολλοῖς σὺν ἄλλοις
Ἴφικλον κατέκτανον
ἐσθλόν τ' Ἀφάρητα, θοοὺς μάτρωας· οὐ
γὰρ καρτερόθυμος Ἄρης 130
κρίνει φίλον ἐν πολέμῳ,
τυφλὰ δ' ἐκ χειρῶν βέλη
ψυχαῖς ἔπι δυσμενέων
φοιτᾷ θάνατόν τε φέρει
τοῖσιν ἂν δαίμων θέλῃ. 135

But a destructive fate killed more of them, since the daughter of Leto, warlike huntress, did not yet put a stop to her wrath. We were fighting steadfastly over the sleek hide with the Kouretes, staunch in battle; there I, with many others, killed

[152] Burnett (1985) 142 notes that Meleager fails to visualize the boar, since "no one of his epithets is visual." The animal is imagined instead as a manifestation of pure destructive energy.

> Iphiklos and noble Aphares, my swift maternal uncles. For stronghearted Ares does not discern a kinsman in war, but arrows fly forth blindly from the hands against the souls of one's enemies, and bear death to whomever the divinity wishes.[153]

Despite the uncertainty concerning the first word of line 123, the sense of lines 122-124 (οὐ γάρ πω δαΐφρων [**παῦσεν**] **χόλον** ἀγροτέρα Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ, "since the daughter of Leto, warlike huntress, did not yet put a stop to her wrath") seems to reiterate that of the counterfactual condition (97-102). The replacement of πλάξιππος Οἰνεύς (97), "horse-driving Oineus," with Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ (124), "the daughter of Leto," as the source of an action exerted upon the noun χόλον (123) lends further emphasis to the goddess' agency in this situation. The manifestation of her destructive anger changes from the boar itself to internecine strife around its hide. Meleager uses certain verbal echoes to blur the boundaries between these two conflicts: he repeats the adverb ἐνδυκέως (125 and 112), "steadfastly," and picks up the first-person plural verbs στασάμεθ' (112) and θάπτομεν (115) with μαρνάμεθ' (125), "we were fighting," which obscures his individual contribution behind a description of collective action.

Meleager's language takes on a striking lack of clarity in depicting the war against the Kouretes. He softens his admission of responsibility for the murders of his maternal uncles (128, κατέκτανον, "I killed") by adding the prepositional phrase πολλοῖς σὺν ἄλλοις (127), "with many others."[154] What exactly does it mean for Meleager to kill his mother's brothers in the company of many others? Should we imagine that he struck the killing series of blows or that he was simply fighting on the opposing side when they died?[155] For sophisticated audiences of victory odes the earlier sense that his account was simply resetting the neutral narration of the frame narrative is replaced by the suspicion of a deliberate intention to draw the audience toward specific conclusions while concealing other reasonable understandings of the events described.

Meleager attempts to explain his actions with a strange gnomic statement. The idea that Ares fails to discern a friend in war seems to contradict the frame narrative of Herakles' encounter with Meleager, in which Meleager prevents Herakles from firing an arrow by identifying himself as a friend. The emphasis on the blindness of the arrows in line 132 is another contradictory detail. We have seen no indication that Meleager fights using a bow and arrow, and he describes killing Klymenos with the participle ἐξεναρίζων (146-47), "slaying," which suggests hand-to-hand combat.[156] The notion that these arrows are τυφλά (132), "blind," and directed by the wishes of a δαίμων (135) is incoherent, but both of these descriptors work to remove agency from the one firing.[157] Meleager has seemingly crafted

---

[153] I add the supplement τῶν δ' ὤ]λεσε in line 121, and πλεῦνα]ς in line 122.

[154] Brannan (1972) 243 observes that πολλοῖς σὺν ἄλλοις (127) can be construed in more than one way: "Is it Meleager who along with others slew his uncles? Or is it his uncles who were slain among many others? The latter is the usual and perhaps correct interpretation, but the syntax is not clear."

[155] Kyriakou (2001) 20 reports a tradition according to which "Meleager's uncles vied for a prize that did not belong to them and the hero killed them deliberately." Jebb (1905) 470-71, following Robert (1898), speculates that the *Pleuroniae* of Phrynichus might have told the story of Meleager's slaying of the Thestiadae and Althaea's vengeance upon her son.

[156] The verb ἐξεναρίζω can have the specific sense of despoiling the armor of an enemy; cf. *Iliad* 4.448, 13.619, etc.

[157] We might recall the contradictory description of the arrow in lines 81-82 as both ταΰσιον (81) and τραχύν (82).

this account of his uncles' killing with a simultaneous view to producing maximal obscurity and ridding himself of culpability.[158]

Meleager shifts from a deliberately obscure mode of narration to one increasingly marked by vividness in describing his death at his mother's hands (136-144):

> Ταῦτ' οὐκ ἐπιλεξαμένα
> Θεστίου κούρα δαΐφρων
> μάτηρ κακόποτμος ἐμοὶ
> βούλευσεν ὄλεθρον ἀτάρβακτος γυνά,
> καῖέ τε δαιδαλέας ἐκ 140
> λάρνακος ὠκύμορον
> φιτρὸν ἐξαύσασα· τὸν δὴ
> Μοῖρ' ἐπέκλωσεν τότε
> ζωᾶς ὅρον ἁμετέρας ἔμμεν.
>
> The fiery daughter of Thestius, my ill-fated mother, fearless woman, refusing to take these things into account, devised destruction for me, and, having snatched the firebrand of my early death, which Fate had indeed assigned at that time to be the boundary of my life, from its cunningly wrought coffer, she began to burn it.[159]

His language draws an implicit comparison between Althaia and Artemis.[160] He describes Althaia as δαΐφρων (137), "fiery," the same epithet applied to Artemis above (122), in addition to κακόποτμος (138), "ill-fated," and ἀτάρβακτος (139), "fearless," both of which appear here for the first time in Greek literature. The application of such distinct language to Althaia emphasizes her central importance to Meleager's narrative, which had been directly occasioned by Herakles' question concerning the identity of Meleager's killer (89-91). This section of the account offers the formal answer to that question.

Meleager depicts his mother as both emotional and rational in her decision to kill him.[161] The participial phrase Ταῦτ' οὐκ ἐπιλεξαμένα (136), "refusing to take these things into account," suggests a willful blindness to her son's perspective on the conflict, but the verb βούλευσεν (139), "she devised," signifies a deliberate choice. The bifurcation of an Althaia simultaneously motivated by bitter anger and acting in cold blood is reflected by the epithet δαΐφρων (137), which has two etymologies: from δάϊς, "torch," and δάω, "to learn."[162] The meaning of δαΐφρων, if derived from δάϊς is "fiery," a reflection of Althaia's passionate anger toward her son, whereas the sense derived from δάω is "prudent," which matches the idea of cunningness implied in βούλευσεν (139).

Meleager uses especially evocative language in describing Althaia's burning of the firebrand. The phrase δαιδαλέας λάρνακος (140-41), "cunningly wrought coffer," also

---

[158] Lefkowitz (1969) 78 adds that "nonvolition is further suggested in the impersonal structuring of the sentence."
[159] Maehler (2004) 124 observes that "now that Meleager is focussing on Althaia and his own miserable death, the narrative technique changes."
[160] Cairns (1997) 45 notes that the ring composition of Meleager's speech serves to link Artemis and Althaea.
[161] Lefkowitz (1969) 80 observes that Bacchylides makes "Althaea seem strangely godlike in her willful isolation and in her ability to act on her intentions."
[162] For further discussion of the etymologies of δαΐφρων from δάϊς and δάω, see Brannan (1972) 242.

famously appears in Simonides fr. 543 in a passage concerning a mother and her son. In that poem, Danaë comforts the infant Perseus from within a δαιδαλέα λάρναξ as winds howl around them on the sea (1-7):

> ὅτε λάρνακι
> ἐν δαιδαλέαι
> ἄνεμός τέ μιν πνέων
> κινηθεῖσά τε λίμνα δείματι
> ἔρειπεν, οὐκ ἀδιάντοισι παρειαῖς 5
> ἀμφί τε Περσέι βάλλε φίλαν χέρα
> εἶπέν τ'·

> When in the cunningly wrought box the blowing wind and troubled sea were dashing her down in fear, with not unwetted cheeks she threw a loving arm around Perseus, and said.

This allusion serves as an exact inversion of the scenario proposed by Simonides, who depicts a mother for whom the δαιδαλέα λάρναξ functions as a locus of protection, shielding herself and her child from the elements. Meleager, on the other hand, describes a mother who hides the instrument with which she will murder her son in a δαιδαλέα λάρναξ.[163] The recurrence of this phrase draws an implicit comparison between the two women: Danaë clings fearfully (4, δείματι, "in fear") to Perseus, whereas Althaia is called ἀτάρβακτος (139), "fearless," by Meleager. Using this comparison to highlight the unnatural callousness of Althaia, Bacchylides creates sympathy for Meleager as his mother's victim.[164]

The scene shifts suddenly to Meleager's murder of Klymenos, which marks the end of his account (144-54):

> Τύχον
> μὲν Δαϊπύλου Κλύμενον
> παῖδ' ἄλκιμον ἐξεναρί-
> ζων ἀμώμητον δέμας,
> πύργων προπάροιθε κιχήσ
> ας· τοὶ δὲ πρὸς εὐκτιμέναν
> φεῦγον ἀρχαίαν πόλιν
>
> Πλευρῶνα· μίνυθεν δέ μοι ψυχὰ γλυκεῖα·
> γνῶν δ' ὀλιγοσθενέων,
> αἰαῖ· πύματον δὲ πνέων δάκρυσα τλά[μων,
> ἀγλαὰν ἥβαν προλείπων.»

---

[163] Segal (1990) observes that "Althaea, whose name suggests "nurture" (cf. Latin *alo*, "nurture"), is the destroyer of her son."

[164] Karachalios (2009) 15 argues that Althaia's solidarity with her brothers represents a failure to transition from the role of daughter to that of mother: "First, as daughter of Thestius, she is presented in her original state, the one that a woman is supposed to leave behind for ever when she marries into a new *oikos*. In her preference for her brothers over her son, she in fact regresses to that former state."

> I happened to be slaying Klymenos, blameless in body, the brave son of Daïpylos, after overtaking him before the towers, and the others were fleeing to the well-built ancient city of Pleuron, but my sweet soul was wasting away, and I recognized that I was becoming faint, aiai! And I cried, wretched, breathing my last, leaving behind my splendid youth."

Meleager cuts from Althaia's burning of the firebrand to his own acts of violence before the ramparts. The sequence of verbs and participles in this passage tracks the movements in space and time: he speaks of Althaia using the aorist βούλευσεν (139) and the imperfect καῖέ (140), "she began to burn," but the transition to the aorist τύχον (144), "I happened to be," with the supplementary present participle ἐξεναρίζων (146-147), "slaying," marks his own emergence at the center of the narrative, and the aorist participle κιχήσας (148-149), "after overtaking," establishes the relative sequence of events. The inclusion of τύχον (144) as the last word of its line reflects the close proximity of these two scenes.

The audience views Klymenos' death through Meleager's eyes, watching an event from his individual perspective for the first time in this narrative. The only first-person singular verb used by Meleager to this point had been κατέκτανον (128), "I killed," but τύχον (144), γνῶν (152), "I recognized," and δάκρυσα (153), "I cried," all follow in these final lines. He calls Klymenos Δαϊπύλου παῖδ' ἄλκιμον (145-46), "the brave son of Daïpylos," and ἀμώμητον δέμας (146), "blameless in body."[165] Bacchylides' description works to collapse Meleager and his victim into one another. The reference to Klymenos as his father's son recalls the use of a patronymic in introducing Meleager: Πορθανίδα (70), "the son of Porthaon." Furthermore, Klymenos leaves behind the beautiful corpse that we never see from Meleager, who cuts away from the moment of his own death, but Herakles' forthcoming curiosity about a sister that resembles Meleager (168) is indicative of the blameless beauty of his form.

Meleager mentions the departure of the other Kouretes, who fled for Pleuron (149-51), before turning to the realization of his own imminent death. He first describes the sense that his soul had become weak in objective terms with a third-person verb (151, **μίνυθεν** δέ μοι ψυχὰ γλυκεῖα, "but my sweet soul was wasting away"), and then follows that with a first-person expression of his internal experience of the event (152, **γνῶν** δ' ὀλιγοσθενέων, "and I recognized that I was becoming faint"). In the latter clause, the construction of the aorist verb γνῶν (152) with the supplementary participle ὀλιγοσθενέων (152), "becoming faint," mirrors the construction of τύχον (144) and ἐξεναρίζων (146-147) above. The violence that Meleager externalized onto Klymenos is made internal here. The exclamations αἰαῖ (153) and τλά[μων (153), "wretched," mark sudden ruptures in the narrative, as Meleager's subjectivity, which had been elided for most of the account, moves to the forefront.[166]

I contend that Meleager's tears (153, δάκρυσα) come about in response to the unexpected finality of his death. Franco Moretti, in the essay "Kindergarten," argues that tears tend to acknowledge situations in which we recognize the irrevocable loss of a desired state of affairs:

---

[165] Wind (1964) 34 observes that Klymenos is blameless both physically and in the matter of his own death, since "Meleager just chanced to come upon him."

[166] Lefkowitz (1969) 82 observes that αἰαῖ (153) "is more natural in dramatic lyric than in the festive context of a victory ode."

> This is what makes one cry. Tears are always the product of *powerlessness*. They presuppose two mutually opposed facts: that it is clear how the present state of things should be changed - and that this change is *impossible*. They presuppose a definitive estrangement of facts from values, and thus the end of any relationship between the idea of *teleology* and that of *causality*. In this lies the second reason why death plays an indispensable part in 'moving' literature. The person who dies never appears as one who is carrying out an intention (these texts as a matter of principle do not permit suicide) but as one subjected to a chain of *causes* beyond his control - not as an artificer of his own desires, but as the victim of 'reality' in its most radical form.[167]

Moretti frames the realization of this powerlessness in temporal terms as the notion of the "too late," which is inherent in the participial phrases that surround the verb δάκρυσα (153): πύματον δὲ πνέων (153), "breathing my last," and ἀγλαὰν ἥβαν προλείπων (154), "leaving behind my splendid youth."[168] The use of πύματον (153), "last," highlights the stark irrevocability of Althaia's actions, and the phrase ἀγλαὰν ἥβαν (154), "splendid youth," on the heels of γλυκεῖα ψυχά (151), "sweet soul," articulates the preciousness of the thing that has been lost.

Bacchylides returns to indirect discourse in reporting Herakles' embodied response to Meleager's narrative (155-58):

> Φασὶν ἀδεισιβόαν Ἀμ- 155
> φιτρύωνος παῖδα μοῦνον δὴ τότε
> τέγξαι βλέφαρον, ταλαπενθέος
> πότμον οἰκτίροντα φωτός·

> They say that the fearless son of Amphitryon wet his eyes for the only time then, pitying the fate of the woeful man.[169]

We have now seen three occurrences of weeping in the mythological narrative of the encounter of Herakles and Meleager: Meleager begins his account in tears (94), he responds with tears to the realization that he is about to die (153), and Bacchylides reports that the only time Herakles ever cried was after listening to Meleager (155-57).[170] I would argue that the poet presents Herakles' tearful reaction to Meleager's account as a model for the proper emotional response to both Meleager and the victory ode itself.[171] Herakles is positioned as a surrogate for the audience. We hear Meleager's somber tale at the same time as he does. He demonstrates for us that the appropriate response to narrated tears is tears from the narratee, but he himself exists and weeps within a frame narrative, which, in addition to modeling

---

[167] Moretti (2005) 162.
[168] See Moretti (2005) 159-62.
[169] For discussion of the return to indirect discourse, see Burnett (1985) 146.
[170] Lefkowitz (1969) 84 oddly downplays the significance of Herakles' tears, arguing that he remains essentially unchanged after Meleager's account. She asserts that "tears come to his eyes, but he does not actually weep," which seems to be an excessively literal reading of Bacchylides' descriptive language in this scene. Brannan (1972) 252, on the other hand, contends that "Herakles has been shattered by the fate of another hero. He is anxious to console, and sympathize with another hero."
[171] Peponi (2012) 33-69, focusing upon Homer and Plato, discusses weeping as a form of aesthetic response.

tears, also serves as a potential source of emotions for the audience.[172] I contend that Bacchylides' aim is to produce a feedback loop of tears, beginning with Meleager, moving to Herakles, and culminating in the audience of the victory ode.[173]

Film melodrama provides a useful comparandum for thinking about the emotional effects produced by Meleager's narrative. Barry Keith Grant defines melodrama as

> a somewhat indistinct genre that refers to films about familial and domestic tensions. Originally the term, a hybrid deriving from a combination of music and drama, referred to stage plays that, beginning in the late eighteenth century, used music to emphasize dramatic or particularly emotional moments. More recently the category refers to narratives in any popular form that seem contrived or excessive in emotion and sentimentality, in which dramatic conflicts and plot take precedence over character and motivation, and in which there is a clear distinction between heroes and villains.[174]

Linda Williams emphasizes the importance of victimization to the melodramatic mode:

> If emotional and moral registers are sounded, if a work invites us to feel sympathy for the virtues of beset victims, if the narrative trajectory is ultimately more concerned with a retrieval and staging of innocence than with the psychological causes of motives and action, then the operative mode is melodrama. In cinema the mode of melodrama defines a broad category of moving pictures that move us to pathos for protagonists beset by forces more powerful than they and who are perceived as victims.[175]

Bacchylides has carefully constructed Meleager's account in similar fashion to downplay his responsibility in the deaths of his maternal uncles and to emphasize his victimization at the hands of Artemis, the boar, and his mother. Assuming the voice of a neutral narrator, he subsumes his identity within that of the Kalydonians, who suffer beneath the onslaught of the boar. When Meleager describes his role in his uncles' murders, he weakens the admission by inserting the prepositional phrase πολλοῖς σὺν ἄλλοις (127). Finally, he characterizes Althaia as an unfeeling monster, who refuses to consider her son's perspective (136, Ταῦτ' οὐκ ἐπιλεξαμένα), and Bacchylides' allusion to Simonides' Danaë emphasizes Althaia's unnatural hostility toward her son by comparison.

Melodrama is a narrative mode especially associated with the induction of tears. Williams discusses the traditional conception of melodrama, alongside pornography and horror films, as one of the cinematic body genres:

---

[172] Burnett (1985) 141 notes that "In spite of its different mode of performance, the mythic encounter of Ode 5 is very much like a tragic messenger-scene. Meleager as deuteragonist reports, and Herakles as protagonist responds, the first offering the audience the epic pleasure of hearing a finished tale well told, the second providing the very different dramatic pleasure of watching an as yet unfinished event take shape."

[173] We should notice that Meleager, Herakles, and most of the audience members are male. Karachalios (2009) 8-21 argues that the tears of Meleager and Herakles represent an inversion of heroic ideals; cf. Van Wees (1998) for further discussion of weeping as a gendered act in archaic Greece.

[174] Grant (2007) 75-76.

[175] Williams (1998) 42.

> In the body genres I am isolating here, however, it seems to be the case that the success of these genres is often measured by the degree to which the audience sensation mimics what is seen on the screen. Whether this mimicry is exact, e.g., whether the spectator at the porn film actually orgasms, whether the spectator at the horror film actually shudders in fear, whether the spectator of the melodrama actually dissolves in tears, the success of these genres seems a self-evident matter of measuring bodily response.[176]

Bacchylides describes a scenario that corresponds closely to Williams' suggestion that "the audience sensation mimics what is seen on screen." Meleager's tears, both as narrator (94) and as a character within his own narration (153), seem to bring about those of Herakles. This sequence of tears teaches the audience of the victory ode that weeping is an appropriate response to Bacchylides' narrative.

Herakles replies to Meleager's account by with the expression of a dour gnomic statement (159-164):

> καί νιν ἀμειβόμενος
> τᾶδ' ἔφα· «Θνατοῖσι μὴ φῦναι φέριστον 160
>
> μηδ' ἀελίου προσιδεῖν
> φέγγος· ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τίς ἐστιν
> πρᾶξις τάδε μυρομένοις,
> χρὴ κεῖνο λέγειν ὅ τι καὶ μέλλει τελεῖν.
>
> And answering him he said these things: "It is best for mortal men never to be born and never to look upon the light of the sun, but since there is no use bewailing these things, a man ought to speak of what he means to accomplish.

His adage responds to the earlier aphorisms that introduced the mythological exemplum (50-55), commenced Meleager's narrative (94-96), and capped the mention of his uncles' deaths (129-135). Bacchylides situates each of these passages on or across a stanza boundary: the first concludes strophe B, the second bridges strophe Γ and antistrophe Γ, the third finishes strophe Δ, and the fourth runs between epode Δ and strophe E. I would argue that this structural correspondence suggests that these passages ought to be read together. Each of these statements highlights the control exerted upon human affairs by the divine. In lines 50-55, Bacchylides compliments Hieron by asserting that the man to whom the gods have given a successful and affluent life is happy, and avows that no one is fortunate in all respects. The gnomic statement with which Meleager begins his narrative (94-96) presents a darker conception of man's dependence upon the gods, lamenting that it is difficult for a mortal to change the mind of a divinity. In lines 129-135, Meleager denies that men have agency in war, declaring that arrows fly forth blindly, guided by the will of a god. Herakles' statement seems to build upon the implications of these three earlier aphorisms, concluding that human

[176] Williams (1991) 4-5.

life is an unnecessary burden.[177] These four adages work to emphasize the notion of victimization upon which Bacchylides' mythological narrative depends.

In the final lines of the mythological exemplum, Herakles asks whether Meleager has a sister, and Meleager mentions Deianeira (165-175):

> Ἦρά τις ἐν μεγάροις Οἰ-
> νῆος ἀρηϊφίλου
> ἔστιν ἀδμήτα θυγάτρων,
> σοὶ φυὰν ἀλιγκία;
> Τάν κεν λιπαρὰν <ἐ>θέλων θείμαν ἄκοι-
> τιν.» Τὸν δὲ μενεπτολέμου
> ψυχὰ προσέφα Μελεά-
> γρου· «Λίπον χλωραύχενα
> ἐν δώμασι Δαϊάνει
> ραν, νῆϊν ἔτι χρυσέας
> Κύπριδος θελξιμβρότου.»

> Is there an unwed daughter in the halls of Oineus, dear to Ares, similar to you in form? I would willing make her my brilliant wife." The soul of Meleager, steadfast in battle, answered him: "I left green-necked Deianeira at home, still ignorant of golden Kypris, charmer of mortals."

Despite modeling the correct embodied response, Herakles betrays crucial ways in which he fails to comprehend the key points of Meleager's narrative. The epithet ἀρηϊφίλου (166), "dear to Ares," corresponds directly to the earlier gnomic statement about man's lack of agency in martial affairs (129-135):

> οὐ
> γὰρ καρτερόθυμος Ἄρης
> κρίνει φίλον ἐν πολέμῳ,
> τυφλὰ δ' ἐκ χειρῶν βέλη
> ψυχαῖς ἔπι δυσμενέων
> φοιτᾷ θάνατόν τε φέρει
> τοῖσιν ἂν δαίμων θέλῃ.

> For stronghearted Ares does not discern a friend in war, but arrows fly forth blindly from the hands against the souls of one's enemies, and bear death to whomever the divinity wishes.

The constitutive elements of ἀρηϊφίλου (166) are Ἄρης (130) and φίλον (131). In calling Oineus a friend of Ares, Herakles ignores the basic sentiment of Meleager's contention that Ares fails to recognize a friend in battle.

[177] Burnett (1985) 145 notes that Herakles "is mortal now, but he will not be so always."

Several of his statements also manifest a belief in his own heroic agency that runs counter to Meleager's emphasis on victimization.[178] Herakles follows the assertion that "It is best for mortal men never to be born and never to look upon the light of the sun" (160-62) with a statement of his own resolve (162-64):

> ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τίς ἐστιν
> πρᾶξις τάδε μυρομένοις,
> χρὴ κεῖνο λέγειν ὅ τι καὶ μέλλει τελεῖν.
>
> but since there is no use bewailing these things, a man ought to speak of what he means to accomplish.

There is a sharp disconnect between the powerlessness of the first notion and the straightforward practicality of the second; the first seems to emanate from the gnomic logic of the victory ode, while the second articulates his true feelings. In proposing a potential marriage to Deianeira, Herakles further emphasizes his confidence in his own choices with the participle <ἐ>θέλων (169), "willing," and the verb θείμαν (169), "make." He trusts that he is truly the one in charge.

I would argue that Bacchylides leverages the disparity in knowledge between Herakles and the audience of the victory ode to create an especially affecting form of dramatic irony.[179] Variant accounts of the meeting of Herakles and Meleager in the underworld and the betrothal of Deianeira seem to have been in circulation. According to a scholion to *Iliad* 21.194, Pindar told a version in which Meleager, hoping to protect his sister from Achelous, offers her to Herakles.[180] There is uncertainty as to which of these tellings came first, but we can see that Bacchylides emphasizes Herakles' active role in his eventual fate by making him the inquirer. Several features of Bacchylides' account draw attention to the unfortunate aftermath of the union.[181] The epithet θελξιμβρότου (175), "charmer of mortals," which is applied to Aphrodite, calls to mind the nature of Herakles' demise through a "love charm."[182] Furthermore, the sudden choice to end the myth with Meleager's suggestion prompts the audience to look ahead to the marriage and its bitter fruits.[183] The thought of Herakles wearing Nessus' robe could hardly have been far from the minds of spectators at the victory ode.[184]

---

[178] Cairns (1997) 47 observes that the epithets with which Herakles is introduced (56, ἐρειψιπύλαν, "gate-destroying," and 57, ἀνίκατον, "unconquerable") stress his previous heroic successes, but coming on the heels of the idea that "no one of mortal men is born blessed in all things," they might foreshadow an eventual reversal of fortune.

[179] For further discussion of dramatic irony in this scene, see Lefkowitz (1969) 93 and Brannan (1972) 253.

[180] See Maehler (2004) 107-08 and Stern (1967) 35-37 for comparative discussion of the accounts of Pindar and Bacchylides.

[181] Bacchylides 16, a dithyrambic fragment, continues the narrative of Herakles' unfortunate marriage to Deianeira. See Fearn (2007) 177-81 for discussion of mythological narration in Bacchylides' dithyrambs.

[182] Brannan (1972) 256 notes that "The very word θελξιμβρότου indicates the magic which will be his undoing in an action undertaken unknowingly in the name of love."

[183] Kirkwood (1966) 113 cites this passage as an example of "The distinctively Bacchylidean technique of fragmentary narrative, of an abrupt ending that leaves much of dramatic import untold, yet sharply suggested."

[184] Goldhill (1983) 77 observes a shift in contextual emphasis between the opening and closing of this mythological narrative. The immediate context of Herakles' descent into the underworld is Eurystheus'

The scholarship on melodrama offers a productive framework for thinking about dramatic irony. Christine Gledhill writes of film melodrama that

> Its central protagonists become objects of pathos because constructed as victims of forces that lie beyond their control and understanding. Nevertheless, the externalization of conflict into narrative structures or *mise en scène* offers the audience signs of the protagonists' condition and the forces in play. Pathos, unlike pity, is a cognitive as well as affective construct. The audience is involved on a character's behalf and yet can exercise pity only by reading and evaluating signs inaccessible to the dramatis personae.[185]

The audience's position as an objective observer of the narrative qua narrative allows for the production of both emotional and intellectual responses. Thomas Elsaesser elaborates on the significance of this positioning:

> Such archetypal melodramatic situations activate very strongly an audience's participation, for there is a desire to make up for the emotional deficiency, to impart the different awareness, which in other genres is systematically frustrated to produce suspense: the primitive desire to warn the heroine of the perils looming visibly over her in the shape of the villain's shadow. But in the more sophisticated melodramas this pathos is most acutely produced through a 'liberal' *mise en scène* which balances different points of view, so that the spectator is in a position of seeing and evaluating contrasting attitudes within a given thematic framework – a framework which is the result of the total configuration and therefore inaccessible to the protagonists themselves. The spectator, say in Otto Preminger's *Daisy Kenyon* or a Nicholas Ray movie is made aware of the slightest qualitative imbalance in a relationship and also sensitized to the tragic implications which a radical misunderstanding or a misconception of motives might have, even when this is not played out in terms of a tragic ending.[186]

The audience of the victory ode wants to warn Herakles about Deianeira, but there is no time. Bacchylides designs the scene in such a way that the audience's awareness of the situation coincides with the dissolution of the mythological narrative itself. This scenario, like melodrama, is completely devoid of suspense. We understand where the narrative is heading, but, frozen in our knowledge of its tragic consequences, we have the rug pulled out from under us.

Our response in this moment is brought about by a combination of affective and cognitive factors. Williams complicates the earlier notion that the spectator simply mimics the emotions shown on-screen by adding a consideration of cognition: "Pathos in the spectator is thus never merely a matter of losing oneself in "over-identification." It is never a matter of simply mimicking the emotion of the protagonist, but, rather, a complex negotiation

---

demand that he bring back Kerberos, but the destructive marriage to Deianeira assumes this position at the end of the account.

[185] Gledhill (1987) 30.

[186] Elsaesser (1987) 66.

between emotions and between emotion and thought."[187] There is certainly an extent to which a pathetic identification with Herakles (and Meleager) is meant to inform the emotional response of the audience to Bacchylides' narrative, but this identification is enriched and perhaps intensified by a broader view of the mythological tradition in which the present episode fits. Herakles himself only knows half of the story.

Bacchylides uses direct speech to conduct the audience through a complex series of affective and embodied responses. The narrative opens at a wide level of focus, starting with Herakles' descent into the underworld, and centers on his encounter with Meleager, whose description of the Kalydonian boar hunt and the resulting civil strife becomes the central episode of the entire victory ode. Meleager assumes the voice of a neutral narrator at the beginning of his account, continuing the use of gnomic statements from Bacchylides. This posture of distance from the events described takes on a clear strategic importance during Meleager's admission of involvement in the deaths of his maternal uncles. He obscures this portion of his narrative in order to maintain a position of innocent victimization at the hands of his mother Althaia. The nature of his narration shifts dramatically as he describes his own demise; he relates his internal experience of death. At the conclusion of the account, Herakles reacts with tears to Meleager's tears, modeling the appropriate embodied response. In the final lines of the mythological exemplum, Herakles asks whether Meleager has a sister, and Meleager mentions Deianeira. I would argue that this moment, in which the audience glimpses a destructive future inaccessible to Herakles himself, combines the forces of emotion and intellectual understanding to produce a particularly potent response, one that manifests in the form of tears.

Pythian 9

Pindar wrote his ninth Pythian ode in honor of Telesikrates of Kyrene, who won the race in armor in 474 BCE.[188] The victory ode features several mythological narratives, but I focus in this chapter upon the first, which describes the marriage of Apollo and Kyrene. Pindar turns the tradition of the deity's abduction of this Thessalian nymph into a mythological rendering of the colonization of the Libyan city of Kyrene, which occurred in the second half of the seventh century BCE.[189] Apollo, encountering Kyrene wrestling with a lion, summons the centaur Chiron. He and Chiron then have a lengthy conversation about the propriety of a potential sexual union with the nymph. I would argue that Chiron's response to Apollo, which evinces a version of the "hermeneutics of suspicion," ignoring the surface meaning of Apollo's address, and hitting instead upon its latent significance, models an interpretive mode that the audience is meant to apply in turn to the victory ode. The

[187] Williams (1998) 49.
[188] I assume that the original performance of this victory ode took place in Kyrene following Telesikrates' return from Delphi, but Felson (2004) 367 notes that the contents of the poem "neither designate nor contradict the localization of that poetic event at Cyrene."
[189] See Calame (2014) 281-82 for discussion of archeological evidence for the archaic settlement of Kyrene by Greeks.

employment of a similarly suspicious hermeneutic reveals the clever fictionality of Pindar's mythological account.

Pindar opens Pythian 9 by expressing a desire to celebrate Telesikrates (1-8):

> Ἐθέλω χαλκάσπιδα Πυθιονίκαν
> σὺν βαθυζώνοισιν ἀγγέλλων
> Τελεσικράτη Χαρίτεσσι γεγωνεῖν
> ὄλβιον ἄνδρα διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας·
> τὰν ὁ χαιτάεις ἀνεμοσφαράγων 5
> ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων ποτὲ Λατοΐδας
> ἅρπασ', ἔνεικέ τε χρυς<έῳ> παρθένον ἀγροτέραν
> δίφρῳ, τόθι νιν πολυμήλου
> καὶ πολυκαρποτάτας θῆκε δέσποιναν χθονός
> ῥίζαν ἀπείρου τρίταν εὐ-
> ήρατον θάλλοισαν οἰκεῖν.
>
> With the help of the deep-girdled Graces, I wish to proclaim and sing of Telesikrates, the Pythian victor with brazen shield, a fortunate man, the crown of horse-driving Kyrene, whom the flowing-haired son of Leto once snatched from the hollows of Pelion, which echo in the wind, and he carried the wild maiden in his golden chariot to where he established her as mistress of a flock-rich and fruitful land to inhabit the lovely and flourishing third root of the continent.

He invokes the βαθυζώνοισιν Χαρίτεσσι (2-3), "deep-girdled Graces," as his aids in announcing and celebrating the triumphant man.[190] Using a series of epithets and appositional phrases, he develops his description of Telesikrates through the first four lines: χαλκάσπιδα Πυθιονίκαν (1), "the Pythian victor with brazen shield," ὄλβιον ἄνδρα (4), "a fortunate man," and διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας (4), "the crown of horse-driving Kyrene."[191] The last of these provides an unusually early entry into the mythological narrative of Apollo and Kyrene.[192]

Scholars have long debated the originality of Pindar's treatment of this myth.[193] A scholion to Pythian 9 cites two lines from Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* concerning a Thessalian nymph named Kyrene:

> ἢ οἵη Φθίῃ Χαρίτων ἄπο κάλλος ἔχουσα
> Πηνειοῦ παρ' ὕδωρ καλὴ ναίεσκε Κυρήνη

---

[190] Invocation of the Graces is a fairly common feature near the beginnings of victory odes; cf. O. 4.9, 14.4, P. 6.2, N. 4.7, 10.1.

[191] See Felson Rubin (1978) 365 for discussion of διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας (4) as a metaphor.

[192] As Gildersleeve (1885) notes, P. 9 resembles P. 3 and P. 4 in that the myth starts near the beginning of the poem.

[193] Robbins (1978) 92 summarizes the arguments of Drexler (1931) 464 and Studniczka (1890) 41 respectively: "One commentator, for instance, feels that the lovely scene of Cyrene's bare-handed combat with the beast cannot have formed part of the *Eoiae* where it would have been 'redundant and purposeless.' It is thus Pindaric invention. Another influential commentator feels that Apollo's encounter with Cyrene is, in Pindar, 'unnecessary' and so must have been transposed wholesale from the Hesiodic catalogue."

> Or like beautiful Kyrene, who used to live beside the water of Peneios in Phthia, having her beauty from the Graces.

We can hardly deduce the true extent of Pindar's debt to Hesiod from the meager evidence of this fragment. Richard Janko suggests that the tradition about the Thessalian nymph antedates the colonization of the city in Libya:

> However, as Drexler showed, the story of the nymph Cyrene is certainly older than this and of Thessalian origin; Servius (ad *Aen* IV 337) records that Apollo 'transfiguratus in lupum cum Cyrena concubuit', a tradition of immemorial age, while Cyrene's genealogy is variously given, but always links her with Thessaly; her sister Alcaea was a city heroine of Larisa. There is no evidence at all for any Thessalian participation in the founding of Cyrene (or in the population of Thera indeed), so why invent a foundation-legend involving *Thessaly* after a colonisation by men of *Thera*? Better surely to suppose that the settlers relied on an already existent legend when they named the site; perhaps they were prompted by a spring called in Libyan something like Κύρα. If in our *Catalogue* Apollo did carry his nymph across to Africa, we know not why, although legends of such transfers are common enough (e.g. Zeus and Europa, *Cat* 140); but there is no proof that it was because a city of that name existed there yet.[194]

Accepting Janko's reasoning, I would argue that the collocation of the two Kyrenes is the poet's invention.

Pindar uses a rather ostentatious example of grammatical sleight of hand to bring together the city and the maiden. He calls Telesikrates διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας (4), "the crown of horse-driving Kyrene," that is, the city in Libya, but the relative pronoun τάν (5), "whom," the antecedent of which is Κυράνας (4), refers to the nymph from Thessaly.[195] This is a moment of bold invention, if no previous association existed between the two Kyrenes. Carol Dougherty sees the bringing together of nymph and city as "a kind of narrative pun that appropriates a Libyan city's name and reinterprets it within a Greek poetic tradition of rape."[196] Pindar begins line 5 with τάν, but the hyperbaton of ὁ χαιτάεις Λατοΐδας (5), "the flowing-haired son of Leto," and the delayed placement of the verb ἅρπασ' (6), "he snatched," serve to postpone the realization that the referent has shifted. The adverb ποτέ (5), "once," enacts a similar temporal displacement of the local in favor of the mythological. Pindar uses a relative clause to transport his audience from fifth-century Kyrene to Thessaly of the timeless past.

The narrative moves back to Kyrene at the end of the first strophe. The relative adverb τόθι (6), "to where," refers to Telesikrates' hometown. Pindar compresses this first account of the settlement of Kyrene into a mere four lines (5-8). In the following triads, he returns to the same terrain at a tighter level of focus, but the rendition here is brisk and allusive. He uses simple verbs to describe the rape and resettlement of Kyrene: ἅρπασ' (6), ἔνεικέ (6), "he carried," and θῆκε (7), "he established." He lavishes his most ornate language on descriptions of places. Apollo removes Kyrene ἀνεμοσφαράγων ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων (5),

---

[194] Janko (1982) 248 n. 38; cf. Dräger (1993) 221-29.
[195] See Felson (2004) 371 for further discussion of τάν (5).
[196] Dougherty (1993) 149.

"from the hollows of Pelion, which echo in the wind," and installs her as πολυμήλου καὶ πολυκαρποτάτας δέσποιναν χθονός (6-7), "mistress of a flock-rich and fruitful land." Pindar calls Libya ῥίζαν ἀπείρου τρίταν εὐήρατον θάλλοισαν (8), "the lovely and flourishing third root of the continent."[197] The effect is to reduce the narrative of colonization to its essential components, verbs of motion and locations.

The action of the first antistrophe centers around Aphrodite, who sanctions the marriage of Apollo and Kyrene (9-17):

> ὑπέδεκτο δ' ἀργυρόπεζ' Ἀφροδίτα
> Δάλιον ξεῖνον θεοδμάτων 10
> ὀχέων ἐφαπτομένα χερὶ κούφᾳ·
> καί σφιν ἐπὶ γλυκεραῖς εὐναῖς ἐρατὰν βάλεν αἰδῶ,
> ξυνὸν ἁρμόζοισα θεῷ τε γάμον
> μιχθέντα κούρᾳ θ' Ὑψέος εὐρυβία
> ὃς Λαπιθᾶν ὑπερόπλων τουτάκις ἦν βασιλεύς,
> ἐξ Ὠκεανοῦ γένος ἥρως
> δεύτερος· ὅν ποτε Πίνδου κλεενναῖς ἐν πτυχαῖς 15
> Ναὶς εὐφρανθεῖσα Πηνει-
> οῦ λέχει Κρέοισ' ἔτικτεν,
> Γαίας θυγάτηρ.
>
> And silver-footed Aphrodite received the Delian stranger from his divinely wrought chariot, touching him with a light hand, and she cast lovely reverence on their sweet love-makings, bringing together in a common bond of marriage the god and the daughter of wide-ruling Hypseus, who was then king of the proud Lapiths, a hero of the second generation from Okeanos. A Naiad once bore him in the famous folds of Pindos, Kreousa the daughter of Gaia, delighting in the bed of Peneios.

The narrative focuses upon the events immediately following the abduction. Pindar refers to Apollo as Δάλιον ξεῖνον (10), "the Delian guest," stressing his position as a foreigner in Libya. The notion of Apollo as a ξεῖνος has two obvious applications to the broader themes of this victory ode: 1) Apollo's status mirrors that of Pindar 2) the emphasis on Apollo as a foreigner from Greece corresponds to the colonization of Kyrene by Greeks. Pindar draws the social bonds even closer by introducing the imagery of marriage: ξυνὸν ἁρμόζοισα θεῷ τε γάμον μιχθέντα κούρᾳ θ' Ὑψέος εὐρυβία (13), "bringing together in a common bond of marriage the god and the daughter of wide-ruling Hypseus."[198] Dougherty remarks upon the close relationship between marriage and colonization in the archaic Greek imagination:

> the rhetorical relationship between marriage and victory is more complex than it appears, for the marriage of Apollo and Cyrene also represents the Greek colonization of Cyrene, and as we have seen, marriage operates within the larger context of Greek

[197] Carey (1981) 68 notes that ἀπείρου (8) means "continent" here rather than "earth."
[198] See Carey (1981) 69-70 for discussion of the sense of γάμον (13).

colonial representation as a metaphor to describe founding a city overseas in terms of cross-cultural contact and civilization.[199]

The simple progression of Kyrene from παρθένον ἀγροτέραν (6), "wild maiden," to δέσποιναν (7), "mistress," illustrates the civilizing influence of marriage.[200]

Pindar offers a brief digression on Hypseus, the father of Kyrene, in the second half of the first antistrophe. The use of the relative pronoun ὃς (14), "who," seems to reset the narrative from τάν (5) above. He stresses Hypseus' status as a βασιλεύς (14), "king," and ἥρως (14), "hero." The description of his conception and birth draws the narrative even further back in time, and Pindar alludes to the ultimate lineage of Hypseus from Okeanos (14) and of Kreousa from Gaia (16).[201] Nancy Felson observes that "a fronted locative prepositional phrase (15): Πίνδου κλεενναῖς ἐν πτυχαῖς, "in the famed folds of Mt. Pindus," initiates the geographical displacement to a space far north of the land of Cyrene."[202] The phrase εὐφρανθεῖσα Πηνειοῦ λέχει (15-16), "delighting in the bed of Peneios," recalls Hesiod's Πηνειοῦ παρ' ὕδωρ, "beside the water of Peneios." This digression reorients the audience in both time and space.

The first epode offers a detailed characterization of Kyrene, focusing upon her warlike disposition (17-25):

ὁ δὲ τὰν εὐώλενον
θρέψατο παῖδα Κυράναν· ἁ μὲν οὔθ' ἱ-
στῶν παλιμβάμους ἐφίλησεν ὁδούς,
οὔτε δείπνων †οἰκουριᾶν μεθ' ἑταιρᾶν τέρψιας,
ἀλλ' ἀκόντεσσίν τε χαλκ<έοι>ς 20
φασγάνῳ τε μαρναμένα κεράϊζεν ἀγρίους
θῆρας, ἦ πολλάν τε καὶ ἡσύχιον
βουσὶν εἰρήναν παρέχοισα πατρῴαις,
τὸν δὲ σύγκοιτον γλυκύν
παῦρον ἐπὶ γλεφάροις
ὕπνον ἀναλίσκοισα ῥέποντα πρὸς ἀῶ. 25

And he raised a lovely-armed daughter Cyrene. She loved neither going back and forth at her loom, nor the delights of dinners with her female housemates, but fighting with bronze javelins and a sword she would slay wild animals, in truth providing

[199] Dougherty (1993) 140. See also Kurke (1991) 108-134 for the role of marriage imagery in the rhetoric of the victory ode.
[200] Carson (1990) 144 remarks that "The presexual or asexual female in Greek thought is part of the wilderness, an untamed animal who, given a choice, prefers the wild life of Artemis, roaming the woods undomesticated and unloving of men." Felson Rubin (1978) 359 notes that "Cyrene as a land in Africa undergoes a corresponding and simultaneous change, from uncultivated and unsettled though rich in potential to settled, cultivated, and florescent." Jakob (1994) 427 argues to that contrary that "the struggle of Cyrene with the carnivorous beasts has nothing to do with her assimilation into wild nature; rather, it means a relationship with culture, an important constituent of which is the guarding of the herds of the οἶκος."
[201] Robbins (1978) 94 notes that Kyrene and Chiron are related, since Okeanos is the father of Philyra, Chiron's mother.
[202] Felson (2004) 371.

> great and quiet peace to her father's cattle, spending only for a short time sleep, the sweet bedfellow that falls upon the eyelids towards dawn.

Pindar uses two negated clauses formed around the verb ἐφίλησεν (18), "she loved," to describe Kyrene's distaste for the traditional activities of weaving (18) and dining with her companions (19).[203] Kyrene resembles Apollo's sister Artemis in her fondness for hunting wild animals.[204] Pindar frames her hunts in martial terms: ἀκόντεσσίν τε χαλκ<έοι>ς φασγάνῳ τε μαρναμένα (20-21), "fighting with bronze javelins and a sword."[205] These lines elaborate upon the earlier reference to her as παρθένον ἀγροτέραν (6). The appositional relationship between the nouns σύγκοιτον (23), "bedfellow," and ὕπνον (25), "sleep," prefigures the sexualization of Kyrene. Sleep is but the first of her bedfellows in this narrative.

Pindar trains his focus at the beginning of the second strophe upon the moment in which Apollo first laid eyes upon Kyrene (26-29):

> κίχε νιν λέοντί ποτ' εὐρυφαρέτρας
> ὀβρίμῳ μούναν παλαίοισαν
> ἄτερ ἐγχέων ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων.
> αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ μεγάρων Χίρωνα προσήνεπε φωνᾷ·
>
> Apollo of the broad quiver, the far-worker, once happened upon her wrestling alone with a mighty lion without spears, and he immediately called Chiron from his halls and addressed him.

Apollo encounters the nymph as she is wrestling a lion with her bare hands. Pindar characterizes her as an athlete rather than a warrior by emphasizing the absence of weapons (29, ἄτερ ἐγχέων, "without spears") and using the participle παλαίοισαν (27), "wrestling."[206] The deity summons the centaur Chiron ἐκ μεγάρων (29), "from his halls." According to Robbins, the collocation of Kyrene and Chiron here is significant:

> None of this is absolutely conclusive, but it does at least help us to understand why Pindar provides the genealogical information he does and points to a curious but real connection between Cheiron and Cyrene in Pindar's imagination. Most important of all, perhaps, is the bond created between the two by Pindar's use of ἀγρότερος. At *Pyth*. 9.6a Cyrene is called παρθένον ἀγροτέραν. The word is also used at *Pyth* 3.4b of Cheiron himself: he is φῆρ' ἀγρότερον. There are only two further instances of the

---

[203] Woodbury (1982) 250 notes that "The pleasures of dinners enjoyed among home-keeping companions are, on the other hand, almost unknown to us elsewhere, unless we can imagine that the girls of an ἀγέλα such as Alcman's maiden chorus at Sparta or those of Sappho's θίασος at Mytilene enjoyed such entertainments."
[204] Carson (1990) 151 observes that "The eccentric Kyrene of Pindar spurns not only domestic work but also passing time in τέρψιας ("play" or "amusements") with the girls of her house."
[205] Carey (1981) 72 notes that "φασγάνωι emphasizes her courage. μαρναμένα and κεράϊζεν (cf. μάχαι N.3.44) raise the huntress to the level of a warrior."
[206] Carson (1982) 124 argues that "Pindar's representation of Kyrene and Telesikrates includes many facets, as it seems to me, which draw the nymph and the victor into significant comparison with each other."

> word in Pindar, once in a Cheironic context: Achilles, Cheiron's ward, fights with λεόντεσσιν ἀγροτέροις at *Nem*. 3.44.[207]

Pindar's language imagines Kyrene as one of Chiron's famous students, an Achilles or Asklepios.

Apollo addresses the centaur, beginning the first of two lengthy speeches around which this mythological narrative revolves (30-37):

> 'σεμνὸν ἄντρον, Φιλλυρίδα προλιπὼν 30
> θυμὸν γυναικὸς καὶ μεγάλαν δύνασιν
> θαύμασον, οἷον ἀταρβεῖ νεῖκος ἄγει κεφαλᾷ,
> μόχθου καθύπερθε νεᾶνις
> ἦτορ ἔχοισα· φόβῳ δ' οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες.
> τίς νιν ἀνθρώπων τέκεν; ποί-
> ας δ' ἀποσπασθεῖσα φύτλας
> ὀρέων κευθμῶνας ἔχει σκιοέντων,
> γεύεται δ' ἀλκᾶς ἀπειράντου; 35
> ὁσία κλυτὰν χέρα οἱ προσενεγκεῖν
> ἦρα καὶ ἐκ λεχέων κεῖραι μελιαδέα ποίαν;'

> "Son of Philyra, coming forth from your sacred cave, marvel at the heart and great physical strength of this woman, what sort of strife she leads with a fearless head, a young woman with a heart superior to toil, and her mind is not stormtossed by fear. Who among men bore her? From what stock she has been torn that she possesses the hollows of shadowy mountains and makes trial of her boundless valor? Is it holy for me to lay my famous hand upon her and indeed to shear the honey-sweet flower from her bed?"

We might ask how Pindar imagines the relationship between Chiron and Apollo. Leonard Woodbury argues that the centaur and the deity take on the roles of a teacher and his student:

> everything depends upon the interpretation of the scene, the most memorable passage in the ode, in which Apollo seeks the advice of Cheiron concerning his love for Cyrene. He is still enrolled as a pupil in the Centaur's school for heroes, where Achilles, Asclepius, and Jason were also reared in the Greek excellences, and the authority of the wise Cheiron, and of his answer, is unquestionable, if only we could divine its meaning.[208]

The problem with this characterization is that Apollo is no mortal hero.[209] Robbins refers to "the courtesy with which Apollo, temporarily waiving his own omniscience, seeks advice

---

[207] Robbins (1978) 96.
[208] Woodbury (1972) 561-62.
[209] Jakob (1994) 429 argues that "The thesis of Woodbury, that Apollo is a pupil of Cheiron and is in need of the Centaur's advice because he has fallen in love for the first time, is not supported by the text, although it renders plausible the prolonged presence of the god on the mountain and his characterization as *Naturmensch*.

from the great teacher."[210] Perhaps we should strive to produce a reading that retains the essential identity of Apollo as an omniscient divinity. I would suggest that this exchange must be read on two levels: a literal one and a metaexegetical one that directs the audience in specific interpretive directions.

Apollo's first words to Chiron are σεμνὸν ἄντρον (30), "holy cave," the location from which the centaur arrives. The initial placement of this phrase creates the fleeting impression that the cave itself is the vocative addressee of these words, but the true vocative appears in the following clause (30, Φιλλυρίδα, "son of Philyra"), and we realize that the cave is an accusative dependent on the participle προλιπών (30), "abandoning." I contend that these moments of temporary disorientation, beginning with the identification of the two Kyrenes produced by the relative clause in the first strophe, are a defining feature of this victory ode. The organization of Pindar's text requires that the audience constantly be reevaluating and reframing the information that comes before them. Apollo's exhortation in the following lines produces another instance of this phenomenon (30-31): θυμὸν γυναικὸς καὶ μεγάλαν δύνασιν θαύμασον, "marvel at the heart and great physical strength of this woman." The imperative verb θαύμασον (31), "marvel," contains and reframes the accusative noun θύμον (30), "heart." In the shimmer of Pindar's language, Kyrene's heart becomes the centaur's capacity for wonder.[211]

Apollo asks a series of questions regarding Kyrene's identity, beginning with her parentage: τίς νιν ἀνθρώπων τέκεν (32), "Who among men bore her?" He uses simple and direct language here, but his phrasing of the second question is considerably more complex, hinting at the sexual nature of his fascination with the nymph. The aorist passive participle ἀποσπασθεῖσα (33), "torn," evinces an underlying violence. In describing Kyrene as torn from her φύτλας (33), "stock," Apollo both intimates the aggression of sexual conquest and suggests that Kyrene marks a radical break in her own lineage, the kind of break occasioned by a divine branch on the family tree.[212] The phrase ὀρέων κευθμῶνας σκιοέντων (34), "the hollows of shadowy mountains," expresses a doubled seclusion. The κευθμῶνας are themselves hiding places, and the adjective σκιοέντων emphasizes the concealed nature of the mountains. Apollo presents Kyrene's favorite haunts as ideally suited for clandestine lovemaking. Finally, the verb γεύεται (35), "she makes trial," has a sensual connotation.[213]

Apollo concludes his speech by turning subtext into text. He reveals that his interest in Kyrene has been sexual all along, asking Chiron about her erotic availability. He frames his inquiry as a matter of propriety, asking whether it is ὁσία (36), "lawful," for him to have sex with the nymph. He presents himself in an admirable light, using the phrase κλυτὰν χέρα (36), "famous hand," to characterize his divine touch. He describes the taking of her virginity as ἐκ λεχέων κεῖραι μελιαδέα ποίαν (37), "to shear the honey-sweet flower from her

---

The respect, however, the Centaur feels for the god and the admiration he shows for his omniscience do not justify a teacher-pupil relationship."

[210] Robbins (1978) 99.

[211] Apollo's description draws attention to a number of Kyrene's body parts: θύμον (30), κεφαλᾷ (31), "head," ἦτορ (32), "heart," and φρένες (32), "mind." These are all areas associated with thinking and feeling. Two of these phrases (31, ἀταρβεῖ κεφαλᾷ, "fearless head," and 32, φόβῳ δ' οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες, "and her mind is not stormtossed by fear") emphasize the absence of fear. He forms a composite picture of a woman whose corporeality serves as a barrier against unruly emotions. She even maintains her stoic resolve when faced with a lion.

[212] See Woodbury (1982) 252 for further discussion of ἀποσπασθεῖσα (33).

[213] The literal meaning of γεύομαι is "to taste."

bed," continuing the image of rupture from ἀποσπασθεῖσα (33).[214] How, then, does Pindar characterize Apollo? I would argue that he comes across as a rather devious actor, seeking permission from Chiron for an act that he already intends to commit. Woodbury's vision of Apollo as the naïve student of the venerable centaur willfully misses the undercurrent of sexual violence in this speech.[215]

Chiron laughs and offers his response (38-49):

τὸν δὲ Κένταυρος ζαμενής, ἀγανᾷ
χλ<οα>ρὸν γελάσσαις ὀφρύϊ, μῆτιν ἑάν
εὐθὺς ἀμείβετο· 'κρυπταὶ κλαῖδες ἐντὶ σοφᾶς
Πειθοῦς ἱερᾶν φιλοτάτων,
Φοῖβε, καὶ ἔν τε θεοῖς τοῦτο κἀνθρώποις ὁμῶς 40
αἰδέοντ', ἀμφανδὸν ἀδεί-
ας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶς.
καὶ γὰρ σέ, τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψεύδει θιγεῖν,
ἔτραπε μείλιχος ὀργὰ παρφάμεν τοῦ-
τον λόγον. κούρας δ' ὁπόθεν γενεάν
ἐξερωτᾷς, ὦ ἄνα; κύριον ὃς πάντων τέλος
οἶσθα καὶ πάσας κελεύθους· 45
ὅσσα τε χθὼν ἠρινὰ φύλλ' ἀναπέμπει, χὠπόσαι
ἐν θαλάσσᾳ καὶ ποταμοῖς ψάμαθοι
κύμασιν ῥιπαῖς τ' ἀνέμων κλονέονται,
χὤ τι μέλλει, χὠπόθεν
ἔσσεται, εὖ καθορᾷς.

The mighty centaur, laughing softly with a gentle brow, straightaway answered his own cunning, "Hidden are wise Persuasion's keys to holy lovemaking, Phoebus, and both gods and men feel shame at this, to engage openly for the first time in sweet love. For in fact a pleasant impulse led you, for whom it is forbidden to touch upon falsehood, to make a misleading speech. You ask from what race the girl comes, my lord? You who know the fixed end of everything and all of the roads? You see clearly how many leaves the earth sends up in spring, and how many pebbles in the sea and the rivers are driven in confusion by waves and the rush of winds, and what is about to happen, and whence it will come to be.[216]

I contend that the centaur's rebuttal, in denying the surface meaning of Apollo's address, hints at the untrustworthy nature of authoritative speech in general. To borrow a phrase from

[214] Felson Rubin (1978) 359 notes that this image communicates the notion of cultivation of land.
[215] Woodbury (1972) 565 argues that "there is nothing in Apollo's language that proposes or implies the use of violence. It is true that, much earlier, at the beginning of the myth (6), the violent verb ἅρπασ' was used of Apollo, but that occurred in a description of Cyrene's forcible abduction from the vales of Pelion to the rich land of Libya; it has nothing to say about sexual assault. It would indeed be grotesque for Apollo to make an enquiry about holiness, of the kind that all Greeks made to him at Delphi, with regard to his own commission of so brutal an act." Carey (1981) 76 takes up a similar position, but Dougherty (1993) 143 asserts that "this language is violent and must be recognized as such and not glossed over or effaced through euphemism."
[216] See Woodbury (1972) 563-64 and Carey (1981) 77 for discussion of the textual uncertainty concerning χλ<οα>ρόν (38).

critical theory, he introduces a "hermeneutics of suspicion," which offers itself as an interpretive lens through which to read the victory ode as a whole.

Let me take a moment to clarify my claims before turning to a close reading of Chiron's speech. The "hermeneutics of suspicion," a phrase attributed to Paul Ricoeur, refers to "a distinctively modern style of interpretation that circumvents obvious or self-evident meanings in order to draw out less visible and less flattering truths."[217] Chiron's response follows a similar interpretive model in ignoring the stated significance of Apollo's words and imputing to them ulterior motives. Pindar, then, as I have been suggesting about direct speech throughout this chapter, uses the centaur's riposte to offer up suspicion as a mode of exegesis that might be applied to Pythian 9. Rita Felski describes a similar phenomenon in which modern authors flag their own works for suspicious interpretation:

> Narrative ellipses, ironic juxtapositions, and stylistic or tonal incongruities serve as red flags that we are not to take words on trust. Suspicion is invited—indeed demanded—by a text, as the only feasible way of dealing with implausible statements, shaky rationalizations, or clashing perspectives. Literary works thus train their readers in a hermeneutic of suspicion—a hermeneutic that can subsequently be put into play in order to query the sacrosanct authority of these same works.[218]

I would argue that the suspicious tenor of Chiron's speech is meant to alert us to the idea that we cannot necessarily take Pindar's narration at face value.

How exactly does Chiron attack the credibility of Apollo's address? His first response is to laugh (38, γελάσσαις, "laughing"), recalling the laughter of Zeus and Apollo himself at the equally devious Hermes in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*.[219] The centaur's first words concern persuasive speech (39): κρυπταὶ κλαΐδες ἐντὶ σοφᾶς Πειθοῦς ἱερᾶν φιλοτάτων, "Hidden are wise Persuasion's keys to holy lovemaking."[220] The adjective κρυπταί (39) draws attention to Apollo's rhetoric of concealment. Chiron contrasts the wisdom of this concealment to the shame experienced by everyone in making love ἀμφανδόν (41), "openly." These initial lines establish the central opposition between what lies hidden and what is manifest.

Chiron asserts that a μείλιχος ὀργά (43), "pleasant impulse," drove Apollo παρφάμεν τοῦτον λόγον (43), "to make a misleading speech." This is the substance of the accusation. He picks up Apollo's earlier preoccupation with propriety (36, ὁσία, "lawful") by referring to him as someone τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψεύδει θιγεῖν (42), "for whom it is forbidden to touch upon falsehood." The infinitive verb θιγεῖν (42) recalls κλυτὰν χέρα προσενεγκεῖν (36), "to lay my famous hand upon." The centaur, then, responds to Apollo's request to touch the nymph with a prohibition against a rhetorical form of handsiness.

Chiron's next move is to cast doubt upon the seriousness of Apollo's questions. He addresses him respectfully with the vocative ἄνα (44), "lord," but his tone expresses

---

[217] Felski (2012). Scholars often claim that the "hermeneutics of suspicion" first appeared in Ricoeur's book *Freud and Philosophy* (1977), but Scott-Baumann (2009) 59-77 demonstrates that the genealogy of the phrase is more complicated.
[218] Felski (2015) 43.
[219] See *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 389 for Zeus and 420 for Apollo.
[220] See Winnington-Ingram (1969) 10-11, Woodbury (1972) 567-68, and Carey (1981) 77-78 for further discussion of this expression.

incredulity. Was Apollo really curious about Kyrene's lineage? The centaur renders this idea ridiculous by rehearsing the countless forms of the deity's omniscience.[221] Apollo sees κύριον πάντων τέλος (44), "the fixed end of everything," and πάσας κελεύθους (45), "all of the roads." The phrase πάσας κελεύθους (45) imagines Apollo, like Pindar, as we saw in the last chapter, overlooking the vast topography of mythological events. He knows the number of leaves brought forth in spring and the quantity of pebbles in the sea. Chiron returns to the notion of divination, adding that Apollo understands the future and its causes. What, then, was the point of the deity's speech? Why was he asking questions to which he knew the answers? Following the centaur's lead, we assume an attitude of suspicion toward everything that comes next.

Chiron follows his rebuttal by prophesying Apollo's marriage to Kyrene (51-58):

ἐρέω· ταύτᾳ πόσις ἵκεο βᾶσσαν
τάνδε, καὶ μέλλεις ὑπὲρ πόντου
Διὸς ἔξοχον ποτὶ κᾶπον ἐνεῖκαι·
ἔνθα νιν ἀρχέπολιν θήσεις, ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀγείραις
νασιώταν ὄχθον ἐς ἀμφίπεδον·
νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότνιά σοι Λιβύα 55
δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσέοις
πρόφρων· ἵνα οἱ χθονὸς αἶσαν
αὐτίκα συντελέθειν ἔννομον δωρήσεται,
οὔτε παγκάρπων φυτῶν νά-
ποινον οὔτ' ἀγνῶτα θηρῶν.

I will tell you. You came to this glen as her husband, and you are about to bring her over the sea to the supreme orchard of Zeus, where you will make her ruler of a city, after gathering together the island people to the hill surrounded by plains, but now mistress Libya with her broad meadows will gladly receive your famous bride in her golden home, where she will immediately give to her a dispensation of land to be counted as her lawful possession, neither without share of plants bearing all kinds of fruit, nor ignorant of wild animals.

The centaur begins with a strong expression of his own authority: ἐρέω (51), "I will tell you." He describes Apollo's actions paratactically, keeping the verbs ἵκεο (51), "you came," and μέλλεις ἐνεῖκαι (52), "you are about to bring," parallel to one another, but I would argue that this construction conceals an implied purpose clause: you came in order to bring her. In shifting between these two discursive modes, his words acquire a certain reifying effect. In announcing the things that Apollo will do, Chiron speaks them into being. He asserts that Apollo will establish Kyrene as ἀρχέπολιν (54), "ruler of a city," after gathering together the λαὸν νασιώταν (54-55), "island people." We realize at this point that this prophecy of marriage serves to mythologize the colonization of Kyrene. Dougherty describes the aspects of this mythologization:

[221] Winnington-Ingram (1969) 11 notes that "The question about Cyrene's parentage he never answers at all, but leaves to the omniscience of the god."

> Chiron's reassuring response presents the flip side and describes both marriage and colonization as fruitful and productive institutions. No mention of any violence or conflict between Greeks and indigenous peoples here; instead the native landscape is personified as Lady Libya, graciously receiving the famous nymph within her golden halls; she gives her as a wedding gift title to the land which is productive of all kinds of fruits and flocks.[222]

Chiron emphasizes the kindly relationship between Libya and Kyrene, which is defined by Libya's generosity. Colonization is imagined here as a form of aristocratic (and in this case divine) gift exchange.

This prophecy functions somewhat differently from other prophecies that appear in victory odes, which often exploit the varying levels of knowledge possessed by the mythological characters and the audience of the performance. Isthmian 8, for instance, leverages our awareness that Achilles is the destined son of Thetis. Zeus and Poseidon hear in her words a simple warning, but we hear a premonition of the *Iliad*.[223] The problem with Chiron's prophecy is that everyone already possesses the relevant information. There is no reason to explain the future to Apollo, who, as the centaur has shown, is omniscient.[224] The audience has also heard an abbreviated version of this material in Pindar's narration from the first strophe. Chiron even echoes Pindar's language: ἐνεῖκαι (53), "to bring," corresponds to ἔνεικέ (6), "he carried," θήσεις (54), "you will make," follows θῆκε (7), "he established," and οὔτε παγκάρπων φυτῶν νάποινον οὔτ' ἀγνῶτα θηρῶν (57-58), "neither without share of plants bearing all kinds of fruit, nor ignorant of wild animals," is an elaboration upon πολυμήλου καὶ πολυκαρποτάτας (6-7), "flock-rich and fruitful." I contend that the primary function of this prophecy is to locate the narrative origin of the colonization of Kyrene, in Pindar's account, in the mythological past.

Framing the colonization of Kyrene as a prophecy lends added authority to the account. Kyrene requires a place in the mythological tradition, and the centaur's prophecy does the work of establishing that place.[225] In this moment of retroactive mythmaking Pindar demonstrates the subtlety of his poetic technique, but he also provides the tools to detect his moment of invention. Chiron transitions awkwardly from claiming that Apollo's questions were disingenuous to describing for him his future marriage to Kyrene. The same logic that denies the legitimacy of the deity's questions also undercuts the motivation for this prophecy.[226] I would argue that Pindar is winking here at the artificiality of his own narrative. He and Apollo, as Kyrene's twin abductors (the one on the level of discourse, the other literally), both seem to derive a sense of pleasure from the performance of fictionality. Apollo understands that he will eventually whisk Kyrene away to "the lovely and flourishing third root of the continent." Why, then, does he mask his intentions? He knows that there is a thrill in the lie.

---

[222] Dougherty (1993) 145.
[223] Slatkin (1991) argues that Themis' prophecy articulates the suppressed cosmological stakes that underlie the narrative of the *Iliad.*
[224] Carey (1981) 77 notes that "Chiron's 'advice' is in fact what he and Apollo know to be fated."
[225] See Calame (2014) for a broader discussion of the mythological tradition surrounding the foundation of Kyrene.
[226] Carey (1981) 80 contends that Chiron's delivery of a prophecy to Apollo is merely ironic, rather than a logical fallacy.

Chiron ends his prophecy with a mention of Aristaios, the immortal son born from Kyrene and Apollo (59-65):

τόθι παῖδα τέξεται, ὃν κλυτὸς Ἑρμᾶς
εὐθρόνοις Ὥραισι καὶ Γαίᾳ 60
ἀνελὼν φίλας ὑπὸ ματέρος οἴσει.
ταὶ δ' ἐπιγουνίδιον θαησάμεναι βρέφος αὐταῖς,
νέκταρ ἐν χείλεσσι καὶ ἀμβροσίαν
στάξοισι, θήσονταί τέ νιν ἀθάνατον,
Ζῆνα καὶ ἁγνὸν Ἀπόλλων', ἀνδράσι χάρμα φίλοις
ἄγχιστον ὀπάονα μήλων,
Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον, τοῖς δ' Ἀρισταῖον καλεῖν. 65

There she will bear a child, whom famous Hermes, taking up from beneath his mother, will bring to the Horai with their splendid thrones and Gaia, and marveling at the baby, as he lies on their knees, they will drip nectar and ambrosia on his lips, and they will make him immortal, Zeus and holy Apollo, a delight to men whom he loves, nearest companion of flocks, Agreus and Nomios, and called Aristaios by others."

We again find ourselves in the difficult position of not knowing how much of the tradition articulated in this account existed before Pythian 9. I would argue that Aristaios was likely the traditional son of Apollo and the Thessalian nymph Kyrene. Dougherty notes that "In later literature, Aristaeus has no connection with Libya; in fact, even in Pindar's account, he is immediately taken back to Greece."[227] I suggest that we might view this description of the birth as Aristaios as a conventional cap on what has been an especially innovative telling of the foundation of Kyrene. Hermes is to bring the infant to the Horai and Gaia, who will make him immortal: νέκταρ ἐν χείλεσσι καὶ ἀμβροσίαν στάξοισι, θήσονταί τέ νιν ἀθάνατον (63), "they will drip nectar and ambrosia on his lips, and they will make him immortal."[228] Assuming a number of names and epithets, Aristaios will become a bucolic deity (64, ἄγχιστον ὀπάονα μήλων, "nearest companion of flocks").[229] Chiron, then, concludes his prophecy by returning to the Thessalian traditions surrounding Kyrene and her son.[230]

Pindar ends his mythological narration by recounting the fulfillment of Chiron's prophecy (65-70):

ὣς ἄρ' εἰπὼν ἔντυεν τερ-
πνὰν γάμου κραίνειν τελευτάν.
ὠκεῖα δ' ἐπειγομένων ἤδη θεῶν
πρᾶξις ὁδοί τε βραχεῖαι. κεῖνο κεῖν' ἆ-
μαρ διαίτασεν· θαλάμῳ δὲ μίγεν
ἐν πολυχρύσῳ Λιβύας· ἵνα καλλίσταν πόλιν

[227] Dougherty (1993) 147.
[228] Robbins (1978) 101 notes that "Gaia is the great-grandmother of Kyrene" and the Horai "are especially suitable to civilization."
[229] See Woodbury (1982) 256-58 for further discussion of these epithets.
[230] Carey (1981) 84 and Robbins (1978) 100, citing Servius' note on *Georgics* 1.14, demonstate that Pindar's description of Aristaios is derived from Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women*.

ἀμφέπει κλεινάν τ' ἀέθλοις. 70

> Having spoken thus he incited Apollo to make delightful fulfillment of the marriage. Accomplishment is swift when the gods are already in haste and short are the roads. That very day brought the matter to a conclusion, and they mingled in the golden chamber of Libya, where she looks after a most beautiful city and one famous for contests.

This passage marks the third statement of the settlement of Kyrene in Libya, which may be Pindar's individual contribution to the tradition of Apollo and Kyrene. The first and most oblique of these occurs in the opening strophe. Pindar refrains from mentioning Libya by name, but refers instead to ῥίζαν ἀπείρου τρίταν εὐήρατον θάλλοισαν (7-8), "the lovely and flourishing third root of the continent." The second takes place during Chiron's prophetic speech (55-56): νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότνιά σοι Λιβύα δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσέοις πρόφρων, "but now mistress Libya with her broad meadows will gladly receive your famous bride in her golden home." In this third and final statement Pindar reiterates the detail of Libya's golden abode (68-70): θαλάμῳ δὲ μίγεν ἐν πολυχρύσῳ Λιβύας, "and they mingled in the golden chamber of Libya." In calling the city of Kyrene καλλίσταν κλεινάν τ' ἀέθλοις (69-70), "most beautiful and famous for contests," he departs from mythological time and returns to that of Telesikrates and his athletic achievement.

The exchange between Apollo and Chiron is crucial to the interpretation of this victory ode. Pindar makes the connection between the city of Kyrene and the nymph of the same name in the opening strophe, using a relative clause to draw attention to his own creativity in the service of colonial ideology. In the mythological narrative that follows, he envisions Apollo as a similarly devious figure, who also indulges in moments of fictionality, feigning a position of ignorance in relation to Kyrene. Chiron responds by employing the "hermeneutics of suspicion," denying the apparent meaning of Apollo's address, and accusing him of deceptive speech. The centaur's cynical approach to Apollo's words models an interpretive method that might be applied in turn to the victory ode as a whole. Chiron cites Apollo's omniscience as his primary argument against the deity's position of ignorance, but his own decision to deliver a prophecy violates this same logic. Following the centaur's lead, we are forced to ask what other work this prophetic speech might be doing. Pindar uses Chiron's prophecy to situate his own account of Apollo's abduction and colonial establishment of Kyrene as a preordained event in the mythological record. Why does he draw our attention to the logical tears in this fictionalized tapestry? I would argue that he wants us to appreciate the cleverness of his invention. Chiron's speech offers the ultimate acknowledgment that this victory ode is engaged in a fundamentally narcissistic task. Lacking a mythological tradition with which to praise the city of Kyrene, Pindar blends the tale of Apollo's rape of a homophonous nymph with the colonial history of the city in question, but rather than hiding this labor, he includes the tools by which we might appreciate his spirit of inventiveness. Pythian 9 celebrates the poet alongside the accomplishments of his victorious patron.

Direct speech provides Bacchylides and Pindar the opportunity to dictate the ways in which their victory odes will be understood. The interactions between mythological characters often constitute a sort of commentary that is applicable beyond the immediate context of the conversation in question. These astonishing moments, in which heroes and

divinities speak through the voice of a local chorus, allow the poets to shape mythological reality in ways that reflect their own individual sensibilities. The words of a Chiron or Meleager have the advantage of appearing distinct from the narrating voice, but they articulate the same poetic vision. These speeches and the interstices between them gesture toward structures of meaning that could not have been conveyed otherwise. Like masks, they afford a crucial measure of distance from the audience. We have looked at two victory odes in this chapter that exemplify the power of direct speech to communicate the interpretive agenda of the poet.

Bacchylides 5 is a poem boiling over with affective and emotional energies. Meleager's speech is composed in such a way as to create a heightened feeling of victimization while downplaying his culpability for the deaths of his uncles. Herakles' tearful reaction to Meleager's account demonstrates to the audience that an intensely emotional response is appropriate and even desired. In the final lines of this mythological narrative, Bacchylides raises the stakes by combining the affective response of pathetic identification with an intellectual awareness of Herakles' doomed fate. Bacchylides, then, conducts his audience through a symphony of emotions evoked by the speeches of Meleager and Herakles.

In contrast, Pindar uses direct speech in Pythian 9 to highlight the fictionality of his own mythological account. In combining Apollo's rape of a Thessalian nymph with the colonial history of a city in Libya, he fashions a narrative designed to meet the ideological requirements of the occasion. Chiron's speech serves to acknowledge the artificiality of Pindar's invention, but also nods toward its ingenuity. In assuming an attitude of suspicion toward the faulty logic of Chiron's prophecy, the audience comes to recognize the clever mythological edifice that Pindar has constructed.

The two poets employ direct speech in markedly different ways but toward the same ends of guiding interpretation in specific directions. Bacchylides' approach depends upon the production of affective and emotional responses, whereas Pindar is engaged in a more intellectual undertaking. In both cases, direct speech allows the poet to recede into the background, but he maintains control over our understanding from afar. We listen to the words of these heroes and divinities, taking in the splendor of their cadence, but the poet is always guiding us. He remains the puppeteer, pulling the strings of meaning according to his own wishes.

Chapter Three

The Open Ending

The publication of Sappho's "Tithonus Poem" in 2004 stimulated a number of scholarly controversies, including the question of the poem's completeness.[231] The "Tithonus Poem" consists of twelve lines composed in an aeolic metrical form (1-12):

ὕμμες πεδὰ Μοίcαν ἰ]ο̣κ[ό]λ̣πων κάλα δῶρα, παῖδες,
cπουδάcδετε καὶ τὰ]ν̣ φιλάοιδον λιγύραν χελύνναν·

ἔμοι δ' ἄπαλον πρίν] π̣ο̣τ' [ἔ]ο̣ντα χρόα γῆρας ἤδη
ἐπέλλαβε, λεῦκαι δ' ἐγ]ένοντο τρίχες ἐκ μελαίναν·

βάρυc δέ μ' ὀ [θ]ῦμ̣ο̣c πεπόηται, γόνα δ' [ο]ὐ φέροιcι, 5
τὰ δή ποτα λαίψηρ' ἔον ὄρχηcθ' ἴcα νεβρίοιcι.

τὰ ⟨μὲν⟩ cτεναχίcδω θαμέωc· ἀλλὰ τί κεν ποείην;
ἀγήραον ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ' οὐ δύνατον γένεcθαι.

καὶ γάρ π̣[ο]τ̣α̣ Τίθωνον ἔφαντο βροδόπαχυν Αὔων
ἔρωι φ̣. α̣θ̣ειcαν βάμεν' εἰc ἔcχατα γᾶc φέροιcα[ν, 10

ἔοντα̣ [κ]ά̣λ̣ο̣ν καὶ νέον, ἀλλ' αὖτον ὕμωc ἔμαρψε
χρόνωι π̣ό̣λ̣ι̣ο̣ν γῆρας, ἔχ[ο]ν̣τ' ἀθανάταν ἄκοιτιν.

Hasten after the beautiful gifts of the violet-bosomed Muses, my children, and the shrill tortoise shell lyre that loves song. But now old age has seized my skin that once was tender, and my hair has become white from black. And my heart has been made heavy, and my knees fail to support me, which once were light to dance like fawns. I often bewail these things, but what can I do? It is impossible for a human being to be ageless. For in fact they used to say that rosy-armed Dawn, smitten by love, travelled

[231] For the editio princeps of the papyrus fragment containing the "Tithonus Poem," some of which was already known as Sappho fr. 58, see Daniel and Gronewald (2004a) and (2004b). I use Voigt's numeration for the fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus.

> to the ends of the earth carrying Tithonus, who was beautiful and young, but nevertheless gray old age overtook him in time, having an immortal wife.[232]

Sappho appears to conclude the poem with a mythological exemplum recounting the marriage of Eos and Tithonus (9-12), but scholars were immediately troubled by the open nature of the ending, that is, the fact that the poem terminates without returning from the mythological exemplum to the voice of the poet. Hans Bernsdorff defended the completeness of the "Tithonus Poem," proposing several parallels from Pindar and Horace.[233] Lowell Edmunds responded to Bernsdorff's suggestion by asserting that

> Pindar is the wrong place in which to look. Dionysius of Halicarnassus took Pindar and Sappho to represent opposite kinds of style, and Horace is likely to be reflecting this view in *Odes* 4.2. Although both Pindar and Sappho are "lyric" poets, they differ in time, place, dialect, meters, and performance venue, thus also, I assume, in the use of the mythical exemplum. In this last respect, some differences are immediately obvious. First, the opening and closing formulas of the Pindaric mythical narrative are strikingly different from those in monody. Second, the myth in Pindar tends to be more allusive and to be complexly related to the historical reality to which it refers.[234]

Is Edmunds correct in his "assumption" about the use of mythological exempla?

It is certainly the case that Pindar and Sappho diverged from each other in all of the respects that Edmunds mentions, but I would argue that Pindar's treatment of mythology still owes much to Sappho and Alcaeus. Pindar's truncated narrative approach might have its basis in the telescoped accounts of the Lesbian poets. Drew Griffith argues that "Pindaric narrative is dominated by summary," which distinguishes it from the more expansive style of epic.[235] Nemean 1, for instance, compresses the entire scope of Herakles' eternal existence within its mythological account. Alcaeus fr. 42 similarly condenses the action of the Trojan War into a mere sixteen lines, highlighting the figures of Helen and Thetis.[236] Perhaps the open ending is another narrative feature inherited by Pindar from his Lesbian predecessors.[237]

What, then, is the significance of the open ending in the victory ode? I would argue that Pindar viewed it as an experimental formal device that might be applied upon a broader canvas. Edmunds cites the paucity of attestations of the open ending in Sappho and Alcaeus as an argument against the completeness of the "Tithonus Poem," but the open ending should be rare.[238] This method of termination acquires much of its power from the element of

---

[232] There is some disagreement about how to describe the meter of the "Tithonus Poem." West (2005) 1 classifies the metrical structure as "hagesichoreans with choriambic expansion," but Lidov (2009) 104 calls the line "an acephalous hipponactean with a double choriambic expansion." I provide the supplements suggested by West (2005) 5.

[233] Bernsdorff (2005) 2-5. He cites Pindar O. 4, N. 1, *Pae*. 4, and Horace *Epod*. 13, *Carm*. 1.7, 1.8, 3.11, and 3.27.

[234] Edmunds (2009) 59.

[235] Griffith (1993) 618.

[236] For discussion of Alcaeus fr. 42, see Burnett (1983) 190-98 and Caprioli (2012).

[237] Rutherford (1997) 55 makes a similar suggestion.

[238] Edmunds (2009) 59-61 discusses Sappho frs. 16 and 17 and Alcaeus frs. 38A, 42, 44, and 298, eliminating all but Sappho fr. 16 and Alcaeus frs. 42 and 44 from consideration as genuine instances.

surprise. The point is that most mythological exempla conclude with a comment by the poet articulating the terms of the comparison, but the refusal to provide closure upsets the accustomed expectation, making the final image of the poem persist in the minds of the audience.

Pindar is careful to select uncommonly powerful moments and images to occupy this terminal position. We should note that the open ending entails a compromise of sorts in that the strength of the conclusion is achieved at the cost of a certain amount of lucidity. The poet negates the audience's ability to draw the strands of the victory ode back together. The effect of the typical ending is to resettle the audience in the present day of the victory celebration. The mythological world dissolves, replaced by the victor's contemporary concerns, perhaps embodied by a wish for future athletic success or a remembrance of ancestral achievements. This form of closure allows the audience to process the winding course of the complex poem that has preceded. The open ending, on the other hand, eschews a comfortable resolution, fixing upon a single moment in mythological time. Nemean 10, for instance, concludes with the resurrection of Kastor. Pindar describes how he opened his eyes and his voice returned to him. This is a startling vision of restoration that almost simultaneously bursts into existence and disappears. Pindar opts for disorientation at the close of these victory odes, because the power of the image demands this placement.

I would add that Edmunds was right to note the distinctions in performance type between the victory odes of Pindar and the surviving poems of Sappho and Alcaeus. We should remember that the Lesbian poets composed for solo performance in more intimate venues. The transition from monody to chorality would only have increased the possibilities for formal experimentation using the open ending. Firstly, the triadic forms of choral poetry provide fixed structures by which to manipulate the expectations of the audience. The familiar sequence of strophe, antistrophe, and epode creates a basic understanding of how a victory ode should proceed. Olympian 4, for instance, defies convention by confining the entire mythological account to its lone epode. Secondly, the amplification of scale brought about by the larger number of voices and the longer lengths of the poems heightens the ultimate impact of the open ending. The mythological narratives that conclude Nemean 1 and Nemean 10 play out over the course of multiple triads. The "Tithonus Poem," by contrast, lasts a mere twelve lines. These victory odes, buoyed by a cascade of voices, allow audiences to invest in the development of an expansive tale that refuses to be contained within a frame.

This chapter considers the open endings of Olympian 4, Nemean 1, and Nemean 10. I begin with Olympian 4, which celebrates the victory of Psaumis of Kamarina in the chariot race at Olympia in 452 BCE. I argue that Pindar designed this poem to induce maximal perplexity. Starting with a discussion of the triad structure and the unique role of the epode therein, I demonstrate that by making the entire epode an account of Erginos' mythological victory in the race in armor, which closes with a direct speech, Pindar upends all expectations about how a victory ode should conclude. My second case study is Nemean 1, written for the chariot victory at Nemea of Chromios of Aetna sometime after 476 BCE. I contend that Pindar calibrates the metrical structures of this victory ode to counterbalance the disorientation caused by the open ending, which imagines Herakles' immortal existence on Olympos. My final case study is Nemean 10, which honors the accomplishments of the wrestler Theaios of Argos. I maintain that this victory ode is obsessed with closure. Nemean 10 explores a series of constraints upon speech, repurposing them as thematic fodder for a

mythological account of the death and deification of Kastor, but ultimately subverts the notion of closure by ending with the promise of speech.

Olympian 4

Olympian 4 represents an ideal starting point for a discussion of the open ending in the victory ode. The poem, which the ancient evidence assigns to the chariot victory at Olympia of Psaumis of Kamarina in 452 BCE, concludes with a narrative of Erginos' victory in the race in armor at the contest staged by Hypsipyle on Lemnos.[239] Olympian 4 consists of a single triad, and devotes the epode to the mythological account (1-27):

Ἐλατὴρ ὑπέρτατε βροντᾶς ἀκαμαντόποδος
Ζεῦ· τεαὶ γὰρ Ὧραι
ὑπὸ ποικιλοφόρμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς ἑλισσόμεναί μ' ἔπεμψαν
ὑψηλοτάτων μάρτυρ' ἀέθλων·
ξείνων δ' εὖ πρασσόντων
ἔσαναν αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαν ποτὶ γλυκεῖαν ἐσλοί· 5
ἀλλὰ Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς Αἴτναν ἔχεις
ἵππον ἀνεμόεσσαν ἑκατογκεφάλα
Τυφῶνος ὀβρίμου,
Οὐλυμπιονίκαν
δέξαι Χαρίτων θ' ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον,

χρονιώτατον φάος εὐρυσθενέων ἀρετᾶν. 10
Ψαύμιος γὰρ ἵκει
ὀχέων, ὃς ἐλαίᾳ στεφανωθεὶς Πισάτιδι κῦδος ὄρσαι
σπεύδει Καμαρίνᾳ. θεὸς εὔφρων
εἴη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς·
ἐπεί νιν αἰνέω, μάλα μὲν τροφαῖς ἑτοῖμον ἵππων,
χαίροντά τε ξενίαις πανδόκοις, 15
καὶ πρὸς Ἡσυχίαν φιλόπολιν καθαρᾷ
γνώμᾳ τετραμμένον.
οὐ ψεύδεϊ τέγξω
λόγον· διάπειρά τοι βροτῶν ἔλεγχος·

ἅπερ Κλυμένοιο παῖδα
Λαμνιάδων γυναικῶν ἔλυσεν ἐξ ἀτιμίας. 20
χαλκ<έοι>σι δ' ἐν ἔντεσι νικῶν δρόμον
ἔειπεν Ὑψιπυλείᾳ μετὰ στέφανον ἰών·

[239] P. Oxy. 222, col. ii, 22, P. Oxy. 2438, 14-18, Drachmann i 128, Drachmann i 129, Drachmann i 130, Drachmann i 139, Drachmann i 144. Mader (1990) 14 and Barrett (2007) 38-46 argue that both Olympian 4 and Olympian 5 honor Psaumis' victory in the mule car race at Olympia in 456 BCE.

‘οὗτος ἐγὼ ταχυτᾶτι·
χεῖρες δὲ καὶ ἦτορ ἴσον. φύονται δὲ καὶ νέοις 25
ἐν ἀνδράσιν πολιαί
θαμάκι παρὰ τὸν ἁλικίας ἐοικότα χρόνον.’

Highest driver of thunder untiring of foot, Zeus; for the Horai twirling under song with its ornamented phorminx sent me as a witness of loftiest contests, and when their guest friends do well noble men immediately gladden at the sweet message. But Kronos’ son, you who hold Aitna, windy weight of hundred-headed mighty Typhos, receive on account of the Graces this revel of victory at Olympia, most enduring light of virtues wide in strength. For it comes in honor of Psaumis’ chariot, who, crowned with the olive of Pisa, hastens to stir up fame for Kamarina. May a god be favorable to his future prayers, since I praise him as exceedingly eager in the raising of horses, rejoicing in all kinds of hospitality, and turned toward city-loving Hesychia with a clear mind. I will not wet my speech with falsehood. Perseverance is the test of mortals, which released the son of Klymenos from the Lemnian women’s dishonor. And winning the race in bronze armor he said to Hypsipyle while going after the crown, “Such am I in swiftness, and my hands and heart are equal. But even among young men gray hairs often grow contrary to the suitable time of life.”[240]

We should consider the structure of the triad. The sequence of strophe and antistrophe introduces a familiar element of repetition, allowing the audience to orient itself within the context of a novel metrical scheme, but the epode is distinct. William Mullen has observed that

> the epode must have stood out from the strophe and antistrophe in some kind of relief, since though it shared the same general kind of meter with them it formed its own separate pattern. The nature of Pindar’s metrical art makes this particularly easy to grasp. Every Pindaric epode is composed in the same general kind of meter as the strophe and antistrophe that precede it, but every one of its periods will be different not only from each other but also from each of the periods in the strophe and antistrophe as well.[241]

I would add that the epode is a locus of uncertainty. It is impossible for the audience to predict the exact shape of the initial epode or to determine whether another triad will follow the termination of each individual epode. Pindar exploits these two metrical uncertainties to heighten the effect produced by the conclusion of Olympian 4.

The lone epode of Olympian 4 begins with a relative clause referring back to the gnomic statement that closes the antistrophe. Pindar had declared that διάπειρά τοι βροτῶν ἔλεγχος (18), “Perseverance is the test of mortals,” a sentiment applicable both to Psaumis’ victory in the chariot race and Erginos’ triumph in the mythological race in armor. The structure here is comparable to that of the “Tithonus Poem,” in which the gnomic statement ἀγήραον ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ’ οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι (8), “It is impossible for a human being to be

[240] The other victory odes that consist of a single triad are O. 11, 12, P. 7, and I. 3.
[241] Mullen (1982) 91.

ageless," immediately precedes the introduction of the exemplum. Sappho had used the particle sequence καὶ γάρ (9), "For in fact," to articulate the logical connection between the gnomic statement and the exemplum, and the relative pronoun ἅπερ (19), "which," serves a similar function in Olympian 4, tying its antecedent, διάπειρά (18), to Erginos' behavior.[242]

We should note the extraordinary allusiveness of the mythological narrative that closes Olympian 4. Pindar declares that persistence, the virtue celebrated in the gnomic statement at the end of the antistrophe, freed Erginos Λαμνιάδων γυναικῶν ἐξ ἀτιμίας (20), "from the Lemnian women's dishonor," but he never names him directly, instead calling him Κλυμένοιο παῖδα (19), "the son of Klymenos."[243] The mentions of Λαμνιάδων γυναικῶν (20) and later Ὑψιπυλείᾳ (22), "Hypsipyle," are the only indications that this incident even occurred during the Argonauts' visit to the island of Lemnos.[244] What is the nature of the ἀτιμίας (20) inflicted upon Erginos by the Lemnian women? Pindar waits until the final lines of the victory ode to offer an indirect explanation (25-27), suggesting that they taunted him on account of his grey hair. The allusiveness of the narration complements the uncertain nature of the epode as a metrical structure.

Pindar offsets some of this uncertainty by depicting Erginos as a victor, establishing a clear parallel between the Argonaut and Psaumis. The prepositional phrase χαλκέοισι ἐν ἔντεσι (22), "in bronze armor," which modifies the noun δρόμον (22), "the race," communicates the athletic event in which Erginos achieved success. Pindar had alluded to Psaumis' chariot victory earlier in the poem with the expressions Ψαύμιος γὰρ ἵκει ὀχέων (10-11), "For it comes in honor of Psaumis' chariot," and μάλα μὲν τροφαῖς ἑτοῖμον ἵππων (14), "exceedingly eager in the raising of horses." Following his victory Erginos acquires a στέφανον (23), "the crown," which recalls the aorist passive participle στεφανωθείς (11), "crowned," used by Pindar to relate Psaumis' adornment with ἐλαίᾳ Πισάτιδι (11), "the olive of Pisa." The presentation of Erginos as a victor on the model of Psaumis relieves some of the confusion surrounding this mythological account, although Erginos' response to Hypsipyle threatens to end Olympian 4 on a note of obscurity.

The victory ode concludes with a direct speech by Erginos, which the aorist verb ἔειπεν (23), "said," introduces. He begins with the assertion οὗτος ἐγὼ ταχυτᾶτι (24), "Such am I in swiftness." The referent of the demonstrative adjective οὗτος (24), which stands in for τοιοῦτος, "such as this," is unclear at first, until we realize that he is speaking in the immediate wake of his victory.[245] He means that he is a winner as far as speed is concerned. He also commends the sturdiness of his own physique, singling out his χεῖρες (25), "hands," and ἦτορ (25), "heart."[246] He finishes with the clever observation that φύονται καὶ νέοις ἐν ἀνδράσιν πολιαί θαμάκι παρὰ τὸν ἁλικίας ἐοικότα χρόνον (25-27), "even among young men

---

[242] Bonifazi (2004) 47 notes of the mythological passages of Pindar's victory odes that "γάρ is the particle that introduces mythical sections without a relative pronoun, for example in *Ol*. 7.27—with καί—and in *Pyth*. 4.70."
[243] For discussion of Erginos' position within the mythological tradition, see Gerber (1987) 21-22 and Kowalzig (2007) 366-67.
[244] Cf. P. 4.252-54.
[245] Gildersleeve (1885) ad loc. suggests that "Erginos is slightly out of breath."
[246] Gerber (1987) 23 notes that "One might have thought that in this context Pindar would have mentioned πόδες rather than χεῖρες, but the latter has primarily a general rather than a specific reference, i.e., it is not Erginos' literal hands that are stressed (although the race in armour involved the carrying of a shield), but his overall strength."

gray hairs often grow contrary to the suitable time of life."[247] I would argue that this response, in addition to providing a retort to the ἀτιμίας (20), "dishonor," directed at him by the Lemnian women, offers a metapoetic comment on the sudden ending of the victory ode. The phrase παρὰ τὸν ἁλικίας ἐοικότα χρόνον (27) applies both to the unexpected termination of Olympian 4 and Erginos' premature emergence as a silver fox.

How surprising would this ending have been to the original audience? I would begin by noting that no other victory ode closes with direct mythological speech.[248] The commencement of such an address in the latter half of the initial epode would have indicated to the audience that a second triad was likely to follow. Mullen notes that "Apart from the five odes of a single triad and P.4 with its prodigious thirteen, all Pindar's other triadic epinicians consist of three, four, or five triads."[249] The audience would, then, have had reason to expect the poem to continue for at least two more triads. Pindar must have understood that by ending Olympian 4 within an obscure speech inside a particularly allusive exemplum he was designing the poem to bring about maximal perplexity.

Nemean 1

Nemean 1, written to celebrate the victory of Chromios of Aetna in the chariot race at Nemea sometime after 476 BCE, is an unusual victory ode in a number of respects.[250] Like Olympian 4 and Nemean 10, this poem ends within a mythological narration, but Nemean 1 pushes the limits of framing even further by concluding with a prophecy uttered in indirect discourse. Starting with an account of Hera's attempted murder of the infant Herakles, Pindar uses the prophet Teiresias to envision the entire scope of his immortal existence. The open ending, in refusing to close the narrative loop, stresses the eternal nature of Herakles' posthumous fate, but also poses a problem by preventing Pindar from explaining the terms of the exemplum. I suggest that Pindar manipulates the metrical structures of the victory ode to articulate a comparison of Chromios and Herakles, harnessing the four triads of Nemean 1 like a chariot team.

The first strophe establishes an essential metaphor of the victory ode as a chariot. Pindar begins the poem by invoking Ortygia, a small island located in the Sicilian city of Syracuse (1-7):

> Ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφεοῦ,
> κλεινᾶν Συρακοσσᾶν θάλος Ὀρτυγία,
> δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος,

---

[247] For discussion of the seldom taken position that Pindar voices these words, see Mader (1990) 56-58, Gerber (1987) 23, and Nicholson (2011) 106.

[248] Nemean 1, as I discuss below, concludes with indirect speech, but no other victory ode than Olympian 4 concludes with direct speech. For further discussion of direct mythological speech, see chapter two.

[249] Mullen (1982) 92.

[250] For discussion of the date of Nemean 1, see Carey (1981) 104, Braswell (1992) 26-27, Luraghi (1994) 339 n. 285, Morrison (2007) 23-24, and Morrison (2012) 117 n. 23.

Δάλου κασιγνήτα, σέθεν ἁδυεπής
ὕμνος ὁρμᾶται θέμεν 5
αἶνον ἀελλοπόδων
μέγαν ἵππων, Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου χάριν·
ἅρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου Νεμέα
τ' ἔργμασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος.

Holy resting place of the Alpheos, Ortygia, scion of famous Syracuse, bed of Artemis, sister of Delos, from you a sweet-sounding song rushes forth to render great praise of storm-footed horses, in honor of Zeus Aitnaios, and the chariot of Chromios and Nemea urge me to yoke a celebratory song for victorious deeds.

The opening address to Ortygia fixes a starting point for the movement of the victory ode, which he refers to as a ἁδυεπής ὕμνος (4-5), "sweet-sounding song."[251] This movement is both enacted and described by Nemean 1. Kathryn Morgan observes that "Ortygia and Arethusa are the heart of a geographic network centered on Syracuse, and the first stanzas move outward from this hub."[252] Pindar narrates an identical movement in which his song ὁρμᾶται (5), "rushes forth," σέθεν (4), "from you," that is, from Ortygia. The verb ὁρμᾶται (5), especially in proximity to the mention of Chromios' ἀελλοπόδων ἵππων (6), "storm-footed horses," likens the poem to a speeding chariot. In hastening to celebrate the horses, Nemean 1 mimics them.

Pindar clarifies the terms of this comparison even further in line 7. He asserts that the ἅρμα Χρομίου (7), "chariot of Chromios," and Νεμέα (7), "Nemea," have roused him ζεῦξαι (7), "to yoke," a victory ode in honor of Chromios' achievement in the chariot race. This image of harnessing offers a metapoetic comment on the structural coherence of Nemean 1. When referring to poetic production, Pindar's uses of the verb ζεύγνυμι, "I yoke," signify the bringing together of discrete elements.[253] Isthmian 1, for instance, employs a form of ζεύγνυμι to describe the combination of poetic components (6): εἶξον, ὦ Ἀπολλωνιάς· ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος, "Yield, island of Apollo. Surely with the help of the gods I will yoke the completion of both poems." Pindar assures the island of Delos that he intends to compose a separate poem for her in addition to the victory ode. I would suggest that the verb ζεύξω (6), "I will yoke," indicates that these two poems represent a coordinated production.[254] The fact that Isthmian 1 even draws attention to the other poem implies that they should be read together. Pythian 10 also features ζεύγνυμι in a metaphor of harnessing a chariot (64-65): πέποιθα ξενίᾳ προσανέϊ Θώρακος, ὅσπερ ἐμὰν ποιπνύων χάριν τόδ' ἔζευξεν ἅρμα Πιερίδων τετράορον, "I have put my trust in the kind hospitality of Thorax, who, laboring for my sake, yoked this four-horse chariot of the Pierians." Pythian

[251] For discussion of the epithet ἁδυεπής (4), see Braswell (1992) 35-36, who observes that "Both the compound itself and its use with ὕμνος ultimately reflect the Indo-European formulaic combination of words for 'speech' and 'sweet.'"
[252] Morgan (2015) 384.
[253] The scholia (Drachmann iii 12) assert that ζεῦξαι μέλος (7) is equivalent to συνθεῖναι ἐγκωμιαστικὸν μέλος, "to put together a celebratory song." The verb συνθεῖναι also communicates the idea of bringing together discrete elements. For further discussion of ζεῦξαι (7), see Rose (1974) 172, Carey (1981) 106, and Braswell (1992) 39.
[254] For further discussion of the simultaneous production of poems, see chapter four.

10, like Nemean 1, is composed of four triads. I would argue that the four horses of the adjective τετράορον (65), "four-horse," correspond to the four triads of the victory ode, especially since we have seen that Pindar uses ζεύγνυμι in Isthmian 1 to refer to poetic combination. What, then, is the precise significance of ζεῦξαι (7) in Nemean 1? Pindar stresses here the structural coherence of the four triads, implicitly likening them to the horses that bore Chromios to victory.

Why does Pindar emphasize the structural coherence of Nemean 1? I would argue that he is alluding to the crucial transitions between the first epode and second strophe and the third epode and fourth strophe, which are the supporting structures that hold the poem together. The mythological account of Hera's attempt to murder the infant Herakles is remarkable in both its length and scope.[255] The narrative begins in the second epode and runs through the end of the victory ode, recounting the entire extent of Herakles' existence from birth to eternal afterlife. Pindar establishes the encounter with Hera's snakes as the first incident in a distinguished heroic career, presenting Herakles as the epitome of a masculine ideal also embodied by Chromios. The open ending accentuates the eternal nature of Herakles' fate, but also prevents Pindar from explicating the comparison of Chromios and Herakles.[256] He relies instead upon the metrical structures that harness the four triads to articulate the terms of the analogy.

We should track the progression of this mythological accoujnt. Pindar begins the narrative in the first line of the second epode, transitioning away from direct praise of Chromios (33-50):

ἐγὼ δ' Ἡ-
ρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως
ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετᾶν μεγάλαις,
ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων λόγον,
ὡς, ἐπεὶ σπλάγχνων ὕπο ματέρος αὐ- 35
τίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διός
ὠδῖνα φεύγων διδύμῳ
σὺν κασιγνήτῳ μόλεν,

ὡς {τ'} οὐ λαθὼν χρυσόθρονον
Ἥραν κροκωτὸν σπάργανον ἐγκατέβα·
ἀλλὰ θεῶν βασιλ<έα>
σπερχθεῖσα θυμῷ πέμπε δράκοντας ἄφαρ. 40
τοὶ μὲν οἰχθεισᾶν πυλᾶν
ἐς θαλάμου μυχὸν εὐ-
ρὺν ἔβαν, τέκνοισιν ὠκείας γνάθους
ἀμφελίξασθαι μεμαῶτες· ὁ δ' ὀρ-
θὸν μὲν ἄντεινεν κάρα, πειρᾶτο δὲ πρῶτον μάχας,

δισσαῖσι δοιοὺς αὐχένων

[255] Morgan (2015) 383 notes that "*Nemean* 1 falls into two slightly uneven parts," and that the second part, which consists of the mythological account, surpasses the first in length.
[256] Rosenmeyer (1969) 239 suggests that "Pindar was, apparently, so caught up in his tale that he allowed it to occupy the bulk of the poem, down to its end, without turning back to the victor as he usually does."

μάρψαις ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν ἑαῖς ὄφιας. 45
ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόνος
ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν μελέων ἀφάτων.
ἐκ δ' ἄρ' ἄτλατον δέος
πλᾶξε γυναῖκας, ὅσαι
τύχον Ἀλκμήνας ἀρήγοισαι λέχει·
καὶ γὰρ αὐτὰ ποσσὶν ἄπεπλος ὀρού- 50
σαισ' ἀπὸ στρωμνᾶς ὅμως ἄμυνεν ὕβριν κνωδάλων.

And I myself gladly cling to Herakles above all, rousing an ancient account amidst the great heights of achievements, how, as soon as the son of Zeus came into the wondrous radiance of the sun from his mother's womb, fleeing the pangs of childbirth with his twin brother, not having escaped the notice of golden-throned Hera, he put on his yellow swaddling clothes, but the queen of the gods, irritated in her heart, sent snakes immediately. When the doors had been opened they went into the broad recess of the bedroom, eager to close their swift jaws around the children, but he lifted his head up straight, and he made his first attempt at battle, taking hold of the two snakes by their necks with his two inescapable hands. And for them being strangled time exhaled the souls from their monstrous frames, and unendurable fear struck the women, as many as happened to be attending the bed of Alkmene, and nevertheless she herself, having leapt to her feet from the couch without a robe, was warding off the insolence of the beasts.

He asserts his devotion to Herakles with the verb ἀντέχομαι (33), "I cling to," which imagines the hero as a helpful landmark in contextualizing heroic achievements.[257] The placement of Ἡρακλέος (33), "Herakles," as the third word in the sentence signals a shift in emphasis toward the mythological exemplum. Pindar had even addressed Chromios in the second antistrophe (29, Ἀγησιδάμου παῖ, "Son of Hagesidamos"), offering him words of gnomic advice, but the second epode marks a new stage of the victory ode.[258]

The mythological account opens with the image of Herakles' birth, highlighting his cleverness and courage from the beginning. Pindar uses a temporal clause to describe the newborn's departure from his mother's womb. The essential structure of this clause is ἐπεὶ αὐτίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διός μόλεν (35-36), "as soon as the son of Zeus came into the wondrous radiance of the sun," but the addition of prepositional and participial phrases heightens the drama. The participle φεύγων (36), "fleeing," suggests a heroic escape, and the noun ὠδῖνα (36), "the pangs of childbirth," illustrates the ordeal overcome.[259] The prepositional phrase διδύμῳ σὺν κασιγνήτῳ (36), "with his twin brother," which refers to the contemporaneous birth of Iphikles, adds a companion to this initial adventure.

Pindar repeats the adverb ὡς (37), "how," at the beginning of the third strophe, introducing the main clause: οὐ λαθὼν χρυσόθρονον Ἥραν κροκωτὸν σπάργανον ἐγκατέβα (37-38), "not having escaped the notice of golden-throned Hera, he put on his yellow swaddling clothes." The verb ἐγκατέβα (38) emphasizes the infant Herakles' agency in his

[257] For the vividness of ἀντέχομαι (33), see Carey (1981) 120 and Braswell (1992) 57.
[258] Hagesidamos also appears at N. 9.42.
[259] Carey (1981) 120 notes that "the pain of labour is, to Pindar's imagination, shared by the child."

first swaddling, creating the impression that he clothed himself.[260] The participial phrase οὐ λαθὼν χρυσόθρονον Ἥραν (37-38) draws our attention to Hera's involvement in the narrative, framing her as an ominous watcher from afar whose interest marks Herakles as exceptional.

Pindar emphasizes the instantaneous nature of Hera's reaction to Herakles' birth.[261] He calls her θεῶν βασιλέα (39), "queen of the gods," stressing her authority, and characterizes her mental state with the participial phrase σπερχθεῖσα θυμῷ (40), "irritated in her heart." The combination of the imperfect verb πέμπε (40), "sent," and the adverb ἄφαρ (40), "immediately," suggests that Hera unleashes her δράκοντας (40), "snakes," the moment Herakles receives his swaddling clothes.[262] I suggest that the coincidence of Herakles' birth and Hera's attack is a Pindaric innovation. In *Idyll* 24, Theocritus offers a similar account of Hera's serpentine assault upon the infants, but he adds that Herakles was δεκάμηνον (1), "ten months old."[263] By beginning with Herakles' birth, Pindar allows his narrative to cover the entire extent of his existence from delivery to immortal afterlife.[264]

Pindar frames Herakles' fight against the snakes as his first battle against an extraordinary opponent, presenting the infant as an expression of the masculine ideal. He refrains from describing how exactly the serpents gained entrance to the bedroom, inserting the vague genitive absolute οἰχθεισᾶν πυλᾶν (41), "When the doors had been opened." Who are we supposed to imagine opened the doors?[265] The perspective shifts momentarily to that of the snakes with the participial phrase τέκνοισιν ὠκείας γνάθους ἀμφελίξασθαι μεμαῶτες (42-43), "eager to close their swift jaws around the children," but Herakles takes over as the focus of three clauses that conclude the sentence: 1) ὁ δ' ὀρθὸν μὲν ἄντεινεν κάρα (43), "but he lifted his head up straight," 2) πειρᾶτο δὲ πρῶτον μάχας (43), "and he made his first attempt at battle," and 3) δισσαῖσι δοιοὺς αὐχένων μάρψαις ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν ἑαῖς ὄφιας (44-45), "taking hold of the two snakes by their necks with his two inescapable hands."

In the first of these clauses Herakles responds to the creeping threat by holding his head upright, a signifier of his masculine prowess in two respects.[266] Firstly, since the neck of a newborn should not be strong enough to support the head, this action marks the first demonstration of Herakles' prodigious strength, foreshadowing the strangling of the snakes. Secondly, lifting up the head is associated in Greek literature with the assumption of one's masculine responsibilities. The final stanza of Sappho's "Brothers Poem" (P. Sapph. Obbink) imagines the poet's brother Larichos assuming a similar posture (17-20):

---

[260] We should assume that Alkmena's attendants wrapped Herakles in his swaddling clothes. Illig (1932) 21 suggests that he climbed down and wrapped himself up, but Carey (1981) 121 contends that this notion "is grotesque" and "would anticipate and weaken the serpent-killing."

[261] For the swift sequence of these events, see Rose (1974) 158-59.

[262] Braswell (1992) 60 notes that "the imperfect is normal with the verbs of sending when the mere fact of the action is mentioned but not its successful completion."

[263] For comparison of Nemean 1 and *Idyll* 24, see Herter (1940) 153 and Carey (1981) 121; cf. Rosenmeyer (1969) 242.

[264] Morrison (2007) 38 notes that Nemean 1 incorporates "the whole of Herakles' life and achievements."

[265] Carey (1981) 121, following Herter (1940) 156, suggests that "the doors open before the god-sent snakes as before a divinity."

[266] Petrucione (1986) 42 relates Herakles' lifting his head up straight (43, ὀρθόν) to Pindar's gnomic assertion that one should travel ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς (25), "on straight roads." Rose (1974) 168-69 sees a parallel between ὀρθόν (43) and ὀρθώσειν (15), "would exalt."

κἄμμες, αἴ κε τὰν κεφάλαν ἀέρρη
Λάριχος καὶ δή ποτ᾽ ἄνηρ γένηται,
καὶ μάλ᾽ ἐκ πόλλαν βαρυθυμίαν κεν
αἶψα λύθειμεν. 20

And if Larichos lifts up his head and indeed ever becomes a man, we would suddenly be released even from our many burdensome troubles.[267]

Sappho equates the ideas of lifting one's head and becoming a man, both of which stand in stark opposition to the behavior of the delinquent brother Charaxos, who is away at sea. I would argue that the infant Herakles' action of raising his head alludes to this conception of ideal masculinity, especially since his courageous conduct serves to protect his brother Iphikles. Even with so small a gesture he indicates his masculine potential. The second clause establishes this incident as the beginning of Herakles' splendid career. Teiresias' forthcoming prophecy, which mentions the θῆρας ἀιδροδίκας (63), "lawless beasts," encountered both on land and at sea, further emphasizes the continuity between this victory and the more spectacular ones that follow. The third clause, a participial phrase, describes the actual strangling. The successive placements of the adjectives δισσαῖσι (44), "two," and δοιούς (44), "two," stress the enmeshed character of the scene.[268] The word order, which interlocks the phrases δισσαῖσι ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν ἑαῖς (44-45), "with his two inescapable hands," and δοιοὺς ὄφιας (44-45), "the two snakes," reflects the entanglement of Herakles' limbs with the serpents.[269] These defeated monsters ultimately crown the infant's body, marking the occasion of his first victory.

Pindar describes the various reactions of the immediate bystanders to Herakles' miraculous feat in the third antistrophe. The attendant women experience ἄτλατον δέος (48), "unendurable fear," but Alkmena moves to protect her children from the monsters.[270] Pindar recounts her frantic response with the participial phrase ποσσὶν ἄπεπλος ὀρούσαισ' ἀπὸ στρωμνᾶς (50), "having leapt to her feet from the couch without a robe," which envisions her as a disembodied tumult of limbs.[271] Alkmena overcomes the ὕβριν κνωδάλων (50), "insolence of the beasts," showing no fear before the serpentine manifestation of Hera's violent designs upon Herakles.

Having progressed to this point in the mythological narrative, I propose to consider the transition between the third epode and fourth strophe from a distinct perspective, as I would argue that this moment is crucial to the structural cohesion of the poem. The movement from the third epode to the fourth strophe restages that from the first epode to the second strophe, asserting an essential analogy between Pindar and Amphitryon as observers of the remarkable achievements of Chromios and Herakles respectively. This reliance upon metrical structure to articulate the terms of the comparison allows Pindar to conclude the victory ode within the mythological account rather than having to explain them.

---

[267] For discussion of the text of P. Sapph. Obbink, see Obbink (2014).
[268] Braswell (1992) 63 notes that "Greek tends to juxtapose related words and concepts."
[269] For the significance of the two snakes, see Rosenmeyer (1969) 243-45, Rose (1974) 159 n. 39, and Braswell (1992) 63.
[270] Race (1990) 165 observes that "Portents are generally more terrifying at night."
[271] Carey (1981) 122 notes that "ποσσίν combines two ideas, vigorous motion (Il. 21.269) and (under the influence of ἄπεπλος) lack of footwear."

The transition between the first epode and second strophe proceeds through a mythological account that begins in the first antistrophe, halting at the doors of Chromios' house (13-25):

σπεῖρέ νυν ἀγλαΐαν
 τινὰ νάσῳ, τὰν Ὀλύμπου δεσπότας
Ζεὺς ἔδωκεν Φερσεφόνᾳ, κατένευ-
 σέν τέ οἱ χαίταις, ἀριστεύοισαν εὐκάρπου χθονός

Σικελίαν πίειραν ὀρθώ-
 σειν κορυφαῖς πολίων ἀφνεαῖς·
ὤπασε δὲ Κρονίων πολέμου
 μναστῆρά οἱ χαλκεντέος
λαὸν ἵππαιχμον, θαμὰ δὴ καὶ Ὀλυμ-
 πιάδων φύλλοις ἐλαιᾶν χρυσέοις
μιχθέντα. πολλῶν ἐπέβαν
 καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλών·

ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις
ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου καλὰ μελπόμενος,
ἔνθα μοι ἁρμόδιον
δεῖπνον κεκόσμηται, θαμὰ δ' ἀλλοδαπῶν
οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι
ἐντί· λέλογχε δὲ μεμ-
 φομένοις ἐσλοὺς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν
ἀντίον. τέχναι δ' ἑτέρων ἕτεραι·
 χρὴ δ' ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φυᾷ.

Sow now some splendor on that island, which Zeus, the master of Olympos, gave to Persephone, and he nodded in assent with his locks that he would exalt fertile Sicily as the best of the fruitful earth with her rich peaks of cities, and the son of Kronos granted to her an equestrian people enamored of bronze-armed war, and often indeed mingled with the golden leaves of olives from Olympia. I have set foot upon an occasion for many topics without having cast any falsehood. And I have taken my stand at the doors of the court of a hospitable man singing of beautiful things, where a fitting meal has been arranged for me, and this house is not unfamiliar with frequent visitors from abroad. It is his lot to bring noble men against his censurers as water against smoke. Some men have some skills, others other, but going on straight roads one should strive by means of natural ability.

Pindar issues a command to an unspecified addressee (13): σπεῖρέ νυν ἀγλαΐαν τινὰ νάσῳ, "Sow now some splendor on that island." It is unclear whether this represents a continuation of the opening invocation of Ortygia or the recent mention of the Muse (12) has brought about an apostrophe to her, but the request to confer luster on Syracuse initiates a brief

mythological account in which Zeus offers the island to Persephone to make it prosper.[272] Pindar calls the λαόν (17), "people," of Syracuse πολέμου μναστῆρά χαλκεντέος (16), "enamored of bronze-armed war," ἵππαιχμον (17), "equestrian," and θαμὰ δὴ καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδων φύλλοις ἐλαιᾶν χρυσέοις μιχθέντα (17-18), "often indeed mingled with the golden leaves of olives from Olympia."[273] The epithet ἵππαιχμον (17), which recalls the earlier reference to Chromios' ἀελλοπόδων ἵππων (6), "storm-footed horses," bridges the two surrounding characterizations of distinction in war and athletics.[274]

The final line of the first epode is a description of movement. The verb ἐπέβαν (18), "I have set foot," recounts the beginning of a procession down a narrative track, but the second strophe arrests that movement. Pindar locates himself ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου (19-20), "at the doors of the court of a hospitable man," and the verb ἔσταν (19), "I have taken my stand," freezes him there.[275] The progression from movement to stasis depicted by the verbs ἐπέβαν (18) and ἔσταν (19) is also a progression from figurative to literal space.[276] The πολλῶν καιρόν (18), "occasion for many topics," refers to the victory in the chariot race, but the αὐλείαις θύραις (19) are the actual doors of Chromios' house. Pindar shifts from a state of free movement in narrative space to one of static placement.

The transition between the third epode and fourth strophe tracks that between the first epode and second strophe. Amphitryon, who arrives at the scene of Herakles' strangling of the snakes, follows Pindar's progression from movement to stasis (51-59):

ταχὺ δὲ Καδμείων ἀγοὶ χαλ-
 κ<έοι>ς σὺν ὅπλοις ἔδραμον ἀθρόοι,
ἐν χερὶ δ' Ἀμφιτρύων κολεοῦ
 γυμνὸν τινάσσων <φάσγανον>
ἵκετ', ὀξείαις ἀνίαισι τυπείς.
 τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον πιέζει πάνθ' ὁμῶς·
εὐθὺς δ' ἀπήμων κραδία
 κᾶδος ἀμφ' ἀλλότριον.

ἔστα δὲ θάμβει δυσφόρῳ 55
τερπνῷ τε μιχθείς. εἶδε γὰρ ἐκνόμιον
λῆμά τε καὶ δύναμιν
υἱοῦ· παλίγγλωσσον δέ οἱ ἀθάνατοι
ἀγγέλων ῥῆσιν θέσαν.

---

[272] Braswell (1992) 41 asserts that this imperative is addressed to the Muse.
[273] For the distribution of these attributes among particular Sicilian cities, see Morrison (2007) 25-26 and Morrison (2012) 117-18.
[274] Braswell (1992) 44 notes that "for Pindar war and games are the two occasions on which men can best realize (and display) their inborn excellence."
[275] Morrison (2007) 24-25 argues that Nemean 1 was composed for sympotic performance at Chromios' house.
[276] Radt (1966) 151, Carey (1981) 106-10, Morrison (2007) 24-25, and Morgan (2015) 384 contend that the progression from σέθεν ἁδυεπής ὕμνος ὁρμᾶται (4-5), "from you a sweet-sounding song rushes forth," to ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις (19) tracks the movement of a κῶμος, "revel," although Carey (1981) 107 notes that "the metaphor changes in v.13." I am amenable to the idea of the κῶμος, but I would emphasize the more immediate transition from ἐπέβαν (18) to ἔσταν (19).

And swiftly the leaders of the Kadmeians came running in a crowd with their bronze arms, and Amphitryon arrived brandishing his sword uncovered from the scabbard in his hand, stricken with sharp distress. For his own pain oppresses every man alike, but the heart is quickly free from sorrow at the grief of another man. He stood affected by amazement both grievous and pleasant, for he saw the extraordinary resolution and power of his son, and the immortals made the speech of the messengers false for him.

Pindar recounts the arrival of the Kadmeian leaders in the third epode. Several elements of this description echo aspects of the first epode. The prepositional phrase χαλκέοις σὺν ὅπλοις (51), "with their bronze arms," calls to mind the epithet χαλκεντέος (16), "bronze-armed," and the verbs ἔδραμον (51), "came running," and ἵκετ' (53), "arrived," recall the movement inherent in ἐπέβαν (18), "I have set foot." I would also add that the third epode retains the first epode's fascination with the intersection between war and athletics in that the combination of χαλκέοις σὺν ὅπλοις (51) and ἔδραμον (51) evokes the hoplitodromos, an athletic event consisting of a footrace in armor.

The fourth strophe focuses upon Amphitryon, whose static response to Herakles' miraculous feat mirrors Pindar's fixed stance in the second strophe. As numerous scholars have noted, ἕστα (55), "he stood," echoes ἔσταν (19).[277] The emphatic tautometric placements of these verbs, followed by the particle δέ, in the opening lines of the second and fourth strophes serve to illustrate the analogy between Pindar and Amphitryon, both of whom bear witness to remarkable events. Amphitryon freezes before the infant Herakles, experiencing θάμβει δυσφόρῳ τερπνῷ τε (55-56), "amazement both grievous and pleasant," as he observes ἐκνόμιον λῆμά τε καὶ δύναμιν υἱοῦ (56-57), "the extraordinary resolution and power of his son."[278] Chromios' victory in the chariot race at Nemea likewise inspires Pindar to travel to Sicily.[279] The resemblance between the second and fourth strophes is the harness that holds the chariot together.

Pindar ends the poem with a prophecy delivered by Teiresias in indirect discourse, leveraging the open ending to emphasize the eternal nature of Herakles' fate (60-72):

γείτονα δ' ἐκκάλεσεν 60
Διὸς ὑψίστου προφάταν ἔξοχον,
ὀρθόμαντιν Τειρεσίαν· ὁ δέ οἱ
φράζε καὶ παντὶ στρατῷ, ποίαις ὁμιλήσει τύχαις,

ὅσσους μὲν ἐν χέρσῳ κτανών,
ὅσσους δὲ πόντῳ θῆρας ἀϊδροδίκας·
καί τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ
ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον 65
φᾶ ἑ δᾳώσειν μόρον.

[277] See Mezger (1880), Bury (1890), Rose (1974) 170, Segal (1974b) 35, Carey (1981) 124, Petrucione (1986) 42, Braswell (1992) 69, and Morrison (2007) 34-35.
[278] For discussion of ἐκνόμιον λῆμα (57), see Rose (1974) 161.
[279] Rosenmeyer (1969) 241 notes that "The amazement of Amphitryon at his son's firstling performance (55-58; note λῆμά; the child's equivalent of Chromius' βουλαί?) is a convenient paradigm for the response to the patron's victory;" cf. Rose (1974) 170.

καὶ γὰρ ὅταν θεοὶ ἐν
 πεδίῳ Φλέγρας Γιγάντεσσιν μάχαν
ἀντιάζωσιν, βελέων ὑπὸ ῥι-
 παῖσι κείνου φαιδίμαν γαίᾳ πεφύρσεσθαι κόμαν

ἔνεπεν· αὐτὸν μὰν ἐν εἰρή-
 νᾳ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον <ἐν> σχερῷ
ἡσυχίαν καμάτων μεγάλων 70
 ποινὰν λαχόντ' ἐξαίρετον
ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμασι, δεξάμενον
 θαλερὰν Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν καὶ γάμον
δαίσαντα πὰρ Διὶ Κρονίδᾳ,
 σεμνὸν αἰνήσειν νόμον.

He summoned his neighbor, the foremost prophet of highest Zeus, the true seer Teiresias, and he declared to him and to all the people what sort of fortunes he would encounter, how many lawless beasts he would slaughter on land, and how many in the sea, and he said that he would give the most hateful doom to some man coming in crooked excess. For in fact when the gods would encounter the giants in battle on the plain of Phlegra, he said that beneath the force of his arrows their shining hair would be sullied; indeed he himself in uninterrupted peace for all time, having been allotted quiet in a blessed house as a special recompense for his great labors, having received flourishing Hebe as his wife and having feasted his marriage beside Zeus, Kronos' son, would praise his holy rule.

The report of Teiresias' prophecy is constructed around three verbs of speaking: φράζε (61), "declared," φᾶ (65), "said," and ἔνεπεν (69), "said."[280] The verb φράζε (61) initiates three indirect questions pertaining to the events of Herakles' career. Pindar begins at the broadest level with ποίαις ὁμιλήσει τύχαις (61), "what sort of fortunes he would encounter." The notion of Herakles' fortunes seems to encompass the full range of his experiences both as a mortal man and after deification. The next two indirect questions elaborate upon Herakles' slayings of θῆρας ἀϊδροδίκας (63), "lawless beasts," delineating whether he slaughtered them ἐν χέρσῳ (62), "on land," or πόντῳ (63), "in the sea." These two categories encompass some of Herakles' most iconic achievements, including his defeats of the Nemean lion (62, ἐν χέρσῳ) and Lernean Hydra (63, πόντῳ).

The verb φᾶ (65), "said," introduces an indirect statement recounting Herakles' murder of an unspecified enemy: τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον ἑ δᾳώσειν μόρον (64-66), "that he would give the most hateful doom to some man coming in crooked surfeit."[281] Pindar seems to be referring here to an individual murderous episode, although there is some debate concerning this issue among scholars.[282] Supposing that this

[280] For the infrequency of indirect speech in Pindar, see Foster (2002) 143 and Morrison (2007) 30.
[281] Radt (1966) 167, Privitera (1972) 36 n. 54, Slater (1984) 254, and Morrison (2007) 35 hear in σὺν πλαγίῳ ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα (64-65) an echo of ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα (25), "going on straight roads."
[282] Dissen (1830) and Fennell (1899) argue that τινα ἀνδρῶν (64) means "many a man," as opposed to "some man." The former of these two possibilities would make this passage encompass the extent of Herakles' violent career rather than an individual episode. For discussion of the possibilities, see Carey (1981) 127.

passage alludes to Herakles' defeat of a single opponent, we can observe a narrowing of Pindar's focus from the broader categories related under the verb φράζε (61). The characterization of his adversary as σὺν πλαγίῳ κόρῳ στείχοντα (64-65), in addition to the epithet ἀϊδροδίκας (63), "lawless," above, confers a sense of righteousness upon Herakles' behavior.[283]

The verb ἔνεπεν (69) initiates two indirect statements. The first describes Herakles' contribution to the Gigantomachy (67-68): καὶ γὰρ ὅταν θεοὶ ἐν πεδίῳ Φλέγρας Γιγάντεσσιν μάχαν ἀντιάζωσιν, βελέων ὑπὸ ῥιπαῖσι κείνου φαιδίμαν γαίᾳ πεφύρσεσθαι κόμαν, "For in fact when the gods would encounter the giants in battle on the plain of Phlegra, (he said) that beneath the force of his arrows their shining hair would be sullied." This passage, unlike the indirect questions following φράζε (61) and the indirect statement after φᾶ (65), refers to a specific episode in Herakles' career. Pindar sets the action ἐν πεδίῳ Φλέγρας (67), "on the plain of Phlegra," and focuses upon the φαιδίμαν κόμαν (68), "shining hair," of his adversaries.[284]

The second indirect statement is constructed around the future infinitive αἰνήσειν (72), "would praise," and the aorist participles λαχόντ' (70), "having been allotted," δεξάμενον (71), "having received," and δαίσαντα (72), "having feasted." Pindar shifts from an overview of Herakles' achievements as a mortal hero to an illustration of his blessed existence after death. Herakles is allotted ἡσυχίαν (70), "quiet," as a καμάτων μεγάλων ποινὰν λαχόντ' ἐξαίρετον (70), "special recompense for his great labors," receives Ἥβαν (71), "Hebe," as his θαλερὰν ἄκοιτιν (71), "flourishing wife," and feasts his γάμον (71), "marriage," πὰρ Διὶ Κρονίδᾳ (72), "beside Zeus, Kronos' son." As many scholars have argued, Herakles' relationship to Zeus inevitably suggests that of Chromios and Hieron.[285] He lives ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμασι (71), "in a blessed house," recalling αὐλείαις θύραις (19), "the doors of the court," to which Pindar travels.[286] Herakles' fate points toward a form of compensation for toil that outlasts even fame, and the open ending serves to emphasize the everlasting quality of his posthumous honors. Nemean 1 concludes with the phrase σεμνὸν αἰνήσειν νόμον (72), "he would praise his holy rule," in which the future infinitive αἰνήσειν (72) refers to an eternal action.[287] The open ending allows that action to remain eternal within the boundless scope of the mythological narrative.

Does Pindar's structural gambit pay off? The open ending remains rather abrupt, suspending the audience in a vision of endless futurity, and the second level of framing provided by the prophecy adds to the sense of estrangement from Pindar's authorial voice.[288]

---

[283] For discussion of the rectitude of Herakles' behavior, see Rose (1974) 173-74 and Slater (1984) 259.

[284] Slater (1984) 258 and Morgan (2015) 388 note that the plain of Phlegra was believed to be located in the vicinity of Kumai, where Hieron won a naval victory in 474 BCE.

[285] Radt (1966) 167, Rose (1974) 169, Slater (1984) 259, and Morgan (2015) 387-88 detect an implied comparison of Hieron and Zeus, although Braswell (1992) 82 argues that this "is another example of the kind of overinterpretation which continues to bedevil Pindaric criticism."

[286] For the parallel between Herakles' home and that of Chromios, see Radt (1966) 167, Slater (1984) 251, and Morrison (2007) 31.

[287] Foster (2002) 144 argues that "by indirectly summarizing Teiresias' prophecy, the primary narrator actually extends the reach of the narrative from the remote past of Herakles' triumph not only to Chromius' present victory but also into the indeterminate future."

[288] Cf. Morrison (2007) 30, who argues that "the audience during performance would have recognized the distinct metrical structure of the epode as signalling a potential end, so that the end of *N.* 1 was probably not very abrupt."

It is impossible to know how much power performance, especially dance, might have had to reinforce the metrical structures that articulate the terms of the exemplum.[289] Perhaps a repetition of gestures in the second and fourth strophes would have made the connections between them even stronger? Pindar harnesses the four triads of Nemean 1, driving them toward a fixed destination, but the road ahead remains infinite.

Nemean 10

Nemean 10, the date of which is unknown, celebrates the achievements of the wrestler Theaios of Argos.[290] The victory ode is comprised of two halves: (1) a series of catalogues honoring the heroes of Argos, Theaios himself, and his maternal relatives, and (2) a mythological account depicting the death and deification of Kastor.[291] Nemean 10 is obsessed with closure. The poem explores several constraints that bring about the termination of speech, and concludes with an open ending. The mythological narrative tracks the sequence of these constraints, but ultimately subverts them, closing with the promise of speech.

The first half of Nemean 10 consists of three distinct catalogues, each of which concludes with a statement about constraints upon speech.[292] The first catalogue reports the famous achievements of the mythological citizens of Argos (1-18), the second records Theaios' victories in various athletic competitions throughout Greece (21-28), and the third celebrates the victories of Theaios' maternal relatives (37-44). These three catalogues closely correspond to the first three triads of the victory ode.[293] I would argue that these catalogues and the passages that follow them reframe the final triad of Nemean 1, which closes with a similar catalogue of Herakles' heroic accomplishments. Pindar uses these sequences of catalogue and termination to explain the ending of Nemean 1 and anticipate the conclusion of Nemean 10.

The first catalogue consumes the entire opening triad, recounting the notable accomplishments of the denizens of Argos (1-18):

Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρό-
νων τε πεντήκοντα κορᾶν, Χάριτες,
Ἄργος Ἥρας δῶμα θεοπρεπὲς ὑμνεῖ-
τε· φλέγεται δ' ἀρεταῖς
μυρίαις ἔργων θρασέων ἕνεκεν.

---

[289] For the coordination of metrical structures and dance, see Mullen (1982).
[290] For discussion of the date of Nemean 10, see Bowra (1964) 411, Cannatà Fera (2004) 97-99, and Henry (2005) 91.
[291] Carne-Ross (1985) 81-84 offers his own overview of the structure of Nemean 10.
[292] For discussion of catalogues in Pindar, see Race (1986) 32-33.
[293] Race (1986) 111 notes that "One unusual feature of this ode is the regularity with which the topics correspond to the triads. The first triad praises the city, the second the victor, the third his clan, and the fourth and fifth tell the story of Kastor and Polydeukes."

μακρὰ μὲν τὰ Περσέος ἀμφὶ Μεδοίσας Γοργόνος,
πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ καταοίκισεν ἄστη 5
ταῖς Ἐπάφου παλάμαις·
οὐδ' Ὑπερμήστρα παρεπλάγχθη, μονό-
ψαφον ἐν κολ<εῷ> κατασχοῖσα ξίφος.

Διομήδεα δ' ἄμβροτον ξαν-
θά ποτε Γλαυκῶπις ἔθηκε θεόν·
γαῖα δ' ἐν Θήβαις ὑπέδεκτο κεραυνω-
θεῖσα Διὸς βέλεσιν
μάντιν Οἰκλείδαν, πολέμοιο νέφος·
καὶ γυναιξὶν καλλικόμοισιν ἀριστεύει πάλαι· 10
Ζεὺς ἐπ' Ἀλκμήναν Δανάαν τε μολὼν τοῦ-
τον κατέφανε λόγον·
πατρὶ δ' Ἀδράστοιο Λυγκεῖ τε φρενῶν
καρπὸν εὐθείᾳ συνάρμοξεν δίκᾳ·

θρέψε δ' αἰχμὰν Ἀμφιτρύωνος. ὁ δ' ὅλβῳ φέρτατος
ἵκετ' ἐς κείνου γενεάν, ἐπεὶ ἐν χαλκ<έοι>ς ὅπλοις
Τηλεβόας ἔναρεν· τῷ ὄψιν ἐειδόμενος 15
ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς αὐλὰν ἐσῆλθεν,
σπέρμ' ἀδείμαντον φέρων Ἡρακλέος· οὗ κατ' Ὄλυμπον
ἄλοχος Ἥβα τελείᾳ παρὰ ματέρι βαίνοισ'
ἔστι, καλλίστα θεῶν.

Sing, Graces, of Argos, the city of Danaos and of his fifty daughters on their splendid thrones, Hera's home that befits a goddess. It is ablaze with countless accomplishments on account of bold deeds. Lengthy are the affairs of Perseus concerning the Gorgon Medusa, and many cities were founded in Egypt through the arts of Epaphos, and Hypermestra did not err, keeping her sword solitary of purpose in its scabbard. The fair-haired grey-eyed one once made Diomedes an immortal god, and in Thebes the earth struck by the thunderbolts of Zeus received Oikles' son the seer, a storm cloud of war, and of old it is the best for women with beautiful hair. Zeus, having come to Alkmena and Danaë, confirmed this account, and in the father of Adrastos and Lynkeus it coupled the fruit of wisdom with straight justice, and it reared the spear of Amphitryon. Supreme in fortune, he became a relative of that god, when in his bronze armor he slew the Teleboai; assuming his appearance the king of the immortals came into his hall, bearing the fearless seed of Herakles, whose bride Hebe, most beautiful of goddesses, walks on Olympos beside her all-powerful mother.[294]

Pindar constructs this catalogue to highlight certain aspects of the city's mythological past while keeping others hidden.[295] The narrative of Danaos and his daughters frames the first

[294] For the thematic cohesion of the opening triad, see Stern (1969) 125-29.
[295] For the political implications of this catalogue, see Kowalzig (2007) 176-77.

strophe. Pindar initially defines Argos as Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρόνων τε πεντήκοντα κορᾶν (1), "the city of Danaos and of his fifty daughters on their splendid thrones." The outline of Danaos' treacherous scheme, in which he instructs his daughters to murder their husbands on their collective wedding night, is hardly visible at this point. The epithet ἀγλαοθρόνων (1), used once elsewhere in Pindar of the Muses, confers a sense of solemnity upon the daughters, eliding the grotesque nature of their actions.[296] This narrative returns at the end of the first strophe with the mention of Hypermestra, the one daughter who refused to slay her husband. The negated verb παρεπλάγχθη (6), "err," and the participial phrase μονόψαφον ἐν κολεῷ κατασχοῖσα ξίφος (6), "keeping her sword solitary of purpose in its scabbard," both allude to the larger context for Hypermestra's behavior while emphasizing her defiance of her father's command. The epithet μονόψαφον (6) transfers Hypermestra's independent resolve to her ξίφος (6), "sword," begging the question of its original purpose. The first strophe also refers to Perseus' slaughter of Medusa and the foundation of cities in Egypt by Epaphos (4-5). The emphatic placements of μακρά (4) and πολλά (5) at the beginnings of their respective lines stress the vastness of both accounts. These are undertakings that cannot be related without some amount of careful selection. From the beginning of the victory ode, Pindar demonstrates that stories must be told with care.

The first antistrophe simultaneously glances backward at the first strophe and looks ahead to the first epode. Pindar recounts the deification of Diomedes (7), the death of the seer Amphiaraos (8-9), the seductions of Alkmene and Danaë (10-11), and the kingships of Talaos and Lynkeus (12). The fates of Diomedes and Amphiaraos are both singular events receiving similar treatments, although the account of the earth swallowing up Amphiaraos is slightly longer, but the final two passages point toward the first epode and first strophe respectively. Alkmene is the wife of Amphitryon, whose accomplishments feature in the first epode, and Lynkeus is the husband of Hypermestra, that is, the sole husband who survives Danaos' murderous plot. I would also note that Lynkeus shares his name with the keen-sighted son of Aphareus, who appears in the mythological narrative that concludes the victory ode. The first antistrophe, then, functions as a bridge between the first strophe and the rest of Nemean 10.

Despite the lack of a vital connection between Herakles and Argos, the first epode alludes to the catalogue of his heroic achievements that concludes Nemean 1.[297] Pindar cites the city of Argos' role in nourishing αἰχμὰν Ἀμφιτρύωνος (13), "the spear of Amphitryon," and adds that Amphitryon received the honor of becoming a kinsman of Zeus (13-15). His language here recalls the initial appearance of Amphitryon in the third epode of Nemean 1 (51-53). Both passages use the verb ἵκετ', although the sense is figurative in Nemean 10 (14) and literal in Nemean 1 (53). Amphitryon becomes a relative of Zeus in Nemean 10, but actually arrives at the scene of Herakles' defeat of the snakes in Nemean 1. The prepositional phrase ἐν χαλκέοις ὅπλοις (14), "in his bronze armor," applied to Amphitryon in Nemean 10, evokes χαλκέοις σὺν ὅπλοις (51), "with their bronze arms," from Nemean 1. Amphitryon is among the Kadmeian leaders described in that passage, and Pindar elaborates upon his martial readiness with the participial phrase ἐν χερὶ κολεοῦ γυμνὸν τινάσσων φάσγανον (52), "brandishing his sword uncovered from the scabbard in his hand." The

[296] Cf. O. 13.96.

[297] Carne-Ross (1985) 83 notes that "Herakles wasn't Argive, of course, but he belongs in any victory song and his mother Alkmena was an Argive woman." Kowalzig (2007) 172 adds that "Herakles is not present at Argos in myth and decidedly a latecomer in cult."

earlier illustration of Hypermestra holding her sword ἐν κολεῷ (6) serves as an inversion of this scene.

The illustration of Herakles' existence on Olympos beside Hebe echoes the final epode of Nemean 1, in which Herakles is characterized as δεξάμενον θαλερὰν Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν καὶ γάμον δαίσαντα πὰρ Δὶ Κρονίδᾳ (71-72), "having received flourishing Hebe as his wife and feasted his marriage beside Zeus Kronos' son." Pindar shifts the grammatical focus in Nemean 10 to Hebe, making her the subject of a relative clause. The nominative phrase ἄλοχος Ἥβα (18), "bride Hebe," replaces the accusative phrase θαλερὰν Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν (71). He emphasizes her position τελείᾳ παρὰ ματέρι (18), "beside her all-powerful mother," that is, Hera, as a supplement to the depiction of Herakles πὰρ Δὶ Κρονίδᾳ (71) at the end of Nemean 1. The first epode concludes with an appositional characterization of her as καλλίστα θεῶν (18), "most beautiful of goddesses." Unlike Nemean 1, the victory ode does not close with the union of Herakles and Hebe, but Pindar marks this moment as a crucial transition point.

Pindar terminates the catalogue of Argive achievements at the beginning of the second strophe, expressing an understanding of human speech as restricted both by physical deficiency and the patience of the audience (19-20):

βραχύ μοι στόμα πάντ' ἀναγή-
 σασθ', ὅσων Ἀργεῖον ἔχει τέμενος
μοῖραν ἐσλῶν· ἔστι δὲ καὶ κόρος ἀνθρώ- 20
 πων βαρὺς ἀντιάσαι·

My mouth is too small to rehearse everything that the Argive precinct holds as its portion of blessings, and there is also the surfeit of men, which is harsh to encounter.

This is the first of three passages following the catalogues that comprise the first half of Nemean 10. I would argue that each of these passages articulates a separate constraint or set of constraints upon speech that might provide a retroactive explanation for the ending of Nemean 1. Pindar claims here that his mouth is βραχὺ πάντ' ἀναγήσασθ', ὅσων Ἀργεῖον ἔχει τέμενος μοῖραν ἐσλῶν (19-20), "too small to rehearse everything that the Argive precinct holds as its portion of blessings."[298] The constraint in question is physical deficiency. Pindar is equipped with a merely human vocal organ that cannot sing forever. He also cites κόρος ἀνθρώπων (20), "the surfeit of men," as an impetus for brevity. Just as no one would be able to narrate every detail of Herakles' heroic career, so no one would want to hear such an account in its entirety.

The second catalogue recounts Theaios' athletic victories (21-28):

ἀλλ' ὅμως εὔχορδον ἔγειρε λύραν,
καὶ παλαισμάτων λάβε φροντίδ'· ἀγών τοι χάλκεος
δᾶμον ὀτρύνει ποτὶ βουθυσίαν Ἥ-
 ρας ἀέθλων τε κρίσιν·
Οὐλία παῖς ἔνθα νικάσαις δὶς ἔ-
 σχεν Θεαῖος εὐφόρων λάθαν πόνων.

[298] Cf. I. 7.43-44: τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τις παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν, "If someone looks after things far away, he is too small to reach the abode of the gods with floor of bronze."

ἐκράτησε δὲ καί ποθ' Ἕλλα- 25
 να στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, τύχᾳ τε μολών
καὶ τὸν Ἰσθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέᾳ στέφανον, Μοί-
 σαισί τ' ἔδωκ' ἀρόσαι,
τρὶς μὲν ἐν πόντοιο πύλαισι λαχών,
τρὶς δὲ καὶ σεμνοῖς δαπέδοις ἐν Ἀδραστείῳ νόμῳ.

But nevertheless rouse the well-strung lyre and take thought of wrestling; surely the contest for bronze hastens the people toward the sacrifice of oxen for Hera and the judgment of the games, where Oulias' son, Theaios, twice victorious, possessed forgetfulness of his patiently borne labors. And he once conquered the host of the Hellenes at Pytho too, and coming with good fortune he won the crown at both the Isthmos and Nemea, and gave the Muses work to do with their plough, winning thrice at the gates of the sea, and thrice on the holy ground in the institution of Adrastos.

The singular imperative verbs ἔγειρε (21), "rouse," and λάβε (22), "take," mark a shift from the earlier plural imperative ὑμνεῖτε (2), "sing," addressed to the Graces. Perhaps Pindar has trained his focus upon one of the Graces in particular? He asks the unstated recipient of these commands to awaken εὔχορδον λύραν (21), "the well-strung lyre," and lavish consideration upon παλαισμάτων (22), "wrestling." The second strophe concludes with a mention of Theaios' two victories at the Argive Heraia (22-24). The phrase ἀγών χάλκεος (22), "the contest for bronze," which recalls ἐν χαλκέοις ὅπλοις (14), "in his bronze armor," from the first epode, alludes to the bronze shield that was the prize at the Argive Heraia. Pindar continues the catalogue of victories in the second antistrophe, reporting that Theaios was victorious once at the Pythian festival (25), thrice at the Isthmos (27), and thrice at Nemea (28). He first names all three sites, but circles back to the Isthmos and Nemea for further description, calling the Isthmos πόντοιο πύλαισι (27), "the gates of the sea," and Nemea σεμνοῖς δαπέδοις ἐν Ἀδραστείῳ νόμῳ (28), "the holy ground in the institution of Adrastos."[299]

Pindar interrupts the second catalogue in the second antistrophe to allude to the hope for an eventual victory at Olympia (29-36):

Ζεῦ πάτερ, τῶν μὰν ἔραται φρενί, σιγᾷ
 οἱ στόμα· πὰν δὲ τέλος
ἐν τὶν ἔργων· οὐδ' ἀμόχθῳ καρδίᾳ 30
 προσφέρων τόλμαν παραιτεῖται χάριν.

γνώτ' ἀείδω θ<εῷ> τε καὶ ὅστις ἁμιλλᾶται πέρι
ἐσχάτων <ἀέ>θλων κορυφαῖς. ὕπατον δ' ἔσχεν Πίσα
Ἡρακλέος τεθμόν. ἁδεῖαί γε μὲν ἀμβολάδαν
ἐν τελεταῖς δὶς Ἀθαναίων νιν ὀμφαί
κώμασαν· γαίᾳ δὲ καυθείσᾳ πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας 35

[299] Race (1990) 177 argues that "The second element receives considerable emphasis: it is longer, more impressive, has the proper name Adrastos, and ends its period."

ἔμολεν Ἥρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν ἀγγ<έω>ν
ἔρκεσιν παμποικίλοις.

Father Zeus, his mouth is silent about what he desires with his mind, and every fulfillment of deeds is with you, and he does not ask this favor offering courage with a heart shrinking from toil. I sing things known by the god and whoever contends for the summits of the ultimate games, and Pisa held the highest ordinance of Herakles. Sweet voices celebrated him as a prelude twice in the rites of the Athenians, and in earth burned by fire the fruit of the olive came to the brave people of Hera in the all-variegated walls of jars.

Theaios is too reverent to mention Olympia himself. Propriety is the constraint manifested in this passage. Pindar repeats the word στόμα (29), "mouth," from the second strophe (19), emphasizing that Theaios' silence parallels his own inability to express everything that he might. He replaces Theaios' muteness with his own pious speech, invoking Zeus as Ζεῦ πάτερ (29), "Father Zeus," and attributing to him πὰν τέλος ἔργων (29-30), "every fulfillment of deeds."[300] Pindar takes it upon himself to voice the ambition for Olympia, referring to Πίσα (32), "Pisa," a town near Olympia. He also mentions Theaios' two victories at the Panathenaia (33-36), which brought with them jars of olive oil (35-36), as harbingers of the forthcoming achievement.[301]

The third catalogue records the numerous athletic accomplishments of Theaios' maternal relatives (37-44):

ἐπέβα δέ, Θεαῖε, ματρώ-
ων πολύγνωτον γένος ὑμετέρων
εὐάγων τιμὰ Χαρίτεσσί τε καὶ σὺν
Τυνδαρίδαις θαμάκις.
ἀξιωθείην κεν, ἐὼν Θρασύκλου
Ἀντία τε σύγγονος, Ἄργεϊ μὴ κρύπτειν φάος 40
ὀμμάτων. νικαφορίαις γὰρ ὅσαις †ἱπ-
ποτρόφον ἄστυ τὸ Προί-
τοιο θάλησεν† Κορίνθου τ' ἐν μυχοῖς·
καὶ Κλεωναίων πρὸς ἀνδρῶν τετράκις,

Σικυωνόθε δ' ἀργυρωθέν-
τες σὺν οἰνηραῖς φιάλαις ἀπέβαν,
ἐκ δὲ Πελλάνας ἐπιεσσάμενοι νῶ-
τον μαλακαῖσι κρόκαις·

Theaios, the honor of successful contests often follows the famous race of your maternal ancestors with the aid of the Graces and the Tyndaridai. If I were a relative

[300] Race (1990) 129 n. 29 asserts that "Ζεῦ πάτερ is a much more familiar and warmer appellation than Κρονίων, since it establishes a close I-Thou relationship between the worshipper and the god." Polydeukes addresses Zeus as πάτερ Κρονίων (76), "father, son of Kronos."
[301] Carne-Ross (1985) 84 connects the jars of olive oil from the Panathenaia with the olive wreath that was the prize at Olympia.

of Thrasyklos and Antias, I would not deem it worthy to hide the light of my eyes in Argos. For this horse-raising city of Proitos has flourished with so many victories in the glens of Corinth, and four times from the men of Kleonai, and they departed from Sikyon rewarded with silver wine bowls, and from Pellana wearing cloths of soft wool on their backs.

Pindar begins the third strophe by addressing Theaios (37), but the emphasis shifts to the victories of his maternal relatives. He asserts that εὐάγων τιμά (38), "the honor of successful contests," accompanies them in addition to Χαρίτεσσί (38), "the Graces," and Τυνδαρίδαις (38), "the Tyndaridai." The reference to the Graces recalls the opening invocation to them (1), and the mention of the Tyndaridai anticipates the mythological account of the deification of Kastor (49-90). Pindar names Thrasyklos and Antias (39-40), maternal relatives of Theaios, citing them as consummate models of athletic success whose achievements represent a stimulus to future generations of athletes to compete in contests throughout Greece. He mentions their triumphs Κορίνθου τ' ἐν μυχοῖς (42), "in the glens of Corinth," that is, at Isthmia, and reports four victories Κλεωναίων πρὸς ἀνδρῶν (42), "from the men of Kleonai," who administered the contest at Nemea at the time. He emphasizes the material composition of the trophies taken from Sicyon (43, ἀργυρωθέντες σὺν οἰνηραῖς φιάλαις, "rewarded with silver wine bowls") and Pellana (44, ἐπιεσσάμενοι νῶτον μαλακαῖσι κρόκαις, "wearing cloths of soft wool on their backs"), picking up the characterization of the Argive Heraia as ἀγών χάλκεος (22), "the contest for bronze."

Pindar concludes this catalogue by lamenting his inability to reckon the many victories in local competitions throughout Greece (45-48):

ἀλλὰ χαλκὸν μυρίον οὐ δυνατόν 45
ἐξελέγχειν – μακροτέρας γὰρ ἀριθμῆσαι σχολᾶς –
ὅν τε Κλείτωρ καὶ Τεγέα καὶ Ἀχαιῶν
ὑψίβατοι πόλιες
καὶ Λύκαιον πὰρ Διὸς θῆκε δρόμῳ,
σὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικῶντι σθένει.

But it is not possible to compute the immense amount of bronze—for it would take more leisure than we have to count it—which Kleitor, Tegea, the lofty cities of the Achaians, and Lykaion set beside the racecourse of Zeus to win with strength of feet and hands.

This passage articulates the constraint of time. The verbs ἐξελέγχειν (46), "to compute," and ἀριθμῆσαι (46), "to count," frame the task of honoring these victors as a matter of accounting, but there is insufficient σχολᾶς (46), "leisure," to calculate χαλκὸν μυρίον (45), "the immense amount of bronze."[302] Pindar uses the notion of enumeration to express a vast sense of scope. Poetic speech is inadequate to handle inventories of this size, because poetic speech occurs in time. He suggests that the task might be completed, but it would take more

[302] Henry (2005) 107 argues that ἀλλὰ χαλκὸν μυρίον οὐ δυνατόν ἐξελέγχειν (45-46) should be translated as "'but it is not possible to put the countless bronze to the test', i. e. to attempt to discover where each of their bronze prizes was won," but this interpretation makes the verb ἀριθμῆσαι (46) a non sequitur.

time than he has to spare. Pindar cannot escape the basic temporal restrictions that govern all human activity.

The first part of Nemean 10 concludes with the third antistrophe. The remainder of the victory ode consists of a mythological account of the death and deification of Kastor. I have been arguing that Pindar formulates a series of constraints upon speech in the first half of Nemean 10, which serve to explain the ending of Nemean 1 and anticipate the resolution of Nemean 10. These constraints are physical deficiency (19-20), propriety (29-36), and time (45-48). I contend that the narrative of Kastor and Polydeukes proceeds through these three constraints as thematic reference points, but ultimately subverts them by concluding with the promise of speech.

Pindar introduces the topic of the mythological account in the third epode (49-53):

> Κάστορος δ' ἐλθόντος ἐπὶ ξενίαν πὰρ Παμφάη
> καὶ κασιγνήτου Πολυδεύκεος, οὐ θαῦμα σφίσιν 50
> ἐγγενὲς ἔμμεν ἀεθληταῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν· ἐπεί
> εὐρυχόρου ταμίαι Σπάρτας ἀγώνων
> μοῖραν Ἑρμᾷ καὶ σὺν Ἡρακλεῖ διέποντι θάλειαν,
> μάλα μὲν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων περικαδόμενοι. καὶ
> μὰν θεῶν πιστὸν γένος.
>
> And because Kastor and his brother Polydeukes came for hospitality to the house of Pamphaës, it is no wonder that it is inborn for them to be noble athletes, since those stewards of spacious Sparta manage their plentiful portion of the games with Hermes and Herakles, being very concerned about just men. Indeed the race of the gods is trusty.

The first word of the third epode is Κάστορος (49), "Kastor," announcing the sudden focus upon the divine twins. Pindar uses a genitive absolute to communicate their relationship to Pamphaës, another maternal ancestor of Theaios. Kastor and Polydeukes visited Pamphaës ἐπὶ ξενίαν (49), "for hospitality," and this ancient association explains the family's propensity to produce ἀεθληταῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν (51), "noble athletes."[303] The gnomic statement καὶ μὰν θεῶν πιστὸν γένος (53), "Indeed the race of the gods is trusty," reinforces the earlier emphasis upon propriety, stressing the idea that it often bears fruit.

The fourth triad narrates the strife between Kastor and Polydeukes and the sons of Aphareus, Idas and Lynkeus (55-72):

> μεταμειβόμενοι δ' ἐναλλὰξ 55
> ἁμέραν τὰν μὲν παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳ
> Δὶ νέμονται, τὰν δ' ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίας
> ἐν γυάλοις Θεράπνας,
> πότμον ἀμπιπλάντες ὁμοῖον· ἐπεί
> τοῦτον, ἢ πάμπαν θεὸς ἔμμεναι οἰκεῖν τ' οὐρανῷ,
> εἵλετ' αἰῶνα φθιμένου Πολυδεύκης

[303] Currie (2005) 58 notes that "This kind of family theoxeny story was evidently a common encomiastic theme." He cites Herodotus 6.127.3, Pindar O. 3.38-41, 6.77-81, P. 8.58-60, N. 7.86-97, I. 2.39-40, and Plato *Lysis* 205c6-d1.

Κάστορος ἐν πολέμῳ.
τὸν γὰρ Ἴδας ἀμφὶ βουσίν πως χολω- 60
θεὶς ἔτρωσεν χαλκέας λόγχας ἀκμᾷ.

ἀπὸ Ταϋγέτου πεδαυγά-
ζων ἴδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει
ἡμένους. κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων πάν-
των γένετ' ὀξύτατον
ὄμμα. λαιψηροῖς δὲ πόδεσσιν ἄφαρ
ἐξικέσθαν, καὶ μέγα ἔργον ἐμήσαντ' ὠκέως
καὶ πάθον δεινὸν παλάμαις Ἀφαρητί- 65
δαι Διός· αὐτίκα γάρ
ἦλθε Λήδας παῖς διώκων· τοὶ δ' ἔναν-
τα στάθεν τύμβῳ σχεδὸν πατρωΐῳ·

ἔνθεν ἁρπάξαντες ἄγαλμ' Ἀΐδα, ξεστὸν πέτρον,
ἔμβαλον στέρνῳ Πολυδεύκεος· ἀλλ' οὔ νιν φλάσαν
οὐδ' ἀνέχασσαν· ἐφορμαθεὶς δ' ἄρ' ἄκοντι θοῷ,
ἤλασε Λυγκέος ἐν πλευραῖσι χαλκόν. 70
Ζεὺς δ' ἐπ' Ἴδᾳ πυρφόρον πλᾶξε ψολόεντα κεραυνόν·
ἅμα δ' ἐκαίοντ' ἐρῆμοι. χαλεπὰ δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώ-
ποις ὁμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων.

Changing alternately, they spend one day beside their dear father Zeus, and they spend the other in the depths of the earth in the hollows of Therapna, fulfilling a like fate, since Polydeukes chose this life rather than to be a god entirely and to dwell on Olympos when Kastor had perished in war. For Idas, somehow angered about cattle, wounded him with the point of his bronze spear. Watching keenly from Taygetos, Lynkeus saw them sitting in the trunk of an oak tree. For of all mortals he had the sharpest eye. And the sons of Aphareus immediately arrived on swift feet and quickly contrived a great deed, and they suffered terribly at the hands of Zeus. For the son of Leda came straightaway, pursuing them, and they stood opposite near the tomb of their father. Having seized from there the ornament of Hades, a hewn stone, they cast it at the breast of Polydeukes, but they did not crush him nor push him back, and attacking them with his swift javelin, he drove the bronze into Lynkeus' side. And Zeus hurled against Idas a sooty fire-bearing thunderbolt, and at the same time they burned alone. Strife against those who are stronger is difficult for men to face.

Pindar begins the account with a broad description of the divine twins' fate.[304] The participial phrase μεταμειβόμενοι δ' ἐναλλὰξ (55), "changing alternately," alludes to the divided existence on Olympos and in the underworld.[305] He sketches this existence with the construction ἁμέραν τὰν μὲν νέμονται, τὰν δ' (55-56), "they spend one day, and they spend

[304] Young (1993) 128 notes that "This myth reveals a typical Pindaric ring form. Before narrating his story, Pindar states the gist at the outset."
[305] Cf. *Od*. 11.301-04.

the other," contrasting the prepositional phrases παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳ Δὶ (55-56), "beside their dear father Zeus," and ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίας (56), "in the depths of the earth." Pindar recounts Polydeukes' choice with a causal clause (57-59), in which the nominal phrase τοῦτον αἰῶνα (58-59), "this life," refers to the existence depicted above. He articulates the alternative as ἢ πάμπαν θεὸς ἔμμεναι οἰκεῖν τ' οὐρανῷ (58), "rather than to be a god entirely and to dwell on Olympos." The genitive absolute φθιμένου Κάστορος ἐν πολέμῳ (59), "when Kastor had perished in war," relates the immediate circumstances surrounding the choice.[306]

Pindar stresses Lynkeus' corporeal talents in the fourth antistrophe, opposing him to the earlier conception of physical deficiency as a constraint upon speech. The narrative begins with Kastor and Idas. Pindar characterizes their initial dispute as ἀμφὶ βουσίν (60), "about cattle," that is, a matter of stolen cows.[307] Lynkeus observes the divine twins from Taygetos (61-62), a mountain in the Peloponnese. The participle πεδαυγάζων (61), "Watching keenly," draws attention to his exceptional vision, and Pindar explains that κείνου ἐπιχθονίων πάντων γένετ' ὀξύτατον ὄμμα (62-63), "of all mortals he had the sharpest eye." The illustration of Lynkeus' ὀξύτατον ὄμμα (62-63) inverts the depiction of Pindar's στόμα (19), "mouth," as βραχύ (19), "too small." Lynkeus represents a corruption of the basic constraints that check normative human behavior.

Idas and Lynkeus attack Kastor and Polydeukes with their father's tombstone, an affront to propriety. After the arrival of Polydeukes, Pindar situates the sons of Aphareus in a defensive stance τύμβῳ σχεδὸν πατρωΐῳ (66), "near the tomb of their father." They resort to dislodging his tombstone (67), which they throw at Polydeukes (68). Pindar calls the tombstone ἄγαλμ' Ἀΐδα (67), "the ornament of Hades," and ξεστὸν πέτρον (67), "a hewn stone." The reference to Hades makes this a religious offense in addition to a slight against Aphareus. Pindar had emphasized fatherhood in the second antistrophe, invoking Zeus as Ζεῦ πάτερ (29), "Father Zeus," and the divine patriarch punishes them here, striking Idas with a πυρφόρον ψολόεντα κεραυνόν (71), "sooty fire-bearing thunderbolt."[308] The sons of Aphareus suffer terribly for their act of impropriety.

The final triad recounts the exchange between Polydeukes and Zeus that results in the divine twins' alternating existence (73-90):

ταχέως δ' ἐπ' ἀδελφεοῦ βί-
 αν πάλιν χώρησεν ὁ Τυνδαρίδας,
καί νιν οὔπω τεθναότ', ἄσθματι δὲ φρίσ-
 σοντα πνοὰς ἔκιχεν.
θερμὰ δὴ τέγγων δάκρυα στοναχαῖς 75
ὄρθιον φώνασε· 'Πάτερ Κρονίων, τίς δὴ λύσις
ἔσσεται πενθ<έω>ν; καὶ ἐμοὶ θάνατον σὺν
 τῷδ' ἐπίτειλον, ἄναξ.
οἴχεται τιμὰ φίλων τατωμένῳ
 φωτί· παῦροι δ' ἐν πόνῳ πιστοὶ βροτῶν

[306] Frame (1978) 140 takes φθιμένου Κάστορος ἐν πολέμῳ (59) as a possessive genitive with αἰῶνα (59).
[307] For discussion of the dispute, see Young (1993) 129 and Henry (2005) 110, who cite Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* (*Chrestomathia* 106-09) and Apollodorus 3.11.2.3-4.
[308] Stern (1969) 127 contrasts the πυρφόρον ψολόεντα κεραυνόν (71) that strikes Idas with the benign thunderbolt used to deify Amphiaraos (8-9).

καμάτου μεταλαμβάνειν.’ ὣς
ἤνεπε· Ζεὺς δ' ἀντίος ἤλυθέ οἱ,
καὶ τόδ' ἐξαύδασ' ἔπος· ‘Ἐσσί μοι υἱός· 80
τόνδε δ' ἔπειτα πόσις
σπέρμα θνατὸν ματρὶ τεᾷ πελάσαις
στάξεν ἥρως, ἀλλ' ἄγε τῶνδέ τοι ἔμπαν αἵρεσιν
παρδίδωμ'· εἰ μὲν θάνατόν τε φυγὼν καὶ
γῆρας ἀπεχθόμενον
αὐτὸς Οὔλυμπον θέλεις <ναίειν ἐμοὶ>
σύν τ' Ἀθαναίᾳ κελαινεγχεῖ τ' Ἄρει,

ἔστι σοι τούτων λάχος· εἰ δὲ κασιγνήτου πέρι 85
μάρνασαι, πάντων δὲ νοεῖς ἀποδάσσασθαι ἴσον,
ἥμισυ μέν κε πνέοις γαίας ὑπένερθεν ἐών,
ἥμισυ δ' οὐρανοῦ ἐν χρυς<έοι>ς δόμοισιν.’
ὣς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος οὐ γνώμᾳ διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν,
ἀνὰ δ' ἔλυσεν μὲν ὀφθαλμόν, ἔπειτα δὲ φωνὰν 90
χαλκομίτρα Κάστορος.

The son of Tyndareos swiftly returned to his mighty brother, and he came upon him not yet dead, but rattling his breaths with panting. Shedding indeed hot tears he cried aloud with a groan, “Father, son of Kronos, what deliverance will there be from sorrows? Prescribe death for me along with this man, lord. Honor departs for a man bereft of his friends, and few mortals are trustworthy in toil to take a share of the trouble.” Thus he spoke. And Zeus came opposite him, and he proclaimed this speech: “You are my son, but her husband, a hero, let drop this man afterward as his mortal seed, having approached your mother. But come, I nevertheless grant you the choice of these options: if you yourself wish, having escaped death and hateful old age, to inhabit Olympos with me, Athena, and Ares with black spear, you have an allotment of these things, but if you strive on behalf of your brother, and you are minded to apportion everything equally with him, then you may live being half of the time beneath the earth, and half of the time in the golden homes of heaven.” When Zeus had spoken thus, Polydeukes did not set a twofold design in his judgment, but he freed the eye, and then the voice of bronze-armored Kastor.

The final strophe emphasizes Kastor’s weakened state as he lies on the verge of death. Polydeukes encounters him ἄσθματι δὲ φρίσσοντα πνοάς (74), “rattling his breaths with panting.”[309] The wounds inflicted by Idas have rendered him unable to speak, whereas Pindar stresses Polydeukes’ comparative control over his vocal register with the noun στοναχαῖς (75), “a groan,” and the verbs φώνασε (76), “cried,” and ἤνεπε (79), “spoke.” Kastor’s silence in this moment is emblematic of his mute status throughout the victory ode. His brother addresses Zeus in direct speech, but Kastor never utters a word that we are allowed to hear.

[309] For discussion of ἄσθματι (74), see Young (1993) 130 and Henry (2005) 114.

Zeus frames the fate chosen by Polydeukes as a division of time. Polydeukes complains to his father about his allowing Kastor to die, asking that he perish alongside his brother (77).[310] Zeus responds by explaining that Polydeukes is his son (80), but that Tyndareos sired Kastor from his σπέρμα θνατόν (81), "mortal seed."[311] He offers him the choice of an eternal life beside the immortals (83-85) or an alternating existence on Olympos and in the underworld (85-88). Pindar constructs the second option around the opposition of ἥμισυ μέν, ἥμισυ δ' (87-88), "half of the time, and half of the time," which underscores the crucial division of time proposed by Zeus. The prepositional phrases γαίας ὑπένερθεν (87), "beneath the earth," and οὐρανοῦ ἐν χρυσέοις δόμοισιν (88), "in the golden homes of heaven," articulate the contrast between the two sides of this fate.[312] Kastor and Polydeukes have the option to be immortal together, but they cannot escape the fetters of time.

Despite the persistent emphasis upon discursive constraints, the victory ode concludes with the promise of speech. Polydeukes chooses to endure an alternating existence with his brother (89), whose restoration Pindar describes in vivid terms (90). He first relates that Polydeukes unfettered Kastor's ὀφθαλμόν (90), "eye," which recalls the earlier description of Lynkeus as possessing ὀξύτατον ὄμμα (62-63), "the sharpest eye," and closes the poem with the release of Kastor's φωνάν (90), "voice."[313] It is significant that Pindar describes Kastor's restoration with the active verb in tmesis ἀνὰ δ' ἔλυσεν (90), "freed," which indicates that Polydeukes' choice was the motivating cause.[314] I would argue that this ending disrupts the course of Nemean 10 to this point. The victory ode has progressed through three catalogues, terminating each with a statement about constraints upon speech, but Kastor cannot be constrained, because his speech remains unstated. The audience is left wondering what Kastor said upon his return from death. The effect, then, of the open ending of Nemean 10 is to refuse a final resolution. Kastor's speech begins where Pindar's concludes.[315]

Nemean 10 proceeds through a fitful sequence of starts and stops, beginning and ending three separate catalogues, the first of which restages the conclusion of Nemean 1. The poem functions as a systematic exploration of closure, explaining the various reasons why speech must be brought to a halt. Pindar redeploys these reasons in the mythological narrative, warping them as through a fun house mirror. He concludes the poem with the image of Kastor's resurrection. In this moment the man who was silent throughout the victory ode opens his mouth. Perhaps this is the final constraint. Pindar leaves us straining to catch the words of a speech that we cannot hear.

---

[310] Crotty (1982) 77 argues that "the brothers' loyalty to each other may have suggestions of the relationship between the poet and the athlete."

[311] Henry (2005) 116 notes that "As Castor lies dying, we are forcefully reminded of the act that brought him into being: even at the very beginning of his existence, his present death was destined to occur, for he grew from mortal 'seed.'"

[312] Young (1993) 130 notes that "It is an astounding choice: permanent immortality or dying millions of deaths. Nor can we ignore the implication of the choice. If he chooses the second alternative, Polydeuces will awaken every morning realizing either that he is in the underworld, or that he must descend to it later that very day."

[313] For the ritual significance of releasing the eyes and mouth, see Young (1993) 131-32.

[314] Cf. Huxley (1975) 21, who, following Fennell (1899) 134 and Sandys (1919) 425, makes Zeus the subject of ἀνὰ δ' ἔλυσεν (90).

[315] Rutherford (1997) 54 contends that "This is as much a beginning as an end."

The open ending presents a unique set of issues. We have seen that Pindar likely drew upon the narrative innovations of Sappho and Alcaeus, adapting them to the requirements of choral poetry. The conventional victory ode transitions away from the mythological account with a return to the present tense of the victory celebration, parsing the import of the exemplum, but the poems surveyed above refuse to provide this closure. Olympian 4, Nemean 1, and Nemean 10 all conclude within the frame of a mythological narrative, but offer distinct conceptions of the uses to which the open ending might be put.

Olympian 4 represents an ideal illustration of the possibilities for formal experimentation offered by the open ending. The poem progresses through a strophe and antistrophe concerned with Psaumis' athletic achievements, but the epode contains a mythological account of Erginos' retort to the Lemnian women. The introduction of successive levels of narrative framing at this late stage in the triad creates the expectation of a return to the poet's voice, but instead the victory ode simply concludes. Olympian 4 demonstrates that the structural innovations pioneered by the Lesbian poets for use in monostrophic contexts are even more effective in triadic poetry.

Nemean 1 proposes its own conception of the relationship between the triad structure and the open ending. Pindar harnesses the four triads of the victory ode like the horses of a chariot, drawing special attention to the opening lines of the second and fourth strophes, which articulate the crucial comparison of Pindar and Amphitryon as witnesses of the spectacular accomplishments of Chromios and Herakles respectively. This conspicuous construction of the poem allows Pindar to close Nemean 1 within the mythological account rather than returning to his own voice. The mythological narrative of Herakles covers the full duration of his eternal existence. Pindar begins with Herakles' birth, transitioning to the attack, which he presents as the initial incident in a lengthy heroic career. The account concludes with a report of a prophecy by Teiresias, which envisions Herakles' posthumous marriage to Hebe and eternal position beside Zeus. The open ending accentuates this perpetual vision by refusing to close the narrative frame.

Nemean 10 interrogates the very notion of closure. Pindar proceeds through a series of catalogues in the first half of the victory ode, terminating each with a statement enunciating a particular constraint upon speech. These constraints, which are physical deficiency, propriety, and time, become the thematic reference points around which the mythological narrative of Kastor's death and shared immortality is later constructed. Lynkeus' eyesight represents a corruption of the basic checks that govern human behavior, the conversion by the sons of Aphareus of their father's tombstone into a weapon violates the fundamental idea of paternal respect, and the ultimate choice offered to Polydeukes by Zeus functions as a division of time. The final image of the poem works to upset this emphasis upon endings. Pindar depicts Kastor's resurrection, closing with the restoration of his voice. The audience is left wondering what was said in this moment.

We have examined Pindar's uses of the open ending, lingering upon the diverse images that conclude these three victory odes. Is there anything that connects them other than a common refusal to abandon the narration? I would argue that Pindar has selected moments that gesture beyond the set boundaries of the mythological world envisioned. The abbreviated nature of these accounts leaves room for the imagination. Did Hypsipyle respond to Erginos? What other monstrous obstacles did Herakles overcome? Pindar invites his audience to continue composing the poem in their own minds.

Chapter Four

Interlocking Victory Odes

There survive a number of instances in which multiple victory odes were composed for the same athletic victory, both by the same poet and by different poets. In four of these instances scholars differentiate between the primary victory ode and a shorter poem possibly written and performed at the festival site in the days immediately following the victory: Olympian 10 and Olympian 11 for Hagesidamos of Western Lokroi in the boys' boxing at Olympia in 476 BCE, Pythian 1 and Bacchylides 4 for Hieron of Aitna in the chariot race at the Pythian festival in 470 BCE, Bacchylides 1 and Bacchylides 2 for Argeios of Keos in the boys' boxing at Isthmia in 454 or 452 BCE, and Bacchylides 6 and Bacchylides 7 for Lachon of Keos in the boys' sprint at Olympia in 452 BCE.[316] There are also four instances in which two poems of considerable length were composed to celebrate the same victory: Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5 for Hieron of Syracuse in the single-horse race at Olympia in 476 BCE, Olympian 2 and Olympian 3 for Theron of Akragas in the chariot race at Olympia in 476 BCE, Pythian 4 and Pythian 5 for Arkesilas of Kyrene in the chariot race at the Pythian festival in 462 BCE, and Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13 for Pytheas of Aegina in the boys' pancratium at Nemea in 485 or 483 BCE. In this chapter, I will examine three of the latter instances.

We might wonder why an individual victor would commission two victory odes, especially from the same poet. In a simplistic sense the performance of multiple poems adds to the lavishness of the celebration, but I would also argue that the poets themselves viewed these situations as opportunities to work upon a broader canvas. There is a certain finitude to the prospect of a single poem composed for a specific occasion, but two poems have the potential to interact with each other or even coalesce into a unit. I have been suggesting that a tendency toward experimentation animated the genre, inspiring the poets to transgress some of the formal constraints associated with older poetic conceptions. The reality of multiple commissions served as another incentive to experiment by allowing the poets to transcend the boundaries between individual poems.

We should take a minute to consider how the performance of multiple victory odes at a single celebration would have worked. The performances might have taken place on separate days or on the same day. I contend that in either case the inevitable consequence of

[316] Gelzer (1985) argues for the performance of the shorter poems at the festival sites, although Eckerman (2012) advises caution about this position.

staging two performances in a relatively brief window of time would have been the implicit juxtaposition of them. The audience would likely have held the two performances in close association with each other, continuing to process the first while beginning to experience the second. I would suggest that the poets understood this to be the case, and took pains in the production of their victory odes to engage with the potential for individual poems to bleed into one another.

My primary contention is that the coordinated design of multiple poems from the earliest stages of composition would have enabled the poets to imagine architectures of praise encompassing both victory odes. I am gesturing here toward a particularly intimate form of intertextual engagement rooted in the mutual processes of poetic ideation and composition. The reality of simultaneous production allows for a fluid interaction between texts, which might allude to each other in both directions or even become entangled. I would argue that the poets exploited this potential for bidirectionality, producing poems that conversed with each other.[317]

There are obvious distinctions between the types of intertextual engagements possible for an individual poet composing multiple victory odes and for two poets collaborating on separate victory odes. The case of a single poet composing multiple poems is comparatively simple. Keeping the desires of the patron in mind, he exerts authorial control over what to include in both poems, and can coordinate them however he wishes. He chooses the mythological exempla, the gnomic statements, and how to incorporate the victor's distinguished relatives into the poems. I would argue that the artistry of a single poet makes a finer level of interaction attainable. He might cultivate clever repetitions of image and phrase between his two compositions, almost treating them like one long poem.

The prospect of two poets working in collaboration suggests a more complicated scenario. While Pindar and Bacchylides produced for their patrons distinct poetic creations that survive for us with clear attributions, the possibility of a collaborative approach to composition implies a somewhat messier conception of authorship.[318] If the poets discussed and agreed on a unified argument across the two poems commissioned for a particular victory, there would seem to be an extent to which each poet, having contributed to the combined thought process, is responsible for both poems. Contemporary writers who work collaboratively have remarked that it is difficult to assign credit retroactively for the

---

[317] Scholarship on intertextuality has long stressed the ability of readers to construct bidirectional formulations of the relationships between texts. Fowler (2000) 130, for instances, asserts that "If we locate 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;" cf. Martindale (1993) 7-8. What I am suggesting is an author-focused bidirectionality, although I acknowledge that the figure of the author is necessarily a reconstruction. Hinds (1998) 49 has sensibly stated that "one of the most persistent ways in which both Roman and modern readers construct the meaning of a poetic text is by attempting to construct from (and for) it an intention-bearing authorial voice, a construction which they generally hope or believe (in a belief which must always be partly misguided) to be a reconstruction." This is what I have tried to do in proposing that Pindar and Bacchylides composed victory odes in coordination.

[318] Discussion of collaborative authorship also appears in the scholarship on Old Comedy, especially Mastromarco (1979), Halliwell (1980), Halliwell (1989), and Sidwell (1993). Halliwell (1989) provides a useful overview of the evidence, most of which consists of accusations of plagiarism and authorial collaboration. The intriguing compound verb συμποιέω appears twice (Aristophanes fr. 596 and Eupolis fr. 89), denoting collaborative authorship of comedies.

inception of individual ideas.[319] The natural flow of human conversation is dynamic, and ideas often come about as a consequence of the reciprocal exchange of views between speakers. I do not wish to take this argument to its logical extreme. In every substantial respect Pindar is, for instance, the author of Nemean 5, but we should remain open to the suggestion that both participants in a collaboration retain some of the responsibility for their collective intellectual labor.

This notion of authorial collaboration upends the traditional consensus that Pindar and Bacchylides were bitter rivals. The scholiasts, for instance, to Pindar's Olympian 2.86-88 assert that the reference to the two crows that squawk ineffectually against the eagle of Zeus is directed at Bacchylides and Simonides.[320] This tradition of animosity extends to the relationship between the two poets and Hieron. The scholiast to Pythian 2.52-53 (ἐμὲ δὲ χρεών φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν, "I must avoid the violent bite of slander") contends that the lines in question offer a riddling allusion to Bacchylides, who is supposed to have maligned Pindar to Hieron.[321] These comments, like most of the biographical readings found in the Pindar scholia, have the ring of baseless speculation, but they express a broader cultural understanding of the two poets as assumed competitors.[322]

The default assumption for the cultural institutions of the archaic and early classical Greeks is that they were necessarily competitive. The performance context of the victory ode seems to invite such agonistic notions. After all, the athletes celebrated in these poems strove fiercely to defeat their opponents; it is perhaps natural to expect a similarly competitive spirit from the poets themselves. We see many instances of poetic competition elsewhere among the Greeks. The City Dionysia at Athens famously featured tragic, comedic, and dithyrambic competitions, and Derek Collins, exploring the existence of competitive elements in a range of literary genres, has argued that competition is essentially ubiquitous.[323] It is easy to imagine how Pindar and Bacchylides came to be viewed as natural adversaries, but I would argue that this unwavering emphasis on competition risks flattening Greek culture into a single inflexible conception.[324] Entertaining the possibility of co-ordination between Pindar and Bacchylides, Felix Budelmann suggests that "perhaps competition is not the only mode in which they operated."[325] Not every circumstance calls for competition, and some even reward collaboration.

---

[319] Lewis (2017) describes how the psychologists Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, who co-authored a number of seminal articles in the field of behavioral economics, were rarely able to discern who was responsible for an individual idea.

[320] Drachmann i 98-99.

[321] Drachmann ii 48. Cf. the comments of the scholiasts on P. 2.72 (Drachmann ii 54), 88 (Drachmann ii 58), 90 (Drachmann ii 60), and N. 3.82 (Drachmann iii 62), which also read seemingly unrelated statements as evidence of Pindar's contentious relationship with Bacchylides.

[322] As a parallel, cf. Bundy (1972) on Callimachus *Hymn to Apoll*o 105-13, which the scholiasts and subsequent interpreters understood to refer mockingly to Apollonius *Argonautica* 1.2. Bundy argues against this interpretation, calling into question the ancient belief in a quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius.

[323] Collins (2004); cf. Griffith (1990) and Burckhardt (1998).

[324] Most (2012) 253, who considers the phenomenon of both poets writing victory odes to celebrate the same victory, insists that "each poet designed his poem not only so as to celebrate the victor but also in order to demonstrate to everyone—the victor, the audience, above all the other poet—that his own mode of celebration was the better one."

[325] Budelmann (2012) 179 n. 18.

What, then, are the mechanisms by which I imagine collaboration taking place? I would venture that the poets might have convened some weeks or months before the occasion of an individual victory celebration, possibly sharing drafts of their prospective poems.[326] The numerous athletic competitions in various regions throughout Greece would have provided a recurrent schedule of venues for these meetings.[327] I would also suggest that the nature and extent of collaboration likely varied from commission to commission. Sometimes the poets might have composed their victory odes in close communication, but at other times that would not have been possible.

How might we bring these implications to bear in constructing bidirectional readings of the victory odes produced simultaneously? The first step requires discovering the conceptual imperatives underlying the commission. How did the poet want to set about praising the victor? In most cases we must extract this information from evidence internal to the text, but a second victory ode provides a kind of control condition. One poem might take an idiosyncratic approach to the celebration of a given victory, but we would not expect both poems to develop the same eccentric strategies independently. The aim is to locate those points at which the poems reveal that they are trying to accomplish the same thing.

The pattern of thought most critical to the victory ode is analogy. Pindar and Bacchylides generally praise their patrons by employing some sort of comparison to a divinity or hero. I would argue that this is the conceptual level at which the bonds between poems composed for the same victory are forged. The poets might develop an elaborate comparative framework across both poems, such as a metaphor in which the first poem contains the tenor and the second the vehicle. In reading these victory odes, we must be alert to the complex structures of association that Pindar and Bacchylides produce. This is not to suggest that our attention should be focused exclusively on higher-order correspondences. The larger connections between poems are often supported by delicate resemblances of language and image, suggesting that the process of collaboration continued and evolved through the composition and editing of each individual victory ode.

This chapter examines three case studies of paired victory odes written to celebrate the same athletic victory. I begin with an instance in which both poems were composed by the same poet: Pythian 4 and Pythian 5. Accounting for the strange circumstances surrounding these two poems, I argue that Pindar establishes the charioteer Karrhotos in Pythian 5 as a model for the exile Damophilos in Pythian 4. Karrhotos exemplifies the ideal of benefaction, while Damophilos aspires to the same standard. My second case study is Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13. I contend that Pindar and Bacchylides construct between the two poems a multigenerational comparative framework equating Pytheas' family with the Aiakidai. Within this scheme Pytheas represents Achilles, although Peleus' son is absent from Nemean 5. My final case study is Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5. Scrutinizing the

---

[326] Martin (2000) 423-24 offers a comparable instance of poetic collaboration in the tradition of Turkish song-contests: "But one detail of the sociology of Turkish song-contests remains suggestive: each *ashik* not only secretly observes his audience just prior to performance in order to prepare verses that will praise the specific group each night; he also *confers* at length, prior to the performance, with that night's competitor. In other words, competition *induces* collaboration."

[327] Uhlig (forthcoming) similarly imagines that conversations might have taken place between Pindar and Aeschylus, suggesting a host of possible venues for these hypothetical meetings, including Syracuse, Kamarina, Akragas, Gela, and Athens.

close verbal likenesses between Olympian 1 and a brief passage from Bacchylides 5, I suggest that the two poems reinforce each other in collectively praising Hieron.

Pythian 4 and Pythian 5

Pindar composed a pair of victory odes to celebrate the victory of king Arkesilas of Kyrene in the chariot race at the Pythian festival in 462 BCE: Pythian 4 and Pythian 5. Pythian 4 is an anomaly within the corpus of Pindar's victory odes. Stretching on for almost three hundred lines, the poem is more than twice as long as any of its peers. It is also anomalous in its content. After a quasi-epic recitation of the expedition of the Argo, which transcends the usual narrative scope of the genre, Pythian 4 ends with a defense of Damophilos, an exiled citizen of Kyrene. Pythian 5, on the other hand, is a more conventional victory ode. The poem praises Arkesilas for his wise leadership and celebrates the deft maneuvering of the charioteer Karrhotos, a relative of Arkesilas.[328] I would argue that Pindar presents Karrhotos and Damophilos in parallel. Karrhotos, who dedicates the victorious chariot in the temple of Apollo at Delphi, represents the ideal benefactor, providing a model for Damophilos, who hopes to reenter the aristocratic culture of Kyrene.[329]

Pythian 4 and Pythian 5 share the feature of an unusual emphasis upon a contemporary figure other than the victor. The final triad of Pythian 4 makes an unexpected appeal on Damophilos' behalf. Pindar attests to his reformed character, beseeching Arkesilas to restore him to his native land. Pythian 5 shines a similar light on Karrhotos, recounting his adroit performance in the race and subsequent dedication of the chariot. While Damophilos and Karrhotos appear to have little in common, the one a controversial fugitive and the other a triumphant athlete, I would argue that Pindar presents them as mirror images of one another.[330] Damophilos is the former benefactor, whose return represents a risk for Arkesilas, and Karrhotos is the current benefactor, whose chariot victory reminds the king that friends are useful to have.

The scholia that introduce Pythian 4 describe a period of civic unrest in Kyrene during which Arkesilas killed a number of his political opponents and exiled others,

---

[328] The scholia (Drachmann ii 175-76) assert that Karrhotos was related to Arkesilas by marriage; cf. Gildersleeve (1885), Lefkowitz (1984) 40, Longley-Cook (1989) 238, and Nicholson (2005) 46-47.

[329] The scholia (Drachmann ii 175-76) suggest that Karrhotos might have further assisted Arkesilas in the colonization of Euhesperides, but the accounts are muddled. For discussion of the interpretive possibilities, see Lefkowitz (1985) 40-41, Longley-Cook (1989) 243-46, and Nicholson (2005) 46-47.

[330] Young (1971) 42 offers an instructive framework for thinking about the imperfect correspondence between Karrhotos and Damophilos: "If we regard the comparison made by the Pindaric paradigm as more like a Homeric simile than a medieval or modern allegory, we are on sounder ground. We do not expect a precise point for point correspondence in the Homeric simile; some details may, in fact, appear wholly unrelated. But the poet views at least one feature (and usually more) in the compared object or event as so similar to a feature of the other that he presents his simile, regardless of secondary disparities, as an effective means of illustrating the point which he wishes to make."

including Damophilos.[331] There has been much scholarly debate concerning the immediate circumstances that account for the petition on behalf of Damophilos in the final triad of Pythian 4. While I concede that this matter is entirely speculative, the most probable scenario to me is that Damophilos commissioned Pythian 4 as a gift for Arkesilas.[332] I am in agreement with Gildersleeve and subsequent scholars who have suggested that the final triad represents the rhetorical staging of a reconciliation that must have taken place beforehand.[333] The enactment of so complicated a negotiation through the performance of a victory ode seems highly unlikely, and for Pindar to endanger his relationship with Arkesilas by interceding in support of a legitimately problematic figure is unrealistic. It is also unclear to me how the performance in Kyrene of a victory ode that had not been sanctioned by Arkesilas would have been possible.[334] I propose that Arkesilas and Damophilos had already resolved their differences, and that Damophilos commissioned Pythian 4 to celebrate his renewed friendship with the king.

Moving to Pythian 5, commentators have long wondered about the exceptional emphasis placed upon Karrhotos. The sheer amount of space allotted to him defies the convention for references to trainers and auxiliary athletes. Mary Lefkowitz has suggested that "The extraordinary circumstances of Carrhotus' victory explain why Carrhotus the charioteer merits such extended praise in an ode for the official victor Arcesilaus."[335] Lefkowitz is referring to Karrhotos' successful preservation of the chariot, an unusual accomplishment in such a dangerous event.[336] Nigel Nicholson argues, to the contrary, that "The explanation should be sought instead not in how the charioteer won the race, but in who the charioteer was and, more specifically, how he was related to the victor."[337] Nicholson asserts that there were two kinds of charioteers in the late archaic period, those who were hired on a purely professional basis and those, like Karrhotos, who had a more intimate connection with the owner of the chariot team. The former group posed a problem for aristocrats by undercutting the idea that athletic victory was the result of innate personal characteristics that they alone possessed and by validating a form of economic exchange that minimized the importance of personal ties between the parties involved. For Nicholson, then, it is crucial that "Carrhotus is marked both as an aristocrat and as a close friend of Arcesilas."[338] The focus upon him served as an elite reminder that victory was achievable without "the taint of commodity exchange."[339]

---

[331] For Damophilos' exile, see schol. inscr. a (Drachmann ii 92); cf. Longley-Cook (1989) 199 n. 34 and Segal (1986) 13 n. 22.

[332] The scholia (Drachmann ii 163) first suggested that Damophilos might have commissioned Pythian 4. For futher discussion of this possibility, see Carey (1980b) 143-44 and Longley-Cook (1989) 200-01.

[333] See Gildersleeve (1885), Carey (1980b) 147-48, Braswell (1988) 5-6, and Sigelman (2016) 134-35. Lattimore (1947) 22 suggests, to the contrary, that "We are not forced to believe that the reconciliation had been arranged before the ode was written or sung;" cf. Felson (1999) 29-31.

[334] Longley-Cook (1989) 198 n. 33 remarks that "We cannot, however, absolutely discount the possibility that Arcesilas rejected both ode and plea with the result that *P*.4 was not performed," although it is hard to reconcile this disastrous occurrence with the presumably successful performance of Pythian 5.

[335] Lefkowitz (1985) 39; cf. Dougherty (1993) 109, who offers the same explanation.

[336] Lefkowitz (1985) 38 and Nicholson (2005) 45 both cite the fictitious chariot race from Sophocles *Electra* (723-48), in which nine of the ten teams crash, as evidence of the hazardous nature of the event.

[337] Nicholson (2005) 46.

[338] Nicholson (2005) 49.

[339] Nicholson (2005) 51.

Building on Nicholson's contention that the emphasis upon Karrhotos stems from his aristocratic status and relationship to Arkesilas, I would argue that Pindar sets him up as a model for Damophilos, who seeks to reenter the civic life of Kyrene. The first indicator that Damophilos and Karrhotos are meant to be taken together is the fact that Pindar uses the aorist passive participle ξενωθείς to describe them both. The poet recounts his own recent entertainment of Damophilos in Thebes at the end of Pythian 4 with ξενωθείς (298-99):

καί κε μυθήσαιθ', ὁποίαν, Ἀρκεσίλα,
εὗρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων,
πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς.

And he would tell you, Arkesilas, what sort of spring of immortal songs he found, having recently been hosted in Thebes.

He also uses ξενωθείς to relate Karrhotos' treatment by the citizens of Delphi (30-31):

ἀλλ' ἀρισθάρματον 30
ὕδατι Κασταλίας ξενω-
θεὶς γέρας ἀμφέβαλε τεαῖσιν κόμαις,

But having been honored as a guest by the water of Kastalia he placed around your hair the prize for first place in the chariot race.

I would note that ξενωθείς is a marked form for two reasons: (1) ξενωθείς is the final word of Pythian 4 (299) and (2) these are the only two occurrences of a form derived from ξενόω in all of Pindar. There are other similarities between these two passages. Neither of them states the identity of the host; both feature locative datives where a dative of personal agent would also be appropriate. Pindar is himself the host in Pythian 4 and the citizens of Delphi are the hosts in Pythian 5, but the poet elides this information, focusing instead upon the relationships between the hosted figures and Arkesilas. The immediate context of both passages is an address to Arkesilas. The vocative Ἀρκεσίλα (298) in Pythian 4 offers a reminder that Pindar's defense of Damophilos has been directed at the king, and in Pythian 5 the adjective τεαῖσιν (31), "your," which modifies the noun κόμαις (31), "hair," refers back to the earlier invocation ὦ θεόμορ' Ἀρκεσίλα (5), "O Arkesilas, favored by the gods." In both cases, then, the act of hospitality is triangulated to involve Arkesilas, whom Pindar establishes as the ultimate recipient. Damophilos converts Pindar's poetic inspiration, which he experienced as a guest in Thebes, into a victory ode for Arkesilas, and Karrhotos lavishes upon Arkesilas the chariot victory for which the citizens of Delphi honored him.

The second indicator is a gnomic statement from the second antistrophe of Pythian 5, which shows that the illustration of Karrhotos' achievement functions as an exemplum of a particular point (43-44):

ἑκόντι τοίνυν πρέπει
νόῳ τὸν εὐεργέταν ὑπαντιάσαι.

Therefore it is fitting to encounter one's benefactor with a willing mind.

Previous scholars have stressed the broad applicability of this sentiment.[340] Leslie Kurke, for instance, asserts that "The obligation to reciprocate one's benefactor applies equally to the charioteer's dedication (34-42), Arkesilas' gratitude to the charioteer (26-32), and the king's debt to Apollo (23-25)," but I would argue that the most appropriate referent is Damophilos.[341] The phrase ἑκόντι νόῳ (43-44), "with a willing mind," suggests a hypothetical benefactor about whom one harbors misgivings. We should remember that both Karrhotos and Damophilos were exceptional figures whose prominent positions made them potential sources of danger for Arkesilas. Damophilos, as a former insurrectionist, represents the more immediate threat, but the singular brilliance of Karrhotos' performance in the chariot race is also problematic.[342] In what follows, I contend that Pindar develops in these two victory odes a conception of proper benefaction as dependent upon the subordination of one's largesse to the public good. The ideal bestowal benefits both Arkesilas and the city of Kyrene as a whole, attesting to the humility of the donor. Pindar emphasizes Karrhotos' dedication of the chariot at Delphi, which makes his victory a civic contribution. Damophilos, likewise, commissions a victory ode, displaying his desires both for reconciliation with Arkesilas and for reintegration into the aristocratic culture of the city. Karrhotos, then, provides the ideal exemplum of this virtue, while Damophilos represents an aspirational case.

The presentation of Karrhotos both before and after the articulation of this gnomic statement establishes him as an exemplum of proper benefaction.[343] Karrhotos first appears in the initial epode of Pythian 5 (23-29):

τῶ σε μὴ λαθέτω,
Κυράνᾳ γλυκὺν ἀμφὶ κᾶ-
πον Ἀφροδίτας ἀειδόμενον,
παντὶ μὲν θεὸν αἴτιον ὑπερτιθέμεν, 25
φιλεῖν δὲ Κάρρωτον ἔξοχ' ἑταίρων·
ὃς οὐ τὰν Ἐπιμαθέος ἄγων
ὀψινόου θυγατέρα Πρόφασιν Βαττιδᾶν
ἀφίκετο δόμους θεμισκρεόντων·

Therefore let it not escape your notice, being sung of beside the sweet garden of Aphrodite in Kyrene, to set a god as the cause over everything, and to love exceedingly among your companions Karrhotos, who did not arrive at the homes of

[340] See Hubbard (1985) 128 n. 78, Longley-Cook (1989) 241, and Kurke (1991) 126-27.
[341] Kurke (1991) 127.
[342] Kurke (1991) 195-224 illustrates the necessity of reintegrating the victorious athlete into the citizen body, which fears the victor's potential designs upon tyranny. Karrhotos' victory presents a similar situation, although the point is rather to convince Arkesilas that the charioteer has no ambitions of overthrowing him. Both Karrhotos and Damophilos utilize the same strategies described by Kurke of converting one's own achievements or singular status into an act of civic munificence.
[343] While the exempla in Pindar's victory odes are typically mythological, the charioteer is not unique; Young (1971) 34-46 argues that, Strepsiades, the deceased uncle of the victor in Isthmian 7, occupies the position of an exemplum.

the Battidai, who rule by divine right, leading Prophasis, the daughter of late thinking Epimetheus.

Pindar begins his description of Karrhotos' accomplishment with a relative clause, the standard formal introduction to a mythological exemplum.[344] He urges Arkesilas to cherish Karrhotos, fabricating a mythological account according to which the charioteer leads home Victory as his bride rather than Prophasis (Excuse), the daughter of Epimetheus (Afterthought).[345] We should note that Karrhotos' ultimate destination is Βαττιδᾶν δόμους θεμισκρεόντων (28-29), "the homes of the Battidai, who rule by divine right," rather than his own house. The installation, then, of Karrhotos' figurative bride in the royal palace, a public space, commences the characterization of his victory as a collective accomplishment.

Pindar stresses Karrhotos' salvation and dedication of the chariot in the second strophe (32-42), which make his achievement a civic contribution:

ἀκηράτοις ἁνίαις
ποδαρκέων δώδεκ' ἂν δρόμων τέμενος.
κατέκλασε γὰρ ἐντέων σθένος οὐδέν· ἀλλὰ κρέμαται
ὁπόσα χεριαρᾶν 35
τεκτόνων δαίδαλ' ἄγων
Κρισαῖον λόφον
ἄμειψεν ἐν κοιλόπεδον νάπος
θεοῦ· τό σφ' ἔχει κυπαρίσσινον
μέλαθρον ἀμφ' ἀνδριάντι σχεδόν, 40
Κρῆτες ὃν τοξοφόροι τέγεϊ Παρνασσίῳ
καθέσσαντο μονόδροπον φυτόν.

For he did not shatter the strength of his equipment, but they are hung up, however many ornaments of dexterous craftsmen driving he passed the hill of Krisa on his way to the valley that lies in a hollow of the god. The chamber of cypress-wood holds them near the statue carved from a single trunk, which the bow-bearing Cretans set up in a chamber on Parnassos.

The phrase ἀκηράτοις ἁνίαις (32), "with undamaged reins," introduces the notion of conservation, which the statement κατέκλασε γὰρ ἐντέων σθένος οὐδέν (34), "For he did not shatter the strength of his equipment," further construes.[346] The adjective ἀκηράτοις (32), "undamaged," has the curious effect of echoing Karrhotos' name. I would argue that Pindar means to associate him with the upright qualities connoted by this uncommon epithet, which

[344] For discussion of the formal connection between relative clauses and mythological narratives, see Bundy (1986) 8, Köhnken (1971) 132-35, Slater (1983), Hummel (1993) 326-28, and Bonifazi (2004).
[345] Lefkowitz (1985) 37 and Kurke (1991) 125-27, who discusses this passage in the context of marriage exchange, assume that Karrhotos' companion is Victory. Nicholson (2005) 44 suggests that his companion might be either Victory or Glory.
[346] For discussion of the preservation of the chariot, see Lefkowitz (1985) 38, Longley-Cook (1989) 234-38, and Nichsolson (2005) 43-45.

can also signify "undefiled, inviolate, or virgin."[347] Karrhotos is the kind of virtuous citizen whose successes bring honor to a community. The verb κρέμαται (34), "they are hung up," and the mention of τό κυπαρίσσινον μέλαθρον (39-40), "the chamber of cypress-wood," emphasize his successful dedication of the chariot in the temple of Apollo at Delphi, which converts his own individual accomplishment into a communal religious observance.[348] The victory in the chariot race becomes a shared possession, although Karrhotos' bravery makes everything possible.

Pindar transitions to direct address of Karrhotos in the second antistrophe, reasserting the charioteer's status as an exemplum (45-49):

> Ἀλεξιβιάδα, σὲ δ' ἠΰκομοι φλέγοντι Χάριτες. 45
> μακάριος, ὃς ἔχεις
> καὶ πεδὰ μέγαν κάματον
> λόγων φερτάτων
> μναμήϊ'·
> Son of Alexibios, the fair-haired Graces are setting you ablaze. You are blessed, who possess a memorial of finest words even after great toil.

The addressee to this point has been Arkesilas, invoked in line 5. The poem shifts its focus from the first mention of Karrhotos (26), but Pindar is careful in that passage to remind the ruler that he remains the central figure of the victory ode. The participle ἀειδόμενον (24), "being sung of," stresses Arkesilas' continued status as laudandus, and Pindar involves him in the celebration by noting that Karrhotos placed a crown around his head (30-31). For these reasons the actual change in addressee feels like a meaningful departure. I would argue that the use of apostrophe helps to reestablish Karrhotos' position as a model for Damophilos.[349] The combination of the vocative patronymic Ἀλεξιβιάδα (45), "Son of Alexibios," and the second-person singular accusative personal pronoun σέ (45), "you," highlights Karrhotos' exceptional status in this victory ode. The collocation of a vocative and the second-person singular personal pronoun is often used in Pindar to apostrophize a divinity, a mythological hero, or the laudandus.[350] In applying this marked form of address to Karrhotos, Pindar reaffirms his position in the rarified class of those often exemplary individuals.

Pindar concludes the portion of the victory ode dedicated to Karrhotos by collapsing his expedition to Delphi into two clauses, the first of which describes the race and the second his return (49-53):

---

[347] The adjective ἀκήρατος appears nowhere else in Pindar's victory odes and once in a paian fragment (8.81). Nicholson (2005) 43 speculates that "Pindar's observation that his reins were 'unsullied' (ἀκηράτοις, 32) may be intended to suggest that the reins were not dirtied by dust kicked up by teams in front of him, that is, that Carrhotus led from start to finish."

[348] Sobak (2013) 122-124 argues that the use of deictic markers and mentions of Delphic topography transport the audience to Delphi, "enabling them to metaphorically accompany Karrhotos as he leaves the sanctuary of the games and travels down to the temple of Apollo."

[349] For further discussion of Pindar's use of apostrophe here, see Longley-Cook (1989) 242 and Sobak (2013) 124-25.

[350] Cf. O. 1.36, 5.21, 6.12, 10.3-4, P. 1.29, 2.18, 4.59, 89, 5.5-6, 6.50, 8.61, 11.62, 12.1, N. 1.2-4, 29, 2.14, 3.65, 5.41, 6.62, 7.58, 86, 94-95, 9.30-31, I. 1.55, 3.4-5, 5.1-2, 17-18, 6.3-4, 52, 7.31.

ἐν τεσσαράκοντα γάρ
πετόντεσσιν ἀνιόχοις ὅλον 50
δίφρον κομίξαις ἀταρβεῖ φρενί,
ἦλθες ἤδη Λιβύας πεδίον ἐξ ἀγλαῶν
ἀέθλων καὶ πατρωΐαν πόλιν.

For among forty charioteers who fell, having preserved your chariot intact with a fearless mind, you have now come to the plain of Libya from the splendid contests and to your paternal city.

The first clause is constructed around the participial phrase ὅλον δίφρον κομίξαις (50-51), "having preserved your chariot intact." Pindar restates the fact of Karrhotos' salvation of the chariot, stressing this time the perilous nature of the event with the prepositional phrase ἐν τεσσαράκοντα πετόντεσσιν ἀνιόχοις (49-50), "among forty charioteers who fell," which illustrates the brutal wreckage of the scene. The second clause tracks the stages of Karrhotos' homecoming, which progresses from Λιβύας πεδίον (52), "the plain of Libya," to πατρωΐαν πόλιν (53), "your paternal city." I would argue that this progression figures in geographical terms Karrhotos' reincorporation into the civic life of Kyrene. Libya, as the larger region, and Kyrene, as an individual city within Libya, represent concentric circles through which Karrhotos must pass on his way to Βαττιδᾶν δόμους θεμισκρεόντων (28-29), "the homes of the Battidai, who rule by divine right." Pindar, then, rings the composition of this exemplum with parallel assertions of Karrhotos' arrival in the city (28-29 and 52-53), highlighting his successful completion of the victor's circuit.[351]

The final triad of Pythian 4 depicts Damophilos as aspiring to the ideal of benefaction exemplified by Karrhotos. Pindar makes three main points about Damophilos: (1) he has learned vital lessons in exile (279-87), (2) the relationship between him and Arkesilas attests to the king's strength (289-93), and (3) he hopes to contribute to the aristocratic life of the city (293-99). The poet reminds Arkesilas about Damophilos' innate righteousness before rehearsing the lessons that he learned during his banishment (279-87):

ἐπέγνω μὲν Κυράνα
καὶ τὸ κλεεννότατον μέγαρον Βάττου δικαιᾶν 280
Δαμοφίλου πραπίδων. κεῖνος γὰρ ἐν παισὶν νέος,
ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρέσβυς ἐγκύρ-
σαις ἑκατονταετεῖ βιοτᾷ,
ὀρφανίζει μὲν κακὰν γλῶσσαν φαεννᾶς ὀπός,
ἔμαθε δ' ὑβρίζοντα μισεῖν,

οὐκ ἐρίζων ἀντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, 285
οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν. ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει.
εὖ νιν ἔγνωκεν·

[351] Dougherty (1993) 110 notes that Karrhotos' journey resonates as an imitation of "Battus' original, founding trip from the oracle of Apollo at Delphi to the site of the new colony."

> Kyrene and the most famous palace of Battos observed the just heart of Damophilos. For that man, a youth among boys, but in counsels an old man who has attained a life of a hundred years, deprives an evil tongue of a shining voice, and he learned to hate the man who is arrogant, not striving against the good, nor delaying any completion. For the fitting time for men has a brief span. He has come to know it well.

The verb ἐπέγνω (279), "observed," which begins the sentence, emphasizes Kyrene's existing knowledge of Damophilos' virtues. Despite participating in the insurrection, Damophilos has exhibited his δικαιᾶν πραπίδων (280-81), "just heart," to the city in the past, providing reason for optimism about his return. Pindar adds that Damophilos has acquired a wealth of wisdom in exile. The verbs ἔμαθε (284), "he learned," and ἔγνωκεν (287), "he has come to know," highlight the lessons that he has learned.[352] The first lesson is ὑβρίζοντα μισεῖν (284), "to hate the man who is arrogant," and the second is a gnomic statement that serves to explain the first (286): ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει, "For the fitting time for men has a brief span." Damophilos' period in exile has taught him to strive for a life that matches his station and to shun the influence of wicked men.

Having offered a reminder of Damophilos' righteousness and recounted the lessons that he learned, Pindar uses the figure of Atlas to frame the relationship between the exile and Arkesilas in a way that emphasizes the king's strength. He asserts that Damophilos bears a burden similar to the Titan (289-93):

> καὶ μὰν κεῖνος Ἄτλας οὐρανῷ
> προσπαλαίει νῦν γε πατρῴ- 290
> ας ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπό τε κτεάνων·
> λῦσε δὲ Ζεὺς ἄφθιτος Τιτᾶνας. ἐν δὲ χρόνῳ
> μεταβολαὶ λήξαντος οὔρου
>
> ἱστίων.
>
> And indeed that Atlas is wrestling now with the sky away from his homeland and his possessions. Immortal Zeus released the Titans. In time there are changings of sails with the wind having abated.

The comparison to Atlas emphasizes both Damophilos' vulnerability and his nobility.[353] The verb προσπαλαίει (290), "is wrestling," frames his existence as one of constant struggle while also depicting him as an athlete. Pindar contrasts the οὐρανῷ (289), "sky," with which he wrestles, to the πατρῴας γᾶς (290), "homeland," from which he is separated. The one is an omnipresent obstacle, while the other is a source of longing. Pindar pursues the analogy even further, casting Arkesilas in the role of Zeus. We should note that the ancient sources

---

[352] Segal (1986) 108 observes the correspondence between ἐπέγνω (279) and ἔγνωκεν (287): "Cyrene knows of his just thoughts (ἐπέγνω, 279b), and Damophilus himself knows the right measure of things (εὖ νιν ἔγνωκεν, 287)."

[353] Carey (1980b) 151 suggests that the metaphor is more exact, arguing that "the implication would be that Damophilos is the last of the rebels to be pardoned, and the logical conclusion would be that he was the leader," but this is a lot to draw from a mere comparison of Damophilos to Atlas; cf. Braswell (1988) 390-91.

are in disagreement as to whether Zeus ever released the Titans.[354] I would argue that, despite the positive assertion with the indicative verb λῦσε (291), "released," Pindar exploits this point of uncertainty within the mythological tradition, highlighting the king's tremendous power in this situation. While I contend that Arkesilas and Damophilos had reconciled before the performance of the victory ode, Pindar's decision to dramatize the reconciliation portrays the king in the strongest light possible. Arkesilas, like Zeus, can either accept or deny Damophilos' petition. The former option would accentuate the firmness of his rule, while the latter presents him as a merciful potentate.

Having spoken for Damophilos to this point, Pindar begins to ventriloquize the exile's own sentiments in a series of prayers that visualize his successful reintegration into the civic life of Kyrene (293-97):

> ἀλλ' εὔχεται οὐλομέναν νοῦ-
> σον διαντλήσαις ποτέ
> οἶκον ἰδεῖν, ἐπ' Ἀπόλλω-
> νός τε κράνᾳ συμποσίας ἐφέπων
> θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν πολλάκις, ἔν τε σοφοῖς 295
> δαιδαλέαν φόρμιγγα βαστάζων πολί-
> ταις ἡσυχίᾳ θιγέμεν,
> μήτ' ὦν τινι πῆμα πορών, ἀπαθὴς δ' αὐτὸς πρὸς ἀστῶν·
> But he prays that, having endured to the end his destructive sickness, at some point he might see his home, that, devoting himself to the symposia at the fountain of Apollo, he might often deliver his heart to youth, and that, holding in his hands the ornate lyre among his wise citizens, he might touch upon peace, providing no pain to any of them, and suffering nothing himself from his fellow citizens.

There are three of these prayers: (1) οἶκον ἰδεῖν (294), "that he might see his home," (2) θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν (295), "that he might deliver his heart to youth," and (3) ἡσυχίᾳ θιγέμεν (296), "that he might touch upon peace." The first is contextualized by the participial phrase οὐλομέναν νοῦσον διαντλήσαις (293), "having endured to the end his destructive sickness." Pindar describes Damophilos' exile as a terrible disease that has almost destroyed him.[355] His fondest desire is simply to return home.[356] The second prayer situates Damophilos in the aristocratic culture of the city. Pindar pictures him ἐπ' Ἀπόλλωνός κράνᾳ τε συμποσίας ἐφέπων (294), "devoting himself to the symposia at the fountain of Apollo." This image reinscribes Damophilos in the social structures that he abandoned as an exile. The third prayer elaborates upon the second, envisioning Damophilos

[354] Pindar's assertion seems to refer primarily to Kronos and Prometheus. Olympian 2 mentions a Κρόνου τύρσιν (70), "tower of Kronos," on the Isles of the Blessed, indicating that Pindar accepts the tradition according to which Zeus freed Kronos and established him as ruler of the Isles of the Blessed. Van der Valk (1985) argues that Hesiod might have known this tradition, but the matter is uncertain. Hesiod suggests in the *Theogony* that Zeus played an indirect role in the release of Prometheus, since Herakles freed him οὐκ ἀέκητι Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ὕψι μέδοντος (529), "not without Olympian Zeus, who rules on high." There is, however, no tradition in which Zeus releases Atlas from his punishment of holding up the heavens. For further discussion of Zeus' release of the Titans, see Braswell (1988) 390-91.

[355] Robbins (1975) 212 observes that this image of disease recalls the earlier presentation of Arkesilas as a healer (270); cf. Carey (1980b) 151 and Sigelman (2016) 134-35.

[356] Carey (1980b) 152 notes that "neither Cyrene nor Damophilus is whole while the latter is in exile."

δαιδαλέαν φόρμιγγα βαστάζων (296), "holding in his hands the ornate lyre," in the aforementioned symposia. I would suggest that this image of Damophilos as a musician invokes the present reality of the victory ode whose performance he has contributed to the city. Damophilos may not have played a lyre himself during the performance, but he was responsible for this musical entertainment.

Pythian 4 ends with the conspicuous participle ξενωθείς (299), tying together the figures of Karrhotos and Damophilos. I would argue that for an audience that had witnessed the performance of these two victory odes it was clear that Arkesilas had discovered a pair of trustworthy benefactors. Pindar stresses the contributions made by Karrhotos and Damophilos to the public good. Karrhotos models the ideal of benefaction by dedicating the winning chariot in the temple of Apollo at Delphi, making his victory an act of civic munificence. Damophilos aspires to the same standard of benefaction, arriving in Kyrene with a precious gift for Arkesilas in the form of the victory ode itself, a spectacle for the city's amusement. Pythian 4 and Pythian 5 combine to articulate a conception of proper benefaction embodied by the duo of Karrhotos and Damophilos, the charioteer and the exile.

Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13

Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13 were both composed to celebrate the victory of Pytheas of Aegina in the boys' pancratium at Nemea in 485 or 483 BCE.[357] In this chapter, I argue that Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13 combine to form a macrotextual account of the accomplishments of the Aiakidai. I imagine that the poets must have worked closely together in order to coordinate their victory odes. Both poems focus on moments of crisis for the lasting fame of that heroic lineage. Nemean 5 describes Peleus' attempted seduction by Hippolyta, while Bacchylides 13 narrates Achilles' withdrawal from the fighting at Troy. In lingering on these moments of uncertainty for the Aiakidai, the poets present the athletic achievements of Pytheas and his relatives as similar crucibles in which the sterling reputation of the family continues to be formed. For Pindar and Bacchylides, Pytheas represents Achilles in a multigenerational comparative scheme that can only be discerned by attending to both victory odes together.

Pindar and Bacchylides both envision the news of Pytheas' athletic achievement travelling widely throughout Greece. Nemean 5 begins by declaring the broad influence of Pindar's poetry (1-5):

> Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-
> ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος
> ἑστᾰότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας
> ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,
> στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι

[357] For the dating of Pytheas' victory at Nemea, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922) 169, Turyn (1952) 163-64, Maehler (1982) I. ii. 251, Pfeijffer (1995), and Fearn (2007) 342-50; cf. Hornblower (2004) 227-30.

Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενής
νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον, 5

I am not a sculptor, to make statues that stand unmoving on the same base, but on every merchantman and in every boat, sweet song, go forth from Aegina, announcing that the son of Lampon, mighty Pytheas, won a crown for the pancratium at Nemea.

Pindar's famous assertion that he is Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός (1), "not a sculptor," has received much scholarly commentary, focusing especially on the nature of the opposition between statues and his γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά (2), "sweet song." Maria Pavlou summarizes the two sides of the debate:

> Some contend that the statement is polemical, and that Pindar juxtaposes his song with handicrafts in order to highlight the superiority of the former and challenge the enduring character of the latter; due to its mobility and ability to transcend spatial and temporal constraints, song surpasses statues, which perforce remain idle and still. Others see no rivalry in the claim, pointing out that Pindar compares himself with other craftsmen because, by placing his poetry on a par with concrete monuments of art, he can emphasize the monumentalizing power of his song.[358]

I agree with aspects of both positions. I would argue that Pindar emphasizes mobility while assimilating his song to the materiality of statues.[359]

I would also suggest that Pindar is interacting here with the image from Bacchylides 13 of Ἀρετ[ά] (139), "Excellence," roaming over land and sea (175-81):

οὐ γὰρ ἀλαμπέϊ νυκ[τός 175
πασιφανὴς Ἀρετ[ὰ
  κρυφθεῖσ' ἀμαυρο[ῦται καλύπτρᾳ,

ἀλλ' ἔμπεδον ἀκ[αμάτᾳ
  βρύουσα δόξᾳ
στρωφᾶται κατὰ γᾶν [τε 180
καὶ πολύπλαγκτον θ[άλασσαν.

For shining Excellence, hidden by the lightless veil of night, is not made dim, but constantly teeming with untiring glory wanders over land and sea that drives a man far from his course.

Both of these passages contrast a notion of stifled communication of athletic achievement to a vision of wider broadcast. Pindar addresses γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά (2), "sweet song," in the vocative, whereas Bacchylides makes πασιφανὴς Ἀρετά (139), "shining Excellence," the

[358] Pavlou (2010) 2. She cites Farnell (1930) 186, Hubbard (1985) 104, Ford (2002) 119-23, Loscalzo (2003) 150-54, Burnett (2005) 63, O'Sullivan (2003) 79-85, and Kurke (1991) 251 for the former position, and Mullen (1982) 145, Steiner (1998) 139, and Steiner (2001) 251 and 263-64 for the latter position; cf. Kurke (2016b) 6 and Fearn (2017) 18-20.
[359] Fearn (2017) 18-20 arrives at a similar understanding of this passage.

nominative focus of these sentiments. Pindar contrasts his songs to ἐλινύσοντα ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος ἑστᾰότ' (1-2), "statues that stand unmoving on the same base." He imagines them instead as wares stowed ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ (2), "on every merchantman and in every boat." I would argue that this characterization of song as a type of exportable commodity collapses the hard distinction that some scholars have seen with statues.[360] The fact that his song bears a victory announcement (3-5, διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενής νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον, "announcing that the son of Lampon, mighty Pytheas, won a crown for the pancratium at Nemea") is another feature shared with statues.[361] Joseph Day contends that victor statues from this period often depict the moment of pronouncement of the victory:

> Evidence for victor statues, which Pindar had in mind, is scanty and problematic for archaic times. Still, one can cite the iconographic tradition of portraying the victor at the moment of crowning (and thus proclamation) or just prior to it. From the early classical period, one thinks of the Delphic charioteer, already filleted, parading to the place where he will be crowned and proclaimed; and from somewhat later, Polykleitos' Diadoumenos. This tradition might extend well into the sixth century. At least a few archaic *kouroi*, sometimes filletted but otherwise without gesture or attributes, seem to have been dedicated as victor statues. They may have been intended to portray the victor at the moment of proclamation and crowning.[362]

Pindar, then, seems to characterize his song in a similar fashion. The emphasis here concerns mobility. Both the statues and Pindar's sweet song stand upon other surfaces, but the βαθμίδος (2), "base," is stationary, whereas the merchantmen and boats travel everywhere.

For Bacchylides, on the other hand, the dismissed conception involves concealment; Excellence is not ἀλαμπέϊ νυκτὸς κρυφθεῖσ' καλύπτρᾳ (138-40), "hidden by the lightless veil of night." The ἀλαμπέϊ καλύπτρᾳ (138-40) adds a gendered component to this opposition. Unlike a maiden who covers her head with a veil, Excellence στρωφᾶται (143), "wanders." This action of wandering is quintessentially male. While the women remain at home with their heads covered, heroes, like Jason and Odysseus, roam over land and sea. Pindar and Bacchylides share this vision of their respective songs declaring Pytheas' achievement far and wide.

Both Pindar and Bacchylides emphasize Pytheas' familial lineage. In addition to Pytheas himself (4, 43), Pindar mentions his father Lampon (4), his maternal uncle Euthymenes (41), and his maternal grandfather Themistios (50).[363] Bacchylides only mentions Pytheas himself (191) and Lampon (68, 226), but the beginning of the victory ode is missing. The divine name Κλειώ, "Klio," which also appears at the end of the poem (228), is the only word that can be restored from this section. Bacchylides elsewhere collocates the Muses and his victors in the opening lines of his victory odes, which suggests that Pytheas and his family likely appeared there.[364] I would argue that Pindar and Bacchylides combine

---

[360] Cf. Fearn (2017) 19.
[361] See Fearn (2013) 240-50.
[362] Day (1994) 64-65; cf. Kurke (1998).
[363] For the emphasis on Pytheas' family in Nemean 5, see Segal (1974a) 407-08, Robbins (1987) 25-29, Fearn (2007) 113, Fearn (2011) 186-88, and Most (2012) 259-60.
[364] Cf. Bacchylides 3.3-4, 4.8-13, 5.13-16, 6.1-11. Klio also appears at Bacchylides 12.2.

to praise Pytheas' family by comparing them to the Aiakidai. Over the course of these poems, they make a point of emphasizing the familial relations invoked in connection with Pytheas: father, maternal uncle, and maternal grandfather. This scheme, which can only be discerned by reading the two victory odes together, makes Pytheas into Achilles.

The two poets essentially divide between themselves the labor of praising the successive generations after Aiakos. Pindar focuses on the generation of Aiakos' sons, introducing the trio of Peleus, Telamon, and Phokos (7-16):

> ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέν-
> τας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεᾶν Νηρηΐδων
> Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν
> ματρόπολίν τε, φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν·
> τάν ποτ' εὔανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλυτάν
> θέσσαντο, πὰρ βωμὸν πατέρος Ἑλλανίου 10
> στάντες, πίτναν τ' ἐς αἰθέρα χεῖρας ἁμᾶ
> Ἐνδαΐδος ἀριγνῶτες υἱοί
> καὶ βία Φώκου κρέοντος,
>
> ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὃν Ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥῆγμῖνι πόντου.
> αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν
> ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον,
> πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον, 15
> καὶ τίς ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους
> δαίμων ἀπ' Οἰνώνας ἔλασεν.
>
> And he conferred honor upon the Aiakidai, those heroes, the spearmen born from Kronos and Zeus and from the golden Nereids, and upon his mother city, a land friendly to strangers, which once the eminent sons of Endais and the might of lord Phokos, the son of a goddess, whom Psamatheia bore on the shore of the sea, prayed, standing beside the altar of father Hellanios, would be full of brave men and famous for ships, and together they stretched their hands toward the sky. I am ashamed to mention a great thing if it was not hazarded in accordance with justice, how indeed they left that famous island, and what divinity drove the brave men from Oinona.

The poet envisions these three praying for the future success of the island (9-13), but refrains from describing the murder of Phokos by his half-brothers (14-18).[365] The emphasis on Phokos' attendance beside the altar of Zeus Hellanios (10-11) undercuts this refusal. Pindar later alludes to other elements of this narrative by mentioning the exile of Peleus and Telamon from Aegina (15) and the anger of a divinity (15-16). He had earlier foreshadowed the appearance of Phokos by referring to the Aiakidai as (7) ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεᾶν Νηρηΐδων, "those heroes, the spearmen born from Kronos and Zeus and from the golden Nereids." The mention of χρυσεᾶν Νηρηΐδων (7), "the

[365] For discussion of this introductory image, see Segal (1974a) 400, Robbins (1987) 29, Burnett (2005) 65-66, Pavlou (2010) 7-9, Fearn (2017) 28-30, and Kurke (2017) 246.

golden Nereids," must refer to the parentage of Achilles and Phokos.[366] Achilles was famously the son of the Nereid Thetis, and Pindar explains that the mother of Phokos was Psamatheia, to whose Nereid lineage the description of his birth on the seashore alludes (13): ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὃν Ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥῆγμῖνι πόντου, "the son of a goddess, whom Psamatheia bore on the shore of the sea." The broad strokes of interfamilial slaughter are, then, visible beneath the surface of this narrative.[367] I would suggest that the appearance of Phokos and his mother Psamatheia represents an aborted alternative to the development of the lineage of the Aiakidai through Endais. Phokos' death concedes unchallenged control over the paternal line to Peleus and Telamon. This submerged account of Phokos' murder marks the first crisis averted in the sequence of events culminating in the preeminence of Achilles.[368]

Pindar presents his account of Peleus' seduction as one of the songs sung by the Muses at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (25-36):

αἱ δὲ πρώτιστον μὲν ὕμνη-
σαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν
Πηλέα θ', ὥς τέ νιν ἁβρὰ
Κρηθεὶς Ἱππολύτα δόλῳ πεδᾶσαι
ἤθελε ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπόν
πείσαισ' ἀκοίταν ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν,
ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον,
ὡς ἦρα νυμφείας ἐπείρα
κεῖνος ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου

εὐνᾶς· τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν· πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ
παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν.
τοῖο δ' ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι·
εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν,
ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον
δείσαις· ὁ δ' εὖ φράσθη κατένευ-
σέν τέ οἱ ὀρσινεφὴς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ
Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς, ὥστ' ἐν τάχει
ποντίαν χρυσαλακάτων τινὰ Νη-
ρεΐδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν.

Beginning with Zeus first of all, they celebrated in song holy Thetis and Peleus, and how Hippolyta, the luxuriant daughter of Kretheus, wanted to fetter him with a trick, after persuading her husband, the watcher of the Magnesians, with manifold resolutions to be her co-conspirator, and she fabricated a false account, that he had made an attempt on her bridal abode in the bed of Akastos, but the opposite was true,

[366] Pfeijffer (1999) 25 observes that the mention of the Nereids (7) "emphatically includes Phocus as well as Peleus and Telamon in the notion of the Αἰακίδας."
[367] For discussion of Phokos' murder, see Segal (1974a) 400-01, Robbins (1987) 31-33, Burnett (2005) 66-70, Pavlou (2010) 9-12, Most (2012) 260-64, and Kurke (2017).
[368] Segal (1974a) 400 notes that "Pindar has built Phocus into a significant moral and aesthetic structure," who "embodies the negative side of Pytheas' bloom;" cf. Burnett (2005) 64. Phokos resembles the boys beaten by Pytheas in the pancratium, inevitable losers in a zero-sum game.

> for often beguiling him she would entreat him with all of her heart. But the repugnant words provoked his anger. Straightaway he refused the bride, fearing the wrath of the father who protects the rights of hospitality, and Zeus, king of the immortals, who raises the clouds from heaven, observed him well, and promised that he would soon make one of the Nereids of the sea with distaff of gold his wife,

The Muses begin in traditional form with a hymn to Zeus (25), before turning to Peleus and Thetis themselves (25-26).[369] They choose to relate the narrative of Hippolyta's attempted seduction of Peleus. I would argue that this episode represents another potential challenge to the development of the lineage of the Aiakidai as we know them. If Hippolyta had succeeded, there would have been no marriage of Peleus and Thetis, no birth of Achilles or Neoptolemos.[370] Hippolyta, who wanted πεδᾶσαι (26), "to fetter," Peleus, functions as a kind of Circe or Kalypso, threatening to arrest the appointed order of things.

Pindar uses temporal markers to heighten the danger posed by Hippolyta. He describes her repeated entreaties using the adverbial accusative πολλά (31), "often," and the imperfect verb λιτάνευεν (32), "she would entreat."[371] The verb κνίζον (32), "provoked," is also imperfect, imagining Hippolyta's αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι (32), "repugnant words," as the cause of Peleus' ὀργάν (32), "anger," over a period of time.[372] She locks Peleus in a pattern of behavior that threatens the future viability of his line. His refusal, on the other hand, is envisioned as a singular event with the adverb εὐθύς (33), "straightaway," and the aorist verb ἀπανάνατο (33), "he refused." What does εὐθύς (33) mean in the context of a habitual series of actions? I would argue that the incompatibility of these two temporalities reflects the sharpness of Peleus' break from the potential existence offered by Hippolyta. Zeus responds to his pious demonstration with more aorist actions (34, φράσθη, "observed," and 34, κατένευσέν, "promised"). Peleus and Zeus, then, explode Hippolyta's arrested temporality, allowing for the production of a legitimate child.

Pindar establishes two crucial identifications between members of Pytheas' family and relatives of Achilles. He emphasizes Thetis' status as a Nereid (35-36), resuming the earlier reference to the Aiakidai as ἀπὸ χρυσεᾶν Νηρηΐδων (7), "from the golden Nereids." Pindar later mentions Pytheas' maternal grandfather Themistios (50), the figure who corresponds to Nereus as Achilles' maternal grandfather.[373] He fleshes out the familial structure of the Aiakidai even further by referring to Poseidon as the γαμβρόν, "brother-in-law," of Thetis (37).[374] The sharp transition from Poseidon, Thetis' brother-in-law and Achilles' maternal uncle, to Euthymenes, Pytheas' maternal uncle (43), articulates the exact parallel between them. These two identifications (of Themistios with Nereus and Euthymenes with Poseidon) confirm that Pytheas is Achilles within the terms of the

---

[369] Cf. *Theogony* 47-48 for the tradition of the Muses beginning and ending their songs with Zeus.
[370] Burnett (2005) 72 observes that "Hippolyta, in her corruption, offers a kind of reverse portrait of the pure and unwilling Nereid."
[371] For discussion of the aspect of λιτάνευεν (32), see Bury (1890) 93 and Pfeijffer (1999) 154.
[372] Pfeijffer (1999) 73-74 suggests that ὀργάν (32) might mean either "anger" or "lust." Perhaps Pindar is playing with this semantic ambiguity, since Peleus' aversion to Hippolyta is not clear at this point.
[373] The scholia (Drachmann iii 99) report that Themistios is Pytheas' maternal grandfather; cf. Robbins (1987) 27, Most (2012) 259-60, and Fearn (2017) 47 n. 101.
[374] Privitera (1982) 122 n. 1 and Burnett (2005) 73-74 argue that the sense of γαμβρόν (37) is "suitor" or "(prospective) bridegroom."

comparison, which only makes sense when we read Nemean 5 macrotextually with Bacchylides 13. Achilles is never even named in Pindar's poem, but the emphasis on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis sets the stage for his role in Bacchylides' victory ode.[375]

Bacchylides begins the mythological portion of his poem with the image of local maidens recounting the lineage of the Aiakidai. Bacchylides actually starts the family tree with Asopos, Aegina's father, referring to her as ποταμοῦ θύγατερ δινᾶντος ἠπιόφρον (44-45), "gentle-minded daughter of the eddying river." The allusion to Asopos is oblique, but an Aiginetan audience would surely have known the identity of the river. The next branch on the tree is represented by the coupling of Zeus and Aegina (77-83):

> Ὦ ποταμοῦ θύγατερ
> δινᾶντος Αἴγιν' ἠπιόφρον,
>
> ἦ τοι μεγάλαν [Κρονίδας
> ἔδωκε τιμὰν 80
> ἐν πάντεσσιν [νεορτόν
> πυρσὸν ὡς Ἕλλ[ασι νίκαν
> φαίνων·
>
> O Aegina, gentle-minded daughter of the eddying river, surely the son of Kronos gave great honor to you, showing forth among all the Greeks a newly arisen victory like a beacon.

Despite the lacuna, I would argue that the subject of ἔδωκε must be Zeus in one form or another. The sense of the passage, which relates the lineage of the Aiakidai, implies that the μεγάλαν τιμάν (79-80), "great honor," given to Aegina is both Pytheas' victory and the birth of her son Aiakos.

> The first mention of Aiakos is made by a chorus of local maidens (91-99):
> ταὶ δὲ στεφανωσάμε[ναι φοιν]ικέων
> ἀνθέων δόνακός τ' ἐ[πιχω-
> ρίαν ἄθυρσιν
> παρθένοι μέλπουσι τ[εὸν τέκο]ς, ὦ
> δέσποινα παγξε[ίνου χθονός, 95
> Ἐν]δαΐδα τε ῥοδό[παχυν,
> ἃ τὸ[ν ἰσ]ό[θε]ον ἔτι[κτεν Πηλέα
> καὶ Τελαμ[ῶ]να [κο]ρυ[στὰν
> Αἰακῷ μειχθεῖσ' ἐν εὐ[νᾷ·
>
> And maidens crowned with the local adornment of crimson flowers and reeds sing of your child, O mistress of a hospitable land, and of rosy-armed Endais, who, after mingling in bed with Aiakos, bore god-like Peleus and helmeted Telamon.

[375] For further discussion of the absence of Achilles in Nemean 5, see Robbins (1987) 30 and Fearn (2007) 113.

We should note the structural similarities between this passage and Pindar's introduction of his mythological narration in Nemean 5. Both poets place their accounts in the mouths of choruses. According to Pindar, the chorus of the Muses celebrated Peleus and Thetis (25-26).[376] In Bacchylides 13, the Aiginetan maidens μέλπουσι (94), "sing of," τεὸν τέκος (94), "your child," that is, Aiakos, and Ἐνδαΐδα ῥοδόπαχυν (96), "rosy-armed Endais."[377] These songs both take up the theme of marriage, but from altogether different perspectives. Nemean 5 recounts Hippolyta's failed attempt to seduce Peleus (26-39), which makes the marriage to Thetis possible, while Bacchylides 13 describes Endais' union with Aiakos and the subsequent births of Peleus and Telamon (97-99).

Bacchylides opens a new triad by introducing the respective sons of Peleus and Telamon, lavishing an unequal amount of descriptive attention upon them (100-104):

τῶν υἷας ἀερσιμάχ[ας 100
  ταχύν τ' Ἀχιλλέα
εὐειδέος τ' Ἐριβοίας
παῖδ' ὑπέρθυμον βοά[σω
Αἴαντα σακεσφόρον ἥ[ρω,

whose battle-rousing sons I will celebrate, swift Achilles and the daring son of beautiful Eriboia, the shieldbearing hero Aias.

The simple adjective ταχύν (100-01), "swift," a sort of abbreviation of the common Homeric epithet πόδας ὠκύς, "swift-footed," suffices for Achilles, whose alacrity matches the brevity of his portrayal. The depiction of Aias, whose mother even receives the ornate epithet εὐειδέος (102), "beautiful," provides a sharp contrast. Bacchylides uses the compound adjectives ὑπέρθυμον (103), "daring," and σακεσφόρον (104), "shield-bearing," of Aias, and refers to him as a ἥρω (104), "hero." The emphasis here upon Aias serves as a narrative feint. Aias' position in this passage parallels that of Phokos in Nemean 5. Both figures provide false starts before the more fundamental narratives of Achilles and Peleus emerge.[378]

Bacchylides begins to recount the martial exploits of Aias, but a shift in focus makes Achilles' central position in the victory ode clear (105-120):

ὅστ' ἐπὶ πρύμνᾳ σταθ[εὶς 105
  ἔσχεν θρασυκάρδιον [ὁρ-
  μαίνοντα ν[ᾶας
θεσπεσίῳ πυ[ρὶ καῦσαι
Ἕκτορα χαλ[κεομίτρα]ν,
ὁππότε Πη[λεΐδας 110
  τρα[χ]εῖαν [ἐν στήθεσσι μ]ᾶνιν
ὠρίνατ[ο, Δαρδανίδας

[376] Robbins (1987) 29 observes that "This story is a song within a song, so to speak, for it is sung by the Muses on Pelion, no doubt at Peleus' wedding (though we are not specifically told this)."
[377] For further discussion of the framing of this mythological narrative, see Burnett (1985) 93 and Power (2000).
[378] Burnett (1985) 94 and Fearn (2007) 140-41 contend that Bacchylides offers a balanced presentation of the martial accomplishments of the two heroes, but I would argue that this narrative is structured around the presence and absence of Achilles.

τ' ἔλυσεν ἄ[τας·
οἳ πρὶν μὲν [πολύπυργο]ν
Ἰ]λίου θαητὸν ἄστυ 115
οὐ λεῖπον, ἀτυζόμενοι [δέ
πτᾶσσον ὀξεῖαν μάχα[ν,
εὖτ' ἐν πεδίῳ κλονέω[ν
μαίνοιτ' Ἀχιλλεύς,
λαοφόνον δόρυ σείων· 120

who standing upon the stern checked bold-hearted bronze-helmeted Hector in his eagerness to burn the ships with awful fire, when the son of Peleus stirred up harsh anger in his heart, and released from ruin the Dardanids, who would not previously leave the marvelous many-towered city of Ilion, but, terrified, would cower in fear of keen battle, whenever Achilles was raging, driving over the plain, brandishing his murderous spear.

Aias is the antecedent of a relative clause stressing his steadfast valor before Hector's assault upon the ships. The participle σταθείς (105), "standing," emphasizes his essential character as the foremost defensive fighter among the Greeks, and the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ πρύμνᾳ (105), "on the stern," locates the action. Through the end of line 109 all indications suggest the commencement of a mythological exemplum centered around Aias, but the arrival of a temporal clause reorients the narrative (110-13): ὁππότε Πηλεΐδας τραχεῖαν ἐν στήθεσσι μᾶνιν ὠρίνατο, "when the son of Peleus stirred up harsh anger in his heart." Bacchylides offers Achilles' departure from the fighting as the necessary precondition for Aias' protection of the ships. His reference to Achilles as Πηλεΐδας (110), "the son of Peleus," and use of the noun μᾶνιν (111), "anger," invoke the opening line of book 1 of the *Iliad*: Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος, "Sing, goddess, of the anger of Achilles, the son of Peleus."[379] Illustrating Achilles' dynamic ferocity with the participial phrases ἐν πεδίῳ κλονέων (118), "driving over the plain," and λαοφόνον δόρυ σείων (120), "brandishing his murderous spear," Bacchylides establishes him as the clear focal point of the mythological narrative.

The basic plot of the *Iliad* structures the rest of this passage. Bacchylides presents Achilles' anger at the loss of Briseis as another moment of potential crisis for the lasting reputation of the Aiakidai (133-140):

Ὥς Τρῶες, ἐπ[εὶ] κλύον [αἰ-
χματὰν Ἀχιλλέα
μίμνο[ντ'] ἐν κλισίῃσιν 135
εἵνεκ[ε]ν ξανθᾶς γυναικός,
Β]ρ[ι]σηΐδος ἱμερογυίου,
θεοῖσιν ἄντειναν χέρας,
φοιβὰν ἐσιδόντες ὑπαὶ
χειμῶνος αἴγλαν· 140

[379] Fearn (2007) 126 notes that "Bacchylides uses μᾶνιν in a prominent position at the end of a strophe to recall Akhilleus' specifically Iliadic wrath, as well as the first word of the *Iliad*."

So the Trojans, when they heard that spearman Achilles was remaining in his tent on account of the fair-haired woman, Briseis with lovely limbs, they stretched up their hands to the gods, looking at the radiant gleam under the winter storm.

We should note the resemblance between the Trojans' posture and that of Peleus, Telamon, and Phokos in Nemean 5. Bacchylides reports that the Trojans θεοῖσιν ἄντειναν χέρας, φοιβὰν ἐσιδόντες ὑπαὶ χειμῶνος αἴγλαν (138-40), "stretched up their hands to the gods, looking at the radiant gleam under the winter storm," while Pindar states that the three brothers πίτναν τ' ἐς αἰθέρα χεῖρας (11), "stretched their hands toward the sky." Bacchylides leaves the content of the Trojans' futile prayer unstated, whereas the concurrent reality of Nemean 5, which celebrates the mythological history of Aegina, makes clear that the island would become εὔανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλυτάν (9), "full of brave men and famous for ships." Bacchylides pictures the Homeric scene of Achilles μίμνοντ' ἐν κλισίῃσιν (135), "remaining in his tent," removed from the fighting, and uses the prepositional phrase εἵνεκεν ξανθᾶς γυναικός, Βρισηΐδος ἱμερογυίου (136-37), "on account of the fair-haired woman, Briseis with lovely limbs," to reference the dispute between Achilles and Agamemnon over Briseis.[380] The epithet ἱμερογυίου (137), "with lovely limbs," suggests Achilles' anguished ἵμερος, "desire," for Briseis. He might have remained in his tent for the rest of the conflict. Much like the attempted seduction of Peleus in Nemean 5, this is a precarious episode for the future fame of the Aiakidai.

After recounting Hector's attack upon the ships (141-156), Bacchylides envisions Achilles' forthcoming return to combat from an omniscient perspective (157-67):

ἆ δύσφ]ρονες, ἦ μεγάλαισιν ἐλπίσιν
πνε<ί>]οντες ὑπερφ[ία]λον
θ' ἱέντες] αὐ[δὰ]ν
Τ[ρῶε]ς ἱππευταὶ κυανώπιδας ἐκ- 160
πέρσαντες ὤισθεν] νέας
νεῖσθαι πάλιν εἰλα]πίνας τ' ἐν
λαόφο]ροις ἕξειν θ[εόδ]ματον πόλιν.
μ]έλλον ἄρα πρότε[ρο]ν δι-
ν]ᾶντα φοινίξει[ν Σκ]άμανδρ[ον, 165
θ]νᾴσκοντες ὑπ[' Αἰα]κίδαις
ἐρειψ[ι]πύ[ργοις·

O mistaken ones! Breathing in their huge hopes and uttering arrogant shouts surely the Trojan horsemen supposed that, having destroyed the dark-eyed ships, they would return home again and that their god-built city would hold feasts in its streets. In truth they were first about to stain the eddying Skamander crimson, dying at the hands of the Aiakidai, overthrowers of the gates of cities.

[380] For further discussion of Bacchylides' description of Briseis, see Carne-Ross (1962) 85, Segal (1976) 129, and Fearn (2007) 133.

He shifts as narrator to the perspective of someone with explicit knowledge of the outcome of events, easing the transition back to Pytheas and the present day.[381] After casting the entire narrative to this point in the past tense, he indicates that the Trojans μέλλον δινᾶντα φοινίξειν Σκάμανδρον (164-65), "were about to stain the eddying Skamander crimson," a reference to Achilles' pollution of and battle with the river in book 21 of the *Iliad*.[382] Bacchylides concludes his mythological narrative by referring to Achilles and Aias as Αἰακίδαις ἐρειψιπύ[ργοις (166-67), "the Aiakidai, overthrowers of the gates of cities," reasserting the initial focus upon the two of them as the respective sons of Peleus and Telamon.

Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13 combine to form a composite victory ode that celebrates Pytheas of Aegina and his family of athletes by comparing them to Achilles and the Aiakidai. The poets must have written their respective poems in careful coordination. After briefly alluding to the murder of Phokos, Nemean 5 fixes its gaze upon Peleus, elaborating a report of his attempted seduction by Hippolyta. Bacchylides 13 begins by describing the martial exploits of Aias, but then focuses on the narrative of Achilles' departure from the fighting at Troy. Both of these accounts emphasize moments of vulnerability for the lasting reputation of the Aiakidai, but ultimately insist upon the destined outcome. I would suggest that Pytheas' victory becomes another such moment in which uncertainty succumbs to the inevitable.

Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5

Pindar and Bacchylides both composed victory odes to celebrate Hieron's success in the single-horse race at Olympia in 476 BCE: Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5.[383] I would argue that these two poems evince a kind of symbiotic relationship; each draws strength from its proximity to the other. I would also suggest that the engagement between them is distinctly textual.[384] The poets manipulate and reconfigure each other's language in a way that attests to a visual rather than aural interaction.[385] The verbal correspondences between these poems have an effect that resembles collage, as if the words were torn from a papyrus

---

[381] For further discussion of Bacchylides as narrator, see Fearn (2007) 139-40.

[382] For the numerous intertextual connections between Bacchylides 13 and the *Iliad*, see Fearn (2007) 120-43 and Most (2012) 255-59.

[383] There has been much debate concerning the precise nature of Bacchylides 5. Steffen (1961), Bowra (1964) 124, and Brannan (1972) 203-04 advocated the view that it is a "poetic epistle," meant to introduce the poet to Hieron, but contemporary scholars have abandoned this position. Morgan (2015) 253, who follows Schmidt (1987), argues that the poem "is best construed as an epinician, given we have no reason to believe that the same event could not be celebrated by more than one poem."

[384] The scholarship on Old Comedy adduces an intriguing parallel for the possible circulation of drafts. Fowler (1989) 257-58 argues that Aristophanes published a "reading version" of the revised *Clouds*; cf. Hutchinson (1984) 100. Perhaps Pindar and Bacchylides shared preliminary "reading versions" of their victory odes prior to the official performances.

[385] This is to say that the poets must have had texts in front of them, although I am not suggesting that the rest of the audience would have initially experienced these poems in textual form.

sheet and recombined. The locus of this interaction is a single passage from Bacchylides 5, which, depending upon the order in which the poems were performed, either invokes or reproduces Olympian 1.[386]

The passage in question is Bacchylides' return from his mythological excursus concerning the meeting of Herakles and Meleager. He exhorts the Muse Kalliope to bring her chariot to a stop (176-86):

Λευκώλενε Καλλιόπα,
  στᾶσον εὐποίητον ἅρμα
αὐτοῦ· Δία τε Κρονίδαν
  ὕμνησον Ὀλύμπιον ἀρχαγὸν θεῶν,
τόν τ' ἀκαμαντορόαν 180
  Ἀλφεόν, Πέλοπός τε βίαν,
καὶ Πίσαν ἔνθ ὁ κλεεννὸς
  πο]σσὶ νικάσας δρόμῳ
ἦλθ]εν Φερένικος <ἐς> εὐπύργους Συρακόσ-
  σας Ἱέρωνι φέρων 185
εὐδ]αιμονίας πέταλον.

White-armed Kalliope, stop your well-made chariot here. Celebrate Zeus in song, the son of Kronos, Olympian, leader of the gods, and the Alpheos, tirelessly streaming, and the might of Pelops, and Pisa where famous Pherenikos, victorious with his feet in the race, came to well-walled Syracuse bearing a leaf of blessedness for Hieron.

This passage articulates in miniature the essential points of Olympian 1.[387] The objection could be made that Bacchylides is simply naming the conventional topics that would be mentioned in praising a victory of Hieron at Olympia, but this list is fairly specific and full. Bacchylides 3, by contrast, which celebrates Hieron's chariot victory at Olympia in 468 BCE, mentions only Zeus (70, 55, 26), the Alpheos (7), and Hieron (4, 64, 92). Other victory odes briefly refer to Pelops, but Olympian 1 is the only poem to sing explicitly of his βίαν (181), "might," by taking the race between Pelops and Oinomaos as its mythological narrative.

Why does Bacchylides focus upon Kalliope here? I maintain that the answer concerns her ancient association with kings. Hesiod famously describes her fondness for them in the proem to his *Theogony* (80): ἡ γὰρ καὶ βασιλεῦσιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ, "For she accompanies reverent kings."[388] The epithet Λευκώλενε (176), "white-armed," also

[386] My preference is for Bacchylides 5 to have been performed first, because Bacchylides' invocation of Kalliope would have the effect of requesting that she sing Olympian 1.
[387] In what follows I offer an extended explication of this passage, drawing attention to its numerous points of correspondence with Olympian 1. This orientation might cause the appearance at times that I am unidirectionally reading this passage against Olympian 1, which I have tried to avoid, but even where unstated my assumption is always that the direction of influence is fluid. For further discussion of this passage, see Lefkowitz (1969) 87-89, Brannan (1972) 260-63, and Burnett (1985) 147.
[388] Cf. Morgan (2015) 257-58.

connotes royalty, being commonly applied to Hera, Helen, and Arete in Homer.[389] Near the end of Olympian 1, Pindar asserts the preeminence of kings in a different way (113-15): τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται βασιλεῦσι, "The highest pinnacle is formed by kings." The appearance of Kalliope here likewise serves to foreground an emphasis on kingship in this passage.

After invoking Kalliope, Bacchylides asks her to celebrate Zeus (178), Pelops (181), and Hieron (185), all of whom are rulers in their respective spheres. Zeus and Hieron are unquestionably kings, and, in associating Pelops with the other two, Bacchylides complements Pindar's more explicit conception of him as such. Pindar stresses Pelops' dominion over the Peloponnese as founder, implying his position as ruler: λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίᾳ (23-24), "Fame shines for him in the colony of brave men founded by Lydian Pelops." The noun ἀποικίᾳ (24), "colony," is a reminder that Pelops is the heroic founder of a colony, and his foundation of the Peloponnese echoes that of Aitna by Hieron.[390] The epithet ἀρχαγόν (179), "leader," used in Bacchylides' poem of Zeus, can also have the sense of a founder.[391] By commanding Kalliope, the Muse associated with kings, to celebrate Pelops alongside Zeus and Hieron, Bacchylides stresses the similarities among the three figures as founders and rulers.

The image of Kalliope driving εὐποίητον ἅρμα (177), "a well-made chariot," reflects the central prominence of chariots in Olympian 1.[392] The word ἅρμα, "chariot," appears twice in Pindar's poem: Pelops asks Poseidon to convey him in a swift chariot to Elis (77-78, ἐμὲ δ' ἐπὶ ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἁρμάτων ἐς Ἆλιν, "convey me in the swiftest chariot to Elis") and, near the end of the victory ode, the poet looks ahead to Hieron's prospective success σὺν ἅρματι θοῷ (110), "with a swift chariot."[393] Pindar later describes the vehicle bestowed upon Pelops by Poseidon as δίφρον χρύσεον (87), "a golden chariot." This is the chariot with which Pelops defeats Oinomaos, one of the aetiological myths for the founding of the contest at Olympia.[394] Bacchylides, then, either anticipates or appropriates these Pindaric vehicles, making Kalliope the driver of a metaphorical chariot of song.

Bacchylides calls the Alpheos ἀκαμαντορόαν (180), "tirelessly streaming," resonating with Pindar's phrase πτεροῖσίν ἀκάμαντας ἵππους (87), "horses untiring with wings." These are the winged horses that Poseidon offers to Pelops as a form of conveyance to Elis and to the contest for the hand of Hippodameia. The relationship between Bacchylides' and Pindar's language here, as elsewhere in these two poems, is one of slight modification. The simple adjective ἀκάμαντας (87), "untiring," becomes the compound adjective ἀκαμαντορόαν (180). This epithet lends the river a sense of strenuous athletic energy, and in its connection to Pindar's image of horses draws an implicit comparison to Pherenikos. Pindar in fact introduces the Alpheos in connection with Pherenikos in Olympian 1 (17-21):

---

[389] For Hera, see *Iliad* 1.55, 195, 208, 572, 595, 5.711, 755, 767, 775, 784, 8.350, 381, 484, 14.277, 15.78, 92, 130, 19.407, 20.112, 21.377, 418, 434, 512, 24.55; for Helen, see *Iliad* 3.121 and *Odyssey* 22.227; for Arete, see *Odyssey* 7.233, 335, 11.335. Cf. Lefkowitz (1969) 88.

[390] Cf. Athanassaki (2003) 121-22, Foster (2013) 307-08, and Morgan (2015) 232-33.

[391] Cf. Plato *Timaeus* 21e for ἀρχαγός used of the founder of a city.

[392] Brannan (1972) 260 asserts that "the εὐποίητον ἅρμα (177) is clearly the Μοῖσαν γλυκύδωρον ἄγαλμα of line 4;" cf. Wind (1964) 41-42.

[393] For discussion of Pindar's wish for a chariot victory for Hieron at Olympia, see Segal (1964) 220, Lefkowitz (1976) 95, Gerber (1982) 165, and Morgan (2015) 252.

[394] For the connection between Pelops' victory in the chariot race and the Olympics, see Nagy (1990) 116-35.

ἀλλὰ Δω-
ρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου
λάμβαν', εἴ τί τοι Πίσας τε καὶ Φερενίκου χάρις
νόον ὑπὸ γλυκυτάταις ἔθηκε φροντίσιν,
ὅτε παρ' Ἀλφεῷ σύτο δέμας 20
ἀκέντητον ἐν δρόμοισι παρέχων,

But take the Dorian lyre from its peg, if indeed the splendor of Pisa and Pherenikos placed your mind under the influence of sweetest thoughts, when he rushed beside the Alpheos, furnishing his body ungoaded in the race.[395]

The image of Pherenikos rushing beside the Alpheos almost suggests that the horse's true competitor was the river. Pindar mentions none of his actual opponents. Bacchylides' use, then, of the epithet ἀκαμαντορόαν (180) has two effects, both of which relate to elements of Pindar's victory ode: (1) to reflect the phrase πτεροῖσίν ἀκάμαντας ἵππους (87) and (2) to develop Pindar's notion of the Alpheos as a competitor.

In the following line (181), Bacchylides employs the construction Πέλοπός τε βίαν, "the might of Pelops." Pindar uses the same construction of Oinomaos (88): Οἰνομάου βίαν, "the might of Oinomaos." This combination of the noun βία, "might," and another noun or personal pronoun in the genitive case occurs five other times in Pindar's victory odes but nowhere else in Bacchylides.[396] The two uses, then, of this construction, which represents a sort of Pindaric mannerism, in reference to Pelops and Oinomaos, are conspicuous.[397] Perhaps Bacchylides even suggests that Pelops acquires or receives the might of Oinomaos when he succeeds in the contest.[398] What appears as a possession of the murderous father-in-law in Olympian 1 becomes a possession of the son-in-law in Bacchylides 5.

The technique of Pindar and Bacchylides modifying each other's language continues at line 183 of Bacchylides 5: ποσσὶ νικάσας δρόμῳ, "victorious with his feet in the race." I would suggest that these three words correspond elliptically to the contents of lines 93-99 of Pindar's victory ode:

τὸ δὲ κλέος
τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν **δρόμοις**
Πέλοπος, ἵνα ταχυτὰς **ποδῶν** ἐρίζεται 95
ἀκμαί τ' ἰσχύος θρασύπονοι·
ὁ **νικῶν** δὲ λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίοτον
ἔχει μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν

ἀέθλων γ' ἕνεκεν·

The fame of the Olympic festivals in the racecourses of Pelops shines afar, where there is competition for swiftness of feet and boldly laboring feats of strength, and for

[395] Lefkowitz (1976) 91 associates Pherenikos with Poseidon's tireless horses.
[396] P. 11.61, N. 5.12, 10.73, 11.22, I. 8.54.
[397] For further discussion of this construction, see Gerber (1982) 137.
[398] For discussion of Pelops' actions of taking and receiving from Oinomaos, see Segal (1964) 222-23 and Gerber (1982) 136-37.

> the rest of his life the victorious man possesses honied fair weather on account of contests.

The three words that comprise line 183 of Bacchylides 5 all occur in adapted form in lines 94-99 of Olympian 1: δρόμῳ corresponds to δρόμοις (94), ποσσί to ποδῶν (95), and νικάσας to νικῶν (97). Looking at this passage in Pindar's poem, we notice that δρόμοις (94), ποδῶν (95), and νικῶν (97) appear in descending sequence from the right to the left side of the column. Perhaps the placement of these words caught Bacchylides' eye, prompting him to compose a line consisting of them, or the efficiency of Bacchylides' language struck Pindar. In either case the effect of Bacchylides' phrase is to reshape Pindar's general description of the athletic contests at Olympia, refocusing its essential features around the triumphant figure of Pherenikos: Hieron's horse vied ἐν δρόμοις (94), "in the racecourses," exhibiting his ταχυτὰς ποδῶν (95), "swiftness of feet," and ultimately emerging νικῶν (97), "victorious."

Bacchylides concludes with the image of Pherenikos bearing εὐδαιμονίας πέταλον (186), "a leaf of blessedness," to Hieron in Syracuse. These two words both mirror language used by Pindar in Olympian 1. The noun εὐδαιμονίας (186), "blessedness," offers a substitution for and expansion of εὐδίαν (98), "fair weather."[399] The meaning of these two terms is virtually identical, as εὐδίαν (98) is a metaphor describing the feeling of supreme calm experienced by victorious athletes, and the word εὐδαιμονία contains εὐδία (εὐδ-αιμον-ία).[400] I would further suggest that the noun πέταλον (186), "leaf," reflects the idea inherent in the verb στεφανῶσαι (100), "to crown." In the final triad, Pindar asserts that he must στεφανῶσαι κεῖνον ἱππίῳ νόμῳ Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ (101-03), "crown that man with an equestrian melody in Aeolic song." This image of a πέταλον (186) metonymically encapsulates the notion of crowning.

The case of Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5 demonstrates that reception can occur even during the process of composition. Perhaps Bacchylides, examining an early draft of Olympian 1, chose to encode a tribute to Pindar's victory ode within his own. Or did Pindar discover in this brief passage the inspiration for his most famous poem? I would also suggest that some combination of these two scenarios is possible. Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5 reinforce each other in their collective mission of praise. Both poems establish the primacy of Hieron, aligning him with Zeus and Pelops as a founder and ruler, while envisioning the triumphant strides of Pherenikos. I believe that, after the audience had witnessed both victory odes, rather than ranking them against each other, they would have reflected upon the terrible power of Hieron, who brought together the most famous poets in all of Greece to combine in celebrating his immortal victory at Olympia.

The intertextual engagements between victory odes composed to celebrate the same victory take a number of different forms. We have looked at three distinct case studies, each of which offers a unique solution to the problem of coordinated praise of an athletic victor. This diversity of approaches likely stems from the various circumstances in which the poems were produced. I would suggest that the composition of victory odes was a haphazard business. We cannot know how much time typically passed between the commission of a

---

[399] The use of ἐὐδαιμονίας (186) also recalls εὐδαίμων (55) from earlier in the victory ode; cf. Lefkowitz (1969) 88.

[400] Morgan (2015) 245 associates εὐδίαν (98) with the cult honors received by Pelops and Hieron; cf. Slater (1989) 498-99.

victory ode and the festival at which it was performed, but it is easy to imagine the incessant pressure to devise a suitable response to the poetic task at hand. Pindar and Bacchylides must have been particularly adept at discovering ways to accommodate the unexpected. The paired poems that we have examined bear witness to the spirit of ingenuity and experimentation that fired the genre.

Pythian 4 and Pythian 5 combine to articulate a conception of proper benefaction as predicated upon the subordination of one's largesse to the public good. Pythian 5 positions Karrhotos as the ideal benefactor. Pindar describes his preservation and dedication of the winning chariot in the temple of Apollo at Delphi, which makes his victory an act of public munificence. The final triad of Pythian 4 articulates a plea on behalf of Damophilos, a former citizen banished for his participation in revolutionary activities. Damophilos presents the victory ode as a gift for Arkesilas and Kyrene as a whole. Pindar depicts these two figures as mirror images of one another, casting Karrhotos as an exemplum and Damophilos as an aspiring benefactor who hopes to reenter the aristocratic life of the city.

Nemean 5 and Bacchylides 13 articulate between themselves a multigenerational scheme comparing Pytheas' family of athletes to the Aiakidai. Both victory odes focus on moments of potential crisis for the enduring fame of that mythological lineage. Nemean 5 relates the attempted seduction of Peleus by Hippolyta, which would have prevented the hero's marriage to Thetis and the eventual birth of Achilles. Bacchylides 13 recounts Achilles' departure from the fighting at Troy. Each victory ode briefly draws attention to an auxiliary member of the Aiakidai before transitioning to the true topic. This emphasis upon strenuous predicaments makes the central comparison of Pytheas to Achilles especially stark. We realize that Pytheas, like Achilles, represents the inevitable culmination of his family's notable achievements.

Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5 offer a different model of interaction from the other case studies. Bacchylides ends his mythological narrative of Herakles and Meleager in the underworld by asking Kalliope to sing a list of themes that mirrors the essential points of Pindar's victory ode. This speaks to a close textual engagement between the two poets, who must have shared drafts of their respective poems. Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 5 reinforce each other by echoing the same language and invoking the same images of athletic excellence. The ultimate effect of both poems is to formulate a shared program of praise that associates Hieron with Zeus and Pelops.

I hope that these three case studies have demonstrated the intricate ways in which the handful of victory odes composed to celebrate the same victories interact and engage with each other. The poets managed, both individually and in collaboration, to construct elaborate encomiastic architectures across the scope of multiple poems. These cases attest to the inventiveness and experimentation that defined the genre. Faced with a diverse range of commissions, the poets continuously discovered novel strategies to satisfy their patrons.

Bibliography

Adorno, T. W. *Aesthetic Theory*. Translated and edited by R. Hullot-Kentor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Anzai, M. "First-Person Forms in Pindar: A Re-Examination." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 39 (1994): 141-50.

Athanassaki, L. "Transformations of Colonial Disruption into Narrative Continuity in Pindar's Epinician Odes." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101 (2003): 93-128.

Barrett, W. "Pindar and Psaumis: *Olympians* 4 and 5." In *Greek Lyric*, *Tragedy*, *and Textual Criticism*: *Collected Papers*, 38-53. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Barron, J. P. "Ibycus: *Gorgias* and Other Poems." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 31 (1984): 13-24.

Beck, D. *Homeric Conversation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Bernsdorff, H. "Offene Gedichtschlüsse." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 153 (2005): 1-6.

Best, S. and S. Marcus. "Surface Reading: An Introduction." *Representations* 108 (2009): 1-21.

Boeke, H. *The Value of Victory in Pindar's Odes*: *Gnomai*, *Cosmology and the Role of the Poet*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.

Bonifazi, A. "Relative Pronouns and Memory: Pindar beyond Syntax." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 102 (2004): 41-68.

Bowra, C. M. "Pindar, *Pythian XI*." *The Classical Quarterly* 30 (1936): 129-41.

———. *Pindar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Brannan, P. T. "Hieron and Bacchylides: An Analysis of Bacchylides' *Fifth Ode*." *Classical Folia* 26 (1972): 185-278.

Braswell, B. K. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1988.

———. *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One*. Fribourg: University Press Fribourg Switzerland, 1992.

Bremer, J. M. "Pindar's Paradoxical Ἐγώ and a Recent Controversy about the Performance of His Epinicia." In *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric*: *Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Vrijie Universiteit Amsterdam*, edited by S. R. Slings, 41-58. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1990.

Budelmann, F. "Epinician and the Symposion: A Comparison with the Enkomia." In *Reading the Victory Ode*, edited by Agócs, P., Carey, C., and R. Rawles, 173-90. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Bundy, E. L. "The 'Quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios' Part 1: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's 'Hymn to Apollo.'" *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5 (1972): 39-94.

———. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Burckhardt, J. *The Greeks and Greek Civilization*. Translated by S. Stern and edited by O. Murray. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Burnett, A. P. *Three Archaic Poets*: *Archilochus*, *Alcaeus*, *Sappho*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1983.

———. *The Art of Bacchylides*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1985.

———. “Performing Pindar’s Odes.” *Classical Philology* 84 (1989): 283-93.
———. *Pindar’s Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
Burton, R. W. B. *Pindar’s Pythian Odes*, *Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
Bury, J. B. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. London and New York: MacMillan and Co., 1890.
Cairns, D. L. “Form and Meaning in Bacchylides’ Fifth Ode.” *Scholia* 6 (1997): 34-48.
Calame, C. *Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*. Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo & Bizzarri, 1977.
———. “Narrative Semantics and Pragmatics: The Poetic Creation of Cyrene.” In *Approaches to Greek Myth*, edited by L. Edmunds, 280-352. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014.
Campbell, D. A. *Greek Lyric*, *Volume 1*: *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
Cannatà Fera, M. “Poesia e statuaria: gli eroi argivi di Pindaro e di Antifane.” In *La città di Argo*: *mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche*, edited by P. A. Bernardini, 95-106. Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 2004.
Caprioli, M. “On Alcaeus 42, Voigt.” *The Classical Quarterly* N.S. 62 (2012): 22-38.
Carey, C. “Three Myths in Pindar: N. 4, O. 9, N. 3.” *Eranos* 78 (1980a): 143-62.
———. “The Epilogue of Pindar’s Fourth Pythian.” *Maia* 32 (1980b): 143-53.
———. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*: *Pythian* 2, *Pythian* 9, *Nemean* 1, *Nemean* 7, *Isthmian* 8. Salem, NH: Ayer Co., 1981.
———. “The Performance of the Victory Ode.” *American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 545-65.
———. “The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus.” *Classical Philology* 86 (1991): 192-200.
Carne-Ross, D. S. “*The Gaiety of Language*.” *Arion* 1 (1962): 65-88.
———. *Pindar*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
Carpenter, R. *Beyond the Pillars of Heracles*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1966.
Carson, A. “Wedding at Noon in Pindar’s Ninth Pythian.” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 23 (1982): 121-28.
———. “Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, Dirt, and Desire.” In *Before Sexuality*: *The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Halperin, D. M., Winkler, J. J., and F. I. Zeitlin, 135-69. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
Collins, D. *Master of the Game*: *Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
Crotty, K. *Song and Action*: *The Victory Odes of Pindar*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
Currie, B. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
D’Alessio, G. B. “First-Person Problems in Pindar.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 39 (1994): 117-34.
Daniel, R. W. and M. Gronewald. “Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus.” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 147 (2004a): 1-8.
———. “Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus.” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 149 (2004b): 1-4.

Davies, M. “Monody, Choral Lyric, and the Tyranny of the Handbook.” *The Classical Quarterly* 38 (1988): 52-64.
Day, J. W. “Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96 (1994): 37–74.
Dickson, K. “Voice and Sign in Pindar.” *Ramus* 19 (1990): 109-29.
Dissen, L. G. *Pindari Carmina quae supersunt cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis ex recensione Boeckhii commentario perpetuo illustravit Ludolphus Dissenius*. Gothae: Sumptibus Guil. Hennings, 1830.
Dougherty, C. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
Drachmann, A. B. *Moderne Pindarfortolkning*. Copenhagen: Forlagt af Universitets Boghandler, 1891.
———. *Scholia vetera in Pindari Carmina*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903-27.
Dräger, P. *Argo pasimelousa*: *der Argonautenmythos in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1993.
Drexler, H. “Nachträge zur Kyrenesage.” *Hermes* 66 (1931): 455-64
Düring, I. “Klytaimestra—νηλὴς γυνά. A Study of the Development of a Literary Motif.” *Eranos* 41 (1943): 91-123.
Eckerman, C. C. “Was Epinician Poetry Performed at Panhellenic Sanctuaries?” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 52 (2012): 338-60.
Edmunds, L. “Tithonus in the "New Sappho" and the Narrated Mythical Exemplum in Archaic Greek Poetry.” In *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues*, edited by Greene, E. and M. B. Skinner, 58-70. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.
Elsaesser, T. “Tales of Sound and Fury: Observations on the Family Melodrama. In *Home Is Where the Heart Is*: *Studies in Melodrama and the Women*’*s Film*, edited by C. Gledhill, 43-69. London: British Film Institute, 1987.
Färber, H. *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*. Munich: Neuer Filser-Verlag, 1936.
Farnell, L. R. *The Works of Pindar*: *Translated with Literary and Critical Commentaries*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1930-32.
Fearn, D. W. *Bacchylides*: *Politics*, *Performance*, *Poetic Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
———. “Aeginetan Epinician Culture: Naming, Ritual, and Politics.” In *Aegina*: *Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry. Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC*, edited by D. W. Fearn, 175–226. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2011.
———. “*Kleos* v Stone? Lyric Poetry and Contexts for Memorialization.” In *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, edited by Liddel, P. and P. Low, 231–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
———. *Pindar’s Eyes*: *Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
Felski, R. “Critique and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion.” *M/C Journal* 15 (2012).
———. *The Limits of Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.
Felson, N. “Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar’s Pythian Four.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 99 (1999): 1-31.
———. “The Poetic Effects of Deixis in Pindar’s Ninth Pythian Ode.” *Arethusa* 37 (2004): 365-89.

Felson Rubin, N. "Narrative Structure in Pindar's Ninth Pythian." *Classical World* 71 (1978): 353-67.
Fennell, C. A. M. *The Nemean and Isthmian Odes with Notes Explanatory and Critical*, *Introductions*, *and Introductory Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899.
Ferrari, G. *Alcman and the Cosmos of Sparta*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
Finglass, P. J. *Pindar*: *Pythian Eleven*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Finley, J. H. *Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.
Ford, A. *The Origins of Criticism*: *Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
Foster, J. A. *Structured Polyphony*: *Narrative Framing and Reception in Theocritus*, *Idylls* 6, 15 *and* 24. Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2002.
Foster, M. "Hagesias as Sunoikistêr: Seercraft and Colonial Ideology in Pindar's Sixth *Olympian* Ode." *Classical Antiquity* 32 (2013): 283-321.
Fowler, D. "Taplin on Cocks." *The Classical Quarterly* 39 (1989): 257-59.
———. *Roman Constructions*: *Readings in Postmodern Latin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Frame, D. *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
Gallagher, C. *The Industrial Reformation of English Fiction*: *Social Discourse and Narrative Form*, *1832-1867*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
Gelzer, T. "*Mousa Authigenes*: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien." *Museum Helveticum* 42 (1985): 95-120.
Gerber, D. E. *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
———. "Pindar's *Olympian* Four: A Commentary." *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 25 (1987): 7-24.
Gibson, J. J. "The Theory of Affordances." In *Perceiving*, *Acting*, *and Knowing*, edited by Shaw, R. E. and J. Bransford, 67-82. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977.
Gigante, G. E. V. "Per Pindaro Narratore: in margine alla IV Pitica." *Annali della facoltà di Lettere*, *Naples* 17 (1974/75): 27-41.
Gildersleeve, B. L. *The Olympian and Pythian Odes*: *with an Introductory Essay, Notes, and Indexes*. New York: Harper, 1885.
Gledhill, C. "The Melodramatic Field: An Investigation." In *Home Is Where the Heart Is*: *Studies in Melodrama and the Women's Film*, edited by C. Gledhill, 4-42. London: British Film Institute, 1987.
Golann, C. P. "The Third Stasimon of Euripides' Helena." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 76 (1945): 31-46.
Goldhill, S. "Narrative Structure in Bacchylides 5." *Eranos* 81 (1983): 65-81.
Grant, B. K. *Film Genre*: *From Iconography to Ideology*. London and New York: Wallflower, 2007.
Greenblatt, S. *Renaissance Self-fashioning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Griffith, M. "Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry." In *Cabinet of the Muses*: *Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*, edited by Griffith, M. and D. Mastronarde, 185-207. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
Griffith, R. D. "In the Dark Backward: Time in Pindaric Narrative." *Poetics Today* 14 (1993): 607-23.

Halliwell, F. S. "Aristophanes' Apprenticeship." *The Classical Quarterly* 30 (1980): 33-45.
———. "Authorial Collaboration in the Athenian Comic Theatre." *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 30 (1989): 515-528.
Harvey, A. E. "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry." *The Classical Quarterly* N.S. 5 (1955): 157-75.
Heath, M. "Alcaeus, Thetis, Helen." *Hermes* 114 (1986): 257-62.
———. "Receiving the Κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician." *American Journal of Philology* 109 (1988): 180-95.
Heath, M. and M. R. Lefkowitz. "Epinician Performance." *Classical Philology* 86 (1991): 173-91.
Henrichs, A. "Dancing in Athens, Dancing on Delos: Some Patterns of Choral Projection in Euripides." *Philologus* 140 (1996): 48-62.
Henry, W. B. *Pindar's Nemeans*, *A Selection*: *Edition and Commentary*. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2005.
Herington, J. "Pindar's Eleventh Pythian Ode and Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*." In *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*: *Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, edited by D. E. Gerber, 137-46. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.
———. *Poetry into Drama*: *Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
Herter, H. "Ein Neues Türwunder: Zu Pind. Nem. I und Theokrit. id. XXIV." *Rheinisches Museum* 89 (1940): 152-57.
Hinds, S. *Allusion and Intertext*: *Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Hornblower, S. *Thucydides and Pindar*: *Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
Hubbard, T. K. *The Pindaric Mind*: *A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
———. "Envy and the Invisible Roar." *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 31 (1990): 343-51.
———. "Pylades and Orestes in Pindar's *Eleventh Pythian*: The Uses of Friendship." In *Allusion*, *Authority*, *and Truth*: *Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis*, edited by Mitsis, P. and C. Tsagalis, 187-200. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010.
Hummel, P. *La Syntaxe de Pindare*. Louvain: Peeters, 1993.
Hutchinson, G. O. "Propertius and the Unity of the Book." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 74 (1984): 99-106.
Huxley, G. *Pindar's Vision of the Past*. Belfast: The Author, 1975.
Illig, L. *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen*. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1932.
Instone, S. J. "Pythian 11: Did Pindar Err?" *The Classical Quarterly* N.S. 36 (1986): 86-94.
Itsumi, K. *Pindaric Metre*: *The* '*Other Half*'. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Jakob, D. J. "Nature vs. Culture in Pindar's Ninth Pythian." *Mètis* 9-10 (1994): 425-31.
Janko, R. *Homer*, *Hesiod*, *and the Hymns*: *Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
Jebb, R. C. *Bacchylides*: *The Poems and Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.

Karachalios, F. “Mythical Inversions and History in Bacchylides 5.” *Princeton/ Stanford Working Papers in Classics* (2009): 1-28.
Kirkwood, G. M. “The Narrative Art of Bacchylides.” In *The Classical Tradition*: *Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, edited by L. Wallach, 98-114. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1966.
Köhnken, A. *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar; Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971.
Kowalzig, B. *Singing for the Gods*: *Performance of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
Krummen, E. *Pyrsos Hymnon: festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1990.
Kurke, L. “The Poet’s Pentathlon: Genre in Pindar’s First *Isthmian*.” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 29 (1988): 97-113.
———. *The Traffic in Praise*: *Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
———. “The Economy of Kudos.” In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, edited by Dougherty, C. and L. Kurke, 131-63. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
———. “The Cultural Impact of (on) Democracy: Decentering Tragedy.” In *Democracy* 2500*?*: *Questions and Challenges*, edited by Morris. I and K. Raaflaub, 155-69. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., 1998.
———. “Archaic Greek Poetry. In *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*, edited by H. A. Shapiro, 141-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
———. “Pindar’s *Pythian* 11 and the *Oresteia*: Contestatory Ritual Poetics in the 5th c. BCE.” *Classical Antiquity* 32 (2013): 101-75.
———. “Gendered Spheres and Mythic Models in Sappho’s Brothers Poem.” In *The Newest Sappho*: *P*. *Sapph*. *Obbink and P*. *GC inv*. *105*, *Frs*. *1-4*, edited by Bierl, A. and A. Lardinois, 238-65. Leiden: Brill, 2016a.
———. “Pindar’s Material Imaginary: Dedication and Politics in Olympian 7.” UCL Housman Lecture (2016b): 1-43.
———. “The ‘Rough Stones’ of Aegina: Pindar, Pausanias, and the Topography of Aeginetan Justice.” *Classical Antiquity* 36 (2017): 236-87.
Kyriakou, P. “Poet, Victory, and Justice in Bacchylides.” *Philologus* 145 (2001): 16-33.
Lardinois, A. “Sappho’s Brothers Song and the Fictionality of Early Greek Lyric Poetry.” In *The Newest Sappho*: *P*. *Sapph*. *Obbink and P*. *GC inv*. *105*, *Frs*. *1-4*, edited by Bierl, A. and A. Lardinois, 167-87. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
Lattimore, R. *The Odes of Pindar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.
Lefkowitz, M. R. “Bacchylides’ Ode 5: Imitation and Originality.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 73 (1969): 45-96.
———. *The Victory Ode*: *An Introduction*. Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes Press, 1976.
———. “Pindar’s *Pythian V*.” *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt* 31 (1985): 33-69.
———. *First-Person Fictions*. *Pindar’s Poetic ‘I’*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
———. “The First Person in Pindar Reconsidered — Again.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 40 (1995): 139-50.

Levine, C. *Forms*: *Whole*, *Rhythm*, *Hierarchy*, *Network*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.
Levinson, M. "What is New Formalism?" *PMLA* 122 (2007): 558-69.
Lewis, M. *The Undoing Project*: *A Friendship that Changed Our Minds*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2017.
Lewis, V. *Myth*, *Locality*, *and Identity in Pindar's Sicilian Odes*. Ph.D. diss. University of California, Berkeley, 2014.
———. *Myth*, *Locality*, *and Identity in Pindar*'s *Sicilian Odes*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.
Lidov, J. "Meter and Metrical Style of the New Poem" In *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues*, edited by Greene, E. and M. B. Skinner, 103-17. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.
Longley-Cook, I. A. *A Literary Study of Pindar's Fourth and Fifth Pythian Odes*. Ph.D. diss. University of St Andrews, 1989.
Loscalzo, D. *La parola inestinguibile*: *studi sull'epinicio pindarico*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 2003.
Luraghi, N. *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia*: *da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*. Firenze: L.S. Olschki, 1994.
Lye, C. "Racial Form." *Representations* 104 (2008): 92-101.
Mackie, H. S. *Graceful Errors*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.
Mäder, W. *Die Psaumis-Oden* Pindars (*O*. 4 *und O*. 5): *ein Kommentar*. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1990.
Maehler, H. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, *I*: *Die Siegeslieder*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
———. *Bacchylides*: *A Selection*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Martin, R. P. *The Language of Heroes*: *Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
———. "Synchronic Aspects of Homeric Performance: The Evidence of the Hymn to Apollo." In *Una Nueva Visión de la Cultura Griega Antigua hacia el Fin del Milenio*, edited by M. González de Tobia, 403-32. La Plata, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de La Plata, 2000.
Martindale, C. *Redeeming the Text*: *Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
Mastromarco, G. "L'esordio 'segreto' di Aristofane." *Quaderni di storia* 10 (1979): 153-96.
Mastronarde, D. J. *Euripides*: *Medea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
Mezger, F. *Pindars Siegeslieder*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1880.
Miller, A. "Pindaric Mimesis: The Associative Mode." *Classical Journal* 89 (1993) 21-53.
Molyneux, J. H. "Simonides and the Dioscuri." *Phoenix* 25 (1971): 197-205.
Moretti, F. *Signs Taken for Wonders*: *On the Sociology of Literary Forms*. London and New York: Verso, 2005.
Morgan, K. A. "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ." *Classical Philology* 88 (1993): 1-15.
———. *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B. C.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
Morrison, A. D. *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2007.

———. “Performance, Reperformance, and Pindar’s Audiences.” In *Reading the Victory Ode*, edited by Agócs, P., Carey, C., and R. Rawles, 111-33. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
Most, G. W. “Poet and Public: Communicative Strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides.” In *Reading the Victory Ode*, edited by Agócs, P., Carey, C., and R. Rawles, 249-76. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
Mullen, W. *Choreia*: *Pindar and Dance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
Nagy, G. *Pindar’s Homer*: *The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
Nicholson, N. J. *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
———. “Pindar’s *Olympian* 4: Psaumis and Camarina after the Deinomenids.” *Classical Philology* 106 (2011): 93-114.
———. *The Poetics of Victory in the Greek West*: *Epinician*, *Oral Tradition*, *and the Deinomenid Empire*. New York, Oxford University Press, 2015.
Nikolaidou-Arabatzi, S. “Choral Projections and *Embolima* in Euripides’ Tragedies.” *Greece & Rome* 62 (2015): 25-47.
Norman, D. *Design of Everyday Things*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
Obbink, D. “Two New Poems by Sappho.” Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 189 (2014): 32-49.
———. “Goodbye Family Gloom! The Coming of Charaxos in the Brothers Song.” In *The Newest Sappho*: *P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105*, *Frs. 1-4*, edited by Bierl, A. and A. Lardinois, 208-24. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
O’Sullivan, P. “Victory Statue, Victory Song: Pindar’s Agonistic Poetics and Its Legacy.” In *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Phillips, D. and J. Pritchard, 75–100. Classical Press of Wales: Swansea, 2003.
Pavlou, M. “Pindar *Nemean* 5: Real and Poetic Statues.” *Phoenix* 64 (2010): 1–17.
Pelliccia, H. *Mind*, *Body*, *and Speech in Homer and Pindar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1995.
Peponi, A. “Sparta’s Prima Ballerina: *Choreia* in Alcman 3 *PMGF*.” *The Classical Quarterly* 57 (2007): 351-62.
———. *Frontiers of Pleasure*: *Models of Aesthetic Response in Archaic and Classical Greek Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
———. “Sappho and the Mythopoetics of the Domestic.” In *The Newest Sappho*: *P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105*, *Frs. 1-4*, edited by Bierl, A. and A. Lardinois, 225-37. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
Péron, J. *Les Images Maritimes de Pindare*. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1974.
Perrotta, G. *Safo e Pindaro*. Bari: G. Laterza, 1935.
Petrucione, J. “The Role of the Poet and His Song in Nemean 1.” *American Journal of Philology* 107 (1986): 34-45.
Pfeijffer, I. L. “The Date of Pindar’s Fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides’ Thirteenth Ode.” *The Classical Quarterly* 45 (1995): 318–32.
———. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar*: *A Commentary on Nemean V*, *Nemean III*, *& Pythian VIII*. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999.
Power, T. “The ‘Parthenoi’ of Bacchylides 13.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100 (2000): 67-81.

Privitera, G. A. “Eracle nella prima nemea.” *Giornale italiano di filologia: rivista trimestrale di cultura* 3 (1972): 28-51.
———. *Le istmiche*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1982.
Race, W. H. “Some Digressions and Returns in Greek Authors.” *Classical Journal* 76 (1980): 1-8.
———. *Pindar*. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
———. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1990.
Radt, S. L. “Pindars Erste Nemeische Ode: Versuch Einer Interpretation.” *Mnemosyne* 19 (1966): 148-74.
Rawles, R. “Early Epinician: Ibycus and Simonides.” In *Reading the Victory Ode*, edited by Agócs, P., Carey, C., and R. Rawles, 3-27. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
Resinski, R. “Deianeira's Neck in Bacchylides, *Ode* 5.” *Helios* 27 (2000): 3-14.
Ricoeur, P. *Freud and Philosophy*: *An Essay on Interpretation*. Translated by D. Savage. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.
Robbins, E. I. “Jason and Cheiron: The Myth of Pindar's Fourth Pythian.” *Phoenix* 29 (1975): 205-13.
———. “Cyrene and Cheiron: The Myth of Pindar's Ninth Pythian.” *Phoenix* 32 (1978): 91-104.
———. “Pindar's Oresteia and the Tragedians.” In *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy*: *Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher*, edited by Cropp, M., Fantham, E., and S. E. Scully, 1-11. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986.
———. “Nereids with Golden Distaffs: Pindar, *Nem*. 5.” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 25 (1987): 25–33.
———. “Epinikion.” *Der Neue Pauly* 3 (1997): 1147-48.
Robert, C. “Theseus und Meleagros bei Bakchylides.” *Hermes* 33 (1898):130-59.
Romm, J. S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
Rose, P. W. “The Myth of Pindar's First Nemean: Sportsmen, Poetry, and Paideia.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 78 (1974): 145-75.
Rosenmeyer, T. G. “The Rookie, A Reading of Pindar ‘Nemean’ 1.” *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 2 (1969): 233-46.
Rösler, W. *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*. Munich: W. Fink, 1980.
Rossi, S. “La composizione tecnica delle ode di Bacchilide.” *Rivista storica dell'Antichità* N.S. 7 (1903): 472-88.
Rutherford, I. “Odes and Ends: Closure in Greek Lyric.” In *Classical Closure*: *Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, edited by Roberts, D. H., Dunn, F. M., and D. Fowler, 43-61. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
Sandgren, F. “Funktion der Reden in Pindars Pythia IV.” *Eranos* 70 (1972): 12-22.
Sandys, J. *The Odes of Pindar*: *Including the Principal Fragments with an Introduction and an English Translation*. London: W. Heinemann, 1919.
Schadewaldt, W. *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1928.
Schmidt, D. A. “The Performance of Bacchylides *Ode* 5.” *The Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987): 20-23.

Schulten, A. “Die Säulen des Herakles.” In *Die Strasse von Gibraltar*, edited by O. Jessep, 174-206. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1927.
Schwartz, J. *Pseudo-Hesiodeia: Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'oeuvres attribuées à Hésiode*. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
Scott-Baumann, A. *Ricoeur and the Hermeneutics of Suspicion*. London and New York: Continuum, 2009.
Segal, C. P. “God and Man in Pindar’s First and Third Olympian Odes.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1964): 211-67.
———. “Arrest and Movement: Pindar’s Fifth Nemean.” *Hermes* 102 (1974a): 397–411.
———. “Time and the Hero: The Myth of *Nemean* 1.” *Rheinisches Museum* 117 (1974b): 29-39.
———. “Bacchylides Reconsidered: Epithets and the Dynamics of Lyric Narrative.” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* No. 22 (1976): 99-130.
———. *Pindar’s Mythmaking*: *The Fourth Pythian Ode*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
———. “Sacrifice and Violence in the Myth of Meleager and Heracles: Homer, Bacchylides, Sophocles.” *Helios* 17 (1990): 7-24.
Sevieri, R. “Un eroe in cerca d'identità: Oreste nella Pitica XI di Pindaro per Trasideo di Tebe.” *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 43 (1999): 77-110.
Sidwell, K. “Authorial Collaboration? Aristophanes’ *Knights* and Eupolis.” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 34 (1993): 365-89.
Sigelman, A. C. *Pindar’s Poetics of Immortality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
Slater, N. J. *Plautus in Performance*: *The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
Slater, W. J. “Simonides’ House.” *Phoenix* 26 (1972): 232-40.
———. “Pindar’s Myths: Two Pragmatic Explanations.” In *Arktouros*: *Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of His* 65*th Birthday*, edited by Bowersock, G. W. Burkert, W., and M. C. J. Putnam, 63-70. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1979.
———. “Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle.” *Classical Antiquity* 2 (1983): 117-32/
———. “*Nemean One*. The Victor’s Return in Poetry and Politics.” In *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. *Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, edited by D. E. Gerber, 241-64. Chico: Scholar’s Press, 1984.
———. “Pelops at Olympia.” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 30 (1989): 485-501.
Slatkin, L. M. *The Power of Thetis*: *Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
Sobak, R. “Dance, Deixis, and the Performance of Kyrenean Identity: A Thematic Commentary on Pindar’s *Fifth Pythian*.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 107 (2013): 99-153.
Steffen, W. “Bacchylides’ Fifth Ode.” *Eos* 51 (1961): 11-20.
Stehle, E. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece*: *Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
———. “Larichos in the Brothers Poem: Sappho Speaks Truth to the Wine-Pourer.” In *The Newest Sappho*: *P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105*, *Frs. 1-4*, edited by Bierl, A. and A. Lardinois, 266-92. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Steiner, D. T. “Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete’s Allure.” *Classical Antiquity* 17 (1998): 123–50.
———. *Images in Mind*: *Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Stern, J. H. “The Imagery of Bacchylides’ *Ode* 5.” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 6 (1967): 35-43.
———. “The Myths of Pindar’s Nemean 10.” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 10 (1969): 125-32.
Studniczka, F. *Kyrene: Eine altgriechische Göttin*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1890.
Svarlien, D. A. “Reversal of Imagery and Values in Bacchylides 3 and 5.” *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 50 (1995): 35-45.
Swift, L. A. *The Hidden Muse*: *Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
Tarkow, T. A. “Dependence on Externals: The Role of Animals in Bacchylides’ *Ode* 5.” *Rivista di studi classici* 26 (1978): 379-87.
Turyn, A. *Pindari Carmina*, *cum Fragmentis*, *Edidit Alexander Turyn*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
Uhlig, A. *Script and Song in Pindar and Aeschylus*. Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2011.
———. *Theatrical Reenactment in Pindar and Aeschylus*. Forthcoming.
Van der Valk, M. “On the God Cronus.” *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 26 (1985): 5-11.
Van Wees, H. “A Brief History of Tears: Gender Differentiation in Archaic Greece.” In *When Men Were Men*: *Masculinity*, *Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, edited by Foxhall, L. and J. Salmon, 10-53. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
Watkins, C. *How to Kill a Dragon*: *Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
West, M. L. “Other Early Poetry.” In *Ancient Greek Literature*, edited by K. J. Dover, 29-49. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
———. “The Invention of Homer.” *The Classical Quarterly* 49 (1999): 364-82.
———. “The New Sappho.” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 151 (2005): 1-9.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. *Pindaros*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922.
Williams, L. “Film Bodies: Gender, Genre, and Excess.” *Film Quarterly* 44 (1991): 2-13.
———. “Melodrama Revised.” In *Refiguring American Film Genres*: *Theory and History*, edited by N. Brownem 42-88. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
Wilson, P. “The Politics of Dance: Dithyrambic Contest and Social Order in Ancient Greece.” In *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Phillips, D. J. and D. Pritchard, 163-96. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2003.
Wind, R. L. *Bacchylides’ Odes* 5, 17 *and* 18: *A Study in Point of View*. Ph.D. diss., State University of Iowa, 1964.
Winkler, J. J. “The Ephebes’ Song: *Tragōidia* and *Polis*.” In *Nothing to Do with Dionysus*? *Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, edited by Winkler, J. J. and F. I. Zeitlin, 20-62. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
Winnington-Ingram, R. P. “Pindar’s Ninth Pythian Ode.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16 (1969): 9-15.
Wohl, V. *Euripides and the Politics of Form*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Woodbury, L. "Apollo's First Love: Pindar, *Pyth*. 9.26 ff." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 103 (1972); 561-73.
———. "Cyrene and the Τελευτά of Marriage in Pindar's Ninth Pythian Ode." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 112 (1982): 245-58.
Young, D. C. *Three Odes of Pindar*: *A Literary Study of Pythian* 11, *Pythian* 3, *and Olympian* 7. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
———. *Pindar Isthmian* 7, *Myth and Exempla*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
———. "'Something Like the Gods': A Pindaric Theme and the Myth of *Nemean* 10." *Greek*, *Roman*, *and Byzantine Studies* 34 (1993): 123-32.